

DEKALB COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PLANNING • BUILDING • GIS

301 S. Union St., Auburn IN 46706

Planning: 260.925.1923 • Building: 260.925.3021 • GIS: 260.927.2356 • Fax: 260.927.4791

AGENDA

DeKalb County Plan Commission

Commissioners Court – 2nd Floor DeKalb County Court House

Wednesday, April 19, 2023

8:30 AM

1. Roll call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of Minutes: February 15, 2023
4. Consideration of Claims: February 2023, March 2023

AutoCAD Renewal	\$430.00
InDesign Renewal	\$450.00
Office Supplies	\$355.35
Mileage – Paul White	\$68.00
Ben Davis Oil Change	\$86.47
Lassus Fuel	\$759.02
The Star News Subscription	\$299.00
Verizon	\$153.36
ICC Membership Dues	\$145.00
APA Membership Dues	\$347.00
Auburn Building Inspections	\$45.00
Westwood Car Wash	\$25.00
Payroll	\$40,273.72
TOTAL:	\$43,436.92

5. Old Business: None
6. New Business:
 - Discussion of Unified Development Ordinance:
 - CSES Overlay: Landscape Buffer Requirement (Section 3.13 H(c)(1)(a) & (b))
 - Section 1.14: Establishment of Standard Zoning Districts
 - Section 2.03: Conservation Agricultural (A2) District Uses
 - Section 6.01: Subdivision Design Standards
 - Discussion of current policies & Rules of Procedure
 - Remove fees from UDO & move to an appendix of Rules of Procedure
 - Confidentiality Agreements
 - HB1167: Livestreaming of meetings (July 1, 2023 start)
7. Reports from Officers, Committees, Staff or Town/City Liaisons
8. Comments from Public in Attendance

9. Adjournment

Next Meeting: May 17, 2023

If you cannot attend, please contact Andrea Noll:

Anoll@co.dekalb.in.us | (260) 925-1923

***PLEASE ENTER THROUGH THE NORTH DOOR OF
COURTHOUSE LOCATED ON SEVENTH STREET.**

****No cellphones, tablets, laptops or weapons permitted.**

MINUTES
DEKALB COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday February 15, 2023

The Regular Meeting of the DeKalb County Plan Commission was called to order at 7:01 p.m. in the DeKalb County Commissioner's Courtroom by Zoning Administrator, Chris Gaumer.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Angie Holt, Frank Pulver, Bill Van Wye, Mike Watson, Glenn Crawford, Jerry Yoder, Jason Carnahan, Elysia Rodgers, Sandy Harrison, and Suzanne Davis.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Planning Commission Attorney Andrew Kruse, Director/Zoning Administrator Chris Gaumer, and Secretary Andrea Noll.

Community Representatives Present: Don Myers (Auburn)

Public in Attendance: Bob Glick, Melvin Steury, Tim Maldeney, Curtis Nordick, Heath Hoow, Stacy Wayne, Nathan Hook, Jerry Hook, William Miles, Sherrill Miles, Brian Capp, Lloyd Graber, Karl & Erin Reith, Andrew Provines, Johnathan & Jessica Shull, David Capp, Judith Capp, Nicole Steury, Josh Ayers, Craig Steury, Janet Provines, David Dowden, Reed Davis, Amy Prosser, Jim Finon, Jeff Morr, Beth Holman, Susan Lawrence, Joe & Teresa Ellert, Don & Ronni Cumings, Tina Krafft, Brett Munsey, Briar Munsey, Jessica Harty, Justin Reinig, Jerry Thomas, Nathan Wiles, Lucas & Sarah Shake, Dawn Schrader, Jennifer Hathaway, Trena Roudebush, Larry Williams, Kelly Pacifico, Angela Provines, Amy Hampel, Sara Shull, Dave & Ruth Walters, Hilliard Munsey, Chip Hampel, Jeff & Vickie Tuttle, Brent Houser, Ben Steury, Larry Kimmel, Jake Feters, Josh & Kelly Kneller, Lynn Reinhart, Todd Goings, Bridget Ortiz, Kathryn Bassett, and Sarah Delbecq.

Jason Carnahan led The Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mike Watson moved to approve the January 17, 2023 meeting minutes. Seconded by Bill Van Wye. None opposed. Motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS:

Jason Carnahan inquired about a motion to approve January 2023 claims, totaling \$49,430.86. Sandy Harrison motioned to approve with a second from Frank Pulver. None Opposed. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

None.

