

**STAFF REPORT**

Town Council, November 19, 2015

**Land Development Ordinance Text Amendment Round 31 items A and C (PL15-046e)**

Consideration of proposed amendments to the Land Development Ordinance (LDO)

Speaker: Mary Beerman

From: Jeff Ulma, Planning Director

Prepared by: Mary Beerman, Senior Planner

Approved by: Mike Bajorek, Interim Town Manager

Approved by: Russ Overton, Assistant Town Manager

**Executive Summary:** Proposed amendments to the LDO regarding connectivity and dimensional standards for low-density residential development have been discussed at two council work sessions and two council public hearings since December 2014. Following a public hearing on the most recent draft on August 27, 2015, the Planning and Zoning Board considered the two amendment items and recommended approval of each by a vote of 4-3.

**OVERVIEW**

**SCHEDULE:**

Public Hearing	August 27, 2015
Planning and Zoning Board Work Session	September 15, 2015
Planning and Zoning Board Meeting	October 19, 2015
Final Action by Town Council	November 19, 2015
Effective	November 19, 2015

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:**

A brief description of each proposed amendment is provided below. More detailed background information is included in the section of this report entitled "DETAILS REGARDING PROPOSED LDO AMENDMENTS".

**Item A CONNECTIVITY** – The proposed amendment would provide more flexible standards related to requirements for street connectivity, and enable certain decisions regarding connectivity to be made at the time of rezoning rather than site or subdivision plan approval.

**Item C DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS FOR LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT** – The proposed amendment would specify the Land Use Plan categories within which a particular general use zoning district could be requested, and include prohibiting use of the TR district where the Land Use Plan designation is low or very-low density residential.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Implementation of most of the proposed changes will be absorbed by existing staff during the review and approval process for various development applications and/or construction plan submittals. However, it should be noted that LDO amendments have had, and continue to have, a cumulative impact on staff resources that may adversely impact the time needed for review of development.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments to the Land Development Ordinance.

**DETAILS REGARDING PROPOSED LDO AMENDMENTS**

**ITEM A – CONNECTIVITY**

**HISTORY**

**Town Council Meeting (April 24, 2014)**

Town Council requested that staff review the issue of street connectivity to determine if greater flexibility could be applied to the street connectivity requirements. Greater flexibility was desired so that options could be considered where residents in existing neighborhoods were opposed to such connections, provided public safety and traffic flow were adequately addressed. Many such neighborhoods were constructed prior to the establishment of the Town’s connectivity ordinance or under county standards. Such neighborhoods may also consist of large lots without municipal services such as water, sewer, solid waste collection, and police and fire protection. Council also requested that staff explore how connectivity could be addressed earlier in the development process.

A working group was established consisting of staff members from the Transportation & Facilities, Public Works, Planning, Police, Fire, and Inspections & Permits Departments.

**Town Council Work Session (December 9, 2014)**

An approach suggested by staff was to categorize existing neighborhoods into one of three tiers for the purpose of determining the degree of connectivity required for development proposed on adjacent properties. Council directed staff to prepare an amendment to the LDO for consideration.

**Town Council Public Hearing (March 26, 2015)**

Following the hearing, council members expressed concerns and referred the item back to a work session.

**Town Council Work Session #2 (July 21, 2015)**

At the work session, staff presented several options for connectivity. Council approved moving forward with Option 2, which is summarized below under “Summary of Proposed Amendment”.

**Town Council Public Hearing #2 (August 27, 2015)**

There were no speakers at the public hearing, and no comments from council members.

**Planning and Zoning Board Meeting (October 19, 2015)**

The Planning and Zoning Board recommended approval of the proposed amendment by a vote of 4-3. Board members casting dissenting votes expressed concern with requiring road connections where adjacent land uses may be incompatible. It was noted that the proposed ordinance was an improvement, but did not provide any protection for existing Tier 1 neighborhoods. Several board members asked that council direct staff to look at additional changes that would allow connectivity to be waived at the time of rezoning where a preliminary development plan or concept plan was provided, and where commercial use was proposed adjacent to existing residential use.

