



## Town of Taos Annexation Strategic Plan Public Meeting Summary

The Town of Taos Annexation Strategic Plan is being prepared to assist the Town of Taos with a preliminary fiscal analysis of annexing various unincorporated areas within the current Town boundary and to recommend specific annexation and zoning strategies for each unincorporated area.

Three public meetings regarding annexation were held on November 4, 2006 at the Town of Taos Council Chambers to solicit input regarding:

- Residents' concerns and issues regarding annexation
- Conditions under which residents might support annexation
- Residents' land use and infrastructure needs
- Initial support for/opposition to annexation

Approximately 130 people participated in the meetings, which were split into three sessions:

- Morning session: Ranchitos and Chamisa
- Early afternoon session: Weimer and Este Es
- Late afternoon session: Canon, Las Haciendas, and In-holdings

Each session began with an overview of the annexation process, then examined some myths and facts regarding annexation and the maps of the annexation study areas. A question and answer session with the entire group followed the presentation. Notes from this discussion were taken on an easel for everyone to see, in addition to private notes taken by team members. After the overall group discussion, the participants were split into smaller groups for break-out discussions specific to their neighborhood. At each of these group discussions, there was a general facilitator and a note-taker who used an easel and took notes that everyone could see.

This summary represents a general synthesis of the public input gathered at the meetings. It is based on a review of team members' notes, an analysis of the recorded meeting notes captured on easels during the general Q&A and breakout groups, and comments received from meeting participants. This summary should not be interpreted as a complete record of the thoughts of all or even a majority of the residents in those areas. For a more comprehensive assessment of residents' support or opposition to annexation, a scientific survey is one tool that could provide a more precise measurement of residents' opinions.

### General Comments and Concerns

- Most residents who attended the annexation meetings did not support annexation. Some residents were open to annexation but needed more information to make a final decision.
- A main concern of all residents who attended the meetings was a need for more information, in particular how much annexation would cost them in terms of increased taxes and fees relative to extension of utilities specific to their property. Also, they wanted to know when they would receive utility extensions and whether they would have to pay increased taxes or fees for a long time prior to receiving utility services. Finally, they wanted clarification around the Town's policies relative to requiring hook-up to Town utilities and the conveyance of water rights.

- There is concern and mistrust among community members regarding why the Town of Taos is pursuing annexation at this time, how the boundaries were chosen, and the location of the boundaries.
- Many residents are interested in how the Town would resolve/deliver on infrastructure and zoning issues in their neighborhoods.
- In terms of land use, most residents seemed to want things to remain as they are relative to land use type and density.
- Many residents are concerned about the possibility of having to give up domestic wells and water rights; most did not want to give up their existing wells.
- There are concerns about the location of the service boundary with some of the mutual domestic water suppliers. Many residents on the edges would prefer to be served by the Town.
- Residents' process suggestions included a Town-administered survey to capture true public opinion of annexation, additional informational meetings (perhaps at the neighborhood level), a mailing of the meeting summary to everyone who signed into the meetings, a more comprehensive description of potential costs, and a more comprehensive outreach process to better disseminate information and solicit input, including door-to-door outreach.

### **Ranchitos and Chamisa Session**

- 40 people attended ( $\frac{3}{4}$  Ranchitos and  $\frac{1}{4}$  Chamisa)
- Residents seemed more or less open to annexation, but needed more information before making a decision.
- A couple of participants signed petitions supporting annexation.

