Barrow Impact Fee Discussion

Guy Herring
Director of Planning and Development
gherring@barrowga.org
233 East Broad Street
Winder, Ga 30680

Timeline

- Barrow began informal impact fee discussion with the development community in Spring and Summer of 2006
- Single family residential starts/permits issued for 2005 were 1154 (highest in history)
- Development community not opposed to "reasonable" impact fees.
- Services discussed were Public Safety, Libraries, Parks and Recreation.

Timeline

- November 2006 BOC awards and enters into contract to conduct Impact Fee Assessment Report, Methodology Report and Ordinance for Phase I of the proposal.
- Data collection began including information from County Departments.
- Single family residential slows through 2006 ending with 915 starts/permits.

3

Timeline

- Impact Fee Advisory Committee is appointed in August 2007.
- IFAC meetings began.
- Methodology Report and Draft Impact Fee Ordinance was presented to the BOC in November 2007.
- Phase I of the contract/proposal was complete.
- Single family residential slows to 688 in 2007
- Impact Fees tabled November 2007.

LOS

- Level of Service for Public Safety was relatively high, above average as compared to similar Counties.
- Level of Service for Libraries and Park/Rec were low but not extremely low.
- Parks/Rec LOS based on County wide service area and 2030 Recreation Master Plan thus causing Parks/Rec to be adopted at a higher level of service than current.

Reasons for Not Adopting

- LOS for Public Safety was good and public does not mind funding Public Safety through general fund/taxes.
- Level of Service for Libraries and Park/Rec were low but not extremely low.
- 2030 Recreation Master Plan ($80 million) used to create Capital Improvement Element with LOS based on County wide service, thus causing Parks/Rec to be adopted at a higher level of service than current.
- Development Community uncertain Capital Improvement Projects will benefit local developments.
- More economical for each to put in their own amenities package to support their development instead of relying on County.
- Recreation Master Plan would create excessive spending according to public.
- Support not available.