CAMPBELL COUNTY & MUNICIPAL
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

MAY 13, 2014
7:00 PM

AGENDA

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll call and determination of quorum.
3. Approval of the April 8, 2014 minutes.

Public Hearings:

4. FILE NUMBER: 108-13-TXA-03
   APPLICANT: Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC
   REQUEST: Proposed update to sections 300, of the Subdivision Regulations clarifying the
             balance between minor divisions and necessary street improvements.

5. FILE NUMBER: 108-13-TXA-04
   APPLICANT: Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC
   REQUEST: Proposed update to section 415, Item D, of the Subdivision Regulations clarifying
             modifying the volume, arrangement and sizes of flag lots.

6. FILE NUMBER: 108-13-TXA-05
   APPLICANT: Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC
   REQUEST: Proposed update to section 405 and Appendix C, of the Subdivision Regulations
             aligning applicable pavement and cul-de-sac dimensions.

7. Director's Report

8. Adjournment

IF YOU CANNOT ATTEND THE MEETING,
PLEASE CALL THE P&Z OFFICE AT 859-292-3880.

The Commission will make every reasonable accommodation to assist qualified persons attending
the meeting, if there is a need for the Commission to be aware of, contact the office.
Mr. Verst called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. Following roll call, a quorum was found to be present. Mr. Verst asked if everyone had reviewed the April 8th, 2014 meeting minutes and asked if there were any additions or corrections. Mr. Verst stated that the minutes should be corrected to reflect that, on page 2 of the minutes, Mr. Barrow could not have seconded his own motion. Upon checking the records, it was Mr. Williams who seconded the motion. Mr. Verst asked if there was any discussion on the corrections to the minutes or if there were any other changes that needed to be made. There being none, Mr. Verst called for a motion. Mr. Barrow made a motion to approve the April 8th meeting minutes as corrected. Mr. Stubbs seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Blake and Mr. Stubbs in favor of the motion. Ms. Harding, Mr. Stapleton, Mr. Pfeffer and Mr. Verst abstained. Motion passed.

Mr. Verst introduced case #108-14-TXA-03, Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC with a request to update section 300, of the Subdivision Regulations clarifying the balance between minor divisions and necessary street improvements. Mr. Verst called for Ms. Minter to present the staff report and recommendations. Ms. Minter presented the staff report and recommendation as follows:

FILE NUMBER: 108-14-TXA-03
APPLICANT: Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC
REQUEST: Proposed update to sections 300, of the Subdivision Regulations clarifying the balance between minor divisions and necessary street improvements.

On behalf of the Campbell County Planning and Zoning Commission, the Campbell County Planning & Zoning staff is submitting this request for a Public Hearing to modify SECTION 300 - Summary of the Subdivision Review Procedure of the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations. This text amendment is proposed to address a discrepancy in the number of minor divisions and the corresponding requirements for public right of way improvements.

PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS:

Delete lines 36 and 37, “Where a Minor Division of Land involves three or more lots, the provisions of Section 405(H)2 also apply.” (See attachment)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

To adopt the proposed text amendments to the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.
SUPPORTING INFORMATION/BASES FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. Pursuant to KRS 100.277 and KRS 100.281, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt regulations for the subdivision of land within its boundaries.

2. Pursuant to Campbell County Subdivision Regulations Article I SECTION 130, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt and revise its subdivision regulations. Proper notice has been given for the Public Hearing.

3. The proposed changes are consistent with the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update and the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Verst thanked Ms. Minter for her report and reminded the Commission that this was a public hearing. Mr. Verst opened the public hearing. There being no audience members to provide feedback, Mr. Verst closed the public hearing and opened the floor for discussion among the Commissioners.

There was no discussion. Mr. Verst commented that the correction seems very straightforward and a matter of clerical correction more than anything else. There still being no comments from the Commissioners, Mr. Verst called for a motion. Mr. Pfeffer made a motion to accept the text change as proposed in the staff report citing as the bases for his motion that 1) pursuant to KRS 100.277 and KRS 100.281, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt regulations for the subdivision of land within its boundaries; 2) that the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations Article I SECTION 130, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt and revise its subdivision regulations and proper notice has been given for the Public Hearing; and 3) that the proposed changes are consistent with the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update and the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Verst asked if there were any questions or discussion on the motion before them. There being none, Mr. Verst called for a second to the motion. Ms. Blake seconded the motion. Mr. Verst called for a roll call vote. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Blake, Ms. Harding, Mr. Stapleton, Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Pfeffer in favor of the motion. Mr. Verst abstained. Motion passed.

