

MINUTES
ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
APRIL 6, 2011
REGULAR MEETING

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Crawford (Chair), At-Large, Eno Township; Larry Wright (Vice-Chair), At-Large, Cedar Grove Township; Alan Campbell, Cedar Grove Township Representative; Buddy Hartley, Little River Township Representative; Lisa Stuckey, Chapel Hill Township Representative; Mark Marcoplos, At-Large, Bingham Township; Andrea Rohrbacher, At-Large Chapel Hill Township; Peter Hallenbeck, Cheeks Township Representative; Maxecine Mitchell, At-Large Bingham Township;

MEMBERS ABSENT: Judith Wegner, Bingham Township Representative; Rachel Hawkins, Hillsborough Township Representative; Vacant- Eno Township Representative;

STAFF PRESENT: Craig Benedict, Planning Director; Tom Altieri, Comprehensive Planning Supervisor (Planner III); Perdita Holtz, Planning Systems Coordinator (Planner III); Michael Harvey, Current Planning Supervisor (Planner III); Shannon Berry, Special Projects Planner (Planner II); Tina Love, Administrative Assistant II

OTHERS PRESENT: Ben Lloyd, Dolly Hunter

Documents handed out by staff: Revised Attachment A to Item 8 of Agenda; Updated Planning Board Member Contact List

Visuals used during meeting: PowerPoint on Buckhorn Economic Development District

AGENDA ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

AGENDA ITEM 2: INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a) Next Regular Planning Board meeting scheduled for May 4, 2011
- b) Planning Calendar for April and May
- c) Oral report by Planning staff on status of UDO after April 5, 2011 BOCC meeting

Craig Benedict: The UDO was approved last night with a 6 to 1 vote. There were several people from the public who spoke in favor. All the groups thanked the groups thanked the Planning Board for considering their concerns during the process in the outreach meetings. A few comments from our Commissioners and a motion to approve was made by one of your own, Maxecine Mitchell. The last person to leave the planning and knows all the hard work that went in by the Planning Board members, seconded by Steve Yuhasz. Discussion was minimal and they approved it and will be sending a letter to the Planning Board to thank them for their diligence in getting this approved. Maybe 15 to 20 minutes for the entire item. People may not be satisfied with the responses but at least we are responding and in many cases, including their concerns. I think what was accented by this board and discussion with the Board of County Commissioners is the deliberations and thoughtfulness that went into the many hours of work you did on the UDO that a lot of people don't know. To show the new era in Orange County, thoughts of Phase II began at 10:00 this morning and comments the Planning Board made in your resolution back to the Board of County Commissioners was please offer the Planning Board clarity in your future endeavors. Let us plug in with all people involved early in the process.

Brian Crawford: I would like to take this time to thank the staff for all the hard work that went into pulling this UDO together. We are very proud of the work you did. I would also like to thank my fellow member of the Planning Board you did in pulling this off and making some of the hard decisions we had to make.

AGENDA ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES
March 2, 2011 Regular meeting

MOTION made by Alan Campbell to approve March 2, 2001 minutes with changes. Seconded by Larry Wright.
VOTE: Unanimous

62 Andrea Rohrbacher: On page 29, I was not listed as being present.

63
64 Perdita Holtz: The clerk sent over an incorrect version that was corrected after this was sent out. The correct version was
65 adopted.

66
67 Andrea Rohrbacher: Ok, thank you.

68
69 Larry Wright: On page 4, line 228 should read, "Comprehensive Plan and remember we were trying to keep it so it wasn't so
70 thick, to keep it manageable". On page 4, line 232 should read, "Hey, they (staff), are dead on and I believe that's right."

71
72
73 **AGENDA ITEM 5:**

PUBLIC CHARGE
Introduction to the Public Charge

The Board of County Commissioners, under the authority of North Carolina General Statute, appoints the Orange County Planning Board (OCPB) to uphold the written land development laws of the County. The general purpose of OCPB is to guide and accomplish coordinated and harmonious development. OCPB shall do so in a manner which considers the present and future needs of its citizens and businesses through efficient and responsive process that contributes to and promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the overall County. The OCPB will make every effort to uphold a vision of responsive governance and quality public services during our deliberations, decisions, and recommendations.

