Joint City-County Planning Commission
of
Barren County, Kentucky

October 19th, 2026

The Joint City-County Planning Commission of Barren County, Kentucky met in regular session on Monday, October 19th, 2026, at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers of the Glasgow City Hall.

Chairman Gumm called the meeting to order and called for a roll call of members.

The following Commission Members were present:

Eddie Atnip	Ricky Houchens
Joe Austin	Joan Norris
Lewis Bauer	Janis Turner
Bobby Bunnell	Maria Westcott
Thomas Grubbs (Via Zoom)	Candy Wethington
Tommy Gumm	Forrest Wise

David Rutherford was absent.

I. GENERAL BUSINESS:

Agenda Item # 1 – *Approval of Minutes*

A motion was made by Forrest Wise and was seconded by Joan Norris to approve the September 21st, 2026, meeting minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item # 2 – *Approval of Invoices*

The Invoices were presented for payment.

A motion was made by Eddie Atnip and was seconded by Lewis Bauer to approve the invoices as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item # 3 – *Committee Report*

There were no active Committee Reports.

Agenda Item # 4 – *Treasurer's Report*

Janis Turner, Treasurer, presented the Treasurer's Report for the period ending on September 30th, 2026.

Agenda Item # 5 – *Director's Report*

Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, stated that there was not a Director's Report for the October 19th meeting.

II. PUBLIC HEARING:

1. 10192026-01-B – Creation of Text to the Barren County Zoning/Land Use Ordinance Pursuant to KRS 100.201 & 100.203 – *Barren County Zoning Ordinance*

Chairman Gumm opened a public hearing and served as the officer.

A public hearing was conducted.

Chairman Gumm swore in Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, who then stated that all appropriate notifications of the proposed Barren County Zoning/Land Use Ordinance have been made, which included four public hearings that took place in July and August of 2026.

Mr. Myatt presented the proposed Barren County Zoning Ordinance and Land Use Text, and stated that R.M. True, a representative/owner of The Kentucky Steward, LLC, was present to answer questions regarding Article 17, which addresses High Intensity Technological Infrastructure (HITI), of the proposed Barren County Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Gumm swore in Reece True. Mr. True and stated the following:

I introduced myself and my team to this commission about a month or so ago. I thought it'd be prudent to reintroduce myself. As I said, my name is R.M. True. I'm a civil engineer and the managing director of the Kentucky Steward and a lifelong resident of rural Kentucky, my mission statement as a company is to simply steward Kentucky's environment and culture, and that very mission is what brought me to the commission in the first place earlier this summer. Over the past several years, it has become increasingly clear that Kentucky communities are being asked to evaluate increasingly large and technically complex infrastructure proposals with relatively few tools specifically designed for that purpose. Recognizing that challenge, I authored House Bill 937 and have continued working with state legislators, local officials, engineers, attorneys, utilities, and stakeholders to advance HITI-related policy initiatives intended to improve transparency, disclosure requirements, stakeholder participation, and local decision-making authority throughout the Commonwealth, as proposed, House Bill 937 would have established some of the most comprehensive stakeholder-focused review requirements for large-scale HITI projects in Kentucky. It was assigned committee to committee and was not voted on. So as a result, communities are largely left dependent on the authorities and NKRS 100 as it's currently in existence to navigate HITI development. So, for that reason, a significant portion of my work has shifted from a county-to-county basis to develop and implement legally defensible local frameworks capable of providing many of the same transparency and due diligence benefits at the local level. Article 17 is obviously a byproduct of that effort. I do want to be clear, though. My role throughout this process has not been to facilitate development nor to prevent it from a legal defensibility standpoint. My role to the commission. Has simply been developing a

