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Purpose

Indianapolis Insight has been a process of broad-based and balanced citizen participation. Consistent with national trends in comprehensive planning, this plan has improved upon previous plans by:

- Placing more emphasis on policies rooted in common community values,
- Focusing more attention on ways to positively position Indianapolis within the context of total metropolitan growth, and
- Tackling issues on a comprehensive, countywide basis.

Indianapolis Insight is being developed in two major parts. The first section of the plan, called the Community Values Component, has been completed and consists of community values, goals and supporting documentation. The second major component will consist of specific land use recommendations.

The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan Mapping Handbook is to outline the process for completing the land use recommendation phase of the Indianapolis Insight process. It distills the guidance set down in the Community Values Component and provides instructions and explanation for the mapping of land use recommendations.
Community Values Component

The Community Values Component sets forth a framework for development of the General Land Use Maps. It also includes planning principles, value statements and recommendations for new and revised policies, procedures, programs, and ordinances as they relate to land use or to the mission of the Department of Metropolitan Development.

The Community Values Component provides an array of supporting information. The document includes chapters on the history of the city and county, environmental conditions and population and housing trends. A glossary of planning terms is also provided.

The Community Values Component was developed through an extensive public input process. Since September 2000, approximately 700 volunteers have contributed over 3600 hours to the planning process.

Public input was gathered through Town Hall meetings and Issues Committees. Two series of Town Hall Meetings have been held. Each series was conducted in four locations around the city on various nights of the week over a three-week period. The first series, in September and October of 2000, provided insight into the issues and values that Indianapolis citizens have about the development of the city and county. The second series of Town Hall Meetings was held in October of 2001. This series was held in an open house format where the draft Community Values Component was presented for open discussion.

In between the two series of Town Hall Meetings, eight Issue Committees met to discuss issues and develop goals, recommendations, and standards in their particular topical area. Each committee was comprised of 30 to 40 experts, city staff persons and Indianapolis citizens. The Issue Committees each met eight to nine times beginning in late January 2001. The Community Values Component was largely developed from the deliberations of the Issue Committees.

On February 20, 2002 the Metropolitan Development Commission (MDC) officially adopted the Indianapolis Insight Plan Community Values Component as the first phase of the Comprehensive Plan for Marion County, Indiana.
Land Use Component

The second component of the plan, the land use recommendations, is required by state statute as the basis for zoning and will consist of two parts: the General Land Use Maps and Critical Areas.

The General Land Use Maps are a guide for staff, decision-makers and the public when reviewing projects, and are used to evaluate rezoning applications; to project future population and employment concentrations, and to consider redevelopment options.

Critical Areas exhibit an unusual character, important location, or significant infrastructure need that warrants a high degree of scrutiny. Critical area recommendations address significant land use issues that require more detailed information than that shown on the General Land Use Maps.

The General Land Use Maps

The General Land Use Maps are envisioned as double-sided, color maps. The front of the maps will depict the following elements:

- Primary Land Use Categories
- Secondary Land Use Categories
- Indexing
- Sub-Area Plan Overlay

The back of the maps will show and describe the Critical Areas.

Primary Land Use Categories

Primary land use categories broadly define development by use and intensity, and should be considered the most appropriate use for the land. They are the starting point for determining the appropriateness of land use requests.

In addition to the primary land use recommendation, the Metropolitan Development Commission also considers the following factors in their land use decisions. However these factors are evaluated in light of the Comprehensive Plan’s land use recommendations.

- current conditions and the character of existing structures and uses,
- the most desirable use for the property,
- the conservation of property values, and
- responsible development and growth
The Plan anticipates that the impacts of any deviation in land use from the one recommended by the Plan should be comparable to the typical impacts of the primary land use recommendation.

Because the Comprehensive Plan assumes that Marion County will eventually be fully developed, the Plan’s recommendations cover every parcel of land in the county either through the General Land Use Map or the appropriate sub-area plan.

The following categories are used to designate primary land use recommendations on the land use plan maps:

- **Residential**
  - greater than 0.00 and equal to or less than 1.75 units per acre
  - greater than 1.75 and equal to or less than 3.50 units per acre
  - greater than 3.50 and equal to or less than 5.00 units per acre
  - greater than 5.00 and equal to or less than 8.00 units per acre
  - greater than 8.00 and equal to or less than 15.00 units per acre
  - greater than 16.00 units per acre

- **Mixed Uses**
  - Urban Mixed-Use
  - Village Mixed-Use
  - Airport Related Mixed-Use

- **Commercial**
  - Office Commercial Uses
  - Community Commercial Uses
  - Regional Commercial Uses
  - Heavy Commercial Uses

- **Industrial**
  - Light Industrial
  - General Industrial

- **Other Land Uses**
  - Park
  - Linear Park
  - Special Use
  - Floodway

These categories are described in more detail on the following pages.
Residential Development greater than 0.00 and equal to or less than 1.75 units per acre.

