

Working Group (WG) Mtg. #30 Summary

December 6, 2010

Durango Public Library 4 - 6:30pm

**NEXT MEETING DATE AND AGENDA**

---

**December 20 at 4 pm at DRO Library**

Agenda:

- Review revised FLUP Land use designations (attached)
- Review and revise draft FLUP based on synthesis of FG workshops

FUTURE WG MEETING DATES:

**January 4<sup>th</sup> - Location TBD- > review GIS-mapped FLUP  
>review FLUP amendment process**

Attendees: Michelle Gilleland, Sally Bellarue, Jeannine Justice, Brian Kimmel, Dick Norton, Barbara Jefferies, Travis Craig, Barb Wagner, Greg Spitler, Peter Treguillus, Roy Horvath, Dick White, Greg Spitler

Guests: Jenny Burbey, Denise Boheimer, Lucy Baizel, Amita (Ami) Nathwani, Mae Morley

Staff/Consultants: Robby Overfield, Jason Meininger, Tracie Hughes, Julia Stantic, Susan Hakanson, Charlie Deans, Gabe Preston

The Agenda for this meeting included:

Agenda:

- New WG Member recruitment
- Review revised FLUP land use designations (attached)
- Review FLUP work in progress (WIP) map and draft FG FLUP

**Discussion:**

**New WG member recruitment/additions status**

Jason began the meeting with a brief overview of the procedures for finding new working group members. The group then went around the room and introduced themselves to the new working group members.

**Review revised FLUP Land Use Designations**

The WG reviewed suggested changes to the Proposed Future Land Use Intensity Designations. These included a sentence of what a development application is in the intro paragraph, capped density transfers ability so that they are at the density ranges of the land use designations. Some working group members questioned the reason for capping the density. Charlie explained there was concern voiced that prior to the density cap, the densities could be increased unlimited beyond the land use designation definition. There was a suggestion to cap the density transfers to 120% of the density cap for that designation. After a good amount of dialogue, it was decided to run through all the modifications, then revisit the density cap provision in the context of all the revisions. When asked how a project application with multiple applicants or properties would work, Jason responded by saying there would be multiple plat recordings to cross reference the rights of one being transferred to another.

Barbara J asked why no ditch setbacks, well setbacks etc were included in Resource Conservation. Jason responded because they are utilities that need to be accessed (i.e. easements). The clarification that was needed was whether or not ditches, well pad setbacks, etc. could be included in the percentage of land that is "set aside" in the A/R designation. Staff, WG and consultants all agreed any land used for O&G wells setbacks or utility purposes that were in agricultural uses would be included in the area to meet the "set aside" provision. There was discussion about how pinyon-juniper land was affected by this incentive. Jason explained non agricultural assessed land is not a part of this designation. Michelle G. asked what designations pinyon-juniper would fall under? Brian K. suggested they met rural and are not in ag, and the open space conservancy considers these land in their easements because of the benefit to wildlife habitat. He emphasized rural and ag are individual elements under one designations. Barbara W. wanted more clarity on home based businesses. Charlie explained it would be defined in the LUC, as would all the terms included as permitted uses

under A/R. The language in the A/R designation was revised, (see attached for agreed upon changes). Charlie explained the changes in Mixed Use/Commercial and highlighted that the Industrial/Employment designation had the residential component removed. The word "larger" was taken out of the I/E designation. Changes to the DR/R occurred; it was changed to Resort/Recreation and the group had no other comments

### **Review FLUP Work in Progress (WIP) map as another decision tool**

Charlie explained the assumptions used and how he arrived at developing the WIP map. He stated everyone has seen this map before, but not everyone had an explanation on its creation. Charlie explained the ReCon areas (slopes, wildlife habitat, floodplains, etc.) were already mapped; the existing subdivisions of 10 ac or smaller lot sizes were mapped as RR; Assessor data was used to map the commercially assessed properties. Jason clarified that the Bondad Landfill had an outline around it, and other purple areas did not, because it was the only open and active landfill in the County.

