

MINUTES
ELKHART COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD ON THE 14TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2008 AT 9:00 A.M.
MEETING ROOM – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING
4230 ELKHART ROAD, GOSHEN, INDIANA

1. The regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission was called to order by the Chairperson, Jeff Burbrink, with the following members present: Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Dennis Sharkey, Blake Doriot, and Mike Yoder. Staff members present were: Robert Watkins, Plan Director; Mark Kanney, Planning Manager; Duane Burrow, Senior Planner; Robert Nemeth, Planner; Dan Piehl, Planner; and James W. Kolbus, Attorney for the Board.

2. A motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Yoder*) that the minutes of the regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission held on the 10th day of January 2008 be approved as submitted and the motion was carried unanimously.

3. A motion was made and seconded (*Miller/Sharkey*) that the legal advertisements, having been published on the 26th day of January 2008 in the Goshen News and on the 2nd day of February 2008 in The Elkhart Truth, be approved as read. The motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

4. A motion was made and seconded (*Miller/Doriot*) that the Elkhart County Zoning Ordinance and Elkhart County Subdivision Control Ordinance be accepted as evidence for today's hearings. With a unanimous vote, the motion was carried.

5. The application for a zone map change from M-1 PUD to M-1, for *Forest River, Inc.* represented by Wightman Petrie, Inc., on property located on the Northeast corner of CR 1 and Old US 20, common address of 55470 CR 1 in Cleveland Township, was presented at this time.

Mr. Nemeth presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #20081027*.

Mr. Burbrink asked if the railroad to the north is active, but Mr. Nemeth was not sure. Mr. Doriot said yes, but that it is not very active.

* (*It is noted that board member Tom Lantz arrived for the meeting at this time.*)

Present on behalf of this request representing Forest River was Ken Jones of Wightman Petrie, Inc., 4703 Chester Drive, Elkhart. He also noted that Mike Stump, the property manager for Forest River, Inc., is also present.

A revised site plan was then displayed and submitted to the Board [*attached to file as Petitioner Exhibit #1*]. Mr. Jones then explained that this is another phase of expansion for the firm. Forest River is the largest single employer in the county at this point in time with approximately 5,700 people working for them. This is hailing another phase of expansion for the company, particularly targeted in the Elkhart area. A lot of new facilities have been built in the last several years by Forest River in Goshen, Topeka, Lagrange County, and Millersburg. This will be a push in Elkhart to bring some of the jobs home and expand their operation.

The 100,000 sq. ft. building will be dedicated to RV manufacturing, which is Forest River's principal source of business. The site could expand in the future from the first single building because they have plenty of room to grow, which is one of the reasons why they are approaching the Plan Commission with a straight rezoning as opposed to a GPUD. One of the things that

happens in the industry is they need to react quickly due to building construction projects going from zero to under construction in a short period of time, so they would like that flexibility.

Mr. Nemeth did talk about previous re-zonings on the site and Mr. Jones indicated they are familiar with those. In 1996, there was a PUD on the easterly portion of the property, which was for storage of the finished projects.

The site will be fully served by municipal utilities from the City of Elkhart and that discussion has already begun. They plan to annex the property upon construction, but typically the City of Elkhart wants the building to be finished before they bring it in.

Site development standards will include those that apply from the Elkhart County Ordinance as well as the City of Elkhart. From the city, there will be a little more of a review regarding buffers, stormwater management, noise, operation, site lighting, and site security. A significant portion of the property is already fenced, but Mr. Jones indicated they will maintain that and add in fencing where it's needed.

The buffer north of the south property line will be extended approximately 100 ft. on the eastern portion of the property. They will commit to meet with the property owners on the southern border so they are aware of the buffer area. In most cases, the homes are located approximately 200 ft. from their property line as it is, but there will be additional buffering. There will be a two to four ft. mound added with plantings, which will be in accordance with the city ordinance. Mr. Jones is asking for the PUD designations to be removed from the properties so they can have a straight M-1 zoning. The offering of the self imposed conditions are allowed under the re-zoning.

