Overview and Trends

Housing trends in Orange Township mirror the rapid growth of the region, as can be seen in the figures to the right. The 2010 Census states 9,890 total housing units existed, with only 6.2%, or 616 units, of those being vacant. In 2015, the ACS 5-year estimate for housing predicted 10,012 housing units with 4.7%, or 467 units, of those being vacant. Based on these statistics, the housing stock grew by 122 units, or 1.23%, in 5 years and faced continued growth.

In reality, growth has surpassed those predictions, as expressed by figure 27. Between 2010 and 2015, 862 residential building permits were issued, representing a 5-year increase of 8.7% from 9,890 housing units in 2010. Between 2015 and 2017, 738 residential building permits were issued, representing a more rapid three-year increase of 6.9%. Overall from 2010 to August 2017, 1,600 new housing units have been built or issued permits in Orange Township, representing a growth rate of 16.2%. The clear trend for residential development in Orange Township is accelerating growth for all housing types.

Delaware County as a whole ranks 86th out of Ohio’s 88 counties for number of affordable housing units per 100 extremely low-income renter households, at 18.4 affordable units by that measure, compared to 30.8 for Ohio. Severe renter cost burden in the county is 17%, compared to 24% for Ohio.
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Residential land use is the primary and most valuable land use in Orange Township, as expressed by the figures to the right. A diverse mix of appropriate land uses should be fostered in order to avoid imbalances. Such an imbalance could create secondary impacts in other areas, such as transportation, economic development, the school district, and the environment. For example, imbalanced development of residential land use may result in traffic congestion due to dwindled access to nearby commercial development and less commercial tax revenues for the Township. With current housing trends, the threat of this imbalance will increase, and must be addressed to maintain vital community functions. Housing values, visualized in figure 33, are generally higher when farther from U.S. 23, a primarily commercial corridor, in the east, northeast, and far west of the Township. The average value of these homes are $291,161.

Single and Multi-Family Residential Districts

Residential land use is generalized into two types of districts in Orange Township: single-family and multi-family. As seen in figures 28, 29, and 30, single-family outnumbers multi-family by measure of gross units, but multi-family units are being developed at a faster rate than in the past. Of the 1,700 housing units developed from 2010 to August 2017, 28.22% were zoned multi-family, while the 2015 total housing mix consisted of approximately 23.94% multi-family zoned units.
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Public Meeting 9/12: SWOT Analysis

**Strengths**
- Steady Home Values
  - Home values have remained steady or grown for many residents.
  - The excellent school system keeps home values high.

**Weaknesses**
- Lack of senior living and community centers.
- Challenged to adapt to poorly planned growth.
- Housing decisions based on market, not community need.
- Property taxes rising too quickly.

**Opportunities**
- New types of housing could be amended to zoning code.
- Infill development: good option for prior developed land.

**Threats**
- Perception that increase of multi-family housing raises property taxes.
- Multi-family development may flood the schools and lower home values as a result.

Suggestions & Solutions from Public Meetings

More senior communities without multi-family development
- Solution: Amend residential district zoning code for more flexibility in single-family housing density above 2 units/acre. Current 2 unit/acre cap does not generally allow for condos unless they are physically attached and zoned multi-family.

More senior communities without multi-family development
- Solution: Cluster housing, or increased density within subdivisions while maintaining gross units per acre, is allowed within zoning resolution, but barriers exist.

Mixed-use zoning to reduce traffic burdens and increase pedestrian flexibility for residents
- Solution: Allows for diverse housing types.
- Solution: Consider “nodes” of commercial activity in designated areas that serve the local population.

Refer to Appendix C.1 for 9/12 Meeting Results
Online Survey Results

1. Land development, including housing and density, was ranked second in areas of interest in the Township, as seen in figure 11. Responses and SWOT analysis indicate that much of this interest is attributed to negative feelings toward the current trends of housing development that have increased in density and disrupted expected traffic patterns and school capacity. Responses also indicate that residents feel housing development has outpaced accompanying development, such as roadways, new businesses, and community centers.

2. Limiting housing growth was a popular concern among survey respondents. While housing growth is a market driven process, some respondents favor controlling growth to maintain a sense of rural community and open space rather than developing all available land. Existing residents also wish to protect their housing investment and resist property devaluation.

3. Many respondents appear at odds with developers and the processes that allow them to build. A lack of transparency and engagement is embedded in their discourse. Some mention that neighboring townships have more effective zoning and planning processes.

4. Senior housing must be planned better to avoid locating in and near multi-family housing units, thus decreasing the tax burden on seniors. There is also a concern with too much dense housing close to schools, indicating that much planning should take place if senior housing is to be developed well for the community.
Goal H-1: Adapt to Township Growth Trends by Encouraging Housing Diversity.

Orange Township's significant growth requires creative strategies to satisfy its housing demand.

Strategy H-1.1: Continue setting technical review meetings and invite developers to better communication between county/township departments.

Strategy H-1.2: Consider amending the zoning code to include mixed-uses that allow for more flexible housing options in targeted subareas.

Strategy H-1.3: Explore density options to encourage open space opportunities such as allowing an extra floor on a building proposal in exchange for more open space kept on the lot.

Strategy H-1.4: Consider a Detached Condos Zoned District, such as “R-3” zoning district in Liberty Town-ship: One- and Two-Family Residence District, to implement in areas buffering US-23 to serve ‘empty-nesters’ and thus avoid multi-family while serving a community need in targeted areas.

Strategy H-1.5: Consider amending cluster housing standards in the SFPRD District.

Responsible Parties: Township Trustees and Orange Township Planning and Zoning staff and boards.

Goal H-2: Encourage Proportionate Senior and Retiree Communities

The current density for the existing senior living district (Planned Elderly Residential District, PERD) is 4 units per acre or 12 residents per acre, and should be utilized for enjoyable and efficient senior (age-restricted) communities.

Strategy H-2.1: Encourage more PERD districts, thus avoiding inflating schools, increasing traffic flow, and other outcomes from multi-family districts.

Strategy H-2.2: Encourage the affordability of senior/retiree housing by increasing the supply, thus lowering demand.

Strategy H-2.3: Consider amending standards in the PERD district.

Responsible Parties: Township Trustees and Orange Township Planning and Zoning staff and boards.
Residential Land Use Map

- Water Area
- OTP Roads
- Residential Districts:
  - Farm Residence District
  - Multi-Family Planned Residence District
  - Planned Elderly Residential District
  - Single-Family Planned Residence District
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