

Orange County, NC
Code of Ordinances

Unified Development Ordinance

Implementation Bridge



March 24, 2011

Prepared by
Clarion Associates



Contents

A. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	2
What is an Implementation Bridge?	2
How Should This Document be Used?	3
B. RELATIONSHIP TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	4
Overarching Goals of the Comprehensive Plan	4
Specific Goals of the Comprehensive Plan	5
How the New UDO Implements the Plan	9
C. IDEAS RAISED DURING THE UDO PROCESS.....	10
Economic Development Ideas.....	10
Relevant Comprehensive Plan Provisions.....	10
Incentives	11
Economic Development Districts.....	11
Permitted Uses and Standards Ideas	11
Relevant Comprehensive Plan Provisions.....	11
Suburban-Rural Edge Differentiation	12
Uses.....	12
Standards	12
Environmental Ideas.....	13
Relevant Comprehensive Plan Provisions.....	13
Stormwater Management and Groundwater.....	13
Transportation	13
Procedural Ideas.....	14
Relevant Comprehensive Plan Provisions.....	14
Streamlining	14
Communication.....	14
Formatting / Clarification.....	14
D. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
Recommended Phased Consideration of Amendments	15
1. Issues Repeatedly Raised During Consideration of the UDO.....	15
2. Issues That Are Particularly Compelling or Time-Sensitive.....	16
Recommended Next Steps.....	17
Appendix	18



A. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

What is an Implementation Bridge?

Orange County has been working to develop a Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). This project was initiated in fall, 2009, to consolidate existing County land use regulations into a central document where all regulations governing the development and use of property would be located. This new UDO includes regulations currently contained within the following documents:

- Zoning Ordinance
- Subdivision Ordinance
- Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance
- Environmental Impact Ordinance
- Stormwater Ordinance for Neuse River Lands

Benefits of placing all development regulations into one central document include making existing land use regulations more user-friendly, and eliminating existing contradictions and inconsistencies. The County's 2030 Comprehensive Plan supports the development of a UDO.

On August 24, 2009, the Board of County Commissioners authorized County planning and zoning staff to:

- Incorporate land use development regulations into a central document;
- Correct identified inconsistencies;
- Begin modification/updating of existing development standards (i.e. signage, parking, landscaping, lighting, stream buffers, etc);
- Update graphics/tables; and
- Develop Conditional Use/Rezoning regulations.

The process of creating the UDO was intended to be incremental. Work to initially create the document would be Phase I, focusing on structure, organization, and the specified adjustments noted above. It was anticipated at the beginning of this initiative that ideas for other substantive changes to the County's land use regulations would be offered during the process of creating the UDO. Accordingly, the concept of an "Implementation Bridge" was introduced: An inventory of these ideas would be maintained, and at the end of Phase I a report would be prepared documenting public comments and providing a synopsis of possible future UDO amendments that would follow in Phase II and beyond. This Implementation Bridge is that report. It is intended



to be a summary of issues, comments, suggestions, and concerns, along with strategies for addressing these.

How Should This Document be Used?

This Implementation Bridge is intended to be a reference and repository of ideas. During public review of the initial drafts of the Unified Development Ordinance, many comments and suggestions were offered by citizens, stakeholders, and Board members. The substantive comments that suggest future ordinance amendments as part of Phase II of this initiative and beyond have been collected, and appear as an Appendix to this report. This document also includes recommendations for priorities and strategies in pursuing subsequent amendments to the UDO as Phase II and beyond. The comments that have been received are summarized here, grouped into the following categories: economic development ideas, use and design ideas, environmental ideas, and procedural ideas.

Orange County's main policy document addressing land use issues is its 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan sets forth goals and objectives for the future of Orange County, and serves as a blueprint and guide for decision-making. Development of the Unified Development Ordinance is called for in the Comprehensive Plan, and the UDO has been drafted within the context of the goals and objectives articulated in the Plan. Consideration of Comprehensive Plan principles and guidance is paramount in the development and subsequent adjustment of the new Unified Development Ordinance. Accordingly, the goals of the Comprehensive Plan are reiterated below, for reference and consideration as work proceeds on the UDO.

This Implementation Bridge concludes with recommendations for proceeding into Phase II and beyond - - suggestions for priorities in considering a sequence of amendments to the new UDO.



B. RELATIONSHIP TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Overarching Goals of the Comprehensive Plan

Orange County's Comprehensive Plan was adopted in November, 2008, following an extensive process of discussion and citizen engagement. The Plan was written and adopted with the intent of being a blueprint document to guide future policy decisions for the County through the year 2030. Eight Lead Advisory Boards provided leadership and direction for the Plan:

- Planning Board
- Economic Development Commission
- Affordable Housing Advisory Board
- Commission for the Environment
- Agricultural Preservation Board
- Historic Preservation Commission
- Parks and Recreation Advisory Council
- Orange Unified Transportation

A point of consensus in Orange County that emerged during preparation of the Plan is that the County needs to move toward becoming a sustainable community. The Comprehensive Plan includes a focus on implementation that is designed to link the economy, the environment, and social equity.

There are seven Overarching Goals highlighted in the Comprehensive Plan, as follows:

1. Economic Development: Viable and sustainable economic development that contributes to both property and sales tax revenues, and enhances high-quality employment opportunities for County residents.
2. Housing: Opportunity for all citizens for Orange County to rent or purchase safe, decent, accessible, and affordable housing.
3. Land Use: Coordination of the amount, location, pattern and designation of future land uses, with the availability of County services and facilities sufficient to meet the needs of Orange County's population and economy consistent with other Comprehensive Plan element goals and objectives.



4. Natural and Cultural Systems: A sustainable balance and appreciation of natural, cultural, and agricultural resources.
5. Parks and Recreation: Regionally coordinated park facilities that provide healthy opportunities for recreation and exercise for all citizens of Orange County, and that preserve important cultural and natural resources.
6. Services and Facilities: Growth consistent with the provision of adequate and sustainable County services and facilities while managing the impacts upon the environmental infrastructure and effectively protecting the County's natural and cultural resources.
7. Transportation: An efficient and balanced transportation system that uses multiple motorized and non-motorized modes of transportation and for which the planning, design, and implementation will be guided by the following overarching qualities:
 - A. Protects air quality, water quality and quantity, soil quality, and biological resources.
 - B. Promotes public health and safety.
 - C. Encourages sustainable economic development.
 - D. Provides equal access to all users.
 - E. Is highly modally and inter-modally integrated and connected.
 - F. Fosters sustainable and efficient use of resources, including financial and natural resources.
 - G. Protects the County's natural and cultural heritage.
 - H. Uses creative and well-designed infrastructure.
 - I. Is attractive, user-friendly, and easy to understand because of factors such as signage, brochures, and web pages.
 - J. Respects privacy and citizen rights.