Mr. Doriot asked if there is a swale between the two parcels and Mr. Jones said he doesn't think so. Mr. Miller indicated there is a ditch there. Mr. Doriot asked if they will maintain the drainage coming through and Mr. Jones said they will be required to follow the requirements of Elkhart County and the City of Elkhart. The existing drainage patterns will have to be maintained or managed. Mr. Jones said they agree with the Staff's Recommendation and asked that the Board send them to the Commissioners with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. Sharkey pointed out that staff has recommended a 50 ft. no build buffer and asked if he is willing to make that 100 ft. Mr. Jones said it would be a linear 50 ft. and they are going to extend it another 50 ft. north. He indicated they would add that to the subdivision plat which has been filed so the agreement can be formalized.

Mr. Miller asked if there is an issue with water in the area. The petitioner clarified that the ditch is north of the tracks and there is only a retention area on site. Mr. Jones' familiarity with the site is limited, but when they get into the design of site, then they will discover all of those details. From his experience on other sites in the area, he doesn't foresee any trouble with permeability and soils because it's all sandy. Sewer and water hook-up is also available in the area.

Terry Karre, 29741 Old US 20, Elkhart, was present to express some concerns. Mr. Karre pointed out the location of his property on the aerial photo. He indicated that the factory wakes him up at 6:00 a.m. every morning. There is a mound behind the building which is fifteen ft. tall, but he can still hear the phones and intercoms early in the morning.

Mr. Karre doesn't have a problem with them expanding their facility. He indicated he created the last piece of property Forest River bought with Beau Mitchell. At the time, he understood that it would only be parking. Expanding isn't the problem, but he is worried about the water table. There is a lot of rusty water in the area and the neighboring property owners are on wells.

They would be non-objective to it if Forest River is interested in buying the three properties and making it all commercial. Having three property owners backed up against the warehouse could change the property values.

The Board asked how deep his well is and Mr. Karre said 30 ft. to 70 ft. deep. He then pointed out a location on the aerial photo where a natural spring comes out, so there is a lot of water movement through there.

Mr. Yoder questioned the location of the mound. Mr. Karre said they put a mound on the south side of the subject property which is around 15 ft. tall. He doesn't feel that adding another 10 ft. on top of the existing mound will reduce the noise. As the expansion happens, Mr. Karre doesn't want the properties to be boxed in. The three properties he is representing today were pointed out on the aerial photo.

Also present with some concerns was Jim Morauski, 29773 Old US 20, Elkhart. He explained that he lives on the lot to the east of the corporate offices and west of Mr. Karre's property, which he pointed out on the map. He explained that all of the vegetation of the 50 ft. buffer goes up the side of the hill and they are already taking a portion of his hill away. The 50 ft. buffer won't allow the hill to stay. The trees that are now 12-14 ft. high will be gone as well. Mr. Morauski would rather have the 100 ft. buffer so the existing hill can stay with the existing trees and vegetation that are on it.

Ray Petit, 29675 Old US 20, Elkhart, was present to voice some concerns on this request. Mr. Petit pointed out his property on the aerial photo and said he can see where the new building is going to go from his backyard. He has lived in the house for his entire life and has noticed the water getting rusty in the past few years. He's not sure why, but he thinks it is from all of the new development. He assumes the drainage from the new building will go into the city system. The bank that goes into the river is known as Spring Hill and does have freshwater.

When Manchester Tank expanded, Mr. Petit was present for the public hearing and an extra 100 ft. to the rear was given to the neighboring property owners. He too is concerned what will happen to their drinking water. The 50 ft. natural buffer zone is enough. When Manchester Tank expanded, he said 100 ft. (to back of their properties) was given to them. Pine trees and a chain link fence were also put up in consideration for their expansion.

Mr. Petit asked Forest River for a mound system with landscape and trees, which they have kindly agreed to extend. He wants to make sure that it is put in writing. There is an existing landscape mound, but it's only around two to three ft. There is also an existing dirt mound that isn't landscaped and is eroding away. He would like a six to eight ft. buffer with landscaping and pine trees on top.

Mr. Miller asked if it's currently more than 50 ft. and Mr. Petit said about 20 ft., so he knows it can go higher without having erosion problems.

Lavern Werner, 29713 Old US 20, Elkhart, was present in opposition of this request. Mr. Werner said when Manchester Tank came in years ago for a rezoning, they talked about putting in a buffer zone and it would be quiet, but it never happened. Now they want to rezone the property and put a factory behind him. He is concerned they will want to put in a warehouse and the value of his property will devalue. If the spring becomes polluted, Mr. Werner said their water table will be ruined.

