

**Georgetown Scott County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee  
November 22, 2022, Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Present Committee members were Alonzo Allen, Chase Azevedo, Jack Conner, Joe Pat Covington, Dwayne Ellison, Greg Hampton, Rick Hostetler, Kim Menke, Charlie Mifflin, Debbie Osborne, Tom Prather, Kim Rice, Mary Singer, Todd Stone, and Mark Sulski. Director Joe Kane, Commission Engineer Ben Krebs, and Planners Elise Ketz and Matt Summers were present.

**Introduction**

**Motion by Rick Hostetler, seconded by Charlie Mifflin** to approve the October 25, 2022 meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

**Land Use Planning Update**

Summers presented the Urban Service Boundary (USB) proposed for the 2022 Comprehensive Plan. Applications for inclusion or exclusion will be heard at the January 12, 2023, Planning Commission meeting. The upcoming Executive Steering Committee (ESC) discussions will focus on finalizing the Future Land Use (FLU) maps and transportation within the next three months, and that a public meeting would be hosted April/May 2023 to present the FLU maps, transportation components, and collect feedback on potential action items.

**Urban Service Boundary Proposals**

Summers presented the USB map for Georgetown. There is a proposed net increase in the USB from 15,800 acres in 2016 to 16,900 acres in 2022. Approximately 165 acres have been removed from the 2016 USB map, most notably the Oxford Community and areas west of the bypass loop around Frankfort Road/ US-460 that followed the previous Greenbelt lines. Approximately 1,271 acres have been included in the 2022 USB proposal, specifically to include the entirety of some boundary parcels, portions of the Wiles Farm, portions of the Smith Farm, the Stonehedge Estates subdivision, and the new Scott County High School property. Certain areas, such as those along Long Lick Pike, are being included in the 2022 USB now to add additional FLU Industrial land and to serve as a bridge to areas which are expected to be used for a future mega-site.

Kim Menke emphasized the importance of an interconnected FLU, USB, and infrastructure plans. Chase Azevedo discussed how the USB relates to the GMWSS regional facilities plan. He explained the logistics and steps related to the process of expanding treatment plant facilities. Menke asked if the regional facilities plan considered potential areas of growth; and if so, if the plan also considered the diverse land uses proposed for the areas of growth. Azevedo confirmed that the proposed USB is incorporated into the regional facilities plan.

Ben Krebs stated that there are portions of the Wiles property is within the McCracken Creek watershed. This area, and any subsequent development outwards, would need to be pumped to treatment facilities within the existing operating area/watershed of GMWSS. Azevedo stated that the regional facilities plan includes the area but not the logistics on how the area will be served. Current GMWSS policies state that the inclusion and method of how an area is served is driven by the development of the area. Tom Prather stated that GMWSS is working on a backbone that would eventually serve development in the aforementioned areas.

Mark Sulski expressed concerns with having most of a property within the USB and a remainder outside of it. Joe Kane stated that in some cases, only a portion of a farm or property would be included in the USB given the size and shape of the property. He expressed that a high volume of land being added in one area would put pressure on county roads that are not capable of supporting the demand.

Mary Singer asked about if a developer could develop the entirety of a parcel split by the USB. Summers stated that, where possible, the developer would be expected to adhere to the boundary as drawn or to submit a request to amend the USB.

Kim Rice asked about how the placement of the USB boundary would impact individual property owners. Summers stated that, where possible, the USB boundary follows property lines to reduce confusion. It is not always in the best interest to incorporate more land than the infrastructure can support. Elise Ketz stated that, if incorporated in its entirety, a developer may misinterpret that the property can be fully developed or be incentivized to “leapfrog develop” even though the infrastructure cannot support it. In the case of the Wiles property, Summers stated that the intent is to reduce impact of urban development on smaller county roads.

Hostetler asked how inclusion in the USB would impact property owners in the Stonehedge subdivision. Summers stated that being within the USB does not change property zoning, how a property owner can use their property, or require annexation into the city. Rather, he says, the USB is a planning tool to identify the areas which can be reasonably served by existing facilities while also managing future growth. Inclusion in the USB would make it easier for the subdivision to be annexed if they were interested in it, but annexation is not required. Singer asked if there was any impact on the property taxes. Summers stated that being in the USB does not change taxes unless the property is annexed into the city.

Summers presented the USB Map for Sadieville. The 2022 USB proposal would measure 1,520 acres, as compared to the 2017 USB of 3,615 acres. Approximately 2,095 acres were removed from the 2016 USB map with the intent to have the USB better focus and manage the anticipated growth.

Menke asked the benefits of removing such a large portion of the land mass from the Sadieville USB. Summers stated that the reduction in total land area would not reduce the ability to develop the properties around the interstate or along US-25/KY-32 corridor. By reducing the USB, the intent is to encourage growth and investment into the existing downtown area and promote concentrated

development along the interstate and US-25/KY-32 corridor. The reduced area offers a more compact and contiguous growth as opposed to encouraging leapfrog development.

