



Nederland Planning Commission

AGENDA

Wednesday, September 28, 2011 ~ 7:00 pm
Nederland Community Center
750 Highway 72 North

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Roll Call
- 3) Approval of minutes from August 24, 2011
- 4) Action Items
 - a. Consideration of change to Nederland Municipal Code Section 16-210 requiring paving of parking lots of 20+ spaces
- 5) Discussion Items
 - a. Nederland Comprehensive Plan update - Review of draft RFQ
- 6) Other Business
- 7) Adjournment



Nederland Planning Commission

MINUTES

Wednesday, August 24, 2011 ~ 7:00 pm
Nederland Community Center
750 Highway 72 North

1) Call to Order

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

2) Roll Call

Present: Chairman Bill Martin, Commissioners Denise Jackson, Kris Larsen and Mikki Osterloo, Trustee Kevin Mueller

Also present: Town Administrator Alisha Reis, Deputy Town Clerk Kristen Edwards.

Absent: Commissioners Roger Cornell, Steve Williams

3) Approval of minutes from July 27, 2011

The motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Larsen, seconded by Commissioner Jackson and unanimously approved.

4) Action Items

- a. Vacation of Right of Way Application from Wendy Williams (442 W. 4th Street); and
- b. Vacation of Right of Way Application from Michael and Janet Pelkey (422 W. 4th Street)

Applicant Wendy Williams, 442 W. 4th Street, explained that the road basically dead ends in her yard. She treats the property in question as their yard at the moment and would like to formalize that agreement. She also has concerns about liability, particularly with the creek running through the property, and would like to have the property in question covered under her homeowner's insurance

policy. She clarified for the Commission which property pertains to her vacation request and which pertains to the Pelkeys'. Reis clarified that per State law, a vacation divides the street in half, with each half going to the directly adjacent property.

Commissioner Martin noted that the only two vacations since 2006 have been the Library and the Rambo property on Lower W. 3rd, both of which were commercial. He asked if there are any different considerations given that this is a residential property. Reis explained that often vacations have been used to relieve the burden of maintenance on the municipality or State. The other significant consideration is often the public benefit aspect; in the cases of the library and the Rambo vacation, the argument for public good was found to be persuasive. She explained that it should be thought of as vacating not by property but by Street, i.e. the 4th Street vacation and, separately, the Tilden Street vacation. She explained that traditionally communities seek compensation for land they vacate, but Resolution 2006-10 specifically says that the Town shouldn't sell streets, only vacate them. Reis reminded the group that a Resolution is less binding than an Ordinance which has been turned into Code, but emphasized that in good faith they should follow the intent of the Resolution. Chairman Martin wondered if the Commission can recommend compensation; Reis explained they can, but the Board of Trustees would need to revisit the policy set in 2006 in order to follow that recommendation. Commissioner Jackson wondered if the Town Attorney's memo could be interpreted to mean that as the Town only has an 'interest' in the land and doesn't technically own it, the land can't be sold per se, and that is what is driving the language in the 2006 Resolution. Reis said that is not her understanding and reiterated that many vacations involve compensation; she will clarify the point with the Town Attorney.

In response to questions, Reis noted that vacations of right-of-way are not common. To have two in the past five years is surprising; normally when towns have an interest in land they don't readily relinquish it.

Ms. Williams asked what would happen if there were a cost associated with the vacation vis-à-vis the property owner on the other side of the street (Leonard Kottenstette). She wondered if there were a cost for the vacation, would Mr. Kottenstette also be required to pay it? Reis asserted that is normally the case, but reminded the group that per current policy that option is off the table.

Mr. Kottenstette raised the question of whether or not the vacations would create new buildable lots. He noted that while the current owners may not choose to build, the next ones might. He suggested that a deed restriction or something similar should be put in place to prevent future owners from building. Reis clarified that the vacations wouldn't create new separate buildable lots and that the vacated property would be added to the current lots. Commissioner Jackson said she didn't think putting restrictions on the property would be permitted. Reis pointed out that the Town could maintain the easement on the property and, as you can't build a permanent structure on an easement, potential building would be restricted in that manner.

Commissioner Larsen wondered if the current use of roadway easements is the only use for the properties. Do the properties have to be used as a road, or could the Town put in solar panels or build a shed or any number of other things? The group agreed that in this case the geography precludes most other uses, but agreed that it is an important question in general for potential future vacations of roadways and impacts the higher level policy. Staff agreed to clarify the point with the Town Attorney and have a clear answer prior to the item going before the BOT.

