

**ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
131 W. MARGARET LANE, SUITE 201
HILLSBOROUGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27278**



**AGENDA
ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

**WHITTED MEETING FACILITY
300 WEST TRYON STREET, SECOND FLOOR
HILLSBOROUGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27278**

Wednesday, March 6, 2024

Regular Meeting – 7:00 pm

<u>No.</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>
1.		CALL TO ORDER
2.	4 - 5	INFORMATIONAL ITEMS a. Planning Calendar for March and April
3.	6 - 18	APPROVAL OF MINUTES February 7, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes
4.		CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONS TO AGENDA
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 residents 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 its respect to all present. The Board asks those attending this meeting to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner toward each other, County staff, and Board members. At any time should a member of the Board or the public fail to observe this charge, the Chair will take steps to restore order and decorum. Should it become impossible to restore order and continue the meeting, the Chair will recess the meeting until such time that a genuine commitment to this public charge is observed.

The Planning Board asks that all electronic devices such as cell phones, pagers, and computers should please be turned off or set to silent/vibrate.

Please be kind to everyone.

No.	Page(s)	Agenda Item
6.		CHAIR COMMENTS
7.	No materials	<p>ORANGE COUNTY CLIMATE ACTION PLAN – To receive a briefing on the adopted Climate Action Plan, including intersection with planning topics and potential areas of collaboration.</p> <p>The Climate Action Plan is available for viewing at: https://www.orangecountync.gov/3096/Climate-Action-Plan</p> <p>Presenter: Amy Eckberg, Sustainability Projects Manager</p>
8.	19 - 23	<p>NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS – To discuss existing public notification requirements contained in the Unified Development Ordinance. This topic was requested for discussion by the Planning Board.</p> <p>Presenter: Perdita Holtz, Deputy Director – Long-Range Planning</p>
9.		ADJOURNMENT

Sign up to receive a notification when Planning Board agendas are posted

Interested persons can sign up at <https://www.orangecountync.gov/list.aspx> to receive a notification when agendas are posted. (Scroll down to the "Agenda Center" category and choose Planning Board).

Monthly Planning & Inspections Newsletter

Sign up at <https://www.orangecountync.gov/list.aspx?ListID=408> to receive the monthly communication on happenings in the Planning & Inspections Department.

Written Comments

Interested persons who cannot attend the meeting in-person are invited to submit written comments on agenda items to the Planning Board via email at planningboard@orangecountync.gov no later than 3:00 p.m. on the afternoon of the meeting. Please include in the Subject line of the email the title of the agenda item your comment pertains to. Emails sent to this address are viewable on Google Groups: <https://groups.google.com/g/ocplanningboard>

Written comments can also be dropped off at the Planning Department's offices at 131 W. Margaret Lane, 2nd floor, Hillsborough, NC during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday). Written comments will be scanned and sent by staff to the email address indicated above.

Review Process

The Planning Board is an appointed volunteer advisory board which makes recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners (the elected officials). The Board of County Commissioners holds a formal public hearing and makes decisions. Section 2.8 of the County's [Unified Development Ordinance](#) contains a flowchart depicting the review process for rezoning and text amendment applications.

Planning Board Member Potential Conflict of Interest

It is the duty of every Board member to avoid both conflicts of interest and appearances of conflict. Board members having any conflicts of interest or appearances of conflict with respect to matters before the Board should identify the conflict or appearance of conflict and refrain from undue participation in the matter involved.

As a reminder, NC General Statute § 160D-109 establishes the following standard: Members of appointed boards shall not vote on any advisory or legislative decision regarding a development regulation where the outcome of the matter being considered is reasonably likely to have a direct, substantial, and readily identifiable financial impact on the member. An appointed board member shall not vote on any zoning amendment if the landowner of the property subject to a rezoning petition or the applicant for a text amendment is a person with whom the member has a close familial, business, or other associational relationship.

If any Planning Board member has any concern about a possible conflict related to an agenda item, please notify Planning staff and get in touch directly with a member of the County Attorney's staff before the meeting time to determine whether a conflict exists – and if so, how best to handle the potential conflict.

March 2024						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
					1	2
Notes: * Planning Board Member Attendance Required Planning Board meetings are held in room 230 on the second floor of the Whitted Building located at 300 W. Tryon St., Hillsborough, NC 27278						
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		ELECTION	Planning Board Meeting 7:00 pm* Whitted Bldg.	BOCC Business Meeting 7:00 pm Whitted Bldg.		
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
		BOCC Work Session 7:00 pm Whitted Bldg.				
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
		BOCC Business Meeting 7:00 pm Southern Human Serv Ctr				
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
					HOLIDAY	

April 2024						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	1	2	3	4	5	6
		BOCC Business Meeting 7:00 pm Whitted Bldg.	Planning Board Meeting 7:00 pm* Whitted Bldg.			
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
		BOCC Budget Work Session 7:00 pm Southern Human Serv Ctr.				
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
		BOCC Business Meeting 7:00 pm Southern Human Serv Ctr.		BOCC Joint Meeting with School Boards 7:00 pm Whitted Bldg.		
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				
		BOCC Work Session 7:00 pm Southern Human Serv Ctr.	Notes: * Planning Board Member Attendance Required Planning Board meetings are held in room 230 on the second floor of the Whitted Building located at 300 W. Tryon St., Hillsborough, NC 27278			

MEETING MINUTES
ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 7
REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lamar Proctor (Vice-Chair), Cheeks Township Representative; Delores Bailey, At-Large Representative; Beth Bronson, At-Large Representative; Marilyn Carter, At-Large Representative; Statler Gilfillen, Eno Township Representative; Chris Johnston, Hillsborough Township Representative; Liz Kalies, Chapel Hill Township Representative; Steve Kaufmann, Bingham Township Representative; Melissa Poole, Little River Township Representative; Whitney Watson, At-Large Representative.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Adam Beeman (Chair), Cedar Grove Township Representative; Charity Kirk, At-Large Representative.

STAFF PRESENT: Cy Stober, Planning & Inspections Director; Perdita Holtz, Deputy Director – Long Range Planning & Administration; Tom Altieri, Senior Planner – Long Range Planning & Administration; Lauren Coffey, Planning Technician.