Summers presented the USB map for Stamping Ground. The 2022 USB proposed measures 900 acres, as opposed to the 1,450 acre USB approved in 2017. Approximately 550 acres were removed from the 2016 USB map with the intent to have the USB better focus and manage the anticipated growth. Large farms to the southwest and northeast of downtown Stamping Ground have been removed from the USB. Furthermore, the southern boundary follows the old railroad bed that went through Stamping Ground and out towards Frankfort, which is hoped to be developed as a trail connection to Georgetown. Much like Sadieville, the goal is to facilitate investment and redevelopment of the historic downtown areas and avoid leapfrog development where possible.

**Motion by Hostetler, seconded by Mifflin** to endorse three USBs as proposed and to direct Staff to advertise and prepare for a public hearing on them.

### **Future Land Use Plan – City of Georgetown**

Summers introduced the FLU map for Georgetown. He emphasized five topics related to the strategy for designating FLU areas.

1. “Urban Residential”, or residential areas within city limits or that has a density level that is greater than one dwelling per 5 acres, has been separated into two subtypes: “Low Density Residential (LDR)” and “Medium Density Residential (MDR)”. LDR areas include those which are already developed at a density between 1 unit per 5 acres and 4.4 units per acre. LDR areas also include undeveloped parcels which have constraints such as limited access, terrain, or floodplain which limits their ability to be developed at a higher density level. MDR areas include those which are already developed at a density between 4.5 units per acre and 12 units per acre. MDR areas also include undeveloped parcels which have multiple road connections internally and to collector and arterial roads as well as located near commercial areas that can support a high volume of site activity. “High Density Residential (HDR)” areas are areas developed at a density between 12 units per 1 acre and 16 units per 1 acre. HDR is only proposed in Mixed Use Development areas.
2. Two new areas for FLU Commerce/BIT have been established, at the Champion Way – Lexus Way intersection and at the Long Lick Pike – McClelland Circle intersection.
  - a. Summers presented detailed information on the proposed additions to the USB along the west portion of the Bypass loop. While other FLU categories have sufficient area to satisfy expected land use needs through 2030, undeveloped FLU Commerce/BIT and FLU Industrial areas are limited and in need of additional land planned for these uses. Subsequently, the area between Long Lick Pike (northern boundary), McClelland Circle (eastern boundary), Lloyd Road (western boundary) and the old railroad bed to Stamping

Ground (southern boundary) has been designated as FLU Commerce/BIT. This area is sufficient enough to satisfy the expected needs for Commerce/BIT land while also establishing a bridge to an industrial mega-site off of Long Lick Pike.

3. All school properties, government facilities, and parks are designated as FLU Quasi-Public.
4. FLU Floodplain areas are also noted in order to reduce the confusion related to the development potential of a property.
5. There are two areas surrounding the historic downtown core of Georgetown that are designated as FLU Mixed Use.
  - a. Summers presented detailed information on the FLU designations in downtown Georgetown. Areas in the core that are zoned B-3 Downtown Commercial are designated FLU Mixed Use. Staff reviewed previous Small Area Plans for the areas along North Water Street and North Broadway.
    - i. The area along the west side of North Water Street are designated as FLU Quasi-Public and to encourage development of a linear park along the creek. The FLU designations along the North Broadway corridor are aligned with those in the North Broadway Small Area Plan.
    - ii. An area east and south of the Elkhorn Creek and west of the Desha Estates subdivision is being designated as FLU Mixed Use. Given its proximity to the historic downtown core, Staff would require development within these areas to compliment the character of downtown Georgetown. Staff's vision for development and redevelopment in this area includes trails to allow the community to engage the creeks in a sustainable manner.

Kane spoke on the draft results of the Economic Development Strategic Plan (EDSP). He stated that the Mixed Use areas, as well as Industrial, Commercial, and Commerce/BIT will be refined based upon the recommendations of the plan. One key feature, he stated, was the development of an entertainment district in downtown Georgetown along South Water Street. Kane expects that all mixed use areas in Georgetown be context sensitive so as to not disrupt the existing character of the neighborhoods within which the development would be located. He also expects them to make appropriate connections to existing trails, walkways, and roads.

Prather asked about the alignment of road improvement goals and FLU development goals. In addition, he asked if, when doing the Comprehensive Plan, that the plan for the future of these mixed use areas emulate the Chevy Chase neighborhood in Lexington. Rice stated that, as the areas develop, the community needs to incorporate the Legacy Trail route concept plan in all of the communities and ensure that there are quality routes and amenities for parks and pedestrians. All ideas, she stated, should be based on existing studies done for different neighborhoods in Scott County in order to make sure that

what is done is the best for the community. Summers stated that, as a property developed, Staff aims to work on identifying infrastructure needs so that the appropriate improvements can be made to ensure the infrastructure essential to a development's success be planned for.

**Additional & Concluding Comments**

Kane addressed next steps. Kane reiterated that the ESC meetings would remain on the fourth Tuesday of the month. He stated that there would be no December meeting and that the next meeting will be on Tuesday January 24, 2023.

**There being no further business, the Meeting was adjourned by Kane at 5:25pm.**