

GEORGETOWN-SCOTT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Volume I

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Reference Maps

Appendix B

Zoning Tables

Appendix C

Urban Service Boundary Goals, Criteria, and Guidelines

Appendix D

List of References

SCOTT COUNTY - GEORGETOWN - SADIEVILLE - STAMPING GROUND

2006

GEORGETOWN-SCOTT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
2006
VOLUME I - APPENDIX A

REFERENCE MAPS

Land Use

- Map 1 - Subdivisions Under Development
- Map 2 - North/South Dividing Line for Rural Land Use Policies
- Map 3 - Southern Greenbelt Land Use Map
- Map 4 - Southeastern Greenbelt Land Use Map
- Map 5 - Southwestern Greenbelt Land Use Map
- Map 6 - Southwestern Greenbelt Land Use Map
- Map 7 - Georgetown Future Land Use
- Map 8 - Small Area Development Plans
- Map 9 - Special Planning Areas
- Map 10 - Georgetown Renaissance Area / Historic Downtown
- Map 11 - Proposed Future Reservoir Properties
- Map 12 - Population Growth 1990-2000 (By Census Block Group)
- Map 13 - Population Growth 1990-2000 (By Census Tract)
- Map 14 - Georgetown Annexation History

Urban Service Boundaries / City Limits

- Map 15 - Georgetown Urban Service Boundary
- Map 16 - West Georgetown USB
- Map 17 - East Georgetown USB
- Map 18 - North Georgetown USB
- Map 19 - Sadieville City Limits
- Map 20 - Stamping Ground City Limits

Government Services / Community Facilities

- Map 21 - Georgetown Fire Districts & Stations
- Map 22 - Scott County Fire Districts & Stations
- Map 23 - Police Beats
- Map 24 - EMS Districts
- Map 25 - EMA Warning Sirens
- Map 26 - Elementary School Districts
- Map 27 - Middle School Districts

Transportation

- Map 28 - Airport Development Zones
- Map 29 - KY Six-Year Highway Plan
- Map 30 - Functional Classification Map

Physical Features

- Map 31 - Parks & Recreation / Trails
- Map 32 - 100-500 Year Floodplain
- Map 33 - Soils
- Map 34 - Geology
- Map 35 - Topography
- Map 36 - Watershed and Aquifer Recharge

Maps On-Line

Selected planning maps are also available from the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission on-line at www.gscplanning.com and at the Planning Commission office.

GEORGETOWN-SCOTT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
2006
VOLUME I - APPENDIX B

ZONING TABLES

Table 1 - Zoning Designations

All of Scott County and its municipalities are divided into zoning districts as shown on the Zoning Map. These zoning districts are designated as follows:

ZONE DESIGNATOR	ZONING DISTRICT NAME
A-1	Agricultural
A-1R	
A-1S	
C-1	Conservation
H	Historic
R-1 (A-B-C)	Residential
R-2	
R-3	
P-1	Professional Offices
P-2	
B-1	Neighborhood Commercial
B-2	Highway Commercial
B-3	Central Business District
B-4	Community Commercial
B-5	General Commercial Park
BP-1	Business, Research & Technology Park
I-1	Light Industrial
I-2	Heavy Industrial
ESLI	Environmentally Sensitive Light Industry

Detailed information regarding appropriate uses in each district designation are contained in the Scott County *Zoning Ordinance*, April 2003 version.

