

Contents

Summary and Recommendations: Codifying the Constitutional Standard for Dedications along Existing Public Rights-of-Way Could Help Balance Property Rights and Local Land Use Authority	1
It is constitutional for local governments to require dedications that meet the requirements of the Nollan/Dolan test.	1
Although the bill would have benefited property owners, it would have shifted more of the costs of development to taxpayers.	2
Some states have laws to protect property owners’ rights while maintaining local authority to require dedications.	4
Analysis: Dedications along Existing Public Rights-of-Way, Balancing Property Rights with Local Authority over Land Use Regulation	5
Dedications help local governments meet the infrastructure demands of new land development.	6
Subdivisions of property in Tennessee are approved using a multistep process that can include required dedications of rights-of-way.	7
Although local governments say requiring dedications can be beneficial for communities, others argue requiring dedications can have negative effects.	11
Local governments can require dedications subject to certain limitations.	12
Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366 would have prohibited a local government from requiring dedications along existing rights-of-way.	18
Other states have adopted a variety of approaches that may help to protect property owners’ rights.	21
References	25
Persons Contacted	29
Appendix A: Senate Bill 2849 by Bailey, House Bill 2274 by Williams	31
Appendix B: Map of Property Proposed to Be Subdivided in Putnam County	35
Appendix C: Senate Bill 1604 by Bailey, House Bill 366 by Williams	37
Appendix D: Letter from Speaker of the Tennessee House Cameron Sexton and Speaker of the Senate Randy McNally	41
Appendix E: Adequate Facility Taxes and Impact Fees of Tennessee’s Counties and Cities	43
Appendix F: Counties and Cities in Tennessee with Subdivision Regulations	47
Appendix G: Local Planning and Development Staff Survey Results	53



DRAFT

Summary and Recommendations: Codifying the Constitutional Standard for Dedications along Existing Public Rights-of-Way Could Help Balance Property Rights and Local Land Use Authority

When subdividing his property to build a new house in 2016, a property owner in Putnam County was surprised to learn that as a condition for approving the subdivision of the property, the county would require him to dedicate a portion of his land along the existing roadway. Dedication occurs when property owners give land or the right to use that land to the local government for public use—for example, road widening, space for utilities, or sidewalks. Local governments commonly condition subdivision approval on these dedications and typically do not pay for them.

Because of situations like the one in Putnam County, the Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors (TAPS) has said that requiring owners to dedicate land along existing public rights-of-way without compensation is unconstitutional, especially in cases where the property may be subdivided into only a few lots—though stakeholders don't necessarily agree on what "a few lots" would be. TAPS also questions why local governments don't pay for dedications like the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT), which pays for rights-of-way that it acquires through purchase or eminent domain. And they argue the land is not used by local governments for many years after being dedicated.

In response to these concerns, Senate Bill 1604 by Senator Bailey and House Bill 366 by Representative Williams was introduced in the 112th General Assembly and would have prohibited local governments from requiring a property owner to dedicate land along an existing public right-of-way as a condition of approving any application made to develop the property. Local officials opposed to the bill said whether to require dedications as a condition of subdivision approval should be a local decision so local governments can ensure their land use regulations meet their local needs, and the bill might have significantly increased local expenditures because the land that would otherwise be dedicated would have to be purchased. Local officials also say there are a number of reasons why a dedication may be required beyond widening a highway or other road. The Lieutenant Governor and House Speaker requested that the Commission study the bill.

It is constitutional for local governments to require dedications that meet the requirements of the Nollan/Dolan test.

The US Supreme Court has ruled that dedications that are required as a condition of local government permit approval are constitutional if they

pass the *Nollan/Dolan* test, a two-prong test developed in two cases, *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission* and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*. In *Nollan*, the Supreme Court held that there must be an “essential nexus” connecting whatever condition a local government imposed on property owners and a valid government purpose. In *Dolan*, the Supreme Court held that there must not only be a nexus between the effects of a development and the required dedication, but that there should also be a “rough proportionality” between the two. For example, in *Dolan* a property owner applied for a permit from the city to expand her store. As a condition for approving the permit, the city required that she dedicate a strip of land beside the store to be used for a pedestrian and bicycle path to help offset increased vehicle traffic to the store. The US Supreme Court ruled that there was an essential nexus because there theoretically could be an increase in traffic resulting from the store’s expansion, but the amount of land being required in this case was in excess of the likely impact. The Court held the dedication was unconstitutional.

Dedications that meet the *Nollan/Dolan* test do not violate the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution, the clause that prohibits the government from taking private property for public use without just compensation. The Tennessee Constitution has a similar takings clause in Article 1, Section 21, which the Tennessee Supreme Court ruled in the 2014 case of *Phillips v. Montgomery County* “should be interpreted no different than the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment.”

Property owners can contest a dedication requirement in court if they think the dedication violates the federal or state constitution. One researcher conducted an informal review of appellate court decisions involving the *Nollan/Dolan* test and found that property owners prevailed in about half the cases. However, litigation is expensive and may take considerable time to resolve.

Dedication requirements can also be challenged during the land development approval process at the local level before a permit is approved. In the 2016 Putnam County example mentioned earlier, after the owner objected to the dedication requirement, the county changed its subdivision regulations so that no land dedications were required along state roads. Property owners can also request a variance from the zoning or subdivision regulations if they are unhappy with a dedication requirement. However, property owners who don’t work in land development may not be familiar with the process.

Although the bill would have benefited property owners, it would have shifted more of the costs of development to taxpayers.

Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366 attempted to address the issues created when local governments condition subdivision approval on dedications

that don't meet the requirements of the *Nollan/Dolan* test by prohibiting all dedication requirements along existing public rights-of-way. It would have required local governments to pay for land that they might have otherwise acquired through dedications without compensating property owners. Currently, only one state, Massachusetts, has a statute that prohibits local governments from conditioning approval of new subdivisions on dedications of land without compensating property owners. A few other states have restricted dedications in certain circumstances—such as subdivisions of farmland, subdivisions containing fewer than a specified number of parcels, and based on the gross area of the proposed subdivision—regardless of whether the dedications would pass the *Nollan/Dolan* test. But Tennessee has a long-standing tradition of local control regarding land use regulation, which allows local governments to manage land development in ways that meet their communities' needs.

Local officials say that requiring dedications of land along existing public rights-of-way can be beneficial for communities because these dedications help local governments meet the demands of new land development. The additional land might be used for widening the road but also for any number of other purposes, such as building or maintaining utility lines and drainage ditches that may be needed to meet infrastructure needs created by the new development. By dedicating a segment of property, the property owner bears some of the cost of any new infrastructure construction or improvements created by the change in how the property is used, and the total cost does not have to be borne by the community as a whole. As described by a representative of the Tennessee Municipal League at the September 2021 Commission meeting, dedications “reduce the cost to be borne by taxpayers associated with the construction of improvements that are necessary to mitigate the effects of the development.”

Citing TDOT's practice of paying for rights-of-way that it acquires along state roads, proponents of the bill questioned why local governments do not pay for dedications they require for subdivision approval. Proponents also noted TDOT does not accept land dedicated to local governments along state roads for its road-widening projects and questioned why local governments would require dedications along these roads. But unlike TDOT, local governments are engaging in land use regulation when they require property owners to dedicate property as a condition of subdivision approval. And local governments utilize dedicated properties for purposes mentioned above other than road widening. The property owner is changing how the property will be used without which there might not be a need for new infrastructure to accommodate the change. In contrast, TDOT is initiating its infrastructure projects.

Because courts have found dedications that meet the *Nollan/Dolan* test are a constitutional means for governments to regulate land use, because new developments can and often do add to a community's infrastructure needs and costs, because dedications can help offset those costs so that they don't fall solely on community taxpayers, and because of Tennessee's

long-standing tradition of local control regarding land use regulation, **the Commission does not recommend the approach that was taken in the proposed legislation.**

Citing a hypothetical subdivision of a family farm among heirs, proponents of the bill said they considered setting a threshold so that dedications could be required only for subdivisions that result in a large number of new parcels. However, because there is no agreed upon criteria to determine such a threshold, representatives for local officials said that a threshold would likely be arbitrary.

Some states have laws to protect property owners' rights while maintaining local authority to require dedications.

Five states—Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Minnesota, and Utah—have incorporated the language of the *Nollan/Dolan* test into state statute, which provides guidance to local governments to help ensure that the dedications they require meet the *Nollan/Dolan* test. Although Texas law does not include the “essential nexus” language from the test, it does specify that the dedication should be roughly proportionate to the costs of the development. Additionally, some states go further by requiring local governments to provide written analysis justifying required dedications.

Based on the actions taken by these other states to protect property owners' rights while maintaining local authority to require dedications and to provide guidance to local governments, staff presented to the Commission at its January 20, 2022, meeting a draft recommendation that **the General Assembly should codify in state law the *Nollan/Dolan* test, the constitutionally-based standard that has been established and applied by the US Supreme Court for dedications.** Acting on this draft recommendation, Senator Bailey and Representative Williams introduced and the General Assembly passed Senate Bill 2849 and House Bill 2274 to incorporate language from the *Nollan/Dolan* test into Tennessee's statutes. (see appendix A).

It prohibits regional and municipal planning commissions, in exercising their platting power, from requiring an owner of private property to dedicate real property to the public, or pay money to a public entity in an amount that is determined on an individual and discretionary basis, unless there is an essential nexus between the dedication or payment and a legitimate local government interest and the dedication or payment is roughly proportional both in nature and extent to the impact of the proposed use or development of the property.

Analysis: Dedications along Existing Public Rights-of-Way, Balancing Property Rights with Local Authority over Land Use Regulation

When a Putnam County property owner was subdividing his property along State Route 136 to build a house, he was surprised to learn that as a condition for approving the subdivision of the property, the county would require him to dedicate land along the existing roadway without compensating him for it (see appendix B for a map of the property).¹ A dedication occurs when property owners give land or the right to use that land² to the local government for public use.³ Local governments commonly condition subdivision approval on these dedications and typically do not pay for them.

Situations like the one in Putnam County have led some stakeholders to argue that local governments should be prohibited from requiring property owners to dedicate land along existing public rights-of-way without compensation as a condition of subdivision approval. The Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors (TAPS) says that the requirements are unconstitutional and also questions why local governments don't pay for dedications like the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT), which acquires rights-of-way through purchase or eminent domain.⁴ And TAPS argues the land is not used by local governments for many years after being dedicated. In response to these concerns, Senate Bill 1604 by Senator Bailey and House Bill 366 by Representative Williams was introduced in the 112th General Assembly and would have prohibited local governments from requiring a property owner to dedicate land along an existing public right-of-way as a condition of approving any application made to develop the property (see appendix C).