framework through which future proposals can be evaluated using substantive evidence, technical analysis, public input, and documented findings, rather than assumptions or incomplete information. So the ordinance, Article 17, specifically before you, is not an approval of any future project or active, whether projects in litigation or whatever, it's not a denial of any future project, but ultimately it's a framework for evaluating future projects should they be proposed. Over the last several weeks, the draft has benefited from input provided by residents, stakeholder professionals, industry representatives, public officials, legal counsel, and other stakeholders. Many revisions reflected in the current draft resulted directly from that feedback. Sure, many of us are aware of the original draft, which is really all the puzzle pieces on the table. And so, from the weeks that followed that, it's really just throwing some puzzle pieces in the trash and making sure that it has enough teeth to to provide very kind of what it needs, as with any ordinance, there will likely be future opportunities for refinement. It's an iterative process; the industry changes, knowledge changes. There's case studies to look at throughout the Commonwealth and extra state examples. So, as with this ordinance, this time of year, you guys are considering new language. It would be prudent to to maintain that process, but ultimately the need for a framework to evaluate these types of developments exists today. Really, it existed yesterday, but today is today. To my knowledge, Article 17, as it's currently drafted, represents the most comprehensive HITI-specific conditional use review framework currently developed in Kentucky, and is specifically intended to improve transparency, strengthen stakeholder participation, expand due diligence, and provide decision makers with a more complete factual record upon which future decisions may be based. Ultimately, whether an individual supports HITI development, like data centers, or opposes them, or just ultimately is indifferent. They just don't care, but they're a member of the community. I do believe stakeholders benefit when significant land use decisions are evaluated through a transparent process supported by evidence, analysis, public participation, and clear findings of fact or burden of proof. So thank you for your time and consideration. My team and I look forward to discussing any comments or review notes that you guys might have. And on the matter of my team, we do have Todd Tharpe online. He's got over 30 years as a hydrogeologist. The latter 10 years or more are in Kentucky, especially. He's extremely familiar with karstic systems. So, any any type of questions you guys have with regard to any of the hydrogeological assessments or groundwater evaluations offer for testing, dye tracing. You can direct to him. I can speak to it in general. Just, but if there's anything, I'll defer to him. And then we have Ben True here with True Power Systems PLC. He's got an electrical and power systems engineering background. So if there's any questions that are more pertinent to power systems and in that neck of the woods, I would defer that to him. But I'm happy to be here, happy to work with this commission. You guys have been great. So, if you have anything, I can answer that.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak in favor of the proposed Barren County Zoning/Land Use Ordinance.

Nobody present spoke in favor of the proposed Ordinance.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Steven Gibson, of Cave City, Kentucky was sworn in. Mr. Gibson stated the following:

I'd like to take the time to thank you for taking the time to build this policy, being in the military knows hard work. To build this policy, put everything into it, the definitions that are so important for the individuals that are reading the policies that you presented: community impact reports, community benefit analysis reports, existing conditions report, technical applicability memorandums. Those are good things that I've seen that are in those. But some of the things that I did see that I noticed, everybody's here for data centers. That's the main thing we're talking about zoning, and this all started with the data center. Barren County has tried before to implement zoning in some form, some way. There's X amount of some 60 counties in Kentucky that does not have zoning in their counties. Roughly, some have implemented little bits of zoning to mess with to be able to adjust some of the issues that the counties are seeing, but with the zoning ordinance that we have before us, the way that I read it, I could be wrong. I just want to make sure that I'm reading it correctly. This does not stop a data center from coming to Barren County or specifically to the Cave City area, the way that I'm reading it, all it does is put rules and regulations in place to heed it from coming. Whether that is what burden of proof they have to prove, of how it's going to be beneficial, or what qualities of life that it could bring, as far as improving the improving the water capacity to certain areas of Cave City. So that's an important thing that we need to look at I believe is zoning and ordinances do not limit things coming. It puts policies and procedures in place to make those work for us, or they can work against us as a people, and that's what we're here for as the citizens of Barron County, the roughly 45 people, 60 people that we have here. And Kevin, I do think y'all did a great job. I'm not harping on y'all at all, but I think it's important that the citizens understand that this does not stop forward progress in Barron County. None of this is going to stop the forward progress. It will come some form, some way. It could be big scale or middle scale. But that's the way that we need to approach this. Is how is this limiting the potential of further growth in Barron County, and especially in the Cave City area? What's going to happen to that property? Nobody wants a data center. It's Mammoth Cave. That's very important for us to remember. Just the items that we have there for us to take in every day, but these regulations are very thoughtful and written very well. So, I just want everybody to actually take the time to read these and understand how that will affect Barren County and what it does not limit, but they can still come in. That's all I have.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Martin Peterson, of Glasgow, Kentucky was sworn in. Mr. Peterson stated the following:

There's a couple of things that I haven't didn't have an opportunity actually to read the proposed ordinance. I certainly hope I will be able to do that. But just a couple of questions to begin with that are more general. I want to be sure who who will be in charge of the administration and enforcement of the ordinance. Is it this commission, all of you, and especially as far as enforcement, who who's going to be hired, or who's going to be responsible for that?