In rebuttal, Mr. Jones said apparently there were some commitments made at the time the property was being developed by R.W. Strefling. They were providing space for the Glaval operation to expand their finished product and storage area. Mr. Jones can't promise that putting a

manufacturing zone in the proposed M-1 zone won't have impact on the adjoining residential properties. Their goal is to try and minimize the impact the best they can and they will meet the standards which are imposed upon them by the Ordinance since the PUD will be removed. They feel comfortable that those standards will be adequate for the land use.

The three property owners to the south were the original petitioners on the rezoning in 1996 and they sold their land to Strefling to allow the rezoning to occur. There was an opportunity to be more proactive and controlling of the adjoining property owners at that time, but now it is 12 years later and there has to be some growth and change in use on properties. This request is a natural evolution of the site and he indicated they will no longer store vans there.

Mr. Jones indicated they will try their best to be a good neighbor. Between the time of the Plan Commission meeting today and the Commissioners meeting in March, they will meet with the property owners again to make sure they do everything they can to buffer their properties. Forest River can make commitments to the neighboring property owners with regard to lighting and speakers, but they will begin operation before 6:00 a.m.

In regards to the groundwater issue, Mr. Jones said he's not familiar with any issue in the area. He indicated the neighbors do have the potential for connection to city utilities and he offered to help them with that. They will look at the changing conditions on the site and see if they have anything to do with the neighbors experiencing rusty water. The petitioner believes the wells are beyond the depth that the site run-off would have any effect. They will be required to filter, store, and release storm water according to standards and they will not release to the city storm water because there is no outlet there.

Mr. Jones said this is a very typical site development in the manufacturing land use category and they will be required to meet all of the standards that are currently in place. The standards are very adequate and they can follow those without any issues on this site.

Mr. Warner asked what emissions will be allowed from this plant. Mr. Jones said a typical RV facility in Elkhart County has to meet a set of strict standards regarding their emissions. The emissions are controlled by state and local requirements. He is not expecting any odor issues and they will be required to comply with the local standards, including the City of Elkhart standards. Any emissions will be under an IDEM permit.

Mr. Yoder asked when the property was initially sold and rezoned, what limitations were placed on the PUD. Mr. Jones said in Ordinance 96-29, there was a stipulation under Section 5 that a site development plan be limited to parking and finished products of Glaval, with all other uses to be considered a major change to the site development plan. It meant that the property owner would have to come back to the Plan Commission to discuss any change in that use.

When asked by the Board about the requested buffer, Mr. Jones said the 50 ft. buffer is double what Elkhart County or Elkhart City would require. Forest River agreed to do twice as much of a buffer as what was required, plus additional work on the development of the buffer to provide adequate room. Mr. Jones doesn't think there will be an advantage of adding another 50 ft. because it's already adequate as is. They have done a complete boundary survey of the property, so they know exactly where those boundaries are. There isn't going to be any work being done off of the site. If there is earth work happening on the west side property line, then it will be happening on the Forest River site.

Mr. Yoder asked if there are particular plantings, buffers, or barriers that are more effective for the sound issue than others. The petitioner said they could look at some alternative plantings. When they use their standard schedule of plantings and buffer areas, there is a requirement to make

sure they are placed a certain distance from one another. There are other types of trees that can be planted closer together and they would probably be a similar cost. Mr. Jones indicated he would be willing to look at that and talk to the property owners about it. If the 15 ft. existing mound isn't reducing the sound from something that is ¼ mile to the north, then something a couple hundred feet from the property line probably won't have a huge impact. Mr. Jones said they are willing to do what they need to do and indicated they are required to reduce their ambient light at the property line. Lighting around the perimeter will be aimed inwards.

Mr. Sharkey suggested they reduce some noise by using cell phones rather than a PA system. Mr. Jones indicated that most of the new properties that Forest River builds don't have exterior PA systems anymore because it's all radio communication.

Mr. Doriot asked if the petitioner plans to meet with the adjoining property owners before the Commissioners meeting. If there is a favorable recommendation today, Mr. Jones said they will schedule a meeting with the property owners and have their landscape designer present at the meeting. They will come up with something they can build and maintain, which will work for the property owners.

Mr. Yoder asked why they want to build here instead of some other location. Mike Stump, 55470 CR 1, Elkhart, explained they have expanded all over Elkhart and LaGrange county. They have one particular facility that Forest River put up in Elkhart, which is a 24,000 sq. ft. service building and is being used as a call center. They have excess manufacturing capabilities in every other location except for this one. Mr. Stump indicated they are bursting at the seams in Elkhart. They can either expand in Elkhart and utilize this site, or they will have to expand at the other properties they own in Elkhart. Forest River would like to remain in Elkhart and this is the most logical location for them to do that.