The Commission went through Resolution 2006-10 point by point, with a particular focus on points 2, 3, 4 and 8 as emphasized in the Staff memo. The Commission found #2 problematic, as there's not really a "substantial benefit to the public." Ms. Williams noted that the aesthetic enhancement portion of #3 is one of the applicants' primary arguments, as they take care of and maintain the properties. The Commission found no direct benefits amongst the many listed in #3, and found no other indirect benefits other than the aesthetic enhancement piece. Chairman Martin noted that vacating the land could be considered a 'direct taking' of open space, as the land shifts from public to private property. Commissioner Larsen made the argument that vacating the land could possibly protect it better, as it eliminates the possibility that a future Town government could again use it as a road. Chairman Martin countered that future private property owners pose an equal threat of building on the property.

The Commission classified #4 as a 'sticking point', noting that significant benefit goes to the individual property owners. Chairman Martin wondered if any compelling benefits to the Town

exist or if there are any reasons for the Town to want to get rid of the properties. Mr. Pelkey noted that the high and fast stream poses a danger to children and is a potential liability to the Town. Reis pointed out that if an incident occurred, the Town would likely be protected by governmental immunity and the Town would not be liable. Ms. Pelkey noted that there are a number of trees on the property; were the trees to become beetle-infested, the Pelkeys would bear the burden of the tree removal instead of the Town. Reis said that could be a condition of the vacation.

Chairman Martin raised the question of what precedents are being set in the case of vacation. Commissioner Osterloo said her biggest concern is setting a precedent that could lead to the Town giving away significant amounts of property. Commissioner Jackson said she would love to sell the property to the applicants, but unfortunately policy prevents that from happening. As is, she doesn't think the application meets the criteria for vacation. She would strongly recommend that the Board of Trustees consider a change of policy to allow the receipt of financial compensation. Chairman Martin pointed out that #10 does allow for some form of compensation to come to the Town, albeit not direct financial compensation.

Ms. Williams pointed out that if the vacation isn't granted, she would argue that it is the Town's responsibility to maintain the space, including plowing and pruning. Reis noted that the road would be at the bottom of the plowing list, behind emergency and school routes.

Ms. Williams also made the point that the total property tax increase would be more than the \$12 that would go to the Town annually, including moneys going to the school district and other places that could be considered 'public benefits.' Staff will ask the Town Treasurer to calculate the total increases for all categories before the item goes to the Board of Trustees.

The Commission went around the table for final thoughts. Chairman Martin acknowledged that one could make the argument that the vacation is convenient and would keep the properties clean, but he doesn't find it a compelling argument and he doesn't believe the proposal meets the conditions of the 2006 Resolution. Commissioner Osterloo agreed that the proposal doesn't meet the 2006 guidelines, but she isn't against the concept of vacations overall and thought the Board would do well to look at the policy more closely. She doesn't

find the 'increased taxes' argument to be a significant enough 'public benefit' to be persuasive. Commissioner Larsen noted that it would take around 15 years to 'break even' with the valuations vis-à-vis the increase in property taxes. He is in favor of the proposal; while acknowledging that the benefit to the Town is slight, he thinks that would be more benefit than the Town gets now. Trustee Mueller is in favor of public ownership of land and thinks that is only way to preserve said land. He doesn't believe that this situation meets the burden of the 2006 policy statements. Commissioner Jackson said she is concerned about the Town receiving a deluge of vacation requests if the land is vacated for free and again emphasized that she'd like the Board to revisit the option of receiving compensation for vacations, particularly in the current economic times. Commissioner Larsen reiterated the importance of the question of what, if anything, can be done with the land other than using it as a road. Trustee Mueller asserted that the Town can always designate it as an area to be preserved and argued that would be the highest and best use.

The motion to recommend denial of both applications to the Board of Trustees was made by Commissioner Jackson, seconded by Commissioner Osterloo and approved 3-1, with Chairman Martin and Commissioners Jackson and Osterloo in favor and Commissioner Larsen against.

The Commission made an additional recommendation for the Board of Trustees to revisit point #8 in Resolution 2006-10 and consider changing the policy to allow the Town to receive financial compensation for vacations.