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD ADJACENT TO PROPERTY PROPOSED FOR DEVELOPMENT		CONNECTIVITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPERTY PROPOSED FOR DEVELOPMENT
Tier Number	Tier Description	
1	Any residential neighborhood not otherwise classified as Tier 2 or Tier 3.	Standard requirements of Section 7.10.3 apply

<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subdivision or site plan was approved by the Town of Cary prior to January 14, 1999, or by a jurisdiction other than the Town of Cary; and</li> <li>• A public street right-of-way in the existing neighborhood extends to the common property line, however the street itself does not extend to the common property line; or no existing street or street right-of-way or extends to the common property line; and</li> <li>• Potential public safety issues such as inadequate fire and police protection, are present, or are likely to be created in the future, if a proposed new development does not connect to the adjacent existing neighborhood.</li> </ul>	<p>A connection to the property line is required for emergency access only.</p> <p>Design alternatives may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• paved street connection with removable obstructions to prevent non-emergency access;</li> <li>• raised curb;</li> <li>• turf stone with grass;</li> <li>• other methods approved by the Director of Transportation and Facilities and the Fire Chief</li> </ul> <p>Pedestrian, bicycle and utility connections to the property line are required.</p>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subdivision or site plan was approved by the Town of Cary prior to January 14, 1999, or by a jurisdiction other than the Town of Cary; and</li> <li>• A public street right-of-way in the existing neighborhood extends to the common property line, however the street itself does not extend to the common property line; or no existing street or street right-of-way or extends to the common property line; and</li> <li>• There are no apparent public safety issues present or likely to be created in the future if a street connection is not provided,</li> </ul>	<p>A road connection to the property line is not required.</p> <p>Pedestrian, bicycle and utility connections to the property line are required.</p>

If the proposed amendment is adopted, then where permitted based on the Tier of the adjacent neighborhood, an applicant would have the option to offer a zoning condition to prohibit connectivity to that existing neighborhood when the site or subdivision plan is submitted.

<b>POTENTIAL ZONING CONDITIONS RELATED TO CONNECTIVITY</b>			
<b>POTENTIAL ZONING CONDITIONS</b>	<b>TIER OF EXISTING ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOOD</b>		
	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Tier 3</b>
<b>Provide a full public road connection</b>	Zoning condition allowed, but not necessary <sup>1</sup>	Zoning condition allowed <sup>2</sup>	
<b>Do not provide a full public road connection</b>	Zoning condition not allowed <sup>3</sup>	Zoning condition allowed <sup>2</sup>	
<b>Provide emergency vehicle connection only</b>	Zoning condition not allowed <sup>3</sup>		Zoning condition allowed, but not necessary <sup>1</sup>
<b>Specify type of emergency access to be provided</b>	Zoning condition allowed <sup>4</sup>		

<sup>1</sup> Connection is already required by the LDO, however a condition would ensure that the applicant does not request to eliminate the connection through the quasi-judicial review process.

<sup>2</sup> *Connection is neither required nor prohibited by the LDO, therefore either commitment at the rezoning stage is more restrictive.*

<sup>3</sup> *Connection is required by the LDO, and a condition to not provide a connection would be less restrictive. An applicant could request to eliminate or modify the connection only through the quasi-judicial review process.*

<sup>4</sup> *This condition would be more restrictive than the LDO. Emergency access is required, but there are several design options.*

In addition to rezoning requests submitted after adoption of the proposed amendment, this amendment would apply to all rezoning cases that are in process at the time of adoption of the ordinance amendment, provided that final action on the rezoning case occurs after the effective date of the ordinance amendment.

## PROPOSED TEXT

### 7.10 CONNECTIVITY

#### 7.10.1 Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this section is to support the creation of a highly connected transportation system within the Town in order to provide choices for drivers, bicyclists, public transit passengers, and pedestrians; promote walking, bicycling and public transit; connect neighborhoods to each other and to local destinations such as schools, parks, and shopping centers; reduce vehicle miles of travel and travel times; improve air quality; reduce emergency response times; increase effectiveness of municipal service delivery; and free up arterial capacity to better serve regional long distance travel needs. Any additional pedestrian connections required under this section do not have to address handicap accessibility standards.