Mr. Verst introduced case #106-14-TXA-04, Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC with a request to update section 415, Item D, of the Subdivision Regulations clarifying modifying the volume, arrangement and sizes of flag lots. Mr. Verst called for Ms. Minter to present the staff report and recommendations. Ms. Minter presented the staff report and recommendation as follows:

FILE NUMBER: 106-14-TXA-04
APPLICANT: Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC
REQUEST: Proposed update to section 415, Item D, of the Subdivision Regulations clarifying modifying the volume, arrangement and sizes of flag lots.

On behalf of the Campbell County Planning and Zoning Commission, the Campbell County Planning & Zoning staff is submitting this request for a Public Hearing to modify SECTION 415 Lot Arrangement and Sizes (D) Flag Lots of the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations. This proposed text amendment is to provide needed flexibility in the division of land based upon the common geographic characteristics of land in Campbell County.

PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS:

Referencing SECTION 415 Lot Arrangement and Sizes (D) Flag Lots, proposed revisions include allowing for planning staff review of flag lots, increasing the maximum number of flag lots from 5% to 15% within a major division, and refining language related to the adjacent flag lots based upon the potential increase in the volume of lots. (See attachment for specific proposed text changes.)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

To adopt the proposed text amendments to the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.
SUPPORTING INFORMATION/BASES FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. Pursuant to KRS 100.277 and KRS 100.281, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt regulations for the subdivision of land within its boundaries.

2. Pursuant to Campbell County Subdivision Regulations Article I SECTION 130, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt and revise its subdivision regulations. Proper notice has been given for the Public Hearing.

3. The proposed changes are consistent with the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update and the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Verst thanked Ms. Minter for her report and reminded the Commission that this was a public hearing. Mr. Verst opened the public hearing. There being no audience members to provide feedback, Mr. Verst closed the public hearing and opened the floor for discussion among the Commissioners.

Mr. Verst started the discussion with a request for additional input from the Commissioners. The changes proposed by staff have been in discussion since shortly after the Subdivision Regulation update of July 2012. Mr. Verst stated that he fully supports these changes and know that they are in the best interest of the County to make these changes. However, while we are updating this section, would it not be in our interest to also review the entire section? Mr. Verst added that there was one other item that he feels needs to be addressed – the length of the flag stem. Currently, our regulations indicate the flag stem should be no more than 250 feet before widening out to the required width of the lot according to the zoning ordinance. Mr. Verst proposed that this figure needs to either be increased or the requirement for limiting the length be deleted altogether.

Ms. Minter had, in a previous training session, indicated the progression of the flag lot requirement from its origin in our 1982 Subdivision Regulations, as well as compared our current standards in relation to other entities. Ms. Minter reviewed this information again with the Commissioners briefly. Ms. Minter commented that while she agrees that she has heard from developers that the length of 250 feet is considered stringent in their opinion. With that being said, Ms. Minter strongly encouraged the Commission to set a new maximum standard to be required and not delete the maximum stem length altogether. Plans have been submitted to staff for preliminary review that would definitely be an abuse of the flag lot requirements if there were no maximum length requirement. The issues that arise from not regulating flag lots are long term and horrific to resolve.

