

Working Group (WG) Mtg. #36 Summary

March 21, 2011

La Plata County Fairgrounds 4 - 6:30pm

NEXT MEETING DATE: April 4 at 4 pm at the Pine Room, LPC Fairgrounds

Agenda:

- Summary of Joint PC/BoCC Meeting on March 24
- Continue review of verbal and written comments received to date from community regarding the FLUP (Note: the County Attorney states there is a differing legal opinion regarding the SUIT letter and that the details will be worked out by the Board/Tribal Council and their respective counsel.)
- Review revisions to FLUP, Land Use designations and Amendment process
- Overview of Comprehensive Community Plan document
- Discuss WG recommendation to PC and BoCC on Comprehensive Community Plan
- review plan schedule and next steps
 - Apr 16 10 am to 2 pm Community Open House at Recreation Center
 - April 28 6 pm PC Workstudy session

FUTURE WG MEETING DATES:

None scheduled

March 21 MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Barbara Wagner, Jim Tencza, Greg Spitler, Jack Llewlyn, Travis Craig, Brain Kimmel, Sally Bellerue, Barbara Jefferies, Dick Norton, Peter Tregillus, Roy Horvath, Michelle Gilleland

Other Attendees: Commissioner Hotter, Commissioner Lieb, Vicki Vandagriff, Nancy Lauro, Greg Hoch, Diane Paxton, Charles Tabone, Jeff Malinchak, Jerry Lucas, Shawn Nau

Staff/Consultants: Charlie Deans, Jim O'Donnell, Erick Aune, Jason Meininger, Robby Overfield

Discussion:

Reviewed the changes from the previous meeting:

- Revised the FLUP designation from A/R to MU/C and I/E for the Airport Business Park.
- Mirrored the Rural Center south of CR 225a
- Stippled an expanded La Posta Area
- Replaced the RC/D designation with the A/R designation on areas of irrigated ag lands.
- Revised the FLUP in the NE quad to show slopes and floodplains as an RC/D designation.

Question about where we are in the process for specific parcels, or are we looking at "influence zones". The first step was to receive input from the focus groups and the community workshops and distill the general land use concepts into the FLUP. We are now starting to get specific requests for individual parcels and these requests are more appropriate to go to the PC, as that is the PC's role, for them to determine the specifics of individual requests. WG agreed that they should not begin taking individual/parcel specific requests.

Parcel specific FLUP designations:

Can the land use designations be shown as able to gradate the more intense colors to so it appears more conceptual and not parcel specific? Charlie said that is a graphic touch up that can be done once all the land use designations are settled on the map.

Discussion around the ability for a property owner to develop/get credit for property over 30% slopes, even though they may not get a density transfer credit now. Most group members generally thought it was ok; one voice expressed disagreement with this point.

Discussion and concerns about potentially speculating on property purchase solely for transfer of density to another receiving area. Can receiving areas send density? Charlie said this was not the intent of the TDR program proposed; if that was allowed it would undermine the purpose of the program.

Request on the SUIT letter and a desire from Dick Norton to review the January 10th letter?

Jason indicated the County Attorney advised him to not distribute the letter, but he would ask again about its availability.

When does the FLUP go from conceptual to actual zoning? When is the last time for a property owner to advocate for their individual parcels? Jason stated this would occur during the actual LUDC revisions and the Zoning Map creation, which would be another extensive community process.

Discussion about how the WG wants to approach their recommendation to the PC:

- Two ends of the spectrum
 - Short letter of support from all working group members, to
 - There is no support from the WG and is up to individual members to provide letters if they so choose,
 - Or something in-between.
- Paraphrase the last two years, and indicate the WG generally feels the Comp Plan sends the community in a better direction.
- Concerns expressed about ramifications if the WG members sign off on an unqualified letter of approval.
- General agreement about the WG forwarding a recommendation to the PC that the Comp Plan is moving the County in the right direction, that the process was good, and that it represents our best effort.
- WG requested the planning team to propose a draft letter based on WG discussion for the next meeting.

Discussion on increasing the Subarea stippling around Grandview to extend east to the mesa drop off and down to the alignment with CR 220. Group decided to not extend the stippling. Jason stated the FLUP and Comp Plan are advisory and the zoning and entitlements come during the LUDC revision. Planning team was asked to write a sample map amendment request and fee range. Also to label and darken County Roads to be more visible.

Observers comments:

Diane Paxton, Nancy Lauro, and the (3) property owners expressed their satisfaction with the WG's resolution to the RC expansion area being mirrored both north and south of Hwy 160 from the CR 225a intersection up to the narrow gauge home park center.

Greg Hoch expressed concerns about the FLUP not utilizing the City of Durango Comp Plan FLUP in the City's future plan area. He believes the WG should reflect the city's designations; specifically Grand View, Ewing Mesa and the Animas Valley. Greg recommends if nothing else, stipple all the areas within the City's planning area. Shawn Nau responded with a letter dated Feb 15th (attached) to Ron LeBlanc clarifying how land uses will be addressed within the IGA areas (Grandview, La Posta, north Animas). Shawn recommends Greg speak with Ron about the designations to be sure the City staff are all on the same page. Shawn recommends the WG keep the designations as shown on the FLUP since these were the result of the community process and not revise these to the City plan. There is more specific subarea planning underway for La Posta and Grandview that will include community involvement and will cover land uses, development standards, and fiscal feasibility for special districts.