

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING #1 of the COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN PROCESS March 28, 2007

Planning Commission in attendance:

Alan Jones
Rick Nelson
DuWayne Ebertowski
Alan Fox
Jim Spaanstra
Larry Anna
Joe Siccardi

Atty: Kristin Schledorn

Admin: Bonnie Benedik, Phyllis Scheneman (notes)

Comm. Spaanstra will be out of the country May 10-20.

Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) will be developed by the Planning and Zoning Division staff (PZ). See Power Point and John's notes for the elements of the plan. Throughout the process, there may be other items that come up.

Comm. Spaanstra questioned whether we already have a CMP in place. John explained the difference and asked to continue.

Legal Authority for Master Planning:

Comm. Siccardi: (First line) This is not something the Planning Commission is "authorized" to do, but "required" to do. Seems to me there's a little difference. Before the word gets out too far, express what the responsibility is.

Kristin: It's our duty. We already have a CMP in place.

Nature and Purpose of the Master Plan:

John: The CMP will provide for future needs of our community. Update every 5 years to accommodate growth in Jeffco. The CMP should not address issues in great detail, but outline desirable scenarios.

Encompass most significant elements of the community. Plan formulation can exhibit all characteristics, but also address goals and issues. Serve as a guide and provide continuity in addressing issues.

Comm. Spaanstra: "General" would remain "general." Currently, the master plan is a combination of all Community Plans (CPs). It strikes me we are going in a slightly different direction.

John: The CMP will be a much broader plan.

Comm. Spaanstra: An overlay that's a step up from CPs?

Master Planning Process:

No comments

Master Plan as a living document...

No comments

Plan Elements

Comm. Nelson: How does a community plan differ from a master plan in its components – make-up? I understand we have a number of community plans. How specifically would they be different other than cementing them all together?

John: This will not affect CPs. Overall master plan for the entire unincorporated Jefferson County in regards to land use, transportation and other elements.

Comm. Nelson: Like an overlay master community plan. Any different components?

John: Could be along the way here that we might discover.

Comm. Nelson: It would be helpful if the PC were involved in some key issues up front, philosophically.. Things we constantly get as concerns objections.- the more controversial items – do a full review of all of them. Have philosophical discussion before staff goes out for a number of months of meetings. It would be helpful before those meetings.

John: We're starting with you all and will hold bulk of meetings with you as experts and staff as experts and also solicit input from community through community outreach = notifications, mailings questionnaires. We're on the same page.

Comm. Nelson: After many months of communities working thousands of hours, we come in at the last minute and don't have our input until too late. Awkward for the community, and they then feel we're at odds, and we're not.

John: That's why we're involving you through the entire length of the process. Public will testify at 2 meetings, and monthly meetings with you all.

Comm. Spaanstra: Have public meetings where people can express their views. Then at the end a public hearing - a final hearing.

Comm. Anna: My questions was the difference between a public meeting and a public hearing.

Kristin: This is a public meeting – there's a quorum – a majority of you. Public hearing is when the public is allowed to testify. Throughout the process – as we get a third of the way through, we'll hold a public hearing on what we've accomplished so far, hear from the public, then move forward, have another after we're through another chunk of it, and then have a public meeting and at the end before adoption have another public hearing.

Comm. Spaanstra: I was thinking today of seeing if anyone of the public has any questions about what was presented. Providing that opportunity would be helpful, as long as we're not walking some line in terms of the record.

Kristin: We have set it up so there are comment cards, a designated e-mail, designated phone line, address if they want to send it through regular mail. We will be getting dialog from the public as we go along. It's within your discretion if you want to get public comment today. If you want these workshops open to the public, to take testimony, that can happen.

Comm. Spaanstra: It might be helpful to have a section of each of the public meetings to let the public know what they're thinking. Is there some way to accomplish that?

Comm. Ebertowski: We need to be looking at renewable energy and utilities somewhere. The Governor signed the bill to get 20% renewable energy. Look at developments coming in that are supplied by REA, Excel, solar. We should be looking at it now.

John: As we go through these+, maybe we can find a spot to introduce that.

Comm. Ebertowski: Maybe under Public Facilities? Didn't know where to stick it now.

