

Taz Vass 800 hillside ave Dolores

### Dolores Zoning Notes

-Broad mix of uses down town, allow mixed residential:

**Maintain** residential apartments downtown. Osprey employees and others want to rent a small place. Owners living behind their Business is the oldest business model there is. Besides, there is no demand for businesses to rent spaces or they would be full of businesses. Business abhors a vacuum.

-talk about architectural design standards for downtown:

How? Now you have a board judging what is correct. It conflicts with being business friendly. If you had the money to build a bar anywhere in the world, would you build it on the old foundations of the Hollywood? On a back street, off highway in a highway strip town?

-Allow increased building heights downtown with residential upstairs:

35 feet high is plenty. The issue with building in the central business district is enforcing the FEMA requirement to build the the first floor above flood stage. The expense of an elevator required for ADA access to "upstairs" will exceed the markets's ability to pay the rent. See Dolores State bank for what a 35 feet high building looks like. Maybe 35 feet high is too tall.

-Change codes to make some nonconforming buildings and signs conforming:

I support the the sign code in general. The current moderate size sign is needed to attract tourist traffic driving thru town at 50 Mph. The only non-conforming signs I know of are the leftover historic signs like on Central. I say avoid a plethora of city code signs, like "no parking on central on snow days". Then we live with ugly meaningless signs 365 days a year that only apply for 3 days a year.

There are more than several non conforming lots in town that were 25 foot fronts with the associated houses that are within the lot set back requirements. The other issue about those small houses, is they may not be allowed to rebuild if they burn down and are less than 900 square feet. 900 feet is the minimum house size in the current code. There are more than several houses less than that that folks live in happily.

About "tiny" houses, I think individual lots in town would qualify, for say for 3,000 feet "lots. But I think that water and sewer taps should be required from each dwelling. The result I see from this "tiny" setting, is a storage shed as big as the "house". So I don't know what the town gains. I would rather see a consistent 6,000 foot minimum and a ratio of house size to out buildings, ie 2 to 1. Allow a 700 square foot house and a 350 foot garage. Or 2 to 1.5. Allow a 700 square foot house and a 450 foot garage. Everyone has more out door toys than they know how to store. It's where we live.

-residential transitions+mixes-variety of lot sizes. We have a variety of lot sizes now. My question is, does the town actually have the land space to create a transition? Or the demand. Dolores state bank is a half a block developenet next to two residential houses. It is what is it is. If transitions is business unfriendly because it might limit development in some unforeseen way, I'm all for simplicity on this topic.

-Up-update zoning district options:

I don't know what this one means.

—involve the public:

I support this one. If anyone will show up

-clarify processes. Any vagueness hurts anyone thinking of developing a property.

-consider future technology: Hmmm. If Dolores food market installs a natural gas generator to offset the change in the electric bill, is that allowed? The current land use code does not account for current technology. Solar panels are allowed now. Should solar heat gain be covered up buy a tall house built to the south?

-make LUC user friendly: yes, a complex LUC does not assist in enforcement or usability or customer adapting to it.

-tiny houses: tiny house are a nice dream of cheap folks. It won't really serve the poor. And yes rents have risen faster than cash flow, but that is a national problem not cured by a LUC. I

think individual lots in town would qualify, for say for 3,000 (2,000?) feet "lots. But I think that water and sewer taps should be required for each dwelling. The result I see from this "tiny" setting around the county (no residential zoning), is a storage shed as big as the "house". So I don't know what the town gains. I would rather see a consistent 6,000 foot minimum lot size and a ratio of house size to out buildings, ie 2 to 1. Allow a 700 square foot house and a 350 foot garage. Or 2 to 1.5. Allow a 700 square foot house and a 450 foot garage. Everyone has more out door toys than they know how to store. It's where we live.

