

FISCAL

Continued from Page 1

Family Residential. All but Hughes voted yes on this ordinance.

Ordinance 2026-008 changes a 46.84 acre lot on 215 Avawam Drive from UC-1 Single Family Residential to UC-2 Multi Family Residential. While this ordinance proved to be the least controversial of the day, with all magistrates and Judge Executive Reagan Taylor voting yes.

The 352 acres on Moran Mill Road proved to be the most contentious discussion of the meeting. When the court moved to that item, Hughes brought up Cook vs. Madison County Planning Commission, a case recently decided by the Kentucky Court of Appeals.

That case also came about due to an incident that arose in the Madison County Planning Commission in 2023. It was decided in July of this year that notice of a land use change had not been given within the appropriate 14 day window before a vote. In that instance, the fiscal court sent the ordinance back to the planning commission to start the process over before the vote.

“From the information we’re getting, it’s a 13 days was what was on the letters that was mailed out. Technically it wasn’t 14 days. The letter was dated July 8, and the meeting was on July 21... You take 21 minus eight, that’s 13,” Hughes said of Ordinance 2026-009.

County Planning Director Bert Thomas replied to Hughes that it was in fact 14 calendar days when you count the day the letter was dated and the day of the meeting.

Hughes was also critical of an attorney signing in the stead of the property owner for the initial land use application on Moran Mill Road. Both factors applied to Hughes’ “no”



BLAKE VICKERS — RR

Travis Barnes, who lives in the area near Moran Mill Road, said he believed people in the area would appeal the Madison County Fiscal Court’s “yes” vote on a controversial zoning ordinance.

vote on the ordinance.

Thomas responded to those claims, saying that they had came up during a planning commission hearing and that they had been cleared up.

“That came up during the public hearing. It was addressed by the planning commission attorney. It was addressed by the applicant as well, they felt okay with it. Obviously if someone doesn’t agree with it, there’s appeals that can be made to that,” Thomas said.

Magistrate Tom Botkin mentioned that he had visited some of the properties in question before the vote, and thanked land owners for letting him see them. He said that swaths of that land in question in the ordinance didn’t fall within the county’s urban development corridor. A significant factor in his “no” vote.

“While I believe that there’s places on this property that you can build homes, there’s also places where you cannot build homes. So you have to weigh all that. But for me, for my consistency, and for

our vote, it comes down to me for our map,” Botkin said. “Part of this property is not in the corridor... I’m voting ‘no’ on this one based on this matter.”

Like other recent zoning changes, all three of those ordinances have drawn significant push-back online and in public comment sections of meetings. When the first readings for those ordinances were passed, several people who live in that part of the community have came out to voice concerns about impacts on the environment, traffic, and any farms in that area.

Public comment and potential legal challenge

Recent Madison County Fiscal Court meetings have gotten increasingly tense, with members of the public both for and against further growth in the county coming out in protest or support of certain ordinances.

That divide is further highlighted by members of non-profit groups Preserve Madison County and Madison County Forward sitting on opposite sides of the room. While both

groups and other supporters turned out for the Aug. 25 meeting, numbers on both sides were lower and emotions cooler than in the prior meeting.

Preserve Madison County member Mary McMahan as the first person to speak during public comment. Several audience members on her side of the

literal and figurative isle exclaimed “oh lord,” quoting an off the cuff remark made by Magistrate Stephen Lochmueller the last time McMahan spoke during public comment.

“My name is Mary McMahan, otherwise known as ‘oh lord’ thanks to Mr. Lochmueller there,” she said coming up to the podium to speak.

“You’re welcome,” Lochmueller replied.

McMahan asked the court several questions, specifically, she was looking for updates on any revisions made to the county comprehensive plan and any regulations on write-in elections.

In past meetings, Judge Executive Taylor has answered questions from McMahan. This time around, he noted that the public comment section is for members of the public to speak. and that it is not necessarily a question and answer session with the fiscal court. Taylor told

SEE LAND, PAGE 11

ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS CONTRACT 604-26-01 LANDSCAPE PACKAGE RICHMOND REGIONAL SPORTS COMPLEX CITY OF RICHMOND RICHMOND, KENTUCKY

Sealed proposals for the following work will be received by the City of Richmond, Madison County, Kentucky, at the city hall until 1:30 p.m. local time, Tuesday, September 15, 2026, for furnishing labor and materials and performing all work as set forth by the Advertisement, General Conditions, Specifications, and/or Drawings prepared by Bell Engineering. Immediately following the scheduled closing time for the reception of bids, all proposals which have been submitted in accordance with the above conditions will be publicly opened and read aloud.