5) Discussion Items

a. Nederland Comprehensive Plan Update

Reis took the Commission through a packet of materials she'd prepared in anticipation of the upcoming RFQ going out to consulting firms. The packet included a draft RFQ, sample RFQs from other towns, and a number of articles discussing important considerations when going through this process and selecting a consultant. She explained that the RFQ can be released to a wide vendor list in November after the budget is finalized. Then the targeted RFP can go to a narrower group who rank the highest of the RFQ respondents.

Staff will email the electronic version of the draft to the group. Commissioners should send comments and edits back to Staff, who will generate a draft to approve at the September meeting.

6) Other Business

Edwards reminded the group that Boulder County recently announced the commencement of their Comprehensive Plan update. They are holding a number of community meetings throughout the County, with the one in Nederland happening the following Wednesday night. She encouraged the Commission to attend the meeting and relayed that the County Planner with whom she spoke was very enthusiastic about the ways in which the two plans and processes could overlap and support each other. Reis noted that the overlap is particularly important vis-à-vis the three-mile 'zone of influence' around the Town.

Trustee Mueller updated the group on the recent Board of Trustees' workshop regarding Phase 2 of the sidewalk project, held so as to give the BOT more information as to whether or not to move forward with the project and accept the funding from CDOT. He noted that many of the details have not yet been fleshed out. Reis noted that she recommended design reviews at the 30%, 50% and 90% completion points, as was the process with the wastewater plant. She emphasized that it is not yet decided whether or not the project will move forward; the BOT will be hearing further public discussion on the matter at an upcoming meeting.

Reis noted that Safe Routes to School put out a call for grants, which the Town is looking to possibly use to complete the trail connection and make the highway crossings by the Community Center and at the library. The grant application is due in December; if the funds are obtained and used for that purpose, it would effectively complete the missing pieces in the trail system.

Reis reiterated the need for the Commission to adopt a set of bylaws and the need to elect a Vice Chair as well as a Chair for the Commission.

Chairman Martin reminded the group that he has a conflict and will miss the next meeting. Commissioner Larsen volunteered to lead the meeting in his absence.

7) Adjournment

The motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Larsen, seconded by Commissioner Jackson and unanimously approved at 8:41 pm.

Approved by the Planning Commission,

Bill Martin, Chair, Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Kristen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk



AGENDA INFORMATION MEMORANDUM TOWN OF NEDERLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Date: September 28, 2011

Initiated By: /s/Alisha Reis

Dept: Zoning

Action X Discussion

AGENDA ITEM:

Consideration of change to Nederland Municipal Code Section 16-210 requiring paving of parking lots of 20+ spaces

SUMMARY:

Applicant Ron Mitchell (NCBDR, LLC) is requesting a variance from N.M.C. Sec. 16-210: "Parking lots containing more than twenty (20) spaces shall be paved."

The applicant applied for a building permit on May 31, 2011, in conjunction with the property's change of use from the Artist's Niche to the Thai Restaurant. The parking requirements for the proposed restaurant necessitated 25 parking spots on site; the plan submitted included 29 spots. On June 10, 2011, as part of the planning and zoning review of the plans, the applicant was notified that per the current code the parking lot would need to be paved. Staff recognized at the time that the paving requirement might not align with the perspective of the current Town leadership, and discussed the option of seeking a variance with the applicant. It was agreed that a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) would be issued to allow the restaurant to open while the applicant pursued the parking variance, but a full CO would be held until the resolution of the issue.

Staff's thoughts on how to approach the issue are to have the item first be heard by the Planning Commission and the BOT. These groups can consider a potential change to the code such that 20+ space lots are not automatically required to be paved, but instead undergo a special review to determine on a case-by-case basis whether or not paving is desired. If the BOT decides to make that (or a similar) code change, they can rule in that context whether or not paving is appropriate for this specific site. If the BOT decides not to change the code, the applicant must go before the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA) to request a variance.

Staff received the variance application on September 2nd and deemed it complete. Notices of the public hearing were posted around Town and on-site, as well as mailed to property owners within a 300-foot radius.

The Fire Department and Police Department reviewed the application and had no concerns from their respective points of view.