#### Ranchitos general characterization of concerns/conditions:

- A strong majority of residents needed more information about annexation before making a decision
- There was a strong consensus that Ranchitos should remain low density, rural, and agricultural
- There was a desire to protect current agricultural uses and open space through zoning, via the R-A zone and/or official open space designations
- There was a concern that there might be a gap between tax increases and service provision; residents felt that service provision should trigger tax increases rather than annexation alone triggering them

#### Chamisa general characterization of concerns/conditions:

- Most wanted to keep existing water wells, acequias, and water rights
- Most wanted to hook up to sewer
- Most wanted to maintain the relative rural character of the area by bringing back former ETZ zones
- There is concern about plans for a sports arena or other uses of the existing gravel pit area
- Most wanted roads to be upgraded (i.e. private roads taken over and maintained by the Town and other roads improved vis-à-vis drainage, but not paved)
- There was a concern about increased traffic if roads became paved

- There were concerns in Chamisa about the boundary with the El Valle water & sewer district – residents living in the water district area at the meeting would prefer to be served by the Town
- Many seemed open to annexation, but needed more information to make a final decision

### **Weimer & Este Es Session**

- 40 people attended ( $\frac{3}{4}$  Weimer and  $\frac{1}{4}$  Este Es)
- Residents seemed to have mixed feelings about annexation and wanted more information before making a decision

#### Este Es general characterization of concerns/conditions:

- Most wanted to keep existing water wells and water rights
- Most wanted to hook up to sewer – although there is a concern about the boundary with El Valle water & sewer district – residents living in the water district area preferred to be served by the Town
- Most wanted to maintain the relatively rural character of the area by bringing back the former ETZ zones; to grandfather in existing uses; to allow for some mixture of uses e.g. home businesses closer to Town.
- Several identified the need to improve Este Es Road to make it more pedestrian-friendly
- Most seemed open to annexation, but wanted more information.

#### Weimer general characterization of concerns/conditions:

- Most wanted to keep existing water wells and water rights
- Land use – no increase in densities; grandfather in existing uses
- There was a consensus that existing covenants and deed restrictions should be honored/maintained in the event of annexation.
- How soon could the Town upgrade certain roads to D-class? How much would that cost and who would pay for it?
- Many are in favor of extending Town police and fire services
- In general most were not in favor of annexation, especially without more information

### **Canon, Las Haciendas & In-holdings**

- 50+ people attended (  $\frac{4}{5}$  Canon and  $\frac{1}{5}$  for the rest)
- Residents were generally against annexation.

#### Canon general characterization of concerns/conditions:

- All wanted to keep existing water wells, acequias, and water rights
- All wanted to stay on Canon water & sewer district
- All wanted to keep basic rural land uses
- There was a strong interest in pursuing Traditional Historic Community status in order to prevent annexation
- Most if not all at the meeting had signed a petition against the annexation
- There are major issues of mistrust with the Town; many questioned where the proposed boundary on the map came from and what forces were behind annexation

#### Las Haciendas general characterization of concerns/conditions:

- All wanted to maintain existing community and individual wells – could there be optional hook-up?
- Interested in sewer and upgrades to roads -- but timing of delivery services would be a potential key condition
- Trust issues with Town due to previous annexation attempts and splitting of neighborhood
- May be open to annexation, but have a lot of reservations

In-holdings (only La Morada) general characterization of concerns/conditions:

- Desire to preserve existing land use and structures as-is
- Potential interest in historic district overlay
- No utilities or roads needed or wanted
- Seem to be against annexation – don't see any need to change

A more complete summary of the meetings is being developed by the consultant team and will be available in January. The consultant team will be using the input received at the meetings to develop recommendations for the Annexation Strategic Study.

### **Preliminary Conclusions**

An overview of the community input received during the annexation public meetings suggests that blanket annexation of all the study areas via the petition method is unlikely to be successful. A majority of residents indicated that they are not in favor of annexation at this time, although some areas are more receptive to annexation than others. In all areas, the majority of residents favored maintaining the existing land uses and densities that were the result of the zones in place under the former ETZ. In each session, an informal hand count vote was taken at the end to determine the current level of support for annexation. This informal vote can be used as a cursory public opinion barometer for each area:

- **Ranchitos:** 1 in favor, 3 opposed, 9 need more information
- **Chamisa:** 1 in favor, 5 need more information
- **Este Es:** 8 need more information
- **Weimer:** 1 in favor, 10 opposed, 6 need more information
- **Canon:** 35 opposed
- **Las Haciendas:** 7 opposed
- **La Morada:** 1 opposed
- **Jeantete:** N/A
- **Mabel Dodge:** N/A

