Ms. Minter called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM and asked for a roll call. Following roll call, a quorum was found to be present. Ms. Minter reminded the audience that there were two public hearings occurring tonight and that if anyone wanted to speak, they needed to sign up with Ms. Turner to do so. Ms. Minter asked if everyone had reviewed the February 8, 2011 meeting minutes and asked if there were any additions or corrections. There being none, Ms. Minter called for a motion. Mr. Verst made a motion to approve the February 8th meeting minutes as submitted. Ms. Blake seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Pfeffer, Ms. Wright, Ms. Blake and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Ms. Minter opened the public hearing for case #05-11-ZMA-07, a request submitted by Trans-Ash for a zone map amendment proposing a change in zoning from R-RE/HC to IP, to the Planning Commission and asked Mr. Hutchinson to present the staff report and staff’s recommendation to the Commission. Mr. Hutchinson began by stating clearly for the record that all KRS requirements for public notification were followed including a sign posted on the site. Mr. Hutchinson also pointed out there was a conflict between the agenda and the report as to the acreage listed. The agenda listed 31 acres which is the total acreage of the entire Trans-Ash project; while the report lists only 29 acres which is correct because there were approximately 2 acres cut out for a Dollar General project that is not included in this zone change request. Ms. Minter recognized Mr. Williams’ arrival at 7:07 PM as he joined the Commission while Staff took the podium. Mr. Hutchinson presented his report to the Commission.

FILE NUMBER: 05-11-ZMA-07
APPLICANT: Trans-Ash
LOCATION: A 29 acre area located on Mary Ingles Highway 0.75 miles west of Four Mile Road, City of Silver Grove.
REQUEST: The submitted request is for approval of a zone map amendment proposing a change in zoning from R-RE / HC to IP. The proposal includes five lots and five industrial / warehouse users.

Considerations:

1. The 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update designates the area for Light Industrial. The Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance classifies the plan within the HC (Highway Commercial)
Zone and R-RE (Residential Rural Estate) Zone. The HC Zone permits automotive uses, financial institutions, bowling alleys, hotels, restaurants, garages, police and fire stations, advertising signs and dry cleaners. The R-RE Zone permits detached single-family dwellings on a minimum lot size of three (3) acre. Areas to the east and west of the site in question are zoned HC and R-RE. Areas to the south are zoned R-RE and to the north are I-4 (Industrial River) Zone.

2. The site in question was formerly occupied by a driving range and a putt-putt golf course.

3. The Transportation Plan Element of the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update identifies Mary Ingles Highway as a collector roadway.

4. The request is to rezone 5 lots 29 acres from HC and R-RE to IP (Industrial Park). The submitted site plan is a conceptual drawing of lots #3-7. The concept is for industrial and warehousing with components that include outside and inside storage. Before lots #3-7 are developed, the applicant will have to submit individual site plans to the Planning Commission for review and approval. Lot #1 & #2 are to remain in the HC Zone.

5. CITY OF SILVER GROVE ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS:

   IP (Industrial Park) Zone
   The IP Zone is established to provide a location for the rendering of food products, production of cigars, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, toiletries, commercial advertising structures, electric appliances, electrical machinery, fountain and beverage dispensing equipment, furniture, instruments, metal products, office equipment, pottery, textiles, dairy products, glass products, jewelry, leather products, craftsman and artisan shapes, taxidermy, blacksmith, welding shops, fire stations, industrial engineering offices, laboratories, offices, machine shops, printing, publishing, schools for industrial or business training, warehousing, distribution, building materials, sales yards, governmentally owned garages, carpet and rug cleaning, contractors office and storage yard, bus lines shops, stone and monument works, dry cleaning, marine warehousing sales and services, nurseries.

   The area and density regulations for permitted uses in the IP Zone in the Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance are as follows:

   Zone Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum tract for industrial development</td>
<td>20 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area Within Minimum Tract</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot width at building setback line</td>
<td>One Hundred Fifty (150) Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum front yard depth</td>
<td>Along internal roads Fifty (50) feet, along arterial streets Seventy Five (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side yard width on each side of lot</td>
<td>In internal parts of the park Fifty Feet (50), adjacent to arterial roads Seventy Five (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum rear yard depth</td>
<td>Fifty (50) feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum building height</td>
<td>Forty (40) feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The submitted plan indicates the following:

   a. The plan indicates existing elevations of the site are 476’ and 506’ feet.
   b. The plan indicates the rear part of lots 5 & 6 is within both the floodplain and floodway.
c. The plan indicates approximate locations of existing underground utilities.

d. The plan indicates the location of proposed water lines, fire hydrants, and relocation of sanitary sewer lines.

e. The plan indicates the construction of a public street 25’ feet wide, approximately 600’ feet in length ending in a cul-de-sac.

f. The plan indicates the public right-of-way (ROW) over the proposed street is 60’ feet.

g. The plan indicates an access easement for Harold Jackson beginning at the terminus of the cul-de-sac.

h. The plan indicates only one access point for the property.

i. The plan indicates lots #1 & #2 are to remain HC for commercial use.

j. The plan indicates lot #2 will share a 25’ foot access drive with lots #1 & #3 for ingress / egress.

k. The plan indicates the existing vegetation along the creek will remain.

l. The plan indicates a lake on lot 5 to remain for detention.

m. The plan does not show the bearings and distances of any internal lot lines.

n. The plan indicates lots #2 (1.066 acres) & #3 (1.2421 acres) don’t meet the minimum lot requirement of 3 acres for the R-RE Zone.

o. The plan does not show sidewalks.

p. The plan shows a conceptual design for lot’s #3-7. The concept shows five industrial buildings on a variety of scales. The drawing shows outside storage for materials on lot’s # 5 & 6. Lot #7 is shown to be a warehouse area with several loading and unloading docks for shipping. *These are just conceptual designs staff did not review the buildings on lot’s #3-7 for compliance to the zoning ordinance for things such as parking, lighting, signage etc. That review will be completed when they submit a site plan for individual lots.*

q. The plan notes a 10’ foot screening buffer will be provided when any of the proposed uses is adjacent to residential.

r. The plan notes “proposed buildings, storage areas and parking are approximate. A site plan meeting the requirements of section 9.19 of the Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance will be submitted for each site as uses are determined.”

s. The plan notes loading and unloading areas shall be provided in accordance with the Ordinance.

t. The plan notes all fences, lighting & signage will conform to the Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance.

7. Four previous plans for this site have been approved by the Planning Commission. The first case # 05-07-GRP-SIL-01, a grading plan for Carl J Schwarber Commerce Park, was approved April 10, 2007 with six conditions. The second case # 05-08-GRP-SIL-02, a grading plan for Trans Ash, was approved October 9, 2007 with four conditions. The third case # 05-08-GRP-03, a grading plan for Trans Ash, was approved February 10, 2009 with nine conditions. The fourth case # 05-10-PPL-04, a preliminary plan Trans Ash, was approved August 10, 2010 with fourteen conditions. To date the applicant has complied with all conditions from the previously approved plans.

8. A site plan for Lot #1 of the Trans Ash Development case 05-10-SPD-05 was approved by the Planning Commission on October 12, 2010. There were fourteen conditions associated with this approval. Condition #8 specifically stated “That the parking lot / drive aisle along the east end of the parking lot be opened when development occurs to improve connectivity.” That refers to a connection between future parking lots on parcels #1 and 2. Condition #3 stated “That all access points be from the internal street system, not State Route 8.”

**Campbell County Staff Recommendation – Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance:**

To approve the Map Amendment subject to the following conditions:
1. That the Legislative Body adopts the map amendment portion of the submitted request.
2. That the applicant submits site development plans to the Campbell County Planning Commission for review and approval prior to construction on lot’s #3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.
3. That the applicant complies with all applicable building, subdivision and zoning ordinance regulations.
4. That access to lot #2 be from the internal street system not Mary Ingles Highway.
5. That sidewalks be placed along the internal street system.

Bases for Recommendation:

The proposed subdivision is consistent with the recommendations of the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update, the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance, except as noted below:

1. Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance, Section 10.7 IP E.5: “A site plan as regulated by Section 9.19 of this ordinance shall be required for any use in this zone.”
2. Campbell County Subdivision Regulations, Section 6.1 Intersections E.2: “In the case of collector streets, intersections with said streets shall be spaced not less than four hundred (400) feet apart…”
3. Campbell County Subdivision Regulations Table 2 States: With 7-25 lots provided sidewalks along one side of the street.”