Color: Light Yellow
Index Number: 1

This density is consistent with rural development patterns and could also limit the impact of development on property with extreme topography or other significant environmental considerations such as floodplains, wetlands and old-growth woodlands. Additionally, this density would be conducive to agricultural and estate development.

Residential Development greater than 1.75 and equal to or less than 3.50 units per acre.

Color: Dark Yellow
Index Number: 2

This density is consistent with single-family residential development in transitional areas between rural and suburban development patterns and is the typical density for single-family residential development in suburban areas of the City. Development at this density should not take place in rural and suburban areas where surrounding development patterns exhibit characteristics suitable for higher densities (property on mass transit corridors, near concentrations of employment, or near major commercial centers, for example).
Residential Development greater than 3.50 and equal to or less than 5.00 units per acre.

Color: Light Orange  
Index Number: 3

This density is consistent with single-family residential development in suburban areas of the City and in transitional areas between suburban and urban patterns of development. Development at this density should not take place on mass transit corridors. Multi-family residential development is acceptable, but is unlikely considering the density ranges recommended.

Residential Development greater than 5.00 and equal to or less than 8.00 units per acre.

Color: Dark Orange  
Index Number: 4

In suburban and rural areas this is a common multi-family density and typically the highest density single-family category in suburban areas. In urban areas, it is common for both single-family and multi-family development. Development at this density is appropriate along bus corridors but should not take place in proximity to planned light rail transit stops.
Residential Development greater than 8.00 and equal to or less than 15.00 units per acre.

Color: Light Brown
Index Number: 5

This density is typically the highest density serviceable in suburban areas. In suburban areas it would typically be a multi-family (apartment or condominium) category. In urban areas, this is the highest density single-family residential category and a common multi-family category. Development at this density is appropriate for all types of mass transit corridors.

Residential Development greater than 15.00 units per acre.

Color: Dark Brown
Index Number: 6

This density is appropriate only within relatively intense urban areas where there is a full range of urban services and where those services have the capacity to accommodate the development. It may be appropriate in rare circumstances in suburban areas as assisted-living housing and as a buffer between major retail commercial uses and lower density residential uses. Development at this density is appropriate for all types of mass transit corridors.
Urban Mixed-Use

Color: Beige
Index Number: 7

This land use category consists of existing areas of densely developed, pedestrian oriented, mixed-use (primarily commercial), development within the historic central city and first generation suburban areas of Indianapolis. The development pattern varies from location to location but typically includes multi-story buildings located at or near rights-of-way, with entrances and large windows facing the street. Parking is typically within, to the side, or to the rear of buildings. Original building uses were retail and services on the ground floor with offices or apartments on subsequent floors. Future development in these areas should maintain the historic fabric of the existing development. This category is also used in areas where it is appropriate to replicate this older style of development or where it is appropriate to develop small (less than 5-acre) retail uses that serve the immediate neighborhood. The Plan anticipates that development of property with this recommendation would result from a public input process.

56th and Illinois Streets 52nd Street and College Avenue

Village Mixed-Use

Color: Peach
Index Number: 8

This land use category consists of a development focused on a mixed-use core of small, neighborhood office/retail nodes, public and semi public uses, open space and light industrial development. Residential development densities vary from compact single-family residential development and small-scale multi-family residential development near the “Main Street” or “Village Center” and progress to lower densities outward from this core. Village mixed use areas are intended to strengthen existing, historically rural, small towns and cities within Indianapolis, which are intended to continue as neighborhood gathering places and should allow a wide range of small businesses, housing types, and public and semi-public facilities. This category should be compatible in size and scale to existing villages in Marion County. It will allow development of residential and limited commercial uses on smaller lots than in other sections of rural and suburban Indianapolis.

Potential development in these areas should focus on design issues related to architecture, building size, parking, landscaping and lighting to promote a pedestrian-oriented
“village” or “small town” atmosphere, rather than focusing on residential density. Strip commercial development (integrated centers setback from rights-of-way by parking areas), large-scale freestanding retail uses and heavy industrial development are generally inappropriate within this land use category. The Plan anticipates that this category will typically be designated as a critical area. The Plan also anticipates that development of property with this recommendation would result from a public input process.

**Airport Related Mixed-Use**

Color: Salmon  
Index Number: 18

This land use category consists of commercial and industrial land uses that are considered complementary to airport development but do not exhibit characteristics incompatible with sensitive land uses. This land use category is intended as a buffer between airports and more sensitive land uses. All residential development is inappropriate within this district.
Office Commercial Uses

Color: Pink
Index Number: 9

This land use category is for low-intensity office uses, integrated office development and compatible office-type uses. Retail uses are not promoted in this category, unless those uses are significantly subordinate to the primary office use or the retail use exclusively serves an abundance of office uses in proximity to the retail use. Office Commercial Uses can exist either as buffers between higher intensity land uses and lower intensity land uses or as major employment centers. The following uses are representative of this land use category: medical and dental facilities, education services, insurance, real estate, financial institutions, design firms, legal services, day care centers, mortuaries, and communications studios.

