

Westfield City Council Members

Scott Willis, (District 1)
Jake Gilbert, (District 2)
Mike Johns, (District 5)
Troy Patton, (At Large)
Joe Edwards, (District 3)
Cindy L. Spoljaric, (At Large)
Scott Frei, (District 4)



CITY OF WESTFIELD, IN
CityCouncil_Meeting_Agenda_09_12_2022

Monday, September 12, 2022 at 07:00 PM

BOARD OR COMMISSION: City Council Meeting

MEETING DATE: Monday, September 12, 2022 at 07:00 PM

MEETING PLACE: Westfield City Hall- Assembly Room

THE FOLLOWING AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE AT THE DISCRETION OF THE COUNCIL

AGENDA

Pledge of Allegiance

Invocation: Tim Ayers, with Grace Church

Opening of Meeting

Note the presence of a quorum

Announce any changes to Agenda

Approval of Minutes:

Documents: [Meeting Minutes August 22, 2022](#) | [Meeting Minutes August 31, 2022](#)

Claims:

Documents: [Docket for September 12, 2022](#)

Approval of Claims

Miscellaneous Business/Special Recognition:

Proclamation-September as Childhood Cancer Awareness Month

2023 Budget Discussion, Processes and Procedures

Update on PW projects/Capital Improvement Plan**Documents:** [Council Presentation](#)**Non-Residential Data Presentation-Part 2 of 2/Caleb Ernest****Documents:** [Non-Residential Presentation](#)**Old Business:**

REMINDER: PER RESOLUTION 21-121 RELATING TO TRANSPARENCY, COUNCILORS DO NOT NEED TO RECUSE THEMSELVES, BUT ARE REQUIRED TO DISCLOSE IF THEY HAVE RECEIVED CONTRIBUTIONS OF \$1,000 OR MORE WHEN VOTING ON ANY ACTIONS INVOLVING ONE OF THEIR CONTRIBUTORS

Resolution 22-113: Common Council of the City of Westfield Amending in Pertinent Part Resolution 14-122**Council Introduction:** August 22, 2022**Adoption Consideration:** September 12, 2022**Documents:** [Resolution 22-113](#)**Ordinance 22-37: City of Westfield Authorizing the City of Westfield to Become a Member of the Central IN. Regional Development Authority****Council Introduction:** August 22, 2022**Adoption Consideration:** September 12, 2022**Documents:** [Ordinance 22-37](#)**Resolution 22-114: City of Westfield Adopting a Preliminary Strategic Economic Development Plan for Central IN Regional Development Authority****Council Introduction:** August 22, 2022**Adoption Consideration:** September 12, 2022**Documents:** [Resolution 22-114](#)**Ordinance 20-25: Northpoint II PUD****Council Introduction:** July 13, 2020**APC Public Hearing:** February 16, 2022**APC 2nd Public Hearing:** August 15, 2022**APC Negative Recommendation:** August 15, 2022**Adoption Consideration:** August 22, 2022/Vote delayed to next meeting**Adoption Consideration:** September 12, 2022**Documents:** [Ordinance 20-25](#) | [Department Report](#) | [Public Comments updated 9/12 @ 5pm](#)**Ordinance 22-06 Towns @ Union PUD****Council Introduction:** February 14, 2022**APC Public Hearing:** March 7, 2022

APC Recommendation: August 15, 2022

Adoption Consideration: September 12, 2022

Documents: [Ordinance 22-06](#) | [Ordinance 22-06](#) | [Department Report](#) | [Council Presentation](#)

Ordinance 22-31: Amending Provisions in the Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance

Council Introduction: July 11, 2022

APC Public Hearing: August 1, 2022

APC Recommendation: September 6, 2022

Adoption Consideration: September 12, 2022

Documents: [Ordinance 22-31](#) | [Department Report](#)

Ordinance 22-34: Austrian Pine PUD Amendment I

Council Introduction: August 8, 2022

APC Public Hearing: September 6, 2022

Workshop: N/A

Adoption Consideration: September 12, 2022

Documents: [Ordinance 22-34](#) | [Location Map](#) | [Staff Report](#) | [Project Narrative](#) | [OrthoIndy Expansion Site Plan](#) | [OrthoIndy Expansion Renderings](#) | [APC Certification](#)

Ordinance 22-36 Storm Water Utility Rate

Council Introduction: August 8, 2022

Public Hearing: August 22, 2022

Adoption Consideration: September 12, 2022

Documents: [Ordinance 22-36](#)

New Business:

Resolution 22-117: Common Council Declaring a Certain Area Within the City an Economic Revitalization Area, Qualifying Certain Real Property Improvements for Tax Abatement, & Setting the Time and Place for a Public Hearing Regarding the Same (NexCore Companies LLC)

Council Introduction: September 12, 2022

Adoption Consideration: October 10, 2022

Documents: [Resolution 22-117](#) | [Concept Plan](#) | [First Floor Plan](#)

Resolution 22-118: Council Confirming Declaration of a Certain Area Within the City an Economic Revitalization Area

Council Introduction: September 12, 2022

Public Hearing: October 10, 2022

Adoption Consideration: October 24, 2022

Documents: [Resolution 22-118](#)

Ordinance 22-38: Osborne Trails, Phase 8 Annexation

Council Introduction: September 12, 2022

Public Hearing: September 12, 2022

Adoption Consideration: October 10, 2022

Documents: [Ordinance 22-38](#) | [Location Map](#)

Ordinance 22-39: Aberdeen Annexation

Council Introduction: September 12, 2022

Public Hearing: September 12, 2022

Adoption Consideration: October 10, 2022

Documents: [Ordinance 22-39](#) | [Location Map](#)

Ordinance 22-40: Wheeler Landing PUD Amendment (Market District)

Council Introduction: September 12, 2022

APC Public Hearing: October 3, 2022

APC Recommendation: TBD

Adoption Consideration: TBD

Documents: [Ordinance 22-40](#) | [Project Narrative](#) | [Landscape Plan](#)

Guests:

Residents who wish to address the Council.


Clerk Treasurer Comments

City Council Comments

Mayor Comments

Adjourn


Annexation Area



Not To Scale

EXHIBIT LEGEND

- | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|---------|
|  | ANNEXATION AREA |  | PARCELS |
|  | EXISTING CITY LIMITS |  | STREETS |





21068

DAVIS STOKES COLLABORATIVE, P.C.
DSC
ARCHITECTS


GRAND MILLENNIUM MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING

Westfield, Indiana

06.28.22

Schematic Rendering





LOT 1
177,130 SF
4.066 Ac.±

3-STORY
MEDICAL
OFFICE
BUILDING
60,000 RSF
277 PARKING
SPACES
4.40 ACRES

COMMON AR
ENTIRELY D.

DETENTION
N.P. =885
MAX. 100YR=
MIN. TOP OF BAN
BOTTOM=8;

RESOLUTION NUMBER 22-118

CONFIRMATORY RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WESTFIELD, INDIANA CONFIRMING DECLARATION OF A CERTAIN AREA WITHIN THE CITY OF WESTFIELD AN ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION AREA

18th Street Development, LLC (NexCore Companies, LLC)

WHEREAS, 18th Street Development LLC, an Indiana company (“Applicant”), has advised the City of Westfield, Indiana (“City”) that it seeks to undertake certain real property improvements to the area generally located at 535 Park Street, Westfield, Indiana (the “Area”); and

WHEREAS, under I.C. 6-1.1-12.1-1, *et. seq.* (the “Act”), the City, by and through its City Council acting in its capacity as the fiscal body of the City and as the designating body identified in the Act (the “Council”), has the right and opportunity to abate the payment of real property taxes for real estate located within an area declared by the Council to be an Economic Revitalization Area; and

WHEREAS, under the Act, the Council may find that a particular area within the jurisdiction of the City is an Economic Revitalization Area and may, by adoption of a resolution, declare such area to be an Economic Revitalization Area, which resolution must be confirmed, modified, or rescinded; and

WHEREAS, Applicant has duly submitted Statements of Benefits regarding the proposed real estate improvements as required by the Act, along with such related and/or supporting information as the City deems necessary to evaluate Applicant’s request for abatement of real taxes; and

WHEREAS, a duly constituted meeting of the City Council was held on October 10, 2022, at which the Council reviewed and approved the requested real property abatement and declared the Area to be an “Economic Revitalization Area” in accordance with the Act by virtue of Council Resolution 21-117, as amended, adopted and approved as of that date (the “Declaratory Resolution”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to I.C. 6-1.1-12.1-1, *et seq.*, the City Council has properly published a notice of public hearing in the *Indianapolis Star* and the *Times of Noblesville* on, October 14, 2022, and filed the required information with the affected taxing units, as required in I.C. 6-1.1-12.1-2.5; and

WHEREAS, such hearing was held on this night by the City Council and all persons and organizations wishing to express their views were heard and consideration given to any such views; and

WHEREAS, no remonstrance, written or oral, has been filed stating opposition, of any type or character, to the Declaratory Resolution, the designation of the Area as an “Economic Revitalization Area,” or the approval of real property tax abatement.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF
THE CITY OF WESTFIELD, INDIANA AS FOLLOWS:**

SECTION I. It is hereby declared by the Council that the Declaratory Resolution is in all respects hereby confirmed, and the Council further hereby confirms that the SB-1(RP) form filed by Applicant comply with I.C. 6-1.1-12.1-3 and that all qualifications for an economic revitalization area have been met by the Applicant as to the location described in the Declaratory Resolution, and the real property tax abatement is approved as described in the Declaratory Resolution.

SECTION II. This resolution shall be effective immediately upon its passage, subject to any right of appeal as provided by Indiana law.

SECTION III. Upon the adoption of this resolution, the Clerk-Treasurer shall cause a certified copy of this resolution, including the description of the previously described location and attached map, to be filed with the Hamilton County Assessor and/or such other Hamilton County government officials as shall be necessary to make the Applicant eligible to file for real estate and personal property tax abatement as approved by virtue of the Declaratory Resolution and ratified and confirmed by this resolution.

SECTION IV. Following the legally required public notice and conducting of a public hearing on the matter pursuant to such notice, the Council hereby takes final action, as defined in I.C. 6-1.1-12.1-2.5, as of the date hereof, with regard to the designation of the Property as an Economic Revitalization Area, approval of the SB-1(RP) , and the Council’s prior adoption of the Declaratory Resolution.

SECTION V. The Council hereby incorporates the provisions of I.C. 6-1.1-12.1-12 pertaining to the repayment of a deduction falsely obtained for the Economic Revitalization Area confirmed through the adoption of this Resolution

**ALL OF WHICH IS HEREBY ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF WESTFIELD,
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA THIS 10th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2022.**

**WESTFIELD COMMON COUNCIL
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA**

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

ATTEST:

Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security Number in this document, unless required by law: Kai Chuck

I hereby certify that RESOLUTION 22-118 was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield on the _____ day of _____, 2022, at _____ m.

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE Resolution 22-118 I hereby VETO Resolution 22-118
This _____ day of _____, 2022 This _____ day of _____, 2022

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

Prepared By:
Kai Chuck, Economic Development Director
Mayor's Office
City of Westfield, Indiana

EXHIBIT A

Legal Description of Area

TBD

EXHIBIT B

City of Westfield Portal Online Map



9/1/2022, 10:43:33 AM

Rivers & Streams Major Roads Interstates & US Highways

Minor Roads State Highways Subdivisions

City of Westfield
City of Westfield

RESOLUTION 22-114

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF WESTFIELD, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA ADOPTING A PRELIMINARY STRATEGIC ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE CENTRAL INDIANA REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY UNDER IND. CODE §36-7.7 *et. seq.*

WHEREAS, on or around March 18, 2020, Governor Holcomb signed P.L.83-2020 (SEA 350) (the “Act”), which allows eligible political subdivisions located in the Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson Metropolitan Statistical Area to create the Central Indiana Regional Development Authority (the “RDA”) and to carry out its powers as more particularly described in the Act;

WHEREAS, on _____, the Common Council (“Council”) for the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana (“Westfield”) adopted Ordinance No. _____, authorizing Westfield to become a member of the RDA;

WHEREAS, in order to establish the RDA, the fiscal bodies of a combination of any two (2) or more qualified counties or municipalities must adopt a preliminary strategic economic development plan (the “Plan”) by substantially similar resolution;

WHEREAS, the Plan must include provisions and general information concerning (i) the participating members of the RDA, (ii) the membership of the strategy committee, (iii) a timeline for submitting the comprehensive development plan, as defined by the Act, and (iv) a strategy for attracting (or any projected) investments, grants, matching funds, or local tax revenue; and

WHEREAS, the Council now desires to adopt the Plan, as more particularly described in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Common Council for the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, meeting in regular session as follows:

Section 1. The Council hereby approves the Plan, as more particularly described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 2. This Resolution shall be of full force and effect from and upon its adoption and in accordance with Indiana law.

SO RESOLVED, by the Common Council for the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana this _____ day of _____, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Joe Edwards

Joe Edwards

Joe Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

ATTEST:

Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer

I hereby certify that RESOLUTION 22-114 was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield
on the _____ day of _____, 2021, at _____ m.

Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE RESOLUTION 22-114 I hereby VETO RESOLUTION 22- 114
this _____ day of _____, 2022. this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

This document was prepared by Manuel Herceg, Taft Stettinius & Hollister, LLP, One Indiana Square, Suite 3500, Indianapolis, IN 46204 (317-713-3500).

I affirm under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security Number in this document, unless required by law. /s/ Manuel Herceg.

Exhibit A

[*The Plan*]

**CENTRAL INDIANA REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
PRELIMINARY STRATEGIC ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

ARTICLE I

Name and Participating Members

The name of the development authority is the Central Indiana Regional Development Authority (the “RDA”). The RDA may establish such acronyms or abbreviations as may be appropriate for business use, and may establish logos, service marks, or trademarks as may be appropriate to further its purposes, mission recognition and goals.

Subject to taking the enabling actions as provided in Ind. Code §36-7.7 *et. seq.* (the “Act”), the participating members of the RDA may include any eligible political subdivision, described in Ind. Code §36-7.7-2-7, that is located in the Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson Metropolitan Statistical Area (as defined by the United States Census Bureau). It is anticipated that the initial membership will include, without limitation, the following political subdivisions:

- a) The City of Fishers;
- b) The City of Noblesville;
- c) The Consolidated City of Indianapolis;
- d) The City of Westfield;
- e) The City of Carmel;
- f) The Town of Zionsville;
- g) The Town of McCordsville; and
- h) The City of Anderson

All participating members of the RDA are hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Members”.

ARTICLE II

Purpose and Powers

Section 1. General Purpose. The RDA is a separate body corporate and politic that shall carry out the purposes of the Act by: (i) acquiring, constructing, equipping, owning, and financing projects and facilities to or for the benefit of eligible political subdivisions under this article; and (ii) funding and developing: (A) airport authority projects; (B) commuter transportation district and other rail projects and services; (C) regional transportation authority projects and services; (D) economic development projects; (E) intermodal transportation projects; (F) regional trail or greenway projects; (G) regional transportation infrastructure projects under IC 36-9-43; and (H) any other capital infrastructure project that enhances the region with the goal of attracting people or business; that are of regional importance.

Section 2. General Duties. The RDA shall do the following: (i) assist in the coordination of local efforts concerning projects that are of regional importance; (ii) assist a county, a municipality, a commuter transportation district, an airport authority, and a regional transportation authority in coordinating regional transportation and economic development efforts; and (iii) fund projects that are of regional importance, as provided in the Act.

Section 3. General Powers. The RDA may do any of the following: (i) finance, improve, construct, reconstruct, renovate, purchase, acquire, and equip land and projects that are of regional importance; (ii) finance and construct additional improvements to projects or other capital improvements owned by the RDA; (iii) construct or reconstruct highways, roads, and bridges; (iv) acquire land or all or a part of one (1) or more projects from an eligible political subdivision by purchase; (v) acquire all or a part of one (1) or more projects from an eligible political subdivision by purchase to fund or refund indebtedness incurred on account of the projects to enable the eligible political subdivision to make a savings in debt service obligations or lease rental obligations or to obtain relief from covenants that the eligible political subdivision considers to be unduly burdensome; (vi) make grants or provide other financial assistance to or on behalf of the following: (A) a commuter transportation district, (B) an airport authority, (C) a regional transportation authority. A loan, a loan guarantee, a grant, or other financial assistance under this clause may be used by a regional transportation authority for acquiring, improving, operating, maintaining, financing, and supporting the following: (x) bus services (including fixed route services and flexible or demand-responsive services) that are a component of a public transportation system, (y) bus terminals, stations, or facilities or other regional bus authority projects, (D) a county, (E) a municipality; (vii) provide funding to assist a railroad that is providing commuter transportation services in a county containing territory included in the RDA; (viii) provide funding to assist an airport authority located in a county containing territory included in the RDA in the construction, reconstruction, renovation, purchase, lease, acquisition, and equipping of an airport facility or airport project; (ix) provide funding for intermodal transportation projects and facilities; (x) provide funding for regional trails and greenways; (xi) provide funding for economic development projects; (xii) provide funding for regional transportation infrastructure projects under IC 36-9-43; (xiii) hold, use, lease, rent, purchase, acquire, and dispose of by purchase, exchange, gift, bequest, grant, condemnation, lease, or sublease, on the terms and conditions determined by the RDA, any real or personal property; (xiv) after giving notice, enter upon any lots or lands for the purpose of surveying or examining them to determine the location of a project; (xv) make or enter into all contracts and agreements necessary or incidental to the performance of the RDA's duties and the execution of the RDA's powers under this article; (xvi) sue, be sued, plead, and be impleaded; (xvii) design, order, contract for, construct, reconstruct, and renovate a project or improvements to a project; (xviii) appoint an executive director and employ appraisers, real estate experts, engineers, architects, surveyors, attorneys, accountants, auditors, clerks, construction managers, and any consultants or employees who are necessary or desired by the RDA in exercising its powers or carrying out its duties under this article; (xix) accept loans, grants, and other forms of financial assistance from the federal government, the state government, a political subdivision, or any other public or private source; (xx) use the RDA's funds to match federal grants or make loans, loan guarantees, or grants to carry out the RDA's powers and duties under this article; (xxi) except as prohibited by law, take any action necessary to carry out the Act. Projects funded by the RDA must be of regional importance.

ARTICLE III

The Strategy Committee

Section 1. Membership. The management and affairs of the RDA shall be vested in the Strategy Committee (the “Committee”).

Section 2. Committee. The Committee shall consist of (i) the chief executive officer (or their designee) of each political subdivision with a population of 7,500 people or greater (the “Population Threshold”), and (ii) one (1) chief executive officer (or their designee) to collectively represent all political subdivisions who do not meet or exceed the Population Threshold. Each member of the committee, before entering upon the duties of office, must take and subscribe an oath of office under Ind. Code §5-4-1, which shall be endorsed upon the certificate of appointment and filed with the records of the Committee. A member of the committee is not entitled to receive any compensation for performance of the member’s duties. The Committee structure shall be re-evaluated every five (5) years. Service on the Strategy Committee does not constitute a “lucrative office” pursuant to Article II, § 9 of the Indiana Constitution.

Section 3. Chair; Officers. In January of each year, the Committee shall hold an organizational meeting at which the Committee shall elect the following officers from the members of the Committee: (i) chair, (ii) vice chair, and (iii) secretary-treasurer. The affirmative vote of at least a majority of the members of the Committee is necessary to elect an officer under this section. An officer elected under this section serves from the date of the officer’s election until the officer’s successor is elected and qualified.

Section 4. Ex Officio Officer. The Mayor of the Consolidated City of Indianapolis is an *ex officio* officer of the Committee. This appointment is in addition to the committee appointment described in Article III, Section 2.

Section 5. Meetings, Quorum, Affirmative Votes. The committee shall meet at least quarterly. The chair of the Committee or any two (2) members of the committee may call a special meeting of the Committee. A majority of the appointed members of the Committee constitutes a quorum. The affirmative votes of at least a majority of the appointed members of the Committee are necessary to authorize any action of the Committee.

Section 6. Bylaws. The Committee shall adopt the bylaws and rules that the Committee considers necessary for the proper conduct of the Committee's duties and the safeguarding of the RDA’s funds and property.

ARTICLE IV

Regional Strategy Fund

The Committee shall establish and administer a regional strategy fund (the “Fund”) that consists of the following: (i) any payments required under an interlocal agreement for a project that specifically states: (A) the amount for which each member is responsible; and (B) the term of the agreement. The transfers allowed by this subdivision may be made from any local revenue of the county or municipality, including property tax revenue, distributions, incentive payments,

money deposited in the county's or municipality's local major moves construction fund under IC 8-14-16, money received by the county or municipality under a development agreement (as defined by IC 36-1-8-9.5), or any other local revenue that is not otherwise restricted by law or committed for the payment of other obligations; (ii) money received from the federal government; (iii) gifts, contributions, donations, and private grants made to the fund; and (iv) money transferred to the RDA under an interlocal agreement.

The Committee shall designate a participating member to be the administrator of the Fund at no cost to the RDA. The designated member shall only make disbursements pursuant to instructions by the Committee.

ARTICLE V

Comprehensive Strategic Economic Development Plan

The RDA shall prepare a comprehensive strategic economic development plan (“Comprehensive Plan”) to serve as a roadmap to diversify and strengthen the regional economy, establish regional goals and objectives, develop and implement a regional action plan, identify ways to eliminate duplicative government services within the region, and identify investment priorities and funding sources, all in accordance with Ind. Code §36-7.7-3-4.

The RDA shall adopt the Comprehensive Plan by or before December 31, 2022.

ARTICLE VI

Strategy for Attracting Investments

To ensure Central Indiana is positioned to be a vital and dynamic commercial center and a magnet for world-class talent and innovation, policymakers must promote and invest in strategies that play to the region’s industry sector strengths while supporting groups adversely impacted by the pandemic. This is an opportune time for new thinking as business, philanthropic and political leaders refocus on creating jobs; developing and attracting a highly skilled workforce; and luring residents and workers, to ensure the long-term success of Central Indiana.

As further established by the Comprehensive Plan, the RDA will focus on the following strategies for attracting (or any projected) investments, grants, matching funds, or local tax revenue:

- **Key Sectors**
 - *Health Care & Medical Technology* - Establish more educational opportunities for healthcare certifications and create career pathways for advanced medical degrees
 - *Software Development* – Develop a targeted recruitment plan for tech talent; and partner with regional stakeholders to identify key strategic advantages for the region.
 - *Logistics & Manufacturing* – Partner with higher education institutions to create a roundtable for automation and robotics; create a rigorous training program in

automation and robotics field culminating in a certificate or credential; and introduce robotics and automation into K-12 curriculum.

- *Green Jobs* – Create incentives for green energy in homes, schools, retail shops, offices, and industrial facilities to support sustainability; and develop training and credential programs for high-demand green jobs.
- *Finance & Insurance* – Launch an aggressive program to recruit more finance and industry sector remote workers to the region.

- Talent

- *Engage Learners Early On* – Correlate skills with wages and opportunities; encourage digital skills development; and expand the work and learn Indiana portal to younger adults and promote it in Central Indiana high schools.
- *Advocate for the Adult Learner* – Increased access to childcare; and short-term training options.
- *Community Support* – Establish a “choice employers” designation; and set postsecondary benchmarks

- Quality of Place

- *Green Space* – implement recommendations from the White River Visioning Plan; identifying future park locations and implement standards for new green spaces; increase Walk Score by connecting broken sidewalk segments and expand and connect trail infrastructure; expand and connect trail infrastructure; complete housing studies for communities in the RDA; consider new policies for mixed-use developments; and identify opportunities for senior housing projects.

- Societal Risk Factors

- *Improved Access, Improved Health* – Expand telehealth options from local providers to increase medical care access and improve productivity; promote healthy lifestyles through community campaigns; prioritize alternative transportation plans; and implement SNAP benefits for use at farmers markets.

- Entrepreneurship

- *Form Community Co-Working Networks* – Establish co-working spaces and mentorship networks within each participating member’s community; and implement policies to support women, minorities, and veterans and their entrepreneurial efforts.
- *Build a Regional Marketing Presence for Entrepreneur Programs* – Increase regional visibility as a tech hub; attract an international venture capital conference to the region; and establish targets for awarding public contracts to entrepreneurs and small businesses within the region.

- Infrastructure
 - *Make Autonomous and Electric a Regional Advantage* – Market the region to facilitate autonomous vehicle investment; and support autonomous and electric vehicle adoption through investments in new infrastructure.
 - *Roadways Receive Regular Upkeep* – Develop a regional investment strategy for roadways; and incentivize communities to collaborate on large infrastructure projects.
 - *Broadband Access for All* – 100% coverage of high-speed broadband service for the entire region; build upon the Next Level Connections broadband program; and co-locate broadband with new and existing infrastructure, including above-ground infrastructure, and then codify a “dig once” policy within the region.

ARTICLE VII

Vacating Development Authority

A county or municipality shall be a member of the RDA for not less than five years (“Initial Commitment”). After completing its Initial Commitment, a participating member may vacate the RDA subject to (i) providing all Members with two year’s written notice of its intent to vacate, and (ii) the fiscal body of the participating member must adopt an ordinance to vacate membership in the RDA.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 22-117

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WESTFIELD, INDIANA DECLARING A CERTAIN AREA WITHIN THE CITY OF WESTFIELD AN ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION AREA, QUALIFYING CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IMPROVEMENTS FOR TAX ABATEMENT, AND SETTING THE TIME AND PLACE FOR A PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE SAME

18th Street Development, LLC (NexCore Companies, LLC)

WHEREAS, under I.C. 6-1.1-12.1-1, *et. seq.* (the "Act"), the City of Westfield, Indiana, (the "City") by and through its Common Council acting in its capacity as the fiscal body of the City and as the designating body identified in the Act (the "Council"), has the right and opportunity to abate the payment of real property taxes for real estate located within an area declared by the Council to be an Economic Revitalization Area; and

WHEREAS, under the Act, the Council may find that a particular area within the jurisdiction of the City is an Economic Revitalization Area and may, by adoption of a resolution, declare such area to be an Economic Revitalization Area, which resolution must be confirmed, modified, or rescinded; and

WHEREAS, the Council desires to declare the area within the corporate boundaries of the City of generally located at 535 Park Street, Westfield, Indiana, more particularly described in Exhibit A (the "Area"), attached hereto and made a part hereof, which Area is also shown on the map attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit B, as an Economic Revitalization Area in which property making application to the City pursuant to the Act may receive real property tax abatement pursuant to the applicable procedures of the Act; and

WHEREAS, 18th Street Development, LLC (the "Applicant") has filed with this Council a Statement of Benefits, Real Property (Form SB-1/Real Property) ("Form SB-1") attached hereto as Exhibit C which describes the proposed project (the "Project") to be developed by the Applicant, in order to receive real property tax abatement for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Project includes the construction of a 30,000 square foot facility on approximately five (5) acres of land; and

WHEREAS, this Council has reviewed the Form SB-1; and

WHEREAS, the improvement of the Area will be of public utility and will be to the benefit and welfare of the citizens and taxpayers of the City.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF
THE CITY OF WESTFIELD, INDIANA AS FOLLOWS:**

SECTION I. The Area described and/or depicted in Exhibit A is located within the corporate boundaries of the City and is found to meet the criteria set forth in the Act for designation as an Economic Revitalization Area.

SECTION II. The Area described and/or depicted in Exhibit A is hereby declared to be an Economic Revitalization Area, as defined in the Act, to be known as the NexCore Companies LLC Economic Revitalization Area.

SECTION III. A public hearing shall be held at the time and place of the regular meeting of the Council on October 10, 2022 at the Westfield City Hall, 130 Penn Street, Westfield, Indiana. The Council shall publish or cause to be published, pursuant to the Act, notice (the "Notice") of the adoption and substance of this Resolution in accordance with I.C. 5-3-1 one (1) time at least ten (10) days before the date of the public hearing on this matter (the "Public Hearing"), which Notice shall state the date and time for the Public Hearing, that the Council will hear all remonstrance's and objections from interested persons at the Public Hearing, that at the conclusion of the Public Hearing the Council may take final action on the proposed designation determining whether the qualifications for an economic revitalization area have been met and confirming, modifying, or rescinding this Resolution, and that a copy of this Resolution, including the description of the Area, has been filed with and shall be available for inspection in the office of the Hamilton County Assessor.

SECTION IV. Under Section 2.5(b) of the Act, a copy of this Resolution shall be filed with the Hamilton County Assessor and made available for public inspection.

SECTION V. Under Section 2.5(c) of the Act, the Council shall file a copy of the Notice with each taxing unit that has authority to levy property taxes in the geographic area where the Area is located. Such information shall be filed with the officers of the taxing unit who are authorized to fix budgets, tax rates, and tax levies under I.C. 6 1.1-17-5 at least ten (10) days prior to the date of the Public Hearing.

SECTION VI. The proposed Project will be located in the Area which has been declared as an Economic Revitalization Area pursuant to the Act.

SECTION VII. Based upon the information in the Form SB-1, the Council makes the following findings:

- (1) The estimate of Thirty-Four Million and Three Hundred Dollars (\$34,000,300.00) as the assessed value of the Project is reasonable.

- (2) The estimate of hiring Thirty-Two (32) new individuals who will be employed through term of the abatement period can be reasonably expected to result from the proposed Project.
- (3) The estimate of Two Million Two Hundred Thirty-Two Thousand and Eight Hundred (\$2,232,800) for the aggregate annual salaries without benefits of those individuals who will be employed can be reasonably expected to result from the proposed Project.
- (4) The other benefits about which information has been presented to this Council are benefits that can be reasonably expected to result from the proposed Project.
- (5) The totality of benefits is sufficient to justify the granting of a ten (10) year real property tax abatement to the Applicant.

SECTION VIII. The Form SB-1 submitted by the Applicant is approved.

SECTION IX. The Council hereby determines that it is in the best interest to allow the real property tax deductions for the Project, and the same are hereby approved. The period for real property tax deductions under the Act for the Project shall be ten (10) years, utilizing the following schedule:

Year 1 – 40%
Year 2 – 40%
Year 3 – 40%
Year 4 – 30%
Year 5 – 30%
Year 6 – 30%
Year 7 – 30%
Year 8 – 30%
Year 9 – 30%
Year 10 – 30%

SECTION XI. Pursuant to the Act, the Council shall cause to be filed a certified copy of this Resolution with the Hamilton County Auditor.

SECTION XII. The sections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses, and phrases of this Resolution are separable, and if any phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, or section of this Resolution shall be declared unconstitutional, invalid, or unenforceable by the valid judgment or decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, such unconstitutionality, invalidity, or unenforceability shall not affect any of the remaining phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, and sections of this Resolution, and a suitable and equitable

provision shall be substituted for such provision in order to carry out, so far as may be valid and enforceable, the intent and purpose of the provision and this Resolution.

SECTION XIII. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its adoption.

THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE IS BLANK INTENTIONALLY

**ALL OF WHICH IS HEREBY ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF
WESTFIELD, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA THIS 10TH DAY OF OCTOBER,
2022.**

**WESTFIELD CITY COMMON COUNCIL
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA**

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

ATTEST:

Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security Number in this document, unless required by law: Kai Chuck

I hereby certify that RESOLUTION 22-117 was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield on the _____ day of _____, 2022, at _____ m.

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE Resolution 22-117
This _____ day of _____, 2022

I hereby VETO Resolution 22-117
This _____ day of _____, 2022

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

Prepared By:
Kai Chuck, Economic Development Director
Mayor's Office
City of Westfield, Indiana

EXHIBIT A

Legal Description of Area

TBD.

EXHIBIT B

City of Westfield Portal Online Map



EXHIBIT C

Statement of Benefits Form – Real Property

DocuSign Envelope ID: B0F63C0D-0A41-4F2F-9B22-9FB070B7B182



STATEMENT OF BENEFITS REAL ESTATE IMPROVEMENTS

State Form 51767 (R7 / 1-21)

Prescribed by the Department of Local Government Finance

This statement is being completed for real property that qualifies under the following Indiana Code (check one box):

- ☐ Redevelopment or rehabilitation of real estate improvements (IC 6-1.1-12.1-4)
☐ Residentially distressed area (IC 6-1.1-12.1-4.1)

INSTRUCTIONS:

- This statement must be submitted to the body designating the Economic Revitalization Area prior to the public hearing if the designating body requires information from the applicant in making its decision about whether to designate an Economic Revitalization Area. Otherwise, this statement must be submitted to the designating body **BEFORE** the redevelopment or rehabilitation of real property for which the person wishes to claim a deduction.
- The statement of benefits form must be submitted to the designating body and the area designated an economic revitalization area before the initiation of the redevelopment or rehabilitation for which the person desires to claim a deduction.
- To obtain a deduction, a Form 322/RE must be filed with the county auditor before May 10 in the year in which the addition to assessed valuation is made or not later than thirty (30) days after the assessment notice is mailed to the property owner if it was mailed after April 10. A property owner who failed to file a deduction application within the prescribed deadline may file an application between January 1 and May 10 of a subsequent year.
- A property owner who files for the deduction must provide the county auditor and designating body with a Form CF-1/Real Property. The Form CF-1/Real Property should be attached to the Form 322/RE when the deduction is first claimed and then updated annually for each year the deduction is applicable. IC 6-1.1-12.1-5.1(b)
- For a Form SB-1/Real Property that is approved after June 30, 2013, the designating body is required to establish an abatement schedule for each deduction allowed. For a Form SB-1/Real Property that is approved prior to July 1, 2013, the abatement schedule approved by the designating body remains in effect. IC 6-1.1-12.1-17

20__ PAY 20__
FORM SB-1 / Real Property
PRIVACY NOTICE Any information concerning the cost of the property and specific salaries paid to individual employees by the property owner is confidential per IC 6-1.1-12.1-5.1.

SECTION 1 TAXPAYER INFORMATION					
Name of taxpayer 18th Street Development LLC					
Address of taxpayer (number and street, city, state, and ZIP code) 1550 Market Street Suite 200, Denver, CO 80202					
Name of contact person Peter Phillips		Telephone number (214) 801-7335		E-mail address peter.phillips@nexcoregroup.com	
SECTION 2 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT					
Name of designating body City of Westfield				Resolution number	
Location of property 535 Park St., Westfield, IN 46074		County Hamilton		DLGF taxing district number 29015	
Description of real property improvements, redevelopment, or rehabilitation (use additional sheets if necessary) This Class A medical facility will be a one-stop healthcare destination. Next level stem-cell research/care and acute-care outpatient services will be performed here to include a multi-practice suite, acting as a potential space for bio-health and life sciences. Additional services will include wound care, surgical diagnostic, and imaging.				Estimated start date (month, day, year) 12.1.2022	
				Estimated completion date (month, day, year) 3.31.2024	
SECTION 3 ESTIMATE OF EMPLOYEES AND SALARIES AS RESULT OF PROPOSED PROJECT					
Current Number	Salaries	Number Retained	Salaries	Number Additional	Salaries
				32.00	\$2,232,800.00
SECTION 4 ESTIMATED TOTAL COST AND VALUE OF PROPOSED PROJECT					
			REAL ESTATE IMPROVEMENTS		
			COST		
Current values			2,530,000.00		
Plus estimated values of proposed project			31,470,300.00		
Less values of any property being replaced					
Net estimated values upon completion of project			34,000,300.00		
			ASSESSED VALUE		
			488,800.00		
SECTION 5 WASTE CONVERTED AND OTHER BENEFITS PROMISED BY THE TAXPAYER					
Estimated solid waste converted (pounds) _____			Estimated hazardous waste converted (pounds) _____		
Other benefits					
SECTION 6 TAXPAYER CERTIFICATION					
I hereby certify that the representations in this statement are true.					
Signature of authorized representative Greg Hundley				Date signed (month, day, year) 8/31/2022	
Printed name of authorized representative Greg Hundley				Title Authorized Representative	

FOR USE OF THE DESIGNATING BODY

We find that the applicant meets the general standards in the resolution adopted or to be adopted by this body. Said resolution, passed or to be passed under IC 6-1.1-12.1, provides for the following limitations:

- A. The designated area has been limited to a period of time not to exceed _____ calendar years* (see below). The date this designation expires is _____. *NOTE: This question addresses whether the resolution contains an expiration date for the designated area.*
- B. The type of deduction that is allowed in the designated area is limited to:
1. Redevelopment or rehabilitation of real estate improvements ☐ Yes ☐ No
 2. Residentially distressed areas ☐ Yes ☐ No
- C. The amount of the deduction applicable is limited to \$ _____.
- D. Other limitations or conditions (specify) _____
- E. Number of years allowed: ☐ Year 1 ☐ Year 2 ☐ Year 3 ☐ Year 4 ☐ Year 5 (* see below)
☐ Year 6 ☐ Year 7 ☐ Year 8 ☐ Year 9 ☐ Year 10
- F. For a statement of benefits approved after June 30, 2013, did this designating body adopt an abatement schedule per IC 6-1.1-12.1-17?
☐ Yes ☐ No
 If yes, attach a copy of the abatement schedule to this form.
 If no, the designating body is required to establish an abatement schedule before the deduction can be determined.

We have also reviewed the information contained in the statement of benefits and find that the estimates and expectations are reasonable and have determined that the totality of benefits is sufficient to justify the deduction described above.

Approved (signature and title of authorized member of designating body)	Telephone number ()	Date signed (month, day, year)
Printed name of authorized member of designating body	Name of designating body	
Attested by (signature and title of attester)	Printed name of attester	

* If the designating body limits the time period during which an area is an economic revitalization area, that limitation does not limit the length of time a taxpayer is entitled to receive a deduction to a number of years that is less than the number of years designated under IC 6-1.1-12.1-17.

- A. For residentially distressed areas where the Form SB-1/Real Property was approved prior to July 1, 2013, the deductions established in IC 6-1.1-12.1-4.1 remain in effect. The deduction period may not exceed five (5) years. For a Form SB-1/Real Property that is approved after June 30, 2013, the designating body is required to establish an abatement schedule for each deduction allowed. Except as provided in IC 6-1.1-12.1-18, the deduction period may not exceed ten (10) years. (See IC 6-1.1-12.1-17 below.)
- B. For the redevelopment or rehabilitation of real property where the Form SB-1/Real Property was approved prior to July 1, 2013, the abatement schedule approved by the designating body remains in effect. For a Form SB-1/Real Property that is approved after June 30, 2013, the designating body is required to establish an abatement schedule for each deduction allowed. (See IC 6-1.1-12.1-17 below.)

IC 6-1.1-12.1-17

Abatement schedules

Sec. 17. (a) A designating body may provide to a business that is established in or relocated to a revitalization area and that receives a deduction under section 4 or 4.5 of this chapter an abatement schedule based on the following factors:

- (1) The total amount of the taxpayer's investment in real and personal property.
- (2) The number of new full-time equivalent jobs created.
- (3) The average wage of the new employees compared to the state minimum wage.
- (4) The infrastructure requirements for the taxpayer's investment.

(b) This subsection applies to a statement of benefits approved after June 30, 2013. A designating body shall establish an abatement schedule for each deduction allowed under this chapter. An abatement schedule must specify the percentage amount of the deduction for each year of the deduction. Except as provided in IC 6-1.1-12.1-18, an abatement schedule may not exceed ten (10) years.

(c) An abatement schedule approved for a particular taxpayer before July 1, 2013, remains in effect until the abatement schedule expires under the terms of the resolution approving the taxpayer's statement of benefits.

ORDINANCE 22-37

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF WESTFIELD, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF WESTFIELD TO BECOME A MEMBER OF THE CENTRAL INDIANA REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY UNDER IND. CODE §36-7.7 *et. seq.*

WHEREAS, on or around March 18, 2020, Governor Holcomb signed P.L.83-2020 (SEA 350) (the “Act”), which allows eligible political subdivisions located in the Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson Metropolitan Statistical Area to create the Central Indiana Regional Development Authority (the “Development Authority”) and to carry out its powers as more particularly described in the Act;

WHEREAS, the Development Authority is a separate body corporate and politic that shall carry out the purposes of the Act by (i) acquiring, constructing, equipping, owning, and financing projects and facilities to or for the benefit of members of the Development Authority; and (ii) funding and developing: (A) airport authority projects; (B) commuter transportation district and other rail projects and services; (C) regional transportation authority projects and services; (D) economic development projects; (E) intermodal transportation projects; (F) regional trail or greenway projects; (G) regional transportation infrastructure projects under Ind. Code § 36-9-43; and (H) any other capital infrastructure project that enhances the region with the goal of attracting people or business; that are of regional importance;

WHEREAS, the Development Authority has the power to, among other items, (i) finance, improve, construct, reconstruct, renovate, purchase, acquire, and equip land and projects that are of regional importance; (ii) finance and construct additional improvements to projects or other capital improvements owned by the development authority; (iii) construct or reconstruct highways, roads, and bridges; (iv) acquire land or all or a part of one (1) or more projects from an eligible political subdivision by purchase; (v) provide funding for intermodal transportation projects and facilities; (vi) provide funding for regional trails and greenways; (vii) provide funding for economic development projects; (viii) provide funding for regional transportation infrastructure projects under Ind. Code § 36-9-43; and all other powers as prescribed by the Act;

WHEREAS, the Development Authority may be established by (i) one or more counties and one more adjacent counties, (ii) one more counties and one or more municipalities in adjacent counties, or (iii) one or more municipalities and one or more municipalities in adjacent counties;

WHEREAS, the Act permits the City of Westfield, the City of Carmel, the City of Greenwood, and Marion County to immediately withdraw from the development authority to which they belong in order to join the Development Authority;

WHEREAS, the Development Authority shall be governed by a strategy committee whose composition and structure will be established by a preliminary development plan (the “Plan”), which in accordance with the Act, is to be adopted by separate resolution of the participating member; and

WHEREAS, the Common Council (“Council”) for the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana (“City”) now desires to authorize the City to become a member of the Development Authority, under Ind. Code § 36-7.7-3-9.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the Common Council for the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana, meeting in regular session as follows:

Section 1. The Council hereby authorizes the City to become a member of the Development Authority pursuant to the Act. The City shall be a member of the development authority for not less than five years.

Section 2. The Council shall adopt the Plan by separate resolution, which resolution shall be substantially similar to the resolutions of other participating members of the Development Authority.

Section 3. The City shall notify the Indiana Economic Development Commission of its membership in the Development Authority.

Section 4. This Ordinance shall be of full force and effect from and upon its adoption and in accordance with Indiana law.

SO ORDAINED, by the Common Council for the City of Westfield meeting this _____ day of _____, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Joe Edwards

Joe Edwards

Joe Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

ATTEST:

Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer

I hereby certify that ORDINANCE 22-37 was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield on
the _____ day of _____, 2021, at _____ m.

Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE Ordinance 22-37
this _____ day of _____, 2022.

I hereby VETO Ordinance 22-37
this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

This document was prepared by Manny Herceg, Taft Stettinius & Hollister, LLP, One Indiana Square, Suite 3500, Indianapolis, IN 46204 (317-713-3500).

I affirm under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security Number in this document, unless required by law. /s/ Manuel Herceg.

ORDINANCE NUMBER 22-__

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WESTFIELD AND WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA CONCERNING AMENDMENT TO THE WHEELER LANDING PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

This is an ordinance to amend the Unified Development Ordinance of the City of Westfield and Washington Township, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Unified Development Ordinance"), enacted by the City of Westfield pursuant to its authority under the laws of the State of Indiana, Ind. Code § 36-7-4 et seq., as amended.

WHEREAS, the City of Westfield, Indiana (the "City") and the Township of Washington, both of Hamilton County, Indiana are subject to the Unified Development Ordinance;

WHEREAS, the Common Council enacted Ordinance No. 18-04, the Wheeler Landing Planned Unit Development District (the "Wheeler Landing PUD Ordinance") on September 24, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission (the "Commission") considered Petition No. _____ (the "Petition"), requesting an amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance and the Zoning Map with regard to the subject real estate more particularly described in Exhibit A, attached hereto (the "Real Estate"); and

WHEREAS, the Commission forwarded the Petition No. _____ to the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Common Council") with a _____ recommendation (xx-xx) in accordance with Indiana Code§ 36-7-4-608, as required by Indiana Code§ 36-7-4-1505; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Commission certified the action of the Commission to the Common Council on _____, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the Common Council is subject to the provisions of the Indiana Code §36- 7-4-1507 and Indiana Code§ 36-7-4-1512 concerning any action on this request; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana, meeting in regular session, that the Wheeler Landing PUD Ordinance, Unified Development Ordinance, and Zoning Map, are hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Applicability of Ordinance.

- 1.1 This Ordinance shall amend the Wheeler Landing PUD Ordinance, as applicable to the Real Estate.

- 1.2 All other provisions of the Wheeler Landing PUD Ordinance shall remain in effect with the adoption of this Ordinance.
- 1.3 Chapter ("Chapter") and Article ("Article") cross-references of this Ordinance shall hereafter refer to the section as specified and referenced in the Unified Development Ordinance.
- 1.4 All provisions and representations of the Unified Development Ordinance that conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby made inapplicable to the Real Estate and shall be superseded by the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 2. Definitions. Capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Ordinance or the Wheeler Landing PUD Ordinance shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Unified Development Ordinance.

Section 3. Outdoor Merchandising.

3.1 The standards of Article 6.12(C)(2) shall be modified to allow Outdoor Sales Displays generally in the areas indicated on Exhibit B.

3.2 Outdoor Sales Displays may include the following: fresh produce and floral items, that will be rotated seasonally, including hanging floral baskets, flowers and plants in the warmer months of spring and summer, corn stalks, pumpkins and gourds in fall, cold tolerant plants, holiday favorites in winter such as wreaths, pinecones, Christmas trees and firewood, and other secondary merchandise. Outdoor Sales Displays may include propane tanks, provided the tanks are stored in a screened enclosure with a cage door comparable to the example provided in Exhibit C.

3.3 The Outdoor Sales Displays may utilize refurbished antique pick-up trucks, tractors, and other such appropriate merchandising props as conceptually depicted in Exhibit C. In addition, weather permitting, outdoor prepared food sales, such as grilled meats and side dishes, specialty events such as live hatch chili pepper roasting and occasional produce vendor sales may take place.

- 3.4 Prohibited Outdoor Sales Displays include:
 - A. Mulch, salt, windshield washer fluid and other similar bulk merchandise,
 - B. Patio furniture, gas grills and other similar merchandise, and
 - C. Storage of shipping boxes (including cardboard boxes) with product inventory outside of merchandisers. The sale and merchandising of these products would take place inside the building. The prohibition of palletized merchandise does not preclude the use of portable merchandiser stands designed to hold and display the allowed outdoor sales products noted above in the first paragraph.

Section 4. **Development Standards.**

4.1 The following modifications to the requirements of Chapter 6 Development Standards shall apply to the development of the Real Estate:

- A. Foundation Plantings (Article 6.8(L)(4); shall apply; however, the foundation plantings of the Building Façades may be located in excess of fifteen (15) feet from the Building Façade, patio fence or other barrier.
- B. Foundation Plantings (Article 6.8(L)(3); Planters shall be a permitted landscaping material meeting the requirements of Article 6.8(L).
- C. Placement, Minimum Distance from Sidewalk and Curb (Article 6.8(G)(4)(d): shall not apply in order to permit street trees in the tree lawn between the sidewalk and the perimeter private drives.

(SIGNATURE PAGE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWS)

ALL OF WHICH IS ORDAINED/RESOLVED THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

ATTEST:

Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer

I hereby certify that **ORDINANCE 22-__** was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield on the _____ day of _____, 2022, at _____ m.

Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE **ORDINANCE 22-__**
this _____ day of _____, 2022.

I hereby VETO **ORDINANCE 22-__**
this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security number in this document, unless required by law.

Printed Name of Declarant

Prepared by: _____


SCHEDULE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A	Real Estate (Legal Description)
Exhibit B	Outdoor Display Concept Plan
Exhibit C	Outdoor Display Conceptual Character Imagery

Project Narrative

The requested PUD Amendment for Wheeler Landing is related to the previously submitted Detailed Development Plan for Market District at Wheeler Landing. The proposed plan would construct a 49,600 square foot grocery store on 6.22 acres at the northeast corner of Grand Park Boulevard and Tournament Trail. The subject PUD Amendment request would allow limited outdoor merchandise sales and displays and an alternate foundation planting plan.

Drawing name: K:\IND\DEV\170126004_Giant Eagle_Wheeler Market District_Westfield_IN\2_Design\CAD\PlantSheet\L1.0-LANDSCAPE PLAN.dwg L1.0 Aug 30, 2022 2:53pm by: Mike Timko
This document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.



Indiana Utilities Protection Service

Call 811

before you dig

NORTH

GRAPHIC SCALE IN FEET
0 15' 30' 60'

TNERSHIP
204

REVISIONS		DATE	BY
NO			

NO.	DATE	REVISIONS
1	08/30/22	DPW COMMENTS
2	08/25/22	CITY COMMENTS
3	08/10/22	CITY COMMENTS
4	08/05/22	CITY COMMENTS

SCALE: AS NOTED
DESIGNED BY: NJB
DRAWN BY: CPP
CHECKED BY: MJT

Kimley-Horn
©2022 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
250 EAST 96TH STREET, SUITE 550,
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46240
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

NOT APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION
MICHELLE E. RYAN
ARCHITECT
8/30/2022

Market DISTRICT

LANDSCAPE PLAN

MARKET DISTRICT AT
WHEELER LANDING
802 E. TOURNAMENT TRAIL,
WESTFIELD, IN 46074

ORIGINAL ISSUE:
07/01/2022
KHA PROJECT NO.
170126004
SHEET NUMBER
L1.0

Drawing name: K:\IND_LEVE\170126004_Gen1_Eagle_Wheeler_Market_District_Westfield_IN\2_Design\CADD\PlanSheets\L1.0-LANDSCAPE PLAN.dwg L1.1 Aug 30, 2022 2:53pm by Mike Timko
This document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

LANDSCAPE NOTES

1. THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTALLING MATERIALS AND PLANTS SHOWN ON THE LANDSCAPE PLAN. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COST TO REPAIR UTILITIES, ADJACENT LANDSCAPE, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROPERTY THAT IS DAMAGED BY THE CONTRACTOR OR THEIR SUBCONTRACTOR'S OPERATIONS DURING INSTALLATION OR DURING THE SPECIFIED MAINTENANCE PERIOD. CALL FOR UTILITY LOCATIONS PRIOR TO ANY EXCAVATION AND PLANTING.

2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT ANY DISCREPANCY IN PLAN VS. FIELD CONDITIONS IMMEDIATELY TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT, PRIOR TO CONTINUING WITH THAT PORTION OF WORK.

3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REPAIR OF ANY OF THEIR TRENCHES OR EXCAVATIONS THAT SETTLE.

4. ALL NURSERY STOCK SHALL BE WELL BRANCHED, HEALTHY, FULL, PRE-INOCULATED AND FERTILIZED. DECIDUOUS TREES SHALL BE FREE OF FRESH SCARS. TRUNKS WILL BE WRAPPED IF NECESSARY TO PREVENT SUN SCALD AND INSECT DAMAGE. THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE THE WRAP AT THE PROPER TIME AS A PART OF THIS CONTRACT.

5. ALL NURSERY STOCK SHALL BE GUARANTEED, BY THE CONTRACTOR, FOR ONE YEAR FROM DATE OF FINAL INSPECTION.

6. PLANTING AREA SOIL SHALL BE TOPSOIL FOR ALL TREE, SHRUB, ORNAMENTAL GRASS, PERENNIAL, AND ANNUAL BEDS. AMENDED SOIL SHALL BE PROVIDED AND GRADED BY THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR UP TO A 6" DEPTH BELOW FINISHED GRADE IN TURF AREAS AND A 12" DEPTH IN PLANTING AREAS.

7. PLANTING AREA TOPSOIL SHALL BE AMENDED WITH 25% SPHAGNUM PEATMOSS, 5% HUMUS AND 65% PULVERIZED SOIL. AMENDED TURF AREA SOIL SHALL BE STANDARD TOPSOIL. TOPSOIL SHALL CONFORM TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS FREE OF HEAVY CLAY, ROCKS, AND DIRT CLOUDS OVER 1 INCH IN DIAMETER, AS WELL AS CONTAIN 3%-5% OF ORGANIC MATTER.

8. SEED/SOD LIMIT LINES ARE APPROXIMATE. CONTRACTOR SHALL SEED/SOD ALL AREAS WHICH ARE DISTURBED BY GRADING WITH THE SPECIFIED SEED/SOD MIXES.
9. CONTRACTOR SHALL STAKE INDIVIDUAL TREE AND SHRUB LOCATIONS AND OUTLINE HERBACEOUS PLANTING AREAS, SHALL ADJUST LOCATIONS WHEN REQUESTED, AND SHALL OBTAIN PROJECT LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT'S ACCEPTANCE PRIOR TO PLANTING.

10. ALL PLANT ID TAGS SHALL BE REMOVED AFTER INSTALLATION.

11. CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL SHREDDED HARDWOOD MULCH AT A 3" DEPTH TO ALL TREES, SHRUB, PERENNIAL, AND GROUNDCOVER AREAS. TREES PLACED IN AREA COVERED BY TURF SHALL RECEIVE A 4 FT WIDE MAXIMUM TREE RING WITH 3" DEPTH SHREDDED HARDWOOD MULCH. A SPADED BED EDGE SHALL SEPARATE MULCH BEDS FROM TURF OR SEEDED AREAS. A SPADED EDGE IS NOT REQUIRED ALONG CURBED EDGES.

12. WEED FABRIC SHALL BE APPLIED UNDER MULCH.

13. MULCH SHALL NOT BE HELD IN PLACE BY PLASTIC NET, OR SPRAYING OF ANY BINDER MATERIAL OR ASPHALT EMULSION.

14. DO NOT DISTURB THE EXISTING PAVING, LIGHTING, OR LANDSCAPING THAT EXISTS ADJACENT TO THE SITE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON PLAN.


15. PLANT QUANTITIES SHOWN ARE FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE OWNER AND JURISDICTIONAL REVIEW AGENCIES. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING ALL PLANT QUANTITIES AS DRAWN.

16. THE OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE MAY REJECT ANY PLANT MATERIALS THAT ARE DISEASED, DEFORMED, OR OTHERWISE NOT EXHIBITING SUPERIOR QUALITY.

17. WEEDING, LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE, AND WATERING TO BE THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY DURING CONSTRUCTION. ALL PLANT MATERIALS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION SHALL BE MAINTAINED AS LIVING VEGETATION AND SHALL BE PROMPTLY REPLACED BY LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR DURING WARRANTY PERIOD IF THE PLANT MATERIAL HAS DIED PRIOR TO FINAL ACCEPTANCE. PLANTING AREAS SHALL BE KEPT FREE OF TRASH, LITTER, AND WEEDS AT ALL TIMES.

18. THE CONTINUED MAINTENANCE OF ALL REQUIRED LANDSCAPING AFTER WARRANTY PERIOD EXPIRES SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY ON WHICH SAID MATERIALS ARE REQUIRED.

Indiana Utilities Protection Service



NOTES:


1. INSPECT TREE FOR DAMAGED BRANCHES, APPLY CORRECTIVE PRUNING.
2. SET ROOT BALL ON UNEXCAVATED OR TAMPED SOIL. TOP OF ROOTBALL SHALL BE TWO INCHES ABOVE SURROUNDING GRADE WITH BURLAP AND WIRE BASKET INTACT.
3. REMOVE WIRE BASKET AND BURLAP DOWN FOUR TO SIX INCHES BELOW TOP OF ROOT BALL. REMOVE ALL TWINE AND (IF USED), SYNTHETIC MATERIAL. REMOVE OR CORRECT GIRDLING ROOTS.
4. TAMP EXCAVATED SOIL AROUND BASE OF ROOTBALL.
5. BACKFILL REMAINDER EXCAVATED SOIL TAMPED LIGHTLY. HIGH CLAY OR POOR SOIL SHALL RECEIVE SOIL AMENDMENT PER LANDSCAPE NOTES.
6. WATER THOROUGHLY WITHIN TWO HOURS USING 10 TO 15 GALLONS OF WATER.
7. APPLY MULCH IN EVEN LAYER, KEEPING AWAY FROM ROOT FLARE.
8. FINAL LOCATION OF TREE TO BE APPROVED BY OWNER.

1 TREE PLANTING

NTS

ORDINANCE CHART

ZONING: PUD		
REQUIREMENT	REQUIRED	PROVIDED
EXTERNAL STREET FRONTAGE		
• Minimum depth of 10 ft. • 3 shade or evergreen trees/100 LF • 2 ornamental trees/100 LF • 25 shrubs/100 LF	• Grand Park Boulevard: 419 LF 419/100 = 4 4 x 3 = 12 shade or evergreen trees 4 x 2 = 8 ornamental trees 4 x 25 = 100 shrubs • Tournament Trail: 398 LF 398/100 = 4 4 x 3 = 12 shade or evergreen trees 4 x 2 = 8 ornamental trees 4 x 25 = 100 shrubs	• Grand Park Boulevard: 12 shade trees, 8 ornamental trees, 100 shrubs * 3 shade trees, 8 ornamental trees, and 22 shrubs relocated on site for building visibility • Tournament Trail: 12 shade trees, 8 ornamental trees, 100 shrubs * 4 shade trees, 8 ornamental trees, and 33 shrubs relocated on site for building visibility
MINIMUM LOT LANDSCAPING		
• Business Uses: 10 shade trees + 10 ornamental or evergreen trees + 25 shrubs/acre	• 6 acres 6 x 10 = 60 shade trees 6 x 10 = 60 ornamental or evergreen trees 6 x 25 = 150 shrubs	• 60 shade trees, 60 ornamental trees, 150 shrubs minimum
PARKING INTERIOR		
• 10% of parking area to be landscaped • 1 tree + 4 shrubs/island	• 116,788 * 10% = 11,678 SF • 1 tree + 4 shrubs/island	• 11,760 SF = 10.1% • 1 tree + 4 shrubs/island
PARKING PERIMETER		
• 1 tree/30 LF • 1 shrub/3 LF	• South Parking: 595 LF 595/30 = 20 trees 334/3 = 198 shrubs • East Parking: 63 LF 63/30 = 2 trees 63/3 = 21 shrubs • West Parking: 207 LF 207/30 = 7 trees 207/3 = 69 shrubs	• South Parking: 20 trees, 198 shrubs • East Parking: 2 trees, 21 shrubs • West Parking: 7 trees, 69 shrubs
FOUNDATION PLANTINGS		
• Front Building Façade: 1 ornamental tree or shrub/12 LF of façade • Foundation plantings required approx. every 40 LF along long expanses (over 80 LF) of building façade	• Front Façade: 247 LF 247/12 = 21 ornamental trees or shrubs • Rear and Side Facades: 651 LF Foundation plantings required approx. every 40 LF	• Front Façade: 21 shrubs • Foundation plantings provided as feasible




NOTES:

1. APPLY CORRECTIVE PRUNING.
2. SET ROOT BALL OR CONTAINER ON UNEXCAVATED OR TAMPED SOIL. TOP OF ROOTBALL (CONTAINER) SHALL BE ONE INCH ABOVE SURROUNDING GRADE. FOR LARGER SHRUBS WITHIN PLANTING BED DIG A DEEPER PIT ONLY FOR THOSE SHRUBS.
3. REMOVE BURLAP FROM TOP HALF THE LENGTH OF ROOTBALL. TWINE AND (IF USED) SYNTHETIC MATERIAL SHALL BE REMOVED FROM PLANTING BED. FOR CONTAINER GROWN SHRUBS, REMOVE CONTAINER AND LOOSEN ROOTS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
4. REMOVE OR CORRECT GIRDLING ROOTS.
5. PLUMB AND BACKFILL WITH AMENDED SOIL PER LANDSCAPE NOTES. WATER THOROUGHLY WITHIN TWO HOURS.
6. APPLY MULCH IN EVEN LAYER, KEEPING AWAY FROM ROOT FLARE. MULCH LIMITS FOR SHRUBS EXTEND TO ALL LIMITS OF PLANTING BED, SEE PLANS FOR BED LAYOUTS.

2 SHRUB PLANTING


NTS

MULCHING LEGEND




MULCH
HARDWOOD SHREDDED MULCH,
NATURAL BROWN COLOR

SEEDING LEGEND



PERMANENT SEEDING
AMERITURF FRONTRUNNER BLEND TALL
FESCUE; APPLY AT A RATE OF 350 LBS/ACRE
(8LBS/1000 SQFT)



SCALE: AS NOTED
DESIGNED BY: NJB
DRAWN BY: CPP
CHECKED BY: MJT



LANDSCAPE
DETAILS

MARKET DISTRICT AT
WHEELER LANDING
802 E. TOURNAMENT TRAIL,
WESTFIELD, IN 46074

ORIGINAL ISSUE:

07/01/2022

KHA PROJECT NO.

170126004

SHEET NUMBER

L1.1

ORDINANCE NUMBER 22-06

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WESTFIELD AND WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA CONCERNING AMENDMENT TO THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

“Towns at Union”

This is a Planned Unit Development District Ordinance (to be known as the "**Towns at Union PUD**") to amend the Unified Development Ordinance of the City of Westfield and Washington Township, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Unified Development Ordinance"), enacted by the City of Westfield pursuant to its authority under the laws of the State of Indiana, Ind. Code § 36-7-4 et seq., as amended.

WHEREAS, the City of Westfield, Indiana (the "City") and the Township of Washington, both of Hamilton County, Indiana are subject to the Unified Development Ordinance;

WHEREAS, the Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission (the "Commission") considered a petition (**Petition No. 2203-PUD-05**), requesting an amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance and the Zoning Map with regard to the subject real estate more particularly described in **Exhibit A** attached hereto (the "Real Estate");

WHEREAS, the Commission forwarded **Petition No. 2203-PUD-05** to the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Common Council") with a **FAVORABLE** recommendation (7-0 vote) in accordance with Indiana Code § 36-7-4-608, as required by Indiana Code § 36-7-4-1505;

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Commission certified the action of the Commission to the Common Council on August 16, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the Common Council is subject to the provisions of the Indiana Code §36-7-4-1507 and Indiana Code § 36-7-4-1512 concerning any action on this request.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana, meeting in regular session, that the Unified Development Ordinance and Zoning Map are hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Applicability of Ordinance.

- 1.1 The Unified Development Ordinance and Zoning Map are hereby changed to designate the Real Estate as a Planned Unit Development District to be known as the "**Towns at Union PUD District**" (the "District").
- 1.2 Development of the Real Estate shall be governed by (i) the provisions of this Ordinance and its exhibits, and (ii) the provisions of the Unified Development

Ordinance, as amended and applicable to the Underlying Zoning District or a Planned Unit Development District, except as modified, revised, supplemented or expressly made inapplicable by this Ordinance.

- 1.3 Chapter (“*Chapter*”) and Article (“*Article*”) cross-references of this Ordinance shall hereafter refer to the section as specified and referenced in the Unified Development Ordinance.
- 1.4 All provisions and representations of the Unified Development Ordinance that conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby made inapplicable to the Real Estate and shall be superseded by the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 2. **Definitions.** Capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Ordinance shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the UDO.

- 2.1 **“Front-Load Townhome”** A dwelling building including individual townhomes which have a garage and entry door on the same elevation facing the street.
- 2.2 **“Rear-Load Townhome”** A dwelling building including individual townhomes which have a garage on the rear elevation of the townhome and an entry door on the elevation facing the street.

Section 3. **Concept Plan.** The Concept Plan, attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, is hereby incorporated in accordance with Article 10.9(F)(2) Planned Unit Development Districts; PUD District Ordinance Requirements; Concept Plan.

- 3.1 The Real Estate shall be developed in compliance with Article 10.9(F) Planned Unit Development Districts; PUD District Ordinance Requirements. The details and determination between dry or wet detention/retention areas shall be finalized at the time of Secondary Plat and Construction Plan review.
- 3.2 The Real Estate shall be developed in substantial compliance with the Concept Plan.
- 3.3 The Concept Plan includes “Front-Load Townhomes” and “Rear-Load Townhomes” which dwelling orientations are identified on **Exhibit C** and are further regulated under the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 4. **Underlying Zoning District.** The Underlying Zoning District shall be SFA: Single-Family Attached District.

Section 5. **Permitted Uses.** The permitted uses shall be limited to Townhome Dwellings.

- 5.1 **Maximum Dwellings:** The total number of Dwelling Units permitted in the District

shall not exceed seventy-three (73).

Section 6. **General Regulations.** The standards of Chapter 4: Zoning Districts, as applicable to the Underlying Zoning District, shall apply to the development of the District, except as otherwise modified below with the following table which replaces and supersedes the Section 4.9 (A-L) of the UDO:

Standard	
Minimum Lot Area	No Minimum
Minimum Lot Frontage	No Minimum
Maximum Density	See Section 5.1
Maximum Dwelling Units Per Building	6
Maximum Project Size	13 Acres
Minimum Building Setback Lines from perimeter of Real Estate	
Setback from Union Street (stoop and porch may encroach)	10'
Setback from north perimeter of Real Estate	25'
Setback from east perimeter of Real Estate	80'
Setback from south perimeter of Real Estate	80'
Minimum Driveway Length	20'
Minimum Internal Building Setbacks	
Setback from internal street	0'
Side Yard & Rear Yard	0'
Minimum Distance Between Structures	20'
Maximum Lot Coverage	100%
Minimum Lot Width	20'
Maximum Building Height	2 Stories
Minimum Living Area (Total) Per Dwelling Unit	1,800sqft

Section 7. **Development Standards.** The standards of Chapter 6: Development Standards shall apply to the development of the District, except as otherwise modified below.

7.1 Article 6.3 Architectural Standards: Article 6.3 shall not apply, rather, the following shall apply:

- A. Character Exhibit: The Character Exhibit for Townhomes, attached hereto as **Exhibit D**, is hereby incorporated to capture the intended architecture of townhouses to be constructed. It is not the intent to limit the architecture shown in the Character Exhibit, but to establish a benchmark for quality, vision, and appearance of architecture within the

development. The Department shall determine whether a structure is consistent with the established benchmark and complies with the standards of this Ordinance. The Department's decision may be appealed to the Plan Commission.

B. Building Materials: Permitted exterior building materials are as follows:

- i. Masonry Material (brick or cultured stone), LP smart trim, composite trim, composite veneer panels, vinyl shutters, aluminum facia, aluminum soffits, aluminum downspouts/gutters.
- ii. Vinyl siding shall be prohibited.

C. Roof Standards:

- i. The primary/main roof overhang or eaves shall be a minimum of eleven inches (11”) on all facades of each Building, as measured prior to the installation of any Masonry Materials.
- ii. Dimensional shingles are required with metal roof accents permitted.
- iii. Roof Pitch: The minimum primary/main and secondary roof pitches of all townhome buildings shall be no less than 6:12.
- iv. Shed roof dormer accents shall be no less than 3:12.

D. Dwelling Design: The following standards shall apply to all Townhomes:

- i. Perimeter Lots Fronting Union Street: Townhomes as shown on the Concept Plan (i) facing Union Street and (ii) the internal sidewalk opposite the entrance off of Union Street, shall require the front door to face the street/sidewalk and the garage shall face an internal street.
- ii. Garages: All Dwellings shall have a two (2) car garage.
- iii. Exterior Materials: Masonry wainscot shall be required at a minimum height of the lower of (i) 36” above grade, or (ii) the bottom of the first floor windows of each dwelling (masonry on all 4-sides of the dwelling).
- iv. Front Building Façade Requirements: At a minimum, each Dwelling shall utilize the following architectural elements on the front building façade (façade including the entry door – see

Exhibit C which identifies the front elevation) unless specifically noted otherwise:

- a) All units shall be offset a minimum two (2) feet, unit to unit.
 - b) All buildings shall have a minimum of three (3) materials, colors, or patterns on the front façade, one of which shall be masonry.
 - c) A minimum of four (4) windows.
 - d) A one by 4-inch nominal window trim board shall be provided unless the window is wrapped in masonry or shutters are provided.
 - e) Windows installed in a front door, garage door, a service door with a window, and transom windows in bathroom or storage areas shall count as one window for purposes of these requirements as long as the window(s) in the garage exceed an aggregate of four (4) square feet in size.
- v. Side Building Façade Requirements: At a minimum, the side elevation for each end unit on each Townhome building shall utilize the following architectural elements (exclusive of common firewalls separating units contained in same building structure):
- a) All side facades shall have a minimum of two (2) materials, colors, or patterns.
 - b) A minimum of two (2) windows shall be required .
 - c) A one by 4-inch nominal window trim board shall be provided unless the window is wrapped in masonry or shutters are provided.
 - d) Windows installed in a garage, a service door with a window, and transom windows in bathroom or storage areas shall count as one window for purposes of this requirement as long as the window(s) in the garage exceed an aggregate of four (4) square feet in size.
- vi. Rear Building Façade Requirements: At a minimum, each Dwelling shall utilize the following architectural elements on the Rear Façade (façade opposite the façade including the entry door):

- a) All rear facades shall have a minimum of two (2) materials, colors, or patterns.
- b) A minimum of four (4) windows shall be required.
- c) A one by 4-inch nominal window trim board shall be provided unless the window is wrapped in masonry or shutters are provided.
- d) Windows installed in a patio door, garage door and transom windows in bathroom or storage areas shall count as one window for purposes of this requirement as long as the window(s) in the garage exceed an aggregate of four (4) square feet in size.

7.2. Article 6.8 Landscaping Standards: Shall apply, except as otherwise modified or enhanced below.

- A. General Design Standards: Landscaping shall be as generally depicted on **Exhibit B**. If a provision of Article 6.8 Landscaping Standards is in conflict with **Exhibit B**, then this Ordinance shall control. Relocation of plant materials shall be permitted as part of the Detailed Development Plan approval.
- B. Tree Preservation: Article 6.8(E) Tree Preservation Standards in UDO shall apply. Trees shall be substantially preserved as shown on the Concept Plan as “Existing Trees”.
- C. Easements: Article 6.8(G)(4)(f) Easements, of the UDO shall be modified as follows:
 - i. Landscaping shall be permitted within utility or drainage easements, so long as 10 ft separation from any storm sewer or subsurface drain is maintained.
- D. Ponds: Article 6.8(I)(1)(b), of the UDO, Wetlands/aquatic vegetation planted around the wet perimeter shall not apply.
- E. Street Trees: Article 6.8(J) Street Trees shall not apply.
- F. Lot Landscaping: Article 6.8(K) Minimum Lot Landscaping Requirements shall not apply. Rather, the following shall apply, as generally illustrated on the Concept Plan.
 - i. At a minimum, the yard between the entry door of a dwelling and

the street shall be sodded and the remainder of the Lot shall be seeded.

- ii. A minimum of: one (1) Shade Tree and four (4) Shrubs shall be required per Townhome Dwelling.
 - iii. Each Townhome on a Corner Lot shall have a minimum of one (1) additional Shade Tree required between the side of the dwelling and the street.
- G. Open Space/Common Areas: Five (5) trees per acre shall be required and provided on the Real Estate.
- H. External Street Frontages: Article 6.8(M)(1) External Street Frontage Landscaping Requirements shall not apply.
- I. Buffer Yards: Article 6.8(N) Buffer Yard Requirements shall apply except as otherwise modified below.
- i. The south Buffer Yard shall be Twenty-five (25) feet in depth and a metal fence of the type and style depicted in **Exhibit E** shall be required along the perimeter of the south Buffer Yard.
 - ii. Trees to be preserved shall constitute the required Buffer Yard tree plantings. No shrubs or mounding shall be required.
 - iii. All buffers shall preserve existing trees, supplemental plantings not required.
- J. Vision Clearance: Article 6.19 shall be modified to require a thirty (30) feet maximum at Union Street and internal streets.

Section 8. **Infrastructure Standards.** The District's infrastructure shall comply with the Unified Development Ordinance and the City's Construction Standards (see Chapter 7: Subdivision Regulations) except as modified below, unless otherwise approved by the Plan Commission or Department of Public Works in consideration to the preservation of the natural topography and environment and in consideration to the unique design intent of the District.

Section 9. **Design Standards.** The standards of Chapter 8: Design Standards shall apply to the development of the District, except as otherwise modified below.

- 9.1 Minimum Open Space: Open Space (green space area on lots, common areas and the area of ponds) shall be a minimum of thirty (30) percent and as generally shown

on the Concept Plan. Pond area shall be included in Open Space.

9.2 Article 8.6(H) Multi-family Districts: Shall not apply, rather site amenities shall include (i) a covered gathering structure, (ii) dog park, and (iii) a bike maintenance station, the character of which is generally illustrated on **Exhibit F**.

9.3 Article 8.7(C): shall not apply, instead the following shall apply: The minimum sidewalk width shall be five (5) feet, regardless of location or design. Five (5) foot sidewalk abutting roll curb shall be permitted and sidewalks shall be provided as generally shown on the Concept Plan.

Section 10. **Duration.** Failure to obtain Secondary Plat / Construction Plan approval for the District by January 1, 2028 (unless otherwise extended by the Director) shall automatically void this Ordinance and cause the zoning classification of the Real Estate to revert to the AG-SF 1 District.

Section 11. **Severability.** If any term or provision of this ordinance is held to be illegal or unenforceable, the validity or enforceability of the remainder of this ordinance will not be affected.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank, signature page follows]

ALL OF WHICH IS HEREBY ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF
WESTFIELD, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

ATTEST:

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby certify that **ORDINANCE 22-06** was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield

on the _____ day of _____, 2022, at _____ m.

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE Ordinance 22-06

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I hereby VETO Ordinance 22-06

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security number in this document, unless required by law: Jon C. Dobosiewicz

This document prepared by: James E. Shinaver and Jon C. Dobosiewicz; Nelson & Frankenger
550 Congressional Blvd, Suite 210, Carmel, IN 46032 (317) 844-0106

SCHEDULE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A	Real Estate (Legal Description)
Exhibit B	Concept Plan
Exhibit C	Dwelling Orientation Exhibits
Exhibit D	Dwelling Character Exhibits
Exhibit E	Fence Exhibit
Exhibit F	Amenity Character Exhibits


EXHIBIT A
REAL ESTATE
(Page 1 of 2)

Part of the Southwest Quarter of Section 6, Township 18 North, Range 4 East of the Second Principal Meridian, in the City of Westfield, Washington Township, Hamilton County, Indiana, based on a survey prepared by Michael G. Judt, Professional Surveyor Number 21500017, HWC Engineering, Project Number 2019-243-A, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Southwest corner of said Southwest Quarter, marked by a Harrison Monument found per Hamilton County Surveyor reference ties; thence North 00 degrees 15 minutes 36 seconds West (grid bearing, Indiana State Plane, East Zone, NAD 83, 2011, EPOCH 2010.0000) along the west line of said Southwest Quarter a distance of 324.72 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, marked by a mag nail with washer stamped "HWC ENGINEERING FIRM #0114"; thence continuing North 00 degrees 15 minutes 36 seconds West along said west line a distance of 847.06 feet to a southwest corner of a tract of land described in Instrument Number 200000054546 in the Office of the Recorder of Hamilton County, Indiana, the following two (2) courses being along a south and west line of said tract; (1) thence North 89 degrees 29 minutes 37 seconds East a distance of 660.00 feet; (2) thence South 00 degrees 15 minutes 36 seconds East a distance of 659.86 feet to a southwest corner of said tract; thence continuing South 00 degrees 15 minutes 36 seconds East along the southerly extension of the previous line a distance of 190.45 feet to a 5/8-inch rebar with cap stamped "HWC ENGINEERING FIRM #0114"; thence South 89 degrees 46 minutes 31 seconds West a distance of 659.99 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, containing 12.859 acres, more or less.

.

EXHIBIT A
REAL ESTATE
(Page 2 of 2)



Note: Larger scale paper and digital copies of the Concept Plan are on file with the Department of Economic and Community Development under Docket Number 2203-PUD-05.




EXHIBIT C
DWELLING ORIENTATION EXHIBIT
(Page 1 of 1)




EXHIBIT D
DWELLING CHARACTER EXHIBITS
(Page 1 of 2)



EXHIBIT D
DWELLING CHARACTER EXHIBITS
(Page 2 of 2)




EXHIBIT E
FENCE EXHIBIT
(Page 1 of 1)



EXHIBIT F
AMENITY CHARACTER EXHIBITS
(Page 1 of 2)



EXHIBIT F
AMENITY CHARACTER EXHIBITS
(Page 2 of 2)



ORDINANCE 22-38

AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING CERTAIN REAL ESTATE TO THE CITY OF WESTFIELD, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA

WHEREAS, the Westfield City Council (the “Council”) has the authority and desires to annex lands into the municipality as defined by Indiana Code 36-4-3; and,

WHEREAS, one hundred percent (100%) of the owners of the parcels proposed for annexation as identified in **Exhibit A** and **Exhibit B** (the “Annexation Area”) have filed a petition with the Council; and,

WHEREAS, the Council has conducted a public hearing on September 12, 2022, as required by law with regard to the annexation of the Annexation Area; and,

WHEREAS, the Council has adopted a fiscal plan for the annexation of the Annexation Area in accordance with Indiana Code 36-4-3-3.1 (Resolution 22-115); and,

WHEREAS, the Annexation Area meets the contiguity requirements of Indiana Code 36-4-3-1.5; and,

WHEREAS, the Council now finds that the statutory criteria for annexation have been met; and,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL THAT THE OFFICIAL CITY MAP ADOPTED BY REFERENCE IN SECTION 2-515 OF THE WESTFIELD CODE BE MODIFIED AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Annexation Area, generally located on the west side of Horton Road, north of 193rd Street, and adjacent to the existing corporate limits along the northern, southern, and western boundaries of the Annexation Area, is hereby annexed to and declared to be a part of the City.

Section 2. The Annexation Area is to further include the contiguous public highways and rights-of-way of the public highways which are adjacent to the annexation area per Indiana Code 36-4-3-2.5.

Section 3. The Annexation Area is hereby assigned to City Council District 3 and shall become a part thereof immediately upon the effective date of this Ordinance.

Section 4. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage by the Council, its publication, and upon the passage of any applicable waiting period, all as provided by the laws of the State of Indiana. All ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed. Any portion of the Ordinance later to be found void or invalid shall not affect the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

ALL OF WHICH IS HEREBY ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF WESTFIELD,
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA THIS _____ DAY OF OCTOBER, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

ATTEST:

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby certify that **ORDINANCE 22-38** was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield
on the _____ day of October, 2022, at _____ m.

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE Ordinance 22-38
this _____ day of October, 2022.

I hereby VETO Ordinance 22-38
this _____ day of October,
2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security number in this document,
unless required by law: Ryan Collingwood

Prepared by: Ryan Collingwood, Associate Planner
City of Westfield Community Development Department
2728 East 171st Street, Westfield, IN 46074, (317) 804-3170

EXHIBIT A
ANNEXATION AREA




EXHIBIT LEGEND

- | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|---------|
|  | ANNEXATION AREA |  | PARCELS |
|  | EXISTING CITY LIMITS |  | STREETS |

Not To Scale



EXHIBIT B
ANNEXATION AREA
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

This description includes two (2) parcels of land:

Parcel Nos. 08-05-22-00-00-016.000, 08-05-23-00-00-024.000

The East Half of the Southeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 22, and the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 23, all in Township 19 North, Range 3 East of the Second Principal Meridian, Washington Township, Hamilton County, Indiana, based upon a survey prepared by Michael G. Judt, Professional Surveyor Number 21500017, HWC Engineering Job Number 2020-277-S, dated March 10, 2021, more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the southeast corner of said Southwest Quarter of said Southwest Quarter of said Section 23, marked by a mag nail with washer stamped "CRIPE 0055"; thence North 00 degrees 06 minutes 21 seconds East (assumed bearing per Osborne Trails, Section 1, per plat recorded in Plat Cabinet 5, Slide 1052 as Instrument Number 2019051344 in the Office of the Recorder of Hamilton County, Indiana) along the east line of said Southwest Quarter of said Southwest Quarter a distance of 1321.70 feet to the northeast corner of said Quarter-Quarter Section; thence South 89 degrees 43 minutes 45 seconds West along the north line of said Quarter-Quarter Section a distance of 1326.42 feet to the northwest corner thereof, marked by a 5/8-inch rebar with cap stamped "MILLER S0083"; thence South 89 degrees 44 minutes 37 seconds West along the north line of said East Half of said Southeast Quarter of said Southeast Quarter of said Section 22 a distance of 661.87 feet to a corner of Osborne Trails, Section 3, per plat recorded in Plat Cabinet 6, Slide 45 as Instrument Number 2021004908 in said Recorder's Office, said corner marked by a 5/8-inch rebar with cap stamped "S&A FIRM 0008"; thence South 00 degrees 02 minutes 47 seconds West along an east line of said Osborne Trails, Section 3 and an east line of said Osborne Trails, Section 1 a distance of 1322.09 feet to the southeast corner of Common Area #6 in said Osborne Trails, Section 1, marked by a 5/8-inch rebar with cap stamped "S&A FIRM 0008"; thence North 89 degrees 43 minutes 26 seconds East along a north line of said Osborne Trails, Section 1 a distance of 661.94 feet to the southwest corner of said Southwest Quarter of said Section 23, marked by a stone; thence North 89 degrees 43 minutes 18 seconds East along the south line of said Southwest Quarter of said Southwest Quarter of said Section 23 a distance of 1324.98 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, containing 60.314 acres, more or less.

Westfield City Council August 22, 2022

The Westfield City Council held a meeting on August 22, 2022 at Westfield City Hall. Present were Mike Johns, Scott Frei, Scott Willis, Cindy Spoljaric, Jake Gilbert and Joe Edwards. Troy Patton attended virtually. Mayor Cook, Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer, Anne Poindexter and Manny Herceg were also in attendance.

Mayor Cook called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM

Approval of Minutes:

Scott Willis made the motion to approve the August 8, 2022 minutes as presented. Cindy Spoljaric seconded. Vote: Yes-7; No-0. Motion carries.

Claims:

Troy Patton made a motion to approve the claims. Joe Edwards seconded. Vote: Yes-7; No-0. Motion carries.

Miscellaneous Business/Special Presentation

Update on Historical Cabin-Diana Peyton

Diana Peyton stated that the historical Barker cabin has an anticipated finish date of November 1st. With rising building material costs they are over budget and looking for community support either by monetary donations or by purchasing a memorial brick to be placed around the cabin. They are estimating the need for an additional \$25,000.

Presentation: Non-residential Data Presentation-Caleb Ernest

Caleb Ernest presented the 2nd part in a series of data driven information that shows properties within the City of Westfield. The presentation went over basic terminology, discussed land use, and the processes and procedures of development projects.

Council Discussion/Questions on Mid-Term Budget Review

Mike Johns stated that he had two questions. The first one pertaining to the overage in the Admin salary line (difference between the salary line that Jeremy Lollar's salary came out of and Todd Burtron's). The second question was about the Grand Park budget and if the budget had been adjusted to reflect William's and the five employees that left the city and went to work with Legacy Sports Group to manage the park. There was council discussion.

Old Business:

Per Resolution 21-121, Relating to Transparency, Councilors Do Not Need to Recuse Themselves, but are Required to Disclose if They Have Received Contributions of \$1,000 or More When Voting on Any Actions Involving One of Their Donors.

Ordinance 20-25: Northpoint II PUD

Council Introduction: July 13, 2020

APC Public Hearing: February 16, 2022

APC 2nd Public Hearing: August 15, 2022

APC Negative Recommendation: August 15, 2022

Adoption Consideration: August 22, 2022

Pam Howard presented stating the petitioner is asking for a zoning change of 183.5 acres located on the NS of SR 38 between Anthony Rd. & Hinkle Rd. to accommodate an industrial and single-family development.

Developer Chris Wilkes, with Holladay Properties, gave another lengthy presentation on the proposed development. Mr. Wilkes stated that he has a company interested in the project, the details and terms of which are considered proprietary. Councilors Frei and Gilbert essentially requested to receive any information that Mr. Wilkes might be willing to share within a 48-hour window. Councilor Gilbert suggested delaying a vote. Mr. Wilkes proposed the Council vote on his agenda item at the next Council meeting in order to give him time to disclose more information about “the company” to city leadership.