Mr. Hutchinson asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff. Ms. Minter asked the Commission to remember, before the began questions of Staff, that the questions they ask should be in regards to the zone change request before them and not in regards to the conceptual site plan that was submitted. Mr. Verst asked Mr. Hutchinson to confirm the side yard width requirement listed on page 3 of his report listed as 50’ feet. Mr. Verst felt it seemed a little excessive. Mr. Hutchinson felt certain it was correct. Ms. Harding stated that she can understand taking this portion of land and moving it to the HC Zone. Ms. Harding wanted confirmation that she was reading the map correctly. There is a lake currently on lot 6 and the existing lake shown on lot 6 is being partially filled and the remainder used as a detention basin. Mr. Hutchinson confirmed she was correct. Ms. Harding has a greater difficulty reconciling moving the site to the IP Zone. The site has been graded and so that it is raised above the flood plain. Ms. Harding is highly concerned about possible contamination should an industry move onto this site that uses chemicals like trichlorine, tretacycline and benzene just to name a few. Ms. Harding knows you could say that the EPA would take care of this, but she strongly feels you have to be proactive with these issues. Ms. Harding asked what kind of conditions can the Commission impart that would keep those types of industrial users from moving into the industrial park. Mr. Hutchinson stated that at this time, the Commission is not looking at any individual application or business that would be in this industrial park. By approving the IP Zone, you are approving any business listed under the permitted uses in the zoning ordinance. Ms. Harding asked, for future reference, if the approval of the IP Zone meant any of the businesses listed would be capable of applying for a site development plan review. Mr. Hutchinson stated that was correct. Mr. Hutchinson pointed out on the drawing the dividing line between the portion of the property that was HC and where the land became R-RE. The objective of the applicant was to change this portion of property to the IP Zone allowing for industrial users to make use of the property. When the applicant submits their site development plan for a specific site review and approval by the Commission, then that would be the time for the Commission to express their concerns and make the applicant deal with how a potential metal working establishment would deal with their by-products to prevent any potential contamination. Ms. Harding stated she understood what Mr. Hutchinson was stating, but if the Commission waited until the site development plan review phase then it would be too late to regulate or omit any specific possible polluters if the Commission approved the change to the IP Zone today without any conditions regulating the permitted uses. Ms. Minter referred the question to Legal Counsel. Ms. McEvoy-Boh stated that, when the applicant comes back before the Commission with the site development plan review, they have to meet a brand new set of parameters. At that time, we evaluate if
they meet each of those items. That’s not what we are doing today. Today we are discussing only the zone change aspect of this project. Unfortunately, it is not even something we can even touch on today. Ms. Harding understands, but if we approve the zone change and later they come before us and want us to approve a site plan for a business that is on the list and they meet all the parameters for a business that is allowed, do we have to approve it? Ms. McEvoy-Boh replied that the Commission would have to approve the plan as long as all parameters were met. You cannot reject or deny a plan because you don’t like the applicant or the business. Ms. Harding replied that was exactly her point. This is the time to deny a request for a zone change if you don’t want to see that type of business in this area because once we approve the zone change we don’t get a chance to prevent high ground water pollution. Ms. Harding is from the State of Michigan where everyone complies with all the requirements, but still somehow manages to pollute the ground water. Ms. Harding wants to make certain that before the Commission approves this request, that we are all aware, that this is our one and only opportunity to impose any conditions that would help regulate permitted uses.

Ms. Minter reminded the Commission that the public hearing was still open and this was not the discussion phase for this case. Mr. Hutchinson asked if there were any other questions for Staff. Mr. Verst asked Mr. Klear if he was able to confirm the side yard width requirement. Mr. Klear corrected the report to state that the side yard requirement was 25’ feet on the internal street system. Ms. Minter asked if there were any additional questions of Staff. Mr. Pfeffer wanted clarification that lots 1 & 2 are already in the HC Zone. Mr. Hutchinson replied that was correct. Mr. Pfeffer clarified that adjacent property to the right is HC. Mr. Hutchinson replied that was correct. Mr. Pfeffer clarified that adjacent property to the left is HC. Mr. Hutchinson replied that was correct. Mr. Pfeffer stated that what you have is, basically, that we are going to break up one long contiguous section of HC to plop in a little piece of IP right in the middle of it. Mr. Hutchinson stated that was correct.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any other questions of Staff. There being none, Ms. Minter asked the applicant to come forward, state his name and address for the record. Mr. Joe Kramer, Cardinal Engineering, 1 Moock Road, Wilder, KY came forward for the applicant, Trans-Ash. Mr. Kramer stated that after reading the report prepared by Staff, the applicant agrees with the conditions listed in the report. Mr. Kramer stated both his client and he feel that the current R-RE Zone is definitely inappropriate and the HC Zone is somewhat more appropriate, but is intended more for light industrial use. Based on the 2008 Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Kramer feels the IP Zone is the best intended use of land. Mr. Kramer asked if the Commission had any questions that he could answer for them. Ms. Minter asked if there were questions for the applicant. Mr. Verst asked if the applicant would be willing to consider a condition that states if a warehousing facility were to be placed on the lots facing Mary Ingles Highway, that no truck docks would face Mary Ingles Highway. Mr. Kramer replied they would not be willing to agree to that condition at this time as they cannot foresee what type of business would actually be placed on that lot. Mr. Kramer stated he would rather face that issue at the time of the site development plan review. Mr. Kramer feels it may restrict the potential sale of that lot.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any other questions for the applicant. There being none, Ms. Minter opened the floor to the general public. The only signature was Mr. Joe Kramer. He had nothing to add to his comments. There was no one else that wished to speak. Ms. Minter closed the public hearing and opened the floor to discussion among the Commission.

Mr. Verst stated he would like to explain his question to the applicant about the truck docks. Mr. Verst stated that commonly for industrial zone changes it is addressed that truck docks should be faced away from residential zones. Mr. Verst believes this is more difficult to address at the site development plan stage. At the very least, if the truck docks are not faced away from Mary Ingles Highway, heavy screening should be required from the applicant. Mr. Verst wants the record to clearly reflect his concerns and the need for heavy screening of the truck docks if they face Mary Ingles Highway.

Ms. Minter asked Ms. Harding if she wanted to add to her previous comments on high ground water contamination. Ms. Harding stated she felt she clearly expressed her concerns, but wants to make certain
they are clearly stated in the record for review by the City of Silver Grove when the Commission’s recommendation is referred to them. Mr. Verst recommended to Ms. Harding that if she felt that certain uses should not be allowed within the IP Zone due to high ground water contamination factors, she could request a text amendment be considered by the City of Silver Grove removing the suspect industries from the permitted uses. Ms. Blake asked if there would be any point in making any special conditions on this approval in regards to drainage. Ms. Harding stated she was not certain. Mr. Verst stated that as of today there was no requirement for water quality conditions. He is aware that they are in the process of being implemented in the near future, but as for this case there is nothing in place.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any other comments. Mr. Pfeffer stated he had an issue with the Dollar General traffic using the same site access road as semi-trailer traffic. Mr. Pfeffer stated he knows they travel along Mary Ingles Highway frequently, but to be leaving/entering a site from a single driveway at the same time as residential traffic, truly is a safety concern. Mr. Hutchinson reminded the Commission that the applicant is required, from previous approvals by the Commission, to install roads per the higher standards fit to withstand the industrial traffic. Mr. Pfeffer understood that requirement, but stated he felt the Dollar General was more of a “residential” or family time traffic and felt that the semi-trailer would require a wider width road or clear sight distance to provide a safer environment.

Mr. Klear commended the Commission on their discussions on the zone change and not getting distracted by the conceptual plan. Mr. Klear replied to Mr. Pfeffer’s concern that the County does not have a heightened width standard that requires a wider road to accommodate a semi-trailer versus a sedan vehicle. In addressing Ms. Harding’s concerns, Mr. Klear stated that the Commission has a greater ability to attach conditions at this time rather than at the site development plan review phase. Mr. Klear informed the Commission that the IP Zone is intended to be less manufacturing based and more research based. It is not the more intensive production that you might see in the other industrial zones which is more likely to result in the types of issues that Ms. Harding has raised; however, the IP Zone does allow for all uses listed under the permitted uses are allowed at this point in time. Manufacturing is an activity that can be part of the permitted use. The Planning Commission needs to take that element into consideration with their deliberations.

Mr. Barrow asked if the lot layout and numbers are final or if they are conceptual at this point as well. Mr. Klear stated they were approved this way as a subdivision plat. They can still be changed just by submitting a re-subdivision plat, but this is how they appear today. Mr. Barrow asked if they could break the larger lot down into smaller lots. Mr. Klear stated that they could absolutely do that if they desired.

A member of the audience asked if he could speak. Ms. Minter asked him to wait one moment. Ms. Minter stated she would entertain a motion. Mr. Verst made a motion to re-open the public hearing. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Williams, Ms. Wright, Ms. Blake and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Ms. Minter re-opened the public hearing. Ms. Minter asked the audience member to step forward, state his name and address for the record, and then remember to sign in when he had a chance. Mr. Timothy Caine, owner of Die Hard Paintball, 4936 Mary Ingles Highway, Silver Grove, KY stepped forward. Mr. Caine’s property is downwind from both Trans-Ash and Lafarge. His business is on the first floor and his family lives on the second floor. Mr. Caine stated he already had difficulty when Trans-Ash was grading and using fly ash to fill in the area. The fly ash kept blowing in through all the windows. He eventually had to keep all his windows shut and dust all his goods two to three times a week to remove grime that came in when the door was opened through normal business traffic coming and going. Lafarge is across the street and up and he gets the dust and rotten egg smell from them. Mr. Caine stated he already has an on-going problem with Lafarge and doesn’t need another company producing air or water pollutants immediately next door to his home. Mr. Caine thanked the Commission for re-opening the hearing to let him speak and asked the Commission to just keep him and his family in mind when they make their decision.
Ms. Minter asked the audience if anyone else wished to speak. There being none, Ms. Minter closed the public hearing. Mr. Klear made a point of clarification. The Commission does not actually approve the zone change request. The Commission makes a recommendation to the City of Silver Grove. The City of Silver Grove either approves or denies the zone change request. Mr. Verst added to what Mr. Kramer stated previously in the fact that the Comprehensive Plan shows this area being light industrial and highway commercial. Mr. Verst believes the zone map amendment is in conformance with the intention of the Comprehensive Plan and/or at least moving into that direction.

