

SUMMARY NOTES  
ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
OCTOBER 5, 2011  
ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

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

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Crawford, Eno Township Representative (Chair); Peter Hallenbeck, Cheeks Township Representative; Larry Wright, Cedar Grove Township At-Large;

STAFF PRESENT: Perdita Holtz, Planning Systems Coordinator; Tom Altieri, Comprehensive Planning Supervisor, Tina Love, Administrative Assistant II

AGENDA ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

AGENDA ITEM 2: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AMENDMENTS

To review and comment upon proposed Comprehensive Plan text amendments to clean-up of Land Use category consistency issues, Zoning matrix, overlay categories, references to Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations, and other minor clean ups.

Presenter: Perdita Holtz, Planner III

Perdita Holtz presented the suggested text amendment changes to the Comprehensive Plan and noted that most of the changes were due to inconsistency in names and terms used.

Pete Hallenbeck noted he had reviewed all the pages and changes and it struck him that things fell into three general classes, changing things due to the UDO when they were rebuilt in other documents, the sweeping changes which tend to be factoring something out, and the third that struck him the most was future land use map. He noted that due to computerization of land records there is a much better ability now to do things that are parcel by parcel. Things were graphically difficult back in the blueprint days and are now a lot easier to do. He thinks a lot of the changes are reflecting the ability to have very fine detail, down to the parcel level, adding overlays and things to it that GIS gives you. He added that he did not see any problems with the changes.

Larry Wright advised that after reading the material he had looked at other counties and in particular Bennington County in Vermont and it strikes him that if somebody grows grapes in a rural area, would zoning permit them to have a store to sell the wine. He noted that he'd been advised that a group of women wanted to have an art studio in a rural area, it was in character of the rural area, but because it was zoned rural, they couldn't have that art studio and sell their paintings there. He noted that Vermont refers to the 'Mom and Pop' enterprises as Small Scale Enterprise. They talk about compatible with, and most appropriate to, in character to the rural area, and they refer to customary home occupation. He noted it would be nice to permit this type of use in the rural areas of the County.

Perdita Holtz advised that planning staff is starting work again on Ag Support Enterprises and she expects drafts will be coming forward sometime next year. She also noted that in some cases, people are able to request these types of uses through the Conditional Use or Conditional Zoning process but that it seems that people may not want to go through the process – they just want to be able to do something without an approval process. And then it becomes a balancing act because there's a certain segment of people who want to have control over what is able to locate near them.

AGENDA ITEM 3: UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) TEXT AMENDMENTS

To review and comment upon proposed UDO text amendments to clean-up text relating to the proposed Comprehensive Plan text amendments (#2 above) and to amend some processes and standards related to economic development projects.

Presenter: Perdita Holtz, Planner III

Perdita Holtz presented the suggested text amendment changes to the UDO noting the green, orange, and red text. She reviewed most of the red text items and noted the most substantive changes. She also quickly went through an example of how the current Land use Intensity measures work and how the proposed measures would be applied.

60 Pete Hallenbeck noted that the constant theme appears to be that the County is having a hard time coming to grip with small scale  
61 start-up endeavors where people want to do it on the property where they live and it really comes into play in rural areas where they  
62 may have a lot of property. He suggested it is a very different impact than if they are in an urban or suburban area. He thinks the  
63 County is doing a good job of focusing on the economic development areas but is having a hard time figuring out how to foster start-  
64 ups. Pete added that one of the challenges with the way everything is done is due to the fact that the rural areas are huge in the  
65 County but not homogenous; they are very different depending on where you are in the County.

66  
67 In reference to discussion regarding car shops as an example, Pete Hallenbeck suggested some of the conditional situations  
68 discussed held out some hope because you could put a lot of conditions on there that would say you can do this but we don't want to  
69 see any cars outside and that shop has to be so many feet away, can't be running loud equipment past a certain time, there are all  
70 kinds of restrictions that would allow things to start-up and happen and yet still have control for all the neighbors in the area.

71  
72 In reference to the measuring noise levels Pete Hallenbeck asked if there is an agreed upon instrument for making that  
73 measurement. Perdita Holtz made a note to look into that especially in regard to peak versus over time.

74  
75 Larry Wright noted, in reference to buffers, that in Research Triangle Park so much development has gone in where each  
76 development required buffers that now it is not a walkable community. He noted that in some cases buses have to be used to move  
77 employees from one campus to another. He thinks there are advantages to not having a buffer between company A and company  
78 B.

79  
80 **AGENDA ITEM 3:           ADJOURNMENT**

81  
82 Meeting was adjourned by consensus  
83

---

Brian Crawford, Chair