TABLE 2 - ZONING BY AREA
Scott County, Kentucky – 285 Square Miles

ZONE	NAME	ACREAGE	SQ. MILES	LABEL
A-1	Unincorporated Scott County	167870.73119	262.29802	167870.73
A-1	Georgetown	901.06359	1.40791	901.06
A-1	Sadieville	115.82177	0.18097	115.82
A-1	Stamping Ground	38.62049	0.06034	38.62
A-1S	Unincorporated Scott County	11.03652	0.01724	11.04
A-1S	Georgetown	7.09355	0.01108	7.09
B-1	Unincorporated Scott County	50.55363	0.07899	50.55
B-1	Georgetown	25.48727	0.03982	25.49
B-1	Stamping Ground	20.30981	0.03173	20.31
B-2	Unincorporated Scott County	156.84758	0.24507	156.85
B-2	Georgetown	690.99429	1.07968	690.99
B-2	Stamping Ground	7.10259	0.01110	7.10
B-3	Unincorporated Scott County	24.12214	0.03769	24.12
B-3	Georgetown	70.82437	0.11066	70.82
B-3	Sadieville	3.39307	0.00530	3.39
B-4	Georgetown	43.01459	0.06721	43.01
B-5	Unincorporated Scott County	0.02046	0.00003	0.02
B-5	Georgetown	318.99017	0.49842	318.99
BP-1	Unincorporated Scott County	1.12913	0.00176	1.13
BP-1	Georgetown	244.73864	0.38240	244.74
C-1	Unincorporated Scott County	60.85189	0.09508	60.85
C-1	Georgetown	15.98187	0.02497	15.98
C-1	Sadieville	76.02257	0.11879	76.02
C-1	Stamping Ground	8.23817	0.01287	8.24
GB	Unincorporated Scott County	2.74501	0.00429	2.75
GB	Georgetown	7.07939	0.01106	7.08
I-1	Unincorporated Scott County	589.84230	0.92163	589.84
I-1	Georgetown	664.86883	1.03886	664.87
I-1	Sadieville	1.03985	0.00162	1.04
I-1	Stamping Ground	22.33615	0.03490	22.34
I-1 (ESLI)	Unincorporated Scott County	2.45010	0.00383	2.45
I-1 (ESLI)	Georgetown	100.23625	0.15662	100.24
I-1*	Unincorporated Scott County	0.00479	0.00001	0.00
I-1*	Georgetown	155.17762	0.24247	155.18
I-2	Unincorporated Scott County	178.25731	0.27853	178.26
I-2	Georgetown	1406.95039	2.19836	1406.95
P-1	Georgetown	76.83424	0.12005	76.83
P-1B	Unincorporated Scott County	0.41542	0.00065	0.42
P-1B	Georgetown	94.01936	0.14691	94.02
R-1	Unincorporated Scott County	51.43948	0.08037	51.44
R-1	Georgetown	25.75032	0.04023	25.75
R-1A	Unincorporated Scott County	1899.387.06	2.96779	1899.39
R-1A	Georgetown	371.46168	0.58041	371.46
R-1A	Sadieville	7.08511	0.01107	7.09
R-1A	Stamping Ground	126.31024	0.19736	126.31
R-1B	Unincorporated Scott County	312.26597	0.48792	312.27
R-1B	Georgetown	661.98647	1.03435	661.99
R-1B	Sadieville	72.22432	0.11285	72.22
R-1B	Stamping Ground	49.32013	0.07706	49.32
R-1C	Unincorporated Scott County	256.03658	0.40006	256.04
R-1C	Georgetown	1436.45257	2.24446	1436.45
R-1C	Sadieville	17.86746	0.02792	17.87
R-1C	Stamping Ground	0.58458	0.00091	0.58
R-2	Unincorporated Scott County	42.96243	0.06713	42.96
R-2	Georgetown	2587.95342	4.04368	2587.95
R-2	Sadieville	151.69161	0.23702	151.69
R-2	Stamping Ground	27.92934	0.04364	27.93
R-3	Unincorporated Scott County	87.14549	0.13616	87.15
R-3	Georgetown	639.63627	0.99943	639.64

Table Data based on GIS statistics as of August 2006. May not be an exact match to zoning ordinances as recorded by the County Clerk's Office.

GEORGETOWN-SCOTT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
2006
VOLUME I – APPENDIX C

**URBAN SERVICE BOUNDARY
GOALS, CRITERIA, AND GUIDELINES**

This section of the Plan establishes inclusion criteria for establishing or adjusting Urban Service Boundaries within Scott County. An "Urban Service Boundary" (USB) is a line that indicates the extent of future urban development that will require city services (sewer, water, police, fire, etc.). The Urban Service Boundaries for a given municipality includes those properties that can be developed to urban uses and densities and annexed to those cities within the current planning period.

Public services include, among other things, water, sewage collection and treatment, transportation facilities, and police and fire protection, which are typically provided by city or county governments. Governments can pay for these services only through user fees or taxation. For successful urban development within urban service boundaries, no such development should be approved except upon the condition of annexation. Annexation is necessary to provide the revenue streams required to cover the cost of urban services over the long term and should include all new urban development.

Policies should also encourage annexation of existing industrial and commercial development areas. Industrial and commercial development requires a level of services, especially for sewer, roads, and fire and police protection, that can best be provided by government. For these reasons, each city's incorporated boundary should eventually be co-extensive with all developed lands within their respective Urban Service Boundaries.