-Create opportunities for more housing choices: Dolores is not homogeneous in housing choices. There are more than several duplexes and other high density dwellings that stay rented. There are small house, medium houses, and large house folks live. What keeps housing tight in Dolores is the cost of construction. One can build 600 square feet dwelling in multifamily zones in a duplex or or more if one has the land. The lot on 3rd and riverside can accommodate 5 (?) units. All it takes is the money to buy the lot for \$90k and build 5 units with the associated taps. So, market forces are what limit development in Dolores.

-Standards for VRBO/ABNB. Besides the potential marijuana business, it the first new business that has landed in Dolores for decades. It's another way to make an income, increase foot traffic for existing business, allow folks to experience the wonders of Dolores in a lower density setting than the two motels in town. I think quality is the only competitive edge. If the existing motels can compete with Local ANBNBs, then great. I say it will increase the tourist lodging pie bigger and the sales tax pie. Yes, gentrification is happening in Dolores and all that that implies. But it's a national problem. All housing expenses are rising. I don't know how the LUC can cure that. I agree with a business license and paying lodging taxes. Perhaps the transparency of commercial property taxes is also in order. All residents benefit from more commercial taxes collected in Dolores

-better coordination/integration with hazard regulations; floodplains, slope:

I don't know what integration means. It's my understanding that if the Town does not enforce the first floor height above the flood level, the whole town could lose FEMA flood insurance for the everyone. And Yes, building above the flood level adds to building costs. More building costs mean new developments cost more money and are less likely to pass the market test. Gravity is switched on, is my comment for the slope problem.

-solar energy facilities Solar access: A 35 foot residential building height would certainly shade some house in town if a house is built to full height on some of the smaller lots in town. A 35 foot house blocking the sun from a neighbors photovoltaic panels is a certainly solar access and perhaps should looked at. Does a south facing picture window that gains heat from the sun count as solar access? It certainly would reduce the quality of life for the shaded neighbor.

-Dark Sky lighting: the towns street lights are the biggest offenders for d a dark sky rating. Enforcement of current codes to limit motion detectors and lights from crossing property lines has been neglected in the past. Write any dark sky code you want. Until the town and other Commercial buildings in town (ie new maintenance barn) change their current non- conforming lights, Dark sky is bright topic.

-Business friendly: I consider the business atmosphere in Dolores to be friendly enough. It's the market forces that limits businesses in Dolores. 80% of the highway lots are 150 fronts on 145. The price of land and buildings are too high for business incubation. Even banks have come and gone in Dolores. I don't think a LUC can reduce the costs of starting up in Dolores. Again, if there was demand for more businesses in Dolores, they would be open.

-annexation: By state law, Annexation can only happen when the landowner agrees to be annexed. The Town may make more money from taps as out of town taps pay more. Flag pole annexations are illegal . And annexation can only go up river. Those folks have no benefit joining the town when the county currently has no residential inspection for residential construction.

-Streamline Approval process: I agree. I have certainly seen projects on hold recently because of the revolving door of Town managers and building inspectors. But, it's the government job to protect and raise the tax base to increase property tax revenue. Can the LUC streamline the process without Govt approval? Maybe not.

-ADA access: So currently, new commercial buildings must accommodate the disabled. Any low story building get the added expense of an elevator. The first floor floor height raises the cost of buildings. Retrofitting current buildings won't be supposed by the market. You all have to write ADA standard in, but it won't keep make the market economy change.

The state and the town can lead on this topic. While some sidewalks are getting ramps for the corners, can a street without a sidewalk be considered ADA compliant?

-Eco-Friendly Community: Write what you want for the environment. Rural residents already lead the world on the amount of carbon load it takes to live here. I don't see the LUC reducing our carbon loads, and I see it increasing the costs to live in Dolores.