There was council discussion.

Scott Willis made the motion to shelf the Ordinance indefinitely in order to have an executive session to explore the details. Jake Gilbert seconded.

There was continued council discussion. Scott Willis rescinded his motion. Jake Gilbert rescinded his second.

Scott Willis made the motion to delay the vote for a short period of time to have an executive session to explore the details. Jake Gilbert seconded. Vote: Yes-4; No-3 (J. Edwards, C. Spoljaric, M. Johns). Motion carries.

Ordinance 22-36: Stormwater Water Utility Rate**Council Introduction: August 8, 2022****Public Hearing: August 22, 2022****Adoption Consideration: September 12, 2022**

Jeremy Lollar presented stating that this is an update to the Ordinance (Stormwater rate). The current rate is \$4.19. The Master Plan Study shows the rate should be \$6.13. The Ordinance proposes a graduated increase over the next 5 years. Effective January 1st 2023 the rate would be \$4.55 with either a .39/.40 increase during the next 5 years, getting the rate to \$6.13.

Public Hearing Open: 9:04 PM/No comments**Public Hearing Closed: 9:05 PM**

Cindy Spoljaric had concerns about the language in Section 1, (E & F). There was discussion

New Business**Resolution 22-114: City of Westfield Adopting a Preliminary Strategic Economic Development Plan for the Central IN Regional Development Authority****Council Introduction: August 22, 2022****Adoption Consideration: September 12, 2022**

Manny Herceg presented this and the following Ordinance together. The Ordinance opts the city into the Central IN Regional Development Authority (CIRDA). There is no economic contribution to join at this time, but there is an initial five-year term requirement, followed by an opt-out option given a two-year notice. The city would have one vote which would allow say in certain processes which could bring funds to this region. Once the Ordinance is adopted then the Resolution outlining the preliminary strategic economic development plan would be considered for adoption.

Joe Edwards expressed some concerns, stating he would like to see the fine print. The program was established and funded by the state legislature. The mayor stated the fine print and rules are very well defined by the state legislature.

Ordinance 22-37: City of Westfield Authorizing the City of Westfield to Become a Member of the Central IN Regional Development Authority**Council Introduction: August 22, 2022****Adoption Consideration: September 12, 2022**

Presented with above Resolution

Resolution 22-113: \$6 Million Debt Repayment for Grand Park

Council Introduction: August 22, 2022

Adoption consideration: September 12, 2022

Cindy Spoljaric presented stating the changes that have been made since the last meeting. This Resolution has repayment (by RDC) of \$3M by December 1, 2022 and the remaining balance of \$3M by December 2023. There was council discussion on the language in the Resolution.

A Resolution would need to be passed by the RDC to approve the repayments/schedule. Jeremy Lollar suggested that to by-pass having to do an additional appropriation of the 2022 budget, that the first payment be made January 1, 2023 and balance by December 1, 2023. Doing this would allow for planning the payments in the 2023 budget. Jeremy also stated if the council wished to spend the \$6M in 2023 that it would need to be appropriated into the original fund that it came out of.

It was agreed upon that a Resolution with language/term changes made would be brought to the next meeting.

Guests:

Marla Ailor spoke stating that Councilor Willis had received more than a \$1,000 campaign donation from Chris Wilkes and should have stated this prior to Ordinance 20-25 (Northpoint II) being discussed. Mrs. Ailor also told council that she knew someone on the Fishers City Council that had been provided documents by Mayor Fadness on the topic of CIRDA, and she would be happy to get that for any council members wishing to review it.

Chris Larsen stated that the council meeting scheduled for August 31st would be at 10 AM Eastern Time.

Clerk Treasurer Comments:

None

City Council Comments:

Cindy Spoljaric -Asked about the Thoroughfare Plan updated & a Capital Improvement Plan update. Gave APC & ARPA update.

Mike Johns- Stated he had met with Manny Herceg to discuss Taft invoicing and was assured that invoicing would be received in a timely manner.

Mayor Comments:

None

Without any further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:35 PM

Clerk-Treasurer

President



Westfield City Council Report

Ordinance Number:	22-31
APC Petition Number:	2208-ZOA-02
Petitioner:	City of Westfield
Requested Action:	Approval of an Ordinance to amend Article 6.8 and Article 10.9 of the Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance.
Exhibits:	1. Department Report 2. Ord. 22-31 (Clean) 3. Ord. 22-31 (Redline)
Staff Reviewer:	Caleb Ernest, Senior Planner

PETITION HISTORY

This petition was introduced at the [July 11, 2022](#), City Council meeting. The discussion for this meeting can be viewed [here](#). The petition received a public hearing at the [August 1, 2022](#), Advisory Plan Commission (the “Plan Commission”) meeting. The discussion for this meeting can be viewed [here](#). The petition received a unanimous favorable recommendation at the [September 6, 2022](#), Plan Commission meeting. The discussion for this meeting can be viewed [here](#).

OVERVIEW

The Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance (the “UDO”) was originally adopted in September 2014. Since then, seven amendment ordinances have been adopted (November 2014, May 2015, May 2017, April 2018, August 2019, September 2019 and May 2022). This amendment ordinance is proposed to address the following topic, which is further summarized herein.

Article 6.8 Landscaping Standards:

UDO Article 6.8(F)(3)(a)(ii) Selection, Installation, and Maintenance of Plant Materials; Installation; Timing and Permits; requires a landscape inspection for all Common Area landscaping within each Secondary Plat section once one of two thresholds has been met:

1. More than fifty percent (50%) of the Lots within the Secondary Plat section have been issued Building Permits; or
2. Twelve (12) months have passed since the issuance of the first Building Permit within the Secondary Plat section.

This process has created several issues when one of the above thresholds has been met:

- i) During off-season parts of the year where planting is not ideal (winter and peak summer months) plantings would be installed and later die or are not available for installation resulting in temporarily permitting otherwise compliant building permits. This prevents the homeowner from moving into their home due to seasonal delays in inspecting the required landscaping when the home itself is ready for a homeowner to move in.
- ii) Due to either supply chain issues, lack of irrigation systems installed or continued maintenance of the landscaping areas, once the City's landscaping inspection has occurred, the landscaping could die after the inspection has been passed when further construction of the remaining 50% of the section ensues.
- iii) Construction of any given Secondary Plat section damages installed plantings at 50% build out of a section. Essentially, installed plantings per the City's above requirement are sometimes either destroyed due to its location for future construction of lots and infrastructure or damaged due to the location being too close in proximity to current construction.
- iv) The City has a lack of sureties in place to guarantee the landscaping will be installed according to the landscape plan on file. Revised landscape plans created during the section's construction results in City records not being as updated as when the landscape plan was approved months prior to construction.

Due to the above concerns as well as other one-off occurrences, it is the City's recommendation to replace the current UDO standard with requiring a performance bond for Common Area landscaping within each residential Secondary Plat section.

A performance bond would create a surety with the City that landscaping will be installed either by the builder or the City if the bond is ever pulled. A performance bond would also grant the builder to complete installation of required landscaping at a time best appropriate for the builder. Once installation is then completed, a City inspection will occur to confirm the accurate landscaping has been installed; which will result in releasing the performance bond.

Similarly, if construction of the bonded section has not been completed within a twelve (12) month timeframe, the performance bond can be pulled per this proposed standard. A bond could be pulled any time with proof of incomplete installation of landscaping, however, the twelve (12) month language would provide another surety that prevents the builder from ignoring the performance bond and potentially never installing landscaping.

Lastly, requiring a performance bond will create a more efficient process alleviating staff time and tracking of every Secondary Plat section and one of the two thresholds aforementioned.

MODIFICATIONS SINCE AUGUST 1, 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

Since the [August 1, 2022](#), meeting, the ordinance was revised to include a new section being added into Article 10 of the UDO. This new section, titled "Landscaping Bonds" will be located as the new Article 10.9. This section creates the standards describing the process, requirements,

supplemental documents and other related requirements for the landscaping bond process. The edits to the proposed ordinance can be found in **Exhibit 3 (Ord. 22-31 (Redline))**.

STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

Indiana Code 36-7-4-603 states that reasonable regard shall be paid to:

1. The Comprehensive Plan.
 2. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses.
 3. The most desirable use for which the land is adapted.
 4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction.
 5. Responsible growth and development.
-

PROCEDURAL

Procedures to amend a zoning ordinance are established by Indiana Code (I.C. 36-7-4-600, et seq.). Amendments are required to be considered at a public hearing. The public hearing for this petition was held at the [August 1, 2022](#), Plan Commission meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS / ACTIONS

Plan Commission Recommendation

At its [September 6, 2022](#), meeting, the Plan Commission forwarded a favorable recommendation of this petition to the Council (Vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed).

City Council

Introduction: [July 11, 2022](#)

Eligible for Adoption: [September 6, 2022](#)

Submitted by: Caleb Ernest, Senior Planner, Community Development Department

APC CERTIFICATION**WESTFIELD-WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP ADVISORY
PLAN COMMISSION CERTIFICATION**

The Westfield-Washington Township Advisory Plan Commission held a public hearing on Monday, August 1, 2022, to consider an amendment to the Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance. Notice of the public hearing was advertised and noticed in accordance with Indiana law and the Advisory Plan Commission's Rules of Procedure. Notice was shown to have been published in a newspaper of general circulation in Hamilton County, Indiana. The petition is as follows:

Docket No.	2208-ZOA-02
Ordinance No.	22-31
Petitioner	City of Westfield
Description	Approval of an Ordinance to amend Article 6.8 and Article 10.9 of the Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance.

On September 6, 2022, the Plan commission forwarded a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding this petition (Vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed).

The above-mentioned proposal and the Advisory Plan Commission's recommendation thereof are hereby certified.



Kevin M. Todd, Secretary

September 7, 2022

Date



Westfield City Council Report

Ordinance Number:	22-06
APC Petition Number:	2203-PUD-05
Petitioner:	Pulte Homes of Indiana, LLC
Requested Action:	A change in zoning for 12.85 acres +/- from the AG-SF1: Agriculture / Single-family Rural District to the Towns at Union Planned Unit Development (PUD) District.
Current Zoning:	AG-SF1: Agriculture / Single-family Rural District
Current Land Use:	Cemetery / Vacant
Acreage:	12.85 acres +/-
Exhibits:	1. Department Report 2. Location Map 3. Proposed Ordinance 22-06 (Clean) 4. Proposed Ordinance 22-06 (Redline) 5. Issue List 6. Issue List with Petitioner's Responses 7. Revised Concept Plan 8. Project Description 9. Revised Townhome Examples (Dwelling Character) 10. Neighborhood Meeting Summary 11. Fence Exhibit 12. Single-family Distance Exhibit 13. Union Right-of-way Cross Section Exhibit 14. Public Comment

Staff Reviewer: Caleb Ernest, Senior Planner

PETITION HISTORY

This petition was introduced at the [February 14, 2022](#), City Council meeting. The discussion for this petition can be viewed [here](#). The petition received a public hearing at the [March 7, 2022](#), Advisory Plan Commission (the "Plan Commission") meeting. The discussion for this public hearing can be viewed [here](#). The petition appeared for an update and discussion at the [July 18,](#)

[2022](#), Plan Commission meeting. The discussion for this meeting can be viewed [here](#). The petition received a unanimous positive recommendation (7-0) at the [August 15, 2022](#), Plan Commission meeting. The discussion for this meeting can be viewed [here](#).

The petitioner held a neighbor meeting on March 1, 2022. A summary of this meeting has been provided by the petitioner and included as [Exhibit 10](#).

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Location: This subject real estate is approximately 12.85 acres in size and is located east of and adjacent to Union Street and south of David Brown Drive (the “Real Estate”, see [Exhibit 2](#)). The Property is currently zoned the AG-SF1 District. Adjacent zoning districts to the south and east are also zoned the AG-SF1 District. Adjacent zoning districts to the west, north and east are zoned the MF-2: Multi-family Medium Density District.

Project Description: The petitioner is requesting a change in zoning from the AG-SF1 District to accommodate a residential use, as described in the Project Description (see [Exhibit 8](#)).

ORDINANCE DETAILS

Please note: some standards listed in the PUD are contingent on Public Work’s review and standards from the Construction Standards, they are therefore not discussed in this report, the Department has recommended removal of those standards.

Concept Plan: The proposed ordinance incorporates a Concept Plan (see [Exhibit 7](#)) and requires that the Real Estate be developed in substantial compliance with the Concept Plan.

Underlying Zoning: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance assigns SFA: Single-family Attached District as the Underlying Zoning District.

Permitted Uses: The permitted uses shall be limited to Townhome Dwellings. The total number of dwelling units permitted shall not exceed eighty-four (84).

General Regulations: The table below outlines the proposed lot standards as compared to the UDO’s requirements for SFA lots (the proposed Underlying Zoning District).

	PUD	UDO (SFA)
Min. Lot Area	No minimum	No minimum
Min. Lot Frontage	No minimum	No minimum
Max. Density	84 dwelling units	4 dwelling units per acre
Max. Dwelling Units Per Building	6	4
Max. Project Size	See Real Estate	30 acres
Min. Building Setback Lines from perimeter of Real Estate:	-	-

Setback from Union Street (stoop and porch may encroach)	10'	25'
Setback from north perimeter of Real Estate	25'	No structure shall be erected above the projected 1:2 Proximity Slope line from the perimeter of the project.
Setback from east perimeter of Real Estate	80'	No structure shall be erected above the projected 1:2 Proximity Slope line from the perimeter of the project.
Setback from south perimeter of Real Estate	80'	No structure shall be erected above the projected 1:2 Proximity Slope line from the perimeter of the project.
Min. Driveway Length	20'	n/a
Min. Internal Building Setbacks:	-	Buildings with more than one adjacent unit shall stagger the Front Building Setback Line for each unit by at least 4'
Setback from internal street	n/a	20'
Side Yard & Rear Yard	n/a	n/a
Min. Distance Between Structures	20'	No Exterior Vinyl: 25 feet Exterior Vinyl: 30 feet
Max. Lot Coverage	n/a	n/a
Max. Lot Width	20'	n/a
Max. Building Height	3 Stories	35'
Min. Living Area (Total) Per Dwelling Unit	1,900 sq. ft	Single-story: 1,300 sq. ft Story and one-half: 1,600 sq. ft Two-story: 1,800 sq. ft

Development Standards: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance establishes some alternative development standards from the UDO. Below you will find sections of text beginning with the words “In the UDO” which are to show what the current UDO requirement is, compared to the bullet points, which show the proposed PUD standards. The proposed PUD standards of note are briefly highlighted and summarized below, but do not reflect the total text or wording of each standard:

- Architectural Standards: The proposed ordinance exempts the Real Estate from the architectural standards of Article 6.3 of the UDO and instead includes a Character Exhibit ([Exhibit 9](#)) to establish a benchmark for quality, vision, and appearance of architecture. Additionally, the proposed ordinance includes standards for Building Materials, Roofing and Dwelling Design which includes front, side and rear façade requirements.
- Landscaping Standards: shall apply, except:
 - Landscaping shall be depicted on the Concept Plan (Exhibit B of Ordinance);
 - Tree Preservation (Article 6.8(E) of UDO) shall not apply, rather:
 - Trees shall generally be preserved as shown on the Concept Plan;
 - Trees preserved may be removed for required grading, utilities, and drainage needs;
 - Trees preserved shall constitute as required buffer and plantings;
 - No tree inventory and/or new plantings are required;
 - Drainage and utility easements may overlap buffer yards.

In the UDO, best practices standards are required for tree preservations in Article 6.8(E)(1) & (2). Article 6.8(E)(3) contains requirements for tree inventories for the purposes of crediting landscaping to meet other landscaping requirements in the Landscaping Standards. Similarly, the remainder of Article 6.8(E) contains standards supplemental to the plans, replacement, incentives, tree protection and tree preservation easements for when trees are being preserved.

- Easements (Article 6.8(G)(4)(f) of UDO) shall apply, except:
 - Landscaping shall be permitted within utility or drainage easements, so long as 10 ft separation from any storm sewer or subsurface drain is maintained.
- Ponds (Article 6.8(I)(2) of UDO) shall not apply.

In the UDO, wetlands/aquatic vegetation is planted around the wet perimeter of such areas to further the design objective of natural appearances around detention and retention areas.

- Street Trees (Article 6.8(J) of UDO) shall not apply.
 - If provided, they are not required to be located within ROW or within min. 8' wide planting strip.

In the UDO, street trees are required within ROW of all new Local Streets in residential Major subdivisions. Street trees shall only be required 1 side of a Residential Frontage Road and shall be located within a min. 8-foot wide planting strip between curb and sidewalk. Street trees shall be spaced an average of every 50 feet with a max. of 60 feet and a min. of 25 feet.

- Lot Landscaping (Article 6.8(K) of UDO) shall apply, except:
 - Yard between entry door of dwelling and street shall be sodded and remainder of lot seeded;
 - Min. 1 shade tree and 4 shrubs required per dwelling (if shade tree does not fit in front yard, it may be relocated on the lot);
 - Each townhome on a Corner Lot shall have min. 1 shade tree between side of dwelling and the street.

In the UDO, a Townhouse dwelling is permitted in the MF1: Multi-family Low Density District and would require lot landscaping per the chart below:

	Proposed in PUD	UDO (Multi-family Residential ((per Dwelling Unit))
Shade trees	1	1
Ornamental or Evergreen Trees	n/a	1
Shrubs	4	4

- Foundation Plantings (Article 6.8(L)(1-5) of UDO) shall not apply.

In the UDO, foundation plantings are required approximately every 40 feet against long expanses (over 80 feet) of Building Facades, fences, and other barriers to create a softening effect. Similarly, 1 shrub or ornamental tree per 12 lineal feet would be required along Front Building Facades.

- Open Space/Common Areas: 5 trees per acre shall be required.

In the UDO, open space/common areas are required 10 trees per acre.

- External Street Frontages (Article 6.8(M)(1) of UDO) shall not apply.

In the UDO, external street landscaping is required abutting external streets along residential development. The plantings required within a min. depth of 30 feet are: 4 evergreen trees, 3 shade trees, 3 ornamental trees and 25 shrubs per 100 lineal feet. In addition, a min. 3-foot tall undulating mound shall be required along the entire external street frontage.

- Buffer Yards (Article 6.8(N) of UDO) shall apply as follows:
 - North Buffer: 5 feet (excluding parking area);
 - East Buffer: 15 feet;
 - South Buffer: 25 feet;
 - West Buffer: N/A;
 - All buffers shall preserve existing trees, supplemental plantings not required. Trees to be preserved may be removed for required grading, utilities, and drainage needs;
 - A tree inventory shall not be required.

In the UDO, no buffer yards are required for proposed SFA underlying zoning districts adjacent to Multi-family districts. A Buffer Yard B is required for proposed SFA underlying zoning districts adjacent to AG-SF1 districts. Buffer Yard B requires a min. width of 40 feet, 4 shade trees, 4 evergreen trees and 10 shrubs per 100 lineal feet. Additionally, a min. 4-foot tall undulating mound for at least 60% of the length of the shared lot line is required.

- Parking Area Landscaping (Article 6.8(O) of UDO) shall not apply, rather:
 - Parking shall be provided as generally shown on the Concept Plan;
 - Parking areas shall be screened with shrubs and/or grasses;
 - Hammer heads shall not permit parking, and shall have safety bollards as shown on the Concept Plan.

In the UDO, parking areas shall be screened with a min. 1 tree per 30 linear feet and 1 shrub per 3 feet of parking area length. Perimeter parking area landscaping is required for parking areas with

10 or more spaces where the parking area is located within: i) an established Front Yard, ii) a required yard, or iii) 20 feet of a Lot Line or ROW line.

- Bike Parking (Article 6.14(H) of UDO) shall not apply.

In the UDO, a min. of 1 bicycle parking space (or position) shall be provided per 30 vehicular parking spaces. No more than 15 bicycle parking spaces shall be required for any Principal Building.

- Design Standards shall apply, except:
 - Min. Open Space: min. of 30% as generally shown on Concept Plan (landscape qualifier for ponds shall not apply);

In the UDO, the min. open space for SFA zoning districts is 35%.

- Article 8.6(H) of UDO (Multi-family District amenities) shall not apply, rather site amenities shall include either a:
 - Covered gathering structure;
 - Community fire pit;
 - Or similar structure the character of which is illustrated on Exhibit E of the Ordinance.

In the UDO, the minimum number of amenities based on the number of dwelling units is shown below on the table. This standard in the UDO only applies to Multi-family Districts.

Number of Dwelling Units	Minimum Number of Amenities Required
1 to 60	2
61 - 90	3
91 - 120	4
121 - 250	5

- Article 8.7(C) of UDO shall not apply, rather min. sidewalk width shall be 5 feet and as generally shown on the Concept Plan.

In the UDO, the min. sidewalk width shall be as indicated in the Thoroughfare Plan or 5 feet (6 feet if immediately abutting the curb), whichever is greater.

MODIFICATIONS SINCE THE MARCH 7TH PUBLIC HEARING

After the [March 7, 2022](#), public hearing, the petitioner has revised the proposed ordinance to incorporate comments as a result of Plan Commission, public and Department comments. These changes can be seen in the redline ordinance exhibit (see [Exhibit 4](#)). The following briefly highlights those revisions, which will be further presented by the petitioner at the [July 18, 2022](#), Plan Commission meeting:

- A Definitions Section was added to the Proposed Ordinance.
- The Concept Plan was revised to include classification of front or rear-load dwelling orientations.
- Maximum Dwellings was reduced from eighty-four (84) to seventy-three (73).

- The General Regulations table was modified, including Maximum Density, Maximum Project Size, Setback from internal street, Side Yard & Rear Yard setbacks, Maximum Lot Coverage, Maximum Building Height, Minimum Living Area (Total) Per Dwelling Unit.
- The Development Standards modified sections, including the Character Exhibit section, Front and Side Building Façade Requirements, Lot Landscaping and Parking Standards.
- The Infrastructure Standards modified the internal public street section standard.
- The Design Standards modified the Minimum Open Space and Multi-family Districts standards.
- A new Exhibit for Dwelling Character Exhibits was included as well as modifying Exhibit C to reflect Dwelling Orientation.
- Addressed **Issue List with Petitioner Responses** (see [Exhibit 6](#)).

MODIFICATIONS SINCE THE JULY 18TH PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

After the [July 18, 2022](#), Plan Commission update and discussion meeting, the petitioner has revised the proposed ordinance to incorporate comments as a result of Plan Commission and Department comments. These changes can be seen in the updated redline ordinance exhibit (see [Exhibit 4](#)). The following briefly highlights those revisions, which will be further presented by the petitioner at the August 15, 2022, Plan Commission meeting:

- The Dwelling Design section (Section 7.1(D)) modified exterior material requirements for front, side and rear facades.
- The Landscaping Standards (Section 7.2) modified sections including Tree Preservation, Easements, Street Trees, Lot Landscaping, Foundation Plantings and Buffer Yards.
- Sections were either removed or edited including Vision Clearance, Parking and Loading, Infrastructure Standards, Design Standards and Maintenance Standards.
- Exhibits B (Concept Plan), C (Dwelling Orientation), D (Dwelling Character), E (Fence) and F (Amenity Character) were all revised.

MODIFICATIONS SINCE THE AUGUST 15th 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

After the August 15, 2022, Plan Commission meeting, the petitioner revised the proposed ordinance with three (3) additional edits, as discussed, that evening. Those edits include:

- Article 7.2(B) was modified to remove the word “generally” to “substantially”.
- Article 7.2(D) was modified to correct the code citation.
- Article 7.2(F)(iii) was modified to add the word “additional” before “Shade Tree”.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan (the “[Comprehensive Plan](#)”) identifies the majority of this Property as being within the “Existing Suburban” land use classification. Indiana Code states that reasonable regard be paid to the Comprehensive Plan when considering zoning map changes; however, the Comprehensive Plan is not law. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to serve as a guide in making land use decisions.

The land uses contemplated for “Existing Suburban” are: Detached dwellings, Attached dwellings, Institutional uses and Recreational uses.

Development Policies for “Existing Suburban” include:

- i) Promoting the protection of the existing suburban character of the area.
- ii) Encouraging only compatible infill development on vacant parcels in existing neighborhoods as a means of avoiding sprawl.
- iii) Permitting new development only upon a demonstration that it will not alter the character of the area, and will not generate negative land use impacts.
- iv) Ensuring that infill development is compatible in mass, scale, density, materials, and architectural style to existing development.
- v) Ensuring that new development adjacent to existing suburban is properly buffered.

Thoroughfare Plan: The following corridors are impacted by the development of the Real Estate:

- (i) Secondary Arterial: S. Union Street;
- (ii) Proposed Local: other proposed streets internal to the development, and;
- (iii) Alternative Transportation Plan: perimeter pathways along perimeter streets and sidewalks along internal streets.

PROCEDURAL

Public Hearing: A change of zoning request is required to be considered at a public hearing by the Plan Commission. The public hearing for this petition is scheduled for the [March 7, 2022](#), Plan Commission meeting. Notice of the public hearing was provided in accordance with Indiana law and the Plan Commission’s Rules of Procedure.

Statutory Considerations: Indiana Code 36-7-4-603 states that in the consideration of zoning ordinance amendments and zone map changes that reasonable regard shall be paid to:

- 1. The Comprehensive Plan.
- 2. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses.
- 3. The most desirable use for which the land is adapted.
- 4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction.
- 5. Responsible growth and development.

Council Introduction: The petition was introduced at the [February 14, 2022](#), City Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS / ACTIONS

Plan Commission Recommendation

At its [August 15, 2022](#), meeting, the Plan Commission forwarded a favorable recommendation of this petition to the Council (Vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed).

City Council

Introduction: [February 14, 2022](#)

Eligible for Adoption: [August 15, 2022](#)

Submitted by: Caleb Ernest, Senior Planner, Community Development Department

APC CERTIFICATION

**WESTFIELD-WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP ADVISORY
PLAN COMMISSION CERTIFICATION**

The Westfield-Washington Township Advisory Plan Commission held a public hearing on Monday, March 7, 2022, to consider an amendment to the Zoning Map and Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance. Notice of the public hearing was advertised and noticed in accordance with Indiana law and the Advisory Plan Commission's Rules of Procedure. Notice was shown to have been published in a newspaper of general circulation in Hamilton County, Indiana. The petition is as follows:

Docket No. 2203-PUD-05

Ordinance No. 22-06

Petitioner Pulte Homes of Indiana, LLC

Description A change in zoning for 12.85 acres +/- from the AG-SF1: Agriculture / Single-family Rural District to the Towns at Union Planned Unit Development (PUD) District.

On August 15, 2022, the Plan commission forwarded a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding this petition (Vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed).

The above-mentioned proposal and the Advisory Plan Commission's recommendation thereof are hereby certified.



Kevin M. Todd, Secretary

August 16, 2022

Date

Aerial Location Map



Concept Plan – “Before”

Key Design Features:

1. **84 Units**
2. **All 3-Story Units**
3. **1 Amenity Feature**
 - **Seating Area**



Concept Plan – “After”

Key Design Features:

1. **73 Units**
2. **All 2-Story Units**
3. **3 Amenity Features**
 - **Gathering Area,**
 - **Dog Park,**
 - **Bike Station / Open Space along Union St.**
4. **Boulevard Entrance**
5. **Increased Tree Preservation Area**
6. **Varied Unit Counts in Buildings along Union St.**



Illustrative Renderings




Key Design Features:

- 1. Will design rear load units from scratch***
- 2. Rear Load and Front Load units will have compatible architectural styles/colors/materials***



Community Amenities




Concept Plan – “After”

Key Design Features:

1. **73 Units**
2. **All 2-Story Units**
3. **3 Amenity Features**
 - **Gathering Area,**
 - **Dog Park,**
 - **Bike Station / Open Space along Union St.**
4. **Boulevard Entrance**
5. **Increased Tree Preservation Area**
6. **Varied Unit Counts in Buildings along Union St.**




Union Street Corridor



*****2-Story rear load units
upgrade the aesthetics
along Union Street***




Site Topography / Pond Location




Site has between 20' – 26' of elevation drop from Union Street to east property line.

Pond in the low spot.



Connectivity Plan



Adjacent Properties/Uses

Hamilton Square Apartments

3 Bedroom Rent from
\$1,596 - \$2,118
(1,386 Sq Ft)


Valley Farms Apartments

3 Bedroom Rent from
\$979+
(1,296 Sq Ft)

Ashley Place Apartments

1&2 Bedroom Rent from
\$900 - \$2,414
(1,296 Sq Ft)

Existing Cemetery and land to remain with Cemetery



Density Map

Hamilton Square Apartments

9.9 du/ac

(202 units on 20.39 ac)

Ashley Place Apartments

11.03 du/ac

(192 units on 17.41 ac)

Valley Farms Apartments


11.5 du/ac

(92 units on 8 ac)

Towns at Union

5.68 du/ac

(73 units on 12.859 ac)



ORDINANCE 22-39

AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING CERTAIN REAL ESTATE TO THE CITY OF WESTFIELD, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA

WHEREAS, the Westfield City Council (the “Council”) has the authority and desires to annex lands into the municipality as defined by Indiana Code 36-4-3; and,

WHEREAS, one hundred percent (100%) of the owners of the parcels proposed for annexation as identified in **Exhibit A** and **Exhibit B** (the “Annexation Area”) have filed a petition with the Council; and,

WHEREAS, the Council has conducted a public hearing on September 12, 2022, as required by law with regard to the annexation of the Annexation Area; and,

WHEREAS, the Council has adopted a fiscal plan for the annexation of the Annexation Area in accordance with Indiana Code 36-4-3-3.1 (Resolution 22-116); and,

WHEREAS, the Annexation Area meets the contiguity requirements of Indiana Code 36-4-3-1.5; and,

WHEREAS, the Council now finds that the statutory criteria for annexation have been met; and,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL THAT THE OFFICIAL CITY MAP ADOPTED BY REFERENCE IN SECTION 2-515 OF THE WESTFIELD CODE BE MODIFIED AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Annexation Area, generally located on the east side of Horton Road, south of 199th Street, and adjacent to the existing corporate limits along portions of the eastern and western boundaries of the Annexation Area, is hereby annexed to and declared to be a part of the City.

Section 2. The Annexation Area is to further include the contiguous public highways and rights-of-way of the public highways which are adjacent to the annexation area per Indiana Code 36-4-3-2.5.

Section 3. The Annexation Area is hereby assigned to City Council District 3 and shall become a part thereof immediately upon the effective date of this Ordinance.

Section 4. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage by the Council, its publication, and upon the passage of any applicable waiting period, all as provided by the laws of the State of Indiana. All ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed. Any portion of the Ordinance later to be found void or invalid shall not affect the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

ALL OF WHICH IS HEREBY ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF WESTFIELD,
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA THIS _____ DAY OF OCTOBER, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

ATTEST:

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby certify that **ORDINANCE 22-39** was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield
on the _____ day of October, 2022, at _____ m.

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE Ordinance 22-39
this _____ day of October, 2022.

I hereby VETO Ordinance 22-39
this _____ day of October,
2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor


I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security number in this document,
unless required by law: Ryan Collingwood

Prepared by: Ryan Collingwood, Associate Planner
City of Westfield Community Development Department
2728 East 171st Street, Westfield, IN 46074, (317) 804-3170

EXHIBIT A
ANNEXATION AREA



EXHIBIT LEGEND



Not To Scale



EXHIBIT B
ANNEXATION AREA
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

This description includes five (5) parcels of land:

Parcel Nos. 08-05-26-00-00-003.000, 08-05-23-00-00-022.000, 08-05-23-00-00-017.000, 08-05-26-00-00-004.000, 08-05-23-00-00-018.000

A part of the Northeast and Northwest Quarters of Section 26, and a part of the Southeast and Southwest Quarters of Section 23, all in Township 19 North, Range 3 East, Hamilton County, Indiana being that 153.208 acre parcel surveyed by Paul E. Klodzen, PS #20400015 and shown on a survey certified January 19, 2019 as Cripe Job number 170504-33000 more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Southeast corner of the Northeast Quarter of said Section 26; thence North 00 degrees 14 minutes 39 seconds East (basis of bearings is Indiana State Plane Grid Bearing, East Zone) along the East line of said Northeast Quarter 1988.70 feet to the Southeast corner of the North Half of the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of said Section 26; thence South 89 degrees 47 minutes 55 seconds West along the South line of said North Half 1323.05 feet to the Southwest corner thereof; thence North 00 degrees 14 minutes 49 seconds East along the West line of said North Half 662.10 feet to the Northwest corner thereof and the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence South 89 degrees 45 minutes 50 seconds West along the North line of the Northeast Quarter of said Section 26 a distance of 661.51 feet to the Northeast corner of the West Half of the Northwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of said Section 26; thence South 00 degrees 14 minutes 54 seconds West along the East line of said West Half 1323.41 feet to the Southeast corner thereof; thence South 89 degrees 49 minutes 59 seconds West along the South line of said West Half 661.54 feet to the Southwest corner thereof; thence South 89 degrees 45 minutes 06 seconds West along the South line of the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 26 a distance of 1324.06 feet to the Southwest corner thereof; thence North 00 degrees 12 minutes 52 seconds East along the West line of said Quarter-Quarter 1321.94 feet to the Northwest corner thereof; thence North 00 degrees 06 minutes 09 seconds East along the West line of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 23 a distance of 1321.61 feet to the Northwest corner thereof; thence North 89 degrees 43 minutes 36 seconds East along the North line of said Quarter-Quarter 1037.15 feet to the northwest corner of Instrument Number 2015004954, recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Hamilton County, Indiana (the following two courses are along the West and South boundaries of said Instrument); (1) thence South 01 degrees 19 minutes 55 seconds West 316.44 feet; (2) thence North 88 degrees 56 minutes 56 seconds East 295.71 feet to the East line of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 23; thence South 00 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds West along said East line 348.46 feet to the Southwest corner of the North Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 23; thence North 89 degrees 39 minutes 19 seconds East along the South line of the North Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 23 a distance of 334.99 feet to the Southeast corner of Instrument Number 2016046931, recorded in said Recorder's Office; thence North 00 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds East along the East boundary of said Instrument and parallel with the West line of the

Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 23 a distance of 991.95 feet to the Northeast corner of said Instrument and the North line of 10 acres off the South side of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 23; thence North 89 degrees 32 minutes 47 seconds East along said north line 1193.20 feet to the Northwest corner of Instrument Number 2015055336, recorded in said Recorder's Office; thence South 33 degrees 30 minutes 39 seconds East along the West boundary of said Instrument 1187.67 feet to the North line of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 23; thence South 89 degrees 39 minutes 19 seconds West along said North line 866.04 feet to the Northwest corner of said South Half; thence South 00 degrees 01 minutes 56 seconds East along the West line of said South Half 663.26 feet to the Point of Beginning, containing 153.208 acres, more or less.

NARRATIVE
Austrian Pine PUD Ordinance Text Amendment

OrthoIndy is developing several buildings on a 6.38-acre parcel, Lot 3 in Austrian Pine PUD, with addresses of 222, 246 and 288 East 175th Street. The initial phase is an orthopedic clinic (east building), and the second phase is an orthopedic surgery center (middle building). A third phase will be a medical office building (west building).

A setback requirement in Section 9.2 of the PUD is that a minimum of 2 buildings...shall exceed the Maximum Setback (120 feet as per UDO Article 5.3(G)) to provide for staggered building setbacks. At this time, three of five buildings have been constructed in the PUD. Section 9.2 would require that the final two buildings (the surgical center and the medical office building) be setback more than 120 feet from SR 32. This is problematic for the practical, cohesive and aesthetic development of OrthoIndy's trio of buildings. The clinic and the surgery center will function independently from a patient's perspective yet interdependently for the doctors as they necessarily and seamlessly move between the clinic and the surgery center. It is important that these two phases align more than a 120-foot setback will allow if the surgery center is required to meet that setback. Requiring the last two buildings to setback more than 120 feet from SR 32 would result in a less-aesthetic gap-tooth appearance to passersby on SR 32. Another factor that must be considered is that, as the PUD buildings/sites have developed, all of the storm water basins have been located along the south edge of the parcel making site design a challenge under the 120-foot setback requirement.

The goal of the PUD setback requirement in Section 9.2 is "to provide for staggered building setbacks". When the PUD was adopted, Westfield did not want to see a soldier row of building facades along the SR 32 corridor, hence the reason for the current language. As the PUD is developing, the staggering of buildings fronting on SR 32 is happening naturally, being impacted by the consistent location of the storm water basins along the south line and a north line that, itself, is not straight. OrthoIndy would like to revise the PUD language of Section 9.2 in order to remove the mandate that at least two buildings exceed the 120-foot maximum setback, while retaining the stated goal of staggering the buildings. This is the question for consideration.

DRAFT

ORTHOINDY
BONE · JOINT · SPINE · MUSCLE

SCHEMATIC DESIGN

PROJECT
ORTHO INDY / CORNERSTONE
WESTFIELD ASC

LOCATION
WESTFIELD, IN

TEAM
arcDESIGN

DATE
JULY 18, 2022

WESTFIELD ASC EXTERIOR DESIGN REVIEW

DRAFT



EXTERIOR DESIGN VIEW NO. 1 Northwest corner looking southeast.

WESTIFELD MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING | ORTHOINDY + CORNERSTONE | aD # 22137 | 07/07/2022

arcDESIGN
architecture + interiors

DRAFT



EXTERIOR DESIGN VIEW NO. 2

Southwest corner looking northeast.

WESTIFELD MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING | ORTHOINDY + CORNERSTONE | aD # 22137 | 07/07/2022

arcDESIGN
architecture + interiors

DRAFT



EXTERIOR DESIGN VIEW NO. 3

Southeast corner looking northwest.

WESTIFELD MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING | ORTHOINDY + CORNERSTONE | aD # 22137 | 07/07/2022

arcDESIGN
architecture + interiors

DRAFT



EXTERIOR DESIGN VIEW NO. 4

North side looking south.

WESTIFELD MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING | ORTHOINDY + CORNERSTONE | aD # 22137 | 07/07/2022

arcDESIGN
architecture + interiors

DRAFT



EXTERIOR DESIGN VIEW NO. 5

Northeast corner looking southwest.

WESTIFELD MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING | ORTHOINDY + CORNERSTONE | aD # 22137 | 07/07/2022

arcDESIGN
architecture + interiors

**WESTFIELD-WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP ADVISORY
PLAN COMMISSION CERTIFICATION**

The Westfield-Washington Township Advisory Plan Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, September 6, 2022, to consider an amendment to the Zoning Map and Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance. Notice of the public hearing was advertised and noticed in accordance with Indiana law and the Advisory Plan Commission's Rules of Procedure. Notice was shown to have been published in a newspaper of general circulation in Hamilton County, Indiana. The petition is as follows:

Docket No.	2209-PUD-18
Ordinance No.	22-34
Petitioner	OI Land Ventures II, LLC by Krieg DeVault, LLP (the "Petitioner")
Description	An amendment to the Austrian Pine PUD to modify landscape requirements as well as the number of buildings required to exceed the Maximum Setback of the State Highway 32 Overlay District

On September 6, 2022, a motion was made and passed to send a negative recommendation (Vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed) to the City Council regarding this petition.

The above-mentioned proposal and the Advisory Plan Commission's recommendation thereof are hereby certified.



Kevin M. Todd, Secretary

September 7, 2022


Date

LOCATION: H:\2022\W220366\Engineering\design\exhibits\W220366 conceptual layout.dwg
DATE/TIME: June 28, 2022 - 3:55pm
PLOTED BY: wagner




10505 N. College Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46280
weihe.net
317 | 846 - 6611

SCALE: 1" = 30'
0 15 30 60



WESTFIELD PROPERTIES LLC. LOT 5 CONCEPT PLAN

Date:06/28/2022



ORDINANCE NUMBER 20-25

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WESTFIELD AND WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA CONCERNING THE NORTHPOINT II PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT and THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

This is an Ordinance (this "Ordinance") to amend the Unified Development Ordinance of the City of Westfield and Washington Township, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Unified Development Ordinance"), enacted by the City of Westfield pursuant to its authority under the laws of the State of Indiana, Ind. Code § 36-7-4 et seq., as amended;

WHEREAS, the City of Westfield, Indiana (the "City") and the Township of Washington, both of Hamilton County, Indiana are subject to the Unified Development Ordinance of the City of Westfield and Washington Township, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Unified Development Ordinance" or the "UDO"), enacted by the City of Westfield pursuant to its authority under the laws of the State of Indiana, Ind. Code § 36-7-4 et seq., as amended;

WHEREAS, the Westfield-Washington Township Advisory Plan Commission ("Commission") considered a petition (**Petition No. 2008 - PUD - 09**) filed with the Commission requesting an amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance, and to the Zoning Map with regard to the subject real estate more particularly described in **Exhibit A** ("Real Estate");

WHEREAS, the Commission forwarded **Petition No. 2008 - PUD - 09** to the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Common Council") with an unfavorable recommendation (5 in favor, 2 against) in accordance with Indiana Code § 36-7-4-608, as required by Indiana Code § 36-7-4-1505;

WHEREAS, the Common Council is subject to the provisions of the Indiana Code §36-7-4-1507 and Indiana Code § 36-7-4-1512 concerning any action on this request; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana, meeting in regular session, that the Unified Development Ordinance, and Zoning Map, are hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Applicability of Ordinance.

- 1.1 This Planned Unit Development shall hereinafter be referred to as NorthPoint II PUD.
- 1.2 Development of the Real Estate shall be governed by (i) the provisions of this Ordinance and its exhibits, and (ii) the provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance, as amended and applicable to the Underlying Zoning District or a Planned Unit Development District, except as modified, revised,

- supplemented or expressly made inapplicable by this Ordinance.
- 1.3 Chapter (“Chapter”) and Article (“Article”) cross-references of this Ordinance shall hereafter refer to the section as specified and referenced in the Unified Development Ordinance.
- 1.4 All provisions and representations of the Unified Development Ordinance that conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby made inapplicable to the Real Estate and shall be superseded by the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 2. **Definitions.** Capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Ordinance shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Unified Development Ordinance.

The following words and terms, not defined elsewhere in this Ordinance or its Exhibits, shall have the following meanings:

- 2.1 EIFS (Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems). Multi-layered exterior wall systems, typically consisting of insulation board, a durable, water-resistant base coat, and an attractive and durable finish coat.
- 2.2 Exterior Material. The separate architectural siding materials and patterns on a Building Facade such as Masonry materials, horizontal siding, shake siding, vertical siding, and board & batten siding (each of the foregoing are examples of separate Exterior Materials).
- 2.3 Facade, Primary. The primary architectural facade which contains commercial or retail public entrances, tenant signs or the facade facing a dedicated street.
- 2.4 Facade, Secondary. Any building elevation not having commercial or retail public entrances. Secondary facades include building elevations with service and employee entrances, utility service areas and delivery areas. Secondary facades do not face dedicated or private streets.
- 2.5 Low Slope Roof. A roof surface with a maximum slope of 2 inches rise for 12 inches run.
- 2.6 Real Estate. The real estate, as described in **Exhibit A** to the Ordinance.

Section 3. **Concept Plan.** The Concept Plan, attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, is hereby incorporated in accordance with Article 10.9(F)(2) Planned Unit Development Districts; PUD District Ordinance Requirements; Concept Plan.

- 3.1 The Concept Plan hereby allocates the Real Estate into the following Districts as shown on Exhibit B:
- Conservation Lot Residential Area
 - Commerce Parke (Area 1); and
 - Commerce Parke (Area 2)

Substantial conformance with the Concept Plan shall be required.

3.2 The approximate size of each District is as follows.

<u>District</u>	<u>Area</u>
Commerce Parke (Area 1)	58 Acres
Commerce Parke (Area 2)	92 Acres
Conservation Lot Residential Area (including tree preservation)	28 Acres
Total acreage	180 Acres

The Conservation Lot Residential Area (inclusive of tree preservation) may not be reduced below 25 acres in total size. No more than five individual buildable lots shall be created in the Conservation Lot Residential Area.

Section 4. Underlying Zoning District(s).

4.1 The Underlying Zoning District of the District shall be:

Commerce Parke Area 1 and Area 2:	EI
Conservation Lot Residential Area	SF1
(the “Underlying Zoning District”).	

Section 5. Permitted Uses. The permitted uses shall be as set forth below.

5.1 Only the uses identified below shall be permitted in the District. Uses which are designated as permitted by a Special Exception in the Use Table of Chapter 13 of the UDO are only permitted in a District if specifically provided as a permitted use herein.

A. Commerce Parke Area 1 and Area 2 Permitted Uses

- Commercial Businesses:** All uses provided as a permitted use in the Use Table of Chapter 13 of the UDO in the LB or GB category except the uses of Restaurant, Fast Food; and Tavern or Nightclub (excluding a microbrewery which shall be permitted) shall be permitted
- Industrial Businesses:** All uses listed as a permitted use in the Use Table of Chapter 13 of the UDO in the EI category and the uses of construction and manufacturing of outdoor advertising signs; manufacturing, engraving and sales of cemetery monuments and tombstones;; canneries (e.g. taking fresh fruits and vegetables and canning for distribution) coffee roasting; food processing (e.g. commercial bakeries, smokehouses); granaries; grain processing; milk processing plants (without any on-site milking); warehousing and distribution operations (outdoor storage); and structural steel fabricating (similar to the existing uses of Westfield Steel); shall also be a permitted uses.
- Any other business that can be classified as either general business or light industrial business in the UDO will be eligible with the approval of the

Director. The Director shall favorably consider uses which are substantially similar to a permitted use if the impacts on surrounding properties is no greater than uses specifically permitted by Section 5.1(A)(2).

4. Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to any of the permitted uses.

B. Permitted Uses for the Conservation Lot Residential Area:

1. Dwelling, Single-family.
2. Agricultural Use.
3. Stable, Private.

Section 6. **General Regulations.** The standards of Chapter 4 Zoning Districts, as applicable to the Underlying Zoning District, shall apply to the development of the District, except as otherwise modified below.

A. Conservation Lot Residential Area

Minimum Lot Area:	3 acres
Minimum Lot Frontage:	25 feet
Minimum Front Yard Setbacks:	40 feet
Minimum Living Area of single-family dwelling	2,500 gross square feet
Maximum percentage of Lot covered by single-family dwelling or accessory buildings	Thirty percent (30%)

B. Commerce Parke Lot Standards (Area 1 and Area 2):

Minimum Lot Area:	3 acres
Minimum Lot Frontage:	70 feet
Minimum Lot Width At Setback Line:	100 feet
Minimum Front Yard Setbacks:	30 feet
Minimum Parking Lot Setback:	20 feet from the property line abutting any street
Minimum Side Yard:	10 feet
Minimum Rear Yard:	10 feet

Maximum gross square feet of retail per a single building:	65,000 gross square feet
Minimum Building Setback along exterior of District	100 feet from any boundary of the District
Maximum Building Height (Area 1)	45 feet

Section 7. **Development Standards.** The standards of Chapter 6 Development Standards shall apply to the development of the District, except as otherwise modified below.

7.1 Article 6.1 Accessory Use and Building Standards shall apply unless otherwise amended.

In the Residential District, each Lot may have one Accessory Building of greater height than the Principal Building, so long as the height of the Accessory Building does not exceed the lesser of: a) the height of the Principal Building by more than thirty percent (30%), or (b) thirty five (35) feet.

7.2 Article 6.3 Architectural Standards: The following shall replace Article 6.3 in its entirety as related to the Commerce Parke.

A. Character Exhibit for Commerce Parke. The Character Exhibits, attached hereto as **Exhibit C** are hereby incorporated as a compilation of images designed to capture the intended quality of structures to be constructed in the Commerce Parke Area 1 and Area 2. Buildings shall be constructed substantially similar to those in the Character Exhibit. Any west facing façade in Commerce Parke Area 2 must be constructed substantially in conformance with **Exhibit C-1** hereto.

B. Architectural Standards for Commerce Parke Area 1 and 2:

1. Façade Rules.

a. All building elevations shall be considered either a Primary Façade or a Secondary Façade.

b. A façade facing State Road 38 must meet Primary Façade requirements of this Section.

c. Architecture for Primary and Secondary Facades fronting on a public right of way, or which are visible from adjoining residential uses, shall comply with the Architectural Requirements of Article 5.3(K) of the UDO. Any references in Article 5.3(K) to State Road 32 shall be interpreted to apply to the public right of way upon which the structure fronts.

d. Any Primary Facade which does not front on a public right of way, or any Primary Façade or Secondary Facades which are not visible from adjoining residential uses, shall not be required to Section 5.3(K) of the UDO, but instead shall comply with the requirements provided below.

2. Roof Design.

a. Roofs may be either residential character or Low Slope. Roofing material shall be a minimum of commercial grade dimensional asphalt shingle, cedar shake, slate, metal roofing or rubber roofing.

b. All roofs must incorporate appropriately sloped roofs, tall parapets or screen walls to architecturally conceal roof-mounted equipment.

c. Rooftop equipment screens and rooftop penetrations (i.e., vents) shall be of a color compatible with the overall building or roof color (not an accent color).

d. Where pitched roofs are used, the main pitch of the roof shall be not less than 6:12.

3. Facade Materials.

a. Primary Façade Materials.

i. Permitted building finish materials for the Primary Façade include: Brick (clay), natural stone, simulated cut stone, finished (textured and painted) concrete, finished (textured) pre-cast concrete panels, tile (ceramic or porcelain) architectural block (textured) and EFIS (Dryvit) wall systems (if used for a maximum of 50% of the façade and only if it is used at least eight feet (8') above grade), steel or architecturally insulated metal panel systems (if used for a maximum of 50% of the façade).

ii. Prohibited building finish materials on the Primary Facades include: wood, plywood, unfinished concrete or unfinished concrete panels, plastics, reflective glass, vinyl siding.

iii. Primary Facades may have window glazing or glass storefronts.

iv. Permitted building trim materials include: brick (clay), stone, simulated cut stone, tile (ceramic or porcelain), wood, glass, painted aluminum, formed polymers and EIFS (Drive).

v. Colors used on building facades must be complementary. Natural, muted colors should serve as the Primary Façade color, with brighter colors used as limited accents.

vi. Decorative architectural lighting is required at a minimum of one fixture every 40 feet on Primary Facades.

vii. On Primary Facades which do not face a primary arterial, overhead doors may be permitted on the Primary Façade elevations.

b. Secondary Façades Materials.

i. In addition to those materials permitted for the Primary Façade, the Secondary Façade may include architectural metal wall panels.

ii. Prohibited building finish materials on the Secondary Facades include: wood, plywood, unfinished concrete or

unfinished concrete panels, plastics, reflective glass.

iii. Overhead doors are permitted on Secondary Facade elevations, but shall not be orientated towards a public right-of-way.

- c. Facades in Area 1. Notwithstanding anything provided in 7.1(B)(3) hereof any building constructed in Area 1 shall be prohibited from having overhead doors on facades facing north, south or west.

4. Wall Planes.

- a. A Building may be constructed with wall planes which do not meet the required offsets provided in Article 5.3(K)(2(b))) of the UDO only if an alternative feature provided herein is utilized. If no alternative features provided herein are utilized and the wall plane is otherwise required to meet the conditions of Article 5.3(K(2(b))), compliance with Article 5.3(K(2(b))) of the UDO must be accomplished. If an alternative feature is utilized the distance between offsets required under Article Article 5.3(K(2(b))) of the UDO may be increased as provided hereunder, but the obligation for offsets is not eliminated.
- b. The distance between required offsets may be increased up to two times the otherwise permitted separation provided in Article 5.3(K(2(b))) of the UDO if one or more of the following is utilized:
- (i) Change in materials on the same vertical plane occurring with a separation of no more than sixty (60) feet between material changes with a width of at least four (4) feet; or
 - (ii) A change in paint colors for materials of the same type with a separation of no less than sixty (60) feet and a change in color which is at least six (6) feet in width. To qualify for an increased distance between offsets, the change in paint colors must be significant enough to provide a meaningful and visually apparent contrast.
 - (iii) Alternatively, in lieu of only vertical articulation, architectural articulation which occurs no less than every sixty (60) feet comprised of either a vertical articulation of not less than eighteen (18) inches and/or horizontal articulation of not less than thirty-six (36) inches shall be acceptable wall plane changes. Horizontal articulation should account for not less than fifty percent (50%) of the articulation required herein.
- c. Any wall plane which is a Primary Façade must utilize a change in wall height of at least twenty-four (24) inches on all require wall planes and one of the two of the following features on a majority of the offsets which are required on a wall plane:
- A change in paint color in compliance with Section

- 7.2(B)(4)(b)(ii) hereof; or
- a change in materials in compliance with Section 7.2(B)(4)(b)(i) hereof.

7.3 Article 6.3. Architectural Standard: The following shall apply in addition to the Requirements of Section 6.3(C) of the UDO for the Conservation Lot Residential Area.

- A. Perimeter Lot Requirements. No lots in the Conservation Lot Residential Area shall be required to comply with 6.3(C)(1)(a) in regards to orientation of the front façade. Any side or rear facade visible from an External Street or from a an adjacent AG SF-1 zoned property shall be required to comply with the requirements of 6.3(C)(1)(b).
- B. Building Materials. In addition to the requirements of Section 6.3(C)(3) of the UDO, the following shall apply to the Conservation Lot Residential Area:
 - (i) No vinyl siding shall be permitted on a single-family dwelling; and
 - (ii) At least fifty percent (50%) of the front façade of a single-family dwelling (excluding doors and windows) shall be Brick (clay), natural stone or simulated cut stone.

7.4 Article 6.5 Fence Standards: Shall apply unless otherwise amended:

Any fencing located on along an External Street and separating the Conservation Lot Residential Area from Commerce Parke Area 1 shall be a three-rail fencing which is dark in color.

7.5 Article 6.8 Landscaping Standard: Shall apply, except as follows:

- A. Article 6.8 L of the UDO shall apply, except as follows:
 - 1. Regardless of length of a façade, any façade which is comprised primarily of overhead doors shall allow for the elimination of required foundation plantings along such a facade.
- B. Article 6.8 N of the UDO shall be replaced in its entirety with the following:
 - 1. Plantings in Buffer Yards should physically separate and visually screen different land uses and/or zoning districts from one another without precluding connectivity between uses. Plantings in buffer yards shall consist of two (2) or more species of both trees and shrubs.
 - 2. A fifty (50') Buffer Yard shall be placed around the entirety of the Commerce Park. Within the Buffer Yard, upon request from the City of Westfield Parks Department, Westfield Washington Township, or the Hamilton County Parks Department, a perpetual easement of at least thirty (30') feet in width will be granted or dedicated for the construction of a multi-use trail which may be asphalt or gravel in construction. This easement shall

be located in the area which constitutes required setbacks, building setbacks and/or buffer yards. Landscaping may be removed for the construction of a path within this easement area. The construction of the path shall only be required to be completed at the time of construction along the length of a newly platted Lot's border with the buffer yard.

3. In areas where a trail easement is not granted or dedicated the Buffer Yard Planting requirements shall be as required around the perimeter of each District in accordance with the UDO except as follows:

(a). No buffer yards shall be required:

(i) adjacent to proposed greenways and park areas (including existing parks to the east of the District); and

(ii) within easements prohibiting landscaping.

4. Within buffer yards at least eight (8) evergreen trees per one hundred (100) linear feet and five (5) evergreen shrubs per one (100) hundred linear feet shall be planted. Such plantings should be arranged in a manner that creates a visual barrier between uses without precluding connectivity between uses.

5. Between the Commerce Parke (Area 1) and the Conservation Lot Residential Area (excluding the area shown as a Tree Preservation Area), an earthen mound of at least six (6) feet in height shall be created. Any landscaping required in said buffer yard shall be planted near the top of the required mounding.

6. Between the Conservation Lot Residential Area and adjacent AG-SF1 zoned properties Buffer Yard A requirements of the UDO shall be required (excluding the area shown as a Tree Preservation Area).

7. Tree preservation. Any tree which is larger than six (6) inches in diameter at breast height and which is located within ten (10) feet of the property line of the District shall be preserved unless removal is required for the installation of utilities or vehicular or pedestrian access to the Property or the installation of a multi-use trail or path as provided in Section 7.5(A)(2)(a) hereof. The area shown as "Tree Preservation" within the Conservation Lot Residential Area shall be substantially maintained as it exists as of the date of adoption of this Ordinance. The costs of maintenance shall be borne by the Developer and/or any owner's association created for the Commerce Park Areas 1 and 2.

7.6 Article 6.12 Outside Storage and Display shall apply except as specifically modified:

A. Commerce Parke:

1. Uses in the Commerce Parke shall be permitted to have outside storage subject to the screening/buffering requirements as set forth in this Ordinance.

2. Outside storage shall be permitted in accordance with Article 6.12(D) of the UDO.

3. No outside storage shall be permitted within two hundred feet (200') of the right-of-way of State Road 38 or within two hundred feet (200') of the northern boundary of Area 1 or Area 1's boundary with the

Conservation Lot Residential Area.

4. Service/Material Yard and Storage Areas.

a. Article 6.12(D)(2) of the UDO shall apply with the following addition: Must be completely screened as follows:

i. The fence required under Article 6.12(D)(2)(b) of the UDO shall be an opaque wood privacy fence, the style of which shall be consistent throughout the Commerce Parke.

7.7 Article 6.15 Performance Standards shall apply except as specifically modified:

A. In addition to the requirements of Article 6.15, B (4) of the UDO, the following shall apply to the Commerce Parke:

No outdoor speakers shall be used in conjunction with any uses between the hours of 11 P.M. and 6 A.M.

7.8 Access to surrounding right of way. The District shall have access only to State Road 38. No access to Anthony Road shall be permitted.

Section 8. **Annexation.** The Real Estate, or parts thereof that may be the subject of a secondary plat approval, shall be annexed into the corporate limits of the City of Westfield prior to the approval and recording of a secondary plat for that part of the Real Estate. A Minor Subdivision for the purpose of Annexation is exempt from this standard.

Section 9. **Duration.** Failure to obtain Secondary Plat/Construction Plan approval for the District by January 1, 2033 (unless otherwise extended by the Director) shall automatically void this Ordinance and cause the zoning classification of the Real Estate to revert to AG-SF1 District.

Section 10. **Severability.** If any term or provision of this ordinance is held to be illegal or unenforceable, the validity or enforceability of the remainder of this ordinance will not be affected.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.]

[SIGNATURE PAGE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWS.]

ALL OF WHICH IS ORDAINED/RESOLVED THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

ATTEST:

Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer

I hereby certify that **ORDINANCE 20-25** was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield

on the _____ day of _____, 2022, at _____ m.

Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE **ORDINANCE 20-25**

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I hereby VETO **ORDINANCE 20-25**

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

This document prepared by:

Russell L. Brown, Clark, Quinn, Moses, Scott & Grahm, LLP, 320 N. Meridian Street, Suite 1100, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security number in this document, unless required by law. Russell L. Brown

SCHEDULE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A	Real Estate (Legal Description)
Exhibit B	Concept Plan
Exhibit C	Character Exhibit
Exhibit C-1	Area 2 Front Façade Character Exhibit

EXHIBIT A
REAL ESTATE

PART OF THE NORTH HALF OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 4 EAST, LOCATED IN WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE STONE AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 4 EAST; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 01 MINUTE 33 SECONDS EAST (ASSUMED BEARING) 2081.64 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER TO A 5/8" IRON ROD WITH YELLOW CAP STAMPED MILLER SURVEYING AT THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THIS DESCRIPTION; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 01 MINUTE 33 SECONDS EAST 581.19 FEET TO A STONE AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE SOUTH 88 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 33 SECONDS EAST 1083.56 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 20 TO A 5/8" IRON ROD WITH YELLOW CAP STAMPED MILLER SURVEYING; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 10 MINUTES 59 SECONDS 2278.22 FEET PARALLEL WITH THE EAST LINE OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER TO A 5/8" IRON ROD WITH YELLOW CAP STAMPED MILLER SURVEYING ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF STATE ROAD 38 AS DESCRIBED IN EXHIBIT "A", PARCEL 21, IDOT PROJECT STP-5229 (008); THENCE NORTH 57 DEGREES 18 MINUTES 05 SECONDS WEST 1031.18 FEET ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE TO A 5/8" IRON ROD WITH YELLOW CAP STAMPED MILLER SURVEYING AT POINT #118 AS REFERRED TO IN SAID EXHIBIT "A"; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY 603.22 FEET ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE AND ALONG AN ARC TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 8732.36 FEET AND SUBTENDED BY A LONG CHORD HAVING A BEARING OF NORTH 59 DEGREES 16 MINUTES 49 SECONDS WEST AND A LENGTH OF 603.10 FEET TO A 5/8" IRON ROD WITH YELLOW CAP STAMPED MILLER SURVEYING AT POINT #124 AS REFERRED TO IN SAID EXHIBIT "A"; THENCE NORTH 61 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 33 SECONDS WEST 318.82 FEET, MORE OR LESS, ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE TO A 5/8" IRON ROD WITH YELLOW CAP STAMPED MILLER SURVEYING THAT BEARS SOUTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 45 SECONDS EAST FROM THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 45 SECONDS WEST 1293.11 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. CONTAINING 67.58 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

AND ALSO:

A PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 17, AND A PART OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 20, BOTH BEING IN TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 4 EAST, IN WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOW:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 17; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 44 SECONDS EAST (ASSUMED BEARING), ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER, A DISTANCE OF 1,330.30 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTH HALF OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE SOUTH 88 DEGREES 39 MINUTES 34 SECONDS EAST, ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SOUTH HALF, A DISTANCE OF 1,350.91 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING SOUTH 88 DEGREES 39 MINUTES 34 SECONDS EAST A DISTANCE OF 1,315.20 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 21 MINUTES 20 SECONDS WEST, ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 1,327.71 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE NORTH 88 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 52 SECONDS WEST, ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST


QUARTER, A DISTANCE OF 580.77 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF A TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN INSTRUMENT NUMBER 2005-001215 IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 01 MINUTES 17 SECONDS EAST, ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID TRACT OF LAND, A DISTANCE OF 1,293.25 FEET TO THE NORTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE STATE ROAD 38; THENCE ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE THE FOLLOWING 4 COURSES: (1) NORTH 61 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 07 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 691.86 FEET; (2) NORTH 60 DEGREES 52 MINUTES 34 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 125.11 FEET; (3) SOUTH 28 DEGREES 51 MINUTES 17 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 10.00 FEET; (4) NORTH 60 DEGREES 52 MINUTES 35 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 20.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 44 SECONDS EAST A DISTANCE OF 2,241.43 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 58.580 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

AND ALSO:

A PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 17, AND A PART OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 20, BOTH BEING IN TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 4 EAST, IN WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOW:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 17; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 44 SECONDS EAST (ASSUMED BEARING), ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER, A DISTANCE OF 101.75 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THIS DESCRIPTION; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 44 SECONDS EAST, ALONG SAID WEST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 1,228.55 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTH HALF OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER; THENCE SOUTH 88 DEGREES 39 MINUTES 34 SECONDS EAST, ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SOUTH HALF, A DISTANCE OF 1,350.91 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 44 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 2,241.43 FEET TO THE NORTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE STATE ROAD 38; THENCE ALONG THE NORTH LINES OF SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY THE FOLLOWING 2 COURSES: (1) NORTH 60 DEGREES 52 MINUTES 35 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF A DISTANCE OF 804.96 FEET; (2) NORTH 60 DEGREES 41 MINUTES 08 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 326.89 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF A TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN INSTRUMENT NUMBER 2019025668 IN SAID RECORDERS OFFICE; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 24 MINUTES 08 SECONDS EAST, ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID TRACT OF LAND, A DISTANCE OF 482.11 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID TRACT; THENCE NORTH 88 DEGREES 19 MINUTES 29 SECONDS WEST, ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID TRACT, A DISTANCE OF 361.22 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 55.131 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

EXHIBIT B
CONCEPT PLAN



NORTHPOINT

WESTFIELD, INDIANA

DATE: 07.21.2022

MASTER PLAN

EXHIBIT C
CHARACTER EXHIBIT





EXHIBIT C-1
AREA 2 FRONT FAÇADE CHARACTER EXHIBIT





Westfield City Council Report

Ordinance Number:	22-34
APC Petition Number:	2209-PUD-18
Petitioner:	OI Land Ventures II, LLC by Krieg DeVault, LLP (the "Petitioner")
Requested Action:	An amendment specific to Lot 3 of the Austrian Pine PUD to modify landscape requirements as well as the number of buildings required to exceed the Maximum Setback of the State Highway 32 Overlay District
Current Zoning:	Austrian Pine PUD (Ord. 19-12)
Current Land Use:	Commercial
Exhibits:	1. Staff Report 2. Location Map 3. Project Narrative 4. Proposed Ordinance 22-34 5. OrthoIndy Expansion Site Plan 6. OrthoIndy Expansion Renderings 7. APC Certification
Prepared by:	Daine Crabtree, Senior Planner

PETITION HISTORY

The Austrian Pine PUD was approved at the June 10, 2019, Westfield City Council meeting.

This petition was introduced at the August 8, 2022, City Council meeting and received a public hearing at the September 6, 2022 Advisory Plan Commission (the "Plan Commission") meeting. At this same meeting, the APC voted for the petition to forego a workshop meeting and also forwarded a favorable (vote: 7-0) recommendation to the City Council.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Location: The petitioner is requesting an amendment to the Austrian Pine PUD District (the "District") specific to Lot 3 (approximately 6.38 acres +/- (the "Property")), which is located at the southeast corner of State Road 32 & Austrian Pine Way approximately (see **Exhibit 2**).

The proposal seeks to modify language regarding landscape requirements and the maximum number of buildings required to exceed the State Highway 32 Overlay District for the future expansion of the OrthoIndy building, which is currently under construction.

ZONING REQUEST

Number of Buildings to Exceed the Maximum Setback

The current Austrian Pine PUD requires that a minimum of two (2) buildings shall exceed the Maximum Setback of the State Highway 32 Overlay District in order to provide for staggered building setbacks. The proposed PUD Amendment would revise this language to permit a maximum of two (2) buildings to exceed the Maximum Setback, but it would not require it (the word “shall” has been replaced by the word “may”).

The intent of the original language was to guarantee that in the event the District was developed with multiple buildings of a smaller footprint, the staggering of setbacks would provide visual relief. Because OrthoIndy’s building footprint post-addition is so large (30,000+ SF), this intended relief may no longer be necessary.

Added Language Regarding Landscaping

In addition, language currently in the adjacent [Springmill Pointe PUD \(Ord. 19-36\)](#) regarding landscaping conflicts with perimeter Drainage and Utility Easements has been proposed to be added to this Petition.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Future Land Use Plan in the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan (the “Comprehensive Plan”) identifies the Property as “Employment Corridor” (aka ‘Highway Corridor’). The Comprehensive Plan is not law; rather, it is intended to serve as a guide in making land use decisions. Appropriate land uses in Highway Corridors are office and service uses, research and development, and retail and institutional uses that are subordinate to and supportive of the office and service uses. The Property is also located within the 2010 Family Sports Capital Addendum II to the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan.

PROCEDURAL

Public Hearing: Planned Unit Development (PUD) Districts are required to be considered at a public hearing by the Plan Commission. The public hearing for this petition occurred at the September 6, 2022, Plan Commission meeting. Notice of the public hearing was provided in accordance with Indiana law and the Plan Commission’s Rules of Procedure.

Statutory Considerations:

Indiana Code 36-7-4-603 states that in the consideration of zoning ordinance amendments and zone map changes that reasonable regard shall be paid to:

1. The Comprehensive Plan
2. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses
3. The most desirable use for which the land is adapted
4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction
5. Responsible growth and development

Council Introduction: The petition was introduced at the August 8, 2022, City Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS / ACTIONS

Plan Commission Recommendation

At its September 6, 2022, meeting, the Plan Commission forwarded a favorable recommendation of this petition to the Council (Vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed).

City Council

Introduction: August 8, 2022


Eligible for Adoption: September 12, 2022

Submitted by: Daine Crabtree, Senior Planner
Community Development Department


Lot 3, Austrian Pine PUD

Aerial Location Map

 Site



Zoning Map



GIS.DBO.PW_Streets Zoning
Parcel
Parcel
Zoning - All
E1 (Enclosed Industrial)
PUD (Planned Unit Development)

0 0.025 0.05
Miles





Westfield City Council Report

Ordinance Number:	20-25
APC Petition Number:	2008-PUD-09
Petitioner:	Northpoint Owners, LLC by Clark, Quinn, Moses, Scott, & Grahm, LLP
Requested Action:	A change of zoning for 183.5 acres +/- from the AG-SF1: Agriculture/Single-Family Rural District to the Northpoint II PUD District.
Current Zoning:	AG-SF1: Agriculture/Single-family Rural District
Current Land Use:	Agriculture
Acreage:	183.5 acres +/-
Exhibits:	1. Department Report & APC Certification 2. Proposed Ord. 20-25 (clean) 3. Location Map 4. Concept Plan 5. Character Exhibit 6. Area 2 Front Façade Character Exhibit 7. Proposed Ord. 20-25 redlined (text only) 8. Updated Narrative Statement 9. Petitioner's Response to Issue List 10. Neighbor Meeting Summaries 11. Remonstrance Packet (February 2022) 12. Remonstrator's Response (March 2022) 13. Public Comments

Staff Reviewer: Pam Howard, Assistant Director

PETITION HISTORY

This petition was introduced at the [July 13, 2020](#), City Council meeting, the discussion for this petition can be viewed [here](#). The petition received a public hearing at the [February 22, 2022](#), Advisory Plan Commission (the "Plan Commission") meeting, the discussion for this petition can be viewed [here](#). Due to the proposed changes, and the amount of time since the first hearing, a second public hearing is being held at the August 15, 2022, Plan Commission meeting.

The petitioner held 4 neighbor meetings on August 13, 2020; August 27, 2020; February 4, 2021; and January 31, 2022. Summaries of these meetings have been provided by the petitioner and included as **Exhibit 10**.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Location: This subject real estate is approximately 183.5 acres in size and is located on the north side of SR 38 between Anthony Road and Hinkle Road (see **Exhibit 2**). The Property is currently zoned AG-SF1: Agriculture/Single-family Rural District. Adjacent zoning districts are the Northpoint PUD to the southwest and the AG-SF1 District along all other borders. Adjacent land uses on the north side of SR 38 include Single-Family Residential, Agricultural, and Public Park uses. The south side of SR 38 includes a commercial nursery and a boat storage facility in addition to Single-Family Residential uses.

Project Description: The petitioner is requesting a change in zoning from the AG-SF1 District to the Northpoint II PUD District to accommodate industrial and Single-Family development, as described in the Petitioner's Updated Narrative Statement (see **Exhibit 8**).

ORDINANCE DETAILS

Definitions: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance includes several definitions that are not present in the UDO. These include: EFIS, Exterior Material, Primary Façade, Secondary Façade, Low Slope Roof, and Real Estate.

Concept Plan: The proposed ordinance incorporates a Concept Plan (see **Exhibit 4**) which divides the Real Estate into 3 areas for development: one Conservation Lot Residential Area (the "Residential Area") and two Commerce Parke areas ("Area 1" and "Area 2"). The approximate size for each area is also outlined in the PUD ordinance. The Residential Area will contain a maximum of 5 lots and also includes a tree preservation area. The PUD requires substantial conformance with this Concept Plan.

Underlying Zoning: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance assigns EI: Enclosed Industrial as the underlying zoning district for the Commerce Parke areas, and SF1 as the underlying zoning district for the Residential Area.

Permitted Uses in Commerce Parke Areas: The proposed ordinance allows most of the uses permitted by the Underlying Zoning District of EI, with a few exceptions. Additionally, the proposed ordinance permits many of the UDO's LB and GB uses. This results in the following uses being permitted (*italicized uses are added uses per the PUD and would not be permitted by underlying zoning*):

- Auction Rooms
- Childcare / daycare centers
- Commissary, food catering service
- Garden and Lawn center
- Health, fitness and exercise center
- Hotel (or Motel)
- Mortuaries
- Office (General, Medical, Professional)
- Restaurant (Sit Down, Specialty, Takeout and Deli-style)
- Retail (High, Medium, Low Intensity)
- School (Fine Arts or Commercial, Professional Trade or Business)
- Amphitheatre / outdoor theater
- Assembly halls / auditoriums
- Civic center

- Education Institution, without dormitory accommodations
- Hospital (major)
- Museum / exhibition hall
- Public Safety and Service Use
- Religious Institution
- Club (Civic, Private)
- Development Amenities
- Commercial Recreational Facility
- Micro-brewery
- Indoor Theater
- Data processing / call centers
- Engineering, research and testing laboratories
- Light Industry
- Construction Trade Office
- Self-Storage Facility
- Trucking Companies
- Warehousing and distribution operations (inside storage)
- Wholesalers (inside storage)
- Temporary Use and Event
- Bus stations / transit stops
- Commercial parking lots and structures, public
- Heliports
- Utilities - not regulated by IURC
- Wireless communication Service Facilities
- *Construction and manufacturing of outdoor advertising signs*
- *manufacturing, engraving and sales of cemetery monuments and tombstones*
- *canneries (e.g. taking fresh fruits and vegetables and canning for distribution)*
- *coffee roasting*
- *food processing (e.g. commercial bakeries, smokehouses)*
- *granaries*
- *grain processing*
- *milk processing plants (without any on-site milking)*
- *warehousing and distribution operations (outdoor storage);*
- *structural steel fabricating (similar to the existing uses of Westfield Steel)*
- *any other business that can be classified as either general business or light industrial in the UDO, with approval of the Director*

Permitted Uses in the Conservation Lot Residential Area: The proposed ordinance permits Single-Family Dwellings, Agricultural Uses, and Private Stables in this area.

General Regulations for the Conservation Lot Residential Area: As proposed, the PUD ordinance defaults to the general regulations for the SF1 District, with some modifications. A comparison of the standards is included in the chart below.

	Proposed in PUD	UDO (SF1)
Min. Lot Area	3 acres	30,000 SF
Min. Lot Frontage	25'	60' for Lots in Subdivisions
Min. Front Yard Setback	40'	50' for Local and Private Streets

Min. Side Yard Setback	Not modified	20'
Min. Rear Yard Setback	Not modified	30'
Min. Lot Width	Not modified	100'
Max. Building Height	Not modified	2 ½ Stories
Min. Living Area of SF Dwelling	2,500 gross SF	Single-story: 2,000 SF Two-Story: 1,200 SF ground floor Tri-level: 1,200 SF (Basement and first level) Story and one-half: 1,200 SF (lower and main levels)
Max. percentage of Lot covered by SF dwelling or accessory buildings	30%	No equivalent standard
Development Plan Review	Not modified	Required for Major Subdivisions

General Regulations for Commerce Parke Areas: As proposed, the PUD ordinance defaults to the general regulations for the EI District, with some modifications. A comparison of the standards is included in the chart below.

	Proposed in PUD	UDO (EI)
Min. Tract Requirement	Not modified	3 acres
Min. Lot Size	3 acres	No equivalent standard
Min. Lot Frontage	70'	70'
Min. Front Yard Setback	30'	100' for Expressways or Arterials, 40' for all other streets
Min. Side Yard Setback	10'	20'
Min. Rear Yard Setback	10'	20'
Min. Parking Lot Setback	20' from the property line abutting any street	No equivalent standard
Min. Lot Width	100'	None
Max. Building Height	45' for Area 1 Not modified for Area 2	60'
Min. Building Size	Not modified	No minimum
Max. gross SF of retail per a single building	65,000 GSF	No equivalent standard
Min. Building Setback along exterior of District	100' from any boundary of the District	No equivalent standard
Performance Standards	Not modified	Shall comply with Article 6.15

Development Plan Review	Not modified	Required
-------------------------	--------------	----------

Development Standards: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance establishes alternative development standards from the UDO. The development standards of note are briefly highlighted below:

Accessory Use and Building Standards: As written, the PUD Ordinance proposes increasing the maximum height for Accessory Buildings in the Residential District to 35’ or 30% taller than the Principal Building, whichever is less. The UDO restricts the height to 18’, and also requires that they be subordinate in size to the Principal Building.

Character Exhibit: The proposed Ordinance incorporates a Character Exhibit, including images for the Commerce Parke Areas (see **Exhibit 5**), and requires the buildings to be constructed substantially similar to the exhibit. Additionally, the PUD Ordinance includes an exhibit specific to west-facing facades in Area 2 (see **Exhibit 6**), and requires substantial conformance with this exhibit.

Architectural Standards for Commerce Parke Areas: The PUD Ordinance proposes alternative standards from those in the UDO. Facades fronting on a public right-of-way (ROW) or visible from adjoining residential uses will comply with the Architectural Requirements of the State Highway 32 Overlay District (UDO Article 5.3(K)), with any referencing to SR 32 being interpreted to apply to the public ROW that the structure fronts on. Facades that do not front on a public ROW and are not visible from an adjoining residential district will comply with the alternative standards set forth in the PUD Ordinance. These standards relate to Roof Design, Façade Materials, and Wall Planes; and are further explained below:

- Permits roofs to be either residential character or Low Slope (defined as no steeper than 2:12, which is also referred to as a Flat Roof). Where pitched roofs are used, the minimum roof pitch for the main roof would be 6:12. The UDO does not contain any requirement for roofs on buildings in Industrial Districts.
- Roof-Mounted Mechanical Equipment would be required to be screened, the color of the screening (and other roof penetrations) would be compatible with the overall building or roof color. This is similar to the UDO requirements that Mechanical Equipment and External Wall Protrusions be visually integrated into the overall design of the building.
- Specific permitted and prohibited materials are outlined in the proposed ordinance for both Primary and Secondary Facades. EFIS and architecturally insulated metal panel systems would be permitted to be used on a maximum of 50% of the façade. EFIS would also be restricted to 8’ or higher above grade. The UDO does contain material requirements for facades that are not visible from a street or adjoining residential district.
- Colors used on building facades would be required to be complementary; with natural, muted colors serving as the primary color, and brighter colors being used as accents. The closest UDO standard requires the use of multiple colors and textures when non-masonry materials are used.
- Decorative architectural lighting would be required, the UDO does not contain an equivalent requirement.
- Overhead doors would be permitted on Primary Facades that do not face a Primary Arterial (SR 38). If located on a Secondary Façade, then they would not be permitted to face a public ROW. Overhead doors on buildings within Area 1 would be required to face east. The UDO does not regulate the location of Overhead Doors/Loading Berths outside of the US 31 & SR 32 Overlay Districts.

- Provides alternative options for meeting the facades offset requirements of the UDO, identical to those approved in a PUD amendment for Northpoint I last year. The alternative options proposed are:
 - Allow the separation between the required offsets to be increased up to two times the distance required by the UDO for the applicable building size if a change in either building material or paint colors occurs every sixty (60) feet, with a minimum width of four (4) feet for a material change and six (6) feet for a color change. A change in color would need to be significant enough to provide a meaningful and visually apparent contrast.
 - Allow a mix of horizontal and vertical articulation every sixty (60) feet. The minimum width for the vertical articulation would be eighteen (18) inches and the minimum depth for the horizontal articulation would be thirty-six (36) inches. If using this alternative, then horizontal articulation would need to make up at least fifty (50) percent of the required articulation.
 - Primary Facades would be required to incorporate a change in wall height of at least twenty-four (24) inches on all wall planes, in addition to using either the material or color change option described previously.

Architectural Standards for Conservation Lot Residential Area: The proposed ordinance would require all lots with a side or rear façade facing an External Street or an AG-SF1 zoned property to comply with the UDO’s standards for perimeter lots. Additionally, the proposed ordinance prohibits vinyl siding and requires 50% masonry on front facades.

Fence Standards: As proposed, the PUD ordinance defaults to the Fence Standards of the UDO, with an additional requirement that any fencing located along an External Street or separating the Residential Area from Area 1 would be required to be a dark color three-rail fence.

Landscaping Standards: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance defaults to the Landscaping Standards of the UDO, with the two exceptions listed below:

Foundation Plantings: The PUD Ordinance proposes to eliminate the Foundation Planting requirement along facades that are comprised primarily of overhead doors. The UDO does not contain an equivalent exemption, but it is a known issue that may be addressed in a future UDO amendment.

Buffer Yard Requirements: The PUD Ordinance proposes to replace the standards of UDO Article 6.8(N) with those described below:

- Width and Plantings:

	Proposed in PUD around Commerce Parke (UDO would require Buffer A)	UDO Buffer A (proposed between Residential Area and AG-SF1 properties)
Width	50’	30’
Shade Trees	None	3
Evergreen Trees	8 (staggered on alternating sides of mound)	3
Shrubs	5 (evergreen)	10 (any variety)

Mound	6' between Area 1 and Residential Area (excluding the Tree Preservation area)	None
Variety	At least 2 species of trees and shrubs	No equivalent standard

- Allows landscaping to be removed if a trail is constructed within a thirty (30) foot or greater easement that could be dedicated to the City or County Parks Department or to the Township.
- Exempting the Buffer Yard Requirement:
 - o Adjacent to a proposed greenway or park area.
 - o Within easements prohibiting landscaping. The UDO permits buffer plantings to be clustered, which can help to accommodate easements that cross a buffer yard; however, the minimum plantings would still need to be met. The proposed standard would allow the number of planting to be reduced to accommodate easements.
- Tree Preservation: The UDO does address requirements for preservation areas, but does not require any preservation. The proposed ordinance adds the below requirements:
 - o Require any tree larger than 6" DBH and within ten (10) feet of the property line, to be preserved unless required to be removed for utility installation, pedestrian/vehicular access, or installation of the multi-use trail.
 - o Requiring the area shown as "Tree Preservation" on the Concept Plan to be substantially maintained as it exists when the PUD ordinance is adopted and stating that the developer or owner's association will be responsible for the cost to maintain this area.

Outside Storage and Display Standards: The PUD Ordinance would permit Outside Storage and Display in the Commerce Parke area, which the UDO would not permit in the Underlying Zoning District. Outside Storage areas would follow the standards of UDO Article 6.12(D), with two additions. The first would require the fencing to be an opaque wood privacy fence, with a consistent style throughout the Commerce Parke. The second would prohibit Outside Storage within 200' of:

- the SR 38 right-of-way,
- the northern boundary of Area 1, or
- Area 1's boundary with the residential area.

Performance Standards: The proposed Ordinance defaults to the Performance Standards of the UDO, with the added standard that outdoor speakers not be used, in conjunction with any use, between 11 P.M. and 6 A.M.

Access to surrounding right-of-way: As proposed, the PUD ordinance would restrict access to the property to SR 38 only. The UDO does not contain an equivalent standard.

Annexation: The proposed ordinance would require annexation to be complete prior to approval and recording of a Secondary Plat, with the exception of a Minor Subdivision for annexation purposes. This is consistent with other recent PUDs.

Duration: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance includes a provision stating that the zoning will revert back to AG-SF1 if Secondary Plat / Construction Plan approval has not been obtained by January 1, 2033.

Severability: The proposed ordinance includes a provision stating that if any portion of the ordinance is determined to be illegal or unenforceable, then the remainder of the ordinance will remain valid and enforceable.