It should be noted that there is considerable mistrust regarding the Town's intentions, particularly by longtime Taos residents in the more historic areas of town. Throughout the day of meetings, residents repeatedly expressed that they were frustrated by a lack of notice about the annexation study, how the area boundaries were determined, and why more information wasn't available, including cost estimates, service provision details, and service delivery

timelines. Until this information can be provided to residents, only a small minority of community members residing in the unincorporated areas can be expected to support annexation, which will likely limit the effectiveness of the current annexation strategy by petition, resulting at best in piece-meal annexation of limited areas. Further, without a public information campaign that involves a comprehensive outreach strategy to listen to residents, provide them with information about the services provided by the Town, and answer residents' questions, the Town of Taos should expect current anti-annexation activity to continue to escalate.

# Appendix A

## Meeting Notes from Group 1 -- Ranchitos and Chamisa

### *Large Group*

Not contacted as a property owner

- No mailing
- News Ad/ Radio

Use wells for irrigation?

- No town policy for abandonment
- Use can go forward

Required Hook up policy 300' from line

- New Development
- New Zoning

How would sewer lines go in?

- Trenching across owner property
- Least impact- of trenching – property owner pays

Sounds expensive? How much? What if you can't afford it?

- Look up
- Sewer line through Ranchitos \$5000 Hook up charge

Exchange for H2O rights to town

- May have cash in/value of H2O rights

1/3 acre foot – single family

No requirement for sewer

(H2O rights often from Acequia)

OSE Transfer of Domestic Use right

(1/3 acre')

Minimize affects to Acequia

Land dried up for service

Impact of Annexation for Community Domestic Water Association Water District

Give up H2O rights?

- El Valle/ Canon only CDWA that would be

Canon continue service but agreement with town

Acequia? No town jurisdiction. No impacts to Acequia.

Upper Ranchitos Association H2O MD?

Annexation would no effect Association – Agreement between MD and Town

Boundary – Splits? How were boundaries chosen?

In holdings/ Police force suggestion

Easement for utilities/ Pausing?

Inconvenient schedule – with Acequia meeting?

Regrettable/ Future meetings

Francisco Vigil? Answer later

Petition Approach? Just property petition?

-Town may choose another method or change boundaries

-Other two methods don't apply- Petition only method

-All three methods are open but petition method preferred

50% didn't want to Annex will town try another way?

It's a possibility, legal possibility

Can owners on the other side of road boundary?

El Valle agreement with town “no annex with town at this time”

Boundary Well?

Wells could continue existing well regardless of 300' line. Can continue use line type doesn't mean service is available.

Agricultural use – livestock? Town zoning?

No town ordinance - # hooted animal

Goal to compliment existing use

Annexation related to by-pass?

Project on Hold

Inform us about work going on by-pass

NMDOT Highway guys out there

Question West Canon – We'll try to find out.

H2O rights – surface + underground ditch rights after annex

Town has no jurisdiction over surface rights. New development town/ Develop agreement for needed water rights

Zoning? What will zoning be?

I want it to be rural-  
Intent to be very flexible – find concerns, explain what town can do.

Info – community – petition methods  
Unique situation hear from community change town ordinance to accommodate desired uses-

Deadline- None now

Boundary cleanup – helpful for police/ service – town burden provide service  
Take comment sheets to neighbors

Count Commission Meetings?  
Town council at 630?