OTHERS PRESENT: Leigh Anne King, Emily Gvino, Dale Morgan, Michael Hughes, John Dempsey, Margo Lakin, Lynn Nilssen, Lisa Brown, Candice Bender, June Minton, Robb Minton, Peter Sandbeck, Regina Baratta.

AGENDA ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting began at 7:00 PM.

AGENDA ITEM 2: INFORMATION ITEMS

Vice-Chair Proctor reviewed the upcoming calendar for March.

AGENDA ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 3, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes.

Marilyn Carter presented a correction to language on line 964 of the draft minutes.

MOTION BY Statler Gilfillen to approve the Meeting Minutes with amendment to line 964. Seconded by Melissa Poole.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

None.

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 law 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

50 County. The OCPB will make every effort to uphold a vision of responsive governance and
 51 quality public services during our deliberations, decisions, and recommendations.
 52

53 **PUBLIC CHARGE**
 54 The Planning Board pledges to the citizens of Orange County its respect. The Board asks
 55 its citizens to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner, both with the Board
 56 and with fellow citizens. At any time, should any member of the Board or any citizen fail to
 57 observe this public charge, the Chair will ask the offending member to leave the meeting
 58 until that individual regains personal control. Should decorum fail to be restored, the Chair
 59 will recess the meeting until such time that a genuine commitment to this public charge is
 60 observed.
 61

62 **AGENDA ITEM 6: CHAIR COMMENTS**
 63 None.
 64

65 **AGENDA ITEM 7: UPDATE ON COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN (CLUP) –** To receive a presentation from Clarion
 66 Associates, the County's consultant preparing the Land Use Plan update.
 67

68 Tom Altieri introduced Leigh Anne King and Emily Gvino, consultants from Clarion Associates working on the
 69 Orange County Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
 70

71 Leigh Anne King provided an update on the progress of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan since the last
 72 briefing. She shared community engagement findings from what was learned at various meetings and online
 73 engagement.
 74

75 Emily Gvino presented methods and findings from the first Community Engagement Window of three to occur
 76 over the course of the Plan, including statistics on community goals and visions for the County. Ms. Gvino
 77 summarized the importance of this data for guiding next steps in developing policy guidance to balance land
 78 use needs and community priorities.
 79

80 Leigh Anne King discussed using results from the Strategic Plan Survey relating to land use to help build a
 81 better representative sample, since all community engagement responses for the Comprehensive Land Use
 82 Plan surveys have been self-selected while the Strategic Plan survey was conducted to be statistically
 83 significant. Ms. King also reviewed project deliverables that are currently or soon to be available, including the
 84 Community Policy Profile, stakeholder interview summary reports, a data fact book, and maps. Ms. King
 85 detailed next steps on the project, including a similar briefing to the Board of Commissioners, a presentation at
 86 the Agricultural Summit, publishing the fact book on the website, and then developing the Plan beginning
 87 Summer 2024.
 88

89 Vice-Chair Proctor invited all Planning Board members to ask questions.
 90

91 Beth Bronson: Did you say that the results of the Community Engagement Workshop would be available
 92 on the website under the resource tab?
 93

94 Leigh Anne King: Yes, we'll have a summary report specifically for the first round of engagement that will
 95 have the documentation that you saw here as well as verbatim comments when people wrote on Post-It notes
 96 or wrote in online, all of that will be documented in that report.
 97

98 Beth Bronson asked about the option of continuing to keep surveys open past the engagement window to
 99 potentially have input for the County that would not be captured in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

100
101 Leigh Anne King: Leaving it open is an option. The one thing I would caution you about with respect to that
102 is I would recommend that if you're going to be asking the public to take a survey, you want to use the data.
103 And we can't continuously be changing the report. So, I think that's one of the challenges of doing it that way.
104

105 Beth Bronson: Absolutely. I mean, I agree 100 percent with you in respect to that and I understand the
106 design of using the data set to move forward to second and third. I guess that makes sense and if County had
107 a section of, "here, you want to answer these questions separate from this and move those questions to a
108 different location," I could understand that.
109

110 Leigh Anne King: And there's also an opportunity to reach out and provide comment at any point and time
111 through the website. But I think we can kind of take into account what you're concerned about. Should there
112 always be a place for someone to kind of express their interest or concerns?
113

114 Beth Bronson: Yeah you would want to state you're not using that anymore but these responses could be
115 used by the County at a later date. I think it would be valuable data for the County in a way.
116

117 Cy Stober: If I may interject – This is a constant struggle for planners when we do plans of any scale,
118 small area plans, corridor plans, neighborhood block plans, or a county-wide comprehensive land use plan, is
119 you have to close the survey if you're going to use it. And this is a critical part of informing the values that will
120 inform the model and work that we're going to do in the next steps of the project. And so, we do have to close
121 the survey and we certainly don't want to mislead the public that if they participate, that input will then be used.
122 Because we can't use it at this point. We will be doing other outreach and engagement; I believe that will
123 probably include some other survey work. And there will, of course, always be opportunities, Tom has set up a
124 good email address for people to get in touch about this planning effort. And we're working closely with
125 community relations staff as well to use social media and get the word out and get feedback through those
126 avenues, too. So, I completely hear you, Ms. Bronson. We'd love to be able to somehow in real time just have
127 a constant feed into the models and have them adjust accordingly, but it's not possible and we have to make
128 the hard decision on when to close the window.
129

130 Beth Bronson: And I would agree with that. I wouldn't want there to be like an open survey that didn't
131 count or anything like that that may even keep somebody from filling out the survey you do want data on. I
132 don't think you would want to change anything based on that. But if there is a way, yeah, to have those
133 responses kind of in a repository. That's great.
134

135 Liz Kalies: I don't have any questions. But also thank you. It was really thorough and really thought
136 provoking so really nice work. Appreciate it.
137

