

THE NORTH PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

Notes from November 8th, 2010
North Plains Community Plan Update Meeting
Apex Recreation Center

***Welcome to your community
meeting!***

OPENING COMMENTS?

- Introductions
- Last meeting was on Equestrian, results are available.
- Process – staff will compile data, there will be more land use meetings, next meeting covers the Ralston Area, November 22nd, then Fairmount more generally, we will bring in recommendations. After meetings wrapped up, open houses, and reviews. 4th quarter of next year, the goal is to bring the plan to the Planning Commission.
- Overview of Acreage map.
- Special Character area – concept used in South Jeffco plan, area of less density,

agricultural uses, owners like to preserve it in that way. They have recommendations that are typically less dense, and agricultural uses. Different approaches, some recommend separation between buildings, some talk about minimum lot size, some gross density. Planners use gross density as it allows flexibility on how the lots are created, and lets you transition. But Minimum lot sizes can be used too.

- Should we examine? Half hands raised.
 - o Existing plan recommendation overview.
 - Q: Why are red lines drawn in on map?
 - A: Those show property lines, all owned by open space. Also, there are areas that have a purple box, these are existing lot configuration of these areas. These will be used as examples later, for reference purposes.
 - Existing Van Bibber Park up to 2 units per acre. Area north of Van Bibber, area 26, up to 2.5 du. Small

section of 25, which is 3.5 dwelling units per acre. Areas north of 58th avenue, 29, which is residential up to 2.7 dwelling units per acre.

- 10 acres zoned agricultural, what will this do to my agricultural zoning?
 - A: this process will not change existing zoning or allowed uses.
 - Q: What will this due to value of property?
 - A: This is the purpose for this meeting, are there owners that have plans to subdivide in future? The value of the property is an issue.
 - C: Opposite view, the value, quality of future generations, etc..

- A: it truly is a balance, knowing what the plan recommends has some certainty of values.
- Density recommendations versus value of land. Is there some general agreement – common vision? If people in certain area agree, then the plan could reflect that and preserve that area.
- **Russ: What are characteristics we would like to preserve?**
 - Stream flows – north tributary of Van Bibber creek, existing floodplain, wildlife corridor, have water rights, non interference for water rights 35 years ago. Future trails, and preservation of drainage

systems, ponds and stream flows, existing vegetation, irrigation uses, south highline canal.

- Neighbors west of Van bibber creek, preservation of open space is a major concern.
- No curb/gutter approach, low lighting, dirt driveways.
- Q: Existing trails and forestry? Equipad trails?
 - C: Informal trails, a good tie in use to existing trails at meadow lake and van bibber park. Good for future hiking, pedestrian/equestrian.
- Flexibility should be considered as a characteristic if there is not consensus.
- Historic significance, trail called Old Prospectors Trail runs all the way through Van Bibber. Stage coach route and stops. On south end of Van Bibber creek.

- Russ – How about equestrian uses? Should these be kept?
Yes.
 - C: Open Space has master plan that is supposed to include equestrian trails and equipad trails, Jefferson County Horseman's Association dba Horse Council will be looking at this because many of the equestrian trails are no longer connected.
- 3 corridors that are set up as trailways or greenbelts for equestrian uses, wheatridge – south of 44th, Van Bibber trail cuts off short at Ward, then North one runs from Arvada Reservoir and travels east, to Kipling and probably farther east.
 - Open Space will be extending vb trail west all the way to Fairmount trail

under the xcel powerlines,
will be happening
2011/2012.

- Russ – Other characteristics?
View corridors?
 - C: might want to give thought to lots for land that is adjacent to park, to make sure that any housing or development would be away from it and you would allow that portion of property to remain open to provide access to wildlife, and keep development back away from park edge itself so it is not being intruded or impacted. Win/win when you provide for setbacks. Old plan provided for this to the west. Advantage for wildlife and for that character.
- Q: Are these Wright water drawings?

- No, these are FEMA 100 year floodplains. Currently adopted
 - Q: That is not an all exclusive floodplain map – showing Russ example.
 - Urban drainage has their own, and some 500 year. This is the general 100 year floodplain.
- C: floodplain advantage can be eligible to buy flood insurance, then have certain restrictions that can occur for open areas, keep development out due to restrictions. Can work as a characteristic of a special area.
- Russ – Zoning Map, and Structure by Decade map.
- Russ – another complexity is water availability along

58th avenue, 8 inch pipe
example.

- Q: If special character is annexed – what happens?
 - No the special character area goes away and Arvada has it's own classifications and recommendations.
- Q: Agricultural land want to maintain, others may not want it. With the plan we have now, should we leave it with language of any new development excellent site design?
 - A: Densities recommendation in plan can only be achieved by using excellent site design. All developments that have come in have all been under the recommended.

- Cut out density example:
 - Idea sharing:
 - C: Do not feel that you should in having out building side set back a2 a1, you should not distinguish buildings that have livestock in them.
 - Q: What is A-35?
 - A: 35 acre minimum lot size.
 - Q: If Master plan comes up with less density recommendations, and someone with larger tract, could they sell it and what is the process?
 - A: Yes, they could sell, master plan is

advisory. If plan says 1 acre minimum for example, it does not prevent anyone to come in to county to come in a rezone for small lot size, could be a unique situation and then it would be up to PC and BCC if they want to approve. If you have 0.5 acre lot, it wouldn't affect you at all. Just if you come in and want to rezone property. They look at zoning

resolution as well. No matter how tightly or loosely this is worded, it is advisory only.