CHANGES SINCE THE FEBRUARY 22, 2022, PUBLIC HEARING

The Petitioner has made several changes to the proposed ordinance since the February 22, 2022, Public Hearing. The more substantive changes are summarized below:

- Removing the definition of External Street, as suggested by the Department due to the fact that the proposed definition aligned with the UDO's definition
- Updating the Districts of the PUD as follows:
 - o Removing the Dedicated Park Area
 - o Adding a Conservation Lot Residential Area, which includes a Tree Preservation Area
 - o Renumbering the Commerce Parke Areas
- Updating the Concept Plan to reflect the changes to the District Areas and requiring substantial conformance with the Concept Plan
- Adding standards for the Conservation Lot Residential Area, which include:
 - o Permitted Uses
 - o Lot Standards
 - o Accessory Building Standards
 - o Architectural Standards
 - o Fence Standards
 - o Landscape Buffer Requirements
- Relocating the maximum building height standard to the General Regulations section of the ordinance, and removing the unnecessary language that duplicates a UDO standard.
- Exempting facades containing mostly overhead doors from the Foundation Planting requirements
- Updating the Buffer Requirements to include 2 areas of tree preservation
- Prohibiting Outside Storage near the north and west boundaries of Area 1
- Updating the duration language and adding severability language similar to other recently approved PUDs

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan identifies the "Rural Northwest and Northeast" land use as the appropriate land use for the Property. The Rural Northwest and Northeast section of the Comprehensive Plan proposes the following uses as appropriate: Single-family detached houses on large lots or in a Rural or Conservation Subdivisions, Accessory dwellings, Equestrian Uses, Agriculture (including artisan farms), Institutional uses (such as schools, churches, public safety facilities, and similar uses). Development Policies for Rural Northwest and Northeast are located on p. 32 of the [Comprehensive Plan](#). Indiana Code states that reasonable regard be paid to the Comprehensive Plan when considering zone map changes; however, the Comprehensive Plan is not law. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to serve as a guide in making land use decisions.

Thoroughfare Plan: The following corridors are impacted by the development of the Property: (i) Primary Arterial 1: SR 38, (ii) Proposed Local: other proposed streets internal to the development, and (iii)

Alternative Transportation Plan: perimeter pathways along perimeter streets and sidewalks along internal streets.

PROCEDURAL

Public Hearing: A change of zoning request is required to be considered at a public hearing by the Plan Commission. A public hearing was held for this petition at the [February 22, 2022](#), Plan Commission meeting. Due to the proposed changes, and the amount of time since the first hearing, a second public hearing is being held at the August 15, 2022, Plan Commission meeting. Notice of both public hearings was provided in accordance with Indiana law and the Plan Commission's Rules of Procedure.

Statutory Considerations: Indiana Code 36-7-4-603 states that in the consideration of zoning ordinance amendments and zone map changes that reasonable regard shall be paid to:

1. The Comprehensive Plan.
2. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses.
3. The most desirable use for which the land is adapted.
4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction.
5. Responsible growth and development.

Council Introduction: The petition was introduced at the [July 13, 2020](#), City Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS / ACTIONS


Plan Commission Recommendation

At its [August 15, 2022](#), meeting, the Plan Commission forwarded an unfavorable recommendation of this petition to the Council (Vote: 5 in favor, 2 opposed).

City Council

Introduction:	January 11, 2021
Eligible for Adoption:	August 22, 2022 (tabled after discussion)
Eligible for Adoption:	September 12, 2022
Submitted by:	Pam Howard, Assistant Director Community Development Department

Annexation Area



Not To Scale




EXHIBIT LEGEND

- | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|---------|
|  | ANNEXATION AREA |  | PARCELS |
|  | EXISTING CITY LIMITS |  | STREETS |

I hereby certify that each of the above listed vouchers and invoices, or bills attached there to, are true and correct and I have audited same in accordance with IC5-11-10-1.6.

September 12, 2022

Fiscal Officer

ALLOWANCE OF ACCOUNTS PAYABLE VOUCHERS

CITY OF WESTFIELD

We have examined the Accounts Payable Vouchers listed on the foregoing Register of Accounts Payable Vouchers consisting of 40 pages and except for accounts payables not allowed as shown on the Register such account payables are hereby allowed in the total amount of \$0 and pending director approval such accounts payables are hereby allowed in the total amount of \$0.

Dated this 12 day of September, 2022

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Signatures of Governing Board

Approved by State Board of Accounts for the City of Westfield, 2013

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 1 of 24

WESTFIELD\KAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.		Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name									
101	General									
	Administration									
VEN008029	Liberty Mutual Insurance	APP095997	8/19/2022	101001339	ADM-INSURANCE	Installment 9		5,901.18	73386	8/22/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101001119	ADM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins		3,113.28	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN005574	Bose McKinney and Evans LLP	APP096178	8/29/2022	101001331	ADM-CONSULTING	July services		3,500.00		
VEN001469	O W Krohn and Associates	APP096179	8/29/2022	101001331	ADM-CONSULTING	July services		868.75		
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101001111	ADM-SALARY	sal		10,035.20	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101001120	ADM-FICA /MEDICARE	fica		587.56	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101001120	ADM-FICA /MEDICARE	med		137.45	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101001121	ADM-PERF	perf		1,425.00	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101001119	ADM-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours		167.03	73468	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101001119	ADM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins		126.08	73469	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101001119	ADM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins		28.96	73470	9/1/2022
VEN000917	Humane Society for Hamilton	APP096396	9/6/2022	101001349	ADM-SERVICES	Strays		6,531.00		
VEN001195	Krieg Devault LLP	APP096445	9/6/2022	101001330	ADM-ATTORNEY/CONSULT	GEFT		5,463.00		
VEN001195	Krieg Devault LLP	APP096446	9/6/2022	101001330	ADM-ATTORNEY/CONSULT	Eler		315.00		
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101001119	ADM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins		6.50	73471	9/6/2022
VEN0009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101001119	ADM-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP		10.68		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	101001343	ADM-BUILDING	June City Hall		780.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	101001343	ADM-BUILDING	July City Hall		780.00		
VEN006494	Pure Water Partners	APP096496	9/6/2022	101001224	ADM-OPERATING SUPPLIES	Water CSC conference room		705.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	101001343	ADM-BUILDING	City Hall		780.00		
VEN003729	Metronet	APP096632	9/8/2022	101001343	ADM-BUILDING	City Hall alarm		60.95		
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096634	9/8/2022	101001328	ADM-HEAT/GAS	Admin		147.41	73480	9/8/2022
Subtotal for Administration								41,470.03		
Police										
VEN008029	Liberty Mutual Insurance	APP095997	8/19/2022	101002339	POLICE-INSURANCE	Installment 9		9,634.95	73386	8/22/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101002119	POLICE-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins		83,845.48	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN001856	Sun Badge Co	APP096156	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniform Badges		226.50		
VEN000942	Imagery LLC	APP096157	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Polo Shirts		464.88		
VEN000747	Galls	APP096158	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniform Boots		148.00		
VEN000747	Galls	APP096158	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Radio Pouch, MAG Retention		69.50		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096159	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Sew on Uniform Patches		33.60		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096159	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Tourniquet Belt Case		39.89		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 2 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101	General								
	Police								
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096159	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Sew on Uniform Patches	22.80		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096159	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniforms-Mattes	80.39		
VEN008843	Coban Technologies Inc	APP096161	8/26/2022	101002349	POLICE-SERVICES	Intvew Room Systems, Ri	4,270.80		
VEN006333	Axon Enterprise Inc	APP096162	8/26/2022	101002349	POLICE-SERVICES	Dynamic Bundle	49,362.00		
VEN006494	Pure Water Partners	APP096163	8/26/2022	101002349	POLICE-SERVICES	Quarterly Statement	180.00		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096164	8/26/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniforms-Gentry	252.54		
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101002111	POLICE-SALARY	sal	247,191.14	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101002119	POLICE-HEALTH/DENTAL	hsa	166.68	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101002120	POLICE-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	14,756.91	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101002120	POLICE-FICA/MEDICARE	med	3,451.20	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101002121	POLICE-PERF	perf	36,983.23	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN002050	Verizon Wireless	APP096236	8/30/2022	101002349	POLICE-SERVICES	SMS Content for Investigation	50.00	73466	8/30/2022
VEN002050	Verizon Wireless	APP096236	8/30/2022	101002349	POLICE-SERVICES	SMS Content for Investigation	50.00	73466	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101002119	POLICE-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	4,610.06	73468	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101002119	POLICE-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	3,734.21	73469	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101002119	POLICE-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	822.72	73470	9/1/2022
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096411	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniforms-Bevelaqua	213.45		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096411	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniforms-Burtron	131.70		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096411	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniforms-Hollowell	731.98		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096411	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniforms-Gehlausen	270.96		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096411	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Citizens Academy Shirts	1,100.52		
VEN002353	Boldens Cleaners	APP096412	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Dry Cleaning	35.50		
VEN000314	C.A.R. Clinic	APP096413	9/6/2022	101002360	POLICE-VEHICLE REPAIR	Vehicle Repairs	6,110.18		
VEN000480	CSI Signs	APP096414	9/6/2022	101002337	POLICE-PRINTING	Police Substation Sign	133.54		
VEN000942	Imagery LLC	APP096415	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Polo Shirts	287.13		
VEN001257	Logo USA	APP096416	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Dodgeball Shirts	124.00		
VEN010611	Law Enforcement System	APP096447	9/6/2022	101002224	POLICE-OPERATING SUPPLI	72 Hour Tow Stickers	152.00		
VEN009277	Nelson and Co LLC	APP096448	9/6/2022	101002229	POLICE-UNIFORMS	Uniform Shorts-Bowell	54.99		
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101002119	POLICE-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	243.75	73471	9/6/2022
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101002119	POLICE-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	400.50		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	June PSB	1,000.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	PSB lobby	100.00		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 3 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101 General									
Police									
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	Supplies	100.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	July PSB	1,000.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	July PSB lobby	100.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	Supplies	100.00		
VEN005581	Newton Oil Company	APP096497	9/6/2022	101002226	POLICE-VEHICLE GAS/SUPP	Fuel	14,872.01		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	PSB	1,000.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	PSB lobby	100.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	Supplies	100.00		
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096589	9/7/2022	101002342	POLICE-WATER/SEWER	40 percent - psb	337.38	73475	9/8/2022
VEN005403	BrightView Landscapes LLC	APP096607	9/7/2022	101002343	POLICE-BUILDING MAINTEN	Turf application sta 81	100.00		
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096634	9/8/2022	101002328	POLICE-HEAT/GAS	PSB	185.14	73480	9/8/2022
Subtotal for Police							489,532.21		
Economic and Community Development									
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101003119	ECD-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	12,513.86	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101003111	ECD-SALARY	sal	36,353.37	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101003119	ECD-HEALTH/DENTAL	hsa	166.68	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101003120	ECD-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	2,192.73	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101003120	ECD-FICA/MEDICARE	med	512.82	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101003121	ECD-PERF	perf	5,162.19	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101003119	ECD-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	633.27	73468	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101003119	ECD-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	512.50	73469	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101003119	ECD-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	146.16	73470	9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101003119	ECD-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	46.67	73471	9/6/2022
VEN0009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101003119	ECD-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	80.10		
Subtotal for Economic and Community Development							58,320.35		
Parks									
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101005119	PARKS-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	3,716.42	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN000485	Current Publishing	APP096200	8/29/2022	101005349	PARKS-SERVICES	Display ad	509.00		
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101005111	PARKS-SALARY	sal	11,557.18	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101005120	PARKS-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	690.31	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101005120	PARKS-FICA/MEDICARE	med	161.45	500000814	8/30/2022

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 4 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name								
101	General								
Parks									
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101005121	PARKS-PERF	perf	1,398.30	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101005119	PARKS-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	198.99	73468	8/30/2022
VEN009668	Sewa International Inc	APP096300	8/31/2022	101005347	PARKS-PROMOTION	Cuisine Connect Culture	500.00		
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101005119	PARKS-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	212.64	73469	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101005119	PARKS-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	41.76	73470	9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101005119	PARKS-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	13.00	73471	9/6/2022
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101005119	PARKS-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	21.36		
Subtotal for Parks							19,020.41		
Economic Dev									
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101006119	ECONOMIC DEV-HEALTH/D	Sept Ins	631.11	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101006111	ECONOMIC DEV-SALARY	sal	3,502.00	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101006120	ECONOMIC DEV-FICA/MEDI	fica	216.90	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101006120	ECONOMIC DEV-FICA/MEDI	med	50.73	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101006121	ECONOMIC DEV-PERF	perf	497.28	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101006119	ECONOMIC DEV-HEALTH/D	July clinic hours	33.41	73468	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101006119	ECONOMIC DEV-HEALTH/D	Sept Ins	20.86	73469	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101006119	ECONOMIC DEV-HEALTH/D	Sept Ins	6.40	73470	9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101006119	ECONOMIC DEV-HEALTH/D	Sept Ins	3.25	73471	9/6/2022
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101006119	ECONOMIC DEV-HEALTH/D	4th quart EAP	5.34		
VEN006668	Indy Chamber	APP096635	9/8/2022	101006350	ECONOMIC DEV-SUBSCRIP/	2022 Accelerate Indy Campai	25,315.00		
Subtotal for Economic Dev							30,282.28		
Informatics									
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101007119	IT-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	6,820.96	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101007111	IT-SALARY	sal	19,201.56	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101007120	IT-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	1,126.87	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101007120	IT-FICA/MEDICARE	med	263.53	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101007121	IT-PERF	perf	2,726.63	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN002050	Verizon Wireless	APP096232	8/30/2022	101007332	IT-CELLULAR/PAGERS/MOBI	Cell phones and air cards	6,023.73	73465	8/30/2022
VEN004591	Virtusa Corporation	APP096237	8/30/2022	101007349	IT-SERVICES	August services	789.00		
VEN006597	ATEC Inc	APP096238	8/30/2022	101007349	IT-SERVICES	3rd quart CCTV maint	4,900.00		
VEN006597	ATEC Inc	APP096238	8/30/2022	101007349	IT-SERVICES	3rd quart HVAC maint	3,252.00		
VEN005146	Konica Minolta Business	APP096239	8/30/2022	101007337	IT-PRINTING	Click charges	2.85		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 5 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.		Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name									
101	General									
Informatics										
VEN005146	Konica Minolta Business	APP096240	8/30/2022	101007337	IT-PRINTING	Click charges	121.64			
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101007119	IT-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	366.02	73468		8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101007119	IT-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	269.80	73469		9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101007119	IT-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	70.72	73470		9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101007119	IT-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	19.50	73471		9/6/2022
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101007119	IT-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	37.38			
Subtotal for Informatics							45,992.19			
Clerk Treasurer										
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101008119	CT-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	4,586.21	500000813		8/23/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101008111	CT-SALARY	sal	19,507.14	500000814		8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101008120	CT-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	1,143.83	500000814		8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101008120	CT-FICA/MEDICARE	med	267.51	500000814		8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101008121	CT-PERF	perf	2,138.22	500000814		8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101008119	CT-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	249.81	73468		8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101008119	CT-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	220.74	73469		9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101008119	CT-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	70.72	73470		9/1/2022
VEN010612	DebtBook	APP096398	9/6/2022	101008331	CT-CONSULTING	Debt and Lease software	9,750.00			
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101008119	CT-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	17.42	73471		9/6/2022
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101008119	CT-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	32.04			
VEN001826	Staples	APP096590	9/7/2022	101008223	CT-OFFICE SUPPLIES	Office supplies	174.03			
Subtotal for Clerk Treasurer							38,157.67			
Mayor										
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101009119	MAYOR-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	1,381.46	500000813		8/23/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101009111	MAYOR-SALARY	sal	4,758.57	500000814		8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101009120	MAYOR- FICA/MEDICARE	fica	286.05	500000814		8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101009120	MAYOR- FICA/MEDICARE	med	66.90	500000814		8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101009121	MAYOR-PERF	perf	675.72	500000814		8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101009119	MAYOR-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	76.98	73468		8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101009119	MAYOR-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	40.62	73469		9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101009119	MAYOR-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	14.48	73470		9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101009119	MAYOR-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	1.69	73471		9/6/2022

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 6 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101	General								
	Mayor								
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101009119	MAYOR-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	5.34		
	Subtotal for Mayor						7,307.81		
	Public Works								
VEN000589	Duke Energy	APP095995	8/19/2022	101013341	PW-ELECTRIC	PW	24.87	73385	8/22/2022
VEN008029	Liberty Mutual Insurance	APP095997	8/19/2022	101013339	PW-INSURANCE	Installment 9	5,157.73	73386	8/22/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101013119	PW-HEALTH AND DENTAL	Sept Ins	25,093.05	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096071	8/24/2022	101013342	PW-WATER/SEWER	GRJN 204 Mill Bldg T	166.70	73462	8/24/2022
VEN000589	Duke Energy	APP096142	8/26/2022	101013341	PW-ELECTRIC	PW	30.25	73463	8/26/2022
VEN000589	Duke Energy	APP096151	8/26/2022	101013341	PW-ELECTRIC	PW	64.95	73464	8/26/2022
VEN009542	H and N Outdoor Services LLC	APP096201	8/29/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	Low Profile landscape Maint c	12,783.06		
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101013111	PW-SALARY	sal	54,844.91	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101013119	PW-HEALTH AND DENTAL	hsa	166.68	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101013120	PW-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	3,246.70	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101013120	PW-FICA/MEDICARE	med	759.31	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101013121	PW-PERF	perf	8,520.22	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101013119	PW-HEALTH AND DENTAL	July clinic hours	1,337.70	73468	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101013119	PW-HEALTH AND DENTAL	Sept Ins	1,108.70	73469	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101013119	PW-HEALTH AND DENTAL	Sept Ins	244.16	73470	9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101013119	PW-HEALTH AND DENTAL	Sept Ins	94.25	73471	9/6/2022
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101013119	PW-HEALTH AND DENTAL	4th quart EAP	202.92		
VEN005403	BrightView Landscapes LLC	APP096484	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	Freedom Trail	60.96		
VEN005403	BrightView Landscapes LLC	APP096485	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	Multiple Sites COW	51,798.00		
VEN002139	Williams Creek Management	APP096487	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	GRJN	10,420.00		
VEN009542	H and N Outdoor Services LLC	APP096488	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	US 31 Annual Prairie Mowing	22,360.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	June CSC	1,370.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	June nightly floor cleaning	440.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	June Workout Facility	120.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	July CSC	1,370.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	July Floor cleaning	440.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	July Workout Facility	120.00		
VEN002139	Williams Creek Management	APP096491	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	GJ Meadow Planting	49,764.00		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 7 of 24

WESTFIELD/KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101 General									
Public Works									
VEN000402	Cintas	APP096493	9/6/2022	101013229	PW-UNIFORMS	Uniforms	70.20		
VEN006494	Pure Water Partners	APP096496	9/6/2022	101013224	PW-OPERATING SUPPLIES	Water CSC conference room	705.00		
VEN003729	Metronet	APP096499	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	GRJN	311.68		
VEN000402	Cintas	APP096503	9/6/2022	101013229	PW-UNIFORMS	Uniforms	72.80		
VEN000402	Cintas	APP096504	9/6/2022	101013229	PW-UNIFORMS	Work Shirts	3,406.45		
VEN005709	Service Sanitation Inc	APP096508	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	Deer Walk	144.25		
VEN005709	Service Sanitation Inc	APP096508	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	166th St	122.62		
VEN002139	Williams Creek Management	APP096509	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	US 31 Landscape maint	17,930.00		
VEN002139	Williams Creek Management	APP096510	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	GJ corridor maint	1,950.00		
VEN000402	Cintas	APP096511	9/6/2022	101013229	PW-UNIFORMS	Uniforms	72.80		
VEN003323	Recreation InSites LLC	APP096517	9/6/2022	101013345	PW-EQUIP REPAIR	Simon Moon	367.00		
VEN000987	Indiana Street Commissioner's Assoc	APP096518	9/6/2022	101013334	PW-TRAVEL/TRAINING/SEMI	ISCA conference	825.00		
VEN000987	Indiana Street Commissioner's Assoc	APP096518	9/6/2022	101013350	PW-SUBS/DUES	Membership fee	35.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	CSC	1,370.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	CSC nightly floor cleaning	440.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	CSC workout facility	120.00		
VEN010561	Northside Window	APP096522	9/6/2022	101013343	PW-BLDG MAINT	Window Cleaning CSC GRJN	2,795.00		
VEN005897	Hamilton County Reporter	APP096523	9/6/2022	101013349	PW-CONTRACTUAL SERVIC	RFP Cafe	14.00		
VEN000589	Duke Energy	APP096626	9/8/2022	101013341	PW-ELECTRIC	PW	4,297.26	73482	9/8/2022
VEN000589	Duke Energy	APP096629	9/8/2022	101013341	PW-ELECTRIC	Admin	253.63	73483	9/8/2022
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096631	9/8/2022	101013342	PW-WATER/SEWER	GRJN	692.94	73478	9/8/2022
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096633	9/8/2022	101013328	PW-HEAT/GAS	PW	1,587.76	73479	9/8/2022
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096634	9/8/2022	101013328	PW-HEAT/GAS	CSC	93.00	73480	9/8/2022
Subtotal for Public Works							289,785.51		
Communications									
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101020119	COMM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	1,280.97	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN001359	Michelle Krcmery	APP096085	8/24/2022	101020331	COMM- CONSULT	July services	1,160.00		
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101020111	COMM-SALARY	sal	7,838.11	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101020120	COMM-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	482.93	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101020120	COMM-FICA/MEDICARE	med	112.94	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101020121	COMM-PERF	perf	1,113.02	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101020119	COMM-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	68.26	73468	8/30/2022

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 8 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.		Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name									
101	General									
Communications										
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101020119	COMM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	41.72	73469	9/1/2022	
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101020119	COMM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	12.80	73470	9/1/2022	
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101020119	COMM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	9.75	73471	9/6/2022	
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101020119	COMM-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	16.02			
Subtotal for Communications							12,136.52			
Customer Service										
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101021119	CUSTOMER SERV-HEALTH/	Sept Ins	1,180.28	500000813	8/23/2022	
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101021111	CUSTOMER SERV-SALARY	sal	6,292.80	500000814	8/30/2022	
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101021120	CUSTOMER SERV- FICA/ME	fica	375.18	500000814	8/30/2022	
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101021120	CUSTOMER SERV- FICA/ME	med	87.76	500000814	8/30/2022	
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101021121	CUSTOMER SERV- PERF	perf	893.58	500000814	8/30/2022	
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101021119	CUSTOMER SERV-HEALTH/	July clinic hours	140.89	73468	8/30/2022	
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101021119	CUSTOMER SERV-HEALTH/	Sept Ins	142.62	73469	9/1/2022	
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101021119	CUSTOMER SERV-HEALTH/	Sept Ins	28.96	73470	9/1/2022	
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101021119	CUSTOMER SERV-HEALTH/	Sept Ins	13.00	73471	9/6/2022	
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101021119	CUSTOMER SERV-HEALTH/	4th quart EAP	21.36			
Subtotal for Customer Service							9,176.43			
Human Resources										
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	101022119	HR-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	2,588.22	500000813	8/23/2022	
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101022111	HR -SALARY	sal	6,078.00	500000814	8/30/2022	
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101022120	HR-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	363.06	500000814	8/30/2022	
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101022120	HR-FICA/MEDICARE	med	84.92	500000814	8/30/2022	
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	101022121	HR PERF	perf	863.08	500000814	8/30/2022	
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	101022119	HR-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	140.89	73468	8/30/2022	
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	101022119	HR-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	106.32	73469	9/1/2022	
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	101022119	HR-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	28.96	73470	9/1/2022	
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	101022119	HR-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	6.50	73471	9/6/2022	
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	101022119	HR-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	10.68			
Subtotal for Human Resources							10,270.63			
Subtotal for Fund 101 General							1,051,452.04			

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 9 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
111 Food and Beverage Tax									
Grand Park									
VEN001637	Ray's Trash Service	APP096115	8/25/2022	111015349	FOOD/BEV GP-CONSTRUCT	GPEC trash Colts City	1,598.60		
VEN004873	Siteone Landscape Supply	APP096118	8/25/2022	111015349	FOOD/BEV GP-CONSTRUCT	Rope line	53.00		
VEN000260	Boldens Cleaning and Restoration	APP096466	9/6/2022	111015349	FOOD/BEV GP-CONSTRUCT	GPEC carpet cleaning	1,990.40		
VEN005709	Service Sanitation Inc	APP096470	9/6/2022	111015349	FOOD/BEV GP-CONSTRUCT	2022 Addl restrooms	4,860.00		
VEN006678	Amazon Capital Services	APP096592	9/7/2022	111015349	FOOD/BEV GP-CONSTRUCT	IT storm damaged replaceme	2,647.00		
Subtotal for Grand Park							11,149.00		
Subtotal for Fund 111 Food and Beverage Tax							11,149.00		
Fund No. Fund Name									
176 ARP2021-Covid Recovery									
City Council									
VEN002118	Westfield Washington Education	APP096167	8/26/2022	176010349	ARP2021-COUNCIL SERVIC	ARPA recipient	57,405.00		
VEN010606	Westfield Student Impact	APP096168	8/26/2022	176010349	ARP2021-COUNCIL SERVIC	ARPA recipient	69,730.00		
VEN006428	Trinity Free Clinic Inc	APP096169	8/26/2022	176010349	ARP2021-COUNCIL SERVIC	ARPA recipient	107,103.00		
VEN010600	Link Observatory Space Science Instit	APP096170	8/26/2022	176010349	ARP2021-COUNCIL SERVIC	ARPA recipient	15,362.00		
VEN007879	Heart and Soul Free Clinic	APP096171	8/26/2022	176010349	ARP2021-COUNCIL SERVIC	ARPA recipient	79,437.00		
VEN005661	Barnes and Thornburg LLP	APP096176	8/29/2022	176010330	ARP2021-COUNCIL LEGAL	June services	3,000.00		
VEN002102	Westfield Education Foundation	APP096203	8/29/2022	176010241	ARP2021-COUNCIL NON-PR	APRA recipient	57,405.00		
VEN005604	Student Impact	APP096204	8/29/2022	176010241	ARP2021-COUNCIL NON-PR	ARPA recipient	69,730.00		
VEN006428	Trinity Free Clinic Inc	APP096205	8/29/2022	176010241	ARP2021-COUNCIL NON-PR	ARPA recipient	107,103.00		
VEN010600	Link Observatory Space Science Instit	APP096206	8/29/2022	176010241	ARP2021-COUNCIL NON-PR	ARPA recipient	15,362.00		
VEN007879	Heart and Soul Free Clinic	APP096207	8/29/2022	176010241	ARP2021-COUNCIL NON-PR	ARPA recipient	79,437.00		
Subtotal for City Council							661,074.00		
Subtotal for Fund 176 ARP2021-Covid Recovery							661,074.00		
Fund No. Fund Name									
201 Motor Vehicle Highway (MVH)									
Public Works									
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	201013119	MVH-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	3,862.14	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	201013111	MVH-SALARY	sal	9,537.38	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	201013120	MVH-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	560.55	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	201013120	MVH-FICA/MEDICARE	med	131.10	500000814	8/30/2022

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 10 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
201	Motor Vehicle Highway (MVH)								
Public Works									
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	201013121	MVH-PERF	perf	1,354.31	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	201013119	MVH-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	212.06	73468	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	201013119	MVH-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	191.78	73469	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	201013119	MVH-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	35.36	73470	9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	201013119	MVH-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	9.75	73471	9/6/2022
VEN009547	Crafco Inc	APP096494	9/6/2022	201013433	MVH-INFRASTRUCTURE RE	Asphalt	1,276.51		
VEN005581	Newton Oil Company	APP096497	9/6/2022	201013226	MVH-VEHICLE GAS/ SUPPLI	Fuel	12,221.09		
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096502	9/6/2022	201013349	MVH-CONTRACTUAL SERV	Physical	85.00		
VEN001363	Mid-state Truck Equipment	APP096505	9/6/2022	201013345	MVH-EQUIP REPAIR	Snowplow	7,000.00		
VEN001363	Mid-state Truck Equipment	APP096505	9/6/2022	201013345	MVH-EQUIP REPAIR	Steel cutting edge guard	5,966.80		
VEN001044	Irving Materials	APP096506	9/6/2022	201013231	MVH-SUBGRADE MATERIAL	Riprap	377.12		
VEN001384	Milestone Contractors LP	APP096512	9/6/2022	201013231	MVH-SUBGRADE MATERIAL	Surface	318.72		
VEN001384	Milestone Contractors LP	APP096513	9/6/2022	201013433	MVH-INFRASTRUCTURE RE	Surface	1,359.02		
VEN006285	Ceres Solutions Cooperative	APP096515	9/6/2022	201013226	MVH-VEHICLE GAS/ SUPPLI	Fuel	720.59		
VEN010562	Jonathan Losure	APP096520	9/6/2022	201013360	MVH-VEHICLE REPAIR	CDL	17.00		
VEN010559	Christopher Starks	APP096524	9/6/2022	201013360	MVH-VEHICLE REPAIR	CDL	17.00		
VEN010558	Tanner Swindle	APP096525	9/6/2022	201013360	MVH-VEHICLE REPAIR	CDL	17.00		
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096526	9/6/2022	201013349	MVH-CONTRACTUAL SERV	Physicals	255.00		
VEN001671	Rieth-Riley Construction	APP096527	9/6/2022	201013233	MVH-ASPHALT	Asphalt	1,224.94		
VEN001778	Shelby Materials	APP096528	9/6/2022	201013231	MVH-SUBGRADE MATERIAL	Concrete	480.00		
VEN009426	Best One of Tipton	APP096529	9/6/2022	201013345	MVH-EQUIP REPAIR	Street Sweeper service	540.57		
VEN006426	DISA Inc	APP096530	9/6/2022	201013349	MVH-CONTRACTUAL SERV	Alcohol testing	28.00		
Subtotal for Public Works							47,798.79		
Subtotal for Fund 201 Motor Vehicle Highway (MVH)							47,798.79		
Fund No. Fund Name									
202	Local Road and Street (LRS)								
Public Works									
VEN004182	The Hoosier Co	APP096516	9/6/2022	202013228	LRS-SIGNS AND POSTS	Sign Posts and Sleeves	50,150.00		
VEN000921	Huston Electric	APP096521	9/6/2022	202013349	LRS-SERVICES	Wheeler Rd	657.99		
Subtotal for Public Works							50,807.99		
Subtotal for Fund 202 Local Road and Street (LRS)							50,807.99		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 11 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
203 Fire Operating									
Fire									
VEN008029	Liberty Mutual Insurance	APP095997	8/19/2022	203012339	FIRE-INSURANCE	Installment 9	5,578.73	73386	8/22/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096064	8/23/2022	203012119	FIRE-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	94,881.39	500000813	8/23/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	203012111	FIRE-SALARY	sal	260,605.97	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	203012111	FIRE-SALARY	fire ltd plan	3,220.45	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	203012120	FIRE-FICA AND MEDICARE	fica	15,499.33	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	203012120	FIRE-FICA AND MEDICARE	med	3,624.79	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096220	8/29/2022	203012121	FIRE-PERF	perf	40,808.22	500000814	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096265	8/30/2022	203012119	FIRE-HEALTH/DENTAL	July clinic hours	5,318.86	73468	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096323	9/1/2022	203012119	FIRE-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	4,347.25	73469	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096327	9/1/2022	203012119	FIRE-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	1,004.88	73470	9/1/2022
VEN000569	Don Hinds Ford Inc	APP096399	9/6/2022	203012472	FIRE-EQUIP	parts for Medic 380	650.20		
VEN002148	Witmer Public Safety Group	APP096400	9/6/2022	203012229	FIRE-UNIFORMS	uniforms	60.94		
VEN006285	Ceres Solutions Cooperative	APP096401	9/6/2022	203012226	FIRE-VEHICLE GAS/SUPPLIE	fuel - 81 and 82	3,199.54		
VEN000266	Bound Tree Medical	APP096402	9/6/2022	203012224	FIRE-OPERATING SUPPLIES	EMS Supplies	129.10		
VEN010336	MES-The Uniform House	APP096403	9/6/2022	203012229	FIRE-UNIFORMS	gloves, changes, shoes, shiel	4,440.53		
VEN000903	Hoosier Fire Equipment	APP096404	9/6/2022	203012229	FIRE-UNIFORMS	helmet	370.85		
VEN000903	Hoosier Fire Equipment	APP096404	9/6/2022	203012472	FIRE-EQUIP	repairs on scott X3 pro	1,027.05		
VEN000065	Airgas Mid America	APP096405	9/6/2022	203012224	FIRE-OPERATING SUPPLIES	oxygen	216.36		
VEN001849	Stryker Sales	APP096406	9/6/2022	203012224	FIRE-OPERATING SUPPLIES	EMS - 2 lead ECG	373.28		
VEN000682	Fastenal	APP096407	9/6/2022	203012224	FIRE-OPERATING SUPPLIES	batteries	401.04		
VEN009548	Impact Rescue LLC	APP096409	9/6/2022	203012472	FIRE-EQUIP	new ladder equipment	15,599.52		
VEN000637	EMSAR-indiana	APP096410	9/6/2022	203012224	FIRE-OPERATING SUPPLIES	repairs on cot	63.00		
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096452	9/6/2022	203012119	FIRE-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	262.21	73471	9/6/2022
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096458	9/6/2022	203012119	FIRE-HEALTH/DENTAL	4th quart EAP	432.54		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	203012343	FIRE-BUILDING MAINTENAN	PSB lobby	100.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	203012343	FIRE-BUILDING MAINTENAN	July PSB lobby	100.00		
VEN005581	Newton Oil Company	APP096497	9/6/2022	203012226	FIRE-VEHICLE GAS/SUPPLIE	Fuel	2,062.31		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	203012343	FIRE-BUILDING MAINTENAN	PSB lobby	100.00		
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096589	9/7/2022	203012342	FIRE-WATER/SEWER	60 percent - psb	506.07	73475	9/8/2022
VEN006285	Ceres Solutions Cooperative	APP096595	9/7/2022	203012226	FIRE-VEHICLE GAS/SUPPLIE	fuel	5,463.72		
VEN005584	The Accumed Group	APP096596	9/7/2022	203012349	FIRE-SERVICES	Billing Service Fee	6,500.22		
VEN001849	Stryker Sales	APP096597	9/7/2022	203012224	FIRE-OPERATING SUPPLIES	stair pro	3,642.21		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 12 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
203 Fire Operating									
Fire									
VEN007709	MacQueen Emergency Group DBA	APP096598	9/7/2022	203012472	FIRE-EQUIP	equipment	10,626.84		
VEN000266	Bound Tree Medical	APP096599	9/7/2022	203012224	FIRE-OPERATING SUPPLIES	EMS Supplies	875.32		
VEN000903	Hoosier Fire Equipment	APP096600	9/7/2022	203012229	FIRE-UNIFORMS	3 helmets	1,111.40		
VEN000761	GearGrid Corp	APP096601	9/7/2022	203012472	FIRE-EQUIP	gear lockers for new HQ	36,199.02		
VEN010336	MES-The Uniform House	APP096602	9/7/2022	203012229	FIRE-UNIFORMS	tactical shoes	249.59		
VEN000483	Cummins Crosspoint LLC	APP096603	9/7/2022	203012360	FIRE-VEHICLE MAINT	hose molded	50.61		
VEN003382	McGavic Outdoor Power	APP096604	9/7/2022	203012360	FIRE-VEHICLE MAINT	parts - E-82	8.57		
VEN002326	OREILLY AUTO	APP096605	9/7/2022	203012360	FIRE-VEHICLE MAINT	parts for repairs	59.84		
VEN010336	MES-The Uniform House	APP096606	9/7/2022	203012229	FIRE-UNIFORMS	duty boots	505.00		
VEN005403	BrightView Landscapes LLC	APP096607	9/7/2022	203012343	FIRE-BUILDING MAINTENAN	Turf application sta 81	100.00		
VEN005403	BrightView Landscapes LLC	APP096607	9/7/2022	203012343	FIRE-BUILDING MAINTENAN	Turf application sta 82	200.00		
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096628	9/8/2022	203012342	FIRE-WATER/SEWER	Sta 82	256.78	73476	9/8/2022
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096630	9/8/2022	203012342	FIRE-WATER/SEWER	Sta 83	468.08	73477	9/8/2022
VEN002336	Citizens Westfield	APP096634	9/8/2022	203012328	FIRE-GAS/HEAT	PSB	185.14	73480	9/8/2022
Subtotal for Fire							531,486.75		
Subtotal for Fund 203 Fire Operating							531,486.75		
Fund No. Fund Name									
204 Park Impact									
Public Works									
VEN006748	V3 Companies	APP096086	8/17/2022	204013349	PARK IMPACT-SERVICES	Simon Moon Expansion Desig	52,650.00		
VEN008285	EnvelopIQ LLC	APP096507	9/6/2022	204013474	PW-PARK IMPACT CONSTR	GJ Stage AV access control d	4,092.00		
VEN008285	EnvelopIQ LLC	APP096507	9/6/2022	204013474	PW-PARK IMPACT CONSTR	GJ Stage mechanical strike re	4,973.00		
VEN000921	Huston Electric	APP096514	9/6/2022	204013474	PW-PARK IMPACT CONSTR	Union St	2,400.00		
Subtotal for Public Works							64,115.00		
Subtotal for Fund 204 Park Impact							64,115.00		
Fund No. Fund Name									
206 Parks Programming/Events									
Parks									
VEN010560	Ellie Sophia Pet Photography	APP096083	8/24/2022	206005347	PARKS PROGRAM-PROMOT	Barktoberfest	800.00		
VEN010128	Artist Development Company	APP096084	8/24/2022	206005347	PARKS PROGRAM-PROMOT	Summer Concerts Food Truc	200.00		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 13 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
206	Parks Programming/Events								
Parks									
VEN010128	Artist Development Company	APP096177	8/29/2022	206005347	PARKS PROGRAM-PROMOT	Market Concerts	500.00		
Subtotal for Parks							1,500.00		
Subtotal for Fund 206 Parks Programming/Events							1,500.00		
Fund No. Fund Name									
239	Law Enforcement								
Police									
VEN010467	Butler University	APP095936	8/17/2022	239002334	LAW ENFORCE-TRAVEL/TR	Tuition-W. Ottenweller	3,450.00	73395	8/23/2022
VEN001993	Treasurer Of State of Indiana	APP096143	8/26/2022	239002334	LAW ENFORCE-TRAVEL/TR	Breath Test Recertification-St	40.00		
VEN001052	Indiana University	APP096154	8/26/2022	239002334	LAW ENFORCE-TRAVEL/TR	Tuition-Martin	2,019.84	73472	9/6/2022
VEN001052	Indiana University	APP096155	8/26/2022	239002334	LAW ENFORCE-TRAVEL/TR	Tuition-Hollowell	5,000.00	73473	9/6/2022
VEN001178	Kiesler's Police Supply	APP096160	8/26/2022	239002334	LAW ENFORCE-TRAVEL/TR	223 & 9MM Ammo	5,650.92		
Subtotal for Police							16,160.76		
Subtotal for Fund 239 Law Enforcement							16,160.76		
Fund No. Fund Name									
264	Road and Street Improvement (Road Impact)								
Public Works									
VEN005929	WSP USA Inc	APP096492	9/6/2022	264013349	ROAD IMPACT-SERVICES	Won Call eng svcs	2,054.95		
VEN010557	Absolute Stability Commercial	APP096495	9/6/2022	264013400	ROAD IMPACT-LAND PURC	Jersey St Parcel 28B	2,100.00		
VEN005475	Estridge Development Mgmt	APP096500	9/6/2022	264013349	ROAD IMPACT-SERVICES	Harmony Rd Impact fee reim	79,262.40		
Subtotal for Public Works							83,417.35		
Subtotal for Fund 264 Road and Street Improvement (Road Impact)							83,417.35		
Fund No. Fund Name									
269	Training Facility Center								
Public Safety (Police and Fire)									
VEN000405	Citizens Energy Group	APP096072	8/24/2022	269014342	TRAINING FAC-WATER/SE	Training Facility	38.09	73461	8/24/2022
VEN001277	Macallister Machinery Co	APP096408	9/6/2022	269014433	TRAINING FAC-INFRASTR R	HCTC-backhoe loader rental	1,169.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096489	9/6/2022	269014343	TRAINING FAC-BUILDING M	June Training Facility	190.00		
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096490	9/6/2022	269014343	TRAINING FAC-BUILDING M	July Training Facility	190.00		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 14 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name								
269	Training Facility Center								
	Public Safety (Police and Fire)								
VEN008965	First Class Cleaning Services Inc	APP096519	9/6/2022	269014343	TRAINING FAC-BUILDING M	Training Facility	190.00		
VEN002191	City of Noblesville Utilities	APP096627	9/8/2022	269014342	TRAINING FAC-WATER/SE	Training Facility	20.36	73481	9/8/2022
	Subtotal for Public Safety (Police and Fire)						1,797.45		
	Subtotal for Fund 269 Training Facility Center						1,797.45		
Fund No.	Fund Name								
350	GO Bond 2020								
	Public Works								
VEN001671	Rieth-Riley Construction	APP096087	8/17/2022	350013474	GO BOND 2020 PW CONST	191st and Chad Hittle RAB C	230,540.92		
	Subtotal for Public Works						230,540.92		
	Subtotal for Fund 350 GO Bond 2020						230,540.92		
Fund No.	Fund Name								
362	Grand Junction Ban SinkFD								
	Public Works								
VEN007818	Regions Equipment Finance	APP096531	9/6/2022	362013381	GRAND JUNC REV BAN2019	2016 Bond	463,617.48		
	Subtotal for Public Works						463,617.48		
	Subtotal for Fund 362 Grand Junction Ban SinkFD						463,617.48		
Fund No.	Fund Name								
640	Sports Campus Operating								
	Grand Park								
VEN008029	Liberty Mutual Insurance	APP095996	8/19/2022	640015339	SPORTS CAMPUS-INSURAN	Installment 9	854.33	4104	8/22/2022
VEN008029	Liberty Mutual Insurance	APP095996	8/19/2022	640015339	SPORTS CAMPUS-INSURAN	Installment 9	1,044.17	4104	8/22/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096063	8/23/2022	640015119	SPORTS CAMPUS-HEALTH/	Sept Ins	7,061.45	100000210	8/23/2022
VEN008277	C2 Media	APP096112	8/25/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Hardware sponsorship banner	88.00		
VEN009271	Ewing Irrigation and Landscape	APP096113	8/25/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Irrigation	280.32		
VEN009271	Ewing Irrigation and Landscape	APP096113	8/25/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Irrigation	127.64		
VEN001637	Ray's Trash Service	APP096116	8/25/2022	640015349	SPORTS CAMPUS-SERVICE	Trash	1,220.25		
VEN009271	Ewing Irrigation and Landscape	APP096117	8/25/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Irrigation	1,648.14		
VEN003382	McGavic Outdoor Power	APP096119	8/25/2022	640015345	SPORTS CAMPUS-EQUIP R	Laztec	129.20		
VEN003382	McGavic Outdoor Power	APP096119	8/25/2022	640015345	SPORTS CAMPUS-EQUIP R	Laztec	134.73		
VEN003382	McGavic Outdoor Power	APP096119	8/25/2022	640015345	SPORTS CAMPUS-EQUIP R	Laztec	858.45		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 15 of 24

WESTFIELD\KAGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
640	Sports Campus Operating								
Grand Park									
VEN006285	Ceres Solutions Cooperative	APP096121	8/25/2022	640015226	SPORTS CAMPUS-GAS	Fuel	1,221.56		
VEN009271	Ewing Irrigation and Landscape	APP096122	8/25/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Drainage	218.47		
VEN009271	Ewing Irrigation and Landscape	APP096122	8/25/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Drainage	422.08		
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096217	8/29/2022	640015111	SPORTS CAMPUS-SALARY	sal	26,351.80	100000211	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096217	8/29/2022	640015120	SPORTS CAMPUS-FICA/ME	fica	1,604.40	100000211	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096217	8/29/2022	640015120	SPORTS CAMPUS-FICA/ME	med	375.19	100000211	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096217	8/29/2022	640015121	SPORTS CAMPUS-PERF	perf	2,957.98	100000211	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096264	8/30/2022	640015119	SPORTS CAMPUS-HEALTH/	July clinic hours	370.37	4122	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096321	9/1/2022	640015119	SPORTS CAMPUS-HEALTH/	Sept Ins	227.26	4123	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096326	9/1/2022	640015119	SPORTS CAMPUS-HEALTH/	Sept Ins	73.76	4124	9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096453	9/6/2022	640015119	SPORTS CAMPUS-HEALTH/	Sept Ins	35.75	4125	9/6/2022
VEN010613	Sportsfield Specialties Inc	APP096456	9/6/2022	640015472	SPORTS CAMPUS-EQUIPME	F6 crossbar	4,605.00		
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096457	9/6/2022	640015119	SPORTS CAMPUS-HEALTH/	4th quart EAP	53.40		
VEN003729	Metronet	APP096459	9/6/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Diam	59.61		
VEN003729	Metronet	APP096459	9/6/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Field	59.61		
VEN001277	Macallister Machinery Co	APP096460	9/6/2022	640015366	SPORTS CAMPUS-LEASE R	June July MacAllister Golf Car	5,190.00		
VEN001277	Macallister Machinery Co	APP096461	9/6/2022	640015366	SPORTS CAMPUS-LEASE R	Lift rental marching band	215.00		
VEN001277	Macallister Machinery Co	APP096462	9/6/2022	640015472	SPORTS CAMPUS-EQUIPME	Pond Pump	165.00		
VEN006285	Ceres Solutions Cooperative	APP096463	9/6/2022	640015226	SPORTS CAMPUS-GAS	Fuel	180.35		
VEN001277	Macallister Machinery Co	APP096464	9/6/2022	640015472	SPORTS CAMPUS-EQUIPME	Pond Pump	1,215.00		
VEN000402	Cintas	APP096472	9/6/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Mats	216.27		
VEN006898	Supply Warehouse Inc	APP096474	9/6/2022	640015224	SPORTS CAMPUS-OPERATI	Restroom supplies	293.32		
VEN006285	Ceres Solutions Cooperative	APP096593	9/7/2022	640015226	SPORTS CAMPUS-GAS	Fuel	1,690.80		
Subtotal for Grand Park							61,248.66		
Sport Campus Indoor Event Ctr									
VEN008029	Liberty Mutual Insurance	APP095996	8/19/2022	640023339	GP INDOOR-INSURANCE	Installment 9	1,898.52	4104	8/22/2022
VEN003729	Metronet	APP095998	8/19/2022	640023224	GP INDOOR-OPERATING SU	GPEC	651.11	4105	8/22/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096063	8/23/2022	640023119	GP INDOOR-HEALTH/DENT	Sept Ins	1,830.62	100000210	8/23/2022
VEN009271	Ewing Irrigation and Landscape	APP096113	8/25/2022	640023432	GP INDOOR-SIDEWALKS AN	Turf for GP sign	1,948.11		
VEN007684	Perfection Group Inc	APP096114	8/25/2022	640023343	GP INDOOR-BLDG MAINT	GPEC AC	325.00		
VEN007684	Perfection Group Inc	APP096120	8/25/2022	640023343	GP INDOOR-BLDG MAINT	C1 AC	265.00		
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096217	8/29/2022	640023111	GP INDOOR-SALARY	sal	4,037.60	100000211	8/30/2022

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 16 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
640	Sports Campus Operating								
Sport Campus Indoor Event Ctr									
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096217	8/29/2022	640023120	GP INDOOR-FIICA/MEDICAR	fica	238.13	100000211	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096217	8/29/2022	640023120	GP INDOOR-FIICA/MEDICAR	med	55.69	100000211	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096217	8/29/2022	640023121	GP INDOOR-PERF	perf	573.34	100000211	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096264	8/30/2022	640023119	GP INDOOR-HEALTH/DENT	July clinic hours	98.77	4122	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096321	9/1/2022	640023119	GP INDOOR-HEALTH/DENT	Sept Ins	85.46	4123	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096326	9/1/2022	640023119	GP INDOOR-HEALTH/DENT	Sept Ins	14.48	4124	9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096453	9/6/2022	640023119	GP INDOOR-HEALTH/DENT	Sept Ins	3.25	4125	9/6/2022
VEN009811	CuraLinc LLC	APP096457	9/6/2022	640023119	GP INDOOR-HEALTH/DENT	4th quart EAP	10.68		
VEN009984	Legacy Sports Group LLC	APP096465	9/6/2022	640023331	GP INDOOR-CONSULTING	4th quart	163,950.00		
VEN007684	Perfection Group Inc	APP096467	9/6/2022	640023343	GP INDOOR-BLDG MAINT	Soccer Admin AC repair	568.61		
VEN007684	Perfection Group Inc	APP096468	9/6/2022	640023343	GP INDOOR-BLDG MAINT	Baseball admin AC	2,118.18		
VEN007684	Perfection Group Inc	APP096469	9/6/2022	640023343	GP INDOOR-BLDG MAINT	Baseball Admin AC troublesh	265.00		
VEN009985	Team IP Inc	APP096471	9/6/2022	640023224	GP INDOOR-OPERATING SU	Badge lanyards	354.31		
VEN006390	Ecolab Pest	APP096473	9/6/2022	640023343	GP INDOOR-BLDG MAINT	GPEC	472.95		
VEN006898	Supply Warehouse Inc	APP096474	9/6/2022	640023224	GP INDOOR-OPERATING SU	Restroom supplies	690.36		
Subtotal for Sport Campus Indoor Event Ctr							180,455.17		
Subtotal for Fund 640 Sports Campus Operating							241,703.83		
Fund No. Fund Name									
701	Payroll								
Clerk Treasurer									
VEN000008	77 Police and Fire Fund	APP096030	8/22/2022	701008133	PAYROLL-PERF	Non Civilian PERF	82,255.68	700001302	8/22/2022
VEN001550	PERF	APP096031	8/22/2022	701008133	PAYROLL-PERF	Civilian PERF	50,389.70	700001303	8/22/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096061	8/23/2022	701008930	PAYROLL-INS. DED	Sept Ins	15,985.43	700001304	8/23/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096216	8/29/2022	701008110	PAYROLL-NET SALARIES	net sal	522,879.95	700001308	8/30/2022
VEN000163	Aul Retirement	APP096233	8/30/2022	701008931	PAYROLL-401A MATCHING-	Contributions and loan pmts	30,433.21	700001305	8/30/2022
VEN000959	Indiana Dept Of Revenue	APP096234	8/30/2022	701008923	PAYROLL-STATE WITHHOL	State	21,779.16	700001307	8/30/2022
VEN000959	Indiana Dept Of Revenue	APP096234	8/30/2022	701008923	PAYROLL-STATE WITHHOL	COIT	9,267.17	700001307	8/30/2022
VEN000920	Huntington National Bank	APP096235	8/30/2022	701008131	PAYROLL-EMPLOYER'S FIC	FICA	44,744.56	700001306	8/30/2022
VEN000920	Huntington National Bank	APP096235	8/30/2022	701008132	PAYROLL-EMPLOYER'S ME	Medicare	10,464.45	700001306	8/30/2022
VEN000920	Huntington National Bank	APP096235	8/30/2022	701008921	PAYROLL-FEDERAL WITHH	Federal	67,320.31	700001306	8/30/2022
VEN000920	Huntington National Bank	APP096235	8/30/2022	701008922	PAYROLL-EMPLOYEE FICA	FICA	44,744.56	700001306	8/30/2022

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 17 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
701 Payroll									
Clerk Treasurer									
VEN000920	Huntington National Bank	APP096235	8/30/2022	701008922	PAYROLL-EMPLOYEE FICA	Medicare	10,464.41	700001306	8/30/2022
VEN000703	Fire Fighters Credit Union	APP096244	8/30/2022	701008141	PAYROLL-UNION DUES	Union Dues 4416	3,316.91	18027	8/30/2022
VEN000703	Fire Fighters Credit Union	APP096245	8/30/2022	701008141	PAYROLL-UNION DUES	Union Dues WFD	84.00	18028	8/30/2022
VEN005722	Aflac Premium Holding	APP096246	8/30/2022	701008930	PAYROLL-INS. DED	Sept Ins	3,099.05	18025	8/30/2022
VEN000058	AFLAC	APP096247	8/30/2022	701008930	PAYROLL-INS. DED	Sept Ins	5,586.46	18024	8/30/2022
VEN000948	IN Family and Social Services	APP096248	8/30/2022	701008140	PAYROLL-SUPPORT WITHH	Child Support	1,536.00	700001310	8/30/2022
VEN007701	DiMartino Associates	APP096249	8/30/2022	701008930	PAYROLL-INS. DED	Fire LTD	3,220.45	18026	8/30/2022
VEN004836	Nationwide Retirement Solutions	APP096250	8/30/2022	701008931	PAYROLL-401A MATCHING-	Contributions and loan pmts	4,717.29	18032	8/30/2022
VEN010216	John Hauber Trustee	APP096251	8/30/2022	701008142	PAYROLL-GARNISHMENT	Garnishment	277.00	18030	8/30/2022
VEN001864	Supporting Heroes	APP096252	8/30/2022	701008991	PAYROLL-MISC	Supporting Heroes	80.84	18033	8/30/2022
VEN002177	Indiana Members Credit Union	APP096253	8/30/2022	701008930	PAYROLL-INS. DED	Emplor HSA	500.04	18029	8/30/2022
VEN001390	MISDU	APP096254	8/30/2022	701008140	PAYROLL-SUPPORT WITHH	Child Support	443.45	18031	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096320	9/1/2022	701008930	PAYROLL-INS. DED	Sept Ins	4,918.83	18034	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096324	9/1/2022	701008930	PAYROLL-INS. DED	Sept Ins	70.72	18035	9/1/2022
VEN000008	77 Police and Fire Fund	APP096397	8/22/2022	701008133	PAYROLL-PERF	PERF adj	0.01	700001309	8/22/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096455	9/6/2022	701008930	PAYROLL-INS. DED	Sept Ins	2,146.55	18036	9/6/2022
VEN000008	77 Police and Fire Fund	APP096620	9/7/2022	701008133	PAYROLL-PERF	Non Civilian PERF	81,562.26	70001311	9/7/2022
VEN001550	PERF	APP096621	9/7/2022	701008133	PAYROLL-PERF	Civilian PERF	50,077.65	70001312	9/7/2022
Subtotal for Clerk Treasurer							1,072,366.10		
Subtotal for Fund 701 Payroll							1,072,366.10		

Fund No. Fund Name

806 UMR

Clerk Treasurer									
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096041	8/19/2022	806008119	UMR GROUP HEALTH	UMR Med Rx	98,097.16	806000018	8/19/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096212	8/26/2022	806008119	UMR GROUP HEALTH	Med and Rx	43,238.58	806000019	8/26/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096328	9/1/2022	806008119	UMR GROUP HEALTH	Sept Fees	86,475.22	806000021	9/1/2022
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096609	8/19/2022	806008119	UMR GROUP HEALTH	UMR Med-RX 08/15-08/19/22	21,241.58	806000020	8/19/2022
Subtotal for Clerk Treasurer							249,052.54		
Subtotal for Fund 806 UMR							249,052.54		

Fund No. Fund Name

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 18 of 24

WESTFIELD/KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
900	Stormwater								
	Stormwater								
VEN002020	United Healthcare	APP096062	8/23/2022	900016119	STORM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	9,252.83	900000300	8/23/2022
VEN002193	Christopher Burke	APP096082	8/22/2022	900016349	STORM-SERVICE	Stormwater Utility Update	14,495.00		
VEN002193	Christopher Burke	APP096088	8/17/2022	900016309	STORM-CONSULTING FEES	Stormwater On Call Support	2,001.00		
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096219	8/29/2022	900016111	STORM-SALARY	sal	23,104.07	900000301	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096219	8/29/2022	900016120	STORM-FICA/MEDICARE	fica	1,373.12	900000301	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096219	8/29/2022	900016120	STORM-FICA/MEDICARE	med	321.16	900000301	8/30/2022
VEN001537	Payroll	APP096219	8/29/2022	900016121	STORM-PERF	perf	2,548.50	900000301	8/30/2022
VEN001676	Riverview Hospital	APP096263	8/30/2022	900016119	STORM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Jul clinic hours	501.09	42152	8/30/2022
VEN000534	Delta Dental	APP096322	9/1/2022	900016119	STORM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	456.16	42153	9/1/2022
VEN010036	VSP Insurance	APP096325	9/1/2022	900016119	STORM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	101.36	42154	9/1/2022
VEN004479	Symetra Life Insurance	APP096454	9/6/2022	900016119	STORM-HEALTH/DENTAL	Sept Ins	19.50	42155	9/6/2022
VEN003987	Indiana Reclamation and Excavating	APP096483	9/6/2022	900016433	STORM-INFRASTRUCTURE	Sunbrook Way	3,133.82		
VEN003987	Indiana Reclamation and Excavating	APP096486	9/6/2022	900016433	STORM-INFRASTRUCTURE	Clarks Hill	1,910.00		
VEN005581	Newton Oil Company	APP096498	9/6/2022	900016226	STORM-VEHICLE GAS	Unleaded fuel	97.17		
VEN003987	Indiana Reclamation and Excavating	APP096501	9/6/2022	900016433	STORM-INFRASTRUCTURE	Sinkhole	1,878.71		
VEN010563	John Foster	APP096532	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.27		
VEN010563	John Foster	APP096532	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	152.22		
VEN010564	Jamie Nicole Mattingly	APP096533	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.90		
VEN010564	Jamie Nicole Mattingly	APP096533	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	1.98		
VEN010565	Ruby Moss	APP096534	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.50		
VEN010566	Richard Rody	APP096535	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.45		
VEN010567	David Stump	APP096536	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.14		
VEN010567	David Stump	APP096536	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	41.91		
VEN010568	John Lauri	APP096537	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.15		
VEN010569	Lowell Werner	APP096538	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		11.67		
VEN010570	Linda Donovan	APP096539	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.27		
VEN010571	Mike and Tifney Fields	APP096540	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.77		
VEN010610	Shiv Patel	APP096541	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	500.00		
VEN010572	Anthony Merkel	APP096542	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.00		
VEN010573	Lorren Company	APP096543	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	34.93		
VEN010574	Robert Stevens	APP096544	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.04		
VEN010575	John Schaaf	APP096545	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.74		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 19 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From		Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name								
Fund No.	Fund Name								
900	Stormwater								
	Stormwater								
VEN010576	Michael Kaylor	APP096546	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.14		
VEN010577	Wagner Marji	APP096547	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.14		
VEN010578	Scott and Cara Krueger	APP096548	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.82		
VEN010579	Barbara Graves	APP096549	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.45		
VEN010580	Donald Rainwater	APP096550	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.04		
VEN010581	Glenn Griffis	APP096551	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.31		
VEN006334	Cathy Hoberty	APP096552	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.29		
VEN010582	Devin Moyers	APP096553	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.09		
VEN010583	Matthew Buchanan	APP096554	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.55		
VEN010584	Gary Nunnally	APP096555	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.17		
VEN010584	Gary Nunnally	APP096555	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	486.66		
VEN010585	Tom James	APP096556	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.60		
VEN010586	Greg Fettig	APP096557	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.77		
VEN007675	Brooks and Tracy Green	APP096558	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.04		
VEN010587	Alice McHale	APP096560	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.77		
VEN010588	Karthik Mangu	APP096561	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		2.82		
VEN010590	Lisa Keeney	APP096562	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.09		
VEN010591	Luann Rickert	APP096563	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.14		
VEN010592	James Johnson	APP096564	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.87		
VEN010593	Justin Clemens	APP096565	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.00		
VEN010594	Darek Woodward	APP096566	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.27		
VEN010595	Steven Caswell	APP096567	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		10.45		
VEN010596	Emet and Tonja Talley	APP096568	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.55		
VEN010597	Eric and Chanda Schwartz	APP096569	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.63		
VEN001075	James Wood	APP096570	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.55		
VEN010598	Hassan Jaradat and Teresa Arqawi	APP096571	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.90		
VEN010598	Hassan Jaradat and Teresa Arqawi	APP096571	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	100.00		
VEN010599	Michael Brandtner	APP096572	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.27		
VEN010601	Maria Modesitt	APP096573	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.55		
VEN010602	Tyler King	APP096574	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.55		
VEN010603	Robert Disko	APP096575	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.63		
VEN010604	Robert Schleinitz	APP096576	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.09		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 20 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name								
900	Stormwater								
	Stormwater								
VEN010605	Ashley Patton	APP096577	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		7.87		
VEN009364	Andrew Long	APP096578	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.14		
VEN010608	Grace Flemmer	APP096579	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.82		
VEN010608	Grace Flemmer	APP096579	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	11.33		
VEN010609	Stephen Dewitt	APP096580	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		9.50		
VEN010609	Stephen Dewitt	APP096580	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND	OVER PAYMENT	90.55		
VEN010607	FSRE Holdings LLC	APP096581	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		33.97		
VEN010589	Mark Sikora	APP096582	9/6/2022	900016370	STORMWATER-REFUND		8.14		
	Subtotal for Stormwater						63,073.95		
	Subtotal for Fund 900 Stormwater						63,073.95		
Fund No.	Fund Name								
901	SW 2017 Construction								
	Stormwater								
VEN000005	3D Company Inc	APP096301	8/31/2022	901016474	STORM-2017 BD CONSTRU	Budgeted culvert portion	25,684.55		
	Subtotal for Stormwater						25,684.55		
	Subtotal for Fund 901 SW 2017 Construction						25,684.55		
Fund No.	Fund Name								
950	Trash								
	Trash								
VEN001637	Ray's Trash Service	APP096449	9/6/2022	950017851	TRASH-RES QRTLTY FEE CO	August collection	29,071.20		
VEN010563	John Foster	APP096532	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.99		
VEN010563	John Foster	APP096532	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		24.70		
VEN010564	Jamie Nicole Mattingly	APP096533	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.38		
VEN010564	Jamie Nicole Mattingly	APP096533	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.57		
VEN010565	Ruby Moss	APP096534	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.28		
VEN010565	Ruby Moss	APP096534	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		28.35		
VEN010566	Richard Rody	APP096535	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.51		
VEN010566	Richard Rody	APP096535	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		31.19		
VEN010567	David Stump	APP096536	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.96		
VEN010567	David Stump	APP096536	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		24.30		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 21 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name								
950	Trash								
	Trash								
VEN010568	John Lauri	APP096537	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.44		
VEN010568	John Lauri	APP096537	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		30.30		
VEN010569	Lowell Werner	APP096538	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.80		
VEN010569	Lowell Werner	APP096538	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		34.83		
VEN010570	Linda Donavan	APP096539	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.99		
VEN010570	Linda Donavan	APP096539	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		24.70		
VEN010571	Mike and Tifney Fields	APP096540	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.35		
VEN010571	Mike and Tifney Fields	APP096540	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.16		
VEN010572	Anthony Merkel	APP096542	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.92		
VEN010572	Anthony Merkel	APP096542	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		23.89		
VEN010574	Robert Stevens	APP096544	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.41		
VEN010574	Robert Stevens	APP096544	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.97		
VEN010575	John Schaaf	APP096545	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.34		
VEN010575	John Schaaf	APP096545	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.07		
VEN010576	Michael Kaylor	APP096546	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.96		
VEN010576	Michael Kaylor	APP096546	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		24.30		
VEN010577	Wagner Marji	APP096547	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.96		
VEN010577	Wagner Marji	APP096547	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		24.30		
VEN010578	Scott and Cara Krueger	APP096548	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.12		
VEN010578	Scott and Cara Krueger	APP096548	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		26.32		
VEN010579	Barbara Graves	APP096549	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.51		
VEN010579	Barbara Graves	APP096549	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		31.19		
VEN010580	Donald Rainwater	APP096550	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.41		
VEN010580	Donald Rainwater	APP096550	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.97		
VEN010581	Glenn Griffis	APP096551	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.48		
VEN010581	Glenn Griffis	APP096551	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		30.78		
VEN006334	Cathy Hoberly	APP096552	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.47		
VEN006334	Cathy Hoberly	APP096552	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		30.71		
VEN010582	Devin Moyers	APP096553	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.18		
VEN010582	Devin Moyers	APP096553	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		27.14		
VEN010583	Matthew Buchanan	APP096554	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.05		
VEN010583	Matthew Buchanan	APP096554	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		25.52		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 22 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
950 Trash									
Trash									
VEN010584	Gary Nunnally	APP096555	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.45		
VEN010584	Gary Nunnally	APP096555	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		30.37		
VEN010585	Tom James	APP096556	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.31		
VEN010585	Tom James	APP096556	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		28.66		
VEN010586	Greg Fetting	APP096557	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.35		
VEN010586	Greg Fetting	APP096557	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.16		
VEN007675	Brooks and Tracy Green	APP096558	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.41		
VEN007675	Brooks and Tracy Green	APP096558	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.97		
VEN010587	Alice McHale	APP096560	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.35		
VEN010587	Alice McHale	APP096560	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.16		
VEN010588	Karthik Mangu	APP096561	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		0.98		
VEN010588	Karthik Mangu	APP096561	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		8.12		
VEN010590	Lisa Keeney	APP096562	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.18		
VEN010590	Lisa Keeney	APP096562	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		27.14		
VEN010591	Luann Rickert	APP096563	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.96		
VEN010591	Luann Rickert	APP096563	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		24.30		
VEN010592	James Johnson	APP096564	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.37		
VEN010592	James Johnson	APP096564	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.48		
VEN010593	Justin Clemens	APP096565	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.92		
VEN010593	Justin Clemens	APP096565	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		23.89		
VEN010594	Darek Woodward	APP096566	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		1.99		
VEN010594	Darek Woodward	APP096566	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		24.70		
VEN010595	Steven Caswell	APP096567	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.51		
VEN010595	Steven Caswell	APP096567	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		31.19		
VEN010596	Emet and Tonja Talley	APP096568	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.05		
VEN010596	Emet and Tonja Talley	APP096568	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		25.52		
VEN010597	Eric and Chanda Schwartz	APP096569	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.32		
VEN010597	Eric and Chanda Schwartz	APP096569	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		28.75		
VEN001075	James Wood	APP096570	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.05		
VEN001075	James Wood	APP096570	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		25.52		
VEN010598	Hassan Jaradat and Teresa Arqawi	APP096571	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		2.38		
VEN010598	Hassan Jaradat and Teresa Arqawi	APP096571	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND		29.57		

Purchase Invoice Register

City of Westfield

Report Date Range: 08/17/22..09/08/22

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 23 of 24

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From		Buy-From Vendor Name	Invoice No.	Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Vendor No.										
Fund No.	Fund Name									
950	Trash									
	Trash									
VEN010599	Michael Brandtner	APP096572	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			1.99		
VEN010599	Michael Brandtner	APP096572	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			24.70		
VEN010601	Marla Modesitt	APP096573	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			2.05		
VEN010601	Marla Modesitt	APP096573	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			25.52		
VEN010602	Tyler King	APP096574	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			2.05		
VEN010602	Tyler King	APP096574	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			25.52		
VEN010603	Robert Disko	APP096575	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			2.32		
VEN010603	Robert Disko	APP096575	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			28.75		
VEN010604	Robert Schleinitz	APP096576	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			2.18		
VEN010604	Robert Schleinitz	APP096576	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			27.14		
VEN010605	Ashley Patton	APP096577	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			1.89		
VEN010605	Ashley Patton	APP096577	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			23.49		
VEN009364	Andrew Long	APP096578	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			1.96		
VEN009364	Andrew Long	APP096578	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			24.30		
VEN010608	Grace Flemmer	APP096579	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			2.12		
VEN010608	Grace Flemmer	APP096579	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			26.32		
VEN010609	Stephen Dewitt	APP096580	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			2.28		
VEN010609	Stephen Dewitt	APP096580	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			28.35		
VEN010607	FSRE Holdings LLC	APP096581	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			8.16		
VEN010607	FSRE Holdings LLC	APP096581	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			101.41		
VEN010589	Mark Sikora	APP096582	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			1.96		
VEN010589	Mark Sikora	APP096582	9/6/2022	950017370	TRASH-REFUND			24.30		
VEN008448	Springbrook Holding LLC	APP096636	9/8/2022	950017371	TRASH-CREDIT CARD PRO	CivicPay fees		465.00		
Subtotal for Trash								31,022.81		
Subtotal for Fund 950 Trash								31,022.81		
Posted Invoices Total								4,897,821.31		

Credit Memos

Vendor No.	Vendor Name	Cr. Memo No.	Date	GL Acct.	GL Account Name	Description	Amount
------------	-------------	--------------	------	----------	-----------------	-------------	--------

[illegible]

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 1 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101 General									
Administration									
842143040	BBQ VENTURES, INC	GJPCARD0088879	9/8/2022	101001347	Adm-Promotions	LUNCH AT CITY MANAGE	31.12		
351329072	LUKE OIL CO INC	GJPCARD0088883	9/8/2022	101001334	Adm-Travel/Training/Seminar	GAS FOR CITY MANAGE	83.19		
260546728	MILLERS FLOWER SHOP	GJPCARD0088895	9/8/2022	101001347	Adm-Promotions	FUNERAL GIFT- CHRISTI	85.00		
362769519	ERNIES WRECKER SERVICE IN	GJPCARD0088897	9/8/2022	101001334	Adm-Travel/Training/Seminar	SERVICE FOR FLAT TIRE	145.00		
954604723	TELEFLORA LLC	GJPCARD0089125	9/8/2022	101001347	Adm-Promotions	FUNERAL GIFT- PASSIN	85.08		
Subtotal for Administration							429.39		
Police									
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088783	9/8/2022	101002223	Police-Office Supplies	PACKING TAPE	47.40		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088797	9/8/2022	101002224	Police-Operating Supplies	BOXES FOR PROPERTY	57.36		
201299323	RMP INCORPORATED	GJPCARD0088798	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	MEAL DURING TRAINING	20.00		
VEN001820	SQUARE, INC.	GJPCARD0088807	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	INVESTIGATORS TRAINI	49.91		
770510487	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088811	9/8/2022	101002224	Police-Operating Supplies	FLAGS FOR HONOR GU	529.74		
VEN002025	University of Louisville	GJPCARD0088846	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	WORKING CONTROLLIN	500.00		
311537655	MARATHON PETROLEUM COMPAN	GJPCARD0088864	9/8/2022	101002226	Police-Vehicle Gas/Supplies	TRAVEL TO TRAINING-L.	60.00		
522261790	THOMSON REUTERS U.S. LLC	GJPCARD0088865	9/8/2022	101002350	Police-Subscriptions/Dues	MONTHLY STATEMENT	736.45		
350312630	FLANNER AND BUCHANAN INC.	GJPCARD0088880	9/8/2022	101002347	Police-Promotions	FLOWERS FOR ROTHRO	174.30		
VEN004513	Evident	GJPCARD0088881	9/8/2022	101002224	Police-Operating Supplies	EVIDENCE ORANGE FLA	18.00		
810914704	COOL DOUGH 2 LLC	GJPCARD0088884	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	MEALS DURING TRAININ	42.69		
472156115	TOAST INC	GJPCARD0088885	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	MEALS DURING TRAININ	101.83		
911325671	STARBUCKS CORPORATION	GJPCARD0088886	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	MEALS DURING TRAININ	22.50		
843818228	BLUE SKY HOSPITALITY LLC	GJPCARD0088887	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	HOTEL DURING TRAININ	185.34		
843818228	BLUE SKY HOSPITALITY LLC	GJPCARD0088888	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	HOTEL DURING TRAININ	185.34		
VEN000060	Agency One Security Group	GJPCARD0088907	9/8/2022	101002343	Police-Building Maintenance	BUILDING KEYS	24.00		
872333832	TRIBUTE STORE	GJPCARD0088908	9/8/2022	101002347	Police-Promotions	CHRISTINE BROWN FUN	136.90		
384061754	ARLO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088909	9/8/2022	101002350	Police-Subscriptions/Dues	MONTHLY STATEMENT	61.95		
454168768	TOAST, INC.	GJPCARD0088910	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	MEALS DURING TRAININ	96.88		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0088912	9/8/2022	101002355	Police-K-9 Maint	DOG FOOD	54.99		
271884433	PLAZA DEL SOL, LLC	GJPCARD0088928	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	MEALS DURING TRAININ	73.04		
611443499	5.11 INC	GJPCARD0088931	9/8/2022	101002229	Police-Uniforms	5.11 PANTS / POLO - CHI	256.00		
542170160	EXPRESS, LLC	GJPCARD0088944	9/8/2022	101002229	Police-Uniforms	DETECTIVE CLOTHING-L	168.00		
VEN002025	University of Louisville	GJPCARD0088960	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	INTERNAL AFFAIRS: POL	850.00		
020545884	ZEBRA TECHNOLOGIES INTERN	GJPCARD0088976	9/8/2022	101002337	Police-Printing	PRINTER RIBBONS FOR	95.96		

Purchase Card Register
City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM
Page 2 of 16
WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101 General									
Police									
VEN001476	Office Depot	GJPCARD0088981	9/8/2022	101002223	Police-Office Supplies	MARKERS	10.49		
821051874	COMMAND PRESENCE TRAINING	GJPCARD0088993	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	LEADING WITHOUT RAN	358.00		
474878003	ASHFORD TRS BLOOMINGTON L	GJPCARD0089014	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	HOTEL DURING TRAININ	356.16		
474878003	ASHFORD TRS BLOOMINGTON L	GJPCARD0089015	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	HOTEL DURING TRAININ	356.16		
474878003	ASHFORD TRS BLOOMINGTON L	GJPCARD0089016	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	HOTEL DURING TRAININ	356.16		
581498312	RARE HOSPITALTY INTL INC	GJPCARD0089020	9/8/2022	101002347	Police-Promotions	VOLUNTEER LUNCH	12.17		
VEN001820	SQUARE, INC.	GJPCARD0089053	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	MANAGING CRITICAL INC	224.00		
VEN000060	Agency One Security Group	GJPCARD0089063	9/8/2022	101002343	Police-Building Maintenance	REPLACEMENT BUILDIN	58.50		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089064	9/8/2022	101002337	Police-Printing	ID PRINTER	2,095.00		
811361842	VIKTOS LLC	GJPCARD0089065	9/8/2022	101002229	Police-Uniforms	DETECTIVE BACKPACK-	139.85		
910656890	RECREATIONAL EQUIPMENT IN	GJPCARD0089066	9/8/2022	101002229	Police-Uniforms	DETECTIVE CLOTHING-	330.95		
VEN000946	IN BMV VEHICLE SER	GJPCARD0089075	9/8/2022	101002334	Police-Travel/Training/Semina	NOTARY CERTIFICATION	50.00		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089076	9/8/2022	101002229	Police-Uniforms	DETECTIVE HOLSTER-L.	99.99		
VEN000946	IN BMV VEHICLE SER	GJPCARD0089110	9/8/2022	101002350	Police-Subscriptions/Dues	VEHICLE TITLE/REGISTR	284.69		
VEN004513	Evident	GJPCARD0089121	9/8/2022	101002224	Police-Operating Supplies	RED EVIDENCE PRO ST	27.00		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089149	9/8/2022	101002229	Police-Uniforms	5.11 PANTS	354.95		
020809769	HULU, LLC	GJPCARD0089152	9/8/2022	101002349	Police-Services	MONTHLY STATEMENT	85.98		
Subtotal for Police							9,748.63		
Economic and Community Development									
VEN000946	IN BMV VEHICLE SER	GJPCARD0088813	9/8/2022	101003334	ECD-Travel/Training/Seminar	IN_ LICENSING#NE06916	50.00		
351538557	NORMANDY FLOWER SHOP IN	GJPCARD0088866	9/8/2022	101003347	ECD-Promotions	NORMANDYFLOWERS#2	84.00		
770510487	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088890	9/8/2022	101003338	ECD-Legal	HCR#R1198_36.40.ANNE	36.40		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088898	9/8/2022	101003223	ECD-Office Supplies	AMAZON#8009811_OFFI	62.98		
VEN001820	SQUARE, INC.	GJPCARD0088958	9/8/2022	101003337	ECD-Printing	CAVE#23442-BUSINESS	49.69		
770510487	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089018	9/8/2022	101003350	ECD-Subscriptions/Dues	MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL	419.00		
VEN000478	Crown Trophy	GJPCARD0089061	9/8/2022	101003223	ECD-Office Supplies	CROWN TROPHY.NAME	78.00		
770510487	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089079	9/8/2022	101003338	ECD-Legal	HCR.PUBLIC LEGAL NOT	28.00		
770510487	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089094	9/8/2022	101003338	ECD-Legal	HCR.PUBLIC LEGAL NOT	23.34		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089140	9/8/2022	101003223	ECD-Office Supplies	AMAZON.OFFICESUPPLY	107.45		
770510487	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089156	9/8/2022	101003350	ECD-Subscriptions/Dues	AICP.PRORATED DUES#	100.00		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 3 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

	Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name									
101	General									
	Economic and Community Development									
	VEN003173	AMAZON MKTPLACE	GJPCARD0089180	9/8/2022	101003223	ECD-Office Supplies	AMAZON MKTP	120.19		
	Subtotal for Economic and Community Development							1,159.05		
	Parks									
	271771199	PRINTBEAR, LLC	GJPCARD0088800	9/8/2022	101005347	Parks-Promotion	STICKERS FOR GJP TAB	67.00		
	271771199	PRINTBEAR, LLC	GJPCARD0088806	9/8/2022	101005347	Parks-Promotion	WESTFIELD WELCOME	200.00		
	VEN002097	Westfield Chamber Of Commerce	GJPCARD0088903	9/8/2022	101005334	Parks-Travel/Training/Semina	LEADERSHIP SUMMIT TI	60.00		
	VEN000480	CSI Signs	GJPCARD0088904	9/8/2022	101005347	Parks-Promotion	LANTERN DAY SIGNAGE	269.14		
	202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088951	9/8/2022	101005472	Parks-Equipment	EQUIPMENT STORAGE	170.89		
	VEN007922	Kroger Limited Partnership	GJPCARD0088952	9/8/2022	101005347	Parks-Promotion	WATER FOR VOLUNTEE	17.94		
	770034661	INTUIT PAYMENT SOLUTIONS,	GJPCARD0089042	9/8/2022	101005347	Parks-Promotion	TEMPORARY STAGE ST	7,300.00		
	VEN000480	CSI Signs	GJPCARD0089056	9/8/2022	101005349	Parks-Services	EVENT SIGNAGE	61.50		
	VEN000480	CSI Signs	GJPCARD0089067	9/8/2022	101005349	Parks-Services	EVENT SIGNAGE	236.94		
	202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089093	9/8/2022	101005347	Parks-Promotion	SOCCER BALLS AND AC	156.83		
	202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089101	9/8/2022	101005347	Parks-Promotion	CCC GAMES, ARTIFACTS	129.49		
	460707085	BLOOMERANG LLC	GJPCARD0089102	9/8/2022	101005350	Parks-Subscption/Dues	BLOOMERANG - ADDITIO	10.00		
	412192662	AADVANCED LIMOUSINES LLC	GJPCARD0089147	9/8/2022	101005347	Parks-Promotion	50 PAYMENT OF TROLLE	923.00		
	201665019	FACEBOOK INC.	GJPCARD0089153	9/8/2022	101005349	Parks-Services	FACEBOOK AD FOR WE	32.83		
	202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089178	9/8/2022	101005223	Parks-Office Supplies	AMAZON - EARPIECES F	45.65		
	Subtotal for Parks							9,681.21		
	Economic Dev									
	770510487	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088782	9/8/2022	101006350	Economic Dev-Subscrip/Dues	ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP D	350.00		
	Subtotal for Economic Dev							350.00		
	Informatics									
	VEN002022	UNITED STATES POSTAL SERV	GJPCARD0088784	9/8/2022	101007333	IT-Postage	MAP / DATA MAILING TO	28.15		
	770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088799	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	WINDOWS UPDATE PRO	249.00		
	820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088801	9/8/2022	101007332	IT-Cellular/Pagers/Mobile	3PACK OF GLASS SCRE	7.37		
	860850417	GODADDY.COM LLC	GJPCARD0088802	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	YOUTHASISTANCE.ORG	62.32		
	VEN001403	MULDOONS OF CARMEL, INC	GJPCARD0088817	9/8/2022	101007347	IT-Promotion	COLTS CAMP IT TEARDO	121.39		
	843871927	LOS AGAVE	GJPCARD0088838	9/8/2022	101007347	IT-Promotion	COLTS CAMP IT TEARDO	56.87		
	VEN000718	FORMSPRING LLC	GJPCARD0088839	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	MONTHLY RENEWAL	105.93		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 4 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101	General								
	Informatics								
843871927	LOS AGAVE	GJPCARD0088892	9/8/2022	101007347	IT-Promotion	CAMP TEARDOWN PLAN	56.87		
870361597	SENSAPHONE	GJPCARD0088899	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	ANNUAL PANIC SYSTEM	214.20		
VEN005162	Validated Custom Solutions	GJPCARD0088913	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	TF WASTE GRINDER AL	335.00		
VEN005162	Validated Custom Solutions	GJPCARD0088914	9/8/2022	101007472	IT-Equipment	CH DOOR REPAIR	1,458.85		
VEN005162	Validated Custom Solutions	GJPCARD0088915	9/8/2022	101007331	IT-Consulting	PW BREAKROOM AV PR	562.50		
873718653	LASTPASS US LP	GJPCARD0088916	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	ANNUAL PASSWORD MG	-750.99		
VEN005162	Validated Custom Solutions	GJPCARD0088929	9/8/2022	101007349	IT-Services	Q2. ACCESS CONTROL	6,438.00		
VEN007922	Kroger Limited Partnership	GJPCARD0088932	9/8/2022	101007347	IT-Promotion	SODA FOR UPPER LEVE	57.04		
770510487	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088964	9/8/2022	101007350	IT-Subscriptions/Dues	GIS PROFESSIONAL CER	285.00		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088965	9/8/2022	101007223	IT-Office Supplies	2X DIXIE HOT CUPS 50P	33.90		
873718653	LASTPASS US LP	GJPCARD0088978	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	ANNUAL PASSWORD MG	750.99		
611648780	ZOOM VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS	GJPCARD0088980	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	AUGUST BACKUP CONF	140.00		
873718653	LASTPASS US LP	GJPCARD0088995	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	ANNUAL CLOUD PASSW	648.00		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088997	9/8/2022	101007223	IT-Office Supplies	COFFEE FOR UPPER LE	14.78		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088998	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	CAFE AP MOUNT TOOLS	95.42		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089025	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	STREET OFFICE REMOD	359.98		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089027	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	STREET OFFICE REMOD	179.90		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089028	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	USB SOUND CARD AUDI	6.92		
811335285	WASABI TECHNOLOGIES	GJPCARD0089043	9/8/2022	101007349	IT-Services	MONTHLY FEE HOT STO	6.41		
860850417	GODADDY.COM LLC	GJPCARD0089044	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	1YR FEE FOR EMAIL SEC	59.88		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089057	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	TOOL KIT FOR TRENTO	19.51		
200652664	IDW,LLC	GJPCARD0089080	9/8/2022	101007223	IT-Office Supplies	ID BADGE HOLDERS	89.11		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089081	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	FIBER REEL	89.95		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089082	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	1X OTTERBOX COMMUT	34.99		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089095	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	FIBER PATCH CABLE	198.00		
452342647	SOUTHERN ROCK RESTAURANT	GJPCARD0089105	9/8/2022	101007347	IT-Promotion	INDIANA DATA HARVEST	116.52		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0089113	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	PADLOCK HASP - NET B	4.98		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089122	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	2X VELCRO TAPE	27.66		
843871927	LOS AGAVE	GJPCARD0089138	9/8/2022	101007347	IT-Promotion	TEAM INTRO - TRENT, A	105.59		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089139	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	5X OTTERBOX DEFENDE	119.85		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089141	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	20X 240GP SSD HDD	439.80		
260097223	TIGGEE,LLC	GJPCARD0089154	9/8/2022	101007389	IT-Software Licensing	PUBLIC DNS	10.08		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 5 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

	Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name									
101	General									
	Informatics									
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089155	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	COLTS BOX LOCKS	128.72		
	820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089157	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	WIRELESS MOUSE	27.88		
	770034661	INTUIT PAYMENT SOLUTIONS,	GJPCARD0089159	9/8/2022	101007331	IT-Consulting	CRM ACH AND SHAREPO	8,775.00		
	202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089179	9/8/2022	101007451	IT-Computer/Equip	NET BOX TEMPERATUR	132.86		
	Subtotal for Informatics							21,904.18		
	Clerk Treasurer									
	833674717	KOTO INDY INC	GJPCARD0088814	9/8/2022	101008347	CT-Promotions	CT OFFICE BD LUNCH	133.36		
	710833125	FLOWER SHOP NETWORK, INC	GJPCARD0088900	9/8/2022	101008349	CT-Services	FUNERAL FLOWERS FO	64.84		
	874180750	CHARWEST LLC	GJPCARD0089137	9/8/2022	101008347	CT-Promotions	STAFF APPREC LUNCH	146.00		
	454168768	TOAST, INC.	GJPCARD0089172	9/8/2022	101008347	CT-Promotions	LUNCH MEETING	61.23		
	Subtotal for Clerk Treasurer							405.43		
	Mayor									
	260746511	CAVE CO. PRINTING	GJPCARD0088906	9/8/2022	101009347	Mayor-Promotions	MAYOR - BUSINESS CAR	44.60		
	Subtotal for Mayor							44.60		
	City Council									
	710833125	FLOWER SHOP NETWORK, INC	GJPCARD0088902	9/8/2022	101010349	City Council-Services	FUNERAL FLOWERS	86.24		
	593451625	JOY ROCKWELL ENTERPRISES	GJPCARD0089142	9/8/2022	101010347	City Council-Promotions	POSTCARDS	5,892.02		
	Subtotal for City Council							5,978.26		
	Public Works									
	VEN000247	BLUE SKY CASINO HQ	GJPCARD0088809	9/8/2022	101013334	PW-Travel/Training/Seminars	HOTEL ROOM FOR JOH	305.10		
	VEN000247	BLUE SKY CASINO HQ	GJPCARD0088810	9/8/2022	101013334	PW-Travel/Training/Seminars	HOTEL ROOM FOR JUST	305.10		
	351516486	MID STATE TRUCK EQUIPMENT	GJPCARD0088821	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	INV. #120680 STRAP KIT	79.99		
	VEN000247	BLUE SKY CASINO HQ	GJPCARD0088836	9/8/2022	101013334	PW-Travel/Training/Seminars	HOTEL ROOM FOR TRAV	305.10		
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088841	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	PW NEW BREAKROOM	123.93		
	133487402	DENNY'S CORP	GJPCARD0088844	9/8/2022	101013347	PW-Promotions	BREAKFAST FOR JUSTIN	37.57		
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088856	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	PW SINK REPAIR RETUR	-30.98		
	844332073	WESTFIELD ACE, LLC	GJPCARD0088857	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	CAULK, ETC MATERIALS	21.55		
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088860	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	PW NEW BREAKROOM	94.44		
	VEN000247	BLUE SKY CASINO HQ	GJPCARD0088861	9/8/2022	101013347	PW-Promotions	DINNER FOR JOHN NAIL,	98.48		
	954604723	TELEFLORA LLC	GJPCARD0088863	9/8/2022	101013347	PW-Promotions	FLOWERS FOR FUNERA	94.97		
	351845000	ROUDEBUSH EQUIPMENT INC	GJPCARD0088867	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	INV. #19950 REPAIR LAN	110.06		
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088874	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	NAILS FOR NAIL GUN.	69.98		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 6 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101 General									
Public Works									
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088876	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	PW WINDOW BLIND AND	42.47		
VEN000944	IN ASSN CITIES & TOWNS	GJPCARD0088882	9/8/2022	101013350	PW-Subs/Dues	2022 INDIANA ASSOCIATI	75.00		
VEN008108	Kimball Midwest	GJPCARD0088921	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	INV. #100213301 SHOP C	148.18		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088922	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	FLOORING FOR NEW OF	1,031.05		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088923	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	PW - NEW OFFICE IN BA	230.73		
042896127	STAPLES INC	GJPCARD0088924	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	CHAIRS FOR NEW OFFIC	959.96		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088925	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	PLYWOOD FOR REMOD	1,131.30		
VEN001476	Office Depot	GJPCARD0088926	9/8/2022	101013451	PW-Computer Equipment	KEYBOARDS AND MOUS	105.97		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088927	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	ROBOT VACUUM AND M	265.74		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088934	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	STAPLES FOR STREET B	16.97		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088936	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	TIM AND CARLTON'S WO	65.29		
VEN000733	Freije Engineered Solutions Co	GJPCARD0088937	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	201 MILL STREET AC RE	569.75		
VEN000733	Freije Engineered Solutions Co	GJPCARD0088938	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	CITY HALL DEHUMIDIFIE	3,100.74		
VEN000733	Freije Engineered Solutions Co	GJPCARD0088939	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	CITY SERVICES - HVAC	1,611.20		
VEN000733	Freije Engineered Solutions Co	GJPCARD0088940	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	PW - HVAC REPAIR	860.80		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088941	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	THIS WAS A RETURN FR	-1,290.81		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088942	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	NEW OFFICE IN STREET	209.23		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088947	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	RETURN OF SUPPLIES F	-41.85		
VEN000944	IN ASSN CITIES & TOWNS	GJPCARD0088959	9/8/2022	101013334	PW-Travel/Training/Seminars	2022 AIM CONFERENCE	345.00		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088962	9/8/2022	101013345	PW-Equip Repair	GRAND JUNCTION EQUI	81.90		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0088963	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	REPAIR SPRAYER TANK	12.28		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088966	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SUPPLIES MATERIALS F	381.39		
340526850	SHERWIN WILLIAMS CO	GJPCARD0088967	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	PAINT FOR NEW OFFICE	227.80		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088968	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SUPPLIES MATERIALS F	26.28		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088972	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SPRAY FOAM/OUTLET B	41.80		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088973	9/8/2022	101013343	PW-Bldg Maint	KITCHEN CABINETS FOR	4,884.98		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088974	9/8/2022	101013451	PW-Computer Equipment	TWO TV MOUNTS FOR R	53.98		
042896127	STAPLES INC	GJPCARD0088975	9/8/2022	101013223	PW-Office Supplies	OFFICE SUPPLIES, INCL	336.50		
844332073	WESTFIELD ACE, LLC	GJPCARD0088977	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	WEED EATER PARTS	59.38		
440618012	O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STOR	GJPCARD0088991	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	INV. #4333-135266 IMPAC	14.99		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088996	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	MATERIALS FOR BUILDIN	13.28		
VEN009986	Best Times Ahead LLC	GJPCARD0089013	9/8/2022	101013347	PW-Promotions	STAFF LUNCH - AUGUST	115.10		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 7 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
101	General								
	Public Works								
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089017	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	RETURN OF SUPPLIES F	-275.26		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089019	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	RETURN OF NAIL GUN O	-159.00		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089021	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SUPPLIES, TOOLS, MAT	627.37		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089022	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SUPPLIES MATERIALS F	22.38		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089023	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SUPPLIES MATERIALS F	23.96		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089024	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SUPPLIES MATERIALS F	13.28		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089031	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SUPPLIES FOR BUILDING	275.26		
VEN006898	Supply Warehouse Inc	GJPCARD0089032	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	INV. #600577 FACILITY S	502.85		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089034	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	SUPPLIES FOR BUILDING	680.23		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089035	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	FRAMING TOOLS (RETU	161.49		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089036	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	NAIL GUN FOR WOOD W	209.00		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089041	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	PAGE AND CISCO'S TRU	52.42		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089047	9/8/2022	101013349	PW-Contractual Services	LUMBER SUPPLIES FOR	1,127.40		
844332073	WESTFIELD ACE, LLC	GJPCARD0089051	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	CHARGER FOR POWER	226.79		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089054	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	CARLTON'S WORK STRI	12.75		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089077	9/8/2022	101013229	PW-Uniforms	WORK BOOTS FOR ADA	134.97		
872041548	WESTFIELD CULVERS LLC	GJPCARD0089089	9/8/2022	101013347	PW-Promotions	LUNCH FOR JUSTIN JON	24.72		
VEN008108	Kimball Midwest	GJPCARD0089098	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	INV. #100170843 DEGRE	168.12		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089100	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	CREEK STOMP PROGRA	79.78		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0089133	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	BUG SPRAY	16.99		
VEN008108	Kimball Midwest	GJPCARD0089134	9/8/2022	101013229	PW-Uniforms	INV. #100159052 FIRST AI	350.64		
941351799	EWING IRRIGATION PRODUCT	GJPCARD0089150	9/8/2022	101013345	PW-Equip Repair	INV. #17464140 IRRIGATI	4.05		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0089162	9/8/2022	101013224	PW-Operating Supplies	BACKPACK HOLDERS/SP	94.98		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089173	9/8/2022	101013347	PW-Promotions	LIQUID IV FOR CREW ME	132.70		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089174	9/8/2022	101013347	PW-Promotions	LIQUID IV FOR CREW ME	128.68		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089175	9/8/2022	101013347	PW-Promotions	LIQUID IV FOR CREW ME	117.90		
VEN000946	IN BMV VEHICLE SER	GJPCARD0089176	9/8/2022	101013350	PW-Subs/Dues	RENEWAL OF PROFESSI	105.56		
	Subtotal for Public Works						22,161.68		
	Communications								
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088788	9/8/2022	101020337	Comm-Printing	MICROPHONE HANDHEL	29.22		
710415188	WAL-MART STORES, INC.	GJPCARD0088804	9/8/2022	101020347	Comm-Promotions	SNACKS DRINK PRODU	129.53		
582554149	THE ROCKET SCIENCE GROUP,	GJPCARD0088845	9/8/2022	101020350	Comm-Dues membership	MAILCHIMP ACCOUNT F	59.00		

Purchase Card Register
City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM
Page 8 of 16
WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name								
101	General								
	Communications								
131102020	THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPAN	GJPCARD0088859	9/8/2022	101020350	Comm-Dues membership	NEW YORK TIME MONTH	6.00		
472390983	GANNETT CO., INC.	GJPCARD0088950	9/8/2022	101020350	Comm-Dues membership	INDY STAR SUBSCRIPTI	9.99		
VEN002097	Westfield Chamber Of Commerce	GJPCARD0088955	9/8/2022	101020350	Comm-Dues membership	WESTFIELD CHAMBER O	25.00		
VEN001820	SQUARE, INC.	GJPCARD0089011	9/8/2022	101020347	Comm-Promotions	COFFEE PLANNING MEE	18.60		
352008646	MT PUBLISHING COMPANY INC	GJPCARD0089090	9/8/2022	101020337	Comm-Printing	CITY OF WESTFIELD FU	500.00		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089096	9/8/2022	101020337	Comm-Printing	MEMORY CARD AND RE	379.92		
131102020	THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPAN	GJPCARD0089170	9/8/2022	101020350	Comm-Dues membership	NEW YORK TIMES DIGIT	6.00		
	Subtotal for Communications						1,163.26		
	Customer Service								
841946169	MORE MOE'S INDIANA-WESTF	GJPCARD0088969	9/8/2022	101021347	Cust Serv-Promo	GUEST SERVICES - TEA	50.04		
VEN000491	CVS PHARMACY, INC.	GJPCARD0088970	9/8/2022	101021347	Cust Serv-Promo	GS: EMPLOYEE ANNIVER	3.84		
	Subtotal for Customer Service						53.88		
	Human Resources								
VEN001820	SQUARE, INC.	GJPCARD0088787	9/8/2022	101022334	HR- Training	EDUCATION MATERIALS-	27.00		
VEN001225	Law Enforcement Training Board	GJPCARD0088805	9/8/2022	101022334	HR- Training	PARKING FOR INDY SHR	30.00		
VEN000944	IN ASSN CITIES & TOWNS	GJPCARD0088930	9/8/2022	101022334	HR- Training	2022 IMPACT ANNUAL C	150.00		
VEN000944	IN ASSN CITIES & TOWNS	GJPCARD0088935	9/8/2022	101022334	HR- Training	2022 ANNUAL IMPACT C	150.00		
	Subtotal for Human Resources						357.00		
	Subtotal for Fund 101 General						73,436.57		
Fund No.	Fund Name								
111	Food and Beverage Tax								
	Grand Park								
VEN000384	CHICK-FIL-A CORP	GJPCARD0088830	9/8/2022	111015349	Food/Bev GP-Construct Ser	COLTS INTERN APPRECI	121.77		
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0088873	9/8/2022	111015349	Food/Bev GP-Construct Ser	COLTS TRAINING CAMP	8.55		
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0089109	9/8/2022	111015349	Food/Bev GP-Construct Ser	PARKING STAFF SNACK	39.63		
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0089167	9/8/2022	111015349	Food/Bev GP-Construct Ser	2022 CTC PARKING STA	61.45		
	Subtotal for Grand Park						231.40		
	Subtotal for Fund 111 Food and Beverage Tax						231.40		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 9 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

	Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No.	Fund Name									
201	Motor Vehicle Highway (MVH)									
	Public Works									
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088785	9/8/2022	201013349	MVH-Contractual Serv	SWITCH OUTLET SPACE	5.24		
	202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088793	9/8/2022	201013472	MVH-Equip	LIQUID IV FOR CREWS T	158.67		
	202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088794	9/8/2022	201013472	MVH-Equip	LIQUID IV FOR CREWS T	117.90		
	440618012	O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STOR	GJPCARD0088795	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE	486.62		
	381909144	BELLE TIRE DISTRIBUTORS I	GJPCARD0088796	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	REPLACEMENT TIRE FO	206.99		
	440618012	O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STOR	GJPCARD0088812	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	INV. #4333-137378 BATTE	-22.00		
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088832	9/8/2022	201013349	MVH-Contractual Serv	PRIMER FOR NEW OFFI	124.85		
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088833	9/8/2022	201013349	MVH-Contractual Serv	PAINT FOR NEW OFFICE	53.94		
	370948752	MARTIN BAYLEY, INC.	GJPCARD0088837	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	FUEL FOR MY CITY TRU	102.61		
	440618012	O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STOR	GJPCARD0088849	9/8/2022	201013345	MVH-Equip Repair	INV. #4333-136902 SIGN	185.73		
	560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088858	9/8/2022	201013349	MVH-Contractual Serv	PAINT FOR NEW OFFICE	307.07		
	VEN000946	IN BMV VEHICLE SER	GJPCARD0088878	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	NEW PLATE FOR VEHICL	15.00		
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088911	9/8/2022	201013349	MVH-Contractual Serv	SUPPLIES FOR NEW OF	391.79		
	VEN008967	J and F Distributing Co	GJPCARD0088917	9/8/2022	201013345	MVH-Equip Repair	INV. #1236549 HYDRAULI	80.80		
	VEN008967	J and F Distributing Co	GJPCARD0088918	9/8/2022	201013345	MVH-Equip Repair	INV. #1236547 HYDRAULI	209.88		
	381909144	BELLE TIRE DISTRIBUTORS I	GJPCARD0088953	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	TIRES FOR #2244 (JON M	1,320.96		
	381909144	BELLE TIRE DISTRIBUTORS I	GJPCARD0088954	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	NEW TIRES MOVED OVE	120.00		
	351845000	ROUDEBUSH EQUIPMENT INC	GJPCARD0088971	9/8/2022	201013345	MVH-Equip Repair	INV. #19894 HINGE FOR	12.96		
	VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089004	9/8/2022	201013345	MVH-Equip Repair	PLYWOOD/SUPPLIES FO	629.91		
	820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089038	9/8/2022	201013345	MVH-Equip Repair	SHARPENING WHEEL RE	59.97		
	440618012	O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STOR	GJPCARD0089073	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	CLEANING SUPPLIES FO	49.33		
	941351799	EWING IRRIGATION PRODUCT	GJPCARD0089099	9/8/2022	201013345	MVH-Equip Repair	INV. #17495531 HAND TO	80.97		
	440618012	O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STOR	GJPCARD0089103	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	INV. #4333-133395; OIL FI	79.27		
	VEN008108	Kimball Midwest	GJPCARD0089117	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	INV. #100163375 FIRST AI	87.98		
	312826011	LEGENDS BODY SHOP	GJPCARD0089135	9/8/2022	201013360	MVH-Vehicle Repair	INV. #529 DENT PAINT R	920.00		
	VEN008108	Kimball Midwest	GJPCARD0089181	9/8/2022	201013226	MVH-Vehicle Gas/ Supplies	MVH-Vehicle Gas/Supplies	82.10		
	Subtotal for Public Works							5,868.54		
Subtotal for Fund 201 Motor Vehicle Highway (MVH)								5,868.54		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 10 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
202	Local Road and Street (LRS)								
Public Works									
VEN001829	Stello Products Inc	GJPCARD0088862	9/8/2022	202013228	LRS-Signs and Posts	INV. #34807 CITY SIGNS,	213.80		
364485550	SITEONE LANDSCAPE-114	GJPCARD0089010	9/8/2022	202013432	LRS-Sidewalk	INV. #122356999-001 STR	462.39		
VEN001820	SQUARE, INC.	GJPCARD0089058	9/8/2022	202013432	LRS-Sidewalk	INV. #220542 SIDEWALK	906.94		
VEN001829	Stello Products Inc	GJPCARD0089074	9/8/2022	202013228	LRS-Signs and Posts	INV. #34465; VARIOUS ST	7,461.13		
VEN008108	Kimball Midwest	GJPCARD0089088	9/8/2022	202013228	LRS-Signs and Posts	INV. #100172128 WASP S	292.80		
Subtotal for Public Works							9,337.06		
Subtotal for Fund 202 Local Road and Street (LRS)							9,337.06		
Fund No. Fund Name									
203	Fire Operating								
Fire									
472390983	GANNETT CO., INC.	GJPCARD0088792	9/8/2022	203012350	Fire-Subscriptions/Dues	INDY STAR SUBSCRIPTI	22.00		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088803	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	STATION 83 SPRAYER	15.96		
811436574	HITTLE FLORAL DESIGN LLC	GJPCARD0088815	9/8/2022	203012347	Fire-Promotions	FLOWERS FOR DEPUTY	80.99		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088816	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	BOOK FOR PIO	8.19		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088818	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	BOOK FOR PIO	6.74		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088819	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	BOOK FOR PIO	16.55		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0088824	9/8/2022	203012472	Fire-Equip	EQUIPMENT	53.96		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0088828	9/8/2022	203012472	Fire-Equip	EQUIPMENT	148.32		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088840	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	PIO BOOKS	26.20		
350865121	TWAY COMPANY	GJPCARD0088842	9/8/2022	203012472	Fire-Equip	EQUIPMENT	1,154.50		
351762640	WESTFIELD FIRE ENDOWMENT	GJPCARD0088843	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	METRO FIRE PLANNERS	475.00		
351762640	WESTFIELD FIRE ENDOWMENT	GJPCARD0088847	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	METRO FIRE PLANNERS	475.00		
954841037	GET HELP NOW, INC.	GJPCARD0088852	9/8/2022	203012224	Fire-Operating Supplies	SENIOR SAFETY DECAL	75.00		
011111111	SHOIFY PAYMENTS (USA) IN	GJPCARD0088869	9/8/2022	203012472	Fire-Equip	MISC. EQUIPMENT	242.19		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088875	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	STATION 81 SINK CLOG	38.27		
VEN002120	Westfield Winnelson	GJPCARD0088877	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	STATION 81 SINK DRAIN	31.53		
362407381	UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, IN	GJPCARD0088893	9/8/2022	203012223	Fire-Office Supplies	SHIPPING	20.50		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088901	9/8/2022	203012223	Fire-Office Supplies	OFFICE SUPPLIES - CAR	24.98		
042896127	STAPLES INC	GJPCARD0088943	9/8/2022	203012223	Fire-Office Supplies	OFFICE SUPPLIES	45.29		
042896127	STAPLES INC	GJPCARD0088945	9/8/2022	203012223	Fire-Office Supplies	OFFICE SUPPLIES	77.35		
VEN006898	Supply Warehouse Inc	GJPCARD0088946	9/8/2022	203012224	Fire-Operating Supplies	STATION SUPPLIES	322.48		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 11 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
203 Fire Operating									
Fire									
VEN001883	Target Corporation	GJPCARD0088956	9/8/2022	203012224	Fire-Operating Supplies	BREAKROOM SUPPLIES	33.17		
VEN001476	Office Depot	GJPCARD0088957	9/8/2022	203012223	Fire-Office Supplies	RECRUIT EMS BINDERS	78.44		
202597227	GOOGLE PAYMENT CORP.	GJPCARD0088961	9/8/2022	203012349	Fire-Services	CABLE	64.99		
VEN000365	Chapman Electric Supply	GJPCARD0088992	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	STATION 81 - INTERIOR	57.14		
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0088999	9/8/2022	203012347	Fire-Promotions	RECRUIT GRAD DINNER	600.57		
042896127	STAPLES INC	GJPCARD0089000	9/8/2022	203012223	Fire-Office Supplies	OFFICE SUPPLIES	77.35		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089001	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	3 REPLACEMENT COFFE	78.75		
042896127	STAPLES INC	GJPCARD0089003	9/8/2022	203012223	Fire-Office Supplies	OFFICE SUPPLIES	192.60		
VEN000365	Chapman Electric Supply	GJPCARD0089009	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	STATION 83 BREAKERS	54.86		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089012	9/8/2022	203012360	Fire-Vehicle Maint	E381 PARTS	10.26		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089029	9/8/2022	203012224	Fire-Operating Supplies	COFFEE POTS	16.50		
VEN008604	OHD	GJPCARD0089030	9/8/2022	203012224	Fire-Operating Supplies	SHIPPING COSTS FOR S	75.00		
VEN001815	Speedway Superamerica	GJPCARD0089033	9/8/2022	203012347	Fire-Promotions	ICE FOR RECRUITS	27.45		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0089037	9/8/2022	203012360	Fire-Vehicle Maint	VEHICLE REPAIR PARTS	53.96		
844332073	WESTFIELD ACE, LLC	GJPCARD0089039	9/8/2022	203012472	Fire-Equip	FASTENERS FOR TRAINI	3.98		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089049	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	STATION 82 KITCHEN TA	54.01		
042723701	PANERA, LLC	GJPCARD0089052	9/8/2022	203012347	Fire-Promotions	RECRUIT CLASS BREAK	113.26		
462967004	FINNER LLC	GJPCARD0089055	9/8/2022	203012347	Fire-Promotions	MAYDAY TRAINING LUN	195.11		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0089070	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	REFILL ON GAS GRILL B	22.09		
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0089072	9/8/2022	203012347	Fire-Promotions	RECRUIT CLASS DINNER	528.53		
VEN006898	Supply Warehouse Inc	GJPCARD0089083	9/8/2022	203012224	Fire-Operating Supplies	STATION SUPPLIES	510.56		
VEN001476	Office Depot	GJPCARD0089087	9/8/2022	203012223	Fire-Office Supplies	EMS OFFICE SUPPLIES	178.75		
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0089091	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	RECRUIT SCHOOL	13.57		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089092	9/8/2022	203012360	Fire-Vehicle Maint	EMS 380 REPAIRS	3.38		
473175020	CHICALL, LLC	GJPCARD0089097	9/8/2022	203012472	Fire-Equip	SHIPPING FOR SCBA MA	235.52		
VEN000946	IN BMV VEHICLE SER	GJPCARD0089106	9/8/2022	203012360	Fire-Vehicle Maint	2 VEHICLE REGISTRATIO	30.00		
844332073	WESTFIELD ACE, LLC	GJPCARD0089111	9/8/2022	203012472	Fire-Equip	SCBA	4.13		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089118	9/8/2022	203012360	Fire-Vehicle Maint	PARTS FOR REPAIRS ON	4.59		
202597227	GOOGLE PAYMENT CORP.	GJPCARD0089120	9/8/2022	203012349	Fire-Services	CABLE	64.99		
872333832	TRIBUTE STORE	GJPCARD0089123	9/8/2022	203012347	Fire-Promotions	FLOWERS FOR FUNERA	110.95		
364286656	WORLDPOINT ECC INCORPORAT	GJPCARD0089127	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	AHA ECC HANDBOOK FO	173.88		
352012442	INDIANA GOLF CAR INC	GJPCARD0089136	9/8/2022	203012360	Fire-Vehicle Maint	REPAIRS ON EMS 380 G	254.28		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 12 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
203	Fire Operating								
Fire									
844332073	WESTFIELD ACE, LLC	GJPCARD0089151	9/8/2022	203012360	Fire-Vehicle Maint	BATTERY FOR EMS-381	286.20		
VEN000365	Chapman Electric Supply	GJPCARD0089168	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	STATION 81 BAY LIGHTS	29.06		
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0089169	9/8/2022	203012334	Fire-Travel/Training/Seminars	DRINKS FOR TRAINING	22.83		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089171	9/8/2022	203012343	Fire-Building Maintenance	MICROWAVE FOR 81 BR	79.00		
Subtotal for Fire							7,700.71		
Subtotal for Fund 203 Fire Operating							7,700.71		
Fund No. Fund Name									
206	Parks Programming/Events								
Parks									
273245944	PSP GROUP, LLC	GJPCARD0088786	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	SQUIRREL STAMPEDE P	6.40		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088820	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	53.98		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088822	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	SUPPLIES FOR SENSOR	96.78		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088823	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	ACRYLIC SIGN HOLDERS	28.98		
541387365	DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC.	GJPCARD0088848	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	CRAFT SUPPLIES FOR B	185.00		
VEN000894	HOBBY LOBBY STORES INC	GJPCARD0088850	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	EVENT SUPPLIES FOR S	43.33		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088851	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	22.99		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0088870	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	14.29		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088889	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	46.06		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088894	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	29.97		
832788543	GOLDFINCHS	GJPCARD0088896	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	SQUIRREL STAMPEDE A	1,250.00		
391837105	4IMPRINT, INC	GJPCARD0088919	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	KOOZIES FOR SQUIRRE	290.17		
VEN007922	Kroger Limited Partnership	GJPCARD0088920	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	FOOD FOR GREEN ROO	44.47		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088948	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAMES/EVENT SUPPLIE	63.82		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088949	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	18.54		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088979	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	DECOR SUPPLIES FOR	79.99		
VEN000667	EVENTBRITE INC.	GJPCARD0088982	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GUEST REQUESTED RE	20.00		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088983	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	9.57		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088984	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	8.75		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088985	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	8.75		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088987	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	8.89		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088988	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	9.89		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 13 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
206	Parks Programming/Events								
Parks									
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088989	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	GAME SUPPLIES FOR SQ	8.89		
274811963	ORIENTAL TRADING COMPANY	GJPCARD0089005	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	CUISINE, CONNECT CUL	161.74		
043157107	RAINBOW BALLOONS INC	GJPCARD0089006	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	BALLOON DECOR FOR C	242.65		
VEN001869	Swank Motion Pictures	GJPCARD0089060	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	MOVIE LICENSES	2,180.00		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089128	9/8/2022	206005347	Parks Program-Promotions	FAN FOR TRAILER	51.66		
Subtotal for Parks							4,985.56		
Subtotal for Fund 206 Parks Programming/Events							4,985.56		
Fund No. Fund Name									
239	Law Enforcement								
Police									
VEN002025	University of Louisville	GJPCARD0088994	9/8/2022	239002334	Law Enforce-Travel/Train	HIRING PROCESS BACK	420.00		
VEN001824	STANDARD PARKING	GJPCARD0089124	9/8/2022	239002334	Law Enforce-Travel/Train	PARKING DURING TRAIN	32.00		
611728225	DRURY CLEVELAND LLC CO DR	GJPCARD0089143	9/8/2022	239002334	Law Enforce-Travel/Train	MEALS DURING TRAININ	43.48		
611728225	DRURY CLEVELAND LLC CO DR	GJPCARD0089144	9/8/2022	239002334	Law Enforce-Travel/Train	HOTEL DURING TRAININ	1,127.96		
800802161	WHOLESOME BURGER XVI LLC	GJPCARD0089145	9/8/2022	239002334	Law Enforce-Travel/Train	MEALS DURING TRAININ	26.88		
340673060	HEINEN'S INC	GJPCARD0089158	9/8/2022	239002334	Law Enforce-Travel/Train	MEALS DURING TRAININ	29.48		
341953155	PILOT CORPORATION	GJPCARD0089160	9/8/2022	239002334	Law Enforce-Travel/Train	MEALS DURING TRAININ	9.98		
364063453	POTBELLY SANDWICH WORKS L	GJPCARD0089161	9/8/2022	239002334	Law Enforce-Travel/Train	MEALS DURING TRAININ	15.32		
Subtotal for Police							1,705.10		
Subtotal for Fund 239 Law Enforcement							1,705.10		
Fund No. Fund Name									
241	Police Donation								
Police									
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0089115	9/8/2022	241002347	Police Donation-Promotions	FOOD ITEMS FOR COMM	102.57		
161687235	MEIJER GREAT LAKES LIMITE	GJPCARD0089116	9/8/2022	241002347	Police Donation-Promotions	BAGGED ICE-COMMUNIT	27.54		
VEN001820	SQUARE, INC.	GJPCARD0089129	9/8/2022	241002347	Police Donation-Promotions	MUSIC FOR COMMUNITY	300.00		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089132	9/8/2022	241002347	Police Donation-Promotions	LP TANK EXCHANGE-CO	19.92		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0089177	9/8/2022	241002347	Police Donation-Promotions	REFUND FOR HOT DOG	-62.35		
Subtotal for Police							387.68		
Subtotal for Fund 241 Police Donation							387.68		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 14 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
269	Training Facility Center								
Public Safety (Police and Fire)									
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0088831	9/8/2022	269014224	Training Fac-Oper Supplies	HCTC BIN SPLINE	339.99		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089050	9/8/2022	269014472	Training Fac-Equipment	TOOLS FOR HCTC	228.70		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0089068	9/8/2022	269014343	Training Fac-Building Maint	BOTTLE FOR GAS GRILL	59.99		
VEN003525	MACALLISTER	GJPCARD0089182	9/8/2022	269014345	Training Fac-Equipment Repa	FISHERS MACALLISTER	63.66		
Subtotal for Public Safety (Police and Fire)							692.34		
Subtotal for Fund 269 Training Facility Center							692.34		
Fund No. Fund Name									
350	GO Bond 2020								
Fire									
770034661	INTUIT PAYMENT SOLUTIONS,	GJPCARD0088933	9/8/2022	350012473	Go Bond 2020 FD Vehicle	EQUIPMENT FOR NEW V	2,495.00		
Subtotal for Fire							2,495.00		
Subtotal for Fund 350 GO Bond 2020							2,495.00		
Fund No. Fund Name									
640	Sports Campus Operating								
Grand Park									
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088789	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	CART PARTS	50.00		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088790	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	CART PART	54.78		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088791	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	CART PARTS	80.64		
813878272	GO4ELLIS, LLC	GJPCARD0088808	9/8/2022	640015224	Sports Campus-Operating Su	ATHLETIC TRAINER FOR	14.99		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088826	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	ELECTRICAL BALLASTS	196.30		
202796414	DMX INC	GJPCARD0088827	9/8/2022	640015350	Sports Campus-Dues/Sub Fe	PANDORA SUBSCRIPTIO	28.84		
813878272	GO4ELLIS, LLC	GJPCARD0088834	9/8/2022	640015224	Sports Campus-Operating Su	ATHLETIC TRAINER FOR	427.50		
813878272	GO4ELLIS, LLC	GJPCARD0088835	9/8/2022	640015224	Sports Campus-Operating Su	ATHLETIC TRAINER FOR	90.00		
202936165	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088855	9/8/2022	640015224	Sports Campus-Operating Su	GOLF CART OPERATING	426.44		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088871	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	GUTTER PARTS	76.36		
273731303	POWERSPORTS PLUS, LLC	GJPCARD0088872	9/8/2022	640015360	Sports Campus-Veh Repair	GOLF CART PARTS	61.80		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089007	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	REFUND	-199.72		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089026	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	ELECTRICAL PARTS	137.85		
231307731	UNITED REFRIGERATION INC	GJPCARD0089046	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	BELTS AND TOOLS	188.34		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089048	9/8/2022	640015224	Sports Campus-Operating Su	GROUNDS OPERATING	59.96		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 15 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
640 Sports Campus Operating									
Grand Park									
VEN001922	THE HOME DEPOT	GJPCARD0089059	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	TOOLS	19.99		
844332073	WESTFIELD ACE, LLC	GJPCARD0089062	9/8/2022	640015224	Sports Campus-Operating Su	GROUNDS OPERATING	47.67		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089069	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	TOOL	26.95		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089071	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	REFUND	-91.09		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089084	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	REFUND	-80.00		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089085	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	PLUMBING TOOLS AND	122.74		
560748358	LOWES COMPANIES, INC.	GJPCARD0089108	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	SEALANT AND TAPE	11.55		
VEN001922	THE HOME DEPOT	GJPCARD0089114	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	TOOL	23.99		
VEN001922	THE HOME DEPOT	GJPCARD0089119	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	TRAILER HITCH	8.54		
470979240	MEYER DISTRIBUTING PARTNE	GJPCARD0089130	9/8/2022	640015345	Sports Campus-Equip Repair	GROUNDS EQUIPMENT	27.79		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089131	9/8/2022	640015224	Sports Campus-Operating Su	GROUNDS OPERATING	142.65		
440618012	O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STOR	GJPCARD0089148	9/8/2022	640015345	Sports Campus-Equip Repair	GROUNDS SUPPLIES - N	138.73		
VEN001922	THE HOME DEPOT	GJPCARD0089163	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	TOOLS	109.97		
231307731	UNITED REFRIGERATION INC	GJPCARD0089164	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	BELTS AND TOOLS	167.56		
VEN001983	Tractor Supply Company	GJPCARD0089165	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	SCREWS	4.74		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089166	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	TOOLS	51.44		
VEN010615	EBAY	GJPCARD0089183	9/8/2022	640015343	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	Sports Campus-Bldg Maint	80.00		
Subtotal for Grand Park							2,507.30		
Sport Campus Indoor Event Ctr									
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0088825	9/8/2022	640023224	GP Indoor-Operating Supplies	CHEMICALS	12.93		
020721755	M2 COMMERCE, LLC	GJPCARD0088853	9/8/2022	640023224	GP Indoor-Operating Supplies	CHEMICALS	85.16		
820544687	AMAZON.COM, INC.	GJPCARD0088854	9/8/2022	640023223	GP Indoor-Office Supply	OFFICE SUPPLIES	9.34		
VEN002022	UNITED STATES POSTAL SERV	GJPCARD0088905	9/8/2022	640023223	GP Indoor-Office Supply	OFFICE SUPPLIES - STA	36.00		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088986	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	FIRE SPRINKLER COVER	37.95		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0088990	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	FIRE SPRINKLER COVER	148.00		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089002	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	FAUCET	56.90		
020721755	M2 COMMERCE, LLC	GJPCARD0089008	9/8/2022	640023224	GP Indoor-Operating Supplies	CHEMICALS	94.90		
VEN001337	Menards	GJPCARD0089045	9/8/2022	640023224	GP Indoor-Operating Supplies	CHEMICALS	52.53		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089086	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	ELECTRICAL PLUG	11.99		
VEN000800	Grainger	GJPCARD0089104	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	FAUCET	64.80		
770430924	PAYPAL	GJPCARD0089107	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	CHEMICAL	120.93		
		GJPCARD0089112	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	DOOR CLOSER	72.99		

Purchase Card Register

City of Westfield

9/8/2022 10:46 AM

Page 16 of 16

WESTFIELD\KGAGNON

Buy-From Vendor No.	Buy-From Vendor Name	Document No.	Posting Date	G/L Acct.	G/L Account Name	Description	Amount	Check No.	Check Date
Fund No. Fund Name									
640 Sports Campus Operating									
Sport Campus Indoor Event Ctr									
VEN001235	Lee Supply Corp	GJPCARD0089126	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	MIXING VALVE	898.73		
VEN000946	IN BMV VEHICLE SER	GJPCARD0089146	9/8/2022	640023343	GP Indoor-Bldg Maint	ELEVATOR PERMIT	131.98		
Subtotal for Sport Campus Indoor Event Ctr							1,835.13		
Subtotal for Fund 640 Sports Campus Operating							4,342.43		
Posted Invoices Total							111,182.39		

Westfield City Council August 31, 2022

The Westfield City Council held a 2023 budget meeting on August 31, 2022 (10:00 AM) at Westfield City Hall. Present were Scott Frei, Scott Willis, Cindy Spoljaric, Jake Gilbert, Troy Patton, and Joe Edwards. Marla Ailor, representing the Clerk's office, was in attendance. Manny Herceg attended virtually.

Joe Edwards called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM

2023 Budget Discussion

Jeremy Lollar presented stating the National Cost of Living rose by 10%. The city is requesting a 5% salary increase across the board.

Administration Budget

Mr. Lollar covered the Administration budget stating the main increase was in the salary line due to the previous chief of staff's benefits (100%) and 50% of his salary coming from a different department. There was also an ask to add a paid intern to the Finance Department and a vacation rollover payout of \$59,165.

Police Budget

Chief Rush stated that in 2023 the department is requesting three additional police officers totaling \$351,165. including salaries, benefits, uniforms, and equipment. Vehicle fuel line has a proposed increase due to cost per gallon increase. There is a request to add ten additional police vehicles and equipment.

Community Development

Kevin Todd presented stating that a 2022 position was postponed to 2023 so they would be filling that position. The consulting budget would be reduced by \$30,000. Revenue for 2023 is increasing, and construction dollars will be added to buildout three individual offices in what is now a conference room. This increase would include basic furnishings for the office.

Westfield Welcome

Kayla Arnold stated she is requesting to hire one full time event coordinator, move one current part-time employee, to full time, and hire another part-time person to fill that position. Kayla is also purposing to hire five part-time seasonal employees to manage the Ice Ribbon at Grand Junction Plaza (November 18-December 31, 2023). She is requesting an increase in the promotion line due to the increase in the cost of fireworks, and adding additional events in 2023.

Economic Development

Kai Chuck presented stating that there is a proposed increase in subscriptions and dues (mainly Chamber), and a decrease in travel training.

Informatics

Chris Larsen presented stating he proposes to hire a GIS Technician, promote a team member from System Analyst to Senior Business Analyst. The focus of the Business Analyst would be on technical issues within the police and fire departments, improving efficiency, and effectiveness of the current technology systems. Chris also requests increases in operating supplies, and computer equipment lines.

Clerk Treasurer

Kerri Gagnon and Micha Farrar presented stating the office requests to hire a Project Research person. There is a decrease in the insurance line as two of the CT employees do not use the city insurance. Councilor Patton requested the consulting line be reduced.

Mayor

Cost of Living Increase

City Council

Councilor Patton stated he would like to see the legal line reduced.

Fire

Chief Roberts presenting stating they are requesting to fill twelve new positions due to the increase in call volume and the demand for service on the rise. These new positions would require an additional increase in the '77 PERF Fund as well as the travel training line. Vehicle leases, and vehicle gas/supply lines have requested increases as well.

Board of Public Works

Johnathon Nail presented stating that they are requesting a new position in Parks Department due to the growth of the city. Revenue for Stormwater is projected to increase if the new stormwater rate goes up. Anticipated additional appropriations for 2022 include PW- Electric, MVH-Vehicle Gas/Supplies, MVH-Subgrade materials, and MVH-Equipment Repair.

Grand Park

Matt Trnian stated his request is to hire a Grounds Assistant to do the irrigation on campus and an Operations Assistant. There was council discussion on projected revenue and expenses in 2023 and what additional appropriations might be needed in 2022.

Guest Services

Rachelle Freed stated there are no new staff/promotions being requested in 2023.

Communications Department

Chris Proffitt presented requesting to hire 2 paid summer interns @\$15/hour for 10 weeks in 2023. Expense line totals increased by \$1,400 due to subscription dues, and social media boosts. Media monitoring was moved from Consulting line to Services line. Councilor Patton initiated discussion on the purpose of this department.

Human Resources

Bradie Louks stated she is requesting an additional person be added to HR. A new Employee Engagement & Professional Development Activity line is being requested (\$3,000) to cover all teams events, D,E, and I trainings, lunch and learns. An additional appropriation is anticipated for 2022.

Council discussion/comments were made.

Meeting adjourned at 1:07 PM

Clerk-Treasurer

President

ORDINANCE NO. 22-36

2022047501 ORDINANCE \$25.00
09/27/2022 12:41:25P 4 PGS
Jennifer Hayden
HAMILTON County Recorder IN
Recorded as Presented

ORDINANCE TO ADJUST THE STORMWATER UTILITY FEE

WHEREAS, the City of Westfield ("City") provides collection, disposal and drainage of storm and surface water for its residents ("Stormwater Utility");

WHEREAS, the City established the Stormwater Fee Schedule on April 16, 2016, Ordinance 16-08 and approved a basic monthly stormwater service charge of \$4.16 per ERU;

WHEREAS, Ordinance 16-08 instructs the City Council ("Council") to revisit the rate structure used to determine the Stormwater User Fee every 5 years and may adjust it accordingly to meet the needs of the city stormwater program;

WHEREAS, the City has updated its Stormwater Master Plan that includes stormwater capital projects to improve serviceability, to protect public infrastructure and property, to improve public health and safety, and to comply with the federal stormwater quality regulations;

WHEREAS, the Stormwater Management Division ("Division") within the Department of Public Works ("Department") has updated its stormwater program costs for projects within the corporate boundary of the City of Westfield, Indiana ("District") and found that the existing rates and charges for the use of services provided to City residents by the Stormwater Utility do not produce sufficient revenue to satisfy the fiscal needs of the stormwater program;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the Westfield City Common Council meeting in session as follows:

Section 1. The Council adopts and approves the stormwater user fees as recommended by the Division for the District, to wit:

- a. The monthly Stormwater User Fees shall be uniform for all residential property units located in the District, and same shall be assigned one (1) Equivalent Residential Unit ("ERU"). Except for apartments which would pay multiple ERUs based on the amount of impervious area similar to non-residential properties.
- b. The monthly Stormwater User Fees for all non-residential properties located in the District shall be determined by using an ERU multiplier, which shall be the quotient obtained by dividing the total square feet of impervious surface area within a non-residential property by a divisor of 3,500 square feet, which quotient will then be multiplied by the ERU to obtain the Stormwater User Fee, except that the monthly Stormwater User Fee for a non-residential property located in the District shall not be less than one (1) ERU.
- c. The monthly Stormwater User Fees for all tax-exempt municipal property located in the District shall be the product of the ERU multiplied by 0.50.
- d. The monthly Stormwater User Fees for all unimproved property located in the District shall be the product of the ERU multiplied by 0.33.

COPY

- e. A 5-year graduated ERU shall be implemented for all properties in the District. The first year, starting January 1, 2023 the ERU will be \$4.55, the second year \$4.94, the third year \$5.33, the fourth year \$5.73 and the fifth year \$6.13.
- f. On January 1 of each year beginning in 2028, a 3% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) shall be added to the previous year's rates and charges. This 3% shall occur automatically each year unless and at such time the Council amends or adjust the percentage of the COLA increase for the next fiscal year.

Section 2. If the monthly Stormwater User Fee is not paid by its due date, as stated on the Division's fee invoice, which may be combined with and made a part of the City's billings issued pursuant to City Ordinance 07-23. Section 5c, a late charge of ten percent (10%) will be assessed, together with the costs of collection, if any, including reasonable attorney's fees.


Section 3. The Department shall be responsible for calculating and assessing all monthly Stormwater User Fees and for establishing billing and collection procedures for the same, and for taking all other lawful actions, including, but not limited to, those set forth in City Ordinance 07-23, as are necessary or convenient in order to implement the City's stormwater management and user fee system.

Section 4. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and upon its adoption in accordance to the law. All ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed. The invalidity of any section, clause, sentence or provision of this Ordinance shall not affect the validity of any other part of this Ordinance which can be given effect without such invalid part of parts.

ALL OF WHICH IS ORDAINED THIS 12th DAY OF Sept, 2022.

WESTFIELD COMMON COUNCIL

Voting For


Joe Edwards


Scott Frei


Jake Gilbert


Mike Johns

Troy Patton


Cindy L. Spoljaric


Scott Willis

Voting Against

Joe Edwards


Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns


Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Abstain

Joe Edwards

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

ATTEST:


Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security Number in this document, unless required by law: Christopher B. Burke Engineering, LLC

I hereby certify that ORDINANCE 22-36 was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield on the 14th day of September, 2022 at 9:40 A.M.

Cindy Gossard
Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer


I hereby APPROVE Ordinance 22-36
this 14th day of September, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook
J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I hereby VETO Ordinance _____ this
_____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

This instrument prepared by:
Christopher B. Burke Engineering, LLC 115 West Washington Street Suite 1368, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.
(317)266-8000



ORDINANCE 22-31

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND PROVISIONS
IN THE WESTFIELD-WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP
UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE**

WHEREAS, the City of Westfield, (the "City") is a duly formed municipal corporation within the State of Indiana, governed by its duly elected Mayor and Common Council (the "Council"); and,

WHEREAS, it is the duty and the responsibility of the City to administer the Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance (the "UDO") throughout the City and Washington Township, Indiana as identified through the adoption of a Joinder Agreement; and,

WHEREAS, from time to time it is necessary to amend and revise the UDO, and pursuant to I.C. § 36-7-4-602 and I.C. § 36-7-4-701, the City is authorized to amend the UDO; and

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2022, the Westfield-Washington Township Advisory Plan Commission forwarded Petition No. 2028-ZOA-02 to the Council with a 7-0 recommendation in accordance with Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana, meeting in regular session, that the following provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance are amended as follows:

Section 1. **Article 6 Development Standards** shall be amended as follows:

A. Article 6.8 Landscaping Standards shall be amended as follows:

- A. Article 6.8(F)(3)(a)(ii) Selection, Installation, and Maintenance of Plant Materials; Installation; Timing and Permits;** shall be replaced as follows:
- ~~B. Landscaping and related improvements (e.g., paths, Development Amenity improvements, mounds) for Open Space, Development Amenities, Common Areas, Buffer Yards or External Street Frontage Landscaping shall be installed prior to the issuance of a subsequent Building Permit for more than fifty percent (50%) of the Lots within the Secondary Plat section in which the required landscaping or improvements located, or within twelve (12) months from when the first Building Permit in the Secondary Plat section was issued, whichever occurs first.~~
- B. Landscaping located within all Common Areas (e.g., Buffer Yards, External Street Frontage Landscaping, Parking Area Landscaping,**

COPY

Unified Development Ordinance Amendment

Detention and Retention Areas) shall require a performance bond, filed and approved with the Department, prior to the release of each section of a Secondary Plat in which the landscaping is located, unless as otherwise waived by the Director and in accordance with Article 10.9 Landscaping Bonds.

Section 2. **Article 10 Processes and Permits** shall be amended as follows:

- A. **Article 10.9** shall be relocated to Article 10.10 and subsequent Articles shall be relocated and renumbered in numerical succession. A new Article, titled **Landscaping Bonds**, shall be added as Article 10.9 as follows:
- B. **"Applicability:** This Article shall apply to all residential Subdivision Secondary Plats.
- C. **General:** A performance bond (the "Bond") acceptable to the City shall be required for Common Area Landscaping in residential Subdivision Secondary Plats and shall be executed prior to the recording of the Secondary Plat for each single section of a Subdivision.
 - a. **Requirements:** The Bond shall:
 - i. Be in an amount of one hundred and twenty five percent (125%) of the estimated costs determined by the City to be sufficient to complete the required Landscaping and installations in compliance with this Ordinance and any applicable Planned Unit Development (PUD) Ordinances or Zoning Commitments.
 - ii. Provide surety satisfactory to the City.
 - iii. Specify the time for the completion of the improvements and installations (see Article 10.9(F)(a)(iii)).
 - b. **Duration of Bond:** All Bonds shall be effective from approval of the Bond as formalized in a Bond approval letter sent to the Applicant confirming the Bond has been accepted by the Department. The Bond shall not be released until the Department has certified that it has inspected the required Common Area Landscaping after completion and that they have been installed in accordance with the intent of the approved Landscape Plan.
 - c. **Alternative Guarantees:** Nothing in this Article shall in any way limit the ability of the City to consider other alternative forms of insuring the proper completion of Subdivisions involving required Landscaping in Common Areas which is to be approved on a plat.
- D. **Application:** An Applicant shall submit a completed application to the Department on a form provided by the Department with supplemental information. Applications, estimates, warranties, the breakdown of Landscaping and the Landscape Plan filed by an Applicant for a Bond shall be checked by the Department.

Unified Development Ordinance Amendment

- E. Supplemental Information: Any persons, who shall make application for a Bond, shall, at the time of making such application, furnish the below items:
- a. Estimate: Written estimate of total cost of materials, installation and any additional costs related to the Common Area landscaping.
 - i. Contractor quote(s): A quote or quotes from the contractor(s) supplying and/or installing the required Common Area Landscaping. Quotes so furnished shall become a permanent public record, shall be used in determining compliance with the submitted Bond.
 - ii. Miscellaneous costs associated with the Common Area Landscaping that are not included in the contractor quote(s).
 - b. Warranty: A warranty made between the Developer and the home owner's association, or property management group, which includes the duration of the warranty and what is covered under the written agreement of the warranty.
 - c. Breakdown of Landscaping Quantities: A detailed breakdown of the required Common Area Landscaping including the quantities of plantings and their associated costs. Plantings shall include, but are not limited to, shade, ornamental and evergreen trees, shade, ornamental and evergreen shrubs, all groundcover materials and/or plantings.
 - d. Landscape Plan: The Applicant shall provide the Landscape Plan accepted by the Public Works Department. If this Landscape Plan differs from the Landscape Plan approved by the Plan Commission, said plan shall be submitted to the Department, administratively reviewed and approved (unless as otherwise specified in Article 10.7 Development Plan Review).
- F. Acceptance of Bond: Once the Applicant's submitted application and other supplemental information has been reviewed and approved, the Bond shall be submitted to the Department for the approved amount.
- G. Release of Bond:
- a. Inspection: Inspections of the work completed as are necessary to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Ordinance and the terms of the Bond.
 - i. It shall be the Developer's responsibility to request an inspection and summary of noncompliant Landscaping upon completion of the required Common Area Landscaping.
 - ii. Re-inspections of work found to be incomplete or not ready for inspection may be subject to assessment of re-inspection fees as prescribed herein.
 - iii. If an inspection has not been requested and Common Area Landscaping has not been completed within twelve (12)

Unified Development Ordinance Amendment

months of the Secondary Plat's recording, the Department shall pull the Bond on file, unless modified by the Director.


1. Should a Bond be pulled, the Department shall not release any additional Improvement Location Permits for the Bonded section of the Secondary Plat until Landscape compliance is achieved.
- b. Certificate of Compliance: Once an inspection has been passed, a Certificate of Compliance shall be sent to the Applicant confirming the completion (see also Article 10.4 Certificate of Compliance).
- c. Release of Bond: No Bond shall be released until a Certificate of Compliance has been issued. Once the Certificate of Compliance has been issued, the Bond may be released upon request by the Applicant.
- d. Change of Bond: Should there be, at any time, either i) a re-submittal of the current Bond on file with the Department, or ii) a new Bond with the intent of replacing the current Bond on file with the Department, the new Bond shall be submitted, reviewed and approved by the Department prior to the release of the current Bond on file with the Department. The submittal, review and approval shall follow the same procedures as stated in this Ordinance.
- e. Substitutions: Should there be, at any time, substitutions for any Common Area Landscaping and as approved on the Landscape Plan, the Applicant shall either i) submit an updated Landscape Plan reflecting the substitutions, or ii) submit information that clearly identifies and describes Landscaping that is being substituted and receive Department's approval of the substituted Landscaping."

Section 3.

This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect in accordance with Indiana law, upon the passage of any applicable waiting periods, all as provided by the laws of the State of Indiana. All ordinances or parts thereof that are in conflict herewith are hereby ordered repealed. All acts undertaken to in creation of this Ordinance are hereby ratified.

[The remainder of this age intentionally left blank.]

ALL OF WHICH IS ORDAINED THIS 12th DAY OF Sept, 2022.
WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Voting ForVoting AgainstAbstain

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards

James J. Edwards


Scott Frei


Scott Frei

Scott Frei


Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert


Mike Johns

Mike Johns

Mike Johns


Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton


Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric


Cindy L. Spoljaric


Scott Willis

Scott Willis


Scott Willis

ATTEST:


Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer

I hereby certify that ORDINANCE 22-31 was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield


on the 14th day of September, 2022, at 9:40 A m.


Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

Unified Development Ordinance Amendment

I hereby APPROVE ORDINANCE 22-31

this 14th day of September, 2022.



J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I hereby VETO ORDINANCE 22-31

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

This document prepared by:

Caleb Ernest, Senior Planner

City of Westfield, Community Development Department

2728 East 171st Street, Westfield, Indiana 46074 | (317) 804-3170

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security Number in this document, unless required by law: Caleb D. Ernest.

ORDINANCE NUMBER 22-34

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WESTFIELD AND WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP,
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA CONCERNING AMENDMENT TO THE UNIFIED
DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE**

This is a Planned Unit Development District Ordinance (to be known as the "AUSTRIAN PINE PUD DISTRICT AMENDMENT 1") to amend the Unified Development Ordinance of the City of Westfield and the Township of Washington, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Unified Development Ordinance"), enacted by the City of Westfield pursuant to its authority under the Laws of the State of Indiana, Indiana Code § 36-7-4 et seq., as amended.

WHEREAS, the City of Westfield, Indiana (the "City") and the Township of Washington, both of Hamilton County, Indiana are subject to the Unified Development Ordinance;

WHEREAS, the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Common Council") enacted Ordinance 19-12, Austrian Pine Planned Unit Development Ordinance on June 10, 2019;

WHEREAS, the Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission (the "Commission") considered a petition (**Petition No. 2209-PUD-18**), requesting an amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance with regard to the subject real estate more particularly described in **Exhibit A** attached hereto (the "Real Estate");

WHEREAS, the Commission did take action to forwarded **Petition No. 2209-PUD-18** to the Common Council with a favorable recommendation (7 Aye, 0 Nay ___ Abstain) in accordance with Indiana Code§ 36-7-4-607, as required by Indiana Code§ 36-7-4-1505;

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Commission certified the action of the Commission to the Common Council on September 7, 2022;

WHEREAS, the Common Council is subject to the provisions of Indiana Code § 36-7-4-1512 concerning any action on this request; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana, meeting in regular session, that the Unified Development Ordinance is hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Applicability of Ordinance.

- 1.1 All provisions and representations of the Unified Development Ordinance and Austrian Pine PUD Ordinance that conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby made inapplicable to the Real Estate and shall be superseded by the terms of this Ordinance.

COPY

- 1.2 Development of the Real Estate shall be governed by (i) the provisions of this Ordinance and its exhibits, (ii) the provisions of the Austrian Pine PUD Ordinance and its Exhibits, and (iii) the provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance (the "UDO"), as amended by the Austrian Pine PUD Ordinance, except as modified, revised, supplemented, or expressly made inapplicable by this Ordinance or the Austrian Pine PUD Ordinance, as amended.
- 1.3 All provisions and representations of the Unified Development Ordinance that conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby made inapplicable to the Real Estate and shall be superseded by the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 2. **Overlay Districts.** The Overlay District Regulations, Section 9.2 of the Austrian Pine PUD Ordinance shall be deleted and replaced in its entirety by the following:

- 2.1 **Article 5.3(G) Setback Requirements:** Shall apply except as modified below:
- A. A Maximum of two (2) buildings may exceed the Maximum Setback.
 - B. No two adjacent buildings shall be constructed at the same distance from the centerline of SR 32 in order to provide for staggered building setbacks.

Section 3. **Development Standards.** The Development Standards, Section 10.3 of the Austrian Pine PUD Ordinance, shall be amended by the addition of a new subsection "E" as follows:

- 3.1 **Utility and Building Expansion Areas.** Landscaping is restricted within drainage and utility courses (whether within or without an easement) that are required the City's Department of Public Works to service all building operations. As a result, if plantings required by this Ordinance are not permitted by the City along or within such Easements, utility service line routes, or building expansion areas, then the required plantings shall be relocated and installed elsewhere on the Real Estate. If the relocation of plantings results in planting congestion or is otherwise contrary to landscaping best management practices, then the Director or Plan Commission may approve a landscape plan with fewer plantings than otherwise required.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank. Signature page follows.]


ALL OF WHICH IS ORDAINED/RESOLVED THIS 12th DAY OF Sept, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Voting For


Voting Against

Abstain


Joe Edwards

Joe Edwards

Joe Edwards


Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei


Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert


Mike Johns


Mike Johns

Mike Johns


Troy Patton


Troy Patton

Troy Patton


Cindy L. Spoljaric

Troy Patton


Troy Patton


Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis

ATTEST:


Cindy Gossard, Clerk Treasurer

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security Number in this document, unless required by law: Kevin Buchheit.

I hereby certify that ORDINANCE 22-34 was delivered to the Mayor of

Westfield on the 14th day of September, 2022, at 9:40A M.

Cindy Gossard
Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE Ordinance 22-34

this 14th day of September, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook
J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I hereby VETO Ordinance _____

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

This instrument prepared by:

Kevin Buchheit, Krieg DeVault LLP, 12800 North Meridian Street, Suite 300, Carmel, Indiana 46032. (317) 808-5820.

EXHIBIT "A"
Legal Description

LOT 3 IN THE REPLAT OF LOT 3 IN THE REPLAT OF BLOCK A IN AUSTRIAN PINE
PUD SECONDARY PLAT, AS PER PLAT THEREOF, RECORDED OCTOBER 6, 2021 IN
PLAT CABINET 6, SLIDE 1168, INSTRUMENT NO. 2021072663 IN THE OFFICE OF THE
RECORDER OF HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA.

ORDINANCE NUMBER 22-06

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WESTFIELD AND WASHINGTON
TOWNSHIP, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA CONCERNING AMENDMENT TO
THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE**

"Towns at Union"

This is a Planned Unit Development District Ordinance (to be known as the "**Towns at Union PUD**") to amend the Unified Development Ordinance of the City of Westfield and Washington Township, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Unified Development Ordinance"), enacted by the City of Westfield pursuant to its authority under the laws of the State of Indiana, Ind. Code § 36-7-4 et seq., as amended.

WHEREAS, the City of Westfield, Indiana (the "City") and the Township of Washington, both of Hamilton County, Indiana are subject to the Unified Development Ordinance;

WHEREAS, the Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission (the "Commission") considered a petition (**Petition No. 2203-PUD-05**), requesting an amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance and the Zoning Map with regard to the subject real estate more particularly described in **Exhibit A** attached hereto (the "Real Estate");

WHEREAS, the Commission forwarded **Petition No. 2203-PUD-05** to the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana (the "Common Council") with a **FAVORABLE** recommendation (7-0 vote) in accordance with Indiana Code § 36-7-4-608, as required by Indiana Code § 36-7-4-1505;

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Commission certified the action of the Commission to the Common Council on August 16, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the Common Council is subject to the provisions of the Indiana Code §36-7-4-1507 and Indiana Code § 36-7-4-1512 concerning any action on this request.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Hamilton County, Indiana, meeting in regular session, that the Unified Development Ordinance and Zoning Map are hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Applicability of Ordinance.

- 1.1 The Unified Development Ordinance and Zoning Map are hereby changed to designate the Real Estate as a Planned Unit Development District to be known as the "**Towns at Union PUD District**" (the "District").
- 1.2 Development of the Real Estate shall be governed by (i) the provisions of this Ordinance and its exhibits, and (ii) the provisions of the Unified Development

COPY

Ordinance, as amended and applicable to the Underlying Zoning District or a Planned Unit Development District, except as modified, revised, supplemented or expressly made inapplicable by this Ordinance.

- 1.3 Chapter (“*Chapter*”) and Article (“*Article*”) cross-references of this Ordinance shall hereafter refer to the section as specified and referenced in the Unified Development Ordinance.
- 1.4 All provisions and representations of the Unified Development Ordinance that conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby made inapplicable to the Real Estate and shall be superseded by the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 2. **Definitions.** Capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Ordinance shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the UDO.

- 2.1 **“Front-Load Townhome”** A dwelling building including individual townhomes which have a garage and entry door on the same elevation facing the street.
- 2.2 **“Rear-Load Townhome”** A dwelling building including individual townhomes which have a garage on the rear elevation of the townhome and an entry door on the elevation facing the street.

Section 3. **Concept Plan.** The Concept Plan, attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, is hereby incorporated in accordance with Article 10.9(F)(2) Planned Unit Development Districts; PUD District Ordinance Requirements; Concept Plan.

- 3.1 The Real Estate shall be developed in compliance with Article 10.9(F) Planned Unit Development Districts; PUD District Ordinance Requirements. The details and determination between dry or wet detention/retention areas shall be finalized at the time of Secondary Plat and Construction Plan review.
- 3.2 The Real Estate shall be developed in substantial compliance with the Concept Plan.
- 3.3 The Concept Plan includes “Front-Load Townhomes” and “Rear-Load Townhomes” which dwelling orientations are identified on **Exhibit C** and are further regulated under the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 4. **Underlying Zoning District.** The Underlying Zoning District shall be SFA: Single-Family Attached District.

Section 5. **Permitted Uses.** The permitted uses shall be limited to Townhome Dwellings.

- 5.1 **Maximum Dwellings:** The total number of Dwelling Units permitted in the District

shall not exceed seventy-three (73).

Section 6. General Regulations. The standards of Chapter 4: Zoning Districts, as applicable to the Underlying Zoning District, shall apply to the development of the District, except as otherwise modified below with the following table which replaces and supersedes the Section 4.9 (A-L) of the UDO:

Standard	
Minimum Lot Area	No Minimum
Minimum Lot Frontage	No Minimum
Maximum Density	See Section 5.1
Maximum Dwelling Units Per Building	6
Maximum Project Size	13 Acres
Minimum Building Setback Lines from perimeter of Real Estate	
Setback from Union Street (stoop and porch may encroach)	10'
Setback form north perimeter of Real Estate	25'
Setback form east perimeter of Real Estate	80'
Setback from south perimeter of Real Estate	80'
Minimum Driveway Length	20'
Minimum Internal Building Setbacks	
Setback from internal street	0'
Side Yard & Rear Yard	0'
Minimum Distance Between Structures	20'
Maximum Lot Coverage	100%
Minimum Lot Width	20'
Maximum Building Height	2 Stories
Minimum Living Area (Total) Per Dwelling Unit	1,800sqft

Section 7. Development Standards. The standards of Chapter 6: Development Standards shall apply to the development of the District, except as otherwise modified below.

7.1 **Article 6.3 Architectural Standards:** Article 6.3 shall not apply, rather, the following shall apply:

- A. **Character Exhibit:** The Character Exhibit for Townhomes, attached hereto as **Exhibit D**, is hereby incorporated to capture the intended architecture of townhouses to be constructed. It is not the intent to limit the architecture shown in the Character Exhibit, but to establish a benchmark for quality, vision, and appearance of architecture within the

development. The Department shall determine whether a structure is consistent with the established benchmark and complies with the standards of this Ordinance. The Department's decision may be appealed to the Plan Commission.

B. Building Materials: Permitted exterior building materials are as follows:

- i. Masonry Material (brick or cultured stone), LP smart trim, composite trim, composite veneer panels, vinyl shutters, aluminum facia, aluminum soffits, aluminum downspouts/gutters.
- ii. Vinyl siding shall be prohibited.

C. Roof Standards:

- i. The primary/main roof overhang or eaves shall be a minimum of eleven inches (11") on all facades of each Building, as measured prior to the installation of any Masonry Materials.
- ii. Dimensional shingles are required with metal roof accents permitted.
- iii. Roof Pitch: The minimum primary/main and secondary roof pitches of all townhome buildings shall be no less than 6:12.
- iv. Shed roof dormer accents shall be no less than 3:12.

D. Dwelling Design: The following standards shall apply to all Townhomes:

- i. Perimeter Lots Fronting Union Street: Townhomes as shown on the Concept Plan (i) facing Union Street and (ii) the internal sidewalk opposite the entrance off of Union Street, shall require the front door to face the street/sidewalk and the garage shall face an internal street.
- ii. Garages: All Dwellings shall have a two (2) car garage.
- iii. Exterior Materials: Masonry wainscot shall be required at a minimum height of the lower of (i) 36" above grade, or (ii) the bottom of the first floor windows of each dwelling (masonry on all 4-sides of the dwelling).
- iv. Front Building Façade Requirements: At a minimum, each Dwelling shall utilize the following architectural elements on the front building façade (façade including the entry door – see

Exhibit C which identifies the front elevation) unless specifically noted otherwise:

- a) All units shall be offset a minimum two (2) feet, unit to unit.
 - b) All buildings shall have a minimum of three (3) materials, colors, or patterns on the front façade, one of which shall be masonry.
 - c) A minimum of four (4) windows.
 - d) A one by 4-inch nominal window trim board shall be provided unless the window is wrapped in masonry or shutters are provided.
 - e) Windows installed in a front door, garage door, a service door with a window, and transom windows in bathroom or storage areas shall count as one window for purposes of these requirements as long as the window(s) in the garage exceed an aggregate of four (4) square feet in size.
- v. **Side Building Façade Requirements:** At a minimum, the side elevation for each end unit on each Townhome building shall utilize the following architectural elements (exclusive of common firewalls separating units contained in same building structure):
- a) All side facades shall have a minimum of two (2) materials, colors, or patterns.
 - b) A minimum of two (2) windows shall be required .
 - c) A one by 4-inch nominal window trim board shall be provided unless the window is wrapped in masonry or shutters are provided.
 - d) Windows installed in a garage, a service door with a window, and transom windows in bathroom or storage areas shall count as one window for purposes of this requirement as long as the window(s) in the garage exceed an aggregate of four (4) square feet in size.
- vi. **Rear Building Façade Requirements:** At a minimum, each Dwelling shall utilize the following architectural elements on the Rear Façade (façade opposite the façade including the entry door):

- a) All rear facades shall have a minimum of two (2) materials, colors, or patterns.
- b) A minimum of four (4) windows shall be required.
- c) A one by 4-inch nominal window trim board shall be provided unless the window is wrapped in masonry or shutters are provided.
- d) Windows installed in a patio door, garage door and transom windows in bathroom or storage areas shall count as one window for purposes of this requirement as long as the window(s) in the garage exceed an aggregate of four (4) square feet in size.

7.2. Article 6.8 Landscaping Standards: Shall apply, except as otherwise modified or enhanced below.

- A. General Design Standards: Landscaping shall be as generally depicted on **Exhibit B**. If a provision of Article 6.8 Landscaping Standards is in conflict with **Exhibit B**, then this Ordinance shall control. Relocation of plant materials shall be permitted as part of the Detailed Development Plan approval.
- B. Tree Preservation: Article 6.8(E) Tree Preservation Standards in UDO shall apply. Trees shall be substantially preserved as shown on the Concept Plan as "Existing Trees".
- C. Easements: Article 6.8(G)(4)(f) Easements, of the UDO shall be modified as follows:
 - i. Landscaping shall be permitted within utility or drainage easements, so long as 10 ft separation from any storm sewer or subsurface drain is maintained.
- D. Ponds: Article 6.8(I)(1)(b), of the UDO, Wetlands/aquatic vegetation planted around the wet perimeter shall not apply.
- E. Street Trees: Article 6.8(J) Street Trees shall not apply.
- F. Lot Landscaping: Article 6.8(K) Minimum Lot Landscaping Requirements shall not apply. Rather, the following shall apply, as generally illustrated on the Concept Plan.
 - i. At a minimum, the yard between the entry door of a dwelling and

the street shall be sodded and the remainder of the Lot shall be seeded.

- ii. A minimum of: one (1) Shade Tree and four (4) Shrubs shall be required per Townhome Dwelling.
 - iii. Each Townhome on a Corner Lot shall have a minimum of one (1) additional Shade Tree required between the side of the dwelling and the street.
- G. Open Space/Common Areas: Five (5) trees per acre shall be required and provided on the Real Estate.
- H. External Street Frontages: Article 6.8(M)(1) External Street Frontage Landscaping Requirements shall not apply.
- I. Buffer Yards: Article 6.8(N) Buffer Yard Requirements shall apply except as otherwise modified below.
- i. The south Buffer Yard shall be Twenty-five (25) feet in depth and a metal fence of the type and style depicted in **Exhibit E** shall be required along the perimeter of the south Buffer Yard.
 - ii. Trees to be preserved shall constitute the required Buffer Yard tree plantings. No shrubs or mounding shall be required.
 - iii. All buffers shall preserve existing trees, supplemental plantings not required.
- J. Vision Clearance: Article 6.19 shall be modified to require a thirty (30) feet maximum at Union Street and internal streets.

Section 8. **Infrastructure Standards.** The District's infrastructure shall comply with the Unified Development Ordinance and the City's Construction Standards (see Chapter 7: Subdivision Regulations) except as modified below, unless otherwise approved by the Plan Commission or Department of Public Works in consideration to the preservation of the natural topography and environment and in consideration to the unique design intent of the District.

Section 9. **Design Standards.** The standards of Chapter 8: Design Standards shall apply to the development of the District, except as otherwise modified below.

- 9.1 Minimum Open Space: Open Space (green space area on lots, common areas and the area of ponds) shall be a minimum of thirty (30) percent and as generally shown

on the Concept Plan. Pond area shall be included in Open Space.

- 9.2 Article 8.6(H) Multi-family Districts: Shall not apply, rather site amenities shall include (i) a covered gathering structure, (ii) dog park, and (iii) a bike maintenance station, the character of which is generally illustrated on **Exhibit F**.
- 9.3 Article 8.7(C): shall not apply, instead the following shall apply: The minimum sidewalk width shall be five (5) feet, regardless of location or design. Five (5) foot sidewalk abutting roll curb shall be permitted and sidewalks shall be provided as generally shown on the Concept Plan.

Section 10. **Duration.** Failure to obtain Secondary Plat / Construction Plan approval for the District by January 1, 2028 (unless otherwise extended by the Director) shall automatically void this Ordinance and cause the zoning classification of the Real Estate to revert to the AG-SF 1 District.

Section 11. **Severability.** If any term or provision of this ordinance is held to be illegal or unenforceable, the validity or enforceability of the remainder of this ordinance will not be affected.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank, signature page follows]

ALL OF WHICH IS HEREBY ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF
WESTFIELD, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA THIS 12th DAY OF Sept, 2022.

WESTFIELD CITY COUNCIL
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA

Voting For

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Voting Against

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Scott Willis

Abstain

James J. Edwards

Scott Frei

Jake Gilbert

Mike Johns

Troy Patton

Cindy L. Spoljaric


Scott Willis

ATTEST:

Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer


I hereby certify that **ORDINANCE 22-06** was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield

on the 14th day of September, 2022, at 9:40 A m.


Cindy J. Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE Ordinance 22-06

this 14th day of September, 2022.


J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I hereby VETO Ordinance 22-06

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that I have taken reasonable care to redact each Social Security number in this document, unless required by law: Jon C. Dobosiewicz

This document prepared by: James E. Shinaver and Jon C. Dobosiewicz; Nelson & Frankenberger
550 Congressional Blvd, Suite 210, Carmel, IN 46032 (317) 844-0106

SCHEDULE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A	Real Estate (Legal Description)
Exhibit B	Concept Plan
Exhibit C	Dwelling Orientation Exhibits
Exhibit D	Dwelling Character Exhibits
Exhibit E	Fence Exhibit
Exhibit F	Amenity Character Exhibits

EXHIBIT A
REAL ESTATE
(Page 1 of 2)

Part of the Southwest Quarter of Section 6, Township 18 North, Range 4 East of the Second Principal Meridian, in the City of Westfield, Washington Township, Hamilton County, Indiana, based on a survey prepared by Michael G. Judt, Professional Surveyor Number 21500017, HWC Engineering, Project Number 2019-243-A, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Southwest corner of said Southwest Quarter, marked by a Harrison Monument found per Hamilton County Surveyor reference ties; thence North 00 degrees 15 minutes 36 seconds West (grid bearing, Indiana State Plane, East Zone, NAD 83, 2011, EPOCH 2010.0000) along the west line of said Southwest Quarter a distance of 324.72 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, marked by a mag nail with washer stamped "HWC ENGINEERING FIRM #0114"; thence continuing North 00 degrees 15 minutes 36 seconds West along said west line a distance of 847.06 feet to a southwest corner of a tract of land described in Instrument Number 200000054546 in the Office of the Recorder of Hamilton County, Indiana, the following two (2) courses being along a south and west line of said tract; (1) thence North 89 degrees 29 minutes 37 seconds East a distance of 660.00 feet; (2) thence South 00 degrees 15 minutes 36 seconds East a distance of 659.86 feet to a southwest corner of said tract; thence continuing South 00 degrees 15 minutes 36 seconds East along the southerly extension of the previous line a distance of 190.45 feet to a 5/8-inch rebar with cap stamped "HWC ENGINEERING FIRM #0114"; thence South 89 degrees 46 minutes 31 seconds West a distance of 659.99 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, containing 12.859 acres, more or less.

EXHIBIT A
REAL ESTATE
(Page 2 of 2)





EXHIBIT B
CONCEPT PLAN
(Page 1 of 1)



Note: Larger scale paper and digital copies of the Concept Plan are on file with the Department of Economic and Community Development under Docket Number 2203-PUD-05.

EXHIBIT C
DWELLING ORIENTATION EXHIBIT
 (Page 1 of 1)




EXHIBIT D
DWELLING CHARACTER EXHIBITS
(Page 1 of 2)



EXHIBIT D
DWELLING CHARACTER EXHIBITS
(Page 2 of 2)



EXHIBIT E
FENCE EXHIBIT
(Page 1 of 1)



EXHIBIT F
AMENITY CHARACTER EXHIBITS
(Page 1 of 2)



EXHIBIT F
AMENITY CHARACTER EXHIBITS
(Page 2 of 2)



RESOLUTION 22-113

A RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WESTFIELD AMENDING IN PERTINENT PART RESOLUTION 14-122

WHEREAS, The City of Westfield, ("City") is a duly formed municipal corporation within the State of Indiana, governed by its duly elected Mayor and Common Council ("Council"); and,

WHEREAS, the Council acts as the legislative body of the City and has regular meetings each month; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 14-122 previously provided for a loan or temporary transfer, subject to repayment, of \$6,000,000.00 of Infrastructure Improvement Funds of the City to be utilized for the continued development of Grand Park; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 14-122 previously provided that repayment of the \$6,000,000.00 loan from the Infrastructure Improvement Funds for the continued development of Grand Park would be made as soon as assets become available. However, no such repayment, in full or part, has yet been made; and

WHEREAS, specific terms for repayment should now be established.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Common Council of the City of Westfield, Indiana, that:

Section 1. Resolution 14-122 is hereby amended to provide that specific repayments shall be made as follows:

- a. The sum of \$3,000,000.00 shall be repaid to the Infrastructure Improvement Funds on or before January 15, 2023.
- b. The remaining sum of \$3,000,000.00 shall be repaid to the Infrastructure Improvement Funds on or before December 1, 2023
- c. In the event that Grand Park is sold prior to the above dates, then and in those events the entire \$6,000,000.00 shall be repaid in full from the sale proceeds.

Section 2. This Resolution, and the remaining provisions of Resolution 14-122, shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and approval by the Mayor.

[THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

PASSED THIS 12th DAY OF AUGUST 2022, BY THE WESTFIELD COMMON COUNCIL,
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA.

WESTFIELD COMMON COUNCIL

Voting For

Voting Against

Abstain



Scott Willis

Scott Willis

Scott Willis



Jake Gilbert

Jake Gilbert


Jake Gilbert



Joe Edwards

Joe Edwards


Joe Edwards



Scott Frei

Scott Frei

Scott Frei



Mike Johns

Mike Johns


Mike Johns



Troy Patton

Troy Patton

Troy Patton



Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

Cindy L. Spoljaric

ATTEST:



Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby certify that RESOLUTION 22-113 was delivered to the Mayor of Westfield

on the 14th day of Sept, 2021, at 9:40 A m.

Cindy Gossard
Cindy Gossard, Clerk-Treasurer

I hereby APPROVE RESOLUTION 22-113

this 14th day of September, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook
J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

I hereby VETO RESOLUTION 22-113

this _____ day of _____, 2022.

J. Andrew Cook, Mayor

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

Docket Number: 2008-PUD-09
Petitioner: Northpoint Owners, LLC by Clark, Quinn, Moses, Scott & Grahn, LLP
Request: Petitioner requests a change of zoning for 183.5 acres +/- from the AG-SF1: Agriculture/Single-Family Rural District to the Northpoint II PUD District.

Enclosed Attachments: September 12, 2022, Adoption Consideration

1. Quisenberry-May, Janet	08/17/2020
2. Squire, Jean and Denice	08/17/2020
3. Savoy, Abby	08/17/2020
4. Schultz, Cheryl	08/17/2020
5. Miler, Ann & Glenn	08/17/2020
6. Beck, Dave	08/20/2020
7. Beck, Lucy	08/20/2020
8. Coy, Vicki	08/24/2020
9. Canada, Brad	08/26/2020
10. Hutchens, Brandon	08/27/2020
11. McCullough, Dale (via mail)	08/25/2020
12. Sommer, Joel & Heather	08/30/2020
13. McCullough, Dale	08/31/2020
14. Pedzinski, James	08/31/2020
15. Mundy, Dennis (via voicemail)	09/01/2020
16. Gudeman, Rebecca	09/02/2020
17. Smith, Amanda	09/08/2020
18. Dunbar, David & Sandy	09/08/2020
19. McCullough, Dale	11/14/2020
20. Dolvin, Steve	12/23/2020
21. Bolinger, Angie	12/29/2020
22. Dolvin, Steve	02/02/2021
23. Canada, Brad	02/02/2021
24. Koehler, Amy	02/02/2021
25. Evans, Kaitalyn & Justin	02/09/2021

26. Hinshaw, Elaine	02/09/2021
27. Santangini, Susannah	02/09/2021
28. May, Jim	02/10/2021
29. Hackman, Paige	02/10/2021
30. Quissenberry-May, Janet	02/10/2021
31. Schultz, Cheryl	02/10/2021
32. Quinlan, Brenda	02/10/2021
33. Kirkwood, Martin	02/11/2021
34. Graber, Jill	02/11/2021
35. Johnson, Ralph	02/11/2021
36. Goodrich, Chuck	02/11/2021
37. Pike, Wayne	02/11/2021
38. Gascho, Timothy	02/11/2021
39. Schillinger, Des	02/11/2021
40. McCullough, Dale	02/11/2021
41. Hogan, Lori	02/11/2021
42. Hogan, James	02/11/2021
43. Pike, Cathy	02/11/2021
44. Armstrong, Tim	02/11/2021
45. Wheeler, Wayne	02/11/2021
46. Lovett, Alyssa	02/11/2021
47. Wheeler, Christy	02/11/2021
48. Sommer, Ted and Carol	02/11/2021
49. Still, Allen	02/12/2021
50. Boyle, Patrick & Wendy	02/12/2021
51. Whitcomb, Sara	02/12/2021
52. Pedzinski, James	02/12/2021
53. Hinshaw, Melissa	02/12/2021
54. Gudeman, Rebecca	02/12/2021
55. Dunbar, David & Sandy	02/12/2021
56. Rusher, Justin	02/12/2021
57. Whaley, Brent	02/16/2021

58. Hunt Hackman, Paige	01/27/2022
59. Squire, Jean & Denice	01/30/2022
60. Christensen, Curt	01/31/2022
61. Gascho, TJ	01/31/2022
62. Mihal, Casey	01/31/2022
63. Canada, Brad	01/31/2022
64. Goodrich, Chuck	02/01/2022
65. Canada, Brad	02/01/2022
66. Quissenberry-May, Janet	02/02/2022
67. Vento, Frank & Sharon	02/02/2022
68. Mihal, Lori-Kate	02/02/2022
69. Still, Cami	02/03/2022
70. Quissenberry-May, Janet	02/03/2022
71. Miller, Kelly	02/03/2022
72. McGrath, Shari	02/03/2022
73. McGrath, Chris	02/03/2022
74. Tinder, Michael	02/03/2022
75. McGrath, Emily	02/03/2022
76. DePew, Andrew	02/03/2022
77. DePew, Patricia	02/03/2022
78. Still, Allen	02/04/2022
79. Still, Keaton	02/04/2022
80. Still, Ainsley	02/04/2022
81. Still, Corinne	02/04/2022
82. Megyese, Todd	02/04/2022
83. Williams, Jenny	02/04/2022
84. Miller, Chad	02/04/2022
85. Pedzinski, James	02/04/2022
86. Quisenberry-May, Janet	02/04/2022
87. May, Jim	02/04/2022
88. Hogan, James	02/07/2022
89. Wheeler, Wayne	02/09/2022

90. Wheeler, Christy	02/09/2022
91. Borshoff, David & Alessia	02/09/2022
92. May, Jim	02/10/2022
93. Pedzinski, Kathy	02/13/2022
94. Weaver, Casey	02/14/2022
95. Johnson, Ralph	02/14/2022
96. Quisenberry-May, Janet	02/14/2022
97. Pedzinski, Jacob	02/15/2022
98. Pike, Cathy	02/16/2022
99. Pike, Barry Wayne	02/16/2022
100. Emerson, JR	02/17/2022
101. Marcus, Edward	02/17/2022
102. Kirkwood, Martin	02/18/2022
103. Sommer, Ted & Carol	02/19/2022
104. Hastings, Jon & Lindsey	02/19/2022
105. Boyle, Patrick & Wendy	02/20/2022
106. Dues, Tony	02/20/2022
107. Elmore, Mitchell & Sammi	02/20/2022
108. Evans, Justin	02/21/2022
109. Sikora, Doug	02/21/2022
110. Bracken-Emerson, Jill	02/21/2022
111. Adams, Jon	02/21/2022
112. Corya, Adam	02/21/2022
113. Armstrong, Tim	02/21/2022
114. Furtado, Lidia & Kate	02/21/2022
115. Schillinger, Des	02/22/2022
116. Dunbar, David	02/22/2022
117. Dunbar, Sandra	02/22/2022
118. Gudeman, Rebecca	02/22/2022
119. Farrell, Eric	02/22/2022
120. Tatum, Susie & Randy	02/22/2022
121. Hogan, James	02/23/2022

122.	Whaley, Jennifer	02/21/2022
123.	Hunt, Keith & Lori	03/01/2022
124.	Canada, Brad	07/18/2022
125.	McGrath, Shari	07/20/2022
126.	Pedzinski, James	08/01/2022
127.	Mihal, Casey	08/08/2022
128.	May, Jim	08/08/2022
129.	Quisenberry-May, Janet	08/08/2022
130.	Still, Allen	08/09/2022
131.	Still, Keaton	08/09/2022
132.	Still, Ainsley	08/09/2022
133.	Still, Rinney	08/09/2022
134.	Love, Bradley	08/10/2022
135.	Goodrich, Chuck	08/10/2022
136.	Wheeler, Wayne	08/10/2022
137.	Tatum, Susie	08/10/2022
138.	Miller, Ann Glenn	08/10/2022
139.	Gascho, Timothy	08/11/2022
140.	Pedzinski, James	08/11/2022
141.	Hogan, James	08/11/2022
142.	Wheeler, Christy	08/12/2022
143.	Gudeman, Rebecca	08/14/2022
144.	Mihal, Casey	08/14/2022
145.	Pike, Cathy	08/15/2022
146.	Evans, Justin	08/15/2022
147.	Garcia, Marco	08/15/2022
148.	Emerson, JR	08/15/2022
149.	Sikora, Doug & Lorie	08/15/2022
150.	Pike, Wayne	08/15/2022
151.	Corya, Adam	08/15/2022
152.	Davis, Sara	08/15/2022
153.	Squire, Jean & Denice	08/15/2022

154.	Dues, Tony	08/15/2022
155.	Adams, Joe	08/15/2022
156.	Bracken-Emerson, Jill	08/15/2022
157.	Brooker, Dory	08/16/2022
158.	Schillinger, Des	08/22/2022
159.	Hogan, James	08/23/2022
160.	Pedzinski, James	08/26/2022
161.	Christensen, Curt	09/09/2022
162.	Canada, Brad	09/09/2022
163.	Wheeler, Wayne	09/09/2022
164.	Wheeler, Christy	09/09/2022
165.	Armstrong, Timothy	09/12/2022
166.	Pike, Wayne	09/12/2022
167.	Pike, Cathy	09/12/2022
168.	Bracken-Emerson, Jill	09/12/2022
169.	Schillinger, Des	09/12/2022
170.	Gudeman, Rebecca	09/12/2022
171.	Hinshaw, Melissa	09/12/2022

Pamela Howard

From: JANET QUISENBERRY <bichon2222@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 10:47 AM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Warning: This external email is from bichon2222@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

To the members of the Advisory Plan Commission,

Please vote **NO** on the Northpoint II proposal.