- Compiled question today/ provide answer with study give us more answers
- Another meeting- follow up
- Good suggestion
- Advertise meetings better!!!
- Try to communicate better
- We try and go door to door
- Send a Flyer!!
- Town should do addressing better now it's with Billing doesn't reach out of town limit

Mutual Domestic Water Service District  
Town doesn't intend to take over  
Mutual agreement only

History- 90% against original county project  
Ranchitos line- town took over  
Sewer- county pays more

## ***Ranchitos Group***

### Infrastructure

- 1011 Ranchitos – sewer not yet near property- timing- how quickly could sewer service be provided? State law: within “a reasonable amount of time” – town could define “reasonable” as 5 years – town revisits schedule yearly.
- ICIP – does Town have input? Yes – happens at Town Council, open for discussion at meetings, public process.
- Taxation begins in Year I? Town would notify assessor. Begin programming it in.
- Public easement through property (orange marker)
  - Taxation in year 1 with no services?
  - Town rights to easement< Town would maintain it. Would have to have access to it. 300 ft. law was intended for new development- might be waved for annexation.

- Would like more cost info. Before making map recommendations
- What about private easements (neighbor roads)?
  - Would have to bring roads up to standards and enter negotiations with town or
  - Automatic conversion

#### Not necessarily public ROW

- What if property owner doesn't want to provide access?
  - Town could use legal means if property was annexed
- Does town have condemnation rights outside of town?
  - Yes never used it in 25 years – it is a last resort – but could condemn an easement with just compensation if necessary. Town does not want to force this ... but legally this is possible.
- Water contamination with population growth – sewer could be very beneficial. We need real costs to help make the decision.
- Taos Land Trust land (teal marker)- seems like no advantage to annex (17 acres) Why would town want it?

#### Land Use/Zoning/ Boundaries

Compatibility – representative of character- complementary to ETZ zones

- For Ranchitos, not recommending higher densities – wouldn't be appropriate

Ag lands- will town levy more taxes on Ag land?

- Zone changes trigger reassessments Ag uses taxed the same whether county or town.
- “Vacant Land”- open space instead
- Wetlands being sold as build able lots (purple) - but these are really not build able – could they be protected and sold as ag/ open space. Would be more appropriate. Need to be rezoned for protection. (Not officially designated as wetlands- start there). Town could request an inventory. Taos Valley Ac. Association might be another place to start.
- \*Consensus: this land should remain low density, rural, Ag use.

#### Conditions of Annexation

- Gap between tax increase and service provision: You pay once not twice. Opp for negotiation with neighbors, “ We will annex if \_\_\_\_”- leverage now
- Current tax property rate different between Town and County” 19%
- The R-A Zone sounds like it would be the best fit
- El Prado district parcels were removed from annex consideration
- If zoning might be changed in a year, breaking community trust to go into the Town under current negotiations.
  - Good faith for Town and County. County/kng at growth management plan too...
  - Why doesn't Town try and annex after new master plan is done?
- Ranchitos wants more meetings- notify them using addresses on sign-in sheets.
- More information needed!!

- El Prado pieces that were removed were sold but the previous development proposal is dead – new owner intends to keep it rural (upper piece). Lower piece is wetlands and was subdivided.
- Possible condition: cost increases are triggered by service provision, not annexation.
- Possible condition: no annexation until current infrastructure is dry
- Town: get away from growth at all costs mentality

Other concerns:

- Please mail out meeting summaries to everyone who signed in
  - Much better than web posting
- Please communicate the schedule

VOTE:

- Favor annexation with conditions-1
- Opposed- 3
- Not enough info yet- 9

## *Chamisa Group*

Concerns and Questions:

- Bob Romero – Don Rosario Road Area
  - Zoned RA – 3 road easement status if annexed?
- Ruth Houston
  - Concerns
    - Spot Zoning – Storage Units
    - No trust in area’s political pour representation
    - Want to keep wells water
- Mark Francis
  - Keep RA zoning
  - Keep access to water
  - Need to pump/ lift station sewage up to main line – expensive
- Nancy Campbell
  - Why can’t I hook up to sewer
  - Where is boundary of EC Valle water district
  - Gravel pit – sports stadium? 3000 per. What are town plans? Will new roads become open?