Mr. Myatt stated the enforcement part lies with the staff, whether it's the enforcement officer of Barren County, which is your code enforcement officer, as well as the planning commission staff. There are requirements and state statutes that allow for evidentiary hearings to have to come before the planning commission if necessary. But the enforcement will have to be applied through the staff, the same as it is in any other department within county or city government.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Robert Sneed, of Glasgow, Kentucky was sworn in. Mr. Sneed stated the following:

First, I'd like to talk a little bit about the process of how we got to where we are tonight, and then talk about a couple of specifics about Article 17, which is the reason why all the people are here today. I am opposed to the text as it's currently written. Article 17 was first posted to the public back in August. It was a draft of 80 pages long. However, it contained zero standards. There was nothing for us to look at and judge, or to put any public comments on. The first time the public got to see the actual draft of the standards that were inserted in Article 17 was on October 9th, four days before the last land use committee meeting. I gave the public four days to review what became a 50-page document that now included standards. It was over the weekend. I had some time to look at it, but not as much time that I would like to. And I don't think the majority of the public had sufficient time to actually review what was being proposed. Secondly, following up on the questions that were raised by the prior gentleman, I think before we pass an ordinance of this scope, I think an analysis of the cost to the county needs to be done so we can take that into account and whether or not it's a wise and prudent decision to adopt. Unless we know those costs up front, we're just shooting in the dark as to what we're adopting. With regard to specifics on the standards, I have to commend Kevin and the Land Use Committee and Kentucky Steward for doing a great job. It's a monumental task. However, there are some shortcomings on what those standards provide. The standards don't provide enough protection to the residents in terms of the noise. There is a standard that requires that noise be measured by a dBA weighted scale. The dBA scale misses low frequency sounds that are picked up by a dBc scale. Now there is a noise standard that applies to vibrations and noise, but that only picks up noise that is transferred through the ground. And a person who's hearing their windows rattled and hum at 3 a.m. in the morning because of the sound put off by the cooling fans of a data center, that cooling center is going to comply with the noise standard through the vibrations, but they'll also not be caught by the standard dBA scale. We need to include a dBc weighted standard in the noise standards to protect residents. Many other jurisdictions that consider 65 dBc to be appropriate during the daytime and 60 at night. Low frequency noise from data centers can cause chronic stress, elevated cortisol levels, and reduced productivity in bovine animals. Those standards also need to apply in agricultural lands as well. We're the number one cattle-producing county in the state of Kentucky. We not only need to protect the residents of the county, but we need to protect our livestock and our livelihood, two other areas really important is the enforcement provisions. As I read the enforcement provisions, there's no mandatory trigger that requires enforcement. It says the board of adjustment may. There needs to be a mechanism that a resident who's harmed by standards being violated to be able to trigger enforcement action, including monitoring notice to the data center and remedies imposed. As it is now the remedies falls to the state statute. There's nothing in there that says that a data center violating a noise standard every day is a continuing is a different violation. It's just one violation. There needs to be a standard put in there that each day the violation occurs constitute a separate violation, and the only penalties that are available under state statute involve a misdemeanor and a nominal fine. A $500 fine is not going to be a burden to a multi-billion-dollar industry or business. There needs to be a significant daily fine that impacts their business isn't considered just the cost of doing business of paying $500 once a year or twice a year. The third thing is, I know that we cannot ban data centers, but we can regulate the size of them.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

David Buckingham, of Glasgow, Kentucky was sworn in. Mr. Buckingham stated the following:

I don't really have a whole lot to say. It seems to me that you've got 152 pages of a whole bunch of stuff that I don't think most folks in this room understand what's in there, and Mr. Myatt did an excellent job of offering explanation. I don't know if anybody knew what he's talking about or not. I'm opposed to this planning zoning ordinance right now, mainly on the basis that this is way too much, way too fast. I don't think anybody in the county really understands how it's going to affect us. We hear about fees. We hear about applications. We don't know what it's going to cost the county. We're the folks that are paying the taxes in this county, we need to know. We need to have more information here. I think you need to slow down, and I just want to state my opposition because I really don't understand what's really happening here to try to digest what's in 152 pages, and we're talking about local ordinances, and we're talking about state statutes, and we're talking about regulations, and we're talking about laws, and this gets kind of confusing. I don't know how what you are proposing to do is going to affect me on my property in Barren County, which has been in my family for seventy years. I'm just asking you to slow down.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Robin Lively, of Barren County, Kentucky was sworn in. Ms. Lively stated the following:

