



Meeting Agenda

Development Service Advisory Commission

Tuesday, March 3, 2026

8:00 AM

Eastern Flank Event Facility

CALL TO ORDER

CITIZEN COMMENTS (Open for citizens to be heard on any issue or concern, including those related to items on the agenda. Please submit a Speaker Card at the beginning of the meeting if you would like to address the Board/Commission. If you would like to speak on an agenda item, the Chair will hold your comment until the public comment period associated with the item. As provided by law, Boards/Commissions shall make no decisions or consideration of action of citizen comments for items not on the agenda, except to refer the matter to the City Administrator/Staff for administrative consideration, or to a schedule the matter for consideration at a later date. Those addressing the Board/Commission are requested to come to the microphone and identify themselves by name and address for the official record. The Chair may restrict the period for public comment, including the length of the public comment period, the number of individuals who can speak and the length of time each individual may speak. When time allows, the standard individual public comment time is two minutes.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes from the January 6, 2026, meeting.
2. Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes From The February 3, 2026, Meeting.

Sponsors: Katherine Harelson, Walter Denton

NEW BUSINESS

3. Presentation on the General Purpose and Process of Performance Agreements/Sureties.

Sponsors: Amy Diaz-Barriga, Walter Denton

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

Anyone needing accommodations due to disabilities please contact the ADA Coordinator at 615-791-3277 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.



**HISTORIC
FRANKLIN
TENNESSEE**

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMISSION**

A meeting of the Development Services Advisory Commission was held at Eastern Flank Battlefield Park Event Facility, on Tuesday, January 6th, 2026, 8:00 am – 9:00 am.

Committee Members

Ben Crenshaw, Chair	P
Mary McGowan, Vice Chair	P
Kate McDonald	P
Claudia ZuaZua	P
Mike Hathaway	A
Scotty Bernick	P
Daniel Jones	A
Paige Parham	A
Dana Kose	P
Michael Walters Young	A
Matt Brown	P

Employees Present

Walter Denton, Assistant City Administrator
Tom Marsh, Dir. of Building & Neighborhood Services
Amy Diaz-Barriga, Asst. Dir. of Planning & Sustainability
Bill Squires, Asst. City Attorney
Jimmy Wiseman, Asst. Dir. of Engineering
Alex Brown, Asst. Dir. of Building & Neighborhood Services
Alex Bearden, Development Services Manager
Katherine Harelson, Budget & Performance Analyst
Presley Parker, Development Services IT Specialist
Skye Gerhart, Management Fellow

The purpose of the regular meeting will be to discuss matters regarding Development Services and will include the following items:

Ben Crenshaw began the meeting at 8:00 am.

1. Approval of Minutes/Review of Meeting Notes from January 6, 2026, meeting.

- Meeting minutes were approved by acclamation.

2. Announcements and Other Business.

- The meeting opened with Bill Squires providing the Commission a refresher on the State of Tennessee's Open Meetings laws. He emphasized communication regarding city business needs to be between Commissioners and staff.

3. Discussion of Plan Review Fees for Completed Resubmittals.

- Alex Brown made a presentation showing the current building plan review fees in the municipal code. The one that they want to focus on is the plan review fee that will be applied after a third review.
 - The City's municipal code requires a 50% fee of the original plan review fee for projects in the third review cycle. However, this has not been enforced by staff.
 - The goal is to start enforcing the fee that is in place in the municipal code.

- Alderman Matt Brown asked how long the City has gone without enforcing the fee.
 - Alex Brown responded that staff has never enforced the fee, and it's been around for about a decade.
 - The reason it wasn't enforced was that there was some subjectivity that brought enforcing the fee into question. An example is whether a submitted plan was considered incomplete or it's complete but has a lot of deficiencies.
 - Matt Brown asked how much the fee would be.
 - Alex responded that it is based on the size of the project. Fees usually range from \$50 - \$400 at 100%, so the 50% at third review would range from \$25 - \$200.
- Ben Crenshaw asked how many projects usually go through more than two reviews.
 - Alex responded that the vast majority of projects go through more than two reviews.
 - Ben said he would like the Commission to discuss how they can help decrease the number of incomplete plans being submitted.
- Scotty Bernick asked if this is mainly an issue with building plan review or is it also including the planning side of plan review (i.e. site plans, final plats).
 - Alex responded that this is just with building plans.
- Ben asked the Commission what their feedback is on the enforcement of the building plan review fee.
 - Matt responded that he would rather increase the upfront fee. Since the fee is already in the municipal code, we should start implementing what's already there.
 - Mary McGowan asked if this needs to go to Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Matt responded that it doesn't since it is already in the municipal code.
- Ben commented that staff should just make sure that fair notice is given so the development community is aware of the upcoming change.