- Q: So purpose of this meeting is getting temperature of people to see if they want less or more density in this area?

- A: Yes, that is the intent of this meeting. Would they support some

different
change, less
density or
recommend
ation to
waive
developmen
t standards
for roads,
etc.. These
are all types
of things
that can be
done with a
special
character
area.

- C: Not in favor of changing anything, but if it is changed, smaller roads and curbs. In favor of leaving it as is.
 - C: Russ – fencing example.

- C: In favor of less density, have seen other examples where areas are ruined by more density, and liked the fencing example. Such a special area that maybe the larger lots would command a higher price, that is a possibility.
- C: North end of Van Bibber, no smaller than 1 acre lot size, not including roads, etc.. then still maintain horse property, be more attractive property, if they close in the horses would have to go somewhere. Fencing should stay, prefer high tension wire.
- C: No changes, we moved here with open

space, free air. No changes to neighborhood as it is currently. We are speaking for 20 acres, get from Russ. We are in a unique spot.

- C: John, 1-10 in favor of decreasing density – 11. Speaking of other parcels, represent about 10 acres, area 25, southern 29, north tributary of van bibber creek there is a floodplain (we will look into this), current wildlife corridor. Would make an excellent tie in to existing creek. Green ash grove trees, no fences, unique area. Stream flow rights. Excellent view of N.

Table Mountain and others, view preservation. No more than 1 house per 1 acre on average, linkage, donating portion for future use to preclude high density development.

- C: Trailhead at Indiana, land south of that 18 acres is owned by park district which we are developing, but with that said we have ownership under conservation easement which gives numerous restrictions, so it's interesting that these people are here that we want it to be more natural, we will have some area to build on Indiana, but bulk of it

will be open space.
Prospect Recreation,
our hope is some of
land to east can be
added to park, we are
trying to make park
extend east.

- C: Speak for 4
properties that are 2
acre to 3.5 acres that
were all built in 90's.
180 acres whole area, if
we allow that to
develop, that is an
additional 540 acres on
58th avenue, from
eldridge to ward,
infrastructure, how do
we keep feel of
neighborhood? Light
pollution, traffic
controls, 58th could
become 4 lane or 3 lane
with turn lanes. I very
much concur with open

fencing. Horse style fencing is good. 2 to 2.5 minimum lot size, whatever we could do to preserve views, height restrictions, no high lighting to west. Prospective, valley alone since 1980 is only 500+-. We need to change that plan.

- C: Lower density
- C: Area 25 – 2 acres, then allowing 2.5 up on other side, to west repeat minimum of 1 per 2 acres. I agree about 500 example. I feel this should remain special character area, can capture characteristics. Bowling alley lots, if you could keep development up near

58th, easier to do water, easier to handle access, less impervious area, continue to capture more. Area near park, urban garden, one of the things we are promoting in city of wheat ridge, adjacent to development – provide green areas where you can grow your own produce. Codes could be changed for this use, would encourage this community garden idea. Strongly support 1 unit / 2 or 2.5 acres – anything over that would overcrowd. Traffic, etc...

- Russ: Concerns is accessory dwelling units, would something like that be appropriate in this area? County

allows it in certain circumstances. Would essentially double the dwelling unit, 40% of main structure – from Heather – 1,200 square feet. Is this reasonable in this area?

- C: Opposed: 5ish – would be junky, could consider attached units to their house?
- C: Great idea? Sounds good, but no guarantee this will last into the future, then you have another house to sell.
 - A: Zoning wouldn't allow you to sell additional house, one property with two houses on it. Question is what happens in 30 years.
- Russ: Consider characteristics again, anything else?

- Wildlife
- Flexibility in design, not a uniform area.
- Existing vegetation, many large evergreen trees, mature trees, almost has a semi mountain feel due landscape in native feel. Unique area. Green Ash tree, 3rd largest in state, registered at CSU. Largest in Greeley, 2nd in Boulder
- C: take map of this area and define where these special areas are, that begins to define the special area. Question raised about if I can't get maximum value of land, surrounding area should also be considered, that also raises value.
- Should put more emphasis on intangibles, and less emphasis on \$. This is a unique area, and it allows

for enjoyment of others as well.

- Could become a wonderful presentation at APA, in terms of protection of area, and commitment of people that have a vested interest.
- Low lighting
- Fortress-like fencing
example – boundary.
- Height of buildings, should this be considered?
 - More open land is, taller buildings don't look that tall
- 35 feet for residential
however they don't say that they can't raise the land level.
- No multi-family unit dwellings.
- Russ: 6/7 acre parcel, few small lots and a couple of large lots? Overall density much less, but there are

some small and some large?

Does this make sense?

- If it keeps with your design, in a creative artistic manner, perhaps.
- Generally people are not liking this.
- We will clean up and gather comments. Draft some recommendations, with special character, lot sizes, and density will still take some work. Encourage to stay involved. Fairmount land use meetings in January.
- Russ Clark 303-271-8754, email rclark@jeffco.us
 - NEXT Meeting, Monday November 22nd, 6-8:30. Ralston portion of plan. Essentially base of mountains on west, clear creek on south, eastern edge of N.table mountain.

-

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR
PARTICIPATION!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!**