

Working Group (WG) Mtg. #35 Summary

March 7, 2011

La Plata County Fairgrounds 4 - 6:30pm

NEXT MEETING DATE: March 21 at 4 pm at the Pine Room, LPC Fairgrounds

Agenda:

- Continue review of verbal and written comments received to date from community meetings regarding the FLUP
- Discuss WG recommendation to PC and BoCC on Comprehensive Community Plan
- review plan schedule and next steps
 - Mar 24th, 4 pm, Joint meeting PC and BoCC at Anasazi Room- WG welcome to attend but not required.

FUTURE WG MEETING DATES:

Working Group Meeting April 4th at LPC Fairgrounds Pine Room

March 7 MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Greg Spitler, Jen Lopez, Travis Craig, Brian Kimmel, Barbara Jefferies, Dick Norton, Barbara Wagner, Sally Bellerue, Jim Tenzca, Roy Horvath

Other Attendees: Commissioner Bobby Lieb, Greg Hoch, Marilyn Lang, Nancy Wald, Steve Wald, Art Charette

Staff/Consultants: Jason Meininger, Julia Stantic, Susan Hakanson, Charlie Deans, Jim O'Donnell

Agenda:

- review and discuss verbal and written comments received to date from community meetings regarding the FLUP (letters attached)
- review plan schedule and next steps
 - Mar 24th, 4 pm, Joint meeting PC and BoCC

Discussion:

Greg Hoch offered introduction and provided a history of the City involvement. He provided the group with an explanation of letter and communications between the City and County. Greg addressed the question, "How and why did the City feel left out," which Barbara Jefferies posed to the group. Greg addressed this by explaining joint planning efforts in the past and stressed that the City and County must work together. "We have not been actively involved because we recognize if we were, it could foster the impression the City is telling the County what to do." When the City saw the FLUP, they felt no attention had been given to their Comp. Plan. Greg discussed the public involvement that went in to their plan. He stressed how the City didn't understand how this wasn't included. He felt the City did a good job talking with property owners in their plans, and explained how they met with individual property owners, (he stated they were able to do this because they are compact and could provide more services). Land uses in the Grandview area have some similarity, but not all of them match up. Greg addressed the classifications on the Crader property, as well as the La Posta Road. He discussed the planning efforts made on and with the Ewing Mesa. The Kreger Ranch on CR 250 was highlighted as being another area in which the City had been extensively involved with. Portions of un-annexed areas of Florida Road were highlighted as being yet other areas where the City has a long history of working with the property owners. The concern came from when the City saw the County's FLUP and the differences in designations. It made the two plans contradictory. We had suggested the County just adopted the City's Plan for Grandview. We had a concentrated area and were able to reach out to individuals. The IGA is in existence, and it will probably be amended in the next two years. We believe the County needs a new Comp. Plan and Land Use Code. We don't want to do anything that gets in the way of successful completion and a good outcome. We are here to work closely with Charlie and Jason and other planning members. Greg had attended a meeting at Fort Lewis Mesa the other day, and the stippled area was addressed as being part of an area which needs future planning. Greg suggested the Air Park then be stippled too, because of the current and future planning efforts between the two entities that are occurring. Greg offered some history as to old BoCC directions given to the City to plan the above identified areas. Greg stated he would be here at the next two meetings, to make sure we are working together to establish an agreement.

Q: Dick Norton: The City's Comp. Plan was rushed through, due to elections. He offered the need for the City's water. Greg: We will extend our utilities in our planning area only. Getting back on track is implicit of providing water. The City is sticking to their planning areas, in light of the economic downturn. However, based on the proposed plan from the County, the City is reconsidering extending the City Limits, due to cost of services and where the FLUP is directing growth. Again, we want to work on something that might work better.

Q: Barbara Wagner: What is the relationship between City Limits and City Planning Boundary?

A: Greg Hoch: Due to State Statute, we can plan up to three miles out from City Limits. The Grandview area, was not rushed as Norton indicated, but there was a sudden sense of urgency to get this area planned, due to the hospital relocation. We did not address infrastructure, and we don't want you to make the same mistake. We are trying to do this planning better, like we are doing with La Posta now. The potential for a good partnership in this area is really good.

Q: Jim Tenza: Who determines when the City annexes property?