138 Delores Bailey: The number of people that answered the survey was only 604?
139

140 Leigh Anne King: For the Strategic Plan Survey. For a statistically significant survey for Orange County
141 based on your population, it was supposed to be 580 responses or something like that that I read in the report.
142 So, they actually exceeded the number to meet that statistically significant threshold. I know it's, for the non-
143 statisticians like myself, it's always hard to think that that many people can be representative of a body that's
144 way larger than that. But what they do is they look at, they do a random sampling and they also go through
145 and check for all of the socio-demographics to make sure that those are representative of the larger
146 community as well. The community engagement we conducted is self-selected. So, we do look at how
147 representative it is of the community. But it is not statistically significant because those folks chose to
148 participate, they're not randomly sampled.
149

150 Delores Bailey: Right. And along that same line, in the group that you selected the ones that you just
151 mentioned, did you have a breakdown of how many African Americans, how many Hispanics? I know that she
152 mentioned that there was whole session done in Spanish. And were there any takers to that or –
153

154 Leigh Anne King: No. So, you know, there was a fair amount of effort that went into making it accessible
155 and reaching out to different organizations and contacts that represent those communities within Orange
156 County, and I think that's one thing that we really want to improve upon for the second round of engagement is
157 to make sure that we don't just kind of provide the opportunity, but we're actually engaging with those
158 community members. So, I think we're ready and know how to do that, we just have to make sure that we are
159 going to be able to engage with them directly. And we have some ideas for how we can do that better in the
160 second round of engagement.
161

162 Chris Johnston: I want to go back to the DEI database that you were talking about. You sent out
163 messages to 70 orgs and 100 direct outreaches, what was the response rate on that? In terms of how many
164 people actually replied back to your outreach?
165

166 Leigh Anne King: So, some of the outreach was just more informational to let them know. I think the 70 plus
167 was, "these community meetings are happening in January. Here's the time and location. We encourage you
168 to attend. Please make your networks aware that this is an opportunity." We also publicized that the gift cards
169 were going to be available as kind of an incentive to attend. For the direct reach contacts, there was some
170 level of response as part of that. So, Tate Consulting that worked on the team, they were directly emailing and
171 calling different contacts as part of that work. I don't want to speak on behalf of them, but I think what I would
172 characterize my understanding of that experience is that they didn't receive as much response as they had
173 hoped to. You don't always get everyone on the phone when you make the first call. And so, I think there's
174 some work to be done to kind of make land use planning important to these groups and organizations, and
175 help them understand why it's important to be participating in this process. So that's another part of our
176 charge moving forward.
177

178 Chris Johnston: In the public workshops and that sort of thing, how many repeat people came to those
179 meetings? Did you have a lot of people who were there for Meeting 1, 2, and 3?
180

181 Leigh Anne King: We did have some folks. I don't think that we have an accurate counting of that
182 necessarily. I would say not the majority of people. The majority of people from meeting to meeting were new.
183 But there were some that were repeat. I think there were some that actually attended every meeting.
184

185 Chris Johnston: And at the end of all this, if we go through and we don't have the representation that
186 matches the County or whatever the case may be, what's the end outcome there?
187

188 Leigh Anne King: Well, that's why you have the Strategic Plan Survey because that is, that's the one you
189 can kind of hang your hat on in terms of representation across the community. That's the one that really did
190 look closely at making sure that all communities were represented in the data. I'm sure you're probably aware
191 of this, this is a challenge that most communities face, to get harder-to-reach communities that maybe
192 historically haven't been involved or haven't been asked to be involved in engagement processes. It's harder
193 to connect with them. So again, I think we're coming up with some different ideas for how we can do that
194 better in the second round.
195

196 Chris Johnston: I guess I just come back to the question of there seems to be a sub-vendor who's entire
197 purpose is to make sure that we have this kind of outreach and it just doesn't seem to be happening quite yet.
198 And so, I don't know what that deliverable looks like. It's a problem across the board. But what are next steps

199 and how can we address while we're still in the process and not at the end go, "oops, you know, we didn't have
200 an opportunity."

201
202 Leigh Anne King: Yeah, I think that's a really good point. So Emily mentioned there's some specific groups
203 that we identified from the data that we were not getting the representation in terms of the participation and so
204 I think now that we know that we do have, Tate will continue to do, they continue to have some a role in the
205 community engagement in this next window where they can maybe be a little more targeted to some very
206 specific groups. So the database I think had over 200 different contacts. I think there were a lot to connect
207 with, which is great to have that many groups and organizations and businesses in the County to reach out to.
208 It also makes it a little difficult to have personal conversations with all of them. But I think that now we can kind
209 of narrow that down a little bit more and have some more targeted discussions and maybe push a little bit
210 harder to have those discussions so that we can make sure that those different community groups are
211 represented in the second round of engagement.

212
213 Chris Johnston: Last comment, Cy, have you all looked into how the Health Department can be a place to
214 contact the more diverse communities and populations?

215
216 Cy Stober: We have not. That's very constructive feedback, thank you.

217
218 Whitney Watson: I have two questions. One is if Clarion can drill down a little bit through the kind of
219 economic development options that might be developed. So, it's one thing to sort of go, "we'd like to see
220 renewable energy." I don't know what that really means. Does it mean a lithium mine like out by Charlotte or
221 does it mean something else? It would be nice to know what people think those different kind of job categories
222 would be. And along with that, what education requirements there might be as well as transportation and
223 training? And then my other question has to do with drilling into what people think about or the community
224 thinks about affordable housing. Maybe it's great to say, "we would love ADUs or tiny home villages
225 everywhere, but not in my backyard." So perhaps presenting some alternatives in one of these engagement
226 sessions might help people tease out what they really mean about that.

227
228 Leigh Anne King: On the economic development-related land uses, I think that it's a good question. I would
229 be very surprised if a mine would be supported by this community. But I could be wrong. I think that what we
230 want to do with the land use scenarios that we're going to be testing in the fall is to start to, like you're saying,
231 drill down a little more specifically, particularly looking in the economic development districts and potentially
232 other places, if that's where this drives us to. What are the types of land uses that should be accommodated
233 within those areas? What types of employment are we wanting to support? I think that's important. We have
234 the Economic Development Commission and staff representation as part of the staff working group that are
235 helping us to kind of understand what their goals are, what they're working on. I think we might not have a
236 specific piece of feedback that was shared in this but one of the pieces of feedback we received in the
237 community engagement is there's an interest in small businesses and local businesses in particular. One of
238 the questions I have as a consultant kind of thinking about this stuff is not to say that that's not a good thing to
239 support, but what are the, in Orange County, generally speaking, what are the wages that those employees
240 make and are those wages that would actually allow people to kind of both live and work in this community?
241 It's an important question to consider. If we are, if one of our goals is to try to reduce the amount of people
242 that are working elsewhere and driving in every day or cross-commuting. So, I think that that's definitely
243 something, I don't have an answer to your question about what those land uses will be. But I think that's
244 something that we're going to be working through as part of those land use scenarios. You know, solar farms,
245 that's one that a lot of communities are looking at. Is that a type of use that we want to be supporting and
246 where does that make the most sense?