Local officials opposed to the bill said whether to require dedications as a condition of subdivision approval should be a local decision so local governments can ensure their land use regulations meet their local needs,⁵ and the bill might have significantly increased local expenditures because the land that would otherwise be dedicated would have to be purchased. Local officials also say there are a number of reasons why a dedication may be required beyond widening a highway or other road. For example,

¹ Telephone interview with Kevin Rush, planning director, Putnam County, October 29, 2021.

² This is known as an easement. An easement is the right of use over the property of another. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 6th Ed. (1990), s.v. "easement."

³ 9 *Tennessee Jurisprudence* § 2, s.v. "dedication," and *Black's Law Dictionary*, 6th Ed. (1990), s.v. "dedication."

⁴ Tennessee Association of Property Surveyors Position Paper on Right-of-Way Dedications and Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366; Benjamin Moorman, Right-of-Way Dedications/Reservations (Powerpoint Presentation, Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Nashville, Tennessee, September 15, 2021) and Online Interview with Jeff Hoge, director, Right of Way Division, Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT), October 27, 2021.

⁵ Email from David Connor, executive director, Tennessee County Services Association, November 23, 2021.

dedications enable highway departments to work on things such as ditches and driveway tiles which they cannot do if the property has not been dedicated by the owner and accepted by the local government.⁶ Once the land is dedicated, local governments will typically begin maintaining the shoulders, ditches, and related facilities at taxpayer expense so the property owner does not have to pay for it alone.⁷ The Lieutenant Governor and House Speaker requested that the Commission study the bill (see appendix D).

Dedications can appear to create a tension between individual property rights and public interests. To better evaluate how courts and states have addressed dedications that go too far, it's helpful to understand why local governments require dedications and how new subdivisions are approved in Tennessee.

Dedications help local governments meet the infrastructure demands of new land development.

While new construction can benefit a community by providing additional living space for residents, creating new jobs, or adding amenities, it can also generate costs for the community. For instance, a large housing development or shopping center on a two-lane road could increase traffic, requiring the installation of turn lanes or traffic lights for the sake of safety. Parking lots and other impermeable surfaces could increase rainwater runoff, requiring the construction of new drainage system to avoid flooding of neighboring properties. However, not all construction requires new infrastructure—residential developments for retirees who have few if any school-aged children won't increase the need for new schools, for example—but new developments can and often do add to a community's infrastructure needs, and local governments must find some way to meet these needs.

To offset the costs of needs resulting from development, some local governments are authorized to levy adequate facilities taxes (also known as development taxes) or impact fees. Adequate facilities (development) taxes are privilege taxes on development, and revenue collected from these taxes (unless earmarked) is deposited into the general fund.⁸ Impact fees, by contrast, are user fees on new developments that are based on a standard formula and a pre-determined fee schedule.⁹ The funds raised

⁶ Sandra Knight, highway superintendent, Bradley County, representative, Tennessee County Highway Officials Association, testimony before Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, September 15, 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdWxtznY_Fo.

⁷ Text from Calvin Clifton, business development manager, Mattern & Craig, September 15, 2021.

⁸ Green and Eldridge 2004.

⁹ Ibid.

from impact fees are put into a separate fund and not deposited into the general fund.¹⁰

These days, however, there are limits on which local governments can impose adequate facilities (development) taxes and impact fees. From the late 1980s to the early 2000s, local governments in Tennessee were authorized to impose adequate facilities (development) taxes or impact fees through private acts. In 2006, the General Assembly passed the County Powers Relief Act that prohibited enactment of any new private acts that authorize impact fees or adequate facilities (development) taxes.¹¹ The act grandfathered-in existing private acts. Counties that meet certain growth requirements were authorized to enact adequate facilities (development) taxes earmarked for education.¹² Four counties have enacted such a tax (see appendix E).

The result is that 396 cities and 56 counties in Tennessee lack the authority to levy impact fees and adequate facilities (development) taxes to help pay for costs associated with new construction. For many such governments, dedications are now one of the few means they have to help offset the costs of infrastructure needs resulting from new development.

Dedications are a type of exaction,¹³ which simply means they are a condition that local governments can require of property owners in return for approval of land use permits.¹⁴ They can take many different forms, but one common type of dedication—which Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366 would have prohibited local governments from requiring—is the dedication of a strip of land that runs alongside an existing public right-of-way. Dedications can be required at any stage of the land development process.¹⁵ As in the Putnam County example discussed above, some local governments require dedications of right-of-way along existing roads as a condition for approving new subdivisions.

Subdivisions of property in Tennessee are approved using a multistep process that can include required dedications of rights-of-way.

Most counties and cities in Tennessee have subdivision regulations, a set of local government regulations that can help “prevent traffic congestion, inadequate streets, undersized water lines [and] small and overcrowded lots.”¹⁶ In these communities, when a property owner applies to their local planning commission to subdivide a property, they must go through a subdivision approval process. What is involved in that process,

¹⁰ Green and Eldridge 2004.

¹¹ Public Chapter 953, Acts of 2006.

¹² Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 67-4-2901 et seq. (County Powers Relief Act).

¹³ Cordes 1995. Other types of exactions include fees in lieu of dedications and impact fees.

¹⁴ Fenster 2007 and Matlock 2015.

¹⁵ Cordes 1995.

¹⁶ Tennessee Department of Economic and Community Development 2003.

however, largely depends on local regulations. The regulations may have infrastructure improvement requirements governing how roads and other infrastructure and facilities are constructed, and they may include a requirement for dedications as a condition of subdivision approval.

In communities that have adopted subdivision regulations, any subdivision of property will be subject to approval by the planning commission if the owner is dividing any tract or parcel into two or more lots, sites, or other divisions requiring new street or utility construction or dividing into lots less than five acres for sale or building development.¹⁷ This is not limited to private citizens, either; requirements for dedications can also apply to other local governments. For example, cities may require counties to dedicate property and build sidewalks when county property is within city limits. This can result in additional costs for the county.¹⁸

The local subdivision regulations outline the steps of the subdivision review process (see figure). Many local governments' subdivision regulations define and differentiate between major and minor subdivisions. For example, Knoxville's regulations define a minor subdivision¹⁹ as a subdivision of land of less than six lots that doesn't qualify for administrative plat²⁰ or concept plan²¹ review. Typically, a local government's regulations will outline a shorter and less complex review process for minor subdivisions. An example is the city of Millersville's subdivision regulations which require a preliminary plat for a major subdivision but not a minor one.²²

¹⁷ Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 13-4-301, 13-4-302, 13-3-401 and 13-3-402.

¹⁸ Rogers Anderson, county mayor, Williamson County, comments at Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations meeting, September 15, 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdWxtznY_Fo.


¹⁹ Knoxville, Tennessee Subdivision Regulations, 2021, Section 45-20. https://library.municode.com/tn/knoxville/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=APXBZOCO.

²⁰ A plat is a plan, map, or chart of a piece of land with actual or proposed features (such as lots). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary (2021), s.v. "plat." <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/plat> An administrative plat is a "plat divides the tract into no more than two (2) lots thereby creating only one (1) new lot, where the plat combines existing lots into no more than two lots, where an adjustment is made to the lot line(s) between two (2) existing recorded lots, where a plat is required for recording an easement or new information and no subdivision of land is involved, or, where the plat meets the requirements for an exempt or corrected plat." Knoxville, Tennessee Subdivision Regulations, Section 46-20.

²¹ A concept plan is "required for any subdivision that will divide land into six (6) or more lots or include the construction and dedication of a public street." Knoxville, Tennessee Subdivision Regulations, Section 42-20.

²² Millersville, Tennessee Code of Ordinances, 2021, Section 2-101. https://library.municode.com/tn/Millersville/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CD_ORD_CHIGEPR_S1-1DECICO.

Figure. Subdivision Plat Approval Process



Oftentimes, the subdivision regulations will require property owners to have a preapplication conference with the planning commission or planning staff to receive guidance before proceeding further in the subdividing process. The property owners will submit drawings showing the general layout of the proposed subdivision of property.

For major subdivisions, the plat approval process really begins with the submission of a preliminary plat. After approval of the preliminary plat, the property owner can proceed with the development of the final plat and begin construction of any required infrastructure and lot preparation. The development standards in effect on the date of approval remain in effect for three years, provided the applicant obtains final development plan approval, secures permits, and commences site preparation within the vesting period.²³

²³ Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 13-3-413 and 13-4-310.

As a part of the subdivision approval process, local governments may require subdividing property owners to dedicate right-of-way along existing roads, and in these cases, the community's major thoroughfare plan sometimes helps determine the amount of property to be dedicated. State law requires local governments to adopt a major thoroughfare plan²⁴ before subdivision regulations can be enforced.²⁵ These plans include recommended minimum street widths that vary across cities and counties, by type of road (e.g. local, collector, or arterial), and by whether the road includes a median, parking, bikeways, or sidewalks. There are no requirements in state law that the plans be updated on a regular basis. Local governments vary on how often they update the thoroughfare plans. Sometimes roads don't meet the minimum street width requirements of the local government's major thoroughfare plan.

Of Tennessee's 95 counties, 70 (74%) have subdivision regulations, and of Tennessee's 345 cities, 267 (77%) have subdivision regulations.²⁶ (see appendix F). Many of these city and county subdivision regulations were reviewed by TACIR staff and were found to include provisions similar to Putnam County's regulations,²⁷ which state that

subdivisions that adjoin existing roads and highways shall dedicate additional right-of-way to meet the above minimum street width requirements (e.g. The minimum for local roads is 50 feet).

- (1) The entire right-of-way shall be provided where any part of the subdivision is on both sides of the existing street.
- (2) When the subdivision is located on only one side of an existing street, one-half (1/2) of the required right-of-way, measured from the center line of the existing roadway, shall be provided.²⁸

Approval of the final plat comes next. Once the planning commission is assured the plat complies with the standards in the subdivision regulations and that improvements will be installed, then the plat should receive final approval. Several certificates are required to be signed on a final plat prior to recording the plat with the county register's office. This includes

²⁴ Major thoroughfare plans are also known as "major street plans" or "major road plans."

²⁵ Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 13-3-405 and 13-4-305 (determining adequacy); Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 13-3-402 and 13-4-302; Tennessee Department of Economic and Community Development 2003 (requiring adoption).

²⁶ Status of Planning in Tennessee Counties and Cities 2020.

²⁷ TACIR staff reviewed the subdivision regulations of Anderson, Bedford, Blount, Bradley, Cambell, Cheatham, Claiborne, Coffee, Cumberland, Davidson, Dickson, Franklin, Greene, Hamblem, Hamilton, Henry, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Lincoln, Marion, Marshall, Maury, Monroe, Montgomery, Putnam, Rutherford, Shelby, Sumner, Tipton, Warren, Washington, Williamson, and Wilson counties and the city of Johnson City.

