




Community Engagement Window #2 Engagement Summary

Planning Board December 4, 2024

CLARION




Agenda



- 1. Project Update
- Community Engagement Window #2
 - a. Activities
 - b. Objectives
 - c. Outcomes
- 3. Discussion of Policy Direction
- 4. Next Steps

Project Timeline





PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Status Report



Work that has been completed:

- Phase 4:
 - Development of Land Use & Recommendations Report (land use alternatives)
 - Community Engagement Window #2

Work that is underway:

- Phase 4:
 - Community Engagement Window #2 Summary Report
 - Develop Draft Plan Framework, Vision, and Goals
 - <u>Develop Plan Policies and Actions</u>

Engagement Activities

Community Engagement Window #2: Testing the Conservation and Growth Framework



- The second Community Engagement Window – Testing the Conservation and Growth Framework- was held in the fall of 2024.
- This phase of engagement asked community members to review **modeled land use alternatives** and **draft vision themes and goals**.



Community Engagement Window (CEW) #2





CEW#2 activities included:

- Staff tabling at three events (August and September 2024)
- Five in-person meetings (September and October 2024)
- Online activities available (September 25 – November 3)

Community Engagement Window (CEW) #2







CEW#2 activities included:

Online Outreach:

Social media, newsletters, bilingual flyers

Direct Mailings

1,000+ properties

Online surveys available

305 surveys completed online



The three objectives of Community Engagement Window #2 included:



Engagement Satisfaction



Representative Engagement




Increased Engagement





Measuring Representation of Engagement






Measuring Representation of Engagement

Do you identify as Hispanic/Latinx?

questionnaire.



12



Measuring Increased Engagement

Benchmark: The Orange County Climate Action Plan

Activity	Climate Action Plan	LUP2050: Community Engagement Window #1	LUP2050: Community Engagement Window #2	LUP2050 Total
Community Survey	510 completed surveys	164 complete surveys	420 complete surveys	584 complete surveys
In Person Engagement	Draft CAP Symposium: 12 attendees Online Focus Groups: 40 participants total	Approximately 244 in person attendees at community events	Approximately 165 in person attendees at community events	409 in person attendees

Community Engagement Window #3 will occur in late spring 2025.

Additional Public Inputs



Organizational Letters Received

- Duke Forest Teaching and Research Laboratory
- NC Wildlife Resources Commission
- Sierra Club, Orange-Chatham Group Executive Committee
- Triangle Connectivity Collaborative
- Southern Environmental Law Center, Chapel Hill Office

Personal Letters Received

- Barry Jacobs
- Michael Hughes



- Takeaways from Community Engagement Window #2 to Apply to Community Engagement Window #3
 - **Engagement satisfaction:** continue to offer multiple ways to participate with creative, fun, flexible, and accessible options
 - **Representative engagement:** Continue creating partnerships/connections and tailoring outreach efforts to support representative participation (such as African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian community members; youth; etc.)
 - Increased engagement: Community Engagement Window #3 will occur in the spring of 2025 to continue to increase overall engagement numbers.

Refresher on Land Use Alternatives


Refresher on Key Question Being Tested Through Alternatives

Which aspects of the land use alternatives best achieve the balance of sustainable development in Orange County?




Refresher on Land Use Alternatives

Baseline Alternative with Policy Updates



Continue Current Policies



Enhance Agricultural and Environmental Protections Low-Impact Rural Conservation Neighborhoods and New Employment in Strategic Locations

#3



Mixed-Use Centers and New Employment in Strategic Locations

Engagement Outcomes

- Participants were provided two ways to provide feedback both online or in person:
 - Short Survey (7 questions)
 - Long Survey (12 questions about the land use alternatives and 4 questions about the draft Vision Themes and Goals)
- The same questions were posed to participants for both online engagement and in person meetings.

