Discussion Topics

1. Planning Overview / Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
2. Concurrent Plan Amendment / Rezoning and Small Scale Amendments
3. Urban Service Area Expansions, Urban Sprawl, Needs Analysis
4. Financial Feasibility: Funding Infrastructure and Services
5. Concurrency: Transportation
6. Concurrency: Schools and Parks
7. Developments of Regional Impact
8. Sector Plans and New Towns
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Concurrency is:

- Requirement that necessary public facilities are available *concurrent* with impacts of development

Concurrency is not:

- A planning tool
- A funding mechanism
Concurrency Background

1985 Growth Management Act

- Financial feasibility
- Adopt and maintain LOS standards
- Adopt a schedule of capital improvements
- Transportation concurrency was a state mandate
1992 Amendment
- Consider area-wide LOS
- Parallel corridors

1993 Amendment
- Concurrency exception for infill and redevelopment
- Long Term Financial Feasibility (10 – 15 year CIE)

1999 Amendment
- Promote integrated land use and multi-modal planning
2005 Amendments – SB 360

- Strict 5-year financial feasibility requirement
- Annual reporting of CIE
- Introduced proportionate-fair share as local government option
Concurrent Background

2009 Amendment – SB 360
- Eliminated Concurrency Requirements in Dense Urban Land Area (DULAs)

2011 Amendment – HB 7207
- Removed Financial Feasibility Requirements
- Optional Transportation Concurrency
- Changed application of Proportionate Share
Connectivity Background

Orange County Concurrency

- 10-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements (LTCMS)
- Parallel corridors (TCMA)
- Public-private partnerships (Proportionate Share)
- Innovation Way Multimodal Transportation District (MMTD)
- Alternative Mobility Area (TCEA)
- Concurrency Background
- Concurrency Implementation
- Changes under HB 7207
- Recommendations
- Requested Direction
Comprehensive Plan

- Transportation Element
- Capital Improvements Element
- Future Land Use Element

OBJ Elem 1.2

Orange County shall use the Urban Service Area concept as an effective fiscal and land use technique for managing growth. The Urban Service Area shall be used to identify the area where Orange County has the primary responsibility for providing infrastructure and services to support urban development.

OBJ T2.2

The County will maintain a concurrency management system which ensures that transportation facilities and services needed to support development and redevelopment are available concurrent with the impacts of such development.

OBJ CIE 1.3

Orange County shall regulate growth by requiring the adopted level of service standards for traffic circulation, mass transit, recreation, potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, and stormwater management, and elementary schools to be maintained through public or private investment.

OBJ T1.1

The County adopts the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) or most current annual update by reference as the County's 20-year roadway improvement program. This plan includes the 10-year Capital Improvement Schedule, a 5-year Capital Improvement Program, state roadway projects, and other needed county transportation improvement projects inclusive of proposed partnership projects. This annually updated plan represents a cost feasible project plan that addresses current and future roadway deficiencies.
# Orange County Code (Ch. 30) Concurrency Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Item</th>
<th>Staff Report</th>
<th>Information Letter</th>
<th>Encumbrance Letter</th>
<th>Reservation Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp Plan Amendment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Rezoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential PSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Plat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Plat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Site Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concurrency Implementation

People, Processes, and Systems

Application

Reservation

Permitting
Concurrency Implementation

- Final approval at building permit

Capacity is available:
  - Apply, reserve trips
  - Pay impact fees

Capacity is not available:
  - Reduce development impacts
  - Provide improvement
  - Provide monetary contribution
  - Wait until improvement in place
Why is there a belief that concurrency failed?

- Complicated
- Technical
- Equity
- Economy
- Bureaucratic
- Consistent Application
- Evolution

Concurrency Test

GO TO JAIL
Go Directly to Jail

DO NOT COLLECT PERMIT
PAY ANOTHER $200
Has transportation concurrency failed in Orange County?

- Integral part of Land Development Process
- Deferred key decisions to permitting
- Supported development of capital improvements program
  - Prioritization
  - Funding
- Few failing facilities
Concurrent Implementation
Presentation Outline

- Concurrency Background
- Concurrency Implementation
- Changes under HB 7207
- Recommendations
- Requested Direction
- Transportation concurrency is now optional
  - Rescind
  - Retain
  - Revise

- Amended language for proportionate share and impact fee credits
If we rescind:

- Must amend comprehensive plan
- Amendment not subject to state review

Connection of major plan goals and objectives

May result in uncoordinated timing of infrastructure and development

Fiscal impacts

Resolves unintended consequences
If we retain:

- Maintain Comprehensive Plan provisions
- Five-year Capital Improvement Schedule
- Adopt and Maintain LOS standards
- Revise plan and code related to proportionate share and impact fee credits

Allow time to develop an alternative

Compatibility with other counties and municipalities
If we revise:

- Legislation encourages policy guidelines and techniques to address potential negative impacts.
- Legislation encourages tools and techniques to complement the application of concurrency.

Flexibility to develop plan and system
Requires additional resources and time
• Concurrency Background
• Concurrency Implementation
• Changes under HB 7207
• Recommendations
• Requested Direction
Decision Points

- Rescind, retain, or revise transportation concurrency
- Interpretation on proportionate share and impact fee credit language

Coordinate with other county and municipal governments

Engage the RSTF
Recommendation

- Prepare necessary Comprehensive Plan and code changes
- Develop Concurrency Alternative (Thoroughfare / Mobility Plan)
  - Improve land use and transportation connection
  - Multi-modal, safety focus
  - Complement existing plan goals
  - Evaluate funding implications (fiscal sustainability)
- Concurrency Background
- Concurrency Implementation
- Changes under HB 7207
- Recommendations
- Requested Direction
- Retain transportation concurrency
- Direct staff to work with RSTF to enhance our current system
- Develop a long-term alternative to concurrency
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