247

248 Whitney Watson: Right. So, kind of a follow onto that is, what is the economic potential for that? Because it
249 may be that there's lots of jobs created to build that farm, but only two or three or so to maintain it. And
250 perhaps a better example of the kind of jobs that people might question is, "do I want something that's a
251 warehouse where they may hire 50 to 75 people, but they're not actually producing anything, versus a
252 manufacturing facility with maybe a larger employment work force, different kinds of salaries, that kind of
253 thing?" And that makes a big difference, I think, when people think about, "yeah, I'm willing to have a
254 warehouse down the road from me with it's traffic versus a production facility that's making something that gets
255 shipped all over the country."

256
257 Leigh Anne King: On the affordable housing question that you had in terms of kind of what are people
258 thinking about when they say they want to solve this problem, what are the solutions that they're interested in.
259 I mean, one of the things is we haven't defined and designed exactly what the second round of engagement
260 will look like. But we could potentially kind of explore different models and share that with the community
261 members. I think an important thing to also be thinking about, too, is that while this is a County plan focused
262 on the County's direct authority, where you have land use, planning and zoning jurisdiction, affordable housing
263 as we know is not a County alone problem. This is very much also a challenge that the municipalities and
264 neighboring jurisdictions are dealing with as well. That's part of a challenge. When I work with counties, I try
265 to recommend that we think about how are there ways to partner it because a lot of the services, the public
266 transportation, the jobs, are often located within the municipalities. And affordability is not just about housing.
267 It's also about transportation and other related costs. And so, the further out you put people, the more
268 potentially over time their costs are going to be increasing. So, it's a challenge because it's not just a question
269 that the County alone can really solve, and shouldn't be solving alone. It's really a more regional kind, or at
270 least within the County, problem to be addressing.

271
272 Whitney Watson: I was really glad to see that that nexus of affordable housing and transportation came up
273 over and over again. Because that does mean that we will hopefully focus our attention on finding a good
274 solution for both of those.

275
276 Lamar Proctor: So the Strategic Survey Plan is done by a different agency or business?

277
278 Leigh Anne King: BerryDunn, and they actually had, there was a different group as part of their consultant
279 team that conducted the survey, if I remember correctly.

280
281 Lamar Proctor: And will those results also appear on the website at some point?

282
283 Leigh Anne King: There's a full report, that anybody can access, it's on the County's website.

284
285 Lamar Proctor: And so, where will that appear for the public to see those results? Would it be on
286 OrangeCountylanduseplan.com?

287
288 Leigh Anne King: We can cross reference it. We can definitely add that to the website. I don't think we
289 currently have that today, but –

290
291 Cy Stober: The Strategic Plan is coming to the Commissioners for adoption at their next meeting, on
292 February 20th. Where that will be stored on the County's website, that project was managed by the Manager's
293 Office, so I'm not sure, but we're happy to provide links to that from the Comprehensive Plan.

294
295 Lamar Proctor: I think it would be very helpful for all of the survey results, whether they're the community
296 engagement, the Strategic Plan Survey, or the stakeholder interviews, to see all the different conversations
297 and clearly identify the source of that information. I do think the Strategic Plan Survey, being that it's

298 statistically significant, is really important in terms of identifying the needs and opinions and views of the
299 County residents. The community engagement window, did I get those numbers right? There were only like
300 16 online surveys?
301

302 Leigh Anne King: That's right. I was surprised about that too. That is, as Emily was stating, that is not
303 normal. Even before the pandemic, most communities that we work with, very few people show up at the
304 public meetings, the in-person meetings, and a lot more folks respond online, and it was kind of the flip, here in
305 Orange County, which was interesting. That it's a good thing, I think people are feeling safe to come out and
306 go to these meetings, which is good. But there's something about in-person engagement, maybe, that they're
307 more attracted to, than doing a survey online. And part of that could be, because you do have a lot— the
308 Climate Action Plan, the Strategic Plan, the Land Use Plan—there's been a lot of surveys and public
309 engagement, and that might be part of the reason why there weren't more higher level of online responses as
310 well.
311

312 Lamar Proctor: Well, I do think that more data is better. So, anything that we can do to facilitate the next
313 round... Will there be another round of online surveys? I know that this one's closed.
314

315 Leigh Anne King: Every engagement round comes with both an online and an in-person component. And
316 they're the same thing, so it makes it accessible if folks' schedules don't permit them to come to the meeting.
317

318 Lamar Proctor: Well, I think knowing that we had such a low number on the online, we should be
319 cognizant of that, in the next window to try and get links out to as many sources as possible.
320

321 Leigh Anne King: I think that's right. And that probably is part of the story behind why we didn't have folks in
322 the younger age brackets, that Emily was mentioning, because that's where get, typically speaking, we get a
323 lot of feedback from those groups online.
324

325 Lamar Proctor: I felt when I read the community stakeholder interview themes, that they didn't really... I
326 guess my question is, how did y'all present that? How was that decided on the narratives there? Was it just
327 verbatim from people? How did you compile those interviews and present them in this format?
328

329 Leigh Anne King: So, what we did was we tried to organize under key critical topics that we were hearing
330 about from multiple interviewees, or survey respondents, across the 57 interviews and the survey responses
331 that we received. Some of these issues are, many people, if not all people, were speaking to them. Some of
332 them had maybe fewer responses. This was more of a qualitative exercise than the quantitative exercise that
333 we just showed you with respect to the community engagement, so there may have been some issues that
334 maybe we only heard from 5 or 10 people about, but we feel like as, with our expertise and our experience,
335 that this is an important issue to be raising, even if the entire group was not necessarily speaking to it, it's an
336 important idea to be sharing and publishing as part of this report.
337

338 Lamar Proctor: Because there was, in the stakeholder interview themes and narratives, there was a much
339 stronger push for development that I don't think was reflected in the surveys and the community engagement,
340 and I was wondering if you noticed that, if I'm misreading that, or if –
341

342 Leigh Anne King: I think that's right. That's part of the reason why I kept the economic development stool
343 on the Sustainable Development Venn Diagram, because, not to underplay the community engagement, I
344 think it's very important, but there are also some important stakeholders that we met with in this process that
345 had a slightly different view about things, and those inputs are important as well in this process. So, we're
346 collectively looking at all those inputs, even if they don't match up. And that's going to happen. That's very

347 common. These processes are, that's what makes them interesting and challenging, because not everybody
348 sees the world in the same way.