Community Engagement Window #2

- Total of 420 surveys received
- Approximately 115 surveys were received at in-person meetings and 305 were completed online
- Approximately **286** short surveys and **134** long surveys were completed

				N
	In Person	Online	Total	Gravell
				Americ
Surveys	115	305	420	El Cent
Exit Questionnaire	106	199		Efland
			305	Jones G
				Total

Meeting	Approximate Number of Attendees In Person
Gravelly Hill	~60
American Legion	~55
El Centro	15
Efland Cheeks	16
Jones Grove	19
Total	165





Summary of Survey Responses: Vision Themes & Goals

<u>Short Survey</u>: Strong support for <u>all</u> Vision Themes

- Highest Support:
 - Protect Critical Watershed Areas and Open Spaces and Preserve Agricultural Lands (85%)
- Lowest Support:
 - Cultivate Sustainable Development (69%)
 - Advance Equitable Housing (67%)

Long survey: Strong support for most Goals

- Highest Support:
 - Environment, Parks, and Recreation (91%)
 - Working Lands and Open Space (84%)
- Lowest Support:
 - Regional and Local Growth (46%)
 - Economy and Employment (62%)




Overall Takeaways

- Strong support for changing Orange County's current approach to managing land use to both protect natural lands and support development of needed housing
- Strong support for protecting priority agricultural, environmental, and rural lands
- Desire to see more housing choices
- Mixed support for higher-density residential mixed-use development and providing more employment opportunities
- Support for Rural Conservation Neighborhoods
- Support for expanding Economic Development Area near Mebane/I-85
- Support for Goals and Vision Themes, with some adjustments
- Not as supportive of extension of public water and sewer, or development of private water and wastewater systems

Community Engagement Window #2 Outcomes: Vision Themes

Sample of engagement findings below. Full report will be available online.

Do the Vision Themes address Orange County's needs over the next 25 years?



1= Not very supportive 4 ■ 5 = Very Supportive



Overall Takeaways

- Strong support for changing Orange County's current approach to managing land use to both protect natural lands and support development of needed housing
- Strong support for protecting priority agricultural, environmental, and rural lands
- Desire to see more housing choices
- Mixed support for higher-density residential mixed-use development and providing more employment opportunities
- Support for Rural Conservation Neighborhoods
- Support for expanding Economic Development Area near Mebane/I-85
- Support for Goals and Vision Themes, with some adjustments
- Mixed support for extension of public water and sewer and development of private water and wastewater systems



Summary of Long Survey Responses: Land Use Alternatives

Land Use **58%** are satisfied with current approach to land use

Land Use Alternative #2 Majority of respondents (54%) support a focus on protection of environmental, agricultural, watershed, and rural lands



Summary of Long Survey Responses: Land Use Alternatives

 Majority (52%) support encouraging new Rural Conservation Neighborhoods

Land Use Alternative #3

Land Use . Alternative #4

- Support is more evenly divided between:
 - Those who support (44%) and do not support (39%) allowing the development of private water and wastewater systems to support Rural Conservation Neighborhoods
 - Those who support (49%) and do not support (35%) including a new
 Economic Development Area south of West Ten Road
 - Those who support (41%) and do not support (46%) allowing two types of higher intensity mixed use developments
 - Those who **support (48%)** and **do not support (41%)** the **extension of public water and sewer** to support higher intensity mixed use developments

Next Steps



- During the winter of 2024 and spring of 2025, the Project Team will be developing the plan. This includes:
 - Draft Plan Framework, Vision, and Goals
 - Growth and Conservation Framework
 - Policies and Actions
- Community Engagement Window #3: Unveiling the Plan is tentatively scheduled for May and June 2025.

Guidance from BOCC



At the November work session, the BOCC indicated support for development of the following policies in the plan:

- New approaches to encourage **conservation subdivisions** in the unincorporated portions of the County that protect high priority agricultural and environmental lands
- Policies to express support for more dense housing options within the municipalities
- Expansion of economic development opportunities near I-85/Mebane
- Other?






Reference Slides




Short Survey Question: I support Orange County's current approach to guiding conservation and growth in unincorporated Orange County.



*272 out of 420 respondents answered this question.




Short Survey Question: To protect priority agricultural, environmental, and rural lands, I support further restricting development in unincorporated Orange County.