²⁸ Putnam County, Tennessee Subdivision Regulations, Article III Design and Specifications, B. Streets, 2. Design (k). <https://putnamcountyttn.gov/sites/default/files/downloadable/PutnamCountySubdivisionRegulations.pdf>.

a certificate signed by the property owner which says that they dedicate streets, rights-of-way, and any sites for public use.²⁹

There is no available information that shows how many dedications have been required over the years or the amount or value of the property that has been dedicated statewide.³⁰ To get information on dedications that have been required by local governments around the state, TACIR staff conducted a survey of local government employees. Respondents could not provide detailed information on the dedications that have been required by their local governments. None of the ten respondents said they track the number of dedications they require people to make or the amount of land dedicated.

Seven (70%) respondents did say that their local government usually or always requires an owner to dedicate land along a right-of-way as a condition of subdivision plat approval; three (30%) said they rarely did. Eight (80%) respondents said they usually or always require dedication of property along the existing rights-of-way as a condition of subdivision plat approval for developments of five parcels or less; two (20%) said they rarely did so. Eight (80%) respondents said they usually or always require dedications along existing rights-of-way as a condition of plat approval for plats being transferred to a family member; two (20%) said they rarely did so. For the full survey results, see appendix G.

Although local governments say requiring dedications can be beneficial for communities, others argue requiring dedications can have negative effects.

Stakeholders disagree about whether there are benefits of requiring dedications as part of regulating land use. Local officials say that requiring dedications can be beneficial for communities. They save taxpayers' money and "reduce the cost to be borne by taxpayers associated with the construction of improvements that are necessary to mitigate the effects of the development."³¹ Dedications enable highway departments to work on things such as ditches and driveway tiles which they cannot do if the property has not been dedicated by the owner and accepted by the local government.³² Once the land is dedicated, local governments will

²⁹ See Putnam County, Tennessee Subdivision Regulations, Article II Procedure for Plat Approval, C. Final Plat Requirements.

³⁰ The Tennessee Comptroller of the Treasury, Division of Property Assessments, doesn't track information on dedications. Emails from Ryan Duggin, assistant director, Division of Property Assessments, Tennessee Comptroller of the Treasury, October 18, 2021 and October 25, 2021.

³¹ Prepared Remarks of, Mr. Kevin Rigsby, town planner, Town of Smyrna, before the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations Relating to Right-of-Way Dedications, September 15, 2021.

³² Sandra Knight, highway superintendent, Bradley County, representative, Tennessee County Highway Officials Association, testimony before Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, September 15, 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdWxtznY_Fo.

begin maintaining the shoulders, ditches, and related facilities at taxpayer expense so the property owner does not have to pay for it alone.³³

Some, however, argue that requiring dedications can have negative effects for a community. Charles Schneider, chief executive officer of the Home Builders Association of Tennessee testified at the September 2021 TACIR meeting that dedication requirements are one of the factors that reduce the number of buildable lots of subdivision developments.³⁴ Some argue that additional expenses of complying with land use controls, including exactions such as dedications, “drive up the cost of development and result in higher costs for the home buyer or commercial users, thus eliminating affordable housing and/or driving away needed commerce.”³⁵ Other stakeholders say that dedications take the dedicated land off property tax rolls, reducing local revenue, and that the dedicated land is rarely used.³⁶

In the absence of data on the number of dedications that have been required over the years or the amount or value of the property that has been dedicated statewide, it is difficult to evaluate any claims about gains or losses to property tax revenue from dedicated property, or how much it might cost local governments if they were required to pay compensation for dedications. Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366’s fiscal note estimated that the costs to local governments would exceed \$250,000 in fiscal year 2021-22 and subsequent years. It was based mainly on information from Knox County.³⁷ The bill’s fiscal note originally estimated an increase in local government expenditures exceeding \$1,000,000 in FY 21-22 and subsequent years. Benefits and costs aside, some stakeholders have also argued that requiring dedications along existing roads as a condition of plat approval without just compensation is unconstitutional.³⁸

Local governments can require dedications subject to certain limitations.

Proponents of Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366 argued that requiring dedications along existing rights-of-way as a condition of plat approval is

³³ Text from Calvin Clifton, business development manager, Mattern & Craig, September 15, 2021.

³⁴ Charles Schneider, chief executive officer, Home Builders Association of Tennessee, testimony before Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, September 15, 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdWxtznY_Fo.

³⁵ Curtin 2003.

³⁶ Benjamin Moorman, legislative chair, Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors, testimony before Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, September 15, 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdWxtznY_Fo.

³⁷ Fiscal Note for Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366, March 22, 2021 and email from Bojan Savic, assistant director, Fiscal Review Committee, Tennessee General Assembly, September 27, 2021.

³⁸ Benjamin Moorman, legislative chair, Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors, testimony before Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, September 15, 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdWxtznY_Fo.

a taking³⁹ without just compensation and therefore unconstitutional. The issue of dedications and whether requiring them is constitutional has been raised in courts of law, both at the federal and state levels. And the answer that has emerged over the years is, in brief, that the constitutionality of dedications depends on the facts of specific cases and whether they meet the requirements of a two-prong test developed from a pair of Supreme Court cases, which are discussed below. Some dedications may be unconstitutional, but other dedications may be a legitimate exercise of a local government's police power—specifically, the power to regulate health, safety, and public welfare. The difference comes down to the exact facts of each case.

Both the US and Tennessee constitutions prohibit the taking of private property without just compensation.

Both federal and state constitutional law prohibit the taking of private property without compensation as a general principle. The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment in the US Constitution states “nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.” In *Chicago, Burlington, & Quincy Railroad Co. v. City of Chicago*, the US Supreme Court determined that this applied to the states through the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.⁴⁰ In addition to the US Constitution, Article I, Section 21 of the Tennessee Constitution requires just compensation for takings, saying “that no man's particular services shall be demanded, or property taken, or applied to public use, without the consent of his representatives, or without just compensation being made therefore.”

These constitutional provisions limit governments' exercise of the power of eminent domain, which is the power to acquire private property for public use.⁴¹ However, there is another government power, the police power, which is the power to regulate health, safety, and public welfare.⁴² The exercise of this power can affect the use or value of private property such as when governments regulate land use.⁴³ Typically, a government's exercise of the police power does not constitute a compensable taking, but if the exercise of that power is unreasonable it may result in a compensable taking.⁴⁴

³⁹ A taking is the seizure of private property or a substantial deprivation of the right to its free use or enjoyment that is caused by government action and especially by the exercise of eminent domain and for which just compensation to the owner must be given according to the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Merriam-Webster's Dictionary (2021), s.v. “taking.”

⁴⁰ *Chicago, Burlington, & Quincy Railroad Co. v. City of Chicago* 166 U.S. 226 (1897).

⁴¹ Grimes 1996.

⁴² Huffer and Murphy 2007.

⁴³ Grimes 1996.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

Although courts have upheld local authority to regulate land use, they have also placed limits on this authority.

Legal precedents reaching back across the past century have affirmed that local governments do have broad authority to regulate land use.⁴⁵ This was addressed in the 1926 landmark case of *Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.*⁴⁶ In that case, the village council of Euclid, Ohio, passed a zoning ordinance to define and regulate such things as types of development, building heights, lot areas, and so on. At the time, zoning ordinances were a relative novelty, and the Ambler Realty Company, a local developer, sued the village council, claiming such ordinances were a violation of due process. The US Supreme Court sided with the city, holding that local governments can regulate land use as an exercise of their police power.

Yet even as it upheld local governments' authority to regulate land use as part of their police power, the Court made it clear that there were still limits to how far a government's police power extended, as it held in the 1922 case of *Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon*.⁴⁷ Many years before the case arose, the Pennsylvania Coal Company had deeded the surface rights for a parcel of land to an individual, Mahon, who built a house there. The coal company, however, retained the mining rights to coal located underneath the land, and in the deed, Mahon expressly accepted the risks that might arise from that mining. Decades later, the Pennsylvania state legislature passed a law known as the Kohler Act, which prohibited any underground coal mining that, among other things, might cause the land above to subside and endanger housing. Mahon then filed a lawsuit to stop the coal company from mining under his land claiming it was a violation of the Kohler Act.

At issue, therefore, was the nature of the Kohler Act as a form of land use regulation and whether the law could effectively limit the coal company's right to extract coal from land that it legally owned, even if the law was passed in the name of defending public safety. In this instance, the US Supreme Court held that the Kohler Act went too far and amounted to a violation of the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment, depriving the company of its property rights without compensation. This was the first time that the Court ruled a regulatory act could constitute a taking, which is known as a regulatory taking.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Kerseten 2000 and Ledman 1993.

⁴⁶ *Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.* 272 US 365 (1926).

⁴⁷ *Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon*, 260 U.S. 393 (1922).

⁴⁸ A regulatory taking is an appropriation or diminution of private property rights by a governmental regulation which exceeds the government's legitimate police power (as the power to enact safety regulations) and for which the owner may seek a writ of mandamus, declaratory relief, or just compensation (as by inverse condemnation). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary (2021), s.v. "regulatory taking."

Courts have held that it is constitutional for governments to require dedications that meet the requirements of the Nollan/Dolan test.

The US Supreme Court has ruled that dedications that are required as a condition of local government permit approval are constitutional if they pass the *Nollan/Dolan* test, a two-prong test developed in two cases, *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission* and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*.

In the 1987 case *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission*, a couple living in California wished to obtain a building permit to tear down a beachfront home and build a larger one in its place. Before granting approval for the permit, the California Coastal Commission required the owners to dedicate a strip of the beachfront on their property as an easement so that members of the public could pass along the shore on their way to public beaches located north and south of the property. The Nollans objected to this condition, and the suit they brought against the California Coastal Commission made its way to the US Supreme Court. There, the California Coastal Commission argued that the new and larger house would be a “psychological impediment to public access,” somehow keeping pedestrians passing along the street from being able to see that there was also public access on the beach. The Court did not find that argument persuasive, and it ultimately deemed the easement a taking.

However, it is crucial to note that the Court did not rule dedications in general to be unconstitutional. Rather, it held that there must be an “essential nexus” between whatever condition a local government imposed on property owners and a legitimate government purpose:

The government’s power to forbid particular land uses in order to advance some legitimate police power purpose includes the power to condition such use upon some concession by the owner, even a concession of property rights, so long as the condition furthers the same governmental purpose advanced as justification for prohibiting the use.⁴⁹

In this instance, the Court determined that the easement being required across the Nollans’ property was not sufficiently connected to a legitimate government purpose, and for that reason it amounted to a taking. Had the California Coastal Commission been able to connect the easement to a valid purpose, the Court noted, it would have been permissible.

The second case came in 1994. In *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, a hardware store owner in Tigard, Oregon, sought a permit to expand her store. As a condition of approval for the permit, the city required that she dedicate a strip of land beside the store for a greenway with a pedestrian and bicycle

⁴⁹ *Nollan*, 483 US 825 (1987).

path easement, the stated purpose of which was to help offset increased traffic. The store owner sued, and the case came before the US Supreme Court.