Ms. Minter asked Ms. McEvoy-Boh to review what was necessary to approve the zone change request. Ms. McEvoy-Boh read KRS 100.213:

(1) Before any map amendment is granted, the planning commission or legislative body or fiscal court must find that the map amendment is in agreement with the comprehensive plan, or such a finding that one or more of the following apply and such finding shall be recorded in the minutes and records of the planning commission or the legislative body or fiscal court:
   a. that the existing zoning classification given to the property is inappropriate and that the proposed zoning classification is appropriate;
   b. that there have been major changes of an economic, physical, or social nature within the area involved which were not anticipated in the adopted comprehensive plan and which have substantially altered the basic character of such area.

(2) The planning commission, legislative body, or fiscal court may adopt provisions which prohibit for a period of two (2) years, the reconsideration of a denied map amendment or the consideration of a map amendment identical to a denied map amendment.

Mr. Pfeffer asked Ms. McEvoy-Boh to repeat the portion before the “or”, the first part. Ms. McEvoy-Boh repeated “the planning commission or legislative body or fiscal court must find that the map amendment is in agreement with the comprehensive plan.” Ms. Harding stated that if it were up to her she would break down the IP Zone into and IP 1 and IP 2 so that the more intense industrial users could be separated out. Mr. Klear advised Ms. Harding that Silver Grove actually has I-1, I-2, and I-4 Zones. Ms. Harding asked if these were within the IP Zone. Mr. Klear stated that these were individual and separate from the IP Zone. Mr. Hutchinson identified that the Lafarge Plant across the street was located in the I-4 Zone. Mr. Klear advised Ms. Harding that the City of Silver Grove revised the IP Zone within the last three years to increase the number of permitted uses for this zone. If Ms. Harding’s decision would be based upon thinking a text amendment would be possible to reduce permitted uses, Mr. Klear advised her that this would be a faulty assumption.

Mr. Williams asked legal counsel if a category of use is appropriate in the IP Zone if the Commission could find that a particular use for this particular site plan is not appropriate. Ms. McEvoy-Boh asked him to clarify if he was asking about the use or the site plan. Ms. McEvoy-Boh stated Mr. Klear previously explained you could exclude uses at this level now. Mr. Klear reiterated his statement using as an example the first permitted use listed is candy and confectionary. For example, if the first site plan that comes before you is for a candy and confectionary, the Commission cannot say “No, you cannot have a candy and confectionary business!” However, you could say, “The loading dock has to be in the southern portion of the building versus the northern portion.” Mr. Williams stated he was trying to find a delicate way to ask if you could exclude a business at the site development plan review phase. Ms. McEvoy-Boh supported Mr. Klear’s statement stating that you cannot place restriction based up on personal bias; however, if you could link direct actions of by-products of the candy and confectionary business to the affects they would have on the ground water, you could deny their request based on the harm to the general welfare of the public. Mr. Williams stated he had difficulty placing a condition on a hypothetical situation when he doesn’t have enough information to fully discredit a permitted use without knowing the how, why or what of the materials used in the profession, the storage of the chemicals, the processing of the materials or disposal of the by-products. Mr. Williams stated he just doesn’t feel comfortable with that kind of decision at this stage because it is all hypothetical. Mr. Klear answered Mr. Williams stating
that questions Mr. Williams has that pertain to the site plan elements, yes, that would be hypothetical; but, questions, to the overall use, no, that is not hypothetical. Those are points that can be used as basis to make a yes or no determination as to if Mr. Williams feels the zone map amendment should be approved. Ms. McEvoy-Boh stated there were legitimate issues raised that would be basis for denial of the zone map amendment, but you cannot use “I don’t like you because you’re my competitor” as the basis for the decision to not allow a permitted use. The Commission has discussed safety concerns in regards to traffic and water pollution. Ms. McEvoy-Boh stated these concerns are legitimate, but she wasn’t certain how you wanted to determine which permitted uses would be violators or contributors to these concerns. Mr. Williams stated he understood what she was stating now. Mr. Williams stated that the Commission could not object to the permitted use, but how would the Commission deal with objections to how the applicant planned to deal with the chemicals or pollutants. Ms. McEvoy-Boh stated you would have to work with the applicant to reach a compromise. Mr. Williams stated he wasn’t concerned about this before he got to the meeting until he heard the comments and discussion from others. Mr. Klear stated maybe the issue is that the Commonwealth of Kentucky does not have very strong environmental restrictions. Ms. Harding stated that this is why it is so important the Commission make the right decision at this stage.

Ms. McEvoy-Boh reminded the Commission that this is a decision that is actually going to be made by the City of Silver Grove. The Commission is obviously taking this request seriously and investing a lot of thought and consideration to this situation, but be aware that the City can choose to accept or deny the recommendation of the Commission. It is ultimately their decision. Ms. Minter asked if there were any additional comments regarding this case. Ms. Blake stated that in past the Commission has had discussions regarding the need for information or training on ground water table contamination. Ms. Blake suggested maybe this was a time to step back and have someone more knowledgeable to examine this situation and advise us if they feel there is danger of contamination. Mr. Williams suggested maybe the move was to let the City of Silver Grove determine if they were concerned with ground water table contamination. Let them determine the course of action they desire to see taken. Ms. Minter stated that she sees two items. First, we can decide or not decide today. We can table this item if needed until we have the necessary input to make an informed decision. Secondly, to be discussed after the Director’s Report later tonight, the Commission’s need to obtain additional training, information or education regarding ground water contamination. Ms. Minter stated she was just putting these items out there for the Commission’s consideration.

Mr. Verst stated that he did not feel it was fair to the applicant to put them on hold while the Commission tables this case and goes out to get additional training. Mr. Verst strongly believes that the site development plan review process will allow the Commission an opportunity to provide input on each individual site as they are developed and prevent any of these worst case scenarios from happening. Ms. Harding stated she agreed with Mr. Verst. The Commission is not to act as arbitrators or the decision makers. We can voice our concerns and we’ve done our job. Mr. Barrow stated that Staff has reviewed everything and recommended approval. It fits with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Barrow stated he feels like some of the stuff we have discussed is likely to never come up before us.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any other questions or comments. There being none, Ms. Minter called for a motion. Mr. Verst made a motion to recommend approval to the City of Silver Grove to approve case #05-11-ZMA-07, a request submitted by Trans-Ash for a zone map amendment proposing a change in zoning from R-RE / HC to IP, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Legislative Body adopts the map amendment portion of the submitted request.
2. That the applicant submits site development plans to the Campbell County Planning Commission for review and approval prior to construction on lot’s #3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.
3. That the applicant complies with all applicable building, subdivision and zoning ordinance regulations.
4. That access to lot #2 be from the internal street system not Mary Ingles Highway.
5. That sidewalks be placed along the internal street system.
Mr. Verst cited that the zone map amendment is consistent with the recommendations of the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update, the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance, except as noted in the staff report. Mr. Pfeiffer asked how the Commission was to include their concerns with the ground water contamination, the truck docks facing Mary Ingles Highway and the traffic safety concerns. Mr. Klear advised the Commission that the approved meeting minutes would be sent with the Commission’s recommendation to the City of Silver Grove thus being part of the package and part of the record. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Pfeiffer, Mr. Williams, Ms. Wright, Ms. Blake and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Ms. Minter called for a five minute recess at 8:20 PM. Ms. Minter called the meeting to order at 8:25 PM.

Ms. Minter introduced case #90-11-TXA-01, City of Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance Article XI Off-Street Parking Regulations Text Amendment, to the Planning Commission and asked Mr. Klear to present the staff report and staff’s recommendation to the Commission.

**FILE NUMBER:** 90-11-TXA-01  
**APPLICANT:** Campbell County Planning Department on behalf of the City of Silver Grove  
**REQUEST:** Proposed text amendment to the City of Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance Article XI Off-Street Parking Regulations.

**Background:**

The City of Silver Grove has submitted a request to modify its Zoning Ordinance to update provisions with the Off-Street Parking Regulations.

**Proposed Text Amendment:**

See attachment. (A copy of the actual text amendment is attached at the end of these meeting minutes.)

**Campbell County Staff Recommendation – Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance:**

That the Planning Commission recommends that the City of Silver Grove adopt the proposed text amendment to the City of Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance.

**Bases for Recommendation:**

1. Per Kentucky Revised Statutes (KRS) 100.203, the City of Silver Grove has the authority to enact zoning regulations within its jurisdiction. This authority includes the provision to amend its zoning classifications, uses, etc.