Community Commercial Uses

Color: Red
Index Number: 10

This land use category is for low-intensity retail commercial and office uses, which serve a predominantly residential market adjacent to, or very near, the location of the use. The uses in this land use category are designed to fulfill a broad range of retail, personal, professional and business services and are either freestanding or part of a small integrated center typically anchored by a grocery store. These centers contain no, or extremely limited, outdoor display of merchandise. Generally, these uses are consistent with the following characteristics:

- Maximum Gross Floor Area: 125,000 square feet
- Maximum Acreage: 25 acres
- Service Area Radius: 2 miles
- Location: On an arterial or at the intersection of an arterial with a collector.
- Maximum Outlots: 3
Regional Commercial Uses

Color: Red
Index Number: 11

This land use category is for general commercial and office type uses, which serve a market that encompasses several residential neighborhoods or communities. The uses in this land use category tend to benefit greatly from major business grouping and regional-sized shopping centers; therefore, this land use category may consist of a collection of relatively large freestanding commercial uses and integrated centers. These uses are generally characterized by indoor operations, but may have accessory outdoor operations limited to approximately 5 to 10 percent of a use’s gross floor area. Generally, these uses are consistent with the following characteristics:

- **Maximum Gross Floor Area:** 1,000,000 square feet
- **Service Area Radius:** 15 miles
- **Location:** On a primary arterial near the intersection with a secondary or primary arterial.
- **Maximum Outlots:** As needed.
**Heavy Commercial Uses**

Color: Red  
Index Number: 12

This land use category is for general commercial and related office type uses. The uses in this land use category tend to exhibit characteristics that are not compatible with less intensive land uses and are predominantly devoted to exterior operations, sales and display of goods; such as automobile sales and heavy equipment sales.

Location: On a primary arterial
**Light Industrial**

Color: Light Purple  
Index Number: 13

This land use category consists of industrial uses, which are conducted within enclosed structures and which may have no, or extremely limited outdoor storage requirements. Those industrial uses that require no outdoor storage can be considered appropriate buffers, provided the use does not exhibit characteristics incompatible with less intensive land uses. This category, regardless of the amount of outdoor storage, is considered an appropriate buffer between general industrial uses and less intensive land uses. Light industrial uses should create minimal impact on adjacent property.

**General Industrial**

Color: Dark Purple  
Index Number: 14

This land use category consists of industrial uses, which are intensive and are characterized by outdoor operations, significant requirements for outdoor storage, and/or intense emissions of light, odor, noise and vibration. These uses may have significant impacts that are difficult, expensive or impossible to completely eliminate or buffer from adjacent properties.
**Park**

Color: Green  
Index Number: 15

This land use category consists of public or private property designated for active and/or passive recreational amenities.

![Centennial & Groff Neighborhood Park](image1.png) ![Winding River Golf Course](image2.png)

**Linear Park**

Color: Green  
Index Number: 16

This land use category consists of public or private property designated for active and/or passive recreational amenities and is primarily used for the passage of people or wildlife. Typical examples are greenways and parkways.

![Pleasant Run Greenway](image3.png) ![Monon Rail-Trail](image4.png)
Special Use

Color: Grey  
Index Number: 17

This land use category consists of a variety public, semi-public and private land uses that either serve a specific public purpose (such as schools, churches, libraries, neighborhood centers and public safety facilities) or are unique uses exhibiting significant impacts on adjacent property (such as the Indianapolis International Airport, Indiana State Fair, and Indianapolis Motor Speedway).

Floodway

Color: Blue  
Index Number: 19

This land use classification consists of areas within the floodway. These areas exhibit a great potential for property loss and damage or for water quality degradation and should not be developed. Nonconforming uses currently within a floodway should not be expanded or altered. For residential density calculations, property within this category is recommended for zero units per acre.
Secondary Land Use Categories

Secondary land use categories designate areas where some characteristic of the site has a modifying effect on the primary land use, so that the two uses (both primary and secondary) should be considered together in making land use decisions for the site. Secondary land use categories can be used to identify and preserve the character of land possessing special environmental, natural or historical characteristics. Careful attention should be given to the secondary land use recommendation in regard to development proposals.

