From:	Greg Brewer
To:	Ryan Crum
Subject:	Fwd: TC - 11/09/21 - Colonnade
Date:	Monday, November 8, 2021 2:43:30 PM
Attachments:	TC - 110921 - Kevin Smith remonstrance.docx Colonnade Comparison Matrix - CLSC - 110921.xlsx Cornerstone - Colonnade.docx

---

Did you get this one?

Greg Brewer
Councilman, Town of McCordsville

From: Kevin Smith <kevin.smith@aes.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 10:42:17 AM
To: Greg Brewer <gbrewer@mccordsville.org>; Larry Longman <llongman@mccordsville.org>; Tom Strayer <tstrayer@mccordsville.org>; Branden Williams <bwilliams@mccordsville.org>; Barry Wood <bwood@mccordsville.org>
Subject: TC - 11/09/21 - Colonnade

Please find attached a few documents:

TC - 110921 - Kevin Smith remonstrance.docx - My remonstrance as to why developments continue to get approved that don't meet the zoning ordinance.

Colonnade Comparison Matrix - CLSC - 110921.xlsx – The Comparison Matrix Ryan created of Colonnade different sections and Champion Lake.
I added a column to show some of Champion Lake **actual** features as they are not the minimum the zoning allows but well above the minimum including lot size and roof pitch.
As you can see Colonnade meets the bare minimum (sometimes) and nothing more.

Cornerstone - Colonnade.docx – Shows the cornerstone series actual product layout which are zero lot line homes that actually overlap each other.

Ideas to make this development worthy of approval:

- Make 50% of the roofs greater than 6:12
  - This would help make homes look unique.
- Dark Sky Dusk to Dawn lights
- Commitment to Rear elevation of all homes
  - 2' bump out
  - Gable
  - First floor masonry of any multi-story residence. (In Zoning Ordinance)
- Masonry requirements for 100' lots – (First floor full masonry – committed to in PUD)
  - Remove additional reference to ARC – (can remove requirement if doesn't look right)
  - Find a design that works with First floor full masonry.
- Mounds – were 6' now 5'
  - Make them taller to block headlights into CLSC homes where inner streets point south.
- Amenity Center – Pool, BB courts, etc. – NOT
  - Monkey bars and walking trail
  - Fitness trail with stations

- No Remonstrance for boat noise

Regarding Colonnade

Barry – One of your first comments about Colonnade during the Informal presentation was it looked **too Typical.**

While some gains were made in the south facing lot size, they are still right at half the size of neighbors across the street.

Tom – You spent decades developing a Zoning Ordinance with standards aimed at making homes appear unique and different than their neighbors.

During the August Plan Commission meeting you asked Ryan if we make developers adhere to the rear façade requirements of the ZO.

The answer was "well we haven't in the past".

I am baffled as to why the rear facade requirements are not enforced as the rear elevations are just as important as the front and sometimes even more visible from external streets.

The rear 2' bump out and required gable are critical to making these homes appear unique and **not** typical. (like their neighbors)

Most of the rear upgrades such as covered porches, screened-in porch, three-season room, and room extensions in this PUD are exempt from the roof pitch requirements and will appear to be **afterthoughts** and simply **"Tacked on"** to the house.

The required third bay garage is exempt from the roof pitch requirement and will also look **"Tacked on"** to the house as an **afterthought**.

The first-floor masonry wrap requirement on 2-story homes is critical as well, but not part of the Colonnade PUD???

It is the square box construction with no personality except minimal features on the front (Lipstick) that make these homes look **"Typical"** and just like all others in McCordsville, with what appears to be afterthought room additions.

This site could be so much more!

This development will also be sub-par as there is no amenity center or clubhouse for well over 500 residents. (no pool, no BB courts, etc. only a walking path and monkey bars)

Please take time to actually read through the PUD you will be asked to approve.

Development Standards Comparison Matrix

Colonnade - Platinum Properties, Beazer Homes, Finecraft Builders

Standard	Area B - Cornerstone by Finecraft	Area C - Beazer Homes	Area D - Beazer Homes	Area E - Finecraft Builders	Champion Lake	Champion Lake Actual	Zoning Code R2
Bulk							
FY Setback	10'	25'	30'	30'	30'		30'
SY Setback	0'	5'	15'	10'	15'		15'
Min. Bldg Separation	NA	NA	NA	30'	NA		NA
RY Setback	15'	15'	15'	15'	20'		20'
Lot Width	40'	50'	80'	100'	100'	145'	100'
Min. Lot Area	3,780 SF	6,500 SF	11,200 SF	14,000 SF	23,000	30,000+ avg.	23,000
Min. Home Size	1,800 SF	1,800/2,200 SF	2,000/2,500 SF	2,200/2,600 SF	2,100 SF/2,400 SF	3,000 SF Avg.	2,100 SF/2,400 SF
Max. Lot Coverage	NA	50%	50%	45%	35%		35%
Max Density	2.79 u/a				1.99 u/a	1.3 u/a	1.99 u/a
Architectural					****		
Roof Pitch	6:12 primary roof pitch, allowances for ancillary roofs & certain home styles	6:12 primary roof pitch, allowances for ancillary roofs & certain home styles	6:12 primary roof pitch, allowances for ancillary roofs & certain home styles	6:12 primary roof pitch, allowances for ancillary roofs & certain home styles	Per Zoning Ordinance	Most 10:12	6:12, gables 8:12
Shingle Type	Dimensional	Dimensional	Dimensional	Dimensional	Per Zoning Ordinance		Dimensional
Vinyl	Prohibited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Per Zoning Ordinance	None	Permitted
Front Façade Brick	16" Wainscot	75% of homes shall have 50% brick, remainder must have min. 24" wainscot	24" wainscot	1st floor	Per Zoning Ordinance		50% on all front facades, 2-story homes shall have 1st floor brick wrap
Side Façade Brick	Corner lots - 16" wainscot	Corner lots - 24" wainscot	24" wainscot	1st floor	Per Zoning Ordinance		50% of 1st floor if abutting street, park, trail, or open space
Rear Façade Brick	None	None	24" wainscot	1st floor	Per Zoning Ordinance		50% of 1st floor if abutting street, park, trail, or open space
Façade Articulation	Min. 1 2' of-set or 2nd floor cantilever of 1' or greater, and gable or hip. Front gables must have detailing.	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Min. 1 2' off-set and 1 gable. Front gable shall have detailing & 3 roof planes visible from street	Per Zoning Ordinance	Most	Min. 1 2' off-set and gable on front façade
Min. Overhang	12" (siding), 8" brick/stone	12" (siding), 8" brick/stone	12" (siding), 8" brick/stone	12" (siding), 8" brick/stone	Per Zoning Ordinance		9"
Special Lots (requirements for high visibility lots)	16" waiscot	24" wainscot	No requirement	No requirement	Per Zoning Ordinance		No requirement
Max Elevation %	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	0%	10%
Anti-monotony	The same home elevation will not be constructed on an adjacent lot or directly across the street.	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	No two alike!	Single elevation may not be repeated unless separated by at least 3 different elevations
Exterior Chimneys	Brick or stone	Brick or stone	Brick or stone	Brick or stone	Per Zoning Ordinance		Brick or stucco
Front Porch Columns	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance		6" x 6"
Min. # of Windows	3 on front & rear elevations, 2 on side elevations	3 on all sides acing a street, 3 on rear, and 2 on sides	3 on all sides acing a street, 3 on rear, and 2 on sides	3 on all sides acing a street, 3 on rear, and 2 on sides	Per Zoning Ordinance		3 on all front facades, 1 on all others
Corner Lots	See above	See above	See above	See above	Per Zoning Ordinance		3 windows
Window Treatment	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance		Shutters, mullions or grids on all facing street except large picture, casement & small non-opening.
Trim Dimension	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance		1x6 (unless adj to brick)
Garage Size	Min. 380 SF	Min. width of 22'; 10 lots will have add'tl storage area	3-car garage required	Min. width of 22'	Per Zoning Ordinance		Min. width of 22'
Decorative garage doors	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance		Front-loading
Front-loading 3rd Car Garage Bay	Per Zoning Ordinance	No requirement	All homes	No requirement	Per Zoning Ordinance		Separate door & recessed at least 2'