BEFORE NEW BUSINESS:

Jason Carnahan advised the board and the large public in attendance of how the rest of the meeting would be administered.

NEW BUSINESS:

Petition # 23-03: DeKalb County Commissioners requesting a Text Amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance regarding revisions to the Commercial Solar Energy Systems (CSES) Overlay District, Article 3, Section 3.09-3.13.

Chris Gaumer informed the public in attendance that 20 extra copies of the staff report for the Textual Amendments were provided prior to the meeting. Mr. Gaumer then explained to the public in attendance, the basic roles and responsibilities of the DeKalb County Plan Commission regarding text amendments and Indiana Code. He then outlined the 7 proposed amendments the County Commissioners have requested to the Plan Commission via power point slides.

Those amendments being:

- Total Acreage
- Approval Process & Fire Protection Plan
- Decommissioning (Bond type/percentage & Insurance)
- Setbacks: Non-Participating Land Owners
- Height Restrictions
- Visual Buffer & Landscaping
- Wildlife Corridors

Mr. Gaumer reminded the board that there are no findings of fact; only that the Plan Comm has to pay reasonable regard to: The Comprehensive Plan, Conditions and Character of the current structures and uses in each district, the most desirable use for which the land is adapted, and the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction and responsible development and growth.

Jason Carnahan initiated discussions between the board members regarding the amendments and to direct any questions to Commissioner representative , Mike Watson.

Mike Watson briefly explained the origin behind the amendments. At the end of the original ordinance, those amendments were presented by Commissioner Hartman, after some discussion between the commissioners, to lower the percentage of the bond, raise the height and make some buffer changes.

Mr. Watson explained that when he went back through to make the current red-lined changes, he just restored the changes back to their original ordinance language (with the exception of the panels and technology changes). He checked with the solar companies regarding the 12-foot height requirement to make sure it was feasible. Mr. Watson welcomed any questions from the board members.

Bill Van Wye inquired about the panel height reduction and landscape berm height.

Mr. Watson clarified that the solar company will be using a different panel than they had originally proposed, to be compliant with the decreased height. The technology change allows for the lower height requirement, which also allows the landscape berms to be shorter.

Mr. Van Wye asked if there were any restrictions on where they can put the inverter that switches it to the power line; he stated that someone had asked him to clarify at the meeting.

Mr. Watson advised that there were not.

Mr. Gaumer replied that there was a noise restriction (how high the sound decibels can be) for the solar equipment/machines but not a location requirement.

Mr. Watson indicated that the restrictions are part of the approval process for the Plan Comm.

Mr. Carnahan asked if they initially had something in the ordinance about the height of supporting structures as well, because now the wording only includes the panels.

Mr. Gaumer stated that the supporting structure height requirements were in the original text that the Plan Comm sent to the commissioners. He would have to look and see exactly if it was in the ordinance.

Mr. Carnahan suggested that a supporting structures height requirement should at least be entered as a subcategory to the panel height.

Mr. Watson clarified that it was not in the ordinance that he redlined.

Mr. Gaumer confirmed with Mr. Watson's statement, but reiterated that it was in the ordinance that the Plan Commission gave a recommendation to the county commissioners on and that it had been removed. So, the Plan Commission removed any other equipment associated with the CSES as a height restriction.

Referencing a packet (exhibit #2 on the exhibit list) from the Sculpin Solar Project (Sarah Massara), Sandy Harrison addressed Mr. Watson regarding panel height.

Mr. Watson responded that if there's a change that needs to be made, it has to be made by the commissioners and then sent back to Plan Commission. Mrs. Harrison understood.

Chris Gaumer advised that in our ordinance under 3.13, the approval process – "B., b. 1., a-j." states what applicants for the CSES cannot receive waivers from. Height is not included in the text of that section. Meaning, they could request a waiver from the Plan Commission to allow for 15-foot (or whichever height they would need), panel height. The applicant would also need to create a landscape buffer that would screen that panel at its maximum tilt.

Sandy Harrison then asked Mr. Gaumer if it would be easier to give them a 14-foot height; and if they came in at 12 feet, that would be good.

Mr. Gaumer advised that's something that would have to be a comment (not a recommendation) back to the County Commissioners on if they would send it back to the Plan Commission again, with a further revision.

Glenn Crawford inquired about who determines which landscape buffer is used.

Mr. Gaumer responded that the Plan Commission and the Zoning Administrator would during the Development Plan Process.

Mike Watson stated that the landscape plan has to be submitted as part of the Development Plan, which is then considered by the Plan Commission. Mr. Gaumer agreed.