PUBLIC CHARGE

The Planning Board pledges to the citizens of Orange County its respect. The Board asks its citizens to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner, both with the Board and with fellow citizens. At any time, should any member of the Board or any citizen fail to observe this public charge, the Chair will ask the offending member to leave the meeting until that individual regains personal control. Should decorum fail to be restored, the Chair will recess the meeting until such time that a genuine commitment to this public charge is observed.

74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91 **AGENDA ITEM 6:** **CHAIR COMMENTS**

92
93 Brian Crawford: During the last month we have been going through the emails and there was an issue with former board
94 member, May Becker, so we don't have any negative conclusions about what actually happened because I did do some
95 background checking. I didn't respond to the email because one of the things I asked May to do was send what correspondence
96 she had, so I could read it and investigate with staff and the county attorney before I made a comment. I am satisfied with what
97 transpired and why she is not here today. If you recall, back in December, we all filled out an Orange County Disclosure
98 Statement and it was recommended by the county attorney that we disclose our status and put this file and it was accompanied
99 by the Board of County Commissioners ethics policy. One of the things that May Becker did was to disclose that she had a
100 home address that was outside of Orange County. That home address was listed in Florida as what is called the homestead
101 exemption. You know that if a homestead exception means that most people take it saying that live there a certain amount of
102 time of the year and as residents we can take the benefit of a tax reduction. This was her primary residence that she disclosed
103 so if she has her home in Florida as a primary residence, then the question you have to ask is; can she vote for the Board of
104 County Commissioners in an Orange County election? Really, no, she was appointed to a board in which she could not vote in
105 that community so when her time for the Board of County Commissioners to appoint her, that came out and you couldn't
106 reappoint. I am on the Election Board so I know we are pretty strict on reviewing and that comes up all the time, complaints from
107 the citizens so that it what it really was through her own self-disclosure. Once she disclosed it, we were duty bound, to say you
108 really can't serve on the board unless you change your individual status. We need to take a moment for introductions.

109
110 Buddy Hartley: I am from Little River Township. I have been a resident since 1977. I am retired state employee and now work
111 for the County Schools in the driver education program.

112
113 Maxine Mitchell: I am here as an at large member for the Bingham Township and I have been in that area since 1992. I
114 currently work with the Interfaith Council Homestart which is the shelter for women and children. I am also in school trying to get
115 my Master's.

116
117 Lisa Stuckey: I am the representative for Chapel Hill Township. I have always been a volunteer in community, county and city
118 organizations. I was a member of the Chapel Hill/Carrboro Board of Education and went off about a year ago. I served in 1997
119 and 2001 on the Orange County Capital Needs Task Force.

120
121 *Five (5) new members were sworn in: Andrea Rohrbacher, Alan Campbell, Buddy Hartley, Maxine Mitchell and Lisa Stuckey.*

123 Craig Benedict: We have an orientation before this regular meeting with some of the new members and I told them that the
124 ordinance they will here to enforce, the UDO, we will not give a copy to them until we go to print. We did go over some general
125 discussion about our Land Use Plan, the Comprehensive Plan effort that the Planning Board was squarely involved in and how it
126 evolved into the UDO and how the next phase may be addressing some of those small area plans, that the Planning Board had
127 designees that were represented on in the Efland Mebane area or in the Eno Economic Development in Hillsborough.

128
129 Brian Crawford: One thing we have to do better about is being green. We have tons of paper going forward. We will try to do
130 better.