In this plan, one secondary land use category has been designated: Environmentally Sensitive. This secondary land use classification consists of land possessing special environmental or potentially valuable natural characteristics that require careful attention with regard to development proposals. Steeply sloped areas, high-quality woodlands, wetlands, significant aquifers, or other waterbody resources are examples of this designation.
Indexing

Another key element of the Comprehensive Plan is the use of an indexing system. Indexing is a method of numerically assigning an alternate land use recommendation to an area. Where the Comprehensive Plan uses indexing, the primary recommendation is identified by a color and the alternate land use recommendation by the index number. Indexing is most often used in those areas where the primary land use recommendation requires some public expenditure for implementation; for example, the acquisition of park land.

The primary land use recommendation represents the most appropriate and acceptable use for an area. The alternate land use is considered less appropriate than the primary land use. Unless it is clearly demonstrated to the Metropolitan Development Commission or Board of Zoning Appeals that development of the alternate recommendation would adequately protect the major features of the primary recommendation, the alternate use should be deemed inappropriate.

Sub-Plan Overlay

Over the years, detailed plans have been completed for many parts of the county. These sub-area plans are usually for a neighborhood or street corridor. In order to avoid unnecessary duplications or contradictory recommendations, the comprehensive plan update will not re-plan these areas. The small area plans are more detailed studies of the affected area and typically contain a detailed analysis of the area in question and contain proposed land use and zoning maps.

The recommended land uses in the sub-area plans have been generalized and will be included on the General Land Use Maps to provide context; however, to ascertain the true primary land use recommendation for parcels within their boundaries, the sub-area plans must be consulted.

During the update process, all small area plans were evaluated for continued applicability. In the event that a small area plan exists for an area, but is not included on the Small Area Plan Overlay, it was determined that significant changes to the area had rendered the land use recommendations of the plan obsolete. In those cases, the small area plan can be referenced for appropriate detail, but the land use recommendations of the General Land Use Maps supercede the land use and zoning recommendations of the small area plan.

Additionally, small area plans will continue to be adopted as updates to the Comprehensive Plan subsequent to the adoption of this document and the General Land Use Maps. In these instances, the primary land use recommendation of the small area plan would supercede the recommendation of the General Land Use Map; however, any secondary land use recommendation should be incorporated into recommendations on land use petitions.
The following map shows the extent of the neighborhood and corridor plans that will be included in the Small Area Plan Overlay. The map also shows how the portions of Center Township without neighborhood or corridor plans will be planned in conjunction with neighboring townships.

1 This portion of Center Township to be planned with Wayne Township
2 This portion of Center Township to be planned with Wayne Township
3 This portion of Center Township to be planned with Warren Township
4 This portion of Center Township to be planned with Warren Township
5 This portion of Center Township to be planned with Perry Township
Critical Areas

The Comprehensive Plan also designates critical areas. Each critical area exhibits an unusual character, important location, or significant infrastructure need that warrants a high degree of scrutiny. Critical area recommendations address significant land use issues that require more detailed information than that shown on the General Land Use Maps. The critical area text documents and explains why a certain area is considered critical and presents additional information about the area. The Metropolitan Development Commission and Board of Zoning Appeals should use this information to make decisions on land use petitions filed on or near these locations.

Once critical areas are identified, explanatory text will need to be developed to provide guidance for subsequent land use decisions. The text will generally describe why the area is critical, specific recommendations for the area and any additional data necessary.

Critical areas should be used sparingly so that they retain their “specialness” which is one of their chief benefits.
Planning Area Meetings

It is estimated that each planning area will require nine 1.5-hour meetings to complete the tasks required to update the Land Use Component. The general milestones for each meeting are outlined in the following table. If more meetings are needed to complete the work, they will be added to the schedule.

Anticipated Schedule

| 1st mtg. | Introduction to process.  
|          | Propose land uses for stable areas. |
| 2nd mtg. | Accept land uses for stable areas.  
|          | Designate environmentally sensitive areas (floodways, wellfields, etc.).  
|          | Propose land uses for areas in transition. |
| 3rd mtg. | Accept designations for environmentally sensitive areas and land uses for areas in transition.  
|          | Propose land uses for undeveloped areas based on mapping standards (proposed parks and greenways, areas around interchanges, areas in proximity to mass transit, growth areas around major employment centers, planned schools and other civic structures). |
| 4th mtg. | Accept land uses for undeveloped areas based on mapping standards.  
|          | Propose areas for scenario building, build scenarios. * |
| 5th mtg. | Present results of scenario testing.  
|          | Decide among scenarios. |
| 6th mtg. | Accept scenarios.  
|          | Propose land uses for remaining areas, propose indexing. |
| 7th mtg. | Accept land uses for remaining areas, accept indexing.  
|          | Propose critical areas. |
| 8th mtg. | Accept critical areas.  
|          | Propose critical area text. |
| 9th mtg. | Accept critical area text. |

* not all township planning areas will have large, undeveloped areas suitable for scenario testing.

