

THE NORTH PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

Notes from Aug 9, 2010
North Plains Community Plan Update Meeting
Apex Recreation Center

Welcome to your community meeting!

OPENING COMMENTS?

- Introduction, and overview of reasons for meeting and plan update.
- no comments

Open Space Chapter continued from page 4

- Q: #4 - liability releases for private property – if you have a trail across private property. Release that saves owner from being liable. I recommend you check – state legislature, may have now done that and put it in state statute.
 - o A: Russ – will check with Open Space too.
 - o C: This means Use trail at own risk, or release of liability. Should not be deleted unless it is already taken care of at state level.
- C: Page 5 #6, might be covering trail connections to the Boulder trails and other trails in region, especially since Boulder has acquired more open space.
- C: #11 – maintenance of open space...once that is stated it could have other ramifications if it is not maintained.
 - o A: Currently we feel this is duplicative with CMP, but does not cover it totally. As general rule OS purchased by Jeffco if left in possession, Jeffco provides maintenance. Recreation District also provides maintenance at times...follow up with Flora and Russ. Might only refer to trails,
 - C: It is broader than trails, we have to keep it in because recreation areas aren't always active

recreational areas. Smaller parks should be provided that have recreational opportunities – example – Easley – Fairmount Park. More than just open space, HOA, etc...

- A: Russ – we will keep and follow up on who should be providing maintenance.

- C: Page 6:#2, references specific plan that does not seem to be in existence. Planning on deleting this policy.
 - C: Remember lottery had something to do with this.
 - A: yes there are other agencies that link to plan, but this specific plan does not exist.
 - C: Probably had it's name change
 - A: We'll continue to search, but think that it is covered by working with other districts and agencies.
- C: F3 – private open space....include “maintenance” in there. Encourage private sector – is “manage” broad enough to make sure that maintenance is included?
 - A: We could include that language.
 - Q: Does “private sector” refer to developers?
 - A: Developers and more, some Governmental Agencies and private non-profits.
 - Q: how can you encourage incentives?
 - A: This is difficult – many policies that say “encourage”. We can potentially change rules in LDR to have different incentives, sort of a bartering system, but if not you are not a developer, it is more just the general encouragement. There is not a lot that we, as the planning department, are able to do to force people to do things other than strongly encourage.
 - C: Reference to encouraging conservation easements – incentives can be that we offer in rural cluster development so that it is transferred to the land conservancy and is protected. Might want to look for language in Mountain plans.
 - A: yes some are in Master plan and appendix

- C: incentives should be offered as...easements, etc.. Rather than just encourage. FU w/russ.
- Q: There appears to be a duplicate policy in recreation and housing.
 - A: Chapters might have printing error, we will look into this.

Transportation Chapter:

- C: #2 – We think we should keep in local plan unless we hear different. Equestrians might not want curb & gutter
 - C: Yes, plan to keep in Local Plan.
- C: “Besides school, Sheriff’s office, Local Police” – you might want to include that language.
 - C: plus “Fire Districts”
- C: Page 2: #6, we need comments, we are not entirely sure that every path should become a dedicated ROW. Suggesting to delete as it is written.
 - C: On some trail connection the Recreation District would decline because they didn’t want maintenance. We attempted that once it became ROW and it took on different character. McIntyre – districts preferred to take money but not connect to other trails.
 - C: Russ, I was reading #6 as stand alone, but it is more of a 5b, and in that context it makes perfect sense. So we will leave it in.
 - C: Little districts like ours we cannot do that, example like 52nd, we can’t maintain this. I don’t think we should make this a mandatory thing because small districts may not be able to do that.
 - C: Russ: We should work together and maybe paths should become decided ROW to county. There may be a piece that Park & Recreation District can’t manage, so we should work together to find a solution. We

will work with staff and we'll definitely modify it so it is not read as a separate policy as 5.

- Q: will the county take on ROW that aren't necessarily automobile related?
 - o C: Russ – most have standard widths, Will Kerns is trying to get more of these, talk to Russ. We will rewrite this so it is more clear.
- C: Page 3: #13, recommending on deleting, Level Of Service is no longer used to calculate, we use different calculation now.
 - o C: capacity model should be used, then look at what is percentage.
 - A: Yes, LOS terminology is no longer used, capacity is used.
- C: Page 4: 19 – delete – Striping is done in accordance with adopted standards.
- Q: Any thought to replace, example emergency phones where it has public telephones? We should look at something in those areas
 - o C: Call boxes are available that can be solar.
 - C: Sheriff: Yes, there are currently being three installed on North Indiana – that is Sheriff's understanding. But we should look into doing this on trails, etc... Trails can be overgrown and unsafe. It is unrealistic that every trail could have one, but possibly major trails that we expect significant traffic, etc.. Or at a minimum at the trail heads. Cell phones don't work on a lot of mountain trails.