The criteria included below address issues related to boundary design and location, rural and environmental protection, public facilities, cost efficiency, and quantity of land. No single element of the criteria, therefore, stands alone as a determinant of boundary adjustment. These criteria have value both as a group and as individual points to assist the Planning Commission in making specific judgments. When used together, however, the criteria interact to offer comprehensive guidelines for making effective boundary decisions.

Urban Service Boundaries Goals And Objectives

The Goals and Objectives listed in Section I of each element of the Comprehensive Plan should also help guide decisions about Urban Service Boundaries. They include objectives useful for evaluating and selecting the most appropriate locations for the boundaries.

1. Supply: Maintain an adequate supply of developable land to accommodate anticipated growth and allow sufficient market flexibility.

2. Location: The Urban Service Boundary for each city should be located so as to allow for the most cost-efficient provision of public facilities and services.
3. Selection Criteria: Formalize the use of the criteria adopted by the Planning Commission Urban Land Use Subcommittee in September 2006.
4. Annexation: Annexation policies should reinforce the Urban Service Boundary. Development within urban service boundaries that requires public services should be annexed.
5. Deviations: In certain unique and very limited situations, the Planning Commission may wish to consider and allow minor deviations from the recommended USB location to avoid a substantially unjust outcome for particular properties. These limited situations could include properties where pre-existing zoning for urban development extends outside the proposed USB; or properties that would be divided by the boundary to create parcels that would be otherwise unusable for any reasonable purpose. However, in making these minor adjustments, the concept and integrity of the USB must be maintained.
6. Small Area Development: Additional small area development plans may need to be considered for US 62W and US 25S, and other similar corridors as they become community concerns to the Transportation and Rural Subcommittees.

Criteria and Guidelines

1. The USB should be located so as to achieve or enhance major plan themes and goals.
2. The USB should be located to encourage cost effective and efficient use of public facilities.
3. The land within the USB should be sufficient in quantity to accommodate 10 years of projected population growth and economic development.
4. The USB should be located to direct development away from significant or scenic landscapes, as defined in the Comprehensive Plan.
5. The USB should be located to direct development away from prime agricultural land.
6. The USB should be located to direct development away from major environmentally sensitive and geologic hazard areas.
7. The USB should be located so as to exclude public facilities that conflict with or inhibit urban development.
8. The USB should follow significant natural or man-made features, such as large lakes; minor and major drainage boundaries; parks; railroads and principal arterials or freeways, wherever appropriate.
9. Urban development should be compact and must be contiguous.
10. The USB line should be located along the tops of ridgelines within drainage basins to allow for efficient sewer design and construction within the USB, while not putting unnecessary development pressure on land outside the USB.
11. The USB should include existing development that is contiguous to the existing or planned urban area.
12. The USB may, but does not have to follow property lines.
13. The USB should be located to enable, encourage and stabilize and not conflict with evolving patterns or rural land preservation and protection.

GEORGETOWN-SCOTT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
2006
VOLUME I – APPENDIX D

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Georgetown/Scott County, 2006 Community Profile, Kentucky Tourism Cabinet
2. “20/20” Plan, Georgetown/Scott County
3. “Watershed & Land Use Planning – A Best Management Practices Technology Transfer Project – Dry Run Watershed Case Study Proposal”, 2003, Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission.
4. U.S. Census Bureau Data, Scott County, Kentucky 2000 – 2005
5. Scott County Socio-Economic Report, 2006
6. Highway Capacity Manual; Transportation Research Board, National Highway Transportation Council, 2000
7. Georgetown-Scott County *Zoning Ordinance*; Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission, April, 2003
8. Georgetown-Scott County *Subdivision and Development Regulations*; Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission
9. Six-Year Highway Plan; Commonwealth of Kentucky, May 2006
10. Traffic Study – “The Shoppes at Cherry Point”, Final Report; Jordan, Jones & Goulding, Inc.; July 13, 2006
11. Trip Generation Manual; The Institute of Transportation Engineers; 7th Edition
12. Kentucky Revised Statutes, Chapter 100
13. Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission, Socio-Economic Report, 2006
14. Traffic Collision Statistics, Georgetown Police Department, 2000-2005
15. Regional Transportation Committee, Unscheduled Projects List, Bluegrass Area Development District, 2006
- 16.