After an in-depth and lengthy discussion, there was a general consensus among the Commissioners that the length of the flag stem needed to be updated in addition to the text changes proposed by staff. After a brief discussion, it was determined that there would be one motion to be made for the changes outlined by staff and a separate one to address the flag stem length requirement. Mr. Pfeffer pointed out that there was an additional change pertaining to the changes proposed by staff. Staff corrected the numeric items on line 46, page 4.25 and line 23 of page 4.26 to change “5%” to “15%”, but that the change to the alphabetical wording. Mr. Pfeffer added that “five” should be changed to “fifteen” in both of those same locations. Both staff and the remaining Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Verst asked if there were any other questions or comments. There being none, Mr. Verst called for a motion. Mr. Barrow made a motion to accept the text change as proposed in the staff report as well as the changes indicated on pages 4.25 and 4.26 by Mr. Pfeffer. Mr. Barrow cited the basis for his motion is that 1) pursuant to KRS 100.277 and KRS 100.281, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt regulations for the subdivision of land within its boundaries; 2) that the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations Article I SECTION 130, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt and revise its subdivision regulations and proper notice has been given for the Public Hearing; and 3) that the proposed changes are consistent with the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update and the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Verst asked if there were any questions or discussion on the motion before them. There being none, Mr. Verst called for a second to the motion. Mr. Stapleton seconded the motion. Mr. Verst called for a roll call vote. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Blake, Ms. Harding, Mr. Stapleton, Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Pfeffer in favor of the motion. Mr. Verst abstained. Motion passed.
Mr. Verst asked if there were any motions on the flag stem requirement. Mr. Stapleton made a motion to change line 39 on page 4.25 and line 20 on page 4.26 to change 250 feet to be 350 feet in both numerical and alphabetical citing of the maximum flag stem length. Mr. Stapleton stated the bases for his motion is that 1) discussion among the Commission tonight; 2) pursuant to KRS 100.277 and KRS 100.281, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt regulations for the subdivision of land within its boundaries; 3) that the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations Article I SECTION 130, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt and revise its subdivision regulations and proper notice has been given for the Public Hearing; and 4) that the proposed changes are consistent with the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update and the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Verst asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the motion. There being none, Mr. Verst called for a second to the motion. Ms. Harding seconded the motion. Mr. Verst called for a roll call vote. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Stapleton, Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Pfeffer in favor of the motion. Ms. Blake was against the motion. Mr. Verst abstained. Motion passed.

Mr. Verst introduced case #108-14-TXA-05, Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC with a request to update section 405 and Appendix C, of the Subdivision Regulations aligning applicable pavement and cul-de-sac dimensions. Mr. Verst called for Ms. Minter to present the staff report and recommendations. Ms. Minter presented the staff report and recommendation as follows:

FILE NUMBER: 108-14-TXA-05
APPLICANT: Campbell County Planning & Zoning Department on behalf of the CC&MP&ZC
REQUEST: Proposed update to section 405 and Appendix C, of the Subdivision Regulations aligning applicable pavement and cul-de-sac dimensions.

On behalf of the Campbell County Planning and Zoning Commission, the Campbell County Planning & Zoning staff is submitting this request for a Public Hearing to modify SECTION 405 – Street Design (M) Cul-De-Sac Streets of the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations. This text amendment is proposed to balance the street design for pavement width and the corresponding termination of the cul-de-sac.

PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS:

Residential subdivision with cul-de-sacs more than nine hundred feet (900’) from an intersection shall be built with a radius equal to a commercial/industrial design. For residential subdivision cul-de-sac with commercial/industrial design, up to an eight feet radius may be substituted with a clear zone. Clear zones are not required to be paved but must be graded to align with the street/cul-de-sac. Clear zones must remain free of obstacles including sidewalks, landscaping and other fixtures. (See attachment)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

To adopt the proposed text amendments to the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION/BASES FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. Pursuant to KRS 100.277 and KRS 100.281, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt regulations for the subdivision of land within its boundaries.

2. Pursuant to Campbell County Subdivision Regulations Article I SECTION 130, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt and revise its subdivision regulations. Proper notice has been given for the Public Hearing.

3. The proposed changes are consistent with the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update and the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Verst thanked Ms. Minter for her report and reminded the Commission that this was a public hearing. Mr. Verst opened the public hearing. There being no audience members to provide feedback, Mr. Verst closed the public hearing and opened the floor for discussion among the Commissioners.

Mr. Pfeffer initiated a discussion as to the nature and reasoning of the clearance area of 8 feet. Ms. Minter clarified that the objective was for school buses and snow plow equipment to be capable of turning
in the cul-de-sac without the encumbrances of fire hydrants, mailboxes, light poles, etc. in the area surrounding the concrete paved cul-de-sac. It is a safety issue for these larger type vehicles.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Verst asked if anyone had any questions or comments regarding the proposed text change. There being no additional questions or comments from the Commissioners, Mr. Verst called for a motion. Mr. Barrow made a motion to accept the text change as proposed in the staff report citing as the bases for his motion that 1) pursuant to KRS 100.277 and KRS 100.281, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt regulations for the subdivision of land within its boundaries; 2) that the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations Article I SECTION 130, the Planning and Zoning Commission has the authority to adopt and revise its subdivision regulations and proper notice has been given for the Public Hearing; and 3) that the proposed changes are consistent with the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update and the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Verst asked if there were any questions or discussion on the motion before them. There being none, Mr. Verst called for a second to the motion. Mr. Stubbs seconded the motion. Mr. Verst called for a roll call vote. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Blake, Ms. Harding, Mr. Stapleton, Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Pfeffer in favor of the motion. Mr. Verst abstained. Motion passed.