Front-load Garage Width	3-car garages limited to 50% of front façade	3-car garages limited to 50% of front façade	3-car garages limited to 50% of front façade	3-car garages limited to 50% of front façade	Per Zoning Ordinance		45% of front façade
Side-load Garage Requirement	No requirement	No requirement	No requirement	Required	Per Zoning Ordinance		25%
Garage Protrusion	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance	Per Zoning Ordinance		If 8' or more, landscaping required, more than 10' is prohibited
Roofing Colors	Min. 3 colors offered	Min. 3 colors offered	Min. 3 colors offered	Min. 3 colors offered	No requirement		No requirement
Miscellaneous							
Lot & Foundation Plantings	1 tree and 12 shrubs	1 tree and 12 shrubs	1 tree and 12 shrubs	1 tree and 12 shrubs	Per Zoning Ordinance		3 trees & 12 shrubs
Perimeter Landscaping	10 trees & 10 shrubs per 100', 5-8' mounding along CR 750N				No requirement		No requirement
Perimeter Paths/Sidewalks	Per Zoning Ordinance				No requirement		Yes
Internal/Greenway Paths	Yes				No requirement		In some cases
Model Homes	No requirement	Full Basement	Full Basement	Full Basement	No requirement		No requirement

****Only applies to new homes built after 1/26/2015. Expansions of existing homes are excluded from all architectural requirements.

Cornerstone Series – Area B

B. <u>The Development Standards for Area B (Cornerstone) shall be as follows:</u>

1. Maximum Number of Lots	34
2. Minimum Lot Area	3,780 Square Feet
3. Minimum Lot Width	40 feet
4. Minimum Front Yard Setback	10 feet
5. Minimum Driveway Depth	20 feet
6. Minimum Side Yard Setback	0 feet*
7. Minimum Rear Yard Setback	15 feet
8. Minimum Livable Floor Area	1,800 square feet
9. Maximum Lot Coverage	N/A
10. Maximum Height-Principal	35 feet
11. Minimum Building Separation	10 feet**

* Minimum setback on either side of the structure. Homes with masonry on the side elevations may encroach into the Min. side-yard setback a maximum of 6 inches.

** Minimum building separation does not include roof overhangs or masonry wainscot.

From PUD Ordinance

The Grove at Legacy in Carmel

Same two homes from PUD Ordinance above

From: Greg Brewer
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Fwd: Colonnade Development
Date: Monday, November 8, 2021 7:40:04 AM

Ryan,

Please add this to your remonstrance pile.

Greg Brewer
Town Councilman for McCordsville District 2

From: Sean Conboy <seanconboy22@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 12:02 AM
To: Greg Brewer
Subject: Colonnade Development

Greg,

My name is Sean Conboy and we live at 5835 W 700 N. I am emailing my concerns for this project:

1) The amount of new traffic will make a current problem worse! After reading the traffic study, they did not study the worst case scenario which is from 1:30-3:00 pm during McCordsville Elementary School pick up. Recently, I was waiting on Mt. Comfort heading South, waiting to turn East onto 700 N and had to wait because the pick up line was backed up to Mt. Comfort Rd. Once on 700 N, I also had to wait and we were stopped. The round about proposal will not alleviate this and if either of the two housing developments get approved this will be considerably worse especially during the years of construction.

2) 4-5 Champion Lake homes will still look at either a side of a house or the backyards of 16 homes out of our front door. 15 of the homes are not transitional, it is an abrupt change.

3) Most of the homes we will see do not address a transitional development to Champion Lake.

4) There are no green spaces, amenities, basketball courts, pool, parks, etc.

5) We have seen other proposals that at least address these issues and are

looking, at least in some part to the Champion Lake transition.

6) The changes they made were minimal.

Thanks,
Sean Conboy
317-345-8976

From: Bob Gibbs
To: Engineering
Subject: Test
Date: Monday, August 26, 2024 2:10:37 PM

I am sending two pictures of the backup for the elementary school. The traffic issues need to b resolved before this land access from schoo moves forward. I will send one more photo which shows the other direction stretching back to mount comfort road. It's just ridiculous a very day.

Scan from my iPad

From: Herman, Mindy
To: Ryan Crum
Cc: "mjscaj6@gmail.com"; Herman, Mindy
Subject: Colonade Remonstrance
Date: Tuesday, August 17, 2021 9:22:16 AM

Ryan,

Hi, thank you for your work to support the town. Please share this in full with Planning and with Town Council.

A. Please make sure we hold all the new requests to the standards the town has set. If we require certain materials, please do not make exceptions. Please look at more variations in each section including more builders and/or some lots reserved for custom properties. Please make sure that we keep the differentiation in houses high not just in color but in much variety in house options, lot sizes, etc. while sticking to the town standards without exceptions. Those guidelines are important for us to have high sustainable quality.

B. Please make sure any PUD plan brings with it greenspace in a variety of areas not just retention pond, there needs to be amenities whether they be pools, park, basketball court, pickleball court, clubhouse, etc. if we are going to have higher density options this increases the need to have more spaces.

C. In addition, the infrastructure of the town should be addressed BEFORE we REZONE, while we can handle R1 this density and volume with the other approvals made by the town are exceeding the capacities of

1. Traffic, especially the intersection of 700 and Mt Comfort; roads need to handle the many additional cars
2. Parks and Greenspace continuity and locations
3. School capacity
4. Other PUD recently approved that are going to change the infrastructure needs already and provide some housing options to make sure we have a greater variety of options for potential residents.

D. Needs of the community, we have multiple friends that are looking for custom home lots of ½ acre to 3 acres. Some of these are outside of McCordsville, colleagues etc. and choosing new location b/c they cannot find readily available R2/R1 building sites and also want to see more greenspace/park options near the lots/land with a more paced growth plan. Others are in existing neighborhoods with high density and looking for more land, quality to stay, but also having trouble getting out of neighborhoods that are PUD b/c of resale value. There is a market need for some larger lots available for custom homes to retain contributors to the town and tax base. We have investments in multiple properties and acreage and feel the community needs to be represented with a strong variety of housing and some larger lot sizes and custom home options available for builders to pick up.

E. Finally, I feel we need to keep the plan that was established re: parks and some R1 or R2 housing near the school as planned. That was a thoughtful plan that included many participants in the community. We need to make sure all commissions are representing the sustainability of the community and not just a tax consideration. I appreciate the strong intelligent town council, town staff, and committee members and their ability to consider the constituents especially those most affected by each item brought forward to their respective committees.

Thank you for your consideration. John will see you at the meeting on Tuesday night if I can get there before it

finishes I will but have pre-existing commitment.

Mindy Herman (and John)

Notice required by law: This e-mail may constitute an advertisement or solicitation under U.S. law, if its primary purpose is to advertise or promote a commercial product or service. You may choose not to receive advertising and promotional messages from Crowe LLP (except for the crowe.com website, which tracks e-mail preferences through a separate process) at this e-mail address by forwarding this message to CroweUnsubscribe@crowe.com. If you do so, the sender of this message will be notified promptly. Our principal postal address is 225 W Wacker Drive, Suite 2600, Chicago, IL 60602-4903. This email message is from Crowe LLP or one of its subsidiaries and may contain privileged or confidential information or other information exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email immediately and delete this message without reading further or forwarding to others. This email is not intended to be a contract or other legally binding obligation, and any tax advice expressed in this email should not be construed as a formal tax opinion unless expressly stated. Visit www.crowe.com/disclosure for more information about Crowe LLP and its subsidiaries.

From: Walter Spurr
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonade PUD
Date: Tuesday, August 17, 2021 2:06:15 PM

Mr. Crum,

Unless a complete and comprehensive Traffic Study has been completed, I believe the Colonade PUD should be halted. This project will add between 550-1000 (depending on the number of units in the townhomes) cars to the traffic congestion to this area. There needs to be a plan of how to alleviate or at the least significantly reduce the traffic congestion this project will create. The Stop signs at 750/600 and 700/600 will only add to the congestion. If no one on the council has been in these areas between 7:00-8:00 am and 5:00-6:00 pm (not to mention the traffic issues on 700 during school drop off and pick up) traveling West on 700 or West and East on 750 then I am not sure they understand the traffic issues.