2. Pursuant to the City of Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance Article XVII AMENDMENT PROCEDURE, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to amend the zoning ordinance.

3. Proper notice has been given in accordance with Article XVII Amendment Procedure of the City of Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Klear asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff. Ms. Minter asked Mr. Klear to confirm that since this is a public hearing tonight that proper notification was issued. Mr. Klear answered in the affirmative. Ms. Minter asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff. Mr. Verst asked what standard the City of Silver Grove was trying to come into alignment with. Mr. Klear did a study of the Cities of Alexandria, Fort Thomas, Highland Heights and Cold Spring, per the City of Silver Grove’s
request, and tried to bring Silver Grove’s standards a little closer in alignment with the other cities. Mr. Pfeffer asked for a clarification of pg 11-5, line 19 of the reference to Section 9.19 of this Ordinance. Mr. Klear state that the reference was in the existing unchanged text so he did not personally change this reference, but Section 9.19 is the portion of the Zoning Ordinance that deals with Site Plan requirements. Mr. Pfeffer asked for a confirmation that on page 11-7, the handicap parking requirement chart, it requires 1 space, but the applicant can have 5. Mr. Pfeffer wanted assurance that only a minimum number of required spaces were listed. Mr. Klear stated that was correct. Mr. Verst asked if there was any mention of van accessible aisle. Mr. Klear stated that he did not specifically call out anything regarding vans.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any additional questions for Staff. There being none, Ms. Minter asked if anyone in the audience wanted to come forward and speak. An audience member decided at the last moment to speak. Ms. Minter asked her to come forward, state her name and address for the record and make certain she signed in before she left. Ms. Jill Fessler, 224 E. 2nd Street, Silver Grove, KY thanked Mr. Klear for the excellent job in his attention to detail when rewriting the parking guidelines. Ms. Fessler stated she was so impressed that he included the ADA standards. As it stands today, there is nothing like it in their parking guidelines and it is just amazing. Thank you. Ms. Minter thanked Ms Fessler for her comments.

Ms. Minter closed the public hearing and opened the floor for discussion among the Commission. Mr. Verst asked Ms. Blake what her opinion was on the van spaces. Ms. Blake stated that she was not as concerned because of the size of the city. In future developments, it may be a concern. Mr. Barrow commented that he has a friend with a new Ford van that can lower a wheelchair within a remarkably small space that doesn’t even require the extra wide special van accessible handicap parking space.

Mr. Verst made a motion to approve case #9-11-TXA-01, City of Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance Article XI Off-Street Parking Regulations Text Amendment. The basis for his motion is that per Kentucky Revised Statutes (KRS) 100.203, the City of Silver Grove has the authority to enact zoning regulations within its jurisdiction and that this authority includes the provision to amend its zoning classifications, uses, etc.; that pursuant to the City of Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance Article XVII AMENDMENT PROCEDURE, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to amend the zoning ordinance; and that proper notice has been given in accordance with Article XVII Amendment Procedure of the City of Silver Grove Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Minter asked if Mr. Verst wanted to include the spelling correction from “walking” to “walking” on page 11-3, line 19. Mr. Verst replied in the affirmative. Mr. Barrows seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Williams, Ms. Wright, Ms. Blake and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Director’s Report

Mr. Klear asked the Commission on their thoughts in regards to receiving their packets electronically for the first time. Ms. Minter liked getting the email, but did find herself printing so she could make comments in the margins. Mr. Williams loved it as he didn’t have to worry about carrying around a bunch of papers and could read the information on his laptop. Mr. Verst stated he liked receiving the email packet as well, but he doesn’t feel the burden for printing out the packet should be on a volunteer Commissioner. Mr. Verst stated if any of the Commissioners felt they would rather have the packets mailed, they should have it mailed to them. Mr. Barrows stated that per a conversation with Ms. Turner prior to tonight’s meeting, it wouldn’t be difficult to have paper copies mailed if needed. Ms. Blake asked to receive a paper copy mailed to her. Ms. Minter advised the Commission to email Ms. Turner if they wanted a paper copy mailed to them otherwise emailed copies would be the continued method of communication.

Mr. Klear advised the Commission that it had been brought to his attention that the Commission may be interested in moving the location of their meeting to the new County Administration Building. Mr. Klear stated he had performed some research and the meetings can be moved however this action would require
that the Commission to amend their By-laws to change the primary location of where they conducted their business. Mr. Williams stated the Newport location was a safer building with secure parking and handicap accessible parking. Mr. Williams asked Mr. Klear where the majority of the applicants were arriving from. Mr. Klear stated that the applicants varied from meeting to meeting. Tonight’s applicants were all from the City of Silver Grove. Tonight’s case for the zone change, the applicant, Trans-Ash, is located in Cincinnati and their representative, Mr. Kramer, works in Wilder and lives in Alexandria. The locations vary greatly from month to month. Mr. Verst stated that if you’re from the south end of the county, the drive to Newport is going to be a drive, but being in the south part of the county, you’re used to driving to getting places. Ms. Minter stated she had been concerned about the parking and older building as well. Ms. Blake stated she rarely is able to make use of the handicap parking space to the side of building. The ramp and stairs are hazardous in the dark, let alone in any foul weather. Ms. Blake is supportive of moving the meetings to the new location where adequate handicap parking, off-street parking, and street lights are available to make it safer for everyone to reach their cars. Mr. Williams stated it does get dangerous when there is foul weather. Ms. Minter asked how we go about changing the bylaws. Mr. Klear stated the Commission would instruct Staff to make the proposed change to the bylaws and the Commission would vote on the change at one of their meetings. Mr. Verst stated that it would be best if the Board of Adjustment moved their meeting location as well. It would be less confusing to the public if both meetings were moved at the same time to the same location. Ms. Minter asked if the Commission wanted to take action at this time or leave this as information to consider only. Mr. Klear stated that wasn’t really necessary for both bodies to have the same meeting location; however, the Board is meeting next week and he will advise them on this issue. Ms. Blake made a motion to have Staff act on the Commission’s behalf to have the By-laws amended to change the location of the Commission’s location for conducting business to 1098 Monmouth Street, Newport, KY. Ms. Wright seconded that motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Williams, Ms. Wright, Ms. Blake, and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Mr. Klear reminded the Commission that OKI has issued a general invitation to the Commission to attend the OKI Regional Planning Forum Quarterly Meetings beginning on March 18th at 10am. OKI is requesting that you pre-register for the meeting just so they have a final head count for how many participants to expect.

Mr. Klear’s final item for discussion was House Bill 68 (HB 68) which has not yet been issued into law, but is being closely monitored. This bill will prevent individuals from serving on both the Board of Adjustments and the Planning Commission. We currently only have one member on both boards, but in past have had up to two. Mr. Klear will continue to monitor this legislation and keep us updated. Mr. Klear concluded the Director’s Report.

Ms. Minter stated that she wanted it noted that there are three items that the Commission has expressed an interest in receiving additional training: minutes; flag lots; and ground water quality. Mr. Klear stated there were no cases before the Commission for the month of April. There was a brief discussion if the Commission should meet anyway just to prevent any delay to the zone change or text change case approved tonight. Mr. Klear recommended a brief meeting to approve the minutes to keep those cases moving forward and this would also allow the By-laws to be approved. To prevent any confusion, Ms. Minter reminded everyone, that April’s meeting would be held at the Alexandria location. Ms. Minter asked if there was any other business to discuss. There being none, Ms. Minter asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Verst made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Wright seconded the motion. An oral vote found everyone in favor. None opposed. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 9:10 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Klear, AICP
Director of P&Z

Approved:

Justin Verst
Vice Chair
ARTICLE XI

OFF-STREET PARKING REGULATIONS

In all zones, off-street parking facilities for the storage or parking of motor vehicles for use of occupants, employees, and patrons of the building hereafter erected, altered or extended, and all uses of the land after the effective date of this Ordinance, shall be provided and maintained as herein prescribed. However, where a building permit has been issued prior to the date of adoption of this ordinance and provided that construction has not begun within ninety (90) consecutive calendar days of such effective date, off-street parking facilities in the amounts required by this ordinance shall prevail.

SECTION 11.0 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

A. Computation of Parking Spaces: In determining the number of parking spaces required, if such spaces result in fractional parts thereof, the number of said spaces required shall be construed to be the next highest whole number.

B. Addition to Buildings: Whenever the intensity of use of any building, structure, or premises shall be increase through addition of dwelling units, gross floor area, seating capacity, or other units of measurement specified herein - additional parking spaces shall be provided in the amounts hereafter specified for that use, if the parking space is inadequate to serve such increase in intensity of use.

C. Location of off-Street Parking Facilities: All off-street parking facilities shall be located on the same lot or zoning lot as the building served, except for the following:

1. Off-street parking facilities (subject to additional restrictions according to screening requirements in Section 9.17 and other requirements of this ordinance) shall be located as follows:

   a. Single- Family Residential Zones – Off-street parking may be permitted in the driveways in the front, side and rear yard depths, provided all requirements of this ordinance are met. Additionally, off-street parking located in the rear yard depth shall be setback a minimum of ten (10) feet from the rear lot line.