Conditions:

- Keep water/wells
- Town to take over Rosario Road and have it paved – issue – Mefn to get own get in
- Sub standard roads in County areas brought up to standards (Ag character)

- Residential/ Agricultural Along Chamisa/ No Commercial
- No widening of Road/ Paum otherwise would begin another by-pass
- Don't put in arena or gym in gravel pit area
- Keep same zoning as under ETZ (CU/ density same as under ETZ)
- Joint lift station
- Dark streets/ low traffic

Vote: 1 for annexation; 5 need more information

# Appendix B

## Meeting Notes from Group 2 – Este Es & Weimer

### *General Group*

#### **Will water rights be preserved or will Town separate them?**

Annexation will not change water rights on surface and domestic wells – you decide

No town ordinance for water well abandonment

Hook up may require owner to supply water rights

Town wants to minimize impact on acequias, prefer domestic well rights

#### **Assessment/double tax**

Still County tax, State, school

Additional 19% municipal tax increase

#### **El Valle boundary drawn? What does it mean?**

Service Boundaries

Town will not propose annexation agreement with El Valle – petition to get out

If you are in W+S district you will still be on W+S service (tax)

You will not be annexed

Exception: mutual agreement between Town and Association

#### **What other agreements impact our decision?**

**How much was HDR paid?** ~\$29,000.

**Council guaranteed to pass Annexation?**

**Don't know how council will vote.**

#### **Planning team role:**

Present recommendations to council based on info gathered

Handshake between Association and Town

Abeyta Water Agreement–

Petition from property owners

Method of Annexation

Settlement includes written agreement between Town and WW Association

Get info record

Manager

**El Valle decision in minutes**

**Northern boundary of town**

**El Valle separate**

**Additional regulation; animals, agricultural uses?**

What you need

City zoning and covenants Livestock  
Two enforcement mechanisms  
Town could enforce zoning but not a contractual right (usually)

**NA Boards , input will be honored to be involved in discussion of terms of annexation**  
Question?? Further research??

**Does HDR function – or input from NA?**

NA roles: help organize  
Provide input  
Matt will be meeting with them over time

**Boundary divides NAs, what happens to NA portions (in/out)?**

NA could organize in both Town and county  
Ideally boundaries line up

**Infor gathering reasonable exchange of infor?**

**How many parcels in Este Es and Weimer?**

See maps

**Majority voted against annex. Would city annex?**

Take to Town council  
Doesn't prevent parcels from petitioning

**Pros/Cons? What services, i.e., police, schools, fiber optics?**

Wish list open, schools are separate: police, fire, animal control, city voice.

**H2O quantity single family?**

1/3 acre/ft consumptive use, cash in lieu of water rights,  
Commercial is different, hotels, car wash  
Will publish schedule of H2O rights/use

**Size of residential house? Even with no service?**

Water assessor not sure, change in use – yes.

**Need for concrete answers for cost and services**

**Town plans for fiber optics?**

No.

**Hook up to sewer? Cost? Existing development?**

- No hook up requirement
- If homeowner requests
- Meter to house \$\$ to homeowner
- New Development:
- Infill: if there is service within 300' you MUST hook up
- Town prefers to remove septic due to ground water impacts

**Does Town have plans for service lines to areas?**

Yes, on CIP for many areas

**Este Es / Weimer - is annexation all or none?**

Not sure yet, lets hear from you.

***Este Es Group***

Concerns:

El Valle sewer line 5' from boundary – research agreements/El Valle service easements

- Este Es Roads
- Pedestrian safety, worse to have 2 lane dragstrip
- Traffic calming, reduce speed
- Not always street humps
- Condition of annexation
- Current street standards are bad

**Splitting NA, El Valle boundary?**

Paying customers expected to be in Town  
Easements, utilities

**Why redundant lines?**

Zoning of cohesive neighborhood  
El Valle water service, part sewer

R-2 zoning in town?

Area outside of proposed area – want to be in

Conditions:

- Condition – voluntary hook up, H2O yes, sewer should be compulsory
- Cost benefits significant: comparative cost for monthly service hook up vs. not
- Loss of rights – when?
- ETZ El Valle authority, reinstate ETZ?
- Animal use, conditional use - 2 horses, 1 acre (temporary in winter)
- Zoning to match current density

Vote: all 8 need more information

## *Weimer Group*

### **Concerns:**

#### **What are costs for infrastructure provision?**

A SAD is one option – councilor said he will not approve annexation under this condition.