Public Works supports waiving the paving requirement if the alternative includes a high-quality permeable surface lot supported by a properly executed drainage plan that is well-maintained on an ongoing basis. They have significant concerns that a poorly engineered and/or badly maintained surface would result in road base erosion during times of heavy runoff, clogging lower-lying culverts and drains. They would require a site engineer to assess the grading and drainage dynamics and generate a Town-approved drainage plan. See the attached Public Works Site Review for their full assessment.

The Sustainability Advisory Board (SAB) was not able to reach all members so was unable to issue a formal group statement, but the sentiment of those who weighed in was support for the variance on the grounds that “when it comes to pavement and sustainability, less is more.” They indicated that asphalt is not environmentally friendly, and not paving the lot keeps Nederland’s surfaces more natural and historic.

The Downtown Development Authority (DDA) did not have enough time to generate an official response as a group, but the sentiments of one member follow:

“This is a tough one. I think the lot should conform to the rules and be paved by the property owner. How the property owner works that out with the renter is their business. However, the cost of paving may be too much for the restaurant to afford and thus it goes out of business. Paved lots are much easier to maintain and are more attractive to potential customers. However, if the property owner doesn't maintain the paved lot, (think shopping center), that is just as bad as having a dirt lot. My input would be to grant the variance with the stipulation that the lot will eventually be paved at some point in the future on a date agreed upon by the Town and the property owner. Can the Town require that the lot be paved if the property is ever sold to a new owner?”

Per ADA requirements, the handicapped-accessible spaces on the lot are required to be paved regardless of the surfacing of the rest of the lot.

ALTERNATIVES:

- 1) Recommend a change in policy to the BOT such that 20+ space parking lots go through a review to determine the appropriateness of paving
- 2) Recommend an alternative change in policy to the BOT
- 3) Recommend no change of policy to the BOT and that the applicant pursue a variance to the current code

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Parking variance application
- 2) N.M.C. Section 16-210
- 3) Public Works' site review



Application for Parking Variance Board of Trustees

Town of Nederland
45 W. 1st Street, PO Box 396, Nederland CO 80466

Name: Nederland Central Business District Redevelopment, LLC

Address: PO Box 1705 Boulder, Colorado 80306-1705

Phone: (Home) 303-618-9431 (Work) 303-618-9431

Email ronaldamitchell@mail.com Date of Application: _____

Address and location of property: 155 Highway 119 East, Nederland CO 80466

Block 6 Lots 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 Subdivision WOHLCKES Zoning CBD

If applicant has applied for a building permit, please complete the following section:

Date of building permit application: _____

Date building permit denied: _____

Reason for denial of permit: _____

In addition to completing the form above, applicants must submit the following:

- A statement explaining the situation and the reason for the variance request.
 - o Can be in the form of a letter addressed to the Board of Trustees
- A set of mailing labels of all property owners and addresses within 300 feet of the boundaries of the property in question. This can be obtained
 - o from the Boulder County Assessor's Office (303) 441-3530 for a fee; or
 - o using the 'buffer' tool on the e-mapping section of the Assessor's website: <http://maps.bouldercounty.org/boco/emapping/>
 - This tool will generate a list of the required properties, which can be exported into a CSV file & printed onto mailing labels
- A plat map or survey of the property in question
- Check or cash for non-refundable \$500 variance application fee

Upon receipt of a completed application, the Zoning Administrator will schedule a review of the application with the Planning Commission. The application, including the Planning

Commission's recommendation, will then go to the Board of Trustees for a public hearing and final decision. 15 days prior to the hearing, the applicant is responsible for posting a sign/signs on the property in question announcing the hearing. There must be one sign facing each public street adjacent to the property, and signs must be large enough to be read by a person in a passing vehicle.

Please see Chapter 16 Article VIII of the Nederland Municipal Code (Section 16-200 through 16-211) for the Town's requirements regarding off-street parking.

If you have questions regarding this application or the subsequent process, please contact Deputy Town Clerk Kristen Edwards at (303) 258-3266 x22 or kristene@nederlandco.org

For Use by Zoning Administrator

	Yes	No
<u>Included with application</u>		
Statement:	_____	_____
Mailing labels for adjacent properties:	_____	_____
Plat or survey of property in question:	_____	_____
Application fee:	_____	_____

Date complete application received: _____

Date of Planning Commission review: _____

Public notice deadline: _____

Date letters sent to adjacent property owners: _____

Date of Board of Trustees hearing: _____

Board of Trustees decision: Approved _____ Disapproved _____

Reason for decision: _____

Date certificate issued by Zoning Administrator: _____

Signed:

Zoning Administrator

Mayor, Town of Nederland

Nederland Central Business District Redevelopment, LLC

PO Box 1705

Boulder CO 80306-1705

September 2, 2011

Board of Trustees,
Town of Nederland,
Nederland CO 80466

Dear Trustees:

This letter is in application for a variance to not pave the parking area for the new Thai Restaurant at 155 Highway 119 East, Nederland CO 80466.

