

Doney Park-Timberline-Fernwood Area Plan Update Committee
Notes for Meeting #19a (continuation of Meeting 19)
June 24, 2021 5:00-8:30 pm on Zoom

I. Welcome and Introductions

Committee Members

Bryan Bates (chair)
John Ruggles
Monica Julian
Bernice Carver
Jim Clifford
Dave Browning
Evelyn Wannie
Rob Wilson

County Staff

Jessica Simmons
Melissa Shaw
Areina Contreras
Jess McNeely
Naomi Yazzie-Sloan
Kelly Bingham
Jeronimo Vasquez

Members of the Public

Ed Jirsa
Doug Meyer
William LeRoy
Autumn Montoya
Barbara Greenlees
Toni
Jon Paxton
Ken Lorton
James Michael
Brian Bollig
Rick L
Sandra
Karen Land
Jim Johnson
Teresa Alfred
Cheryl Barlow
Bruce Jacks
Kathy Waldrup
Josh Castro
Karen Burdorff
Lynette

Lucy Greenwood
Sheila Walsh
Deanna Toenjes
Andrea Guerrette
Mike McDonald

I. Supervisor Updates

A. Contreras and N. Yazzie-Sloan gave updates from Supervisors Vasquez and Begay, respectively.

II. First Comment Period

J. Michael: Concerned that the flood control basin could be used for multi-family housing. Response: The County owns that and it is designated as a flood control basin. There is talk of possibly having some passive recreation there but there is nothing currently in the works, and it will remain for flood control.

W. LeRoy: Wondered about what types of agreements, if any, committee members signed before serving on this committee. Knows of multiple area plans that use the words shall and/or must. Has sent relevant court decision documents about this to M. Shaw. Why can't the DPTF plan use similar language? Response: The court documents will be forwarded to the County attorney; it's not the call of the area plan committee to decide this.

T. Alfred: "Shall" or "must" should be used in the area plan instead of "should," etc. (or at least as strong of language as possible).

III. Response to Comments

- A comment from D. Meyer was read, with J. Ruggles responding.
- B. Carver thinks instead of saying minimum lot size of 1 acre, it should say no smaller than existing. J. Ruggles says that most of DPTF is already zoned as 2.5- or 5-acre minimum; therefore making those lots smaller would require a zone change.
- Comment from W. LeRoy about shall/must/etc.

IV. Review of Draft Vision Statements

Natural Resources, Open Space, and Environment: no changes

Community Character and Values: no changes

Land Use, Growth, Development, and Partnerships: no changes

Transportation: no changes

V. Review of Land Use Chapter

M. Shaw shared rewording of policy LU.15, and the committee approved the new wording.

The committee finished reviewing the LU chapter, with M. Shaw making changes into the document. The committee requested that the following terms – should, cottage industry, home occupations, public/semipublic – be included in the glossary.

VI. Schedule Review

The next meeting will be **July 8**, and subjects will be the remaining land use policies (LU.2 and LU.16), and the transportation chapter.

VII. Second Comment Period

D. Meyer: The response to his comment was insufficient. LU.2 needs more work because it encourages high density development, which is not what DPTF residents want, according to the survey.

J. Ruggles: People should challenge what is said at these meetings.

E. Wannie: One of the emails that M. Shaw distributed had a comment about subdivisions on forest land. This comment wasn't addressed. It should be on the next agenda. M. Shaw said the committee did address that comment at the last meeting. It was about equestrian access through Slayton Ranch.