



**City of Vermillion
Planning Commission Agenda**

5:30 p.m. Regular Meeting
Monday, January 28, 2019
Large Conference Room – 2nd Floor
City Hall
25 Center Street
Vermillion, SD 57069

1. **Roll Call**
2. **Minutes**
 - a. January 14, 2019 Regular Meeting.
3. **Declaration of Conflict of Interests**
4. **Adoption of the Agenda**
5. **Visitors to Be Heard**
6. **Public Hearings**
7. **Old Business**
 - a. Discussion on Amendments to Zoning Ordinance – Section 155.008 Definitions (comments from Commission)
8. **New Business**
 - a. Schedule for Proposed Amendments to Zoning Ordinance
 - b. Discussion on Amendments to Zoning Ordinance – Section 155.030 NRC Natural Resource Conservation District.
9. **Staff Reports**
10. **Adjourn**

WELCOME TO YOUR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

If you wish to participate in the discussion, the meeting provides several opportunities. After the minutes are approved, the Chairperson will ask if any visitors wish to be heard. Any item not on the agenda may be discussed. During the discussion of agenda topics, anyone may comment. The Chairperson will recognize you if you raise your hand. Please introduce yourself with your name and address when addressing the Planning Commission. Discussion occurs before motions are made and seconded. Discussion also occurs after the motion is seconded and before the vote. You may participate each time if you wish. Your suggestions and ideas are welcome. The best decisions are made when everyone participates and provides information.

Meeting Assistance: The City of Vermillion fully subscribes to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. If you desire to attend this public meeting and are in need of special accommodations, please notify the City Manager's Office at 677-7050 at least 3 working days prior to the meeting so appropriate auxiliary aids and services can be made available.

Unapproved Minutes
Vermillion Planning Commission
Monday, January 14, 2019 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

The regular meeting of the Vermillion Planning Commission was called to order in the Large Conference Room at City Hall on December 10, 2018 at 5:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Present: Fairholm, Forseth, Kleeman, Manning, Muenster, Tuve, Wilson (arrived at 5:32), Iverson.

Absent: Oehler.

Staff present: José Domínguez, City Engineer, James Purdy, Assistant City Manager.

2. Minutes

a. December 10, 2018 Regular Meeting.

Moved by Commissioner Fairholm to adopt December 10, 2018 Regular Meeting as written, seconded by Commissioner Manning. Motion carried 8-0.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Commissioner Tuve to adopt the agenda as printed, seconded by Commissioner Kleeman. Motion carried 8-0.

4. Visitors to be Heard

None.

5. Public Hearing

a. Ordinance 1397 to Rezone Lot 11, in Block 1, LaCroix Addition to the City of Vermillion, Clay County, South Dakota from GB - General Business District to the R-2 Residential District.

James Purdy, Assistant City Manager, explained that a petition to rezone 609 N Crawford Road from GB to R2 was submitted by Mr. Archimedes Plutonium in December 2018. The applicant circulated petitions for rezone which included neighboring properties within 250 feet of the aforementioned address and received the necessary 45% of the aggregate area as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant states that the land has been for sale for approximately four years and many of the inquiries have been for residential uses. The use of the property, whether GB or R-2 could satisfy competing goals of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Approval of the rezone would satisfy the goal of maintaining neighborhoods that are compatible with adjacent land uses. Denial of the rezone satisfies the goal to have business development take place along South Dakota Highway 50 as it is a high visible area with convenient access to roadways.

Commissioner Iverson requested clarification on the size of the lot. It was explained that the lot is essentially the wooded area and the space between that and the road is Department of Transportation (DOT) Right-of-Way (ROW). Mr. Purdy further explained that it is a likelihood that a frontage road would be developed between Lot 11 and the DOT ROW.

Mr. Domínguez, City Engineer, in response to a query from Commissioner Fairholm, estimated that the frontage for the State highway at this location is 24-30 feet wide.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Foreseth, Mr. Domínguez explained that the ROW continues across the road to the west, but it narrows.

Representative of the applicant, Mr. Hazen Bye of Dakota Reality, states that the lot has been listed much longer than the previously stated four years estimating 7 or 8. In that time the only two inquiries have been for residential use. Answering a question from Commissioner Forseth, Mr. Bye stated the size of Lot 11 is approximately 9/10 of an acre. Mr. Hazen noted there is a potential buyer, but it is contingent on the rezone as the desired use is residential.

