

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

Notes 04/05/23 Meeting

Committee Members in Attendance:

Hank Kelly
Robert Chavez
Ray Cvetic
Sarah Cobb
Gilbert Benavides, Trustee
George Radnovich, Trustee
Maida Rubin, Planning Director
Ann Simon, Village Administrator

Other Attendees:

JT Michelson, P&Z Commissioner

Notes:

General discussion:

- Discussion of public meeting date and time – desire expressed to push it back a couple weeks for additional research and prep. The group would like a subject matter expert to speak at the public meeting if possible. Several names were discussed, unfortunately most reside out of state. Group agreed that if they couldn't present in person, it would still be useful to talk to a few experts to get their input on conservation subdivision ordinances.
- Group members floated idea of talking to some bankers for input on financing these projects. A subgroup will reach out to a couple contacts to have this discussion and report back to the group.
- At the next meeting we will be able to have at least one developer join to discuss conservation subdivisions and answer questions.
- The potential public meeting date is now May 4th, although this is still tentative. The group's expectation for that meeting is to provide an introduction about the group's research so far/potential recommendations, have an educational presentation from a guest speaker to provide background into the subject matter, and to have table discussions soliciting input from members of the public.
- The CAC meeting on May 3rd will need to move to May 2nd due to a staff conflict.

Data and map discussion:

- First impressions:
 - The Rio Grande corridor is where the majority of lots that meet the 3 acre threshold are located and may be conservation subdivision candidates, although many properties have existing homes on them.
- Conservation subdivisions would not be inappropriate for properties on the east side of the Village, although fewer properties would meet the 3 acre threshold than those on the west side of the Village.

- There is a point at which a piece of land is too small for a conservation subdivision to make logistical sense. 3 acres may be an appropriate threshold because it sets a fairly low bar for eligibility but could encourage some lot consolidation.
- One group member expressed the desire for conservation to become mandatory for development on properties over a certain size.
- The question of what the incentives are to do a conservation development arose, and how strong those incentives are without a density bonus.
- The question of how to best incentivize/mandate varied housing types/sizes within conservation subdivisions was raised, if that is one of the CS goals.
- Contemplating if this could be appropriate for tripa lots is important.
- Questions the group would like to discuss with developers include:
 - Many CS ordinances do not include a density bonus. What are the benefits, downsides, and available incentives if not including a density bonus in the Village ordinance?
 - What is the appropriate CS lot size threshold that best meets the needs of the Village?

Next meeting: April 19th 2023 at 9:00 am, discussion with developers.

Prior to the next meeting: Reach out to experts and to bankers for additional input and report back at the April 19th meeting.