Respectfully,
Walter Spurr

From: Beth Miller
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Fwd: Screenshot 2021-08-10 at 7.07.11 AM.png.jpeg
Date: Monday, August 16, 2021 1:32:38 PM

I have sent this to town council from last weeks meeting. I feel like the bottom post also relates to all the housing you are approving and shows what people in mccordsville think about all of this new construction. I will also forward pictures from the front of my house of traffic backed up in both directions from mccordsville elementary. The notion of approving all these houses before handling the traffic problems is insane!!!!When a neighborhood of 12 houses plus another 10 down the street wait forever to turn left at rush hour morning and night and u want to add 400 or more in the area is beyond crazy. Have a good day
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Beth Miller <bethmiller@indy.rr.com>
Date: August 10, 2021 at 5:18:24 PM EDT
To: llongman@mccordsville.org, bwilliams@mccordsville.org, bwood@mccordsville.org, gbrewer@mccordsville.org, tstrayer@mccordsville.org
Subject: Screenshot 2021-08-10 at 7.07.11 AM.png.jpeg

I wanted to share this post from a few weeks ago on next door. I have seen many just like this and am planning to forward each time i see one. I live at champion lake and we have been fighting for nicer subdivisions for years but most all in mccordsville are the same. Now I hear that in this area that is mentioned in post below, the town is considering tiny rental homes. This would b near stansbury which is in disrepair and has many homes empty or up for rental. I can't imagine why this is even being considered! Please read the post below and realize as we have said over and over again, people are moving to other towns to find safer and nicer housing. Have a good night.

7:07
◀ Mail
Done 5 of 6

Candi Ridge · Austin Trace

The entire area is deteriorating and in my opinion so is a lot of McCordsville
I've been here for 14 years and Austin Trace is so ran down is embarrassing - we came from the East side 14 years ago and really the whole city is going to hell with crime and people just don't care

and or not sure what the heck the issue is.
If you look at the entire area it looks horrible and ran down then you have them building new subdivisions around and it just makes it looks even worse and the crime in the area has increased here and everywhere basically.
Looking to move within next 5 years for sure. (edited)

2m **Like** **Reply** **Share**

Comment

Sent from my iPad

From: Sean Conboy
To: Ryan Crum; Paige Conboy
Subject: Colonnade Proposal
Date: Monday, August 16, 2021 1:25:50 PM

Ryan,

My name is Sean Conboy and we live at 5835 W 700 N. I am emailing my concerns for this project:

1) The changes they made were minimal
2) We will still look at either a side of a house or the backyards of 16 homes out of our front door
3) Most of the homes we will see do not address a transitional development to Champion Lake
4) There are no green spaces, amenities, basketball courts, pool, parks, etc.
5) We have seen other proposals that at least address these issues and are looking, at least in some part to the Champion Lake transition.
6) The amount of new traffic will make a current problem worse!

Thanks,
Sean Conboy
317-345-8976

From:	Kevin Smith
To:	Ryan Crum
Subject:	Colonnade Remonstrance
Date:	Monday, August 16, 2021 11:02:48 AM
Attachments:	Cornerstone - Colonnade.docx Colonnade-PC-081721.docx

---

Ryan -

Please forward this email on to the PC members.

Thanks,

Kevin

Plan Commission members – re: Colonnade PUD

I realize the purpose of the PUD is to allow the developer some leniency in return for something the town desires.

Seems you are giving more than you are receiving…..

This PUD seems to be setting lower standards than anything we've seen in the past.

From minimal masonry requirements, to NO rear façade architectural features, to raising the bar on same elevation maximums. (20%)

All this while surrounding resident lots and homes exceed their development standards by almost 30%.

I have attached a couple of documents that try to break down what is proposed for the Colonnade PUD and what exists in the area.

- One document highlights some of the more important bullet points that need addressed.

- The other document is for the Cornerstone Series product.

  You might be aware, and this might be what you want, but these are zero lot line homes built overlapping each other.
  The lots have a two-foot side yard jog so the homes can overlap like a puzzle.
  These are true zero lot line and there is nothing that resembles this in the area.
  What if a fire were to break out??

The expansion of lot sizes in area E to 100' is greatly appreciated although they are still less than half the size of surrounding lots. (North and South)

The masonry commitment in area E is also appreciated but emulates their front façade *only*

commitment on a grander scale as the commitment is not for the entire development. (just the front)

As I've said in the past, this could be an awesome property/development.
You have the enforcement tools in place to make sure it becomes that.

Please don't miss this opportunity.

Thanks,

Kevin Smith

Cornerstone Series – Area B

B. <u>The Development Standards for Area B (Cornerstone) shall be as follows:</u>

1. Maximum Number of Lots	34
2. Minimum Lot Area	3,780 Square Feet
3. Minimum Lot Width	40 feet
4. Minimum Front Yard Setback	10 feet
5. Minimum Driveway Depth	20 feet
6. Minimum Side Yard Setback	0 feet*
7. Minimum Rear Yard Setback	15 feet
8. Minimum Livable Floor Area	1,800 square feet
9. Maximum Lot Coverage	N/A
10. Maximum Height-Principal	35 feet
11. Minimum Building Separation	10 feet**

* Minimum setback on either side of the structure. Homes with masonry on the side elevations may encroach into the Min. side-yard setback a maximum of 6 inches.

** Minimum building separation does not include roof overhangs or masonry wainscot.

From PUD Ordinance

The Grove at Legacy in Carmel

Same two homes from PUD Ordinance above

Colonnade – PC – 8/17/21

What is wrong –

- These same types of typical homes don't fit this area!
- Architectural features don't pass Zoning Ordinance –
  - Rear elevations lacking step back and gable commitment in PUD.
  - Rear elevations have no architectural features. (Flat and square)
- Small **16"** wainscot on front – No reason to deviate from masonry standards in ZO.
  - Not enough masonry on **ALL** homes. (Front and full first floor of multi-story)
- Lot sizes and homes are too small – (some lots 42' wide with 30' wide homes)
  - Some with **Zero** side yard setback
- The Price points and home sizes don't compare to surrounding homes.
  - Average $500K with an avg. sq. ft. of just over 3,000 sq, ft.
- They state they **only have 5 elevations** and are asking for an increase to 20% same elevations. (Champion Lake has **0%** same elevations and 90% have basements)
- The Townhomes need to be removed from this calculation
  - 276 lots x 20% = 55 Homes could have the same elevation.
  - Since there are only 199 detached lots and 55 same elevations, the 20% rises to 28%.
  - (57/204=28%) – **Almost a third of the homes could look the same!**
- Traffic study
- No Amenity Center – With as many as 836 families, they need a place to recreate!
- Development Standards Comparison Matrix – ***Column added for Champion Lake Actuals***
  - Their PUD drastically reduces Lot Width, Min. Lot Area, and Min. Home Size below the **current R1 zoning** (and well below R2) while raising density.
  - Champion Lake greatly exceeds the R2 zoning code in all these areas except density, which is obviously far less.
  - Mounds - Need to be a minimum 8'

Development Standards Comparison Matrix

Colonnade - Platinum Properties, Beazer Homes, Finecraft Builders

Standard	Area B - Cornerstone by Finecraft	Area C - Beazer Homes	Area D - Beazer Homes	Area E - Finecraft Builders	Champion Lake	Champion Lake Actual	Zoning Code R2
Bulk							
FY Setback	10'	25'	30'	30'	30'		30'
SY Setback	0'	5'	15'	10'	15'		15'
Agg. SY Setback	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
RY Setback	15'	15'	15'	15'	20'		20'
Lot Width	40'	50'	80'	90'	100'	145'	100'
Min. Lot Area	3,780SF	6,500 SF	11,200 SF	12,000 SF	23,000	30,000+ avg.	23,000
Min. Home Size	1,800 SF	1,800/2,200 SF	2,000/2,500 SF	2,000/2,400 SF	2,100 SF/2,400 SF	3,000 SF Avg.	2,100 SF/2,400 SF
Max. Lot Coverage	NA	50%	50%	35%	35%		35%
Density	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.99 u/a	1.6 u/a	1.99 u/a
Architectural					****		
Roof Pitch	6:12 primary roof pitch, allowances for ancillary roofs & certain home styles	6:12 primary roof pitch, allowances for ancillary roofs & certain home styles	6:12 primary roof pitch, allowances for ancillary roofs & certain home styles	6:12 primary roof pitch, allowances for ancillary roofs & certain home styles	Per Zoning Ordinance	Most 10:12	6:12, gables 8:12

What is right –

- Frontage road
- Full cut-off streetlights
- Some lots have been enlarged to <u>just under half the size</u> of Champion Lake lots.
    - More lots need to be larger.