-Sign regulation update. I support the the sign code in general. The current moderate size sign is needed to attract tourist traffic driving thru town at 50 Mph. Currently Lighted signs over a certain size aren't allowed a white background. The on building signs have no size limit except for 36" letters. A smaller restrictive sign code won't improve our quality of life. The Dolores food market sign is at the limit for size and lighted size. It's also the 46th sign the driver sees when entering Dolores from the top of the hill from the west. Again enforcement of the size and number of signs is an ongoing issue. The only non-conforming signs I know of are the leftover historic signs like on Central. I say avoid a plethora of city code signs, like "no parking on central on snow days". Then we live with ugly meaningless signs 365 days a year that only apply for 3 days a year.

-Special events process: I say each park should have its own application process. I don't think the LUC is the place to administer special events permits. Following that thought, are the parks described in the current LUC? Maybe they should be. I don't what is should say, but there it is.

-The LUC should be more flexible to create opportunities for developments on complex sites: What does "complex site" mean exactly? If the market forces won't support a development on a site, the processes are in place for exceptions and waivers. If the LUC serves all town residents, than notices and hearings are appropriate for "flexibility".

-Not all existing conditions should be nonconforming: I think the towns hands are tied on commercial issues. If the warehouse style building burn, should they be allowed just to rebuild with out question? If they are raw wood walls in the inside should they be rebuilt to comply with current building codes in the name of historic? So the question. Apples to Flood level; ADA; set backs, density. Residential issues abound. Perhaps rules for historic 25 front lots could be written in the LUC.

-allow higher building heights downtown: Higher than what, 35 feet? The bank is 35 feet above flood plain do we want three story buildings down town. I think that 24 to 26 feet above the flood level is plenty for two story commercial buildings downtown. Refer to above market comments about ADA compliance.

-Maintaining Sales Tax: Refer to above comments about Lot size, ADA compliance, Quality, operational expenses, business friendly. Perhaps it's not for the LUC to write code about the sales tax base.

-parking/ ADA location: Write ADA compliance in. Nonconforming commercial sites will provide the parking spaces if the business image or market demands it.

-what does form based codes do + how does that work here?: As I unstained, it sounds complicated. It sounds like the ease use will suffer here. Probably a govt official approval will never change in Dolores.

-infill development: as previously discussed, protecting current residential property values and perceived density expectations should be protected. This LUC is not going to solve market forces on constrain costs. Ditto on commercial infill.

-affordable housing residents and housing that residents can afford:

see above comments on constructions costs and minimum house sizes and density expectations.

-future of tourism and OHV discussion: If you all haven't noticed, Mt biking is a well establish tourist economy. When businesses serve the Mt biking, they flourish. Refer to above comments about the ABNB business. The only other potential tourist traffic increase is the Marijuana

business. If the business must be 1,000 feet from schools or parks, then draw the circles on the town maps and allow them. There is only a few properties that will be allowed. You all don't need an election to write the LUC to allow Marijuana sales. OHV: I'm against OHV on town streets. There is a long list of why's that I will let others drive. Noise and ignoring speed limits are the top two. Allowing OHV traffic to cross the highway at the Outpost Motel and drive down 18th and then around the schools to get to boggy draws constitutes commercial traffic in a residential zone. I say those residents have a right to a residential lifestyle with OHVs racing up and down the street from the Outpost and other places they might stay. Stopping drive thru tourists from our neighboring Tourist destinations is the goal for any thriving business in Dolores. I don't know how the LUC can address tourist and the sales tax base except be keeping a moderate sign code.

-make the code easy to understand: I agree if it is possible.

-eliminate conflicts in regulations: I agree

-Update definitions: I Agree

-Add illustration: I guess. It will only add to complexity and the potential for conflicts to add illustration

-Address enforcement: While I don't know the enforcement language in the current LUC, it's likely strongly written. It's a matter of the town to enforce things.

-Eliminate conflicts with external codes-such as building codes: Sure! That is a difficult task to compare and contrast all aspects of a LUC to conform to an ever changing International Building codes. Don't forget the state inspections for electrical and plumbing.if they apply.

I support 50 % lot coverage in all zones. Maybe the Lots around Flanders park could exceed 50% with the historic main street building with zero front and side setbacks while maintaining the 25 foot alley set back.