#### 7.10.2 Consistency with Other Documents

The design and evaluation of vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation systems built in conjunction with new residential and non-residential development shall adhere to applicable provisions of the Town's Design Guidelines Manual, Downtown Design Guidelines, Cary Comprehensive Transportation Plan, and Standard Specifications and Details Manual, in addition to meeting the requirements of this section.

#### 7.10.3 Standards for Streets/On-Site Vehicular Circulation

The following standards shall be met for all site and subdivision plans and for redevelopment of sites.

##### (A) Street Connectivity

- (1) Any residential development shall be required to achieve a connectivity index of 1.2 or greater. In the event that this requirement is modified pursuant to Section ~~3.19.4~~ 7.10.3(D)(2) a six (6)-foot pedestrian trail shall be provided to link any cul-de-sacs within a residential development in which the required connectivity index has been modified. A connectivity index is a ratio of the number of street links (road sections between intersections and cul-de-sacs) divided by the number of street nodes (intersections and cul-de-sac heads). The following illustration provides an example of how to calculate the index. Street links on existing adjacent streets that are not part of the proposed subdivision are not included in the connectivity index calculation.
- (2) For non-residential, multi-family, or mixed used developments of greater than five (5) acres, an organized and complete street network must be provided with an emphasis on connectivity throughout the development and for future adjacent development.

Sites, five (5) acres or less, must provide street connections with adjacent properties (i.e., taking into account the future development/redevelopment of these properties).

- (a) All access points from public thoroughfares and collectors shown on the Comprehensive Transportation Plan shall be connected with each other through a continuous network of public or private streets. (Non-residential private streets are not required to meet public street standards.) Connections between thoroughfares and collectors shall be direct while maintaining a functional and organized street network. Limited parking in front of buildings along these streets may be provided.

Primary circulation through a development shall meet the following standards:

1. Vehicular access spacing on the street is limited to no less than one hundred fifty (150) feet;
2. Intersections, driveway, or drive aisle connections with the streets shall be substantially perpendicular to the street;
3. Access points shall align with opposing access points on the street or shall be offset by at least one hundred fifty (150) feet; and
4. Adjacent lots or outparcels must share access drives.

## **(B) Street Arrangement**

- (1) The proposed public or private street system shall be designed to provide vehicular and pedestrian interconnections to facilitate internal and external traffic movements in the area. In addition to the specific connectivity requirements described above, roadway interconnections shall be provided during the initial phase of any development plan between the development site and its adjacent properties with one (1) roadway interconnection every one thousand two hundred fifty (1,250) to one thousand five hundred (1,500) linear feet for each direction (north, south, east, west) in which the subject property abuts. If the common property boundary in any direction is less than one thousand two hundred fifty (1,250) linear feet, the subject property will be required to provide an interconnection if it is determined by the Planning Director that the interconnection in that direction can best be accomplished through the subject property due to physical site constraints, such as topography, presence of stream buffers or other natural features, or lot dimensions; or due to presence of existing development or infrastructure, on the subject property or other properties in the area. When the Planning Director deems a vehicular connection not practicable due to topographical and/or environmental constraints, he/she may increase the length requirement and/or require pedestrian connections. The Planning Director may delay the interconnection if such interconnection requires state approval. The intent of this standard is to improve access/egress for Town neighborhoods, provide faster response time for emergency vehicles, and improve the vehicular and pedestrian connections between neighborhoods.
- (2) Any development of more than one hundred (100) residential units or additions to existing developments such that the total number of units exceeds one hundred (100) shall be required to provide for vehicular and pedestrian access to at least two (2) public streets unless such provision is modified pursuant to Section 3.19.1.
- (3) Where new development is adjacent to vacant land likely to be subdivided or redeveloped in the future, or adjacent to property that is likely to be redeveloped in the future, all streets, bicycle paths, sidewalks or pedestrian pathways, and access ways in the development's proposed street system shall continue through to the boundary lines of the area under the same ownership as the subdivision, as determined by the Planning Director or the Director of Transportation and Facilities, to provide for the orderly subdivision of such adjacent land and/or the transportation

and access needs of the community. In addition, all redevelopment and street improvement projects shall take advantage of opportunities for retrofitting existing streets to provide increased vehicular and pedestrian connectivity, such as sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals.