My name is Janet Quisenberry-May. One and a half years ago, I bought a half acre lot on Anthony Road. I live in a subdivision, but for years have longed to own property in a country a setting. When I bought this lot the couple who owned it were going to build, but Westfield would not allow them to put in a new septic system or hook in to the existing septic. I asked if they wanted to sell the lot. My thinking was it is a beautiful country lot with a beautiful field behind it. I would be able to sit at the lot and watch the seasons come and go. Enjoy the wildlife, birds, deer, and lightning bugs. Also, plant flowers, fruit trees, and a garden. According to the comprehensive plan for Westfield, this area is classified as rural residential; therefore, I thought it would be a safe place to purchase my little piece of heaven.

My neighbor on the south has lived there for 65 years. My neighbor on the north has lived there 35 years. Their properties back up to the same beautiful field as mine. The beauty of Anthony Road is outstanding country fields, nice homes, farmstead homes, and the beautiful tree tunnel. All one of a kind.

The east end of my little country lot is adjacent to the proposed Northpoint II development. The west end of the lot is Anthony Road. I have three huge trees on the west end. A maple, mighty oak, and magnificent sycamore. I love sycamores. They are a symbol to me of rural areas in Indiana. Our arborist looked at the oak and sycamore trees and said they are probably 150 to 200 years old. These two trees were probably there during the Civil War and have withstood the storms of time. I now find my dream lot endangered by the Northpoint II development. My trees are in danger too. They serve the Anthony Road area as air filters and add to the history of this country setting.

On August 13, 2020 I took part in a virtual public meeting with Holladay Properties and their attorney.

Here are some of my concerns:

Noise pollution from construction equipment and truck travel in and out of the site. Increased traffic especially on Anthony Road and SR 38 and US 31 will create noise, congestion, and air pollution.

Light pollution from the Northpoint II development will dramatically affect the night sky.

Buffers will be built right up to my east fence line. This is where I enjoy the lightning bugs and nesting bluebirds.

We have a little fire pit and one evening we roasted marshmallows and had s'mores in the midst of lightning bugs, quiet country sounds, and the bright stars above. It was a dream come true for me as I dreamt of many quiet summer evenings at my little country lot. Please see included photo of the evening sky and moon.

The Northpoint II proposal does not meet the zoning requirements of rural residential. Please vote **NO** on the Northpoint II proposal.

You see I'm in the final stages of very severe COPD. I was never a smoker, but all my life I have been plagued with pneumonia, asthma, and chronic bronchitis. At 36 years old I was diagnosed with emphysema. My husband and I are now in our seventies, and are looking forward to spending quiet hours at our peaceful and beautiful rural lot.

The thought of all the pollution from this commercial development plan makes me realize that I will no longer be able to sit at my quiet lot and enjoy the beautiful country view and peaceful evenings. The exhaust fumes of the additional truck and car traffic will make it very difficult for me to breathe because my lung function is less than 25%. When I bought my peaceful country lot, I never dreamed this would happen because it is zoned rural residential.

Please Vote **NO** concerning the Northpoint II proposal and all the problems it will create for my neighbors and me.

God bless you,

Janet Quisenberry-May
317-877-2146

Janet Quisenberry-May

Lot



Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: squiredc@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 12:19 PM
To: APC
Subject: Stop north point II PUD

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Warning: This external email is from squiredc@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Hi,

We are writing to you asking for your support to stop the Northpoint II proposed development.

We recently purchased a house on Anthony Rd. We love our house and we love the scenery Anthony Rd provides. It has the flavor and the visual markings of Brown County. People drive hours and hours to see the beauty of Brown County. Why would the city want to destroy that when there is already plenty of commercial space already set aside for development?

Developers have a alternative motive and it is usually not aligned with those who have invested in the community. We invested in Westfield by choosing to live and purchase property. We trusted that the city would hold true on its development plans. The people who live on Anthony Rd have a lot invested. This plan would definitely decrease the values of everyone's property.

The city of Westfield has a comprehensive plan that specifically states , pages 32-35, thar the city will encourage and maintain the rural country-like atmosphere and allow continuation of the rural patterns that define this area.

Please do not allow this proposal to pass. You are the ultimate decision makers and we desperately need your support in this matter.

Thank you,

Jean and Denice Squire
21035 Anthony Rd
Westfield , IN 46062
317-450-0716

Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: Abby Savoy <abby.savoy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 2:30 PM
To: APC
Subject: Opposing development for Northpoint II PUD Ordinance 20-25

Warning: This external email is from abby.savoy@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Good afternoon,

It has been brought to out attention that there has been some type of request to develop nearby our property.

My family and I oppose this development due to noise, traffic, pollution, and the loss of our "country" feel.

Please feel welcome to contact me at +13306472860.

Sincerely,
Abby Savoy

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Cheryl Schultz <camcschultz@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 5:05 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II

Warning: This external email is from camcschultz@icloud.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

As a 30 + year resident on Hinkle Road (on 5 acres of beautiful, peaceful, park-like property), I implore you to VOTE NO TO NORTHPOINT II DEVELOPMENT!

Thank you,

Cheryl Schultz

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Ann Miller <loveneverfails75@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 9:08 PM
To: APC
Subject: Proposed rezoning

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Warning: This external email is from loveneverfails75@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear Comitte Members

I am writing you in regards to the upcoming request to re zone the area on the northside of St Rd 38 between Anthony Rd & Moontown Rd.

This area is now zoned Rural and that is the way that myself, my family, neighbors & friends would like to keep it.

We have lived here on Anthony Rd for over 30 yrs. It is one of the most beautiful rural roads here in Hamilton County. Please do Not allow it to be ruined by allowing it to be zoned for commercial use! If I am not mistaken North Point on the South side of 38 still has lots & lots of acreage which has already been zoned for commercial which has not been utilized, Why do you need to rezone our beautiful little rural area further out?

Please Please do Not allow this to happen!

I appreciate your help in hearing my request & pray that you will listen to the home owners hearts regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

Ann & Glenn Miller
21188 Anthony Rd
Westfield, IN 46062

8/19/2020

Lucy and Dave Beck
20821 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062

City of Westfield
APC & City Council Members
130 Penn Street
Westfield, IN 46074

Dear Planning Commission & City Council Members,

I'm concerned about the Northpoint II Development. We have enjoyed our country living for nearly 20 years. It's been a perfect location for us for most of this time. We are very concerned about the Northpoint II Docket No. 2008-PUD-09.

We made a mindful choice to purchase our home in a Rural setting, on a large lot. We expected the setting of our home to remain in an Agricultural and Residential area. Changes occur and growth happens in every city. However, to rezone land that has ALWAYS been designated for housing and farming to Industrial does not protect the us as citizens. This development is the exact opposite of why we chose to purchase a home on Anthony Road.

We have already seen a major increase in the traffic on Anthony Road. Four years ago, when Northpoint I was being proposed, we were told that the roadways would be improved to accommodate traffic. This has not happened. We can hear more road noise than ever before. One of our neighbors was killed in a fatal car accident a few months ago due to hazardous traffic on Anthony Road. She was a beloved resident walking on Anthony with her granddaughter and her dog. We were told that SR38 was a hard stop and Industrial & Commercial businesses would not encroach on our road. This type of business will only make the roadways more dangerous and destroy what we fell in love with and negate why we decided to spend the past 20 year here.

In the event you allow this development to be constructed, you will be consciously deciding not to protect the citizens of Anthony Road, Hinkle Road and SR38. We purchased our home in a rural and agricultural setting. Placing an Industrial Park in our front yards, will negatively impact the largest purchase we have ever made. This is not acceptable.

Please do the right thing and instruct Mr. Wilkes and future developers to build their warehouses in areas that are with like-minded businesses.

Sincerely,

Dave Beck
20821 Anthony
Lucy and Dave Beck

8/19/2020

Lucy and Dave Beck
20821 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062

City of Westfield
APC & City Council Members
130 Penn Street
Westfield, IN 46074

Dear Planning Commission & City Council Members,

I'm concerned about the Northpoint II Development. We have enjoyed our country living for nearly 20 years. It's been a perfect location for us for most of this time. We are very concerned about the Northpoint II Docket No. 2008-PUD-09.

We made a mindful choice to purchase our home in a Rural setting, on a large lot. We expected the setting of our home to remain in an Agricultural and Residential area. Changes occur and growth happens in every city. However, to rezone land that has ALWAYS been designated for housing and farming to Industrial does not protect the us as citizens. This development is the exact opposite of why we chose to purchase a home on Anthony Road.

We have already seen a major increase in the traffic on Anthony Road. Four years ago, when Northpoint I was being proposed, we were told that the roadways would be improved to accommodate traffic. This has not happened. We can hear more road noise than ever before. One of our neighbors was killed in a fatal car accident a few months ago due to hazardous traffic on Anthony Road. She was a beloved resident walking on Anthony with her granddaughter and her dog. We were told that SR38 was a hard stop and Industrial & Commercial businesses would not encroach on our road. This type of business will only make the roadways more dangerous and destroy what we fell in love with and negate why we decided to spend the past 20 year here.

In the event you allow this development to be constructed, you will be consciously deciding not to protect the citizens of Anthony Road, Hinkle Road and SR38. We purchased our home in a rural and agricultural setting. Placing an Industrial Park in our front yards, will negatively impact the largest purchase we have ever made. This is not acceptable.

Please do the right thing and instruct Mr. Wilkes and future developers to build their warehouses in areas that are with like-minded businesses.

Sincerely,

Lucy Beck

Lucy and Dave Beck

Pamela Howard

From: Vicki Comcast <vickicoy@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 6:50 AM
To: APC
Subject: Stop land development

Warning: This external email is from vickicoy@comcast.net. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

I want my opinion heard about the proposed development of the land between Anthony and Henkel. We have been residence in South Harbour for over 20 years and the development of farm land to houses and buildings is just getting to be too much. There is already so much more traffic and in my opinion there are plenty of other existing buildings that business can go for their businesses to open. Please leave this property as farm land.

Vicki Coy
1229 Willow Way

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Canada, Brad <brad.canada@stryker.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 12:32 PM
To: APC
Subject: SR38 Industrial Development

Warning: This external email is from brad.canada@stryker.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Good afternoon Westfield Advisory Plan Commission,

My name is Brad Canada and live at 20945 Anthony Road. There has been numerous conversations going on among the neighbors that live on Anthony Road as well as up and down SR38. We know that there is a developer that is aggressively looking to gain approval to rezone a rural "residential" area into a massive industrial park. I wanted to share my perspective and reiterate that I would like your support to not approve this rezoning.

I have only been living in this area for 3 ½ years (grew up in Fishers) but the broader SR38/Anthony/31/Hinkle Creek northeastern part of Westfield is a special place. Driving up through Anthony feels more like Brown County vs Hamilton County. McGregor Park and Bray Family Park makes this area even more special but it's the surrounding areas that add to that. Westfield is a fast growing place and there is so many advantages to that and one that drew us to the area to begin with (schools, people, growth, amenities, etc). Growth in this area is a GOOD thing but there needs to be a balance to protect certain areas to offset the traffic, noise, etc. A HUGE industrial park was just approved south of SR38 that is still being developed so to approve another 180+ acre park + the future progression to then approve another 180+ acre plot on Anthony makes this rural area feel like we are down in Plainfield in the midst of their distribution and industrial areas. Westfield would then be losing a huge chunk of green space that could potentially be a nice residential area that could in theory connect both parks and be a place where the community could get away from the traffic, noise, chaos of what other parts could be.

I plan on raising my 3 young kids in this house and be here forever and part of that decision was giving them an area that was safe. I fear the traffic, I fear the amount of people commuting here daily that is not bought in or involved in this community, I fear the pollution/trash, and most importantly – I fear that this area and this community loses a huge part of what makes this community different that a Fishers, Carmel, or Noblesville. That is the ability to properly plan for future growth by also protecting pockets of the community that make it feel green and enjoy the beautiful scenes of nature and a rural setting in the pockets of heavy residential/commercial areas. I would MUCH more support a residential zoned area to drive population and keep the green area as close to what we can.

We do need industrial growth and areas to bring businesses here (which we have south of SR38 and pockets west on 31) but I strongly encourage you all to please have the voice of your residents and our strong views against turning the most beautiful area in all of central Indiana into a massive concrete industrial zone that would have a huge negative impact on so many people and so many things. Please consider our request to vote "NO" to rezone these areas as industrial north of 38. Please consider keeping the industrial growth and overall focus be on the land and acreage that has already been approved just south of 38. This Anthony Road area between the 2 parks could be an AMAZING area to have green space and parks for generations to come.

Respectfully,

Brad Canada
Brad.canada@stryker.com

703-431-4083

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

Pamela Howard

From: Brandon Hutchens <purduehutch@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2020 2:34 PM
To: planners; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint 2 Opposition

Importance: High

Warning: This external email is from purduehutch@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

To Whom It May Concern:

I live in the Coventry neighborhood off of Grassybranch south of 38 and my biggest concern is there will already be an industrial park to the west of our neighborhood I don't want to be completely surrounded by industrial parks and lose all the beautiful scenery around us!

I am already frustrated about Northpoint 1 but we do not want or need more industry in this area!!!! We will completely lose the feeling of rural North Westfield which helps give it its charm.

Please vote no to Northpoint 2 development.

Please let me know if I can help provide any more detail.

Thank you,
Brandon

Tuesday, August 25, 2020

Economic and Community Development Department
Planning & Zoning Division
Pam Howard, Senior Planner
2728 East 171st Street
Westfield, IN 46074

Re: Northpoint Owners, LLC. Docket No. 2008-PUD-09

Attention: Pam Howard

Enclosed please find my letter of commentary regarding the referenced matter.

Please make timely distribution of same to APC members Mike Johns, Cindy Spoljaric, Jenny Kellerher, Kristen Burkman, Victor McCarty, Randy Graham, Robert Horkay, Andre Maue and Dave Schmitz.

Also, please distribute to Westfield City Council members Scott Willis, Jake Gilbert, Joe Edwards, Scott Frei, Mike Johns, Cindy Spoljaric and Troy Patton.

Thank you for your kind assistance,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Dale McCullough".

Dale McCullough
21151 Anthony Rd.
Westfield, IN 46062
Phone 317 877 2223
Email daleretta@yahoo.com

Tuesday, August 25, 2020

Advisory Plan Commission (APC)
Westfield, IN

Re: Plan Commission Docket Number 2008-PUD-09

Rezone request of 180 acres at St. Rd. 38 and Anthony Rd. by Northpoint Owners, LLC

I am a long- term resident of Westfield having lived on St. Rd. 38 for 15 years and at my Anthony Rd. home for 45 years. I recently became aware of the above referenced rezone request to change the zone of the above acreage from rural agricultural / residential to commercial / industrial.

First of all, I wish to thank all APC members for your voluntary service to the Westfield community. I understand that you bear a substantial responsibility to review all requests for development within the Westfield and Washington Township. You provide a valuable service to the Westfield City Council by screening the broad variety of proposals that you must see.

I suggest to you APC members that the referenced rezone is a particularly dangerous proposal. Since the introduction of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) to the Westfield area it has become the rezone of choice beginning with the Aurora project also near my property. Developers favor PUD because it basically by-passes Hamilton County zoning adopted 50 to 60 years ago. With the PUD type zoning a parcel may include almost any sort of construction and use with possibly the only exclusion being hog or cattle farming. PUD tramples on the rights of adjacent home owners who have specifically chosen a quiet rural setting to establish their home and raise families. PUD strikes at the heart of the very reason our ancestors risked life and limb to migrate from the old world to America to own property and enjoy it in tranquility.

A further concern is the production of grains. The proposed rezone will result in the lose of 180 acres of fertile farm land currently in production. Recalling the recent experience of all of us in going to our local groceries and finding the bread shelves empty due to Covid-19 should give pause to us all in paving over more productive acres in favor of commerce and industry. It may be a stretch of imagination for us to think of America as becoming dependent on the importation of much of our food supplies from countries such as Communist China, but in time such could happen. We are called upon to be good stewards of our land because God isn't making any more land.

Respectfully submitted,

Dale McCullough
21151 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
Phone 317 877 2223
Email daleretta@yahoo.com

Tuesday, August 25, 2020

Westfield City Council
Westfield, IN

Re: Plan Commission Docket Number 2008-PUD-09

Rezone request of 180 acres at St. Rd. 38 and Anthony Rd. by Northpoint Owners, LLC

I am a long- term resident of Westfield having lived on St. Rd. 38 for 15 years and at my Anthony Rd. home for 45 years. I recently became aware of the above referenced rezone request to change the zone of the above acreage from rural agricultural / residential to commercial / industrial.

First of all, I wish to thank all City Council members for your voluntary service to the Westfield community. I understand that you bear a substantial responsibility to review all requests for development within the Westfield and Washington Township. You provide a valuable service to the City of Westfield by screening the broad variety of proposals that you must see.

I suggest to you City Council members that the referenced rezone is a particularly dangerous proposal. Since the introduction of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) to the Westfield area it has become the rezone of choice beginning with the Aurora project also near my property. Developers favor PUD because it basically by-passes Hamilton County zoning adopted 50 to 60 years ago. With the PUD type zoning a parcel may include almost any sort of construction and use with possibly the only exclusion being hog or cattle farming. PUD tramples on the rights of adjacent home owners who have specifically chosen a quiet rural setting to establish their home and raise families. PUD strikes at the heart of the very reason our ancestors risked life and limb to migrate from the old world to America to own property and enjoy it in tranquility.

A further concern is the production of grains. The proposed rezone will result in the lose of 180 acres of fertile farm land currently in production. Recalling the recent experience of all of us in going to our local groceries and finding the bread shelves empty due to Covid-19 should give pause to us all in paving over more productive acres in favor of commerce and industry. It may be a stretch of imagination for us to think of America as becoming dependent on the importation of much of our food supplies from countries such as Communist China, but it is already happening with certain types of foods. We are called upon to be good stewards of our land because God isn't making any more land.

Respectfully submitted,

Dale McCullough
21151 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
Phone 317 877 2223
Email daleretta@yahoo.com

Pamela Howard

From: Heather Sommer <sommer623@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2020 12:51 AM
To: APC; Council Members; Ginny Kelleher; Kristen Burkman; mjohns@c21scheetz.com; Mike Johns; Cindy Spoljaric; swilis@westfield.in.gov; Jake Gilbert; Scott Frei; Troy Patton
Subject: Northpoint proposal

Warning: This external email is from sommer623@hotmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Hello Commission Members and Council Members,

I am writing to you today as a concerned neighbor regarding the modification petition by Northpoint Owners. I have reviewed the proposed industrial and commercial development land use change for this section off of SR 38. We would ask that you please consider a "no" vote in this instance. This is specifically a rural residential area. All of the homeowners have chosen their homes to be in a rural setting. In fact, we purchased a property with log cabin and historic barn to escape the sprawl. This year alone we are investing close to \$50,000 just to protect that historic investment in mainly barn renovation (with some cabin as well). An industrial site seems ill-suited to this idyllic country setting. Additionally, we can only imagine it will decrease the property value as the property's selling point was its history and rural setting. For those of you that are familiar with local history, the Bray family owned much of this land. In fact, our property was also a Bray property as demonstrated by town records and engraving in the barn. There was even a pivotal moment for Hamilton County abolitionists at the very which this area is proposed. It was a defining moment for those taking in active role in abolition and the Underground Railroad and those who wanted to take a less hands on approach. The Hamilton County Parks and Historical Society of Westfield do a wonderful job sharing this story.

We all understand progress but we ask that it be more contained to current areas of Westfield under development or areas closer to other industrial areas. The light, noise, and environmental pollution will have a significant impact on those living in one of the few remaining rural areas of this portion of Hamilton County. The land around Anthony Road and the Bray family has a rich history that seems incongruent with the proposed land uses. When people come down our road (Anthony), they often comment how they feel a world away although just a short drive from modern conveniences. It really is a special part of Hamilton County. We would hate to see it lose that charm for a company whose goals are very different than current land and property owners.

Although it could be perceived as holding back development in this area, SR 38 seems like an appropriate line to separate the suburban sprawl from the rural draw. We kindly ask that you consider the appropriateness of this request by Northpoint.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to Westfield. We hope that such a special and historic area of Westfield can be protected for the current and future residents of the area.

Kind regards,
Joel and Heather Sommer
21244 Anthony Road

Pamela Howard

From: dale mccullough <daleshs54@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 12:25 PM
To: APC
Subject: Re-zone request by Northpoint Owners, LLC, Commission Doc. No. 2008-PUD-09

Warning: This external email is from daleshs54@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

I have notice of a hearing before the APC scheduled for September 8th, 2020 regarding a request by Northpoint Owners for development of Northpoint 2. Properties to be re-zoned are in Westfield Washington Twp. consisting of 180 acres at the north-east corner of St. Rd. 38 and Anthony Rd. Two on-line meetings by North Point representatives have occurred for effected residents to ask questions. At the second meeting a number of persons who's homes border the acreage voiced strenuous objections to a re-zone from Ag.1 / Single family to P.U.D. These residents had seen a list of 56 proposed uses that might be deemed appropriate in the P.U.D.. One of the residents has lived in his birth home for more than 70 years. His parents are now deceased. Other residents have owned their homes for a lesser period but have considerable equity invested both in both money and emotional attachment.

At this point I will note that the purchase of a home is usually the greatest investment in the lifetime of a family. Many considerations enter into the decision to buy or to build. There are 3 major factors, it is said, in determining the value of a property. The factors are said to be location, location and location. It is fair and accurate to state that families currently owning homes situated at St. Rd. 38 and Anthony have located there specifically because of the rural and peaceful setting. Now, if a re-zone to P.U.D. was approved it would bring about a major invasion the purposes of these families. More than one person on the phone conferences stated that they would be moving! Even so the selling price of their property would suffer. Who wants to live next to an amusement part, for example, or even office buildings or factories employing perhaps hundreds of workers and the traffic that would be a daily occurrence. It's a hazard to get off of Anthony and onto Rd. 38 now.

Growing cities and developers love the P.U.D. because of it's liberal interpretation of land use. Adjoining home owners suffer the consequences unless we step up to help protect their rights.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dale McCullough
21151 Anthony Rd.
Westfield, IN 46062

Please make distribution to all A.P.C. members

Pamela Howard

From: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 7:40 PM
To: planners
Subject: Northpoint II opposition

Warning: This external email is from jpedzinski@comcast.net. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear Westfield City Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed "Northpoint II PUD" development current under consideration with the Advisory Planning Commission.

From my research the Westfield comprehensive plan has the property zoned as AG-SF1 (Agriculture / Single Family) and the City Planning Commission is entertaining changing the zoning to commercial for the proposed PUD.

Thus, my objections focus the following issues:

A. Westfield Comprehensive Plan

- a. The Comprehensive plan was intentionally designed to minimize this type of disruption. Why deviate from the plan?
- b. Perhaps the Planning Commission propose moving the PUD north of 216th Street providing a real buffer from the noise, traffic, potential safety issues which will follow this type of development.

B. Tax Money vs Tax Incentives

- a. Has Northpoint II PUD requested favorable tax incentives? Where might we find this information?
- b. Has a survey been completed which documents the incremental impact with the residential tax base which the new housing developments bring to Westfield?

C. Residential Impact and New Home Construction

- a. The allure of moving to one of many new residential subdivisions along Moontown or Grassy Branch or St Rd 38 will be diminished, for the same reasons the Comprehensive plan was established to prevent.
- b. I assume the Planning Commission was part of the process for approving the numerous residential subdivisions already in process along Moontown/Hinkle Road, Grassy Branch Road, and Anthony Road, thus already have some understanding of the impact an industrial park, would have on residential property values.
- c. Will potential homeowners looking at the Westfield area, spend \$500,000 to \$900,000 or more to live next to or across the street from the industrial warehouse park?
- d. Most of my neighbors chose to move to this area to get away from this type of congestion, noise, and traffic.
- e. Many of the homeowners living in the county have "wells" for water. Has a study been completed to determine the impact this type of PUD would have on our local aquifer? What happens in the event of spillage of diesel fuel, oil and other chemicals which may be utilized in these warehouses?
- f. Noise Ordinance – will the noise ordinance be updated to stop all semi-truck traffic after 9 pm or before 7 am?

D. Nature Parks & Wildlife areas

- a. What is being proposed to protect the natural habitat in these areas?

- b. Warehouses, such as the proposed “food processing distribution center” illustrate semi-trucks getting loaded/unloaded, most likely around the clock thus noise, traffic, diesel pollution, etc.
- c. I am sure the Council is aware that there are nature preserves and wildlife areas abutting the proposed PUD, which adds to the beauty of the area

E. Roadways, Traffic & Safety

- a. The narrow roadways are built for county traffic, not fully loaded semi-trucks and construction traffic. Thus, consider the amount of road construction which will happen as well.
- b. Traffic accidents have already increased along these intersections due the new subdivisions. Perhaps the Council request the 2018 & 2019 accident files from INDOT.
- c. The fact that INDOT has prioritized the Moontown/Hinkle & St Rd 38 Intersection for the Conflict Warning System - reference the 08/26/2020 bulletin from INDOT - <https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/INDOT/bulletins/29b8dc7>, should suggest the amount of fatal accidents already documented.
- d. Throughout the day, crossing traffic is challenging and dangerous, I cannot imagine having a line of semi-trucks driving 50 mph or faster through these areas.

Thank you for listening to my objections and considering the impact to our peaceful community!

Sincerely,

James R Pedzinski
Moontown / Hinkle Rd
Email: jpiedzinski@comcast.net

September 2, 2020

Via voicemail

Dennis Mundy
20728 Anthony Road

I been a resident here for 65 years. I'm against the Northpoint for a lot of reasons: safety, traffic, pollution, noise, cars, drainage, more people, more drugs, destruction of the property of those who have lived there for many years. I can't I can't see anything good about it at all; that is my opinion. I would like to know about the upcoming meeting. I'm just expressing my concerns.

Thank you.

Pamela Howard

From: rwgudeman@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 1:11 PM
To: APC
Cc: 'Melissa Hinshaw'
Subject: Proposed Development - North and East of SR 38 and Anthony Rd

Warning: This external email is from rwgudeman@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

To whom it may concern –

This is being written to express concern about the proposed development North of 38/East of Anthony Rd. I live at the northwest corner of these two roads. My property is already compromised with the development along the south side of Indiana 38. This second development will further compromise our home as well as all my neighbors with the added noise and traffic; the building structures conflicting with the current rural homes and pastures. It also impacts ALL of Westfield by taking away the rural setting and open spaces we need. Too much industrial growth and reduction of green spaces has already been allowed... my appeal is to consider the big picture for conservation and be responsible for growth in all areas of the lives of the Westfield citizens.

Secondly, my understanding is that the Comp Plan Land Use Classification clearly establishes the area North of 38 to stay rural – and would take an amendment voted on in order to change. What makes Westfield beautiful and unique is the Comprehensive Plan to keep rural areas. With this proposed development, you are violating this plan.

I am asking that the APC vote against this current PUD – at least until further amendments and public voting on such changes be made.

Thank you.

Rebecca Gudeman

R W Gudeman LLC
20649 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
P: 317-840-1041
E: rwgudeman@gmail.com

Pamela Howard

From: Amanda Smith <asmith@ori.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 8:01 AM
To: APC; Council Members; Cindy Spoljaric; Ginny Kelleher; Kristen Burkman; Mike Johns; Scott Willis; Jake Gilbert; Joe Edwards; Scott Frei
Subject: Rezoning North of 38. Please read.

Warning: This external email is from asmith@ori.net. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear Council,

Good morning! My name is Amanda Smith and I am writing on behalf of the rezoning being voted on tonight. My husband, Ryan, and our family purchased acreage on the corner of Anthony and 216th just last June. We currently live in the subdivision of Centennial, which we have enjoyed for many years, but times are changing and everything around us is being developed. Trees and fields are no more. I understand this because of the location in the city. Because of this, however, we chose to purchase property in one of the furthest places to live and still be in Westfield and the school system that we love. To build in the rural setting comes with quite an expense of purchasing the acreage, putting in a septic and a well, a price we were willing to pay in an area zoned as such. Please consider those of us who have chosen to invest in the rural area of Westfield and keep it zoned that way. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,
Amanda Smith
21575 Anthony Rd.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Pamela Howard

From: Sandra Dunbar <sdunbar213@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:36 PM
To: APC
Subject: Re-zoning of property North of SR38 east of Anthony Rd and west of Hinkle Rd

Warning: This external email is from sdunbar213@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

We are residents of our home located at 21344 Anthony Road, Westfield IN 46062. We are writing to express our concerns about the rezoning of the land located at the northeast corner of Anthony Road and State Road 38. Our understanding is that the land is currently zoning for high density residential and that the owner wants to have the zoning changed to industrial.

Although we appreciate the benefits arising from land development we are opposed to this rezoning request. There are numerous locations in the City of Westfield that are currently zoned industrial where the same owner could purchase to accommodate their industrial clients needs. Most of the property owners adjacent to the proposed land have residential properties that would be adversely affected by an industrial building 40 feet tall regardless of a barrier. Additionally, if a commercial strip mall were developed on the land, the residential culture would also be disrupted.

We feel the current zoning is sufficient for the property owner to develop and benefit from the income of lot sales as opposed to sales to commercial and/or industrial clients.

Please consider our opposition not to prevent development built to the type of development. Thank you in advance for your consideration in our cause.

David and Sandy Dunbar

21344 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
317.696.0228 (David)
317.402.4650 (Sandy)

DISCLAIMER: This message is intended for the sole use of the addressee, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender by reply email and delete this message.

Sandra B. Dunbar
SBD Design
Space Planning and Interior Design
317.402.4650
sdunbar213@gmail.com

Pamela Howard

From: Dale McCullough <daleretta@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2020 5:14 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint Owners Petition, Northpoint II

Warning: This external email is from daleretta@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Northpoint Owners LLC have petitioned the City of Westfield to re-zone 189 acres north of St. Rd. 38 from AG, SF1 to PUD. The petition lists 56 specific uses for the acreage. All would likely not be employed, but the petition if accepted would permit any combination from Amphitheater/outdoor theater to Wholesalers. Currently the acreage includes 30 plus or minus family homes some of which are on the east side of Anthony Rd. and some on the west side. The open acres are fertile, productive farm ground. Northpoint describes the area as Northpoint II. Northpoint Owners describe their intended use as commercial and industrial.

It's difficult to imagine two uses of land more at polar opposites than commercial / industrial and family homes. Home ownership is the fulfilment of the American dream. Early immigrants risked life and limb to cross oceans to a new land that promised them the opportunity to own land and establish homes. In Europe for example land ownership was reserved for the titled royals. American families work and save to accumulate money for a down payment and then mortgage the home they hope to buy or build. Over time they personalize their homes by decoration and improvements. The home truly becomes their castle. Unless they are by nature city dwellers they choose a location that offers quiet enjoyment of their home, free from the traffic, noise and pollution so common in cities.

Northpoint Owners are in business to make a profit on their investment. They are not in the least concerned with adjacent homeowners. Everyone lives somewhere, but it's a safe bet the petitioners won't be living in the midst of their development. Early plans show two drives into Northpoint II. Both are to be accessed from St. Rd. 38. Imagine the safety hazards of workers coming and leaving Northpoint II daily. Add this to heavy traffic already commonly seen on 38. All other nearby roads are two lane county roads unsuited for the heavy traffic of supply and shipping semi-trailer trucks. St. Rd. 38 is already stopped twice within a mile of U.S. 31 and yet another stop planned at the rerouted East St. and 38.

It seems our first consideration should be for the long established vicinity home owners. They are taxpaying, voting neighbors. Their quality of life should be foremost in our minds.

The only responsible answer to Northpoint's petition should be a resounding "NO".

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dale McCullough
21151 Anthony RD.
Westfield, IN 46062

Please distribute to all APC members.

Pamela Howard

From: steve dolvin <steve.dolvin@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020 8:55 AM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II

Warning: This external email is from steve.dolvin@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

APC,

This email is intended to express my disapproval of the Northpoint II Proposal. I am a resident at 211th and Hinkle, which is on the northeast side of the proposed development. I have serious concerns regarding the community impact from this development.

Regards,
Steve Dolvin

Pamela Howard

From: Angie Bolinger <angbol2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 29, 2020 1:03 PM
To: APC; Ginny Kelleher; Kristen Burkman; rhorkay@westfield.gov; mjohns@westfield.gov; Cindy Spoljaric; Andy Cook
Subject: Northpoint II Industrial Park

Warning: This external email is from angbol2@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Hi all,

This is such a bad idea, I'm disappointed this is even being considered. The area proposed is one of the prettiest sections of nature in our county. I am proud of the growth Westfield has had, however, growing just to be growing without consideration of the beauty of our community is a little disheartening.

Will this affect the Bray Family Homestead Park?

Thanks,
Angie Bolinger

Pamela Howard

From: steve dolvin <steve.dolvin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 6:43 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II

Warning: This external email is from steve.dolvin@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

As a resident affected by the potential development, I am opposed to Northpoint II. As a whole, the development does not seem to comply with the Comprehensive Plan, and I have serious concerns about the geologic and aesthetic impact.

Steven Dolvin
4815 E. 211th St

Pamela Howard

From: Canada, Brad <brad.canada@stryker.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 8:56 AM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II

Warning: This external email is from brad.canada@stryker.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

APC Members,

My name is Brad Canada and live at 20945 Anthony Road. There has been numerous conversations going on among the neighbors that live on Anthony Road as well as up and down SR38. We know that there is a developer that is aggressively looking to gain approval to rezone a rural "residential" area into a massive industrial park. I wanted to share my perspective and reiterate that I would like your support to not approve this rezoning.

I have only been living in this area for 4 years (grew up in Fishers) but the broader SR38/Anthony/31/Hinkle Creek northeastern part of Westfield is a special place. Driving up through Anthony feels more like Brown County vs Hamilton County. McGregor Park and Bray Family Park makes this area even more special but it's the surrounding areas that add to that. Westfield is a fast growing place and there is so many advantages to that and one that drew us to the area to begin with (schools, people, growth, amenities, etc). Growth in this area is a GOOD thing but there needs to be a balance to protect certain areas to offset the traffic, noise, etc. A HUGE industrial park was just approved south of SR38 that is still being developed so to approve another 180+ acre park + the future progression to then approve another 180+ acre plot on Anthony makes this rural area feel like we are down in Plainfield in the midst of their distribution and industrial areas. Westfield would then be losing a huge chunk of green space that could potentially be a nice residential area that could in theory connect both parks and be a place where the community could get away from the traffic, noise, chaos of what other parts could be.

I plan on raising my 3 young kids in this house and be here forever and part of that decision was giving them an area that was safe. I fear the traffic, I fear the amount of people commuting here daily that is not bought in or involved in this community, I fear the pollution/trash, and most importantly – I fear that this area and this community loses a huge part of what makes this community different that a Fishers, Carmel, or Noblesville. That is the ability to properly plan for future growth by also protecting pockets of the community that make it feel green and enjoy the beautiful scenes of nature and a rural setting in the pockets of heavy residential/commercial areas. I would MUCH more support a residential zoned area to drive population and keep the green area as close to what we can and continue to build out south of 38 and other areas that are more suited for industrial growth.

We do need industrial growth and areas to bring businesses here (which we have south of SR38 and pockets west on 31) but I strongly encourage you all to please have the voice of your residents and our strong views against turning the most beautiful area in all of central Indiana into a massive concrete industrial zone that would have a huge negative impact on so many people and so many things. Please consider our request to vote "NO" to rezone these areas as industrial north of 38. Please consider keeping the industrial growth and overall focus be on the land and acreage that has already been approved just south of 38. This Anthony Road area between the 2 parks could be an AMAZING area to have future residential neighborhoods, green space and parks for generations to come.

Respectfully,

Brad Canada

Brad.canada@stryker.com

703-431-4083

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

Pamela Howard

From: Amy Koehler <tdogplus@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 9:39 AM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II

Warning: This external email is from tdogplus@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

As owners of two homes on the Anthony Road/ SR 38 perimeter we are EXTREMELY opposed to this entire development. Thank you.
M. Tinder (T &A Homes LLC.

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Kaitalyn Evans <kevans@ccs.k12.in.us>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 12:26 PM
To: APC
Cc: justin.a.evans11@gmail.com
Subject: Northpoint II Objection

Warning: This external email is from kevans@ccs.k12.in.us. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

To Whom It May Concern,

My family and I live at 5376 Sheridan Rd. We moved from our home in downtown Noblesville to our 3-acre property for the serenity, nature, and proximity to so many great local businesses. Our historic property features a large horse barn and carriage house, both original in structure. We feel very strongly about the preservation of the area currently in discussion to be developed by Northpoint II.

We fear that the impending development will bring down our property value, pose a threat to the ecosystem, and endanger the livestock surrounding us. The rural lifestyle that we moved for will be directly threatened by the commercial development plans.

It is our firm request that the land NOT be developed. If it were to be developed, we would strongly request that it would be residential in nature, only. The residential development should preserve our beautiful property line and capitalize on the wide-open land, sky, and animals. Any other option would be a disservice to this beautiful area.

Thanks,

The Evans Family
574-453-8168
kevans@ccs.k12.in.us
justin.a.evans11@gmail.com

Pamela Howard

From: ELAINE Hinshaw <e_hinshaw@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 5:47 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Proposal
Attachments: Northpoint II APC 2-210-21.docx

Warning: This external email is from e_hinshaw@msn.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

I continue to be very concerned about the NorthPoint II project. Didn't Westfield City officials "promise", after the NorthPoint I Project was approved four years ago, that US 38 was a "**hard stop**" for projects such as these? IF governmental bodies, elected and /or appointed (i. e. City Council, Advisory Planning Committee) don't honor the Comp Plan then developers will continue to disregard the Comp Plan and bring forward projects that don't fit within the Comp plan and are extremely objectionable to the residents living next to such proposed developments. Is the City and the APC going to continue to allow these piecemeal petitions for rezones? Furthermore, this petition occurs outside the city limits in the township where affected citizens cannot vote for the Mayor or the City Council members.

Good planning dictates that a city doesn't put a high intensity use next to the types of residences on Anthony Rd. In this area, designated as "rural" by the Comp Plan, there are single family, established estate homes adjoining the proposal. This makes this proposal even more problematic. The now proposed transition of dense housing on less than 1/4 acre lots with 10 feet between houses does not fit within this rural setting. It does not even fit with the types of homes that most Westfield residents currently want to be built in the city.

There would be lights, noise, increased traffic including trucks, and unsightly views. How do these things impact the property values for the existing property owners?

APC members and City Councilors need to ask themselves what their determination would be if their residence was being impacted?

Pamela Howard

From: Susannah Santangini <santanginis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 6:09 PM
To: APC
Subject: Notthpoint 2

Warning: This external email is from santanginis@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Please note that better use of this land should be considered than the current proposal in place.

Pamela Howard

From: Jim May <jrmay47@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 10:56 AM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II PUD

Warning: This external email is from jrmay47@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

February 10, 2021

To Members of the Westfield Advisory Plan Commission,

I have lived in Hamilton County since 1984 and spent most of my 74 years in Indiana. Yes, Hamilton County is a great place to live. We have top notch schools, nearby amenities for our busy lives, and many job opportunities. All of these have things have drawn people to our county.

Something else that has drawn many to Hamilton County is the rural ambiance. A drive on Anthony Road to the northern parts of the county is one of the most scenic areas in Indiana. Nature is abundant. Wildlife, native trees and plants, streams, and rolling farmland are part of this trip.

As you know this area has been designated to maintain a rural feel in the Westfield Comprehensive Plan. The citizens involved in writing this plan had the insight to realize the importance of keeping the rural areas in the county protected. An industrial development was not what they had in mind for this part of Hamilton County.

I am strongly opposed to this industrial park. Please vote **NO** on the Northpoint II PUD.

"The earth is the LORD's, and the fulness thereof." Psalm 24:1a

Thank you,

Jim May
5620 Pine Hill Drive
Noblesville, IN. 46062

Pamela Howard

From: Paige Hunt <paige.a.hunt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:11 PM
To: Council Members; APC
Subject: Object Northpoint II

Warning: This external email is from paige.a.hunt@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

City of Westfield -

I would like to object to the Northpoint II PUD. It does not comply with the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan.

- Rural uses and rural appearance (p. 31)
- Considerable open space and natural-appearing open space (p. 31)
- The last to face development pressure (p. 31)
- Continuation of the historic rural patterns, including homestead farms, artisan farms...(p.32)
- Preserve the night sky by limiting lighting (p. 32)
- Preserve historically significant buildings and resources (barns, houses, etc.) (p. 32)
- Large lots (p. 33)
- No commercial development is noted as acceptable anywhere for the Rural Northeast in the plan

I am getting ready to build off of Anthony Road and 38 and one of the reasons we choose this property was because of the rural environment and high standards in Westfield. To place high density housing and an industrial park completely changes the landscape of what we thought we purchased/were building. Please consider our objection to this proposal.

Thanks!
Paige Hackman

Pamela Howard

From: JANET QUISENBERRY <bichon2222@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:41 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II PUD

Warning: This external email is from bichon2222@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

February 10, 2021

To Members of the Westfield Advisory Plan Commission

Please stop Northpoint II PUD

The acreage included in this PUD is zoned, according to the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan, as rural residential.

This area of Washington Township has a rich history involving the Underground Railroad and historically was the hunting and burial grounds for early Native Americans. There are probably many preservation groups that would provide funding to Westfield to preserve and protect this historic area.

Citizens of Hamilton County and others have been drawn to this beautiful rural residential area in Washington Township. They have built their homes, paid taxes, and cherished these rural acres.

The Westfield and Washington Township Comprehensive Plan states on Page 31 that this Northeast Rural Residential area will continue to have rural uses, and a rural appearance: "natural, open spaces, trees, fields and streams. The predominant land use will be rural residential, including farmsteads, and individual houses on large lots. New development should have a rural feel."

The Northpoint II PUD proposes a 150 acre INDUSTRIAL PARK with approximately 30 acres of crammed together houses. The 270 citizens who wrote this Westfield and Washington Township Comprehensive Plan had a vision for this rural residential area. An INDUSTRIAL PARK with crammed together houses does not fit into this Comprehensive Plan, and should not be forced upon the citizens who live in Washington Township. These citizens have invested heavily, pay taxes, vote, and are located here because they cherish these rural acres.

We simply cannot allow this beautiful rural residential historic area to be crushed by huge construction equipment. As seen in the new 2020 Hamilton County Comprehensive Plan, citizens want to keep the rural areas untouched by development.

Since my letter to you in August, I have been researching a bit about the Underground Railroad activity and our Native American culture which are important factors in voting **NO** on the Northpoint II PUD proposal. In the early 1800's Native Americans had their camps along Anthony Road, and the "Dismal" Swamp which was on the west side of Anthony Road. A Native American body was found buried in a log when Perry Bray's dad, Henry Bray, was clearing this land. I can't help wondering how many of their camps could have been located on this 183 acres that Northpoint II PUD would destroy with an industrial park. Of course, there would be burial grounds, and many artifacts buried here as well. In 1847, Henry Bray killed the last black bear in this same area with a rifle made by local gunsmith, Wyatt Perry. The Native Americans, hunted these bear, the whitetail deer, rabbits, and all the wonderful wildlife from these acres, which sustained their lives. Then came the Underground Railroad in the 1820's. Westfield was an integral part of this system to rescue and protect escaping slaves. In 1837, the famous Rhoads family will forever be documented and cherished in many books and even in court documents, where their case went to court and they were declared free. This same family was protected by these same farm fields and the "Dismal" swamp, and then taken west through the "Swamp" to be sheltered by the Lindley's, another Underground Railroad home. There is a historic marker across the street from the Westfield High School. Thousands of escaping slaves were transported North on Anthony Road in the hope of becoming free people. Their hearts were racing and beating with anticipation while being protected in these very acres that are being threatened. The citizens of Washington Township, now wait with the same anticipation of being free from the threat of an Industrial Park being thrust into the beautiful 183 acres between Anthony Road and Bray Park on Hinkle Road, and North of Highway 38.

We, the citizens in this area have come together. Several of our neighbors went door to door to almost every home with a petition, from SR 38, North on Anthony Rd., along 216th St., and South on Hinkle Rd. Everyone who signed this petition is opposed to this Industrial Park, and many signed a digital petition, all opposing this Industrial Park with its change of 30 acres of cramped housing and 150 acres of industrial park. We received over 400 signatures opposing this Northpoint II Industrial Park. Everyone realizes, if allowed, it will jeopardize our air quality, our underground water beds, our wetlands, and the history of this area. Most of all, the present citizens will face lower property values, noise pollution, light pollution, petroleum fumes poisoning our air quality, and maybe worse, destroying our night sky which the Comprehensive plan states it wants to preserve. Not to mention all the other horrors of this PUD, more traffic, congestion, less safety, and no more rural feel. Northpoint II PUD, does not fit into this rural residential Township. It ruins everything this area stands for. Please preserve this beautiful land, created by God, from being buried under thousands of pounds of asphalt and concrete. The history and the lives of my neighbors will be changed forever in a negative way, if this is allowed to happen.

You, the Westfield Advisory Commission have been appointed to serve in the best interests of this entire areas and its citizens, and I thank you for the countless hours, and many times, thankless hours you all devote to your position. I ask you with the greatest respect to vote **NO** on the Northpoint II PUD and save Westfield Washington Township's historical rural residential area.

God bless you and Thank you

Janet Quisenberry-May

Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: Cheryl Schultz <camcschultz@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:46 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Industrial Park

Warning: This external email is from camcschultz@icloud.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

To whom it may concern,

I am contacting you to voice my opposition to the Northpoint II Industrial Park. Such a development would forever change this serene land. I have lived on Hinkle Road for 31 years and have witnessed development and the negative changes that result. Please vote NO to this development and preserve this beautiful land full of nature and peace.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Schultz

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Brenda <ebkpiq@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 8:24 PM
To: APC
Subject: against the Northpoint II proposal.

Warning: This external email is from ebkpiq@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

The Northpoint II PUD is asking Westfield to approve development that does not comply with the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan.

We need to stop commercial development and a watering down of standards in the Rural Northeast are of Westfield-Washington Township!

No commercial development is noted as acceptable anywhere for the Rural Northeast in the plan and now with building heights up to 45 feet, now to include dense housing on less than 1/4 acre lots with 10 feet between houses and other reduced-space arrangements taking up 28 acres and especially causing Increased traffic on State Road 38,

Against the Northpoint II Proposal!

Brenda Quinlan

Pamela Howard

From: Martin Kirkwood <mkirkwood@alumni.nd.edu>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 12:30 AM
To: APC; planners
Subject: Opposition Plea to 2008-PUD-09

Warning: This external email is from mkirkwood@alumni.nd.edu. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear Advisory Plan Commission and City Planners,

Thank you for the work that you do and the role that you play in the planning and oversight of the development of our community. I witnessed your dedication and seriousness of your work in the last APC meeting on February 1st. During that three plus hour meeting, I heard your compassion, diligence and concern for the role you play and the work you do. I truly appreciate that and trust you will give this letter and all the other citizen concerns about the opposition to the 2008-PUD-09, Northpoint II PUD. To that end, I ask you to read my following plea to you as to why I feel this proposal is totally and unequivocally the wrong way to permit this land to be developed.

My name is Martin Kirkwood and I have been a resident of Westfield, Indiana since 1999 when I moved here to work at Westfield High School as the Director of Guidance. At that time, my wife and I had two young children and one on the way and we were truly excited at the opportunity to take this job and live in this area. We left our families to begin raising our own young family in this wonderful community. I have thoroughly enjoyed my 21 years working, worshiping and raising my family here and would love to eventually retire and live the rest of my life in my current home. We moved here from Muncie, Indiana largely due to the character and aesthetics of this community compared to our previous city and others we had considered.

We purchased our first brand new home in the newly developed Carey Commons neighborhood just south of 32 and Carey Road. Soon thereafter, I remember taking a bus tour of the school district as part of the new hires in the school corporation and was astounded at the vast rural area and limited new development at that time. We enjoyed our time in this neighborhood up to the point when many new developments and commercial expansion began close by. That included the purchase of our neighbors land and rezoning for what became the next Goodwill store and other commercial development on the opposite side of the abandoned Midland railway from our home.

At that time, my wife and I had enjoyed taking Sunday drives around the township to scout out the many rural areas we dreamed of for our forever home to finish raising our children and living our lives. We were beyond excited to find a home on the picturesque Anthony Road that we had driven down numerous times. We purchased our dream home at 21570 Anthony Road in the summer of 2004. At that time, this was a chip and seal, tree lined road that reminded us of Brown County and other peaceful places we had enjoyed visiting on vacations. What a blessing to find this homestead where we sacrificed all we had financially to make this move to what we hoped and thought would remain our peaceful refuge.

After my wife passed away of breast cancer in 2008, I purchased a bench in memory of her to be placed on the creek in MacGregor park. That same creek extends to just south and east of our home on Anthony Road, where we spent hours playing with the kids in what became known as "Our Secret Place." That phrase is what we had inscribed on her bench. What a blessing to have a park and place to spend time reflecting on her life and the peaceful place we lived together for the past four years. As a result of my interest and contact with the folks at MacGregor Park, I was asked and have

willingly served as a member of the Westfield-Washington Township Parks Advisory Committee for the past number of years.

The opportunity to serve on this committee and learn about the operation and role of government entities has been an enlightening and valuable experience. As many of you probably are familiar, our Township participated in a long range plan which included a master plan for the township parks department. In that work, we surveyed and identified one of the key priorities for the residents was to maintain greenspace and expand our parks. As such, from the recommendation of the Parks Advisory Council and Township Trustee the Township Board approved a plan to pursue a bond to begin the process of purchasing nearly 900 additional acres. The plan was to help connect MacGregor and Bray Family Park to what hopefully still will become an additional 100 acre park on the corner of 216th and Hinkle Road. This impressive and forward thinking plan, included an agreement to purchase this exact land that is now being proposed for this Industrial, Commercial uses.

I know this Township's initiative and approval to pursue a \$15 million dollar bond, faced opposition and disapproval by many in the community, including some members of the Westfield City Council and maybe even members of this committee. Unfortunately, due to that pressure and other circumstances the Township Board's approval to pursue this bond was reversed and rescinded, which caused this plan to be thwarted. Now, we see the sad and heartbreaking result of that decision. As much as I understood the residents' concern with the limited increased taxes this bond would have caused, I feared that once we lost this opportunity to preserve this greenspace, the future use of this area would be in jeopardy.

To learn that the city is now considering this proposal to permit an industrial park to be approved in its place is beyond unacceptable. I fear the City and planners are being pressured to find new tax revenue to support other poorly planned and implemented ideas, such as the \$35 million six acre Grand Junction Park that is being built in downtown Westfield. I can't help but feel that my neighbors and I in this area are being prostituted in this situation. To be specific, I believe our beautiful, peaceful area is being put to use for an unworthy and potentially corrupt purpose for the financial gain of others.

I offer this personal and potentially inflammatory perspective not to accuse or blame others, but to hopefully cause you to pause and fully consider the reasons and ramification of this decision before you. I hope and pray that as the primary entity charged with evaluating the future development of our wonderful city and township that you will continue to dutifully and thoughtfully pursue your work. I am not only grateful for your past service and dedication, but at your mercy for the fair and just protection of our future.

Sincerely,

Martin Kirkwood

Pamela Howard

From: Jill Graber <jngraber@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 12:09 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: North Point 2

Warning: This external email is from jngraber@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

I am writing this letter to object to the development of Northpoint 2.

I implore you to consult the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan before casting your vote on February 16th. This development goes against many aspects of that plan. I thought about going through the plan and pointing out all the reasons this development should not be allowed. Then I realized that is your job. It is your job to consult the plan and make sure that any developments that come before you follow what has been put in place.

As a resident of Anthony Road one of the issues that I find most upsetting is the fact that the township has given the city the power to decide what happens to all the land in the township. As a resident of the township and not the city I do not have the privilege to vote for city elected officials. I am okay with this fact except that it is city officials that are going to be making decisions about what will be happening to my neighborhood. If I'm to be honest I'm not that impressed with the development that has been going on in Westfield. When my family and I moved here 14 years ago we chose Westfield because it had a smaller town feel. When we moved here we first lived in a neighborhood off 156th Street. I was saddened to see the land turn into one subdivision after another in that area. Five years ago we decided to look for house that had a bit of land. We were not planning on staying in Westfield but the house we found happened to be Westfield. I have fallen in love with Anthony Road and almost every person that I have had over to my house is in awe of the road. Actually, everyone who has ever driven on this road is in awe of it. I've come across many people who know the road and will take it any chance they get. In the spring, summer, and fall we get many bicyclist and motorcyclist down our road. It is a beautiful tree lined setting. By allowing this development you are taking away a jewel that Westfield has.

These developers that are asking for this have bought land that is not zoned for it. In my opinion that is their problem. There is other land in the township that is zoned commercial, and should be developed first. They haven't even filled Northpoint 1 yet. I know their argument is that they don't have bigger lots available but what they are proposing would sell quickly because of it's access to 38 and 31. The bottom line is they want to make their money from the land that they have purchased. The fact they think adding 20 acres of a neighborhood that has houses stacked on each other as a buffer is a joke. Let's be smart about how we develop Westfield. Let's look at why people move here, what the town wants to look and feel like, and not just let the developers decide how they want to develop it.

Thank you for your time. I would be happy to discuss this further with anyone.

Jill Graber

317-374-1639
21250 Anthony Rd
Westfield, IN 46062

Pamela Howard

From: Ralph <rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 1:30 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint II Objection

Warning: This external email is from rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com
Date: February 11, 2021 at 11:15:41 AM EST
To: rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com
Cc: Christy Wheeler <bigskyorbust@gmail.com>
Subject: APC letter

APC and Westfield Council Members,

My name is Ralph Johnson. I live on Sheridan Road directly across from Northpoint II Development. The fact that I first became aware of this was late summer last year. I've lived at my current address for almost 20 years. Why would I have not been notified of such a drastic change in a zoning to my front yard where widening of road would take my real estate?

Allowing an industrial park to be developed in the middle of an area designated by Hamilton County and City of Westfield as Rural Residential is inconsistent land use at best. The main reason I moved here is because it is rural residential. I have lived in Hamilton County since 1996. This is my retirement home, I retired from AT&T in 2011. Nothing I've seen in Northpoint's wish list fits the life style of peace and tranquility I hoped to enjoy. In speaking with my neighbors, who shared with me they too were unaware of this change too, NOT one person favors this.

I have invested a lot of time and money in my property with the intent it would be my last home. If I'm forced to sell to my property to remain safe and have some peace, WHO will make me whole, the City of Westfield, Northpoint Development, Chris Wilkes? If the residents of the area had been made personally aware zoning changes to begin with, would this be where we are today? If I can't get fair market value for my home, which I won't be able to with an industrial park in my front yard, it would be impossible for me to relocate and replicate what I would have to give up.

I wonder if the commission is aware of all the history of the area in regards to Quakers and the Underground Railroad, the Native America Villages? My mother was a Quaker from Fairmount, I have Native American heritage from both sides of my family and the issues are important to me.

Additionally, I have concerns about pollution. Air, noise, drainage, 24hr. Traffic, who will be in my neighborhood while I'm sleeping, I have a widow for neighbor I worry about. The runoff from this

proposal what will it do to aquifer and ground water of my well. All of this is contrary to what currently exists.

If the developer had proposed a development of 5 and 10 acre home sites, I feel like they might have been welcomed as it would have helped OUR home values, that would be in the interest of the greater good of the community. We are not Carmel nor do we want to be buried in their debt which where we headed if we don't wake up. Very few people gain from these type issues. Westfield has been a bedroom community and that is its best asset. I worked in Kokomo and Indy since I've lived in Hamilton county and I would not live in either of those cities.

This whole situation is extremely overwhelming. Please deny Northpoint II proposal. Thank you.

Ralph Johnson
5069 Sheridan Rd
Westfield, IN 46062
Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: Goodrich, Chuck <cgoodrich@gaylor.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 1:41 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

Warning: This external email is from cgoodrich@gaylor.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to The Northpoint II PUD (Planned Unit Development). This project will be quite detrimental to the surrounding area and there is widespread opposition among the nearby property owners, residents, and voters. The addition of a 152 acre commercial/industrial park in this area, with building heights up to 45 feet, will destroy local wildlife habitat, lower the property values of our existing community, increase traffic congestion and replace quiet, calming rural residential serenity with active, hectic commercial chaos.

Property values in the area will undoubtedly decrease if you approve Northpoint II PUD, which includes dense housing on less than 1/4 acre lots with 10 feet between houses, along with other reduced-space arrangements. This project is not consistent with the existing neighborhoods in the area and these neighborhoods will suffer unless you act to stop it.

Traffic is also a major area of concern. Increased traffic on State Road 38 will be terrible since this is the only planned access to the development. While the traffic may be lighter on average, the local neighborhood traffic will disproportionately surge during morning and evening rush hours, causing traffic and safety issues during critical times for the existing neighborhoods. In general, the area traffic is continuing to increase, and heavy traffic is already common at times on State Road 38, which may not have been anticipated.

Another issue that also does not seem to be adequately considered is the noise. Our area was not structured to implement such a park, with houses so close to the proposed site where noise travels freely. The noise would be unacceptable for our rural community.

I urge you to reject the proposed development, and from recent meetings and discussions with my neighbors, everyone is in agreement that this development tears apart the natural beauty of Hamilton County - a quality it holds dear. Not a single surrounding property owner supports this.

Best regards,
Chuck Goodrich
5015 Nightshade Lane
Noblesville, IN 46062
317-716-7117



Representative Chuck Goodrich
Indiana State House, District 29

President & CEO

Gaylor Electric, Inc.
17230 Kraft Court
Noblesville, IN. 46060

O: 317.214.6300 | M: 317.716.7117



Oops – Please forgive spelling & grammar errors.

Pamela Howard

From: Wayne Pike <bwpike2004@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 2:25 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint II PUD ((2008-PUD-09))

Warning: This external email is from bwpike2004@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear APC and Council Members:

We moved to the Westfield-Washington Township almost 20 years ago. To be honest, we didn't intend to stay in Indiana more than a couple of years. But, then we found that we had actually found "home". The neighborhood was rural (we are from rural areas), and the people are friendly.

We invested a lot of money, both buying and improving our property over the past 20 years. Only time will tell how much the property will be devalued if Northpoint II passes. Our current estimate is 30%. Like a lot of people we are not rich and depend on our property to help us fund retirement.

If Northpoint II passes, we would also lose our privacy. Our property would touch on Northpoint II, so there would be no privacy when we are outside. The light will take away our night sky, not to mention ground water pollution that would threaten our well water and cause potential flooding, and noise and air pollution. We have a small sanctuary area for animals on one corner of our property. With their route for food and water cut off by Northpoint II, I have to wonder what will happen to them.

Because I was one of the people knocking on doors to get signatures for our petition, I know that our neighbors feel the same as we do. There was not one person in favor of Northpoint II, and I knocked on every door in the square mile off Anthony Road, 206th Street, Hinkle Road, and State Road 38. Please do not allow the Northpoint II proposal (2008-PUD-09) to move forward.

Sincerely,

Barry Wayne Pike, homeowner

Pamela Howard

From: TJ Gascho <tj.gascho@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 2:44 PM
To: planners; APC
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)
Importance: High

Warning: This external email is from tj.gascho@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing regarding the proposed Northpoint II PUD. My family and I built our home 4 years ago in Hinkle Creek Estates, which is very close in proximity. We decided to build in Hinkle Creek Estates to enjoy the "country" feel with reasonable access to "city" amenities. We invested significant capital in our home to provide a comfortable and safe environment to raise our three children. I'm sure this is top of mind for many of you when you're making decisions for your respective families. I feel strongly that the Northpoint II PUD will not only jeopardize the safe environment we have for our family, but it will also have a serious negative equity impact on our home value (and many others in the area).

Please take a second to imagine someone building a 183.5 acre commercially congested business park in your back yard. Ruining the natural rural character. Adding significant traffic! Introducing noise and air pollution, and threatening environmental resources! Meanwhile, devaluing your home up to 30%!! Please provide a scenario where it's unreasonable to object. Unfortunately, that scenario is very real for us if Northpoint II PUD is approved.

During your vote, I hope you will understand and acknowledge the negative impact NP II PUD will have on the surrounding community. Please be considerate of these negative impacts along with many others, and vote "NO" to Northpoint II PUD.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Timothy J Gascho II
5164 Morning Mist Ct
Noblesville, IN 46062
P: 317-289-5555

Objection Basis:

-IC 36-7-4-603 (2) (shall pay reasonable regard to the current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in the NRR district)

-IC 36-7-4-603 (4) (shall pay reasonable regard to the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction)

Pamela Howard

From: Des Schillinger <des.schillinger@sai-rep.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 3:44 PM
To: APC; planners
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)
Attachments: Northpoint II.docx

Warning: This external email is from des.schillinger@sai-rep.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear Committee Members,

Good afternoon.

Attached please find my letter regarding the Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

If any questions arise please contact my office.

Thank You and Best Regards,

Des Schillinger
Schillinger Associates, Inc.
17819 Commerce Dr., Suite 100
Westfield IN 46074
PH 765-457-7241
FX 765-457-7732
www.sai-rep.com



Dear Committee Members,

11 February 2021

Good afternoon.

I would like to take a moment to offer up reasons why Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD) should be rejected.

When relocating my business from Kokomo IN a few years back, I was attracted to Westfield for many reasons. To centrally locate my sales office to the center of Indiana, but to also have the office near to where my employees live. I felt that it was prudent for my employees to be in direct proximity to restaurants and hotels for entertaining customers as well as principals during visitations. Therefore, we chose and purchased a building in the Alpha Industrial park. In doing this we are supporting fellow Westfield business and placing our trust and hard-earned monies into the Westfield tax base. This will not happen with the Northpoint II development as the employees will support Noblesville business most of the time.

I made a point at lunch today to drive around the Westfield Industrial complexes which are not full and even have available lots. Northpoint I is not full (779 available acres) and will not be full for quite some time. There is a possibility of an Industrial Park coming in the area around Spring Mill and 32. Also, 191st street still need to be developed. And what do they all have in common? They will support the Westfield businesses.

I reside in Hinkle Estates (20170 Starlight Ct. Noblesville, In.) I can hop on State Road 38 to go to work but I do not. I take the backroads because the trip on 38 is incredibly frustrating because very rarely do you travel at the speed limit. (The State did an analysis on the intersection of 38 and Hinkle which they determined was a very dangerous intersection and they also found that the average speed is below the posted speed limit). In addition, the state added two (2) stoplights to 38 and I am sure Northpoint will require an additional stoplight at Anthony road to allow semi-trucks the opportunity to turn across lanes of traffic to enter and exit Northpoint. In no possible way is this bettering a community or lifestyle.

The beauty of Westfield is the rural nature of the community with the added benefits of business supporting the community through tax revenues. But this all must be planned out over years and kept in balance. If the land at the proposed Northpoint II PUD is to be developed, it should follow the rules that are already in place; agriculture or 3-acre family rural lots.

The people of Westfield have entrusted you to take care of Westfield and its resources. Northpoint II will remove these resources and for what? A half full Industrial park for a decade which reduce the value of the surrounding area.

Please side with the people of Westfield and reject the request.

Thank You and Best Regards,

Des Schillinger
Schillinger Associates, Inc.
17819 Commerce Dr., Suite 100
Westfield IN 46074
CELL 765-457-7241

Pamela Howard

From: Dale McCullough <daleretta@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 3:52 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint 2 petition to rezone

Warning: This external email is from daleretta@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

A petition to rezone a 180 acre parcel of land located in the northeast quadrant of Westfield Washington Township will be coming before the APC on Tuesday, February 16th. This will be the first presentation by the developers. Concerned neighbors will be allowed to speak in person we understand. The acreage is currently zoned SF-3 and Agricultural. Thirty homes border St. Rd. 38 and Anthony Rd. adjacent to the acreage. Homeowners have relied on the Westfield Comprehensive Plan in buying or building their home places. Families did so with the understanding that the northeast quadrant would remain rural in nature and such was recently confirmed by the Hamilton County 2020 Plan. Instead the developer's petition lists more than 60 potential uses ranging from an amusement park to warehousing under a rezone to P.U.D.

Families currently living within the area will suffer greatly from such a re-designation of uses. Realtors have determined that property values could plummet by as much as 40%. Some owners have a history of 70 years of residence here. The P.U.D, describes intended usage as, "commercial and industrial", within their plan for Northpoint 2. Pollution of light levels, chemicals, noise and escalated traffic are sure to follow. Existing homes are all on fresh water wells. Runoff from concentrated drives and parking lots will cause a danger to to current families. A recent revision of the P.U.D. provides for densely spaced single family homes on the east border as a buffer current residences and does not mitigate previously stated problems.

If the City of Westfield wished to retain it's claim as, "One of the best places to live in America," their their first allegiance should be to those already living here.

The only responsible vote to the Northpoint 2 petition is a firm, **"NO"**.

Pamela Howard

From: Lori Hogan <llmhogan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 4:47 PM
To: APC
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

Warning: This external email is from llmhogan@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Greetings,

I would like to voice my opposition AGAINST Northpoint Owners, LLC's Petition No 2008-PUD-09. This PUD will create a drop in the equity of my home and create more traffic in this area. As I am sure most of you are aware, the area between Hinkle/Moontown and Anthony Roads are extremely dangerous now with traffic. Increasing traffic in these areas is asking for more accidents.

We purchased our home with the anticipation that it was in a rural setting. This PUD will dissolve what we loved about this area. Please seriously consider not passing this PUD.

Sincerely,

Lori Hogan
20275 Dayspring Court
Noblesville, IN 46062
317-219-9555

Pamela Howard

From: James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 4:54 PM
To: APC; planners
Subject: James Hogan's Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

Warning: This external email is from james.hogan@elamusa.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Good afternoon and greetings members of the Advisory Plan Commission ("APC") and City Council of the City of Westfield.

I am writing to you today to voice my sincere objection to the above-referenced planned unit development ("PUD") petition. My wife and I, Lori, along with our 4 children, dog and 2 cats, reside in our home at 20275 Dayspring Court in Noblesville, Indiana. The home is the northwesternmost home within the Hinkle Creek Estates subdivision. We are making a significant investment in upgrading our home over the next couple of months and plan to be here a long time.

Our subdivision consists of 2+ acre lots in a rural residential setting complete with well water, septic fields and propane tanks. The neighborhood is on the east side of Hinkle Road. Our neighbor to the west is the *Bray Family Homestead Park*. We have a reassuring feeling knowing that the entire area west of us is in the Northeast Rural Residential district and will therefore never be developed into anything more than Rural Residential homes, agriculture or a Conservation Subdivision. This was a huge factor in us deciding where to live. We love how our rural residential neighborhood meshes so well with that of the Northeast Rural Residential district of Washington Township.

In fact, over the past few years since we moved in, I have praised the responsibility of the City of Westfield/Washington Township in abiding by its Comprehensive Plan. I have trumpeted these praises to my friends and neighbors Dez Schillinger and Rob Hanlon - two significant employers within the City of Westfield. I tell them I wish every community operated like Westfield. Our confidence that the City of Westfield/Washington Township will maintain a governing body that makes politically stable and logical decisions that are empathetic to its residents and neighbors like myself helps me sleep well at night.

On Tuesday, 2/16/21, my faith in your politically stable, logical decision-making abilities will be put to the test. Our entire neighborhood is worried. I am worried.

We want you to vote no to 2008-PUD-09. We offer a logical basis for you to say no. That logic is rooted in a document that Wayne and Christy Wheeler will send you in an emailed attachment, a document entitled *Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD*, dated 2/2/21.

Read it and enjoy it. It provides you a basis for rejection.

In the meantime, I will pray.

I pray that your hearts be touched by the 183+ residents who join me in objecting to this 2008-PUD-09 abomination - noting that not one resident we reached supported it. I pray that you uphold your Comprehensive Plan. And, lastly, I pray that you have courage to VOTE NO, in the face of certain political and monetary pressure, to 2008-PUD-09.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG

161 Lakeview Drive
Suite B
Noblesville, IN 46060



President & CEO
(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

Pamela Howard

From: Pike, Cathy K. <ckpike@iupui.edu>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 5:20 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint II (2008-PUD-09)
Signed By: ckpike@iupui.edu

Dear APC and Council Members:

I am writing to oppose the Northpoint II PUD (2008-PUD-09). My husband and I are “Hoosiers by choice” (to borrow a term recently used by Governor Holcomb). We moved here 20 years ago and have lived in the same home since that time. Our land abuts the proposed Northpoint II PUD. I believe that the Northpoint II PUD should be denied for several reasons. The first of these is its non-compliance with Indiana Code 36-7-603, Chapter 36, zoning ordinance; preparation and consideration of proposals (<http://184.175.130.101/legislative/laws/2020/ic/titles/036#36-7-4-603>). This Code stipulates the following tenets in preparing and considering proposals. They are as follow:

1. The Comprehensive Plan of a given area
2. Current conditions and character of ... structures and uses in each district
3. The most desirable use and adaptation for ... land within a given district
4. Conservation of property values within the jurisdiction, and
5. Responsible methods of development and growth.

The Northpoint II PUD meets none of these stipulations! It is in direct opposition to the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan, which deems the Rural Northeast area of the district as rural, single-family, and agricultural. Homes in the Rural Northeast are expected to be built in ways that include protecting historic structures, having considerable open space, protecting open fields, trees, and streams (City of Westfield, 2007, p. 31). In fact, the Comprehensive Plan states that the Rural Northeast “area will be the last to face development pressure” (City of Westfield, 2007, p. 31). There is no mention in the Comprehensive Plan of commercial property or dense housing as acceptable development options for the Rural Northeast area.

Second, the Northpoint II PUD does not take into consideration the character and uses of this district. This district is rural and agricultural, with houses located on multiple acres. It is **not** urban, commercial, or suburban.

Third, the Northpoint II PUD certainly is not a desirable use and adaptation of the Rural Northeast area. The proposal clearly is not a desirable use of the land, and it is not even needed! Currently, there are almost 2,000 acres in the Westfield-Washington Township of available property that are available for development, meet the criteria of the Comprehensive Plan, and would be acceptable uses for the Northpoint II PUD. (Please refer to our “Remonstrations Against Northpoint II PUD” for further information.)

Fourth, should the Northpoint II PUD be approved, property values within the area are expected to plummet by 30% (Please see “Remonstrations Against Northpoint II PUD” for further information). We and all of our neighbors have worked hard to both maintain our homes and improve our properties’ values over time. My husband and I expect the value of our property to be one of our assets available to us during our retirement. We and our neighbors view any approval of the Northpoint II PUD as a **taking of value** and adamantly oppose the proposal.

Fifth, it is obvious that the Northpoint II PUD represents irresponsible methods of development and growth. The Northeast area is a small rural agricultural corner of the Westfield-Washington Township and is designated as the last area of the entire Township to face pressure from development. The Northpoint II PUD seeks to convert 180 acres of beautiful, rural land to a largely commercial and dense housing development. The plan would not enhance the natural resources or the lives of those of us who would be directly affected by its development. In fact, 183 people who would

be directly affected by this development are opposed to its approval! Nearly 200 people have responded to online and in-person canvassing to say that they oppose the Northpoint II PUD. (Please see the "Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD" document for detailed information and copies of the petitions.) My husband was the primary canvasser in collecting in-person petition signatures. He knocked on every door within a square mile of the Northpoint II PUD, including Anthony Road, 216th Street, Hinkle Road, and State Road 38. Not one person with whom he spoke approved of the Northpoint II PUD.

We sincerely hope and pray that you will deny the Northpoint II PUD and approve only those proposals that meet the standards of the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan for the Rural Northeast district. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter that will affect families for generations.

Cathy Pike

Cathy King Pike, Ph.D., MSW
Professor Emerita and (former) Director of Education Assessment
Indiana University School of Social Work
902 West New York Street, ES 4138G
Indianapolis, IN 46202-5156
317-903-9522 / ckpike@iupui.edu

Celebrating more than 100 Years of Giving Hope and Changing Lives

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the addressed recipient/s and may contain information that is confidential, proprietary or privileged. Any unauthorized review, response, use, distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. Receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient is not a waiver of confidentiality or privilege.

Pamela Howard

From: Armstrong CIV Timothy J <Timothy.J.Armstrong@usmc.mil>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 8:32 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Cc: Armstrong, Kimberly; Timothyjeb@yahoo.com; Kimberly Armstrong
Subject: Opposition to Northpoint 2 PUD

To: Advisory Plan Commission (APC)
From: Armstrong Family @ 20636 Anthony Road
subject: Northpoint 2 Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Enclosures:

- (1) Our Pasture
- (2) Our back yard
- (3) Our son with the alpacas

In 2016 my family and I made the decision to move from a cramped Westfield neighborhood troubled by teenage vandalism, pestered by loud music, and no privacy to a peaceful semi-secluded beautiful country home perfect for gazing at countryside, enjoying wildlife, raising farm animals, and relaxing with peace and quiet. With the existing Comp plan, we knew everything we came to love about our country home would remain untouched by the City of Westfield. Unfortunately, we were devastated to find out several developers put their own interest in front of respecting us and our surrounding neighbors.

To help put this in perspective for you, I've included pictures of our yard aimed right where Northpoint 2 is threatening to build. My wife has cried herself to sleep for the last week at the thought of houses suffocating our property as though we're right back in a crowded neighborhood. The developers' diagram indicates nine homes would back up against our back yard and our pasture. As one of the primary affected residents of Anthony Road, it's incumbent upon me to share with you our side of this. The side negatively impacted by this careless, thoughtless, idea that takes nothing into consideration except for someone to make some money and then walk away.

Our Animals

Part of the dream to our country life was having animals roam in the pasture. We purchased and rescued several animals including alpacas. We currently have the perfect quiet pasture for alpacas. They don't like noise and are very shy around strangers. They like to keep to themselves and approach people on their terms. The shock of the initial construction with the proposed mayhem alone would be enough to cause catastrophic stress to our alpacas. If they survive that, they will be forced to endure a lifelong discomfort of crowded housing right behind their safe space. I get sick to my stomach just thinking about it.

Lowered Property Value

We moved here a few years ago intending for this to be our 'forever home'. We installed a pool, purchased recreational vehicles, and invested time and money on various home improvement projects. My family and I are dug in.

Encroaching on our countryside would obviously force us to move from Westfield which would be a logistical nightmare alone. The worst part is our property value will nose dive causing us to lose money. That's unacceptable to us.

Scenery Destroyed

Choosing to live here in the aftermath would not be a choice at all. We would be stuck at that point. Instead of sitting on the back porch gazing at the sunrise while we enjoy our coffee. We can stare at the back of nine homes right behind our back yard.

Privacy Lost

With that being said, we can kiss our privacy goodbye. I can't stand the thought of being on display as we use our hot tub, relax in our shelter, and host private family gatherings.

Goes Against The Comprehensive Plan

Above all, this development goes against the Comprehensive Plan which states this type of unattractive condensed housing or industrial zoning will NOT be considered north of State Road 38. These developers don't seem to care. Convincing you to let them infringe on our countryside is just a part of everyday business to them and their lawyer.

These are all just the points that come to mind as I take the time to write. Of course there are countless small inconveniences we will encounter along the way such as our line of site internet being demolished because of ridiculous housing between us and the tower we connect to. Only time will tell how much more we have to be troubled with if you allow this to move forward.

I understand Westfield is a growing community. I see new developments pop up like wildfire wherever I go. I know development is inevitable throughout the city. However, we all made a conscientious decision to move out to an area where we would not be impacted and harmed by it. If you give in to this reckless plan, history will be lost, more habitats will be destroyed, and our home will be shattered.

Please don't let this happen to our home and community. Thank you for listening.

Tim Armstrong
Extremely concerned Anthony Rd. resident

Enclosure 1



Enclosure 2



Enclosure 3



Pamela Howard

From: Wayne Wheeler <wwheeler@REINDERS.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 9:12 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Cc: Pamela Howard
Subject: Letter of Opposition to Northpoint II

Warning: This external email is from wwheeler@REINDERS.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear APC and Council Members,

I am writing in opposition to the Northpoint PUD (2008-PUD-09). When I bought my land 4 years ago on Anthony Rd I used the City of Westfield's Comprehensive plan along with the county's plan as a reference guide as to where to look for land. The spot I chose was largely based on the fact that it was 3 acres in the country, surrounded by agricultural land with little chance of having development around me. After having lived in subdivisions my whole life this was a "bucket list" purchase for me. When I bought the property, I knew what the zoning was and what I could build on it. Unlike Northpoint Owners, I did not buy the land and then try to re-zone it for a hog farm or warehouses, I followed the rules set forth in the Comp Plan.

I understand that the Comp Plan is a Policy and not a law, however any amending of the Comp Plan should be a city led process involving multiple public input sessions and not be dictated by a developers re-zoning request. I think you will agree that what is being proposed (industrial/commercial) is diametrically opposed to what the city has put forth in the Comp Plan. I also want to say that I am not against development at all, we need it as a healthy city, however I am against forcing a square peg into a round hole and that's exactly what is going on in this situation. Put industrial/commercial development where it belongs in existing zoned areas and not out in the country in an area that has been thoughtfully protected by the city visionaries in the Comp Plan.

Currently this land is AG-SF1: Agriculture/Single-Family Rural District. The Comp Plan clearly indicates all land on the North side of HWY 38 to fall under this category. (reference page 31 & 32 in Comp Plan) The Rural Northeast quadrant of the township includes single-family residences; agricultural areas, some smaller artisan farms; and some equestrian uses. There are natural areas, including wetlands, wooded areas, and much open farm ground. Also, the area contains two existing large parks, MacGregor and Bray, and there will be a new county park at 216th and Hinkle. Currently there are NO commercial or Industrial uses in the Comp Plan area North of Hwy 38 and East of US 31. However, south of Hwy 38 there is over 1,900 acres of currently zoned commercial/industrial parcels that are undeveloped and already exist on the Comp Plan in designated "business park" areas. Currently there is approximately 184 acres in Northpoint I that is available for development. Northpoint I only has 3 buildings, we don't know how it's going to affect our area yet, the roads are not in, the connection to Hwy 38 doesn't exist yet, the buildings are not up, we don't know what traffic is going to look like...It's not prudent to approve Northpoint II without even understanding the impact on the area of a completed Northpoint I.

I know somebody is reading this, rolling their eyes and mumbling under their breath something about the city needing to diversify their tax base and add more commercial properties, so let's talk about it. All of us want to

increase the commercial tax base in hopes that someday it will lessen the burden on the residential side. What increases the tax base is buildings that are on the tax rolls and not empty industrial/commercial lots. We can continue to develop ground, but if no one is building on it, then what are we doing? Bringing businesses to existing “shovel ready” ground is what gets buildings built and the taxes rolling in. How about we challenge our commercial developers to bring us businesses that are ready to build? At the pace buildings are going up in Northpoint I we have several years of lot inventory already on hand. Currently there are only 2 buildings completed and 1 more under construction. Of those 3 buildings all of them have either an 8 or 10 year tax abatement attached to them. So, if the city is concerned with wanting to expand the tax base on commercial properties then we need more buildings and shorter tax abatement terms. Adding more empty lots does not increase the city’s commercial tax base.

The most appropriate land uses for this area are exactly what is there now, agricultural fields and single-family homes. If Northpoint Owners wants to develop this land, then they need to propose a conservation subdivision or individual 3-acre home sites. My guess is, if they proposed that, they would have never heard from the 400+ people that signed the petition against their current proposal.

Please help us preserve our rural lifestyle and the value of our largest investments, our homes.
Let’s do what’s best for the masses and not the few...

Thank you in advance for considering my concerns and voting “No” on this proposal.

Wayne Wheeler
20889 Anthony Rd
317.697.1160

Pamela Howard

From: Alyssa Lovett <alyssa.kidpsychinc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 10:06 PM
To: APC
Subject: No construction

Warning: This external email is from alyssa.kidpsychinc@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

We live on Anthony Rd. because we wanted to live in the country and have a little farm. Please don't turn our neighborhood into a construction zone and business park.

Pamela Howard

From: Christy Wheeler <bigskyorbust@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 9:18 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Cc: Pamela Howard
Subject: Objection to Northpoint II
Attachments: NP2 CSW Objection.docx

Warning: This external email is from bigskyorbust@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Please find attached my letter of opposition.

Thank you,
Christy Wheeler

February 11, 2021

Dear APC and City Council,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the Northpoint II PUD. It simply does not belong in an agricultural, rural residential area.

I have nothing against progress, nothing against business, nothing against enhancing the tax base for Westfield, but some things simply must be protected...protected so they stay the same, so we have some remembrance of what this community has been for many years and what makes it unique.

Several years ago, multiple individuals and organizations spent countless hours developing a framework to do just this. They created the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan. They did this in order to ensure that as Westfield grew, the growth would be responsible. One can see by reading the Comp Plan that they created a living document, it wasn't created for just a specific point in time. They looked to the future and thoughtfully outlined development policies. For the Northeast Rural Residential (NRR) area, they contemplated the future and the change they saw was potential residential development – NOT commercial/industrial. It was never planned that Industrial and high density housing would be considered for the Northeast area. The NRR area was to be rural for the foreseeable future. I realize that the Comp Plan is not a legally binding document, but it is the official policy of Westfield and the agreed-upon vision for the future of the community. Shouldn't a reasonable person be able to conclude that the Comp Plan is relevant and applicable? Based on the city's own plan, Northpoint II does not belong in the NRR area.

If the city feels that things have changed significantly in terms of land use needs, there is a process to address this – take the time to thoughtfully “redo” the Comp Plan with input from the citizens. Hamilton County just went through this process and they had very interesting and significant citizen input to their process (please see the Remonstrance Packet submitted for more information on this). It would be a travesty to allow a developer to dictate land use...wouldn't that be a bit like the tail wagging the dog?

One might ask, why does this cause such an uproar from the citizens? What's the big deal? This is why it matters to us...

- It matters because this proposal would lead to the degradation of the rural lifestyle of our area...dropping industrial facilities right in the middle of what has been deemed (by Westfield) to be a Rural Residential area. Taking the fields and beautiful night skies and turning them into concrete and parking lots, noise and pollution. There is no amount of buffer or development standards that would protect our area's rural charm from this type of intrusion. The rural character of this area would be completely changed forever.
- It matters because of the types of facilities that would possibly be built on this 180+ acre site. Imagine, a Steel fabricator, an Amphitheater, a Trucking company, a major hospital, even an Amusement Park would be possible with a special exemption approval! Does any of this sound even remotely compatible with Rural Residential?
- It matters because it will decrease our property values. Most of us made a thoughtful choice to live in this area. Many have invested a sizeable amount of money, time, and heart into our

homes. This type of development will significantly decrease the desirableness of this area and thus the value of our homes. Money will be taken away from us so that a developer who doesn't even live here can make money.