*282 out of 420 respondents answered this question.




Short Survey Question: To provide more housing choices, I support residential development in unincorporated Orange County as long as it permanently protects priority agricultural, wildlife habitat, or watershed lands on the development site.



*280 out of 420 respondents answered this question.




Short Survey Question: To provide more housing choices, I support higher-density residential mixed-use developments, such as townhomes and apartments over shops, in a few locations in unincorporated Orange County that could be served by town water and sewer.



*281 out of 420 respondents answered this question.


Short Survey Question: To provide more employment opportunities in unincorporated Orange County, I support the development of new employment centers near I-85 and Mebane.



*280 out of 420 respondents answered this question.




Considering Alternative #1, what is your level of satisfaction with the County's current approach to managing land use? Please select your level of satisfaction on the scale, with 1 being not satisfied and 5 being very satisfied.



*120 out of 420 respondents answered this question.




Considering Alternative #2, what is your level of support for changing the County's current approach of managing land use to be more focused on protection of environmental, agricultural, watershed, and rural lands? Please select your level of support on the scale, with 1 being do not support and 5 being strongly support.



*129 out of 420 respondents answered this question.




Considering Alternative #3, what is your level of support for changing the County's current approach of managing land use to encourage new Rural Conservation Neighborhoods that allow for smaller lot sizes in trade for 60% of the site to be permanently protected? Please circle your level of support on the scale, with 1 being do not support and 5 being strongly support.






The Rural Conservation Neighborhoods included in Alternative #3 would likely require private community water and sewer systems to serve these developments. What is your level of support for allowing the development of private water and wastewater systems to support this type of development? Please circle your level of support on the scale, with 1 being do not support and 5 being strongly support.



*119 out of 420 respondents answered this question.




Alternatives #3 and #4 both include a new Economic Development Area near Efland south of West Ten Road that could provide new employment opportunities and tax base for the County. What is your level of support for changing the County's current approach of managing land use to allow for this new Economic Development Area?





Considering Alternative #4, what is your level of support for changing the County's current approach of managing land use to allow for two types of higher intensity mixed-use developments? Please select your level of support on the scale, with 1 being do not support and 5 being strongly support.




*124 out of 420 respondents answered this question.

Community Engagement Window #2 Outcomes: Vision Themes

Short Survey

answered this question.




Do the Vision Themes address Orange County's needs over the next 25 years?

43

Community Engagement Window #2 Outcomes: Vision Themes


Long Survey

Do you support each Vision Theme listed below as the land use aspirations for Orange County over the next 25 years?




answered this question.






Economy and Employment**




*99 and **103 out of 420 respondents answered these questions.



Environment, Parks, and Recreation







Housing and Affordability

106 out of 420 respondents answered these questions.





Regional and Local Growth*





Resiliency and Hazard Mitigation**

*102 and **100 out of 420 respondents answered these questions.



Services and Community Facilities*






Transportation and Mobility**

*101 and **103 out of 420 respondents answered these questions.





Working Lands and Open Space

105 out of 420 respondents answered these questions.



Summary of <u>Short Survey</u> Responses

- More participants chose to take the short survey
- Majority (61% of responses) support the County's current approach to guiding conservation and growth in Orange County
- Strong agreement (75% of responses) for further restricting development in unincorporated Orange County to protect priority agricultural, environmental, and rural lands
- Majority (64%) support residential development to provide more housing choices (as long as it permanently

protects priority agricultural, wildlife habitat, or watershed lands)

- Majority (59%) support higherdensity residential mixed-use developments in strategic locations
- Majority (68%) support providing more employment opportunities near I-85 and Mebane



Summary of Long Survey Responses: Goals

Strong support for Goals:

- Community Equity (72%)
- Economy and Employment (62%)
- Environment, Parks, and Recreation (91%)
- Housing and Affordability (69%)
- Resiliency and Hazard Mitigation (83%)
- Services and Community Facilities (70%)
- Transportation and Mobility (70%)
- Working Lands and Open Space (84%)

Room for improvement on:

 Regional and Local Growth (46% support)