   No off-street parking area, located in the front yard depth in a single-family residential zone, may exceed four hundred (400) square feet (two parking spaces) except, however, the Zoning Administrator may allow additional off-street parking spaces to be located thereon provided that: (1) the additional parking spaces
will not cause the ratio of unpaved area to paved area (parking
and driveway areas) in the front yard depth to be less than 3:1; (2)
a plan for the proposed parking area is submitted and approved
by the Zoning Administrator; and (3) all other requirements of this
ordinance are met.

b. Multi-Family Residential Zones - Off-street parking may be
permitted in side or rear yard depths of permitted uses in these
zones, provided that off-street parking facilities shall be setback a
minimum of ten (10) feet from the rear lot line. Off-street parking
may be permitted in the required front yard depths, only if
approved according to an approved Development Plan.

c. RMHP Zone – Off-street parking may be permitted in the
driveways in the front and side yard depths, provided all
requirements of this ordinance are met.

d. Commercial Zones (NC and HC) – Off-street parking and
loading/unloading zones may be permitted in the front, side and
rear yard depths, provided all off-street parking facilities shall be
setback a minimum of five (5) feet from any street right-of-way
lines.

e. Industrial Zones (IP and I4) – Off-street parking and
loading/unloading zones may be permitted in the front, side and
rear yard depths, provided all off-street parking facilities shall be
setback a minimum of five (5) feet from any street right-of-way
lines.

f. All Other Zones Not listed herein – Off-street parking shall be
provided via a plan that is submitted and approved by the Zoning
Administrator and further provided that all other requirements of
this ordinance are met.

2. All off-street parking facilities shall be located on the same lot or
zoning lot as the building served, except for the following:

a. Multi-family dwellings where permitted in this Ordinance, and any use
permitted in an industrial zone may supply off-street parking within
three hundred (300) feet from such lot or zoning lot served, upon
approval of the Planning Commission, providing that such off-street
parking is located within the same zone as the establishment being
served and the off-street parking requirements of this ordinance are
complied with at all times. Further, the applicant must also show
sufficient proof that such off-street parking facilities would be
impossible to provide the required off street parking space, as required herein, on the same lot or zoning lot or contiguous to the same lot or zoning lot as the building being served.

b. Where single, two or multi-family dwellings which are permitted herein and are existing at the time of adoption of this Ordinance, occupy a lot of such size that off-street parking could not be provided on the same lot or zoning lot as the use being served, said off-street parking may be permitted to locate within a distance not to exceed three hundred (300) feet from said dwelling or dwellings upon approval of the zoning administrator. In addition said off-street parking lot shall be located in the same zone as the use being served and constructed in accordance with Section 11.0 of this ordinance.

c. Off-street parking as required for "conditional uses" permitted in the Residential (R) Zones, may be permitted to locate on another lot or zoning lot than the building or use being served is located, when approved by the Board of Adjustment, provided that said parking is located within reasonable walking distance of the use or building being served and available at all times without restrictions for said purposes.

D. Collective Parking Provision: Collective off-street parking facilities may be provided; however, such facilities shall not be less than the sum of such facilities as would otherwise be individually required, except as provided below:

1. Collective Parking Provision: In granting collective parking approval, the following shall be considered:

   a. The required parking for the highest use shall be located on the premises as the minimum requirement, additional parking, as determined by the Planning Commission, shall be a minimum of 50% on premises. The other percentage may be located off-premises based on written contract(s) to provide said off-street parking.

   b. The actual need for parking spaces for each individual use or building in relation to the requirement under Section 11.1.

   c. Times of actual need for parking of each individual use or building and the relationship of these times to one another.

   d. The internal control plan of the applicant shall be submitted with the application for review.

   e. The internal controls for scheduling the uses and said controls and/or schedule may be accepted or changed by the Planning
Commission, but the internal control schedule shall be made a condition of approval.

f. The parking needed for scheduled uses on the premises shall not exceed the number of parking spaces established by the Planning Commission.

g. Collective off-street parking located on another lot must be located within five hundred (500) feet walking distance of the entrance to the use to be served. Said walking access shall provide a safe means of pedestrian access to and from the establishment being served.

h. Reserved spaces shall be counted in the minimum requirement but cannot exceed 10% of the total number of parking spaces.

i. Allowance by the Planning Commission for such collective parking facilities, on lots other than the lot upon which the building or use being served is located, should be situated so as to ensure that such locations will not result in added traffic problems, or traffic or pedestrian safety issues.

The Planning Commission is authorized after consideration to issue a permit for not less than the required parking for the highest use on the premises and any additional parking per use the Planning Commission determines is necessary based upon the evidence.

2. Shared Parking Provision: When any land or building is under the same ownership, or upon submission of satisfactory guarantees of the continued operation and proper maintenance of the shared parking facility, and the proposed development is for two (2) or more land uses excluding residential uses, the number of minimum required parking spaces shall be computed by multiplying the number of parking spaces normally required for each land use by the appropriate percentage as shown in the following shared parking credit table for each of the five periods shown. The number of parking spaces required is then determined by adding the results in each column; the column total that generates the highest number of parking spaces becomes the minimum parking requirement.
Shared Parking Credit Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
<th>Nighttime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daytime (6am-6pm)</td>
<td>Evening (6pm-Midnight)</td>
<td>Daytime (6am-6pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Industrial</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Personal Service</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Motel</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Theater/ Commercial Recreational Establishments</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Access: Parking lots or areas adjacent to streets, roads, highways, or deeded rights-of-way shall have driveways or openings not less than twelve (12) feet in width and no more than forty-eight (48) feet in width at the curb, excluding curve radius. These curb cuts shall be so located as to minimize traffic hazards and congestion. All such parking lots or areas shall have a protective wall or bumper block around each parking lot and said parking lots shall be so designed that all vehicles leaving the facility will be traveling forward to approaching traffic.

No residential driveway width at the street, road, highway, or deeded right-of-way junctions shall be more than twenty (20) feet, excluding curb radius, providing that this width may be increased if sufficient proof can be demonstrated after review and approval of the Zoning Administrator.

F. Approval of Modification of Curb Cuts required: Detailed plans shall be submitted to the Planning Commission, or its duly authorized representative, in the form of a site plan, as regulated by Section 9.19 of this Ordinance, for approval of all curb cuts, driveway openings, including modifications thereto, before a permit may be obtained therefore.

For the purpose of minimizing the interference of traffic and congestion on the major street system, as identified in the city's comprehensive plan, the Planning and Zoning Commission shall limit the number of curb cuts along said streets. The number of curb cut intersections with major streets shall be spaced at a distance of not less than 800 feet apart. Access to abutting properties fronting on said major streets shall be provided by a frontage or service road connecting to the curb cut intersection. If the developer can show sufficient proof in the form of a site plan or development plan, that spacing of curb cuts less than 800 feet apart will not impede the movement of traffic flow along said major street, then the Planning and Zoning Commission may vary these requirements accordingly.
G. Driveways Not Computed As Part of Required Parking Lot: Entrances, exits, or driveways shall not be computed as any part of a required parking lot or area.

H. Off-Street Parking Space and Access Drives Defined - For the purposes of this Ordinance, one (1) parking space shall be a minimum of nine (9) feet in width and eighteen (18) feet in length, such parking space shall have a vertical clearance of at least seven (7) feet. Each parking space shall be appropriately dimensioned for automobile parking. All parking lots shall be laid out with the following minimum aisle or access drive widths:

a. Ninety (90) degree (perpendicular) parking - Twenty-two (22) feet (either one (1) or two (2) way circulation)
b. Sixty (60) degree (angle) parking - Fifteen (15) feet (one-way circulation only);
c. Forty-five (45) degree (angle) parking - Twelve (12) feet (one-way circulation only),
d. Thirty (30) degree (angle) parking - Eleven (11) feet (one-way circulation only);
e. Zero (0) degree (parallel) parking - Twelve (12) feet (one-way circulation).

When any combination of these types of parking is used (facing the same aisle) the most restricted aisle or access drive width requirements shall prevail. In addition, a two foot overhand may be permitted on the external sides of a parking area.

If the width of the parking space is increased (over 9 feet) the drive aisle width can be decreased proportionally (2 foot width in drive aisle per 1 foot increase in space with, except that a drive aisle for one-way traffic may not be decreased below 20 feet in width and a drive aisle for one-way traffic may not be decreased below 11 feet in width.

I. Parking and Passenger Loading Zones for the Disabled – In any commercial, industrial, or employment district, or wherever any multi-family residential housing is provided, parking spaces for disabled people shall be provided as indicated on the following table:
Parking Spaces for the Disabled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Required Spaces</th>
<th># of Accessible Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 to 100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 150</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 to 200</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 to 300</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 to 400</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 to 500</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 or over</td>
<td>2% of total # of Required Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Parking spaces for disabled people shall be at least eight (8) feet wide and nineteen (19) feet long [twenty (20) feet in commercial and industrial zones] and shall have an adjacent access aisle of five (5) wide minimum. Two (2) parking spaces for the disabled may share a common access aisle.

