

# Meeting Minutes



1101 Bannock Street  
 Denver, CO 80204  
 Tel: 303-892-1166 Fax: 303-892-1186

<b>Project:</b>	<b>Floyd Hill Master Plan</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>April 29, 2009</b>
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>FHMP Steering Committee Meeting</b>	<b>Time:</b>	<b>6:30 pm</b>
<b>Minutes by:</b>	<b>Norris Design</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Floyd Hill Fire Station</b>

<b>Company</b>	<b>Present - ■ Representative</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Present - ■ Representative</b>
Clear Creek County	■ Fred Rollenhagen	ESRE	■ David Elmgreen
Clear Creek County	■ Jo Ann Sorenson	Saddleback	■ Jane Coffin
Clear Creek County	■ Bert Weaver	Saddleback Mountain	■ Charles Choi
CCC	■ Trent Hyatt	Norris Design	■ John Durham
CCC Economic Development	■ Peggy Stokstad	Norris Design	■ Elena Vossman
CCC Open Space	■ Pete Helseth	CCC Planning Commission	■ Bob Poirot
Idaho Springs	■ Cindy Condon	Beaver Brook	■ Kay Axtell / Julie Westland
Floyd Hill POA	■ Mike Chevarria		
Floyd Hill POA	■ Jim White		

## Floyd Hill - Meeting Minutes

### Major Comments on the Draft Plan received via email from Steering Committee Members

#### Living Document - Process Oriented

- Forces affecting Floyd Hill
- Not trying to "fix a problem" with this master plan, rather identifying solutions / reactions to forces
- Transit - need to allow for it to potentially happen in the master plan - it is a force that affects this area
- Jo Ann gave an update on RMRA feasibility study, meets economic feasibility, believe that there are 4 options technically feasible, viable study, will end in 2009
- Stop locations not identified by RMRA, although Floyd Hill remains a star on the map. I-70 Coalition group identified Idaho Springs as the preferred stop location.
- Consensus for stops is unknown so must include in the plan and acknowledge potential
- Level 2 plan is for transit ready development

#### Hierarchy

- Not a traditional plan with land uses, locations, etc. because those types of plans "expire" on the shelf - hierarchy for land use and transportation integration
- Jim - Core concepts seem too "urban" for Floyd Hill
- Neighbors don't want curb and gutter recommended in the plan
- Need to allow for it to happen should transit occur, but not make it a requirement
- Core shouldn't be split by the highway, should be called an activity center
- Rural and urban have specific connotations to people
- Bert - label "non-motorized" corridors on the hierarchy plan
- Sustainability principles are not urban - condensed building area, stormwater infiltration, etc

## **Identity**

- Section reads like there is a problem that needs to be fixed
- Intent was to note that people outside of the County do not know what Floyd Hill is
- Separation of areas in the County is important

## **Utilities**

- Water extension information was provided by Idaho Springs
- 6" pipe is what we were told]
- Most legal questions regarding water extension are best answered in Water Court and not in the master plan
- Idaho Springs legally can sell water outside the City limits, but not sure of process for approval – very complex

## **Alternatives**

- Alternatives charts are too confusing – need to be more clear
- Bert – do not include any existing platted lots in utility calculations
- Traffic figures have some missing / incorrect labels
- There should be two “activity centers”, one on both north and south sides of the study area
- Market study doesn’t acknowledge transit potential – unknown
- The master plan is a planning tool
- State statute for master plans – should the title be changed?
- “Foundation for Future Planning”

## **Next Steps:**

**Prepare a memorandum that documents the changes per the Steering Committee’s concerns**