

La Plata County Land Use Code Stakeholder Input as of 12/12/16

1. What interest area best describes the perspective you bring to the Land Use Code?			
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
General business/finance	28.6%	2	
Agriculture	42.9%	3	
Development/real estate	14.3%	1	
Professional code user: architect,	14.3%	1	
County district planning group: Florida	14.3%	1	
Community interests: conservation,	42.9%	3	
Other (please specify)		1	
		<i>answered question</i>	7
		<i>skipped question</i>	0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Dec 2, 2016 6:47 PM	and small business	

2. Were you involved with past efforts to revise/rewrite the Land Use Code?			
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Very involved	42.9%	3	
Somewhat involved	28.6%	2	
Aware but not involved	14.3%	1	
Not at all involved or aware	14.3%	1	
Other (please specify)		1	
		<i>answered question</i>	7
		<i>skipped question</i>	0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Nov 18, 2016 11:10 PM	I spent about three solid years as a member of the group that met perhaps 50 times for several hours each meeting to make revisions and talk through the draft of the last "new" land use code that was eventually approved by BOCC but never adopted.	

3. What are the most important issues to be addressed in a new Land Use Code			
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	
Consistency	42.9%	3	
Ease of development	42.9%	3	
Predictability	14.3%	1	
Water availability	28.6%	2	
Open space	28.6%	2	
Rural/urban interface	28.6%	2	
Housing availability	14.3%	1	
Agriculture	85.7%	6	
Growth management	14.3%	1	
Infrastructure	14.3%	1	
Economic development	42.9%	3	
Timeliness	42.9%	3	
Cost of development	57.1%	4	
Simplicity	71.4%	5	
Other (please specify)		1	
		<i>answered question</i>	7
		<i>skipped question</i>	0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
--------	---------------	------------------------	------------

1	Nov 18, 2016 11:10 PM	Everyone of the above is important in some way and to varying degrees to different people. I don't think that there is a viable group that wants "nothing" to happen. Most people recognize that a viable and vibrant economy is vital to the overall health and diversity in the County. Most all people in real estate and development businesses are fine with reasonable rules that protect and promote the future of the County. They just want predictability, reasonableness and a staff that Helps them through the process.
---	-----------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4. What are the biggest challenges with the existing Land Use Code?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	4
<i>answered question</i>	4
<i>skipped question</i>	3

Number	Response Date	Response Text	Categories
1	Dec 2, 2016 6:47 PM	Too restrictive for new development. There are no stand alone chapters. Chapters tie to each other. There are too many departments that add on to the conditions of approval. Lack of check lists and other jurisdictional pieces that do not belong in a Land Use Code.	
2	Dec 2, 2016 2:04 PM		
3	Dec 2, 2016 1:49 AM	Merging existing property rights with new development Need a much bigger box. The current code is a dinosaur and does not meet the needs of our County today. The "criteria" for approval are subjective, superficial and lend themselves to misinterpretation. Many provisions are onerous and have not basis in rational application and therefore have been ignored (for good reason) for years- until a new staff member interprets differently. It is unfair not just to the public but to the staff that has to work with it.	
4	Nov 18, 2016 11:10 PM		

5. What works well in the existing Land Use Code?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	4
<i>answered question</i>	4
<i>skipped question</i>	3

Number	Response Date	Response Text	Categories
1	Dec 2, 2016 2:04 PM	Nothing. The current land use code is outdated and conflicting.	
2	Dec 2, 2016 1:49 AM	I think it is consistent The part that advocates for accessible open space is working well with me. It reads, "In order to balance the needs of the people and serve general health, safety and welfare demands, it is imperative that the County considerably develop a growth management system which accommodates economic vitality, inspiration for innovative development projects and businesses, preserve open, accessible areas to the natural environment for recreation, encourage higher levels of service to be maintained with expanding, concentrated infrastructure sources, as well as identify areas which could most effectively and economically serve the population's needs." It's a bit of a run-on sentence, but it encapsulates a broad spectrum of important ideas.	
3	Nov 28, 2016 2:20 AM		
4	Nov 18, 2016 11:10 PM	Not much.	