These overarching goals form the foundation and structure for the Comprehensive Plan. Each of these topics has its own Element in the Plan, each of which includes specific goals and objectives.

Specific Goals of the Comprehensive Plan

The 2030 Comprehensive Plan then goes on to build on these seven overarching goals and identifies individual specific goals as points of focus and direction for the future. These individual goals are policy directives; as implementation strategies are brought forward as ordinance amendments in future phases of the UDO process, these individual goals will offer guidance on proposed regulatory changes. Following are the specific goals included in the Plan:



Economic Development Goals

Economic Development–1: Public-private sector partnerships that create a stronger business climate.

Economic Development–2: Infrastructure that supports desired development.

Economic Development–3: Effective systems to train and support residents and those who work in Orange County.

Economic Development–4: Partnerships that ensure the County remains a great place in which to live and work.

Housing Goals

Housing–1: A wide range of types and densities of quality housing affordable to all in all parts of the County.

Housing–2: Housing that is usable by as many people as possible regardless of age, ability, or circumstance.

Housing–3: The preservation, repair, and replacement of existing housing supply.

Housing–4: Development ordinances and incentives that promote inclusionary practices and housing options for all income levels.

Land Use Goals

Land Use–1: Fiscally and environmentally responsible, sustainable growth, consistent with the provision of adequate services and facilities and a high quality of life.

Land Use –2: Land uses that are appropriate to on-site environmental conditions and features, and that protect natural resources, cultural resources, and community character.

Land Use–3: A variety of land uses that are coordinated within a program and pattern that limits sprawl, preserves community and rural character, minimizes land use conflicts, supported by an efficient and balanced transportation system.

Land Use–4: Land development regulations, guidelines, techniques and /or incentives that promote the integrated achievement of all Comprehensive Plan goals.



Land Use–5: Life, health, and property safe from hazards.

Land Use–6: A land use planning process that is transparent, fair, open, efficient, and responsive.

Natural and Cultural Systems Goals

Natural and Cultural Systems–1: Energy conservation, sustainable use of non-polluting renewable energy resources, efficient use of non-renewable energy resources, and clean air.

Natural and Cultural Systems–2: Economic viability of agriculture, forestry, and horticulture and their respective lands.

Natural and Cultural Systems–3: Infrastructure and support systems for local and regional agriculture.

Natural and Cultural Systems–4: Preservation of historic, cultural, architectural and archaeological resources, and their associated landscapes.

Natural and Cultural Systems–5: Awareness and appreciation of the diverse cultural history and heritage of Orange county and its residents.

Natural and Cultural Systems–6: Sustainable quality and quantity of ground and surface water resources.

Natural and Cultural Systems–7: A balanced and healthy diversity of native plant and animal populations.

Natural and Cultural Systems–8: Networks of protected natural, cultural, and agricultural lands.

Parks and Recreation Goals

Parks and Recreation–1: Adequate parks and recreational facilities for all citizens within the County, regardless of age, gender, race, or disability.

Parks and Recreation–2: A partnership among regional recreational providers and facility owners/managers, including the appropriate co-location and sharing of school facilities, that meets the County’s recreation needs.



Parks and Recreation–3: Recreational facilities available for the public use in a manner that is multi-generational and accessible to all County citizens at both the countywide and community levels.

Parks and Recreation–4: Healthy lifestyles, quality of life and community building through the provision of a variety of affordable recreational facilities and choice of leisure activities, while responding to the changing needs and interests of County residents.

Parks and Recreation–5: Park and recreational facilities that are environmentally responsible, and where cultural and natural resources and open space within these sites are protected.

Services and Facilities Goals

Services and Facilities-1: Efficient provision of public water and sewer service systems which are consistent with the Land Use Plan and which abide by the current Water and Sewer Management, Planning, and Boundary Agreement, the existing Orange County-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Joint Planning Agreement and Land Use Plan, and future agreements to be negotiated among the County and public and private service providers.

Services and Facilities-2: Adequate, safe, and healthy groundwater withdrawal and wastewater disposal systems with minimal impacts upon water and land resources.

Services and Facilities-3: High quality educational facilities that support our diverse and growing population and present opportunities for life-long learning.

Services and Facilities–4: High quality library facilities that support our diverse and growing population and present opportunities for life-long learning.

Services and Facilities-5: Efficient and effective drainage, stormwater, floodplain management, and erosion control systems.

Services and Facilities-6: Less solid waste per capita with cost effective and environmentally responsible disposal and management.

Services and Facilities-7: Efficient and effective public safety including police, fire, telecommunications, emergency services, and animal services.



Transportation Goals

Transportation–1: An efficient and integrated multi-modal transportation system that protects the natural environment and community character.

Transportation–2: A multi-modal transportation system that is affordable, available, and accessible to all users and that promotes public health and safety.

Transportation–3: Integrated land use planning and transportation planning that serves existing development, supports future development, and is consistent with the County's land use plans which include provisions for preserving the natural environment and community character.

Transportation–4: A countywide and regionally-integrated, multi-modal transportation planning process that is comprehensive, creative and effective.

How the New UDO Implements the Plan

One of the main mechanisms available to Orange County to pursue achievement of these goals is enactment and enforcement of County Ordinances. It is in pursuit of the implementation of these Comprehensive Plan goals that the Unified Development Ordinance initiative was undertaken. The Comprehensive Plan is and should be referenced throughout the UDO. Decision making procedures articulated in the UDO specifically include, wherever legally authorized, determination of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan as one of the criteria for approval of land development proposals.



C. IDEAS RAISED DURING THE UDO PROCESS

When the Orange County Board of Commissioners initiated this UDO process, it was made clear that the intent was to first coordinate, combine, and re-structure the array of existing ordinances. The objective was to eliminate redundancy, make the ordinances more user-friendly, incorporate recent changes in State enabling legislation, and make minor adjustments. It was clear from the outset that there were many objectives in the Comprehensive Plan that warranted consideration in the form of ordinance changes. It was also expected that in the public review of a new draft UDO there would be many ideas and suggestions for substantive changes offered by citizens and advisory boards. Accordingly, arrangements were made early on to collect these comments and ideas, and organize them into an “Implementation Bridge” at the end of the UDO process. The key point was to not lose any of the ideas that would be offered.