In *Dolan*, the Court agreed that there was an essential nexus: a new development could theoretically create increased traffic, and local governments do have a legitimate interest in alleviating traffic. However, the Court determined that the amount of land being required in this case was in excess of the likely impact. The Court therefore held that there must not only be a nexus between the legitimate government interest and the required dedication, but that there should also be a “rough proportionality” between the dedication and the effects of the development.

[A] term such as “rough proportionality” best encapsulates what we hold to be the requirement of the Fifth Amendment. No precise mathematical calculation is required, but the city must make some sort of individualized determination that the required dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact of the proposed development.⁵⁰

In short, the US Supreme Court has held that local governments can indeed require land dedications, provided they meet the two criteria of essential nexus and rough proportionality. Together, these two conditions have come to be known as the *Nollan/Dolan* test.

The *Nollan/Dolan* test has been augmented and reinforced by a subsequent court decision. In the 2013 case of *Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management District*, a Florida property owner sought a new permit to develop more of his land than the original permit allowed.⁵¹ As the property included wetlands, Florida state law required the developer to offset the impacts to the local environment, and to that end he offered to deed a conservation easement to the St. Johns River Water Management District. The District felt this was insufficient and presented the developer with a choice of either reducing the size of the planned development while also dedicating a conservation easement, or to make improvements to wetlands located some distance away. Koontz then sued the district, and these conditions were found to be a violation of the *Nollan/Dolan* standards. After several appeals, the US Supreme Court further elaborated on *Nollan/Dolan* by holding that, one, a government entity must still meet the *Nollan/Dolan* requirements even when denying a permit application, and two, impact fees are also subject to *Nollan/Dolan*.

Dedications that meet the *Nollan/Dolan* test do not violate the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution, the clause that prohibits the government from taking private property for public use without just compensation. The Tennessee Constitution has a similar

⁵⁰ *Dolan*, 512 US 374 (1994).

⁵¹ *Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management District*, 570 U.S. 595 (2013).

takings clause. In the case of *Phillips v. Montgomery County* in 2014,⁵² property owners in Montgomery County, Tennessee, sought to subdivide a roughly 15-acre parcel of property, but their application was denied by the local planning commission, allegedly because there were tentative plans for a state highway extension that would have crossed the property. The Phillips argued that this was a regulatory taking; Montgomery County argued that the Tennessee Supreme Court did not recognize takings under the Tennessee Constitution. The Tennessee Supreme Court took up the case and ruled that “Article I, Section 21 of the Tennessee Constitution should be interpreted no different than the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment.”⁵³ This was the first time the Tennessee Supreme Court held that this section of the state constitution encompasses regulatory takings. The Court then remanded the case to a lower court to determine if a regulatory taking had in fact taken place.

The Tennessee Court of Appeals upheld a dedication in the 1993 case *Copeland v. City of Chattanooga ex rel. its Board of Commissioners*.⁵⁴ In this case, a property owner wished to rezone a parcel of land to build a shopping center. The local government said that, for this rezoning to go ahead, the property owner would need to dedicate 12 feet of right-of-way to allow for the construction of an acceleration/deceleration lane to mitigate the expected increase in traffic on the existing roadway. The property owner objected and brought a lawsuit claiming that this requirement for a dedication amounted to a taking without compensation. The Tennessee Court of Appeals ruled on the case, finding that the requirement for a dedication was a legitimate exercise of the government’s police power.

All told, there is a century of case law that pertains to dedications and strikes a balance between private property rights and the power of governments to regulate land use for the sake of public safety and welfare. And while it is possible for dedications to go too far and become regulatory takings that require compensation, courts have determined that they can be a legitimate tool to ensure that property developers are responsible for the infrastructure costs that directly result from individual developments. As Justice Alito wrote in the *Koontz* decision, “Insisting that landowners internalize the negative externalities of their conduct is a hallmark of responsible land-use policy, and we have long sustained such regulations against constitutional attack.” The key to distinguishing between dedications that go too far and those that don’t lies in the *Nollan/Dolan* test of essential nexus and rough proportionality.

Property owners can challenge dedications in and out of court.

Property owners can contest a dedication requirement in court if they think the dedication violates the state or federal constitution. An owner

⁵² *Phillips v. Montgomery County*, 442 S.W.3d 233 (2014).

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Copeland v. City of Chattanooga ex rel. its Board of Comm’rs*, 866 S.W.2d 565 (1993).

could file a claim under Tennessee’s inverse condemnation statute seeking compensation for a regulatory taking,⁵⁵ but there is a one-year statute of limitation on bringing the claim.⁵⁶ A lawsuit can also be filed in federal court.⁵⁷ One researcher conducted an informal review of appellate court decisions involving the *Nollan/Dolan* test and found that property owners prevailed in about half the cases.⁵⁸ He went on to write that “property owners’ impressive litigation results using *Nollan* and *Dolan* have undoubtedly been noticed by lawyers representing local governments and have led to the abandonment of certain kinds of exactions that they would have imposed prior to *Nollan*, *Dolan*, and *Koontz*.”⁵⁹ However, litigation is expensive and may take considerable time to resolve.

Dedication requirements can also be challenged during the land development approval process at the local level before a permit is approved. For example, in the Putnam County case discussed earlier, after the owner objected to the dedication requirement, the county changed its subdivision regulations so that no right-of-way dedications were required along state roads.⁶⁰ Property owners can also request a variance from the zoning or subdivision regulations if they are unhappy with a dedication requirement.⁶¹ However, property owners who don’t work in land development may not be familiar with the process.

Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366 would have prohibited a local government from requiring dedications along existing rights-of-way.

Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366 attempted to address the issues created when local governments condition subdivision approval on dedications that don’t meet the requirements of the *Nollan/Dolan* test by prohibiting all dedication requirements along existing public rights-of-way. It would have effectively required local governments to pay for land that they might have otherwise acquired through dedications without compensating property owners.

The bill would not have prohibited voluntary dedications. A landowner could still volunteer to dedicate a portion of their property if they wished. Although a governmental entity would not be able to require a dedication under this bill, it could have instead required a reservation on a landowner’s

⁵⁵ Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 29-16-123.

⁵⁶ Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 29-16-124.

⁵⁷ *Knick v Township of Scott*, Pennsylvania 862 F. 3d 310 (2018).

⁵⁸ Echeverria 2015.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ Telephone interview with Kevin Rush, planning director, Putnam County, October 29, 2021. Interview with Charles Whittingham, president, Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors, Vivian Paris, lobbyist, Steve Bivens, lobbyist, Benjamin Moorman, legislative director, Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors, November 5, 2021. See Putnam County, Tennessee Subdivision Regulations Article III Design and Specifications, B. Streets, 2. Design (k) (3).

⁶¹ Tennessee Code Annotated, Sections 13-3-402 and 13-7-206.

property. The exact extent of a reservation would be negotiated with the property owner.

If the governmental entity were to later choose to take possession of the property and make use of the land, it would be obliged to pay compensation to the property owner at that time. There would be no compensation for simply placing a reservation on a piece of property, though, and while the reservation was in place, no permanent buildings could be put within it, restricting the owner's use of that part of the property. There is also no limit on how long a reservation may be kept in place. Moreover, a real estate agent would have no duty to inform property buyers or any other party to a real estate transaction that there was a right-of-way reservation on a given piece of land.

Some local governments do use reservations on occasion. Planning staff for the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County said that they often require dedications, but they require reservations only in relatively limited circumstances.⁶² Nashville's subdivision regulations address reservations in section 3-10 subsection 2(C) and 3:

c. Planned Routing. When applicable, the layout of a street(s) within a subdivision shall conform to the routing depicted upon the Major Street Plan or Collector Plan. The amount of right-of-way for the type of street required shall be dedicated up to a maximum of 60 feet in width. Where any street so depicted requires a right-of-way greater than 60 feet then the developer shall show on the face of the plat an additional area "reserved for future right-of-way" and any required yard area shall be measured from the reservation line.

3. Developed Property. When property containing existing structures is being divided simply to place each structure on a separate lot and the future right-of-way will fall within the existing structure footprint, then the applicant shall be required to note on the face of the plat any additional area necessary for compliance with the Major Street Plan "reserved for future right-of-way." The plat shall also contain a note stating, "When any existing structure is demolished, the setback requirements for any new structure shall be measured from the reservation line."⁶³

The stakeholders who brought the bill said that their primary concern was not larger real estate developments, but small property owners who

⁶² Email from Lisa Milligan, land development manager, Metropolitan Nashville Planning Department, October 26, 2021.

⁶³ Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Subdivision Regulations, 2021, <https://www.nashville.gov/departments/planning/land-development/subdivision-regulations>.

might subdivide their land into just a few lots—such as a family farm being divided among several heirs—and who might unwittingly agree to dedicate some portion of their property during the platting process.⁶⁴ They said that they had entertained the option of limiting the bill’s effects only to such smaller subdivisions while leaving dedications in place for larger developments, but opponents of the bill had not accepted this as a compromise.⁶⁵ Stakeholders don’t necessarily agree on what “a few lots” would be. Because there is no agreed upon criteria to determine such a threshold, representatives of local officials said that a threshold would likely be arbitrary. In its current form, the bill would have prohibited governmental entities from requiring dedications on any property, regardless of size or intended use.

Tennessee has a long-standing tradition of local control regarding land use regulation, which allows local communities to manage land development in ways that meet their needs.⁶⁶ In this vein, local officials say that requiring dedications of land along existing roadways can be beneficial for communities because these dedications help local governments meet the demands of new land development. The additional land might be used for widening the road but also for any number of other purposes, such as building or maintaining utility lines and drainage ditches that may be needed to meet infrastructure needs created by the new development.⁶⁷ By dedicating a segment of property, the property owner bears some of the cost of any new infrastructure construction or improvements created by the change in how the property is used, and the total cost does not have to be borne by the community as a whole.

Citing TDOT’s practice of paying for rights-of-way that it acquires through purchase or eminent domain along state roads, proponents of the bill question why local governments do not pay for dedications they require for subdivision approval.⁶⁸ Proponents also noted TDOT does not accept land dedicated to local governments along state roads for its road-widening projects and questioned why local governments would require dedications along these roads. But unlike TDOT, local governments are engaging in land use regulation when they require property owners to dedicate property as a condition of subdivision approval. And local governments utilize dedicated properties for purposes other than road widening. The

⁶⁴ Interview with Charles Whittingham, president, Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors, Vivian Paris, lobbyist, Steve Bivens, lobbyist, Benjamin Moorman, legislative director, Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors, November 5, 2021.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Kevin Rigsby, town planner, Smyrna, testimony before Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, September 15, 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdWxtznY_Fo.

⁶⁷ Text from Calvin Clifton, business development manager, Mattern & Craig, September 15, 2021.

⁶⁸ Tennessee Association of Property Surveyors Position Paper on Right-of-Way Dedications and Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366; Benjamin Moorman, Right-of-Way Dedications/Reservations (Powerpoint Presentation, Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Nashville, Tennessee, September 15, 2021).

property owner is changing how the property will be used without which there might not be a need for new infrastructure to accommodate the change. In contrast, TDOT is initiating its infrastructure projects.

