

**SUMMARY NOTES  
ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
APRIL 1, 2015  
ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

NOTE: A quorum is not required for Ordinance Review Committee meetings.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Peter Hallenbeck (Chair), Cheeks Township Representative; Lisa Stuckey (Vice-Chair), Chapel Hill Township Representative; Tony Blake, Bingham Township Representative; Paul Guthrie, At-Large Chapel Hill Township; Buddy Hartley, Little River Township Representative; Bryant Warren, Hillsborough Township Representative

**STAFF PRESENT:** Perdita Holtz, Special Projects Coordinator; Michael Harvey, Current Planning Supervisor; Ashley Moncado, Special Projects Planner

**AGENDA ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER  
UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) TEXT AMENDMENTS – SIGN REGULATIONS**

To review and comment upon proposed revisions to the UDO to modify the existing regulations pertaining to signs. This item was previously sent out via e-mail for Planning Board review and was on the February 19, 2015 Quarterly Public Hearing agenda but the hearing was cancelled due to inclement weather. Staff is bringing these proposed amendments to the ORC since time now permits staff to do so.

**Presenter:** Michael Harvey, Current Planning Supervisor

Michael Harvey: Thank you for being here early. We have two items. I would encourage you to email any comments you have. If we could get them by the end of April, I would appreciate it. Reviewed amendment.

Lisa Stuckey: Is a digital sign dangerous?

Michael Harvey: We say they are because they are a distraction. They change so often and frequently, you are always looking up to see the next advertisement.

Paul Guthrie: What about portable signs?

Michael Harvey: They are covered under a different section of the ordinance. They are specifically prohibited.

Tony Blake: What is a snipe sign?

Michael Harvey: Small real estate sign.

Pete Hallenbeck: On page 22, “the examples of on premise commercial signs”, a sign on a roof and a 3D figure. Isn’t that like a triple?

Michael Harvey: It is a triple whammy, it is just the example.

**AGENDA ITEM 2: UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) TEXT AMENDMENTS – IMPERVIOUS SURFACE**

To review and comment upon proposed revisions to the UDO to modify the existing regulations pertaining to impervious surface

**Presenter:** Michael Harvey, Current Planning Supervisor

Michael Harvey: Reviewed text amendment.

Tony Blake: Are they aware they have to record an easement?

Michael Harvey: That is covered in the BMP Manual.

Tony Blake: You might want to mention that.

Michael Harvey: I will talk to Wesley Poole to see if I can figure out a way to address that. Yes it is covered, but a reference would be reasonable.

Lisa Stuckey: I always thought BMPs were those ponds? Referenced page 25 regarding permeable pavement. Is that a state BMP?

Michael Harvey: Out of fifty BMPs, only one gets credit for additional built upon area (i.e. additional impervious) and that is permeable pavement. A permeable surface has to be maintained. There is a heightened level of expense associated with the project. Keep in mind we may be looking at allowing additional stormwater features where you can get an impervious surface increase if that features is based on an infiltration model. What I mean is that stormwater is captured and allowed to infiltrate naturally rather than runoff into a ditch to be conveyed off-site. We still do not know how the State will look at this so we are proceeding cautiously.

Paul Guthrie: What is an impervious surface?

Michael Harvey: By current county definition, gravel qualifies, asphalt, concrete, structure, house roof, etc. The state is looking at modifying its definition of built upon area.

Lisa Stuckey: Is this something the BOCC initiated?

Michael Harvey: They approved our outline form.

**AGENDA ITEM 3: ADJOURNMENT**