

**Georgetown Scott County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee
August 23, 2022, Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. All Committee members were present, except Joe Pat Covington, Dwayne Ellison, Rick Hostetler, Les Jarvis, Rob Jones, Charlie Mifflin, Debbie Osborne, Dann Smith, and Kandice Whitehouse. Director Joe Kane, Commission Engineer Ben Krebs, and Planners Matt Summers and Elise Ketz were present.

Introductions

Motion by Todd Stone, seconded by Alonzo Allen to approve the minutes from the June meeting. Motion passes unanimously.

Public Meeting Feedback Summary

Matt Summers summarized the results of the public meetings in Sadieville and Stamping Ground. Draft Goals & Objectives (G&Os) and preliminary Future Land Use (FLU) maps were presented to the community. Community members at both meetings were agreeable to the G&Os and the FLU as proposed, with minor amendments.

1990 Urban Land Use Study Comments

Summers presented the 990 study performed by the Kentucky Design Assistance Team (KYDAT 1990). The study focused on the expected growth patterns in the next 50 years (1990-2040) and if the Urban Service Area/Boundary (USB) concept is an appropriate mechanism for managing growth of Georgetown and Scott County. The findings from the study stated that (a) “expansion of the sewer treatment system and the bypass will shape the direction and character of Scott County for the next 50 years” (p. 7) , and (b) “expansion should be only enough to support the expected urban growth and to allow some choice in development sites. This policy will help ensure that the urban service is provided in the most cost effective way through contiguous urban development” (p. 12). Summers stated that this aligns with the present circumstances and local sentiment that development should occur in areas where essential infrastructure is available.

FLU Comparison – 2017 to 2022

Summers presented the changes in the community in terms of land use from 2017 to 2022.

Residential Land Use Analysis

Summers presented findings on residential land use in Georgetown. Less than one-third (29.7%, equivalent to 2,200 ac) of the urban residential future land use planned in the 2017 plan is undeveloped or without preliminary plans. The 2017 plan included certain areas which Staff has identified as unlikely to develop, including but not limited to floodplain, land with poor road access, and agritourism business operations. The areas unlikely to develop (besides floodplain areas) will be included in an alternative FLU designation, evaluated on a case-by-case basis. With this omission considered, 1,380 acres of land within the USB designated for urban residential use are remaining.

Summers stated that the Comprehensive Plan will use a 2% growth rate when analyzing future land use needs. The population is expected to increase by 8,142 individuals by 2030 (total population 45,228). Given the current household size of 2.46 individuals per household unit, new 3,192 households will be added in that timeframe (total population in terms of household 18,385). Approximately 3,400 dwelling units have received preliminary development plan (PDP) approval but have not been built (identified as “housing reserve”). Of the “housing reserve”, there are 2,688 single-family lot units (79.1%) and 706 multi-family style units (20.8%). Based on the calculations, Staff projects that the housing reserve can reasonably accommodate the expected new households by 100 residential units in 2030.

Conservative estimates are that 50% of the “housing reserve” will not be built in 2030. Therefore, the community, local government, and Staff will need to plan for 1,700 additional dwelling units in areas that have not received PDP approval as of 2022. Summers stated that trends point to a preferred residential density of 4.5 dwelling units per gross acre. Based on factors discussed, Staff concludes that 380 acres of land would be required to satisfy the expected residential demand in 2030. Staff believes that the 1,380 acres of land already designated as FLU urban residential will sufficiently be able to support the expected growth in 2030.

Allen asked for clarification as to how the 50% value was determined. Summers stated that it is reasonable to expect that not everyone wants a home of a certain density or neighborhood style. He stated that the metric is considered the worst case scenario and advises that the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) plan for the worst and expect circumstances to perform better.

Conner asked on what the current FLU designation of the referenced 1,380 acres needed by 2030 are. Staff stated that there is sufficient land already designated FLU residential, but the properties are zoned A-1. Kane noted that the USB has been approximately the current size it is today for the past 20 years or greater, and that he is researching as to why the USB is so large despite the community not requiring the volume of land within it at that time.

Kim Menke commented on how the 2022 Comprehensive Plan is the first plan where the bypass loop is completely finished. He stated that this offers an opportunity to change the approach to land use management. Because of the distribution of resources and infrastructure, individuals were not able to “choose” (per se) development of any type would be. He stated that the FLU plan should reflect more of a community preference as opposed to the previous approach of building here because it’s the only area you could develop. Both he and Conner ask if this approach has been considered by Staff.