### **Review Future Land Use Plans and notes prepared by Six Focus Groups (FG) at workshops**

Charlie explained the participation during the FG meetings and how the results of the maps were to be discussed with the WG. Peter T. wondered about the RC identified at CR 318 & CR 309. Charlie stated three groups identified this intersection as RC. Mae agreed on this designation being placed at this intersection. Charlie noted that the brown areas on the WIP FLUP, the undesignated lands, had generally been agreed by the FGs to be designated as A/R.

Peter T. wanted to know what our process was for moving towards a map for the elected by officials? Charlie stated the purpose now is to introduce ideas the FG members came up with and the maps which the various groups produced. Charlie explained the WG and staff would determine agreement on the FLUP, based on the FG's input thus far, and develop a draft FLUP map to take back out to the community for a round of reviews. He also stressed that alternative land uses could be established for areas where there was a diversity of opinions. After the FLUP was vetted by the community it will then again come back to the WG for review. There will also be an update to the BoCC and PC some time prior to the community meetings (Jason to determine those dates with BoCC). He explained after the WG's review of the Comprehensive Community Plan package, it would be scheduled for PC review and public hearings.

He presented the County wide FLUP draft that was put together as a compilation/synthesis of the areas of highest agreement mapped by the community. Charlie explained he looked at feasibility of proposals, reviewed the areas designated for growth through google-earth, with a focus on the 2030 planning horizon. Dick N. questioned what assumptions were used in regards to water and sewer. Charlie stated for now infrastructure would be done as per the existing regulations and state statutes, that the goal with this phase is to accomplish zoning in the County. But it was hoped that the staff and WG would support two recommendations in the Comp Plan that (1) the County update the Trip 2030 Plan based on the FLUP, and (2) prepare an Infrastructure Financing and Funding Plan to provide incentives and mechanisms for adequate infrastructure to implement the plan.

### **Upcoming Meeting and Dates**

The group agreed to meet on 12/20/10. Charlie stated that for WG meeting planning purposes, the group should assume that the meetings will continue as per the regular schedule of the first and third Mondays unless the a meeting wasn't needed because of community meetings, or until it was scheduled for the PC or BoCC. Jason stated for now to use Cinco de Mayo as the ending date.

The last 10 minutes of the meeting was spent gathered around the draft FLUP with discussion of how and what assumptions went in to its creation; Charlie presented the County wide FLUP draft that was put together as a compilation/synthesis of the areas of highest agreement mapped by the community. The recruitment process was discussed. Dick N. stated the important point to consider is the message this plans expresses, not so much the process.

Charlie took general areas of agreements from various FG's and developed the synthesized map. Vallecito and County/Animas Valley FG had one plan developed for these two areas. Travis asked what was the WG to do with this draft FG FLUP, and stated that maybe this draft should just go into the community meetings. Dick N stated he would like to discuss the proposed FLUP before it went to the community. Gabe encouraged the working group to think about some of the proposals and decide if they were feasible. Dick W. wanted to know how the growth boundaries of the City

of Durango, the IGA, are or are not folded in to this map. Peter T. suggested the City will most likely head in the direction of not going beyond Tier 3. Jason brought the group up to speed on the iTAG group and suggested the only contentious area that may arise in discussion is Ewing Mesa. The County to date has not received official comments from the City to date. This process is about trying to find a balance between the community input and feasibility. Charlie stated the Grandview, Florida Mesa, the SE quadrant was very dynamic, with several ideas of how the mapping should look. This presented a challenge and it is up to the working group to decide how to move forward. Gem Village identified a large amount of mixed use. The airport area had general consensus on development city and county land and out of the river corridor. The airpark was identified as industrial, both above and below the mesa.

The WG was encouraged to look at all the FG maps that were included in their package and compare them to the synthesized map to check for agreement and accurate representation from the community input maps.

