

# THE NORTH PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN *UPDATE*

Notes from November 22th, 2010  
North Plains Community Plan Update Meeting  
Apex Recreation Center

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

## OPENING COMMENTS?

- Issues: Currently the western boundary of the north plains community plan follows a general topographic line, we'd like it to follow parcel lines, so no ones property is in more than one plan.
- First map is how the plan exists now. We'll pass out the second map, this is a modified boundary area change map. There are more changes than just the western boundary on this as well. Conceptually, does this make sense to match parcel lines, rather than a physical boundary line? There are a couple properties this affects, one is west of Golden, 70% in central mountains plan

- currently, we are thinking to move this into the North Plains plan, separated by other North mountains plan by large open space.
- Base of hogback is another example. Any concerns with this type of change?
    - o C: Yes this makes sense.
      - Q: Does this change what current land owners can do with property?
        - A: No, plan doesn't change any existing land uses, only if landowner comes in to rezoning property. May or may not change what recommendations are, depending on the way they are written. Concept will still function, but just won't split parcels anymore.
    - o Q: Area 39 and 40 only?
      - A: Some area 5 as well, but yes, not many boundary changes. Some changes along North Table Mountain as well. Currently owned almost exclusively by Jefferson County Open Space.

- Annexations by Arvada have created a little pocket, owned by City of Arvada as open space, proposing this be moved in as Open Space. Arvada will double check this for us and let us know.
  - o Q: is there a difference versus park or open space?
    - A: No
- For the rest of the areas we tried to mimic the land use areas, we separated out C&D, as D is mostly developed, these were one recommendation before.
- Areas A,B,C, etc... are just areas for input now, they don't have any recommendations now.
  - o Q: Area was in 9, This is a remainder of annexations. Included in C now.
- Parcel with Open Space Label, this green is an approximation, still working with Open Space on exact boundaries. Entire parcel owned by Jefferson County – portion purchased by general fund, portion with highway funds. Northern part is Open Space. Next to it is Colorado State Land

Board, but this is not really open space, currently used for clay mining. Plan will have to have some sort of recommendation for when that is extinguished.

- Area E, currently it has some large tracts that aren't fully developed.
- Any questions or comments on this general land use recommended boundary modification map?
  - – Q: Parcel B, has that been designated something yet?
    - No, nothing has been designated yet, that is the purpose of the meeting.
    - When plan comes together for review, which should be March-ish, everyone will get full package together, and we'll have another set of meetings for comment, etc...
  - – Q: What about incorporated areas?
    - This map just shows future land use recommendations.

- We have a map of existing zoning if anyone is interested. Handed around.
- Hazards map shows, Dipping Bedrock, FEMA 100-year Floodplains, Rockfall, Subsidence, Landslides, and Slope Failure.
- Maximum Wildlife Quality Area Map, shows Bald Eagle Winter & Foraging, Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse occupied range, mule deer crossings, and riparian areas.
- We hear often that the area west of 93 is in the mountain backdrop. Open Space and Mountain Backdrop area map handed out. Means area of high preservation area, and OS department has authority to start negotiations for property without board approval. Most of area B is not in this area. North of highway 72 is correct, but this is not the case in this area.
  - o Q: Where is that document?
    - Open Space Master Plan
  - o Q: Are these maps from the Master Plan?
    - Data is from the plan, constructed in planning and Zoning

- Q: Board has given blanket approval for negotiations?
  - Yes, Open Space can start negotiating without going through the formal application process.
  - Q: Which board?
    - The Open Space
- Property marked Road and Bridge – that parcel is owned by Jefferson County it is their central Road and Bridge shops, probably recommended for utilities, etc.. Big enough to call out separately.
- South of that area, the F, currently 37 – an activity center. Golden has annexed a vast amount of this, so if that property came into today, existing plan recommends 10du/ac, office, commercial, development around there in GOLDEN they didn't match what north plains recommended. Example 3-4 du/ac, so I spoke with Golden and asked them if they have any concerns in this area, county does not provide water or sanitation, so for that area to come in to develop, 3ac/lot would have to be well/septic. Golden thinks 4du is more appropriate.