131
132
133 **AGENDA ITEM 7: PLANNING BOARD REPRESENTATIVE ON OUTBOARD:**
134 To recommend, for appointment consideration by the BOCC, a member of the Planning Board to serve
135 on the Orange Unified Transportation Board.
136 *Presenter: Perdita Holtz, Planner III*

137
138 Perdita Holtz: Tommy McNeill is formerly the Planning Board representative on the OUTBoard and Tommy resigned his position
139 on March 31, 2011 which was the last day of his regular term so we are looking for a new member. There is actually a slot on
140 the OUTBoard membership roster for a Planning Board member. On page 23, there is a paragraph about what the OUTBoard
141 focuses on and they meet the third Wednesday of every month at 7:15 PM. On page 24, there is a list of people who are
142 currently on the OUTBoard. Finally, there is a County policy that people can only serve on two advisory boards so the potential
143 representative from the Planning Board needs to be one of the people who are listed there. Eight people do not currently serve
144 on the second board. If someone wants to volunteer, it goes to the Board of County Commissioners for a formal designation for
145 appointment.

146
147 Brian Crawford: Anyone interested in volunteering. No one is interested in volunteering. Can we hold this over so I can call
148 some of the Planning Board members?

149
150 Perdita Holtz: The OUTBoard does a lot of important work with the department of transportation, planning and a lot of it is
151 related to Land Use Planning which is why there is someone specific designated from the Planning Board.

152
153 Larry Wright: Could I just give an unofficial recap from the last and maybe this will help people understand. The last time they
154 met, Chuck Edwards, who is the Chief Engineer for the 7th District of DOT which is Orange, Chatham, maybe Caswell County,
155 and he talked with them and told them he would like to work with Orange County with the UDO and he did mention two things
156 that were of interest. Alamance County has a new plant coming in, like a Caterpillar plant, and they are building a new
157 interchange for that. In response to a question from one of the members, they were talking about the Buckhorn exchange and
158 he said for the shopping center as planned, DOT would not upgrade that interchange because they do not feel that retail
159 warrants that. That is DOT's policy. What we need to do, I think, is clearly develop these Economic Development Districts but it
160 is my opinion that we should take him up on this and find out what needs to be done to really push these development districts
161 into viable economic zones so hopefully we can send that message, from the OUTBoard, and let the Board of County
162 Commissioners hear that.

163
164
165 **AGENDA ITEM 8: ZONING ORDINANCE OR UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) TEXT AMENDMENT CHANGE:**
166 To make a recommendation to the BOCC on a citizen-initiated text amendment to add a permitted use
167 to the NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial - 2) zoning district, as heard at the February 28, 2011 quarterly
168 public hearing.
169 *Presenter: Michael Harvey, Planner III*

170
171 Michael Harvey: The purpose of this item is for the Planning Board to make a recommendation on a text amendment petition
172 submitted by Mr. Ben Lloyd amending the Table of Permitted Uses to allow the Motor Vehicle Sales & Rental (New and Used)
173 use category within the Neighborhood Commercial Two (NC-2) general use zoning district as a permitted use.

174
175 You will find at your places a revised resolution of approval completed by Ms. Holtz and Ms. Berry concerning this amendment
176 request. As you are all aware the UDO was adopted last night. As a result, Mr. Lloyd's text amendment will need to be
177 incorporated into the UDO. This revised resolution accomplishes this task. If it is your intent to recommend approval I ask that
178 you reference this revised resolution in your motion.

179
180 As the Board is already aware, this item was reviewed at the February 28, 2011 Quarterly Public Hearing where staff had
181 recommended the petition be denied based on the proposal's inconsistency with the intent of the NC-2 general use zoning
182 district and the potential conflicts with such a use being developed within the Rural Neighborhood Activity and Rural Community
183 Activity Nodes. Several BOCC members proposed modifications to the petition, which were accepted by the applicant, which

184 would only allow for the development of the use on NC-2 zoned property that is located within Commercial Transition Activity or
185 Commercial Industrial Transition Activity Nodes. Mr. Lloyd is here this evening and can confirm his acceptance of the
186 modifications if necessary.

187
188 Staff can recommend approval of the revised petition as the use would be limited to appropriate areas of the County. We do note in our
189 abstract, however, that this should not be viewed as the most prudent way of addressing this type of problem in the future.

190
191 Mark Marcoplos: I wasn't at the public hearing so this is my first experience hearing about this request. Near where I live, in the
192 White Cross area there is an existing commercial operation that has been a used car lot. This property used to be a garage.
193 Aren't there are certain standards that businesses have to meet in terms of how they handle cars or display cars.