4. Presentation and Discussion of the One Stop Process.

- Alex Bearden opened this discussion by giving an overview of the City's One Stop Program. This conversation will be focused on the building permit One Stop rather than the Development One Stop.
 - The One Stop Program is a "same day in same day out" expedited review process to get a larger number of projects out the door. These are mostly focused on smaller building projects.
 - This happens every Monday and Wednesday.
 - One Stop began in 2015 and the original intent was to gather all required personnel in one place, twice a week to get plans through the process quicker. Originally, it was required that everyone attend in person.
 - Staff has taken on an additional 50% of projects in the last decade without any additional staff to handle the workload.
 - Staff has since limited the number of projects can be accepted for a one stop review. Attendance in person has been removed since the COVID-19 pandemic.
 - As it's grown in popularity, the review times, complexities of projects being reviewed, and the number of projects requesting a one stop review have grown. The question that staff would like to pose to the Commission is whether or not we want to continue down this path or if staff should return One Stop to its original intent.
- Mary asked if it has gotten better for staff since limiting the number of projects being submitted. Alex responded that it has helped. He has noticed that the number of submittals has grown since removing the in-person requirement.
- Scotty asked if staff always reaches the submittal limit. Alex responded that they do most of the time. In the slower season, there will be times that they don't hit that limit. Projects that don't make the cut are added to the next cycle.
- Ben asked if it is more of a question of adding more staff since the program has become so popular.



- Matt said that One Stop is one of the best programs at the City. He doesn't think that adding back the in-person requirement is a bad idea. It forces the designer to put some "skin in the game" to get their plan expedited.
- Ben added that there aren't really any similar programs to One Stop in other communities.
- Dana Kose suggested that out of the limited projects that get accepted for One Stop, a majority of the projects selected would have to come in person and the rest can do it virtually.

5. Continued Discussion of 2026 Potential Topics.

- Ben opened the conversation wanting to finish the discussion of potential topics that began in November. He wants to finish the meeting with a good agenda for the year.
 - Scotty said he had spoken with some peers and clients and had some topics he would like to bring forward. They are listed below.
 - First is the process of performance and maintenance sureties. In particular, it was the process of getting sureties reduced or released.
 - The dollars being required up front to get a Land Disturbance Permit (LDP). Parkland impact fees were brought up in particular because they are due at the plat stage rather than building permit.
 - Timing of IDT fees was brought forward.
 - Responses to complex questions and situations during the plan review process might need more than just a comment in IDT. There may be some opportunity to streamline a more thorough response to those types of questions or comments to reduce the back and forth between staff and the applicant.
 - Creating a combined impact fee spreadsheet for the development community.
 - Staff could consider additional guidelines for infill and redevelopment. Staff could even look into adding incentives for infill development. It will likely need to be a policy discussion at a Board level.
 - Scotty says he sees talking about these topics as finding ways for them to help staff rather than adding a burden on them.
 - Matt said that he would love to focus on infill development. He sees it as one of the City's greatest opportunities right now with greenfield development getting more complicated.
- Staff will follow up on this list and bring some of these topics forward at the next few meetings.

Next meeting – Tuesday, February 3rd, 2026

6. Adjourn.



**HISTORIC
FRANKLIN
TENNESSEE**

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMISSION**

A meeting of the Development Services Advisory Commission was held at Eastern Flank Battlefield Park Event Facility, on Tuesday, February 3rd, 2026, 8:00 am – 9:00 am.

