

# THE NORTH PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

## Notes from July 26, 2010 North Plains Community Plan Update Meeting Apex Recreation Center

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

### **OPENING COMMENTS?**

- C: Russ – We talked with Jefferson County health department and they used to have a contract with the State to monitor Rocky Flats, but lost funding – so health department is no longer doing it. We are still checking on who is monitoring it now.
- C: we don't need trail head for equestrian, for policy #(find).
  - o A: equestrian policies portion will be covered in the open space & recreation chapters. Only comparing policies, we will have individual chapter meetings, some will be specifically equestrian-related.

### **HOUSING:**

- Q: Community character – each area is going to have something different – will you explain what exactly the unique character is? Where is that defined?
  - o A: Will be addressed with the local plans, when we get to specific land uses – community character issues will be reviewed.
    - Q: The Objective is to maintain character...Fairmount has more than the plan states – hopeful that it would have a better definition.
      - Yes, that is one of the first things we'll do when we get to the different Community Character areas.
- Q: Park & Recreation service – I think it is fine but there are other places that mentions it, this should be tied together – is that in place of fee in lieu? Or a dedicatory thing?
  - o A: Looks like it is saying instead of a sidewalk they could do a trail, this could be done through other mechanisms, has to be coordinated with recreation department.
    - C: Typically what happens is that a subdivisions HOA claim they will take care of it, but HOA could become

useless and land is not taken care of, if trails allowed for public use it should be connected to trail systems.

- Policy should be kept just who maintains.
  - General: Trails are not internal only, they need to connect to external trail systems and consistent with Open Space & Park & Recreation master plans.

- C: in lieu of sidewalks was written 21 years ago – much more heavy traffic now, no walking kids. Something has to be done with developing McIntyre to 48<sup>th</sup> – sidewalks should be constructed. Kids are not safe walking, high speed cross streets.
  - Q: So do you prefer a sidewalk system?
    - A: Yes, sidewalks off of McIntyre.
  - C: Heather - Possible shared use type sidewalk – unpaved, separated from roadway and also a paved section?
- C: 48<sup>th</sup> trail all the way to highline if we can get right of way, but cut off at 50<sup>th</sup>. Hope was to connect to farmers highline on east side. Can't get across McIntyre around 52<sup>nd</sup>.
  - C: Russ: Let's set a separate meeting for this topic.
    - Q: When would that be?
      - A: After the general policies, no schedule set, but will start working on schedule and these will start after the general policies. Trails is a big issue and it should have its own meeting.
    - C: Should have engineer and OS, Park & Rec.
      - C: schools cutting back on budgets – in Fairmount area many dangerous areas, no place for kids to walk safely.
        - C: Have internal systems set up, may or may not connect, but at least local kids will have trails.
- Q: What is list of wildlife areas under G?
  - A: That is in the current North Plains plan, and that list will stay in North Plains plan or possible master list in master plan.
- Q: When referring to Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) and local plan will items be cross referenced?
  - A: Updated North Plains plan will be within the CMP, so it will reference itself, that is why we are trying to get rid of duplication.
- C: Russ – Planned development overview

- Q: When someone applies for that zoning – can it really go both ways, can they look for allowances – and/or look for restrictions, like areas around it?
  - A: only affects areas within the planned area. Allows you to include or exclude certain uses, where straight zoned districts won't allow that.
    - Q: Grandfathered in?
      - A: All depends on details, if there is use on sight, typically use is grandfathered in.
  
- C: Russ: 13 – tax status of Agricultural land should be protected, we have no control over the Assessors, State is the one that sets the rules, we were proposing deletion of this policy, it can't have any impact just because of the way the state sets the laws. If you really want it in there, we can have it in there. Assessor does not base rates on zoning, just on the use. Commercially zoned if cattle can be assessed at agricultural rates. Likewise, Agricultural-zoned and horse boarding – state laws assess at Commercial rate. Please give this one some thought.
  
- C: Russ – D1 – proposed deletion, if someone can explain intent we are open for suggestions.
  - C: Possible example of this would be to put commercial like 7-11 at entrance and not at back.
    - C: Marco's pizza, etc. Main entrances to housing units do not go through that area, they come off different outlets. Difficult to do all the time, so maybe use words – “to best extent possible.”
    - C: Green acres came in from different areas to Commercial development and Residential.
    - The idea was not to access Commercial development by going through residential suburban area – that would increase traffic. Use local streets to access. Keep separate, “not to use local streets that preserve local subdivision”
      - Signs exist in these areas that say: “no commercial traffic”, or “no trucks over a certain weight.”
        - C: Great – thanks for clarification.
      - Mix of traffic from Coors from original working site, no large semis were supposed to be going in from McIntyre across from 48<sup>th</sup>, supposed to be using 44<sup>th</sup>. Now McIntyre widened. Coors let them know not to use big trucks except down by plant. There is no control, independent trucking school. That

should be addressed along with traffic coming out of Coors.

- Use local streets for Tractor Trailer training.
  - We will check into this.

- Livestock, C: Russ:

- Add language for bottom policy.
- Residential lots – currently the thinking is to keep the language in the local plan. Different lot sizes etc...at this time we'll keep it local and we will have an equestrian meeting in October, but please give any comments now. Language is not matched in master plan, and would not work everywhere in county – going with assumption that if it's in the plan now, we should leave it.

Q – What is definition of livestock?

-A: Excellent question – we have a definition in zoning resolution, we'll see if we can add it to CMP.

- Q: Do you have explanation of Large animals?

- A: Same

- Q: Chickens?

- Heather – in Zoning Resolution – chickens are small livestock.

- C: If A1 or A2 and lot is legal and over 1 acre, you could have 1001 pigs. Original plan has area in appendix of equestrian management.

