

**Georgetown Scott County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee
June 28, 2022, Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. All Committee members were present, except Rob Jones, Kim Rice, Kim Menke, Kandice Whitehouse, Debbie Osborne, Dann Smith, and Mary Singer. Elizabeth Morey with Georgetown News-Graphic and Intern Elisabeth Keenan were present for observation. Director Joe Kane, Commission Engineer Ben Krebs, and Planners Matt Summers and Elise Ketz were present.

Introductions

Motion by Todd Stone, seconded by Jack Conner to approve the minutes from the May meeting. Motion passes unanimously.

Public Meeting Feedback Summary

Matt Summers summarized the results of the June 7, 2022 public meeting. 76 people signed in at the front, but at least 100 were present. Comments were collected at stations and generally affirmed the draft Goals & Objectives (G&Os). Staff is reviewing all comments and incorporating them where applicable. Common discussion was on the 40-acre lot minimum, affordable housing, senior housing, and recreation opportunities (increase amenities and types, positive about the Legacy Trail).

Summers went through the timeline for the Comp Plan. G&Os are waiting for additional feedback from Sadieville (scheduled July 19, 2022) and Stamping Ground (scheduled July 28, 2022) and after which will be ready for ESC endorsement and public hearing with the Planning Commission. Staff is working through the policies for the Future Land Use (FLU) map and is updating information to reflect current and expected patterns. Staff is also working with the consultant on incorporating the Economic Strategic Plan recommendations into the FLU policies.

Land Use Policy Discussion

Joe Kane introduced the land use policies adopted in the 2016/2017 Comp Plan. Kane noted that, after a meeting with GMWSS, it was expressed that there needs to be further identification of lands available for development within Georgetown's Urban Service Boundary (USB). The priority is to understand how many acres of land can actually be developed within the USB. To do this, GMWSS and PC staff are discussing areas that have the infrastructure in place, with or without privilege fees. Staff is also identifying areas that should not be developed or should not be entirely developed due to certain factors/ environmental features.

Charlie Mifflin talked about the developments within the city limits that for one reason or another (ie: street width, drainage concerns, etc) are receiving apprehension from the existing users. He stated that even with utility availability there will typically be pushback. Kane noted that there is interest and research into why an infill project/area is receiving pushback and how best to alleviate that. Kane

reiterated that there should be studying of these areas to as a way to understand current infrastructure issues that limit redevelopment of a site and to guide future policies on land use in the community).

Tom Prather agreed with the interests in infill development but specified that the scale should be smaller overall. He stated that there is a notable “Not in My Backyard” (NIMBY) mentality in the community, and that the larger the infill project, the more likely to have pushback from users. Kane agreed and added that there is a NIMBY mentality when considering what the density of the new development is proposed to be. The preference in the area is for lower densities and for developments that does not impact current property value. He stated that there is interest and policies in place that encourage a mix of housing types within each neighborhood.

Kane continued the conversation on the 2016/2017 FLU types and reasoning. Staff has already made some adjustments to the FLU policies, noted below (further comments underneath):

- Eliminated the Downtown and Office district
- Made the Greenbelt, Mixed Use, and Quasi-Public districts an overlay
 - o Kane discussed the FLU Greenbelt. He stated that the current line is the 820 contours of the Cane Run Creek and the existing Georgetown USB, established in the 1991 ordinance. Further research is being done into how the FLU type functions and amendments are being considered.
- Proposed expansion of the Urban and Rural Residential districts to include subtypes
 - o Kane commented that there are noted issues with only having two residential types. He stated that there is research into expanding the types to further specify which areas are suitable for higher or lower density residential development (other factors will be studied further). He explained the neighborhood centers concept and how high density was recommended to only be permitted in those areas. Recently there have been efforts that contradict this mentality, and staff is doing research into alternatives.
- FLU Industrial Areas
 - o Conner commented on the FLU Industrial areas within the USB mostly being built out, and that alternatives will need to be found. Kane stated that there is interest in expanding the FLU Industrial to the West. Conner asked about the specific intensity of the industrial areas/zoning in all future industrial areas. He also asked for clarification of which FLU type the BP-1 district fits within. Kane stated that there will be a discussion later on what uses would fit and the subsequently applicable zoning districts.

Land Use Policies

Kane introduced the topic specific land use policies of the 2016/2017 Comp Plan. Topics are in bold below; topic specific conversations are within.

- **Commercial Corridor Land Use & Design:**
 - Kane stated that further research into how to execute these goals will be undertaken. Further research into an overlay or ordinance that requires architecture standards and property upkeep is being considered. Dwayne Ellison asked about efforts for the beautification of highway areas and how efforts need approval from the state. Joe Pat Covington and Prather stated that there are ways navigate and further discussion needs to be done on how it will be purchased. Covington emphasized the importance of a beautiful entrance making people want to stop in the community.

- **High-Density Residential Areas:**
 - Kane stated that this was a new addition in the 2016/2017 Comp Plan. Ellison asked how the major arterials that are managed by the state would get pedestrian-focused amenities. Covington stated that grants have been used, such as the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant sponsored by KYTC was used for the West Main Street improvements. Prather went into more details on how the West Main Street project is proceeding as well as other improvements to be made to the area. Kane stated that if the Bike-Pedestrian Master Plan was adopted, it would require a developer to install connectivity amenities.