For a map of the township mapping areas, please see page 18.
Principles, Goals and Mapping Standards

**Principles**

To effectively update the Land Use Component of the Comprehensive Plan, the principles of the Plan must be understood.

**Regionalism**

Comprehensive Plans have had to respond to changing problems and challenges as urban centers have grown outward and matured.

Indianapolis will remain the largest city in the central Indiana region; however, rates of housing and population growth in Indianapolis have been exceeded by the rates of growth in the surrounding counties. Projections indicate that this situation will continue in the future. Many citizens have strong interests in the vitality of several counties within the region because job, school, shopping and recreation destinations are often found in municipalities or counties other than their places of residence.

The Central Indiana economy operates on an increasingly regional scale. Regions, not individual cities, are actively competing for economic development expansion and business retention. Regional cooperation is seen as an integral strategy to overall economic health. The economic well-being of the entire region, however, will continue to depend upon the strength of the central county.

Natural systems do not respect the jurisdictional limits. Air currents spread across the borders of counties, cities and towns. Watersheds collect and concentrate the drainage from urban and rural areas alike. Because of their size, amenities or physical setting, some parks and open space facilities serve the needs of an entire region. Recreation and transportation corridors can be linked within a regional perspective.

Indiana statutes do not mandate regional, however they do allow jurisdictions to work together for the mutual benefit of their citizens. Future plans should take into account current conditions and probable future growth within Marion County and its adjoining jurisdictions.

**Balance of Land Uses**

One of the objectives of land use planning is to balance the needs of a community with available resources. In practice, this balancing is often difficult to achieve. The challenge is to balance multiple land uses with social, political, and economic goals, while striving to maintain the health and sustainability of the ecosystem. Adding to the complexity is the need to comply with natural resource regulations and to view the consequences of land use at both the local and national levels.
The balance of land uses can be measured in a number of ways. One such measure is tax base equity. However, while zoning and planning authority is consolidated in Indianapolis, certain vital public services such as schools, police and fire protection remain segmented; therefore, 61 separate taxing districts exist. Achieving a strong and equitable tax base across so many districts will be a challenge.

To further complicate the ability to balance land use, the Plan should minimize the isolation of families and individuals based on age, income, race or disability by recommending a range of residential uses throughout the County to support the population.

Additionally, certain commercial and industrial land uses are often considered objectionable due to actual or perceived negative impacts; however, the uses may exist as a result of a viable market or are necessary for a fully functioning economy. In this instance, therefore, balancing land use means equitably distributing land uses throughout the City.

Finally, the impact of land uses on the physical and economic environment must be considered when balancing land uses. The possible impact of land uses on air quality, water quality, flood control, and drainage must be estimated and mitigated. The capacity of the infrastructure needed to serve an area should be evaluated in determining the intensity of development for that area. Employment and residential areas should be balanced geographically to minimize transportation problems. The need for open space, woodlands and public recreational areas must continue to grow to meet the ongoing needs of the population.

Intensity of Land Use

Intensity of use refers to the level of activity associated with a type of land use. Generally, the higher the level of activity associated with a land use, the higher the intensity. Measures of an area’s level of activity include the number of people and vehicles that enter and exit the area; the area’s physical development; and the area’s impact on adjacent land uses and sewer, water, drainage, transportation and ecological systems. In this context, the “impact” of a land use is generally associated with the negative effects on nearby land uses and the burden it places on existing systems.

Effective communities are planned and designed to function well. Ideally, a community would be built around a dense mixed-use core and radiate outward with less intensive uses. Indianapolis is fortunate to have a number of mixed-use cores throughout the city upon which to build. While the Regional Center is an important center of activity, various urban and rural villages also serve as important mixed-use building blocks for a vital City. While mixed-use development should be encouraged, in those instances were mixed-use is impractical the following principles of land use planning and intensities should be used to formulate planning recommendations:
• High intensity commercial and industrial land uses should be clustered or assembled in groups to form an activity node.
• The more traffic associated with a land use, the greater the street capacity required to serve the land use. Higher intensity land uses should be located adjacent to major roadways and lower intensity land uses can be on local streets.
• The greater the differences between the intensities of adjacent land uses, the greater amount of buffering necessary to shield the uses.
• The capacity of infrastructure needed to serve an area should be evaluated in determining the intensity of development for that area.
• Redevelopment proposals and infill development should be compatible with surrounding land uses.

Goals

The Community Values Component laid out goals, recommendations and mapping standards as a framework for formulating the Land Use Component. Below are the goals most directly related to land use. To see the full set of goals and recommendations, please consult the Community Values Component. The Mapping Standards follow in the next section.

1. Reflect the regional context in Marion County’s land use plan.

2. Specify land use categories and critical areas to reduce interpretive errors, eliminate the destruction of environmentally-sensitive areas, conserve natural resources and project appropriate land use intensities based on the capacities of supporting infrastructure.