I'm going to read what I've learned, and the one thing I do think is we didn't vote for this in Barren County. We didn't vote for a data center to come into our farmland, our neighbor's farmland. This is an important question for Barren County. If it's allowed to have this thing brought into Barren County. I want to share this. It will affect our future, our children's future, our grandchildren's future, for generations. They are not asking for it now, but the entire data center industry is researching and pushing regulations to allow small modular reactors (SMRs) to provide their power on site with estimates by 2030, stating most data centers are expecting to have them. These are nuclear reactors with small scale, but the same risks as nuclear reactors. They also have an increased scale for the size of a nuclear waste material that is stored on site before shipping, these are the same reactors as nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers and data centers want to roll out multiple as more power is needed. After you already have the current data centers, what is your stance on expanding to allowing SMRs, should we be worried after their foot is in the door, you will be more likely to allow SMRs when and if you're against a data center? What if you say no and they're already established? Relocate their data centers after we already had the side effects and the local revenue? What about the difficulty of putting a new industry into their old sites? What about their old sites? How will they be removed? Who will remove that monstrosity?

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Chelene Nightingale, of Glasgow, Kentucky was sworn in. Ms. Nightingale stated the following:

Before I read a statement here, I just want to say I absolutely love Barren County. My husband and my family moved here about six years ago, and you, my dad's from Kentucky, born and raised, so we weren't because he was in the Air Force. He served our country. We landed here, and I got to tell you, you're the most precious, beautiful, wonderful people I've ever met. We made friends so easily. We got involved in the community, and we've been so appreciative. However, the past two years have been really stressful. It's been sad to see our community divide over this issue, an issue that we did not vote for. We did not elect the current elected officials to give us zoning. If we wanted zoning, I would have stayed in Los Angeles, California. It's tyranny. I don't like to be told what to do with my property, and then to be told that well, we're going to give you zoning whether you want it or not, and then we're going to use your taxpayer money to fund it. Well, we didn't approve it, so I'd like for you to consider that aspect. I want to read this. The proposed data center, and that's what we're told. I guess this is what the zoning was for. And in that case, before I read this, I just want to ask the question: If we're going to be forced with a data center we don't want, why wasn't that in the zoning where you just make an industrial region and leave the rest of us alone? It's also taking away agricultural land and affecting the environment. The proposed data center will consume two times the energy used by every house in the county. Building the infrastructure to supply the energy will impact land beyond the development, eminent domain will take land to build transmission lines. No data center should be allowed to be louder than 25 to 35 watts. And with that said, there's a friend of mine here who lives on the other side of the railroad where this proposed data center is proposed to be built. Do you know that she was never approached about this? Imagine if you were to live on the other side of that railroad, nobody approached you, and everybody's telling you, "Well, it's too late. You're going to be stuck with it" would you want to live next to that data center?

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Paula Pedigo, of Glasgow, Kentucky was sworn in. Ms. Pedigo asked if solar energy production was going to be exempt under agricultural zoning.

Mr. Myatt stated that solar is exempt if the purpose is to provide power on private property, but if power is to be sold onto the grid for any kind of profit the property would then be considered a merchant electric facility.

Ms. Pedigo then stated the following:

Okay, you mentioned also on the report that you would accept a letter of credit for decommissioning. I'm going to ask the commission to please strike that because the decommissioning won't happen for 30 or 40 years, and probably the bank that issues the letter of credit will no longer be existence, they will have merged and moved on, and that particular entity cannot be held accountable for letter of credit. I would also encourage that you go for extreme bonding because 40 years from now, when you're trying to estimate what it's going to cost to decommission a 600-acre development, it's going to be in the millions, and a simple stroke of a pen from a good attorney to dissolve the company, and you're not going to have anything. So I think we really need to strengthen their decommissioning on that as well. Also,

