

**Report of county plan review session
August 9, 2007 at Blount County Public Library**

The plan review session was attended by 22 people according to the sign-in sheet (see list of people on sign-in sheet attached). The session lasted approximately two hours.

The following are summary comments of participants documented at the session.

Need to have regulatory/budget implementation of guiding polices 4 and 5, especially concerning schools

Need regulations that will preserve rural character/open space – e.g. ridge top development regulations – need to do more quicker or we may loose what we want to protect

Need more initiative from Planning Commission to implement Policies Plan

There needs to be economic incentive to preserve open space, e.g. require developers to buy one to five acres of open space for every one acre they develop so that open space land will have a comparable market value demand – also adds to value of surrounding land.

Developments should set aside land for schools or pay in lieu of set aside.

Retain quality of major gateways into the county – highways 411 and 321.

Outlaw ridge top development

It costs County more to service residential development land than it does to service farms and open space lands.

Promotion of County brings people in and this leads to problems of growth, thus we should limit promotional activities.

Should promote tourism since it could help preserve open space.

Should have variance stamp on every subdivision plat stating that the Policies Plan was not followed.

No development within 1000 feet of ridge line of Chilhowee Mountain based on natural and historical considerations (preservation values)

Do unto those downstream as you would want upstream to do to you (water quality).

Small town approval of developments have impact on County infrastructure – especially concerning Louisville

To have smart growth, Cities and County need to be on same page.

Trusting market to protect county as it grows is not satisfactory – need to take direct action

Need county-wide body to bridge jurisdictions and issues.

Need to put burden on developers to show how impacts will be addressed and what benefits will be.

Needs to be hard to get a variance of regulations.

Powers that be should recognize that philosophy (on how to address growth issues) is changing – previous concern with property rights is shifting to concern for protecting the county.

Need to go back to limiting development on inadequate school infrastructure, and also other infrastructure such as fire protection, law enforcement, etc.

Guiding Policy 2 (Land use and development should be managed and regulated in order to preserve the quality of our growing county) should be a regulation to be enforced.

Need real creative thought on what public health, safety and welfare is (in relation to regulations).

Needs to be a balance of types of houses to also encourage affordable housing.

Could designate prime agriculture areas and encourage preservation, and also designate areas for parks in the county.

Need to look at all aspects of character and need in identifying how much open space is enough in the county.

Rural commercial is too much if it serve more that the immediate community.

Need other means than greenbelt (property tax designation) to allow farmers to keep farming.

Need to promote conservation easements.

Need rational planning.

County should rethink (policies plan stand) that the county government will not fund open space.

Cannot depend on wealthy people to protect county (preservation – e.g. three sisters tract)

Need a long term capital improvement plan and budget.

Need do develop a master plan for county.

Participants on sign-in sheet

Rick Brownlie

Sunny Day

Joe King

Linda King

Jim Scully

Kathy Skinner

Phil Mummert

Bob Frink

Nina Gregg

Doug Gamble

Ingrid Haun

Bill Busser

Judy Brownlie

Mark Hasty

William B. Miller

Bob Miller

Brad Ansley

Kim Soltero

Luis Soltero

W. P. Reeves

Nancy Neilsen

Steven Phipps