- **Infrastructure Improvements – Northern Expansion Area:**
 - Kane stated that, post-development of the northern leg of the bypass, a study was recommended of the area. The research should be done to understand how it would impact growth in the area and to preemptively plan for services that would be needed. Prather emphasized that there needs to be a carefully done plan and development pattern. Chase Azevedo stated that there are lines being extended up the bypass to serve the eventual needs of the area and that GMWSS is working to get the system ready for development. Any development in that area would be within the service area of WWTP #1 and a majority of service would not begin to the area until it's completion. He emphasized that the rate of development in that area would be low due to privilege fees and the timeline to completion of the WWTP #1 expansion.

- Planned Unit Developments (PUDs):

- Kane discussed the drafting of a PUD ordinance and the Bike-Pedestrian Master Plan. Kane stated the open space offered in exchange for a PUD status tends to be low-quality or unusable. Prather asked if it was reasonable to require developers to provide these amenities via ordinance. Kane believed it was reasonable, stating that if it is not acted upon at the onset of development conversations, the allocation of usable open space or QOL amenities within the proposed development will not occur. Mifflin recommended consulting with Georgetown-Scott County Parks & Recreation (GSCPR) to determine what they qualify as “high-quality” lands for park space. Prather stated that while it is well-intended, the city lacks the budget to make profit reducing demands of a developer. Prather stated that this makes the city reactive to the needs of its citizens.

- Impact Fees for New Development:

- Sulski asked about the implementation of impact fees for new development. Either money or space can be allocated on a per unit or per acre basis, which would be used to improve, outfit, and maintain the required greenspace in a neighborhood. The fees would be placed upon a developer/builder who would then reflect that additional cost onto new homeowners and not those existing in the community. Sulski stated that it would take work to convince the builder/developer community but that the citizens of the community tend to be open to these improvements.
- Todd Stone referenced the cities of Wilmore and Berea as those who have recently adopted impact fees. For example, it is \$1,500 per unit if you rezone to residential use; and \$3,000 per unit if you rezone and annex into the city. The money generated has restricted uses, mostly into capital improvement programs (CIPs) at the city level. The CIPs could include QOL and public services improvements but could not be used for improving unrelated roads or facilities outside of the area being developed.

- Residential Development:

- Kane discussed the state standards for connectivity between developments and the Road Connectivity Index. Kane stated that there is an interest in decreasing lot widths by developers to increase the number of units that can be developed at a given time. In those instances, lots below a certain width are required to be rear loading. Kane stated and Covington agreed that the narrow lot widths improve the community feel.
- Kane discussed the topic of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as a way to allow for increased density in neighborhood. Currently they are technically allowed in the R-2 and R-3 zoning districts and depending on if the lot area is of sufficient size to meet

the current density standards for the district. to Prather commented on the process to the ADU ordinance in Lexington. Ellison and Azevedo commented on related issues, such as infrastructure and utility extension/service and impacts on parking. Ellison recommended waiting to see how well the ADU ordinance goes through Lexington before considering in Georgetown-Scott County

Kane stated that there are a series of updates to the land use policies that will be made as new information becomes available. He requests feedback from ESC and the community to better craft the policies based upon current and future need.

Recent Growth Statistics Summary

Summers presented the residential growth statistics and patterns in the city of Georgetown to expect in the next 20 years. General summary below:

- The growth rate from 2010 to 2020 was around 2.2%. Staff anticipates that this rate will remain consistent unless an unforeseen situation occurs which results in rapid growth or decline.
 - o Alonzo Allen asked for further clarification on the annual rates. Summers stated that growth was above 2.2% (~2.5%) from 2011-2015 and that growth was below 2.2% (~2.0%) from 2016-2020.
- The city is expected to have a population of 45,000 (1% rate) to 65,000 (3% rate) by 2040. Calculations on for growth and demand use a 2% rate, or a 2040 population of 55,000. Based upon the value and average household size in the city (~2.5 per household), 7,243 additional households are expected to be added.
- Staff calculated the preliminarily approved but not constructed lots in 2022 to be 3,343 single-family lots and 200 apartment/multi-family units. A net 3,700 lots/units will be required in the city to accommodate the projected need.

Activity – FLU Modeling

Kane introduced the activity. The goal is to understand and visualize what the growth projections are and what the densities should be to satisfy the projected demand for different land use types. Kane also explained information on lands that have preliminary development approval but are currently waiting on sewer or other utility availability and therefore have not been constructed. Groups were given a map and instructed to brainstorm where the 3,700 aforementioned residential units, QOL amenities, retail commercial, office commercial and industrial areas would be.

Concluding Comments

Kane gave concluding comments. Meetings with Sadieville (July 19, 2022) and Stamping Ground (July 28, 2022) are scheduled, and ESC members are encouraged to attend. He reiterated that the ESC meetings would remain on the fourth Tuesday of the month.

There being no further business, the Meeting was adjourned by Kane at 6:00pm.