Agenda Item: Decision on Motion 2016-2, UDO Text Amendment for Street Naming Requirements

DATE: September 6, 2016
FROM: Mary Jo Gollnitz, Planner

Background/Issue:
Proposed text is to update UDO in order to more closely align street naming requirements with Mecklenburg County.

Proposal/Solution:
Planning Board unanimously recommended approval of text amendment.

Financial Impact:
None

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:
Quality of Life
Transportation

Recommended Motion/Action:
Approve Motion 2016-2 as presented at Public Hearing.
Motion #2016-2
UDO Text Changes

Existing Text:
155.405.4.P General Subdivision Criteria

STREET NAMES. Proposed street names shall not duplicate nor too closely approximate phonetically the name of any street within the Town or county. Where proposed streets are extensions of existing streets, the existing names should be used, except where a new name can reasonably be used to facilitate the proper street address numbering or to avoid further street name duplication. Words shall not be used as part of street names if used in two other locations within the county.

Proposed Revision:
155.405.4.P General Subdivision Criteria

STREET NAMES: All proposed street names must be reviewed by Matthews Planning Department, Public Works, Police Department, and Fire & EMS Department before being submitted to Mecklenburg County for final approval. A proper street name shall include one (1) to three (3) words as the main name and a street type suffix. A proper street name may include a directional prefix, and/or “extension” following the street type suffix. Proposed street names shall adhere to the following guidelines: do not duplicate nor too closely approximate phonetically the name of any street within the Town or county; do not use business names; do not include punctuation; do not use possibly offensive names; and do not include directional suffixes. Where proposed streets are extensions of existing streets, or align with an existing street, the existing names should be used, except where a new name can reasonably be used to facilitate the proper street address numbering or to avoid further street name duplication. Words shall not be used as the first word part of a street names if used in two other locations within the county. The only exception allowed is use of a generic label naming a topographic feature or a color, which can be part of multiple street names.
SUGGESTED
STATEMENTS OF CONSISTENCY AND REASONABLENESS
Final Decisions on Zoning-Related Issues

ZONING MOTION # ________2016-2__________________________________

Matthews Board of Commissioners makes the following 2 conclusions:

1)  ___X__ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, IS CONSISTENT with the policies for development as outlined by the Matthews Land Use Plan, and/or Town’s long-range Vision Statements, and/or other adopted policies/plans (as specified below)

OR

_____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, IS NOT CONSISTENT with the Matthews Land Use Plan and/or other adopted land development policies and plans.

(A requested zoning can be found “consistent” and not approved, or found to be “not consistent”, but approved.)

2)  ___X__ The requested zoning action IS REASONABLE and in the public interest because:

(ex., may be appropriate with specific surrounding land uses; has been shown that it will not create significant new traffic beyond area roads’ capacities; creates/increases desirable use in Town.)

The amendment promotes Public Safety and helps to eliminate confusion in an emergency situation.

________________________________________________________________________

OR

_____ The requested zoning action IS NOT REASONABLE and in the public interest because:

________________________________________________________________________

(Reasons given for a zoning request being “reasonable” or “not reasonable” are not subject to judicial review.)

Decision Date  ___September 12, 2016_________________________