- A: Keep in mind this is in housing section.

Basically these recommended restrictions come into play when someone comes in to rezone into smaller lots. Many different elements to this. Plan recommends 9,000 sq ft available to first horse, 6,000 to second. On 12,500 sq foot lot doesn't you can't fit 15,000 sq ft. Also on a 12,500 sq ft lot it is difficult to fit in 9,000 sq ft for a single horse, plus allow much room for house, etc..

- C: Basic thinking of setbacks – if you have 12,500 sq foot lot won't be room for shed or anything else, very hard on 12,500. Have to put a pen in middle if you have a stallion. If all of this is going to be allowed on 12,500 it doesn't make sense – stallions and bulls should be removed, and recalculate 12,500 size.
- C: Subdivisions have not allowed stallions, so that might not be an issue.
- C: Stallion example – that get loose in community – it is not safe. Should not be allowed in small area.
  - C: Fencing listed to make sure protection is there.
    - C: Places do not always have fencing areas.
      - C: Should complain about owners not horses.

- C: Point is we are much more dense, so protection should be in place.
  - o C: Should be enforced, but they are not enforced.
    - A: Equestrian meeting will address all of these specific topics.
  
- Russ – ponder – as a character point of view – does it make sense to have equestrian uses on subdivisions where there is ¼ acre lots.
  - o Health safety welfare – might be adequate, but these are the issues that are separate but related – community character & Health, Safety & Welfare. Need to balance these for equestrian uses in residential areas.
  - o We will keep this as a placeholder and leave it as is for now, please give comments via e-mail, letters or phone calls from you or your neighbors.
    - C: idea of having all these animals in residential areas, is kind of a joke – when you start to infringe on neighbors – this is somewhat trendy to have chickens.
  
- C: 2 under livestock – people who moved in around livestock complained – 2 was put in there to address new development.

#### **RETAIL, OFFICE, INDUSTRIAL & MIXED USE:**

- Q: #10 – what is height restriction for commercial and industrial?
  - o A: depends on what the zoning allows, plan recommendations are in each specific community character areas.
  
- C: #13 is basically the same thing you wanted to delete in previous. Retail chapter policy 13 is nearly the same.
  - o Please let us know if you think it is covered, and if not, if the NP #13 retail language is adequate.
    - C: add “adjacent” to the policy?
  
- C: Housing #14 required to notify - #12 encourage, already required by LDR. Encouraged and required are two different things. Chances are we’ll go with modifying master plan to encourage more notification, even though it is currently required by the Zoning Resolution and LDR. That was recent change in zoning resolution – more notification is probably a good thing.
  
- no additional comments, but if you have some come up, please contact and let us know.

#### **OPEN SPACE, TRAILS & RECREATION:**

- Q: What was your goal in changing the first section:?
  - o A: Liked the language, added more protection. This is introduction to chapters not really policy, just setting the stage, but we thought language itself was nice.
  
- C: #2 – Keep “most” should be dropped
  - o Broomfield is now its own county.
    - Prospect Recreation & Park – correct language.

- We'll now have to look at all names that may have changed – Apex, example.
- Q: #2 wording there under 4 – is that supposed to replace 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of introduction on page one on securing...etc, is that supposed to be defined further?
  - No, that was the old language and we just planned to modify existing language.
    - Q: So it will stay in North Plains Plan?
      - A: If you think it is valuable, then yes. One of things that has happened quite a bit in NP area is the acquisition of large amount of open space. Seemed to be a concern that OS wouldn't buy as much property due to the relatively low population – so there are several policies regarding that. Clearly that hasn't happened. OS acres to population is very large.
        - C: Add City of Boulder to list of Entities.
          - A: City of Boulder bought large parcel at 72/93.
            - C: Anyone can buy land in Jeffco.
            - C: Boulder has been buying land, proposal for NW parkway-very much opposed to it. Boulder did not want any commercial competition to southern boundary
        - C: NP area served by various entities, I don't see Boulder as "serving" the county – say something in addition about them.
          - A: Russ – we will reshape this policies and bring back to you.
        - C: Need to be clear that some entities are not here to "serve" Jeffco.
        - Q: Does that property have trails?
          - C: No, no public access, just has oil well underneath it.
        - C: Boulder would allow cattle on it for grazing, spared boulder from having expense for property.
- C: Russ – Design Guidelines explanation
  - Example of small "open space" versus large "Open Space", large= purchased by Jeffco Open Space Department. Small "os" = common open areas, greenbelts, etc..
- C: Private Property – keep in local.
  - Is this assessor issue again?

- Vacant property tax example – in some cases property taxes go down after a house is built on vacant land.
  - o C: State decided that horses were not an ag use. Result, tax rate went up. Early 80's.
  - o Will revise plan to more generic language that encourages the county to ask the state to examine this issue.
- Rural clusters 1998, citizens went to state – given to us that if you set aside Commercial land, it becomes tax exempt, but not you have greatly improved value of land.
- Q: You do have to prove your validity under conservation guidelines to feds.
  - o C: set aside and donate land.
  - o C: Rural clusters – you lose tax benefits
  - o C: Would be helpful to get information out on this.
    - A: For purposes of this policy, we'll work up to larger picture – county should explore ways to work with state...etc.. Big picture thing to keep intent broad enough, but would get point across.
- Q: B1 – inferred? “Before development occurs”...I don't see before development occurs, just provides. Is that inferred?
  - o Staff interprets big picture, don't know if that policy is really needed anymore as large tracts of land have be preserved in the North Plains area since the adoption of the plan 21 years ago, plus, we still have recommendations for visual resources, etc.
- We will stop at bottom of PAGE 3, and pick up here at next meeting.

***THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!!***

Next meeting August 9<sup>th</sup>.