

UTILITY SERVICE AND ANNEXATION CRITERIA 09.14.2021

INTRODUCTION

As stated in the Davidson Planning Ordinance, Davidson is a livable and walkable community because it chooses to rigorously manage growth. The Town of Davidson intends to permit the extension of water and sewer services so as to provide for managed growth that is in the best interests of the citizens of our Town.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this tool is to assist decision-makers in evaluating development proposals for consistency with adopted plans, policies, capacities and investments.

POINTS AVAILABLE: XXXX
TOTAL SCORE: XXXX

1. POLICY ALIGNMENT

POINTS AVAILABLE:
SECTION SCORE:

1. Alignment with Comprehensive Plan

- A. Is there plan consistency with the Growth Management Tiers Map (Pg. 36-37)?
Specifically:
- Is the proposal located in a Primary Growth Area? **(20 pts.)**
 - Is the proposal located in a Secondary Growth Area? **(5 pts.)**
 - Is the proposal located in a Growth Reserve Area? **(-5 pts.)**
- B. Is there plan consistency with the Conservation and Growth Framework (Pg. 46-47)?
Specifically:
- Is the proposal located in an Activity Node? **(20 pts.)**
 - Is the proposal located in District classified as a/an:
 - i. Employment Campus **(10 pts.)**
 - ii. Neighborhood Center **(10 pts.)**
 - iii. Residential Neighborhood **(5 pts.)**
 - iv. Residential Neighborhood Edge and Open Space **(5 pts.)**
 - v. Rural Village Neighborhoods and Open Space **(5 pts.)**
 - vi. Priority Conservation Area **(-5 pts.)**

2. Consistent with Interjurisdictional Agreements

- A. Is there plan consistency with the Davidson-Kannapolis Annexation Agreement? **(5 pts.)**
- B. Is there plan consistency with the Mooresville Boundary Agreement? **(5 pts.)**

Commented [TA1]: This borrows language from the existing water/sewer policy in an effort to acknowledge that work and signal the transition to this tool.

Commented [TA2]: There is not an absolute value because not all items apply to each project (i.e., only certain properties are subject to interjurisdictional agreements; commercial projects don't have impacts on the number of students in schools, etc.)

Commented [TA3]: This assigns points for Activity Node and the District in which the parcel lies.

Commented [TA4]: This only applies if either agreement would be applicable to a parcel(s).

2. LOCATION CHARACTERISTICS & NATURAL ASSETS

POINTS AVAILABLE:

SECTION SCORE:

3. Contiguous with Town Boundary

- A. *Is the site to be developed located within the town boundary? (10 pts.)*
- B. *Do portions of the site to be developed lie contiguous with the current town boundary? (5 pts.)*

4. Creates Logical Town Boundaries

- A. *Does this site to be developed provide a logical extension of town boundaries according to the Growth Management Tiers Map? (5 pts.)*
- B. *Would annexation of this site to be developed eliminate and/or create unincorporated islands within the town's jurisdiction? (+5 pts. or -10 pts.)*

5. Meets Minimum Ordinance Requirements for Natural Assets

- A. *Does the project meet the minimum tree coverage or preservation requirements? (5 pts.)*
- B. *What amount of healthy specimen trees does the project preserve? (75% 10 pts., 50% 5 pts., Less than 50% -5 pts.)*
- C. *Does the project propose development (i.e., buildings and infrastructure) on more than 50% of land outside of the floodplain that's within 600' of the Rocky River? (Yes -5 pts., No 10 pts.)*

Commented [TA5]: This section has been added to assess consistency with DPO tree and open space criteria, which is in line with the current water/sewer policy considerations.

6. Treatment of Natural Features, Including Historic Resources

- A. *Does the project avoid slopes steeper than 20%? (Yes 5 pts., No -5 pts.)*
- B. *Does the project propose development on more than 50% of land identified as prime agricultural soils? (Yes -5 pts.)*
- C. *Does the project propose development of identified viewsheds within a Scenic Byway, floodplain, rock outcropping, or other significant natural feature? (Yes -5 pts., No 5 pts.)*
- D. *Does the project preserve historic resources identified on an adopted plan and/or by a government entity (i.e., Meck. County Historic Landmarks Commission, State Historic Preservation Office)? (+/-5 pts.)*

Commented [TA6]: This section has been added to assess consistency with Environmental Inventory criteria, which is in line with the current water/sewer policy considerations.

3. SERVICE DEMANDS & BENEFITS

POINTS AVAILABLE:

SECTION SCORE:

7. Supported by Public Services

- A. *Could the developed site be adequately served by the Davidson Police Department? (5 pts.)*

Commented [TA7]: For clarity, the Planning Board Ordinance Committee recommends that these determinations be provided in writing. This codifies the current internal approach in which development projects are reviewed by multiple departments as part of an "inter-departmental review."

- B. *Could the developed site be adequately served by the Davidson Fire Department? (5 pts.)*
- C. *Could the developed site be adequately served by Davidson Public Works? (5 pts.)*

8. Demonstrates Community Benefits

- A. *Using the most recent Fiscal Impact Cost-to-Serve Analysis, does the proposed development result in a net positive fiscal benefit compared to its costs? (+/- 5 pts.)*
- B. *Does the proposed development include a specific community benefit identified in an adopted plan? (5 pts.)*

Commented [TA8]: This aims to link the project to a specific Strategic Plan or Comp. Plan policy, or a Mobility Plan project, rather than a vague, undefined reference.

9. Utility Service

- A. *Is the project within 1,000 feet of an existing or planned water or sewer line funded within a Charlotte Water Capital Improvement Plan? (0 pts. – Required)*
- B. *Could the developed site be supported by adequate utility provision by Charlotte Water? (0 pts. – Required)*
- C. *Could the developed site be supported by adequate utility provision by Duke Power (or any other energy supplier)? (0 pts. – Required)*
- D. *Does the project improve utility service to adjacent parcels? (5 pts.)*

10. Supported by Public Schools Framework

- A. *Does CMS have existing or future (with five years) capacity to serve the developed site? (0 pts. – Required or Negative)*

11. Consistency with Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Requirements

- A. *Has the applicant agreed to construct or pay for the improvements specified by the TIA? (5 pts.)*

12. Consistency with Transportation Investments

- A. *Is the development proposal consistent with existing transportation planning efforts (i.e., Davidson Mobility Plan)? (5 pts.)*
- B. *Is the development proposal in an area (1 mile radius) prioritized for transportation improvements in the short term (5 years)? (5 pts.)*
- C. *Is the development proposal in an area (1 mile radius) prioritized for transportation improvements in the medium term (10 years)? (5 pts.)*
- D. *Is the development proposal in an area (1 mile radius) prioritized for transportation improvements in the long term (10+ years)? (5 pts.)*