

A Land Use Zoning Narrative

Dear Commissioner,

Background and Initial Understanding

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me and consider my situation. I purchased my property in 2021 with the clear understanding that its land use designation was Business Park Center-1 (BPC-1).

In 2023, when I explored the possibility of establishing a small event venue, I was informed that the property was designated Residential Low-1 (RL-1), which would prohibit such use. Seeking clarification, I followed up multiple times by both phone and email. On each occasion, I was consistently told that the land use designation was RL-1.

Relying on this information, I adjusted my plans and moved forward with building a single-family home. I was even advised to request a waiver to proceed, which I did, only to later learn that such a waiver was not necessary. By that point, I had already incurred costs and invested considerable time in the process.

Between 2023 and 2025, my family and I made the meaningful decision to move forward with building our home. We engaged an architect, patiently and emotionally designed a residence to meet our needs and involved our children in the process to create a place they could truly call home.

Throughout this time, I remained diligent in confirming the land use designation and any applicable restrictions. Multiple communications with county staff consistently reinforced that the property was designated RL-1.

Permit Application and Discovery of Error

On January 14, I submitted my owner-builder permit application. On January 30, when I visited the office to finalize documentation and payment, I was informed for the first time that there were "inconsistencies with the zoning designation" and was referred to the department of technician on call for further review.

After approximately ten days, I received confirmation that an error had occurred. I was informed that the property had never officially been changed to RL-1 and that the correct designation remained BPC-1. I was further advised that this could not be corrected at that time due to other considerations as quoted below:

“For example, **Chapter 2 Section 220** requires a 50-foot buffer from adjacent commercial properties. **Although this buffer does not impact my parcel, it was cited as one reason for denying the change from BPC-1 to RL-1.**

The outcome is that the parcel remains zoned as **Business Park Center-1 (BPC-1)**: *The purpose of the BPC-1 district is to provide areas for office and business park development. The BPC-1 district permits office, research and development parks, distribution centers, and wholesaling activities. Some retail uses are also permitted to support the businesses and activities within the Business Park Center.*

This parcel is **not** eligible for a residential Dwelling Unit”

Current Zoning and Buffer Considerations

I understand that staff are now evaluating whether my property can retain residential use. One concern raised has been the requirement for a 50-foot buffer from adjacent commercial properties under Chapter 2, Section 220.

However, it has also been acknowledged by the staff that this buffer requirement does not directly impact my parcel. My property is surrounded primarily by residential uses, including neighboring homes and nearby subdivisions. Given this context, the application of the buffer requirement as a basis for denying residential use appears inconsistent with the actual conditions of the area. There is a residential home right next to my parcel on the east side, one right across the street (north) and one home 2 parcels west of mine.

Following my recent discussion with Chanda and Ben, I was left with the option to submit for a Level 4 review which is not only uncertain but expensive. If the land use were in fact RL1 as I was persistently informed, this would not apply. When my family and I made the decision to build a home it was because the land use was meant for that. I never had the desire to go through the process of requesting a land use change.

Efforts to Resolve and Community Context

I have made every effort to resolve this matter in good faith. I have communicated with staff, requested supervisory review, and participated in outreach efforts. Letters were sent

to 13 adjacent neighboring to collect their feedback. Three of them provided feedback. It is important to note that the immediate area is predominantly residential in character.

Additionally, other nearby parcels, many in closer proximity to the airport (like 4414 medulla rd.) have successfully obtained residential land use designations. This further underscore the inconsistency in how my property is being evaluated.

Summary of Position

I entered this process in good faith, relying on repeated and consistent information provided by county staff that my property was designated RL-1. Based on this, I made significant financial, professional, and personal commitments toward building a home for my family.

The subsequent discovery of an internal error, acknowledged by the county, has placed me in an extremely difficult position. Importantly, the 50-foot buffer requirement cited as a concern does not apply to my parcel and should not be used as a basis to deny my ability to construct a single-family home.

I respectfully request that the county consider the totality of these circumstances, including the documented miscommunication, my good-faith reliance, and the surrounding residential character of the area. Allowing me to proceed with building my home would be a fair and reasonable resolution.

Thank you again for your time, consideration, and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

The Salgado's family.

Anielys Salgado



Hector Salgado



Bryan Salgado



Anthony Salgado.