just wanted to make a note. You referenced pre-studies and the studies that we're going to have the companies do and bring to you. I just want to throw back to the solar project, and you guys had about 14 studies and you had five questions on those. So those questions those studies number one are biased because they're done by the consultants. They hire the consultants to do that. A wise professor once told me that a definition of consultant is someone with a laptop from 50 miles away from home. So we need somebody on the commission who's going to be responsible for reading those studies, evaluating those studies, asking questions on those studies, but also having the funding mechanism to require additional studies on behalf of the government, on behalf of the community, so that it's a non-biased study, and we have really good research. Okay, those are my questions. Okay, as far as my comments, two things. I think are extremely important, and one is about the process in which parcels of land is rezoned. As you know, in Cave City at this point we had agriculture land, and it's rezoned to industrial too. So it's it's good to go for for data center. But when they submitted that application or that request to be rezoned, what did you guys consider? What was the evidence? Where's the money? Where's the development plan? And why did you make that request? Why was that approved? Okay, didn't happen. So now they've got more land. They've changed the zoning. They've got more zoning, and now they're ready to roll with it. But if the commission would put into your regulations the fact that if land is going to be rezoned there has to be a plan. There has to be money tied to it, and there has to be a commitment. If that plan changes, it comes back before this body, and you reevaluate it and you reconsider it. If it doesn't happen, then that zoning goes back to what it originally was, because we have farmland that should still be farmland now it's I-2 and still sitting there. What are we going to do with it at this point? Hopefully not a data center. So I would ask you to consider the process by which you're rezoning land and not holding the developers accountable, because it kind of seems like a developer comes in, they ask you rezone this, and you guys are happy to let's rezone it and move on because that seems to be what's happening. My second area on the on the proposed ordinance that we're talking about is again on public participation and the fact that you know yeah yeah it's been posted, but as Bob Sneed pointed out, we only had like four days to review it. And yes, we've had public hearings. There's no documentation of those records. There's no sign-in sheets. There's no records kept of how many people have been here, how many people have spoken, how many people have given of their time, their energies, there's just no records of it. So I'm not quite sure how that is adequately and equitably documenting our public participation, also because if one person comes and speaks, you know what weight does that carry? Are they representing 20 people? Are they representing their neighborhood? Because it takes a lot for a citizen to take their time to come before a body of 13, 14, 15 people, attorneys, you know, all distinguished folks, and swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth is extremely intimidating. So their opinions should count and should carry tremendous weight. So how's the commission going to evaluate that? How's the commission going to evaluate petitions? There's we have at this point we have 1000s of signatures. We have no place to submit them. Who's going to consider that? Who's going to weigh that as you guys weigh the decision on are we going to accept planning and zoning when there's a massive amount of people in the community who are speaking out and who want to be heard, and they are being ignored. I would also like to encourage that the notification process used by the commission be changed. Simply putting it in a little bitty ad in a little bitty newspaper is not notifying the community. We do have social media. We have lots of ways that we can inform people and to have more involvement within our community and within these issues for certain. And I'd also like to ask that you change the date of your meetings to where

your meetings come before or after the fiscal court meeting, so that Kevin can come to fiscal court and tell us what the issues are, what you're going to be voting on, so that the public can have an active role and be involved with the community. Thank you.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Leticia Cline, of Cave City, Kentucky was sworn in. Ms. Cline stated that she had concerns about possible de-annexation for the property owned by Kentucky Industrial Alliance, LLC, after reviewing the proposed Zoning Map, and asked what zoning classification that property would be if it were to be de-annexed from Cave City.

Mr. Myatt stated that would be a question to ask the Commission's attorneys due to the zone change that took place within the city limits of Cave City. The property would be zoned as rural residential or what the future land use map calls for the property to be zoned as under Comprehensive Plan which includes Cave City, which would require a public meeting to be held. Mr. Myatt also stated that the current hearing is only for the proposed text of the Barren County Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Cline asked what the process would be to elect a board of adjustments.

Mr. Myatt stated the board of adjustment is set by its legislative bodies, so before the Zoning Ordinance can be officially implemented, a board of adjustment has to be created by the legislative body, which is the Barren County Fiscal Court, as per state statutes. The Fiscal Court would then have to appoint members to the board of adjustment. The board of adjustment would then have to create their bylaws and fee schedule.

Ms. Cline asked how long the process would be to create and appoint people to the board of adjustment.

Mr. Myatt stated that an approved document needs to be in place before a board of adjustment can be formed, there cannot be a board of adjustment created before Zoning is approved by the Fiscal Court. If that happens, then at that same meeting or close to that same meeting, appointments to the board adjustment would have to take place with regards to the fiscal court. They would have to meet, formulate who they are, their boundary, and then after that is approved the Zoning is enacted again.