That, as stated earlier, is the reason for preparation of this document: to organize the collected comments that suggest UDO revisions so that the comments can be carefully considered, with suggested priorities and an assessment of time-sensitivity.

Following is a summary of the comments that were offered and presented during public events and in individual correspondence, as communicated to the County by the public, advisory board members, and Board of County Commissioners. This summary categorizes and organizes comments by topic not in any priority order, and prefaced by references to Comprehensive Plan goals. Ideas are summarized here. A fuller description of the ideas and comments received is included in the Appendix to this report, presented in the same order as appears here. There is no attempt in presenting this list to evaluate the comments.

Economic Development Ideas

Ideas were offered during the UDO review process that suggest adjustments to better encourage economic development-related activity.

Relevant Comprehensive Plan Provisions

General Economic Development Goal: The County seeks to attract and promote the types of businesses suited to Orange County, businesses that will provide jobs to local residents and provide a more balanced revenue structure that relies less on the generation of private property taxes.



There was strong support during the process for consideration of incentives to encourage economic activity and job creation of the type envisioned for Orange County, and for increased attention to provisions relating to the County's Economic Development Districts.

Incentives

- Streamline procedures for Economic Development Districts and commercial development applications. Consider expedited processing for such applications.
- Study what local private businesses need in order to expand and thrive, and consider what regulatory changes could contribute to that objective.

Economic Development Districts

- Consider different standards for application within Economic Development Districts to encourage commercial development.
- Create a predictable process for consideration of development applications within Economic Development Districts.
- Develop regulations for Rural Economic Development Areas.

Permitted Uses and Standards Ideas

Ideas were offered during the UDO review process that suggest further attention to what land uses are permitted where, to design standards.

Relevant Comprehensive Plan Provisions

General Land Use Goal: Mixed-use is actively encouraged, and locations for new mixed-use centers are being identified, providing live-work-shop opportunities that minimize travel needs.

Housing Goal–1: A wide range of types and densities of quality housing affordable to all in all parts of the County.

Housing Goal–4: Development ordinances and incentives that promote inclusionary practices and housing options for all income levels.

Land Use Goal–2: Land uses that are appropriate to on-site environmental conditions and features, and that protect natural resources, cultural resources, and community character.



Land Use Goal-3: A variety of land uses that are coordinated within a program and pattern that limits sprawl, preserves community and rural character, minimizes land use conflicts, supported by an efficient and balanced transportation system.

Services and Facilities Goal-1: Efficient provision of public water and sewer service systems which are consistent with the Land Use Plan and which abide by the current Water and Sewer Management Planning Boundary Agreement, the existing Orange county-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Joint Planning Agreement and Land Use Plan, and future agreements to be negotiated among the County and public and private service providers.

There was strong support during the process for further consideration of the differentiation between suburban and rural areas, for review of what land uses are permitted where, and consideration of design standards that are applied to new development.

Suburban-Rural Edge Differentiation

- Differentiate between suburban and rural character, and adjust regulations relating to required features such as signing and transportation improvements.
- Review and adjust notification requirements to make more appropriate to rural vs. suburban areas. (E.g., rural rezonings may require larger areas of notification.)

Uses

- Revisit Conditional District provisions to consider restricting locations in which they can be applied.
- Revisit home occupation rules.
- Exclude government or municipal uses from residential zoning.

Standards

- Add back language about required findings that was formerly included for Planned Developments in the existing Zoning Ordinance.
- Differentiate between urban and rural character for regulations such as signage and subdivision standards.
- Review the full range of design standards that are currently included in the UDO, to determine if adjustments would help to promote County goals and objectives. (Note: the Appendix contains 22 specific suggestions for review of standards such as building height, lighting, signs, adult entertainment uses, road and driveway requirements, hours of operation, and airport zoning.)



Environmental Ideas

Ideas were offered during the UDO review process that suggest additional attention to regulatory provisions aimed at environmental protection and preservation.

Relevant Comprehensive Plan Provisions

General Natural and Cultural Systems Goal: The goal is to provide a network of protection for natural, cultural, and agricultural lands, protecting natural areas, prime forests, and wildlife habitats. Preservation of working farms is a key theme, along with protection of historical character. Energy efficiency and use of alternative fuel and power generation options are encouraged.

Land Use Goal-2: Land uses that are appropriate to on-site environmental conditions and features, and that protect natural resources, cultural resources, and community character.

Natural and Cultural Systems Goal-4: Preservation of historic, cultural, architectural and archaeological resources, and their associated landscapes.

There was strong support during the process particularly for consideration of regulatory provisions related to stormwater management, water quality, and transportation.

Stormwater Management and Groundwater

- Revise definitions and references to wastewater treatment systems to avoid opening possibilities for extension of sewer service into areas where the Land Use Plan contemplates no public sewer service.
- Consider criteria for locations of sampling stations under the Pollutant Monitoring Program.
- Consider establishing a mechanism for nutrient trading.

Transportation

- Adjust Section 7.8.2 to encourage roads to be laid out in a manner that avoids significant natural features.
- Develop guidelines for Transit Oriented Development.



Procedural Ideas

Ideas were offered during the UDO review process that suggest additional attention to the procedures that are spelled out in the ordinance, to further enhance the effectiveness of the UDO.

Relevant Comprehensive Plan Provisions

Land Use-6: A land use planning process that is transparent, fair, open, efficient, and responsive.

There was strong support during the process for consideration of changes that would streamline processes and enhance communication with citizens. There were also suggestions related to formatting in the UDO, and requests for clarification of certain provisions.

Streamlining

- Explore ways to shorten review and approval processes.
- Include metrics for approval time for each process.
- Review telecommunication towers process.
- Revisit roles and responsibilities of Planning Board vs. Board of Commissioners for approval decisions.

Communication

- Where we have electronic means to notify the public, we should add those as required notification mechanisms.
- Reconsider public notification requirements for differences between rural versus suburban locations (in terms of distance for notice requirements).
- Consider new ideas for public notification.

Formatting / Clarification

- Include more cross-references, on-line search mechanisms.
- Mention the Orange County / Town of Hillsborough Interlocal Agreement.
- Develop more guidelines for selection of school sites.
- Mention the Water and Sewer Management, Planning, and Boundary Agreement.
- Incorporate references to Animal Control Ordinance, align definitions.
- Include language to better differentiate between the different types of residential zoning districts.
- Reconsider treating withdrawal of an application as a denial.



D. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommended Phased Consideration of Amendments

All of these ideas cannot be considered or pursued at once. Since both the Comprehensive Plan and this Implementation Bridge offer numerous ideas, Orange County needs a framework that will allow the County to take action in a dynamic, orderly, and timely fashion. Orange County has a strong culture and tradition of carefully and purposefully examining public policy proposals. Accordingly, this Implementation Bridge concludes with suggestions for priorities and phasing for next steps. All the ideas should be considered; but since all cannot be considered simultaneously in an effective and time-efficient manner, identification of priority topics would be useful.

There are two categories of topics to highlight: (1) Issues that repeatedly were raised in public comments about Orange County's development regulations; and (2) Issues that are particularly compelling or time-sensitive.

It would be reasonable to construct a phased approach to pursuing amendments to the new UDO, once it is adopted, based upon the two priority categories described above. A preliminary list of priority topics follows, and it would be reasonable to schedule work and consideration of these as amendments to the new UDO as soon as possible following adoption. Consideration of the balance of issues that have been raised should take place as time and workloads permit.

1. Issues Repeatedly Raised During Consideration of the UDO

Adjust Proposed Conditional Districts: The most common issue brought forward during Board and citizen comments, and by the jurisdictions of Carrboro and Chapel Hill, was concern about potential widespread use of Conditional Districts throughout the rural portions of Orange County. Concerns were both about lack of restrictions on locations for use of these districts, and about Planned Development language in the existing Zoning Ordinance that was not carried over explicitly into the new UDO. Orange County staff and Planning Board each responded to these concerns by proposing adjustments to the UDO to be included prior to final adoption. The Planning Board's recommendation for approval of the UDO includes these adjustments. *If the Board of Commissioners makes these recommended adjustments in the UDO that is enacted, the issue is addressed. If the Board of Commissioners decides that this issue needs further study and adopts the UDO without these adjustments, consideration of the adjustments should lead the list of next steps.*



Promote Economic Development: Orange County has had Economic Development Districts in place for 20 years, with only small amounts of activity. Citizens and Boards repeatedly mentioned need for further adjustments to the UDO to help in promoting needed economic development activity. In addition, there were non-UDO issues raised, such as attention to extension of water-sewer service in strategic locations, and technology improvements such as increased areas of available internet access.

Streamline the Process: Numerous comments focused on procedures, and on opportunities to streamline regulation. Opinions were offered suggesting shorter review processes and an efficient system for review of proposals by advisory boards, commissions, and elected officials.

Adjust Location-Specific Standards: Concerns about preservation of rural character were expressed, along with requests for further refinement of standards promoting targeted density and mixed use patterns. “Edge” issues were raised, focusing on the relationships between low-density, protected areas and activity centers. It would be helpful to further study the locational components of density and mixed use standards, with particular reference to existing and forthcoming Small Area Plans, to determine if further refinement or calibration is warranted.

2. Issues That Are Particularly Compelling or Time-Sensitive

Review Procedures: There were many comments offered about procedures that are included in the new UDO, summarized above and listed in the Appendix to this document. It would be prudent in any case to schedule a review and potential adjustment to procedures 3-6 months following enactment of the new UDO, with the benefit of drawing from initial experience in administering the regulations to highlight adjustments that would improve usability. During that review process, it would be desirable to consider each procedural suggestion that has been made and compare suggestions with the early experiences of using the UDO to decide if adjustments are warranted.

Consider Design Standards that may further Comprehensive Plan Goals: Revisit the standards included in the new UDO, with particular attention to locational differences in character between rural and suburban areas, and how standards might be adjusted or developed to reflect those differences.



Recommended Next Steps

As always, and as is appropriate, guidance from the Orange County Board of County Commissioners is needed to provide direction for next steps. As the new UDO approaches the point of adoption, it is desirable for the Board of Commissioners to set priorities for staff and Planning Board work on Phase II of this initiative - - the first set of amendments/adjustments to the new UDO - - and also to identify topics for consideration in subsequent phases following Phase II.

The priority areas suggested above can serve as the starting point for this discussion of phased work on amendments. If the Board of Commissioners finds this suggested list (or adjustments to this list as decided by the Board) to be an acceptable “game plan,” the Board may choose to refer the list to staff to come back with a specific process and schedule for consideration of these amendments. The Board of Commissioners could also decide to refer this list to the Planning Board for recommendation prior to giving direction to staff, to seek the Planning Board’s advice regarding priorities for Phase II work and additional issues that should be given early attention.



Appendix

This Appendix consists of three components, all suggesting areas for further/additional consideration of UDO provisions. This compendium of suggestions for future ordinance amendments was compiled from input received during public review of the new Unified Development Ordinance.

The first section is entitled “Future Phase Suggestions,” and is a collection of comments that have been collected and grouped by topic. The second section offers two resolutions that were adopted and forwarded by the Towns of Carrboro and Chapel Hill. The third section is “Excerpt Alice Gordon’s Comments (Pages 1-3 of 24-page Fax).”

These materials follow, beginning on the next page.

APPENDIX: FUTURE PHASE SUGGESTIONS RECEIVED TO DATE

March 2, 2011

Listed below are ideas that the Orange County Planning staff received as part of the 2009-2010 Unified Development Ordinance review process, or are aware of because the idea was raised during the 2030 Comprehensive Plan process. At this time, these ideas are not being incorporated into the UDO as they exceed the scope of work with which staff was approved to proceed. They are collected and listed here as a resource for consideration of future amendments to the UDO.

The comments are listed as submitted by citizens, stakeholders, and Board members, without evaluation. They appear below grouped by category of comment. The ideas are numbered sequentially and continuously throughout this Appendix for ease of reference.