3. Incorporate a mix of uses where applicable, in the planning, design, development, and/or redevelopment of neighborhoods, support multi-accessible amenities such as neighborhood shopping, schools, libraries, parks and quality employment.

4. Discourage or prevent the encroachment of incompatible uses into each other; be open to appropriate ways to mix and mesh more compatible uses.

5. Use the conventions of land use planning to protect environmentally sensitive areas.

6. Provide all Marion County residents, whether in established or developing neighborhoods, a variety of convenient parks and greenways and to protect existing parks and greenways from encroachment.

7. Clean up and reuse areas with environmental contamination and clarify the status of areas with the perception of environmental contamination.

8. Develop the city in a manner that does not threaten the underground supply of drinking water or unduly contributes to flooding or diminished surface water quality.
9. Develop the city in a manner that does not unduly contribute to diminished air quality and, where possible, retrofit the form of the city to improve air quality.

10. Reserve quality open space as habitats for plants and animals and for the well-being and quality-of-life of the city’s citizens.

11. Take full advantage of the positive impacts of trees on the urban environment by conserving existing trees and planting new trees.

12. Improve the environmental health of neighborhoods.

13. Designate sites and provide infrastructure to encourage growth in the industry clusters that can be demonstrated as current or probable future strengths of the city.

14. Integrate transportation system planning with land use development strategies to increase industry access to local, domestic and international business markets.

15. Provide for an efficient, non-polluting, quiet, and affordable transportation network that provides access for all citizens to and from all areas of the metropolitan region.

16. Maximize the performance and long-term viability of the current thoroughfare system.

17. Improve pedestrian mobility.

18. Use transportation and infrastructure improvements to enhance the quality of life by providing transportation choices that enhance both individual and community mobility.

19. Improve infrastructure, manage demand and maximize use of the existing infrastructure.

20. Establish the opportunity for every citizen in Indianapolis to live in safe and decent housing.

21. Develop a range of housing types, for owners and renters of all income levels in each township, to support the diverse need for housing in our community and to encourage homeownership.

22. Develop new venues for arts and cultural activities throughout the city.

23. Build an adequate supply of public schools to accommodate children from new housing developments.

24. Provide accessible health care.
Mapping Standards

Delineating the land use recommendation maps is one of the most important tasks involved in developing a comprehensive plan.

The following series of standards was developed to facilitate the delineation by providing consistency and reminding the delineators of the wide range of considerations they must keep in mind as they do their work.

The mapping standards represent the work of the Issue Committees as informed by the directions of the Steering Committee and principles of good planning.

Mapping Standards Related to Transportation

**When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:**

- coordinate with the Thoroughfare Plan. *This combines the objectives of minimizing deviations from the land use plan and maintaining an acceptable “level-of-service” on thoroughfares.*

- realize the inter-relationship of land use planning and alternatives to single occupancy vehicles. *If single occupancy vehicles are relied upon exclusively, land development must include sufficient parking and will tend to be at lower densities. Mass transit will not be as effective in these cases. Certain land development options depend upon higher densities, pedestrian scale and less land devoted to automobile parking.*

- note the need for transportation corridor plans that extend over county lines.

- provide sites for inter-modal transportation transfer facilities, including park and ride locations. *The appropriate land use category for these is Special Use.*

- consider public safety impacts; traffic congestion and poor access can impede response time.

- should an interstate route to the southwest be determined, proposed land uses along that corridor should be appropriately designated. *Interstate 69 has the potential of opening several markets. Potential land uses should not interfere with the extension and operation of this interstate.*

Mapping Standards Related to the Environment

**When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:**

- identify critical groundwater resource areas as Environmentally Sensitive areas. *This includes wellfields and potential wellfields.*
• recommend land uses in wellfields that are less polluting uses such as parks, open space, residential, and office.

• identify natural features that provide for clean water benefits, i.e. wetlands (natural and constructed), forested tracts, ravines, and feeder streams or headwater areas.

• propose land uses that are likely to have the least impact on increasing flooding and are likely to be the least impacted by flooding within the floodplains. This decreases the risk of flooding within each watershed and minimizes damages when flooding occurs.

• depict native forest fragments, riparian corridors, stands of native trees, wooded wetlands and important urban and pioneer woodlands as Environmentally Sensitive Areas.

Mapping Standards Related to Parks

When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:

• use a parks-to-population standard of 17.3 acres of parkland for every 1000 persons of actual or projected population. This standard was set in “Pathways to the Future, the Indianapolis-Marion County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan”. This standard should be applied at a sub-township level.

• provide a park within 1 mile of each residential development. Each neighborhood should expect to have a park within convenient walking or bicycling distance.