Other states have adopted a variety of approaches that may help to protect property owners' rights.

Several states have enacted laws to help ensure that property owners' rights are protected while also maintaining local governments' authority to require dedications. Tennessee, like many states, has no statute that places limits on dedications. No other state has passed a bill like Senate Bill 1604 and House Bill 366. The state that comes closest is Massachusetts, where local governments must pay compensation for dedications, but even so they can still require dedications as a condition of plat approval.⁶⁹ Other states have more targeted restrictions on dedications.

A few states place restrictions on when dedications can be required.

Three states place restrictions on when dedications can be required or how much land can be dedicated. Property owners in Delaware can't be required to dedicate right-of-way along a state highway if the property being subdivided is farmland and a right-of-way is not deemed by the state department of transportation to be necessary due to safety issues that would be directly caused by the requested subdivision. There is also a requirement that the parcel being subdivided is divided into no more than two parcels which will continue to be used as farmland or the parcels are transferred to a family member to be used as farmland or their principal residence.⁷⁰ A California law prohibits local governments from requiring dedications for parks or recreational purposes in subdivisions containing less than five parcels that are not used for residential purposes.⁷¹ Louisiana law limits dedications to no more than 5% of the gross area of a proposed subdivision in New Orleans.⁷²

A number of states have laws that help ensure that dedication requirements are constitutional.

Other states have instead chosen to incorporate the constitutionally based language of *Nollan/Dolan* into their statutes, providing guidance to local governments to help ensure that the dedications they require meet the constitutionally based standard. Five states—Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Minnesota, and Utah—have incorporated the language of the *Nollan/Dolan* test into state statute, which provides guidance to local governments to

⁶⁹ Massachusetts ALM GL ch. 41, Section 81Q.

⁷⁰ 17 Delaware Code Section 530.

⁷¹ California Government Code Section 66477.

⁷² Louisiana Revised Statutes Section 33:112.

help ensure that the dedications they require meet the *Nollan/Dolan* test.⁷³ Although Texas law does not include the “essential nexus” language from the test, it does specify that the dedication should be roughly proportionate to the costs of the development.⁷⁴

Three states that did not incorporate the *Nollan/Dolan* language into their statutes did add language that the dedications should be reasonably necessary or reasonably related to the infrastructure need. The language only applies to certain types of dedications. In Louisiana, the requirement applies to dedications for parks, playgrounds and public schools in New Orleans.⁷⁵ Nevada authorizes local governments to require dedications of land for parks and playgrounds that are reasonably necessary to serve a subdivision.⁷⁶ North Carolina requires a dedication for a right-of-way to be reasonably related to the traffic to be generated by the subdivision.⁷⁷

Additionally, three states go further by requiring local governments to provide written analysis justifying required dedications. Texas requires local governments to complete a takings impact analysis before they can require a dedication.⁷⁸ The analysis must describe the specific purpose of the dedication and identify whether and how it substantially advances its stated purpose and describe the burdens imposed on private real property and the benefits to society resulting from the proposed use of the property. The analysis should include a determination of whether the required dedication will constitute a taking. It also needs to describe reasonable alternative actions that could accomplish the specified purpose, and determine whether they would constitute a taking.⁷⁹ Local governments also are required to retain a professional engineer to determine whether a required dedication is roughly proportionate to the costs of the proposed development.⁸⁰ In Washington state, local governments are required to make written findings that appropriate provisions are made for the public health, safety, and general welfare and the public use and interest will be served by the platting of such subdivision and dedication before approving it.⁸¹ Idaho authorizes private property owners to request that a local government do a written takings analysis of a regulatory or administrative action.⁸²

⁷³ Arizona Revised Statutes, Sections 9-500.12 and 11-832; Colorado Revised Statute, Sections 29-20-201-29-20-205; Florida Statute, Section 70.45; Minnesota Statutes, Section 462.358; Utah Code Annotated Section 10-9a-508.

⁷⁴ Texas Local Government Code, Sections 212.904 and 232.110.

⁷⁵ Louisiana Revised Statutes, Section 33:112.

⁷⁶ Nevada Revised Statutes Annotated, Section 278.4979.

⁷⁷ North Carolina General Statutes, Section 136-66.10.

⁷⁸ It only applies to municipalities if they take an action “that has effect in the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the municipality, excluding annexation, and that enacts or enforces an ordinance, rule, regulation, or plan that does not impose identical requirements or restrictions in the entire extraterritorial jurisdiction of the municipality.” Texas Government Code, Section 2007.003.

⁷⁹ Texas Government Code, Section 2007.043.

⁸⁰ Texas Local Government Code, Sections 212.904.

⁸¹ Revised Code Washington, Section 58.17.110.

⁸² Idaho Code, Section 67-8003.

Four states require local governments or the state attorney general to develop guidelines for local governments to help them evaluate their actions to ensure they are constitutional. Utah requires local governments to enact an ordinance establishing guidelines to assist them in identifying actions involving the physical taking or exaction of private real property that may have constitutional taking issues, and they must consider the guidelines when taking any action that might result in the physical taking or exaction of private real property.⁸³ Idaho requires the state attorney general to develop a checklist for local governments to use to evaluate whether a proposed regulatory or administrative action is a taking, and Washington requires the state attorney general to establish a process for determining whether such actions are takings.⁸⁴ Texas requires the state attorney general to develop guidelines for local governments to assist them in evaluating whether the adoption and enforcement of ordinances and resolutions and actions that require a physical invasion of property or requires a dedication may result in a taking.⁸⁵

Some states have laws governing how owners can contest dedication requirements.

Arizona law authorizes property owners to appeal dedication requirements through an administrative hearing process. The local government is required to notify the owner that he or she has the right to appeal the government's action and must provide a description of the appeal procedure. The owner has 30 days to file an appeal with a hearing officer appointed by the local government. Local governments have the burden of establishing that there is an essential nexus between the dedication and a legitimate governmental interest and that the proposed dedication is roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property. If the local government fails to meet their burden, the hearing officer can modify the dedication or delete the requirement altogether. A property owner who is aggrieved by the hearing officer's decision may file a case in court.⁸⁶

Three states authorize property owners to file lawsuits if government actions result in a reduction in the value of property. Not all the laws are specifically targeted at dedications. Texas law authorizes owners to file suit in court if a dedication would result in a reduction of at least 25% in the market value of the property.⁸⁷ In these cases, a court could invalidate the dedication requirement.⁸⁸ The law applies to cities only in limited

⁸³ Utah Code Annotated, Section 63L-4-201.

⁸⁴ Idaho Code, Section 67-8003 and Revised Code Washington, Section 36.70A.370.

⁸⁵ Texas Government Code, Sections 2007.003, 2007.041 and 2007.043.

⁸⁶ Arizona Revised Statutes, Sections 11-832 and 9-500.12.

⁸⁷ Texas Government Code, Sections 2007.002, 2007.003, and 2007.021.

⁸⁸ Texas Government Code, Section 2007.023.

circumstances.⁸⁹ In Florida, if laws, regulations, or ordinances inordinately burden private property without amounting to a taking, property owners can file a lawsuit seeking compensation for the loss in value due to the inordinate burden to the property.⁹⁰ The Right to Farm Act in Louisiana authorizes compensation if a government action diminishes the fair market value or economic viability of agricultural or forest land by 20% or more.⁹¹

In Oregon, property owners may file a claim for compensation with the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) if a local government land use regulation restricts a residential use or a farm or forest practice and reduces the fair market value of their property.⁹² If DLCD finds that a claim is valid, the owner can get compensated or can be authorized to use property without the land use regulation being applied to the extent necessary to offset the reduction in the property's fair market value. This law does not apply to land use regulations that restrict or prohibit activities for the protection of public health and safety.⁹³

DRAFT

⁸⁹ It only applies to municipalities if they take "an action that has effect in the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the municipality, excluding annexation, and that enacts or enforces an ordinance, rule, regulation, or plan that does not impose identical requirements or restrictions in the entire extraterritorial jurisdiction of the municipality." Texas Government Code, Section 2007.003.

⁹⁰ Florida Statutes, Section 70.001.

⁹¹ Louisiana Revised Statutes, Section 3:3610.

⁹² Oregon Revised Statutes, Sections 195.300-336. <https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/measure49/pages/index.aspx>.

⁹³ Oregon Revised Statutes, Section 195.305.

References

- Baker, Matthew. 2010. "Much Ado About Nollan/Dolan: The Comparative Nature of the Legislative-Adjudicative Distinction in Exactions." *Urban Lawyer*. 42 (1): 171-204. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27895770>.
- Baron, Jane B. 2014. "Rescuing the Bundle-of-Rights Metaphor in Property Law." *University of Cincinnati Law Review*. 82 (1): 57-101. <https://scholarship.law.uc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1164&context=uclr>.
- Burling, James. 2019. "The Constitutionality of Legislatively Imposed Exactions" *Brigham-Kanner Property Rights Journal*. 8: 211-240. <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=propertyjournal>.
- Callies, David L. 1998. *Exactions, Impact Fees and Other Land Development Conditions*. Presentation at the Proceedings of the 1998 National Planning Conference. <http://www.impactfees.com/publications%20pdf/Exactions,%20Impact%20Fees%20And%20Other%20Land%20Development%20Conditions%20-%201998%20APA%20Proceedings.pdf>.
- _____. 2000. "Street and Road Exactions After Dolan." Paper presented at the American Planning Association Annual Conference, New York, NY, April 17, 2000. <https://landuselaw.wustl.edu/STREXAC.html>.
- _____. 2014. "Through a Glass Clearly: Predicting the Future in Land Use Takings Law." *Washburn Law Journal*. 54 (1): 43-104. <http://hl-128-171-57-22.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/46033/54WashburnLJ43.pdf>.
- Carlson, Ann E. and Daniel Pollack. 2001. "Takings on the Ground: How the Supreme Court's Takings Jurisprudence Affects Local Land Use Decisions." *UC Davis Law Review*. 35(1):103-156. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/davlr35&div=12&g_sent=1&casa_token=&collection=journals.
- Cordes, Mark W. 1995. "Legal Limits on Development Exactions: Responding to Nollan and Dolan." *Northern Illinois University Law Review*. 15(3): 513-554. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/niulr15&div=29&g_sent=1&casa_token=&collection=journals.
- _____. 1997. "Leapfrogging the Constitution: The Rise of State Takings Legislation." *Ecology Law Quarterly*. 24(2): 187-242. <https://lawcat.berkeley.edu/record/1116002>.
- Curtin, Jr., Daniel J. 2003. "Exactions, Dedications and Development Agreements Nationally and in California: When and How Do the Dolan/Nollan Rules Apply." Paper presented at the Annual Institute on Planning, Zoning and Eminent Domain, San Francisco, CA, April 9-11, 2003. https://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/filattachments/resources__exactions.pdf.
- Donahey, Emma R. 2017. "The Nollan/Dolan Land-Use Exactions Doctrine and its Role in Taking Jurisprudence: Koontz v. St. John's River Water Management District." *Duquesne Energy & Environmental Law Journal*. 4: 1-36. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/joule4&id=12&collection=journals&index=>.
- Eagle, Steven J. 2001. "The Birth of the Property Rights Movement." *Policy Analysis*. 404: 1-40. <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/birth-property-rights-movement>.
- Echeverria, John D. 2015. "17th Annual Conference on Litigating Takings Challenges to Land Use and Environmental Regulations: Vermont Law School, UC Davis School of Law, Georgetown University