The owner/operators of this new business did not really understand the immense cost of to open this business. Over \$100,000 has been spent on repairs, equipment, inventory and other startup costs. The cost to prepare properly drain and pave the area would be around another \$60,000. They are under severe financial strain to make a go of the enterprise.

The environmental impact of such a paving job would be such that a substantial amount of water would not be allowed to permeate the soil and could contribute, in a small way, but significant enough, to increased floor risk and possibly other environmental imbalance and upset.

In the event this request is granted, the business and property owner pledge to adequately maintain a permeable surface of crushed rock and grading as is necessary for normal parking, traffic, and dust control.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ronald A. Mitchell".

Ronald A. Mitchell, Mgr.

- (3) Access to streets and property to be served;
- (4) Grading, drainage, surfacing and subgrading details; and
- (5) Other pertinent details. (Ord. 209 Art. VII §10, 1981)



Sec. 16-210. Design standards.

Parking lots containing more than twenty (20) spaces shall be paved. Adequate drainage facilities shall be provided. Curb or wheel stops shall be provided. (Ord. 209 Art. VII §11, 1981)

Sec. 16-211. Payments to Commercial Parking Fund.

In lieu of meeting the minimum off-street parking requirements set forth in this Article, the owner of a use may agree to contribute to the Commercial Parking Fund by payment of two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500.00) for each off-street space not provided by the owner. In the event that the building existed at the location on March 5, 1996, the owner shall be required to provide off-street parking for the new use in excess of the required spaces which have been required by the former use of the building. (Ord. 422 §8, 1996; Ord. 666 §3, 2008)

Secs. 16-212—16-230. Reserved.

ARTICLE IX

Board of Zoning Adjustment

Sec. 16-231. Organization.

(a) There is hereby created a Board of Zoning Adjustment, to be known as "The Board of Zoning Adjustment of the Town of Nederland, Colorado," hereinafter referred to in this Article as "Board."

(b) The membership of the Board of Zoning Adjustment shall consist of five (5) qualified electors of the Town. Any or all of said members may be members of the Planning Commission. The terms of office shall be for five (5) years, with terms to expire on June 1. To initiate staggered terms, the two (2) terms of the Board which expire June 1, 1995, shall be filled for four- and five-year terms respectively. Two (2) of the terms to expire June 1, 1996, shall be extended to June 1997 and June 1998, respectively. All terms thereafter shall be five-year terms. It is the intent of the Board of Trustees to encourage diversity of participation on the Board of Zoning Adjustment by avoiding overlapping of membership between the Board of Zoning Adjustment and other boards and commissions of the Town.

(c) The concurring vote of four (4) members of the Board of Zoning Adjustment shall be necessary to reverse any order, requirement, decision or determination of any such administrative official, or to decide in favor of the applicant any matter upon which it is required to pass under this Chapter, or to affect any variation in this Chapter. Every decision of such Board shall be subject, however, to review by certiorari by the District Court. Such appeal may be taken by any person aggrieved or by an officer, department, board or bureau of the Town. (Ord. 209 Art. VIII §1, 1981; Ord. 299 §3, 1988; Ord. 386 §1, 1994; Ord. 406 §1, 1995; Ord. 645 §28, 2008)

SITE REVIEW

Thai Restaurant Property – Hwy 119 & Second Street
9-15-11 Site Visit – Mark Weritz, Nederland Public Works
Additional comments, Public Works Manager Jason Morrison

Observations:

Most of property is unpaved, gravel covered, with slightly higher elevated areas along west and south sides. Majority of site is flat with little change in grade, except for north side, which slopes gently to the north toward a shallow ditch that flows with local drainage toward the east. The front concrete patio occasionally floods from runoff spillage from surrounding areas. Concrete patio surfaces were observed to be heavily spalled and partly covered with fine sediment. The majority of the subject property appears to be unaffected from runoff from surrounding properties. The concrete sidewalk on the north side of property obstructs effective site drainage to north side ditch. Building Finished Floor elevation lies below portions of property, especially those on south and west sides.