194
195 Michael Harvey: The ordinance establishes standards addressing adjacent property impact with landscaping, setbacks, etc.
196 This proposal looks at, and establishes regulations dealing with, the number of cars that can be stored or displayed on the
197 property. There are also DMV regulations governing the sale and display of automobiles, which we are required to ensure the
198 property owner adheres to in coordination with DMV officials.

199
200 Mark Marcoplos: It seems likely it wouldn't really get out of hand. If it got sloppy, that someone would curtail it.

201
202 Michael Harvey: The best way to answer that question is there is a proposal to limit the number of cars and in this particular
203 instance, which I believe is acceptable.

204
205 Craig Benedict: There will be a site plan approval required allowing for this type of development within the NC-2 zoning district
206 as for any non-residential development. If this text amendment goes through, the use will become a permitted use at this level in
207 that area and they will have to come in with a site plan prior to commencing operations.

208
209 Mark Marcoplos: I am comfortable with this proposal

210
211 Larry Wright: I welcome this. I am against sprawl but we do live in a county where when you rank all the counties together,
212 probably has the top 10% of the mean economic. As far as tax revenue, we are probably in the bottom five or ten. We have got
213 to do more of this and if we can do it in the Economic Development Zone and the Economic Districts. This is the way we need to
214 think about this. I would like to see more of this.

215
216 Peter Hallenbeck: Mr. Lloyd's property is adjacent to mine. I know the location they are talking about. It certainly fits in with the
217 character and community in Efland. That area is being designated as a place to bring in more businesses for all those reasons
218 and the economy being the way it is any kind of business is good. This process has been underway for a while and I am
219 concern that this application was stuck during the UDO wars but would this be a good example of how to use a conditional use
220 zoning, should we just change the zoning. I don't think it is fair to the applicant to have that long period of time because we are
221 doing other things.

222
223 Mark Marcoplos: On point which is unrelated so we can deal with this issue after we deal with the motion or not but I was
224 curious as to the reference of sitting with the Planning Board for six months to get a general idea of how it did get slowed down
225 and if that is an accurate statement.

226
227 Michael Harvey: That is not an accurate statement. The application was submitted by the applicant in December. February is
228 the first Quarterly Public Hearing that this proposal could be scheduled for a review in accordance with our existing processes.

229
230 **MOTION** made by Alan Campbell to approve the item as per staff's recommendation. Seconded by Mark Marcoplos.
231 **VOTE:** Unanimous

232
233 Craig Benedict: As a post note, unrelated to this application. As was noted in the agenda packet there are two different ways to
234 do things. On is to change the text that is not necessarily specific to any person's property and the other way is in the future, the
235 new UDO we have, allows an applicant a specific property and a specific applicant to say I think I have an appropriately placed
236 business and it works with the neighborhood and I am going to say on my property I am going to do something like this. That will
237 be another avenue that you will have in the future. We now have another way to achieve the same goals and be specific to the
238 needs of a neighborhood or individual. That was one area that needed to be corrected.

239
240
241 **AGENDA ITEM 9: OVERVIEW OF FUTURE ACTIVITIES IN THE BUCKHORN-MEBANE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AREA:**
242 To receive a brief review of Economic Development infrastructure history; overview of water and sewer
243 design in the Buck-Mebane area; and possible next steps, including Land Use Plan changes.
244 *Presenter: Craig Benedict, Planning Director and Tom Altieri, Planner III*

245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305

Craig Benedict: What we hope to proceed with later this spring is a land use plan amendment that will address some recommendations that were brought up as part of the Efland-Buckhorn-Mebane Small Area Plan that was concluded in 2006.

That was a proposal that did get clogged up with our Comprehensive Plan which was in full swing in 2007-2008-2009 and our UDO. It is hard to make amendments when you are changing. This is one of the amendment areas that was noted in the 2006 plan that had participants from our Commissioners and Mebane Commissioners as well as community members. Pete Hallenbeck sat on that committee.

