

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Residential Development		-----Criteria and Rating-----									---Relative Weights---			Comments				
Not Rated	Lowest Value	1	2	3	4	Neutral	5	6	7	8	9	Highest Value	Workshop Score		Assigned Weight	Percent Weight		
Infrastructure -- Group 1													Operation	1 to 5	1 to 5			
	Municipal boundaries						beyond muni influence				1-3 mi. Fayetteville	<1 mile	Overlay Group 1	3.3	2	16.7	Buffer based on size (<50,000; 50,000+); proximity to incorporated areas represents density of services and businesses	
	Primary roads						> 13200 ft		5000 to 13200 ft			< 5000 ft	Overlay Group 1	2.8	3	25.0	Assume cost advantages for projects closer to US and NC highways. Distances based in part on analysis of distance to nearest primary road using point locations of businesses in the Sandhills	
	Public water service						> 5000 ft	4000 to 5000	3000 to 4000 ft	2000 to 3000 ft	1000 to 2000 ft	<1000 ft	Overlay Group 1	4.0	3	25.0	Assume cost advantages for projects within or near public water service areas	
	Public sewer service						>4000 ft	3000 to 4000 ft		2000 to 3000 ft	1000 to 2000 ft	<1000 ft	Overlay Group 1	3.7	4	33.3	Assume cost advantages for projects within or near public wastewater service areas	
Total Group 1														12	100.0			
	Not Rated	Lowest Value					Neutral					Highest Value	Workshop Score	Assigned Weight	Percent Weight			
Property - Group 2													Operation					
	Proximity to elementary schools						>12 mi. any	6-12 mi. low	2-6 mi. low	<2 mi. low	6-12 mi. high	2-6 mi high	<2 mi. high	Overlay Group 2	4.2	4	50.0	Housing too far from existing schools may be less attractive to build and occupy; school performance (high to low) included in criteria
	Proximity to hospitals						>15 miles			5-15 miles		< 5 miles	Overlay Group 2		3	37.5	Proximity to hospitals, including the VA Hospital, is important to much of the current and expected residents in the region	
	Proximity to Fort Bragg						<1 mile					>1 mile	Overlay Group 2	3.3	1	12.5	Location too close to a military installation increases the costs of residential development because of potential impacts of air and ground training; there are no longer rules regarding base personnel living within a limited commuting distance from the ba	
Total Group 2														8	100.0			
	Not Rated	Lowest Value					Neutral					Highest Value	Workshop Score	Assigned Weight	Percent Weight			
Land Factors -- Group 3													Operation	1 to 5	1 to 5			
	Slope (percent)						>25%		15-25%		10-15%	4-10%	<4%	Map Algebra A	3.0		Assume cost advantages for gentle slopes and constraints on steep slopes	
	Wetlands						inside					outside	Map Algebra A	4.2		Wetlands are problematic for residential development		
	Riparian buffer						inside					outside	Map Algebra A			No state buffer rules in basins in the region. 50 foot or even 100 foot buffer is small given the cell size (98.4 feet per side).		
	Floodzone 100-year						100-yr		future 100-yr			outside zone	Map Algebra A	4.2		Floodzones are less suitable for development or would be a cost disadvantage		
	Lands managed for conservation & oper						inside								0	Out of bounds for development		
	Water supply watershed critical protecti						inside								0	Rules restrict development		
	Lakes and reservoirs						inside								0	Water out of bounds for development		
	Military bases						inside								0	Long-term public ownership and restricted use		
Total Group 2														0				
	Group 1 Overlay Weight															45.0		
	Group 2 Overlay Weight															30.0		
	Group 2 Map Algebra Weight															25.0		
<p>Note: Assigned weight: 1 to 5 with 5 the most important for conservation of natural areas; relative weights may be changed when evaluating model results to achieve the best balance between the multiple factors.</p> <p>Note: Cell size is 98.4 feet or 30 meters on a side or about 9,687 square feet or one-fifth acre. This is consistent with the lowest resolution of the available --land cover data (30-meter resolution); most of the data layers used in the model are mapped at a scale of 1:24,000 or better which implies precision to plus or minus 40 feet or less.</p> <p>Sources: William B. Farris, CGIA and Division of Coastal Management, Land Suitability Analysis, 2003; Frederick Steiner, <i>The Living Landscape</i>; Carteret County Land Suitability Analysis; Steiner et al, A Decade with LESA; NRCS Farmland Protection Program Attachment 3; CTNC project sessions, 2005, TRLC project sessions, 2006, Sustainable Sandhills focus group, 2007.</p>																		