There being no other cases to come before the Planning Commission, Mr. Verst called for the Director's Report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Minter advised the Commission that they has a couple of handouts before them that were three-hole punched. These items are updates to their paper copies of the Zoning Ordinance. There was also a handout from OKI regarding some studies coming up regarding KY 536. If the Commissioners attend any meeting or classes pertaining to this topic, they can get training credit for it. Ms. Minter advised them to forward a copy of the agenda of the meeting along with the date and location of the meeting and the time they spend in the class/meeting and a training sheet would be completed for them. The Commission has a training CD pertaining to Comprehensive Plans. If any of the Commissioners are interested in using the CD, please just let staff know.

Ms. Minter stated that there could be a meeting in June. The Commission would be advised as to the nature of the meeting at a later date. Staff had no additional business to discuss with the Commission. Mr. Verst asked the Commissioners if they had any other business to discuss. There being none, Mr. Verst asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pfeffer made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Stubbs seconded the motion. An oral vote found everyone in favor, none opposed. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cynthia Minter
Director of Planning & Zoning

Approved:

Justin Verst
Chair
ARTICLE 3

PROCEDURE FOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL

SECTION 300

Summary of the Subdivision Review Procedure
The following articles apply to subdivisions or the divisions of land which are used for commercial, industrial, residential, or other types of uses. The subdivision of land can occur in two forms. The first form involves a minor division of land (conveyance plat) as outlined in the Definitions section of this document. A minor division of land involves the division of five (5) buildable lots or less from the parent tract, since January 1, 1982, including any remainder or residual tract(s), and is located along an existing public street. The minor division of land involves no widening or extension of a public or private street, and no public utility improvements. A conveyance plat may also be used to record casual sales or the transfer of property from one owner to another. If an applicant or property owner originally used the conveyance plat or minor division of land procedure, but then decided to create more than five buildable lots from the parent tract, then he or she shall be required to follow the major division of land procedure.

The second form involves a major division of land or six (6) or more buildable lots from the parent tract, including any remainder or residual tract(s), and/or subdivisions which include public utilities and/or public or private streets. The review procedure for a major division of land involves a preliminary plat, improvement plan, and a final plat. If, however, the division of land of six (6) or more buildable lots does not require any public utility or public street improvements, the developer will only be required to submit a Preliminary Plat and a Final Plat for review and approval. Finally, even if the developer is beyond the minor division of land or the five (5) buildable lot requirement, then the developer shall follow the requirements of a major division of land.

A) Minor Division of Land - The subdivider or applicant submits a Conveyance Plat to the Planning Commission for review and approval based upon the requirements in Section 375 of this document. Once approved, the subdivider or applicant may then proceed to record the conveyance plat in the County Clerk's office. If the new owner of the property intends to build a structure, then he or she may then proceed to obtain a zoning permit for each tract in the subdivision from the Planning Commission staff and a building permit from the Campbell County Building Inspection Department.

Where a Minor Division of Land involves three or more lots, the provisions of Section 405(H)2 also apply.
B) **Major Division of Land** - The subdivider or applicant submits a Preliminary Plat to the Campbell County Planning Commission staff for review and recommendation. The Campbell County Planning Commission's staff shall review and take action either to approve or disapprove a Preliminary Plat within thirty (30) days unless the time limitation is waived by agreement between the Campbell County Planning Commission and the developer. The Preliminary Plat shall also be reviewed by the Project Review Committee who shall advise the Planning Commission's staff. If the Preliminary Plat is disapproved, the applicant or developer may appeal the decision before the full Planning Commission within thirty (30) days of such denial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINOR DIVISION OF LAND</th>
<th>MAJOR DIVISION OF LAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 buildable lots or less from the parent tract</td>
<td>6 buildable lots or more from the parent tract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No street improvements or extensions</td>
<td>Street improvements or extensions to public or private streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No public utility improvements</td>
<td>Public utility improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Preliminary Plat**
- **Improvement Plan** (not required when private streets are the only subdivision improvement involved or when no public street or utility improvements are involved)
- **Conveyance Plat**
- **Final Plat**

After the Preliminary Plat is approved, the subdivider submits an Improvement Plan to the Planning Commission for Staff review and recommendation. The Planning Commission's staff shall review and take action either to approve or disapprove the Improvement Plan within thirty (30) days unless the time limitation is waived by agreement between the developer and the Planning Commission. The Improvement Plan shall also be reviewed by the Project Review Committee who shall advise the Planning Commission's staff. If the Improvement Plan is disapproved, the applicant or developer may appeal the decision before the full Planning Commission within thirty (30) days. Once the Preliminary Plat and Improvement Plan are approved by the Planning Commission, the subdivider or applicant may commence grading of the site and construct utilities and streets, subject to review, inspection and approval of federal, state and local government agencies for such public utilities.

