



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY REVIEW

HAMLIN RESERVE (Z2400046A and BDG2400020)

Comprehensive Plan Applicable Policies		
Applicable Policy	Consistent	How consistent
Policy 117 Adequately assess the costs and benefits of new development before rezoning or annexation approval. Provide best estimates for the true impact of new development on City and County revenues as well as services, including water, sewer, transportation, safety, greenhouse gas emissions, school capacity, and potential long-term maintenance needs.	Consistent by Meeting City Code	City Code 70-129 requires a cost benefit analysis to be performed for annexations. An analysis was done for this proposal and found to be revenue positive.
Policy 118 Establish an Urban Growth Boundary to discourage development on the edge of the city that strains existing infrastructure or prompts significant public investment in new infrastructure. Public sewer and water should not be extended past the Urban Growth Boundary, with limited exceptions to protect public health and safety	Not consistent	The proposal lies outside the Urban Growth Boundary.
Policy 119 Ensure new developments within the Urban Growth Boundary are within the established level of service for emergency services (such as fire, emergency medical services, police, and community safety).	Consistent by Meeting City Code	City Code 70-129 requires an operational impact analysis to be performed for annexations. An analysis was done for this proposal, and no operational impacts were identified.
Policy 128 Ensure upgrades to the existing sewer system that are required to serve development are provided by the associated developer.	Consistent by Meeting SUDS & UEA Requirements	The Reference Guide for Development requires a Summary Utility Development Statement (SUDS), capacity analysis be performed on all cases except single-family and two-family annexations. The SUDS has been approved, and the Utility Extension Agreement (UEA) will be required prior to the proposal is heard at City Council.
Policy 165 Annexations into the City of Durham should be contiguous with the existing City limits and should not cause service delivery or operational issues for the City or County. Staff will recommend against approval of annexations that create donut holes, enclaves, satellites, or difficult to develop remnant properties. Annexations comprising parcels where one or two single-family homes could be developed should be considered for annexation, even when they do not meet the criteria above, if they cannot be served by well or septic, and/or when it creates an undue burden on the landowner. Annexation into the City limits should only be considered when a substantial benefit to the community can be demonstrated. Annexations that substantially reduce existing enclaves or donut holes are exempt from this policy.	Not consistent	The case is not consistent as the proposal creates a new satellite portion of the City of Durham.

<p>Policy 167: Amendments to the Place Type Map, including the UGB and FGAs, should only be permitted when the proposal demonstrates that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adequate public utilities, emergency services, transportation services, and public schools are available to accommodate the request, and, 2. Durham's ability to achieve the goals of the Comprehensive Plan will be increased, <p>And, either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significant changes have occurred since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and necessitate the proposed amendment; Or, 2. Inconsistencies in land use or other plan policies exist in the adopted Comprehensive Plan that affect Durham's orderly growth and development. <p>Decisions on Place Type Map amendments should include these additional considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For changes to a Place Type designation that changes the intensity of development envisioned for an area, whether the proposal has demonstrated benefits to affordable housing production, environmental goals, and approaches to equitable engagement and outcomes. 2. For changes to the Urban Growth Boundary, whether those parcels were previously included in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan's Suburban Development Tier. 	<p>Not consistent</p>	<p>The Summary Utility Development Statement (SUDS) and Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) have demonstrated that utilities and services can accommodate the proposed development. The parcels were previously included in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan's Suburban Development Tier; however, the proposal does not demonstrate how it increases Durham's ability to achieve the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, no significant changes have occurred since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 2023.</p>
<p>Policy 168: Proposed changes to expand the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) should only be made when the proponent can demonstrate all three of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change does not expand the UGB further into a Critical Watershed. 2. The change does not significantly increase long-term infrastructure maintenance costs for the City or County; and 3. The Change would address a clear need for the community based on the adopted Comprehensive Plan policies. 	<p>Not consistent</p>	<p>The proposal would expand the UGB further into the Falls/Jordan District-A Critical Watershed.</p>