The work to be bid is described as follows:

CONTRACT 604-26-01

Furnish and installation of trees, shrubs, grasses, groundcovers, mulch, staking, and all project elements shown in the construction drawings.

Drawings, Specifications and Contract Documents may be examined at the following places:
City of Richmond
239 West Main Street
Richmond, Kentucky 40475

Bell Engineering
2480 Fortune Drive, Suite 350
Lexington, Kentucky 40509

Builder’s Exchange of Kentucky
1035 Strader Drive, Suite 100
Lexington, Kentucky 40505
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

KPAP, Community Development Office
Cabinet for Economic Development
Capital Plaza Tower
(Advertisement for Bid Only)

or may be obtained from Lynn Imaging, 328 E. Vine Street, Lexington, Kentucky 40507, phone 859/255-1021, upon receipt of non-refundable deposit as follows:

CONTRACT 604-26-01—\$250.00

Sealed proposals for this Contract shall be clearly marked on the outside of the envelope as follows:

“Sealed Proposal for Contract 604-26-01. Not to be opened until 1:30 p.m. local time, Tuesday, September 15, 2026.”

If forwarded by mail, the sealed envelope containing the proposal must be enclosed in another envelope and mailed to the City of Richmond allowing sufficient time for such mailing to reach this address prior to the scheduled closing time for receipt of proposals.

The attention of all contractors is called to the fact that any contract awarded under this Advertisement for Bids is expected to be funded from current funds on hand and/or from revenue bonds.

Bidders must comply with the President’s Executive Order Nos. 11246 and 11375, which prohibit discrimination in employment regarding race, creed, color, sex or national origin. Where the President’s Executive Order No. 11246 is shown, Executive Order No. 11375 also applies.

Bidders must make positive efforts to secure small or minority owned business enterprise participation in this Project.

Bidders must comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the AntiKickback Act, the Contract Work Hours Standard Act, and the DavisBacon Act.

Bidders must certify that they do not and will not maintain or provide for their employees any facilities that are segregated or based on race, color, creed, or national origin.

Bidders must show a certification of prior work under Executive Order 11246 (Equal Employment Opportunity) as amended.

All contractors and subcontractors must comply with 41 CFR 60-4, in regard to affirmative action. This is to ensure equal opportunity to females and minorities, and apply the time tables and goals set forth in 41 CFR 60-4.

The City of Richmond may consider informal any bid not prepared and submitted in accordance with the provisions of this advertisement and/or the Specifications and may waive any informalities or reject any and all bids.

**CITY OF RICHMOND
Robert E. Minerich, City Manager**

ARREST

Continued from Page 1

gathering additional information and will handle the matter in accordance with department and university policies. We will have no further comment at this time.”

In July, EKU basketball player Austin Ball (22) was charged with disregarding a stop sign and operating a motor vehicle under the influence of alcohol.

He pled not guilty at his preliminary hearing on Aug. 4.

According to the citation, an RPD officer observed a vehicle traveling on East Irvine Street early Saturday morning. The driver, Akal, failed to initiate his signal when making a left turn on East Irvine Street.

The officer then observed

the vehicle slow down and the occupants yell at pedestrians on the sidewalk.

After initiating a traffic stop, the officer observed four people in the back seat, none of which were wearing seat belts.

The officer states in the citation that Akal’s eyes were “glossy” and a smell of an alcohol beverage was coming from the car.

Akal told the officer he was coming from the Bluegrass Barrel House and was “just trying to get his buddies home safe.”

Akal also told the officer he had been drinking wine at the his dorm and stated, “I can’t believe I done this.”

In addition, the officer spotted a clear bottle of Cruzan Blueberry Rum in the front passenger floorboard, which was half full.

Akal agreed to Standardized Field Sobriety

Tests (SFSTs).

According to the citation, in the walk and turn tests, the operator stated too soon, did not touch heel to toe, stepped off the line, made an improper turn and took an incorrect number of steps.

Akal was arrested and transported to the Madison County Detention Center.

The 5-foot-10 defensive back took a redshirt season at EKU in 2025. He played at Harlan High School and had 68 tackles and two sacks as a senior, along with seven rushing touchdowns.

The Register collects and publishes police reports as a public service to its readers. The reports often contain allegations against individuals and do not mean the individuals committed a crime. All people named in connection with a crime are presumed innocent until guilty in a court of law.