Once construction work has commenced in a subdivision or proposed subdivision and the public improvements (e.g. streets, sanitary sewer lines, storm sewer lines and water lines, etc.) are completely installed or near completion and inspected, a Final Plat shall be submitted for approval.
Side lot lines shall be as close to right angles with the street centerline as possible, or radial to
curve street centerlines. Lot lines not at right angles with the street centerline, and lot lines
intersecting with curved right-of-ways shall have a reference tie to the tangent line of that
centerline curve. Lot lines of a subdivision, should display an organized and uniform
development pattern.

A) Lot Size - The minimum size of a lot in a proposed subdivision or development depends
on the current zoning district that said subdivision or development or section thereof lies in. The minimum size for the respective zone is contained in the current Zoning
Regulations.

B) Land Adjoining Arterial and Collector Streets - The subdivision of new lots on land with a
minimum lot size of less than 80,000 square feet, which adjoin arterial and/or collector
streets shall be platted in a manner which necessitates vehicular access to be provided
from a secondary street, alley, or private access driveway and not arterial or collector
streets. A plat note shall be provided on the record plat which states that vehicular
access is prohibited from the arterial or collector street in question.

C) Irregular Lots - Irregular lots which include corner lots, double frontage lots, flag lots and
lots that have irregular shape and size because of topography or vegetation shall
conform to the minimum requirements of the applicable zoning ordinance. Corner lots
shall have the minimum lot frontage required by the applicable zone on both streets.
Driveways on corner lots shall be located at the building line farthest from the
intersection. Double frontage lots shall be avoided except where essential to provide
separation of a residential development from arterial streets or to overcome specific
disadvantages of topography and orientation.

D) Flag Lots - All flag lots require submission to the Planning Commission for review and
approval. Flag lots shall only be permitted in those locations where because of existing
geometric, topographic, or other natural features, it would be impractical to extend a
public street as determined by the Planning Commission or Planning Commission’s
Staff. Flag lots shall have a panhandle extending directly to a publicly dedicated street
for the purpose of access.

All flag lots in residential zones shall meet the following standards:

Each flag lot shall have a minimum of twenty-five feet (25') of frontage on a publicly
dedicated street for the purpose of access. Flag lots shall have a panhandle with a
uniform and consistent width with a maximum length of two hundred fifty feet (250')
from a publicly dedicated street.

For minor divisions of land, the maximum number of flag lots permitted shall not exceed two lots within the subdivision.

For major divisions of land, the maximum number of flag lots permitted shall not exceed five-percent (5%) of the total number of lots for the subdivision. For a major division,
no more than two contiguous flag lots shall be permitted.

A driveway must be located within the panhandle of the deeded property for a flag
lot, except in the A-1 or R-RE zones. In the A-1 or R-RE zones only, the driveway
may be located within an access easement across one intervening lot between the
street and the flag lot provided the following conditions are met:
The access easement is at least twenty feet (20') wide; and,

The access easement serves no more than two lots in addition to the one intervening lot on which it is located; and,

An appropriate agreement to assure the perpetual maintenance of the driveway shall be filed with the record plat or access easement declaration.

Also, the driveway for a flag lot shall be located at a minimum of five (5') feet from each lot line, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission and/or its Administrative Official.

The minimum lot area and setback requirements for the flag lot(s) shall be two and one-half (2½) times the requirements of the Zoning Regulations.

All flag lots in non-residential zones shall meet the following standards:

Each flag lot shall have a minimum of thirty feet (30') of frontage on a publicly dedicated street for the purpose of access. Flag lots shall have a panhandle with a uniform and consistent width with a maximum length of two hundred fifty feet (250') from a publicly dedicated street.

The maximum number of flag lots permitted shall not exceed five percent (5% to 15%) of the total number of lots for the subdivision. No more than two contiguous flag lots shall be permitted.