Committee Members

Ben Crenshaw, Chair	A
Mary McGowan, Vice Chair	P
Kate McDonald	A
Claudia ZuaZua	A
Mike Hathaway	P
Scotty Bernick	A
Daniel Jones	P
Paige Parham	A
Dana Kose	P
Michael Walters Young	P
Matt Brown	A

Employees Present

Walter Denton, Assistant City Administrator
Tom Marsh, Dir. of Building & Neighborhood Services
Amy Diaz-Barriga, Asst. Dir. of Planning & Sustainability
Bill Squires, Deputy City Attorney
Jimmy Wiseman, Asst. Dir. of Engineering
Alex Brown, Asst. Dir. of Building & Neighborhood Services
Lisa Clayton, Parks & Recreation Director
Kevin Lindsey, Facilities Superintendent
Heather Eusebio, Research & Planning Specialist
Alex Bearden, Development Services Manager
Katherine Harelson, Budget & Performance Analyst
Presley Parker, Development Services IT Specialist
Skye Gerhart, Management Fellow

The purpose of the regular meeting will be to discuss matters regarding Development Services and will include the following items:

Mary McGowan, Vice Chair, began the meeting at 8:00 am.

1. Approval of Minutes/Review of Meeting Notes from January 6, 2026, meeting.

- Meeting minutes were approved by acclamation.

2. Presentation and Discussion of the Parkland Impact Fee Process.

- Kevin Lindsey and Heather Eusebio gave a presentation to the Commission that provided a comprehensive overview of the parkland impact fee process.
 - The presentation went into the history of the parkland impact fees. The ultimate goal of the fees was to ensure that new developments help acquire parkland and preserve green spaces for community use. Funds collected are allocated to the creation and development of new parkland

- within the applicable service quadrant. Fees are only charged on new residential dwelling units and accessory dwelling units.
- The city is broken into quadrants that way fees collected in one area of the city are spent in that same quadrant.
 - Fee collection can be processed in two ways: Fees Only or Fees and Construction. Both options require a contract. Fees are collected at the final plat stage rather than the building permit stage like all other impact fees.
 - Payment of Fees Only: Focuses only on the payment of impact fees, and there is no construction requirement.
 - Impact Fee and Construction Agreement: This option includes a fee payment and construction requirements. The difference is that the developer has the ability to receive a 50-75% reimbursement of the fees paid.
 - Kevin notes that receiving the funding up front allows the Budget Office to plan for future parks and fund those capital projects in advance.
 - Michael Walters Young adds that the Capital Investment Plan is an ongoing process and the team will be providing updates to the Board later in the month. Parkland is an important revenue source for those park capital projects.
 - Mike Hathaway asked if the quadrant lines are the same as the ward lines.
 - Kevin responded that they are different because Cool Springs was skewing the numbers due to higher property values. He added that the fees have recently been increased and will go up every year by 5% until the City revisits the schedule again in a few years.
 - Mike asked what constitutes a public park for the impact fees.
 - Kevin responded that private is classified as something that is only used for the community being built. Swimming pools are a great example. It can be deemed public if the developer wants to make the amenity open to the public, and it is accessible to the general public. The City will put an easement over it to ensure that it is open to the public.
 - Mary asked what the process is when the development is straight zoned. Kevin said that Parks will work with them at the site plan stage to get that Parkland Agreement started before the plat stage.
 - Amy Diaz-Barriga added that the process can also get started at the preliminary plat stage.
 - Dana Kose asked if there's a way for the public to see which parks were partially funded by a specific development's impact fees.
 - Alex Brown mentioned that the City is currently developing a new map that will show the public where capital projects are being constructed. The impact fee information, however, will not be included.
 - Walter Denton mentioned the budget is a good way to see the funds where the impact fees are collected.
 - Michael responded that the budget process is where the public can see the money that is left in each quadrant. That being said, there is no way we can tie dollars from a particular development to a particular park.
 - Mary asked why the parkland impact fees have to be paid at the final plat stage. That is a pain point she hears from the development community because the other impact fees are due later to a building permit. Sometimes, developers struggle to get the money in place for the impact fee payment that early in the process.
 - Kevin said that staff discussed that process change. The problem is that the Parks team no longer sees the plan after the plat stage. He also mentioned that developments can often get sold off after the plat stage, and it can be tricky to keep track of the owner of the property. Reimbursements, for example, can only be paid to the owner on the contract.



