

**Ouray County Study Group  
Minutes  
August 10, 2008**

**4:00PM**

**Land Use Office**

Draft

Minutes of Ouray County Study Group meeting, October 22, 2008

Meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Chairman Ken Lipton

In attendance: Ken Lipton, Craig Fetterolf, Sara Coulter, Lynn Padget, Ted Collin and John Clark

Karen Risch, and Heidi Albritton, Keith Meinert and Don Batchelder were absent.

Minutes of the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting were discussed:

Moved a sentence at Sara's request. Change is in marked-up version of minutes (attached). Motion to approve (as amended) by Ted Collin, seconded by John Clark.

1. Review Sara Coulter's Synopsis of Theobald Study.

Lynn projected the latest "Ouray County Build-out Analysis Layers" document on the meeting room wall. Under Scenario A, at build-out, which Sara referred to as a sort of "worst case scenario", we will easily provide the maximum number of units required to accommodate current projected growth rates. Sara stated that she tried to show in her synopsis that there is a great deal of overlap in things like riparian areas, and the wildlife maps, making them easier to target for protection. There was discussion about whether or not the wildlife values were "built-in" to the Cluster-development preference area. The consensus was that it was, or should be? Lynn pointed out that the brown "preference areas" might not be as accurate as we might like as well. Ken added that both the Theobald and RPI studies are simply tools for directing our decisions, but we shouldn't ask them to provide as much specificity as we might like.

Sara then reviewed Table 10 from the latest Theobald study. She pointed out that she had edited his table colors to show which scenarios have the lowest net affect on projected build-out numbers. It was also pointed out that there are 900 platted lots available for building in the unincorporated County right now. There was some discussion about how to encourage the development of those lots prior to new PUD development. At the same time, it was pointed out that these lots are actually an boon to the County in their current state, because they provide property tax revenue without requiring any services.

Sara then projected some zoomed-in sections from Theobald's latest maps, to show detailed comparison of projected build-outs under the various scenarios. There was discussion of the positive aspects of a development like the recent Weaver PUD in the Town of Ridgway, and how similar PUDs could more easily happen in the County in the future if we can present the findings of these studies as tools to modify the Land Use Code to be more flexible towards that end. There was consensus that the clustering scenarios are something we can (and should) focus on in our summaries. However, there was also some discussion about how not all clustering is good clustering. Determining how to differentiate that in the actual LUC will be the hard part.

The group then discussed Sara's recommendations. It was agreed that the following changes be made to them:

It was suggested that #1 be removed, but consensus came around to leave it in, if only because it is a valuable concept to state.

It was agreed to combine #2 and #6, striking the second sentence of #2 and replacing it with entirety of #6.

The first clause of #3 was agreed to be removed, leaving it to start with the word "Encourage..."

There as lot of discussion about #4. The concept of TDRs was debated, as well as the variant known as PDRs (purchase of development rights). In the end, there was consensus that some mention of the possible benefit of TDRs (or PDRs) would be valuable. Sara will redraft that recommendation.

There was consensus that #5 be left as is.

2. Review RPi synopsis.

Ken distributed his draft Synopsis of the RPI Study. The group agreed to review his document and meet next week to go over it.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, October 22, 2008, by John Clark