- Law Center–September 19, 2014: The Costs of Koontz.” *Vermont Law Review*. 39 (3): 573-615. https://lawreview.vermontlaw.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/39-3-03_Echeverria.pdf.
- Faus, Richard Wayne. 2000. “Exactions, Impact Fees, and Dedications – Local Government Responses to Nollan/Dolan Takings Law Issues.” *Stetson Law Review*. 29(3): 675-707. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/stet29&div=32&g_sent=1&casa_token=&collection=journals.
- Fenster, Mark. 2007. “Regulating Land Use in a Constitutional Shadow: The Institutional Contexts of Exactions.” *Hastings Law Journal*. 58: 729-776. <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1052&context=facultypub>.
- _____. 2004. “Takings Formalism and Regulatory Formulas: Exactions and the Consequences of Clarity.” *California Law Review*. 92(3): 617-682. <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1053&context=facultypub>.
- Green, Harry A. et al. 2006. “Planning for Growth and Paying for It: TACIR Recommendations on 2005 Growth-Related Bills.” https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/tacir/documents/planning_for_growth06.pdf.
- Green, Harry A. and Leah Eldridge. 2004. “Staff Research Brief: Financing Growth in Tennessee: Local Development Taxes and Impact Fees.” https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/tacir/documents/Financing_Growth.pdf.
- Grimes, George E. 1996. “Texas Private Real Property Rights Preservation Act: A Political Solution to The Regulatory Takings Problem.” *St. Mary’s Law Journal* 27: 557-612. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/stmlj27&div=23&g_sent=1&casa_token=.
- Huffer, Dennis, and James L. Murphy III. 2007. *Eminent Domain in Tennessee: An Attorney’s Guide*. Nashville, Tennessee: Municipal Technical Advisory Service. https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1084&context=utk_mtaspubs.
- Kendall, Douglas T. and James E. Ryan. 1995. “Paying” For the Change: Using Eminent Domain to Secure Exactions and Sidestep Nollan And Dolan.” *Virginia Law Journal*. 81 (7): 1801-1878. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1073642>.
- Kerseten, Michael T. 2000. “Exactions, Severability, and Takings: When Courts Should Sever Unconstitutional Conditions from Development Permits?” *Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review*. 27(2): 279-306. <https://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1225&context=ealr>.
- Ledman, Thomas W. 1993. “Local Governmental Environmental Mitigation Fees: Development Exactions, The Next Generation.” *Florida Law Review*. 45: 835-868.
- Matlock, Rebecca. 2015. “Constitutional Law–Fifth Amendment and Takings–Courts and The Judicial Process Will Impede Orderly City Development by Limiting Local Governments’ Use of Exactions in Development Planning.” *University of Arkansas at Little Rock Law Review*. 37(3): 519-540. <https://lawrepository.ualr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1963&context=lawreview>.
- Mulvaney, Timothy M. 2012. “Exactions for the Future.” *Baylor Law Review*. 64 (2): 511-568. <https://scholarship.law.tamu.edu/facscholar/434/>.
- Needleman, Jane. C. 2006. “Exactions: Exploring Exactly When Nollan and Dolan Should be Triggered.” *Cordozo Law Journal*. 28 (3): 1563-1590. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/cdozo28&div=50&g_sent=1&casa_token=&collection=journals.

- Nolan, Sean F. 2016. "Bargaining for Development Post-Koontz: How the Supreme Court Invaded Local Government." *Florida Law Review*. 67 (1): 171-220. <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/flr/vol67/iss1/4/>.
- Organ, Jerome M. 1995. "Understanding State and Federal Property Rights Legislation." *Oklahoma Law Review*. 48 (2): 191-214. <https://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1808&context=olr>.
- Pace, Andrea B. 2007. "Utah Leads the Way in Regulating Land Use Exactions through Statute but Still Has Room to Improve." *Brigham Young University Journal of Public Law*. 21 (1): 209-233. <https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1382&context=jpl>.
- Ryan, Erin. 2002. "Zoning, Taking, and Dealing: The Problems and Promise of Bargaining in Land Use Planning Conflicts." *Harvard Negotiation Law Journal*. 7: 337-388. <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1278&context=facpubs>.
- Saxer, Shelly Ross. 2015. "To Bargain or Not to Bargain: A Response to Bargaining for Development Post-Koontz." *Florida Law Review Forum*. 67: 5-8. http://www.floridalawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/Saxer_Response.pdf.
- Smith, Marlin R. 1987. "From Subdivision Improvement Requirements to Community Benefit Assessments and Linkage Payments: A Brief History of Land Development Exactions." *Law and Contemporary Problems*. 5(1): 1-30. <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3882&context=lcp>.
- Tappendorf, Julie A., and Matthew T. DiCanni. 2014. "The Big Chill? – The Likely Impact of Koontz on the Local Governments/Developer Relationship." *Touro Law Review*. 30 (2): 455-477. <https://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2528&context=lawreview>.
- Tennessee Department of Economic and Community Development Planning. 2003. *Tennessee Planning Commissioner Handbook*.
- Tisher, Elizabeth. 2017. "Land-Use Regulation After Koontz: Will We "Rue" The Court's Decision?" *Vermont Law Review*. 38: 743-774. <https://lawreview.vermontlaw.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/07-TisherG.pdf>.
- Ward, Kristin N. 2014. "The Post-Koontz Landscape: Koontz's Shortcomings and How to Move Forward." *Emory Law Journal*. 64 (1): 129-167. <https://scholarlycommons.law.emory.edu/elj/vol64/iss1/3/>.
- Wells, Lisalee Anne and Tom Lallas. 1975. "Subdivision Land Dedication: Objectives and Objections" *Stanford Law Review*. 27(2): 419-448. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1228271>.
- Williams, Chris J. 2004. "Do Smart Growth Policies Invite Regulatory Takings Challenges? A Survey of Smart Growth and Regulatory Takings in the Southeastern United States." *Alabama Law Journal*. 55 (3): 895-920. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/bamalr55&div=36&g_sent=1&casa_token=&collection=journals.

DRAFT

Persons Contacted

Senator Paul Bailey
Tennessee District 15

Rodney Carmichael, Former Executive Director
Tennessee County Highway Officials Association

Chris Cignoli, Director of Public Works
City of Springfield, Massachusetts

Calvin Clifton, Business Development Manager
Mattern & Craig

Bob Freudenthal, Executive Director
Tennessee Association of Utility Districts

Kevin Hensley, Associate Director of Public Policy
Tennessee Farm Bureau

Jeff Hoge, Director, Right-of-Way Division
Tennessee Department of Transportation

Brett Howell, Executive Director
Tennessee County Highway Officials Association

Chad Jenkins, Deputy Director
Tennessee Municipal League

Sandra Knight, Highway Superintendent
Bradley County

Stefan Maupin, Director of Public Policy
Tennessee Farm Bureau

Lisa Milligan, Land Development Manager
Metropolitan Nashville Planning Department

Benjamin Moorman, Legislative Chair
Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors

Vivian Paris, Lobbyist
Bivens & Associates

Kevin Rigsby, Town Planner
Town of Smyrna

Charles Schneider, Chief Executive Officer
Home Builders Association of Tennessee

Brian Schults, Director,
Development Services
Regional Planning Agency
Chattanooga-Hamilton County

Amber Torbett, Director of Planning
Sullivan County

Ben York, Engineering Manager
Department of Transportation
Metropolitan Nashville

Jon Ward, Director of Planning
City of Cookeville

Charles Whittenburg, Property Surveyor
Whittenburg Land Surveying

Representative Ryan Williams
Tennessee District 42

DRAFT

Appendix A: Senate Bill 2849 by Bailey, House Bill 2274 by Williams

Senate Commerce and Labor 1

Amendment No. 1 to SB2849

Bailey
Signature of Sponsor

AMEND Senate Bill No. 2849

House Bill No. 2274*

by deleting all language after the caption and substituting instead the following:

WHEREAS, the right to own and use private property is a fundamental right, essential to the continued vitality of a democratic society; and

WHEREAS, governmental regulation of conduct, while equally essential to public order and the preservation of universally held values, must be carried out in a manner that appropriately balances the needs of the public with the rights and legitimate expectations of the individual; and

WHEREAS, this act appropriately and necessarily underscores and reaffirms the federal and state constitutional prohibition in the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution and in Article I, Section 21 of the Tennessee Constitution against taking private property for public use without just compensation; and

WHEREAS, the Tennessee Supreme Court ruled in *Phillips v. Montgomery County*, 442 S.W.3d 233 (2014) that Article I, Section 21 of the Tennessee Constitution should be interpreted no differently than the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment; and

WHEREAS, an individual private property owner should not be required, under the guise of police power regulation of the use and development of property, to bear burdens for the public good that should more properly be borne by the public at large; and

WHEREAS, the fair, consistent, and expeditious adjudication of disputes over land use in state courts in accordance with constitutional standards is a matter of statewide concern; and

WHEREAS, the general assembly intends, through this act, to codify the constitutionally-based standard known as the *Nollan/Dolan* two-prong test, which has been established and

Appendix A: Senate Bill 2849 by Bailey, House Bill 2274 by Williams (continued)

applied by the United States Supreme Court in *Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n*, 483 U.S. 825 (1987), and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374 (1994); now, therefore,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 13-3-403, is amended by adding the following as a new subsection:

()

(1) In exercising the powers granted to it by § 13-3-402, a regional planning commission shall not require an owner of private property to dedicate real property to the public, or pay money to a public entity in an amount that is determined on an individual and discretionary basis, unless there is an essential nexus between the dedication or payment and a legitimate local governmental interest and the dedication or payment is roughly proportional both in nature and extent to the impact of the proposed use or development of the property. An owner of private property required to make a dedication or pay money in violation of this subdivision () (1) may seek relief through a common law writ of certiorari in chancery court.

(2) Regulations adopted by regional planning commissions pursuant to this section must include the provisions in subdivision () (1).

(3) This subsection () does not apply to an assessment, fee, or charge that is imposed on a broad class of property owners by a local governmental entity.