## LA PLATA COUNTY DRAFT FUTURE LAND USE INTENSITY DESIGNATIONS rev Dec 6 Oct 30

These land use designations identify areas in La Plata County that are suitable for future growth (receiving areas) and areas that are sensitive to development (donor areas) within a new development project application. A development project application under the County's present process includes Type I, II, and III Use permits, subdivision applications, and map amendments. Future land use designations are only applicable when a new project application for development is submitted to the County. These designations do not affect the underlying existing uses. **Density transfers to a receiving area cannot exceed the total gross density allowed for that designation.**

**Resource Conservation (RCon): up to 1 DU/35 ac (donor):** areas of high sensitivity to development such as critical wildlife habitat, riparian areas, major drainageways, floodplains/wetlands, and 30% slopes. Density within the RCon area may be transferred at 1 du/10 ac to **receiving areas** outside of a RCon area within a project application.

**Agricultural/Rural (A/R): up to 1 DU/35 ac; or 1 DU /20 ac with 50% set-aside, or 1 DU/10 ac with 70 % set-aside (donor)-** areas that historically or are presently irrigated or non-irrigated agricultural lands that are to be protected and maintained in this use. The densities within the A/R area may also be transferred to a receiving area within a project application. Permitted uses **that support agriculture** in the A/R areas **may include but are not limited to** ~~will allow~~ home-based businesses, bed and breakfasts, **agro-tourism**, equestrian and boarding facilities, farmers market and produce stands.

**Rural Residential (RR): up to 1 DU/3 ac (receiving):** generally existing low to medium density residential development in established neighborhoods-i.e., lands that are committed such as an existing development or subdivision.

**Rurban (R): up to 1 DU/ac; or up to 5 DU/ac when utilizing three of the five community benefit criteria (receiving):** an area with a moderate to high development suitability. These areas should be developed in a manner that encourage sustainable community practices such as (a) clustered housing with min 50% open space set-aside, (b) connected bike/equestrian/pedestrian pathways, (c) renewable community infrastructure (renewable energy, water harvesting, and reclaimed wastewater systems), and (d) community facilities such as schools, parks, community centers, and (e) multi-modal transportation (bicycling, equestrian, ride-share, park and ride and transit provisions). Rurban areas should be adjacent, or within a 1/2 mile, to a designated Rural Center, Mixed Use or Commercial/Employment area.

**Rural Center (RC): up to 8 DU/ac (receiving):** these can be existing rural centers, proposed or new centers, which typically have a public gathering place or community facilities with a mix of land uses associated with them, such as residential and neighborhood-scale retail, and local commercial. Community facilities include schools, post office, community center, recreation facilities, etc, and include two or more multi-modal transportation provisions (bicycling, equestrian, ride-share, park and ride, and transit). Typically this designation will range in size from 5 to 20 acres.

**Mixed Use/Commercial (MU/C): up to 24 DU/ac; 30-40% lot coverage on non-residential uses (receiving)-** commercial, and institutional/civic uses that serve the region and include two or more multi-modal transportation provisions (bicycling, equestrian, ride-share, park and ride, and transit). Maximum single family residential lot size is 5,000 sf. Typically this designation will range in size from 10 to 40 acres.

**Industrial/Commercial/Employment (I/C/E): ~~up to 24 DU/ac; 30-40% lot coverage on non-residential uses (receiving)- larger~~** commercial, industrial, business park and institutional/civic uses that serve the region and include two or more multi-modal transportation provisions (bicycling, equestrian, ride-share, park and ride, and transit). **Maximum single family residential lot size is 5,000 sf but should consist of attached single family and/or multi-family residential.** Typically this designation will range in size from 20 to 100 acres.

**Dude Ranch/Resort/Recreation (DR/R): (receiving)-**commercial facility offering leisure or recreational opportunities with lodging and overnight accommodations, and uses such as retail, restaurants, pubs, campground and cabins, as well as condominiums and single family residential.

**Scenic Corridor Overlay (SCO): (donor)-** these are corridors with high scenic values and high sensitivity to strip commercial development. These corridors would allow retail and/or residential development that may include standards on building heights, parking areas, landscaped buffers along street setbacks, monument signage, and no billboards.

**Resource Extraction Overlay (REO): (receiving)-** areas that are suitable for sand and gravel or other mining activities and would be subject to reclamation plans when operations terminate.