

Georgetown Scott County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee

April 26, 2022, Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. All Committee members were present, except Alonzo Allen, Les Jarvis, Tom Prather, Mary Singer, Dann Smith, and Todd Stone. Elizabeth Morey with the News-Graphic and Eric Colson with the Georgetown Fire Department were present for observation. Director Joe Kane was absent. Commission Engineer Ben Krebs and Planners Matt Summers and Elise Ketz were present.

Introductions

Motion by Jack Conner, seconded by Kim Rice to approve the minutes from the February meeting. Motion passes unanimously.

Visioning Survey Results

Matt Summers presented the survey results. ARPA specific questions would be sent to interested parties. 1,052 surveys were completed: 351 from Georgetown, 20 from Sadieville, 59 from Stamping Ground, and 572 unincorporated Scott County.

Graphics were produced to show the geographical breakdown, plans for moving from Scott County, vision for the future of Scott County, and qualities that contribute to the character of Scott County. Additional graphs of the 2016 vs 2022 attitudes towards the importance and performance of the community in terms of cost of living, high quality educational systems, (and new for 2022) shelter for the unhoused, low poverty rate compared to the Bluegrass areas, and affordable housing. Graphs of community priorities between 2016 vs. 2022 regarding the larger supply of affordable housing and early childhood education opportunities. The sentiment towards the Greenbelt and levels of design standards for commercial constructions had graphics as well.

Conner had some comments on the greenbelt sentiment, and that the decrease in the attitudes to have one. Summers explained that while there have been changes, it is the Staff opinion that the community supports the presence of it as is, or an expansion.

Publicly Available Data Visualization Software – Tableau

Summers introduced Tableau software for data visualization for the steering committee, government bodies, and the public. The data would include demographics, land use analysis and sentiment, and general survey results would be interactive and available for reference.

Vision Statement, Mission Statements, and Fundamental Principles - Review

Summers distributed the Vision Statements, Mission Statements, and Fundamental Principles (VS/MS/FP) draft document, requesting an endorsement. There have been few recommended changes

from the ESC since the last versions. New proposals for utilities came from Chase Azevedo which were not reflected in the draft document are included as a supplement.

Kim Menke had a question about the Mission Statement for the Infrastructure and Community Facilities chapter, specifically that an addition be made wherein the public services and utilities be available at appropriate scales while also considering expectations for future growth potential. He also asked about the language regarding how the expansion costs would be placed upon those creating the need (growth pays for growth). Summers responded that the recommendations could be too specific for the VS/MS/FPs portion of the comprehensive plan, and that they would be more impactful as a Goal & Objective (G&O) or an Action Item.

Conner had comments about the growth paying for growth mentality and how it discouraged development in the Scott County area (Page 3 of worksheet). Summers stated that that specific FP was more applied to residential developments wherein a turn lane or expansion of a substandard road is the responsibility of the site developer.

Menke commented that the collective growth impacting infrastructure quality would be unfair or inequitable to force one developer to pay the costs to improve an area that they are not solely responsible for degrading. Dwayne Ellison discussed the US-25 corridor and the patchwork improvements to it. Menke said that the Comprehensive Plan would be better as a Strategic Plan for widescale improvements.

Rick Hostetler had comments about the incremental growth along Stonehenge and the Cardome property and the impacts on the utilities. Further discussion on the utility availability in these areas. He also discussed the safety and security of key entryways and corridors in the community

Summers reiterated that the VS/MS/FPs are non-actionable items which have limited power to create widespread change. They are intended to guide the G&Os and Ais.

Menke requested that the addition of “drive future needs” be included in the overall VS. He stated that this addition would prepare more proactive instead of reactive. Each provider and agency in the county have its own agenda, and he believes that there needs to be further cooperation in the developments. He requests that more data be shared amongst those providers.

Elise Ketz stated that the Future Land Use Maps and Polices (FLU) would be where the discussion on what and where the development would be best, and that the current conversation would be guiding the detailed development patterns for the future. She reiterated that this step is more for shaping the ideal and the FLU would be more for specific areas of development and identifying what uses would be feasible where.

Conner proposed a partnership with GSCPC in which areas and programs could be researched further by the Economic Strategic Plan Scott County United is working on. He proposes a document scope be submitted to his office so that a better understanding of what is feasible be made available. Summers stated that coexisting plans would be a benefit to the community overall. Hostetler supported this development as it would guide the ability to have grocery stores in the area.

Joe Pat Covington discussed how the development patterns would impact current business decisions to come to the area. Ketz reiterated that the VS/MS/FPs would guide the FLU and would also guide or result in small area studies be undertaken by staff or consultants, where applicable.

Covington reiterated that the state of the sewer system should be at the forefront when considering new developments. Summers stated that all new developments are reviewed at the Technical Review Committee (TRC) and that GMWSS is a consistent attendee.

Conner proposed an in depth review of the development review process between the involved local public agencies as part of his offering to partner with GSCPC. He stated that this would allow for any points of concern could be addressed and system inadequacies be mitigated.

Hostetler asked how infrastructure improvements could be budgeted for. Rice reiterated that the VS/MS/FPs state that the developer would be responsible for it, so it would be likely on them. Azevedo stated that the new and improvements to the infrastructure is on the developer; but if studied further they could consider a model similar to KY American, wherein they pay for the improvements and recoup the costs through consumer-level fees. He said that GMWSS could consider a bonding system or an upfront system development fee program for funding of future growth demands. He reiterated that the decisions would be made by the GMWSS Board.

Covington stated that there are some proposals for partnerships in the county, specifically referencing the Paynes Depot area. He comments that the largest concern with growth is clean drinking water and maintaining and anticipating the demand and volume required to support the population growth. Ellison stated that there would be so many needs that the ability to address the existing ones and future ones would be challenging. Covington stated that the partnerships for broadband are an excellent example of development support and use of federal funds to support the growth and demands of the community.

Azevedo mentioned that the system will remain as a growth-paying-for-growth model until otherwise determined by the GMWSS Board. There are significant concerns on a localized drought. GMWSS made the first long-term plan for the future in 2019.

Summers asked if the VS/MS/FPs were sufficient to address the stated needs. Menke stated that he believes they are insufficient in some areas, specifically those proposed areas which are highly reactive instead of proactive.

Conner asked for items that mention a “growth-paying-for-growth model” to be removed from all the VS/MS/FPs. Ellison argued for the inclusion of developers paying for the growth they create.

Azevedo asked to separate the infrastructure from the community facilities. He believes that there are enough differences that they do not fit together.

Goals and Objectives

Summers gave out an updated G&Os document based off of general comments from the last meetings’ discussion and emailed comments. Additional feedback should be sent into staff for review and consideration. Language of the Economic Growth G&Os were updated based off of the Economic Strategic Plan study.

Summers gave concluding comments. The public meeting date for the Goals and Objectives was scheduled for Tuesday June 7th at the UK Ag Extension office from 6-8pm. An open house meeting at the GSCPC office on Wednesday June 15th during the workday. Meetings with Sadieville and Stamping Ground are proposed for mid-July. 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 Summers at 5:45pm.