Suzanne Davis referenced the Sculpin document where it mentions "...larger setbacks beyond those necessary to reflect the property rights and needs of neighboring non-participating landowners remove even more land from production agricultural use." Which, some find to be counter-productive. Mrs. Davis wondered if that was something that has been considered.

Mr. Watson confirmed that what Mrs. Davis said, was something that he considered (though he couldn't speak for the other 2 commissioners), when he made the original redline suggestions.

Bill Van Wye inquired if noise was the reasoning behind the increased setbacks for non-participating landowners. He questioned why it was changed to 800 feet.

Mr. Watson stated that he couldn't speak on that because he didn't know what the thought process was behind that suggestion.

Mr. Crawford asked who determined the acreage cap in the county. Rather, how the number of 6,000 acres was determined.

Mr. Watson replied that again, he couldn't speak on that because he wasn't the one who made that recommendation.

Jason Carnahan asked if there was any more discussion from the board; and/or questions for Mike Watson.

Mrs. Davis wanted to add that she liked the addition of the fire protection: the inclusion of the fire departments and the fire districts in the approval process. Mike Watson agreed.

Mrs. Harrison asked if that was in Section 9.

Mr. Gaumer responded that they can't request a waiver from that specific approval, but it is in the Development Plan Approval Process in Section 9. They have to obtain written approval from the fire department. This amendment does require an actual Fire Protection Plan.

Frank Pulver asked who would be approving/rejecting if they apply for a waiver.

Mr. Gaumer, Mr. Carnahan, and Mr. Watson all responded: the Plan Commission.

Mr. Pulver asked if it would then return to the Commissioners for approval.

Chris Gaumer clarified that the Development Plan is strictly an approval of the Plan Commission only. The Commissioners, with the recommendation of the Plan Commission, can only adopt the Overlay District. All of these development standards are the responsibility of the Plan Commission to require and uphold.

Frank Pulver inquired how all of the panel height changes came about and how it related to the new technology.

Mr. Gaumer explained that all of that will be in the Development Plan. We require them to give us details of what those panels will look like, how they work, what the maximum tilt will be, etc.

Bill Van Wye inquired if they (for example) lease 80 acres, and there's 20 acres of woods on that property, can they intrude on those woods.

Mr. Gaumer replied that there is an Indiana Code that allows for property owners to harvest on that land.

Suzanne Davis had a question about the agreements that have already been reached with property owners by the solar companies, and if these setbacks affect what those agreements were. She asked if there is any liability to the county.

Attorney Andrew Kruse replied by clarifying her question. If this causes some of the land not to be used than they had originally thought to be used, they would then have to change the amount of land used. Mr. Kruse concluded that he didn't think that the county could be sued; that the main risk of litigation would be if someone had a completed project application totally completed, then we change the ordinance after that. He believes that the case law in Indiana that he researched, said that they would get to operate under that older, original ordinance. But, right now we have no completed applications, so he doesn't think that would apply.

Glenn Crawford asked why the setbacks were the same for a house compared to just a storage barn with no occupancy.

Mike Watson suggested that the language specifies "dwelling."

Mr. Gaumer confirmed that it does.

Mr. Watson stated that a barn, alone on a tract, would not be a primary dwelling.

Jason Carnahan questioned the reasoning for having 200 feet next to industrial and why we wouldn't maximize that space.

Mr. Gaumer responded that that was what the language had said previously in the ordinance (prior to this redline). Also, that setback offers protection from whatever is made/stored in that building.

Mr. Carnahan inquired how to determine which one of the industrial company's buildings is considered the primary structure on that parcel.

Mr. Gaumer clarified that they would look at the overall footprint of the structures on that specific parcel.

Mr. Carnahan asked if that 200-ft setback could be negotiated down like the other setbacks.

Mr. Gaumer stated that would just be for residential dwellings; only non-participating landowners are able to negotiate. Our ordinance, as it is currently, they couldn't negotiate that type of setback.

Mr. Watson clarified that only non-participating landowners and participating landowners can agree to a lesser setback if they so desire. That would be a private agreement between the solar companies and the property owners.

Jerry Yoder asked Mr. Gaumer if he could clarify the wildlife corridors amendment again.

Mr. Gaumer explained that they would have to leave an area open for wildlife to pass through large tracts of land, which would be determined during the technical review process or during the Plan Commission meeting.

Bill Van Wye reminded Jerry Yoder that it would be their choice (as PC Members) on the development plan, where to place those corridors.