The other area that Michael Harvey had mentioned on our land use map was in 1994 we had designated over 1,000 acres for Economic Development in this general area. There are three general areas in the County, Western Orange/Buckhorn area, Central/Hillsborough, and Eastern Orange/Eno which are about 3,000 acres in total. Those areas were put on the map in the 1990s and there has not been much activity because there is no water and sewer there.

These Economic Development zones are to create jobs for residences, save energy, less pollution and to create tax base for Orange County. One of the amendment areas is the Mebane area. The growth in Mebane is at a faster place than anywhere in Orange County and part of Mebane is on the Orange County side. The Tanger Outlet is a retail establishment. Tax base comes in two manners; one is property tax and building property and the other in sales tax. For retail development, we will get more tax dollars from the sales tax revenue than for the property tax. Office and industrial, you just get the property taxes, not the sales tax. Luckily, we do have property next to he Tanger Outlet.

This is another map we showed the new members. The green areas are primarily agricultural residential, 42% is in Use Value which is people in those green areas that conduct farming or forestry operations and they have the ability for a lower tax rate. When you have that type of condition, you need to grow in the areas that are designated. Reviewed map.

Mark Marcoplos: Who is the utility provider?

Craig Benedict: In that case, the water and sewer would be Mebane. The area around the middle school is part of an existing 800 acre utility service agreement with Mebane.

Mark Marcoplos: There is water on the north side that will come from Orange-Alamance water system.

Craig Benedict: That is correct. There is a section of Buckhorn Road that doesn't flow to Hillsborough near the two churches on Buckhorn Road near 70. That will also be part of a sewer improvement project.

Larry Wright: Are these gravity or pumping stations?

Tom Altieri: We have some other maps that show existing service.

Craig Benedict: This is a little about the commercial and residential tax base in the County. You can see primarily residential, 82% . We hope to try to move this line to have more non-residential. More discussion on the PowerPoint presentation.

Tom Altieri: Our Engineering Division is somewhat new to the planning department so we have a staff engineer that is learning to speak planning and some planners learning to speak engineering. In meeting with the staff engineer and learning from our consultant, some of these design options, gravity versus a force main, could have significantly different land use impacts along their length. There are pros and cons to the different designs. Some brief background of the Comprehensive Plan -- that plan includes eight elements, or chapters, service and facilities, housing, parks and recreation, etc. One of the elements is the Land Use Element and that element consists of primarily the map which covers that County's planning jurisdiction, everything outside the municipalities, plus the Chapel Hill Carrboro transition areas. It includes the categories, the colors on the map, locational criteria, and a table that shows the linkage between these land use categories and zoning. Then for more specific, there are small area plans. In the Efland Mebane plan, it recommends a change in the area around Bowman Road to some type of mixed use compatible designation. That mixed use might mimic our Economic Development District with the exception it would include a residential component up to 25% of the land area. That would be multi family, not low density type residential, to maximize public water sewer investments.

Craig Benedict: The idea from that came from our Eno Small Area Plan that Chairman Crawford sat on. In that area, there are some undeveloped lands and some residential lands. You don't want to end up like Research Triangle Park where there is nowhere to live.

Larry Wright: So around these Economic Development zones, we will have a mixed use?

306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366

Tom Altieri: Yes, recommendations and this upcoming proposal are for mixed use.

Craig Benedict: This 423 acres, within that 400 acres, 25% of that could be nestled inside. So you could possibly have 100 acres of a higher density that could service people who are commuting or working in that area.

Larry Wright: So around the Hillsborough area, we have Waterstone on one side, which will have a small hospital or whatever, wouldn't it make sense to have a mixed use around that where people could leave that area and do shopping and commute. You already have the technical college. I would think there would be merit in thinking about mixed use in that area as well.

Craig Benedict: We have an Orange County/Hillsborough Strategic Growth Plan for that area and that is part of the discussion. We have a memorandum of agreement to fine tune that master plan. When Hillsborough determined that it has a certain size to grow to, we said what is left to grow into, what uses do you want there, that is a topic of discussion we will have in the near future. In the Waterstone planned development, there are some residential areas but there are still three quadrants around Churton Street South and I-40 that are still within Orange County jurisdiction, One of the recommendations was that when we mention things in small area plans, they are not reality until it comes before the BOCC to approve it.

