

THE NORTH PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN *UPDATE*

Notes from December 13th, 2010
North Plains Community Plan Update Meeting
Apex Recreation Center

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

OPENING COMMENTS?

- Existing plan recommendation review. This area was recommended for an employment hub, but this has since changed, many open space recommendations, multiple annexations, etc.
- Modified boundary map, this is a draft of possible new areas. Intent is to match parcel lines where we could. One other change we might make is parcels near white ranch, these are isolated parcels, we might bring them into the plan, we will explore this option. These are currently in the North Mountains community plan, these are currently residences. It shouldn't make

- much of a difference either way, just a proposal to make the map more readable.
- Next set of maps: Use Areas overlaid with open space, zoning map, and maximum wildlife quality area map as stated by the Comprehensive Master Plan. Orange/tan is Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse Occupied Range. Bald Eagle activity is also shown. Elk Production area is shown in brown.
 - o Q: Does these show where they are currently, or where they plan to be?
 - A: 2009 Colorado Division of Wildlife data, updated every 4 years.
 - Hazards Map: This brings us to Area L, critical area, Lyden Coal(sp), working of this coal mine were very deep and it is probably not accurate to show this area entirely as a hazard, what was more concerned for him is the natural gas leakage, public service stored gas, now is a water reservoir. Natural gas has migrated at least 1,900 feet from where it should be. Concern is that there shouldn't be any development that relies on well water.

- C: Property along 72, east of 93, filed suit against PS because his land was worthless, natural gas was bubbling out. Drew attention to this hazard, everyone around him didn't want that attention. Requirement that if he develops anything, any buildings have to have methane ventilation, which adds considerable cost. The case went to the supreme court and it was upheld. He claims land still has value. No one knows accurately where the Lyden mine tunnels or how much they took out. Public service was storing gas under great amount of storage, oil and gas commission had set a maximum pressure for that mine and they exceeded it, gas escaped through cracks in rocks, not sure where tunnels are, or storage was. Underground water storage now, but the local entities don't want to deal with the pockets that still might exist. If builder or land owner did due diligence, they might change their mind about developing in this area.

- C: Landfill? County had to go back in and do a fair amount of cleanup, not sure what the status is, but 21 years ago this was still a problematic area.
 - A: We show this as a methane hazard currently.
- C: Superfund sight on highway 72, please identify this on hazard map. Final report, monitoring wells, would not ever be totally cleaned up. Ground water drainage that comes off of landfill on 93 and where that was expanded. This was a concern for the drinking water.
 - A: We will research this.
- Passing out smaller versions of the larger recs and open space map. Last one is the same as the modification of boundaries of use areas. We will start working through these.
 - Q: 1997 a coalition of communities in area sent letter to DRCOG, supported 93 as a formal Urban Growth Area and land use to west should be preserved. HOA's concerned citizens were involved, that is

another factor to consider, I will contact some of these groups.

- Q: Front range mountain backdrop was not included.

- C: Top of blue mountain from 93 and 72, that whole area has been designated as a peregrine falcon recovery area.

This is not well known and not shown on maps. As a result this has an impact on potential development. Please look into this for your wildlife maps. Take into consideration the hunting range for this.

- C: Recent discussions everything west of 93 should be considered foreground and minimal impact for development to preserve viewshed and wildlife preservation.

- Subarea section: Any big problems we should try to address right away? We tried to follow parcels and existing land use patterns.

- C: Land that is east of Highway 93, a lot of it is already in Arvada, or in planning area of Arvada, planning for this area

needs to be coordinated between city and county, we've went through quite a bit of public process already.

- C: Conservation easements are not shown on this map, but we know they exist.
- C: Plan says what land owners might look to to see if they want to change their zoning
 - A: plan is advisory, not regulatory.
- C: You would want to make a plan for the future that is already compatible.
- C: caution – there was a point in time where city of Westminster and other people that take water out of Stanley lake, piece of state legislation, they are entitled for their drinking water source to go 5 miles around, and have something to say what development occurs. Phosphorous issues, drainage into Stanley lake. Expansion of landfill, challenge brought forward, concerned with drainage. Support for additional reservoir Indiana/72, to be able to capture drainage off of rocky flats,

caution is that since they have expressed that in past, and have legislation, you should check into this.

- Area A:
 - o Portions of activity center, high density residential, office, industrial. This is not likely now. Thinking large lot residential, 5-35 acres. Only a portion of A that is not conservation easement or open space. 1 du/2 acres is what plan recommends now. We have other places in plan that talk about rural residential 5-35. Most is Boulder Open Space.
 - Arvada, make it your absolute lowest density option you have in plan.
- Area B:
 - o East of highway 93, zoned industrial and PD. Rail line spur coming up to it, zoning is in place, so we thought to leave it industrial.
 - Q: What is current status of water storage southwest corner of 72/93?