Publicity and Outreach Efforts

- Online outreach through social media, email newsletters, and County homepage, Social media flyers in English and Spanish
- Other publicity throughout Orange County facilities television monitors
- Mailed postcards to owners of 1,000 properties near Gravelly Hill Middle School
- Staff worked with community organizations and leaders to publicize events and online survey
- Staff tabling at community events






Community Meetings

September and October 2024

- Held at Gravelly Hill Middle School (September 25) and American Legion Post 6 (October 3)
- Presentation with overview of project
- Collected feedback from participants through paper copies of survey
- Shorter survey and online activities shared as additional options





Community Partner-Hosted Meetings

October 2024

- Planning staff worked with community organizations to host 3 additional community partner-hosted meetings.
 - Objective was to reach populations that have traditionally been underrepresented in Orange County land use planning.
 - Partnered with meeting hosts to distribute invitations and encourage participation among respective communities.
- El Centro Hispano at the Chapel Hill-Carrboro Chamber (October 9)
 - El Centro Hispano provided live Spanish interpretation of presentation and discussion
- Efland-Cheeks Community Center (October 10)
 - Burmese interpretation services were offered
 - Based on insights from community center staff, \$10 Walmart gift cards were offered to participants.
- Jones Grove Missionary Baptist Church (October 15)







Refresher on Land Use Alternatives



For all "new" alternatives, avoided adding more dense or intensive development within...

- Critical water supply watersheds
- Voluntary Agricultural Districts (VAD) and Enhanced (EVAD)

To the extent practical, avoided adding more dense or intensive development within...

- Protected water supply watersheds
- Conservation corridors (Eno/New Hope Habitat)



Enhance Agricultural and Environmental Protections Low-Impact Rural Conservation Neighborhoods and New Employment in Strategic Locations



Mixed-Use Centers and New Employment in Strategic Locations

56



1

Measuring Engagement Satisfaction

Using voluntary exit questionnaires, participants were asked to **evaluate their satisfaction with community engagement activities**.

Our aim is to make engagement easy, accessible, and fun.


Members of the public should enjoy their experience and feel they were heard and respected.






Measuring Engagement Satisfaction

Were you comfortable sharing your input today?*



Will you participate in future events?**






*283 out of 305 respondents answered this question on the voluntary, self-reported exit questionnaire.

*295 out of 305 respondents answered this question on the voluntary, self-reported exit questionnaire.



Did you previously participate in one of the prior engagement meetings or online engagement held October 2023 - February 2024?



Yes No Not sure

*283 out of 305 respondents answered this question on the voluntary, self-reported exit questionnaire.



Measuring Representation of Engagement

Using voluntary, self-reported exit questionnaires, participants were asked to share demographic information about themselves.

Participants that provide feedback should be representative of Orange County across the following factors: age, race/ethnicity, location of residence, and renter/homeowner. Recent Census data was used to evaluate representation. The information will be leveraged to improve future engagement efforts to improve representation.




Measuring Representation of Engagement


- Age
- Race/Ethnicity
- Living/Working in Orange County

2



Measuring Representation of Engagement





Orange County (2022 Census Data)

*290 out of 305 respondents answered this question on the voluntary, self-reported exit questionnaire.

Exit Questionnaire Responses*

72.1%

80%


70%

90%



Measuring Representation of Engagement

 Do you identify as Hispanic/Latinx?




*285 out of 305 respondents answered this question on the voluntary, self-reported exit questionnaire.




Measuring Representation of Engagement

Do you live in Orange County?*



Do you work in Orange County?**



📕 Yes 📕 No

*296 out of 305 respondents answered this question on the voluntary, self-reported exit questionnaire.

🗖 Yes 🗖 No

**287 out of 305 respondents answered this question on the voluntary, self-reported exit questionnaire.



Measuring Increased Engagement

A benchmark for total numbers of responses received was set to measure engagement for all three community engagement windows.

The benchmark used will be comparing the Orange County Land Use Plan 2050 responses to the Orange County Climate Action Plan, which was recently completed in the community.