2. Access aisles for parking for the disabled shall be part of an accessible route to the building or facility which the parking space serves. An acceptable designed curb ramp shall be provided. Specifications for curb ramps may be obtained from the Kentucky Building Code. Access aisles and accessible routes shall be protected in such a manner that no part of any vehicle or any structure shall be allowed to interfere with access or use of the aisle or route in any way.

3. The location of parking spaces should be as close as possible to the principal handicapped accessible entrance(s). In a multi-building development or shopping center, the spaces should be dispersed to ensure easy access and minimize the travel distance for the handicapped.

4. Parking spaces for the disabled shall be designed as reserved for the disabled by a sign showing the international symbol of accessibility. Such signs shall be above grade.

J1. Off-Street Parking Space to Be Used for Parking Space Only: Any vehicle parking space shall be used for parking only. Any other use of such space, including repair work or servicing of any kind other than in an emergency, or the requirement of any payment for the use of such space, shall be deemed to constitute a separate commercial use in violation of the provisions of this ordinance.
KJ. No Building Shall Be Erected In Off-Street Parking Space: No building of any kind shall be erected in any off-street parking lot, except a parking garage containing parking spaces equal to the requirements set forth in this section of the ordinance, or a shelter house booth for a parking attendant providing the number of spaces required are not reduced.

LK. Off-Street Parking Space Shall Not Be Reduced: The required parking area on any lot, as set forth and designated in this ordinance, shall not be reduced or encroached upon in any manner.

ML. Parking Plan Approval Required: Plans for all parking lot facilities, including parking garages, shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission Zoning Administrator for review and for compliance with the provisions of this Ordinance and such other pertinent ordinances of the City. Such plans shall show the number of spaces and arrangements of parking aisles, location of driveway entrances and exits, provisions for vehicular and pedestrian circulation, locations of sidewalks and curbs on or adjacent to the property, utilities, location of shelters for parking attendant, location of signs, typical cross-sections of pavement, base and subbase in accordance with Article XI, Section 11.0, MN, of this Ordinance, proposed grade of parking lot, storm drainage facilities, location of lighting facilities and such other information or plans as the circumstances may warrant.

NM. Paving of New off-Street Parking: All new off-street parking facilities shall be paved with asphalt concrete or Portland Cement concrete and shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the standards and procedure herein established.

1. Asphalt Concrete Pavement:

   a. General Design Requirements -

      (1) Asphalt concrete pavements shall consist of specified thickness of asphalt concrete surfaces course and a base course, or courses, all constructed on prepared subgrade. Pavement thickness required shall be determined from Table 1 of this ordinance of the appropriate subgrade soil and traffic use.

      (2) Paved areas shall be so designed and constructed that water will quickly drain from the surface and be conducted away from the area through approved system. Transverse and/or longitudinal slopes of not less than 5/8 inch in 10 feet shall be provided. For large paved areas, approved catch basins and storm drainage systems shall be provided.
(3) When the pavement includes a granular base, and the pavement is constructed over granular subgrade, perimeter subsurface drainage shall be provided to prevent lateral flow of water into the base course and to provide for removal of seepage water that may enter the base.

(4) Successive layers of the pavement shall be offset from the edge of the underlying layer a distance equal to the course thickness of the lower layer except when abutting existing construction. When the asphalt layers of the pavement abut a building foundation, barrier curb or similar vertical surface, the abutting surface shall be heavily painted with asphalt prior to construction of the asphalt course. The surface course shall be finished 1/4 inch above adjacent flush construction to permit proper compaction.

b. Construction materials and procedures

(1) Subsurface drainage

(a.) Drainage tile, 6-inch perforated tile or other approved types of similar capacity, where required by the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be bedded at a depth of not less than 12 inches below the bottom elevation of the granular base course. Aggregate for bedding and backfill shall all pass a 3/8 inch sieve and have not more than 5 percent passing a No. 200 sieve. The slope of subsurface drains shall be not less than 6 inches per 100 feet. All such drains shall be properly connected to outlet drains.

(b.) All catch basins, in pavement with granular base, shall be constructed with weep holes, at subbase level, to provide for drainage of seepage water from the granular layer. Weep holes shall be constructed of pipe, or other material, having an opening not less than 1.5 inches clear opening. Suitable provision shall be made to prevent clogging of the opening. Three or more weep holes shall be suitably located around the perimeter of each catch basin.

(2) Base courses shall consist of one or more of the following materials. Construction procedures shall conform to the requirements applicable to the base course selected.
(a) Asphalt Concrete Base Course - Materials and construction shall conform to the current requirements of the Kentucky Bureau of Highways Specifications for Asphalt Concrete Base Course, Class I, except as noted herein:

[aa] Composition requirements of the mixture shall conform to the gradation limits for Asphalt Concrete Base Course I or II set forth in Table 2 of this ordinance. Asphalt content used shall fall within the range shown and shall be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

[bb] Uncrushed gravel and natural sand may be used as aggregate provided all other requirements of the specification are complied with.

(b) Asphalt Treated Base Course - Materials and construction procedures shall conform to the following requirements:

[aa] Aggregates may be crushed or uncrushed material conforming to the gradation requirements, shown in Table 2 of this ordinance for either Base III or Base IV. The aggregate shall be composed of hard durable particles and shall contain no more than a total of 5 percent deleterious substances. In addition, the sand equivalent of the aggregate shall not be less than twenty-five (25) when tested in accordance with AASHTO Designation: T 176-56. The contractor shall set a single gradation and asphalt content, within the specified limits, as the job mix formula to be used on the project. This formula must be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, prior to use. Gradation and asphalt content may vary during construction within the following tolerances:

- % Passing 3/4" or 3/8" Sieve ± 10.0%
- % Passing No. 8 Sieve ± 8.0%
% Passing No. 50 Sieve \( \pm 6.0\% \)
% Passing No. 100 Sieve \( \pm 3.0\% \)
% Asphalt \( \pm 0.4\% \)

[bb] Other construction requirements shall conform to those specified by the Kentucky Bureau of Highways for Asphalt Concrete except that a gradation unit on the plant shall not be required provided the aggregate can be controlled by other means to produce a consistently uniform gradation.

(c) Crushed Stone Base Course

[aa] Crushed Stone Base Course shall conform to all the current requirements of the Kentucky Bureau of Highways for Dense Graded Aggregate Base Course.

(3) Asphalt Concrete Surface Course - Materials and construction shall conform to the current requirements of the Kentucky Bureau of Highways for Asphalt Concrete Surface, Class I. Surface Course Mixture Composition may conform to requirements of either Surface Course I or II as set forth in Table 2 of this ordinance. Minimum course thickness shall be as stated in Table I of this ordinance.

(4) Asphalt Prime and Tack Coat

(a) Asphalt Prime shall conform to the Kentucky Bureau of Highways' requirements for Cutback Asphalt Emulsion Primer Type L. Prime shall be applied to the surface of granular base course at a rate of 0.20 to 0.40 gallons per square yard, as directed by the County Engineer, in conformance with requirements of the referred to specification.

(b) Tack Coat shall consist of SS-1h, meeting the current requirements of the Kentucky Bureau of Highways. It shall, when directed by the Planning and Zoning Commission, be diluted with equal parts of water. Application equipment and procedure shall conform to the requirements of the Kentucky Bureau of Highways for Tack Coats. Tack Coat shall be applied, upon direction of the Planning and Zoning Commission, to
the surface of asphalt courses that have become dusty or dry from traffic use before the subsequent course could be placed or in other circumstances when the Planning and Zoning Commission so directs.

2. Soil-Cement Base Course (with Asphalt Concrete Surface):

a. Description: Soil-cement base course shall consist of soil and cement uniformly mixed, moistened, compacted, finished, and cured in accordance with the specifications herein, and it shall conform to the lines, grades, thickness and typical cross section shown on the plans.

b. Materials:

(1) Cement shall comply with the latest specifications for cement, AASHTO M85, M134, M151; or ASTM C150, C175, C205; or Federal SS-CJ192b, SS-C-218 for the type specified. One cubic foot of Portland Cement shall be considered to weigh 94 pounds and lbbl. of cement shall be considered to weigh 376 pounds.

(2) Water - Water shall be free from substances deleterious to the hardening of the soil-cement.

(3) Soil - Soil shall consist of the material existing in the area to be paved, of approved selected soil, or of a combination of these materials proportioned as directed. The soil shall not contain gravel or stone retained on a 3-inch sieve or more than 45 percent retained on a No. 4 sieve.

c. Construction Methods:

(1) Preparation: Unsuitable soil or material shall be removed and replaced with acceptable soil.

The subgrade shall be firm and able to support without displacement the construction equipment and the compaction hereinafter specified. Soft or yielding subgrade shall be corrected and made stable, before construction proceeds.

(2) Pulverization - The soil shall be so pulverized that, at the completion of moist-mixing, 100 percent by dry weight
passes a 1-inch sieve and a minimum of 80 percent passes a No. 4 sieve, exclusive of gravel or stone retained on the sieves.

