

THE NORTH PLAINS COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

Notes from September 27, 2010 North Plains Community Plan Update Meeting Apex Recreation Center

Welcome to your community meeting!

OPENING COMMENTS?

Purpose of meeting is to go over Airport Northeast Subarea. Break down into two portions – text, then look at land use recs. Wildlife example – fair amount of open space around there, there were wildlife near airport which didn't mix. These could bring predator birds which again, don't mix with the airport.

MAP Examples:

1. Existing Plan Recommendations

- this shows areas of change in hatching – Broomfield, NECDP, and Annexations. Large portions of the area are no longer in the Plan Areas, because of that some of the general language may not make sense. (passing out policies – highlighted in some different ways – yellow and blue – Some staff thinks policy is good general or possibly up to the master plan. Blue- these are recommendations that staff feels that could possibly be deleted, because it's already happened or it's been annexed, etc..)
- Page 1: Change name of airport to current name.

- Housing A General – Maximum densities have to be earned, this should be in the general area.
- B Map area 16 – This is not covered by NECDP, so staff thinks this should be removed.
- C: Map area 17 – same – already covered by Annexation.
- Schools A – covered by NECDP
- B Community Facilities, not sure that this recommendation makes sense giving the few areas that are left. Should this policy stay?
 - C: Few scattered group homes generally that doesn't go over that well, as well as elder care centers they like to walk to grocery stores etc..
 - C: Special homes were fought for, if the general covers these, as long as there is no distinction in the type of group home. Plus zoning resolution has use by right. 3 types of groups homes, few that are allowed, elderly, mentally challenged, disabled?
- C: adaptive reuse – thought this was already captured in master plan. Doesn't mention one specific type of school, but not necessary here.
- Retail/Office – Matches example on 1#2, almost identical.
- Map areas 6,8,&10 – Covered by NECPD, 2. landscaping is required by zoning resolution. 1. Redevelopment should occur to summary map, doesn't make sense to have specific policy in this area, generally that is how all applications are treated. Now there are only 2 parcels in areas 6,8,10,12. Each one of them have a residence on it, and surrounded predominantly by ...get from Russ.
 - 2. area is broomfield
 - 3. strip development – large amount of property along 120th when plan was written, but now only two parcels.
 - 4. Annexation to broomfield – broomfield is now a county, can't annex.
 - 5. Aggregation – think this is a great policy everywhere, so we are recommending this stay higher up in the plan.
- D Map Area 15 – redevelopment triangle – area covered by NECDP or Annexation to Westminster.
- E – oil and gas exploration – confused on this one – why is this policy here and not covered by entire plan? Is this a specific issue here, should we leave in?

- Proposals in the past some of the areas had been considered are now in broomfield – think might be well advised to leave it, and bump it up to a general policy and not leave in the subarea.
 1. We will make this a general policy and not in each subarea
- TRANSPORTATION A: General – Rocky Flats closed, so we might not need this. Do we need first part of this?
 - Talking about constructing east part of 470 – caution in terms of Indiana, if in fact NWP people decide what they want to do in having a contract that doesn't allow for competition, that would mean in the future you wouldn't be able to make improvements. Broomfield experienced this recently to extend e470 to subdivision because they have a no compete. For people that can't pay tolls, if they entered into such a contract, improvements would not be allowed. Think of this when you go forward with these policies, with maintenance and operations, otherwise you'll be denying low income people.
 1. C: Not sure it's relative since it's a state highway.
 - a. Russ: personal opinion – we have to be careful and not have plan support what community desires as far as do not compete – issue we'll have to address – this policy is not how we get there, but we can't forget about it. Plus Indiana is not in Subarea – clean up with Russ.
 - i. C: north of 64th, but Indiana is south of 64th.
 1. Just talking about Subarea boundaries.
 2. Can we put something in to capture this?
 - a. Yes, as general policy.
 - i. C: stepping on political hot potato, across country right now, there is a big move

against this sort of thing. Just fyi.

- This is one of the things we have asked for, can't have any clause in plan that takes opportunity that land goes to someone else. Position we've taken as a community – hot potato or not.
 - Russ – one of options we have is to not show the extension, but that doesn't mean community can't throw in recommendations. Have to show up to the hearing and support.
 1. C: Indiana unsure where it fits in this subarea – maybe under hazard section, raise issue of pollution and contamination, buffer zone and 300 foot easement for parkway be clean.
 - a. Russ: Indiana is in North & Central Plains Subarea, so that will be covered there.
 - i. Heather – policy regarding contamination along Indiana got included in master plan under transportation – heather is checking....
- B page 3: Harlan street – extension has been built – called Westminster Blvd.
- C: Covered by NECDP or Westminster.
- Wildlife – again as written it doesn't clearly link to anything in this subarea – should this be more general area? Should it be tailored to fit airport?
 - - yes, fairly large prairie dog population, contributed to problems and attract predator birds.
- Kenny – the reality is that trapping is simply not a method used to capture nuisance species. There are other options, fencing, etc.. For airport area we will use sometimes have to use lethal methods. There are bigger animals, deer, coyotes, in area – but now the critical area is fenced in.
 - Russ – this policy as written, may not have a lot of value, airport doesn't have a need for it, not much ranching left in area. So question then is where does it go?
 1. C: Convert it over to general policies?
 - a. Q: Is nuisance species explained? Because if a coyote is one, it is illegal to trap.

- i. Might not be aware of state statutes, that is why it was included in plan to give information. Appendix may have references to this.
 - 1. C: Rezone requirements wildlife report.
 - a. C: In this document – reference state – so when state laws change you don't have to change document – only thing you'd have to include is exception to rule.

- Airport NE Subarea Built out – get maps:
C: Are d/u recommendations what is out there now?
 - no, these are recommendations, in some cases they match and in some they don't. That was just a draft recommendation just to start talking.
- HEATHER – Transportation policy – in regard to Indiana st and pollution – it did get generalized – consider potential soil contamination prior to transportation....etc..get from Heather.
 -

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