There are access issues as well. 4du makes sense if they can get water from Golden.

Thoughts?

- C: the property immediately to the north is predominately light industrial, to me it would make sense to continue that to the south. Concentration of industry, for example grants for medical science, lots of that ended up in state of Colorado. Over 75% of those 50 businesses were between Boulder and NW metro area. Medical types of industry, renewable energy, wind energy, solar, etc... Would be appropriate to consider the light industrial type of use on to "F", doesn't have to be intensive. No outdoor storage element, might be too visible.

- Russ: Access not through residential would work for that, but if access comes through residential, would residential work?

- C: Possibly, but would have to be destination-user, for example a place of employment, place where public are not going to

make purchases. Doesn't need high visibility or high levels of interest.

- C: Access through golden gate, state might not allow another access from 93.
  - C: Supposed toll road alignment comes down, golden plans to have 93 come right through that and connect, eventually 93 would come quite close to the northeast boundary of that.
  - Russ showing examples of proposed alignment.
    - C: Portion of that right away is already dedicated, you can see that on the map.
      - So that leans more towards industrial if that is the case.
- State Land Board and piece of property called Open Space, right now the plan is 4du/ac. Golden has expressed the interest for something to develop there to actually beautify the view coming into Golden. They

want some type of development to lessen the impact of that mini-storage that exists now.

- C: Landscaping is the cure for bad architecture. Business parks can be very attractive, need enforce a higher quality. Coors technology is a decent example of that.
- C: Envision where they realign 93, plan is to leave old 93 for commercial, so I agree, it would be a nice business park, scientific park, etc..
- C: difference between brickyard, neither one has set of regulations, catamount they didn't want to do an owners association, so we wrote the design guidelines right on the PD, the coors technology guidelines are a whole book, very specific on what you can and cannot do, so that gives you an example of higher quality standards.
  - Russ, we can discuss design guidelines, etc, but the plan is only advisory.
    - C: I would think you could put something in comp master plan,

that development is encouraged to have instruments in place to promote quality development. What you get when you don't have design guidelines is Washington Avenue. This is an opportunity to have a development that people will be proud of.

- Russ, county can indeed encourage.

- Q: Southern part next to industrial, allow industrial to be extended, but to the north – make that Open space.

- Russ: The northern half is not owned by Jefferson County.

- Is green area, ranchsetters?

- A: It was, but was sold to Open Space.

- Q: South end of that general fund? North

end Open  
Space?

▪ A: Yes.

- Use Area D, already built out area. Leaving existing uses?
  - Yes.
    - Q: Could you define the dipping bedrock, since a lot of the residential areas are within these?
      - Easy to get motion from swelling soils and dipping bedrock if you have additional...
- Use Area E, 36-currently up to 4du/acre and intersection of 58<sup>th</sup> and 93, should have 150,000sq foot for one of the quadrants of commercial development. Currently they put in the really high density senior housing. Already zoned for planned development, not sure that the land left will hold 150,000sq ft.
  - Q: Neighborhood convenience scale center at State highway 93 and 58<sup>th</sup>.
    - Russ, typically means you won't get big box retail, something like

doctors office, just local, but might be as big as a grocery store.

- Rest of E, the equestrian center have come into rezoning for some residential there. Part of it has already been rezoned, to add some additional residential. Rest of it is 4 du/ac.
- Use Area C: there are some floodplain issues here. Originally in the Fairmount area, 4du/ac, which may not be the best use for this land.
  - o Russ: comment – overall – old plan had for each subarea for if area builds out, predicted 15,686 jobs, 3,392 retail, 11,077 office, 1,217 Industrial. There is not going to be this now, we are way below for number of jobs.
    - Q: Was that based off of square feet?
      - A: Yes, based number of employees from acres, and square feet.
    - That area was based off of original plan area, with an activity center, plus top of North Table Mountain,

plus existing recommendations. But large area has been annexed.

- Q: So still talking about Area C? Mixed use?