- It matters because it sets a precedent. Once something like this is anchored on the north side of Highway 38, it paves the way for industrial creep. Think about it...if this industrial park is built, how long will it be before the fields north or east of it fall victim to the same zoning?
- It matters because it will impact our health and safety. Increased heavy equipment and vehicle traffic, air pollution, noise pollution and light pollution. It is common knowledge that vehicle exhaust increases air pollution and noise pollution. It is common knowledge that air pollution is hazardous to our health. But noise pollution has also been shown to affect health negatively. It can cause a number of short and long term health problems such as sleep disturbance, cardiovascular effects, poor work & school performance, hearing impairment, etc...those most vulnerable to noise pollution are the elderly, chronically ill, and children. Groundwater contamination. How will our wells be affected? Will they be contaminated with chemical runoff? Will the aquifer be impacted? Trucks, businesses operating 24/7, people coming in and out of the area at all hours of the day and night brings serious safety issues.

It seems so clear that Northpoint II does not make sense for this area.

Additionally concerning is the way in which this proposal has come about. The developer chose to purchase the land rather than paying for an option to buy the land (which is the common practice). The developer (by his own admission) purchased the land with full knowledge of how the land was zoned. The developer purchased the land knowing what the Comp Plan envisioned for the area. They purchased the land with their eyes wide open. Now they expect to force this development on the Northeast Rural Residential area citizens when there is NO CRITICAL NEED to do so...it's absurd. How could it possibly make any rational sense to destroy this tiny, 1,320 acre district in order to accommodate the business decision of one developer? Hundreds of families vs. one developer. How could the desire of one developer have more value, carry more weight, than that of several hundred families who call this their home? Is a speculative industrial development really the most responsible use for this land?

In closing, I would like to say that this is very personal. It's about our daily life, our reality. This is where we live, where we come home to at the end of the day, this is where we rejuvenate, where we recharge our proverbial batteries. This is our most personal and private place...it is our refuge...it is our home. As you weigh your decision, please take into consideration the fact that this is much more than words and numbers on a piece of paper...it impacts real people.

Thank you very much for your service and your time,

Christy Wheeler

20889 Anthony Road

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth...Genesis 1:1

Pamela Howard

From: Ted Sommer <Ted.Sommer@LWGcpa.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 6:32 PM
To: APC
Cc: Council Members
Subject: FW: Proposed Northpoint II development

Warning: This external email is from Ted.Sommer@LWGcpa.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

From: Ted Sommer
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 11:03 AM
To: Carol Sommer <carol.ann.sommer@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed Northpoint II development

Hello. My name is Ted Sommer. My wife Carol and I live at 21001 Anthony Road. We moved to this property from Carmel in 2008. I grew up on a farm in Missouri, and I wanted to go back to that environment and my wife who is a Master Gardener also cherishes the same more rural environment. We have worked with the Hamilton County Soil and Water District to develop a backyard conservation plan. Over the course of the last decade we have developed a wildlife habitat, improved the water quality of our ponds and planted a great number of plants native to Indiana including those necessary for the propagation of the Monarch butterfly. We would hate to have this threatened by unnecessary increased human activity. If you approve this change to the Master Plan and the PUD Ordinance to include this piece of property, we will see a drop in the value of our home and a reduction in our quality of life. At a minimum I would consider this to be confiscation of my property resulting from the decrease in value of my home.

The owner/developer commented on a call last week with homeowners that the development of this Northpoint II 183 acres would justify the \$7,200,000 investment in East Street and the light at Anthony and Highway 38. Forgive me, but that is nonsense. While I do not particularly like the idea of a stoplight at Anthony Road and East Street, it does have the potential to enhance safety given the increased traffic coming from Northpoint I. It surely does not [support a rationale](#) to further open up land north of Highway 38 to Commercial development and High Density housing when we believe it already has the existing best use of the property as identified in the Master Plan.

Respectfully, we ask that you please not let this development occur in the manner proposed.

Ted and Carol Sommer



Ted Sommer, CPA

LWG CPAs & Advisors

p: (317) 634-4747 ext. 222 f: (317) 632-2727

a: 1776 North Meridian Street, Suite 500, Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

w: LWGcpa.com

e: Ted.Sommer@LWGcpa.com



Pamela Howard

From: Allen Still <allen.still@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 9:08 AM
To: APC; planners
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

Warning: This external email is from allen.still@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Good Morning,

As a neighbor to the *Northeast Rural Residential* district and surrounding area, I am extremely concerned with the plans of Northpoint's Petition No. 2008-PUD-09. A similar opposition to this petition was raised when "Northpoint 1" was built and everyone was ensured that this type of irresponsible development would not bleed into the Northeast Rural Residential district. This petition should be voted down in its entirety as the NRR district will be ruined forever if the APC and City Council pass such an abomination. 2008-PUD-09 shows a blatant disregard for the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan ("Comp Plan") and, further, violates all 5 elements of Indiana Code IC 36-7-4-603.

As a neighboring home owner to the Northeast Rural Residential district, I am concerned that the development will destroy the rural residential culture and threaten our environmental resources including groundwater supply. Our family has enjoyed the amenities provided to us by Hamilton County Parks and Rec and Westfield Washington Parks in Bray Family Homestead and MacGregor Park. These nature parks will be devastated by the noise, light and air pollution and increased traffic. In addition to disregarding the Comprehensive Plan and ruining the rural aspect of the area, this development will eventually destroy our property values as neighboring residents to this irresponsible industrial development.

Please vote no, it is the right thing to do.

Thank You
Allen Still
317-563-2815
allen.still@gmail.com
4965 Morning Mist Ct
Noblesville, IN 46062

Pamela Howard

From: Pat Boyle <pjboyle@midlandatlantic.us>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 11:28 AM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint II PUD Objection
Attachments: Boyle - Letter to Westfield Council and APC.pdf

Warning: This external email is from pjboyle@midlandatlantic.us. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear Council and APC members – I am a resident of Westfield and live on Anthony Rd. Please find attached my letter of objection to the proposed Northpoint II PUD.

Thank you for your service and consideration.

Best regards,

PATRICK BOYLE | MIDLAND ATLANTIC PROPERTIES

Office Direct: 317-597-1718 | Office Main: 317.580.9900, Ext. 1800

Mobile: 317.679.6322 | Fax: 317.580.1169

pjboyle@midlandatlantic.us | www.midlandatlantic.com

3801 East 82nd Street, Suite B, Indianapolis, Indiana 46240

February 11, 2021

Westfield City Council &
Westfield Advisory Plan Commission
Westfield, IN

RE: Objection to the Proposed Northpoint II PUD

To the members of the Westfield City Council and the Westfield Advisory Plan Commission:

My name is Patrick Boyle. My wife Wendy and I live at 21312 Anthony Rd in Westfield. I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed Northpoint II PUD.

I have lived on Anthony Rd now for nearly 7 years but have been a resident of Westfield 24 years (since 1998). I love Westfield and purposely chose it for its small town and community feel as well as its excellent school system. All in all a great place to live and raise a family. In 2014 we moved from Setters Run to Anthony Rd specifically to escape the density of a production home community, gain a little elbow room and enjoy county living. Anthony Rd on this northeast corner of the township has become known a jewel, an oasis in Westfield, where larger-lot, estate and county homes abound which in my opinion and the opinions of many, is at the core of the character and roots of Westfield – what makes it a special place to live.

I am a partner at a real estate development company, Midland Atlantic Properties, and consequently am generally supportive of new development and economic growth, when appropriate. However, “appropriate” is the key word here. Westfield’s comprehensive plan specifically calls for this area in question to remain non-dense residential. The comprehensive plan, written in 2010, was a very well-thought-out plan, the collaborative and deliberate effort of hundreds of members of the community, city staff and officials. Why deviate from that plan now and agree to a re-zoning? I understand the need to evolve, adapt and grow as a city but to disregard a recent comprehensive plan and change from agriculture to industrial zoning (regardless of the design and use standard concessions made by the developer) is just not appropriate, not compatible with the area, contrary to the vision of the community, not smart, just plain wrong and quite frankly, offensive. When we (Midland Atlantic) developed Monon Crossing recently (where Chipotle, Denny’s and Burger King are located) at SR 32 & Wheeler Rd, we did seek a rezoning of original parcels containing old homes and also sought minor variances to things like set backs and landscape requirements in our PUD, but all these changes were compatible with the comprehensive plan and very much in the spirit of the city’s and communities’ vision. The Northpoint II PUD is different, a much more drastic and onerous change.


I understand the desire to attract economic growth, jobs and investment, to the area and I am generally supportive of that vision. However, growth must not be at the cost of a well thought-out and established long term comprehensive plan. The Northpoint developer says that he needs larger tracts of

land to attract larger users which cannot be accommodated at the existing Northpointe I development. Please keep in mind that Northpointe I is still not fully leased or committed to so we feel that they do have room in that project to accommodate the growth they seek. More importantly, there are in fact several larger tracts of land south of SR 38 and either adjacent to, contiguous with or nearby North Pointe I and on SR 32 west for US 31, as shown in the official neighborhood objection package we neighbors have submitted to you, most of which are indeed within the appropriate areas and compatible with the comprehensive plan and some already with appropriate zoning and even some with TIF's in place to accomplish what they are looking for. The city constructed the exit off of US 31 at 191st St to make this a gateway into the business park area and more easily accommodate the truck traffic and commercial activity. Let's stay with that plan and keep the commercial and industrial development in these other areas.

Further the neighborhood group and I believe that this re-zoning request does not meet specific legal requirements to qualify for a rezoning (as described in more detail in the neighborhood objection package). If you allow this, it will open the floodgates for industrial development to sprawl further north and east into this corner of the township, eliminating one of Westfield's last non-dense residential and agricultural areas, forever changing the character of the area and consequently changing the complexion of Westfield as a city and community.

We ask that you councilmen and commission members respect the comprehensive plan, preserve the vision of the community and comprehensive plan and vote against the Northpoint II PUD.

Thank you and respectfully yours,

The image shows two handwritten signatures in black ink. The signature on the left is a stylized, cursive 'P' followed by a long horizontal flourish. The signature on the right is written in a more legible, cursive script and reads 'Wendy Boyle'.

Patrick & Wendy Boyle
21312 Anthony Rd, Westfield, IN 46062
317-679-6322
patandwendyboyle@gmail.com
pjboyle@midlandatlantic.us

Pamela Howard

From: Sara Whitcomb <daviskidpsych@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 12:33 PM
To: APC
Subject: Oppose Northpointe Development

Warning: This external email is from daviskidpsych@icloud.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

My name is Dr Sara Davis Whitcomb and I oppose development on the acreage between Hinkle and Anthony Road north of 38. I have an organic farm and Camp Organic which will negatively be impacted by light pollution, traffic, and eventually other environmental pollutants. I have lived in this beautiful rural setting for 15 years and want it to remain the most picturesque road in Hamilton County. Safe for families and wildlife.

Dr. Sara

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 12:52 PM
To: APC
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

Warning: This external email is from jpedzinski@comcast.net. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

February 12, 2021

Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

Dear Westfield Advisory Plan Commission,

I am writing to express my concern with the thought that the Planning Commission would even consider reviewing the Petition for No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

As a citizen of the Northeast Rural Residential District (NRR), my family relocated to this area for the quiet and scenic location. As part of our selection process, we researched the surrounding Zoning Ordinances and felt comfortable that projects such as Northport II would not be allowed.

Allow me to summarize my concerns...

- A. Nothing in the Northpoint II PUD supports rural residential development. The proposed PUD is blatantly abusive regarding IC 36-7-4-603 Comprehensive Plan.
- B. Current Conditions and character of the land and structures in NRR district will not be maintained as per IC 36-7-4-603 (reasonable regard to current conditions) Most of the residences in this district are on "well water" thus environmental factors contribute to unacceptable risk to our families and homes. The infrastructure (roadways) is mostly supported by the county. Have you taken into consideration the damage caused by heavily laden trucks and the damage they do to county roads? Have you considered the narrow county streets where our children often ride their bikes and play with their pets? The SAFETY Issues need to be addressed.
- C. Property Values – IC -36-7-4-603 (shall pay reasonable regard to the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction). You owe the current homeowners the right to understand how this will impact their property values. From my research, the likeability factor of our rural neighborhoods will be diminished, thus effecting our property values, some are suggesting our property values will be 30% lower because of Northpoint II.

There are many more points which are being made by the NRR Citizens which need to be considered.

I feel the APC has no choice but to reject 2008-PUD-09 and their attempt to reclassify land use to anything other than Rural Residential.

I ask you to consider our views, the citizens of NRR, and consider what you would do if this was being proposed in your neighborhood.

I urge you to reject 2008-PUD—09.

Sincerely,

James R Pedzinski
5250 Nightshade Lane
Noblesville, IN 46062

Pamela Howard

From: Melissa Hinshaw <melissa.hinshaw@cumberlandcg.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 1:29 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint 2 Objection

Warning: This external email is from melissa.hinshaw@cumberlandcg.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Dear APC & City Council,

I'm writing to object to the Northpoint 2 Development. My husband, Seth Hinshaw & I purchased our home on Anthony Road nearly 14 years ago. We chose this area of Westfield because of it's location and the fact that the majority of the homes on our street were built on at least 3 acre lots with a great amount of space and privacy. We believed that our area would be the last to feel encroached up due to the City and County's Comprehensive Plans. The facts show that the City, the County and the State agreed that we would be the last homes to experience development pressure.

We reside in a unique area of Westfield. We are sandwiched between two beautiful parks. These Nature Parks were donated by the generous land owners who lived here before us. McGregor & Bray Parks are an area unique to this part of our community. Also, it's been announced that the Hamilton County Parks Department has put down earnest money and intends to purchase 108 acres of land to develop into yet another beautiful Nature Park. In order to make plans to purchase this land, Hamilton County did update their Comprehensive Plan. Why wouldn't the City of Westfield update our Comprehensive Plan prior to allowing some piece-meal development that is the polar opposite of the vision for this part of our community.

Allowing an Industrial Park to be built does not pay reasonable regard to:

- the current Character of our community
- the most desirable use of the area
- our property values
- the City or the County Comprehensive Plans

This project not only devalues our properties and quality of life, but provides the basis for what is acceptable north of 38.

That is nowhere in any plan.

In fact, it is exactly the opposite of what our community plan is and the Comprehensive Plan of the county.

If city wants to see that changed and believes more property is needed in Westfield for these type of uses, they need to develop that plan, publicly vet that plan and how they intend to plan the area surrounding it...not impose it where it was never envisioned.

I plead you to do the right thing and vote NO to a development that does not benefit anyone except the developers. If you feel this is a benefit to our City, let's take the time to update our Vision for this area. And do that in a transparent and thoughtfully planned way.

Kind Regards,
Melissa Hinshaw



Melissa Hinshaw

Recruiter

Cumberland

office & mobile: 317-460-6751

www.cumberlandcg.com

[LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#)

Pamela Howard

From: rwgudeman@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 2:00 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Concern! Northpoint II development

Warning: This external email is from rwgudeman@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

To whom it may concern –

I am writing to express a deep concern over the development of our rural area North of 38 and East of Anthony. The natural features of our area would be completely disrespected in the proposed development. The homestead farms, the equestrian areas, the agricultural life style of us and our neighbors would be compromised with no thought of preservation for the open spaces so needed by the whole community . Please consider development with conservation of rural and open spaces.

I am asking that the APC vote against this Northpoint II Industrial Park PUD.

Thank you.

Rebecca Gudeman

R W Gudeman LLC
20649 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
P: 317-840-1041
E: rwgudeman@gmail.com

Pamela Howard

From: Sandra Dunbar <sdunbar213@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 2:46 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Opposition

Warning: This external email is from sdunbar213@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

We are residents of the home located at 21344 Anthony Road, Westfield IN 46062. We are writing to further express our concerns about the rezoning of the land at the northeast corner of Anthony Road and SR 38. As stated in a previous email, this proposed rezoning is in total violation of the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan. The Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan allows for development similar to the properties adjacent to the parcel seeking rezoning; low density housing, rural uses including homestead farms, natural appearing open space, limited lighting to preserve night sky, etc. There is no commercial/industrial development noted as acceptable in the comprehensive plan.

There are numerous large acre tracts located and for sale in the Westfield area that are currently zoned for commercial/industrial use. Taking a property surrounded by small farms and low density housing and changing the complexion to be commercial/industrial development park and high density housing, regardless of the income to the city of Westfield, seems ludicrous. By developing the land for its original zoning intent, maintains the culture of the surrounding properties and land.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in our opposition to this rezoning attempt.

David and Sandy Dunbar

David 317-696-0228

Sandy 317-402-4650

Pamela Howard

From: Justin Rusher <justin@hittleconstruction.net>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 5:37 PM
To: Council Members
Cc: APC
Subject: No to Northpoint!

Warning: This external email is from justin@hittleconstruction.net. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

City of Westfield

As a concerned homeowner that is personally affected by the possibility of adding another section of Northpoint industrial and a new high density subdivision as a buffer please consider what you're doing to the current homeowners, traffic and the plan that was adopted. The area is currently rural ag and was stated to stay rural AG in the plan the city spent millions having prepared. If the industrial area in Northpoint 1 wasn't large enough then why did houses get added into the space. Industrial shouldn't be mixed with Residential especially for what is be allowed on the plan. We currently have 3 businesses that make up northpoint 1 and all the rest of the ground is sitting idle, so why do we need more space already? Keep industrial south of 38! The issue I see with a high density, low price point subdivision is the people it attracts, the affect on current homeowners would have on resale value, theft, vandalism and all you're doing is using them as a buffer!? I would much rather have green space than housing.

The route the city is going it seems there is no plan or the plan they had is thrown out the window and it all just boils down to money and padding pockets. The list of investors on this project shows already that this is the case and I won't go into detail on that matter yet. The way the land was purchased and sold the same day, the amount of money to switch owners on the parcels, the trading of other parcels as favors and the amount of corruption around it all. Look at the current available land currently zoned commercial or industrial and fill it in.

The excuse used for developing it for tax purposes is void because when the city gives 8-10 year tax free to all the existing businesses in northpoint 1 then it's hard to make money when it's all abated.

Please rethink about this plan and turn it down.

This is an agricultural area and needs to remain that way.

Thank you

Justin Rusher

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Brent Whaley <whaleyb0@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 5:10 PM
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

Warning: This external email is from whaleyb0@yahoo.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Hi All

Thanks for taking the time to read my email. I have become very concerned after learning of the 180 degree turn on the plans that include Northpoint II. As a resident of the NRR, my family and I moved to this area for very specific reasons and being next to an industrial park certainly is not one of them. The zoning/state of the proposed land was main reason that we moved into our subdivision. Hinkle Creek Estates is a 60 acre development that gives the country feel that we so desperately desired when we made a significant investment in our home. Even since moving here almost 3 years ago, we have seen a dramatic uptick in accidents on Hinkle and State road 38 and to add an industrial park would increase that traffic exponentially. We use Bray Family Park very regularly and value the quaint spring and summer evenings that this area affords. Our children value the space and relative secretive living in which this area is known. Lastly, the introduction of pollution in many forms (noise, car, water, littering) would directly impact all of us in this area and would be a far cry from farmland in which it was indented. There has to be other options for this to be built. My ask is that you please consider those areas since the future of this site was decided long ago for a park.

This area is one of a kind and introducing this complexity would certainly ruin that for many.

Below is my contact information should you have questions for me.

Brent Whaley
5215 Nightshade Lane
Noblesville IN 46062

317-937-2719 Cell
Hinkle Creek Estates

Thanks,

Brent Whaley
Purdue Alumnus

Pamela Howard

From: Paige Hunt <paige.a.hunt@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 27, 2022 11:35 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint Opposition

**WARNING: This external email is from
paige.a.hunt@gmail.com.**

Hi there,

I wanted to send an email to oppose the Northpoint industrial park that is being proposed on 1/31/22. My husband and I are building right on the corner of Hunt Real Estate that would bump up to the proposed park and the Industrial park building. One of the reasons that we chose this piece of property was for the rural area. We love that there aren't huge buildings blocking our views and that it's relatively quiet with little to no traffic. Adding this industrial park not only adds a ton more traffic to 38, it will ultimately add a more traffic to our little road, Anthony, making it more dangerous for our kids to play outside hut also taking away the serenity of a rural landscape. Please consider our opposition.

Thanks,
Paige Hunt Hackman

Pamela Howard

From: Jean <squiredc@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 30, 2022 9:28 AM
To: APC
Subject: North point 2

**WARNING: This external email is from
squiredc@gmail.com.**

Hi,
We live on Anthony Rd in Westfield.
We love the secluded area and the ability to escape the “city” noise and distraction.
Your proposal to bring in more development will completely destroy the atmosphere and the property value of our homes.
Please do not allow this project to continue.
Thank you.
Jean and Denice Squire

Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: Curt Christensen <curtchristensen93@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2022 6:53 AM
To: APC
Subject: NP2

**WARNING: This external email is from
curtchristensen93@yahoo.com.**

I am vehemently opposed to the NP2. This is not the place for industrial development. The people living in this area, including myself, moved, and or built here, because we want a rural living environment. There is plenty of land available west of 31 on 236th street. We are turning Westfield into a 1980's Kokomo. We should learn from the mistakes our neighbors two counties north made.

Our home values will be detrimentally affected, as well as the peacefulness of rural living. The industrial development just west of Grassy Branch is the very reason I did not buy or build in that area. The increase in traffic and road deterioration will just ruin a beautiful rural area. Not to mention the additional trash along the road way and surrounding area which invariably happens.

This is just not a very good idea nor is it right. There are other and more appropriate places where an industrial development can be established. Including west on 38. I can only take an educated guess why you are not trying to establish an industrial park that direction.

This is just flat out not the right place and it will never be a good time.

Curt Christensen

Pamela Howard

From: TJ Gascho <tj.gascho@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2022 7:44 AM
To: APC; planners
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

**WARNING: This external email is from
tj.gascho@gmail.com.**

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing regarding the proposed Northpoint II PUD. My family and I built our home 5 years ago in Hinkle Creek Estates, which is very close in proximity. We decided to build in Hinkle Creek Estates to enjoy the "country" feel with reasonable access to "city" amenities. We invested significant capital in our home to provide a comfortable and safe environment to raise our three children. I'm sure this is top of mind for many of you when you're making decisions for your respective families. I feel strongly that the Northpoint II PUD will not only jeopardize the safe environment we have for our family, but it will also have a serious negative equity impact on our home value (and many others in the area).

Please take a second to imagine someone building a 170 acre commercially congested business park in your back yard. Ruining the natural rural character. Adding significant traffic! Introducing noise and air pollution, and threatening environmental resources! Meanwhile, devaluing your home up to 30%!! Please provide a scenario where it's unreasonable to object. Unfortunately, this scenario is very real for us if Northpoint II PUD is approved.

During your vote, I hope you will understand and acknowledge the negative impact NP II PUD will have on the surrounding community. Please be considerate of these negative impacts along with many others, and vote "NO" to Northpoint II PUD.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Timothy J Gascho II
5164 Morning Mist Ct
Noblesville, IN 46062
P: 317-289-5555

Objection Basis:

-IC 36-7-4-603 (2) (shall pay reasonable regard to the current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in the NRR district)

-IC 36-7-4-603 (4) (shall pay reasonable regard to the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction)

Pamela Howard

From: Casey Mihal <casey.mihal@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2022 12:29 PM
To: APC
Subject: Protest of Northpoint II Industrial Park

**WARNING: This external email is from
casey.mihal@gmail.com.**

Dear Westfield APC,

I am a new resident to the area, writing to you in protest of the Northpoint II Industrial Park that is being proposed once again. While I am a newer resident to this area, I was initially drawn to it due to the rural charm. The area is peaceful, quiet, and beautiful. This is in-line with the Westfield Washington Comprehensive Plan. I have reviewed this plan, and it explicitly states the following regarding the land that Northpoint Owners, LLC wishes to develop:

"The policy of this plan is that these areas will be designated as rural for the foreseeable future. In particular, the development for these areas as anything other than rural or agricultural uses in the near future would violate the contiguity policy set out in the general policies."

The plan also describes the following appropriate land uses in the Rural Northeast area:

- Single-family detached houses on large lots or in a Rural or Conservation Subdivision.**
- Accessory dwellings**
- Equestrian uses**
- Agriculture, including artisan farms**
- Institutional uses, such as schools, churches, public safety facilities, and similar uses**

There is no mention of an industrial park being appropriate or allowed in the Rural Northeast area. I currently see no addendum to this comprehensive plan that would change the status of this land to anything other than the rural definition stated in the original plan drafted in 2007. Therefore, I fail to see how an industrial park could possibly be appropriate, nor how it could represent the interests and well being of the residents surrounding this land. Let me also add here that the new proposal from Northpoint Owners, LLC is a pathetic attempt at including a 10 acre park to make up for the destructive 170 acre industrial park. In accordance with this comprehensive plan, I think a 180 acre park with 0 acres of industrial park would be much more appropriate, and much desired by the residents of the area.

Development of this rural land into an industrial park would send one very clear message: corporate interests are far more important than the interests of your constituents. If this land is to be converted into an industrial park, then it would seem the appropriate progression would be to first call for revision the comprehensive plan with input from the community. Proceeding with development of the land into an industrial park without revision of the plan would surely be a way to lose the trust and support of your constituents.

I will close this letter with a quick reflection of the land in question. I drove around the area today to better understand the physical impact that the industrial park could have. A large majority of this land is occupied by agriculture. The remainder of the land seemed to be wooded and grassland area. Agriculture is already shrinking in the United States (Indiana included) because corporate interests and money are taking over the land. The current supply chain issues our country is facing should offer a stark reminder that we cannot rely 100% on the global distribution network for our food supply. Localized food production should always have a place in Indiana. It would seem that the City of Westfield has already done away with the majority of it's

agricultural land for industrial or commercial purposes. It would be quite upsetting, and frankly detrimental to continue this trend in the Rural Northeast area.

I look forward to speaking my opinions at the upcoming hearings, so that the APC can know without a doubt that I am fully against the Northpoint II Industrial Park.

Best Regards,

Casey Mihal

Pamela Howard

From: Canada, Brad <brad.canada@stryker.com>
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2022 1:32 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
brad.canada@stryker.com.**

APC Members,

I have sent emails in the past but wanted to re-voice my position on continued development north of SR38 as I see this is coming back up stemming from a hard push in 2021 from the Developer.

My name is Brad Canada and live at 20945 Anthony Road. There has been numerous conversations going on among the neighbors that live on Anthony Road as well as up and down SR38. We know that there is a developer that is aggressively looking to gain approval to rezone a rural "residential" area into a massive industrial park. I wanted to share my perspective and reiterate that I would like your support to not approve this rezoning.

I have only been living in this area for 5 years (grew up in Fishers) but the broader SR38/Anthony/31/Hinkle Creek northeastern part of Westfield is a special place. Driving up through Anthony feels more like Brown County vs Hamilton County. McGregor Park and Bray Family Park makes this area even more special but it's the surrounding areas that add to that. Westfield is a fast growing place and there is so many advantages to that and one that drew us to the area to begin with (schools, people, growth, amenities, etc). Growth in this area is a GOOD thing but there needs to be a balance to protect certain areas to offset the traffic, noise, etc. A HUGE industrial park was just approved south of SR38 that is still being developed so to approve another 180+ acre park + the future progression to then approve another 180+ acre plot on Anthony makes this rural area feel like we are down in Plainfield in the midst of their distribution and industrial areas. Westfield would then be losing a huge chunk of green space that could potentially be a nice residential area that could in theory connect both parks and be a place where the community could get away from the traffic, noise, chaos of what other parts could be.

I plan on raising my 3 young kids in this house and be here forever and part of that decision was giving them an area that was safe. I fear the traffic, I fear the amount of people commuting here daily that is not bought in or involved in this community, I fear the pollution/trash, and most importantly – I fear that this area and this community loses a huge part of what makes this community different that a Fishers, Carmel, or Noblesville. That is the ability to properly plan for future growth by also protecting pockets of the community that make it feel green and enjoy the beautiful scenes of nature and a rural setting in the pockets of heavy residential/commercial areas. I would MUCH more support a residential zoned area to drive population and keep the green area as close to what we can and continue to build out south of 38 and other areas that are more suited for industrial growth.

We do need industrial growth and areas to bring businesses here (which we have south of SR38 and pockets west on 31) but I strongly encourage you all to please have the voice of your residents and our strong views against turning the most beautiful area in all of central Indiana into a massive concrete industrial zone that would have a huge negative impact on so many people and so many things. Please consider our request to vote "NO" to rezone these areas as industrial north of 38. Please consider keeping the industrial growth and overall focus be on the land and acreage that has already been approved just south of 38 and other areas that have been designated already as "industrial" for further expansion. This

Anthony Road area between the 2 parks could be an AMAZING area to have future residential neighborhoods (as it is currently zoned), green space and parks for generations to come.

Respectfully,

Brad Canada

Brad.canada@stryker.com

703-431-4083

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

Pamela Howard

From: Goodrich, Chuck <cgoodrich@gaylor.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 12:26 PM
To: APC
Cc: Capozzi, Rafael
Subject: IN STRONG OPPOSITION to Northpoint II Proposal (petition Docket #2008-PUD-09)

**WARNING: This external email is from
cgoodrich@gaylor.com.**

Dear Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to The Northpoint II PUD (Planned Unit Development). This project will be quite detrimental to the surrounding area and there is widespread opposition among the nearby property owners, residents, and voters. The addition of a 152 acre commercial/industrial park in this area, with building heights up to 45 feet, will destroy local wildlife habitat, lower the property values of our existing community, increase traffic congestion and replace quiet, calming rural residential serenity with active, hectic commercial chaos.

Property values in the area will undoubtedly decrease if you approve Northpoint II PUD, which includes dense housing on less than 1/4 acre lots with 10 feet between houses, along with other reduced-space arrangements. This project is not consistent with the existing neighborhoods in the area and these neighborhoods will suffer unless you act to stop it. Traffic is also a major area of concern. Increased traffic on State Road 38 will be terrible since this is the only planned access to the development. While the traffic may be lighter on average, the local neighborhood traffic will disproportionately surge during morning and evening rush hours, causing traffic and safety issues during critical times for the existing neighborhoods. In general, the area traffic is continuing to increase, and heavy traffic is already common at times on State Road 38, which may not have been anticipated.

Another issue that also does not seem to be adequately considered is the noise. Our area was not structured to implement such a park, with houses so close to the proposed site where noise travels freely. The noise would be unacceptable for our rural community.

I urge you to reject the proposed development, and from recent meetings and discussions with my neighbors, everyone is in agreement that this development tears apart the natural beauty of Hamilton County - a quality it holds dear. Not a single surrounding property owner supports this.

Best regards,

Chuck Goodrich

5015 Nightshade Lane

Noblesville, IN 46062

317-716-7117



Representative Chuck Goodrich
Indiana State House, District 29

President & CEO

Gaylor Electric, Inc.

17230 Kraft Court

Noblesville, IN. 46060

O: 317.214.6300 | M: 317.716.7117



Oops – Please forgive spelling & grammar errors.

Pamela Howard

From: Canada, Brad <brad.canada@stryker.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 1:27 PM
To: APC
Subject: RE: Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
brad.canada@stryker.com.**

APC Members,

I also want to add to my email below. After our meeting last night, I want to more directly say regardless of the park, the easement acreage, whatever the developers come back with – I WILL NOT ever approve or support this re-zone project.

There is way too much land already zoned industrial in Westfield and opportunities south of SR38 to develop before we should ever assess or even look at flipping the plan and script for this land SOLELY because a well known developer with a well known personal relationship with the city owns the land.

It would be so disappointing for the city to approve this given there are 3 beautiful parks in that same area that potentially could have a concrete jungle right in the middle of it all with an insane amount of industrial traffic, commuters and numerous stop lights off SR38.

I want to please urge the city to develop the other areas that are zoned industrial. If anything, be flexible with taking 3 acre home lots down to 1 acre to generate more tax revenue. I would much rather see residential and parks vs industrial.

From: Canada, Brad
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2022 1:32 PM
To: 'APC@westfield.in.gov' <APC@westfield.in.gov>
Subject: Northpoint II

APC Members,

I have sent emails in the past but wanted to re-voice my position on continued development north of SR38 as I see this is coming back up stemming from a hard push in 2021 from the Developer.

My name is Brad Canada and live at 20945 Anthony Road. There has been numerous conversations going on among the neighbors that live on Anthony Road as well as up and down SR38. We know that there is a developer that is aggressively looking to gain approval to rezone a rural “residential” area into a massive industrial park. I wanted to share my perspective and reiterate that I would like your support to not approve this rezoning.

I have only been living in this area for 5 years (grew up in Fishers) but the broader SR38/Anthony/31/Hinkle Creek northeastern part of Westfield is a special place. Driving up through Anthony feels more like Brown County vs Hamilton County. McGregor Park and Bray Family Park makes this area even more special but it's the surrounding areas that add to that. Westfield is a fast growing place and there is so many advantages to that and one that drew us to the area to

begin with (schools, people, growth, amenities, etc). Growth in this area is a GOOD thing but there needs to be a balance to protect certain areas to offset the traffic, noise, etc. A HUGE industrial park was just approved south of SR38 that is still being developed so to approve another 180+ acre park + the future progression to then approve another 180+ acre plot on Anthony makes this rural area feel like we are down in Plainfield in the midst of their distribution and industrial areas. Westfield would then be losing a huge chunk of green space that could potentially be a nice residential area that could in theory connect both parks and be a place where the community could get away from the traffic, noise, chaos of what other parts could be.

I plan on raising my 3 young kids in this house and be here forever and part of that decision was giving them an area that was safe. I fear the traffic, I fear the amount of people commuting here daily that is not bought in or involved in this community, I fear the pollution/trash, and most importantly – I fear that this area and this community loses a huge part of what makes this community different than Fishers, Carmel, or Noblesville. That is the ability to properly plan for future growth by also protecting pockets of the community that make it feel green and enjoy the beautiful scenes of nature and a rural setting in the pockets of heavy residential/commercial areas. I would MUCH more support a residential zoned area to drive population and keep the green area as close to what we can and continue to build out south of 38 and other areas that are more suited for industrial growth.

We do need industrial growth and areas to bring businesses here (which we have south of SR38 and pockets west on 31) but I strongly encourage you all to please have the voice of your residents and our strong views against turning the most beautiful area in all of central Indiana into a massive concrete industrial zone that would have a huge negative impact on so many people and so many things. Please consider our request to vote “NO” to rezone these areas as industrial north of 38. Please consider keeping the industrial growth and overall focus be on the land and acreage that has already been approved just south of 38 and other areas that have been designated already as “industrial” for further expansion. This Anthony Road area between the 2 parks could be an AMAZING area to have future residential neighborhoods (as it is currently zoned), green space and parks for generations to come.

Respectfully,

Brad Canada
Brad.canada@stryker.com
703-431-4083

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

Pamela Howard

From: JANET QUISENBERRY <bichon2222@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 12:52 PM
To: APC
Subject: Opposition to NP II PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
bichon2222@gmail.com.**

February 2, 2022

To the members of the Westfield APC

Thank you for devoting your time to Westfield, Indiana.

The Northpoint II PUD will be coming up before you on February 22. My name is Janet Quisenberry-May and I am asking again that you please vote NO on this PUD. It goes against the citizens of this rural residential area in Washington Township, which is spelled out in the Westfield, Washington Comprehensive Plan.

Please keep this area east of highway 31, highway 38 and North , Anthony Road including 216th street, and including Hinkle Rd. where Bray Park is located, rural residential, NO industrial park.

The Department of Natural Resources and the Hamilton County Parks Department have declared Hamilton County with an alarming scarcity of green space.

Please vote NO on this PUD and thank you for reading my opposition letter to this industrial park, it just doesn't fit into a rural residential township.

God bless you
Janet Quisenberry-May

Pamela Howard

From: Sharon Vento <skvento56@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 3:33 PM
To: APC
Subject: Fwd: Northpoint II Proposal (Petition Docket #2008-PUD-09)

**WARNING: This external email is from
skvento56@gmail.com.**

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sharon Vento** <skvento56@gmail.com>
Date: Tuesday, February 1, 2022
Subject: Northpoint II Proposal (Petition Docket #2008-PUD-09)
To: ginnykelleher@gmail.com, rkburkman@gmail.com, rhorkay@westfield.in.gov, mjohns@westfield.in.gov,
cspoljaric@westfield.in.gov, apc@westfield.in.gov
Cc: Sharon Vento <skvento56@gmail.com>

We are writing to you to express our total opposition to Subject Docket regarding the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. We are residents of the Hinkle Creek Estates Subdivision and our address is 5245 Nightshade Lane in Noblesville, IN 46062.

If the Northpoint II Industrial Park proposal is approved, the potential effect to our property includes:

Significantly increased traffic

Increased noise near our neighborhood

Air pollution

Home property value loss ranging from 15% to 30%

Contaminated ground water feeding neighborhood wells

Drainage problems

Loss of natural habitats for wildlife

Devastation of our rural atmosphere

We plead with you to not approve this docket #2008-PUD-09 for the building of the Northpoint II Industrial Park..

Thank you,

Frank and Sharon Vento

Pamela Howard

From: Lori-Kate Mihal <lorikate.mihal@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 8:06 PM
To: ginnykelleher@gmail.com; Kristen Burkman; Robert Horkay; Mike Johns; Cindy Spoljaric
Cc: APC
Subject: Against Northpoint 2 Industrial Park

**WARNING: This external email is from
lorikate.mihal@gmail.com.**

Hello Westfield APC,

I am writing to you in protest of the Northpoint 2 Industrial park proposal that is being heard by the APC on February 22nd. This proposal goes directly against the Westfield Washington Township Comprehensive plan, which states that the land in question is rural residential. If the zoning of this land is to change, it should be done properly with input from the city (especially the residents of this area). Allowing a wealthy business owner to change zoning laws is quite an offensive practice.

Should this proposal be approved, it would cause irreversible and detrimental harm to the surrounding area. The wildlife and natural beauty of the area would be destroyed. There would also be an unbearable amount of noise, light, and air pollution coming from this industrial park that would make the surrounding area unlivable for homeowners. I fail to see how this is just for anyone who has lived in the area.

I would implore you to vote against this rezoning proposal when it is heard. Remember that you represent your constituents, the people, not big businesses.

Best Regards,

Lori-Kate Mihal

Pamela Howard

From: Cami Still <cami.still@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 2:02 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
cami.still@gmail.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 4965 Morning Mist Court, Noblesville 46062 on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,

Cami Still

Pamela Howard

From: JANET QUISENBERRY <bichon2222@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 2:06 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Opposition to Northpoint II PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
bichon2222@gmail.com.**

To the Westfield APC and the Westfield City Council,

Thank you so much for your dedication to the betterment and protection of the Westfield area.

My name is Janet Quisenberry-May, I am again writing to oppose the Northpoint II PUD. This has constantly been in my mind and prayers for about a year and a half. These are the things that I can do for this beautiful rural residential area of Westfield, Washington Township, which those who put their time and vision into the Comprehensive Plan, knew should be preserved as AG-SF1, a rural district. Many great citizens in this section East of highway 31, highway 38 and North on Anthony Road to 216th street, then South on Hinkle Road back to 38, have based their faith in this, remaining rural residential, and oppose an industrial park on the 183 acres, that Northpoint II is wanting to commercialize.

As you can see from our remonstrance package submitted in Feb. 2021, there were 183 signatures obtained opposing this Industrial Park, and 56 letters from concerned citizens around this entire area.

Anyone who enjoys Bray Park does not want an Industrial Park jammed right up to the boundaries. No one who invested in their futures in this area want to possibly lose their water supply, have their nights turned into bright lights have their lungs contaminated by the constant dust and dirt generated by huge earth moving equipment, shoveling the earth up, the dirt and dust is not breathable, and it saturates the trees, gardens, houses all the time, not to mention the noise, and the earth shaking. This is not a one day event, look at Northpoint one, that has been a dirt heap for years and will be for years to come. Also with this, now being the "Great Resignation" period of time, who knows if commercial buildings and industrial parks will be a valid source of tax dollars for Westfield, especially with all the tax abatements that some businesses can receive. Right now Westfield gets regular property tax dollars on these homes in this area and the farm land.

Nobody knows what the future holds in these uncertain times, but God almighty. Please keep these citizens in this area safe and in their rural residentially zoned area, please don't turn it into a place of rezoned commercial uses. This PUD does not fit, put it into some of the 1000 acres or more that Westfield already has zoned for commercial. Please protect your rural residential area from commercial use and this horrible Industrial Park, please vote to protect the citizens that already live, move and have their being in this beautiful rural area. Thank you, and may God bless you.

Janet Quisenberry-May

Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: Kelly Miller <ckmiller5466@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 2:29 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint

**WARNING: This external email is from
ckmiller5466@gmail.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 5019 Morning mist ct noblesville on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,"
Kelly Miller

Pamela Howard

From: shari mcgrath <sharimcgrath@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 3:14 PM
To: APC
Subject: I Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
sharimcgrath@yahoo.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 5244 Morning Mist Ct, Noblesville, on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Shari McGrath

Pamela Howard

From: Chris McGrath <rchrismcgrath@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 3:18 PM
To: APC
Subject: OBJECTION!

**WARNING: This external email is from
rchrismcgrath@gmail.com.**

My family lives at 5244 Morning Mist Ct, Noblesville, on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Thank you -

--

Chris

Pamela Howard

From: Amy Koehler <tdogplus@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 3:35 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint Industrial Park II

**WARNING: This external email is from
tdogplus@yahoo.com.**

I am a homeowner of two properties effected by the proposed development on SE 38. Northpoint Park II I feel will not only devalue my houses at 21500 Anthony Rd. and 5091 SR 38 but those of my neighbors. It goes without saying the traffic, noise and associated changes it brings will also be unacceptable. Please include my wife and I as two more people AGAINST the approval of this plan.
Michael Tinder.

Pamela Howard

From: Emily McGrath <emcgrath1999@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 3:58 PM
To: APC
Subject: I Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
emcgrath1999@yahoo.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 5244 Morning Mist Ct, Noblesville, on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Emily McGrath

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Pamela Howard

From: Gmail - Family <atdepew@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 4:11 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09"

**WARNING: This external email is from
atdepew@gmail.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 20185 Starlight court, Noblesville, IN 46062 on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Andrew DePew

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Trish DePew <trish.depew89@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 4:14 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09"

**WARNING: This external email is from
trish.depew89@gmail.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 20185 starlight court, Noblesville, In 46062
on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Patricia DePew

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Allen Still <allen.still@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 5:22 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
allen.still@gmail.com.**

Members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 4965 Morning Mist Ct (Hinkle Creek Estates) on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Allen Still

Pamela Howard

From: Keaton Still <keaton.still@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 5:24 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
keaton.still@yahoo.com.**

Members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live in Hinkle Creek Estates on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Keaton M Still

Pamela Howard

From: Ainsley Still <ainsley.still@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 5:25 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
ainsley.still@yahoo.com.**

Members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 4965 Morning Mist Ct (Hinkle Creek Estates) on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Ainsley

Pamela Howard

From: Corinne Still <corinne.still@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 5:26 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
corinne.still@yahoo.com.**

Members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 4965 Morning Mist Ct (Hinkle Creek Estates) on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Corinne Still

Pamela Howard

From: Todd Megyese <toddmegyese@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 5:48 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint 2

**WARNING: This external email is from
toddmegyese@gmail.com.**

Hi, my name is Todd Megyese. I recently moved in to the neighborhood Havenwood on Hinkle Rd. My family and I moved here from the city. We absolutely love being a little in the country with no businesses around and only neighborhoods. I'm asking you please to not go through with the plans of Northpoint 2! If I would have known this would happen, I would have never moved here. We love the neighborhood and beautiful parks, and would hate to see a business park this close. We don't want the traffic, the noise, the light pollution, or any of it! I along with many others ask you to keep this a residential area/ farm area!

Pamela Howard

From: Jenny Williams <jennyjowalter@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 4, 2022 9:03 AM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
jennyjowalter@gmail.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 5095 Nightshade Lane on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that its petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High-Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the Northeast Rural Residential District as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Jenny Williams

Pamela Howard

From: chad.miller midstatellc.com <chad.miller@midstatellc.com>
Sent: Friday, February 4, 2022 9:10 AM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
chad.miller@midstatellc.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 5019 Morning Mist Court, Noblesville, IN on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,

Thanks,
Chad Miller
President
Mid-State Engineering LLC
986 Industrial Dr
Tipton, IN 46072

317-660-6454 ph
317-245-2540 fax
765-437-1550 cell



Confidentiality Notice

These documents contain confidential information belonging to Mid-State Engineering LLC. The information is intended only for the use of the individual's or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received these documents in error, please notify us immediately by telephone to arrange for return of the original documents to us.

Pamela Howard

From: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, February 4, 2022 1:36 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09
Importance: High

**WARNING: This external email is from
jpedzinski@comcast.net.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 5250 Nightshade Lane, on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park.

I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09.

I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use.

My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
James R Pedzinski

Pamela Howard

From: JANET QUISENBERRY <bichon2222@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 4, 2022 3:09 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: NorthpointII PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
bichon2222@gmail.com.**

This is Janet Quisenberry—May, I am opposed to this PUD/, Industrial Park. The citizens of this rural residential area should be protected, not thrown under thousands of lbs. of mud, concrete, and asphalt. Please vote NO to NorthpointII PUD,

Thank you and God bless, Janet

Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: Jim May <jrmay47@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 4, 2022 4:16 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Opposition Northpoint II PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
jrmay47@gmail.com.**

I strongly oppose the Northpoint II PUD. The area in question is zoned rural residential. As Hamilton County grows green space needs to be preserved. Families located to this area of Hamilton County to enjoy the beautiful and peaceful ambiance of the natural landscape.

God bless,

Jim May

Pamela Howard

From: James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 9:00 PM
To: APC; planners
Subject: Re: James Hogan's Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)
Attachments: 20210202_NRRCitizens_RmnstrtnAgnst2008-PUD-09(Cert).pdf

**WARNING: This external email is from
james.hogan@elamusa.com.**

Good evening members of the APC,

I am writing to renew my objection to the petition for 2008-PUD-09 filed nearly one year ago today and outlined further below. In short, nothing has changed.

The tweaks to the petitioner's plan presented on Monday (1/31/22) fails to address our demand from the public meetings over 1 year ago. Our demand back then was to simply follow the rules and develop the land in a manner that respects the intended land use of the Northeast Rural Residential ("NRR") District - just as every other land owner in the NRR District has done. It's not asking much at all.

What the petitioners presented last Monday was lipstick on a pig. They chose to ignore the attached *Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD*, dated 2/2/21, but we the people surrounding the land of 2008-PUD-09 find the document even more relevant today than when it was first produced.

Please end this sordid tale, and end it emphatically. VOTE AGAINST 2008-PUD-09 UNANIMOUSLY.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The **ELAM** Group

[161 Lakeview Drive](#)
[Suite B](#)
[Noblesville, IN 46060](#)

President & CEO
(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its

attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Thu, Feb 11, 2021 at 4:53 PM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good afternoon and greetings members of the Advisory Plan Commission ("APC") and City Council of the City of Westfield.

I am writing to you today to voice my sincere objection to the above-referenced planned unit development ("PUD") petition. My wife and I, Lori, along with our 4 children, dog and 2 cats, reside in our home at 20275 Dayspring Court in Noblesville, Indiana. The home is the northwesternmost home within the Hinkle Creek Estates subdivision. We are making a significant investment in upgrading our home over the next couple of months and plan to be here a long time.

Our subdivision consists of 2+ acre lots in a rural residential setting complete with well water, septic fields and propane tanks. The neighborhood is on the east side of Hinkle Road. Our neighbor to the west is the *Bray Family Homestead Park*. We have a reassuring feeling knowing that the entire area west of us is in the Northeast Rural Residential district and will therefore never be developed into anything more than Rural Residential homes, agriculture or a Conservation Subdivision. This was a huge factor in us deciding where to live. We love how our rural residential neighborhood meshes so well with that of the Northeast Rural Residential district of Washington Township.

In fact, over the past few years since we moved in, I have praised the responsibility of the City of Westfield/Washington Township in abiding by its Comprehensive Plan. I have trumpeted these praises to my friends and neighbors Dez Schillinger and Rob Hanlon - two significant employers within the City of Westfield. I tell them I wish every community operated like Westfield. Our confidence that the City of Westfield/Washington Township will maintain a governing body that makes politically stable and logical decisions that are empathetic to its residents and neighbors like myself helps me sleep well at night.

On Tuesday, 2/16/21, my faith in your politically stable, logical decision-making abilities will be put to the test. Our entire neighborhood is worried. I am worried.

We want you to vote no to 2008-PUD-09. We offer a logical basis for you to say no. That logic is rooted in a document that Wayne and Christy Wheeler will send you in an emailed attachment, a document entitled *Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD*, dated 2/2/21.

Read it and enjoy it. It provides you a basis for rejection.

In the meantime, I will pray.

I pray that your hearts be touched by the 183+ residents who join me in objecting to this 2008-PUD-09 abomination - noting that not one resident we reached supported it. I pray that you uphold your Comprehensive Plan. And, lastly, I pray that you have courage to VOTE NO, in the face of certain political and monetary pressure, to 2008-PUD-09.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG

[161 Lakeview Drive](#)
[Suite B](#)
[Noblesville, IN 46060](#)



President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

Pamela Howard

From: Wayne Wheeler <wwheeler@REINDERS.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 10:57 AM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Letter of Opposition to Northpoint II PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
wwheeler@REINDERS.com.**

Dear APC and Council Members,

I am writing in opposition to the Northpoint PUD (2008-PUD-09). When I bought my land 4 years ago on Anthony Rd I used the City of Westfield's Comprehensive plan along with the county's plan as a reference guide as to where to look for land. The spot I chose was largely based on the fact that it was 3 acres in the country, surrounded by agricultural land with little chance of having development around me. After having lived in subdivisions my whole life this was a "bucket list" purchase for me. When I bought the property, I knew what the zoning was and what I could build on it. Unlike Northpoint Owners, I did not buy the land and then try to re-zone it for a hog farm or warehouses, I followed the rules set forth in the Comp Plan.

I understand that the Comp Plan is a Policy and not a law, however any amending of the Comp Plan should be a city led process involving multiple public input sessions and not be dictated by a developers re-zoning request. I think you will agree that what is being proposed (industrial/commercial) is diametrically opposed to what the city has put forth in the Comp Plan. I also want to say that I am not against development at all, we need it as a healthy city, however I am against forcing a square peg into a round hole and that's exactly what is going on in this situation. Put industrial/commercial development where it belongs in existing zoned areas and not out in the country in an area that has been thoughtfully protected by the city visionaries in the Comp Plan.

Currently this land is AG-SF1: Agriculture/Single-Family Rural District. The Comp Plan clearly indicates all land on the North side of HWY 38 to fall under this category. (reference page 31 & 32 in Comp Plan) The Rural Northeast quadrant of the township includes single-family residences; agricultural areas, some smaller artisan farms; and some equestrian uses. There are natural areas, including wetlands, wooded areas, and much open farm ground. Also, the area contains two existing large parks, MacGregor and Bray, and there will be a new county park at 216th and Hinkle. Currently there are NO commercial or Industrial uses in the Comp Plan area North of Hwy 38 and East of US 31. However, south of Hwy 38 there is over 1,000 acres of currently zoned commercial/industrial parcels that are undeveloped and already exist on the Comp Plan in designated "business park" areas. Currently there is approximately over 100 acres in Northpoint I that is still available for development. Northpoint I only has 3 buildings, we don't know how it's going to affect our area yet, It's not prudent to approve Northpoint II without even understanding the impact on the area of a completed Northpoint I.

I know somebody is reading this, rolling their eyes and mumbling under their breath something about the city needing to diversify their tax base and add more commercial properties, so let's talk about it. All of us want to

increase the commercial tax base in hopes that someday it will lessen the burden on the residential side. What increases the tax base is buildings that are on the tax rolls and not empty industrial/commercial lots. We can continue to develop ground, but if no one is building on it, then what are we doing? How about we challenge our commercial developers to bring us businesses that are ready to build? At the pace buildings are going up in Northpoint I we have several years of lot inventory already on hand. Currently there are only 3 buildings completed and all of them have either an 8 or 10 year tax abatement attached to them. So, if the city is concerned with wanting to expand the tax base with commercial properties then we need more buildings and shorter tax abatement terms. Adding more empty lots does not increase the city's commercial tax base.

The most appropriate land uses for this area are exactly what is there now, agricultural fields and single-family homes. If Northpoint Owners wants to develop this land, then they need to propose a conservation subdivision or individual 3-acre home sites. My guess is, if they proposed that, they would have never heard from the 200+ people that signed the petitions against their current proposal.

Please help us preserve our rural lifestyle and the value of our largest investments, our homes. Let's do what's best for the existing tax paying citizens and not for the developers...

Thank you in advance for considering my concerns and voting "No" on this proposal.

Wayne Wheeler
20889 Anthony Rd
317.697.1160

Pamela Howard

From: Christy Wheeler <bigskyorbust@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 2:53 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Opposition to Northpoint II PUD, Ordinance Number 20-25
Attachments: CSW Objection 2022.docx

**WARNING: This external email is from
bigskyorbust@gmail.com.**

Good afternoon,
Please find attached my letter stating my opposition to Ordinance Number 20-25.
Thank you for taking the time to read it.
Christy Wheeler
20889 Anthony Road

February 9, 2022

Dear APC and City Council,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the Northpoint II PUD. It simply does not belong in an agricultural, rural residential area.

I have nothing against progress, nothing against business, nothing against enhancing the tax base for Westfield, but some things simply must be protected...protected so they stay the same, so we have some remembrance of what this community has been for many years and what makes it unique.

Several years ago, multiple individuals and organizations spent countless hours developing a framework to do just this. They created the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan. They did this in order to ensure that as Westfield grew, the growth would be responsible. One can see by reading the Comp Plan that they created a living document, it wasn't created for just a specific point in time. They looked to the future and thoughtfully outlined development policies. For the Northeast Rural Residential (NRR) area, they contemplated the future and the change they saw was potential residential development – NOT commercial/industrial. It was never planned that Industrial development would be considered for the Northeast area. The NRR area was to be "rural for the foreseeable future". I realize that the Comp Plan is not a legally binding document, but it is the official policy of Westfield and the agreed-upon vision for the future of the community. Shouldn't a reasonable person be able to conclude that the Comp Plan is relevant and applicable? Based on the city's own plan, Northpoint II does not belong in the NRR area.

If the city feels that things have changed significantly in terms of land use needs, there is a process to address this – take the time to thoughtfully "redo" the Comp Plan with input from the citizens. Hamilton County just went through this process and they had very interesting and significant citizen input to their process (please see the Remonstrance Packet submitted for more information on this). It would be a travesty to allow a developer to dictate land use...wouldn't that be a bit like the tail wagging the dog?

One might ask, why does this cause such an uproar from the citizens? What's the big deal? This is why it matters to us...

- It matters because this proposal would lead to the degradation of the rural lifestyle of our area...dropping industrial facilities right in the middle of what has been deemed (by Westfield) to be a Rural Residential area. Taking the fields and beautiful night skies and turning them into concrete and parking lots, noise and pollution. There is no amount of buffer or development standards that would protect our area's rural charm from this type of intrusion. The rural character of this area would be completely changed forever.
- It matters because of the types of facilities that could be built on this 180+ acre site. A Steel fabricator, a Trucking company, High Intensity Retail, Bus station...does any of this sound even remotely compatible with Rural Residential?
- It matters because it will decrease our property values. Most of us made a thoughtful choice to live in this area. Many have invested a sizeable amount of money, time, and heart into our homes. This type of development will significantly decrease the desirability of this area and

thus the value of our homes. Money will be taken away from us so that a developer who doesn't even live in this district can make money.

- It matters because it sets a precedent. Once something like this is anchored on the north side of Highway 38, it paves the way for industrial creep. Think about it...if this industrial park is built, how long will it be before the fields north or east of it fall victim to the same zoning?
- It matters because it will impact our health and safety. Increased heavy equipment and vehicle traffic, air pollution, noise pollution and light pollution. It is common knowledge that vehicle exhaust increases air pollution and noise pollution. It is common knowledge that air pollution is hazardous to our health. But noise pollution has also been shown to affect health negatively. It can cause a number of short and long term health problems such as sleep disturbance, cardiovascular effects, poor work & school performance, hearing impairment, etc...those most vulnerable to noise pollution are the elderly, chronically ill, and children. Groundwater contamination. How will our wells be affected? Will they be contaminated with chemical runoff? Will the aquifer be impacted? Trucks and businesses operating 24/7, people coming in and out of the area at all hours of the day and night brings serious safety issues.

It seems so clear that Northpoint II does not make sense for this area.

Additionally concerning is the way in which this proposal has come about. The developer chose to purchase the land rather than paying for an option to buy the land (which is the common practice). The developer (by his own admission) purchased the land with full knowledge of how the land was zoned. The developer purchased the land knowing what the Comp Plan envisioned for the area. They purchased the land with their eyes wide open. Now they expect to force this development on the Northeast Rural Residential area citizens when there is NO CRITICAL NEED to do so...it's absurd. How could it possibly make any rational sense to destroy this tiny, 1,320 acre district in order to accommodate the business decision of one developer? Hundreds of families vs. one developer. How could the desire of one developer have more value, carry more weight, than that of several hundred families who call this their home? Is a speculative industrial development really the most responsible use for this land?

In closing, I would like to say that this is very personal. It's about our daily life, our reality. This is where we live, where we come home to at the end of the day, this is where we rejuvenate, where we recharge our proverbial batteries. This is our most personal and private place...it is our refuge...it is our home. As you weigh your decision, please take into consideration the fact that this is much more than words and numbers on a piece of paper...it impacts real people.

Thank you very much for your service to Westfield and your time,

Christy Wheeler

20889 Anthony Road

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth...Genesis 1:1

Pamela Howard

From: aborshoff@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 4:23 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint 2

**WARNING: This external email is from
aborshoff@gmail.com.**

I am writing to you in protest of the Northpoint 2 development proposal in the Rural Northeast area of Westfield. The area is peaceful, quiet, and beautiful. This is in-line with the Westfield Washington Comprehensive Plan. I have reviewed this plan, and it explicitly states the following regarding the land that Northpoint Owners, LLC wishes to develop:

"The policy of this plan is that these areas will be designated as rural for the foreseeable future. In particular, the development for these areas as anything other than rural or agricultural uses in the near future would violate the contiguity policy set out in the general policies."

The plan also describes the following appropriate land uses in the Rural Northeast area:

- Single-family detached houses on large lots or in a Rural or Conservation Subdivision.**
- Accessory dwellings**
- Equestrian uses**
- Agriculture, including artisan farms**
- Institutional uses, such as schools, churches, public safety facilities, and similar uses**

There is no mention of an industrial park being appropriate or allowed in the Rural Northeast area. I currently see no addendum to this comprehensive plan that would change the status of this land to anything other than the rural definition stated in the original plan drafted in 2007. Therefore, I fail to see how an industrial park could possibly be appropriate, nor how it could represent the interests and well being of the residents surrounding this land. Let me also add here that the new proposal from Northpoint Owners, LLC is a pathetic attempt at including a 10 acre park to make up for the destructive 170 acre industrial park. In accordance with this comprehensive plan, I think a 180 acre park with 0 acres of industrial park would be much more appropriate, and much desired by the residents of the area.

Development of this rural land into an industrial park would send one very clear message: corporate interests are far more important than the interests of your constituents. If this land is to be converted into an industrial park, then it would seem the appropriate progression would be to first call for revision the comprehensive plan with input from the community. Proceeding with development of the land into an industrial park without revision of the plan would surely be a way to lose the trust and support of your constituents.

Kind Regards,

David & Alessia Borshoff

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Jim May <jrmay47@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2022 2:26 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Opposition

**WARNING: This external email is from
jrmay47@gmail.com.**

Members of the APC:

I live at 5620 Pine Hill Drive on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the Northeast Rural Residential District as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,

Jim May

Pamela Howard

From: Kathy Pedzinski <krpedzinski@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 13, 2022 4:24 PM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
krpedzinski@comcast.net.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 5250 Nightshade Lane, Noblesville on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09. I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Do we really want an industrial park to be the first thing visitors see when entering the Noblesville area on the west side from Hwy 38? Please don't agree to this change in zoning.

Sincerely,
Kathy Pedzinski
5250 Nightshade Lane
Noblesville, IN 46062

krpedzinski@comcast.net

Pamela Howard

From: casey@just-install.com
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 8:51 AM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint 2

**WARNING: This external email is from
casey@just-install.com.**

Dear APC,

We moved here 7 years ago from the southwest side of Indy (Decatur Township) to get away from the industrial area. We paid a premium and moved as far from that environment as we could. All the noise, traffic, long waits at traffic signals due to all oversized vehicles, pollution, ambient light, etc. I could go on and on because that's exactly why we moved away, For rural living. It was our dream and we have invested everything we have into it.

Our home is on Hinkle Rd in 103 year old farm house that happens to be 30' feet off of a 50 MPH road. One of our big concerns is the guaranteed increased oversized vehicles. Some of these Roads and old historic homes placement were not designed for industrial use. For our particular family and home, It's a serious safety concern. For all the people in the area like ourselves who have invested everything into the rural lifestyle. We absolutely do **not** want a industrial building, parking lot, parking lot lights and semis in our rural neighborhood.

Thanks you,
Casey Weaver

Pamela Howard

From: Ralph <rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:26 PM
To: APC
Subject: Fwd: Northpoint II Objection

**WARNING: This external email is from
rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com.**

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ralph <rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com>
Date: February 14, 2022 at 12:23:30 PM EST
To: Ralph Johnson <rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Northpoint II Objection

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com
Date: February 11, 2021 at 2:47:40 PM EST
To: Christy Wheeler <bigskyorbust@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Northpoint II Objection

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ralph <rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com>
Date: February 11, 2021 at 2:30:47 PM EST
To: Cindy Spoljaric <cspoljaric@westfield.in.gov>
Subject: Re: Northpoint II Objection

Thx for responding to my letter. You and met and had a conversation outside of the gov. Bldg. several years ago. I believe it was when they put the phone tower in behind AMF boat storage. I still have your card somewhere.

I tried be calm and respectful in my letter, but make no mistake this absolutely the very last thing I want to see happen. If its so great let them put it their front yard.

Ralph Johnson
Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 11, 2021, at 1:58 PM, Cindy Spoljaric
<cspoljaric@westfield.in.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your comments Ralph. I agree with your assessment. I am very aware of the history of this area too...I've been an active member of our WWHS for 15 years. The comp plan did not designate this area for anything but rural uses. I will not vote for such a departure from our plan, with the negative externalities it will bring to your area.

Cindy

Cindy Spoljaric
Westfield City Council, At Large
317-695-6673
Cspoljaric@westfield.in.gov

On Feb 11, 2021, at 1:29 PM, Ralph
<rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com> wrote:

Warning: This external email is from rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From:
rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com
Date: February 11,
2021 at 11:15:41 AM
EST

To:
rjohnsonracer76@gmail.com
Cc: Christy Wheeler
<bigskyorbust@gmail.com>
Subject: APC letter

APC and Westfield
Council Members,

My name is Ralph Johnson. I live on Sheridan Road directly across from Northpoint II Development. The fact that I first became aware of this was late summer last year. I've lived at my current address for almost 20 years. Why would I have not been notified of such a drastic change in a zoning to my front yard where widening of road would take my real estate?

Allowing an industrial park to be developed in the middle of an area designated by Hamilton County and City of Westfield as Rural Residential is inconsistent land use at best. The main reason I moved here is because it is rural residential. I have lived in Hamilton County since 1996. This is my retirement home, I retired from AT&T in 2011. Nothing I've seen in Northpoint's wish list fits the life style of peace and tranquility I hoped to enjoy. In speaking with my neighbors, who shared with me they too were

unaware of this change
too, NOT one person
favors this.

I have invested a lot of
time and money in my
property with the
intent it would be my
last home. If I'm forced
to sell to my property
to remain safe and have
some peace, WHO will
make me whole, the
City of Westfield,
Northpoint
Developement, Chris
Wilkes? If the residents
of the area had been
made personally aware
zoning changes to begin
with, would this be
where we are today? If
I can't get fair market
value for my home,
which I won't be able to
with an industrial park
in my front yard, it
would be impossible for
me to relocate and
replicate what I would
have to give up.

I wonder if the
commission is aware of
all the history of the
area in regards to
Quakers and the
Underground
Railroad, the Native
America Villages? My
mother was a Quaker
from Fairmount, I have
Native American
heritage from both
sides of my family and
the issues are
important to me.

Additionally, I have
concerns about
pollution. Air, noise,
drainage, 24hr. Traffic,

who will be in my neighborhood while I'm sleeping, I have a widow for neighbor I worry about. The runoff from this proposal what will it do to aquifer and ground water of my well. All of this is contrary to what currently exists.

If the developer had proposed a development of 5 and 10 acre home sites, I feel like they might have been welcomed as it would have helped OUR home values, that would be in the interest of the greater good of the community. We are not Carmel nor do we want to be buried in their debt which where we headed if we don't wake up. Very few people gain from these type issues. Westfield has been a bedroom community and that is its best asset. I worked in Kokomo and Indy since I've lived in Hamilton county and I would not live in either of those cities.

This whole situation is extremely overwhelming. Please deny Northpoint II proposal. Thank you.

Ralph Johnson
5069 Sheridan Rd
Westfield, IN 46062
Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: JANET QUISENBERRY <bichon2222@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:30 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Opposition Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
bichon2222@gmail.com.**

February 14, 2022

To the members of Westfield APC and the Westfield City Council,

Please stop this Northpoint II PUD

The acreage included in this PUD is zoned according to the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as rural residential. This is on Page 31 of this plan, which was compiled by over 200 citizens, one of the themes of this carefully thought plan was to "preserve the community's rural and small town atmosphere, even as it accommodates new growth." On page 19, it states this large body of citizens desires through this Plan, open fields, farms, parks etc. all important to the character of Westfield. Also it states "preserve natural features such as stands of trees water bodies, and wetlands".

Please don't allow this 183 acres to be destroyed by an Industrial Park, crushing the history and the current citizens' dreams, homes and way of life. Protect what we have. While preparing for these letters I have sent to you, I did a bit of research on that special area of Anthony Rd. Highway 38, N. On Hinkle rd. And 216th street. There is much history in the book "Our Westfield". 1834-1984 and "A history of Westfield Indiana". For example, in the early 1800's Native Americans had their huts along Anthony Road and the Dismal Swamp which is now part of MacGregor Park, these Native Americans lived all over this area, hunting black bear, rabbits, foxes, muskrats, river otters and the list goes on. I can't help but wonder how many of their camps could have been located right here on this same 183 acres now being threatened, by Northpoint II development. Of course, there would be burial grounds and many artifacts buried here as well, along with this rich history of the Great Miami tribes living, hunting, farming and sustaining the lives of their families. Then came the Underground Railroad in the 1820's. Westfield and highway 38, and Anthony Road all played an integral part of this system, rescuing and protecting slave families. In 1837, the famous John and Rhuann Maria Rhoads Family will forever be documented and cherished in many books and even in the court documents where they were declared a free family after gallant efforts of neighbors protecting them after being sought after by their "owner", and hidden in a haystack about where this 183 acreage is located, and then taken in for protection in Westfield, Indiana. There is a marker for them across from the new high school near Ada Bales park, one of the founders of Westfield.

We, the citizens of this rural-residential, historical area, have come together and in February of 2021, submitted a petition carried by hand door to door and got over 180 signatures, and there was digital petition with over 400 signatures opposing this Northpoint II PUD.

Citizens who live in and around this area in peril, realize this Industrial Park will jeopardize our air quality, our underground aquifers, our wetlands, trees, and the air pollution will be thick from dust, fumes etc. Also, it will destroy the beautiful night sky which the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive plan mentions over and over protecting this rural quality for all to enjoy.

You all have been selected or elected to serve in the best interests of this entire area, and it's citizens and I thank you for the countless hours and many times thankless hours you all devote to your positions I ask you respectfully to vote NO on the NorthpointII PUD and save Westfield-Washington Township's rural-residential. Please preserve this beautiful area and the history and these citizens who live here or their lives will be changed forever in a negative way.

Good bless you and Thank you,

Janet Quisenberry-May

Pamela Howard

From: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 1:52 PM
To: APC
Subject: Object to 2008-PUD-09

Importance: High

**WARNING: This external email is from
jpedzinski@comcast.net.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission ("APC"),

I live at 5250 Nightshade Lane, on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park.

I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09.

I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High-Density use.

My sincere hope is that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the *Northeast Rural Residential District* as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Jacob Pedzinski

Pamela Howard

From: Pike, Cathy K. <ckpike@iupui.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2022 2:40 PM
To: APC
Subject: North Point II Proposal Opposition (2008-PUD-09)

Dear APC and Council Members:

I am writing to oppose the Northpoint II PUD (2008-PUD-09). My husband and I are “Hoosiers by choice” (to borrow a term used not so long ago by Governor Holcomb). We moved here 20 years ago and have lived in the same home since that time. Our land abuts the proposed Northpoint II PUD. I believe that the Northpoint II PUD should be denied for several reasons. The first of these is its non-compliance with Indiana Code 36-7-603 zoning ordinance; preparation and consideration of proposals (<http://184.175.130.101/legislative/laws/2020/ic/titles/036#36-7-4-603>). This Code stipulates the following tenets in preparing and considering proposals. They are as follow:

1. The Comprehensive Plan of a given area
2. Current conditions and character of ... structures and uses in each district
3. The most desirable use and adaptation for ... land within a given district
4. Conservation of property values within the jurisdiction, and
5. Responsible methods of development and growth.

The Northpoint II PUD meets none of these stipulations! It is in direct opposition to the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan, which deems the Rural Northeast area of the district as rural, single-family, and agricultural. Homes in the Rural Northeast are expected to be built in ways that include protecting historic structures, having considerable open space, protecting open fields, trees, and streams (City of Westfield, 2007, p. 31). In fact, the Comprehensive Plan states that the Rural Northeast “area will be the last to face development pressure” (City of Westfield, 2007, p. 31). There is no mention in the Comprehensive Plan of commercial property or dense housing as acceptable development options for the Rural Northeast area.

Second, the Northpoint II PUD does not take into consideration the character and uses of this district. This district is rural and agricultural, with houses located on multiple acres. It is **not** urban, commercial, or suburban.

Third, the Northpoint II PUD certainly is not a desirable use and adaptation of the Rural Northeast area. The proposal clearly is not a desirable use of the land, and it is not even needed! Currently, there are almost 2,000 acres in the Westfield-Washington Township of available property that are available for development, meet the criteria of the Comprehensive Plan, and would be acceptable uses for the Northpoint II PUD. (Please refer to our “Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD” for further information.)

Fourth, should the Northpoint II PUD be approved, property values within the area are expected to plummet by 30% (Please see “Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD” for further information). We and all of our neighbors have worked hard to both maintain our homes and improve our properties’ values over time. My husband and I expect the value of our property to be one of our assets available to us during our retirement. We and our neighbors view any approval of the Northpoint II PUD as a **taking of value** and therefore adamantly oppose the proposal.

Fifth, it is obvious that the Northpoint II PUD represents irresponsible methods of development and growth. The Northeast area is a small rural agricultural corner of the Westfield-Washington Township and is designated as the last area of the entire Township to face pressure from development. The Northpoint II PUD seeks to convert 180 acres of beautiful rural land to a commercial development that allows virtually unfettered commercial endeavors. The North Point II proposal includes fully 73 possible types of commercial development, including an array of all-encompassing types of commercial properties. The proposed North Point II industrial development would abut a recently acquired

Hamilton County park and the Bray Family Farm. There is no place for industrial development in this entirely rural-agricultural area that has no commercial development of any kind.

The plan would not enhance the natural resources or the lives of those of us who would be directly affected by its development. In fact, 183 people who would be directly affected by this development are opposed to its approval! These nearly 200 people have responded to online and in-person canvassing to say that they oppose the Northpoint II PUD. (Please see the "Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD" document for detailed information and copies of the petitions.) My husband was the primary canvasser in collecting in-person petition signatures. He knocked on every door within a square mile of the Northpoint II PUD, including Anthony Road, 216th Street, Hinkle Road, and State Road 38. Not one person with whom he spoke approved of the Northpoint II PUD.

We sincerely hope and pray that you will deny the Northpoint II PUD and approve only those proposals that meet the standards of the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan for the Rural Northeast district. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter that will affect families for generations to come.

Cathy Pike

Cathy King Pike, Ph.D., MSW
Professor Emerita
Indiana University School of Social Work
902 West New York Street, ES 4138G
Indianapolis, IN 46202-5156
317-903-9522 / ckpike@iupui.edu

Celebrating more than 100 Years of Giving Hope and Changing Lives

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the addressed recipient/s and may contain information that is confidential, proprietary or privileged. Any unauthorized review, response, use, distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. Receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient is not a waiver of confidentiality or privilege.

Pamela Howard

From: Wayne Pike <bwpike2004@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2022 3:22 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II (2008-PUD-09)

**WARNING: This external email is from
bwpike2004@yahoo.com.**

Dear APC and Council Members:

We moved to the Westfield-Washington Township almost 20 years ago. To be honest, we didn't intend to stay in Indiana more than a couple of years. But, then we found that we had actually found "home". The neighborhood was rural (we are from rural areas), and the people are friendly.

We invested a lot of money, both buying and improving our property over the past 20 years. Only time will tell how much the property will be devalued if Northpoint II passes. Our current estimate is 30%. Like a lot of people we are not rich and depend on our property to help us fund retirement.

If Northpoint II passes, we would also lose our privacy. Our property would touch on Northpoint II, so there would be no privacy when we are outside. The light will take away our night sky, not to mention ground water pollution that would threaten our well water and cause potential flooding, and noise and air pollution. We have a small sanctuary area for animals on one corner of our property. With their route for food and water cut off by Northpoint II, I have to wonder what will happen to them.

Because I was one of the people knocking on doors to get signatures for our petition, I know that our neighbors feel the same as we do. There was not one person in favor of Northpoint II, and I knocked on every door in the square mile off Anthony Road, 206th Street, Hinkle Road, and State Road 38. Please do not allow the Northpoint II proposal (2008-PUD-09) to move forward.

Sincerely,

Barry Wayne Pike, homeowner

Pamela Howard

From: James R Emerson <JR@EmersonLawLLC.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2022 3:12 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint 2 Industrial Park

**WARNING: This external email is from
JR@EmersonLawLLC.com.**

Committee and Council Members:

I live at 20803 Anthony Road.

I vehemently oppose any rezoning of the property at 32 and Anthony Road, aka Northpoint 2 Industrial Park.

We moved to this area in order to have a rural experience in Hamilton County. We purchased nearly 7 acres of land with a home and two out buildings.

When we purchased our property it was our understanding that this area was and would continue to be zoned as rural/agricultural.

I believe there are other areas already zoned for this proposed project. Those would be a more appropriate location.

If this project goes through we will be forced to view the 45 foot tall buildings (3.2 stories) from my front yard. I don't think that anyone would find that acceptable. Approval would cause the market price of our nearly 7 acres to drop significantly in value.

In addition, I believe the increased traffic and semi-trucks will lead to other unforeseen issues. Likely some form of tax abatement would be made, which in my opinion negates the argument that taxes revenue would increase.

I can assure you that this it was your home that was affected you would not even consider rezoning this property. Again, there are other parcels of land that are already zoned appropriately for this project. So there is no need to rezone this parcel.

I plan to fight this proposal with all of my time and energy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

JR Emerson

JR Emerson, Partner
EMERSON DIVORCE AND
ACCIDENT INJURY ATTORNEYS, LLC
1 S. Rangeline Road, Suite 400
Carmel, IN 46032
P: 317-969-8000

Pamela Howard

From: Christy Wheeler <bigskyorbust@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2022 3:30 PM
To: Pamela Howard
Subject: Fwd: Opposing NorthPoint 2 Industrial Park!!

**WARNING: This external email is from
bigskyorbust@gmail.com.**

Hi, Pam!

I think this was accidentally sent to me and should have gone to APC...just passing it along.

Thanks,
Christy

Begin forwarded message:

From: Edward Marcus <esmarcus@ameritech.net>
Date: February 17, 2022 at 3:24:31 PM EST
To: councilmembers@westfield.in.gov, Christy Wheeler <bigskyorbust@gmail.com>
Subject: Opposing NorthPoint 2 Industrial Park!!

Please say NO to this development. We do not want our neighborhoods adversely affected such that we no longer have a residential setting that is the opposite of what we looked forward to when moving to our current locations.

Edward S. Marcus, DDS
5192 Aegis Drive
Noblesville, IN

Pamela Howard

From: Martin Kirkwood <mkirkwood@alumni.nd.edu>
Sent: Friday, February 18, 2022 10:08 PM
To: APC
Cc: Pamela Howard
Subject: 2nd Letter Opposing Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
mkirkwood@alumni.nd.edu.**

Dear Advisory Plan Commission,

My name is Martin Kirkwood and I have lived at 21570 Anthony Road in Westfield, Indiana since 2004. I previously lived in the Carey Commons neighborhood from 1999-2004. Also, I traveled through the town on my way back and forth to college back in the late 1980's. So, for nearly 40 years, I have witnessed firsthand the transformation that this area has undergone.

I can only imagine the number of conversations and discussions that have happened to help our town/city get where we are today. I very much appreciate and understand the important role you now play in helping plan and direct the development of our community for the future. It is with that perspective and my own service to the community as a member of the Westfield Washington Township Parks Advisory Council that I offer you the following plea.

Please emphatically reject the Northpoint II proposal and help us find a way to preserve this land as was envisioned both in the comprehensive plan and the bold vision of our Township Trustee and Parks Advisory Council.

To that end, I hope you hear the voices of the many residents of this area as we rely on you to fulfill your role to help lead responsible development with the guidance of our comprehensive plan. In addition to the many letters included in this packet, there are over 200 signatures of individuals who oppose this proposal. There was also much work and documentation in the Township and Parks plans for the need and desire to preserve this land for more greenspace for our community.

Additionally, during the three different neighborhood meetings I attended with the developers, there has been adamant objection to this project. Please do not take any of the comments and questions about the details of the plans to be any type of endorsement or acceptance of their proposals and adjustments as it appears some of the report may suggest. Recently, there were over 40 residents in attendance at this last meeting where we voiced our united opposition. It was stated repeatedly that this area being proposed for a zoning change is not appropriate for this purpose and does not fit within the comprehensive plan. Therefore, it is clear that this proposal should be unanimously rejected by your commission.

I recognize and have seen firsthand the significant role each of you serve in planning for our city/township. I know from listening in on a number of your meetings these past couple years the dedication and seriousness with which you take your duties. I want you to know how much your time and effort is appreciated. My fear with seeing this project continuing to be on your agendas is that the process is unfairly in favor of the developers and not the local residents. My hope and prayer are that you will be our voice and help put an end to what I view is not only an inappropriate and irresponsible proposal, but also an unnecessary and disrespectful use of your time.

I know that there are a number of us neighbors who have worked tirelessly to try to express our concerns and reasons for this not being an appropriate use of this land. We put tremendous effort and time into planning our opposition and writing a detailed remonstrance. We have sacrificed significant time and much worry over this project as we truly appreciate and have been drawn to this area for its natural beauty. It seems to me the most appropriate thing you could do would be to not only reject this proposal, but let the City Council and developers know this land deserves to be protected and somehow preserved in its beautiful and natural state.

Sincerely,

Martin Kirkwood

Pamela Howard

From: Ted Sommer <Ted.Sommer@LWGcpa.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 19, 2022 7:02 AM
To: Pamela Howard
Cc: APC
Subject: Ted and Carol Sommer input concerning proposed NP II land use
Attachments: Letter from Ted and Carol Sommer dated February 17 2022 concerning Northpoint II proposal.pdf

**WARNING: This external email is from
Ted.Sommer@LWGcpa.com.**

Pam: Please see that the attached gets to the appropriate decision makers. Any follow up questions can be addressed to me. My cell phone number is 317-509-4228.

Thank You

Ted Sommer



Ted Sommer, CPA

LWG CPAs & Advisors

p: (317) 634-4747 ext. 222 f: (317) 632-2727

a: 1776 North Meridian Street, Suite 500, Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

w: LWGcpa.com

e: Ted.Sommer@LWGcpa.com



Westfield Advisory Planning Commission

February 17, 2022

Town Council Members City of Westfield

Subject: Proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park

From: Ted and Carol Sommer
21001 Anthony Road

My wife Carol and I moved into our house in December of 2008. In the intervening years we have rebuilt and refurbished 3 ponds that flow into each other, and with the help of the Hamilton County Conservation District and my wife (A Master Gardener) we have turned our property into a designated natural habitat. Now, is not a good time to visit, but please come over in May.

We love the relative isolation of our four acres. Allowing this proposed Industrial Park will remove the peace we find in the evenings and will devalue our property. We are in our late 60's and are beginning to contemplate moving and if you allow this use of the 183 acres north of Highway 38 as proposed I will need to disclose that to any potential buyers, and it will result in the confiscation of the value of our property by the City.

Please do not allow this proposed project to go through. It is:

- Contrary to the Westfield Comprehensive Plan
- Incongruent with the 2020 Hamilton County Comprehensive Plan
- When we last checked, there are 1,950 acres of land in the City which is undeveloped and is already zoned in a manner consistent with the proposed use of Northpoint II.
- There are no sidewalks or streetlights along Anthony Road. We are not asking anyone to put them there, but there will be increased traffic along Hwy 38 and Anthony and if this is approved that will be inevitable.

Finally, I grew up on a family farm in Missouri. We like to guess what crop the farmer across the road will plant this next year. We also have seen the sky darken when the Indiana Sand Cranes are on the move. If you approve this Industrial Park, when we look across the road, we will see buildings and crops. If the Industrial Park proves profitable to Holladay and to the city, the Industrial Park will move further north. We will certainly no longer see the Sand Cranes.

Sincerely,


Ted and Carol Sommer

Pamela Howard

From: Jon Hastings <jhaste31@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 19, 2022 6:35 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Industrial Park Northpoint 2 Proposal

**WARNING: This external email is from
jhaste31@gmail.com.**

I am writing to you in protest of the Northpoint 2 development proposal in the Rural Northeast area of Westfield. The area is peaceful, quiet, and beautiful. This is in-line with the Westfield Washington Comprehensive Plan. I have reviewed this plan, and it explicitly states the following regarding the land that Northpoint Owners, LLC wishes to develop:

“The policy of this plan is that these areas will be designated as rural for the foreseeable future. In particular, the development for these areas as anything other than rural or agricultural uses in the near future would violate the contiguity policy set out in the general policies.”

The plan also describes the following appropriate land uses in the Rural Northeast area:

Single-family detached houses on large lots or in a Rural or Conservation Subdivision.
Accessory dwellings
Equestrian uses
Agriculture, including artisan farms
Institutional uses, such as schools, churches, public safety facilities, and similar uses

There is no mention of an industrial park being appropriate or allowed in the Rural Northeast area. I currently see no addendum to this comprehensive plan that would change the status of this land to anything other than the rural definition stated in the original plan drafted in 2007. Therefore, I fail to see how an industrial park could possibly be appropriate, nor how it could represent the interests and well being of the residents surrounding this land. Let me also add here that the new proposal from Northpoint Owners, LLC is a pathetic attempt at including a 10 acre park to make up for the destructive 170 acre industrial park. In accordance with this comprehensive plan, I think a 180 acre park with 0 acres of industrial park would be much more appropriate, and much desired by the residents of the area.

Development of this rural land into an industrial park would send one very clear message: corporate interests are far more important than the interests of your constituents. If this land is to be converted into an industrial park, then it would seem the appropriate progression would be to first call for revision the comprehensive plan with input from the community. Proceeding with development of the land into an industrial park without revision of the plan would surely be a way to lose the trust and support of your constituents.

Jon and Lindsey Hastings

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Pat Boyle <pjboyle@midlandatlantic.us>
Sent: Sunday, February 20, 2022 9:36 AM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Objection
Attachments: Northpoint II Objection Letter - Boyle 022022.pdf; MAP and List of Other Large Parcels Available in Westfield 022022.pdf

**WARNING: This external email is from
pjboyle@midlandatlantic.us.**

Dear Council and APC members – I am a resident of Westfield and live on Anthony Rd. Please find attached my letter of objection to the proposed Northpoint II PUD as well as some supporting documentation.