Tom Altieri: Continued presentation.

Alan Campbell: What happened when they did this before?

Craig Benedict: When they did this in 1994 there were public hearings and community outreach and discussion of that. The reports were that people along the I85 corridor saw this as an area that would be more non-residential in nature so they went along with the program. As late as 2005 and 2006, there are some small residences in this area whose property is zone economic development even though they have an existing single family house people were worried about taxes going up. We said your taxes will go up when your neighbor sell their single family house for a taco bell. If you would like to change your existing residential, the County can return it back to it was in 1993 but if you sell you property, it will be sold as existing residential, not economic development.

Tom Altieri: It should be noted that we have money for engineering but not to break ground. This may change.

Craig Benedict: It is just design work now. The Board of County Commissioners has \$200,000 just for design work. Typically, that equates to \$2,000,000,000 worth of water and sewer infrastructure.

Brian Crawford: Are there any other comments or concerns that came from the public in this meeting?

Tom Altieri: The people that were there were very interested and supportive. Of course, the meeting was just for property owners.

Craig Benedict: Something that may come up at later meetings is about our Land Use and Zoning Plans and our layers we have in Orange County,

Larry Wright: These people cannot tie into the water sewer that are south of that? I was born and raised on an area where water and sewer came in and then it did come in and we could tie into that but we still could not develop our land since it was a rural area. Isn't there some way they could tie into that if they wanted to?

Craig Benedict: Our water sewer plan says if there is an emergency, failing septic or problems with the well, there is emergency circumstances which the agreement allows. There are finite boundaries.

Larry Wright: I am not trying to negotiate for a development there but a private landowner, if they did have cause or need, they could tie into that?

Craig Benedict: South of the road?

Larry Wright: Yes.

Craig Benedict: No. If a proposal comes south of the road, you would have to change the water sewer boundary agreement which takes the approval of all the local governments of Orange County, change the land use plan, the zoning plan, so there is a lot of insurance layers in there so it cannot easily be undone.

Mark Marcoplos: You have Orange Alamance to the north; they used to get their water from wells?

367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427

Craig Benedict: Their agreement was part of the Eno Capacity, this hashed area is the critical area of the Eno River and Eno Critical area, and they still have an allocation of pulled water from the Eno for capacity. They have now switched to wells they have drilled north of Mebane and this area of Graham and probably pulling more water from wells than from the Eno because less treatment costs.

Mark Marcoplos: That has been my understanding. I think this is a concern about what this is doing to the ground water and will they need more wells. I think this is a big question. The other question is, water coming from the east and the Hillsborough EDDs, isn't that part of why the Jordan Lake Plan is advancing?

Craig Benedict: Durham is asking for a Jordan Lake allocation, what is southeast of Orange County. Hillsborough will be likely have the application process and will ask for additional. Orange County has reserved one million gallons. Water from Jordan Lake may eventually be used in this area to give to Mebane to service this area.

Mark Marcoplos: This Jordan Lake plan has advanced without much public scrutiny, no public hearings to my knowledge, without the governments giving their blessing to it. The last time I heard it discussed was about two years ago. This plan was unveiled at an Assembly of Government meeting and they did not get anything close to a majority from the people there yet the plan has moved ahead. I am afraid that it may under the radar. I am suggesting that before we consider this, if we could get information on all the water and sewer amenities involved so we can understand the impact because this Jordan Lake plan has a lot of implications. OAWASA status as an excellent municipal utility and how that may be assumed in the regional. It's a very important issue and also Orange Alamance the status of that utility. I have heard a lot of questions about that.

Craig Benedict: Work with the chair to find out what time frame we could collect this data in.

Mark Marcoplos: Has anyone been hearing about a light industrial zone proposal? I know that Frank Clifton has been there.

Larry Wright: Is this in coordination with Chapel Hill?

Mark Marcoplos: No. Not really in coordination with anything. It started out a member of the economic development commission, an alderman from Carrboro and myself were having meeting and got other people involved to discuss an eco industrial park in these economic development districts to draw in a mix of light industrial businesses use and looking at ways of helping our garbage problem.

