

Summary

Steering Committee Meeting #5

Meeting Information

Date: March 31, 2022
Time: 4:00-6:00 PM
Location: Frederick B. Cooper Commissioners Room
3rd Floor, Claude Mayo, Jr. Administration Building
Nash County Planning & Inspections Department
120 West Washington Street,
Nashville, NC 27856

Agenda Items

- ▶ Review and Discuss Draft Future Land Use Maps
- ▶ Review and Discuss Draft Recommendations
- ▶ Next Steps

Meeting Materials

- ▶ Draft Future Land Use Maps for Alternatives 1 through 7
- ▶ Draft Recommendations (previously distributed)

Summary

Discussed consensus changes – agreed to make these changes.

Alternate FLUM drafts were presented, including the newest Alt. 7 map.

Comments from the Committee on FLUMs:

- General discussion
 - Concerned that preserving certain areas for agriculture would restrict what farmers' children and grandchildren could do with their land when they no longer wanted to farm it.
 - Simple map may be easier to administer and easier for developers to understand.
 - Don't really save any farmland by keeping land R40 vs R30.
 - The conversion of farmland to residential is not so detrimental to agriculture as is the density of development and how it impedes agriculture via traffic, conflicts with neighbors, etc.
 - Current major agricultural operators in Nash County are considering relocating to other counties, as new development has made it more difficult to operate profitably.
 - One member would like to see more development in the northern part of the county.
 - Concern that Nash County is starting to be viewed as developer-unfriendly after recent BOC decisions not to grant additional density to proposed developments.
 - County is moving to provide greater services, such as public drinking water and internet, but will likely not be a sewer provider.
 - Some amount of growth is going to happen either way, so at least more dense development (such as R30) consumes less farmland. In addition, inefficient use of land encourages sprawling development.
 - Well-and-septic development is currently possible on 20,000 sqft lots.

Summary

- BOC has recently rejected more dense development that utilizes private water systems because it would impeded the public water system extension. There is trepidation that private water systems are not as well maintained or as reliable as a publicly-maintained system.
- Question if Voluntary Agricultural Districts (VAD) and their ½-mile buffered area could be incorporated into the future land use map. Currently about 12,000 acres enrolled in the VAD program.
- Alt. 7 map
 - Agreement with the reduction in loopholes for conservation subdivisions
 - Does not protect farmland or agriculture.
 - Different comfort levels for extending R20 and R30 development across the entire county.
 - Would like to see the new, combined character area called "Agricultural/Rural".
 - Seems there is no incentive to extend public water infrastructure extension if the majority of the county is painted as R30. Response is that the county has policies to extend water infrastructure and needs to extend the facilities to get more customers to pay for the county water system.
 - Would be more supportive of this map if private water systems would be permitted to be used to reach higher density developments.
- Draft recommendations:
 - May be some desire to increase front setbacks in the R30 zoning district.
 - Desire to revise open space, buffer, wetlands, etc. standards related to cluster subdivisions.
- Choosing a FLUM
 - Motion and second to approve Alt. 7 map.
 - Discussion:
 - Approving this map will not change any recent BOC zoning updates.
 - Concerned that overall this will create more dense development throughout the county.
 - Concerned that R20 is no longer a recommendation.
 - In support: 6; Not in support: 1
- Review of Draft Goals
 - In light of the committee-selected map (Alt. 7), it has created problems in that it does not necessarily support Draft Plan goals 1, 4, and 5.
 - Draft Goal #1
 - The new map relies more on individual property owner decisions than on the county to protect or support agriculture.
 - A lot of farmers do not enroll in the VAD program because it attaches restrictions on development.
 - Opposition to restricting the ability to develop land.
 - Concern over the word "preserve" in the goal, because the zoning (R30, R40, whatever), is not enough of a difference to influence the landowner who might sell and develop.
 - Support for the goal as it is written.
 - Recommended edit: Perhaps replace "preserve" with "promote the preservation of", and add in "including but not limited to VADs".
 - Draft Goal #4

Summary

- By removing R20 as an option (since public sewer is required for R20 and the county doesn't really have sewer service), this map continues to encourage more dense growth to municipalities.
- Draft Goal #5
 - The selected map does not necessarily provide very much specific spatial guidance to the utility department in the expansion of the water system.
 - Growth will happen where demand exists, and there's a need to get infrastructure there before it develops in a way that inhibits future public water infrastructure expansion.
 - Growth follows infrastructure. If infrastructure isn't installed, then growth likely won't follow.
 - Recommended edit: delete this goal and instead address it in the utility plan.