Kane stated that the plan currently does not consider this approach. He stated that he believes that the current Comprehensive Plan may not be the best time to try this approach as the community has never made a FLU map to reflect the bypass construction despite knowing its route for the past 30+ years. Instead, he believes that the impact would best be understood at the 2026-2028 Comprehensive Plan as information can be collected on community sentiment and the impact the bypass has on new development in the region. Regarding the current Comprehensive Plan, he believes that the short range FLU map should not consider this, but that the long range FLU map could consider this in part or in

whole. He emphasizes that the policy is to discourage “leapfrog” development, wherein one individual develops in a way that discourages internal USB investment and would put additional strain on the community infrastructure.

Prather agreed with Kane’s sentiment, stating that if the large landmass within the bypass became available and infrastructure could accommodate it, it would be reasonable to have a FLU discussion on it. However, given the current circumstances, the resources required are not ready to handle such a large increase in potential development area. Recent installation of infrastructure in the area is not to open the gates to development, rather it is to establish a backbone so that in 20 years it could be considered.

Menke stated that it is important to understand where the community could grow, and that the Economic Development Strategic Plan (EDSP) could conclude that the northwest bypass is the best for commercial development. He stated that leapfrog development may be appropriate for instances of industrial development, citing that while commercial and office uses are integrated with residential, manufacturing and industrial is typically segregated from those uses. He stated that the ESC should consider an alternative approach to land use management in order to accommodate for the interests of the industrial developers. This establishes a strong base for the area. The infill of residential and commercial would occur subsequent to the industrial leapfrog development. He is concerned that the ESC is becoming too constrained.

Kane stated that planning best practices are in favor of incremental growth but acknowledges that the demands of industrial growth may warrant some deviation for the betterment of the community. He is concerned that the leapfrog development approach would produce a false signal that the community can accommodate a private investor’s demands in terms of infrastructure and investment, when in reality services are not available. He proposes considering a plan for a small area study of the region in order to facilitate infrastructure and industrial growth while also reducing instances of leapfrog development.

He and Summers expressed that the community may not be ready to incorporate such a large and viable area (interior to the Northwest Bypass loop) without further review and study. Summers stated that the leg of the bypass is the only major infrastructure to the area, there are no internal roads or connections to public utilities and services.

Mark Sulski commented on the FLU designations of the area around the proposed high school (Junction of Bypass/McClelland Circle & Long Lick Pike). He stated that the ESC should focus on having a pocket of residential around the area as that is often preferred by homeowners with school-aged children. There will be an increase in the demands from private investors to develop land for residential and commercial areas when the school will be completed.

Summers stated that Staff does not disagree with Sulski’s sentiment, but that is important to understand the timeline. News coverage in Georgetown often mentions that the infrastructure for sewer and water will not be available until 2025. Including the properties around the new high school in the short-term FLU map would falsely paint that the city and related infrastructure is ready for private

investors. Summers stated that the 1,400 acres within the USB are already designated as FLU residential and it can be reasonably expected to be supported by public services without requiring an entirely new construction of police, fire, EMS, park, and school facilities. The USB could expand in light of these concerns, however with expansion comes increased need to expand city and county facilities to support it.

Menke asked how the facilities mentioned by Summers would be paid for. He stated that there needs to be a greater emphasis that growth must pay for growth. He stated that residential land does not generate as much tax money in comparison to commercial or industrial land. Prather agreed, saying that the ratio of residential to commercial and industrial lands is approaching a point where the budget and costs are difficult to balance. The ratio, he stated, points to a reduced generation of money that could support the public services required for the community and if it continues could require an alternation of the tax collection system in order to provide high quality services and facilities.