COMMENTS RELATED TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

NEED FOR INCENTIVES

1. The size of a farm should be considered. Organic farmers, which seem to be the trend, 10 acres in order to be called a farm is a bit large for an organic farm. Considering farm income as a requirement to be a farm is difficult because prices can vary so much from year to year that one year a farmer can produce 300 bushels of corn and hardly break even because prices are low and the next year the same farmer can produce 120 bushels and make a lot because prices have gone up substantially.
2. Agricultural Support Enterprises regulations need to be written.
3. Incentives for commercial development (expedited processes, etc.).
4. Focus on the greatest value for the greater good of the entire county with purposeful philosophy and policies to achieve the economic resiliency and community diversity we desperately need and require at this time.
5. Examine what our local private businesses need in order to expand and thrive.
6. Examine why successful businesses left Orange County, such as Smith Breeden, Rho, Contact and BlueCross BlueShield's expansion, and determine what we need to do to have helped them grow here.
7. Economic development projects in the Economic Development Districts should have a predictable and expeditious approval process. Economic development projects in other appropriate areas should have a similar approval process.
8. Economic development approval processes and standards should be revised by local business and planning professionals in conjunction with UNC's Planning, Business and Law Schools.

9. An Economic Development Workgroup consisting of the BOCC, Planning Board and Economic Development Commission should meet Spring/Summer 2011 to examine expediting approval, targeting industries, permitted uses, specialized zoning district by SAP subarea and revised standards.
10. Agricultural Support Enterprises/Rural Economic Development Area, Speedway Small Area Plan and Transit Oriented Development are important initiatives using Conditional Use District structures should be important 2011 BOCC goals.
11. Examine Durham's American Tobacco Campus and American Underground to create an Orange County campus that is walk-able, diverse and attractive for mixed use including affordable space for Incubation and Startup businesses.

TARGETING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

12. Different landscaping standards may be needed for EDDs.
13. Rural Economic Development Area (REDA) regulations need to be written.

COMMENTS RELATED TO USES AND STANDARDS

SUBURBAN-RURAL EDGE AND DIFFERENTIATION

14. Differentiate between urban and rural character -- applicable to signage and subdivision impacts on transportation.
15. Public notification requirements for public hearings and other procedures that are more appropriate rural versus suburban uses/districts (i.e., rural rezonings may require larger area of notification).
16. Cluster development standards for suburban versus rural developments.

PERMITTED LAND USES

17. Need updated Airport Regulations.
18. Regulating adult entertainment uses and nuisance related events at these uses.
19. Airport zoning, possibly as conditional zoning district.
20. Review telecommunications towers process.

DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT

21. Section 2.5.3, No mention of lighting, natural areas inventory, solid waste, or centralized recycling in requirements for information as applications are submitted. Should be added.
22. Include hours of operation. Lighting comes to mind -- Section 5.14.2 (A) (1)
23. Add no fault well repair to requirements.

24. Need to revisit private road standards.
25. There's a lack of land use criteria for reserving school sites. Need some general guidelines (i.e. not in wetlands or on slopes greater than X). Consult County School Joint Construction Standards.
26. Relation to adjacent properties is not addressed -- Section 7.13.3 (C) (1)
27. Is there any limit to building height? Flag for future.
28. Are there provisions for shared driveways? It may be useful in certain cases (i.e. along highways/major roadways).
29. Many places in the UDO have a restriction on the height of a building. While residential structures tend to have 9 to 12 feet per floor, commercial structures can have as much as 15 feet per floor. As the structure covers more area, the roof can have a substantial amount of height to it if it is not a flat roof. Architectural details such as facades and cupolas can affect the height.
30. My comment is this: Would it make more sense to specify the number of occupied stories as a limit on the structure? An occupied story would not include attic space or utility rooms- it would be space occupied by people working in the structure. Page 3-44 and page 4-18 are examples of where this specification occurs. Note that the height limitations that change with additional setback could be used as a maximum height such that either a (for example) 3 story limit OR the maximum height based on setback would be the height limit for the building. An example of this setback based number is found at the top of page 6-2. I would also add in (not sure where) than any building whose height exceeds the apparatus or ladder height restrictions of the fire departments which would respond to a structure fire would be required to be sprinklered.
31. There are various metal vapor lights, the most common being Mercury and Sodium vapor. It would be nice to know why Mercury is being singled out. In particular, is it the presence of Mercury (i.e. environmental) or is it the use of a specific type of fixture such as the yard lights utilities sell that is the concern. If the concern is environmental, then would it not also apply to all fluorescent lights which use mercury?
32. We have incandescent, metal vapor, fluorescent (which is mercury and a phosphorous), and LED. Each has a different lumens per watt rating. If light is being regulated, lumens should be the standard. Also, be aware that any light with a reflector will put out more light in a certain direction than a light with no reflector. As such, lumens is still a weak measure of light output but it is what is on the packaging for all lights and is easier to work with than getting into the amount of light energy per unit area type measurements (candles). As a rule of thumb, incandescent runs 5 to 30 lumens/watt, and LEDs run 60 to 110 lumens/watt.
33. The limits under section (c) "General Operations" and (e) "Use of Accessory Structures" severely limit what a home occupation can do.
34. Somewhere in the Standards for Residential Uses or Development Standards there should be a section that specifies minimum residential driveway sizes of 12 feet wide by 14 feet vertical clearance (already stated in 7.8.5 (B) (15) on page 7-32) for fire apparatus. This is the cleared width of the driveway, not the width of gravel or paving.
35. The travel-way width for Class B with 2 lots should be specified as 12 feet of cleared space, no standard for width of gravel or hard surface.