Mike Watson stated that those were concerns that were expressed by the public. The freedom of movement of wildlife was an important issue.

Mr. Van Wye inquired about the easements on either side of the tiles.

Chris Gaumer confirmed that there would have to be open easements on either side of the tiles unless otherwise stated by the Drainage Board.

Mr. Watson stated that, generally, the Drainage Board would give a variance around 40 feet in most circumstances, and that 75 feet from the tile or from the top of the bank is the normal easement.

Jason Carnahan questioned why they don't have more joint discussions between the two bodies, prior to the public hearings. He stated that it seems like they could collaborate a little better during the development process, instead of going back and forth between the PC and the Commissioners.

Mr. Watson advised that a portion of the process is statutory and there's nothing that precludes a joint Commissioner & PC meeting. Mr. Carnahan added that we've had one joint meeting before.

Mr. Carnahan opened public discussion (**in favor of** the proposed amendments) for 15 minutes, with each speaker only having 3 minutes each.

Jessica Shull spoke in favor of the proposed amendments; clarified the cap on acreage to align with the Comprehensive Plan, the increase in setbacks to help preserve property values, and if there's a cap on acreage, there isn't a worry of using or wasting empty land.

Lucas Shake spoke in favor of the acreage cap, setback changes, and the Fire Protection Plan.

Jessica Harty spoke in favor of the Decommissioning Bond being upheld.

Nicole Steury spoke in favor of the proposed amendments and protecting the non-participating and the participating landowners.

Tina Krafft spoke on the acreage cap, wildlife corridors, and the setback changes.

Jeff Moore spoke against solar in general.

Mr. Carnahan opened public discussion (**against** the proposed amendments) for 15 minutes, with each speaker only having 3 minutes each.

Chip Hampel spoke against the amendments as a whole.

Ben Steury spoke against the setbacks and wasting property because of those. He also presented poster-sized graphs.

Larry Kimmel spoke in favor of the setbacks from 2021.

Dawn Schrader spoke against land being taken away.

Reed Davis spoke in reference to the setbacks.

Jim Finon spoke against the proposed amendments.

Trena Roudebush spoke in regards to the setback changes.

Mr. Carnahan closed the public hearing and welcomed any discussion from the County Commissioners present or from the Plan Commission members.

Glenn Crawford asked if the proposed setbacks could still be farmed.

Jason Carnahan stated that he didn't think that there was a clear answer on that.

Chris Gaumer responded that theoretically the setbacks could be farmed; it would be up to the private property owner and the solar company that's leasing the land, to what happens in those setbacks.

Sandy Harrison commented that she would be concerned about the farming equipment damaging the solar equipment.

Mr. Gaumer reported that the Plan Commission had received quite a few e-mails for and against the proposed amendments that he forwarded to the Plan Commission members as he was receiving them, until 2:00pm today. All members acknowledged they had received them.

Mr. Carnahan advised that there are not actual Findings of Fact for a text amendment. He asked the board if they had any more comments or questions before he would entertain a motion.

Andrew Kruse reported the Jurisdictional Findings, to have Secretary Andrea Noll confirm that the legal notice of the hearing was published in The Star on February 3, 2023 and the publisher's affidavit had been given to staff. Mrs. Noll confirmed.

Mr. Carnahan then asked for a motion to forward on to the County Commissioners.

IT IS, THEREFORE, THE DECISION OF THE PLAN COMMISSION THAT THIS TEXT AMENDMENT, PETITION # 23-03, FOR REVISIONS TO THE COMMERCIAL SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEMS (CSES) OVERLAY DISTRICT, ARTICLE 3, SECTION 3.09-3.13, IS HEREBY CERTIFYING A NON-FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ON THIS 15TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2023.

Motion made by: Sandra Harrison Seconded by: Jerry Yoder

Vote tally: Yes: 8 No: 1 (Angie Holt)

Jason Carnahan – President

Frank Pulver – Vice President

Bill Van Wye

Mike Watson

Sandra Harrison

Angie Holt

Glenn Crawford

Jerry Yoder

Suzanne Davis

Mr. Gaumer asked the board if they would like to have any comments forwarded to the County Commissioners at their public hearing on February 27, 2023 at 6pm.

Sandy Harrison read a letter she had written against the proposed amendments.

Suzanne Davis explained why she doesn't agree with the proposed changes.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, COMMITTEES, STAFF OR TOWN/CITY LIAISONS:

Mike Watson briefed the board about the City of Auburn's Plan Commission meeting last night.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mike Watson motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Bill Van Wye.