<u>Below was handed to you at the 7/20/21 PC meeting</u>

<u>Colonnade – PC – 7/20/21</u>

- A lot of times what is presented and what is actually in the PUD are quite different or not included in the presentation.
- I'll start with the Lots are too small. –
    - CLSC lots are 145' wide, over 200' deep, and over 30000 sq ft
    - The Cedars development east of CLSC on 700 N. are ~.5 acre – 120x211 (25000 sq. ft.)
    - Old Town lots are 125x138 - .38acre – 16552 sqft.
        - Ryan's report states old town is 4.9 u/ac. but **<u>most homes</u>** are built on 2 or more lots, so density is actually far less. (2 lots 33104, .75 acre)
- At a recent TC executive meeting this property was the discussion of Executive homes. – **<u>These are NOT executive homes!</u>**
    - The Price points and home sizes don't compare to surrounding homes.
        - CL – Homes avg. just above $500K with an avg. sq. ft. of just over 3,000 sq, ft.
        - I keep hearing new developments offer something not in McCordsville. We should make this a "Move up" subdivision, which is not offered in McCordsville!
    - At last night's developer meeting with residents, a question was asked about the 6:12 roof pitch.
        - The response was "That is the towns minimum requirement"
        - What I'm saying is - this development meets *some* of the town's minimums – that's it!
        - Homes south have roof pitches in the 10:12 range.
    - These next three requested **<u>exemptions</u>** significantly change the appearance of the homes and development.

1. Proposed homes would only require a wainscot **<u>front</u>** façade with a max. of 36" and a min. of **<u>16"</u>** in height – **no commitment for rear!!**
    a. You should mandate these statements from the Zoning Ordinance –
    b. Pg. 75 3c "The exterior wall surface of the first floor of any multi-story residence shall be masonry"
    c. Pg. 75 3(d) At least 50 percent of the front elevation of all residential buildings greater than 1,500 square feet, exclusive of windows, doorways (other than garage doors), and bays, shall be masonry.
    d. Pg. 75 3(e) The side and rear elevations of all residences greater than 1,500 square feet that abut a street, open space, trail, or park, shall have at least 50 percent masonry as the exterior building material on all visible elevations.
2. Proposed homes would only require a two-foot step back and one gable on the **<u>front elevation</u>**. – ZO requires Front and Rear
    a. ZO – pg. 76 The exterior wall surface of the first floor of any multi-story residence shall have a minimum of one **two foot step back** on both the front and rear elevation and a **gable** on the front and rear elevation.

3. The PUD proposes the same elevation can be built on 20% of lots vs. 10%.
    a. So, 283 lots x 20% = 57 Homes could have the same elevation.
    b. Since there are only 204 detached lots and 57 same elevations, the 20% rises to 28%.
    c. (57/204=28%) – **Almost a third of the homes could look the same!**

- Amenity Center – With as many as 836 families, they need a place to recreate!
    - 204 detached + 632 town homes = 836 families (min. 1600 people)
- Not really a fan of the Dusk to Dawn lights. (No need to light up the dark sky.)
- It seems this PUD is just another example of what is **currently being built**.
    - It needs to continue the example of what **has been** built!
- This is a very special property that could be **Amazing** with proper homes.
- You have an Ordinance in place with rules of building.
    - At some point you have to draw a line and say enough is enough!
    - The ordinance is what gives a home an appealing appearance and value.
    - These same types of typical homes don't fit this area!
- Staff report comments.
    - -The brick percentages proposed within this development do not meet the level the Town has traditionally seen in the developments approved since the recession.
    - -The anti-monotony standards for Areas A & B are different from the Town's standard. Deviation from our standard does make sense, as these are a much different product that we've seen in the past.
    - The Zoning Ordinance limits a specific elevation to being built on no more than 10% of the lots, the petitioner is requesting to increase this number to 20%.
    - -The minimum size of homes for Area E is smaller than we've seen in the past for lots of this size.
    - Currently there is no commitment to basements for any of the Areas.
-

- ** **Question - Area A – 79 lots, min. lot size = 1000 sq. ft., min. livable floor area 1,100 sq. ft., Max. # of dwellings per building = 8 –** How's this work?

From: debbie ruddick
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonnade
Date: Sunday, August 15, 2021 12:47:51 PM

Dear Mr. Crum and town council,

We just want to be heard. The traffic is already a nightmare on our W 700N and Mt Comfort.

An officer stopped my daughter attempting to get around cars parked waiting to enter the elementary school.

She explained that she had to get home for a meeting for work. She works from home.

He yelled at her and when she explained she had to home for her meeting he replied " it is not about you."

How appropriate I feel that pushing this high density project through is telling the existing neighbors the same thing. A slap in the face.

I understand there will be something built . But why not nicer custom homes???

Why more crap ??

Thanks for you time

Debbie Ruddick
Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From: Greg Chester
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: My prior message
Date: Sunday, August 15, 2021 1:30:03 PM

I apologize Ryan, but I did not see all of the exhibits to the plan forColonnade. Or if there is someway that the builders can be held to the commitment suggested by the pictures in these exhibit, I leave it up to the commission to decide whether or not they are acceptable. Personally I do not believe the homes in section E are differentiated enough to meet the objective of satisfying the champion lake residence. I personally believe there should be larger homes with a minimum sales price of $450,000. Probably a pipe dream but that is my thought. Also I saw the mound is 5 to 8 feet with varying adulation and a ton of landscape. I think that is excellent. Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

Mobile: (317) 407-5518
Email: gchester@doz.net

From: Greg Gaskill
To: Jim Gerber
Subject: Questions
Date: Sunday, August 25, 2024 11:28:43 AM

Hello Ryan,

Thank you in advance for taking one input into consideration. I looked at the material provided and wanted to share a couple of thoughts.

Is there a reason we are not requiring these builders to include the "Series" of Homes that they will put into the development or even better a minimum asking price? I understand that size restrictions and building material restrictions help, but they have portfolio of homes and if we limit them to certain Specific homes, I think we improve the likelihood that they do not cut corners in the future.

For example, Pyatt is building homes in New Palestine that would meet the proposed building restrictions. They are low $300's whereas they claim custom E will be $450 and higher. What is going to prevent them from putting in $300k homes in Section E??

Obviously a couple of the members of the commission were all over the developers last meeting about the front elevation on the homes in this development. Here is this going to be controlled. I do not see anything in the more recent documentation that speaks directly to front elevation restrictions, requirements and details.

Did the mound height move to 3' along 700?

Can you not require all of these developers to put money in a trust for future road development? Just thinking a $2,500 per lot assessment might be interesting or pick the number.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Mobile: (317) 607-5318
Email: gsbenton@dot.net

From: Charles Jacobi
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonnade Concerns
Date: Monday, August 2, 2021 9:21:31 PM

Good evening Ryan,

I have some concerns about the proposed Colonnade subdivision. I did not see a playground included in their presentation. How many children are expected to live in 283 homes? Where are they expected to play? Especially those that live in the townhouses or those homes on extremely small lots. I did not understand that any section is for empty nesters or seniors. Thus, many children. Is the developer expecting them to play at the school playground? That might not work for everyone. Or what if in the future the school playground is fenced in and not available 24/7 to the community? Is it fenced in now? I don't remember.