- (4) In general, permanent cul-de-sacs are discouraged in the design of street systems, and should only be used when topography, the presence of natural features, and/or vehicular safety factors make a vehicular connection impractical. Where cul-de-sacs are unavoidable, site and/or subdivision plans shall incorporate provisions for future vehicular and pedestrian connections to adjacent, undeveloped properties, and to existing adjacent development where existing connections are poor.
- (5) Permanent cul-de-sacs shall comply with the length limits and design standards set forth in the Town's Standard Specifications and Details Manual, and shall be provided with a turnaround at the closed street end.

**(C) Cross Access**

All non-residential development shall be designed to allow for both vehicular and pedestrian cross-access to adjacent properties to encourage shared parking and shared access points on public or private streets. A minimum distance of one hundred (100) feet shall be required between a cross-access way and an intersection or driveway entrance. This requirement may be modified pursuant to Section 3.19.1 provided that appropriate bicycle and pedestrian connections are provided between adjacent developments or land uses. A cross access easement must be recorded prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the development.

**(D) Exceptions**

New developments adjacent to existing neighborhoods classified as Tier 2 or Tier 3 Neighborhoods are exempt from portions of 7.10.3(A) – (C), as provided below:

**(1) Classification of Existing Neighborhood Adjacent to Proposed Development**

**(a) Tier 1 Neighborhood**

A Tier 1 neighborhood is defined as any residential neighborhood not otherwise classified as Tier 2 or Tier 3.

**(b) Tier 2 Neighborhood**

A Tier 2 neighborhood is defined as a residential neighborhood that meets all of the following criteria:

1. The neighborhood was developed pursuant to a subdivision or site plan approved at any time by a jurisdiction other than the Town of Cary, or approved by the Town of Cary prior to January 14, 1999; and
2. The neighborhood meets the following criteria:
  - a) A public street right-of-way in the existing neighborhood extends to the common property line, however the street itself does not extend to the common property line; or, no existing right-of-way or street extends to the common property line; and
  - b) There are no factors present to indicate the intent, at the time of approval or construction of the Tier 2 neighborhood, that a street would be connected at a later time, such as recordation of construction easements; or physical constraints such as stream

buffers or topographic issues are present that would have made extension of the street to the property line infeasible at the time of construction of the neighborhood and

3. Potential public safety issues such as inadequate fire and police protection, are present, or are likely to be created in the future, if a proposed new development does not connect to the adjacent existing development. Potential safety issues may be indicated by factors including but not limited to, a single vehicular access point, and/or the major street serving the neighborhood exceeding 1,000 feet in length.

**(c) Tier 3 Neighborhood**

A Tier 3 neighborhood is defined as a residential neighborhood that meets all of the following criteria:

1. The neighborhood was developed pursuant to a subdivision or site plan approved at any time by a jurisdiction other than the Town of Cary, or approved by the Town of Cary prior to January 14, 1999; and
2. The neighborhood meets the following criteria:
  - a) A public street right-of-way in the existing neighborhood extends to the common property line, however the street itself does not extend to the common property line; or, no existing right-of-way or street extends to the common property line; and
  - b) There are no factors present to indicate the intent, at the time of approval or construction of the Tier 3 neighborhood, that a street would be connected at a later time, such as recordation of construction easements; or physical constraints such as stream buffers or topographic issues are present that would have made extension of the road to the property line infeasible at the time of construction of the neighborhood, and
3. There are no apparent public safety issues such as inadequate fire and police protection or response capability present, or likely to be created in the future, if a proposed new development does not connect to the adjacent existing development.

**(d) Neighborhood Classification**

The Director of the Transportation and Facilities Department shall determine the classification of existing neighborhoods.