- A: one of goals of county is to have a balance of houses/jobs. Way below on jobs houses balance.

- Q: A lot of areas that have jobs or tax base have gone to the cities, and have lost potential as well.

- County doesn't collect sales tax from retail, so big box retail doesn't provide a big incentive.

- C: County gets property tax whether it is in city or county.

- Special Districts, if a property goes to golden, it might go out of Prospect, they might not get those anymore.

- C: Taxes from agricultural land, \$1 put in can pull out 0.28 cents. People forget the cost of community services, Ag draws very low. SFR draws highest.
- Community plan recommendations don't change anything on the ground.
  - This opportunity is to make more updated recommendations, the plan is 21 years old. We are just getting input at this point.
- Access would have to come off of 58<sup>th</sup>. Floodplain issue there as well. Cost has to come out somewhere, if community plan

recommendations are not realistic, the odds of them being followed are much lower. Recommendations should make sense.

- If use Area C adjoins highway, but no direct access, won't have good access to 58<sup>th</sup>, then it too should be a destination use, a different type from industrial, it could be school, private club, church, will not work for retail unless it is some type of destination retail. There is not enough access.
  - C: People in past retire community, but they had same problem was cost of access through floodplain.
  - C: two points of access from East,

- Russ, yes but may not want it through residential if use is higher than residential
  - Q: if it stays residential, what is floodplain requirements?
    - A: same as any use.
  - C: higher intensity that have jobs, put those where services are possible, put them near transit, in terms of where to put jobs, think larger parcels that have good access. Not

sure higher  
density  
residential or  
industrial would  
work here.

- Use Area A: Large lot on western side. It is not technically built out, but close. 35 acre lots, they look awkward, but if you look at aerial photos, you realize they are clustered. Market resulted in clustered, without looking like clustering. Existing plan recommendations are 5-35du/ac.
- Denver Water Board Property: Some maps show this as open space, but it is not really open space, they are able to sell property. There might be some on the northern part that they might be interested in selling.
  - o C: northern part is slides from treatment plant.
- Will probably just leave the recommendations as is.
- Next – Use Area B: Alignment has shifted a bit from existing plan to newer map handed out. One of the things we heard when creating master plan, everything west of

highway 93 is highly visible and should be preserved as open space. Next map is a visibility analysis from the black line along highway 93, colors represent visibility from that section of highway 93. Areas that are white or clear are not visible from any areas along the black segment of 93. Green is less visible, yellows are more visible, and reds are most visible. Right near the center of B, it appears it is an area of not visible from 93. Looks like old route from highway was going to go right along that area, and talked about some heavy uses at the intersection. Not everything west of 93 is highly visible from 93. Points taken from every 50 feet for analysis.

- Q: What is B characterized right now.
  - Area 40, 4du/ac
    - Q: Why don't you leave it the same?
- So looking at visibility, wildlife, hazards, what do we think about B, versus 40. 40: residential up to 4du/ac residential and office...get rest from plan...

- More detailed description on bottom of page 4, get this later... Comments?
  - o C: Arvada perspective, their planning area takes in some of this area. See this area around future Jefferson parkway, key location for mixed use, plan designates this, commercial, higher density residential, then low density as you get further away.
    - Q: Low density for Arvada?
      - A: Arvada: LD-residential with water & san, maximum under that category 1.5. 70% open space, on gross level.
    - C: Commercial real estate broker, economic development view: Jeffco has balance issue between housing and jobs, and I agree. This area could be a great opportunity to create a real magnet for county jobs, city of boulder has almost shut out from municipal boundaries. This is close enough to boulder to attract types of industries that would normally want to go to boulder, but

would find their way to jeffco. Not enough large parcels in jeffco for us to be considered for the real important development centers. 500,000 campus example, employment generated would be mostly aerospace type of jobs, considering east aurora, they are finding limited opportunities to grow a campus of this nature and not have to go through two years of entitlement. This area zoned AG, looking at 40-50 year absorption, this is an opportunity to plan for this type of use. One of things I could see in this type of area is something like of locheed martin, or research center. Important to build opportunity for broad range of mixed use, industrial and office. Jeffco doesn't not tend to be an office market. Industrial market lead and support the office jobs, so right now in jeffco, there is declining vacancy, and office is still

lagging behind. People will come here because there is a labor base, educated workforce, etc...