Also, where is a clubhouse or a community center for the subdivision? Or a pool? I didn't see much green space for possibly some park benches for summer time enjoyment.

I am also concerned that they are not following some of McCordsville's building standards. Is there even one section that has 50% brick or masonry on the front facade? I know we have made a couple of exceptions for a special style home. But their examples didn't seem to warrant the change.

I am excited about the homes being built in McCordsville. As I have said for years, let's plan for a community we are proud of and one we still want to live in. Many hours of planning have gone into expectations for the future of McCordsville.

Would you please share this with Tonya and the town council and/or any others for their consideration? Thanks.
Have a great day.
Shirley Jacobi.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Douglas Dau
To: Building
Subject: Beazer Homes
Date: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 6:21:48 PM

Ryan do even thing of give Beazer any permits to build. They done soaked us beazer home owners enough in poor quality and falling apart construction. Built junk never even caring how long homes would stay together. They don't deserve to put their junk up in Mccordsville. There better builders to permit too and keep Mccordsville looking better down the road. There will be no support from us on them building anymore homes here. They were a different name before Beazer and those stucco home issues.
Douglas Dau

Sent from my iPad

From: Bryan Burney
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonnade remonstrance letter-Bryan Burney
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 11:04:13 AM

Hey Ryan,
This a "remonstrance letter" regarding PC-21-21-008 Colonnade. Please include it in the packet for planning commission members for their meeting on 7-20-2021.

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Re: Colonnade

I realize the tract under consideration for the Colonnade development is going to be developed. I care about this because I will have to live with whoever buys or rents there as "neighbors" for the rest of my life. I will have to look at their homes and live with whatever the development brings. This letter is meant to be constructive criticism that hopefully will lead to a better development. I want McCordsville to be as good as it can be and don't wish to see it undershot on quality of development.

Traffic: Please conduct and present the findings of a traffic study. In spite of "best" efforts by Mt. Vernon Schools and MMPD school traffic still stands W 700 N and effectively blocks traffic some early mornings and most early afternoons. Morning school traffic from the north on Mt.Comfort Road turns left onto W 700 N which makes it IMPOSSIBLE to exit W 700 N to the south. The intersection becomes completely useless and those wishing to turn left from W 700 N cannot do so during morning school traffic hours. School traffic could be mitigated by making walkable access to McCordsville Elementary School from Colonnade out the westside to the school. Otherwise access could be via trail or sidewalk along W 700 N. either way, Mt. Vernon School Corp needs to waive bus riding requirements. A commitment was made when McCordsville Elementary School was being planned to limit the W 700 N entrance to bus traffic only. Indeed there is a sign to this effect on the gate. However, it has become a reliever road to get traffic off Mt. Comfort Road. Mt. Comfort Road is where the traffic will go back to if this commitment were to be enforced.

Traffic from the W 700 N access to Colonnade will exit either to the east or to the west. A single entrance to the east forces every single vehicle heading west to pass every single driveway on Champion Lake. Each driveway passage is a potential accident. There are 100 acres to be developed with perhaps as many as 600 residences (depending on how many residences are constructed on the highest density small lots to the north near the new town center). A second exit off W 700 N located immediately to the east of the school access drive makes sense because those vehicles heading west to Mt. Comfort Road will pass many fewer driveways. Those heading off to the east toward Greenfield can use the east exit and completely avoid all of the current Champion Lake Driveways. The east exit could be improved if the lot immediately to the east of Colonnade were purchased and added to the development. It is in Hancock County, but could be annexed into McCordsville. It also borders Stansbury Ditch and is a potential "waterfront" development if properly zoned. It could become neighborhood commerciaL WITH LIQUOR LICENSES AVAILABLE. A development this large needs at least three points of ingress/egress.

Parks: The long term plan for these parcels indicated a park would be placed at this location.

Meadows landing was a prior development planned for this site. Discussion around a potential park produced the comment "McCordsville does not have funds to support a park". Now there is a park impact fee of $750/lot. Colonnade will produce more than $150,000 in park impact fees. McCordsville did a park study and was found to be under-parked. Sites for potential parks were vetted and every single site selected is north of the railroad tracks. Park funds are available and are being collected now from south McCordsville new home sales. At least one park should be planned for the southside and this is where it should be placed. DO NOT APPROVE Colonnade until the developer agrees to donate land for a park which can then be built out and administered with southside generated park impact fees.

Trails: There are zero connected trails and zero cross walks south of the railroad tracks in McCordsville. A trail is needed along W 700 N at the south side of Colonnade. The trail needs to connect all the way to OLD SCHOOL PARK where there needs to be a crosswalk.

Public safety: The number of authorized officers for MMPD has not been increased since 2015. MMPD has not been at fully authorized staffing levels since 2010. The addition of a school safety officer full time at McCordsville Elementary School additionally stretches already thin ranks. Colonnade should not be approved without authorization from McCordsville Town Council and MMPD Commissioners to increase the MMPD by TWO OFFICERS. You should REQUIRE THIS APPROVAL BEFORE APPROVING COLONNADE or it won't happen.
Ambulance and Fire Service within the Town of McCordsville are nearly non-existent. You should insist that plans for a MCCordsville Vernon Township Fire Station be accelerated and firmed up BEFORE VOTING TO APPROVE COLONNADE. McCordsville's existing fire station cannot be staffed 24/7 because HVAC mixes carbon monoxide throughout the building effectively barring sleeping in the station.

Sewers: The new sewer plant expansion should go online soon. The expansion adds 500,000 gallons per day capacity and will cost around 7 million dollars. The Town of MCCordsville is REQUIRED to provide sewer service to its new developments and developers are counting on this being available. Each new residence is generally considered to produce 200 gallons/day of sewage to be processed. Our existing plant operated at 88% capacity in 2020. Generally speaking building permits and certificates of occupancy run well behind the approval and build out of new subdivisions. But once approved, the residences will come sooner rather than later because the investment has already been made and the interest clock is already running. My somewhat imprecise count shows 3479 residences (doesn't include Sagebrook which is sewered by others) approved since 2018. Fully built out, that comes to a need to process 695800 gallons of sewage/day. Clearly this isn't going to work. You should PAUSE additional subdivision approvals UNTIL plans for a properly sized sewer plant are underway. The state of Indiana REQUIRES plans for sewer plant expansion be initiated when existing capacity is over 80-90% utilized. Surely developers who have made their investment and built out streets, utilities, lots and homes will want to sell those homes. When they cannot sell because there is no sewer service they will surely sue the Town of MCCordsville. I, as a taxpayer, DON'T want that substantial unfunded liability.

General comments: I appreciate that homes across the street from Champion Lake will be facing W 700 N and density will be less with larger lot sizes than on the north end near the new town center. However, I believe these lots should be developed and then bavailable for sale to anyone who wants to use THEIR OWN BUILDER to construct a custom home on one of this southernmost row of lots. This option should be available for one year. After that, the

developer/builder should be free to place their own product on those lots. This option allows a potentially higher sale price for those lots and will give the potential to have W 700 N be all custom homes along the Champion Lake portion. This would be a considerable improvement compared to production housing.

The east-west facing homes on the west side all show side yards and fences to the Champion Lake lots across from them. The "curve/corner" at the southwest of COlonnade should be replaced by a second ingress/egress.

Please require at least four different colors of shingles. Every single shingle on the hundreds of homes in Meadows Landing and in Sagebrook are all the same. TALK ABOUT MONOTONY! Isn't there an anti-monotony requirement?

Mounding and landscaping are needed along W 700 N. Please no spruce trees that will be killed by NEEDLECAST. The blue spruce trees planted at Weavers Landing are already dead. They are nicely mulched DEAD TREES>

Thank you for your consideration

Bryan Burney MD
5637 W 700 N
McCordsville, IN 46055
317-260-0734

From: debbie ruddick
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colon ade
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 9:45:52 PM

Dear Mr. Crum,

Please do not get behind this development. There are too many high density developments in this area. 650 is over run and the homes are "cookie cutter."