6. What changes would most improve the Land Use Code?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	5
<i>answered question</i>	5
<i>skipped question</i>	2

Number	Response Date	Response Text	Categories
1	Dec 2, 2016 6:47 PM	Simplify and streamline.	

2	Dec 2, 2016 2:04 PM	Indexes, checklist, defining when conditions of improvement may be necessary, but writing something that does not require hundreds of conditions of approval. Agency comment periods are also problematic to timing
3	Dec 2, 2016 1:49 AM	Better complaint management, easy to understand regulations I would suggest writing into the chapters on land use the following example of what the "Physical Impacts of Development Can Include:" --The exclusion of people from land-locked public land due to the absence of trail easements crossing private lands. Also, please include an 'Action Item' in the 'Implementation' section (chapter 12), for the land use or open space element that offers a property tax incentive for private land owners that are willing to sign trail easements that would provide public access to public lands abutting their private property.
4	Nov 28, 2016 2:20 AM	the code needs to focus on core concerns and protections and not overreach. The last code had a section on colors of agricultural buildings and stuff in your yard. Really! we don't even have architectural guidelines in the County. Why try and throw stuff like that in. Paramount is that the drafters realize the diversity in the County. The District Plans should be clarified, updated, standardized and then given more than just "recommended" status. Its the best we have at community involved input on growth and mostly is good. Beyond that the current new submittal process where projects go to agencies for review before being "accepted" projects needs to be scraped. The agencies take forever to respond and want to respond again anyway once a "real" application is accepted. The commenting agencies need to be held accountable to timelines. The number of reviews can and should be reduced. Once BOCC approval is obtained the preparation of the Final Plat should be administrative. There is nothing left to discuss beyond making sure mechanical issues are done. The process needs a realistic timeline the applicant can depend on (assuming they do their work-which many don't). Staff needs to be trained on the real world implications of time delays on the cost and viability of projects. Give wider berth to administrative reviews. Some temporary use permits for should never have to go to Planning Commission or BOCC. Create better guidelines and let Planning Staff handle. Specific to La Plata County there needs to be better communication between Planning staff and Attorney. Too many times their input contradicts or overlaps or delays. I do feel that the current planning staff and Attorney staff are great. They just need clarifications to work better.
5	Nov 18, 2016 11:10 PM	

7. How would you like to be involved going forward in the Land Use Code rewrite?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Public meeting invitations	71.4%	5
Email updates	57.1%	4
Online updates/comment options	71.4%	5
Phone calls	14.3%	1
Individual meetings	42.9%	3
Other (please specify)		2
		answered question 7
		skipped question 0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Dec 2, 2016 6:47 PM	A county wide survey should be sent out instead of special interest groups giving input at far too many meetings that go nowhere. Meetings dragged on and on for far too long, with nothing resolved.	
2	Nov 18, 2016 11:10 PM	I am already participating as one of two Planning Commission members on the Oversight Committee. Just wanted to use this opportunity to express personal thoughts separate from other work	

8. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

Answer Options	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	5

Number	Response Date	Response Text	Categories
--------	---------------	---------------	------------

1

Dec 2, 2016 2:04 PM

The current list of invited small group interview stakeholders are incomplete. Many people invited have never read the code, never used the code and only heard stories. You need to go back for two to five years and pull applicants, agents, attorneys and debrief with those true users.

The success or failure of this venture (and a lot of \$ spent) is going to be directly proportional to how well the Company writing code understands the unique nature of our County and the clarity of their marching orders. it needs to be very specific. Last go around the Company just cut and pasted from front range counties and it did not

2

Nov 18, 2016 11:10 PM

work AT ALL