Thank you for your service and consideration.

Best regards,



PATRICK BOYLE |
MIDLAND ATLANTIC PROPERTIES

Direct: 317.597.1718 | Mobile: 317.679.6322
pjboyle@midlandatlantic.us | www.midlandatlantic.com
3801 East 82nd Street, Suite B, Indianapolis, Indiana 46240



February 20, 2022

Westfield City Council &
Westfield Advisory Plan Commission
Westfield, IN

RE: Objection to the Proposed Northpoint II PUD

To the members of the Westfield City Council and the Westfield Advisory Plan Commission:

My name is Patrick Boyle. My wife Wendy and I live at 21312 Anthony Rd in Westfield. I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed Northpoint II PUD.

I have lived on Anthony Rd now for nearly 8 years but have been a resident of Westfield 25 years. I love Westfield and purposely chose it for its small town and community feel as well as its excellent school system. All in all a great place to live and raise a family. In 2014 we moved from Setters Run to Anthony Rd specifically to escape the density of a production home community, gain a little elbow room and enjoy country living. Anthony Rd on this northeast corner of the township has become known a little jewel, an oasis in Westfield, where larger-lot, estate and country homes abound which in my opinion and the opinions of many, is at the core of the character and roots of Westfield – what makes it a special place to live.

I am a partner at a real estate development company, Midland Atlantic Properties, and consequently am generally supportive of new development and economic growth, when appropriate. However, “appropriate” is the key word here. Westfield’s comprehensive plan specifically calls for the area proposed for Northpoint II to remain non-dense residential. The comprehensive plan, written in 2010, was a very well-thought-out plan, the collaborative and deliberate effort of hundreds of members of the community, city staff and officials. Why deviate from that plan now and agree to a re-zoning? I understand the need to evolve, adapt and grow as a city but to disregard a recent comprehensive plan and change from agriculture to industrial zoning (regardless of the design and use standard concessions made by the developer) is just not appropriate, not compatible with the area, contrary to the vision of the community and not smart planning. When we (Midland Atlantic) developed Monon Crossing recently (where Chipotle, Denny’s and Burger King are located) at SR 32 & Wheeler Rd, we did seek a rezoning of some of our original parcels containing old homes and also sought minor variances to things like set-backs and landscape requirements in our PUD, but all these changes were compatible with the comprehensive plan and very much in the spirit of the city’s and communities’ vision. The Northpoint II PUD is different, a much more drastic and onerous change.

I understand the desire to attract economic growth, jobs and investment, to the area and I am generally supportive of that vision. However, growth must not be at the cost of a well thought-out and established long term comprehensive plan. The Northpoint developer says that he needs larger tracts of

land to attract larger users which cannot be accommodated at the existing Northpointe I development. Please keep in mind that Northpointe I is still not fully leased or committed to so we feel that they do have room in that project to accommodate the growth they seek. More importantly, there are in fact several larger tracts of land (over 1,900 acres) south of SR 38 and either adjacent to, contiguous with or nearby North Pointe I and on SR 32 west for US 31, as shown in the neighborhood objection package we neighbors have submitted to you previously (and also attached to this letter), most of which are indeed within the appropriate areas and compatible with the comprehensive plan and some already with appropriate zoning and even some with TIF's in place to accomplish what they are looking for. The city constructed the exit off of US 31 at 191st St presumably to make this a gateway into the business park area and more easily accommodate the truck traffic and commercial activity. Let's stay with that plan and keep the commercial and industrial development in these other areas.

Furthermore, the neighborhood group and I believe that this re-zoning request does not meet specific legal requirements to qualify for a rezoning (as described in more detail in the neighborhood objection package). If you allow this, it will open the floodgates for industrial development to sprawl further north and east into this corner of the township, eliminating one of Westfield's last non-dense residential and agricultural areas, forever changing the character of the area and consequently changing the complexion of Westfield as a city and community.

We ask that you councilmen and commission members respect the comprehensive plan, preserve the vision of the community and comprehensive plan and vote against the Northpoint II PUD.


Thank you and respectfully yours,



Patrick & Wendy Boyle
21312 Anthony Rd, Westfield, IN 46062
317-679-6322
patandwendyboyle@gmail.com
pjboyle@midlandatlantic.us

MAP OF LARGE UNDEVELOPED PARCELS IN WESTFIELD

LOCATED WITHIN A LAND USE AREA APPROPRAITE FOR NORTHPOINT II PER THE COMP PLAN



Subject Parcels (proposed Northpoint II):

<u>Owner</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Comp Plan</u> <u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
Bryant 1	14.71	Rural Northeast	AG-SF1
Bryant 2	46.42	Rural Northeast	AG-SF1
Wiehe 1	22.16	Rural Northeast	AG-SF1
Wiehe 2	38.73	Rural Northeast	AG-SF1
Green TAT Farms 1	19.25	Rural Northeast	AG-SF1
Green TAT Farms 2	48.51	Rural Northeast	AG-SF1
Acreage Total		189.78	

Large Undeveloped Parcels Adjacent to Northpoint I:

<u>Map #</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Comp Plan</u> <u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
			Business Park/Employment Corridor/Regional	
1	Roudebush (SR 31 & SR 38)	44.11	Commercial	AG-SF1
2	DeLullo (SR 31 & SR 38)	37.92	Business Park	AG-SF1
3	Burton/Bishop (SR 31 & SR 38)	7.55	Business Park	AG-SF1
4	Wilkins (SR 31 & E 202nd St)	77.08	Employment Corridor	AG-SF1
5	Stepheson (202nd St & N East Rd)	16.89	Business Park	AG-SF1
6	Chance (196th & N East Rd)	16.19	Employment Corridor	AG-SF1
7	Chance (191st St & Flippines Rd)	70	Business Park	SF-2
8	Chance (191st St & Flippines Rd)	6.68	Business Park	SF-2
9	North Westfield Developments LLC	5.14	Employment Corridor	PUD
10	North Westfield Developments LLC	29.39	Employment Corridor	PUD
10	North Westfield Developments LLC	8.39	Employment Corridor	PUD
11	North Westfield Developments LLC	13.28	Employment Corridor	PUD
11	North Westfield Developments LLC	19.26	Employment Corridor	PUD
13	North Westfield Developments LLC	18.51	Employment Corridor	PUD
13	North Westfield Developments LLC	20.5	Employment Corridor	PUD
15	Roberts (196th & Grassy Branch Rd)	79.74	Business Park	SF-2
16	Roberts (196th & Grassy Branch Rd)	77.9	New Suburban	AG-SF1 PUD
17	Roberts (196th & Grassy Branch Rd)	80	New Suburban	AG-SF1 PUD
18	Reasen (E 196th St)	17.53	New Suburban	AG-SF1
19	Bray (SR 38 & Moontown Rd)	54	New Suburban	AG-SF1
20	Freedom Associates of Indiana LLC (N East St & 186th St)	30	Employment Corridor	SF-3
21	Freedom Associates of Indiana LLC (N East St & 186th St)	30	Employment Corridor	SF-3
22	Gapinski (N East St)	10	Employment Corridor	SF-3
23	317 Capital LLC	9	Employment Corridor	SF-3
Acreage Sub Total		779.06		

Other Large Undeveloped Parcels in Westfield within an appropriate Comp Plan Land Use Area:

<u>Map #</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Comp Plan Land Use Category</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
24	Wheeler Landing	181	Employment Corridor	PUD
25	Springmill Center	57	Employment Corridor	PUD
26	Gristmill Crossing	14.7	Regional Commercial	PUD
27	Dartown Crossing	33.93	Employment Corridor	PUD
28	Wood Farms LLC (SR 32)	43.05	Business Park	AG-SF1
29	Wood Farms LLC (just north of 32 & County Line Rd)	43.55	Business Park	AG-SF1
30	Nuckols, Billy S (SR 32)	17.57	Employment Corridor & Villages	AG-SF1
31	HJW Holdings II LLC (Just off the South side of 32)	54.66	Existing Rural Southwest	AG-SF1
32	HJW Holdings V LLC (SR 32 & Mule Barn Rd)	80.25	Employment Corridor	AG-SF1
33	Chance (SR 32 & Centennial Rd)	40	Employment Corridor	AG-SF1
33	Chance (SR 32 & Centennial Rd)	20	Employment Corridor	AG-SF1
33	Chance (SR 32 & Centennial Rd)	20.5	Employment Corridor	AG-SF1
36	Cardinal Real Estate Holdings LLC (SR 32 & near Towne	86.64	Employment Corridor	PUD
37	HJW Holdings III LLC (Just off the South side of 32)	24.05	Employment Corridor	AG-SF1
36	Cardinal Real Estate Holdings LLC (SR 32)	3.25	Employment Corridor	PUD
36	Cardinal Real Estate Holdings LLC (SR 32)	19.99	Employment Corridor	PUD
36	Cardinal Real Estate Holdings LLC (SR 32)	7.97	Employment Corridor	PUD
41	Tyler Eifert (Just off the south side of SR 32)	40	Employment Corridor	AG-SF1
42	Towne Road Crossing North LLC (just north of 32)	14.31	Local Commercial	PUD
42	Towne Road Crossing North LLC (just north of 32)	42.25	Employment Corridor	PUD
44	Saxton (SR 32 & just West of Little Eagle Creek Ave)	78.85	Local Commercial	AG-SF1
45	Ackerson Family Farms LLC (SR 32 & Ditch Rd)	114.87	New Suburban and Regional Commercial	PUD
46	Ackerson Family Farms LLC (SR 32 & Ditch Rd)	41.75	Regional Commercial & Suburban Residential	PUD
47	FHM Family Limited Partnership (SR 32 & Casey Rd)	18.74	Regional Commercial	PUD
47	FHM Family Limited Partnership (SR 32)	4.1	Regional Commercial	PUD
47	FHM Family Limited Partnership (SR 32)	2.21	Regional Commercial	PUD
50	191st Street Land Co LLC (SR 32)	15	Regional Commercial	PUD
51	Mansoori (SR 32)	22.51	Regional Commercial	PUD
51	Mansoori (SR 32)	7.54	Regional Commercial	PUD
51	Mansoori (SR 32)	7.12	Regional Commercial	PUD
54	Mink Investments LLC (SR 32 & Springmill Rd)	13.34	Regional Commercial	EI
Acreage Sub Total		1,170.70		
Acreage Grand Total		1,949.76		

Pamela Howard

From: Tony Dues <TDues@midmark.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 20, 2022 12:53 PM
To: APC
Subject: North Point 3

**WARNING: This external email is from
TDues@midmark.com.**

Hello Planning Commission!
Thank you for taking a minute here!

In regards to the proposed North Point 3 development north of hwy 38 (between Anthony Rd & Hinkle Rd), I have studied this proposal along with the area around it and simply put it does not make any sense. The Westfield & Washtington Township Comphrensize Plan deems this area north of 38 to be rural & agricultural.

There are three parks in this quadrant of land (between 31 & Hinkle Rd), why on earth would an industrial park be a good idea here?!

There is not pressure on our area to have more industrial space. We currently have over 1,000 acres of available industrial sites (one being North Point 2).

I am all for growth but certainly in the right areas. We have seen the negative result of towns with poor planning and putting this industrial park in the middle of a rural setting will do so much to diminish this area of Hamilton County.

A recent assessment by the Indiana DNR deemed Hamilton County as desperately needing green space. Let's do a really great thing for our area and preserve this land either a) into a humongous park/conservation land (w/ the 3 current parks anchoring) or b) if development is needed, keep it rural w/ 3-5 acre homesites. These keep the integrity of this land, the current homes around it, and stays consistent with the Comp Plan.

Thank you again for taking the time and your service to keep Hamilton County great!

Tony

Designing better care.™

Tony Dues

Territory Portfolio Manager
Medical Products

C: 317-431-8884
tdues@midmark.com
Service: 844-856-1230
www.midmark.com



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, including any attachments, contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message and any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, by you is strictly prohibited.

Pamela Howard

From: Mitchell Elmore <mdelmore22@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 20, 2022 1:03 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint 2 PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
mdelmore22@gmail.com.**

This message is in regards to the Northpoint 2 PUD proposal.

Please vote NO in regards to this proposal. In addition to everything that has been discussed and mentioned by other members of the community, I would like to bring up the current Northpoint 1 construction going on just outside of my backyard. I live on the west side of Edwick Drive in Coventry and my backyard and all of my rear windows face the current eyesore called Northpoint 1. While it is fact I built my house and moved in after Northpoint 1 was already agreed upon and in process of construction, it is also fact that it is an eyesore, loud, an increase in traffic, and stands to decrease home prices to those closest to it. The current building under construction on East Street has been nothing short of a disturbance to our house and community. The pure loudness of the construction equipment, loads literally being dropped off and shaking our house, the noise pollution from the equipment and people yelling, the dirtiness of East Street, the already deterioration of East Street, and the steady stream of trash and debris that has ended up in our yard during their construction has been a complete headache for my family. One has to assume that as the construction gets closer to Coventry, the problems will only worsen exponentially. And once businesses take over, the noise, congestion, and lights of the business and semi trucks will become a daily headache for nearby residents.

I find it peculiar that the owners and developers of this proposed project don't live and relax in the immediate area they are actively trying to develop. If that doesn't speak volumes to the drastic decline it is expected to bring to surrounding community, I don't know what does.

There is absolutely no benefit to this project except to the developer. As representatives of the community, it is plainly evident by the community's response that this project is completely unwanted and should be voted on accordingly - which is NO.

Please consider the large amount of citizens that will be directly and indirectly impacted by this project when voting.

Thank you,

Mitchell and Sammi Elmore
20002 Edwick Drive
Westfield, IN 46074

--

Mitchell Elmore
mdelmore22@gmail.com
(317) 910-7215

Pamela Howard

From: Justin Evans <justin.a.evans11@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 8:30 AM
To: APC
Cc: Kaitalyn Smith
Subject: Opposition to Northpoint II - Objection

**WARNING: This external email is from
justin.a.evans11@gmail.com.**

To Whom It May Concern,

My family and I live at 5376 Sheridan Rd. We moved from our home in downtown Noblesville to our 3-acre property for the serenity, nature, and proximity to so many great local businesses. Our historic 100+ year old property features a large horse barn and carriage house, both original in structure. We feel very strongly about the preservation of the area currently in discussion to be developed by Northpoint II.

We fear that the impending development will bring down our property value, pose a threat to the ecosystem, and endanger the livestock surrounding us. The rural lifestyle that we moved for will be directly threatened by the commercial development plans.

It is our firm request that the land NOT be developed. If it were to be developed, we would strongly request that it would be residential in nature, only. The residential development should preserve our beautiful property line and capitalize on the wide-open land, sky, and animals. Any other option would be a disservice to this beautiful area.

Thanks,

The Evans Family
574-453-8168

Pamela Howard

From: Doug Sikora <ds7969@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 11:48 AM
To: APC
Subject: Objection to North Point II

**WARNING: This external email is from
ds7969@yahoo.com.**

My name is Doug Sikora, resident of 20280 Dayspring Court, Noblesville. This email represents our strong objection to North Point II for all the reasons mentioned in "neighbor meeting summary". ie., the well documented traffic dangers on 38 and Hickle Creek Rd., light and noise pollution, negative impact to wildlife using the area and neighboring park, water quality, negative impact on home values, and deviation from the planning/zoning.

Thank you,

Doug Sikora
1-317-379-2399

Pamela Howard

From: Jill Bracken-Emerson <Jill@EmersonLawLLC.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 11:50 AM
To: APC
Cc: Christy Wheeler; Wayne Wheeler
Subject: Objection to NorthPoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
Jill@EmersonLawLLC.com.**

Dear APC and Council Members,

I am writing in opposition to the development of NorthPoint II on land north of State Road 38 and east of Anthony Road. My family and I live on the west side of Anthony Road just north of State Road 38 at 20803 Anthony Road. We purchased 7 acres on Anthony Road in 2020 to develop a family farm, a use for which the area is zoned.

Since purchasing in 2020, we have installed fencing, upgraded an existing barn, upgraded the drainage system, and completely renovated the home. We have purchased cattle seedstock and farming equipment. In the spring of 2021, we began raising cattle, and in the fall sold our first calves to local 4-Hers who intend to show them. Soon cows and their calves will be arriving at our farm for spring and summer grazing. The calves will be sold in the fall.

Purchasing the 7 acres that we own in rural Westfield is the fulfillment of my dream to return to Hamilton County and own a farm and raise cattle. For some background, both of my parents grew up as farmers in Hamilton County. My father in Strawtown and my mother in Westfield. On my father's side, my roots in Hamilton County go back to the late 1800s when my grandmother's family (the McClintock's) owned a large amount of farmland near the Conner homestead, where Conner Prairie now sits. On my mother's side, my mother grew up on a farm on Mule Barn Road near 186th St. Her father Max Harvey raised dairy cattle and drove a school bus for Westfield Washington Schools. She is a 1964 graduate of Westfield High School. Her mother, my grandmother Edith Harvey, was an elementary teacher in Sheridan and Noblesville. Her brother, my uncle, Steve Harvey, has owned Harvey's Collision Center in Westfield since the 1960s. I was born at Riverview in Noblesville and lived in Strawtown until first grade. I started school at Walnut Grove Elementary. In the mid-70s when land prices began to soar in Hamilton County, my parents whose dream it was to farm moved us to Montgomery County, near Crawfordsville, where land prices were still affordable. I was raised on a farm near Crawfordsville and showed livestock in 4-H for 10 years.

It has been my dream to return to a farm and raise cattle with my family in Hamilton County. Purchasing the 7 acres that we own on Anthony Road is the fulfillment of 25 years of work as a lawyer so that we could afford to get back to a farm in Hamilton County. I want my kids, their kids, and the community to learn about agriculture and share in family farm life in rural Hamilton County.

Given the financial investment to purchase and renovate the property that we own, my family's financial nestegg is tied to the land on Anthony Road. Our purchase was based on reliance upon the zoning and

Comprehensive Plan established by Westfield. The development of NorthPoint II with large industrial buildings will destroy the value, character, and purpose of the property that we purchased.

It is my understanding that other areas of Westfield are already zoned for this type of development. NorthPoint II does not belong on land north of State Road 38, an area zoned as and used for family farms. It belongs in an area that is already properly zoned for industrial buildings. Please deny the request for re-zoning.

Best regards,

Jill Bracken-Emerson
Partner
**Emerson Divorce and
Accident Injury Attorneys, LLC**
1 South Rangeline Road, Suite 400
Carmel, Indiana 46032
P: 317-969-8000
F: 317-663-2116

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The materials in this electronic mail transmission (including any attachments) are confidential and are intended only for the named recipient(s) and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient(s), be advised that any unauthorized disclosure, copying, distribution or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately at the email address or telephone number listed above. Receipt by anyone other than the named recipient(s) is in no way to be construed as a waiver of any attorney-client work product or other applicable privilege.

-

Pamela Howard

From: J Adams <jmausgp@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 3:28 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint 2

**WARNING: This external email is from
jmausgp@gmail.com.**

Dear Planners, Commissioners, and Council Members,

My name is Joe Adams and I live at 5059 E. 211th Street which is less than a half mile from the Northpoint 2 property line. My property reaches all the way to Morse Reservoir and has over 1,400 feet of shoreline on Morse Reservoir. The Northpoint 2 fields have drainage tiles and surface water drainage that flows directly into my property and through my property to Morse Reservoir. I know this because in 1997 a large diesel fuel spill in these same fields caused major ecological damage to my property. One of the creeks that run through my property and into Morse sustained significant damage. We had a 100% fish kill of all species. We had as much as 90% of the frogs, toads, salamanders and other amphibians die as a result of this spill. I have worked for more than 20 years to repair that damage.

If an industrial park were to be built on Northpoint 2 land, not only would industrial pollution rise and threaten ground water for miles around but given enough time we would most likely face another industrial accident that would eventually flow into my property and on into Morse Reservoir. Depending on the toxicity of the spill this could not only wipe out wildlife and domestic animals but in the end it could threaten the water supply of everyone that uses Morse Reservoir. And this doesn't even take into account groundwater use by a large industrial park, which could threaten all of us that live around the area and are dependent on the aquifer for our water. And where would wastewater go, and how would it be treated. Frankly there are too many questions and not enough good answers here.

It is also very clear that the decision to have industrial parks below State Road 38 has already been made and there is no reason that Northpoint 2 could not build south of St. Road 38 and away from Morse Reservoir and the Morse watershed.

With parkland becoming increasingly precious and irreplaceable we simply can't put an industrial park on either side of two of our current parks and potentially one of our future parks that could exist in one of the few remaining corridors of undeveloped open space. Afterall, a nature park with no or very limited wildlife isn't a park at all. A nature park tends to draw people from both inside and outside the county. In my experience industrial parks are to be avoided because of truck traffic and pollution and for many other obvious reasons.

For these and the many other reasons already stated, I implore the planners, commissioners and council members to vote NO on North point 2 request of a change of land use.

Sincerely,

Joe Adams

Pamela Howard

From: Adam Corya <adamcorya@callcarpenter.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 3:57 PM
To: APC
Cc: Pamela Howard; Caleb Ernest; Daine Crabtree
Subject: Objection To Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
adamcorya@callcarpenter.com.**

Good Afternoon Members of the City Of Westfield Advisory Plan Commission,

After a thorough review and consideration of the proposed Northpoint II PUD Ordinance Number 20-25, I want to express, in writing, my ardent objection.

My wife and I moved our family from our last neighborhood home within Westfield Washington School District to our current home on Anthony Road specifically to escape the ever-increasing commercial atmosphere within Westfield. We sought an area that we could trust would remain free from the myriad of issues that are unfortunately a given with any commercial real estate setting including major light & noise pollution.

As a real estate professional, I wasn't naive to the potential of some of the surrounding farmland in our area changing hands and for homes to be built on the land. In fact, new neighbors have just completed a gorgeous new home on Anthony Road. This home complies with all of the zoning / ordinances in place as it should. Residential development among an existing residential area is most often a net positive for the existing homeowners in the area. In contrast, there is nothing more damaging to a residential area's value than having industrial buildings erected nearby.

What I couldn't have ever logically foreseen is that a group of commercial investors would actually *close* on land that didn't, at all, comply with the well-established zoning in place. For reasons unknown to me, they must have felt sure it was a slam dunk that they would get their way. With that said, their confidence for a bad idea doesn't justify the support of the stewards of Westfield's well-being. The Northeast Rural Residential district would be ruined forever with an Industrial Park that no one who lives even remotely close to it wants. The current zoning is sound for the area and shouldn't be changed.

Kind Regards,
Adam Corya



6101 N College Ave
Indianapolis, IN 46220
317.460.6514

Email: adamcorya@callcarpenter.com

Website: adamcorya.callcarpenter.com

Facebook: facebook.com/adamcoryarealtor

Pamela Howard

From: Armstrong CIV Timothy J <Timothy.J.Armstrong@usmc.mil>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 7:56 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Cc: Armstrong CIV Timothy J; Kimberly Armstrong
Subject: Opposition to Northpoint 2 PUD

To: Advisory Plan Commission (APC)
From: Armstrong Family @ 20636 Anthony Road
subject: Northpoint 2 Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Enclosures:

- (1) Our Pasture
- (2) Our back yard
- (3) Our son with the alpacas

In 2016 my family and I made the decision to move from a cramped Westfield neighborhood troubled by teenage vandalism, pestered by loud music, and no privacy to a peaceful semi-secluded beautiful country home perfect for gazing at countryside, enjoying wildlife, raising farm animals, and relaxing with peace and quiet. With the existing Comp plan, we knew everything we came to love about our country home would remain untouched by the City of Westfield. Unfortunately, we were devastated to find out several developers put their own interest in front of respecting us and our surrounding neighbors.

To help put this in perspective for you, I've included pictures of our yard aimed right where Northpoint 2 is threatening to build. My wife has cried herself to sleep several times at the thought of hideous buildings suffocating our property as though we never moved to 'the country'. The developers' diagram indicates a large industrial building just to the East of our property along with several plots which would be sold off and potentially rezoned yet again to match someone else's agenda. As one of the primary affected residents of Anthony Road, it's incumbent upon me to share with you our side of this. The side negatively impacted by this careless, thoughtless, idea that takes nothing into consideration except for someone to make some money and then walk away.

Our Animals

Part of the dream to our country life was having animals roam in the pasture. We purchased and rescued several animals including alpacas. We currently have the perfect quiet pasture for alpacas. They don't like noise and are very shy around strangers. They like to keep to themselves and approach people on their terms. The shock of the initial construction with the proposed mayhem alone would be enough to cause catastrophic stress to our alpacas. If they survive that, they will be forced to endure a lifelong discomfort of crowded housing or industrial park right behind their safe space. I get sick to my stomach just thinking about it.

Lowered Property Value

We moved here a few years ago intending for this to be our 'forever home'. We installed a pool, purchased recreational vehicles, and invested time and money on various home improvement projects. My family and I are dug in.

Encroaching on our countryside would obviously force us to move from Westfield which would be a logistical nightmare alone. The worst part is our property value will nose dive causing us to lose money. That's unacceptable to us.

Scenery Destroyed

Choosing to live here in the aftermath would not be a choice at all. We would be stuck at that point. Instead of sitting on the back porch gazing at the sunrise while we enjoy our coffee, we would be staring at overwhelmingly large, ugly buildings and the industrial traffic right behind our yard.

Privacy Lost

With that being said, we can kiss our privacy goodbye. I can't stand the thought of being on display as we use our hot tub, relax in our shelter, and host private family gatherings.

Goes Against The Comprehensive Plan

Above all, this development goes against the Comprehensive Plan which states this type of unattractive condensed housing or industrial zoning will NOT be considered north of State Road 38. These developers don't seem to care. Convincing you to let them infringe on our countryside is just a part of everyday business to them and their lawyer.

These are all just the points that come to mind as I take the time to write. Of course there are countless small inconveniences we will encounter along the way such as our line of site internet being demolished because of ridiculous [buildings](#) between us and the tower we connect to. Only time will tell how much more we have to be troubled with if you allow this to move forward.

I understand Westfield is a growing community. I see new developments pop up like wildfire wherever I go. I know development is inevitable throughout the city. However, we all made a conscientious decision to move out to an area where we would not be impacted and harmed by it.

If you give in to this reckless plan, history will be lost, more habitats will be destroyed, and our home will be shattered.

Please don't let this happen to our home and community. Thank you for listening.

Tim Armstrong
Extremely concerned Anthony Rd. resident

Enclosure 1



Enclosure 2



Enclosure 3



Pamela Howard

From: Lidia Furtado <lidia.furtado82@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 8:07 PM
To: APC
Subject: 2008-PUD-09 (Northpoint 2)

**WARNING: This external email is from
lidia.furtado82@gmail.com.**

To whom it may concern:

We are writing this email in opposition to the development of Northpoint 2 on the north side of SR 38 between Anthony Road and Hinkle Road. We moved to the area in October 2019 for the specific purpose of raising our family in a quiet and rural location. We have a significant concern that the establishment of the Northpoint 2 development will greatly diminish the quality of life in the area. There will be an increase of traffic, noise, and pollution. There is also an anticipation of a drop in property values for homes in the area. The area should remain as rural residential. It is inappropriate that an industrial park would be located right next to the Bray Family Homestead. Working with Hamilton County to establish a passive use nature park would be much more appropriate to the area.

Again, our family is completely opposed to Northpoint 2 development.

Regards,

Lidia and Kate Furtado
4803 E. 216th St. Noblesville, IN 46062

Pamela Howard

From: Des Schillinger <des.schillinger@sai-rep.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 9:09 AM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Industrial Park

**WARNING: This external email is from
des.schillinger@sai-rep.com.**

To Whom it Concerns,

Good morning. I would like to thank you for taking the time to read this email regarding the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park.

I hope before you vote on the above zoning change request for Northpoint II Industrial Park you have taken the opportunity to drive up and down Anthony north of State Road 38 and taken in the beauty. Anthony Road may be the prettiest road in all of Hamilton County. It would be a shame to go against IC36-7-4-603 and ruin this natural setting. This request by Northpoint II **Fails to meet IC 36-7-4-603:** and to meet ANY of the 5 criteria which are to be reasonably considered. As a former resident of Hinkle Creek for 15 years it would be a shame for this area to be changed into an Industrial Park with 40 foot concrete walls all around. This Land should remain as zoned "Farm and 3 acre residential lots".

Economic Reasons

I presently am a business and property owner in the Alpha Industrial Park in Westfield which still has available lots after 30 years. The Northpoint I Industrial Park is not completely built out so why in the world would we open another Industrial Park until what we have is built out. By waiting for these Industrial Parks to build out you are protecting the previous investors in Westfield who believed in Westfield first.

Please vote NO to the request to rezone this area.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss, please contact me.

Thank You and Best Regards,

Des Schillinger
Schillinger Associates, Inc.
17819 Commerce Dr., Suite 100
Westfield, In. 46074
765/457-7241
765/457-7732 Fax
www.sai-rep.com

Pamela Howard

From: David Dunbar <david.b.dunbar56@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 9:29 AM
To: APC
Subject: North Point II

**WARNING: This external email is from
david.b.dunbar56@gmail.com.**

We are residents of our home located at 21344 Anthony Road, Westfield IN 46062. We are writing to express our concerns about the rezoning of the land located at the northeast corner of Anthony Road and State Road 38. Our understanding is that the land is currently zoning for low density residential/agricultural and that the owner wants to have the zoning changed to industrial.

Although we appreciate the benefits arising from land development we are opposed to this rezoning request. The City of Westfield currently has over 1900 acres of undeveloped land zoned industrial where the same owner could purchase to accommodate their industrial clients needs. Most of the property owners adjacent to the proposed land have residential properties that would be adversely affected by an industrial building 40 feet tall regardless of a barrier. Additionally, if a commercial strip mall were developed on the land, the residential culture would also be disrupted.

We feel the current zoning is sufficient for the property owner to develop and benefit from the income of lot sales as opposed to sales to commercial and/or industrial clients.

Please consider our opposition not to prevent development but to the type of development proposed. Thank you in advance for your consideration in our cause.

David and Sandy Dunbar

21344 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
317.696.0228 (David)
317.402.4650 (Sandy)

Pamela Howard

From: Sandra Dunbar <sdunbar213@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 10:37 AM
To: APC
Subject: Opposition/Northpoint 2 Industrial Park

**WARNING: This external email is from
sdunbar213@gmail.com.**

I am a resident at our home located at 21344 Anthony Road, Westfield IN 46062. I am writing to express my concerns about the rezoning of the land located at the northeast corner of Anthony Road and State Road 38. My understanding initially was the land was to be rezoned as high density residential and/or a nature park but now the owner wants to have the zoning changed to industrial.

Although I appreciate the benefits arising from land development I am opposed to this rezoning request. There are numerous locations in the City of Westfield that are currently zoned industrial where the same owner could purchase to accommodate their industrial clients needs. Most of the property owners adjacent to the proposed land have residential properties that would be adversely affected by an industrial building 40 feet tall regardless of a barrier. Additionally, if a commercial strip mall were developed on the land, the residential culture would also be disrupted. Property and land values will be negatively affected.

I feel a high density residential is sufficient for the property owner to develop and benefit from the income of lot sales as opposed to sales to commercial and/or industrial clients. Ideally developing a community center and park for all to enjoy at this location would be great utilization of the land in question north of SR 38.

Please consider our opposition not to prevent development built to the type of development. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sandra B. Dunbar
SBD Design
Space Planning and Interior Design
21344 Anthony Rd, Noblesville, IN 46062
317.402.4650
sdunbar213@gmail.com

Pamela Howard

From: rwgudeman@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 2:08 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Objection

**WARNING: This external email is from
rwgudeman@gmail.com.**

APC – planning commission for Westfield

This is being written to express concern about the proposed development north of 38/east of Anthony Rd. I live at the northwest corner of these two roads. My property is already compromised with the development along the south side of Indiana 38.

There are many reasons to oppose this Northpoint II industrial development; keeping the area rural, land value, overburden Westfield resources, to name a few; in addition, my understanding is there are other developments available for this purpose, already with the correct zoning.

In addition to keeping the Rural area, I would fully support a Parks department acquisition for nature parks to further enhance the preservation of the area.

Thank you for your consideration and taking time to review this in detail.

Rebecca Gudeman

R W Gudeman LLC
20649 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
P: 317-840-1041
E: rwgudeman@gmail.com

Pamela Howard

From: Eric Ferrell <ericferrell33@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 2:17 PM
To: APC
Subject: NorthPoint II OBJECTION

**WARNING: This external email is from
ericferrell33@gmail.com.**

Hello,

First of all, I hope this email finds you well and I appreciate the role you play for our community.

I am reaching out to voice my objection towards the NorthPoint II development that is proposed near SR 38 & Anthony Road. I am a nearby resident, in the Hinkle Creek Estates neighborhood, and I am strongly against what this land is being currently proposed for development of. This proposal is in stark contrast to the surrounding area and would be a disservice to the landscape and current residents in the area. While the obvious potential downfalls to this include increased traffic, noise & light pollution, decreased property values; one major thing stands above all, the impact to the citizens of our community. The people that live near this proposed “developmental” area have worked hard to obtain the land to build their homes and to call this area their own slice of heaven. We all chose to live in this area for the peace and quiet this residential & agricultural area provides; and to have this ripped away from us by having commercial and/or dense residential area created would be a travesty. The ideal situation would be to leave this land as is, however a wonderful alternative would be for a park or other green space to be developed in its place. In this part of Hamilton County, there isn’t a community park filled with playgrounds, basketball/tennis/pickleball courts/disc golf/etc that the nearby residents can enjoy. With the increased home building on Grassy Branch, Moontown/Hinkle & 191st, this would offer a wonderful alternative for the local residents to enjoy for years to come. All while maintaining our property values and eliminating all the negative socioeconomic and environmental impacts that NorthPoint II will bring to this area.

I urge you to please stop this land from being changed from its original zoning and turned in to something that can forever change the lives and landscape for the good people of this area.

Thank you,

Eric Ferrell
5114 Morning Mist Ct
Noblesville, IN 46062

Pamela Howard

From: Susie Tatum <susie.tatum@alsac.stjude.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 4:35 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northfield II Development

**WARNING: This external email is from
susie.tatum@alsac.stjude.org.**

Hello,

I am writing to you about the Northfield II industrial development, which will be on the docket for this evening's meeting.

Please vote **NO** for the following reasons:

- **Opposite the Westfield Comp Plan:** What Northpoint II is proposing doesn't fit in anything the community has planned-in fact, it is exactly the opposite of what the Westfield Comprehensive Plan outlined. If Westfield believes more property is needed for this type of land use, they need to develop a plan, publicly vet the plan, and outline how they intend to plan for the area surrounding such a development...not just allow a developer to dictate placement of an Industrial Park where it was never envisioned!
- **Incongruent with the 2020 Hamilton County Comp Plan:** The public input surveys for this plan (respondents from all townships in the county) showed a clear theme-Maintain what is left of our rural/undeveloped areas! Over 70% of the respondents said their future land use vision was for Agriculture...and nearly 50% said they wanted no more development. A few of the Key Take-Aways from the survey: *"They live in Hamilton County Townships because of community rural character"* and *"There is a strong preference to preserve existing farmland across all townships"*.
- **Devalues surrounding property:** The citizens have invested a sizeable amount of money in their homes. A sampling of just 55 homes in the immediate area shows a combined market value of \$29,267,053. Studies show that placing industrial development in the middle of residential devalues properties by up to 30%. For just this sampling of homes, that equates to a loss of \$8,780,115...that is real money for real families. Real impact to real citizens.
- **Other Land Available:** Westfield currently has an inventory of 1,950 acres of land which is undeveloped and already has the correct zoning for a Northpoint-type development. Additionally, the existing Northpoint development is largely vacant with only 3 operating buildings in existence. The pressure to put Industrial into AG/Rural Residential is completely unnecessary.
- **Sets a precedent:** This project would, if approved, reset the basis for what is acceptable land use north of Highway 38. It would open the flood gates for more Industrial and Commercial development north of Hwy. 38. Once something like this is anchored on the north side of 38, it paves the way for industrial creep...opening up the remainder of the area to the same type of land use and development.

- **This is a Parks Area:** Hamilton County is investing in this area for a new park, the Bray family provided their personal land for a park in this area, and Washington Township has established MacGregor Park here ...even if the development was consistent with the zoning, it wouldn't make sense to drop an Industrial park with 24/7 shifts of activity in the middle of a rural parks quadrant.
- **Unanimous Opposition:** Every land owner in the 1 mile area is OPPOSED to this development. Not one person approached was in favor of it! In a time when no one agrees on anything we have 100% agreement that NP2 must be stopped.
- **Overburdens Westfield Resources (Fire, Police, EMS, Schools):** Adding an Industrial development to an area where the city planning calls for the exact opposite land use creates a gap in resource planning. Many resources needed...few resources planned. WHO PAYS for the gap?
- **Endangers the Water Supply:** The land for the proposed NP2 development is designated as **BOTH** a Wellhead Protection Area and a Source Water Area. Hundreds of families count on the aquifer beneath for their drinking water. There is significant concern about contamination from things like: steel fabrication, chemical spills and manufacturing.
- **Negative Quality of Life Impact:** Pollution/safety/traffic. Dangerous traffic, disruptive noise pollution, and unwanted light pollution. Environmental contamination of industrial activity is part and parcel with air, soil, and groundwater pollution.
- **Fails to meet IC 36-7-4-603:** Fails to meet ANY of the 5 criteria which are to be reasonably considered
- **Alternatives are available:** The owners could develop the land with something that is compatible with the Comp Plan and still make money – a Conservation Subdivision or large parcel home sites. Or, they could work with Hamilton County Park and Rec to convert the entire area into a passive use nature park.

Susie and Randy Tatum
 317-701-5867
 Westfield, IN.

Pamela Howard

From: James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 7:48 AM
To: APC; planners
Subject: Re: James Hogan's Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

**WARNING: This external email is from
james.hogan@elamusa.com.**

Good morning members of the APC,

I want to first thank you for being so attentive to each of us as we voiced our objection to the Northpoint II PUD. I do also owe an apology to Ginny for not making clear that I was representing Hinkle Creek Estates' ("HCE") homeowners association which is why Pam gave me 5 minutes rather than 3 minutes. But I also want to take this opportunity to reiterate our strong opposition to the petitioners' plan. I take particular exception to a few things from their rebuttal:

1. Chris Wilkes concluded there is a lack of interest in large acre lots based on his data from LIBOR. This is simply not the case. True, it takes money to afford one, but, just as true, there is money in Hamilton County. Speaking from experience of living in a "large acre lot" community, I have found the lot size to be the single biggest draw. Our neighborhood has 36 lots. All are developed. The demand is so high that not one, not two, but three houses went on the market. All three sold - two at \$1,000,000.00 and one at \$2,000,000.00. The two \$1 MM homes sold before or within 30 days of hitting the market. The owners who sold the \$2 MM house can't find lots anywhere else and so a neighbor was kind enough to parse off 2 of their 8 acres so that this former homeowner can build a NEW home in our neighborhood. That would be #37 - and it never hit the market! The homeowner can't find neighborhood land anywhere else. Wilkes' statement is simply untrue. The demand is there for 2+ acre lots in this part of Hamilton County. The testimonials from two of you further supports this.
2. I come from Akron, Ohio. I grew up in Bath, Ohio. Bath has a restriction for large acre lots - all 1.5+ minimum in the entire township. Bath is the single most sought-after area in the Akron-Cleveland area. LeBron James' home is in Bath. This lack of demand that Chris Wilkes points out is not only untrue here, but its untrue anywhere else where wealth exists.
3. A truer statement is that there is a lack of 2+ acre offerings in Hamilton County and so the data are so limited as to be rendered meaningless. Offer more large acre lots and they will come, particularly in Hamilton County. See my personal observations of our neighborhood, above.
4. Chris spoke of the economics of his development. This issue is well beyond the almighty dollar. There are places for making money and there are places for resting and relaxing. They are separate. Think about Central Park. What is that worth to a developer? Billions! Maybe a Trillion! But does it beat the priceless serenity? Of course not. Don't let the almighty dollar weigh on your decision on this one.
5. Any development penetrating the north side of State Route 38 that is incongruent with the Comprehensive Plan will forever ruin the Northeast Rural Residential landscape. Several of you alluded to that last night and I applaud your efforts for saying so. My feeling on the Comp Plan is that its lack of "update" doesn't change the NRR District at all as we will fight extremely hard to preserve this NRR District with any update in the future.
6. The one speaker spoke of exasperation for the lack of interest in a park. Those Township Board members that voted it down (there are only 2 of them from what I understand) must listen to us. Times have changed. The overwhelming majority of us who objected to Northpoint II didn't even know those discussions were ongoing. The fact that 3 people can vote on such a big issue and turn our world upside down is absurd. This issue must be

revisited, and several of us are willing to take up that torch. Those two Board members must listen. There is more than one way to slice the onion on funding, as you all know so well.

7. Lastly, please note what the petitioners did not do: they did not argue my points about how the development must pay reasonable regard to Indiana Code IC 36-7-4-603. The Remonstrance Package makes it clear that Northpoint II does not. Please review that exhibit closely.

In close, one thing that kept coming to me is the sign that reads "In God We Trust" behind all of your heads. I am so delighted to see such a wonderful display of reverence. I do trust in God in all of my decisions and statements and do feel as though the Holy Spirit can work through all of us individually and as a group. I pray that God works through all of you as a group to follow Indiana Code and resist the temptation of a developer trying to make crooked that straight path.

Let this be a place of relaxation and enjoyment. Let the developer sell the land. That is an option. Please do what is right for us, those most affected by this monstrosity. Vote this down 9-0.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The **ELAM** Group

[161 Lakeview Drive](#)

[Suite B](#)

[Noblesville, IN 46060](#)

President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 8:59 PM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good evening members of the APC,

I am writing to renew my objection to the petition for 2008-PUD-09 filed nearly one year ago today and outlined further below. In short, nothing has changed.

The tweaks to the petitioner's plan presented on Monday (1/31/22) fails to address our demand from the public meetings over 1 year ago. Our demand back then was to simply follow the rules and develop the land in a manner that respects the intended land use of the Northeast Rural Residential ("NRR") District - just as every other land owner in the NRR District has done. It's not asking much at all.

What the petitioners presented last Monday was lipstick on a pig. They chose to ignore the attached *Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD*, dated 2/2/21, but we the people surrounding the land of 2008-PUD-09 find the document even more relevant today than when it was first produced.

Please end this sordid tale, and end it emphatically. VOTE AGAINST 2008-PUD-09 UNANIMOUSLY.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The **ELAM** Group

161 Lakeview Drive

Suite B

Noblesville, IN 46060

President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Thu, Feb 11, 2021 at 4:53 PM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good afternoon and greetings members of the Advisory Plan Commission ("APC") and City Council of the City of Westfield.

I am writing to you today to voice my sincere objection to the above-referenced planned unit development ("PUD") petition. My wife and I, Lori, along with our 4 children, dog and 2 cats, reside in our home at 20275 Dayspring Court in Noblesville, Indiana. The home is the northwesternmost home within the Hinkle Creek Estates subdivision. We are making a significant investment in upgrading our home over the next couple of months and plan to be here a long time.

Our subdivision consists of 2+ acre lots in a rural residential setting complete with well water, septic fields and propane tanks. The neighborhood is on the east side of Hinkle Road. Our neighbor to the west is the *Bray Family Homestead Park*. We have a reassuring feeling knowing that the entire area west of us is in the Northeast Rural Residential district and will therefore never be developed into anything more than Rural Residential homes, agriculture or a Conservation Subdivision. This was a huge factor in us deciding where to live. We love how our rural residential neighborhood meshes so well with that of the Northeast Rural Residential district of Washington Township.

In fact, over the past few years since we moved in, I have praised the responsibility of the City of Westfield/Washington Township in abiding by its Comprehensive Plan. I have trumpeted these praises to my friends and neighbors Dez Schillinger and Rob Hanlon - two significant employers within the City of Westfield. I tell them I wish every community operated like Westfield. Our confidence that the City of Westfield/Washington Township will maintain a governing body that makes politically stable and logical decisions that are empathetic to its residents and neighbors like myself helps me sleep well at night.

On Tuesday, 2/16/21, my faith in your politically stable, logical decision-making abilities will be put to the test. Our entire neighborhood is worried. I am worried.

We want you to vote no to 2008-PUD-09. We offer a logical basis for you to say no. That logic is rooted in a document that Wayne and Christy Wheeler will send you in an emailed attachment, a document entitled Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD, dated 2/2/21.

Read it and enjoy it. It provides you a basis for rejection.

In the meantime, I will pray.

I pray that your hearts be touched by the 183+ residents who join me in objecting to this 2008-PUD-09 abomination - noting that not one resident we reached supported it. I pray that you uphold your Comprehensive Plan. And, lastly, I pray that you have courage to VOTE NO, in the face of certain political and monetary pressure, to 2008-PUD-09.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG

161 Lakeview Drive
Suite B
Noblesville, IN 46060



President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

Pamela Howard

From: Jen Whaley <jenwhaley3@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 11:45 AM
To: APC
Subject: Neighbor Writing to Object to Northpoint Owners' petition PUD 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
jenwhaley3@gmail.com.**

Dear members of the City of Westfield's Advisory Plan Commission-

I live at 5215 Nightshade Lane on the east side of the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park. I firmly object to the Northpoint Owners, LLC Petition 2008-PUD-09.

I understand that it petitions to change the land use from an existing agriculture/single-family rural use to an Industrial, Commercial and Single-Family High Density use. I hope that the APC will unanimously reject 2008-PUD-09 in order to preserve and honor the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan as we all have and to protect the acceptable use and development of the property in the Northeast Rural Residential District as rural residential and agricultural only.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Whaley

Pamela Howard

From: Lori Hunt <lahunt1961@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2022 5:18 PM
To: APC
Cc: bigskyorbust@gmail.com
Subject: Hunt Family Statement

**WARNING: This external email is from
lahunt1961@gmail.com.**

To whom it may concern,

On Tuesday, February 22, 2022 during the Advisory Plan Commission Meeting there were several comments made by the petitioner, as well as an APC member, that stated the land in question could not just “sit dormant until the end of time” This was further supported by remarks that implied that land is not considered developed and/or utilized without a building or structure on it. I would like to believe these comments were not meant to disparage or belittle the very backbone of our state, however the very concept of Northpoint 2 would suggest otherwise. As a lifelong citizen of Westfield and proud landowner of many buildingless, structureless acres in the NRR area, I would like to state my concerns and objection to the development of Northpoint 2.

While the fields that sit next to the proposed land for Northpoint 2 might appear to be stagnant, they have annually harvested corn and soybeans for over 30 years.. The obvious facts are simple. Not only do these crops find their way from field to fork, but they also play a critical role in the overall agriculture industry. Soybean products serve as the leading source of protein for livestock and poultry. The corn and soybeans grown in our city are also made into biofuels and fiber materials such as ethanol and carpet. This area is zoned AG-SF1:Agriculture/Single-Family Rural District. This agricultural land is not only active and productive, but it is clearly serving the function that the Westfield Comprehension Plan envisioned. So I have to ask myself, why would these comments be made?

The Northpoint 2 proposal makes it evidently clear that development is spurred by positive economic growth, which is desired in Westfield. It also highlights the fact that it is perfectly fine if this growth comes at the expense of the city's prime farmland and well-being of its neighboring citizens. After reading “Exhibit 10: Public Comments” from the 2/22 meeting it is not only my belief, but the overwhelming belief of many that the NRR farmland remains a precious asset that benefits all neighboring residents. This well-managed land protects soil fertility, water quality, and biodiversity. It also creates a beautiful, healthful setting for outdoor recreation and makes durable contributions to the local economy. Most importantly, this land is irreplaceable: once this natural area is turned into Northpoint 2, it can never be restored to its former condition. Land use has a much wider context of responsibility than the creation of economic growth. While the public meetings have highlighted economic growth, little communication has been made of the negative effects that the Northpoint 2 would have on the area such as air and water pollution, soil degradation, and traffic congestion. The current proposed plan of Northpoint 2 does not prove that the benefits of economic growth will be worth the risks taken. It is a gamble that does not acknowledge the full cost of its implementation, nor have the support of it's community members.

To borrow an old farming term, It appears that the developers at Northpoint 2 put the “cart ahead of the horse” by acquiring land zoned AG-SF1 with the sole intent to have it rezoned without the support of it's neighboring citizens. I do understand the Comp Plan is not a legally binding document, but I also understand it is the official policy of Westfield and the agreed-upon vision for the future of the community. It would be a misrepresentation of our great city, its people and its rich history to allow a developer to domineer the decisions of how we use our land. There is a process to address rezoning changes, and this is clearly

not it. I sincerely hope that the city of Westfield, as well as the APC recognize that economic development is not the unmindful, careless pursuit of luring businesses with tall structures to the NRR area. I Instead hope they recognize that investments should not be considered economic development unless they improve the quality of life of the nearby area residents.

A recent facebook post from a member of the APC stated “we have to understand that land sitting dormant is unrealistic”. I can assure you that the land owned by the Hunts will not sit Dormant, but will proudly continue to remain active and productive farmland.

Sincerely,

Keith & Lori Hunt , Ray & Becky Hunt, Dennis Hunt

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Canada, Brad <brad.canada@stryker.com>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 6:17 PM
To: APC
Subject: RE: Northpoint II

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

**WARNING: This external email is from
brad.canada@stryker.com.**

APC Members,

It has come to my attention that these plans will be going back to you all for review. My stance has not changed on my flexibility to support any industrial development in this area.

I have spoken to a few people within the WYSI leadership team and would like to recommend you all partner with WYSI to develop this land as a multi sport baseball/softball/soccer complex as Westfield looks to support these programs in our growing city.

Based on feedback, it needs to be located in Westfield, relatively flat ground to minimize cost of construction, big enough to support the complex and be easy to get in/out of. I know they are actively looking for land to purchase and start plans.

This would be an ideal spot and better use of our community and the growing programs. Grand Park is located in our backyard but capacity is an issue and as you all know – change of ownership could DRASTICALLY impact our WYSI rec and travel sports. Noblesville and Carmel both have their dedicated parks for the community and we are behind. I would be in full support to develop this area and keep it associated with a park vs dramatically change the dynamic of this space in the rural northeast. I would ask you please consider his request and coordinate efforts with WYSI and our community leadership.

From: Canada, Brad
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 1:27 PM
To: 'APC@westfield.in.gov' <APC@westfield.in.gov>
Subject: RE: Northpoint II

APC Members,

I also want to add to my email below. After our meeting last night, I want to more directly say regardless of the park, the easement acreage, whatever the developers come back with – I WILL NOT ever approve or support this re-zone project.

There is way too much land already zoned industrial in Westfield and opportunities south of SR38 to develop before we should ever assess or even look at flipping the plan and script for this land SOLELY because a well known developer with a well known personal relationship with the city owns the land.

It would be so disappointing for the city to approve this given there are 3 beautiful parks in that same area that potentially could have a concrete jungle right in the middle of it all with an insane amount of industrial traffic, commuters and numerous stop lights off SR38.

I want to please urge the city to develop the other areas that are zoned industrial. If anything, be flexible with taking 3 acre home lots down to 1 acre to generate more tax revenue. I would much rather see residential and parks vs industrial.

From: Canada, Brad
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2022 1:32 PM
To: 'APC@westfield.in.gov' <APC@westfield.in.gov>
Subject: Northpoint II

APC Members,

I have sent emails in the past but wanted to re-voice my position on continued development north of SR38 as I see this is coming back up stemming from a hard push in 2021 from the Developer.

My name is Brad Canada and live at 20945 Anthony Road. There has been numerous conversations going on among the neighbors that live on Anthony Road as well as up and down SR38. We know that there is a developer that is aggressively looking to gain approval to rezone a rural "residential" area into a massive industrial park. I wanted to share my perspective and reiterate that I would like your support to not approve this rezoning.

I have only been living in this area for 5 years (grew up in Fishers) but the broader SR38/Anthony/31/Hinkle Creek northeastern part of Westfield is a special place. Driving up through Anthony feels more like Brown County vs Hamilton County. McGregor Park and Bray Family Park makes this area even more special but it's the surrounding areas that add to that. Westfield is a fast growing place and there is so many advantages to that and one that drew us to the area to begin with (schools, people, growth, amenities, etc). Growth in this area is a GOOD thing but there needs to be a balance to protect certain areas to offset the traffic, noise, etc. A HUGE industrial park was just approved south of SR38 that is still being developed so to approve another 180+ acre park + the future progression to then approve another 180+ acre plot on Anthony makes this rural area feel like we are down in Plainfield in the midst of their distribution and industrial areas. Westfield would then be losing a huge chunk of green space that could potentially be a nice residential area that could in theory connect both parks and be a place where the community could get away from the traffic, noise, chaos of what other parts could be.

I plan on raising my 3 young kids in this house and be here forever and part of that decision was giving them an area that was safe. I fear the traffic, I fear the amount of people commuting here daily that is not bought in or involved in this community, I fear the pollution/trash, and most importantly – I fear that this area and this community loses a huge part of what makes this community different that a Fishers, Carmel, or Noblesville. That is the ability to properly plan for future growth by also protecting pockets of the community that make it feel green and enjoy the beautiful scenes of nature and a rural setting in the pockets of heavy residential/commercial areas. I would MUCH more support a residential zoned area to drive population and keep the green area as close to what we can and continue to build out south of 38 and other areas that are more suited for industrial growth.

We do need industrial growth and areas to bring businesses here (which we have south of SR38 and pockets west on 31) but I strongly encourage you all to please have the voice of your residents and our strong views against turning the most beautiful area in all of central Indiana into a massive concrete industrial zone that would have a huge negative impact on so many people and so many things. Please consider our request to vote "NO" to rezone these areas as industrial north of 38. Please consider keeping the industrial growth and overall focus be on the land and acreage that has already been approved just south of 38 and other areas that have been designated already as "industrial" for further expansion. This

Anthony Road area between the 2 parks could be an AMAZING area to have future residential neighborhoods (as it is currently zoned), green space and parks for generations to come.

Respectfully,

Brad Canada

Brad.canada@stryker.com

703-431-4083

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

Pamela Howard

From: shari mcgrath <sharimcgrath@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 9:29 AM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: NorthPoint II

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

**WARNING: This external email is from
sharimcgrath@yahoo.com.**

Good morning,

As a resident of Hinkle Creek Estates, I have many concerns about building Northpoint II off SR 38 and do not want it to be built.

I believe it will negatively effect

- my property value
- the serene/country-like atmosphere of our quaint neighborhood
- noise, traffic and pollution
- safety of my children and pets

I urge you to listen to this community and ask that this not be built.

Thank you,
Shari McGrath

Pamela Howard

From: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:59 AM
To: APC
Cc: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Subject: Objection to Northpoint II PUD changes

**WARNING: This external email is from
jpedzinski@comcast.net.**

Dear APC,

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed development currently referred to **Northpoint II PUD (docket #2008-PUD-09)**. ***Please vote "NO" to the proposed revisions and future developments in our rural residential setting.***

The only plan to which I will not object to is developing the land responsibly in accordance with Comprehensive Plan.

For us, that means Rural Residential developments. In the last meeting, Northpoint countered that nobody builds along St Rd 38 and SR 32. I found their response to be self-serving and very misleading and not based on facts.

Hopefully, you will drive along St Rd 38 and St Rd 32 and see for yourself that there are numerous residential developments underway. I am sure there are many more in the early planning stages. All of which will be affected should the requested zoning changes.

I urge you to listen to your gut, do you honestly believe that Northpoint Group is being 100% open & honest with the APC & local community. Would you want your expensive home and new schools backing up to an industrial park & warehouses? Would you want your children riding their bicycles and sharing the streets with the large semitrucks?

Have you asked Northpoint Owners about their plans for Northpoint III & Northpoint IV developments?

Perhaps you should require that Northpoint Owners disclose their long-term plans, in writing, before being bullied by their legal maneuvering and twisting of reality.

Sincerely,

James R. Pedzinski
5250 Nightshade Ln, Noblesville, IN 46062

Pamela Howard

From: Casey Mihal <casey.mihal@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 7, 2022 11:07 AM
To: APC
Subject: NO to NorthPoint 2!

**WARNING: This external email is from
casey.mihal@gmail.com.**

Hello Westfield APC,

I am writing to you again to repeat what I said a few months ago. It has come to my attention that the Holiday Properties is once again asking for a zoning change so that they can develop their proposed NorthPoint II Industrial park on an area that is currently zoned as rural residential.

Let me be clear here, approval of this rezoning and development of the industrial park would be a slap in the face to Westfield citizens. This would very quickly send the message that businesses are more important than the residents of this city.

This proposed industrial park DOES NOT BELONG on the lot. This area should remain rural residential, as described in the Westfield Comp Plan. The small changes to the proposal do not bring it anywhere near compliance with the Westfield Comp plan, nor what the residents local to the area desire.

This development would also bring harm to the community around the lot. There are many people living in the area that would be harmed due to increased noise, pollution, traffic, decreased safety, decreased property values, and more.

There are plenty of available spaces for Holiday Properties to develop and industrial park, where the correct zoning already exists. I am not against their industrial park, I am against it being in a rural residential area.

I strongly urge all of you to reject the proposal from Holiday Properties for their NorthPoint II industrial park and associated rezoning.

Best Regards,
Casey Mihal
(219) 688-0712

Pamela Howard

From: Jim May <jrmay47@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 1:41 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
jrmay47@gmail.com.**

To Members of the Westfield Advisory Plan Commission:

I have lived in Hamilton County since 1984 and spent most of my 74 years in Indiana. Yes, Hamilton County is a great place to live. We have top notch schools, nearby amenities for our busy lives, and many job opportunities. All of these have things have drawn people to our county.

Something else that has drawn many to Hamilton County is the rural ambiance. A drive on Anthony Road to the northern parts of the county is one of the most scenic areas in Indiana. Nature is abundant. Wildlife, native trees and plants, streams, and rolling farmland are part of this trip.

As you know this area has been designated to maintain a rural feel in the Westfield Comprehensive Plan. The citizens involved in writing this plan had the insight to realize the importance of keeping the rural areas in the county protected. An industrial development was not what they had in mind for this part of Hamilton County.

I am strongly opposed to this industrial park. Please vote **NO** on the Northpoint II PUD.

"The earth is the LORD's, and the fulness thereof." Psalm 24:1a

Thank you,

Jim May
5620 Pine Hill Drive
Noblesville, IN. 46062

Pamela Howard

From: JANET QUISENBERRY <bichon2222@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 3:13 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint II PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
bichon2222@gmail.com.**

August 8, 2022

To the members of the Westfield APC and Westfield City Council:

Thank you for your countless hours of devotion to Westfield. I humbly ask you to vote **NO** on the Northpoint II PUD, coming up on August 15, 2022, before the APC.

We the citizens of this area have been dealing with this threat of an Industrial Park, since August of 2020. This area between Anthony Rd., Hinkle Rd., 216th St., and Highway 38, is about a thousand acres. Now, it is zoned Rural Agriculture and this is very plainly spelled out in the Westfield Washington Twp. Comprehensive Plan. Many of us used this plan to guide us in the purchase of our properties. This Comprehensive plan is a valid living document.

Should this Industrial Park, of almost 200 acres, be allowed, it will cover this entire area with more dust and debris, than our lungs can handle. Our water supply will be threatened and the wildlife and plant life will slowly be strangled by the dust, toxins, concrete and asphalt this Industrial Park will create. Not to mention what it will do to our tax paying citizens, no more night sky, contaminated water supply and the overall health and quality of life will be destroyed.

We have been over this again and again. We all should protect and use this land wisely. It was created by God. This area is zoned rural residential, not commercial. These investors, and Chris Wilkes of Holladay Properties knew this zoning before they started this procedure. They also knew about the Westfield-Washington Comprehensive Plan.

It is statistically proven that crime rates rise considerably around Industrial development. Look what happened to Anderson, still struggling with all the contaminated land from the Automobile industries abandoned facilities, land that is useless, unless it is decontaminated, and costs are staggering. Not only does it contaminate the land, it spoils our waterways, killing water life and all kinds of wildlife, and ruining the quality of life for the land owners who have to live around it. It will also cover up the rich history of the Native Americans who lived on this land and also the history of the Underground Railroad. It will devastate this entire area. We do not yet know what the health affects will be from Northpoint 1. Traffic on Anthony Rd. including semis, has increased since the completion of the new intersection of Anthony Rd. and highway 38.

There are many acres available in Westfield which would be a better fit for an industrial park. A map of these areas was included in our Remonstrance Package. It just does not fit at all in this rural residential area. An industrial park is not a correct use of this beautiful green space, and it is certainly not correct to ruin citizens safety, health, and way of life, not to mention that it will devastate the wildlife in this area which the parks are trying to preserve. It is an irresponsible, destructive development.

Please vote **NO** on Northpoint II PUD.

Thank you and God bless you
Janet Quisenberry-May

Pamela Howard

From: Allen Still <allen.still@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 12:29 PM
To: planners
Subject: Northpoint II - Revised Proposal for 8/15/22

**WARNING: This external email is from
allen.still@gmail.com.**

Good Morning,

After reviewing the new proposal for Northpoint II, it still makes no sense and feels like putting a square peg in a round hole.

- The developer calls the residential space "Conservation Lots" - **please note**; the fact that they use the term "conservation" does not mean this is the same as a Conservation Subdivision. What they are proposing **DOES NOT MATCH** the criteria outlined in the Westfield Comprehensive Plan for a Conservation Subdivision (for more information, please see the Conservation Subdivision Process Tool Box, in Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan, p.30 & pgs. 34-37).
- Also, they are requesting that the proposed residential area be zoned SF1. This is **NOT** the same zoning that the land currently has. Currently, the entire area is zoned AG-SF1. These are 2 different categorizations, with different permitted uses, per the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 4.
- Lastly, they state "Permitted Uses for the Conservation Lot Residential Area" are: Dwelling-Single family, Agricultural Use, and Stable-Private. Once again, they are being **misleading**, as the last two uses they list are, in fact, **NOT** permitted uses for the zoning they are requesting (SF1) according to the UDO.

Whether it's a park or 5 residential lots, there is still no way to buffer an Industrial Park! The lots do nothing to decrease the traffic - nothing to decrease the noise, the dust, the light pollution...nothing to increase our safety...nothing to protect our groundwater from contamination...nothing to protect our property values or our quiet rural lifestyle. This proposal continues to be an egregious VIOLATION of the Comprehensive Plan and a direct threat to our way of life, Please give this proposal a no vote - an unfavorable recommendation.

Thank You
Allen Still

Pamela Howard

From: Keaton Still <keaton.still@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 2:02 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II - Revised Proposal for 8/15/22

**WARNING: This external email is from
keaton.still@yahoo.com.**

Good Afternoon,

After reviewing the new proposal for Northpoint II, it still makes no sense and feels like putting a square peg in a round hole.

- The developer calls the residential space "Conservation Lots" - **please note**; the fact that they use the term "conservation" does not mean this is the same as a Conservation Subdivision. What they are proposing **DOES NOT MATCH** the criteria outlined in the Westfield Comprehensive Plan for a Conservation Subdivision (for more information, please see the Conservation Subdivision Process Tool Box, in Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan, p.30 & pgs. 34-37).
- Also, they are requesting that the proposed residential area be zoned SF1. This is **NOT** the same zoning that the land currently has. Currently, the entire area is zoned AG-SF1. These are 2 different categorizations, with different permitted uses, per the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 4.
- Lastly, they state "Permitted Uses for the Conservation Lot Residential Area" are: Dwelling-Single family, Agricultural Use, and Stable-Private. Once again, they are being **misleading**, as the last two uses they list are, in fact, **NOT** permitted uses for the zoning they are requesting (SF1) according to the UDO.

Whether it's a park or 5 residential lots, there is still no way to buffer an Industrial Park! The lots do nothing to decrease the traffic - nothing to decrease the noise, the dust, the light pollution...nothing to increase our safety...nothing to protect our groundwater from contamination...nothing to protect our property values or our quiet rural lifestyle. This proposal continues to be an egregious VIOLATION of the Comprehensive Plan and a direct threat to our way of life, Please give this proposal a no vote - an unfavorable recommendation.

Thank You
Keaton Still

Pamela Howard

From: Ainsley Still <ainsley.still@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 2:04 PM
To: planners
Subject: Northpoint II - Revised Proposal for 8/15/22

**WARNING: This external email is from
ainsley.still@yahoo.com.**

Good Afternoon,

After reviewing the new proposal for Northpoint II, it still makes no sense and feels like putting a square peg in a round hole.

- The developer calls the residential space "Conservation Lots" - **please note**; the fact that they use the term "conservation" does not mean this is the same as a Conservation Subdivision. What they are proposing **DOES NOT MATCH** the criteria outlined in the Westfield Comprehensive Plan for a Conservation Subdivision (for more information, please see the Conservation Subdivision Process Tool Box, in Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan, p.30 & pgs. 34-37).
- Also, they are requesting that the proposed residential area be zoned SF1. This is **NOT** the same zoning that the land currently has. Currently, the entire area is zoned AG-SF1. These are 2 different categorizations, with different permitted uses, per the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 4.
- Lastly, they state "Permitted Uses for the Conservation Lot Residential Area" are: Dwelling-Single family, Agricultural Use, and Stable-Private. Once again, they are being **misleading**, as the last two uses they list are, in fact, **NOT** permitted uses for the zoning they are requesting (SF1) according to the UDO.

Whether it's a park or 5 residential lots, there is still no way to buffer an Industrial Park! The lots do nothing to decrease the traffic - nothing to decrease the noise, the dust, the light pollution...nothing to increase our safety...nothing to protect our groundwater from contamination...nothing to protect our property values or our quiet rural lifestyle. This proposal continues to be an egregious VIOLATION of the Comprehensive Plan and a direct threat to our way of life, Please give this proposal a no vote - an unfavorable recommendation.

Thank You
Ainsley

Pamela Howard

From: Corinne Still <corinne.still@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 2:07 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II - Revised Proposal for 8/15/22

**WARNING: This external email is from
corinne.still@yahoo.com.**

Good Afternoon,

After reviewing the new proposal for Northpoint II, it still makes no sense and feels like putting a square peg in a round hole.

- The developer calls the residential space "Conservation Lots" - **please note**; the fact that they use the term "conservation" does not mean this is the same as a Conservation Subdivision. What they are proposing **DOES NOT MATCH** the criteria outlined in the Westfield Comprehensive Plan for a Conservation Subdivision (for more information, please see the Conservation Subdivision Process Tool Box, in Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan, p.30 & pgs. 34-37).
- Also, they are requesting that the proposed residential area be zoned SF1. This is **NOT** the same zoning that the land currently has. Currently, the entire area is zoned AG-SF1. These are 2 different categorizations, with different permitted uses, per the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 4.
- Lastly, they state "Permitted Uses for the Conservation Lot Residential Area" are: Dwelling-Single family, Agricultural Use, and Stable-Private. Once again, they are being **misleading**, as the last two uses they list are, in fact, **NOT** permitted uses for the zoning they are requesting (SF1) according to the UDO.

Whether it's a park or 5 residential lots, there is still no way to buffer an Industrial Park! The lots do nothing to decrease the traffic - nothing to decrease the noise, the dust, the light pollution...nothing to increase our safety...nothing to protect our groundwater from contamination...nothing to protect our property values or our quiet rural lifestyle. This proposal continues to be an egregious VIOLATION of the Comprehensive Plan and a direct threat to our way of life, Please give this proposal a no vote - an unfavorable recommendation.

Thank You
Rinney Still

Pamela Howard

From: Bradley Love <bmrdude1@frontier.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 7:10 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
bmrdude1@frontier.com.**

I would like to express my opposition to the Northpoint II development. I understand the wishes to increase the city's tax base, but encroachment into more rural farmland is enough!

Bradley Love
20690 Hinkle Rd.
Noblesville, IN 46062

bmrdude1@frontier.com

SENT VIA EMAIL TO:

APC@WESTFIELD.IN.GOV

PLANNERS@WESTFIELD.IN.GOV

RE: Docket No #2008-PUD-09


Dear Council Members:

I am writing once again to express my vehement opposition to the proposed Northpoint II PUD. The developer has previously failed to gain approval for its proposed development but is again attempting to gain this council's approval for the project, even though it would undoubtedly damage wildlife habitat, increase traffic congestion, and lower the value of surrounding properties.

The intrusion of this commercial/industrial park into a serene rural residential setting will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the quality of life for residents in this area. Bringing more traffic to the area, particularly on State Road 38, is just one major concern. Increased traffic congestion will create safety issues, particularly during rush hour, and increase pollution and noise in the area.

This development is not in the best interest of the community and there is widespread opposition to this project among the surrounding property owners, residents, and voters. This project is completely out of place in the proposed location and is wholly inconsistent with the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan.

I strongly urge you to reject the proposed development and to protect this area as contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan.



Chuck Goodrich
5015 Nightshade Lane
Noblesville, IN 46062
317-716-7117

Pamela Howard

From: Wayne Wheeler <wwheeler@REINDERS.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 2:22 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: NorthPoint II development 2008-PUD-09

**WARNING: This external email is from
wwheeler@REINDERS.com.**

Dear Council Members,

I am writing again to voice my objection to the NorthPoint II PUD. At the February meeting the council asked the Petitioner (Mr. Wilkes – Holladay Properties) to be more creative and engage the citizens before he returned with his next proposal...neither one of those things happened.

This new proposal has replaced the park with 5 residential building lots that the Petitioner describes as “conservation lots”. Please don’t let that fool you, they DO NOT meet the criteria of a Conservation Subdivision as laid out in the Comp Plan workbook. Adding 5 residential lots still does not buffer an Industrial Park from the neighboring AG-SF1 areas. It is absolutely impossible to hide an industrial park behind the depth of just 2 residential lots. Also keep in mind that he has not provided ANY transitional buffering on the North, South or East side of the project.

No matter what he proposes, this area was never contemplated for Industrial, the Comp Plan hasn’t been updated to include this area for any future Industrial development and its completely irresponsible to “spot zone” an industrial park in the middle of AG-SF1 without considering the impact of everyone and everything surrounding it. A holistic approach must be taken when looking at such an egregious violation of the Comp Plan and how it would affect all neighboring properties and any future development around it. You cannot drop an industrial park in the middle of rural residential and just expect it to blend in and not have a huge impact on the existing residents, who by the way, bought and invested in that area because they referenced the Comp Plan and trusted it.

Please put the citizens first and vote NO on this proposal.

Thank you,
Wayne Wheeler
20889 Anthony Rd

From: Susie Tatum <susie.tatum@alsac.stjude.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 2:28 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint II Industrial Park - Vote No!

**WARNING: This external email is from
susie.tatum@alsac.stjude.org.**

I request that you vote against the proposed Northpoint II Industrial Park for the following reasons:

Why NorthPoint II Doesn't Work

- **Opposite the [Westfield Comp Plan](#)**
 - The NorthPoint II proposal does not fit anything the community has planned, and is exactly the opposite of what the Westfield Comprehensive Plan outlined. This proposal would allow a developer to directly contract policy drafted from the community.
- **Devalues Surrounding Properties**
 - Development of an industrial park in the middle of a residential area would have detrimental effects on property values for those residents.
- **Overburdens Westfield Resources**
 - Adding an industrial development to an area where the city planning calls for the exact opposite use creates a gap in resource planning, including Fire, police, EMS, etc.
- **Fails to meet [IC 36-7-4-603](#)**
 - The NorthPoint II proposal fails to meet ANY of the 5 criteria detailed in this state code, which are to be reasonably considered by the plan commission and legislative body.
- **Alternatives are Available**
 - The owners of the land could develop something compatible with the Comp Plan and still economically viable - a conservation subdivision or large parcel home sites for example.
- **Incongruent with the [2020 Hamilton County Comp Plan](#)**

- o The public input surveys for this plan (from all townships in the county) showed a clear theme - Maintain what is left of our rural/undeveloped areas. Over 70% of respondents said their future land use vision was for agriculture. Over 50% said they wanted no more development.
- **Other Land Available**
 - o Westfield current has an inventory of over 1,500 acres of land that is undeveloped and has the correct zoning for a NorthPoint style development. Additionally, the existing NorthPoint development is largely vacant, making the pressure for an additional industrial park unnecessary.
- **Endangers the Water Supply**
 - o The land for the proposed NorthPoint II development is designated as both a Wellhead Protection Area and a Source Water Area. Many families count on the aquifer beneath for drinking water. There is significant concern about contamination from the proposed land uses.
- **Negative Quality of Life Impact**
 - o An industrial park in this area would add dangerous traffic, disruptive noise pollution, unwanted light pollution, vile air pollution, and soil/groundwater pollution.

Susie Tatum

16250 Oak Road

Westfield, In. 46074

Pamela Howard

From: Ann <loveneverfails75@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 8:35 PM
To: APC
Subject: Reject NorthPoint II!

**WARNING: This external email is from
loveneverfails75@hotmail.com.**

Dear Sirs

I am asking that you vote NO No No to the re-zoning of land sor North Point II.

We do Not want commercial buildings in our area...Please!

We have worked our whole lives to finally have a nice quiet country life. Please do Not ruin everything by allowing this pass.

Thank you so much for your time & consideration. Please vote as if you lived here.. & say No to rezoning.

Sincerely,

Ann Glenn Miller

21188 Anthony Rd

Westfield, IN 46062

Sent from my Galaxy

Pamela Howard

From: TJ Gascho <tj.gascho@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2022 8:36 AM
To: APC; Council Members; planners
Subject: Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

**WARNING: This external email is from
tj.gascho@gmail.com.**

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing regarding the proposed Northpoint II PUD. I've reviewed the revised proposal submitted by the Northpoint Owners and it does not offer anything remotely close to "conservation" use of land.

My family and I built our home almost 6 years ago in Hinkle Creek Estates, which is very close in proximity. We decided to build in Hinkle Creek Estates to enjoy the "country" feel with reasonable access to "city" amenities. We invested significant capital in our home to provide a comfortable and safe environment to raise our three children. I'm sure this is top of mind for many of you when you're making decisions for your respective families. I feel strongly that the Northpoint II PUD will not only jeopardize the safe environment we have for our family, but it will also have a serious negative equity impact on our home value (and many others in the area).

Please take a second to imagine someone building a 170 acre commercially congested business park in your back yard. Ruining the natural rural character. Adding significant traffic! Introducing noise and air pollution, and threatening environmental resources! Meanwhile, devaluing your home up to 30%!! Please provide a scenario where it's unreasonable to object. Unfortunately, this scenario is very real for us if Northpoint II PUD is approved.

I must also mention that I, along with my neighbors, rely on the health and safety of underground well water for our residential needs. There is serious concern that adding a commercially congested park so close in proximity will compromise the integrity of our water source.

Also, while I've noticed significant changes in the infrastructure near Anthony Rd, the surrounding infrastructure is not capable of handling the additional traffic anticipated when adding Northpoint II. The Hinkle/Moontown & 38 intersection continues to be a vulnerable intersection. There was another accident this past weekend. Busses encounter this intersection on a daily basis. We've had bus drivers express concerns in the past. Adding Northpoint II will only increase traffic, which statistically makes this a more volatile intersection.

It's my understanding Northpoint I remains largely vacant, which brings up the questions "why add additional pressure to the area?" and "why move forward with unnecessary rezoning?" During your vote, I hope you will understand and acknowledge the unnecessary negative impact NP II PUD will have on the surrounding community. Please be considerate of these negative impacts along with many others, and **continue** to vote "NO" to Northpoint II PUD.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Timothy J Gascho II

5164 Morning Mist Ct
Noblesville, IN 46062
P: 317-289-5555

Objection Basis:

-IC 36-7-4-603 (2) (shall pay reasonable regard to the current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in the NRR district)

-IC 36-7-4-603 (4) (shall pay reasonable regard to the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction)

Pamela Howard

From: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2022 2:41 PM
To: APC
Subject: Objection to Northpoint II development
Importance: High

**WARNING: This external email is from
jpedzinski@comcast.net.**

August 11, 2022

Dear APC

I am writing to express my objection to the Northpoint II proposal.

My issues are the lack of clarification and misleading suggestions in their new proposal.

- a. The developer calls the residential space "Conservation Lots" -***what does that mean?*** Conservation Subdivision is not the same as Conservation Lots. This is very misleading, and I ask that you obtain some clarification.
- b. The developer is requesting proposed residential area be zoned SF1. The entire area is already zoned AG-SF-1. My understanding is that SF-1 and AG-SF-1 are two different categorizations with vastly different permitted uses per the UDO, Chapter 4. I urge you to get some clarification on this issue and enforce AG-SF-1 zoning.
- c. Northpoint states "Permitted Uses for Conservation Lot Residential Area" are Dwelling – Single family Agricultural Use and Stable-Private. Once again, Northpoint is being misleading! Please verify if the last two uses they list are in fact, NOT permitted uses for the zoning they are requesting (SF1) according to the UDO.

Whether it's a park or 5 residential lots, there is still no way to buffer an Industrial Park. The lots do nothing to decrease the noise, the pollution, the safety of our children riding bikes on the county roads & sharing with semi-trucks along with our property values.

This proposal is a direct threat to the reasons we built our retirement home in Hamilton County. We enjoy the wildlife and quiet country living.

This proposal continues to be in VIOLATION of the Comprehensive Plan.
I urge you to vote 'NO', an unfavorable recommendation.

Sincerely,
James R Pedzinski
5250 Nightshade Ln

Noblesville, IN 46062

Pamela Howard

From: James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2022 3:40 PM
To: APC; planners; Council Members
Subject: Re: James Hogan's Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

**WARNING: This external email is from
james.hogan@elamusa.com.**

Good afternoon members of the APC, City Planners and City Council members!

For the numerous objections outlined below in this email string and as laid out by all adjoining and nearby property owners unified and unanimously against the above-referenced Petition, I urge all of you members of the APC to vote UNFAVORABLE and further urge the City Council to vote NO to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09 ("Petition"). I as an affected property and we as a community, many of us ignorant to the process of how these petitions and PUDs come to fruition, have since become enlightened by the process by which developers apply for land use changes incongruent with a Comprehensive Plan. We have educated ourselves on the tweaks, trickery and other tactics used in attempting to deviate from a carefully considered Comprehensive Plan meant for the welfare of the entire community and not that of a single developer.

To be crystal clear, we applaud those developers who develop according to the Comprehensive Plan, but we denounce those that don't. Accordingly, Holladay Properties and the entire petition group is roundly denounced as it relates to this Petition.

The Northeast Rural Residential district has accepted this Comprehensive Plan as its guiding principle and I submit that the Petitioner, the APC and City Council do as well in the absence of any other document. At the end of the day, we know that the Petitioner cannot move forward with its plans without the APC and City Council accepting of these unwarranted property use changes in the form of an Ordinance.

In educating ourselves on the process of deviating from the Comprehensive Plan through the form of an Ordinance, the community is now moving forward with its public outcry with a website to help fight this plan. It is Say No To NP2 and can be found here: <https://www.saynotonp2.com>. Say No To Northpoint II is meant to bring transparency to the intentions of the Petitioner. I am sure it will soon be on Social Media if it isn't already.

With such a groundswell of objections, and also politically through our State Representative, what left is there to say?

The tweaks of the new petition are meaningless. The only meaningful tweak would be a rural residential development. An extension to Bray Park would likely be accepted, I'm sure. But not commercial. Not Industrial. Not high-density housing. None fit with the Rural Residential/Agricultural zoning.

Consequently, it is my feeling (and I'm sure that of virtually all other objecters) that a vote favorable from the APC or a yes from City Council would carry with it a public outcry over how such a vote could be made in the face of knowing that the development would permanently damage a rural landscape badly in need of preservation, anger an entire community of people and disrupt the entire culture of the Northeast Rural Residential district - and for what - all in the name of more "big box" industrial and commercial buildings hell-bent on tax abatements?

The Comprehensive Plan sets out to preserve our rural culture.

Petition 2008-PUD-09 sets out to destroy it.

Please vote UNFAVORABLE and NO to give us a voice and assurance that our political leaders can divorce themselves from developer temptations in setting out to preserve what is right with the Comprehensive Plan norms that all others have accepted without reservation.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The **ELAM** Group

161 Lakeview Drive

Suite B

Noblesville, IN 46060

President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Wed, Feb 23, 2022 at 7:48 AM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good morning members of the APC,

I want to first thank you for being so attentive to each of us as we voiced our objection to the Northpoint II PUD. I do also owe an apology to Ginny for not making clear that I was representing Hinkle Creek Estates' ("HCE") homeowners association which is why Pam gave me 5 minutes rather than 3 minutes. But I also want to take this opportunity to reiterate our strong opposition to the petitioners' plan. I take particular exception to a few things from their rebuttal:

1. Chris Wilkes concluded there is a lack of interest in large acre lots based on his data from LIBOR. This is simply not the case. True, it takes money to afford one, but, just as true, there is money in Hamilton County. Speaking from experience of living in a "large acre lot" community, I have found the lot size to be the single biggest draw. Our neighborhood has 36 lots. All are developed. The demand is so high that not one, not two, but three houses went on the market. All three sold - two at \$1,000,000.00 and one at \$2,000,000.00. The two \$1 MM homes sold before or within 30 days of hitting the market. The owners who sold the \$2 MM house can't find lots anywhere else and so a neighbor was kind enough to parse off 2 of their 8 acres so that this former homeowner can build a NEW home in our neighborhood. That would be #37 - and it never hit the market! The homeowner can't find neighborhood land anywhere else. Wilkes' statement is simply untrue. The demand is there for 2+ acre lots in this part of Hamilton County. The testimonials from two of you further supports this.
2. I come from Akron, Ohio. I grew up in Bath, Ohio. Bath has a restriction for large acre lots - all 1.5+ minimum in the entire township. Bath is the single most sought-after area in the Akron-Cleveland area. LeBron James' home

is in Bath. This lack of demand that Chris Wilkes points out is not only untrue here, but its untrue anywhere else where wealth exists.

3. A truer statement is that there is a lack of 2+ acre offerings in Hamilton County and so the data are so limited as to be rendered meaningless. Offer more large acre lots and they will come, particularly in Hamilton County. See my personal observations of our neighborhood, above.
4. Chris spoke of the economics of his development. This issue is well beyond the almighty dollar. There are places for making money and there are places for resting and relaxing. They are separate. Think about Central Park. What is that worth to a developer? Billions! Maybe a Trillion! But does it beat the priceless serenity? Of course not. Don't let the almighty dollar weigh on your decision on this one.
5. Any development penetrating the north side of State Route 38 that is incongruent with the Comprehensive Plan will forever ruin the Northeast Rural Residential landscape. Several of you alluded to that last night and I applaud your efforts for saying so. My feeling on the Comp Plan is that its lack of "update" doesn't change the NRR District at all as we will fight extremely hard to preserve this NRR District with any update in the future.
6. The one speaker spoke of exasperation for the lack of interest in a park. Those Township Board members that voted it down (there are only 2 of them from what I understand) must listen to us. Times have changed. The overwhelming majority of us who objected to Northpoint II didn't even know those discussions were ongoing. The fact that 3 people can vote on such a big issue and turn our world upside down is absurd. This issue must be revisited, and several of us are willing to take up that torch. Those two Board members must listen. There is more than one way to slice the onion on funding, as you all know so well.
7. Lastly, please note what the petitioners did not do: they did not argue my points about how the development must pay reasonable regard to Indiana Code IC 36-7-4-603. The Remonstrance Package makes it clear that Northpoint II does not. Please review that exhibit closely.

In close, one thing that kept coming to me is the sign that reads "In God We Trust" behind all of your heads. I am so delighted to see such a wonderful display of reverence. I do trust in God in all of my decisions and statements and do feel as though the Holy Spirit can work through all of us individually and as a group. I pray that God works through all of you as a group to follow Indiana Code and resist the temptation of a developer trying to make crooked that straight path.