• use the updated Indianapolis Greenways Plan as the basis for the Linear Park designations. Additions to the updated plan can be included to provide improve connections among neighborhoods, parks and community amenities through a variety of path, trail and sidewalk options.

• coordinate with the Indianapolis Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

• provide greenways links through jurisdictional borders. This is a land use that can serve to complement other land uses with improved access, and serve as a buffer or transitional area between certain less compatible land uses.

Mapping Standards Related to Distribution of Land Uses

When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:

• distribute community assets and services throughout Indianapolis. There should be a broad array of community services in each part of the community, including social services, recreation, childcare, community/intergenerational centers etc.
• recognize the needs for a strong regional business, social and cultural center as well as modern well-planned suburban employment centers. *Multiple site location options for office, research, industry and warehouse-distribution facilities in the region are beneficial. Multiple business centers help to distribute the tax base among taxing districts.*

• provide transition of uses between residential areas and more intense uses. *Office, service-related commercial uses, and multi-family residential should be used to transition between single-family residential, school, and religious uses and more intense land uses.*

• develop stream valleys and transportation corridors for multiple use (utility, recreation) purposes. *Once abandoned, corridors are difficult and costly to reestablish in single ownership.*

Mapping Standards Related to Housing

**When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:**

• recommend residential densities greater than 3.5 units per acre for areas near concentrations of employment or near major commercial centers. *This provides a stepped transition from high intensity land uses to lower intensity land uses and provides more persons with walking/bicycling options.*

• recommend residential densities in the 5 to 8 units per acre category or greater for areas on bus routes. *This provides great enough densities for a functional bus system.*

• recommend residential densities in the 8 to 15 units per acre category or greater for areas near proposed light rail stations. *This provides great enough densities for a functional light rail system.*

• Develop the land use plan to include a variety of housing types and densities in redevelopment areas.

Mapping Standards Related to Commercial and Industrial Uses

**When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:**

• make certain that targeted business clusters can be sited in mutually supportive locations.

• look for rational boundaries inside which non-residential land uses have room to grow. *Do not sacrifice stable residential areas. Redevelopment areas are more likely to have residences located very close by, with predictable conflicts.*
• provide reasonable and effective growth areas around major employment centers. *Establish sufficient room for viable business areas to expand. Compare existing land use plans with zoning. See when isolated residential uses may deter business expansions. Established employers may need assistance in keeping their facilities attractive and competitive. Examples: more employee parking, larger maneuvering areas for trucks, loading, better space arrangements for modern business methods.*

• Reserve large tracts of undeveloped land near existing or proposed interstate interchanges and transit stops for mixed-use industrial and commercial development and other highway-oriented land uses *Interstate interchanges are appropriate locations for park and ride facilities and industrial/commercial developments.* Noise concerns with the interstate dictates limiting residential development. Examples of new interchanges are the new I-70/Six Points Road in the airport area and a possible German Church Rd/I-70 interchange.

• note that many older retail outlets and lots do not fulfill contemporary marketing practices. *Land may need to be reassembled in some cases to meet these requirements. For example many original convenience stores in the 1970s and ‘80s were built in remodeled gas stations. However new convenience stores are often much larger and are purpose-built. Lot depths and widths for modern retail may conflict with the typical lot sizes for older stores. Sites may not accommodate more modern food retailing practices, with drive-up windows and parking spaces that do not conflict with gas dispensing.*

• Designate no less than 50 contiguous acres, preferably an existing brownfield in an older suburban area in proximity to the downtown area, to promote the attraction or expansion of information technology, advanced manufacturing and life science industries. *Nurture the strengths of Indianapolis and create a brownfield redevelopment in Indianapolis as a model public-private cooperation effort.*

Mapping Standards Related to Mixed Land Use Categories

**When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:**

• recommend development of mixed-use communities throughout the region from redevelopment areas to greenfields. *One advantage of this is that it will allow alternate forms of transportation such as transit, walking or biking, reducing the number and length of automobile trips.*

• Identify areas with established architectural and historic qualities where potential overlay districts can bolster preservation and restoration. *New development that respects its historic settings can enhance preservation and restoration of existing structures.*

• Identify areas with a cohesive character for similar overlay zoning even if these areas do not meet historic district standards. *Areas that may not meet historic district*
standards may still have qualities that may be adversely affected by new development that does not respect the established setting.

Mapping Standards Related to Regionalism

When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:

- consult the adopted plans of neighboring planning. Communicate with surrounding jurisdictions to avoid conflicts of land use types near the edges of Marion County.

- recognize the regional impact of the Indianapolis International Airport and make the most of air related cargo and passenger opportunities. Promote the coordination of land use and zoning policies with Marion County, Hendricks County, Morgan County, Plainfield and Mooresville to ensure compatible land uses in lands near the airport. New airport related development would likely be in large-scale projects, requiring overall master plans. These projects may straddle governmental boundaries, but need to be uniformly planned and developed. Development standards should not vary because of jurisdictional boundaries. Opportunities for competitive and efficient development projects should not be compromised when they may include more than one local government.