**(2) Exceptions to Connectivity Requirements for New Development**

- (a) Adjacent to a Tier 1 Neighborhood, all requirements of Section 7.10.3(A) – (C) shall apply.
- (b) Adjacent to a Tier 2 Neighborhood, all requirements of Section 7.10.3(A) – (C) shall apply, with the following exceptions or modifications:
  1. Construction of a road connection to the property line of the Tier 2 Neighborhood is allowed but not required. If no connection is made, a connectivity index less than 1.2 may be approved by the Planning Director if such reduction results from the lack of connection to the Tier 2 Neighborhood.

2. If no road connection is made, an emergency access connection to the Tier 2 neighborhood must be provided. Such connection may include a paved street connection with removable obstructions to prevent non-emergency access, raised curb treatment, turf stone with grass, or other methods approved by the Director of Transportation and Facilities and the Fire Chief.
  3. Pedestrian and bicycle connections, and utility stubs and connections shall continue to be required.
- (c) Adjacent to a Tier 3 Neighborhood, all requirements of Section 7.10.3(A) – (C) shall apply, with the following exceptions or modifications:
1. Construction of a road connection to the property line of the Tier 3 Neighborhood is allowed but not required. If no connection is made, a connectivity index less than 1.2 may be approved by the Planning Director if such reduction results from the lack of connection to the Tier 3 Neighborhood.
  2. Pedestrian and bicycle connections, and utility stubs and connections shall continue to be required.

## ITEM C– DENSITY AND DIMENSIONAL STANDARD FOR LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL USE

### BACKGROUND

#### Land Use Plan and LDO Requirements

##### **1. Land Use Plan Designations for Residential Development**

The Town's adopted land use plan illustrates potential *future* development on every parcel of land in the entire planning area. Currently, the land use plan designations for future residential development include the following:

- VLDR (very low density residential, < 1 unit/acre)
- LDR (low density residential, 1 to 3 units/acre)
- MDR (medium density residential, 3 to 8 units/acres)
- HDR (high density residential, > 8 units per acre),
- MXD (mixed use development; densities are not predetermined)

##### **2. Lot Size Expectations Based on Land Use Plan Designation**

The preferred densities on our land use plan suggest to citizens that development will have lot sizes similar to the gross density of a parcel. For example, land designated as "2 units per acre" suggests to a citizen that the land will have half acre or similarly sized lots. However, after zoning is applied and land for infrastructure, buffers, and recreation space are considered, the resulting lot sizes are often much smaller than citizens expect. One might expect 20,000-square-foot lots and, instead, see 8,000-square-foot lots developed. This may have created a confusing environment for citizens. In addition, we have an unpredictable environment for developers when council rejects projects with lot sizes that appear too small.

##### **3. LDO Standards Applicable in Residential Zoning Districts**

To implement the policy contained in the Land Use Plan, zoning is applied. Zoning districts are the legal mechanism to provide specific development entitlements. Longstanding practice has been that an applicant may request any zoning district that will "fit" within the density range associated with the land use plan designation associated with the property.



Zoning District	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Lot Width (ft.)	Side Setbacks (ft.)	Rear Setbacks (ft.)
R-80	80,000	150	15	30
R-40	40,000	150	15	30
R-20	20,000	90	10	25
R-12	12,000	80	10	25
R-8	8,000	60	5 min., 20 combined	20
TR	5,000	40	0 / 3 min., 6 combined	3 min., 35 front and back combined

### Process to Date

#### Town Council Work Session (December 9, 2014)

Staff presented detailed information regarding the following general approaches to addressing the issue:

- (A) **Option to Deny Rezoning Requests.** Staff believes that council has considerable leeway or discretion when considering rezoning cases. Based on rezoning approval criteria found in Section 3.1.4E of the LDO.
- (B) **Correlate Designated Plan Densities With Allowable Zoning Districts.** Instead of allowing the use of any district (within reason), specify the eligible districts which can be requested so that the district's minimum lot size/density is more in line with the current land use plan's density designations.
- (C) **Adjust Density Ranges on the Plan.** The greatest amount of discussion on this issue over the past few years has centered on rezonings in the MDR (3-8 du/ac) category. This range was established to give greater flexibility, not only in terms of density but also for the product types (i.e., single-family detached units to townhomes). Perhaps this is too broad. (In fact, this category has been limited to a maximum of 6 dwellings per acre in some adopted area plans.) As part of Imagine Cary, the new plan's future land use categories could be narrowed or the range of product types within any category might be more limited.