With regards to air quality, Mr. Stump said they don't do any painting at any of their facilities. Across the street at Glaval, they have certified paint facilities that are properly filtered and maintained to eliminate the emissions coming from those facilities. The paved buildings on the Forest River sites are within the code requirements, but that type of operation won't be at this site. Mr. Stump also indicated they will have interior PA systems. They will not be invisible, but he said they will work very hard with the neighbors to reduce their impact.

Mr. Lantz asked if the 100 ft. mound would be a big issue and Mr. Stump said he is limited because his building is 533 ft. long with 50 ft. of concrete on each end. He has to be able to fit it within that space. Mr. Lantz feels that if they went with 100 ft., then the mound should be put up a little higher. It won't take care of the sound, but it will be out of the sight of the neighbors. Mr. Stump said he would be reluctant to agree to a 100 ft. mound because of the size of the site. If the site were larger, then he would be more willing to look in that direction.

Mr. Burbrink asked about Forest River purchasing the neighbor's properties. Mr. Stump said they had conversation about that and the company is unable to incur that cost at this time.

Mr. Stump then pointed out a retention area at the Glaval site which is to the north side of the railroad. He said the retention is all self-contained on that site. The property Forest River owns was then pointed out on the aerial photo.

Mr. Warner asked where they will access this site and Mr. Stump said from Manchester Drive. They do have access on CR 1 and if any further development does occur in this area, then that is where the access will be.

Mr. Jones clarified that every house is 200 ft. from the petitioner's property line and they are going to add another 50 ft.

Mr. Warner asked if there is any work being done with a combination of walls and plantings to have a greater effect on reducing sound. The petitioner said they have used that in certain applications, but there is a cost associated with all of that. Mounding and plantings are readily absorbed into the cost of the project. They haven't used any type of a sound barrier wall in Elkhart County for any of their clients.

Mr. Warner said he was thinking of the type of walls along the US 20 bypass. Mr. Jones said the highway is a 24 hour impact, but in this case, the impact will be primarily during the day and most employees are gone by the time the neighbors arrive home from work. There will be no impact during the night.

Mr. Sharkey feels the biggest issue is the buffer and asked if anyone has considered a buffer between 50 and 100 ft.

Ray Petit was again allowed to address the Board. Mr. Petit said there's no reason they want to be in the city utilities because they will have to get extra lines put in, pay extra taxes, and pay for utilities. When a factory is put in with a paved parking lot, oil from the vehicles will leak, run-off, and drain into the system.

Mr. Petit suggested they change the location of the building and where they park their chassis to reduce the impact on the neighbors. He indicated the chassis are new and wouldn't leak oil.

Lastly, he's not concerned whether the buffer is 50 ft. or 100 ft. He is concerned about the quality of the mound. If it is well landscaped with trees, then he believes that will be better than having a bigger width with natural vegetation.

Terry Karre was also given permission to address another concern with the Board. Mr. Karre indicated the existing mound is dirt that came off of the golf course, which is eroding. If Forest River doesn't want to buy their properties, he can put another 100 ft. behind them. He also has a 30 ft. well and is worried about the run-off being absorbed.

Mr. Stump responded saying moving the building to another location would be temporary, as he feels there will be another building there in the future. Due to this particular parcel being vacant, they have decided to utilize it first.

A motion was made and seconded (*Sharkey/Doriot*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

During discussion, Mr. Yoder indicated that the whole site will be required to meet MS4 regulations. All of the rainwater will have to be contained and treated to mitigate the concerns. A 30 ft. well in Elkhart County is generally a problem everywhere because it's way too shallow.

Mr. Yoder indicated Forest River could've asked the owners to re-zone before they bought the property since they knew they wanted to expand. He also indicated that Elkhart needs the jobs and it's great to have a company which is willing to expand.

Mr. Miller asked if land that was sold twelve years can ask for this change. Mr. Kolbus said anyone has the right to repetition the Plan Commission or the Board of Zoning Appeals to have something changed. Development will change over time as well as circumstances.

Mr. Lantz indicated the neighbors don't seem to be opposed to it, but they are worried about their water. If that issue is taken care of as well as the buffer, then everyone should be happy.

