

Airport-Northeast Subarea

Annexations have resulted in enclaves of Jefferson County which are scattered throughout this area. Cooperation of the cities and Jefferson County will be required to protect the viability of residential areas and to create redevelopment plans and programs for nonresidential areas. Coordination with the Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport will be necessary to ensure that future development will be compatible with the operation of this facility.

Hazards Policies

A. Map Area A, B, & G

The Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport Policies, in the General Policies Section on hazards associated with the Airport, should be referenced for limitations on development.

1. Areas within the Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport Runway Protection Zones, defined by the Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport Master Plan, should be maintained free of any structures.

Retail, Office, Industrial & Mixed Use Policies

A. Oil & Gas Exploration (Is this an issue???)

Oil and gas exploration, and possible extraction, should be completed a significant amount of time before any major development of the property. Any such development should be compatible with surrounding development. Some techniques which can be used to achieve compatibility are fencing, setbacks, landscaping, etc.

Airport-Northeast Subarea Build-out

Methodology appears under Appendix headings: Housing and Retail, Office, Industrial & Mixed Use.

Area A (West of RMMA):

Property owned by Jefferson County, zoned for office/business/aviation/R&D/etc...

- Russ: Thinking of keeping fairly general – office, business types of uses, making sure we don't preclude anything, but no residential.
 - o Joint venture partnership – urban frontier – 400 acres. Area A –
 - Can you bring us up to speed in past 5-6 years
 - Correction of Russ – A&B should be one, A or B, all of that land technically owned by airport, physically acquired 50 years ago by ownership. Owned by Jeffco as well – we have obligations to that land – have to go through release if we want to build anything other than aviation.
 - Been quite a bit of change – rezoning that land – area A was rezoned about 2004 first time and then 2 years ago we rezoned entire airport – reason we did that was there was about 7 or 8 different zone districts, zoned district for aviation uses. Some was industrial, ag, C1, all of the place, so we took any land that potentially used for aviation uses. Included in that was office/restaurant/retail some uses that airports enjoy to be well rounded.
 - Challenges – we drew lines on land – beltway alignment – topography of land. 60 and 90 feet drop off when land cut east to west, so we recognize use is limited for aviation uses with topography.
 - Also study 2003/2004 that answered that question what could be aviation use for the next 20 years or life of airport – we found out we only may need 180 acres to SW, so once we got some of that info we did a noncommercial office study and at time there was a 50 to 60%. So we were answering basic questions of how much we'll need for aviation – once we give up, hard to get back.
 - Establishing beltway analysis, those were all things that began in 2004, rezoning, recommendations of non-aviation development – 3 zone districts, aviation, light industrial commercial – “non-aviation”, and then hybrid of either one, hybrid was where is beltway going to be, and other is realignment of Simms. Hope was that there would be diagonal cut – realignment of Simms, 112th diagonally over to McCaslin – 4 way alignment. So you would have flow from Westminster and others to this area.
 - We will have more than enough land to last 50 years or more. Topography helped create this analysis. Recently we RFP to sell or lease that nonaviation land. Got 2 proposals back, timing wasn't the greatest, but came back with joint venture, came back with well thought out proposal. Can't find another airport that has done this. Looking at RTD as well. This is really a framework on how we will operate, our contribution is the land. We'll bring skills together, resources, they will pay for development expenses, roadway design, etc... What are we going to build? Trying to work well with surrounding development –

westmoor, and interlocton, don't want heavy industry. Dream is that aviation access, lot of companies that might key up on that, office building below and have hanger there as well. That is what sets us apart from area. Urban Frontier likes that as well.

- What is size of aircraft allowed?
 - Largest that we have today is Boeing business jet, like a 737. We'll never get the wide body aircraft 757, don't think community wants, it. We are locked in landmass wise – we don't have long enough runways to support these type of aircraft. Gulfstream, global express, airbus 319s that occasionally come in, we can certainly handle.
 - Currently 737's fly there now?
 - Yes occasionally?
 - And lear jet, any jet that is in production are flying in on regular basis. 150,000 regular operations in year (landings and takeoffs) Have 3 runways. Longest 9000 feet long. Shorter runway, 7000 feet long, have identified in master plan, potentially widening it 75 feet wide, and maybe lengthening it but can't be 9000 by landlock.
 - Annual operations have gone down, last year was horrible, went back 12 years to get level of operations. But starting to see fuel flowage is coming up a bit and recovering. We have a dip that we are experiencing right now, but average growth has been very slow 2 and 3%
 - Centennial has a lot of private? How do you compare?
 - We compare in every way they are, they are about twice as busy as we are. Look at surrounding community, Centennial has 25

business parks,
Jeffco has probably 4.
As airport grows,
operations grow as
well.

- Any business that has transportation need, they will grow and utilize airport.
 - Possible for commercial to fly in there?
 - Yes possible, but reality is that it is not going to happen, we don't have the facilities to support it. We have mini charter, that holds 19 passengers to Grand Junction – close to commercial, going that direction but only 4 days a week now. Best you could ever hope for is niche player to go in and out. From airline perspective that needs rental, parking, etc... DIA is 5th largest, because of cost of doing business is one of lower cost. Reality from business plan perspective, but has been proposed in the past. My answer today is that community won't get excited unless certificate in hand.
 - Pitkin county commissioners recently agreed to expand to allow commercial flights, is this similar to that airport.
 - No, Aspen has commercial service, 4 or 5. No 737's. 7000 foot runway, elevation of close to 8,000ft. Airplanes don't operate in that area.
- Do you have limitation of size, decibel?
 - Yes, weight limitation of 75,000 pounds, there are bigger ones that come. Would like to increase to 100,000. Noise, there are no noise limitations in and out of the airport today. Old stage one and two, very loud and offensive, reality is that all of those are dying and going away. There is a national mandate to phase out those stage 2 aircraft by 2014/2015. Technology is taking care of a lot of that.
- In design for this, when we did NE plan, we didn't allow any overnight, no hospitals, hotels, motels in order to have that protection. Will you be doing that? We also had a height limitation to protect the approach.