Commercial & Office Land Use Analysis

Summers presented the findings from the land use survey of commercially zoned properties within the USB. Of the 1,440 acres zoned for commercial use in 2022 (B-1 through B-5, P-1 and P-1B), 49.5% is developed (713 acres), 7.7% is undeveloped and government owned (112 acres), and 42.7% is undeveloped but available (615 acres). The 2017 plan designates 654 acres as FLU commercial. As part of this analysis, Staff excluded floodplain, included FLU office, and omitted lands already zoned commercial or office. The lands not zoned or developed but designated as FLU commercial is equivalent to 270 acres. There were 17.65 acres of developed commercial land per 1,000 persons in 2017 and 19.22 acres of developed commercial land per 1,000 persons in 2022. Assuming the ratio of land per 1,000 individuals remains 19.22, Staff expects that 156 acres of undeveloped land would need to be developed for commercial use by 2030, and an additional 190 acres of undeveloped land to be developed for commercial use by 2040; totaling 346 commercially developed acres by 2040. Given that that there are 615 undeveloped acres designated as FLU Commercial, there is no reasonable need to expand the USB for commercial land.

Industrial Lane Use Analysis

Summers presented the findings from the land use survey of industrially zoned properties within the USB. Of the 2,082 acres zoned for industrial use in 2022 (I-1, ESLI, and I-2), 80.5% is developed (1,675 acres), 2.16% is undeveloped but not available (46 acres), and 17.4% is undeveloped but available (363 acres). The 2017 plan designates 545 acres as FLU industrial. As part of this analysis, Staff excluded floodplain and omitted lands already zoned industrial. The lands not zoned or developed but designated as FLU industrial is equivalent to 272 acres. There were 40.87 acres of developed industrial land per 1,000 persons in 2017 and 45.16 acres of developed industrial land per 1,000 persons in 2022. Assuming the ratio of land per 1,000 individuals remains 45.16, Staff expects that 367 acres of undeveloped land would need to be developed for industrial use by 2030, and an additional 449 acres of land would need to be developed for industrial use by 2040; totaling 816 industrially developed acres in 2040. Given that there are 272 undeveloped acres designated as FLU Industrial and including the 273

undeveloped but zoned industrial acres, that no additional FLU industrial designations or expansions must occur at this time. Future expansions would likely be required by 2040.

Menke asked how the metric of acres per 1,000 individuals within the county includes those employed on an industrially zoned parcel but do not reside within Scott County. He asked how growth in employment is considered in the calculation. Summers stated that the metric used is preliminary, and that the hope is the EDSP study would provide a more accurate metric.

Commerce & BIT Land Use Analysis

Summers presented the findings from the land use survey of commerce/BIT zoned properties within the USB. Of the 352 acres zoned for commerce use in 2022 (I-1* and BP-1), 32.1% is developed (113 acres) and 68.1% is undeveloped (240 acres). The 2017 plan designates 304 acres as FLU commerce/BIT. As part of this analysis, Staff excluded floodplain and omitted lands already zoned commerce/BIT. The lands not zoned or developed but designated as FLU commerce/BIT is equivalent to 74 acres. There were 3.04 acres of developed commerce/BIT land per 1,000 persons in 2022. Assuming the ratio of land per 1,000 individuals remains 3.04, Staff expects that 25 acres of undeveloped land would need to be developed for commerce/BIT uses by 2030, and an additional 30 acres of land would need to be developed for commerce/BIT by 2040; totaling 55 commerce/BIT developed acres in 2040. Given that there are 74 acres for FLU commerce/BIT use but are not zoned and 180 acres designated and zoned for commerce/BIT use but not developed Staff concludes that no additional FLU commerce/BIT designations or expansions must occur. Future expansions would likely be required by 2040.

Comments from ESC

Prather stated that, other than FLU industrial and commerce/BIT, the results look favorable. He cautioned that one event could throw the entire system into a deficit. Conner added that that one event could be one developer purchasing all available land of an industrial or commerce/BIT FLU designation. Prather stated that there should be additional research to establish a reserved area that could be but technically isn't designated as FLU industrial or commerce that could be available should a large employer that suits the community wants to move into the area.

Krebs stated that there should need to be some research regarding if the BIT ratio is consistent with other similar communities. Summers stated that it has been considered, but that the definition of BIT is highly variable, so it is difficult to make proper comparisons.

Kane stated that the Staff is waiting for the EDSP to be available prior to making any large moves in one way or another. He stated that Greg Payne, associate consultant to Ted Abernathy, is expected to provide some information on site characteristics and best existing sites within or adjoining the USB that are suited to be FLU industrial or commerce/BIT. Once that is identified, the intent is to consider expanding the USB to those areas and consider designating the other FLU types to form a buffer around the subject property. He said that, should a recommendation be to designate FLU industrial or commerce/BIT along the bypass, a policy should be considered similar to the Greenbelt in

order to protect the agricultural economy while supporting the industrial and commerce/BIT development of the community.