1) the proposed homes are simply tract homes with no character and no added value to the area. W 650 N is overrun and the homes are "cookie cutter."

2) W 700 N is now a high speed shortcut for many and it will be impassable with the number of home proposed!

3) This type of housing will simply bring more traffic and become another "foreclosure" neighborhood when the recession hits..

4) Many at Champion Lake have been here for 25+ years and this type of housing is a slap in the face to good, long standing residents. There seems to be no consideration for those that have raised families, supported the schools and paid taxes here for many years.

5). Not everyone wants a "Fishers" or "Carmel" town center with droves of people. I know many that have fled this type of plan. Please don't drive those that can and do pay taxes out!

6) My recent college graduates are hesitant to return and buy in this area because they cannot make it to work or home due to traffic. And they worry that not only about the road system but the school system as well. Neither is prepared for the incessant high density building!

7) Consider what you would want in your front yard and how you would feel about the affect on your family and your property, please!!!

I would love to retire here, but I will not if we continue to overbuild poor quality, tiny lot neighborhoods.

Deborah L. Ruddick B.S., L.D.H.

From: Jeff Cross
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Concerns with development on W 700N
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 10:54:13 PM

Mr Crum,

We are writing to express our concern for the proposed development of the land north on W 700 N across from Champion Lake Estates. Our concerns are centered around traffic, safety, septic system, and the quality of the proposed development.

We currently live across from MES and for several hours prior to dismissal cars are parked and blocking the ability to drive on W 700 N, including blocking our driveway preventing our ability to leave or enter our property easily. In addition, it's near impossible to turn south onto Mt Comfort Rd due to to current traffic flow. This is not safe. By adding more than 400 homes, what will the town do to address this issue?

It is our understanding an increase in population will put significant strain on an already compromised septic infrastructure. How will that be addressed?

The quality of the proposed development and size of lots are not consistent with the higher quality of homes in the area. We plead for consideration of higher quality homes.

Thank you for your help with these issues

Jeff Cross
317-440-6721

From: john clauss
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Development N of Champion Lake
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 7:30:07 AM

Ryan, this email is concerning the development N of Champion Lake on CR 700. I am not against future developments as long as they enhance the property values of current homeowners in the area. This enhancement can be achieved by: reducing the density of houses per acre, as well as upholding construction standards- for example- 2 story homes to have first level complete brick on all sides. Also addressing the added traffic congestion. John Clauss

From: dstock@indy.rr.com
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonnade PUD
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 9:04:31 AM

Having reviewed the PUD, I feel that while there is some improvement over the previous proposal for this site on the south end, it is still an abrupt transition from the level of the development on Champion Lake, and the north end is even more densely packed by an order of magnitude than the previous proposal. In addition, the huge number of families that will be crammed into this proposal will swamp 700 N and 750 N. This will prevent any solution for the traffic caused by McCordsville Elementary, further adding to the misery on Mt Comfort road and 700 N. Until some plan to solve the issues surrounding McCordsville Elementary, there should be no development of that land, as the solution will have to come from that property either from 750 N (preferably) or 700 N. Any planning on this plot of land cannot occur until there is a solution for the school. Nothing of this density should even be considered without improvements in 750 N to accommodate the enormous traffic increase. The transition from Champion Lake should be more gradual as well.

Dan Stock
5777 West 700 North
Mccordsville, IN 46055

From: mike@lakehouseyoga.org
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Remonstrance regarding Land north of Champion Lake
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 11:54:58 AM

Dear Mr. Crum,

I am adamantly opposed to the current Colonnade development proposal regarding the land north of Champion Lake.

The density of houses does not come close to complimenting the homes on Champion Lake. With that density comes a disproportionate increase in traffic – and we already have traffic problems.

I am pleased that the denser lots are located north of the creek and appreciate that the McCordsville Town Council would like that density to support the future Town center, however the devaluing of one of McCordsville's greatest assets, Champion Lake Estates, must not be sacrificed to accomplish this. All lots south of the creek must be a minimum of .75 acre and the greenway, minimum of 50 feet on both sides of the creek must be preserved.

I would like to speak at the upcoming Town Council meeting to further explain my opposition to the current Colonnade proposal. In addition, I welcome via email, any questions you or the members of the Town Council may have.

Thank you,

Michael Markus

(317) 728-3000

From: Paul Miller
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonnade Subdivision
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 11:57:13 AM

Ryan,

I wanted to voice my concern about the Colonnade subdivision being proposed. I really feel this is the wrong development for what is considered some of the best vacant land in McCordsville. The town only has first-time buyer subdivisions and no place for people to move up to. This land seems perfect to do a subdivision similar to Highland Springs. The density of these homes is very tight. I live across the street on Champion Lake and it would be the backyards facing my house. I know curb appeal is never looked at for backyards but the first thing people will see when driving by. Traffic with the school is a complete mess in the morning and the afternoon and can only imagine how much worse this will be with a crowded subdivision. I understand also that the current sanitation system could not handle the additional capacity without major upgrades to the treatment plant.

I know there have been multiple builders over the years proposing a development there. I hope the patience has not worn out and the board will not approve without doing a thorough investigation of what is best for the town.

I do not support this development, but I am open to seeing new homes across the street.

Thank you,

Paul Miller
5805 West 700 North

From: Brian
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonnade
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 1:03:19 PM

Ryan,
This a "remonstrance letter" regarding PC-21-21-008 Colonnade. Please include it in the packet for planning commission members for their meeting on 7-20-2021.

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Re: Colonnade

I am against the development planned for the north side of CR 700 North east of Mt Comfort Road. I live at 5945 W 700 North, McCordsville. I am against the development for the following reasons;

Traffic: County Road 700 North is overcrowded because of McCordsville Elementary School Traffic still stands on W 700 N and effectively blocks traffic some early mornings and most early afternoons. Morning school traffic from the north on Mt.Comfort Road turns left onto W 700 N which makes it very difficult to exit 700 N to the south. The intersection becomes completely useless and those wishing to turn left from W 700 N cannot do so during morning school traffic hours.

The planned development is too dense and this will affect quality.

The developer of this land should agree to donate land for a park which can then be built out and administered with southside generated park impact fees.

Public safety: The number of authorized officers for MMPD has not been increased since 2015. MMPD has not been at fully authorized staffing levels since 2010. The addition of a school safety officer full time at McCordsville Elementary School additionally stretches already thin ranks.

Ambulance and Fire Service within the Town of McCordsville are nearly non-existent. You should insist that plans for a MCCordsville Vernon Township Fire Station be accelerated and firmed up.

Sewers: The new sewer plant expansion should go online soon. There is already too much approved development for the capacity with the plant expansion. Surely developers who have made their investment and built out streets, utilities, lots and homes will want to sell those homes. When they cannot sell because there is no sewer service they will surely sue the Town of MCCordsville. I, as a taxpayer, DON'T want that substantial unfunded liability.

Thank you for your consideration

Brian Reske, Property Owner
5945 W 700 North
McCordsville IN 46055
317-374-6700
brianreske@aol.com

From:	Kevin Smith
To:	Ryan Crum
Subject:	Colonnade PUD - PC - meeting 7/20/21
Date:	Thursday, July 15, 2021 1:30:06 PM
Attachments:	Colonnade PUD notes.xlsx Colonnade - Bullets.docx Corn Pictures.pptx

---

Ryan –

I am opposed to the proposed Colonnade PUD development as presented.
I have outlined some reasons and speaking points.

Also I have taken the time to review the actual Colonnade PUD Ordinance.
I highlighted some discrepancies between their presentation and their PUD ordinance as well as items that don't pass the McCordsville Zoning Ordinance.

I am also attaching a view from my house looking north.
It shows how high our houses actually sit above the road and could easily see over or down in an 6' buffer.

