

**LAND USE FORM SUB-COMMITTEE**  
**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

Monday, July 18, 2016  
5:00-7:00pm  
230 East Main Street, Georgetown, KY 40324

**AGENDA**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>
5:00-5:05pm	Welcome
5:05-5:20pm	Review of Meeting Content
5:20-6:00pm	Review USB Boundary Policy and proposed changes
6:00-7:00pm	FLUMap Proposed Map and Policy Questions and Discussion

**UPCOMING DATES**

- 1. Next Sub-Committee Meeting: *Monday, August 15, 2016 from 5:00-7:00pm***  
Planning Commission Office, 230 East Main Street, Georgetown, KY 40324

**LAND USE SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Date:	<u>Monday, June 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016</u>	
In Attendance:	Joe Kane, Director	Megan Chan, staff
	Ryan Cooper, staff	Alaina Hagenseker, staff
	Jack Conner	Bret Halverson
	Mike Mizell	William Offutt
	Susan Byars	

The meeting convened in the Planning Office at 5:00 p.m.

Welcome & Introductions

Joe Kane welcomed everyone to the meeting and said that this meeting would focus on the USB boundary and the policy from the previous plan and make amendments as needed to incorporate it into the FLU map.

Review of Meeting Content

Joe discussed how there's a shortage of industrial land for built and how to separate land uses with no good connectivity i.e. roads and trails.

USB Statistics and Background

Tonight's meeting was about the discussion of USB boundaries for the entire county and look at the background statistics to decide if there's a reason to expand it or change the USB at this time. Next

month the FLU will be looked at, and then in August there will be a draft USB and FLU for Georgetown and then after meetings with Sadieville and Stamping Ground there hopes to be a draft USB and FLU for those communities as well. Joe said that 10 year projections are looked at to plan for the expansion of the USB to make sure that development doesn't leapfrog. The projected population growth was looked at to estimate the amount of households needed in Georgetown. There is 1222 acres of residential areas needed for projected growth and there's 1907 acres that are zoned agricultural land planned for Urban Residential Uses on the FLU within the next 10 years. 48% of the land within the USB is agriculture land or undeveloped residential and can be developed to promote infill without expanding the USB. Someone noted that maybe the only thing that may need to be added was the bypass.

Commercial Land is abundantly underutilized at this time and multi-family needs don't have a guide to go off of, and walkable areas are being looked at for building of apartments and such to parks or local amenities. There's going to be a separate housing chapter in the Comprehensive Plan that will focus on affordable housing and multi-use/ high density housing. Raw land has an adequate supply for industrial use.

#### USB Boundary Policy and Guidelines

The Southern Greenbelt Boundary will be revisited to discuss if there is a way to look at the 820 contour boundary as a general limit. The 2006 USB Goals and Objectives were discussed for the 2016 Comp Plan update. A 10-year planning period will be looked at to try to keep an adequate supply and not overestimate or underestimate land use by looking farther than 10 years ahead. Expanding the USB incrementally in equal parts can help to offset some of the strain that might occur especially with sewer services. Scenic areas were identified and described the character and significance to tailor the USB to avoid changing the character of those areas that want to be protected. The 5-acre minimum zoned A-1 was discussed about raising the minimum to 10 or more acres, and it will be discussed again in July. USB development by environmentally sensitive and geologic hazard areas were discussed because some of these areas are already being included within the USB, such as the recharge area. Urban development and public facilities should be included in the USB so those areas could be monitored. "Urban development should be compact and must be contiguous" was discussed about being taken out because those things are already being done with how these things are updated.

The Greenbelt discussion whether if it should be inside or outside the USB and it was decided that as of right now the greenbelt should be outside the USB. Development in this area might change as time and growth goes up. The committee discussed how the riparian zones and tree zones should be protected, as they are detrimental to the health of the local waterways. If the 820 contour is kept there needs to be some clear language that is established at the time of development to deviate from the 820 and should follow the tree line. If the line was amended, it may become obsolete to enforce. It was discussed whether to continue the Greenbelt past the Elkhorn where there are natural features because there is enough land in the USB to be able to restrict that area. The question was raised about how far the Greenbelt should go to help to restrict southern grown, and it was discussed to expand the Greenbelt but not expand the USB in that area yet to help promote infill in the existing USB.

#### Logistics, Details, & Dates

The next meeting will be on July 18<sup>th</sup> from 5-7PM at the Planning Commission Office.

There was no other business to discuss and the meeting was adjourned at 7:15PM

# **DRAFT 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 local 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 Boundary Goals and Objectives**

The Goals and Objectives listed in the Community Form chapter of the Comprehensive Plan should also help guide decisions about Urban Service Boundaries. It includes 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 over a 10-year planning period.
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. Since urban development of land within the USB requires annexation. The USB should not expand too far beyond the current city limits, thereby discouraging leap frog development of land that is not contiguous to city limits.
3. Selection Criteria: Formalize the use of the criteria adopted by the Planning Commission Urban Land Use Subcommittee in June, 2016.
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 460W, US 62W and US 25N, and other similar corridors as they become community concerns to the Planning Commission.

### **Criteria and Guidelines**

1. The USB should be located so as to:
  - a. Achieve or enhance major themes and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.
  - b. Encourage balanced and incremental growth that is cost effective and efficient use of public facilities.
  - c. Provide for urban development that is compact and contiguous. The USB should include existing development that is contiguous to the existing or planned urban area.
  - d. Provide sufficient quantity of land to accommodate 10 years of projected population growth and economic development.
  - e. Enable, encourage and stabilize urban growth patterns.
  - f. Not conflict with evolving patterns or rural land preservation and protection.
  - g. 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.
  - h. Follow the tops of ridgelines within drainage basins to allow for efficient sewer and stormwater design and construction within the USB.
  - i. Follow property lines when there is not a logical physical or natural boundary that breaks a property into separate development areas.
2. The USB should be located to direct development away from:
  - a. Significant or scenic landscapes, as defined in the Comprehensive Plan (see Heritage and Cultural Resource Protection).
  - b. Prime agricultural land.
  - c. Major environmentally sensitive and geologic hazard areas.
  - d. Unnecessary development pressure on land outside the USB.
3. The USB may be amended where specific situations create an unnecessary burden on the land owner, or create impractical or unusable parcels.
  - a. The USB should not encroach on the Greenbelt.
  - b. The Greenbelt is currently shown between the centerline of Cane Run and the 820-ft contour line. As land is zoned for development, the Greenbelt and USB boundaries shall be adjusted based on existing conditions on the property. If the boundary is amended, the total acreage within the Greenbelt shall not be reduced.
  - c. The northeastern portion of the USB is located along the eastern boundary of the Lanes Run Watershed. As land is zoned for development, the USB boundary shall be adjusted based on existing conditions on the property. Where possible, the boundary shall follow parcel lines and natural boundaries.