36. Under (5) (b): 16 feet should be 18 feet so that a passenger car can be passed by fire apparatus. For Class B roads with 3 or more lots, there should be an area 20 feet wide by 50 feet long every 1500 feet so that fire apparatus can pass each other.
37. On (I), remove the word "incandescent" since LED lights are now often used for holiday decorations. Low wattage is not defined, but a typical nightlight/big Christmas tree bulb is 7 watts so you could say any wattage under 10 watts. It would make more sense to use a lumen rating, such as less than 150 lumens. On (J), first off this should be a lumen limit, not watts. As the limit reads, this looks like a total lumens for any given motion activated switch. The lumens looks like it was derived from two incandescent 75 watt bulbs, probably flood lights. Note that if this is the case, the max lumens should be 2400. There are many motion activated systems where a sensor can turn on multiple light fixtures. So I would re-word this to have a 2400 lumen limit per light fixture controlled by the sensor. Finally, on this max lumens per fixture, there are standard outdoor floodlight fixtures that take 3 bulbs. For those fixtures, a reasonable max lumens would be around 3600. You could also add a limit of no one bulb can exceed a rating of 2100 lumens (a 120 watt equivalent) if the intent is to avoid the larger single bulb fixtures -- Section 6.11.3. This is where a definition of "mercury vapor luminaries" is needed. As written, this could mean that any standard fluorescent or compact fluorescent light could not be used, since they are a mercury-phosphorous based light.
38. (C)(1) Some floodlight fixtures do not cover the bulb, the stop just after the threaded base. I'd just stick with the 45 degree from vertical. (c) (2) the "it will shine" is vague. Perhaps something like "no more than 5% of the luminous energy shall shine towards roadways, onto adjacent residential property or into the night sky". (C) (3) Same vagueness- what is the "main beam"? Do you really want to say that no portion of the bulb shall be visible from adjacent properties or the public street right-of-way? From an enforcement point of view, a "Can't see the bulb" is easy to verify for both the owner and the inspector. Note that this is the approach taken on page 6-97, 6.117 (3).
39. All existing and proposed public transportation services and facilities within A RADIUS of one mile of the site shall be documented (leave out "also") -- Section 6.17(B) #(4).
40. This whole section should be looked at with respect to goals and objectives in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan and Commissioners' goals and objectives. County policies do not always support the land development ordinances, particularly with transportation issues. This is too vast a task to address at this time, but I wanted to "tag" this Section for future study -- Section 7.8
41. Move towards intense use of sites to save more of the site in open space - cluster subdivisions. Cluster subdivisions require community wastewater systems. Falls apart on political side. Commissioners very wary due to system failures 20 years ago. Is there a way to put this in the Ordinance 'by right' if designed to specific criteria? Take political part out.
42. Need to update Lighting Standards. Height requirements for outdoor light poles and potential impacts on County recreational facilities is one of the areas that should be revisited.

COMMENTS RELATED TO ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND GROUNDWATER

43. In the section concerning golf courses, Pollutant Monitoring Program, I would suggest some thought be given to the locations of the sampling stations for surface water, groundwater and sediment. Perhaps the intent is to establish upgradient sampling locations as well as sampling locations down-gradient of some potentially contaminating source or specific location?? I think this section needs a bit of discussion as to what the objective is. In addition, under (3) Parameters for Sample Testing- I think that some description of approved analytical methods and minimum detection limits would be helpful. I am not familiar with the EPA HAL thresholds described in this section but I would be willing to look into this. There are various NC soil, water and groundwater limits that may be worth considering for this section.
44. 5(b) of this section- Management Response to Pollutant Monitoring- I would recommend that the responsible party also be required to contact appropriate state regulatory officials if thresholds are exceeded, not just OC do so. I also recommend that the phrase "for thresholds" be removed from this sentence -- Section 5.5.
45. Compare Durham's ordinance requirements for environmental review of subdivisions with Orange County's environmental review process.
46. Nutrient trading.
47. Low Impact Design (LID).
48. Review thresholds and processes associated with the permitting of wastewater treatment facilities.

TRANSPORTATION

49. Section 7.8.2, Public roads need to be laid out in a manner that avoids significant natural and cultural features.
50. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) regulations need to be written.

COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCEDURES

STREAMLINING

51. Will staff be making recommendations to shorten any of the processes?
52. There is an unusual threshold requirement in the Subdivision Regulations – the 21st lot of a subdivision kicks you into an Special Use Permit (SUP) process. Needs to be looked at again – make part of future changes. Planning Board should be able to approve 20 lots or less (without BOCC involvement).
53. Are there metrics and stats for approval time for each approval process?
54. After staff and advisory board review, project went through County Attorney review.

Lengthened the process. Why didn't County Attorney review occur concurrent with staff review? Streamline.

55. A time-line chart for each land-use review process (re-zoning, subdivision, permits, landuse amendments etc.) should be made showing who reviews each step and when.
56. Identify time lags and the reason - such as delays caused by review board's schedules.
57. Identify how approval processes can be simple, efficient, and short.
58. Examine other review and approval processes such as Durham's Development Advisory Committee (DAC) and Design District Review Team (DDRT) which are efficient and streamlined.
59. The members of the above DAC and DDRT are similar to Orange County's Development Advisory Committee (DAC) but have Rules of Procedure, meetings, minutes and quorum requirements consistent with state Statutes. This could replace our current review approval processes when a rezoning application meets all applicable standards.

COMMUNICATION

60. Where we have electronic means to notify the public, we should add this as an expectation or requirement.
61. As people become accustomed to this new document it will be important to provide different kinds of helpful guidance for users to find the sections of the document that are pertinent to their needs. The "Comparative Table" is quite helpful, and is an example of the guidance that will be needed during the transition. Having some kind of on-line search mechanism would be helpful. Perhaps that is already under development.
62. At what point in time will we define metrics of whether the UDO is succeeding?
63. It would be really nice if the final document could be accessed and indexed electronically rather than printed, a hyperlink format. For instance, clicking on a term and the definition pops up.
64. Identifying Comprehensive Plan policies that relate to UDO updates

FORMATTING / CLARIFICATION

65. No mention of Town of Hillsborough interlocal agreement. Add a footnote or a new section. [Note: references to the Orange County-Hillsborough Interlocal Agreement should be added when Zoning/UDO-related items are formally adopted. At this point, neither a joint land use plan nor joint development regulations have been adopted].
66. Section 1.6.2 (A), Is a 1-year hiatus long enough?
67. Section 1.7.2, "Agriculture" should be mentioned somewhere within the discussion of elements.
68. Section 2.2.7 (C), Why treat withdrawal of an application as denial?
69. Section 2.2.8 (A), Shouldn't have to wait a year if withdrawn. 6-months for withdrawal and 1-year for denial?