(3) Cement Application, Mixing and Spreading - Mixing of the soil, cement, and water shall be accomplished either by the mixed-in-place or the central-plant-mixed method.

No cement or soil-cement mixture shall be spread when the soil or subgrade is frozen or when the air temperature is less, than 40 degrees F. in the shade.

The percentage of moisture in the soil, at the time of cement application, shall not exceed the quantity that will permit a uniform and intimate mixture of soil and cement during mixing operations; and it shall not exceed the specified optimum moisture content for the soil-cement mixture.

Any soil-and-cement mixture that has not been compacted and finished shall not remain undisturbed for more than 30 minutes. The soil-cement base course shall have a thickness of not less than six (6) inches.

(4) Compaction - At the start of compaction, the percentage of moisture in the mixture and in unpulverized soil lumps, based on oven-dry weights, shall not be below or more than two percentage points above the specified optimum moisture content, and shall be less than that quantity which will cause the soil-cement mixture to become unstable during compaction and finishing. The specified optimum moisture content and density shall be determined in the field by a moisture density test, AASHTO T134-57 or ASTM D558-57, on representative samples of soil-cement mixture obtained from the area being processed.

Prior to the beginning of compaction, the mixture shall be in a loose condition for its full depth. The loose mixture then shall be uniformly compacted to the specified density within two hours. During compaction operations, shaping may be required to obtain uniform compaction and required grade and cross section.

(5) Finishing - After compaction the surface of the soil-cement shall be shaped to the required lines, grades and cross section. If necessary, during shaping operations, the surface
of the base shall be lightly scarified to remove any tire imprints or smooth. The resulting surface shall specified density. Rolling broom-dragging if required. The moisture content of the surface material must be retained at not less than its specified optimum moisture content during finishing operations. Surface compaction and finishing shall be done in such a manner as to produce, in not longer than two hours, a smooth dense surface free of compaction planes, cracks, ridges or loose materials.

Any portion of the soil-cement that has a density of five pounds or more below that specified shall be corrected or replaced to meet these specifications.

(6) Curing - After the soil-cement has been finished as specified, herein, it shall be protected against drying for seven days by the application of bituminous material. The curing material shall be applied as soon as possible but not later than 24 hours after completion of finishing operations. The finished soil-cement shall be kept continuously moist until the curing material is placed.

The bituminous material specified shall be uniformly applied to the surface of the completed soil-cement at the rate of approximately 0.2 gallon per square yard with approved heating and distributing equipment.

At the time the bituminous material is applied the soil cement surface shall be dense, shall be free of all loose and extraneous material, and shall contain sufficient moisture to prevent penetration of the bituminous materials. Water shall be applied in sufficient quantity to fill the surface voids of the soil-cement immediately before the bituminous curing material is applied.

The curing material shall be maintained by the contractor during the seven day protection period so that all of the soil cement will be covered effectively during this period.

Sufficient protection from freezing shall be given the cement for seven days after its construction and until it has hardened.
(7) Surfacing - Asphalitic concrete shall be applied to the soil cement base course as regulated in Section 11.0, M, Subsection 1, b (3) of this ordinance.

3. Concrete Parking Areas:

a. General Requirements - Thickness of concrete parking shall be:

(1) A minimum of five (5) inches for passenger cars and panel or pick-up truck parking.

(2) A minimum of six (6) inches for driveways accommodating light trucks and for light truck parking.

(3) A minimum of seven (7) inches for heavier commercial or industrial needs.

b. General Requirements - Concrete mix (for areas subject to freeze-thaw conditions.)

(1) Minimum cement content - 564 lb./cu. yd. (6 U.S. bags).

(2) A Maximum size of aggregate - 1 - 1/2 inches.

(3) Maximum water content - 0.49 lb./l lb. of cement (5.5 gal./bag.)

(4) Maximum slump - Four (4) inches.

(5) Air entrainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Aggregate Size (inches)</th>
<th>Entrained Air (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1/4</td>
<td>5 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4, 1</td>
<td>6 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8, 1/2</td>
<td>7 - 1/2 ± 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Construction Procedures:

(1) All soft and yielding material and other portions of the subgrade which will not compact readily when rolled or tared shall be removed and replaced with suitable material placed and compacted. The subgrade shall be thoroughly compacted with suitable equipment so as to have uniform
density at moisture contents of not less than standard optimum (AASHTO-T98).

(2) Longitudinal joint spacing shall not exceed 12.5 feet.

(3) Transverse joint spacings shall be at regular intervals of twenty (20) feet.

(4) All transverse construction joints shall have a depth equal to one-fourth (1/4) of the pavement thickness.

(5) Form offsets at radius points shall be at least two (2) feet.

(6) Pavement joints must be continuous through the curbs.

(7) Where curbs are required they shall be cast integrally.

(8) The pavement shall be struck-off, consolidated, and finished to the grades shown on the plans. All catch basins and manhole castings shall be boxed out and separated from the pavement with expansion joint material. All except premolded or sawed joints shall be edged with a tool having a maximum radius of 1/8 inch. Sawed and formed joints shall be cleaned and sealed before opening to traffic. Final surface texture shall be that obtained with a burlap drag. Curing shall be that obtained with a uniform coverage of white membrane curing compound or by seven day coverage of white polyethylene or waterproof paper. The completed pavement shall be closed to traffic for seven days.

ON. DESIGN AND MAINTENANCE:

1. Screening and Landscaping: All open automobile parking areas containing more than four (4) parking spaces shall be effectively screened on each side adjoining or fronting on any property situated in a residential zone by a solid wall, fence or densely planted compact hedge as regulated by Section 9.17 of this Ordinance. Ground cover shrubs and trees shall be located and maintained so as to not interfere with vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the property or with sight distance clearance at entrances and exits.

2. Lighting: Any parking area intended to be used during non-daylight hours shall be properly illuminated to avoid accidents and other unsafe conditions. During the Development or Site Planning Process, the Zoning Administrator has the authority to require plans
specifying foot candle minimums/maximums and illumination patterns when lighting is an integral part of a development's use. Any lights used to illuminate any out-of-doors area shall be arranged to minimize direct illumination, reflection, or glare on any adjoining property or on any public street. Any lighting used to illuminate off-street parking areas shall be directed away from property in any residential zone in such a way as not to create a nuisance.

3. Ingress and egress to parking areas: Any parking area shall be designed in such a manner that any vehicle entering or leaving the parking area from or into a public or private street shall be travelling in a forward motion. Access driveways for parking areas or loading/unloading spaces shall be located in such a way that any vehicle entering or leaving such area shall be clearly visible for a reasonable distance to any pedestrian or motorist approaching the access or driveway from a public or private street. Where possible and appropriate, inter-connecting parking lots shall be provided for the purpose of reducing the number of local trips onto public streets. All access points shall be limited to driveway entrances and exits specified in parking area plans as approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission Zoning Administrator. Each required parking space shall be connected with a deeded public right-of-way (by means of adequate aisles as required in Section 11.0 H) which offers adequate ingress and egress for automobiles.

4. Parking lots, garages and storage areas shall be so designed and constructed so that all maneuvering into and out of each parking space takes place entirely within property lines of lots, garages and/or storage areas.

5. Striping and signage: All parking areas shall be striped to facilitate the movement in and out of parking stalls. This includes the delineation of access isles and permitted turning movements. The entrances and exits to the parking area shall be clearly marked. All signage and striping shall be adequately maintained to ensure safe and efficient movement of vehicles.

6. Drainage: All parking and loading/unloading areas shall provide for proper and approved drainage of surface water.

7. Wheel Blocks: Curbs, wheel blocks, or other suitable devices must be provided to prevent vehicles from extending beyond a property line, pedestrian walkway or drainage area. A minimum of 2.5 feet should be provided for overhang of a vehicle. When a sidewalk is
used as the wheel stop and overhang for a parking stall, the width of the sidewalk shall be no less than 6 feet.
Table 1

Thickness requirements Of Surface and Base Courses
For Automobiles and Truck Parking Facility Pavements (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types Of Vehicles</th>
<th>Soil Classification</th>
<th>Thickness Of Surface And Base - Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asphalt Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type I or II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Facilities</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Facilities</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thickness of surface and base is shown for each soil classification and street classification. The first number indicates the minimum thickness of asphalt concrete which may be comprised of asphalt concrete surface course, Type I or II, if the surface course does not exceed two (2) inches. When surface thickness is more than two (2) inches, asphalt concrete Base I or II, as specified in Table 2, may be used for all but the upper one (1) inch wearing course which must be asphalt concrete surface course I or II, as specified in Table 2. The second figure indicates the thickness of base course of the type indicated. For example, 1-4 indicates one (1) inch surface and four (4) inches base.

Soils are classified into three (3) groups indicating their relative effectiveness as subgrade.

A – Granular soils that drain well; sand, gravel or combination of sand and gravel.

B – Silty clays, or lean clays, that retain considerable strength when wet. These are average subgrade soils.

