

**SALIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**November 17, 2010 6:00 PM**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**

---

**Planning Commissioners Present:** PT Wood, Greg Bayne, Ted Richardson, Tim Kennedy and Cheryl Brown-Kovacic

**Planning Commissioners Absent:**

**Staff Present:** Don Reimer, Dara MacDonald, Kim Antonucci

---

I. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRPERSON:

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

III. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES:

**Bayne** moved to approve the minutes of October 20, 2010; **Kennedy** seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS:

None

V. AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA:

None

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

None

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. A recommendation for the Zoning for the Salida Municipal Planning Area

Staff presentation:

**Reimer** explained the IGA for regional planning. He discussed the land use code update and zoning map update underway in the County. He explained that the purpose of this meeting is to get public feedback on the proposed zoning and to make a recommendation to the County Planning Commission. Notice of the hearing was published in The Mountain Mail on November 10<sup>th</sup>. **Reimer** provided an overview of each of the proposed zone districts and reviewed the draft map.

**Kennedy** asked about the Highway commercial on Hwy 291 just beyond the MPA. **Reimer** explained that there are some existing commercial uses out there including KSBV Radio, a riding stable, and an equipment repair business and so the County proposed maintaining it as commercial.

Public comments:

**Greg Felt** asked about his property across from G Street and the proposed zoning. He asked if the commercial zoning could follow the topographical bench along the S. Arkansas River rather than the parcel boundary.

**Rob Treat** asked about the Cleora property on the northeast side of the railroad tracks. He purchased the property because of the Industrial zoning and is wondering what would be allowed if it was zoned Backcountry. He feels he has a better argument with the railroad to get a crossing if it remains Industrial rather than Backcountry. **Wood** suggested a split in the zoning along the topographical break between the flatter land and the steep hillside. **Treat** also commented on his property west of Holman and the desire to focus density around the City. **MacDonald** explained that the expectation is that if those properties would develop in the future they would be annexed and developed at City densities at that time. The Rural zoning accommodates the current agricultural uses on the parcel.

**Richardson** asked if **Treat** is interested in keeping the Industrial zoning on the Cleora parcels discussed earlier. **Treat** affirmed that he would like to maintain that option.

**Karin Adams** is confused about the process and does not understand why people are even considering a map at this time with proposed new zones and uses which have not yet been clearly defined. **Reimer** explained that the RPC is looking specifically at the area in the MPA in a parallel process with what the County Code Advisory Committee has been working on. **Antonucci** explained this is the first stage of this rezoning process and is an opportunity to reach out to these property owners. **Adams** explained that property owners have an expectation of the uses that are possible on the property at the time they acquire their property. **Wood** explained that the Commission would like to hear what the landowners want and the Commission wants to make sure that the zoning flows with the existing uses on the property in the MPA. **Adams** is very sensitive to property rights and to good development. She feels that there needs to be full disclosure and that people need to know what is being proposed.

**Bill Smith** asked about the levels of review proposed in each of the zones and how the RPC would review for each level of use. **Reimer** explained the four types of zoning review: Permitted, Administrative, Limited Impact, and Major Impact. The IGA will need to be updated when the County zoning is adopted so that the processes are consistent. The process for each type of review will be the same in each zone but the review standards are defined in the proposed County zoning by use and zone district. **Reimer** explained how the example of a campground use

would be processed. **Wood** explained that the RPC will review these types of applications for compatibility with City standards and recommend those be applied at times. **Reimer** explained that the goal is to develop sub-area planning to specific areas but that has not yet been achieved. **Smith** feels that the process is muddy at this time and that he would have trouble advising a client of the process and what standards are being applied under the new zoning.

**Claudia Mann** owns a property off Hwy 291 and is trying to find out if there was a change proposed to their land, how would they find out about any proposed change? She heard about this meeting through the article published in the Salida Citizen and wants to know if she would be contacted directly if her property was proposed to be rezoned. **Reimer** explained the two processes: county-wide rezoning versus an applicant seeking to rezone their individual property. **Mann** asked about the desire to keep the rural feel of the County and how the County proposes to do that. It is important to her as she is involved in trying to promote local food production. **Antonucci** explained some of the efforts underway to promote local food production. She explained the difficulty under the current zoning due to minimum 2-acre lot sizes that are currently allowed and her feeling that until the community increases the minimum lot sizes it will be difficult to maintain the rural feel. **Wood** explained that the proposed zoning allows all the agriculture uses in the proposed Rural zone.

**Jack Chivvis** asked if there were any changes proposed within the City. **MacDonald** explained that there are no zoning changes proposed within the municipality.

Public hearing was closed at 7:00.

Commission comments:

**Wood** would like to work with Rob Treat to see if we could find an agreeable zoning. **Wood** feels that the RPC has done a pretty good job of looking at current uses and proposed zoning and trying to find compatible zoning for the uses. He explained that parcels within the MSA will most likely be annexed as part of development or redevelopment.

**Richardson** asked about the eventual development of standards within the MPA and ways to improve the review process and possibly incorporate some of the City standards into their review processes. The RPC could specify which of these standards would be utilized for this type of review. **Reimer** feels that is a good suggestion and that we may be able to accomplish that in a short timeframe. In addition he suggests considering that the RPC make their recommendations directly to the BOCC rather than the County PC.

**Brown-Kovacic** would like to be able to consider mixed-uses in some of the areas around the City and would like to figure out how to incorporate some of that into the areas around the municipality. **Reimer** agrees and suggests that Smelertown may be a prime example for where mixed-use would be appropriate. **Brown-Kovacic** is concerned about the mixing of Industrial and Residential in both Smelertown and Cleora. **Reimer** discussed some of the concerns and how they are being addressed for now.

**Richardson** asked about the Commercial/Industrial Uses in the proposed Table of Uses and whether the airport is really the best location for the Industrial zoning. **Reimer** explained that most of the land is owned by the City and County and that the remainder is buffered largely due to topography. The desire is to allow complimentary uses that would support the airport use such as a shipping facility. There was discussion about the airport and whether an overlay specific to the airport wouldn't be most appropriate.

**Richardson** emphasized that we are looking for more commercial and industrial lands especially close to town. He then brought up the area proposed for Rural south of the South Arkansas River and north of CR 107A. He suggested that this area might be more appropriate at Residential rather than Rural. There was discussion about what is possible and desired in this area.

**Brown-Kovacic** asked about the Tenderfoot Industrial Park and what uses are currently located there. **Reimer** explained the subdivision and the uses currently in place.

**Wood** explained there are four areas of concern that have been identified: airport, Cleora, Treat/Starbuck parcels along the trail, area between Little River and CR 107A. **Kennedy** would add the Hwy Commercial on Hwy 291 just outside of the MPA. He does not feel that is consistent with the desire to limit intensive commercial uses outside of the MPA.

**Richardson** suggested reviewing the draft Table of Uses. **Wood** suggested further discussion on the Cleora area with Rob Treat and that staff take a further look at the other four areas. **Reimer** suggested that the RPC could take no action at this time and allow for staff to get more info and schedule a new hearing at a later date. **MacDonald** suggested that staff could contact the owners of those properties where the RPC has questions.

**Brown-Kovacic** asked about the Commercial property adjacent to Sands Lake. Staff clarified that should be Rural since it is owned by the Division of Wildlife.

Commission action:

**Richardson** moved to close the hearing and direct staff to investigate the five properties identified earlier by **Wood** and **Kennedy**. **Brown-Kovacic** seconded the motion. All were in favor.

VIII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:

None

IX. ADJOURN:

7:35