70. Section 2.15.3 (C) (4).- There is no deadline for agencies to respond.
71. Section 2.15.2 (C) (5) - Not applicable if flexible development option used.
72. Section 2.17, Need a process other than that of a major subdivision for recombining existing lots.
73. Need language that will differentiate between the different types of residential zoning districts.
74. Regarding Impervious Surface Ratios and Sliding Scales, the two tables should be combined into one. Need to understand ramifications of any proposed changes -- Section 4.2.5.
75. Some home occupations are permitted but not associated storage? This needs clarification.
76. Kennels and Riding Stables should be addressed separately. Should they require a Class A or Class B Special Use Permit?
77. Clarify how open space areas of golf courses are counted towards meeting ordinance requirements.
78. Change to require a to Class "A" Special Use Permit, which would require BOCC approval rather than Board of Adjustment -- Section 5.9.5
79. Mention Water and Sewer Management and Planning Boundary Agreement. Any system should be designed, planned, constructed and maintained by the responsible entity as assigned through the Agreement -- Section 7.13.4 (C) (1) (b)
80. As I suspect you know, the County's Animal Control Ordinance includes kennel definitions and a permitting process for Class I and Class II Kennels. The County's Zoning Ordinance also includes kennel definitions and process for a kennel (or stable) to obtain a special use permit (which requires one or possibly both of the permits issued Animal Control).
81. There is a need to better coordinate (and dare I say, unify) these ordinances. Some of the issues in regard to kennels include:
82. Different definitions of Class I and Class II permits
83. A lack of clarity as to whether a special use permit is required for Class I as well as Class II kennel
84. A lack of clarity as to whether a special use permit is required for Class I under the Animal Control as well as the Zoning Ordinance
85. Possible process improvements in the permitting process for kennels requiring a special use permit.
86. Also, I think we should consider whether site plans for "riding stables/academies" should be subject to review by Animal Control. One concern is the availability of staff expertise in this area. Another concern is that there are no specific stable standards in the County's Animal Control Ordinances. By contrast, there are such standards for kennels which require permitting.
87. Clarify provisions for Outdoor events/activities, festivals, etc.
88. Review language regarding Principal Uses and Principal Structures (Arti

The following resolution was introduced by Alderman Coleman and seconded by Alderman Haven-O'Donnell:

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE PROPOSED UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE
(UDO) FOR ORANGE COUNTY
Resolution No. 78/2010-11

WHEREAS, revisions have been proposed to the Orange County Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), and under the Orange County/Chapel Hill/Carrboro Joint Planning Agreement, Carrboro is to give comments on these revisions to the Orange County Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, Orange County Planning Staff made a presentation to the Carrboro Board of Aldermen on January 18, 2011, at which time staff described proposed changes as essentially a consolidation of several Orange County Ordinances, with no significant changes in wording; and

WHEREAS, nonetheless, with the incorporation of existing ordinances into the new UDO, important changes have been introduced in the new UDO, and although public presentations have explained certain aspects of the UDO, certain aspects remain unclear as the document is 800 pages and is not quickly understood; and

WHEREAS, these particular areas have been identified as of concern to the Carrboro Board of Aldermen:

- The Conditional District (CD): This “floating zoning district” is a new construct for Orange County and it refers to a district that is not mapped until a rezoning application is approved. The new wording for the CD district leaves out important text, which specifically ties any rezoning to compliance with the underlying Comprehensive Plan. What is missing, for example, is language utilized for the original Planned Development (PD) district that explicitly refers to protecting the character of the surrounding neighborhoods and seeking opportunities for neighborhood scale mixed use; and
- Certain provisions for the University Lake Watershed Overlay District: the Conditional Districts should be prohibited in the University Lake Watershed Overlay District, and
- For the Cane Creek and Upper Eno Protected and Critical Watershed Districts though outside of the Joint Planning Area, the conditional use district should be prohibited; and
- Certain provisions for the Rural Buffer: the original language in the existing zoning ordinance specifies that development is for low densities and relies on ground absorption systems for sewage disposal. The new UDO text changes the disposal method to wastewater treatment facilities, which seems to imply the use of package systems.

WHEREAS, it is important to understand these major changes to the UDO, because these could have an unintended effect on the way development occurs in Orange County;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Carrboro Board of Aldermen asks the Orange County Board of County Commissioners to look further into these areas of concern explained above, in order to head off possible consequences unintended by the Board.

The foregoing resolution having been submitted to a vote received the following vote and was duly adopted this 22nd day of February 2011;

Ayes: Dan Coleman, Sammy Slade, Lydia Lavelle, Mark Chilton, Jacquelyn Gist, Randee Haven-O'Donnell

Noes: None

Absent or Excused: Joal Hall Broun

**A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE PROPOSED UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT
ORDINANCE FOR ORANGE COUNTY (2011-02-28/R-0.1)**

WHEREAS, the Chapel Hill Town Council is committed to upholding the stipulations of the Orange County-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Joint Planning Agreement (JPA) and to maintaining the integrity of the Rural Buffer (RB); and

WHEREAS, Orange County has proposed a Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), and as one of the partners to the Joint Planning Agreement, the Council may provide comments on the UDO to the Orange County Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Development Ordinance has been described as a consolidation of several Orange County ordinances, with no significant changes in wording; and

WHEREAS, nonetheless, with the incorporation of existing ordinances into the new UDO, important changes have been introduced in the new UDO, so that certain aspects remain unclear as the document is 800 pages and is not quickly understood; and

WHEREAS, the major concerns about the proposed Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) are focused on revisions that appear to change the regulatory approach and the uses which were established in the original ordinances, in ways that are not concert with the provisions of the Rural Buffer and other sections of the Joint Planning Agreement; and

WHEREAS, it is important to understand these major changes to the UDO, because they could have an unintended effect on the way development occurs in Orange County;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the following areas have been identified as of particular concern to the Chapel Hill Town Council:

(1) Concerns related to "Conditional District" (CD)

This "floating zoning district" is a new construct for Orange County and it refers to a district that is not mapped until a rezoning application is approved. This new CD district replaces the Planned Development District in the current zoning ordinance. However, the wording for the new CD district leaves out important text from the original ordinance which specifically ties any CD rezoning to conformance with the underlying Comprehensive Plan, including the land use categories in that plan. What is missing, for example, is language utilized in the original ordinance that explicitly refers to protecting the character of surrounding neighborhoods.

In the UDO there are two kinds of Conditional Districts proposed: "Conditional Use Districts" and "Conditional Zoning Districts."

The language for the Conditional Use District states that, except for 31 exclusions, any use permitted in the Table of Permitted Uses can go almost anywhere in Orange County's planning jurisdiction.

With respect to Conditional Zoning Districts, these floating zoning districts can be placed in any of the general use zoning districts, according to the regulations associated with each district. Also, in contrast to the original Orange County zoning ordinance, no special use permit is required, thus eliminating the need for a quasi-judicial process with a decision based on competent, substantial evidence presented at a public hearing.

(2) Concerns related to the Rural Buffer and the Joint Planning Agreement

Some of the proposed new language in the UDO changes essential features of the Rural Buffer (RB). The original language in the existing ordinance specifies that development in the Rural Buffer is for low densities and relies on ground absorption systems for sewage disposal. However, one of the proposed new development standards for the RB district would substitute the term "wastewater treatment facility" and use that term instead of the term "ground absorption systems," for approved Conditional Districts.

The definition of a wastewater treatment facility includes a system that discharges to surface waters, and indeed any other system as may be permitted by the Health Department or the State of North Carolina. That is a significant difference, and the original language should be restored.