349
350 Lamar Proctor: Correct. I just didn't know how you weigh these things, or if you're just like, "here they
351 are. Here's what the statistically significant survey say, here's what the self-inviting group say, and here's what
352 the stakeholders say." I'm just wondering in terms of the themes and narratives in stakeholders, for example,
353 the issue with Mebane, in your report, there's an indication from stakeholders, without really parsing out how
354 many stakeholders or who said it, or where this information's coming from, that Mebane is not really as
355 development hungry as it seems to be. But I think there's plenty of examples that that is also not true, so
356 there's a disconnect between what is verifiable, accurate information, and what stakeholder summary
357 interviews are, and the way they're presented.

358
359 Leigh Anne King: I think so. It sounds like you're interested in more kind of quantifiable reporting of what
360 the stakeholder interview responses were. And I think that we typically write them as more qualitative than
361 quantifiable at that stage. The purpose of those stakeholder surveys and interviews is really to give us a pretty
362 quick dose of what the issues are in the community and then we kind of use that to help define the questions
363 we want to ask the community and test, "is that right, are we hearing it right?" So, what we learn from the
364 community engagement and the Strategic Plan Survey, is that, to your point, there's less of an emphasis on
365 economic development in terms of the community aspirations that we're reading through those two reports
366 than we heard from in the stakeholder information. Does that make sense?

367
368 Lamar Proctor: And that's why I'm noting that kind of disconnect there.

369
370 Leigh Anne King: Yep. And that's something that we will help to shed some light on as part of that new
371 Issues and Opportunities Report. And we're not going to go through line by line comparing every single issue,
372 but I think that we can talk about how there's some differing opinions about some different topics within the
373 community.

374
375 Lamar Proctor: And then, UNC. So, there was, just kind of like, "UNC is there." Is there a way to
376 engage? I know UNC has a school of government and they have a whole branch of people who look at the
377 interface between local government and development, they have small business advisors. And what I did like
378 about your report is it got me thinking about one of the largest, if not the largest employer in the county is UNC
379 Hospital and is there any way to interface with them and get them to be a stakeholder in the community in
380 terms of affordable housing. Because a lot of the people who need affordable housing are the people who are
381 working at UNC Hospital or University of North Carolina, generally. And I didn't know if there was any fertile
382 ground there moving forward, because they are a huge part, and they just seem kind of silent in this
383 conversation.

384
385 Leigh Anne King: I think that that is a really good idea to be exploring. As a land use plan, since our kind of
386 focus is on developing a land use plan at the end of the day for this project, and I think that land use plan can
387 include some recommendations for how the County might go about either partnering or being a funder, or
388 whatever the recommendation is with respect to affordable housing. And it seems like that's a very important
389 opportunity— is how can we be kind of partnering with our biggest employer in the county, that generates a lot
390 of the workforce that can't live here because of wages, etc. and the lack of affordability, that seems like an
391 important kind of recommendation to be considering.

392
393 Lamar Proctor: And last point on the stakeholder interview answers. I think going forward, I'd like for it to
394 have some clarity as to like, this is a qualitative analysis. Because someone who is reviewing this can get
395 misled into thinking, "well, these are quantitatively important things," as opposed to, "this is kind of the
396 conversation themes that come up when we talk to stakeholders."

397
398 Leigh Anne King: One of the reasons that we take a more qualitative approach versus quantitative, is we do
399 want to be representative of the community when we do quantitative analysis, whereas the qualitative analysis
400 with stakeholder surveys is really an opportunity to meet with County leadership, advisory board members,
401 staff, which aren't necessarily going to be representative sociodemographically of the community, but they are
402 the people that are working on a regular basis in this area. So, that's why we take a more qualitative approach
403 as opposed to a quantitative approach.

404
405 Melissa Poole: So, on the renter engagement, obviously, that's of concern, because it was so low, and I
406 can't help but wonder if that could be, intuitively, when you hear "land use plan," and you are not a land owner,
407 or a property owner, you're naturally like, "why, how does this affect me?" So, perhaps in trying to generate
408 more engagement, kind of outlining whether you own property or not, the importance of the Land Use Plan,
409 and probably a particular emphasis on the communities seeming to drive for affordable housing, because one
410 has to assume, if you are not a homeowner, that you're renting because it's expensive to own a home. The
411 second is, I'm concerned with the engagement of, and if I looked at it correctly, obviously those that are 64 and
412 older are turning out, because, generally speaking, those are the folks who are most concerned with, "I've lived
413 here all my life, this is my property, this is what I want." But, I think, now, I know what I put on, every time y'all
414 have sent us stuff, I put it on my social media. I think that broadening the social media, more so than just
415 Facebook, if you want to reach them 15 and older, you got to do Instagram. I mean, there's no two ways about
416 it. They don't Facebook, they don't Twitter. But I also think you can possibly engage more diversity as well,
417 diversity both ethnicity as well as age, if you thought about sending home something, dropping it off at the
418 schools in the office to go home with kids. Because I know, when my children were in elementary school, in
419 particular, everything that went on in this county come home in their little folder on Friday, and I would have to
420 go through 20 pages of stuff. So, you're going hit a greater diversity ethnically, you're going to hit a greater
421 age group. And then, my question. That's my two cents. I'm good at giving an opinion. Looking at the parks
422 and rec, when I was looking through this, and y'all identify what the purpose of, what they are, the key
423 objectives, how are y'all coming up with that? I'm looking at where it breaks out specifically the different parks
424 and areas, so Blackwood Farm Park Master Plan, Little River Regional.