SECTION 2. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 13-4-303, is amended by adding the following as a new subsection:

()

(1) In exercising the powers granted to it by § 13-4-302, the planning commission shall not require an owner of private property to dedicate real property to the public, or pay money to a public entity in an amount that is

Appendix A: Senate Bill 2849 by Bailey, House Bill 2274 by Williams (continued)

determined on an individual and discretionary basis, unless there is an essential nexus between the dedication or payment and a legitimate local governmental interest and the dedication or payment is roughly proportional both in nature and extent to the impact of the proposed use or development of the property. An owner of private property required to make a dedication or pay money in violation of this subdivision () (1) may seek relief through a common law writ of certiorari in chancery court.

(2) Regulations adopted by planning commissions pursuant to this section must include the provisions in subdivision () (1).

(3) This subsection () does not apply to an assessment, fee, or charge that is imposed on a broad class of property owners by a local governmental entity.

SECTION 3. This act takes effect July 1, 2022, the public welfare requiring it.


DRAFT

DRAFT

Appendix B: Map of Property Proposed to Be Subdivided in Putnam County

Planning Dept. Requiring 15ft of R.O.W. be 'dedicated' to the county. Even on this State Route.

Hatch Area for required planning approval. 2,659 Sq. Feet



DRAFT

Appendix C: Senate Bill 1604 by Bailey, House Bill 366 by Williams

HOUSE BILL 366
By Williams

SENATE BILL 1604

By Bailey

AN ACT to amend Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 13;
Title 62 and Title 66, relative to property located
along existing rights-of-way.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 13, Chapter 7, is amended by adding
the following language as a new part:

13-7-701.

As used in this part:

(1) "Governmental entity" means this state or any political subdivision of
this state, including, but not limited to, a municipal, county, or regional planning
commission, or an applicable legislative body;

(2) "Major road plan" means the major road plan adopted by the
applicable regional planning commission in accordance with § 13-3-402(a),
whereby a certified copy of the major road plan has been filed in the office or
offices of the county register or registers of the county or counties lying in whole
or in part in the region;

(3) "Major street plan" means the major street plan adopted by the
planning commission of a municipality in accordance with § 13-4-302(a),
whereby a certified copy of the major street plan has been filed in the office of the
county register of the county in which the municipality is located;

(4) "Regional planning commission" means any regional planning
commission established under § 13-3-101; and

(5) "Right-of-way reservation" means:

Appendix C: Senate Bill 1604 by Bailey, House Bill 366 by Williams (continued)

(A) An agreement between a landowner and a governmental entity whereby the landowner is prohibited from erecting a permanent building within an area designated as the location of a future right-of-way in the major road plan or major street plan; and

(B) A reservation that does not affect the application of the existing right-of-way for determining the placement of easements or setbacks.

13-7-702.

(a) A governmental entity shall not require a right-of-way dedication that requires a landowner to transfer ownership of any portion of the landowner's property located along an existing public right-of-way to the governmental entity as a condition of approving any application made to the governmental entity.

(b)

(1) Subject to subdivisions (b)(2)-(5), a governmental entity may require a right-of-way reservation as a condition of approving any proposed subdivision of a property.

(2) If a governmental entity requires a right-of-way reservation pursuant to subdivision (b)(1), then the landowner has the choice of agreeing to a right-of-way reservation or a right-of-way dedication.

(3) If a landowner, who has agreed to a right-of-way reservation pursuant to subdivision (b)(2), transfers the applicable property to another person, then that new landowner may convert the right-of-way reservation into a right-of-way dedication through a process determined by the governmental entity.

(4) If the governmental entity diminishes the distance of the required right-of-way in the adopted major road plan or major street plan, as applicable,

Appendix C: Senate Bill 1604 by Bailey, House Bill 366 by Williams (continued)

following the creation of a right-of-way reservation, then the right-of-way reservation automatically diminishes to reflect the new distance in the adopted major road plan or major street plan, as applicable.

(5) If a governmental entity takes possession of the property covered by a right-of-way reservation, then the landowner of the property is entitled to just compensation as required by law.

SECTION 2. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 62, Chapter 13, Part 4, is amended by adding the following as a new section:

Notwithstanding §§ 62-13-403, 62-13-404, and 66-5-206, a real estate licensee has no duty to inform any party to a real estate transaction concerning a right-of-way reservation or any rights attached to the real estate with regard to § 13-7-702.

SECTION 3. This act takes effect upon becoming a law, the public welfare requiring it.

DRAFT

Appendix D: Letter from Speaker of the Tennessee House Cameron Sexton and Speaker of the Senate Randy McNally

RANDY McNALLY

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR AND
SPEAKER OF THE SENATE

425 5TH AVENUE NORTH, SUITE 700
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243
TELEPHONE (615) 741-6806



CAMERON SEXTON

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES

425 5TH AVENUE NORTH, SUITE 600
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243
TELEPHONE (615) 741-2343

April 1, 2021

TACIR
226 Anne Dallas Dudley Boulevard
Suite 508
Nashville, Tennessee 37243

To Whom It May Concern,

Speaker of the House Cameron Sexton and Speaker of the Senate Randy McNally formally request TACIR commission a study on HB366/SB1604 by Rep. Ryan Williams and Sen. Paul Bailey.

Thank you,

**Randy McNally, Lieutenant Governor
SENATE**

**Cameron Sexton, Speaker
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

DRAFT

Appendix E: Adequate Facility Taxes and Impact Fees of Tennessee's Counties and Cities

County	City	Earmark	Authorizing Legislation
Bedford		Education capital projects; education debt service	TCA 67-4-2901 et seq. (County Powers Relief Act)
Cheatham	Ashland City	Capital Projects	Private Acts of 1997, Chapter 52
Cheatham	Kingston Springs	Capital Projects	Private Acts of 1997, Chapter 54
Cheatham	Pegram	Capital Projects	Private Acts of 1997, Chapter 53
Cheatham		\$500 parks and recreation, \$750 general fund, \$2,500 education debt fund	Private Acts of 1997, Chapter 28; Private Acts of 2000, Chapter 145; Private Acts of 2011, Chapter 20
Cheatham		Education debt service	Private Acts of 1997, Chapter 89
Cheatham		Education debt service	Private Acts of 1997, Chapter 68
Cheatham		Education debt service	Private Acts of 1997, Chapter 69
Davidson		Public Facilities	Public Chapter 1022, Acts of 1988 (TN Cooperative Public Facilities Financing Act; never levied; superceded by the County Powers Relief Act)
Dickson		Education capital projects	Private Acts of 2000, Chapter 158; Private Acts of 2002, Chapter 162
Fayette	Piperton	Public Facilities related to new development	Private Acts of 2000, Chapter 146
Fayette		Capital projects fund	Private Acts of 2001, Chapter 69; Private Acts of 2003, Chapter 38
Hickman		None	Private Acts of 2000, Chapter 97
Hickman		Capital projects fund	Private Acts of 2003, Chapter 21
Jefferson		Education capital projects; education debt service	TCA 67-4-2901 et seq. (County Powers Relief Act); Resolution 2007-35
Loudon		Education capital projects; education debt service	TCA 67-4-2901 et seq. (County Powers Relief Act)
Macon		None	Private Acts of 2002, Chapter 172
Macon		Capital projects fund	Private Acts of 2004, Chapter 138 (amended 2021)

**Appendix E: Adequate Facility Taxes and Impact Fees of Tennessee’s Counties and Cities
(continued)**

County	City	Earmark	Authorizing Legislation
Marshall		Capital projects fund	Private Acts of 1996, Chapter 211
Marshall		Public Facilities related to New Development	Private Acts of 2000, Chapter 157
Marshall		Capital projects fund	Private Acts of 2001, Chapter 22; Private Acts of 2007, Chapter 61
Maury		Local purpose fund	Private Acts of 1991, Chapter 118; Private Acts of 2000, Chapter 123
Maury	Columbia	None	Private Acts of 1994, Chapter 194
Maury, Williamson	Spring Hill	None	Private Acts of 1988, Chapter 176; Ordinance 94-02
Maury, Williamson	Spring Hill	Public Facilities related to new development	Private Acts of 1988, Chapter 173; Ordinance 15-04
Montgomery		Education capital projects and education debt service	Private Acts of 2004, Chapter 90
Robertson	White House	Public Facilities related to new development	TCA 6-2-201 (Mayor Aldermanic)
Robertson		Capital improvements, debt	Private Acts of 1996, Chapter 213
Rutherford	La Vergne	None	TCA 6-2-201 (Mayor Aldermanic)
Rutherford		Capital improvements, debt	Private Acts of 1996, Chapter 215
Rutherford	Smyrna	None	Private Acts of 1999, Chapter 42; Private Acts of 2000, Chapter 68
Sevier	Gatlinburg	Capital Improvement Fund	Private Acts of 1989, Chapter 56
Sevier	Gatlinburg	Special Benefit Account	Private Acts of 1990, Chapter 167
Sumner		Education capital projects	Private Acts of 1999, Chapter 57
Sumner, Robertson	Portland	None	Private Acts of 2003, Chapter 31
Trousdale		None	Private Acts of 2000, Chapter 71
Trousdale		Education capital projects; education debt service	TCA 67-4-2901 et seq. (County Powers Relief Act)
Williamson	Brentwood	Capital Improvement Fund	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 115
Williamson	Brentwood	Public Facilities related to new development	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 119

**Appendix E: Adequate Facility Taxes and Impact Fees of Tennessee’s Counties and Cities
(continued)**

County	City	Earmark	Authorizing Legislation
Williamson	Brentwood	Public Transportation	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 115
Williamson	Fairview	Capital Improvement	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 116
Williamson	Fairview	Public Facilities related to new development	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 121
Williamson	Franklin	Roads	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 117; Ord. No. 2000-24
Williamson	Franklin	Public Facilities related to new development	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 114
Williamson		School (residential), fire service and highways (commercial)	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 113
Williamson		Public Facilities related to New Development	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 118
Williamson		Schools, roads, parks and recreation, fire protection	Private Acts of 1987, Chapter 120
Williamson	Nolensville	None	TCA 6-2-201 (Mayor Aldermanic); Ord. #07-12, June 2007
Williamson	Nolensville	Public Facilities related to new development	Private Acts of 1997, Chapter 100
Williamson	Fairview	Public Facilities related to new development	Private Acts of 1998, Chapter 150
Wilson	Mt. Juliet	Public Transport	Private Acts of 1998, Chapter 965
Wilson		Two-thirds to the general debt fund and one-third to the capital projects fund	Private Acts of 2003, Chapter 60; Private Acts of 2007, Chapter 22

Sources: TCA, Private Acts, Local Resolutions and Ordinances, 2004 TACIR Financing Growth

