From:	Greg Wilder
To:	Barry Jacobs
Cc:	Earl McKee; Mark Dorosin; Bernadette Pelissier; Penny Rich; Renee Price; Mia Burroughs; Bonnie Hammersley; Travis Myren; Donna Baker; David Hunt
Subject:	RE: Agenda questions and requests
Date:	Tuesday, January 19, 2016 3:21:14 PM
Attachments:	4-b Historical Perspective Handout.pdf 4-b 2012 Resolution Delaying 2013 Revaluation.pdf 4-b 2013 Resolution Regarding the Next Revaluation.pdf

---

Commissioner Jacobs:

Please see follow-up information for two of your three comments/questions areas ATTACHED and below in **Bold Red**.

Greg

From: Barry Jacobs
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Greg Wilder
Subject: Agenda questions and requests

A few points to please address:

4b. Since it's bound to come up, let's anticipate and please have a brief introductory one-pager and oral presentation on why the 2013 reval was postponed and the county decided to wait until 2017.

Please see attached a brief write-up and corresponding resolutions. Dwane Brinson notes that he is not able to detail the reasoning for the 2012 decision to delay the 2013 revaluation as that was presented by the former Tax Administrator. However, Dwane did provide information as to the delay of the 2015 revaluation to 2017. Dwane will also add a bullet or two as talking points in the PowerPoint presentation as well for the January 21st meeting, which Board members should receive today by email.

5a. The abstract mentions that a resident who'd previously complained about the discharge of

firearms attended the Sept. 28 planning board meeting. Did they speak? Did anyone get a reaction from them regarding the text amendment?

The individual did not speak at the Planning Board. Their reaction, in reviewing the amendment with staff, is that they want private shooting activities banned outright. The individual also suggested, if such a ban was not enacted, a more restrictive setback ought to be required such as 1,000 ft. No definitive setback was offered. As these issues were discussed and dismissed at the public hearing (i.e. the County cannot outright ban the discharge of a firearm on private property and the suggested 1,000 ft. setback is too restrictive in that same would require a parcel approximately 300 acres in area), Michael Harvey thought there was no need to mention then again as part of the amendment process. Some of the information exists in Attachment 1 (Ordinance amendment form) of the abstract, specifically the size of property based on the originally proposed setbacks and bans on gun discharge.

Are ballfields covered in another section other than Recreational Facilities on page 10-32?

A ballfield can be considered a recreational facility or an accessory use depending on its intended nature of operation. With respect to a ballfield being an accessory use, Michael Harvey noted that there is a church off of Walnut Grove Church Road that developed a ballfield as an accessory use as part of a church league. There are also schools that have ballfields as accessory uses. A park can

have a ballfield as part of its operation (i.e. providing recreational opportunities to the general public). A ballfield can also be proposed/accommodated in other land uses such as a camp (summer camp has a ballfield) or a community center (we have 2 community centers in Orange County with ballfields). So a 'ballfield' is not just limited to being developed as a 'recreational facility'.

In considering buffers, is there any rationale for distinguishing stream buffers/wildlife corridors from other buffers?

Michael Harvey notes that, from his standpoint the answer is that the County already does. Different buffer types have difference allowances. For example there are uses allowed to be developed within a stream buffer (Section 6.13 of the UDO). A wildlife corridor buffer is typically established as part of a development (i.e. subdivision) process. Most non-residential land uses also have a land use buffer separating the use from adjoining property. Buffer can also overlap. When a development is proposed staff evaluates the various buffers on a given parcel of property and ascertains what allowances/modifications, if any, are allowed. Development then moves forward accordingly based on these allowances. For example while there may be a project with a portion of a stream buffer on the property that is also located within a required land use buffer. Michael Harvey also noted that the land use buffer, being more restrictive in allowing disturbance, takes precedence meaning the County could

not allow any disturbance/use even with the stream buffer regulations contained in the UDO.

8a Can we please get the overall Orange County census data broken down by ethnic group as cited on p. 4/5?

RESPONSE PENDING

Thanks.

Barry