

# Animas RDAC Meeting Minutes

08/24/23

In Attendance:

Anita Rancatti, Dot Wehrly, Sheila Lee, Maria Spero

Location: 8956 CR250

## Proposed List of Items to Change in the Animas LUC

1. Group would like to know where are the official Animas Valley land use maps. They are not part of the current LUC so are they even being updated by the LP Planning Dept?
2. Definition or Minor/Major Uses - Current LUC has nothing defined as Major Use in the Animas Valley. First proposal is to convert all Special Uses back to major use as originally set forth in the AVLUP: Major Use Permits needed
3. Group needs to review all document changes submitted by citizens for both the 2020 LUC revision and the AVDP formulation which were rejected without cause/adequate explanation and determine what needs to be added back and prioritized
4. RV and RV Park definitions should be returned to language before 2020 code change. Add-ons appears to have been made without approval
5. Park Model definitions need to added and clarified along with maximum stay limits like 60 days or less, where allowed, etc
6. VBRO rules - current communications from Marsha Porter imply the survey was completed and the BOCC agrees limits are needed but no work may begin until 2024
7. Manufactured Home Parks rules versus RV Park rules and what takes precedence when it is a combined development.
8. Animas LUC needs language to prevent high density uses any place it is not specifically allowed. This includes any time zoning changes are made. All development should be approached with a goal to limit high density and maintain rural atmosphere.
9. Low density should be applied across the Animas Valley except where it was previously zoned as multi family and existing trailer parks. The purpose of the Animas Valley zoning plan was to limit/prevent high density uses so changes should be rare and hard to obtain.
10. LUC needs stronger language about following the district plan and current zoning
11. Development along the river should be restricted and at least 50 feet away (need to define this distance as river edge or center line) to protect the river and NO high-density development should be allowed within 150' of the river

## Proposed List of Procedural Changes for La Plata Land Use Plan

1. LP Land Use Code is missing call-up procedure for BOCC Review which existed prior to 2020 update. Should be added back to 66-13II. A moratorium on finality of PC rulings should be in place in the meantime if anyone wants to request a call-up
2. The appeals process should have more than 10 days (and days clarified) and there should be clear communication via a slide before each planning meetings or even a pamphlet to describe rights, process and deadline. This should be true for the Call-up Process too.
3. Comment submission to Planning is a mess. The deadline for having comments included in the Hearing should be clear and ALL comments submitted by the deadline should be

included for the Board to read prior to the meeting. These comments should also be posted on the LP county web site WITH the development submission details (by planning ID number). The process was changed recently so comments are not longer linked to the planning project ID and instead are buried in the hearing web site and notes. This obscures comments and disagreements about the proposed development.

4. Notifications are no longer coming to the 2 Animas RDAC contacts in a consistent manner. Since Amber Lamb left, notifications have been spotty. We also need to add her replacement to Google Groups.
5. There are no longer any transcriptions of the planning meetings online. A resident is forced to listen to an audio of the meeting to find the relevant discussions and transcribe it on their own. This presents a lack of transparency to actions taken by the Planning Commission.

### **Other Discussion Items**

Most recent Roberts submission discusses the current river put-in as illegal - the prior owner carved out that area allowing put-in access and installed a fence to prevent access to his property from the put-in. If that fence has been included for 18 10? or more years or if the put-in has continuously been in use for the prescribed years, access may be available through either a prescriptive easement or adverse procession. The AVAC or River Put-in advocates needs to obtain legal assistance on this.

The group was concerned about decisions made involving Planning Commissioners and LP County Planners who may have had a conflict of interest like Dan Murphy moving on to the same engineering firm used by Roberts or Chris Hall making decisions related to the Roberts land when it was under prior ownership.

Next Meeting is 9/7/23 at 2pm at Maria Spero's guest house on CR 203 next door to the Grange.