DRAFT

Appendix F: Counties and Cities in Tennessee with Subdivision Regulations

County	County Has Subdivision Regulations?	Cities in the County WITH Subdivision Regulations	Cities in the County WITHOUT Subdivision Regulations
Anderson	Yes	Clinton, Norris, Oak Ridge, Oliver Springs, Rocky Top	None
Bedford	Yes	Bell Buckle, Shelbyville, Wartrace	Normandy
Benton	No	Camden	Big Sandy
Bledsoe	No	None	Pikeville
Blount	Yes	Alcoa, Friendsville, Louisville, Maryville, Rockford, Townsend, Vonore	None
Bradley	Yes	Cleveland	Charleston
Campbell	Yes	Caryville, Jacksboro, Jelico, LaFollette, Rocky Top	None
Cannon	Yes	Woodbury	Auburntown
Carroll	Yes	Atwood, Bruceton, Huntingdon, McKenzie	Clarksburg, Hollow Rock, McLemoresville, Trezevant
Carter	Yes	Elizabethton, Johnson City, Watauga	None
Cheatham	Yes	Ashland City, Kingston Springs, Pegram, Pleasant View	None
Chester	No	Henderson	Enville, Milledgeville, Silerton
Claiborne	Yes	Harrogate, New Tazewell, Tazewell	Cumberland Gap
Clay	Yes	Celina	None
Cocke	Yes	Newport, Parrottsville	None
Coffee	Yes	Manchester, Tullahoma	None
Crockett	Yes	Alamo	Bells, Friendship, Gadsden, Maury City
Cumberland	Yes	Crossville, Pleasant Hill	Crab Orchard

Appendix F: Counties and Cities in Tennessee with Subdivision Regulations (continued)

County	County Has Subdivision Regulations?	Cities in the County WITH Subdivision Regulations	Cities in the County WITHOUT Subdivision Regulations
Davidson	Yes	Belle Meade, Berry Hill, Forrest Hills, Goodlettsville, Nashville, Ridgetop	None
Decatur	No	Parsons	Decaturville, Scotts Hill
DeKalb	Yes	Liberty, Smithville	Alexandria, Dowelltown
Dickson	Yes	Burns, Charlotte, Dickson, White Bluff	Slayden, Vanleer
Dyer	Yes	Dyersburg, Newbern	Trimble
Fayette	Yes	Braden, Gallaway, Grand Junction, LaGrange, Moscow, Oakland, Piperton, Rossville, Somerville	Williston
Fentress	No	Jamestown	Allardt
Franklin	Yes	Cowan, Decherd, Estill Springs, Huntland, Monteagle, Tullahoma, Winchester	None
Gibson	Yes	Gibson, Humboldt, Kenton, Medina, Milan, Rutherford, Trenton	Yorkville
Giles	No	Ardmore, Pulaski	Elkton, Lynnville, Minor Hill
Grainger	No	None	Bean Station, Blain, Rutledge
Greene	Yes	Baileyton, Greenville, Mosheim, Tusculum	None
Grundy	No	Monteagle	Altamont, Seersheba Springs, Coalmont, Gruetli-Laager, Palmer, Tracy City
Hamblen	Yes	Morristown, White Pine	None

Appendix F: Counties and Cities in Tennessee with Subdivision Regulations (continued)

County	County Has Subdivision Regulations?	Cities in the County WITH Subdivision Regulations	Cities in the County WITHOUT Subdivision Regulations
Hamilton	Yes	Chattanooga, Collegedale, East Ridge, Lakesite, Lookout Mountain, Red Bank, Ridgeside, Signal Mountain, Soddy-Daisy, Walden	None
Hancock	No	Sneedville	None
Hardeman	Yes	Bolivar, Grand Junction, Middleton, Whiteville	Hickory Valley, Hornsby, Saulsbury, Silerton, Toone
Hardin	No	Adamsville, Savannah	Crump, Milledgeville, Saltillo
Hawkins	Yes	Bulls Gap, Church Hill, Kingsport, Mount Carmel, Rogersville, Sugoinsville	None
Haywood	Yes	Brownsville, Stanton	None
Henderson	No	Lexington, Parker's Crossroads	Sardis, Scotts Hill
Henry	Yes	McKenzie, Paris, Puryear	Cottage Grove
Hickman	Yes	Centerville	None
Houston	No	Erin, Tennessee Ridge	None
Humphreys	Yes	McEwen, New Johnsonville, Waverly	None
Jackson	No	Gainesboro	None
Jefferson	Yes	Baneberry, Dandridge, Jefferson City, Morristown, New Market, White Pine	None
Johnson	Yes	Mountain City	None
Knox	Yes	Farragut, Knoxville	None
Lake	Yes	Ridgely, Tiptonville	None
Lauderdale	Yes	Halls, Henning, Ripley	Gates
Lawrence	No	Lawrenceburg, Loretto, St. Joseph	Ethridge

Appendix F: Counties and Cities in Tennessee with Subdivision Regulations (continued)

County	County Has Subdivision Regulations?	Cities in the County WITH Subdivision Regulations	Cities in the County WITHOUT Subdivision Regulations
Lewis	No	Hohenwald	None
Lincoln	Yes	Ardmore, Fayetteville, Petersburg	None
Loudon	Yes	Farragut, Greenback, Lenoir City, Loudon, Philadelphia	None
McMinn	Yes	Athens, Englewood, Etowah, Niota, Sweetwater	Calhoun
McNairy	No	Adamsville, Bethel Springs, Selmer	Eastview, Finger, Guys, Michie, Milledgeville, Ramer, Stantonville
Macon	Yes	Lafayette, Red Boiling Springs	None
Madison	Yes	Humboldt, Jackson, Medon, Threeway	None
Marion	Yes	Jasper, Monteagle, New Hope, Orme, South Pittsburg, Whitwell	Powell's Crossroads
Marshall	Yes	Chapel Hill, Cornersville, Lewisburg, Petersburg	None
Mauzy	Yes	Columbia, Mount Pleasant, Spring Hill	None
Meigs	Yes	Decatur	None
Monroe	Yes	Madisonville, Sweetwater, Tellico Plains, Vonore	None
Montgomery	Yes	Clarksville	None
Moore	Yes	Lynchburg	None
Morgan	No	Harriman, Oliver Springs	Oakdale, Sunbright, Wartburg
Obion	No	Hornbeak, Kenton, Obion, South Fulton, Union City, Woodland Mills	Rives, Samburg, Trimble, Troy
Overton	Yes	Livingston	None
Perry	No	Linden	Lobelville
Pickett	No	None	Byrdstown

Appendix F: Counties and Cities in Tennessee with Subdivision Regulations (continued)

County	County Has Subdivision Regulations?	Cities in the County WITH Subdivision Regulations	Cities in the County WITHOUT Subdivision Regulations
Polk	Yes	Benton, Copperhill, Ducktown	None
Putnam	Yes	Algood, Baxter, Cookeville, Monterey	None
Rhea	Yes	Dayton, Graysville, Spring City	None
Roane	Yes	Harriman, Kingston, Oak Ridge, Oliver Springs, Rockwood	None
Robertson	Yes	Adams, Coopertown, Cross Plains, Greenbrier, Millersville, Portland, Orinda, Ridgetop, Springfield, White House	Cedar Hill
Rutherford	Yes	Eagleville, LaVergne, Murfreesboro, Smyrna	None
Scott	No	Huntsville, Oneida, Winfield	None
Sequatchie	No	Dunlap	None
Sevier	Yes	Gatlinburg, Pigeon Forge, Pittman Center, Sevierville	None
Shelby	Yes	Arlington, Bartlett, Collierville, Germantown, Lakeland, Memphis, Millington	None
Smith	Yes	Carthage, Gordonsville, South Carthage	None
Stewart	No	Cumberland, Dover, Tennessee Ridge	None
Sullivan	Yes	Bluff City, Bristol, Johnson City, Kingsport	None
Sumner	Yes	Gallatin, Goodletsville, Hendersonville, Millersville, Portland, Westmoreland, White House	Mitchellville
Tipton	Yes	Atoka, Brighton, Covington, Garland, Mason, Munford	Burlison
Trousdale	Yes	Hartsville	None
Unicoi	Yes	Erwin, Unicoi	None
Union	Yes	Maynardville, Plainview	Luttrell
Van Buren	Yes	Spencer	None

Appendix F: Counties and Cities in Tennessee with Subdivision Regulations (continued)

County	County Has Subdivision Regulations?	Cities in the County WITH Subdivision Regulations	Cities in the County WITHOUT Subdivision Regulations
Warren	Yes	McMinnville, Morrison	Centertown, Viola
Washington	Yes	Johnson City, Jonesborough, Watauga	None
Wayne	No	Clifton, Waynesboro	Collinwood
Weakley	No	Dresden, Gleason, Greenfield, McKenzie, Martin, Sharon	None
White	Yes	Sparta	Doyle
Williamson	Yes	Brentwood, Fairview, Franklin, Nolensville, Spring Hill, Thompson's Station	None
Wilson	Yes	Lebanon, Mount Juliet, Watertown	None

Source: Status of Planning in Tennessee's Counties and Cities 2020.

DRAFT

Appendix G: Local Planning and Development Staff Survey Results

1. *How often does your local government require an owner to dedicate a right-of-way easement as a condition of subdivision plat approval?*

Response	Percentage
Always	40%
Usually	30%
Rarely	30%
Never	0%

2. *How often does your local government require an owner to dedicate land along a right-of-way and transfer ownership of that land to the local government as a condition of subdivision plat approval?*

Response	Percentage
Always	20%
Usually	20%
Rarely	30%
Never	30%

3. *Does your office track the number of dedications required each year and the amount of land dedicated?*

None of the planners said they tabulate data specific to dedications.

4. *How does your office determine the amount of land to be dedicated?*

Answers varied but the majority of respondents stated it was based on the minimum right-of-way standards in the subdivision regulations or on thoroughfare plans.

Appendix G: Local Planning and Development Staff Survey Results (continued)

5. *Are dedications required by your local government ever challenged in court by property owners?*

None of the planners reported ever having dedication requirements challenged in court.

6. *Does your local government require dedication of property along existing rights-of-way as a condition of subdivision plat approval if the property will be transferred to a family member of the owner?*

Response	Percentage
Always	40%
Usually	40%
Rarely	20%
Never	0%

7. *Does your local government require dedication of property along the existing rights-of-way as a condition of subdivision plat approval for smaller developments of five parcels or less?*

Response	Percentage
Always	50%
Usually	30%
Rarely	20%
Never	0%

8. *Does your local government ever offer dedicated property that it no longer needs to the adjoining property owner?*

Response	Percentage
Yes	70%
No	30%

Appendix G: Local Planning and Development Staff Survey Results (continued)

9. *Does your local government give the adjoining property owner the opportunity to purchase the dedicated property if it is no longer needed by the government?*

Response	Percentage
Yes	57%
No	43%

10. *Does your local government give the property to the adjoining property owner free of charge if the dedicated property is no longer needed by the government?*

Response	Percentage
Yes	71%
No	29%

11. *In your opinion, what are the main impacts you currently see from development in your area and that your local government tries to manage with land dedications, specifically?*

Response	Percentage
Increased road traffic	90%
Water drainage/stormwater runoff	80%
Installing/expanding utility lines	70%