Comm. Nelson: Under Natural Resources – I would sure like to see Natural and Visual Resources. They can be substantially different. One might be a mouse endangered, only to find out later it's not endangered, v. how things look and feel to the public everyday. Make it a key point or a separate point.

LAND USE:

Comm. Ebertowski : I know we're only going to adopt a plan only for unincorporated county. I would like to see an overlay that would include the plans for Superior, Westminster, Arvada, Golden, Lakeside, Mountain View, Wheat Ridge, Lakewood, Morrison, Bow Mar, and Littleton, as well as Broomfield and Denver where they have intruded into traditional Jeffco territory. If we're planning for the area – say, next to Bow Mar or Morrison – I want to be sure we're not putting industrial next to where they are talking about high-density residential. I know we're not going to adopt it, but It would be nice to have their plans to show compatibility. They're all residents of Jeffco except for Broomfield and Denver, but at the same time I'd like to see what they're doing. It would also be good for the public to see what, say, Denver is doing. We have to know what our neighbors are doing. We can't plan in a vacuum.

Comm. Nelson: Regarding other communities. I've run into a couple of situations where municipal jurisdictions are doing development and they adjoin county lines or enclaves of county properties, and they are affecting ground water runoff for the county, creating expensive problems for county residents and the county itself. Worthwhile to have some inter-jurisdictional review looked at on how we handle things like that. I checked into it and found out it's not required by the cities to refer these things to the county for input. We're looking at tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars on each of these issues that I ran across. It would help everybody if we address it better than in the past.

Comm. Ebertowski: On the communities I mentioned it would be worthwhile in addition to the press release to send notification to city clerks that we're doing this plan. Request their plan, and invite them to be involved. We want to see what they're doing and have them know what we're doing.

TRANSPORTATION:

Comm. Ebertowski: I would like to see included, transit, air, private transit (i.e., casino busses), private toll roads (if there should be), also rail (especially for industrial).

Comm. Nelson: Specifically look at improving interchanges at 6th Avenue, Colfax, I-70, 470. That is perhaps the most intense traffic area in Colorado – not positive but has a fair shot at it. We have underrated the development. There is nothing cohesive or comprehensive about anything we do there at present. Would like to see, since it caters to tourism quite a bit, we're the gateway to Colorado. Spot development that has been happening is very erratic from multiple jurisdictions. A comprehensive plan is a great time to work with Golden and Lakewood and really come up with something that makes a big difference looks like it wasn't a multiple jurisdiction competition in the area. Tourism is really what drives a Cabelas. People figure this

out on their own with economics – how it flows, why you want to be where. We've never done anything on our own in the area, etc. We've never done anything with our best asset. Key focus area.

OPEN SPACE:

Comm. Ebertowski: Since Commissioner Cole is not here... I would like to see the relationship not only to the master plan, but also to the recreation districts and cities. Make sure that our trails are connecting. Make sure there is not overabundance of parks in one area v. another area, demonstrate where there might be needs for recreation or open space. Especially in light of if we bring in the other plans. Pocket parks. The infill open space issue is one I know we'll be talking about.

NATURAL & VISUAL RESOURCES:

John: We have our Mineral Extraction Policy Plan in place.

Comm. Anna: What do you mean by plan for development of drainage basins?

John: The Colorado Revised Statute requires components of a master plan to plan for . development of drainage basins. Here is a caveat that says only if a county subdivision regulation requires payment of drainage fees.

Q: A building, commercial development? What kind of development, I guess?

Mike S: We don't have a drainageway development fee when people come in to do development, plat their subdivisions, or get building permits. That could be considered. If we had a fee, the idea would be to look at specific drainageways and see what improvements need to be made to develop them in responsible way. If we had it as an item in the plan, as development comes in, we could try to get improvements along those drainageways in accordance with what the plan recommends.

John: The statute is CRS 30-28-106.

Comm. Siccardi: To some degree, we develop regulations with regard to how we interact with Urban Drainage people. We incorporated many issues we have to look at with regard to flood boundaries. We did approve regulations along that line. This would be a starting point where we might end up with rules for development in those areas. We don't want to encroach on Urban Drainage flood boundary. Could allow some development with elevated stilts or whatever, of that nature.

John: A lot of that had to do with regulations in the Land Development Regulation. We're looking at a master plan.