Commissioner Fairholm questioned who would be responsible for the possible frontage road. Mr. Domínguez explained that the City would build the road within the State's ROW but was unsure of whether or not the property owner would be assessed for the cost.

Commissioner Tuve asked if the proposed property owner was aware of how close the property is to a frontage road. Mr. Bye stated he was unaware of the possibility of the frontage road and was under the impression that it was simply an access road for the farmer to reach the field. Mr. Domínguez explained that while Staff has not been notified by the state that there would be a frontage road, they believe it to be a possibility as there is no other access to the parcel of land east of Lot 11 unless it is access from a future street further south. He further explained that during a call received from the potential buyer, the possibility of the frontage road was discussed. Commissioner Forseth noted that 9/10 of an acre would be enough land to build a house within the trees and maintain privacy. Mr. Domínguez stated that was the reason the potential buyer likes the lot noting that he is only interested in clearing enough trees for the house and driveway.

Motion to Rezone Lot 11, in Block 1, LaCroix Addition to the City of Vermillion, Clay County, South Dakota from GB - General Business

District to the R-2 Residential District by Commissioner Manning and seconded by Commissioner Wilson. Motion carried 8-0.

6. Old Business

None.

7. New Business

a. Adoption of Vermillion Planning Commission Bylaws, Rules and Procedures.

Following extensive research, Mr. Domínguez, was unable to find a signed copy of the Planning Commission Bylaws. Within the scope of his research he found that the latest Bylaws were adopted prior to 1998 and amended twice; once in January 2000 and again in December 2000. Referring to the unsigned copy of the 1998 Bylaws, Mr. Domínguez explained to the Commissioners that Staff reviewed the document and have recommended changes. Three recommendations to Article 7 and one recommendation to Article 9 are proposed as follows:

Article 7, Section 4: Staff received a request from an Alderman regarding Planning Commission Minutes. The request entailed minutes to be taken and open to the public for inspection. Additionally, they requested recordings of the meetings should be taken, kept and made available to the public. At present, recordings are taken for purposes of written minutes to be taken at a later time and then the recording is deleted.

Article 7, Section 5: This section would allow the Planning Commission to remove a member if that member fails to attend four consecutive meetings without presenting an explanation accepted by a majority of the Planning Commission.

Article 7, Section 9: this section would allow the Planning Commission to defer action on an item if the applicant, or their representative, is not present at the meeting.

Article 9, Section 12: This section explains what situations are considered a conflict of interest and how such occasions need to be handled by the member.

Commissioner Muenster stated that while he had found a number of items that could be approved, he would be happy to go through the items with the City Engineer at a later time, if that is the will of the Planning Commission, but would rather not take time to go through the entire document at this meeting. Mr. Domínguez stated that if that is the will of the Commission, that it would be fine but prefers that it is done prior to the next Planning Commission meeting.

In reference to the amendment to Article 7, Section 4, Mr. Domínguez explained that, if adopted, Planning Commission meetings would likely move from the Large Conference Room to the Council Chambers as that space is already has the necessary equipment to record audio/video.

The recordings would be for however long the Council recordings are kept.

Rich Holland, City Council Vice President, asked if the difference between adjoining housing and abutting housing was in the document. Mr. Domínguez explained that it is not in the Bylaws, but would be discussed on the next agenda item regarding zoning code.

Commissioner Fairholm stated that Commissioner Muenster's willingness to discuss the Bylaws with the City Engineer, and taking a longer time to review the Bylaws is fine with him, but expressed concern about recordings stating that he is comfortable with written minutes as have been in the past. Additionally, while he is okay with recording meetings, he believes most recordings of government meetings are for boards of publicly elected officials with a political stance, whereas this is an unelected, selected citizen's board. Therefore audio/video recordings of a citizen meeting would be unusual in the history of our city, and perhaps set a bad precedent. Mr. Domínguez clarified that the original revision of the Bylaws did not include recording. Commissioner Fairholm suggested that the portion regarding recording should be removed from the Bylaws, not because the Planning Commission has anything to hide, but because citizen boards aren't typically recorded. Commissioner Iverson noted that the only reason the recording began was to make the task of taking minutes easier. Presently, it is not possible to transfer the minutes from the recording device to a computer. Commissioner Fairholm noted that without a stenographer, this is a great alternative to take minutes, but does not believe the recording is a public document. Commissioners gave Mr. Domínguez permission to remove the portion of Article 7, Section 4 regarding audio/video recording. Commissioner Fairholm said that however the written minutes are prepared is up to the secretary.