#### **Timeline**

Follows CIP schedule

#### **North east portion**

City should acquire BLM land as open space to protect land for Taos

#### **Health concerns**

Sewer makes sense, people want to choose and not be required to connect, people have different needs.

#### **Roads**

Disagreement over Verde Rd. – community would have to bring road up to county standards- that won't happen, too much disagreement; same with Weimer Rd. - Town would have to acquire ROW. Bad roads are a big stumbling block.

Weimer Rd. improvements, County Maintenance. Yes to fire sewer, plowing, no to water and sewer. **Condition:** Town brings Weimer and Verde up to level “D” service

Concern: Taos doesn't have \$ for this, gap between higher taxes starting without service provision-Town should promise a timeline.

#### **Within community, who would pay the most or least for improvements?**

Lots of cooperation needed.

#### **Could Town require County to bring roads up to standard? Doubtful.**

Many residents moved there because National forest gives privacy, most would not want annexation. Many just bought wells. Individual notification is crucial.

### **Conditions:**

**Roads:** Town brings Weimer and Verde up to level “D” service

**Process:** circulate a survey to every property owner with good info.

Road standards. Grade D for town control? Requires a width for future expansion if needed, turning radius for emergency vehicles, no paving but yes on gravel, 40' easement and 22' roadbed.

#### **Boundaries/land use**

Alger Davis (map) in a low saddle, 5 acre lots with horses, covenants must be kept, doubtful they'd want annexation.

**Consensus:** covenants maintained as a condition of annexation. No higher densities. Pre-existing uses need to be considered. Grandfathering should be passed on sale of land as long as use remains the same. People are being asked for a lot without being given a lot.

**Vote:** annexation with conditions – 1; no annexation – 10; Need more info – 6.

## Appendix C: Meeting Notes from Group 3 – Canon, Las Haciendas & Inholdings

### *Large Group*

#### General Questions / Comments:

Will neighborhood covenants be enforced w/Annex?

Yes – independent of town's authority

Traditional History Communities?

State Statue-recognized by state- protects from Annex

What about buildings? ie Historical structures? Not Annex?

Town has funding and program for protection.

County does not have established program.

If THC- Historic buildings community responsibility>

Yes

- Annex map looks piecemeal
- Petition method as presented opposite
- Eminent Domain- Town more powerful than county-  
Any examples of Eminent Domain?  
Not that Matt is familiar with

Petition Method- who?

Individual Piecemeal

Can we initiate a process to be against Annex?

Yes- can't guarantee council will not Annex

Community petition to Annex

Council then will decide

If majority doesn't want can town still Annex?

Yes town can petition Munciple Boundary Commission

Can one individual petition for Canon?

No only his property

Annexation process id in Comp

Plan 2020- Not individual

We're opposed - get bood info it-Law-

Elderly and Disabled costs?  
Is it mandatory? Is there a grant to help?  
No

Animals- outside of Annexation  
Current uses- grandfathered in-

Mutual Domestic what will happen to have infrastructure H2O (water) rights?  
Annexation doesn't impact

- H2O rights (surface/ domestic well) doesn't change
- Same MD service- town will not compete- If MD wants to invoke agreement
- Single family H2O rights
- 1/3 acre feet

Folks on wells and town service

Why is Canon Divided?

How were annexation Boundaries Drawn?  
County commission/ town manager

Whole Canon on MD depend on H2O

Zoning? How was ETZ wiped out?  
Joint powers underdone rules and regulations put on by ourselves- Canon has been manipulated

How can you say we need you?  
We don't want or need you-  
We'll make sure Town Council hears you

Concerned about Ag function-  
Critical to get zone right ie  
Town RA zoning

Canvassing? Not formalized  
2020 plan? What is motivation?  
Costs?-what is their interest?