Comm. Siccardi: It has to support what we've done, or we go back and change what we've done.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:

Comm. Ebertowski: I would really put tourism in **bold letters**. We need to do something. Don't know how, but tourism money is available from the state.

Kristin: That in the next step we're required to have a recreation and tourism element.

RECREATION & TOURISM:

John: Under statute – the CMP must include a recreation and tourism element and how the county intends to provide for recreation and tourism (see list of types on Power Point printout).

See Comm. Nelson's earlier comments about interchanges under Transportation.

Comm. Nelson: When it says "req.by statute", is this a paraphrase. What you read is the requirement? Need to understand all the details they're charging us with.

Comm. Jones: Questioned John to pin down the location of the Recreation and Tourism in the C.R.S. Will see Paren 5 of CRS 30-28-106.

Kristin will e-mail him the statute.

Comm. Ebertowski: There's a lot more to tourism than just this – than people staying in hotels and motels. Last week I did 3 tours – I had Danes from Denmark, Chinese from China, low income kids from Denver, high income kids from Douglas County, and another class of kids from Jefferson County, just doing tours at Dinosaur Ridge, and I'm just one tour guide. There's a lot here – Red Rocks, Dinosaur Ridge, Coors, NREL, Buffalo Bill's Grave, This is a major attractor. Obviously those Chinese Danes stayed at hotels and motels and ate food in locals and The Fort restaurant. There are a host of things that are attractors for tourists to come here. We have to build and expound on it. Don't know how to put it all in the plan but could put something about cultural, scientific and visual attractors. We've got it. Their coming here. We've got to figure out how to tap into it. Good dollars. We want to get those tourism dollars to make life easier for all of us.

Comm. Ebertowski's notes on attractions: Kayacking at Golden/Clear Creek, JCRS, Tiny Town, Rocky Flats, Heritage Square, Arvada and Lakewood cultural centers, Red Rocks, Dinosaur Ridge, Coors, NREL, Buffalo Bill's Grave, Nature Center, Buffalo Overlook.

AIR, ODOR & NOISE:

Comm. Anna: Does this mean more street sweepers??

John: Noted.

PUBLIC FACILITIES/SERVICES:

Comm. Ebertowski: One we never hear from, and they don't like working with us – the school district, and other higher education facilities, both public and private. This could include medical facilities, too. Don't know how to handle them, but we have one coming in the southern part of the county.

John: Could you elaborate what you mean – medical facilities working with us?

Comm. Ebertowski: The location of major medical facilities. We've been very short on medical facilities until now. We had nothing south of 6th until now. Don't know how good we are north or in the mountains. We ought to start thinking about people get sick; and people are getting old.

John: Medical facilities – which I think our staff has always been keenly interested in – Is medical facilities up in the mountains and in the north. We're funneling people down 285 and I-70 with no medical facilities in those areas.

Comm. Nelson: Should that be Facilities or Public Services? I'm not sure what it means by Public Facilities. Interaction with other government entities would be different from facilities. In my mind facilities are bricks and sticks. Not sure what the objective is here.

John: Call it Public Facilities/Public Services.

Comm. Jones: You mentioned care facilities in the mountains. Do we have any urgent care facilities like walk-ins up in the mountains?

John: I believe there are urgent care facilities. As opposed to anything even less than a traditional hospital – there's an in-between there that's a missing gap.

Comm. Nelson: We need a caveat for many things happening. I get the impression in what I read and see that our technology is fast developing in many arenas. Fossil fuels being one of them. A provision in a master plan to review certain sections that would pertain to new technologies as they're introduced into our culture would be beneficial. It would compel us to address better solutions when they're available, instead of looking in the rear view mirror. We're anticipating things that might address a master plan.

Comm. Spaanstra: The CMP should talk about reuse, recycling, transfer, and landfill facilities to service the county going forward. A phrase, "Everybody wants you to pick it up, no one wants you to put it back down." We ought to be thinking about that.

A Bill just passed the House Appropriations Committee today to encourage recycling in Colorado. Still have another House to go.

DEMOGRAPHICS:

Comm. Nelson: One might be aging trends. If we're doing a shift and we're not really acknowledging it, I'd like to be aware of it. Age dropping or growing that determines values and priorities as we try to accommodate needs.