Mr. Muenster had the following notes to the Bylaws:

- The Commission is known as the Planning and Zoning Commission, rather than simply the Planning Commission.
- Article 3, Section 2: terms are dictated by State Law rather than Council action.
- Article 5, staff support should be called Staff Liaison or Clerk rather than Secretary, as Secretary is an elected official of an organization.
- Article 6, replace "newly appointed members shall elect a Chair and Vice Chair..." Newly appointed members" should be replaced with "members" as it reads as though only the newly appointed members can vote on the matter.
- Article 7, Section 1: Near the end replace the word typically with ordinarily.
- Add that the Comprehensive Plan shall be reviewed annually. Commissioner Fairholm noted that language within the Comprehensive Plan states that the Planning Commission shall review it annually.
- Article 7, Section 3: "Chair calls a special meeting when requested to do so by the majority of the members of the Commission" It should state "Chair or City Administration can also request a special meeting; there should not be a polling

of the Planning Commission to call a special meeting. Commissioner Forseth noted in the same article, "notify in writing" should include electronic communications. Commissioner Fairholm noted that the term "in writing" is utilized twice in the same sentence and is not necessary. Commissioner Muenster suggested that from time-to-time joint meetings with the County could be specified in this article.

- Article 7, Section 5: Planning Commission should not have the authority to remove a member from the board. The Planning Commission shall recommend removal to the Mayor.
- Article 7, Section 9: The Planning Commission shall defer action rather than deny action if an applicant or their representative is not present. Mr. Domínguez stated he would research the language in the ordinance and ensure the Planning Commission Bylaws and forms are consistent.
- Article 9: Staff Report should be listed as an agenda item as necessary.
- Article 9, Section 5: Add the word "discussion" so it reads: "Public testimony will then be closed and the topic will be given to the Planning Commission for discussion and action."
- Article 9, Section 11: "No member may abstain." Add language so it reads, "No member may abstain unless they have stated on the record a conflict of interest." Additionally, add an agenda item: Declaration of Conflict of Interests prior to adoption of the agenda. Commissioner Muenster stated that he was uncomfortable having language that a member may not abstain stating there may be other reasons such as not fully understanding the topic. Chairman Iverson explained that you are selected to be on the commission and if you don't understand, you'd better ask questions.
- Article 9, Section 12: Replace the word "dead" with "defeated."
- Article 10, Section 1: Ex-officio means by virtue of one's office. Should that term be used? It was decided to keep the term, but add language to include members of the public. As a committee would only make a recommendation to the Planning Commission, all committee members regardless of title can vote on committee business.
- Article 9, Section 7: Remove the entire section limiting number of times a member may speak on one item.

Moved by Commissioner Tuve to adopt the Vermillion Planning and Zoning Commission Bylaws, Rules and Procedures with amendments, seconded by Commissioner Fairholm. Motion carried 8-0.

b. Discussion on Amendments to Zoning Ordinance - Section 155.008 Definitions.

Mr. Domínguez provided background of the current zoning ordinance noting that the original ordinance was adopted in 1966 and, following review, the current ordinance was adopted in 2008. Noting that the Comprehensive Plan encourages a periodic review of the zoning ordinance in an effort to update, strengthen and streamline; and that the existing ordinance is now 11 years old, Staff recently compared the definition section of the zoning ordinance with the permitted and

conditional uses in each district with the intent of learning if any definition should be updated, added, or removed; and to ensure that uses in each district are defined. Results of the definitions review found that 26 need to be updated or changed, 23 should be added, and 15 could be removed. As the proposed changes to the definitions are numerous, Staff recommend a review of each district.

Referencing a spreadsheet, Mr. Domínguez explained the review process to the Planning Commission.

