



Steering Committee Meeting

May 18, 2009

Agenda

1. Introductions.....Group
2. Planning Process and Steering Committee Responsibilities.....David Hafley
3. Work Completed to Date.....Michelle Kendall/Group
 - ❖ Document Review
 - ❖ Stakeholder Interviews
 - Neighboring Jurisdictions
 - Stakeholders
 - ❖ Website Updates
4. Issues and Opportunities Exercise....David Hafley/Group
5. Summary of Interview Issues by Topic.....PB Team/Group
6. Upcoming Tasks.....PB Team
 - ❖ Focus Group Meetings
 - ❖ Blog and On-Line Survey
 - ❖ Community Assessment/Existing Conditions Report
7. Open Discussion.....Group
8. Adjourn

1. Introductions

PB Team

David Hafley

Michelle Kendall

Tim Roach

Randy Caldwell

Steering Committee

Susan Allen

Jim Averwater

Clarence Brandon

Jake Durham

Dorris Jernigan

Ernie Johns

David Lee

Mark Lee

Randall Matlock

Rosemary Owen

Lynnisse Patrick

Bill Smith

Mayo Taylor

Mike Vaught

David Waldron



2. Planning Process and Steering Committee Responsibilities.....David Hafley

- ❖ Planning Process
- ❖ Steering Committee Responsibilities



Rutherford County Plan Process

Public Outreach

- Stakeholder Interviews
- Focus Groups
- Steering Committee Meetings

- Public Visioning Workshop/Charrette
- Steering Committee Meetings
- Website

- Steering Committee Meetings
- Public Meetings

- Subcommittee Review Meetings
- Commission Training

Milestones

Where Are We Now?
Community Assessment



Where Are We Going?
Comprehensive Plan Development



How Do We Get There?
Implementation Tools and Strategies



Planning Tools Update

Technical

- Existing Conditions
- Review Plans
- Market Analysis
- Opportunities and Constraints Analysis
- Baseline Scenario

- Goals, Objectives, & Policies
- Develop & Evaluate Alternative Scenarios
- Draft Comp. Plan

- Tools & Strategies
- Final Report/ Executive Summary

- Peer Review of Tools
- Evaluate Existing Zoning/Sub Regs
- Update Zoning Sub Regs
- Train Commission on New Tools

2. Steering Committee Responsibilities

Characteristics of a Successful Steering Committee

- ❖ The Steering Committee is consensus-driven. That is, the distinguishing factor is that members can “live with” a solution, not necessarily “love” it. This is the overarching concept that affects all interactions of the Steering Committee Members and their decisions.
- ❖ The Steering Committee makes recommendations, while the County Commission makes decisions.
- ❖ Steering Committee members represent different segments of the county (physically, demographically (age, race, gender), retired v. working, with young children v. empty nesters v. retirees, etc.)
- ❖ Steering Committee meetings are held for SC members to participate and interact. Guests are welcome to observe the meetings and make written comments. If time allows, they may ask questions or make comments.
- ❖ Steering Committee members will contribute ideas as to how the group will conduct meetings, share information, elect a chair, etc.
- ❖ Steering Committee members commit to these “rules of engagement” once they’re developed and hold other members accountable.

2.Steering Committee Responsibilities

Proposed “**Rules of Engagement**” that the PB Team and Steering Committee **agree to abide by**:

- ❖ Steering Committee Members commit to attend Steering Committee meetings.
- ❖ Steering Committee Members will participate at the meetings - by speaking, writing comments, and communicating ideas as needed and at their own comfort level.
- ❖ Steering Committee Members and PB Team members will arrive promptly.
- ❖ The PB Team will ensure meetings end at the promised time.
- ❖ One person will talk at a time, unless the group breaks up into small groups.
- ❖ Observers are not allowed to communicate to Steering Committee members during the SC meetings.



2. ...Steering Committee Responsibilities

What are some of the **roles** the Steering Committee can play/perform during the planning process?