Craig Benedict: There are discussions out there with nothing finite. There are some Economic Development Zones that the County is interested in targeting for some industries but nothing has hit paper yet.

Peter Hallenbeck: Go back one slide on that bottom line. We are defining utilities of water, sewer and power which would drag this entire EDD into the 1960s and attract the source of industries you get from the 1960s which were plants that consume power and make water dirty. It would be nice if we could get into our heads that data lines are also a utility. Especially if we are ripping up the ground, try to work with the County or telephone company could through some orange and blue conduit in the ground. This area is interesting because the Hillsborough office is fed by a line from Virginia. The Mebane office is on a different line. There is an AT&T line that goes across Efland-Cedar Grove Road. So we have an EDD that has the ability to have two or three different ways to tap into the internet. A lot of businesses that rely heavily on the internet that have webhosting or ecommerce really like areas that have two ways to get the internet so that when someone introduces backhoe phase and then digs up the line, the fancy routers that send the data can say I can't get through that way but I can with this. My second point is, I know there is not much you can do about this, I feel obligated to say this is because I am on the Efland Fire Department so everything you see shaded used to be tax revenue] for Efland. Every time Mebane annexes it Efland Fire Department loses the tax revenue. That means that is primarily Mebane's area. We would still show up when there is a structural response.

Craig Benedict: We are definitely broadband fiber as part of the infrastructure and we are also considering wireless and wired underground. The legislature has moved through the house that cities and counties cannot do their own broadband. We have tried to entice Time Water to move their cable to rural Orange County. They have not done that because of an agreement to have 18 houses per mile. We will be farming out our school and the soccer center as a tower center for purposes along the interstate.

Peter Hallenbeck: I know the legislature is considering, I looked at the bill and there was not anything in there about putting height in the ground for future use and running it.

Craig Benedict: We did try to get Google to come to Orange County. We tried like 1,100 cities. We tried. One of the explanations was the reason the North Carolina did not get these was because North Carolina Legislation was trying to benefit

428 these. Hopefully with whatever comes out of this shoot from our legislature gives us an economic development purposes
429 especially to either have a public private partnership to make it work with Century Link or someone.
430

431 Craig Benedict: What we hope to be proceeding with later this spring is a Land use Plan amendment that will address some
432 recommendations that were brought up as part of the Efland Buckhorn Mebane small area plan that we completed in 2006. That
433 was a proposal that got clogged up with our Comprehensive Plan and our UDO. This is one of the amendment areas that was
434 noted in the 2006 plan that had participation from our Board of County Commissioners and Mebane Commissioners as well as
435 community members. Pete Hallenbeck sat as a representative for our Efland Buckhorn Mebane Small Area Plan. We had a
436 property owners meeting in a very large area to let people know there is interest by our Board of County Commissioners to
437 proceed with promoting Economic Development by putting public water and sewer in the area and look at transportation issues
438 too. This was an introductory meeting and since we will be proceeding most likely in May of this year, we thought we would give
439 you a precursory to what discussed with the public. Before we make changes in the general area of the neighborhood, we
440 thought we would meet with residences to explain what is going on. The 2030 Comprehensive Plan, finished in 2008, did note
441 the need for changes in this area and we have made some changes in the Water and Sewer Management Planning Boundary
442 agreement that will allow for Land Use Plan Amendment backfill in the area.
443

444

445 **AGENDA ITEM 10: COMMITTEE/ADVISORY BOARD REPORTS**

446

447 a) Board of Adjustment

448

449 Larry Wright: We did hear a Kennel Class II application and we approved it in the White Cross area. It was approved with a
450 variety of conditions. One was with the septic system approval and the other was there was a very long entry way and the
451 applicant said they would maintain it.
452

453

454 b) Orange Unified Transportation

455

456 c) Efland-Mebane Small Area Plan Implementation Focus Group (not currently meeting)

457

458

459 **AGENDA ITEM 9: ADJOURNMENT**

460

461 **MOTION:** Larry Wright made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Maxecine Mitchell.

462

VOTE: Unanimous

Brian Crawford, Chair