- C: All depends on gross reservoir. Jeffco open space has right of refusal. Owned by Denver Water now.
 - C: Suggest that area B remain Industrial.
- Area C:
 - Yellow on maps, currently windfarm and mineral extraction. Zoning matches this now.
 - C: Have to have a reclamation plan, what is the subsequent use?
 - A: Special Use Area, Rocky Flats and Buffer. A lot of this is owned by the federal government, may just be included in wildlife refuge. Federal government doesn't need to go through the county's processes.
 - C: Industrial development will be limited by water availability. Keep this industrial, might want to put R&D facility for example.

- C: Arvada, if you need to make it industrial, you may want wind farms for example, but you have to be willing to have other types of Industrial uses.
 - Q: Can't this be done by platting requirements? Can combine all industrial activities to interior of building.
 - A: In this example it could be possible since it is not zoned industrial currently.
 - C: Arvada, heavier industrial versus light industrial example, outside versus inside.
 - C: Heather, Definitions of heavy, medium and light example, this is something we could look at this. Russ, there also are general recommendations of noise, air, odor and light as well.
 - C: Railroad – this is all Rocky Flats area.

- A: Yes, owned by Federal Gov, but not part of Wildlife refuge.
- C: Material extracted here is very special type of material that is not commonly found and highly valued, so as a result, I would be cautious.
 - C: Yes, the type of material to seal, light weight aggregate, in concrete structures it is better to use that and you don't have to use steel and have super structure, but it still has strength.
- C: Boulder might have this in their conservation easement. We will check into this.
- Q: Elk production area and PMJM issues in this area.
- C: Arvada, wildlife refuge there, but rail access, becoming more challenging to find places for heavy uses, they get pushed out

into weld county for example.

We have to find places for these uses somewhere, and rail access is not a common.

- Russ, 196,000 jobs were planned in existing plan at buildout, and 10,500 dwelling units. We will not get anywhere near this with the land left and constraints in area.
- Area D: Section 16
 - o Currently State Land Board Property, tall grass prairie identified, mineral conservation zoning in place to allow mineral extractions. There is a push one some levels to have it preserved as open space, and also push that there is some economic benefits.
 - C: Reasons that boulder was interested is because they own land across street, connections to Standley lake, and if B develops as industrial, it will diminish wildlife connections.

- C: Missing link of the green area, needs to have wildlife connection there.
- C: Arvada, agreement needs to be mentioned.
 - C: There is a problem with underlying mineral extraction agreement. I don't know if anyone has bought state land board out, and then the existing mineral agreement. Neither Jefferson county or boulder want it.
 - A: Russ, part of resolution talked about purchasing mineral rights at a later time.
 - C: Transaction that is being negotiated, hasn't happened yet, we need to take longer view at this, I prefer industrial long term. Light industrial, or light to medium industrial. I don't think open space is a foregone

conclusion nor is it a long term solution.

- Russ: Even if recommendation is industrial, there can be an area preserved for connection for wildlife.

- C: If it is not purchased for open space, it would likely go to city of Arvada. If it stays in county I would support lowest density possible to keep connections open.

- C: Proposal with candelas property would build extention over to this area.

- C: Arvada, we would have interest in using part of property for employment, we support the wildlife migration, portions of open space, but also portions that support employment.

- E: Rocky Flats Wildlife Refuge

- Q: Understanding that there was a 300 foot easement that was set aside for

Parkway on eastern side of property.
What is the cost of purchase for easement is going to be? Study that had been done to assess whether right of way and buffer zone had really been cleaned up. Area along east side along Indiana had not been remediated, until issue gets resolved, this should remain a question.

- Area F: No Public Access
- Area G: Existing plan, this is two different areas, just west of Standley Lake. Portion is 47 and 48, office, industrial, retail, not a lot else going on in there. Plan was reluctant to recommend residential around Rocky Flats. Does it make sense to have all the same recommendation?
 - o C: North parts are removed, might want to talk about separating them. Talk to Arvada and create reasonable transition. Westminster surrounds north area.
 - Convent in north area. All been negotiated to be purchased by Westminster for open space and convent, so leave this separate.

- Q: Is Arvada going to provide water for this area?
 - A: Area south of 96th and we see that area canal that runs through that area, we basically see the area east of canal as lowest density (max of 1.5 units per acre), west of canal is mixed use for variety of housing (minimum of 7 units per acre).
 - Heather: Mixed use spill over into candelas?
 - Mixed housing, retail, limitations on use area, smaller retail.