- Q: what would implications to the county be if that happened?
  - A: UBG modified, infrastructure costs and where they would come from, there is pretty good access there. Wouldn't make sense for retail due to no or low visibility, office/light industrial, mixed use, multi-family. There is a lot of land here that if the development is clustered in areas of less visibility, it could be an intensive area, but not look intensive. Opportunity is there for something special to occur, but county cannot make that happen.
    - Q: How does that area compare to 300,000 people in coors tech?
      - Russ showing spatial extents of both of them. Similar in size.
    - C: some of that visible is buildable slopes.

- C: we should be specific about industrial, light industrial, office, retail that would support job creation.
  - Q: what about floodplain issue?
    - A: Minor in this area, could be worked around.
  - Q: if that were developed, planning would take care of infrastructure?
    - A: that all comes out in the planning process. Any traffic that comes out of this wouldn't have to go through any residential. Plan is advisory, so it could recommend something that doesn't happen. Point of the plan is

to put in place that  
if something  
happens, that it  
makes sense.

- C: We are repeatedly requested a 50 acre site, but only 5 locations, candelas, not ready yet. This area, not ready yet. Rooney Road, not ready yet. Fehringer Ranch, on market but can't be a seller, board, etc, not ready yet. Airport land, not ready yet. There are limited opportunities to compete with rest of the metro area. Coors tech is almost full. Need to look down the road 20-50 years and make a statement about wanting these high quality jobs, we lose opportunity.
- C: 25-30 commercial sales before 2008 per year, not including fast food sites.

2009 there were 7 sales, every one was RTD or open space, or public. 2010, 12 sales, 7 of them have been public, 5 have been private. Land supply and project out, probably have 100 year supply not, but when economy comes back this will change. We need to be ready to meet that. This area is behind the other 4 locations in terms of zoning, etc...

- Russ: JEC when looking for United Launch Alliance, there was nothing in Jeffco that they could go to, and we didn't have a spot that would satisfy all of their requirements. County doesn't have the ability to compete with tax incentives like cities, to get a major employer in, but we have

quality of life, etc...needs to be protected and showcased. Personally, it represents the last opportunity for something significant to happen, there used to be an area near rocky flats, but even in the south there is just pieces of property left. Not trying to tell anyone to do what to do with their property, just personal.

- C: industrial example, Interlocken, Coors, and supportive land uses to go along with it.
- Keller: Been to several of these meetings to watch and participate in process. Care a great deal about these properties. Now we run an quarry, 1965, 1993 aggregate plant. Cows, indoor riding arena, and love property. As we look forward, we saw this process and felt like we needed to be involved in that and

make sure what we come up with for this has not just us in mind, but county, cities and right now it is agricultural, 4du, etc...I can assure that is not what we intend to do, right now we intend to survive this economy, but would like to put together a plan that deal with planning jobs, light industrial, office, whole lot of things on a piece of land this size if you do it smart. If we have flexibility we can address a lot of different needs that this area will have in a smart way with standards that it will be a nice entrance to Arvada and golden, and give business that might want to come here and employee people, they can come here and employ people that live here. But for near future, keep as is and running business. Appreciate everyone's input, felt it was important to listen. I don't want to leave something for next generation, have opportunity

now to put into the community plan the options and flexibility that maybe address some of the needs that are no longer in area.

- C: Flexibility idea makes a lot of sense and concepts mentioned before make sense here.

■ Q:

- Use Area G: South end of Table Mountain, 4du/ac, right now is mix of right of way, one house, and industrial property. Current though is to split it up to more of what is going on.
  - C: used to be workhouse for stone quarry.

Next meeting: December 13<sup>th</sup>, 6:00 – 8:00pm,  
covering Land Use of the North & Central  
Plains Subarea

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