A: The City cannot unilaterally annex. There are two ways to do it. If a property owner wants to annex, we have a contractual agreement. In areas, like Bodo, Animas View Drive, areas we have annexed. This was done with the majority property owners and land, as well as contiguous, (1/6 contiguous). Federal Lands are excluded, and you can annex over them, (i.e. the area where the City annexed Three Springs). Annexation is a very public process and we follow the book, state statute.

Q: Barbara Jefferies: Are you telling Archuleta Water not to come out to influence areas? It seems as though the City is devaluing their land by not allowing them to come out"

A: It is all a matter of money, not based on intent.

Q: BJ: I know several people that were not contacted in your process.

A: I can show you the mailing list, we personally mailed over 500 letters. Sometimes their concerns were addressed, i.e. changes, and sometimes they were not.

Q: Greg Spitler: Part of this county process is to make it simpler.

A: Yes, but we are considered to be more strict. Example of, sidewalk, design standards etc. were addressed as being something the County doesn't do. This is because of zoning, which the County does not have. It is predictable.

Q: Greg Spitler: Entitlement, locked and loaded zoning. But what about the site plan review? But why does it take 60 days?

A: We are in discussions with Three Springs. Block reviews are being looked at for being speeded up. Uses by right, handled by staff, simple process, this is the ideal and where the county is heading, correct? We are in the middle of a new land use code, July adoption projected, but we still need to redo things, like in Three Springs.

Follow up comments included Charlie stating that there are fundamental differences between municipalities and counties as far as statutory authority and enabling legislation, so it is not unusual for there to be marked differences between city and county planning approaches. In this case, the County's FLUP has 7 land use designations; they are simpler and broader and designed to meet the county's needs. The City has 17 FLUP designations, and they are more specific and at a finer resolution concerning density ranges. Jim T stated the exclusion of the City services from the County services is a known when people move here. You expect different services, County is rural, more country, and you don't get all the same City services. It is a trade off, and no one is forcing anyone to be something they're not.

Agenda:

Reviewing and discussing verbal and written comments received to date from community meetings regarding the FLUP. The meetings were overall very productive, we got some great responses, and materials are attached. Barb W addressed the difference in opinion for the Vallecito area. She explained the planning process the residents are going through and explained they are continuing to work together on establishing a clear desire.

Charlie focused discussion on potential changes to the Resource Conservation/Development designation. Also two letters on the Airport designation. Third, the petition on the 160 corridor.

Explained changes made to the RC/D and explained the map, (cross hatch). Irrigated ag lands have been delineated. Charlie highlighted the Ignacio and Grange Hall suggestion of delineating the irrigated lands as not having RC/D designations on top of them. Wildlife, steep slopes and floodplain are included in the RC/D. We could peel off the irrigated lands from the RC/D designation and make them A/R. General discussion around the implications of taking the

irrigated ag lands out of RC/D. There was a question about the ag assessments; Jason stated the Assessor's Office is checking approximately 3,000 properties to verify their use, historically as such or not. A question about DOW's position, Jason stated they generally make public requests, they urge to mitigate, regardless of impacts, wildlife is a big deal and a huge draw to LPC. The DOW did send up a letter with comments, and there are some considerations to be given to inform decision makers on ag now verse more dense development. This could disrupt the wildlife migration corridors. Charlie stated he will come back with a revised FLUP for the WG to discuss.

DRO Airport Business Park: two letters submitted requesting this to be changed to reflect the Florida Mesa map amendment approved five years ago, to allow this parcel to be industrial/commercial. Discussion of showing both mixed use/commercial on west area to allow residential and industrial/employment on remainder, with RC/D on slopes and floodplains.

Third Letter/Petition for additional RC and MU/C along Hwy 160 east of Elmore's Corner:

Raised the concern the expansion would not honor the rural center designation; it would be more strip development. There are more permissible uses in the proposed classification, and many of those, as she notes, are already businesses that are there, though some may not be legal/permitted. It was suggest at the new 225 alignment to flip the currently shown rural center, or to straddle the highway. Support for rural center on both sides of the highway. Support due to the County having property tax by designating this area, the City will not annex that far out. Charlie discussed the timeline and next steps but that all were still tentative at this point.