Mr. Doriot asked if they can put stipulations on a rezoning and Mr. Kolbus said only on straight rezonings. They indicated that they will meet with the property owners before the Commissioners meeting to come up with some type of agreement as to what everyone would like.

As far as the Plan Commission assigning them to a buffer of a certain width, Mr. Doriot suggested stating in their motion that if the request were recommended to go further, then the information be presented to the Commissioners to allow them to decide. Mr. Kolbus indicated in some past rezonings around Goshen, they create a document as part of the rezoning. They will commit to certain things in the county and that can be done at the Commissioners level. He recommended that the Board recommend approval or not and state a condition, which could be requested that it be part of the Commissioner's final action.

Mr. Sharkey indicated he feels the petitioners could work on the quality of the buffer and leave it at 50 ft. Mr. Lantz suggested that Forest River meet with the neighboring property owners before the Commissioners meeting to come up with an agreement.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation, a motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Sharkey*) that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that this request be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis and as presented with voluntary commitments to be filed with the Board of County Commissioners. The motion was carried with a unanimous roll call vote.

6. The amendment to the ***Town of Wakarusa Master Plan and the Elkhart County Comprehensive Plan*** for the Elkhart County Advisory Plan Commission, on property located within the municipal boundaries of Wakarusa and the Urban Growth Boundaries located in the unincorporated area of Elkhart County being bordered on the north by CR 38; bordered on the east by CR 7; bordered on the south by CR 44; and bordered on the west by CR 1, was presented at this time.

* (*It is noted that Blake Doriot stepped down from the Board at this time due to a potential conflict of interest.*)

Mr. Burrow presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review. At the Commissioners meeting, the representative for the Wakarusa Plan Committee requested that the previous item be withdrawn and they have resubmitted amendments (4a and 4b). Mr. Burrow explained that one is a colored proposed land use map and the other is a land use map on top of an aerial photo. They deleted the high density residential from the future land use. The staff feels that was enough of a significant change, so it is being reviewed at today's meeting.

Ken Jones, Wightman Petrie, Inc., 4703 Chester Drive, was present representing the Town of Wakarusa. He indicated they have nothing further to add to the Staff's Recommendation.

Mr. Yoder said he received some communications from the businesses in the Wakarusa area. He asked if those issues have been resolved and Mr. Jones said he doesn't believe there are any issues related to the Master Land Use Plan. It has more to do with the developmental standards, which is a separate issue and has not yet been presented to the Plan Commission.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Sharkey/Yoder*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation, a motion was made and seconded (*Yoder/Burbrink*) that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Town of Wakarusa and the Board of County Commissioners that this request be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis. The motion was carried with a unanimous roll call vote.

* (*It is noted that Mr. Doriot returned to the Board at this time.*)

7. There were no audience items.

8. Mr. Watkins explained that he received a brochure regarding a survey titled "Farming in the Urban Shadow: Can Communities Make a Difference?" He is bringing it up because the survey talks about the same issues that the county has. The tone of the survey was more from a farmer wanting to preserve land rather than sell it for houses. This is a cooperative study that is being done by 161 counties. They will be doing local interviews on selected counties, but Elkhart County is not one of them. They asked for additional people so they can discuss the perspective, so Mr. Watkins has suggested Mr. Burbrink as an extension agent and Mr. Yoder as a farmer.

A Thoroughfare Plan is being worked on that will be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. The intent behind this is to look at the routes in the county that will need to be preserved as transportation corridors. They will also be discussing Administrative Subdivision, which will be a subdivision that allows the staff to make decisions. The Administrative Subdivision will need to be incorporated in the Subdivision Ordinance. Lastly, they are looking at two amendments to the zoning ordinance, consisting of A-1 Rural Residential and A-2 Heritage Farm. Mr. Watkins indicated that Mr. Kanney would be discussing that further with the Board.

Mr. Watkins indicated he would like to insert the Administrative Subdivision into the current draft of the Subdivision Ordinance. He would like to send the revised draft for the Board's review for consideration at the March meeting. Mr. Watkins said the Board decided that open space and fiscal impact has been deleted for the most part, and landscaping and sidewalks have been put on hold.