Todd Stone emphasized the deficits of public services, specifically fire and police. The population growth will continue to expose needs for additional facilities and staff across all offices. He stated that Georgetown FD is at least two fire stations short as it stands. The intent is to construct fire stations besides Toyota along Lexus Way and west of Canewood near Great Crossing Park. Georgetown City Council has identified and is making moves to arrange for a third to be constructed somewhere along the northwest bypass, possibly in closer proximity to the new high school site. He says that the police have some difficulty supporting the community out of the one station downtown. Kane stated he has found similar sentiment amongst the community and expressed in the 2004 plan.

Prather stated that GMWSS is reviewing several iterations of service plans. GMWSS is working with Toyota to use some of its reserved capacity to support the Lanes Run Business Park. WWTP #2 is due for an expansion as soon as WWTP #1 is completed. He stressed that GMWSS does not intend to expand into another watershed as the cost would hurt the service provider, residents, and businesses. He stated that it is his opinion that a linked strategy between all agencies would ensure the best for the future of Georgetown. Kane stated that the hope is to coordinate with GMWSS to develop a system based on expected need, partially based on the existing FLU map, in order to understand if there are any changes that need to be made. Chase Azevedo stated that the facility plan for WWTP #2 would consider the expected growth and land uses expressed in the 2022 Comprehensive Plan.

Menke emphasized that the resources needed for the expected population growth is more than just money. Personnel, facilities, land, equipment, and workers support is essential to supporting this community.

Greenbelt Discussion

Summers presented the amendments to the southern greenbelt proposed for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The 1991 Ordinance established the greenbelt along the 820 contours and some parcel lines. Staff has prepared two alternatives, (1) 100 feet from the creek bed with a contingency that the greenbelt is at least a minimum of 2 feet above the floodplain elevation, and (2) 100 feet from the floodplain or 250 feet from Cane Run (whichever is greater) with a contingency that the greenbelt is at least a minimum of 2 feet above the floodplain elevation.

Mary Singer asked for data on the change in Greenbelt acreage. Summers stated that if approved, the data could be provided. Prather stressed that the changes recommended must not jeopardize the 1991 ordinance. Azevedo recommended that the Staff reference the sewer ordinance when in the area of US-25/Lexington Road to make sure that the language will not compete. Stone stated that the buffer appears to have impacted the Scott County Humane Society property (1376 Lexington Road). He is concerned that the Greenbelt regulations would prevent the Humane Society from executing their business operations. Summers stated that uses permitted within the greenbelt align with those of the A-1 zoning district, and that animal kennel, shelter, and clinic uses are granted as conditional use permits.

Additional & Concluding Comments

Conner stated that Greg Payne is coming to Georgetown to meet with service providers and agencies to discuss the EDSP on September 7, 2022. Six individuals volunteered to attend the meeting. Conner stated that Greg Payne would be attending the September ESC meeting.

Summers addressed next steps. He stated that the FLU maps and draft policies will be presented at the September 27 meeting for endorsement before going before the Planning Commission board at a specially held meeting in October. The map would be advertised for public comment prior to the meeting and any amendments would be entertained at that meeting. USB inclusion or exclusion applications are currently be accepted and Staff is considering advertising this in the Georgetown News-Graphic.

Summers presented the final form of the G&Os and requested an endorsement. Menke mentioned including information on the plan for Georgetown being a site for the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) federal highway plan. He explained that the plan is to establish a hydrogen powered vehicle corridor along I-75 (located in Georgetown), I-64 (located in Louisville) and I-65 (located in Bowling Green). Azevedo mentioned sending in edits regarding municipal public service providers to Staff for consideration and inclusion in the G&Os, specifically mentioning the language in IF 1.2 & IF 2.1. Summers closed the discussion and requested additional edits to the G&Os be sent to Staff via email.

Concluding Comments

Kane reiterated that the ESC meetings would remain on the fourth Tuesday of the month. He stated to contact Staff if ESC members were interested in attending the September 7, 2022 meeting.

There being no further business, the Meeting was adjourned by Kane at 5:45pm.