



HOUSING & NEIGHBORHOODS WORKING GROUP Meeting #3

**Monday, August 20, 2012
2:30PM – 4:30PM
Cansler YMCA, Community Room
616 Jessamine Street, Knoxville, TN 37917**

Welcome and Introductory Remarks

Gary Drinnen, Executive Director of Habitat of Loudon County and Housing Working Group chair, introduced himself, thanked meeting attendees introduced the first presenter.

Parties Present

Heather Bailey (ETDD), Steve Bandy (ETHRA), Sarah M. Booher (Anderson County), Lisa Condrey (ETHRA), Tara Davis (City of Knoxville), Rogers Doughty (City of Knoxville), Mike Dunthorn (City of Knoxville), Kaye Graybeal (Knoxville Knox County MPC), Chris Hamby (City of Alcoa), Joe Hultquist, John Lamb (Blount County Planning Department), Claudia Lever (Oak Ridge MPC), David Massey (City of Knoxville), Jackie Mayo (Knox Housing Partnership), Danny Mitchell (Knoxville Habitat for Humanity), Katie Moore (Knoxville Leadership Foundation), Wolf Naegeli (Foundation for Global Sustainability), Gary Palmer (Town of Farragut), Jeremy Pearson (City of Alcoa), Grant Rosenberg (Knoxville Leadership Foundation), Linda Rust (Knox County), Becky Wade (City of Knoxville), Emily Woodle (City of Knoxville), Chairperson Gary Drinnen (Habitat for Humanity of Loudon County) and staff; Bryan Berry, Amy Brooks, Sherith Colverson, Buz Johnson, Tim Kuhn, Mike Reynolds, Jo Ella Washburn.

Introduction to Scenario Development

MPC Executive Director Mark Donaldson provided an introduction to the scenario planning process. Particularly how scenarios are developed for our region and what they mean in looking at possible futures for our region. Below are the bulleted points from the presentation.

- Scenarios show how the region COULD absorb expected population growth

- Provide examples of what the region’s development patterns and transportation system might look like
- Different scenarios show the same amount of growth for a given time period, but distributed in different ways
- Analyzing differences allows results of policy, regulatory, and investment decisions to be understood
- Trend scenario: first scenario to be developed
 - Provides the best estimate of how the region will develop if no changes occur in development practices or plans, market forces, or transportation investments
 - Provides baseline against which to measure other scenarios
- Alternative scenarios: Depict what could happen if particular policy, regulatory, or investment changes are made
 - Show different ways in which homes, jobs, roads, transit, and open spaces could be spread out or concentrated
- Scenarios are compared against the baseline (trend) scenario using indicators
 - Quantitative measurements applied to each scenario and measure spatial aspects of growth only
 - Comparing indicator values of alternative scenarios shows differences between scenarios

Presentation of Trend Scenario

Kevin Tilbury with the PlanET Consulting Team presented the trend scenario, the first to be developed for our region, and that will be used to compare to other scenarios. The trend scenario answers, “What’s happening today? If we keep doing things the way we’re doing, what will happen by 2030-2040? What will our region look like?” The trend scenario:

- Allocates the next 30 years of population and employment growth using the following projections.
 - By 2040, the population is expected to grow by 298,163 persons
 - By 2040, employment is expected to grow by 240,274 jobs
- Using the “Business as usual” approach for our region, the following current development patterns are assumed to continue for the next 30 years.
 - Strip commercial and regional centers
 - Industrial and Office parks and strip office

- Mix of suburban housing and rural residential

The demand for land in the trend scenario for 2040 is based on the projections noted above for population and jobs, as well as development drivers that were established through a survey of the local development community, including, bankers, developers, planners, economic developers, and city/county officials. These drivers are outlined in the [Livability Report Card](#) on pages 40-43 and reviewed and commented on at the previous working group meeting. The supply of land is considered to be unconstrained vacant land in the PlanET Region. The intensity and regularity of the trend scenario is based on current practices and market desirability.

The regional development pattern for 2010 was shown, as was the estimated development pattern for 2014, 2024, 2034 and 2040. (Images are contained in the PowerPoint presentation shown during the meeting.) By 2040, the trend scenario for the region is expected to yield:

- 115,000+ acres of greenfield development
- 112,000+ new homes consuming 98,000+ acres (0.88 dwelling units per acre)

Kevin listed the benchmarks/indicators currently under consideration for use in monitoring progress toward achieving a regional vision for housing and neighborhoods. Participants will be asked to react to this list (below) in their small group discussions.

- Residential tax revenue
- Jobs-to-housing ratio
- Housing diversity index

A brief Q & A period followed.

Q: In your model – you are not covering Roane County.

A: We are as part of the regional travel demand model including a 10-county area – Roane is included.

Clarification: We have included control totals in each

Q: Statistics to project the trend – what are you using to develop the control totals.

A: Part of the travel demand model. Approved by the TPO Board. Three comparisons of the estimate occurred – Woods and Poole, State Economic Development data and Bernard Lockmuller. Thirty page document available upon request.