A driveway must be located within the panhandle of the deeded property for a flag lot. Also, the driveway for a flag lot shall be located at a minimum of five (5') feet from each lot line, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission and/or its Administrative Official. In the case of two contiguous flag lots, a deeded strip of land that is at least fifteen feet (15') wide is required for each lot with a common unobstructed access easement for a shared driveway to the public street.

The minimum lot area requirements for the flag lot(s) shall be two and one-half (2½) times the requirements of the Zoning Regulations. The minimum setback requirements for the flag lot(s) shall be two (2) times the requirements of the Zoning Regulations or fifty feet (50') whichever is greater.

**E) Lot Frontage, Width and Depth** - All lots in a subdivision shall have the minimum frontage on a public or private street as stated for their respective zone under the current Zoning Regulations.

The maximum depth of a lot shall not be greater than four (4) times the width of the lot, except for flag lots and lots which contain over five (5) acres of area. Exceptional individual site conditions may require variation from these requirements as determined by the Planning Commission and/or its Administrative Official.

**F) Cemeteries** - An applicant, property owner or developer has the option either to (1) preserve an existing private family cemetery and develop around it or (2) relocate an existing cemetery. In relocating a private family cemetery, an applicant, property owner
These maximum grades may be modified by the Commission where extreme
topographic conditions exist or in the interest of good site planning.

J) **Horizontal Curves** - Central angles of horizontal curves shall be kept to a minimum
unless there is sufficient radius length to minimize the severity of the curve. At no time
shall the radius of the centerline of a proposed street be less than two hundred feet
(200') for collector streets, and one hundred feet (100') for local streets, except at
intersections or divided roadways.

The tangent distance between horizontal curves of proposed street centerlines shall not be
less than one hundred feet (100') for any arterial and any collector streets.

K) **Vertical Curves** - Any change in grade of proposed streets shall be transitioned by a
vertical curve. The minimum length for a vertical curve shall be thirty (30) times the
absolute value of the algebraic difference of the grades (in percent) of the two tangents
for crest curves and thirty five (35) times the absolute value for sag curves in sub-
collector and collector streets. The minimum length for a vertical curve shall be ten (10)
times the absolute value of the algebraic difference of the grades (in percent) of the two
tangents in local streets, cul-de-sacs, and alleys.

L) **Intersections** - The two centerlines of proposed streets at their intersection shall be as
nearly to a right angle as possible and that angle at no time shall be less than eighty (80)
degrees. For residential subdivisions, the radius of the curve at the intersection of the
two right-of-way lines shall not be less than twenty feet (20'), and for the intersection of
the two pavement edges, the radius curve shall not be less than twenty-five (25) feet.

For industrial and commercial subdivisions, the radius of the curve at the intersection of
the two right-of-way lines shall not be less than forty feet (40'), and for the intersection of
two pavement edges, the radius curve shall not be less than forty-five feet (45'). The
Campbell County Planning Commission may, in certain situations, increase the minimum
radii based upon existing road conditions and traffic patterns. (See Street and Storm
Drainage Construction Specifications.)

There shall be no greater than four basic street legs at any proposed intersection unless
the intersection is divided. Merging lanes, deceleration lanes, "Y" intersections, etc. are
considered as being parts of one street leg or approach.

Proposed intersections with existing streets shall not be closer than one hundred and
twenty five feet (125') to an intersection of two existing streets as measured from
intersection point to intersection point.

M) **Cul-de-Sacs Streets** - Proposed cul-de-sac streets designed to have a permanently
closed end shall not be more than twelve hundred feet (1200') long for industrial,
commercial or Conventional Residential Subdivisions, as measured from the intersection
of the centerlines of the cul-de-sac and the intersecting street (from station 0+00 of the
cul-de-sac street). This type of street serves twenty-five (25) residential lots or units or
less. Residential subdivision with cul-de-sacs more than nine hundred feet (900') from
an intersection shall be built with a radius equal to a commercial/industrial design. For
residential subdivision cul-de-sac with commercial/industrial design, up to an eight feet
radius may be substituted with a clear zone. Clear zones are not required to be paved
but must be graded to align with the street/ cul-de-sac. Clear zones must remain free of
obstacles including sidewalks, landscaping and other fixtures. The Planning Commission
may require the connection of streets internal to a subdivision to facilitate connectivity.
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