9. In presenting revisions to the Subdivision Control Ordinance, Mr. Kanney reviewed the sub-committee's proposal for A-2 Heritage Farmland and A-1 Rural Residential Districts. Heritage Farmland District is a new zoning district that would allow people to set aside land as farmland in an attempt to protect the agricultural industry in Elkhart County. It would be limited to 20 acres in size and there would be no sewer, water or frontage on major roads. They would only be looking at grounds that have a history of productive agricultural activities on them.

Mr. Doriot asked if it is a 20 acre tax parcel or could two neighbors bring in 20 parcels. Mr. Kanney said he thinks it should be a deeded 20 acre parcel.

Mr. Yoder said he has a concern that they may move in a transition zone where they would allow farmers to combine property. He indicated that part of the emphasis between the A-1 and the A-2 is acknowledging what is happening in A-1, which is a Rural Residential area. A-1 Rural Residential would not allow shooting of firearms or open burning, which raised concerns from several Board members. Mr. Kolbus added that the concept is to create a buffer zone between residential and A-1 zoning.

Mr. Yoder said they are trying to differentiate that there is a clear differentiation between farming and Rural Residential. This plan would allow farmers to designate their area as a farmland district.

When asked by Mr. Doriot how you subdivide the A-2, Mr. Kanney said you have to have 20 acres and are able to build a house on it. An A-2 parcel cannot be made into a subdivision without a rezoning.

The Comprehensive Plan says the A-2 zoning is to protect not only farmland, but agricultural uses as well. They have come to the resolution that it must be separated as well as possible from residential uses. Mr. Kanney indicated it will allow the Plan Commission to

designate where they believe the farming areas should be and stay.

Mr. Doriot asked if this will be a forced rezoning and Mr. Kanney said no, but it can be. He indicated A-3 is owner activated. Mr. Yoder feels it would be appropriate for the Board to take a look at the county and recommend mass rezonings in areas they feel should be A-2. He suggested they send out notifications recommending the rezoning to A-2 and give them the option to opt out. It would be a voluntary thing, but they wouldn't make the farmers go through the hassle of coming in. Mr. Kolbus said they would have to go to these areas with a presentation on the various zonings as he doesn't like the "opt out" because someone might not get their mail. Mr. Lantz suggested having the Township Trustees do that work.

Mr. Watkins encouraged the Board to look at this situation as a package and the only thing missing from the package is the urban growth areas. Mr. Watkins said Mr. Kanney will also be talking about the Thoroughfare Plan, which will designate some areas all by themselves. Mr. Doriot said he would like to see a map that designates the urban growth areas.

Mr. Kanney asked if the Board wants to protect the farmland and Mr. Doriot said voluntarily. Mr. Yoder is interested in protecting the farmer's rights along with the farmland.

Mr. Kanney explained that the only change in Rural Residential districts is the area outside the urban growth area, and they changed the minimum lot size to one acre from the current 20,000 sq. ft. A subdivision would have to be developed with a minimum lot size of one acre. He also indicated that this will help with the Health Department's Wastewater Matrix as 20,000 sq. ft. lots are not enough with septic systems. Mr. Kanney clarified this is a replacement for the current A-1 zone, but not for the R-1 zone.

Mr. Watkins then gave a brief update on the Wastewater Matrix. The consensus of that group was that the minimum lot size in the county should be one acre. In January, the Board of Health adopted the matrix as a policy for a period of time to see how it would work. Mr. Watkins clarified that this would be for new development and not those smaller lots that have already been subdivided.

The proposal for Administrative Subdivisions was then reviewed by Mr. Kanney. The purpose is to simplify the procedure for division of land to run simultaneously with the building permit process. This can only be for one lot as multiple lots would still have to go before the Plan Commission. It was clarified that you can do an Administrative Subdivision as many times as you want as long as the lot meets all of the requirements.

In reviewing the Thoroughfare Plan, Mr. Kanney explained the committee feels that the roads are either eminent of being primary or secondary arterials or they believe they should become part of the plan. They now have five classifications of roads and have eliminated the state roads. The separation distances for the roads were also reviewed by the Board (Table 1). Mr. Kanney also noted the map shows that most of the county roads are no more than collectors. It was then recommended that a study be done to identify the level of service on the roads.

The Board was asked to review the proposal over the next 30 days and come back with some scenarios and questions.

Lastly, Mr. Watkins indicated he would try to get the draft as amended to date.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 11:31 a.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Kate A. Barghahn, Transcriber

Kathleen L. Wilson, Recording Secretary

Jeff Burbrink, Chairman