Presentation of Draft Regional Vision Statement

Rob Kerns presented the Draft Regional Vision Statement, noting that this draft arose out of public participation since the project's kickoff in October 2011. Input was collected in large community forums,

meetings in a box, leadership dialogues, stakeholder interviews, Mindmixer, and the community survey. It is written from a 2040 perspective.

The small groups were asked to focus particularly on the clean and natural section of the draft vision statement as it is most closely aligned with the Environment focus area. The vision statement for the housing section follows.

We have expanded the array of housing options through innovative market-driven development in diverse neighborhood settings, thereby strengthening the tax base and offering greater freedom of choice to all segments of the population.

- In downtown Knoxville and other urban centers, higher density infill housing supports a vibrant civic and cultural scene.
- In our suburban areas, we have improved neighborhood livability with greater walkability; improved connections between jobs, shopping, and employment; and a wider mix of housing types.
- In our rural areas we have protected our scenic character and reduced development pressure on farmland by introducing conservation (cluster) development practices in addition to traditional large lot development.

Throughout the region we have expanded choice of housing types--including housing for seniors-in life care communities and “age in place” housing, as well as housing for smaller households and young adults and live-work housing.

We have kept the cost of housing affordable for all income groups, without sacrificing quality or limiting choice.

We have protected neighborhood character while providing new mixtures of housing choices.

Small Group Discussion

Ann Coulter asked participants to break into three groups to discuss the following questions:

- Do you agree with the components of the draft Regional Vision Statement? Are any important vision ideas mission?
- How does the trend scenario compare to the Regional Vision? Do they align or are there major differences?
- What are the most important scenario benchmarks/indicators for your focus area?

The following is a summary of comments from each group.

Group 1

Vision Statement

- Replace the word market with demand

- Design compatibility with density
- Neighborhood and community is beyond housing and needs to include mixed use
- Redundancy in the word “choice”
- Focus on the positives in the statements.
- Second bullet
- Redundancy in housing and jobs – neighborhoods as a totality.
- Take out large lot developments – make this a positive. Remove in addition to large lot development (bullet #3)
- Promoting Choice needs to be rethought – could apply to all of the areas – headings need to be more descriptive; the rest are adjectives; let’s be consistent

Trend comparison to the regional vision

- Show model developments – part of defining future scenarios
- Clarify difference between urban and rural
- Too general to attach any ideas about our vision to the trend
- Include people leaving the workforce and aging baby boomers to the trend scenario

Indicators Missing

- Reinvestment in existing neighborhoods, retention of the housing stock, rehabilitation of existing
- Affordable houses – near services
- All houses near services
- Prime rates
- Budgets for sidewalks, bikes, etc..
- Assessed value versus sale value of homes
- Affordable housing – not just the government definition – maintenance costs, transportation etc...

Group #2

Vision Statement

- Talk about the communities about who is living there and not the housing types
- Focus on the diversity of people
- Communities of choice for anyone and everyone (race, economics and disability and mobility issues)
- Stating universal design – what needs to be promoting

- Focus on mixed income neighborhoods
- Clarification – innovative market-driven options – what does this mean?
- Revitalization of older housing stock needs to be included

Trend comparison to the regional vision

- Large amount of land consumption
- All the communities are merging
- Loss of community identity
- What is not evident is positive growth, infrastructure amenities
- Affordability of maintaining and providing infrastructure for sprawling communities
- Loss of rural resources

Indicators Missing

- Zoning ordinances
- Vacant and underutilized properties
- Blighted properties
- Number of universally designed houses – aging in place, visitable
- Demographic mix – income, racial, age

Group # 3

Vision Statement

- Drifting to solutions rather than a focus on vision.
- Energy efficiency standards
- Total cost of housing is affordable for all housing groups – needs to be reflective of all costs associated with housing (transportation, energy, etc...), needs also to be inclusive of renters not just “owners”
- Housing market that is response to the needs of seniors, people with special needs
- We have kept the cost of housing affordable – assumes that housing is affordable for all now and it is not.

Trend comparison to the regional vision

- Felt uncomfortable comparing the trend and vision statement.
- Need more information in order to evaluate.

Indicators Missing

- Residential tax revenue – needs to be rethought. This does not include the services required to support new housing.
- Health outcomes – obesity rates, vehicle emissions, walkability
- Energy costs
- Infrastructure costs to the community
- School desirability as a driver for selection of place to live
- Housing turnover – vacancy rate/ Greenfield development rate “Dunhill Index”

Group Report Backs

A spokesperson for each group shared the items that were discussed and recorded.

Next Steps

Rob Kern went over the next steps in the PlanET process that will develop alternative scenarios for feedback and evaluation, leading to the selection of a preferred scenario for the region.

Next Meeting

There will be a joint meeting of all Working Groups in early October. At that meeting, the Working Groups will be able to learn about the alternative growth scenarios.