- ❖ “Point people” in the community – hear comments, note comments, communicate comments to the planning team
- ❖ Bring different points of view
- ❖ Test ideas and strategies
- ❖ Advocate for good planning



3. Work Completed to Date.....Michelle Kendall

❖ Document Review

I. Land Use Plans

- Blackman Community Plan
- Christiana-Buchanan Land Use Study
- North Area Subarea General Land Use Policy Plan
- Salem Pike Study Area Land Use Plan
- Smyrna Comprehensive Plan
- Williamson County Comprehensive Land Use Plan

II. Transportation & Utility Plans

- Southeast Corridor Alternatives Analysis Study

III. County-Wide Plans

- Rutherford County Community Strategic Plan



3. Work Completed to Date.....Michelle Kendall

❖ Stakeholder Interviews

- Neighboring Jurisdictions
 - City of Eagleville
 - City of LaVergne
 - Town of Smyrna
 - Williamson County Planning Department
 - Murfreesboro Planning Department
- Stakeholders
 - Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce
 - Rutherford County Farm Bureau
 - Rutherford County Historic Society
 - Heritage Partnership
 - Rutherford County Homebuilders' Association
 - Stones River Watershed Association
 - Rutherford Neighborhood Alliance
 - Association of Realtors
 - Stones River Battlefield
 - Rutherford County School Board

❖ Website Updates

(http://www.rutherfordcountyttn.gov/planning/comp_plan.htm)



4. **Issues and Opportunities Exercise..David Hafley**

- ❖ Identify topic areas (e.g. economic development, growth management, etc.)
- ❖ Group exercise to identify issues and opportunities
- ❖ “What’s important to you?” exercise
- ❖ Summarize and discuss results



5. Summary of Interview Issues by Topic....PB Team

- ❖ Community Form
- ❖ Community Identity and Quality of Life
- ❖ Economic Development
- ❖ Government Process
- ❖ Infrastructure
- ❖ Land Use and Growth Management
- ❖ Natural, Cultural and Heritage Resources
- ❖ Parks and Open Space
- ❖ Schools



Community Form

- ❖ Economic crisis shifting residential growth from single family homes to rental housing
- ❖ Concern that appropriate “mix” of housing is not available
- ❖ Opportunities for mixed use development have not been well utilized
- ❖ Concern that erosion of distinct communities/area within the county is occurring
- ❖ Lack of connectivity in residential developments – development is too pod-like
- ❖ Due to being landlocked – LaVergne’s development and redevelopment strategies are internally oriented
- ❖ County population densities too low to support efficient provision of utilities



Community Identity and Quality of Life

- ❖ Each municipality within the county has a well-understood community character
- ❖ Acknowledgement that Rutherford County character and quality of life will be different from neighboring counties
- ❖ Acknowledge changing character of county in developing plan – look forward and not backward
- ❖ Individual self-interest must be better balanced with community interests
- ❖ Unrealized opportunity to target senior-oriented developments



Economic Development

- ❖ Availability of land area to support employment investment is low and continues to decline
- ❖ Perception of limited availability of commercial and industrial properties
- ❖ Gateway area provides opportunity to attract higher income workforce
- ❖ Designation of employment sites of 1,000 acres or greater should be county priority
- ❖ Concern over loss of manufacturing jobs



Economic Development

- ❖ Designation of “Job Creation Zones” should be explored
- ❖ Perception that costs of development are too high
- ❖ Continued decline in agricultural land, production and influence on county character
- ❖ “Right to Farm” policies/laws are needed
- ❖ Smyrna’s identified growth corridor is adjacent to Jefferson Pike
- ❖ Future growth areas (SR 840) lack sewer



Government Process

- ❖ Extraterritorial regulation by cities within urban growth boundaries should be explored
- ❖ Perception that rezoning process is inconsistent and can lack objectivity
- ❖ Perception that agriculture community is not adequately represented in decision-making process
- ❖ Intergovernmental coordination between Murfreesboro and county can be strengthened
- ❖ Uneven communication and coordination between county and neighboring jurisdictions



Government Process

- ❖ All stakeholders do not have a “seat at the table” in development decision-making
- ❖ Intergovernmental cooperation works best at staff and not policy/legislative levels
- ❖ Metro government remains a good option and should be investigated
- ❖ School board should be represented on the County Planning Commission
- ❖ Local governments are concerned about impacts from R-15 zoning
- ❖ Concern development tax being misallocated to general fund and not schools
- ❖ Investigate real estate transfer tax as substitute for development fees



Infrastructure

General

- ❖ Assigning costs for services is not working well
- ❖ Development fees and taxes add \$9 to \$10K to each building lot; adds to loss of affordability with unclear benefit from fees and taxes
- ❖ Planning for infrastructure lags planning for development

Water

- ❖ Best management practices for protecting water quality are needed
- ❖ Multiple concerns with CUD on fees, water lines and hydrants
- ❖ Adequacy of water supply is emerging as area of concern