Thank you,

Kevin Smith

Colonnade PUD Ordinance proposal - Review

Land Use Requirements	
B 1a	33% - I would like to see larger lots by reducing the open space.
B 1b	Will not exceed 3 units/acre - At two dwellings per 20' lots brings total to 379 or 3.79/acre
	With 6 dwellings per 20' lot building - total could be 819 dwellings/ 100 acre
Area A	20x110 - **2200** sq. ft. - *From concept presentation*
Min Lot Area	1000 SF - if 20' wide they will be 50' deep!
Max # dwelling/building	6 - This is out of line and needs fixed.
II. Roof Pitch	6:12
	Director of planning may approve lower roof pitches and cladding - Should be Arch. Committee - ZO - pg 75
V. Lighting	NO - Dusk to Dawn lights
Architechural Features	Front - 4 items from ZO pg.79 (e), Side & Rear - 1 item
Area B	42x110 - **4620** sq. ft. - *From concept presentation*
Min Lot Area	3780 SF
Min Lot Width	40 - If 40' wide they will be 94.5' deep
Min Side yd set back	0
Anti-Monotony	The same home will not be constructed on adjacent lot or directly across the street.
	ZO - pg. 76
	4(a) - A single front elevation shall not be repeated unless it is separated by at least three different front elevations along either side of the same street frontage.
	4(b) - There shall not be more than 10 percent of the houses in the subdivision with the same front elevation.
II. Roof Pitch	6:12
	Director of planning may approve lower roof pitches and cladding - Should be Arch. Committee pg 75
V. Front Façade	**16"** Wainscot - Front Only - pg. 75 - 3© 1st floor of any multi-story must be masonry -
	3(d) At least 50 percent of the front elevation of all residential buildings greater than 1,500 square feet, exclusive of windows, doorways (other than garage doors), and bays, shall be masonry.
	3(e) The side and rear elevations of all residences greater than 1,500 square feet that abut a street, open space, trail, or park, shall have at least 50 percent masonry as the exterior building material on all visible elevations.
VI. Lighting	NO - Dusk to Dawn lights
Area C	50x130 - 6500 sq. ft. - *From concept presentation*
Min Lot Area	6500
Anti-Monotony	The same home will not be constructed on adjacent lot or directly across the street.
	pg. 76
	4(a) - A single front elevation shall not be repeated unless it is separated by at least three different front elevations along either side of the same street frontage.
	4(b) - There shall not be more than 10 percent of the houses in the subdivision with the same front elevation.
Min Side yd set back	5'
Max Lot Coverage	50%
II. Roof Pitch	6:12
	Director of planning may approve lower roof pitches and cladding - Should be Arch. Committee pg 75
V. Front Façade	Wainscot Front only - pg. 75 - 3© 1st floor of any multi-story must be masonry -
	3(d) At least 50 percent of the front elevation of all residential buildings greater than 1,500 square feet, exclusive of windows, doorways (other than garage doors), and bays, shall be masonry.
	3(e) The side and rear elevations of all residences greater than 1,500 square feet that abut a street, open space, trail, or park, shall have at least 50 percent masonry as the exterior building material on all visible elevations.
VI. Lighting	NO - Dusk to Dawn lights
Area D	80x140 - 11200 sq. ft. - *From concept presentation*
Min Lot Area	11200
Anti-Monotony	The same home will not be constructed on adjacent lot or directly across the street.

	pg. 76 4(a) - A single front elevation shall not be repeated unless it is separated by at least three different front elevations along either side of the same street frontage. 4(b) - There shall not be more than 10 percent of the houses in the subdivision with the same front elevation.
II. Roof Pitch	6:12 Director of planning may approve lower roof pitches and cladding - Should be Arch. Committee pg 75
V. Front Façade	Wainscot Front only- pg. 75 - 3© 1st floor of any multi-story must be masonry - 3(d) At least 50 percent of the front elevation of all residential buildings greater than 1,500 square feet, exclusive of windows, doorways (other than garage doors), and bays, shall be masonry. 3(e) The side and rear elevations of all residences greater than 1,500 square feet that abut a street, open space, trail, or park, shall have at least 50 percent masonry as the exterior building material on all visible elevations.
VI. Lighting	NO - Dusk to Dawn lights
Area E	90x140 - **12600** sq. ft. - *From concept presentation*
Min Lot Area	12000 - At 90' wide they will be 133' deep
Anti-Monotony	The same home will not be constructed on adjacent lot or directly across the street. pg. 76 4(a) - A single front elevation shall not be repeated unless it is separated by at least three different front elevations along either side of the same street frontage. 4(b) - There shall not be more than 10 percent of the houses in the subdivision with the same front elevation.
II. Roof Pitch	6:12 Director of planning may approve lower roof pitches - Should be Arch. Committee pg 75
V. Front Façade	Wainscot Front only - pg. 75 - 3© 1st floor of any multi-story must be masonry - 3(d) At least 50 percent of the front elevation of all residential buildings greater than 1,500 square feet, exclusive of windows, doorways (other than garage doors), and bays, shall be masonry. 3(e) The side and rear elevations of all residences greater than 1,500 square feet that abut a street, open space, trail, or park, shall have at least 50 percent masonry as the exterior building material on all visible elevations.
VI. Lighting	NO - Dusk to Dawn lights
Buffer & Screening Standards	
a. Buffer Height	6' - Needs to be 8' or more as Champion Lake homes building pads are 8' above road Need fencing along east property line. (Lot)
Miscellaneous Requirements	
D. Traffic Improvements	**TBD** School traffic completely shuts 700N down in the afternoon - * Can't turn left out of 700N from 7:15am - 7:50am, too many lined up to turn left into 700N * Parking on the road waiting for the gate to open about an hour before school lets out
Street Lights	Pg. 105(a) - **Purpose and Intent** The purpose of these exterior lighting standards is to provide minimum outdoor lighting standards that protect the public safety and the general welfare of the community by **reducing unsafe and unpleasant lighting conditions, such as light trespass and light pollution**, while also promoting the safe and efficient movement of vehicles and pedestrians and the security of local properties. (B)(5) **Light Trespass** Light trespass into the night sky and onto neighboring properties shall be prevented through the use of such techniques as horizontally mounted lamps with reflectors, glass, polycarbonate or acrylic refractors, louvered optics, and houseside shields.

Colonnade – PC – 7/20/21

- Lots are too small. – Reduce open space from 33%
    - CLSC lots are 145ft wide and over 30000 sq ft
    - Old Town lots are 125x138 - .38acre – 16552 sqft.
    - Homes east of CLSC on 700 N. are .5 acre – 120x211 (25000 sq. ft.)
- Price points compared to surrounding homes??
- Density – North of ditch – 5 per acre (204 lots on 40 ac) w/2200 sqft. lots and up to 6 dwellings per building?????
- Lot Count – If Duplexes are counted as **two** lots – Total lot count would be **379** or **3.79/acre**
- Amenity Center – Pool, Playground – minimum of 379 families need a place to recreate…
- Mounds 8-10ft to hide car lights – CLSC homes are 8' above road
- Street Lights – Full cut-off like Sagebrook vs. outdated globe style that produce unsafe and unpleasant lighting conditions, such as light trespass and light pollution.
    - McCordsville Elementary school as well as Outlook Christian church both have incorporated full cut-off lighting.
- No Dusk to Dawn lights. – (no need to light up the dark sky)
- Make sure Beazer is the builder or it doesn't happen.
- Fence separating walking Trail and property on east side PUD.
- Anti-Monotony – They Propose – "Same home shall not be constructed on an adjacent lot or directly across the street"
    - ZO - "A single front elevation shall not be repeated unless it is separated by at least three different front elevations along either side of the same street frontage."
- Director of Planning can approve lower roof pitch and Exterior Cladding Styles – Should be ARC.
- Mandate these statements from the Zoning Ordinance –
    - Pg. 75 3c "The exterior wall surface of the first floor of any multi-story residence shall be masonry"
    - Pg. 75 3(d) At least 50 percent of the front elevation of all residential buildings greater than 1,500 square feet, exclusive of windows, doorways (other than garage doors), and bays, shall be masonry.
    - Pg. 75 3(e) The side and rear elevations of all residences greater than 1,500 square feet that abut a street, open space, trail, or park, shall have at least 50 percent masonry as the exterior building material on all visible elevations.
- 50' buffer measures from where????
- No Remonstrant against boat noise
- Draft PUD Ordinance does not agree with presentation

View of Corn from my House

I am 6 ft tall ☺

From: Ginny Burney
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: concerns regarding Colonnade
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 2:05:38 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

While I appreciate the fact that the diagram now shows the fronts of the houses on the south side of the development to be facing south, I would like to register several concerns about the Colonnade PUD being proposed for the property between W700N and W750N.