Let this be a place of relaxation and enjoyment. Let the developer sell the land. That is an option. Please do what is right for us, those most affected by this monstrosity. Vote this down 9-0.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The ELAM Group

161 Lakeview Drive
Suite B
Noblesville, IN 46060

President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 8:59 PM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good evening members of the APC,

I am writing to renew my objection to the petition for 2008-PUD-09 filed nearly one year ago today and outlined further below. In short, nothing has changed.

The tweaks to the petitioner's plan presented on Monday (1/31/22) fails to address our demand from the public meetings over 1 year ago. Our demand back then was to simply follow the rules and develop the land in a manner that respects the intended land use of the Northeast Rural Residential ("NRR") District - just as every other land owner in the NRR District has done. It's not asking much at all.

What the petitioners presented last Monday was lipstick on a pig. They chose to ignore the attached Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD, dated 2/2/21, but we the people surrounding the land of 2008-PUD-09 find the document even more relevant today than when it was first produced.

Please end this sordid tale, and end it emphatically. VOTE AGAINST 2008-PUD-09 UNANIMOUSLY.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The **ELAM** Group

[161 Lakeview Drive](#)

[Suite B](#)

[Noblesville, IN 46060](#)

President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Thu, Feb 11, 2021 at 4:53 PM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good afternoon and greetings members of the Advisory Plan Commission ("APC") and City Council of the City of Westfield.

I am writing to you today to voice my sincere objection to the above-referenced planned unit development ("PUD") petition. My wife and I, Lori, along with our 4 children, dog and 2 cats, reside in our home at 20275 Dayspring Court in Noblesville, Indiana. The home is the northwesternmost home within the Hinkle Creek Estates subdivision. We are

making a significant investment in upgrading our home over the next couple of months and plan to be here a long time.

Our subdivision consists of 2+ acre lots in a rural residential setting complete with well water, septic fields and propane tanks. The neighborhood is on the east side of Hinkle Road. Our neighbor to the west is the *Bray Family Homestead Park*. We have a reassuring feeling knowing that the entire area west of us is in the Northeast Rural Residential district and will therefore never be developed into anything more than Rural Residential homes, agriculture or a Conservation Subdivision. This was a huge factor in us deciding where to live. We love how our rural residential neighborhood meshes so well with that of the Northeast Rural Residential district of Washington Township.

In fact, over the past few years since we moved in, I have praised the responsibility of the City of Westfield/Washington Township in abiding by its Comprehensive Plan. I have trumpeted these praises to my friends and neighbors Dez Schillinger and Rob Hanlon - two significant employers within the City of Westfield. I tell them I wish every community operated like Westfield. Our confidence that the City of Westfield/Washington Township will maintain a governing body that makes politically stable and logical decisions that are empathetic to its residents and neighbors like myself helps me sleep well at night.

On Tuesday, 2/16/21, my faith in your politically stable, logical decision-making abilities will be put to the test. Our entire neighborhood is worried. I am worried.

We want you to vote no to 2008-PUD-09. We offer a logical basis for you to say no. That logic is rooted in a document that Wayne and Christy Wheeler will send you in an emailed attachment, a document entitled Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD, dated 2/2/21.

Read it and enjoy it. It provides you a basis for rejection.

In the meantime, I will pray.

I pray that your hearts be touched by the 183+ residents who join me in objecting to this 2008-PUD-09 abomination - noting that not one resident we reached supported it. I pray that you uphold your Comprehensive Plan. And, lastly, I pray that you have courage to VOTE NO, in the face of certain political and monetary pressure, to 2008-PUD-09.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG

[161 Lakeview Drive](#)
[Suite B](#)
[Noblesville, IN 46060](#)



President & CEO
(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its

attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

8/12/22

Dear Westfield City Officials,

Please deny Northpoint Owners, LLC's request to turn AG-SF1 land into an Industrial Park. (By the way, do you realize that the petitioner is requesting 73 different land uses – EI, LB, & GB?)

You have already heard so much about why NP11 doesn't make sense – I would like to mention a few items that may not have yet been discussed thoroughly:

- The developer's utter disregard for the City Officials, the Comprehensive Plan, and the Citizens
- The opportunity to stop a mistake before it happens

Utter disregard

When Chris White (Equicor) was asked if he was aware, before he purchased the land, that it was zoned AG-SF1...his answer was an arrogant "100% aware". They were so confident that they would meet no resistance that they didn't even take an option on the land but instead flat out bought it. The zoning was of no consequence to the group when they made a decision to purchase...simply a minor inconvenience which would be easily overcome. They saw land that was priced right and they confidently bought it assuming they had enough 'power/influence' to make something happen that should never even be considered. They had no respect for zoning, the comp plan, the purpose of the area (rural), the health & safety of the citizens who live here, or even for the APC/City Council processes. They just saw an opportunity and confidently moved forward thinking none of the aforementioned things would be any sort of hinderance to their ability to get their project done.

Contrast this to the citizens of this area. The majority of whom based a decision to invest their money and their lives here on the only thing available to them – the Westfield Washington Township Comp Plan. And, these same citizens are crying out to you, over and over again, to please listen and reject this proposal.

What the petitioner is proposing continues to be starkly different than the Comp Plan and the land uses around it. Since the February meeting, the petitioner has done nothing to remove the violations to plan...nothing to include the community...has made no changes to the proposal that would be in agreement with the Comp Plan. They understand what a true Conservation Subdivision is...they understand that they could sell large acre homesites...they understand that they could sell the land to the parks at a reasonable price...why haven't they come back to the table with something that is compliant with the Comp Plan??? Because of greed. Even though there is a substantial amount of money to be made with large acre homesites/Conservation Subdivision, there is more to be made with an Industrial Park. No one forced them to buy AG/SF1 land and no one changed the rules on them – they knew what they were getting when they bought it.

Everyone involved in this situation knew how the land was zoned and what the Comp Plan said BEFORE they purchased their land-but there is one huge difference...one group purchased BECAUSE the land was zoned AG-SF1 and the other purchased presuming they could simply ignore it.

Stop a Mistake

I have heard comments at previous APC meetings that it is unfortunate that more couldn't be done because a PUD had already been approved. Because some PUDs had been approved in the past, the APC's hands are pretty much tied and they can't do much to make the PUD better. With Northpoint II PUD, it's not too late! There is something that can be done. We can deny this request in order to preserve what we already have –

preserve the ruralness of the NRR district. Preserve the intent of the Comp Plan. Preserve the water aquifer, the trees, the environment. Preserve our health & safety. Preserve our property values! Once these things are gone, you cannot get them back. Don't let us get into another situation like ones that have already proven to be a regret.

Please, enforce the vision that was set forth for this NRR area – protect our rural lifestyle-support your citizens and vote NO to the Northpoint II PUD proposal.

As always, thank you for your service to Westfield,

Christy Wheeler

20889 Anthony Road

Pamela Howard

From: rwgudeman@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2022 4:05 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint II - Objection to Proposed Land Use

**WARNING: This external email is from
rwgudeman@gmail.com.**

To the Westfield City Council Members and APC Members at Westfield:

Keep our land rural. There are so many reasons to keep our land rural – and I strongly oppose the industrial development. Devaluing the surrounding properties of course – but that is only one reason. Westfield’s zoning, resources, water... Please consider **all** of Westfield and put this to a vote for all to voice their opinion.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Gudeman

R W Gudeman LLC
20649 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
P: 317-840-1041
E: rwgudeman@gmail.com

Pamela Howard

From: Casey Mihal <casey.mihal@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2022 7:32 PM
To: APC
Subject: APC Meeting on Northpoint II Proposal

**WARNING: This external email is from
casey.mihal@gmail.com.**

Hello Westfield APC,

I'm emailing you again regarding the Northpoint II Proposal, which you will be discussing tomorrow at your meeting. I was hoping to speak in person to you tomorrow, but I am very sick and contagious, so it would be a bit irresponsible for me to come in person. That said, I wanted to give you my thoughts via email.

First, the majority of my issues with this proposal can be found here: <https://www.saynotonp2.com/>

Second, I want to make it abundantly clear: no version of any proposal that puts an industrial park on the land in question will work. It does not matter which shade of lipstick you put on this pig, it is still the complete wrong use of the land.

The Westfield Washington Comprehensive plan has already captured the community's thoughts on how this land should be used (rural residential). Indiana Code IC 36-7-4-603 clearly states that the plan commission should pay reasonable regard to the comprehensive plan; an industrial park does the complete opposite. Additionally, the other 4 points in IC 36-7-4-603 would be violated with the approval of this industrial park.

Westfield currently had many acres of land available that has the correct zoning for Holladay Property's Industrial Park proposal. I am not against their industrial park, but I am 100% against where they are trying to put it. The developer should seek to develop the industrial park on land that is appropriate for such a use.

If Holladay Properties still seeks to develop the land in question, they should follow the current zoning and the land uses described in the Westfield Washington Comp Plan. They could develop a conservation subdivision or large parcel home sites. These are economically viable options (and would actually suite Westfield quite well given the population growth in recent years).

Nearly every person in the area who I have spoken to about this issue sees that the Northpoint II Proposal is clearly wrong and does not belong. These are your constituents, the ones who will cast votes come election time. Approval of this proposal sends a clear message to those constituents: big businesses matter more than citizens. I highly doubt you would want that message sent to all of these people.

I could keep writing out more and more issues with this proposal, but at the end of the day I want one thing to be clear: I will never agree to any proposal that puts an industrial park on this land, and I highly encourage you to reject it with me. Holladay Properties may continue to make very small changes to this proposal, but at its core it will not work because an industrial park does not belong on this land.

Best Regards,
Casey Mihal

Pamela Howard

From: Pike, Cathy K. <ckpike@iupui.edu>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 8:30 AM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint II (2008-PUD-09)

Dear APC and Council Members:

I again write to oppose the Northpoint II PUD (2008-PUD-09). My husband and I moved here 20 years ago and have lived in the same home since that time. Our land abuts the proposed Northpoint II PUD. I believe that the Northpoint II PUD should be denied for several reasons. The first of these is its non-compliance with Indiana Code 36-7-603 zoning ordinance; preparation and consideration of proposals (<http://184.175.130.101/legislative/laws/2020/ic/titles/036#36-7-4-603>). This Code stipulates the following tenets in preparing and considering proposals. They are as follow:

1. The Comprehensive Plan of a given area
2. Current conditions and character of ... structures and uses in each district
3. The most desirable use and adaptation for ... land within a given district
4. Conservation of property values within the jurisdiction, and
5. Responsible methods of development and growth.

The Northpoint II PUD meets none of these stipulations! It is in direct opposition to the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan, which deems the Rural Northeast area of the district as rural, single-family, and agricultural. Homes in the Rural Northeast are expected to be built in ways that include protecting historic structures, having considerable open space, protecting open fields, trees, and streams (City of Westfield, 2007, p. 31). In fact, the Comprehensive Plan states that the Rural Northeast “area will be the last to face development pressure” (City of Westfield, 2007, p. 31). There is no mention in the Comprehensive Plan of commercial property or dense housing as acceptable development options for the Rural Northeast area.

My second point is that the Northpoint II PUD does not take into consideration the character and uses of this district. This district is rural and agricultural, with houses located on multiple acres. It is **not** urban, commercial, or suburban. The Northpoint II PUD responses to issues raised at the APC meeting, in February fail to acknowledge the many statements in the Comp Plan that emphasize the importance of protecting and maintaining the rural character of the Rural Northeast area of the Westfield Washington Township. The Northpoint II developers state that Westfield Washington Township “has changed in the last 15 years, yet no update has occurred in the Comp Plan (See “Issues Raised” document, p.1). Their statement actually lends support for why the current A-SF1 designation **should** remain in place for the Rural Northeast area. There are precious few areas left in the area that have maintained their rural character and beauty.

Third, the Northpoint II PUD certainly is not a desirable use and adaptation of the Rural Northeast area. The proposal clearly is not a desirable use of the land, and it is not even needed! Currently, there are almost 2,000 acres in the Westfield-Washington Township of available property that are available for development, meet the criteria of the Comprehensive Plan, and would be acceptable uses for the Northpoint II PUD. (Please refer to our “Remonstrations Against Northpoint II PUD” for further information.)

Fourth, should the Northpoint II PUD be approved, property values within the area are expected to plummet by 30% (Please see “Remonstrations Against Northpoint II PUD” for further information). We and all of our neighbors have worked hard to both maintain our homes and improve our properties’ values over time. My husband and I expect the value of our property to be one of our assets available to us during our retirement. We and our neighbors view any approval of the Northpoint II PUD as a **taking of value** and therefore adamantly oppose the proposal. The statement in

their responses to issues by Northpoint II developers that buffering will prevent substantial loss of value to the current properties is hogwash.

Fifth, it is obvious that the Northpoint II PUD represents irresponsible methods of development and growth. The Northeast area is a small rural agricultural corner of the Westfield-Washington Township and is designated as the last area of the entire Township to face pressure from development. The Northpoint II PUD seeks to convert 183 acres of beautiful rural land to a commercial development that allows virtually unfettered commercial endeavors. The North Point II proposal continues to include **fully 73 possible types of commercial development**, including an array of all-encompassing types of commercial properties. The proposed North Point II industrial development would abut a recently acquired Hamilton County park and the Bray Family Farm. There is no place for industrial development in this entirely rural-agricultural area that has no commercial development.

The developers' statements about how industry developed in this pristine area would ensure the continued quality of life in the Rural Northeast is just simply more hogwash. Potential pollution of air, water, light, and debris are not addressed adequately in the developers responses to the issues raised at the February APC meeting. For instance, line of sight issues would not be mitigated by empty "conservation lots" (not to be confused with *conservation subdivisions* as defined and described in the Comp. Plan). Let's be real. Who would want to buy property and build a home in the middle of an industrial complex, especially when the industrial developers plan for environmental impacts and spillage to be mitigated by the "proposed buffer yards and landscaping" within their so-called 'conservation lots' (See "Issues Raised", p. 1)?

The developers also gloss over the impact of traffic on SR 38, should their proposal be approved. It is almost certain that a second stoplight would be required to manage vehicular flow at the entrance to the property. That would put 2 stoplights within a half-mile of each other. Literally, that would be a nightmare for drivers and the two residential properties between these two stoplights.

The plan would not enhance the natural resources or the lives of those of us who would be directly affected by its development. In fact, 180 people who would be directly affected by this development are opposed to its approval! These nearly 200 people have responded to online and in-person canvassing to say that they oppose the Northpoint II PUD. (Please see the "Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD" document for detailed information and copies of the petitions.) My husband was the primary canvasser in collecting in-person petition signatures. He knocked on every door within a square mile of the Northpoint II PUD, including Anthony Road, 216th Street, Hinkle Road, and State Road 38. **Not one person with whom he spoke approved of the Northpoint II PUD!**

A review of these and other of Northpoint II developers' responses to the issues raised in the February APC meeting brought to mind the vision of a spoiled child stomping their foot and saying, "I want it, so I must have it!" I see no real effort to address the issues that have been raised with the Northpoint II proposal and no consideration of the current or potential residents of the area, should the Northpoint II PUD be approved.

We sincerely hope and pray that you will **vote 'NO'** to the Northpoint II PUD and approve only those proposals that meet the standards of the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan for the Rural Northeast district. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter that will affect families and the community for generations to come.



Cathy King Pike, Ph.D., MSW
Professor Emerita
Indiana University School of Social Work
902 West New York Street, ES 4138G
Indianapolis, IN 46202-5156
317-903-9522 / ckpike@iupui.edu

Celebrating more than 100 Years of Giving Hope and Changing Lives

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the addressed recipient/s and may contain information that is confidential, proprietary or privileged. Any unauthorized review, response, use, distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. Receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient is not a waiver of confidentiality or privilege.

Pamela Howard

From: Justin Evans <justin.a.evans11@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 9:07 AM
To: APC; Council Members
Cc: Kaitalyn Smith
Subject: Opposition to Northpoint II (Yet Again)

**WARNING: This external email is from
justin.a.evans11@gmail.com.**

To Whom It May Concern,

My family and I live at 5376 Sheridan Rd. We moved from our home in downtown Noblesville to our 3-acre property for the serenity, nature, and proximity to so many great local businesses. Our historic 100+ year old property features a large horse barn and carriage house, both original in structure. We feel very strongly about the preservation of the area currently in discussion to be developed by Northpoint II.

We fear that the impending development will bring down our property value, pose a threat to the ecosystem, and endanger the livestock surrounding us. The rural lifestyle that we moved for will be directly threatened by the commercial development plans.

It is our firm request that the land NOT be developed. If it were to be developed, we would strongly request that it would be residential in nature, only. The residential development should preserve our beautiful property line and capitalize on the wide-open land, sky, and animals. Any other option would be a disservice to this beautiful area.

Finally, with the latest adjustments to the plan; this proposal still goes against the already established and agreed Comprehensive plan for our area. Therefore, we strongly believe this proposal should be immediately denied and only future options considered that follow and adhere to the already developed Comprehensive plan for the Westfield area.

Best Regards,
Justin Evans

Pamela Howard

From: Marco Garcia <sr.garcia08@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 1:33 PM
To: APC
Subject: Reject NorthPoint II!

**WARNING: This external email is from
sr.garcia08@icloud.com.**

We live at Coventry development and me and my wife said no to this development. Please let us know what else to do to oppose.

Thank you,

Marco Garcia

Pamela Howard

From: James R Emerson <JR@EmersonLawLLC.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 1:35 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Northpoint 2 Industrial Park
Attachments: 20210318_193935.jpg; 20210318_193940.jpg

**WARNING: This external email is from
JR@EmersonLawLLC.com.**

Committee and Council Members:

I live at 20803 Anthony Road.

I vehemently oppose any rezoning of the property at 32 and Anthony Road, aka Northpoint 2 Industrial Park.

We sold our home on a golf course and moved to this area in order to have a rural experience in Hamilton County. We purchased nearly 7 acres of land with a home and two out buildings.

When we purchased our property it was our understanding that this area was and would continue to be zoned as rural/agricultural.

I believe there are other areas already zoned for this proposed project. Those would be a more appropriate location.

If this project goes through we will be forced to view the 45 foot tall buildings (3.2 stories) from my front yard. I don't think that anyone would find that acceptable. Approval would cause the market price of our nearly 7 acres to drop significantly in value.

I believe the increased traffic and semi-trucks will lead to other unforeseen issues. Likely some form of tax abatement would be made, which in my opinion negates the argument that taxes revenue would increase.

Finally, our property and several of our neighbors floods. No one in government has been willing to help. A new home was recently built across the street. This year the flooding was worse than the year before. This issue will only be exacerbated with additional construction. With large paved areas water will be forced to lower areas. I fear that additional new construction will only make the flooding issue worse.

I can assure you that this it was your home that was affected you would not even consider rezoning this property. Again, there are other parcels of land that are already zoned appropriately for this project. So there is no need to rezone this parcel.

I plan to fight this proposal with all of my time and energy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

JR Emerson

JR Emerson, Partner
EMERSON DIVORCE AND
ACCIDENT INJURY ATTORNEYS, LLC
1 S. Rangeline Road, Suite 400
Carmel, IN 46032
P: 317-969-8000
F: 317-663-2116





Pamela Howard

From: Doug Sikora <ds7969@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 1:55 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II Objection

**WARNING: This external email is from
ds7969@yahoo.com.**

My name is Doug Sikora, resident of 20280 Dayspring Court, Noblesville. This email represents my wife and I's STRONG objection to North Point II for all the reasons mentioned in the "neighbor meeting summary". ie., the well documented traffic dangers on 38 and Hickle Creek Rd., light and noise pollution, negative impact to wildlife using the area and neighboring park, water quality, negative impact on home values, and deviation from the planning/zoning.

Nothing in the new proposal merits true consideration to the citizens bordering this project that have so much to lose.

Thank you for hearing our concerns.

Doug and Lorie Sikora
1-317-379-2399

Pamela Howard

From: Wayne Pike <bwpike2004@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 2:06 PM
To: APC
Subject: Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
bwpike2004@yahoo.com.**

I have read the new proposal for Northpoint II. It seems very similar to the old proposal. I hope that you vote no. This would be very harmful to our community. Barry Wayne Pike

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Pamela Howard

From: Adam Corya <adamcorya@callcarpenter.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 2:39 PM
To: APC
Cc: Pamela Howard; Caleb Ernest; Daine Crabtree
Subject: Re: Objection To Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
adamcorya@callcarpenter.com.**

Good Afternoon Members of the City Of Westfield Advisory Plan Commission,

My feelings expressed in my email below, dated February 21, are unchanged. I am still unaware of a single resident in our area that thinks any commercial development on this land is reasonable. These industrial developers actually *closing* on farmland *before* having secured their *severe* zoning wishes is perplexing. They must have simply miscalculated back then that they could bull over the residents and the city to just go along with what they wanted. I know we residents have made it abundantly clear that we are opposed. And now, my sincere hope is that this dreadful industrial park proposal, in all of its forms, is defeated.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Kind Regards,
Adam Corya
21247 Anthony Road

On Mon, Feb 21, 2022 at 3:56 PM Adam Corya <adamcorya@callcarpenter.com> wrote:
Good Afternoon Members of the City Of Westfield Advisory Plan Commission,

After a thorough review and consideration of the proposed Northpoint II PUD Ordinance Number 20-25, I want to express, in writing, my ardent objection.

My wife and I moved our family from our last neighborhood home within Westfield Washington School District to our current home on Anthony Road specifically to escape the ever-increasing commercial atmosphere within Westfield. We sought an area that we could trust would remain free from the myriad of issues that are unfortunately a given with any commercial real estate setting including major light & noise pollution.

As a real estate professional, I wasn't naive to the potential of some of the surrounding farmland in our area changing hands and for homes to be built on the land. In fact, new neighbors have just completed a gorgeous new home on Anthony Road. This home complies with all of the zoning / ordinances in place as it should. Residential development among an existing residential area is most often a net positive for the existing homeowners in the area. In contrast, there is nothing more damaging to a residential area's value than having industrial buildings erected nearby.

What I couldn't have ever logically foreseen is that a group of commercial investors would actually *close* on land that didn't, at all, comply with the well-established zoning in place. For reasons unknown to me, they must have felt sure it was a slam dunk that they would get their way. With that said, their confidence for a bad idea doesn't justify the support of the stewards of Westfield's well-being. The Northeast Rural Residential district would be ruined forever with an Industrial Park that no one who lives even remotely close to it wants. The current zoning is sound for the area and shouldn't be changed.

Kind Regards,
Adam Corya



6101 N College Ave
Indianapolis, IN 46220
317.460.6514
Email: adamcorya@calccarpenter.com
Website: adamcorya.calccarpenter.com
Facebook: facebook.com/adamcoryarealtor

Pamela Howard

From: Sara Davis Whitcomb <daviskidpsych@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 2:51 PM
To: APC
Subject: Objection to NorthPointe 2 development

**WARNING: This external email is from
daviskidpsych@yahoo.com.**

I live at 21444 Anthony Road and have a small organic farm and a home based psychology practice that serves over 200 individuals with mental health issues in our community. They regularly report how grateful they are to get services in a rural, home setting that is easily accessed without traffic, surrounded by beautiful trees, offers gardening opportunities, and is home to animals that help them feel connected to the environment. It is critical that we preserve the natural habitat of Anthony Road for the well being of all in Westfield, not just the residents of Anthony Road. Few roads have the mature tree canopy, no light pollution, and the diversity of habitat of this area.

Please preserve this unique, therapeutic, and relaxing environment for all to enjoy for decades to come.

Dr. Sara

Sara Davis, Ph.D. HSPP
CEO/Psychologist, Kidpsych, Inc.
Office: 317-758-5125
Kidpsychoffice@gmail.com

LEGAL NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited

Pamela Howard

From: Jean <squiredc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 3:32 PM
To: APC
Subject: NP2 Meeting

**WARNING: This external email is from
squiredc@gmail.com.**

To Whom It May Concern:

We are requesting a vote of NO for the NP2 development .

We are homeowners who do not want any more development north of State Rd 38.

It has been zoned rural/ agriculture and would prefer it stay that way.

There are plenty of other land sites available for industrial development that would not impact the personal investments of the community directly north and east of Anthony Rd.

Thanks for your support.

Jean and Denice Squire

21035 Anthony Rd

Westfield, IN

317-450-0716

Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: Tony Dues <TDues@midmark.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 6:25 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: North Point II Opposition

**WARNING: This external email is from
TDues@midmark.com.**

Hello - Thanks for being open to opinions here in our community!

We are homeowners in this beautiful area "north of 38".

Here is why we, along with so many other people in our community, are opposed to this development:

- There is already 1,500 available acres in this area available for this zoning, why we need to ruin such a beautiful area for this doesn't make much sense.
- The developer purchased this land with the intent of flipping the council & APC's zoning of this area. That seems reckless and quite concerning.
- The home value of so many citizens will be negatively affected by this, we are talking 6-digit decreases in value in homes like ours. That is a blow to so many households.
- The sunsets, deer, beautiful stars would be gone with the erection of 4-story buildings, light pollution and traffic.
- So many bicyclists from around the county come to this area to enjoy the rural setting. That luxury for our community would be gone (24-hour trucks in/out of an industrial park are not bike friendly).

I could go on for quite a while why this is a such a bad idea, but in respect for your time, I'll stop here.

Progress & development are good when they are the right fit, North Point II in this area is not a good fit at all. Terrible and we should be insulted the developer is trying to make this happen.

Thank you for your service and commitment to our beautiful part of Indiana!

Tony

Designing better care.™

Tony Dues

Territory Portfolio Manager
Medical Products

C: 317-431-8884

tdues@midmark.com

Service: 844-856-1230

www.midmark.com



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, including any attachments, contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message and any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, by you is strictly prohibited.

Pamela Howard

From: Joe Adams <joe.adams@lifeomic.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 6:28 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Threat to Parks, Morse Reservoir and families of Hamilton County

**WARNING: This external email is from
joe.adams@lifeomic.com.**

Dear APC,

Regarding the North Point II zoning change. The main concern I have is that fact that there are too many open questions on what kind of industrial park would be allowed to operate at North Point II. We may end up with something that threatens the very air we breathe or the water we drink from the ground itself. The danger here cannot be overstated to families that live within a mile of the proposed North Point II project. And since the North Point II project would drain into Morse Reservoir, the danger goes much farther and affects many more people if an industrial accident were to happen. And to be clear, the threat of an accident can never be made zero, it is just a matter of time and degree.

And when you consider that Hamilton County is woefully short on parks and recreation, yet parks and recreation are sighted by businesses and the public as a high priority when moving to a new location or staying in an existing location. The fact is most of the quality parkland left in Hamilton County is located very near the North Point II proposed site. The North Point II proposed site would not only degrade the existing three parks that are nearly adjacent to North Point II but with light, noise, air, and water pollution North Point II would become a constant threat to the quality of these existing parks and any other parks that might come to pass in the vicinity of Morse Reservoir. And then there is the guaranteed threat of an industrial accident, or the slow water table decline due to water use or pollution. With North Point II located north of State Road 38 the residents of Hamilton County would live under constant threat of an industrial accident or just the fact that over time the pollution (air, noise, light, water) would eventually change the character and quality of the land surrounding it. Not to mention certain types of pollution would drain straight into Morse Reservoir and threaten the water supply of many more residents of Hamilton and even other surrounding counties.

God stopped making park land eons ago, and man has left us only a few parcels of land in Hamilton County that look like they did just over a hundred years ago. Most residents in Hamilton County have not seen many of the animals that inhabit these wooded areas and fields and streams near the proposed North Point II. And if North Point II goes in these rarely seen animals along with much of what is now commonly found flora and fauna in this area will be lost forever. What we do with this land is truly important to the availability of nature to our children and their children. For these reasons alone I implore you to vote NO on North Point II.

Signed,

Joe Adams
5059 E. 211th Street
Noblesville, IN 46062

Pamela Howard

From: Jill Bracken-Emerson <Jill@EmersonLawLLC.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 7:43 PM
To: planners
Subject: Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
Jill@EmersonLawLLC.com.**

I live at 20803 Anthony Road. I object to the petition. It does not belong in an agricultural - residential area. I bought this property for at purposes and I checked the zoning before I bought. The Northpoint Owners should have bought land zoned for the development they wanted. They should not have purchased this land with the hope that it could be rezoned. This plan will interfere with our enjoyment of our property. There will be semis and bright lights. This development is not suited for this site. There are other sites that are more suitable. Petitioner admitted during the presentation that there are other properties available with preexisting proper zoning. Please vote no recommendation.

Jill Bracken-Emerson
20803 Anthony Road
Westfield
317-372-3047

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Dory <dodobrooker@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 4:10 PM
To: APC
Subject: Reject NorthPoint II!

**WARNING: This external email is from
dodobrooker@sbcglobal.net.**

This industrial park should not be approved. There is already an industrial area off East Street just south of 38.

Keep this area of Westfield residential rural.

Dory Brooker

Sent from my iPhone-Dory 

Pamela Howard

From: Des Schillinger <des.schillinger@sai-rep.com>
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2022 2:51 PM
To: Council Members; APC
Subject: North Point II Proposal

**WARNING: This external email is from
des.schillinger@sai-rep.com.**

Good afternoon.

First, I would like to thank the APC Board for their "Negative recommendation" on the North Point II PUD.

City Council has the opportunity this evening to vote against the North Point II PUD and we hope you do.

I know people want to see growth but growth out of control is incredibly costly and dangerous. We need to slow the growth so infrastructure can catch up. The North Point II location needs infrastructure and this idea of build an industrial park they will come is not working and it is costly. North Point I has been around for four (4) years and it is not full. Alpha business park has been around thirty years (30) and it is not full. Weekly we hear of large-scale projects coming to the area but not picking Westfield. Is upsetting 50 + residents to build an Industrial parking going to change those out comes? No.

Westfield needs to change our strategy and use Grand Park as our advantage. Grand Park has the infrastructure (new roads, Hotels, Restaurants, Police and Fire) and the land around it to build a Corporate Campus. Plots of land on a state highway close to US 31 is not an advantage. That plot of land is nearly 30 minutes from Interstate 69 or 65 if you head due east or west on a two (2) lane road through a small town with speed limits of 30MPH. Companies don't want this. It is all about efficiencies. They are looking at Lebanon, Noblesville, and Fishers. It was pointed out in the APC meeting last week that the warehouses in Whitestown have brought crime with them and the individual that stated this is a Westfield resident who was a Whitestown judge. We don't want this.

We want Companies to come to Westfield that will bring 100's of high paying jobs so the people can live and work here and the kids will go to school here and bring pride to the community. We don't need a mostly empty business park that only has warehouses in it.

Please say no to North Point II PUD.

Thank You and Best Regards,

Des Schillinger
Schillinger Associates, Inc.
17819 Commerce Dr. Suite 100
Westfield, In. 46074
765/457-7241
765/457-7732 Fax
765/438-1218 Cell
www.sai-rep.com

Pamela Howard

From: James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 12:20 AM
To: APC; Council Members; planners
Subject: Re: James Hogan's Objection to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09, Ordinance No. 20-25 (Northpoint II PUD)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

**WARNING: This external email is from
james.hogan@elamusa.com.**

Good evening Council Members,

I was unsure if I had to register to speak this evening with a card, but I now realize after speaking with the City Attorney afterward that I could have spoken. Nevertheless, my comments are probably better written anyhow because they are lengthy. I would like to therefore address my concerns with what happened this evening with the following:

1. I am so saddened and dismayed that Councilman Willis changed the course of the conversation over Northpoint II and did so while violating the rule clearly printed on tonight's agenda, which states,

"REMINDER: PER RESOLUTION 21-121 RELATING TO TRANSPARENCY, COUNCILORS DO NOT NEED TO RECUSE THEMSELVES, BUT ARE REQUIRED TO DISCLOSE IF THEY HAVE RECEIVED CONTRIBUTIONS OF \$1,000 OR MORE WHEN VOTING ON ANY ACTIONS INVOLVING ONE OF THEIR CONTRIBUTORS"

Given that Councilman Willis violated Resolution 21-121 by receiving \$1,000 on one occasion and another \$100 on another occasion from Chris Wilkes, who presented the petition, and then proceeded to carry on with seemingly untainted intrigue and curiosity about this "Letter of Intent" that Mr. Wilkes introduced, I believe the ethical thing for the Council to do would be to strike all of Councilman Willis's commentary from the record along with the video clips of the same that will be posted on You Tube. The City should further add a comment of why his commentary was stricken. If this happens, of course Mr. Willis's motion to kick the can down the road on a vote would also be stricken and so it would be as if no such motion entered the record tonight in the first place.

From a practical standpoint, we know that what he said without full disclosure had an adverse impact on the ability to vote tonight and has now cast doubt on the once promising feeling we had coming out of the APC meeting, which is that Council would vote no based on the Unfavorable recommendation of the APC.

Just when the Northeast Rural Residential District residents felt like this nightmare was drawing to a close, we are now fighting a battle at a deeper level: campaign contributions and how they might influence the decision-making of 1 person who could adversely affect the lives of hundreds of people thousands of animals and plants and water quality surrounding the alleged LOI presented tonight by the petitioner.

Further, fair or not, we as a community will now always question whether Chris Wilkes bought Scott Willis's motion. We will question anything Scott Willis says on this matter. The ethical thing for Mr. Willis to do to atone for this violation of

Resolution 21-121 is to simply acknowledge the error in judgment at the next meeting and abstain from the vote when it does occur. More appropriate yet would be for him to vote against Northpoint II to counterbalance the harm that he caused tonight by having the discussion without disclosure that swayed the conversation in the room.

I don't know if there are any other repercussions to Mr. Willis's violation in terms of his role in this matter or in serving on City Council, but I do sincerely hope that the Council identifies those repercussions, informs the public of what those repercussions are and then apply them appropriately. I know hundreds of objectors to Northpoint II who will demand these answers in this regard as well.

2. Chris Wilkes' "breaking news" of an LOI changes NOTHING in terms of the petition put forth. In fact, it confirms our worst fears and the very thing that the APC voted no on: manufacturing juxtaposed against low-density agricultural and rural residential without any transition. No buffer fixes this.

We urge you to vote no and encourage them to go about their development another way: develop according to the zoned use. This petition is nothing more than an attempt to circumvent the Comprehensive Plan rather than going the orthodox route of developing per the Comp Plan as the rest of us have done. If Wilkes develops as rural residential, I am certain nobody will object. Nothing is stopping him from doing it, either, by the way.

If that should happen, what do you think those three residents that Mr. Gilbert mentioned tonight would say if given a choice - rural residential or industrial? We all know what their answer would be.

3. Chris Wilkes has completely disregarded the "hard stop" at SR 38 that was explicitly told to him and/or his group during the Northpoint I petition. At the APC, the petitioner's lawyer mentioned a new "hard stop," this time at the north end of NP11. I have reason to believe they plan to take this straight up to 216th St with NP11, NP14 and NP15 if you don't stop them here. Aside from the lack of care displayed by the petitioner to this border as demonstrated by this petition in the first place, the Council will have also proven those words disingenuous should this ridiculous petition pass.

4. If I understand this correctly, the petitioner is now trying to salvage this petition by having a private conversation with the Council under NDA so that none of them can talk about it, which could then result in a morphed petition, and that morphed petition might then be voted on without public input? This is dirty at best and I hope the Council recognizes it as such. I urge you to see if this is even allowed. To me, it's the petitioner's way of avoiding public scrutiny. Any morphing of this thing should not be allowed given the public uproar. The vote should be on the petition as it was put forth to the APC. If no, they can attempt to re-petition after 1 year passes.

5. Given the petitioners opportunity to have a private conversation with Council, we demand at least an equal amount of time to further raise our objections.

Thank you and I look forward to your responses.

On Thu, Aug 11, 2022 at 15:40 James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good afternoon members of the APC, City Planners and City Council members!

For the numerous objections outlined below in this email string and as laid out by all adjoining and nearby property owners unified and unanimously against the above-referenced Petition, I urge all of you members of the APC to vote UNFAVORABLE and further urge the City Council to vote NO to Petition No. 2008-PUD-09 ("Petition"). I as an affected property and we as a community, many of us ignorant to the process of how these petitions and PUDs come to fruition, have since become enlightened by the process by which developers apply for land use changes incongruent with a Comprehensive Plan. We have educated ourselves on the tweaks, trickery and other tactics used in attempting to deviate from a carefully considered Comprehensive Plan meant for the welfare of the entire community and not that of a single developer.

To be crystal clear, we applaud those developers who develop according to the Comprehensive Plan, but we denounce those that don't. Accordingly, Holladay Properties and the entire petition group is roundly denounced as it relates to this Petition.

The Northeast Rural Residential district has accepted this Comprehensive Plan as its guiding principle and I submit that the Petitioner, the APC and City Council do as well in the absence of any other document. At the end of the day, we know that the Petitioner cannot move forward with its plans without the APC and City Council accepting of these unwarranted property use changes in the form of an Ordinance.

In educating ourselves on the process of deviating from the Comprehensive Plan through the form of an Ordinance, the community is now moving forward with its public outcry with a website to help fight this plan. It is Say No To NP2 and can be found here: <https://www.saynotonp2.com>. Say No To Northpoint II is meant to bring transparency to the intentions of the Petitioner. I am sure it will soon be on Social Media if it isn't already.

With such a groundswell of objections, and also politically through our State Representative, what left is there to say?

The tweaks of the new petition are meaningless. The only meaningful tweak would be a rural residential development. An extension to Bray Park would likely be accepted, I'm sure. But not commercial. Not Industrial. Not high-density housing. None fit with the Rural Residential/Agricultural zoning.

Consequently, it is my feeling (and I'm sure that of virtually all other objecters) that a vote favorable from the APC or a yes from City Council would carry with it a public outcry over how such a vote could be made in the face of knowing that the development would permanently damage a rural landscape badly in need of preservation, anger an entire community of people and disrupt the entire culture of the Northeast Rural Residential district - and for what - all in the name of more "big box" industrial and commercial buildings hell-bent on tax abatements?

The Comprehensive Plan sets out to preserve our rural culture.

Petition 2008-PUD-09 sets out to destroy it.

Please vote UNFAVORABLE and NO to give us a voice and assurance that our political leaders can divorce themselves from developer temptations in setting out to preserve what is right with the Comprehensive Plan norms that all others have accepted without reservation.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The ELAM Group

161 Lakeview Drive

Suite B

Noblesville, IN 46060

President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its

attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Wed, Feb 23, 2022 at 7:48 AM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good morning members of the APC,

I want to first thank you for being so attentive to each of us as we voiced our objection to the Northpoint II PUD. I do also owe an apology to Ginny for not making clear that I was representing Hinkle Creek Estates' ("HCE") homeowners association which is why Pam gave me 5 minutes rather than 3 minutes. But I also want to take this opportunity to reiterate our strong opposition to the petitioners' plan. I take particular exception to a few things from their rebuttal:

1. Chris Wilkes concluded there is a lack of interest in large acre lots based on his data from LIBOR. This is simply not the case. True, it takes money to afford one, but, just as true, there is money in Hamilton County. Speaking from experience of living in a "large acre lot" community, I have found the lot size to be the single biggest draw. Our neighborhood has 36 lots. All are developed. The demand is so high that not one, not two, but three houses went on the market. All three sold - two at \$1,000,000.00 and one at \$2,000,000.00. The two \$1 MM homes sold before or within 30 days of hitting the market. The owners who sold the \$2 MM house can't find lots anywhere else and so a neighbor was kind enough to parse off 2 of their 8 acres so that this former homeowner can build a NEW home in our neighborhood. That would be #37 - and it never hit the market! The homeowner can't find neighborhood land anywhere else. Wilkes' statement is simply untrue. The demand is there for 2+ acre lots in this part of Hamilton County. The testimonials from two of you further supports this.
2. I come from Akron, Ohio. I grew up in Bath, Ohio. Bath has a restriction for large acre lots - all 1.5+ minimum in the entire township. Bath is the single most sought-after area in the Akron-Cleveland area. LeBron James' home is in Bath. This lack of demand that Chris Wilkes points out is not only untrue here, but its untrue anywhere else where wealth exists.
3. A truer statement is that there is a lack of 2+ acre offerings in Hamilton County and so the data are so limited as to be rendered meaningless. Offer more large acre lots and they will come, particularly in Hamilton County. See my personal observations of our neighborhood, above.
4. Chris spoke of the economics of his development. This issue is well beyond the almighty dollar. There are places for making money and there are places for resting and relaxing. They are separate. Think about Central Park. What is that worth to a developer? Billions! Maybe a Trillion! But does it beat the priceless serenity? Of course not. Don't let the almighty dollar weigh on your decision on this one.
5. Any development penetrating the north side of State Route 38 that is incongruent with the Comprehensive Plan will forever ruin the Northeast Rural Residential landscape. Several of you alluded to that last night and I applaud your efforts for saying so. My feeling on the Comp Plan is that its lack of "update" doesn't change the NRR District at all as we will fight extremely hard to preserve this NRR District with any update in the future.
6. The one speaker spoke of exasperation for the lack of interest in a park. Those Township Board members that voted it down (there are only 2 of them from what I understand) must listen to us. Times have changed. The overwhelming majority of us who objected to Northpoint II didn't even know those discussions were ongoing. The fact that 3 people can vote on such a big issue and turn our world upside down is absurd. This issue must be revisited, and several of us are willing to take up that torch. Those two Board members must listen. There is more than one way to slice the onion on funding, as you all know so well.
7. Lastly, please note what the petitioners did not do: they did not argue my points about how the development must pay reasonable regard to Indiana Code IC 36-7-4-603. The Remonstrance Package makes it clear that Northpoint II does not. Please review that exhibit closely.

In close, one thing that kept coming to me is the sign that reads "In God We Trust" behind all of your heads. I am so delighted to see such a wonderful display of reverence. I do trust in God in all of my decisions and statements and do feel as though the Holy Spirit can work through all of us individually and as a group. I pray that God works through all

of you as a group to follow Indiana Code and resist the temptation of a developer trying to make crooked that straight path.

Let this be a place of relaxation and enjoyment. Let the developer sell the land. That is an option. Please do what is right for us, those most affected by this monstrosity. Vote this down 9-0.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The **ELAM** Group

161 Lakeview Drive

Suite B

Noblesville, IN 46060

President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 8:59 PM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good evening members of the APC,

I am writing to renew my objection to the petition for 2008-PUD-09 filed nearly one year ago today and outlined further below. In short, nothing has changed.

The tweaks to the petitioner's plan presented on Monday (1/31/22) fails to address our demand from the public meetings over 1 year ago. Our demand back then was to simply follow the rules and develop the land in a manner that respects the intended land use of the Northeast Rural Residential ("NRR") District - just as every other land owner in the NRR District has done. It's not asking much at all.

What the petitioners presented last Monday was lipstick on a pig. They chose to ignore the attached *Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD*, dated 2/2/21, but we the people surrounding the land of 2008-PUD-09 find the document even more relevant today than when it was first produced.

Please end this sordid tale, and end it emphatically. VOTE AGAINST 2008-PUD-09 UNANIMOUSLY.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG



The **ELAM** Group

161 Lakeview Drive
Suite B
Noblesville, IN 46060

President & CEO

(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

On Thu, Feb 11, 2021 at 4:53 PM James Hogan <james.hogan@elamusa.com> wrote:

Good afternoon and greetings members of the Advisory Plan Commission ("APC") and City Council of the City of Westfield.

I am writing to you today to voice my sincere objection to the above-referenced planned unit development ("PUD") petition. My wife and I, Lori, along with our 4 children, dog and 2 cats, reside in our home at 20275 Dayspring Court in Noblesville, Indiana. The home is the northwesternmost home within the Hinkle Creek Estates subdivision. We are making a significant investment in upgrading our home over the next couple of months and plan to be here a long time.

Our subdivision consists of 2+ acre lots in a rural residential setting complete with well water, septic fields and propane tanks. The neighborhood is on the east side of Hinkle Road. Our neighbor to the west is the *Bray Family Homestead Park*. We have a reassuring feeling knowing that the entire area west of us is in the Northeast Rural Residential district and will therefore never be developed into anything more than Rural Residential homes, agriculture or a Conservation Subdivision. This was a huge factor in us deciding where to live. We love how our rural residential neighborhood meshes so well with that of the Northeast Rural Residential district of Washington Township.

In fact, over the past few years since we moved in, I have praised the responsibility of the City of Westfield/Washington Township in abiding by its Comprehensive Plan. I have trumpeted these praises to my friends and neighbors Dez Schillinger and Rob Hanlon - two significant employers within the City of Westfield. I tell them I wish every community operated like Westfield. Our confidence that the City of Westfield/Washington Township will maintain a governing body that makes politically stable and logical decisions that are empathetic to its residents and neighbors like myself helps me sleep well at night.

On Tuesday, 2/16/21, my faith in your politically stable, logical decision-making abilities will be put to the test. Our entire neighborhood is worried. I am worried.

We want you to vote no to 2008-PUD-09. We offer a logical basis for you to say no. That logic is rooted in a document that Wayne and Christy Wheeler will send you in an emailed attachment, a document entitled *Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD*, dated 2/2/21.

Read it and enjoy it. It provides you a basis for rejection.

In the meantime, I will pray.

I pray that your hearts be touched by the 183+ residents who join me in objecting to this 2008-PUD-09 abomination - noting that not one resident we reached supported it. I pray that you uphold your Comprehensive Plan. And, lastly, I pray that you have courage to VOTE NO, in the face of certain political and monetary pressure, to 2008-PUD-09.

Sincerely,

--

James P. Hogan, LPG

[161 Lakeview Drive](#)
[Suite B](#)
[Noblesville, IN 46060](#)



President & CEO
(888) 510-3526 x102 · Cell: (317) 316-2437 · elamusa.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this e-mail message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail message and promptly delete this e-mail message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive the confidentiality of this e-mail message and any attachments by the transmission of this e-mail message.

--

James P. Hogan
The ELAM Group
(888) 510-3526 x102
<http://www.elamusa.com>

Sent from Gmail Mobile

Pamela Howard

From: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2022 10:26 AM
To: Council Members; APC
Cc: jpedzinski@comcast.net
Subject: NorthPoint LLC

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

**WARNING: This external email is from
jpedzinski@comcast.net.**

Dear City Council Members and APC,

As a concerned property owner that lives along St Rd 38 and Hinkle Road, I watched the recent City Council hearings and the APC hearing.

I urge you to vote NO to the NorthPoint II proposal.

Personally, I have several questions that remain unanswered, and I am hoping you can help me.

1. Who are the board members of NorthPoint LLC?

Perhaps you can request this information before the proposed "Executive Session" and share with the community. I feel this is important that the council know exactly "who" is requesting the rezoning and their interests. Why is this not known?

2. Executive Session – Can you please explain to me the purpose for an "Executive Session". My observation is that NorthPoint is trying to hide their intentions otherwise they would be more transparent with their request. The last-minute appeal that Northpoint has an LOI from a global manufacturing company to buy the entire parcel of land, is suspect in so many ways especially based on their lack of transparency with information.

3. During the APC meeting there was some discussion regarding who owns the land in question. Mr Wilkes suggested that Northpoint does not own the land however Northpoint does have an OPTION to buy the land. In my research, Northpoint did buy the land directly from the Bray Sisters. This is public record on file at the courthouse. So why would he not be transparent?

4. I would like to know the board members of Holladay Properties as well. Holladay Properties was hired by Northpoint to develop the land. Interestingly Holladay Properties Chairman & Chief Development Officer, Mr John Phair, is listed at the President of Northpoint Owners on their Articles of Organization filed with the Indiana Secretary of State.
5. IF Northpoint or Holladay have an “option to buy” in place, it is highly probable that the land investors are somehow connected to Northpoint development, based on their intentional lack of transparency. So perhaps in full disclosure, Mr. Wilkes can explain role of Mr Wiehle and Mr Bryant, whom we know are land investors. We know that Mr Bryant is connected to Northpoint. This is public record and available at the Courthouse.
6. Lastly, can you explain Westfield City Council Resolution 21-121. I believe it states that councilors do not need to recuse themselves but are required to disclose if they have received contributions of \$1,000 or more, when voting on any actions involving from donors. Recognize that donations are public record. It appears that Mr. Willis may have received contributions from Mr Wilkes greater than \$1,000 yet made the decision not to disclose this information before / during / after the NPll presentation. Mr Willis should recuse himself and abstain from voting on Northpoint and future discussions involving Northpoint & Holladay Properties. How disappointing!! The Council Members need to address this before future council meetings and Executive sessions.

This lack of transparency throughout the process cultivates an environment of suspicion.

My hope is that the Council Members can provide some clarity around Northpoint and their intentions.

Regards,
James Pedzinski
5250 Nightshade Ln
Noblesville, IN

Pamela Howard

From: Curt Christensen <curtchristensen93@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, September 9, 2022 8:07 AM
To: Council Members; APC; planners
Subject: North Point II

**WARNING: This external email is from
curtchristensen93@yahoo.com.**

To the Members:

Once again we are voicing our opposition to the North Point II development. What is really frustrating is that we don't even know what the impact of the original development (south of 38) has had on home values, water run off, traffic, trash, or road deterioration especially at the 38 and 31 interchange. Why? Because the development is not even close to being completed. And now they want to start another development of 183 acres. NO we don't want that to happen. There doesn't seem to be a stopping point once they cross 38. The greed will continue.

It seems, per the newspaper article, our concerns have been minimized to noise and light. Our concerns are far greater than noise and light. It is about home values, the change in landscape, the traffic, roadside debris, It is about being away from the manufacturing environment. It is about a lifestyle, a rural life that people want to enjoy. We have repeatedly voiced our opposition to this development. And yet here we are again.

Holladay Properties concern for the people in this area is obviously superficial. They really aren't providing anything but concepts. They don't know who will be occupying the landscape, what type of manufacturing would be going in or time frame. It is all guess work on their end. And we are suppose to be OK with that?

I guess it all boils down to; When does NO become NO?

Curt Christensen
4950 Citadel Dr.

Pamela Howard

From: Canada, Brad <brad.canada@stryker.com>
Sent: Friday, September 9, 2022 9:42 AM
To: Pamela Howard
Subject: FW: SR38 Development

**WARNING: This external email is from
brad.canada@stryker.com.**

Morning Pam – just wanted to send you below to put on record for the Council meeting on Monday. See you there. Thanks for all you are doing.

From: Canada, Brad
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2022 9:01 AM
To: councilmembers@westfield.in.gov
Subject: FW: SR38 Development

Council Members,

My name is Brad Canada, and I currently live on Anthony Road with my wife and 3 young kids. The Northpointe 2 project was recently voted down and voted “NO” 5-2 at the APC meeting this past week specifically to have it re-zoned to commercial/industrial.

This has been a 2-3+ year BATTLE with the Developers coming back 4-5 times with revisions but all met with the same stance that we are all adamantly against the plans from all of the surrounding neighbors.

I included a copy and paste from my last 2 public comments (verbal) when we had the chance to speak at APC meetings so they are on record below my highlighted section.

My new thought and idea I would love to bring to your attention and have some more formal conversations about is around the question of – if not this project, what project can make sense here that would provide value to the Community? I am one of the Westfield Baseball Travel Commissioners (15 Teams – 170 kids ages 7U – 14U). I sent a few individuals from the WYSI Board (Adam Esslinger – President, Chad Schenkel – Capital Campaigns Director and Joe Duepner – Sports Director) an email stating the update to this land after multiple conversations (over last 5+ years) on the need for our community to have a designated sports complex for soccer/baseball/softball etc given the lack of facility space at our Elem Schools and the uncertainty of Grand Park future cost and capacity for both WYSI Rec and WYSI Travel (could also include various other sports – indoor basketball, community pickleball, volleyball, lacrosse etc). This could be an incredible space to build this and match pace with what Noblesville, Carmel and Fishers did years and years ago. This is in Westfield school lines, flat ground with minimal excavation, convenient access with 38 and 31, would be fully supported by the residents surrounding this and could potentially all be connected and expanded into a much bigger park with McGregor, Bray Farm and the new park up Northeast Hinkle. You could continue to keep the feel or rural ag and use this space for betterment of the community. I would be happy to volunteer my time and attention as a liaison role if something like this would ever make sense.

Adam did respond and say they were actively looking and discussing ideas but I thought this would be an incredible use of this space with the perfect timing for all. This is a project all of the local residents around this area would be excited about. I wanted to drive awareness to you all as well. THANK YOU for considering.

My 2 comments pasted below for reference from APC meetings:

August 2022 comments:

APC Members,

I appreciate the open forum in allowing me to share my feedback. Similar to my response last time I stood here 6 months ago, under no circumstances – no adjustments, no revisions and no enhancements will I support this land variance or ever feel even slightly ok with this decision.

I proudly work for a large Medtech Fortune 200 company in various sales and sales leadership positions over the last 15 years. I also am a 4th generation resident from Fishers where my grandparents met and married in their total class of 15 people. My parents did the same at Hamilton Southeastern high school in their class of 60. I graduated in class of 425. Now, they have total class size in Fishers/HSE of close to 2,000. That being said – I am someone that is absolutely pro growth in business, have seen the benefits of community growth, progressive in the way that we need to plan for future expansion in our community, and 100% full understanding of the economics of making decisions like this.

Here is my rational, un-emotional belief and ask from your all: keep the land zoned for exactly what you planned and approved this land to be. Build whatever is currently approved on every square inch of this acreage for this land and you will not see residents pushing back. We're not asking for our community to leave this as is forever and a green space.....we are simply respectfully asking you all to stand firm in prior decisions for this land and do not set a precedent where this could happen over and over and over again.

I know my neighbors have spent a ton of time mapping out all the negative impacts this has on us being in rural northeast. The majority of this board, the investors and developers presenting today, the council and most of our community NEVER have to be up here and drive by this area so it's easy to have the "out of sight – out of mind" mentality and only be thinking dollar signs right now. For all of us in this room.....this is absolutely devastating to us. I know we don't make up a high % of our residents but its destroying 170 acres of rural farmland and standing up a concrete fort that will literally devastate our day to day lifestyle – the opposite of what my wife and I (and 3 young kids) were looking for when we dropped our entire life savings and majority of our current cash into the equity and upkeep of our property.

I will be the first in line to support current and future expansion in industrial and commercial properties today where it is zoned to be. Develop every inch across westfield where it is zoned to be. That is important for tax payers and our community.....just don't do it in rural northeast where it's not intended to be and was never planned for.

I know for a fact there is not one single person in this room that would stand up and fully support + LOVE to see this in their backyard and neighborhood if they actually lived here and were raising their kids or grandkids in this area. Think about that for a minute. We will have hundreds of non westfield residents driving by my driveway and this area and that worries me beyond all belief more than anything else. I'm not being selfish – I just want you all to understand this is literally at the opposite end of the spectrum as what this area was planned for and why we purchased where we are today.

February 2022 comments:

APC Members,

I wanted to first say thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. My wife and I purchased our 16 acre dream property 5 years ago and can tell you that we will live here forever raising our 3 young kids and continue to play a very

active role in this community, at schools and with sports/activities. Simply put - the Anthony Road/SR 38/Hinkle area is absolutely special and one of a kind in Westfield if not Hamilton County.

Before I begin – I want to clearly state my position. Under no circumstances – no adjustments, no revisions and no enhancements will I support this land variance or ever feel even slightly ok with this decision. To say....this room full of neighbors and other concerned residents would be disappointed is an understatement – we would be absolutely devastated if this variance passed. The approval of this drastically changes everything about this area – traffic, commuters, semis, stop lights, noise, cutting down mature trees and taking away the natural and coveted “feel and look” and turning it into a massive industrial park with a ton of uncertainty of what happens next with it. We’re not talking about building a corner McDonalds with this variance – we are talking 170 acres of destruction. Selfishly, my life savings and the investment I made would be crushed and most importantly – if its approved, this community loses a very special and unique area forever.

My simple ask.....do not approve this. I stare south of 38 daily and there is tons of vacant land to develop. I don’t know the hard data but there is hundreds of acres of land in Westfield that are not developed that have strategically and thoughtfully been zoned industrial/commercial as this community plans out future growth. I am absolutely pro-growth and pro-business. I would fully support industrial and commercial expansion in literally – every single acre that is zoned for it in Westfield.

On the outside looking in – this scenario is pretty simple. There is a well known developer that owns a large chunk of land with the financial upside for himself, his partners and even some silent partners that are seeking approval against the City Plan solely based on the ownership and opportunity he sits in. This isn’t because we have maxed out industrial zoned land, it’s not because we are out of space, it’s not because this is the perfect spot for it. It’s solely because there is a quick and easy opportunity based on the scenario at hand.

You all have hard jobs as members because you have to balance every decision with the well being of the residents, the growth of the community and making the right decisions for generations. We are not being greedy, we are not being unreasonable, we are not asking for the moon and we are not trying to stretch the law/regulations for selfish intentions. We as residents are simply asking you all to abide by the Plan and keep this area zoned as is. Build and develop whatever the plan was to build and develop on this land. We all want that and we all are aware we arent stuck in yesteryear and the good ol days.

We are directly and humbly asking for you to represent us knowing hundreds of concerned residents would be devastated if this was approved. Keep this area of Westfield unique, protected and beautiful.

From: Canada, Brad <brad.canada@stryker.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 12:32:34 PM

To: Council Members

Subject: SR38 Development

Warning: This external email is from brad.canada@stryker.com. Do not click on unexpected or untrusted links and attachments.

Good afternoon Westfield Council Members:

My name is Brad Canada and live at 20945 Anthony Road. There has been numerous conversations going

on among the neighbors that live on Anthony Road as well as up and down SR38. We know that there is a developer that is aggressively looking to gain approval to rezone a rural “residential” area into a massive industrial park. I wanted to share my perspective and reiterate that I would like your support to not approve this rezoning.

I have only been living in this area for 3 ½ years (grew up in Fishers) but the broader SR38/Anthony/31/Hinkle Creek northeastern part of Westfield is a special place. Driving up through Anthony feels more like Brown County vs Hamilton County. McGregor Park and Bray Family Park makes this area even more special but it’s the surrounding areas that add to that. Westfield is a fast growing place and there is so many advantages to that and one that drew us to the area to begin with (schools, people, growth, amenities, etc). Growth in this area is a GOOD thing but there needs to be a balance to protect certain areas to offset the traffic, noise, etc. A HUGE industrial park was just approved south of SR38 that is still being developed so to approve another 180+ acre park + the future progression to then approve another 180+ acre plot on Anthony makes this rural area feel like we are down in Plainfield in the midst of their distribution and industrial areas. Westfield would then be losing a huge chunk of green space that could potentially be a nice residential area that could in theory connect both parks and be a place where the community could get away from the traffic, noise, chaos of what other parts could be.

I plan on raising my 3 young kids in this house and be here forever and part of that decision was giving them an area that was safe. I fear the traffic, I fear the amount of people commuting here daily that is not bought in or involved in this community, I fear the pollution/trash, and most importantly – I fear that this area and this community loses a huge part of what makes this community different that a Fishers, Carmel, or Noblesville. That is the ability to properly plan for future growth by also protecting pockets of the community that make it feel green and enjoy the beautiful scenes of nature and a rural setting in the pockets of heavy residential/commercial areas. I would MUCH more support a residential zoned area to drive population and keep the green area as close to what we can.

We do need industrial growth and areas to bring businesses here (which we have south of SR38 and pockets west on 31) but I strongly encourage you all to

please have the voice of your residents and our strong views against turning the most beautiful area in all of central Indiana into a massive concrete industrial zone that would have a huge negative impact on so many people and so many things. Please consider our request to vote "NO" to rezone these areas as industrial north of 38. Please consider keeping the industrial growth and overall focus be on the land and acreage that has already been approved just south of 38. This Anthony Road area between the 2 parks could be an AMAZING area to have green space and parks for generations to come.

Respectfully,

Brad Canada
Brad.canada@stryker.com
703-431-4083

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and the content is safe. Please forward all suspicious emails to informationsecurity@stryker.com.

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

Follow this link to read our [Privacy Statement](#)

Pamela Howard

From: Wayne Wheeler <wwheeler@REINDERS.com>
Sent: Friday, September 9, 2022 4:34 PM
To: planners; Council Members
Subject: Opposition to Northpoint II PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
wwheeler@REINDERS.com.**

Members of the Westfield City Council,

I am writing once again to voice my strong opposition to the Northpoint II PUD. It is now approaching 26 months since the petitioner first brought this project forward to council, in those 26 months the petitioner has not been able to satisfy any of the requests made by the neighbors or Council to bring a proposal forward that did not violate the current Comprehensive Plan. Just the mere fact that this process has taken over 2 years should be an indication that this project DOES NOT belong in rural residential. This project will forever change the surrounding acreage and rural lifestyle in this area.

With the hundreds of opposed citizens and the petitioners inability to provide any compelling reasons to convince the APC to vote positively on the proposal, it should be a very easy decision for the City Council to support the unfavorable APC recommendation and vote NO on the Northpoint II PUD on Monday evening.

Thank you,

Wayne Wheeler
20889 Anthony Rd

September 9, 2022

Dear City Officials,

Think of objective criteria that you could compare the Northpoint II PUD proposal to:

Westfield Washington Township Comprehensive Plan

Hamilton County Comprehensive Plan (2020 update)

Hamilton County Parks and Rec 5 year Master Plan (2022)

Indiana Code 36-7-4-603

Indiana DNR Comprehensive Plan (2021-2025)

IDEM Wellhead Protection Guidance (2019) – Wellhead Protection Program

Citizen property values

Citizens' desires

Non-residential property inventory (Community Dev. Dept)

Central Indiana Water Study (2021)

Hamilton County Water Availability Study (When completed)

Existing city resources/infrastructure (Fire, police, EMS, etc...)

Current safety statistics

Now compare the NP II PUD proposal to these criteria. Can anyone show how the proposal lines up favorably with any of these? We haven't heard the argument that the citizens in the surrounding area are excited (or even neutral) about this proposal. We haven't heard one person make an argument that this proposal makes sense because it's going to improve our environment, improve the traffic, or lessen pollution. We haven't heard one factual argument showing that crime will be lessened or even maintained at current levels because of this proposal. We haven't heard the slightest attempt at an argument showing how this proposal positively matches up with any of the 5 points in Indiana Code. We haven't heard one comment stating that NP II will help lessen the burden on Westfield's resources/infrastructure. We haven't heard a single statistic regarding a percentage increase that citizens can expect on their property values because of this proposal. We haven't heard that the city has decided to open up new areas to industrial development because the existing, planned areas have been completely built out and are 100% occupied. We haven't heard a single statement claiming that our drinking water availability & safety will be enhanced or even maintained by this proposal. In fact, for 25 months, no one has presented any type of argument showing how NP II PUD positively aligns with any of the aspects documented in the above criteria...and that is because it doesn't! This proposal has been, and continues to be, the polar opposite of any resource criteria available. The only **possible** exception- the only positive statement which has been put forth- is incremental tax base. And we all know that any incremental tax benefit would not fully materialize (due to construction buildout, occupancy, and tax

abatements) for decades, if ever. And is that really the most important thing anyway? At the expense of all the negative impacts it would have?

We have heard comments that perhaps this proposal should be accepted because of worse things that could come along (which is really not a ringing endorsement that the proposal on it's own merit is a good thing). But what if something wonderful comes along? If the current owner investors do not find woods, wetlands, and farm fields worthy land uses, there are others who are interested in buying the land to use it as it has been contemplated in the Comp Plan. Hamilton County Parks has interest. An agricultural school has interest. A youth sports group has interest. Individual landowners, who are not developers or investors, have interest. We know that there are people interested in this land that would use it the way it was intended if the current owners are not interested in doing that. It doesn't have to be an Industrial Park or something worse...it could be something better!

Lack of transparency: I do not know Mr. Willis personally; therefore, the only way I can form an opinion is by listening to and watching the things he says and does. And what I saw at the August 22 City Council meeting was disappointing to say the least. I came to the meeting knowing that Mr. Willis had received campaign contributions of \$1,000 or more from both Mr. Wilkes and Mr. White. Both of whom are connected to the Northpoint developments. I fully anticipated when Northpoint II came up on the agenda that Mr. Willis would, according to the agenda statement/Resolution 21-121, make a statement regarding the campaign contributions he had received. However, nothing was said. Not prior to the presentation, not during the presentation, not after the presentation. In fact, Mr. Willis was the first one to make a motion – to indefinitely table the NP II vote and take it into Executive Session. It was shocking! The entire time, I sat there wondering why no one was saying anything-why he didn't disclose this information-and why procedurally nothing happened to cause him to disclose this information. I sat there silently watching the entire course of the evening unfold...and I could do nothing. The only time I would have been able to say something was at the end of the meeting, after the topic was long gone and decided...far too late to have any impact. My question is this: what can be done to rectify the situation? Public apology? Recusal at the next meeting? I understand Resolution 21-121 is not a law, but it has been approved and adopted by the Westfield City Council. As a Marine, I would expect Mr. Willis to understand the importance of following rules/procedures.

In closing, please vote NO to the Northpoint II PUD proposal, it is clearly NOT in the best interest of the community.

Thank you for your service to the city and citizens of Westfield,

Christy Wheeler

20889 Anthony Road

Pamela Howard

From: Armstrong CIV Timothy J <Timothy.J.Armstrong@usmc.mil>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 10:47 AM
To: Council Members; APC; planners
Subject: Resident opposed to Northpoint 2

Council Members,

During the last City Council meeting, a member of City Council mentioned the current plans for Northpoint 2 may be the "best it's going to get". As a resident of Anthony Road who would be staring straight at Industrial buildings right out my back door, I respectfully disagree.

I will never give in to a horrible idea that was never intended for this part of the Township. I will continue to fight, and I hope that ALL Council Members will fight with its residents as well. Just because it's somehow legal to accept money from developers doesn't mean it's ethically correct. From where I stand, it's still a conflict of interest. The responsibility bestowed upon City Council members is to view proposals with sound logic and unbiased conclusions. Developers who have to buy votes destroy the integrity of this process.

Approving a delay so a 'company' can be confirmed does not advocate for anyone other than the developer. For the residents involved: What does the name on the building matter? It's still an extremely obnoxious building in an unwanted industrial park. I imagine the deer and other wildlife don't care what image is displayed on the buildings of the park that will invade their home either.

I recently drove to the new neighborhood placed in Northpoint 1 along with the expansion of East Street. I stopped and looked directly at the new spec warehouse. Without spending a great deal of exact measuring, I knew I was roughly the same distance that my house would be (if not closer). The thought of that in my back yard sickened me.

It's also my opinion that the developer will not be reaching out to residents to seek collaborative ideas on reducing negative impacts. The unprofessional and disrespectful outrage aimed at various council members during the last meeting is all I needed to see to understand the developer's mentality. If a petitioner needs to buy votes, it's fairly obvious it's for a bad idea.

Please view this proposal from the eyes of those that it will affect the most. Residents like me and my family will deal with this decision as long as we live in Westfield. Thank you for taking the time to read.

Respectfully,

Tim and Kim Armstrong
Concerned Anthony Road residents

Dear Council Members:

We moved to the Westfield-Washington Township over 21 years ago. To be honest, we didn't intend to stay in Indiana more than a couple of years. But, then we found that we had actually found "home". The neighborhood was rural (we are from rural areas), and the people are friendly.

We invested a lot of money, both buying and improving our property over the past 20 years. Only time will tell how much the property will be devalued if Northpoint II passes. Our current estimate is 30%. Like a lot of people we are not rich and depend on our property to help us fund retirement.

If Northpoint II passes, we would also lose our privacy. Our property would touch on Northpoint II, so there would be no privacy when we are outside. The light will take away our night sky, not to mention ground water pollution that would threaten our well water and cause potential flooding, and noise and air pollution. We have a small sanctuary area for animals on one corner of our property. With their route for food and water cut off by Northpoint II, I have to wonder what will happen to them.

At present, there is one traffic signal at SR 38 and East Street. Another traffic signal would have to be added about ¼ mile southeast of East Street to allow trucks to enter SR 38. The traffic congestion and noise resulting from this added traffic signal will increase extraordinarily, along with more air pollution from vehicles stopping and starting.

Because I was the person knocking on doors to get signatures for our petition, I know that our neighbors feel the same as we do. There was not one person in favor of Northpoint II, and I knocked on every door in the square mile off Anthony Road, 206th Street, Hinkle Road, and State Road 38. Mr. Wilkes' recent statement at the previous Council meeting about "anonymous" neighbors supporting their proposal is hogwash. Please do not allow the Northpoint II proposal (2008-PUD-09) to move forward.

Sincerely,

Barry Wayne Pike, homeowner

Pamela Howard

From: Pike, Cathy K. <ckpike@iupui.edu>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 11:55 AM
To: Council Members; APC; planners
Subject: Objection to the Northpoint II PUD (2008-PUD-09)

Council Members:

I again write to oppose the Northpoint II PUD (2008-PUD-09). This letter addresses my rationale in opposing the Northpoint II PUD and a few comments about statements and behaviors from the previous Council meeting.

My husband and I moved here more than 21 years ago and have lived in the same home since that time. Our land abuts the proposed Northpoint II PUD. I believe that the Northpoint II PUD should be denied for several reasons. The first of these is its non-compliance with Indiana Code 36-7-603 zoning ordinance; preparation and consideration of proposals (<http://184.175.130.101/legislative/laws/2020/ic/titles/036#36-7-4-603>). This Code stipulates the following tenets in preparing and considering proposals. They are as follow:

1. The Comprehensive Plan of a given area
2. Current conditions and character of ... structures and uses in each district
3. The most desirable use and adaptation for ... land within a given district
4. Conservation of property values within the jurisdiction, and
5. Responsible methods of development and growth.

The Northpoint II PUD meets none of these stipulations! It is in direct opposition to the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan, which deems the Rural Northeast area of the district as rural, single-family, and agricultural. Homes in the Rural Northeast are expected to be built in ways that include protecting historic structures, having considerable open space, protecting open fields, trees, and streams (City of Westfield, 2007, p. 31). In fact, the Comprehensive Plan states that the Rural Northeast “area will be the last to face development pressure” (City of Westfield, 2007, p. 31). There is no mention in the Comprehensive Plan of commercial property or dense housing as acceptable development options for the Rural Northeast area.

My second point is that the Northpoint II PUD does not take into consideration the character and uses of this district. This district is rural and agricultural, with houses located on multiple acres. It is **not** urban, commercial, or suburban. The Northpoint II PUD responses to issues raised at the APC meeting, in February fail to acknowledge the many statements in the Comp Plan that emphasize the importance of protecting and maintaining the rural character of the Rural Northeast area of the Westfield Washington Township. The Northpoint II developers state that Westfield Washington Township “has changed in the last 15 years, yet no update has occurred in the Comp Plan (See “Issues Raised” document, p.1). Their statement actually lends support for why the current A-SF1 designation **should** remain in place for the Rural Northeast area. There are precious few areas left in the area that have maintained their rural character and beauty.

Third, the Northpoint II PUD certainly is not a desirable use and adaptation of the Rural Northeast area. The proposal clearly is not a desirable use of the land, and it is not even needed! Currently, there are almost 2,000 acres in the Westfield-Washington Township of available property that are available for development, meet the criteria of the Comprehensive Plan, and would be acceptable uses for the Northpoint II PUD. (Please refer to our “Remonstrations Against Northpoint II PUD” for further information.)

Fourth, should the Northpoint II PUD be approved, property values within the area are expected to plummet by 30% (Please see “Remonstrations Against Northpoint II PUD” for further information). We and all of our neighbors have worked hard to both maintain our homes and improve our properties’ values over time. My husband and I expect the

value of our property to be one of our assets available to us during our retirement. We and our neighbors view any approval of the Northpoint II PUD as a **taking of value** and therefore adamantly oppose the proposal. The statement in their responses to issues by Northpoint II developers that buffering will prevent substantial loss of value to the current properties is hogwash.

Fifth, it is obvious that the Northpoint II PUD represents irresponsible methods of development and growth. The Northeast area is a small rural agricultural corner of the Westfield-Washington Township and is designated as the last area of the entire Township to face pressure from development. The Northpoint II PUD seeks to convert 183 acres of beautiful rural land to a commercial development that allows virtually unfettered commercial endeavors. The North Point II proposal continues to include **fully 73 possible types of commercial development**, including an array of all-encompassing types of commercial properties. The proposed North Point II industrial development would abut a recently acquired Hamilton County park and the Bray Family Farm. There is no place for industrial development in this entirely rural-agricultural area that has no commercial development.

The developers' statements about how industry developed in this pristine area would ensure the continued quality of life in the Rural Northeast is just simply more hogwash. Potential pollution of air, water, light, and debris are not addressed adequately in the developers responses to the issues raised at the February APC meeting. For instance, line of sight issues would not be mitigated by empty "conservation lots" (not to be confused with *conservation subdivisions* as defined and described in the Comp. Plan). Let's be real. Who would want to buy property and build a home in the middle of an industrial complex, especially when the industrial developers plan for environmental impacts and spillage to be mitigated by the "proposed buffer yards and landscaping" within their so-called 'conservation lots' (See "Issues Raised", p. 1)?

The developers also gloss over the impact of traffic on SR 38, should their proposal be approved. It is almost certain that a second stoplight would be required to manage vehicular flow at the entrance to the property. That would put 2 stoplights within a half-mile of each other. Literally, that would be a nightmare for drivers and the two residential properties between these two stoplights.

The plan would not enhance the natural resources or the lives of those of us who would be directly affected by its development. In fact, 180 people who would be directly affected by this development are opposed to its approval! These nearly 200 people have responded to online and in-person canvassing to say that they oppose the Northpoint II PUD. (Please see the "Remonstrance Against Northpoint II PUD" document for detailed information and copies of the petitions.) My husband was the primary canvasser in collecting in-person petition signatures. He knocked on every door within a square mile of the Northpoint II PUD, including Anthony Road, 216th Street, Hinkle Road, and State Road 38. **Not one person with whom he spoke approved of the Northpoint II PUD!**

I found some statements and actions during the previous Council meeting troubling. Mr. Wilkes' statements and behavior during the meeting were appalling, especially his behavior toward at least two Council members. I was surprised he was allowed to continue behaving so disrespectfully during the meeting. In addition to his effective emulation of a spoiled child stomping their foot and saying, "I want it, so I must have it", I was concerned about his vague and unsupported statements throughout the meeting. For one, he continued to accuse against us and our neighbors of having opposed a park in the Northpoint II PUD. This is blatantly untrue! We and all of our neighbors would love to see this use of the land. He continues to use these statements to try to justify the short-sighted and unwise Northpoint II PUD. He also mentioned "anonymous" neighbors who were in favor of the development. We know this is false, because no neighbor in a one-mile square area supported the Northpoint II PUD. Our petition contains the names and signatures of nearly 200 people in this one-mile square area. Had anyone not agreed with our opposition, they simply could have not completed and signed the petition.

Another of my concerns during the most recent Council meeting was an apparent violation of the Council's own Resolution 21-121 for members to disclose that they have received campaign donations in excess of \$1,000 from a petitioner when voting on any actions involving such contributors. Mr. Scott Willis did not disclose that he had received

campaign contributions in excess of \$2,000 from both Mr. Wilkes and Mr. Chris White, both parties to the Northpoint II PUD.

We sincerely hope and pray that you will **vote 'NO'** to the Northpoint II PUD and approve only those proposals that meet the standards of the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan for the Rural Northeast district. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter that will affect families and the community for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Cathy King Pike

Cathy King Pike, Ph.D., MSW

Professor Emerita

Indiana University School of Social Work

902 West New York Street, ES 4138G

Indianapolis, IN 46202-5156

317-903-9522 / ckpike@iupui.edu

Celebrating more than 100 Years of Giving Hope and Changing Lives

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the addressed recipient/s and may contain information that is confidential, proprietary or privileged. Any unauthorized review, response, use, distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. Receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient is not a waiver of confidentiality or privilege.

Pamela Howard

From: Jill Bracken-Emerson <Jill@EmersonLawLLC.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 2:55 PM
To: Council Members; planners
Cc: APC
Subject: Objection to Northpoint II

**WARNING: This external email is from
Jill@EmersonLawLLC.com.**

Hi Council Members,

I am writing to formally pose my objection to the Northpoint II Development. The Comprehensive Plan does not contemplate an industrial development in the area adjacent to Anthony Road. This area is zoned as Ag-Residential. The homeowners along Anthony Road purchased their property in reliance upon the Comprehensive Plan and the current zoning. Bringing such a development to this area would create noise, water, and air pollution in an area designated for agricultural uses. Further, to say that this land is not being used productively because it is merely farmland is shortsighted. Our nation has made it a priority to ensure that land remains in agricultural production. Feeding our nation is in the national interest. Any land available for agricultural production should remain so.

Moreover, the Council, not the developers, should drive and regulate development. In this respect, the Northpoint II developers either purchased this property knowing that it was not zoned for the use that they were seeking or purchased an option. There is some dispute regarding this issue. If the developers purchased only an option, then denying the petition would not have an adverse financial impact on them, and they can easily move their financial resources to another area that is already properly zoned.

Finally, the developer's last-minute statement that there is a corporate entity that wants to use the site for advanced manufacturing lacks actual credibility. The developer has not provided the identity of the potential client, so who knows whether the client has the actual financial backing to move forward, and more importantly, there is no actual contract requiring the client to locate there if the zoning is changed. How many other sites is the client considering? This is just a last-minute attempt by the developer to create havoc in the process.

The fact that a possible tenant exists should have been raised before the APC. It wasn't. The Council should not consider this issue or this information as it was not considered by the APC. To do so would prevent the homeowner's from having an opportunity to respond and would deny the homeowner's their right to due process.

The Council should follow the NO recommendation of the APC and should vote against the developer's petition.

Thank you,
Jill Bracken-Emerson

Jill Bracken-Emerson
Partner
**Emerson Divorce and
Accident Injury Attorneys, LLC**
1 South Rangeline Road, Suite 400
Carmel, Indiana 46032
P: 317-969-8000
F: 317-663-2116

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The materials in this electronic mail transmission (including any attachments) are confidential and are intended only for the named recipient(s) and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient(s), be advised that any unauthorized disclosure, copying, distribution or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately at the email address or telephone number listed above. Receipt by anyone other than the named recipient(s) is in no way to be construed as a waiver of any attorney-client work product or other applicable privilege.

-

Pamela Howard

From: Des Schillinger <des.schillinger@sai-rep.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 2:57 PM
To: planners; APC; Council Members
Subject: North Point II PUD

**WARNING: This external email is from
des.schillinger@sai-rep.com.**

Councill Members,

Good afternoon.

I would like to thank all of you who are in favor of rejecting Holladay Properties proposal to obtain approval from the city to rezone 183 acres of land on the north side of Ind. 38 between Anthony Road and Hinkle Road from AG-SF1 to Industrial.

One of the main requirements of the Council is to protect the citizens of Westfield and their investments. In this case the value of their homes. We all know that change is coming to Westfield, but it is the Council and the Advisory Plan Commission protect existing developments. The people of Westfield vote for the City Council Members believing and trusting that they would have the citizens best interest in mind. The homeowners surrounding the 185 acres in questions stand to financial lose 100,000s of thousand of dollars of personal wealth with the approval of this area being rezoned Industrial in order to put in an Industrial Park or Business Campus. The loss of this financial magnitude can affect whether a child can go to college, or how a family works it way through long term medical care. The ability to refinance or take equity out of their property has been taken from them. That is a much too expensive price tag, for another Industrial Park in Westfield.

During the last City Council meeting there was a presentation on all the available land that is already zoned for this type of development. There is no need to take these 183 acres of AG-SF1 land and rezone it Industrial!

The CEO of Aptiv said when looking for land in Hamilton County "If I can't see US 31 from my building and people on US 31 can't see my building, I'm not in the right building". An Industrial Park off 38 is not providing the notoriety or visibility a "Global company" desires but there is land in Westfield that would. A "Global company" would have contacted the City of Westfield about the possible move thus looking for a deal and the best possible property available.

Please vote no on Holladay Properties proposal to obtain approval to rezone 183.5 acres of land from AG-SF1 to Industrial.

Thank You and Best Regards,

Des Schillinger
Schillinger Associates, Inc.
17819 Commerce Dr. Suite 100
Westfield, In. 46074
765/457-7241
765/457-7732 Fax

Pamela Howard

From: rwgudeman@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 3:51 PM
To: Council Members
Cc: APC; planners@westfield.in.gov.
Subject: Northpoint II PUD - Say NO

**WARNING: This external email is from
rwgudeman@gmail.com.**

To whom it may concern –

I am aware of the inclusion for tonight's agenda is a vote on Northpoint II PUD. Please consider the UNFAVORABLE recommendation by the APC. I am asking you for a NO for tonight's vote. I strongly oppose the industrial development and all the consequences it would impact.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Gudeman

R W Gudeman LLC
20649 Anthony Road
Westfield, IN 46062
P: 317-840-1041
E: rwgudeman@gmail.com

Pamela Howard

From: Hinshaw, Melissa <melissa.hinshaw@experis.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 3:59 PM
To: Council Members; APC; planners
Subject: Objection to North Point 2
Attachments: Indiana Code IC 36.pdf

**WARNING: This external email is from
melissa.hinshaw@experis.com.**

Dear Council Members and APC,

Northpoint 2 is not compliant with the City of Westfield's current zoning.
Northpoint 2 is not compliant with the City of Westfield's Comprehensive Plan.
Northpoint 2 is not compliant with the 2020 Hamilton County Comprehensive Plan.
Northpoint 2 is not compliant with Indiana Code IC 36-7-4-603 (see attached).

This area is in between 2 nature parks, MacGregor Park, and Bray Park. These 2 parks were donated by generous landowners who resided here. The Hamilton County Parks Department, in collaboration with another generous landowner, is adding a 3rd nature park to this area (directly North of where Northpoint 2 is seeking to develop). The Bray, The McGregor and now the Rhodehamel Family all donated land with the intent of preserving this space.

Below is a link that details Hamilton County Parks Department's intent for the land right next to the potential NP 2 Development.
<https://www.youarecurrent.com/2022/06/14/preserving-beauty-hamilton-county-parks-dept-secures-key-acres-of-land/>

The article is appropriately titled "Preserving Beauty."

Hamilton County Parks and Recreation Dept. Director Chris Stice stated in this article "With surrounding properties in Noblesville and Westfield being developed for commercial and residential use at a rapid pace, county officials and park leadership said they felt it was imperative to secure the property." The purchase price was \$2.2 million. Stice said the department received a \$100,000 donation from the previous owners.

The article also states:

"Aside from the large list of plant and animal species currently found in the area, this property's environmental characteristics would be most enjoyed by passive recreation users who would appreciate the plant and animal diversity, scenic views and relatively rugged terrain," stated Amanda Smith, HCPR Supt. of Natural Resources and Education.

For the past 2 years, the residents of Anthony Road and Hinkle Road have endured stress and worry. We have been threatened with encroachment upon our privacy, burdened with thoughts of the loss the rural aesthetic of where we chose to purchase our homes, and fearful for the decline in value of our property.

Please vote no.

Thank you for your consideration,

Melissa Hinshaw



Melissa Hinshaw
Senior Recruiter
Experis® Health Solutions

Experis
100 Manpower Place
Milwaukee, WI 53212

T: +1 317 460 6751

m
**Please note this is my new email
address
www.experis.com



This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and or privileged information internal to our organization and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity or entities to whom they are addressed. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the recipients. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender by replying to this email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the named addressee you may not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. If you are the intended recipient you are notified that unauthorized disclosure, copy, storage, or distribution of this information is strictly prohibited.

Indiana Code IC 36-7-4-603

Zoning ordinance; preparation and consideration of proposals

Sec. 603. In preparing and considering proposals under the 600 series, the plan commission and the legislative body shall pay reasonable regard to:

- (1) The comprehensive plan;
- (2) Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district;
- (3) The most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted;
- (4) The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction; and
- (5) Responsible development and growth.

[Pre-Local Government Recodification Citations: 18-7-2-39 part; 18-7-4-603; 18-7-4-47 part; 18-7-5-60 part.]

As added by Acts 1981, P.L. 309, SEC.23. Amended by P.L. 335-1985, SEC.17; P.L.220-1986, SEC.17