

Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission

Land Use Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2016

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 18th from 5-7PM at the Planning Commission Office.

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