Comm. Jones: Demographics on senior housing – senior only, where the majority are seniors.

Comm. Nelson: Possibility of having a meeting with young people. Listen to what they have to say. It might be quite valuable from that perspective. They may bring some things to the surface that are quite insightful. It's a research thing. Get input from groups of kids. Kids have feelings and thoughts, some may not be refined, that adults don't think of, and often, simple solutions that are brilliant sometimes.

GENERAL/OTHER TOPICS:

Comm. Ebertowski: Include major landholders, i.e., the Federal Government that owns a substantial part of the southern part of the county, also Denver County which owns all the Denver Mountain. Parks. Could be other Federal agencies – BLM, Fish & Wildlife.

Comm. Fox: The press release on 3/19 says Jeffco to update Comprehensive Master Plan. If we don't have a Comprehensive Master Plan in place, it should be "prepare" a Comprehensive Master Plan. I don't know of any CMP.

Kristin: We do have a CMP – BCC policy designated all CPs and MEPP and some other plans are our Comprehensive Master Plan. We are required by statute to have one, so we're updating.

Comm. Fox: The BCC resolution is CC06-476. It says the purpose is to establish a Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Jefferson County. If you're going to tell the public one title, we shouldn't be using two titles. Broader definition would be Comprehensive Master Plan.

I would suggest to the BCC to pass a corrective resolution so the title is the same wording.

Comm. Siccardi: A Comprehensive Land Use Plan isn't a master plan. It may have been deemed to be a master plan, but what we're talking about here go far beyond a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. I think that's where you get in trouble. Wording should be consistent. I wouldn't

have known we had a master plan, I knew we considered this to be a master plan. If this is going to be a master plan, the policy should be changed accordingly. If this is a master plan, I don't know what it's going to take us a year thinking about it a year – this is pretty comprehensive when you think about all of these documents pulled together.

Comm. Fox: Page 3 of your handout, legal authority – Jeffco is authorized by statute to “make and adopt a master plan for the physical development of the unincorporated territory.” I would highly suggest we have a corrected resolution that they authorize us to make an adopted master plan.

Kristin: Don't need BCC authorization – statutes require us to do it.

Comm. Fox: Then I'm confused. The resolution they passed, was to establish a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Aren't we establishing a master plan instead of what they authorized?

Kristin: No, we have a master plan. I agree the language needs to be adjusted. County has a master plan we're updating by providing broad overarching goals that will then guide how we view the community plans.

Comm. Fox: So the master plan we have now is all the community plans.

Comm. Spaanstra: In effect, where we're headed is to replace the current master plan as defined by the resolution with something that is a notch up from all these community plans.

Comm. Fox: It will be an overlay, won't it?

John: A broader overview.

Comm. Fox: We're to prepare a Comprehensive Master Plan which is an overlay.

Comm. Spaanstra: This is getting to be a technical legal point. For purposes now, we're required to have a master plan. BCC has determined that for now it's all CPs aggregated. We're creating a master plan now which is a kick up from CPs. I hear the confusion and we have to be very clear in how we articulate it going forward. For now it's a legal niche.

Comm. Fox: If I were a novice in the county, I'd want the straight story what we have and don't have.

Comm. Spaanstra: The straight story is what we have now is a collection of community plans. We're headed toward what is more traditionally viewed as a Master Plan. People ought to understand that's what we're doing and if people care about master plans, they should participate.

Comm. Siccardi: If we have CPs adopted by the PC, when we start doing an overlay I assume we'll look at consistency of these plans for the overlay.

Comm. Spaanstra: We should have another enabling resolution identifying what comes out of our process as the master plan for the county, underlaid by the community plans.

Comm. Siccardi: A resolution, or something we'd adopt.

Comm. Nelson: We could have protocols built into the CMP for any conflicts – how they should be handled. We pre-engineer solutions and problems in our mind. Life isn't black and white, it's rainbows. And we'll be surprised all the time. There should be a list of priorities and value systems for the county. There should be some protocol set forth in the master plan to accommodate any potential conflicts.

Comm. Spaanstra: One of the issues to be addressed was raised by Representative Levy's bill in terms of the enforceability or not of any of these documents.

FLOOR:

No comment.

Agenda item closed at 3:17 p.m. No other business.