Other Mapping Standards

When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:

- ensure that land use recommendations are consistent with the anticipated capacity of supporting infrastructure. As an example, locating very low-density residential recommendations along primary arterials is not appropriate.

- use critical areas sparingly to retain the “specialness” that is their value. Critical areas along Marion County edges may need thoughtful coordination among localities.

- identify areas with a concentration of the arts as Arts Districts. Creating arts districts improves the economic base of Indianapolis by generating tourism and enhancing the community.

- Delineate a suitable amount of property in proximity to IUPUI, in order to provide adequate area for expansion, while promoting an aesthetically pleasing campus. IUPUI should be nurtured to ensure that it becomes a high-quality post-secondary education establishment.
Scenario Planning

Using a technique known as scenario planning, citizens will have the opportunity to shape alternative land development arrangements and then test the implications of these arrangements against this Plan’s stated values. This technique allows for conversation, negotiation and compromise.

To be suitable, scenario sites must be have contiguous vacant or agricultural tracts large enough to accommodate a variety of development patterns. The sites also need a framework of roads classified as arterials under the Marion County Thoroughfare Plan that will accommodate future growth and potential mass transit services.

For each of the scenario site citizens will develop three or four plausible and realistic scenarios. During this process participants will have opportunities to draw from their own experiences and consider the opportunities and constraints inherent in the scenario sites. The scenarios will then be tested against this Plan’s stated values using the indicators and measures listed below.

**Value: Balance of Land Uses**
Indicator: Job centers in proximity to residential areas
- Measure: % of office and industrial areas within scenario area
- Measure: % of residential areas within 2 miles of an office or industrial use

Indicator: Retailing in proximity to residential areas
- Measure: % of retail uses within scenario area
- Measure: % of residential areas within 1/2 mile of a retail use

Indicator: Appropriate sites allocated to civic services and facilities
- Measure: % of the facility and service to population ratio met (school sites, fire facilities etc.)

**Value: Healthy Environment**
Indicator: Contribution to air pollution
- Measure: Vehicle mile traveled per capita
- Measure: Pounds per year per capita of oxides of nitrogen (NOX)

Indicator: Protection of wellfields
- Measure: % of wellfields with compatible land uses

Indicator: Minimization of flooding
- Measure: % of floodplains with compatible land uses

Indicator: Provision of parks and greenways
- Measure: housing proximity to recreation, average distance to a park
- Measure: park acres per 1,000 persons
Value: Transportation
Indicator: Access to mass transit
  • Measure: housing proximity to transit
  • Measure: employment proximity to transit
Indicator: Traffic congestion
  • Measure: level of service (LOS) on primary and secondary arterials, based on vehicle trips (VT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

Value: Strong Economy
Indicator: Appropriate sites allocated to office and industrial uses (near interchanges, rail lines and airport)
  • Measure: % of area within 1/2 mile of interstate interchanges, on a rail line or within 1 mile of an airport with land use recommended for an industrial or travel-related use
Indicator: Availability of jobs and workers
  • Measure: jobs to housed workers balance

The results of scenario testing will be presented to citizens at a later meeting. The results will provide an informed basis upon which land use alternatives will be further discussed until a final land use arrangement is established.

Implementation Committees

Implementation of a comprehensive plan is a multi-faceted undertaking. Implementation of this particular plan will be especially complex due to the large number of recommendations and proposed ordinance and procedural changes. To assist in this effort, the formation of Implementation Committees is anticipated.

At this time, two implementation committees are proposed. These will be standing committees that will continue throughout the life of the Plan, and will be comprised of a well-balanced core-group of citizens. The first committee would be devoted to intra-county implementation issues. It would study zoning, permitting and enforcement issues and help implement improvements. The second committee will be comprised of planning professionals from throughout metropolitan Indianapolis to discuss issues of regional cooperation and communication.

End of the Process

Adoption of the land use recommendations by the MDC will take place upon completion of the last township mapping process in order to ensure consistency and coordination among the townships.
The adoption process begins with a finished draft available for public comment.

Approximately 30 days after the finished draft is available for comment, a Steering Committee Meeting will be held to present any feedback from the comment period and receive final guidance from the Steering Committee. After the Steering Committee meeting, a “Wrap-up Event” is proposed. This “Wrap-up Event” will be similar to the “Kick-off Event” conducted at the beginning of the update process and would be held in a central location to present the final document.

The Final Draft will be presented to the Metropolitan Development Commission at their pre-hearing meeting. Approximately two weeks after that presentation, the Final Draft will receive a public hearing before the Metropolitan Development Commission. The MDC will then vote on the Plan’s adoption.
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