



**Rural Fringe Mixed Use District (RFMUD)  
Initial Recommendations Meeting  
Public Workshop, May 26, 2016  
South County Regional Library**

**Meeting Summary:** Community Planning staff together with the County's consultant, AECOM, provided a meeting for residents and interested stakeholders to review ideas provided by the public through previous workshops, surveys, correspondence, interviews and telephone calls and to provide a list of initial staff recommendations. Approximately 39 interested persons attended.

**Kris Van Lengen**, Community Planning Manager reviewed the growth management study, amendment process and timetable. He provided an overview of the research, data and analysis still ongoing: economic analysis (scenario planning) and mitigation bank feasibility analysis for North Belle Meade. Initial recommendations were explained and grouped under the following headings:

- TDR credit ideas affecting Sending owners
- TDR program management
- Sending Land management
- Misc. ideas

The community asked and discussed whether increasing the value of credits in the hands of developers would be an alternative to increasing the number of credits issued to Sending owners. Comments were also made in support of agricultural preservation and to express the ongoing concern in the development community that the incremental cost represented by TDRs makes it difficult for adequate return on investment. The point was also made that TDRs should be considered for Northern GG Estates where watershed coordination can be effected.

Individual surveys were distributed to and completed by the public, covering each of 15 program topics related to the Sending and neutral lands. A numerical representation of the results, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, is shown below.

**Anita Jenkins**, Principal Planner, Community Planning Section, reviewed the concepts previously discussed in the Receiving Land meetings, and provided explanations for the series of initial recommendations made by staff. These were included under the following categories:

- Land use, density/intensity and economic vitality
- Transportation and infrastructure
- Environment
- Development standards and process

Discussion ensued regarding the process of allowing deviations to a zoning overlay, allowable locations for schools, Property Appraiser's Office valuations, the appropriate number of TDRs granted for excess native vegetation or habitat preserve on Receiving land, water and sewer availability, the relationship of Affordable Housing to affordable living concepts, and the need for the County to own the economic analytical tool under development.



Again, individual surveys were distributed to and completed by the public, covering each of 18 program topics related to Receiving lands. A numerical representation of the results, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, is shown below.

### **Workshop Survey Results**

*Survey questions asked respondents to rank each initial recommendation as strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. The percentages indicated below provide a percentage of agreement (agree or strongly disagree) to those who responded, without regard to “neutral” responses.*

#### **Sending and Neutral Issues:**

Additional credits should be provided to balance the anticipated demand from Receiving Areas. Sending Land owners, if they participate, should benefit from additional credits.

**Agree: 69%**

Additional credits should not favor one Sending Land location over another.

**Agree 70%**

Additional credits should be provided to those who entered the program early.

**Agree: 72%**

TDRs should be awarded also for owners who commit to keeping their land in agricultural production

**Agree: 76%**

Eliminate minimum pricing on Base TDRs.

**Agree: 75%**

Improve the Buyer/Seller registries.

**Agree: 81%**

Reduce cost and complexity of applications.

**Agree: 87%**



Create a County-sponsored TDR bank that can buy credits from Sending Lands owners  
**Agree: 82%**

The County should accept land that owners wish to donate, if no other agency is willing.  
**Agree: 63%**

The County should finance maintenance of donated Sending Land through a mitigation bank, if feasible.  
**Agree: 75%**

If a mitigation bank is not a feasible funding source, require a donation to the County with the land, equivalent to all or a portion of any additional TDRs issued.  
**Agree: 65%**

Allow a second dwelling unit to dedicated farming operations of at least 20 acres.  
**Agree: 79%**

Study recreational uses that could be compatible on donated lands that go beyond "passive recreation."  
**Agree: 63%**

Eliminate the use of TDRs in urban areas if they come from RFMUD Sending Lands.  
**Agree: 60%**

Extend the same advantages to Neutral Land owners who want to commit to agricultural uses by offering TDRs.  
**Agree: 76%**

### **Receiving Issues:**

Allow business park stand-alone uses to increase employment opportunities in research technology and other targeted businesses.  
**Agree: 78%**

Revise village rules to allow larger commercial and employment areas.  
**Agree: 76%**

Increase density allowed in rural villages to 4 units per gross acre (TDRs required)  
**Agree: 81%**

Increase density allowed in non-village development to 2 units per acre (TDRs required) and remove 40-acre minimum size  
**Agree: 78%**

Analyze arterial roadway capacity issues.  
**Agree: 77%**

Enhance requirements for greater project connectivity.  
**Agree: 78%**

Consider roadway design standards that promote low speed and safety.  
**Agree: 75%**



Add requirements for transit stops in large developments, business parks or villages.

**Agree: 75%**

Allow TDRs in Receiving Areas for protection of native vegetation/habitat or agriculture.

**Agree: 71%**

Reward projects that advance the greater public interest (examples: greenway connections, flowway connections).

**Agree: 72%**

Incentivize mixed-use developments by studying potential impact fees for mixed-use.

**Agree: 70%**

Use overlays or optional design standards that promote greater certainty in review process.

**Agree: 81%**

Developments complying with zoning overlays should get approval through simple BCC majority or Hearing Examiner process.

**Agree: 80%**

Hearing Examiner can approve individual deviations.

**Agree: 60%**

Hearing Examiner can approve business park proposals.

**Agree: 62%**

Modify the TDR requirements to 0.5 credit for multi-family units and 0 credit for target industry/business park uses

**Agree: 75%**

Currently no provisions for stand-alone commercial. Propose design guidelines (no strip) and use of TDR credits (ex, 1 credit per 6,000 SF).

**Agree: 62%**

Additional incentives for innovative green designs, such as solar power, zero net water, aquifer storage and recovery sites, etc.

**Agree: 80%**