Annex concern develop will take off- 3 levels of government-  
We can do that process

Impact of Annexation on Diversion surface rights,

Future= Food

What rights? 1/3 acre foot taking H2O out of our community  
Historic Community-

Abeyta Litigation- Cap on limits

- Pueblo
- Acequia
- Town

40 years more growth beyond H2O Diversion Rights beyond Towns permitted limit-  
1/3 acre foot= use of single family

CFS on Acequia Madre set can't be reduced  
Transfer can't legally effect that part of Abeyta settlement

Where are these H2O coming from?  
Individual- if doesn't have H2O rights they maybe able to pay with cash in Loo-

How/ where are H2O lines going?  
County roads or private property  
Usually public row-  
Town of Taos has trashed itself won't do what you say- You are not part of it

Where is Paper trail?  
Fixed income etc. – smells like developers

Exceptions on property tax ie. Veterans  
Farmers? County

Honestly? Town/ County

How can they(town) pay for the infrastructure-  
- promised to provide infrastructure  
- - Better chance for our community to provide funding for infrastructure

Groups- complete no or further study-  
Will go forward to council

Openland v. condominiums  
Quality of life very sad

Annex package includes zoning

## ***Canon Group***

### **Concerns:**

#### ***Infrastructure:***

- Water quality concerns are best addressed within the community and the acequia association
- Hard to trust Town promises given history
- Los Pundos Road – 2 one-ways. Is dangerous as is. Bad paving. Not fit for capacity.
- Large development on Los Pundos- how?
  - o Advertised as coming with Cruz Alta – angered neighbors
  - o But it comes off of Los Pundos (again trust issue)
  - o Variance?
  
- River- historic uses no longer possible
- Development (condos) need high infrastructure- town is granting this but county isn't trust
- Piecemeal annexation- property owner now surrounded by new town land with dense zoning
  - o Views blocked, etc. They were not given a voice
  - o There are no guaranteed blockages to stop this from happening in the town or the county
  - o Who do you trust more?

Forming a neighbor association with related covenants to prevent piecemeal annexation?

- Need for a Canon Neighbor Association

Model: Ranchos for NA and THC

- Canon should pursue THC status.

Conditions should be guaranteed- Ag legacy needs to be preserved

### **Vote**

- Yes with conditions –Ø
- No- 35
- Need more info- Ø

### **Other Comments:**

- Process Rec- Work with Acequia Association and Mutual Domestic Association in view of neighbor association

- \*Crucial to remain rural

- Open land behind gas station should be kept as open space

- Joint meeting May 17 -request those minutes for explanation of how this came to be.

## ***Las Haciendas Group***

Concerns:

- Bad experiences with Town council
- Currently have individual and community wells with very good H2O quality
- All roads are paved
- All currently on septic

Conditions of Annexation:

- timing of services 3-5 years
- optional hook up to water
- reasonable cost of l/f frontage

Vote: All (7) were against, although they seemed to want more information

***Inholding Groups:***

***Morada Group:***

David Fernandez (member of Penitente Brotherhood)

Concerns:

- Historic religious structure still used by Penitente Brotherhood; main concern is preservation and protection over the long term in its current state for its current uses; very old area and Morada is historic structure and stations of cross are cultural landscape; currently has State and Federal
- why does need to annexed? Town has nothing offer – very small area; no need for water or sewer; no desire for paved road; no real threat of crime
- Why does town want to annex – what benefit to Town? No real tax \$ because it is religious structure maintained by museum
- Penitente Brotherhood would generally be against it – don't really trust Town
- Town should speak to the Taos Historic museum that maintains/owns the land and structures
- can THC be extended to building, or could there be a historic overlay or zone? Ans: maybe, but need to be in Town; County does not have zone at this time.

Conditions of Annexation:

- might be interested, if can get historic overlay zone and access to grant \$ for further restoration

Vote: All (1) against, although seemed to want more information

***Jeantete Group: no representative***

***Mabel Dodge House: no representative***