425
426 Leigh Anne King: The Community Policy Profile, different policy documents the County has. So that is a
427 summary report of adopted and relevant policy plans that the County has on the books right now, and we
428 wanted to do a review of all of those so we understood what's out there right now, in terms of policy direction,
429 that we need to be considering in this process that has an influence on this Plan. And they're organized by
430 different topic areas because there are so many of those plans.

431
432 Statler Gilfillen: I assume that the real goal of this, the whole study, it's to take, and you've done, I think,
433 an excellent job of surveying people for what their desires are. I'm not questioning that at all. It's to take those
434 citizens' desires, and then create a plan that becomes a law, that we can promote fulfillment of those goals.

435
436 Leigh Anne King: Yes. I would be careful about saying the law because it is a policy document. So, it's not
437 the same as your Zoning Ordinance, but –

438
439 Statler Gilfillen: It's not quite that rigid. I'd like to ask a stupid question. Who is the largest land property
440 owner in the county?

441
442 Cy Stober: It's either Orange County or Duke Forest.

443
444 Statler Gilfillen: Let's say Duke Forest. The County has a lot within the urban areas, that may be one
445 thing and the impact of the study and promoting things might be different. How many of that list at the top 10
446 or 20, that own the most open rural land, that your study, as I'm understanding, will be most directed at, and

447 some of them are property owners that could be developers of housing, affordable housing, if they are
448 approached, and they are at that level of that type of land, by opening a discussion in a practical manner with
449 them, could then, and that is incorporated into the policies where you can, and it helps promote the right type
450 of development, could be beneficial. I haven't heard a discussion where those major policy owners as a group,
451 have been taken into account. That would be my comment there. Because sometimes that focus is what
452 makes the most practical solutions. The only other question I've got, and this one's going to be a little bit,
453 deals with historic sites, and there are many of them within the County. Now, there is the courthouse in
454 downtown Hillsborough. That is a very significant historic site. That is public, everybody's aware of it. There
455 are also, traditionally, many public sites that are historic that they're not publicized purposely, because if you
456 openly publicize them, that leaves them, and they're rural areas, that leaves them very exposed for vandalism
457 and stealing on those sites. Therefore, traditionally, whether it's England or the United States, many of those
458 sites have not been covered. In what you're doing in land use, because some of those sites may impact
459 potential development areas. I'm just raising this point, is there any discussion of how you've handled that in
460 your report?

461
462 Leigh Anne King: Let me start with the first question. I think it's a really good idea that you raise about
463 thinking about the next round of engagement, which honestly, is probably when the larger landowners would
464 be most interested in engaging, when we're starting to talk about the Future Land Use Map and how that could
465 or might change, if at all. I think that's an important idea to be reaching out to them directly as part of this
466 process to let them know that that's part of the discussion that the County's having in development of this Plan.
467 So, that's a really good suggestion. On the historic sites, in terms of how they might be protected or what
468 might happen to those, I think we definitely want to be looking at those, kind of culturally and historically
469 significant properties, as part of this process and thinking about the land use designations that would apply to
470 those properties and how that could potentially influence them. Particularly if they're places that are valued or
471 if you all have a prioritization of historic properties that you want to be protecting. That might be something
472 that the County has, I haven't looked into that, but –

473
474 Statler Gilfillen: I would discuss that with Peter Sandbeck, who is in charge of historic preservations.

475
476 Leigh Anne King: So, that's something that we could definitely take a look at, as part of the more rural parts
477 of the county, when we're looking at the Future Land Use Map.

478
479 Marilyn Carter: First off, thank you for a very comprehensive update to the committee. I had a chance to
480 go to two of the three engagement workshops and a friend and community member from Cedar Grove
481 attended the Cedar Grove workshop and I was happy to hear her report back that there was good
482 representation at that workshop. And the participation level was very high as well. So, I was pleased to hear
483 about that. And I'm also pleased to hear that the plan is to go into the next engagement window and the future
484 land use alternatives discussion, to bring in other groups that might not have been represented. I appreciate it,
485 Emily and yourself, Leigh Anne, referencing that. I noticed in the report, and this is a question, that there's
486 several groups that are referenced, the Occoneechee tribal communities, as well as, of course, we've already
487 discussed some of the other committee members mentioned renters, the Latino population, and so, will those
488 three groups expressly be engaged as part of that next engagement window?

489
490 Leigh Anne King: Yes, I think that's one of the things that Tate Consulting on our team can be focusing in
491 on, as opposed to 200 different contacts, we can be kind of narrowing that focus a little bit. Not that we won't
492 continue to advertise and reach out to the other organization and groups, but that we might want to be paying
493 specific and putting more energy behind connecting with the folks that we did not connect with this time.

494
495 Marilyn Carter: Okay. Thank you for confirming that. And then, this is more of an observation than a
496 question, but when you showed, and appreciated seeing the Strategic Plan Survey feedback in this context, I

497 haven't looked at it in the past, and noticing, and of course, the focus in this conversation is land use, but it
498 stood out that some of the community priorities, and perhaps the community priority that stood out at the top,
499 was our schools, or near the top, was our schools. And we know that our commissioners are discussing a
500 school bond that will need to be funded, and while that is not the purview of the land use planning, I think
501 there's going to be implications, perhaps, big implications for land use planning, and of course, funding that
502 and how we consider in our economic development discussions, even if the community didn't rate economic
503 development as high, we know that we're going to need to identify ways to grow sustainably so that we can
504 fund those school infrastructure improvements, so this is more of an observation that perhaps steps outside of
505 the bounds of what this committee does, but certainly it's perhaps, on many of our minds as we think about
506 those tradeoffs. So, just an observation.