As this review process will be extensive, Mr. Domínguez suggested setting a schedule for the process, but requested the Planning Commission review the definition for twinhome/townhouse as it has recently been a controversial topic. Presently, the City utilizes the recommended definition of the International Zoning Code, which can be confusing. With the approval the City Building Official, Staff propose removing the definitions "Dwelling, Attached" and "Dwelling, Multiple-Family." Staff recommend language addition to "Dwelling, Multiple-Family" to include duplex, 3-plex, and 4-plex to the existing apartments and condominiums. Thusly, a duplex would be considered in the same manner as an apartment. Language would be added to "Dwelling, Single-Family Attached" to include Townhouse, Townhome, and Twinhome. Mr. Domínguez stated regarding minutes and publications, Staff recommend simply utilizing the term "Single-Family Attached" as it encompasses all or the aforementioned uses.

Mr. Domínguez gave a few examples of the proposed additions, omissions and other changes that will be included in the scope of the upcoming zoning ordinance review and requested the Planning Commission return with comments at the next meeting.

The Planning Commission opted to conduct a review of the definitions, review each of the districts to ensure that the uses match the definitions, review the conditional use permit process, and off-street parking requirements at this time and review the remainder of the zoning ordinance at a later time. Mr. Domínguez was asked to prepare a schedule for the review.

c. Motion to table discussion on Amendments to Zoning Ordinance - Section 155.008 Definitions by Commissioner Tuve and seconded by Commissioner Kleeman. Motion carried 8-0.

8. Staff Report

None.

9. Adjourn

Moved by Commissioner Wilson to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Fairholm. Motion carried 8-0. Commissioner Iverson declared the meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Planning & Zoning Commission Agenda Memo

From: Jose Dominguez, City Engineer

Meeting: January 28, 2019

Subject: Discussion on Amendments to Zoning Ordinance – Section 155.008
(comments from Commission)

Presenter: Jose Dominguez

Background: At the January 14, 2019 meeting Staff started the zoning ordinance amendment by proposing several changes to the definitions section of the ordinance. The definition section, with the proposed changes, was given to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff also asked for any comments regarding the proposed changes to be ready for the meeting on January 28th.

Discussion: The proposed changes to the definitions are intended to simplify the ordinance, and remove confusion when a use is listed but there is no definition given. After the changes to the definitions are completed, each of the zoning districts will be reviewed to ensure that the updated definition is being used within the district.

Compliance with Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan encourages that the City perform a periodical review of the zoning ordinance. The review is intended to update, strengthen and streamline the zoning ordinance.

Conclusion/Recommendations: Staff asks for comments on section 155.008 Definitions.

Planning & Zoning Commission Agenda Memo

From: Jose Dominguez, City Engineer
Meeting: January 28, 2019
Subject: Schedule for Proposed Amendments to Zoning Ordinance
Presenter: Jose Dominguez

Background: Due to the proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance, the Planning Commission asked Staff to develop a schedule for the reviews. The requested schedule looked at reviewing each of the districts to ensure that the uses matched the definitions. Additionally, the Commission asked that a few other sections within the ordinance be reviewed due to the number of questions received from the public for amendments.

Discussion: The proposed schedule is split into fifteen different items. Items one through thirteen would be for the Planning and Zoning Commission, while the other two items would be for the City Council.

Each item represents a date that certain sections of the zoning ordinance would be reviewed, or that a public meeting would be held. Since the amendments to the districts are intended to be fairly minor (i.e. ensuring that the use matches the proposed definition), Staff believes that the bulk of the review can be completed by April 22, 2019. By that date, the review of all of the zoning districts would be completed, and the items could be presented to the public for comments. After the public meeting is held, the Commission would review off-premise parking requirements, conditional-use permit procedures, and any miscellaneous items. An additional public meeting would be held on July 8, 2019 to gather comments on the proposed changes to the off-premise parking requirements and the conditional-use permit procedures.

The proposed schedule has been condensed as much as possible in order to speed the process along, and still have public meetings for input. However, due to the fact that there is no external pressure requiring the completion of the amendments, the schedule can be changed if certain items need additional time for review.

Compliance with Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan encourages that the City perform a periodical review of the zoning ordinance. The review is intended to update, strengthen and streamline the zoning ordinance.

Conclusion/Recommendations: Staff asks for comments on the schedule, and that a schedule be approved.