Recommendations:

Regrade property in order to keep surface drainage away from building and to improve site and local drainage. Curbs or berms may be required to keep runoff out of patio area. Regrading will require construction of new ditches or below-grade drains with surface inlets. Dry wells or infiltration trenches/ditches should be considered to reduce offsite runoff of low- to medium-intensity storms. Effects to or from adjoining properties should be considered for improved local drainage of the town block. Salvage surface gravel for reuse after major grading is completed.

Roof drainage can be captured by gutters and downspouts and routed into infiltration trenches. Controlled roof drainage and infiltration systems would require some kind of site maintenance plan, but would provide a “greener” way of managing stormwater drainage.

Parking area south of building appears to be most favorable site for paved ADA parking, as some paving of handicapped-accessible parking and an area adjacent the building would be required. Concrete paving is structurally better than asphalt, but asphalt is OK too. Could the proposed handicapped-accessible parking be used for multiple sites within the downtown area?

The existing north side sidewalk may need to be demolished or have drainage work placed adjacent and beneath it to facilitate effective site drainage to north side ditch.

We strongly recommend that a comprehensive topographic survey be conducted on the subject property, as well as pertinent surrounding properties, so that an effective grading plan can be developed. The topo survey of the Community Center done by Flagstaff Surveying, Inc., dated May 24, 2005 is a good example of the level of survey detail

recommended for the Thai Restaurant site. A site engineer (one who is familiar with “mountain downtown” development) could then develop an appropriate site grading plan for the project, as well as for the existing stormwater management of the local area. Again, we encourage the use of infiltration trenches or ditches to dispose stormwater wherever possible, as well as other stormwater control methods that may be recommended by the site engineer.

As the downtown area is underlain with alpine valley alluvial deposits, the subject site would likely be suitable for infiltration systems. Suitability may need to be determined through a subsurface investigation (test borings, test pits, infiltration testing, etc.) as determined by the site engineer.

As the project site is a prominent one in Town and any improvements to the stormwater management of the downtown area would be most welcome and needed, it is strongly recommended that the Town carefully review the project’s planning and development.

Concerns:

If the above recommendations are not followed, it will create significant additional work for the Public Works Department. A poorly-engineered and/or poorly-maintained parking lot will result in road base erosion that can clog lower-lying culverts and drains, as well as create issues with runoff for neighboring properties.



**AGENDA INFORMATION
MEMORANDUM
TOWN OF NEDERLAND
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Meeting Date: September 28, 2011

Prepared By: /s/ Alisha Reis

Dept: Administration

Action _____ Discussion _____

AGENDA ITEM:

Update of the 2003 Comprehensive Plan – Review of Draft RFQ

SUMMARY:

The next step in the process of selecting a consulting firm to work on the Comprehensive Plan update is to send a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to a wide range of firms. Administrator Reis circulated a draft RFQ to the Commission and has incorporated comments received. The Commission should review and finalize the RFQ such that it can be sent to prospective firms after Board of Trustees approval of the project in the 2012 Budget.

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Working draft RFQ with comments



REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

PROJECT: Town of Nederland Comprehensive Plan Update

NOTICE: DATE TO ISSUE

DEADLINE: DATE OF DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS

PROJECT CONTACT: Alisha Reis, Town Administrator, alishaj@nederlandco.org or (303) 258-3266

Summary: The Town of Nederland is seeking qualifications from professional planning firms to update the town's comprehensive plan, last updated in 2003, to include a thorough section on implementation and a summary guide on use of the document by the public and land owners/developers. The overall plan should incorporate sustainability in address all elements of land use and community growth, integrating the results of the recently completed Envision 2020 report, the ongoing update of the Town's parks/recreation master plan, as well as recognizing the limitations of infrastructure, natural resources, and community desires.

Comment [ar1]: Folks – this introduces a new element that I will need direction on from the full PC. Previously, there had been discussion but I don't know what the will of the PC was then. Thoughts?

Nederland's Comprehensive Plan update should result in a guiding document to help Nederland achieve a sustainable future based on the principals of the Natural Step Process.