

As a result of a meeting with Doug Hancock, Senior Planner with the Blount County Development Services, Thomas Lloyd, Director of Development Services & Building Commissioner with the Blount County Development Services, and Gary Ferguson with the Environmental Health Department to discuss the possibility/likelihood of subdividing the land on Old Walland Hwy, below are highlights from what we were told at the meeting:

- 1) The property cannot – in all likelihood – be subdivided as it “does not meet development standards”.
- 2) One possible scenario is for one owner of the entire tract of land to possibly build one residential structure in addition to the existing residential structure on the property creating a total of 2. But, in order to do so one has many requirements/hurdles to overcome to accomplish this (see #3 below).
- 3) Due to the property being in a floodplain, there is no flexibility from the county for new residential construction - it must adhere to their design standards that would include, among other things, a minimum floor elevation (which to determine will require the involvement of a surveyor and engineer) as well other subdivision and zoning requirements including but not limited to set-backs off road and river.
- 4) Should someone want to improve the existing house, there are requirements from FEMA that will not allow it to be improved by more than 50% of its value and maintain its “grandfathered” status. If the cost of “improvements” exceed the value by more than 50% - it must meet all of today’s requirements (some of which are referenced in #3 hereinabove).
- 5) Other possible uses that one may have for said property – i.e. restaurant, commercial rafting/kayaking/canoeing business, etc. would require a zoning change for the property and we were informed that “will not happen” or , it would require rewriting the zoning ordinance (which is highly unlikely).
- 6) When asked their opinions of the highest and best use for the property, they suggested the following:
One buyer could purchase the property and possibly have up to two residential structures (see #2 hereinabove)