Council expressed a desire to address this issue as quickly as possible, indicating that low density areas should be more in keeping with development standards for lower intensity zoning districts such as R-12.

#### Town Council Public Hearing (March 26, 2015)

In response to the discussion at the December 9 work session, staff recommended a 2-stage approach to address the relationship between the land use plan designation and the zoning districts used to implement the plan:

1. The first stage would revise minimum lot size and setback requirements applicable to detached dwellings in R-12, R-8 and TR zoning districts where the property is within the LDR or VLDR Land Use Plan designation, as follows:
  - In areas designated LDR, standards currently applicable in the R-12 district would also apply in R-8 and TR.
  - In areas designated VLDR, dimensional standards across all three districts would include a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet (3,000 square feet more than R-12), a minimum lot width of 85 feet (5 feet more than R-12), and setback requirements the same as R-12.
2. Staff recognized that to completely address all concerns associated with this issue, more comprehensive revisions to both the Land Use Plan and the Land Development Ordinance would be needed. Staff recommended that the policy direction be addressed as Imagine Cary moves forward, and that expectations regarding the relationship between density and dimensional standards be

clearly expressed in the final document. After completion of the Imagine Cary initiative and adoption of a new Comprehensive Plan, a comprehensive review of (including the potential replacement of) Cary's Land Development Ordinance should be considered.

Following the public hearing, council directed that this item be further discussed at a council work session. Concerns were expressed that the amendment as initially proposed might be overly restrictive.

#### **Feedback from the Wake County Home Builders Association (May 13, 2015)**

Staff met with the government affairs committee of the Wake County Homebuilders Association on May 13, 2015 to present Round 31 LDO amendment items that had been to public hearing and were moving forward to the Planning and Zoning Board (especially Item B, Buffer and Tree Protection Enforcement). As part of the meeting, staff provided the draft amendment text as presented for public hearing on March 26, 2015. While not one of the primary topics presented, concerns were shared regarding other LDO amendments, including this one related to lot sizes. Specifically, concerns were expressed that the smaller lot sizes and dimensions would prevent development of residential product types in demand, potentially resulting in development shifting away from Cary to neighboring jurisdictions. Committee members were advised of, and encouraged to attend, the upcoming work session on July 21.

#### **Town Council Work Session #2 (July 21, 2015)**

Staff reviewed this issue further and offered the following options for council to evaluate:

1. Prohibit the TR district in LDR and VLDR areas;
2. In the TR District, change standards for detached dwellings to match R-8, if in LDR or VLDR;
3. Add a new R-10 zoning district with standards "between" R-8 and R-12;
4. Specify which zoning districts may be requested within each Land Use Plan Designation: and/or
5. A combination of the above.

Council discussed options presented by staff at the work session and directed staff to bring options 1 and 4 to a Town Council public hearing

#### **Town Council Public Hearing #2 (August 27, 2015)**

There were no speakers at the public hearing, and no comments from council members.

#### **Planning and Zoning Board Meeting (October 19, 2015)**

The Planning and Zoning Board recommended approval of the proposed amendment by a vote of 4-3. Board members casting dissenting votes expressed support of the changes that were proposed, but also felt that some additional buffer area should be required in the very-low density areas where 8,000 square-foot lots would still be allowed.

### **PROPOSED TEXT**

#### **4.2.2 GENERAL ZONING DISTRICTS: Residential and Non-Residential Zoning Districts**

The specific purposes of the general use zoning districts are set forth below, along with any district-specific provisions that may apply. The allowed uses and use specific-standards for each of the districts are set forth in Chapter 5. All uses shall comply with the general dimensional standards set forth in Chapter 6, or as may be specified elsewhere in the Ordinance, including, but not limited to, Section 8.4, Alternative Development Option: Cluster Residential Subdivisions.

Some general use zoning districts and their associated conditional use zoning districts may be requested only within specified land use plan categories of the Cary Land Use Plan or applicable Area Plan that support the land use and development intensity associated with the requested zoning district, as provided in the following table.