507
508 Steve Kaufmann: I just want to make one little comment that I appreciated seeing on Page 49— the
509 statement about the limited utility services in the area. Hillsborough sewer utilities are at capacity, likely to
510 shrink without extra funding. This is something that we had to deal with this past year. Is this going to affect
511 the availability of sewage for the rest of the people? Is it going to increase their rates? It seems to be an
512 ongoing concern, has been ever since I moved to Hillsborough. I think when I first moved here, it was the
513 water supply, and they've expanded the water supply, but now it's the sewage. And so, that really affects the
514 ability to expand economic development, and how do you have affordable housing if you don't have water and
515 sewage for the people? And people that live in town that have the water and sewage, their rates are really high
516 and they're complaining about the rates, and they're just going to go higher, possibly. So, I just wanted to
517 throw that out there.

518
519 Lamar Proctor invited members of advisory boards to provide comments.

520
521 Michael Hughes: I'm on the Transportation Advisory Board and the Agricultural Preservation Board.
522 Previously been on the Commission for the Environment and the OWASA Board of Directors. No comments
523 or questions. Just here to listen. Thanks, guys.

524
525 Lamar Proctor invited members of the public to provide comments.

526
527 John Dempsey: Hello, John Dempsey from Hillsborough. Good evening. The Comprehensive Land Use
528 Plan 2050 process offers both an opportunity and a threat. Opening up the County's land use plans and
529 policies for review and reform presents an opportunity to bring land use policy in line with Orange County's
530 Environmental Sustainability Goals. It is an opportunity to set policies that address Urban Stream Syndrome
531 and reduce the current negative impacts of rapid urban development on the streams feeding our watershed.
532 The Orange County Climate Action Plan and the Falls Lake Interim Alternative Implementation Approach, as
533 well as a variety of overlay areas of a special concern, such as the New Hope Corridor Open Space Master
534 Plan, are just some examples of efforts to protect and improve water quality in Orange County. The County
535 should be focused on reforming our UDO to better align with such stated County environmental efforts and
536 initiatives. The Rural Buffer is an example of land use policy that has done exactly that. Since being adopted
537 by a joint planning agreement in 1988, it has been helping to protect the invaluable streams that feed our
538 freshwater resources and drinking water supplies. This is in addition to helping block urban sprawl, and
539 contributing to reinforcing the new agricultural economy that is now helping to supply our restaurants,
540 groceries, and farmers' markets. This is the time during the Comprehensive Land Use Plan 2050 review
541 process, where the County should set a goal of watershed neutral planning and development and begin
542 working towards that end. Much of the current independent science research on water system health and
543 management focuses on that specific topic. The destructive effects of urbanization on water resources,
544 particularly on the health of those streams within areas of rapid growth. The science-based field researches,
545 those with boots-in-the-water, are who should be heard from for a clear understanding of the conditions that
546 need to be addressed during our Comprehensive Land Use 2050 process. There are many public and private

547 resources available for making such informed decisions. North Carolina's Department of Environmental
548 Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency, to name just two. Answers to the challenges posed to our
549 environment by climate change and to our watersheds by Urban Stream Syndrome, are inextricably linked to
550 our land use policy, and thus provide us with a relatively clear path forward. Science-based reforms to our
551 Comprehensive Land Use Plan will contribute to solving those long-term environmental issues that we face
552 together. Now is the time to listen to the boots-in-the-water and bring our UDO into compliance with the
553 science.

554
555 John Dempsey provided a handout of watershed neutral planning and development to the Board.
556

557 Margo Lakin: Good evening, my name is Margo Lakin. I live in Hillsborough. I attended the public input
558 session on January 20. My husband attended the one in Cedar Grove on January 19th. Both sessions saw
559 staggering numbers of concerned citizens who I would argue are the ultimate stakeholders in all of this. Past
560 and current board members from Chapel Hill, Carrboro, and Hillsborough spoke to the importance of
561 protecting the watersheds and the rural buffers and our tree canopy and our biodiversity. Past County
562 commissioners shared how they fought for the Rural Buffer back in the day, as they vehemently encouraged
563 us to do the same now. It was alive and clearly articulated consensus we need a science-based
564 Comprehensive Land Use Plan. We need to hear from the scientists, the experts, who have the concrete data
565 needed to make land use decisions. I also want to remind everyone that during the pandemic, many of us
566 were able to put food on our tables, thanks to the farmers of Orange County who were able to farm only
567 because of the Rural Buffer. We must remember this is Orange County. This isn't Chatham or Johnston or
568 Durham or Alamance. It's imperative to listen to the citizens in creating a Comprehensive Land Use Plan that
569 reflects our wants and our needs. I see Thank Science signs in many yards throughout the County. If we
570 want to truly thank science, it's time we bring science to the table when creating this Comprehensive Land Use
571 Plan. Thank you.

572
573 Rob Minton: Thank you for allowing us to speak in public in this very important meeting. My name is
574 Rob Minton. I've lived in Hillsborough, 25, 30 years, and one of the things that we appreciate of this area is the
575 rural buffers. It needs to be emphasized over and over again. The reason it was created is because of the
576 positive impacts that it has on the community as a whole. That's why people come here. I think that's why this
577 county is unique. Compared to other counties, they have sort of bellied up to lax zoning laws and things that
578 happened in Mebane here, recently with Buc-ee's, with very little environmental concerns. Anyway, wanted to
579 emphasize that science, I agree with the previous speaker, science-based evidence is important here, as well
580 as it is to emphasize the fact that there needs to be... the stakeholders here, I feel, are the people who spoke
581 out in public, and I appreciate the survey having us. I was one of the attendees at this one on January the
582 20th and I was very impressed by the fact that so many people overwhelmingly want to keep this community
583 intact with the rural buffers. The reason things have been very different and unique here is because of that
584 and I would like to certainly continue to encourage this committee and survey to include that within their overall
585 presentation. One question that I have here, is actually who are the stakeholders? I agree with one of the
586 Planning Board members that it seems to be a little disconnect here, with one side, I don't even know who the
587 stakeholders are. I don't know if any of us do, other than to survey, the consultation people, that wasn't
588 addressed at all. If the stakeholders are pro-development, I've got a real problem with that. I think public input
589 is important here and I just wanted to close out by saying please keep the current rural buffers. They're so
590 important. Thank you.

591
592 Lamar Proctor read out the list of stakeholder interviews from the packet and asked if there was input from an
593 scientific resources in terms of ecological protection.
594

595 Leigh Anne King confirmed that one part of the consultant team is Equinox, a group with landscape architects
596 and others focused on the science and the planning of natural lands.