Infrastructure

Sewer

- ❖ Sewer widely viewed as engine of growth
- ❖ Large areas of county are rocky and/or have poor soils for on-site sewerage
- ❖ Feasibility of regional sewer system should be investigated
- ❖ STEP systems are the best development tool employed in Rutherford County
- ❖ STEP systems are a primary reason for unchecked county growth with resultant problems
- ❖ STEP systems displacing most productive agricultural land
- ❖ Densities should be better linked with carrying capacity of soils



Infrastructure

Transportation

- ❖ Improvements to federal and state transportation system are growth drivers
- ❖ Traffic management should be greater factor in development decision-making
- ❖ Perception that transportation/traffic planning not keeping pace with development



Land Use and Growth Management

- ❖ Formerly a rural county with urban areas – county is now urban area with rural pockets
- ❖ Pressure on agriculture lands from developing residential areas
- ❖ Planning within urban growth boundaries is inconsistent
- ❖ Williamson County sees R-15 zoning and STEP systems as major Rutherford County development challenges
- ❖ Practice of using Conditional Use Permit process for home-based businesses is not adequately managed
- ❖ Concerns on process for incorporating existing small area plans into comprehensive plan
- ❖ Concern that new zoning and subdivision regulations will have negative impact



Land Use and Growth Management

- ❖ Concern that public is subsidizing costs associated with growth
- ❖ Belief that all development should be subject to fiscal impact analysis
- ❖ Resource protection overlay zones should be investigated
- ❖ Perception that zoning districts and requirements are too complex
- ❖ Some perceive conflict between adjoining agricultural/residential land uses, i.e. trespassing/encroachment on agricultural land
- ❖ Evaluate a “point” system for density/amenity tradeoffs
- ❖ Electronic submittal of plans and fees should be explored



Natural, Cultural and Heritage Resources

- ❖ Citizens must value natural resources to compel their preservation and protection
- ❖ Archeological review as part of development process is needed
- ❖ Preserving and interpreting cultural and historic resources provide tourism development potential
- ❖ Valuable rural viewsheds are negatively impacted by growth and above ground utilities
- ❖ Family plot cemeteries are abandoned, lost or being developed
- ❖ Historic buildings and homes being demolished without adequate review or demolition permits
- ❖ Tennessee Historical Commission grant for GIS mapping of historic and cultural resources should be tracked



Natural, Cultural and Heritage Resources

- ❖ Antebellum homes being lost to neglect and development
- ❖ Development pressures may/could impact Stones River Battlefield
- ❖ Opportunities for land trusts and conservation easements should be explored
- ❖ Mechanisms for purchasing/protecting large tracts of land is needed



Parks and Open Space

- ❖ County needs dedicated parks and recreation department
- ❖ Access to parks within county and jurisdictions is inconsistent and uneven
- ❖ Parks and open space not being provided with new development
- ❖ Public access to river must be maintained – access points every five miles



Schools

- ❖ School planning needs better integration into county planning process
- ❖ Siting schools in undeveloped areas exacerbates low density development trends
- ❖ Schools should be receiving more of local taxes and fees
- ❖ School board is reacting to growth and not cooperatively planning for growth
- ❖ Cooperation between county and Murfreesboro schools could be improved



6. Upcoming Tasks.....PB Team

- ❖ **Focus Group Meetings**
Tentative dates: **June 9/10** and **June 30/July 1**
- ❖ **Blog and On-Line Survey**
- ❖ **Community Assessment/Existing Conditions Report**
- ❖ **Community-wide Meeting**

7. Open Discussion

What's on your mind?

Agenda

- ✓ Introductions.....Group
- ✓ Planning Process and Steering Committee Responsibilities.....David Hafley
- ✓ Work Completed to Date.....Michelle Kendall/Group
 - ❖ Document Review
 - ❖ Stakeholder Interviews
 - Neighboring Jurisdictions
 - Stakeholders
 - ❖ Website Updates
- ✓ Issues and Opportunities Exercise....David Hafley/Group
- ✓ Summary of Interview Issues by Topic....PB Team/Group
- ✓ Upcoming Tasks.....PB Team
 - ❖ Focus Group Meetings
 - ❖ Blog and On-Line Survey
 - ❖ Community Assessment/Existing Conditions Report
- ✓ Open Discussion.....Group
- ✓ Adjourn