Jason Carnahan adjourned the meeting at 8:21 p.m.

President – Jason Carnahan

Secretary – Andrea Noll

Zoning Districts

1.14 Establishment of Standard Zoning Districts

Each of the standard districts in this Unified Development Ordinance stands alone and are not a part of a hierarchical or pyramidal system of zoning. Only those uses which are expressly permitted, and development standards assigned to each district apply to that zoning district. For the purpose of this Unified Development Ordinance, DeKalb County is divided into the following zoning districts for the general purposes as stated:

Zoning District Abbreviation	Zoning District Name	Zoning District Purpose
OP	Open Space and Parks	This district is established for open space, parks, trails and recreational areas.
A1	Conservation Agricultural	This district is established for the protection of agricultural areas and buildings associated with agricultural production.
A2	Agricultural	This district is established for agricultural areas and buildings associated with agricultural production; also allows for some small infusion of non-agricultural single-family detached homes in areas where impact on agriculture and rural character is minimal.
A3	High Intensity Agricultural	This district is established for high intensity agricultural operations and/or for special agricultural operations likely to have a significant adverse impact on surrounding non-agricultural uses.
A4	Agricultural Business	This district is established for business and industrial uses directly related to agriculture and compatible with location in rural/agricultural areas.
RE	Rural Estate	This district is established for single-family detached homes in a rural or country setting.
R1	Low Density Residential	This district is established for single-family detached homes with medium to large sized lots.
R2	Medium Density Residential	This district is established for single-family detached homes with small to medium sized lots.
R3	Village Residential	This district is established for existing older, single-family detached and limited multiple-family residential lots found in small unincorporated towns or villages.
M1	Multiple-Family Residential	This district is established for small-scale, two and three-family housing units.
M2	Multiple-Family Residential	This district is established for apartment complexes, row houses, and townhouses.
MP	Manufactured Home Park	This district is established for leased lot developments which typically lease dwelling sites for single-wide and double-wide manufactured homes.
IN	Institutional	This district is established for institutional and municipal owned lands for public purpose and use.
C1	Village Commercial	This district is established for existing business uses in small unincorporated towns or villages.
C2	Neighborhood Commercial	This district is established for the provision of small scale retail goods and services required for regular or daily convenience of nearby neighborhoods and agricultural areas.
C3	General Commercial	This district is established for a wide variety of retail, business, service, entertainment and eating establishments.
C4	Highway Commercial	This district is established for commercial uses that are closely related to the special needs of the travelling public, interstate commerce, trucking and, in general, vehicular traffic along interstates and major state highways.
I1	Industrial/Business Park	This district is established for a mixture of office and low intensity industrial uses.
I2	Low Intensity Industrial	This district is established for low intensity industrial uses and light manufacturing facilities.
I3	High Intensity Industrial	This district is established for high intensity industrial uses and heavy manufacturing facilities.
HI	High Impact	This district is established for uses that typically have a high impact to the community.
AP1	Airport, Non-Municipal	This district is established for privately-owned aviation uses and associated facilities.
AP2	Airport, Municipal	This district is established for municipally owned and managed aviation uses and associated facilities.
AP3	Airport Business	This district is established for business and/or industrial uses related to aviation and compatible with location in areas near an airport.

Conservation Agricultural (A1) District

2.03 A1 District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Exception Uses

District Intent	Permitted Uses	Special Exception Uses
<p>The A1 (Conservation Agricultural) District is intended to be used as follows:</p> <p>Use Type and Intensity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agricultural operations <p>Application of Zoning District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing agricultural land <p>Development Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognize the need for strict development standards to maximize protection of agricultural practices <p>Appropriate Adjacent Zoning Districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OP, A1, A2, A3, A4, RE, R1, R2, R3, M1, M2, IN, AP1, AP2, and AP3 <p>Plan Commission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should use this zoning district for existing developments • strive to protect these areas from residential, commercial, and industrial encroachment <p>Board of Zoning Appeals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aggressively protect the integrity of these agricultural areas 	<p>Accessory Permitted Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • home based business <p>Agricultural Permitted Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agricultural crop production • confined feeding operation - up to two (2) times Indiana Department of Environmental Management CAFO numbers • orchard • raising of farm animals • sale of agricultural product • storage buildings: agricultural • storage of agricultural product • tree farm <p>Industrial Permitted Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • telecommunication facility <p>Residential Permitted Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • child care, home • dwelling, manufactured home • dwelling, single family • farmstead • storage buildings: private, non-accessory 	<p>Accessory Special Exception Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dependent housing <p>Agricultural Special Exception Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stable, commercial <p>Commercial Special Exception Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wind energy system <p>Industrial Special Exception Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gravel/sand processing <p>Residential Special Exception Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fair housing facility (small)

Subdivision Introduction

6.01 Design Standards Overview

The below table provides an overview of the major design standards that apply to each type of subdivision. The second table identifies the effect on development standards.