597
598 Delores Bailey requested a change in the time Tate Consulting holds the public input meetings, ensuring that
599 there are ample meeting times for residents who work during the day.

600

601 **AGENDA ITEM 8: ADJOURNMENT**

602

603 **MOTION BY** Melissa Poole to adjourn meeting. Seconded by Statler Gilfillen.

604

605 **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

606

607 The meeting adjourned at 8:54 PM.

**ORANGE COUNTY
PLANNING BOARD
AGENDA ITEM ABSTRACT**
Meeting Date: March 6, 2024

**Action Agenda
Item No. 8**

SUBJECT: Discussion Item - Public Notification Requirements

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Inspections

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Info Item from March 8, 2023 Agenda

INFORMATION CONTACT:

Perdita Holtz, Deputy Director – Long-Range Planning, 919-245-2578
Cy Stober, Director, 919-245-2592

PURPOSE: To discuss current public notification requirements contained in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

BACKGROUND: Planning Board members have requested the opportunity to review and discuss current notification requirements contained in the UDO. Planning staff provided information on the topic as an Information Item on the March 8, 2023 Planning Board Agenda; the memo from the meeting comprises Attachment 1.

The UDO includes public notification for the following types meetings/actions:

Type of Amendment	Mailed Notice PB = Planning Board meeting. PH = Public Hearing (BOCC).	Sign Posted	Newspaper Advertisement (for BOCC Public Hearing)	UDO Section
Comprehensive Plan Text	N/A	N/A	Y	2.3.5
Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map	Y – 1,000' PB & PH	Y	Y	2.3.5
UDO Text Amendment	N/A	N/A	Y	2.8.7
Zoning Atlas Amendment	Y – 1,000' PB & PH	Y	Y	2.8.7
Neighborhood Information Meetings				
NIM for Conditional District Rezoning	Y – 1,000'	Y	N/A	2.9.1(D)
NIM for Minor Subdivisions Using the Flexible Development Option	Y (if proposing >5 lots) – 1,000'	Y	N/A	2.14.4(B)
NIM for Major Subdivisions (Concept Plan stage)	Y – 1,000'	Y	N/A	2.15.2(D)

Type of Amendment	Mailed Notice PB = Planning Board meeting. PH = Public Hearing (BOCC).	Sign Posted	Newspaper Advertisement (for BOCC Public Hearing)	UDO Section
NIM for Governmental Uses	Y, under certain conditions – 1,000'	Y	N/A	2.24.2
BOA Matters				
Special Use Permit	Y – 1,000'	Y	N	2.7.6
Variances	Y – 1,000'	Y	N	2.10.12 / 2.12.6 / 2.7.6
Interpretations	N	N	N	2.11.7 / 2.12.6

If the Planning Board desires to suggest changes to the current public notification requirements, the Board of County Commissioners would need to sanction the concept before staff could begin work on any updates.

RECOMMENDATION(S): The Planning Director recommends the Planning Board discuss the topic as desired.

PLANNING *and* INSPECTIONS

Cy Stober, AICP, Director | cstober@orangecountync.gov | 131 W. Margaret Lane, Hillsborough, NC 27278 | 919.245.2575

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 1, 2023

To: Orange County Planning Board

From: Cy Stober, AICP, Planning Director
Perdita Holtz, AICP, Deputy Director for Long-Range Planning and Administration

Subject: Planning Board Request for Information Regarding Notification Distances for Neighborhood Information Meetings

At the December 7, 2022 Planning Board meeting, the Board requested information on notification distances for Neighborhood Information Meetings (NIMs). Staff has gathered information from peer counties and compiled the information into the table below.

In summary, Orange County currently administers the most robust notifications, in terms of both the types of actions for which a NIM is required to be held and the mailed notification distance. In addition to mailed notifications, the property is posted with a sign that informs interested passerby that an action is proposed on the property. This allows people who may not own property within the 1,000-foot mailed notification boundary to seek out more information if they desire.

The Planning Department also coordinates with the County's Community Relations Department to send out information to an e-mail newsletter list and/or post on the County's social media accounts. Interested persons can sign up for various "sunshine"/newsletter lists at: <https://www.orangecountync.gov/1561/Electronic-Newsletters>. The County's Facebook and Twitter names are OCNCGov.

Comparison of County Notification Requirements

County	NIM Required? (if yes, for what types of actions?)	Regulations or Practice?	Mail Notices for Planning Board Meetings?	Public Hearing Mailed Notification Distance	Any Deviation in Mailed Notice Distance (NIM/ Planning Board/Public Hearing)?
Buncombe	N	N/A	Y	Regulations requires only “abutting” notifications. Practice is 1,000’ notifications, based on a BOCC vote to direct staff to use 1,000’.	N
Chatham	Y for Rezoning, Special Use Permits, Major Subdivisions	Regulations	Y for Major Subdivisions. Planning Board meeting for rezonings is after the public hearing, so no additional notices are mailed.	For rezonings and SUPs: abutting only. For major subdivisions: 400-feet	N
Durham	Y for Comprehensive Plan amendments, rezonings, conservation subdivisions (not regular subdivisions), and statutory development agreements	Regulations	Y	600-feet	N
Wake	N Encouraged only and staff will ask applicant to meet with neighbors, depending on the dynamics.	Practice, if staff asks due to dynamics	N	N/A	Note: mailed notice for the public hearing is 1,000’ as a policy (not in regulations)

County	NIM Required? (if yes, for what types of actions?)	Regulations or Practice?	Mail Notices for Planning Board Meetings?	Public Hearing Mailed Notification Distance	Any Deviation in Mailed Notice Distance (NIM/ Planning Board/Public Hearing)?
Orange	Y for Conditional Districts, Special Use Permits, Minor Subdivisions Utilizing the Flexible Development Option, Major Subdivisions	Regulations	Y	1,000-feet	N
Statutory Requirement NCGS 160D- 602; 106D-406; 160D-803	None		Not Required	Zoning: Affected parcel(s) + abutting parcels (touching or across a right-of-way). SUPs: abutting parcels. Subdivisions: no requirement for administrative or legislative actions; follow SUP requirements for quasi-judicial actions.	