C – Heavy clay soils that lose most of their strength when wet.
### Table 2

Composition Limits For Asphalt Mixtures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>Base I</th>
<th>Base II</th>
<th>Surface I</th>
<th>Surface II</th>
<th>Base III</th>
<th>Base IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1/2&quot;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>85 - 100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>70 - 100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>50 - 80</td>
<td>80 - 100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40 - 80</td>
<td>70 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot;</td>
<td>50 - 80</td>
<td>54 - 76</td>
<td>80 - 100</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>30 - 50</td>
<td>37 - 57</td>
<td>55 - 75</td>
<td>75 - 95</td>
<td>25 - 60</td>
<td>40 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 8</td>
<td>25 - 45</td>
<td>25 - 45</td>
<td>35 - 60</td>
<td>60 - 85</td>
<td>25 - 60</td>
<td>40 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 16</td>
<td>15 - 35</td>
<td>15 - 35</td>
<td>25 - 50</td>
<td>45 - 70</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 50</td>
<td>5 - 20</td>
<td>5 - 20</td>
<td>9 - 21</td>
<td>15 - 40</td>
<td>5 - 30</td>
<td>15 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 100</td>
<td>3 - 10</td>
<td>3 - 10</td>
<td>5 - 14</td>
<td>5 - 25</td>
<td>3 - 15</td>
<td>5 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 200</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>4 - 10</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asphalt</td>
<td>3.5 - 6.0</td>
<td>4.0 - 7.0</td>
<td>5.0 - 8.0</td>
<td>6.0 - 9.0</td>
<td>3.5 - 6.0</td>
<td>4.0 - 8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 11.1 SPECIFIC OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS: The amount of off street parking space required for uses, building, or additions thereto shall be determined according to the following requirements, and the space, so required, shall be stated in the application for a zoning and building permit and shall be reserved for such use. Where more than one use is located in the same building, each individual use shall be in accordance with the off street parking requirements of this section of the Ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF USES</th>
<th>REQUIRED NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Airport, railroad passenger stations and bus terminals</td>
<td>One (1) parking space per each four (4) seating accommodations for waiting passengers, plus one (1) parking space per each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Automobile laundries</td>
<td>One (1) parking space for each employee, plus one (1) space per owner or manager and reservoir space equal to five (5) times the capacity of laundry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Automobile service stations</td>
<td>One (1) space for each gas pump island, plus two (2) spaces for each working bay, plus one (1) parking space for each employee at largest shift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Beauty parlors and barber shops</td>
<td>Two (2) parking spaces per barber and/or beauty shop operator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Bowling establishments</td>
<td>Five (5) parking spaces for each lane; plus one (1) space for each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. City and/or county government</td>
<td>One (1) parking space for each two hundred (200) square feet of gross floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Commercial or trade schools</td>
<td>One (1) parking space for each two (2) students based on design capacity of school plus one (1) parking space for each employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Convalescent homes, nursing homes, rest homes, homes for the aged, and orphanages</td>
<td>One (1) parking space for each two (2) beds, plus one (1) space for each two (2) employees or staff members, including nurses, on the shift of largest employment, plus one (1) parking space per doctor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TYPE OF USES

I. Dance halls, pool and billiard halls and exhibition halls without fixed seats

J. Dormitories, Fraternities, Sorority Houses and Other Group Housing

REQUIRED NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES

One (1) parking space for each one hundred (100) square feet of floor area used for dancing or assembly, or one (1) space for each four (4) persons based on design capacity, whichever is greater, plus one (1) space for each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment.

A. One (1) parking space per each resident capacity of the structure, plus one (1) parking space per owner or operator; plus one (1) Parking space per employee.

B. In addition to the parking required in (A) above, parking will be required for the no resident membership of the organization, as follows:

One (1) parking space for each 50 square feet Of the largest floor area used for assembly, social activity and dining; or one (1) parking space for each 100 square feet of the total all floor area used for assembly, social activity and dining; or one (1) space for each non resident member anticipated in the frat – membership, whichever is greater.

K. Dwellings: One-family

Two-family

L. Dwellings: Multi-family

Two (2) parking spaces.

Four (4) parking spaces, with individual access for each dwelling unit.

One (1) parking space for every one (1) bedroom dwelling an two (2) parking spaces for every dwelling unit with two (2) or more bedrooms.
M. Establishments for sale and consumption on the premises of alcoholic beverages, food, and refreshments, or for take home food services

REQUIRED NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES

One (1) parking space per each:
A. 30 square foot of gross floor area in a drive-in restaurant;
B. 140 square-feet of gross floor in a carry-out restaurant;
C. 40 square feet of gross floor area or two (2) seating accommodations, based on maximum seating capacity, whichever is greater, in a combination restaurant;
D. Two (2) seating accommodations, based on maximum seating capacity in a sit-down restaurant;

plus one (1) parking space per each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment in any type restaurant.

N. Fire Stations

One (1) parking space per each person on duty on largest shift.

O. Hospitals

One (1) parking space for each two (2) beds, plus one (1) space for each two (2) employees, or staff members, including nurses, on the shift of largest employment, plus one (1) parking space per doctor.

P. Laundromats

One (1) parking space for each two (2) washing machines.

Q. Libraries, museums, and art galleries

One (1) parking space per each four (4) seats in rooms for public assembly or one (1) parking space for each fifty (50) square feet of gross floor area for use by the public, whichever is greater, plus one (1) space for each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment.

R. Medical offices and/or clinics

Five (5) parking spaces per each practitioner, plus one (1) parking space per each two (2) employees or one (1) parking space per each two hundred (200) square feet of gross floor area in the building, plus one (1) parking space for each two (2) employees, whichever is greater.
TYPE OF USES

S. Mortuaries or funeral homes

REQUIRED NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES

One (1) parking space for each four (4) seats in the main chapel or public assembly area based on maximum seating capacity, plus one (1) parking space for each funeral vehicle and employee, or in the case of no fixed seats, one (1) parking space for each fifty (50) square feet of floor area in parlors or service rooms, or one (1) parking space for each four (4) persons based on designed capacity of building, whichever is greater, plus one (1) parking space for each funeral vehicle and employee.

T. Offices for professional business and financial real estate and business purposes other than medical offices and/or clinics

One (1) parking space for each two-hundred (200) two hundred-fifty (250) square feet of gross floor area.

U. Post offices

One (1) parking space for each four hundred (400) square feet of gross floor area; plus one (1) parking space for each two (2) employees on the shift of largest employment.

V. Private clubs, boarding houses, and lodge halls

One (1) parking space for each guest sleeping room, or one (1) parking space per each four (4) fixed seats in the main assembly area, whichever is greater, plus one (1) parking space for each two (2) employees, or in the case of no fixed seats, one (1) parking space for each two (2) employees.

W. Retail and personal service stores

One (1) parking space for each hundred twenty-five (125) square feet of gross floor area. Five (5) spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross leasable area, 4 spaces for each additional 1,000 square feet or fraction thereof.

X. Schools-Elementary, junior high and equivalent private or parochial schools

One (1) parking space per teacher and administrator or one (1) space for each four (4) seats in the auditorium, stadium, and other places of assembly or facilities available to the public based on maximum seating capacity, whichever is greater.
TYPE OF USES

Y. Schools-Senior high, trade, and vocational, college and universities, and equivalent private or parochial schools

REQUIRED NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES

Six (6) spaces per each room to be used for class instruction or administrative offices or one (1) space for each four (4) seats in the auditorium, stadium, and other places of assembly or facilities available to the public based on maximum seating capacity, whichever is greater.

Z. Shopping centers

Five (5) Parking spaces per 1000 feet of gross leasable area. 4 spaces for each additional 1,000 square feet or fraction thereof.

AA. Stadium and sports arenas

One (1) parking space for each four (4) seats based on a maximum seating capacity, plus one (1) space for each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment.

BB. Theaters, auditoriums, churches, and places of assembly with fixed seats

One (1) parking space for each four (4) seats based on a maximum seating capacity, plus one (1) additional space for each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment.

CC. Theaters, auditoriums, churches, and places of assembly without fixed seats

One (1) parking space per four (4) people in designed capacity of building, or one (1) parking space per one hundred (100) square feet in main auditorium or assembly area, whichever is greater, plus one (1) parking space for each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment.

DD. Tourist homes, cabins, motels, or hotels

One (1) parking space for each sleeping room or suite, plus one (1) space per each two (2) employees on shift of largest employment.

EE. Industrial establishments, including manufacturing, research and testing laboratories

Two (2) parking spaces for each three (3) employees-the total number of parking spaces being the total number of employees on any two (2) consecutive shifts having the largest number of employees based on design capacity, plus one (1) parking space for each company vehicle.
FF. Wholesale establishments, warehouses, and storage buildings

operating from the premises.

One (1) parking space for each employee, plus one (1) parking space for each company vehicle operating from the premises.

GG. All Other Uses Not Listed Herein

Based on study to be prepared by owner or operator; number of spaces to be required determined according to: (a) Type of use and estimated number of total trips generated during peak conditions (inbound and outbound); (b) Estimated parking duration per vehicle trip (turnover rates); (c) Based on the estimated number of trips generated and average parking duration per trip, calculate number of spaces required; and (d) Estimated number of employees – one (1) space to be provided for each two (2) employees based on shift of maximum employment.