If I have interpreted the diagram correctly, there are only 2 entrances and no turn lanes to this area with 291 dwellings. This will likely make the entrances congested, causing a traffic hazard. This is exacerbated by parents picking up their children from school and lining up on W 700 N, effectively making it a one lane road at pick up time each school day afternoon.

There are no sidewalks for pedestrians along the roadways within the development or along W700N or W750N. With the current level and speed of traffic at peak times of day and no development, it can be a hazard to walk one's dog down W 700 N. When 291 homes are added, this problem of where to safely walk the dogs becomes much more significant.

In an earlier presentation, I thought I heard or saw evidence of a park. That amenity made me feel more accepting. I don't see that in the most recent diagram.

I also have concerns about loss of property value with 291 of production type homes across the road from our custom homes on spacious, well-landscaped lots. Cookie cutter houses with standardized designs, shared-type building materials, and common colors and appearances certainly cannot enhance or even approach our current property values. I see the development as having a detrimental effect on our property value.

I am certain there are changes that can be made to still allow a profit for the investors while addressing the concerns mentioned and maintaining the desirability of this area of McCordsville. Please hear these points and insist upon modifications.

Finally, I am concerned with the burgeoning growth within the area and within Town boundaries. How can our infrastructure accommodate the huge influx of all of these new structures and people coming online so quickly? Are the schools in a position to serve all of these children? Can water run off and increased sewage be accommodated by the current systems? Are there enough police and fire personnel to keep us all safe? These concerns need to be addressed in a public forum.

Sincerely,

Ginny Burney

--
Virginia Burney, Ph.D.

High Ability Education
ginnyburney@gmail.com

From: Sean Conboy
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonnade Development
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 10:37:03 PM

Ryan,

I have multiple concern regarding this new development:
- The number of lots/families will cause a current traffic problem on Mt Comfort road to be exponentially worse
- The development will cause further problems at the school for pick ups and drop offs creating a hazard trying to turn left (south) onto Mt Comfort road from W700N
- The amount of homes including the style is not equal to, or even a transition from the Champion Lake properties
- The east-west facing homes on the west side all show side yards and fences to the Champion Lake lots across from them. The "curve/corner" at the southwest of Colonnade should be replaced by a second ingress/egress. There could also be a second entrance with landscaping and correct lighting at the west end of the development.
- Mounding and landscaping are needed along W700N with correct evergreens (no evergreens susceptible to needle cast)

Thank you!

Sean Conboy
5835 W 700 N
McCordsville, IN 46055
317-345-8976

From: Herman, Mindy
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Concerns about Colonade PUD
Date: Friday, July 16, 2021 8:42:51 AM

Ryan,

Hi, thank you for your work to support the town. Please share this in full with Planning and with Town Council.

A. Please make sure we hold all the new requests to the standards the town has set. If we require certain materials, please do not make exceptions. Please look at more variations in each section including more builders and/or some lots reserved for custom properties. Those guidelines are important for us to have high sustainable quality.

B. In addition, the infrastructure of the town should be addressed BEFORE we REZONE, while we can handle R1 this density and volume with the other approvals made by the town are exceeding the capacities of

1. Traffic, especially the intersection of 700 and Mt Comfort; roads need to handle the many additional cars
2. Sewers
3. Parks and Greenspace continuity and locations
4. School capacity

C. Needs of the community, we have multiple friends that are looking for custom home lots of ½ acre to 3 acres. Some of these are outside of McCordsville, colleagues etc. and choosing new location b/c they cannot find readily available R2/R1 building sites and also want to see more greenspace/park options near the lots/land with a more paced growth plan. Others are in existing neighborhoods with high density and looking for more land, quality to stay, but also having trouble getting out of neighborhoods that are PUD b/c of resale value. There is a market need for some larger lots available for custom homes to retain contributors to the town and tax base. We have investments in multiple properties and acreage and feel the community needs to be represented with a strong variety of housing/lots available.

D. Finally, I feel we need to keep the plan that was established re: parks and some R1 or R2 housing near the school as planned. That was a thoughtful plan that included many participants in the community. We need to make sure all commissions are representing the sustainability of the community and not just a tax consideration. I appreciate the strong intelligent town council, town staff, and committee members and their ability to consider the constituents especially those most affected by each item brought forward to their respective committees.

Thank you for your consideration. We will see you at the meeting on Tuesday night.

Mindy

Mindy Herman | Principal | Crowe LLP
Office: + 1, 317.706.2614 | Cell: + 1, 317.507.5516 | mindy.herman@crowe.com
Asst: Jen Lowery | Office: +1, 317.208.2562 | Jen.lowery@crowe.com
https://www.crowe.com/ life-sciences

Notice required by law: This e-mail may constitute an advertisement or solicitation under U.S.

law, if its primary purpose is to advertise or promote a commercial product or service. You may choose not to receive advertising and promotional messages from Crowe LLP (except for the crowe.com website, which tracks e-mail preferences through a separate process) at this e-mail address by forwarding this message to CroweUnsubscribe@crowe.com. If you do so, the sender of this message will be notified promptly. Our principal postal address is 225 W Wacker Drive, Suite 2600, Chicago, IL 60602-4903. This email message is from Crowe LLP or one of its subsidiaries and may contain privileged or confidential information or other information exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email immediately and delete this message without reading further or forwarding to others. This email is not intended to be a contract or other legally binding obligation, and any tax advice expressed in this email should not be construed as a formal tax opinion unless expressly stated. Visit www.crowe.com/disclosure for more information about Crowe LLP and its subsidiaries.

From: Greg Chester
To: Ryan Crum
Subject: Colonnade
Date: Friday, July 16, 2021 10:18:58 AM

Hello, I am writing in regards to the new planned community located east of the elementary school on the north side of West 700 N., called Colonnade. For context, I am a resident in one of the homes at Champion Lake directly south of this development.

I am a relatively new resident to the community having moved here recently from Westfield, Indiana. So far I have been thrilled with my decision to relocate to McCordsville, but the seemingly untethered development of the area without regard to infrastructure, amenities and property values is quite concerning. Having spent most of my adult life living in Fishers, Westfield and other northern suburbs, I think the blueprint for our community is quite clear. Things like green space, population density, civic amenities, civic services, property value levels and related items truly matter in terms of how a community develops and grows. We can be Avon which is an unmitigated disaster or we can be Westfield which is an amazing success story in the making. That future and direction rests with our leadership at the town level.

This parcel of land and its proximity to the town center present the community with an amazing opportunity to launch forward in a positive way. The planned development simply does not make sense. It is going to stress our infrastructure, our roads, our intersections, our police, our fire services and our schools. It is a selfish plan by a greedy developer to maximize their profits without regard to the neighbors, the community, and the future of our town.

I believe that more green space is needed, consideration of the value of homes adjacent to the property, and the quality of these homes are all important considerations. Low quality, low value homes on this property does not make sense. Yes we need to make access to housing available to our residents. You have accommodated this obligation through your approval of various other communities in Our town. We have enough vinyl villages under construction and tremendous land availability outside of the areas adjacent to the town center.

I believe it is time to draw a line in the sand with respect to this development to ensure that property values, town amenities, civic services, and the path forward for the growth and development of our community are squarely considered. This piece of land could be a tremendous asset to the town and the community. I understand the desire to bring residence close to the town center, but jamming them into shoebox size homes and multi family residences that are low value and low quality is not the answer.

I am pleading with you to put the brakes on this development and to see the tremendous opportunity that lies ahead with respect to this piece of property.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Mobile: (317) 407-5518
Email: gchester@doz.net

--

Confidentiality Note: This email and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for addressee. The information may also be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this email or any attachment is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete this

message and all attachments immediately, and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

Thank you for your cooperation,
Dauby O'Connor & Zaleski, LLC