<b>LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATIONS AND ASSOCIATED GENERAL USE ZONING DISTRICTS</b>				
<b>LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATION</b>	<b>GENERAL ZONING DISTRICT</b>			
	<b>R-12</b>	<b>R-8</b>	<b>TR</b>	<b>RMF</b>
<b>VLDR</b>	•	•		
<b>LDR</b>	•	•		
<b>MDR</b>	•	•	•	•
<b>HDR</b>		•	•	•
<b>INS</b>				
<b>COM</b>				
<b>OFC/IND</b>				
<b>OFC/INS</b>				
<b>Activity Center</b>	•	•	•	•

**(A) R-80: Residential District**

The R-80 district is established to ensure the protection of open space and to promote very low-density residential development that is compatible with watersheds and other environmentally sensitive areas, subject to appropriate standards. The district also can serve as an appropriate buffer between natural resources and water supply reservoirs and more developed areas. The minimum lot area is eighty thousand (80,000) square feet, and the maximum density allowed is fifty-four hundredths (0.54) units per acre.

**(B) R-40: Residential District**

The R-40 district is established to accommodate large-lot residential uses and development compatible with the natural landscape. The minimum lot area is forty thousand (40,000) square feet, and the maximum density allowed is one and eight hundredths (1.08) units per acre. The R-40 district can accommodate development on wells and/or septic tanks; but lots within new subdivisions in this district are required to connect to public water and sewer.

**(C) R-20: Residential District**

The R-20 district is established as a district in which the principal use of land is for low-density residential purposes, and is appropriate in areas where the Land Use Plan designation supports very low or low density residential use. All development in the R-20 district shall be required to utilize public utilities. The minimum lot area is twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, and the maximum density allowed is two and seventeen hundredths (2.17) units per acre.

**(D) R-12: Residential District**

The R-12 district is established as a district in which the principal use of land is for single-family dwellings, and is appropriate in areas where the Land Use Plan designation supports very low, low or medium density residential use. The regulations of this district are intended to discourage any use that would substantially interfere with the development of single-family dwellings and that would be detrimental to the quiet residential nature of the district. The minimum lot area is twelve thousand (12,000) square feet, and the maximum density allowed is three and sixty-three hundredths (3.63) units per acre.

**(E) R-8: Residential District**

The R-8 district is established as a district in which the principal use of land is for single-family dwellings, and is appropriate in areas where the Land Use Plan designation supports low, medium or high density residential use. The regulations for this district are intended to discourage any use that would substantially interfere with the development, use, and enjoyment of single-family dwellings or that would be detrimental to the quiet residential character of the district. The regulations of this district also are designed to encourage the wise use of land and natural resources, with the aim of reducing sprawl and the costly

provision of infrastructure to serve dispersed development. The minimum lot area is eight thousand (8,000) square feet, and the maximum density allowed is five and forty-four hundredths (5.44) units per acre.

**(F) TR: Transitional Residential District**

The TR district is established as a district in which the principal use of land is for a variety of residential uses, and is appropriate in areas where the Land Use Plan designation supports medium or high density residential use. with the exception of multi-family structures. This district is appropriate for infill developments smaller than ten (10) acres in established neighborhoods, for denser residential neighborhoods, and for areas identified for medium-density residential uses in the Town's Land Use Plan. The regulations of this district are intended to allow innovation in the arrangement of buildings within such developments. The minimum lot size for single family detached dwellings is five thousand (5,000) square feet, and the maximum density allowed is six (6) units per acre.

**(G) RMF: Residential Multi-Family District**

The RMF district is established as a district in which the principal use of land is for multi-family dwellings and also less-intensive residential uses such as patio homes, and is appropriate in areas where the Land Use Plan designation supports high density residential use. This district can be applied to locations that are suitable for multi-family development, and thus provide areas within the community for persons desiring to live in multi-family structures at densities sufficient to support public transit. This district should be located so as to not interfere with or damage environmentally sensitive lands and to ensure that adequate open space and recreational facilities are located nearby, or within the district itself, to serve the needs of the persons who are or will be living in the district. The maximum density allowed is 12 units per acre.