Ms. Cline asked for an estimated cost of the proposed Zoning Ordinance, Comprehensive Plan, and consultations.

Mr. Myatt stated the Commission creates the Comprehensive Plan in-house by pulling data from a wide range of sources and metrics. State law requires certain elements to be included in a Comprehensive Plan, such as transportation, housing, economic development, land use, and goals and objectives. The current Comprehensive Plan includes twelve (12) elements pulled from housing and economic studies. Consultants can range anywhere from $10,000.00 to $100,000.00. By law, the Commission is required to make a new Comprehensive Plan every five years. The

last five Comprehensive Plans have been created completely in-house, so there has been no additional cost to the citizens or community.

Ms. Cline asked if the county has to have Zoning in place to be able to regulate against a data center.

Mr. Myatt stated Barren County needs to have zoning to regulate any kind of use whatsoever in unincorporated areas of the county. Without Zoning in place, the county cannot regulate any use.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

James Clark, of Haywood, Kentucky was sworn in. Mr. Clark asked if the Commission Members reached out to people within the community regarding county wide zoning.

Charlie Goodman, JCCPC Legal Counsel, stated that the public hearing is not structured for dialog.

Mr. Clark asked if data centers can be banned under the proposed zoning.

Mr. Myatt stated that data centers cannot be banned.

Mr. Clark then stated the following:
Can't be banned. But if you don't build the thing, we don't even have to talk about something. We don't have to talk about it if we don't build it because you didn't ask us what we want. You're doing it. You're saying, "Hey, here's the date. Here's the time. Be prepared." We don't want it. Nobody. Does anybody? I don't think anybody in this room wants them. You're not asking. That's not how government works. You do not get to do whatever you want willy nilly. You're supposed to be in the community asking if people want this.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Nobody else present spoke in opposition of the proposed Ordinance.

Chairman Gumm closed the public hearing and entertained a motion.

A motion was made by Bobby Bunnell and was seconded by Eddie Atnip to approve the proposed Text of the Barren County Zoning Ordinance because the Barren County Fiscal Court directed the Planning and Zoning Commission to create the Zoning Ordinance after adequate public involvement, of which eight public meetings, including tonight, has been performed. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Gumm announced a 5-10 minute recess at 8:42 PM.

The Commission reconvened at 8:50 PM.

2. 10192026-02-B – Creation of the Official Zoning Map to the Barren County Zoning/Land Use Ordinance Pursuant to KRS 100.207 – *Barren County Official Zoning Map*

Chairman Gumm opened a public hearing and served as the officer.

A public hearing was conducted.

Chairman Gumm swore in Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, who then presented the proposed Official Zoning Map.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the proposed Zoning Map.

Nobody present spoke in favor of the proposed Zoning Map.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Zoning Map or if anyone had a general question.

Rebecca Tracy, of Glasgow, Kentucky was sworn in. Ms. Tracy expressed concerns over the proposed Zoning Map because she has a plot of land that is used for crops each year located near residential areas on 31-E, however, it did not appear that her land was zoned as agricultural on the current proposed Zoning Map.

Mr. Myatt stated that if Ms. Tracy's property is zoned rural residential, her agricultural processing and uses will continue as is. Nothing will change from that. Ms. Tracy will not be assessed from the PVA office in any other manner than what she is currently being assessed by. If Ms. Tracy's property is changed to an agricultural zone, she is then restricted to five-acre parcels, and she can't ask the board of adjustment or anybody else to go lower than that. She would have to apply for a zone change. The rural residential zoning allows for Ms. Tracy to continue her farming practices and operations with the ability to sever off a piece of property that may be six tenths of an acre, or an acre if she chooses that.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Zoning Map.

Joey Crist, Co-Owner of Kentucky Industrial Alliance, was sworn in. Mr. Crist stated the following:

So, the current future land use map. Our property is zoned industrial, all 600 acres right now, it's incorrectly mapped. There is 215-220 acres there on Hughes Road, which would be the Duvall, Hughes, and Wright property. That is residential right now. We developed it, so we object to this map, current map right here. Thank you.

Mr. Myatt stated the map being presented is not the current future land use map, it is the current proposed land use map. The proposed current land use map is what is on the property right now. The future land use map, under the comprehensive plan, is the next public hearing.

Mr. Crist stated that is still incorrect and that he was talking about the future land use map.