Subdivision Overview							
	Minor Subdivision	Conventional Subdivision	Conservation Subdivision	Traditional Subdivision	Strip Commercial	Commercial District Subdivision	Industrial Park Subdivision
	MN	CV	CS	TD	SC	CM	IP
Minimum Pre-Development Area	N/A	2 acres	20 acres	40 acres	2 acres	2 acres	2 acres
Maximum Pre-Development Site Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	200 acres	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maximum Lot Splits from Parent Tract	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minimum Perimeter Landscaping	N/A	30 feet	50 feet	20 feet	10 feet	10 feet	30 feet
Minimum Open Space	N/A	15%	35%	15%	8%	10%	12%
Minimum Block Length	N/A	200 feet	200 feet	200 feet	200 feet	200 feet	200 feet
Maximum Block Length	N/A	1,320 feet	1,760 feet	1,056 feet	1,000 feet	N/A	1,320 feet
Minimum Cul-de-sac Length	N/A	150 feet	100 feet	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	100 feet
Maximum Cul-de-sac Length	N/A	500 feet	1,000 feet	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	660 feet
Internal Street Sidewalks	N/A	Required; 2-Sided	Required; 1-Sided/Optional 2-Sided	Required; 2-Sided	Required; 1-Sided/Optional 2-Sided	Required; 1-Sided/Optional 2-Sided	Required; 1-Sided/Optional 2-Sided
Perimeter Street Sidewalks/Paths	When Required	When Required	When Required	When Required	When Required	When Required	When Required
Minimum Right-of-Way on Internal Streets	N/A	60 feet	54 feet on Main Streets/44 feet on Secondary Streets	56 feet with one parking lane/62 feet with 2 parking lanes	50 feet for public streets/34 feet for private streets	50 feet for public streets/34 feet for private streets	60 feet
Maximum Design Speed	N/A	35 MPH	35 MPH	30 MPH	35 MPH	35 MPH	40 MPH
Minimum Road Width	N/A	28 feet	22 feet	30 feet	24 feet	24 feet	26 feet
On-Street Parking	N/A	Required; 1-Sided/Optional 2-Sided	Not Permitted	Required; 1-Sided/Optional 2-Sided	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted
Minimum Tree Plot Width	5 feet	5 feet	5 feet	7 feet Residential Areas/0 feet Commercial	5 feet	5 feet	5 feet
Minimum Sidewalk	4 feet	4 feet	4 feet	5 feet	4 feet	4 feet	4 feet

Subdivision Introduction (continued)

Effect on Development Standards							
	Minor Subdivision	Conventional Subdivision	Conservation Subdivision	Traditional Subdivision	Strip Commercial	Commercial District Subdivision	Industrial Park Subdivision
	MN	CV	CS	TD	SC	CM	IP
Lot Sizes	None	None	Reduction of 25%	Reduction of 50-70%	None	None	None
Front Yard Setbacks	None	None	None	Reduction of 75-100%	None	None	None
Side Yard Setbacks	None	None	Reduction of 25%	Reduction of 50% of 5 feet; whichever is greater	None	None	None
Density	None	None	Increase by 10%	Increase by 50%	None	None	None

6.02 Prerequisite Zoning

The below table identifies the prerequisite zoning necessary to apply for each type of subdivision.

Effect on Development Standards							
	Minor Subdivision	Conventional Subdivision	Conservation Subdivision	Traditional Subdivision	Strip Commercial	Commercial District Subdivision	Industrial Park Subdivision
	MN	CV	CS	TD	SC	CM	IP
OP	X						
A1	X						
A2	X						
A3	X						
A4	X						
RE	X	X	X				
R1	X	X	X	X			
R2	X	X	X	X			
R3	X	X		X			
M1	X	X		X			
M2	X			X			
MP	X						
IN	X			X		X	
C1	X			X	X	X	
C2	X			X	X	X	
C3	X				X	X	
C4	X				X	X	
I1	X						X
I2	X						X
I3	X						X
HI	X						X
AP1	X						
AP2	X						
AP3	X				X	X	X