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	DATE STAFF PRESENTED ITEM TO PC	DATE PC TURNED COMMENTS TO STAFF
1	Definitions	January 14, 2019	January 28, 2019
2	NRC-Natural Resource Conservation District	January 28, 2019	February 11, 2019
3	R1-Residential District R2-Residential District R3-Residential District R4-Residential District	February 11, 2019	February 25, 2019
4	CB-Central Business District GB-General Business District NC-Neighborhood Commercial District	February 25, 2019	March 11, 2019
5	GI-General Industrial District HI-Heavy Industrial District	March 11, 2019	March 25, 2019
6	Planned Unit Development Districts (only to ensure that uses match the definition in ordinance)	March 25, 2019	April 8, 2019
7	Public Meeting to gather comments on items 1 through 6	April 22, 2019	
8	Off-Street Parking Requirements	May 13, 2019	May 28, 2019
9	Conditional-Use Permit Section	May 28, 2019	June 10, 2019
10	Miscellaneous amendments to ordinance	June 10, 2019	June 24, 2019
11	Public Meeting to gather comments on items 8 through 10	July 8, 2019	
12	Draft of items 1 through 6, 8, 9 and 10	July 22, 2019	August 12, 2019
13	Public Hearing on Amendments	August 26, 2019	
14	1 st Reading of Ordinance at Council	September 3, 2019	
15	2 nd Reading of Ordinance at Council	September 16, 2019	

Planning & Zoning Commission Agenda Memo

From: Jose Dominguez, City Engineer

Meeting: January 28, 2019

Subject: Discussion on Amendments to Zoning Ordinance – Section 155.030
NRC Natural Resource Conservation District.

Presenter: Jose Dominguez

Background: Over the years the City has had two zoning ordinances. The first ordinance was adopted in 1966. This ordinance established different districts (agricultural, residential, commercial and industrial) with allowable uses. The ordinance also allowed conditional-uses; however, these were called ‘special uses’. In order for ‘special uses’ to be approved, they would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission, and then action would be taken by the City Council. In 2008 the City adopted a new zoning ordinance that completely rewrote zoning requirements within the City. This new ordinance still divided the City into districts; however, each of the districts had permitted uses and conditional uses. This, along with different uses being permitted within each zoning districts, were the largest changes between the two ordinances.

Due to the existing zoning ordinance being 11 years old, Staff is proposing that the Planning Commission perform a review of the ordinance, to determine if changes need to be made. The depth and scope of that review can be determined by the Planning Commission.

Staff already presented the proposed changes to section 155.008 Definitions to the Planning Commission at the January 14th meeting.

Discussion: The NRC – Natural Resource Conservation District is the most restrictive zoning district within the City. As such there are few uses allowed within the district. The proposed changes consist of the following:

- Permitted Uses:
 - Remove ‘Single-Family Farm Dwelling’ (we are removing this definition)
 - Change ‘Cemeteries’ to ‘Cemetery’ (to match definition)

- Remove ‘on support existing support structure’ from wireless communication facility (to match definition) and also added verbiage under applicable standards to explain that this permitted use was only for replacement of existing facilities on an existing telecommunications tower that did not require additional space
- Remove ‘Fences’ (section 155.074 covers this item)
- Remove ‘Home Occupation’ (section 155.078 covers this item)
- Remove ‘Railroad right-of-way’
- Conditional Uses
 - Change ‘Accessory use and structure (such as, garage, shed)’ to ‘Accessory building or use’ (to match definition)
 - Remove ‘(new support structure)’ from wireless communication facility (to match definition) and also added verbiage under applicable standards to explain that this conditional use was only for replacement of existing facilities on an existing telecommunications tower that requires additional space
 - Change ‘Veterinarian’ to ‘Large animal veterinarian’ (to match definition)
 - Added ‘Small animal veterinarian’ use, along with applicable standards
 - Change ‘Bed and Breakfast’ to ‘Bed and Breakfast establishment’ (to match definition)
 - Added verbiage under applicable standards for ‘telecommunications tower’ explaining that approval of a conditional use permit for the tower also approved the installation of wireless communication facility at the tower location

Compliance with Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan encourages the City to perform periodic reviews of the zoning ordinance. Those review are intended to update, strengthen and streamline the zoning ordinance.