Public Schools, Facilities, Services & Utilities Chapter

- Overview of Transportation Map
 - o C: Lack of RTD in the plan area

- Russ C: Water pressure and water availability to fight fires – from what we can tell it is not as big of concern now as it was in the past, but we’ll go over it tonight.
- Q: In regard to schools, are you sure that the schools have to follow the recommendations of the county?
 - o A: We are sure that they do not have to follow recommendations, but there is a state mandate that they have to come to county to get approval.
 - C: it all depends on how many people share concern and show up at school board meeting.
- Page 2: #4, Ten fire districts have already adopted the same code as the county.
 - o C: This is a concern – not all of North Plains is covered by a fire district. Should include Mutual Aid.
 - Yes, #3 addresses this.
 - Q: How many fire districts are there,
 - We will look this up and get an answer. 23 on Master Plan map, both incorporated and unincorporated areas.
- C: #5 – proposed deletion:
 - o C: Sheriff: I think it should be put in the master plan for the whole county to encourage this.
 - o C: Heather comment– get from Russ. It is a land development requirement..etc..
 - o – Important from fire safety standpoint.
 - o C: Pressure – houses on North Table mountain, the pressure is very low, always been a problem.
 - o C: Pump station needs replacement. If it goes out there is no pressure.
- C: #6, we’ll leave this in as well.
 - o Q: Should we use this to Local & CMP?
 - A: This probably can’t be applicable county-wide since there are areas of mountains that don’t have hydrants, so “applicable county-wide” would have to be modified, but could probably be used Plains-wide. The concept is sound and we’ll

follow up on this. At a minimum it will be left in the North Plains Plan.

- Q: #8 – is this needed?
 - o YES, absolutely – Sheriff – you can't believe the amount of dangerous material that comes through this county. All of Coors cooling is ammonia, example. There are probably 2 or 3 shipments of nuclear materials that come through county, it is not advertised for good reason, but does need to be addressed.

- C: Page 3:
 - o So this is to review construction plans? Is that your intent?
 - A: Grading permits possible but building permits. Fire Protection District gets SDP referrals before construction occurs.
 - Q: Do you have any complaints from developers?
 - o A: No, this will be well after the zoning process, one of the reasons it is required by building codes and LDR's.

- C: #12 – Maps will be included in Master Plan.
 - o There is an allowance for revisions to plan maps without going back to formally re-adopt the entire plan.

- C: #14 – recommend deletion – Street addresses required by building code now.
 - o Q: Does that also require the they need to be displayed close to road? If house is set back, there should be language so that emergency responders can see.
 - A: We will check regulations and if not, we will leave it in the plan.
 - C: You should also indicate areas of No Mans Land.
 - o A: Yes, Rocco Snart has been working on this and on who will cover

the No Mans Land area by response areas.

- C: #3 no recommendation yet, can we ask for Sheriff comment?:
 - o C: Sheriff – with traffic control, most of that is established Transportation & Engineering through speed limits and has to do with grading, slope, width, number of trips, etc... Except for State Highways, Indiana is still 50mph instead of 45 max because it is a State Highway, we have no control over those. We can write tickets, but have no control. I don't not know if this needs to be in community plan, maybe in Sheriff's plan. We respond to traffic accidents, and react accordingly in those areas. That would be difficult to address through community plan. It works but doesn't belong in plan. There are some things that sheriff does that belong in plan, but probably not this.
 - A: Thanks, we'll address.

- C: #4, will check with building code.

- C: #5 – addressed by Open Space policies, so deleting since it is in Open Space portion. This is still good policy.

- Q: #6 – need sheriff comment: Is this negotiable by Sheriff?
 - o C: Sheriff: Any citizen can request the Sheriff over city law enforcement, by state law the Sheriff is the head law enforcement agency. As the policy is written it doesn't have to be in there.
 - C: In many cases, some of these things are not well known by people that live here – in other words who is responsible for traffic and speeding. Example: State Patrol responsible for speeding. Some of those recommendations are in here not because planning can enforce them, but it provides information to citizens.
 - C: websites and today's technology are available to address this information.

- C: Sheriff - Could provide simple comment that Sheriff is head law enforcement agency, and leave it at that. Transportation and Engineering asks us to recommend.
 - Sheriffs side note – security and safety of buildings is not thought about enough. Using “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design” can be looked at. During planning, we don’t have veto, but do make recommendations that would address safety. Lighting, Landscaping example. This is something that is relatively new but all law enforcement is getting more involved with it. There are developments that could be run past the Sheriff for safety recommendations. Lots of examples with places to hide, etc...
 - Lakewood medical marijuana license won’t be given until sheriff comes and gives green light on property.
 - Sidewalk and grass example. Could put these example into plan to address safety issues.
 - A: Thank you for these comments, Sheriff participation in community plans is very important and should continue.

- C: Russ – in current master plan towards appendix A, page 172 – these concepts are out there, Crime prevention by environmental design language is there, but please look at this and let us have any of your comments. These could apply to general policies. Staff will work on language too.
 - A: Sheriff – yes we will look at these and recommend language.

- C: Next meeting is August 30th – Hazards, Water, when that is done general policies will be completed and we'll have meetings to look at specific topics. If you have topics that need special discussion.
- ***THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!!***