- Area H:

- Currently this is mostly 44, mixed use, office, residential up to 4du, 43 1du/2 ac.
 - Arvada, lowest density residential 1.5 units per acre, assuming we add public water and sewer, but this is a challenging area, unlikely we'll ever serve this area. 70% open space would be required to get the highest density

- C: 4du density seems very high.
 - Yes, this was plan for the employment hub at the time.
 - C: given way the railroad comes around, wildlife migration comes down there towards water. This was to be preserved to be low density because of the wildlife.
 - Low density residential in this area makes sense, versus mixed use/office.
- Area I: Separate on this map because it is owned by Denver Water Board. We are researching this to see if it is covered by clause.
- Area J: Dump
 - What is lifespan?
 - They just rezoned it, so many many years.
 - We should leave this as is.
- Area K: Piece of property most industrially zoned. Current plan recommendations are Office/Industrial.

○ Arvada, we think county's plan should say property should be rezoned to higher industrial and not allow residential, rare opportunity to have high quality employment, campus type environment. (Clear with Russ)

- Zoning of candelas has a lot of residential along western half and retail along eastern half.
 - C: Challenge is owned by variety of industrial owners, there is no ability to master plan the area. What you could do is establish some guidelines if they come in for redevelopment they need to have x amount of landscaping, etc..
- How does outdoor storage work there, line between heavy and light, then county rezones, does he lose use?
 - County to my knowledge hasn't rezoned anyone's property on their own. County initiated

rezoning is approved by all owners.

- Is there a way that county could impose vacations like fencing and landscaping to screen existing uses without doing rezoning?
 - Heather, only way would be if we changed our standards for when someone comes in for building permit, increase our general standards that apply across the county, that's the only way that we would be able to impose something more restrictive.
 - C: Move it towards light industrial with as much landscaping.
 - A: would be nice to have a coordinated plan, will try to encourage.
 - C: Superfund sight there as well. EPA is still monitoring it, plume is extending to the north east into candelas.

- A: We have latest EPA report on this and will research.
 - C: Check with Mindy from Heath & Environment. Had been multiple chemical processing.
- Area L:
 - Area on top of the Lyden mine with natural gas leakage issues, and potential subsidence issues. Current plan calls it a special use area, office, industrial if hazards can be mitigated.
 - C: Recommend Only surface developments, no digging
 - C: Arvada, low density residential, believe hazards can be mitigated, mine workings don't prove to be a hazard if mitigated.
 - C: Topography not particularly good for anything except residential, except for small area where you could do some industrial, or office. Exposure issues, and topography issues.

- C: Odor and pollution problems in the past. Problems in there that would need to be mitigated.
 - What odors?
 - Odors from north, chemical. And landfill
- Area M:
 - Most of owned by Arvada, combination of open space, public facilities.
 - Arvada, Designated as open space in plan.
- Area N:
 - Area 45, office and industrial. Currently some residential, some outdoor storage in area, but basically open. Old abandoned landfill.
 - Arvada: Needs to be broken down, fairly complex. South of tracks, some open space, vacant land designated low density residential. North of tracks area between tracks and Highway 72, that area and area north of 72, fairly strategic areas for commercial development in the future. Starting to get pressure to do

commercial area, we think that intersection is probably the key intersection for big enough area for large commercial retail. Plan designates area south of 72 for industrial/office, thinking of redesignating as retail commercial. Want to make it clear where the bigger development is – neighborhood and community commercial, north. Candelas more regional designation.

- C: Lydan damn needs to be rebuilt? Problems coming down into Arvada along drainage.
 - Damn not in this area.
 - C: Topography north of 72, drops pretty quick, so commercially you could only be looking at a strip.
- Area O:
- Smaller lot sizes than Area P. Currently that area is 9, which is 4du/acre.
 - How much developable land is available? Seems built up.

- A: Not much, some land could be subdivided, but most is built up. Not many large swaths of land.
 - Water supplied by Ralston Valley.
- Area P:
 - Larger lots, mostly developed. 2du/ac in current plan. Area 13. Some is 4 and some 9. Definitely is developed at larger lots, nearly all built out.
 - C: A lot of different places, seems like infill in Indiana might be okay at higher density.
 - A: Big complications in this area is all the canals, that is reason why there are still some larger properties.
 - Arvada: Lowest density, parcels that are available are fairly small for most part.
 - C: O & P, where Arvada is around it, it sounds like it is an infill designation and it should

be compatible with surrounding lots.

- Arvada, yes, that is why we use lowest density category.

Next meeting – January 10th, two meetings on Fairmount. February meeting with be on Airport NEDCP.

**HAPPY HOLIDAYS
THANKS FOR YOUR
PARTICIPATION!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!**