Mr. Myatt stated that these are two different maps, and that he will explain the future land use map and comprehensive plan in the next public hearing.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Zoning Map.

Alan Murrell was sworn in. Mr. Murrell stated that he has over 30 years of experience managing businesses, raising capital, and that he owns several properties in Barren County. Mr. Murrell then stated he has zoning requests for almost 400 acres near Veterans Outer Loop and the Cumberland Parkway, and 25 acres near Barren River Lake. He also stated he has worked with STV Engineering and Matt Allen was present to discuss the zoning requests.

Matthew Allen was sworn in. Mr. Allen stated that Mr. Murrell wants to change the R-1 zoning to light industrial (I-1) for parcel numbers 49-3B, 64-22A, and 64-24. Mr. Murrell also wants parcel number 35-10 to change from R-1 to R-3 high density residential.

Chairman Gumm asked if Mr. Allen and Mr. Murrell were aware of the public hearings the Commission previously to make their presentation and petitions known to the staff.

Mr. Murrell stated that he was not aware of the meeting until later last week and asked if the Commission would consider their requests.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed agenda item.

Nobody else present spoke in opposition of the proposed agenda item.

Chairman Gumm closed the public hearing and entertained a motion.

A motion was made by Ricky Houchens and was seconded by Janis Turner to approve the proposed Official Zoning Map for Barren County because the Barren County Fiscal Court directed the Planning and Zoning Commission to create a map and public meetings were held for review, including the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

3. 10192026-03-B – Comprehensive Plan Update – *Amendment to Map 9.19 Barren County Future Land Use Projections Map in the adopted 2024 Barren County Comprehensive Plan*

Chairman Gumm opened a public hearing and served as the officer.

A public hearing was conducted.

Chairman Gumm swore in Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, who then presented the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak in favor of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Update.

Nobody present spoke in favor of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Update.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone in the audience had a general question or wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Update.

Matthew Allen was sworn in. Mr. Allen stated the following:
So, in light of the previous public hearing, I would ask that the Commission take into consideration in revising the industrial properties on this future land use map to revise those two industrial properties instead of the R1, one of those properties is immediately adjacent to the current future land use map shown as light industrial, and the second parcel is immediately adjacent to that, and the third parcel in question is just off Bishop Lane, in close proximity to it. Immediately to the east of parcel 64-24 that is projected as light industrial. Again, our request is that you would take into consideration of getting those revised to light industrial as well.

Mr. Myatt stated that this hearing also is part of the public engagement as well. So, if that consideration can be done, obviously, if it deems necessary by the Commission to agree those changes can be adequately reflected in a future land use map, the Staff can then correct or show that in a resulting map, and then that map will be forwarded to the Fiscal Court or to the legislative body.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone else wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed agenda item.

Nobody else present spoke in opposition of the proposed agenda item.

Chairman Gumm closed the public hearing and entertained a motion.

A motion was made by Thomas Grubbs and was seconded by Candy Wethington to amend the proposed Barren County Future Land Use Projections Map to reflect that parcel numbers 49-3B, 64-22A, and 64-24 are all zoned industrial, and that parcel number 35-10 is to be zoned as a high-density residential area. Motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Forrest Wise and was seconded by Joan Norris to approve the amended Future Land Use Projections Map because testimony given tonight shows that since the current future land use projections map was adopted, the county has seen growth that the original adopted map did not anticipate. Motion carried unanimously.

4. 10192026-04-B – Fee Schedule Adoption – *Adoption of the proposed fee schedule for the Barren County Zoning Ordinance*

Chairman Gumm opened a public hearing and served as the officer.

A public hearing was conducted.

Chairman Gumm swore in Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, who then presented the proposed Fee Schedule.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak in favor of the proposed Fee Schedule Adoption.

Nobody present spoke in favor of the proposed Fee Schedule Adoption.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak in opposition of the proposed Fee Schedule Adoption.

Nobody present spoke in opposition of the proposed Fee Schedule Adoption.

Chairman Gumm closed the public hearing and entertained a motion.

A motion was made by Eddie Atnip and was seconded by Janis Turner to approve the proposed Fee Schedule as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, upon the motion of Forrest Wise, seconded by Candy Wethington, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:47 PM.

JOINT CITY-COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

OF

BARREN COUNTY, KENTUCKY

By: _____

Tommy Gumm, Chairman

ATTEST:

_____

Janis Turner, Secretary-Treasurer