Conditional Districts should not be allowed in the Rural Buffer. Instead they should only be placed in the Economic Development Districts and other areas with specifically identified land use categories so that they are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and surrounding land uses.

Concerns articulated above are relevant to the Watershed Overlay Districts. Accordingly the conditional districts should be prohibited in the University Lake Watershed Overlay District. In addition, though outside the scope of the Joint Planning Agreement, conditional districts should be prohibited in the Cane Creek and Upper Eno Protected and Critical Watershed Overlay Districts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chapel Hill Town Council asks the Orange County Board of Commissioners to look further into the areas of concern explained above, in order to head off possible consequences unintended by the Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, because of these concerns, it does not seem prudent to adopt the UDO for the sections of the ordinance identified above until the proposed language is clarified, or substantively changed where necessary. In some cases the original language of the existing ordinances should simply be restored.

This the 28th day of February, 2011.

| a

MEMORANDUM

FAX = 3 PAGES

To: Orange County Planning Board
From: Commissioner Alice Gordon
Re: Proposed Unified Development Ordinance - Comments and Suggested Changes
Date: March 2, 2011

As requested on February 28, I am submitting comments and suggested changes to the proposed Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

In the two days since the Quarterly Public Hearing, I have written this document with the comments and suggested changes that I can make at the present time. Since I have not had time to reexamine the entire UDO, I am sure there are other sections that are deserving of more study. Also, I should mention that I have used the language of some of the submitted written comments in this document, but have not had the time to formally provide a citation.

Some of these comments and changes suggest that Conditional Districts be restricted to certain areas of the County. If that is not possible right now for Conditional Use Districts (CUDs), they might instead have certain criteria attached which have the effect of restricting them to certain areas. In some cases, I have suggested some criteria. For Conditional Zoning Districts (CZDs), it is my understanding that they might be restricted to certain areas of the County.

This document has the following major components.

This Cover Memorandum

PROPOSED UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO)
Comments and Proposed Changes from Commissioner Gordon
March 2, 2011

Comparison of CONDITIONAL DISTRICTS in the Proposed Unified Development Ordinance with PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS in the Existing Orange County Zoning Ordinance.

Sec. 3.7 CONDITIONAL DISTRICTS

Article 3 - BASE ZONING DISTRICTS
and Article 6, Sec. 6.7 - ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR MPD-CZ

ADDITIONAL SECTIONS TO BE REVIEWED

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and suggested changes.

16

**PROPOSED UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO)
Comments and Proposed Changes from Commissioner Gordon
March 2, 2011**

1. Location of Conditional Districts

Allow conditional districts only in the Economic Development Districts (EDDs) and the Efland-Cheeks Overlay District.

As a guiding principle for future discussion, Conditional Districts (CDs) should only be allowed in previously identified land use categories and located so that they are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and surrounding land uses. CDs are most appropriate in areas which have public water and sewer (or in transition areas) and which have other defining characteristics such as location along major highway corridors.

2. Linking Conditional Districts to the Comprehensive Plan

Reinstate the overarching, guiding language of Planned Development Districts which specifically links the Conditional Districts to the Comprehensive Plan, including the Land Use Categories of the plan; and links the rezoning to the availability of appropriate infrastructure such transportation facilities and utilities. See the attachment which provides changes for referenced sections. Also change any other sections as needed to reinstate the language.

3. Special Use Permit in the Conditional Zoning Districts (CZDs)

A Special Use Permit is required now for Planned Development Districts, and should be required for CZDs. See the attachment which provides changes for referenced sections. Also change any other sections as needed to reinstate the language.

4. Supermajority

A supermajority of the Commissioners should be required for the approval of Conditional Districts, with certain exceptions (e.g. EDDs). The number required for a supermajority and the process remains to be defined.

5. "Ground absorption systems" and "wastewater treatment facilities"

Restore the term "ground absorption systems" to the text and eliminate the use of "wastewater treatment facility" as a possibility in conditional districts in the RB district. Wastewater treatment facilities should not be located in the Rural Buffer.

The same issue about "wastewater treatment facility" is true for the Agricultural Residential District.

See the attachment which provides changes for referenced sections. Also change any other sections as needed to reinstate the requested language.

6. Some issues related to the Rural Buffer and Joint Planning Agreement

The following are some of the issues identified. Other issues have been addressed

1c

elsewhere in this document.

a. No Conditional Districts in the Rural Buffer

Conditional districts should not be allowed in the Rural Buffer.

See attachment which provides changes for referenced sections. Also change any other sections as needed to modify the language.

b. No Conditional Districts in the Watershed Overlay Districts.

Accordingly, they should be prohibited in the University Lake and Cane Creek Watersheds. The same issue is relevant for the Upper Eno area.

See the attachment which provides changes for referenced sections. Also change any other sections as needed to modify the language.

c. Conditional Districts in Phase 2

If conditional districts (both CZDs and the CUD) are to be discussed for the Rural Buffer and Watersheds, change the language referencing the Rural Buffer to specifically limit the uses. Only uses that are suitable for service with wells for domestic water supply and ground absorption systems for sewage disposal are allowed. In no circumstances should wastewater treatment facilities, except for ground absorption systems, be allowed in the Rural Buffer.

7. Changes that have gone beyond BOCC directives

Issue: Reinstate text from the original ordinances that went beyond BOCC directives. If changes are desired, they should go into Phase 2. Two examples:

a. Restore the language specifying quarterly hearing dates for February, May, August, November.

See the attachment which provides changes for referenced sections. Also change any other sections as needed to reinstate the language.

b. Public Interest District should remain a General Use Zoning District.

See the attachment which provides changes for referenced sections. Also change any other sections as needed to reinstate the language.

8. Land Use Categories and the Comprehensive Plan

Citizen Comment: A citizen made the following point about Orange County which is paraphrased below:

One big issue which may never have been pointed out is that our County has excellent and detailed land use categories identified and approved. Therefore, rezoning should not be a prerequisite for most development activity. And when it is necessary, it should only require small changes to the zoning designations. This citizen went on to say that we do not need a lot of floating districts, and that it is better to utilize general use zoning districts which have been reviewed and approved after careful deliberation and community input.

This is most clearly illustrated in "Appendix F - Land Use and Zoning Matrix" of the Comprehensive Plan. Review that Appendix to see how to see how land use categories are explicitly linked to the general zoning districts.