- Mike asked what the process is like for a large-scale multi-year development coming in. The example provided was Westhaven.
 - Kevin responded that the fees would be phased because it is paid based on the dwelling units on each plat. Additionally, if the development plan is mixed-use, the developer can delay paying the parkland impact fee by building the commercial parts on the front end and the residential later on.
- Michael closed the discussion hoping that the conversation has shown that there has been a very intentional response from staff over the last several years to listen to and understand the concerns of the development community when looking at our impact fees. He hopes that the timing set up by the City reflects that intentionality.

Next meeting – Tuesday, February 3rd, 2026

3. Adjourn.



File #: 26-0257

DATE: 3/3/2026

TO: Development Service Advisory Commission

FROM: Amy Diaz-Barriga, Asst Director of Planning Development
Walter Denton, Asst. City Administrator Community Development

SUBJECT:

Presentation on the General Purpose and Process of Performance Agreements/Sureties.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide information to the Development Services Advisory Commission concerning the City's surety process, including how the process works, how sureties are released or extended, and what staff has done in the last couple of years to further increase process efficiency.

BACKGROUND/STAFF COMMENTS:

The purpose of sureties as it relates to the City of Franklin is to provide secured funds and a contract, ensuring required improvements are completed. The contract is called a Performance Agreement. The City accepts sureties in three forms: Letters of Credit, Cashiers Check, or Bonds. The presentation attached will go into further detail on the process of obtaining sureties, requirements for release and improvements that have been made to the process over the last several years.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no financial impact.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission acknowledge this presentation.

SURETIE

PURPOSE

To provide **secured funds** and a **contract**, ensuring required improvements are completed

CONTRACT: Performance Agreement

SECURED FUNDS:

Letter of Credit, Cashiers Check, or Bond

TOOLS

- Surety Calculator – download
- Action Request Forms – online
- As-Built Submittals: GeoCivix

DETAILS

TIME FRAME: 1 year, renewed

AMOUNT: annually
125% of estimated costs

REDUCTIONS: Once, when 75% of work is complete, for 50% release of funds

RELEASE REQUIREMENTS:

Design Professional verify work is completed to approved plans, inspection by City Staff, certified video inspection, as-builts drawings reviewed and approved by City Staff

MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS:

10% (25% Landscaping) or \$10,000 withheld for 1 year maintenance period; release of maintenance funds after City Staff inspects and finds no deficiencies

RELEASES/EXTENSIONS

YEARS 1-7: Administrative

YEARS 8+: FMPC

Extension Period: 1 month to 1 year

PROCEDURE

2024: City begins tying Certificates of Occupancy and Completion to Surety Releases. Final Certificate Of Occupancy of Site/Development will not be issued until sureties are released to maintenance

GOAL: RELEASE SURETIES

RECENT IMPROVEMENTS FASTER

EMAIL CONTACT:	Switching from mailed letters to email, allows for multiple recipients
GeoCivix	Requesting Performance Agreement information sooner in the process, part of conditions of approval
COMMENTS:	Made Landscape inspections available any month, allowed for shorter extension periods
CALENDER	
EXPANSION:	
SURETY OPTIONS:	Starting in 2026, will accept Performance Bonds as surety option
REMINDER LETTERS:	Send reminder letters one month prior to Action Request Deadline
WARNING NOTICE:	One correspondence, identify to developer if they are showing delinquencies and at risk to call

PROCESS REQUESTS

EXPIRATION DATE	Making sureties extension/release dates easier accessible to developers/owners
TRANSPARENCY:	
RELEASE REQUESTS ONLINE:	Allow Action Requests to be submitted electronically, with documented comments
CONNECT DESIGN PROF:	Include Design Professionals on extension date correspondence