Conclusion/Recommendations: Staff asks the Planning Commission to offer comments on the proposed changes on Section 155.030 NRC – Natural Resource Conservation District.

Vermillion, SD Code of Ordinances

§ 155.030 NRC NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT.

The purpose of this district is to preserve lands best suited for natural drainage areas, public open space, and agricultural uses from encroachment by incompatible uses. The area will also provide protection from floods and erosion, to protect views, to preserve natural settings for wildlife habitats, and to add to the aesthetic and environmental quality of the community.

(A) *Permitted uses.*

<i>Permitted Use</i>	<i>Applicable Standards</i>
Agriculture	§ 155.070
Farm dwellings, single-family	§§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.076, 155.077 and not within identified floodplain area.
Golf course	§§ 155.070, 155.072
Public park areas	§ 155.070
Cemeteries Cemetery	At least 2 acres in size and adequate road system within cemetery. § 155.070 and not within an identified floodplain area.
Electrical substation	An opaque screen, 6 feet in height located at all setback lines. §§ 155.070, 155.077
Public utility facility	§§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.077
Wireless communication facility on existing support structure	§ 155.075, and not within an identified floodplain area, <u>and if replacing facility on existing telecommunications tower the proposed facility cannot occupy a larger space than the existing facility.</u>
Fences	§ 155.074
Home occupation	§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.076, 155.077, 155.078
Roadside stands	Subject to the seasonal sale of farm products, which are produced upon the premises. § 155.070
Railroad right-of-way	Including a strip of land with tracks and auxiliary facilities for track operation, but not including passenger stations, freight terminals, switching and classification yards, repair shops, roundhouses, power houses, interlocking towers, and fueling, sanding and watering stations.
Municipally-owned airport	§§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.073, 155.077 (See Chapter 91 of this code)

(B) *Conditional uses.*

<i>Conditional Uses</i>	<i>Applicable Standards</i>
Accessory use and structure (such as, garage, shed) <u>building or use</u>	§§ 155.071, 155.082(A), 155.095(A) and definition

Vermillion, SD Code of Ordinances

Wireless communication facility <u>(new support structure)</u>	§§ 155.075, 155.095(A), and not within an identified floodplain area, <u>and only if it is replacing existing facilities on an existing telecommunications tower but the proposed facility will occupy a larger space than the existing facility.</u>
Municipally-owned waste water treatment facility	§§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.073, 155.077, 155.095(A)
Veterinarian, <u>Large Animal</u>	Located on a tract of land of not less than 10 acres and that no treatment rooms or pens for animals shall be maintained closer than 200 feet to any property line. * §§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.073, 155.077, 155.095(A)
Veterinarian, <u>Small Animal</u>	<u>Located on a tract of land of not less than 10 acres and that no treatment rooms or pens for animals shall be maintained closer than 200 feet to any property line. *</u> §§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.073, 155.077, 155.095(A)
Bed and breakfast <u>establishment</u>	§§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.076, 155.077, 155.080, 155.095(A)
Wind energy conversion system	§§ 155.070, 155.072, 155.077, 155.081, 155.095(A)
Telecommunications tower	§§ 155.070, 155.075, 155.077, 155.095(A), <u>approval of conditional use permit for the telecommunications tower shall also include the installation of all wireless communication facility on the new telecommunications tower.</u>
* Measured from the closest point of the structure to property line	

Formatted: Left
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0"

(C) *Lot and yard regulations.* All measurements shall be taken from the lot line to the building line (see definitions). Where a side yard or rear yard is required, half of the required yard must be maintained as a landscaped area

	<i>Lot Area</i>	<i>Lot Width</i>	<i>Front Yard</i>	<i>Side Yard</i>	<i>Rear Yard</i>	<i>Maximum Height</i>
All uses	1 acre	75 feet	30 feet	8 feet	25 feet	35 feet
Exceptions:						
#1 A conditional use permit will be required for any structure having a maximum height exceeding 35 feet (§ 155.095(A))						
#2 See adjustments to yard regulations (§ 155.082) for specific exceptions						

(Ord. 1189, passed 7-7-2008; Am. Ord. 1359, passed 9-18-2017; Am. Ord. 1366, passed 2-5-2018)