- No, a lot of the work is being preserved to the new updated. Hospitals, churches, stadiums off ends of runways are not a good idea, schools parallel are maybe okay, but critical zones have been a very important tool that Westminster and broomfield have utilized. 3 dimensional point, no high structures. Radio frequencies, buildings with mirrored glass, etc.. Yes we are keeping that because it was well drafted.
 - Plan for development – Ohio airport blue ash – got land and became mini silicon valley – all development that went into area served by same aircraft, have lowest income tax – because of all of the business coming into the area. There is a rationale for it.
 - Yes, area around centennial is built out, and we have clean slate to build out – renewable energy, etc...
 - Russ – A/B distinction – ODP has line about non-aviation – would that make sense to separate that out?
 - No, I think combination of A/B is the best way to go.
 - Okay, we'll combine.
-

Area B (RMMA):

Existing Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport Property.

Area C (120th Ave Enclaves):

Two lots along 120th Ave, surrounded by office and commercial.

- Put some requirement CFG, noisy – get from Russ. To save county \$ and lawsuits. ML.
 - When we have opportunity to review development, we don't want to take land, we are always looking into critical zones, and we'll say in comments, identifying that airport is on that plan, and then we'll ask that there is a disclosure that buyers of development that it is near airport, noise, fuel, etc..
 - Big push that we had is that making sure prospective buyer sign navigation easement.
 - Is it in the title commitment?
 - Yes easement will show up.
 - Majority of that land is already under navigation easement. Challenge is that you may have a big developer that signs, but to make sure that is transferred to homeowners and commercial businesses.

First line of defense is navigation easements, disclosures as well. Multi-family example – where disclosure is on lease.

- Example – client should go up there for 24 hours and experience it for themselves.
- Realtors should disclose this as well.
 - Should be in the title work.
- Kenny, are you a referral agent?
 - Yes, for Westminster, broomfield, Jeffco.
- Q: Certain directions that helicopters have to take off?
 - A: Yes, we do, they can be more offensive. They have to fly below pattern of fixed wing aircraft. There are 15 based helicopters, 2 schools, one news agency. So you have variety. Because of sheer numbers, we have departure routes, flat irons, promenade examples, 4 directions where they follow roadways, and it is safer.
- C: Retail and office?
 - What is the best if ownership changes, what is the best return they could get with zoning?
 - Probably commercial.
 - Yes, office and retail.
 -

Area D (Walnut Creek Subdivision):

Existing residential subdivision.

- Take a look at where it is? I would treat it as built out
 - Yes the recommendation would be that for sure. Only 2 vacant lots remaining.

Area E (South-West of Standley Lake)

Mostly large lot developments.

- planning on leaving it as is. Bald eagle foraging area, so thinking it as is.

Area F (112th Ave & Wadsworth Blvd)

Two homes on large lots outside of Critical Zone, ~2.5 acres each.

- Planning process from broomfield with owners or properties, wanted to develop that given it's proximity to rtd lot. Owners of property were buying into it at time. To then become working off of feeder system of park & ride.
- Did you ask Broomfield what they would like?
 - We will check with Broomfield and Westminster, but this is an odd one, that close to 36th.
 - Originally they had proposal to change where old wadsworth and extend 11th.
 - Airport – outside of critical zone. Extremely close to critical zone, but don't see that it necessarily conflicts. Or light Industrial, open

space. Airport doesn't have a problem with it. Height restrictions, etc..

- Russ – generally – OS, light industrial, shouldn't happen – congregations, noise sensitive types of businesses, etc.
 - Not very good access.

Area G (111th Ave, near Wadsworth Blvd)

7 SF-D lots inside of Critical Zone, approx lot size is 1 acre.

- Leave as is.

Area H (South-East corner of Standley Lake)

Single, 7 acre lot with 1 SF-D.

- Recommending 4 du/ac to match surrounding densities.
 - If I was owner, I'd wonder why I was letting jeffco have a say in recommending? Needs property owner to have some say in it?
 - Zoned A-2 which wouldn't allow them to subdivide.
 - But plan is for rezoning. If we leave as is we say no additional properties.
 - Leave as is, referral goes to Westminster, so why not consult them ahead of time?
 - Russ: They wouldn't do it through county because there is no water, so we could say any type of recommendations, so if they want to develop they'd have to go through Westminster.
 - Be noting this in this area that relates to public water & sanitation.
 - Russ – will note this, annex..get from Russ.

Area I (South-West corner of Standley Lake, south of Area E)

36 SF-D lots of 1 acre size.

- Russ – was planning on leaving it as is.

- one of issues in that area is from Fire, look in plan, some recommendations in hazards. One subdivision that was never remediated. Not sure if that particular area was ever remediated and that was reason that it never developed. Check with State on this.

- If that is relevant to I, wouldn't it be relevant to E?

_ Yes, absolutely – we will check on this.