

GRAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, February 12th, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sally Blea Will MacDonald
Ingrid Karlstrom Kim Shepton
Deborah Fitch Bob Gnuse
Marcus Davis Henry Broadhurst

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tara Fournet

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Davis Alex Taft
Taylor Schlueter Chris Leahy
Maxine LaBarre-Krostue Patty Kemper

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Marcus Davis at 6:38 PM. Roll call was taken.

Minutes from January 15th, 2020 were presented. Motion to approve was made by Ingrid Karlstrom, seconded by Sally Blea. All in favor "aye", none opposed, motion carried.

Chairperson Marcus Davis gave a reminder to Public Attendees to come to the microphone and identify themselves when making public comments. There was one (1) member of the Public in attendance.

Lots 34 & 47, Grand View Park – Amended Final Plat

Presented by: Alexander Taft, Planner, LEED Green Associate

CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission, February 12, 2020; Board of County Commissioners TBD, 2020

PROJECT NAME : Amended Final Plat, Lots 34, and 35, Amended Final Plat Grand View Park

APPLICANT : Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene

LOCATION : Lots 34, and 35, Grand View Park, 366 GCR 4571 & 390 GCR 4571
ZONING : Mobile Home District (M)

APPLICABLE

REGULATIONS : Grand County Zoning Regulations, Grand County Master Plan, Grand County Subdivision Regulations

ATTACHMENTS :

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Letter of Application and Narrative
- C. Proposed Plat
- D. Title Commitments
- E. Site Photos

STAFF PLANNER : Alexander Taft, LEED Green Associate

REQUEST : The Applicant is requesting an Amended Final Plat to remove a property line to create a conforming lot and gain additional buildable area.

I. BACKGROUND

Grand View Park was originally approved and platted in 1923 recorded at Reception No. 28445. The lots originally created in 1923 were approximately 40' x 100' or 4,000 ft². The developers who purchased the property in 1996 and completed the subdivision in 1997 created lots in the range of 10,000ft² (.25 acres). The lots in the subdivision are serviced by well and public sewer. The service was extended by the developers in 1997. This subdivision borders US Highway 34 to the west.

II. PROPOSAL:

Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene are the owners of Lot 34 and 35 by Warranty Deed at Reception No. 2019007560 and 2017006376. The Applicants propose to combine the two lots and to allow a larger buildable area and create separation between their property and neighbors.

Lot 34 currently contains a dwelling and the Applicant intends to begin construction of a garage in spring or early summer of 2020.

III. STAFF COMMENTS AND ANALYSIS

This Amended Final Plat involves a lot combination of Lot 34 and Lot 35 resulting in one conforming lot. The property owner also owns Lot 47 southwest of this proposal, but has no plans for it currently.

The lots subject in this proposal are residential use and is surrounded by residential uses. The zone district throughout Grand View Park is Mobile Home District which allows individual mobile homes. It appears that the homes within the subdivision are all site build timber frame construction.

The lots as they exist today are pre-existing and non-conforming. They were a vast improvement over the lots created by the original plat. Both lots are served by public sewer via Three Lakes Water and Sanitation District. Access to utilities is either in the adjacent roadway or overhead. The amended plat will benefit both lots by creating a larger area where structures could be built without causing encroachment into the setbacks.

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH GRAND COUNTY REGULATIONS

A. MASTER PLAN

The Grand County Master Plan contains seven (7) Plan Elements that form the core of the Master Plan. The Plan Elements include policies and implementation actions, of which one (1) are relevant to this proposal.

Plan Element 4 - Community and Public Facilities

As stated in Plan Element 4 in the Grand County Master Plan, development shall be located near public facility infrastructure. This increases efficiency and benefits existing users by reducing the impacts on outside resources. The parcels in this proposal are surrounded by existing electric, gas, and telecommunication utilities that make development less impactful.

B. ZONING REGULATIONS

The parcels involved in this proposal lie within the Mobile Home District, existing inside the Grand Lake "Joint Review" Area. The site is surrounded by vacant land or residential uses.

- (a) The owners of these lots will construct a ~~single family dwelling~~ garage, consistent with uses by right in this District.
- (b) This District requires 30' minimum front yard setbacks, 5' minimum side yard setbacks and 20' minimum rear yard setbacks.
- (c) The minimum lot size in the Mobile Home Zoning District is 15,000 ft² (0.34 acres) when serviced by either public water or public sewage facilities. All lots comply with this minimum as proposed.
- (d) Any new construction shall comply with Section 14.4 Off-street Parking.

C. CRS 43-2-303 et al - Vacation Proceeding: Roads, Streets and Highways Compliance with C.R.S. 42-2-303

Grand County has used the criteria in CRS 43-2-303, regarding vacation of roadways to review vacation of utility easements:

43-2-303 (1) All right, title, or interest of a county, of an incorporated town or city or of the state or of any of its political subdivisions in and to any roadway shall be divested upon vacation of such roadway by any of the following methods:

(1)(b) The board of county commissioners of any county may vacate any roadway or any part thereof located entirely within said county if such roadway is not within the limits of any city or town.

(2) No roadway of part thereof shall be vacated so as to leave any land adjoining said roadway without an established public road connecting said land with another established public road.

(3) In the event of vacation under subsection 1 of this section, rights-of-way or easements may be reserved for the continued use of existing sewer, gas, water or similar pipelines and appurtenances for ditches or canals and appurtenances and for electric, telephone, and similar lines and appurtenances.

The vacation of the interior lot line easements created by the plat will not eliminate access for adjacent property owners. The intention of this vacation is to better connect the lots to optimize the buildable area.

D. SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS - 4.3 Final Plat/4.4 Amended Final Plat

The application shall comply with the Subdivision Regulations Amended Final Plat -Section 4.3. Conditions are listed in **BOLD**. Staff notes how the proposed Plat addresses each of the following below:

Section 4.3 (1) (a-c) this application meets the statement of requirements of the Preliminary Plat. The minimum scale complies as it is at a one inch (1") equals forty feet (40') scale on a twenty-four inch (24") by thirty-six inch (36") sheet.

Section 4.3 (2) (a) Title shall read:

2nd Amended Final Plat
Amended Lot 34A Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park
Being a Replat of Lots 34 and 35, Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park according to
the Plat Recorded at Reception 97005037
Part of SW 1/4 NW 1/4 Section 24, Township 3 North, Range 76 West of the 6th P.M.
Conveyance to the owner s Recorded at Reception No. 201 4004579 and 2017004109

A scale of one inch (1") equals twenty feet (20'), date of creation and north arrow are all located on this proposed Plat.

Section 4.3 (2) (b) Legal Description is as follows:

Amended Lot 34A, 2nd Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park

Section 4.3 (2) (c-d) this proposed plat shall include **primary control points, rights-of-way lines of streets, and easements and widths of rights-of-way, and adjacent property lines . Right of way lines for the full width of GCR 4571.**

Section 4.3 (2) (e-f) Boundaries, Right-of Way lines, easements are all shown on the plat and dimensions, bearings, and curves are identified on line and curve tables. Rights-of-Way show names and number. **Pre-existing recorded easements with reference to their location of recording within the Grand County Real Estate records of the Grand County Clerk and Recorders Office.**

Section 4.3 (2) (g- i) **Location and description of monuments shall be included with a legend on the proposed Plat.** Lots include acreage to the nearest 1/100th. All lots are intended to remain residential use.

Section 4.3 (2) (j) a copy of the cover page to a previous title commitment was included in the submittal, **an updated title commitment shall be submitted prior to the Board of County Commissioners review .**

Section 4.3 (2) (k-m) corrections shown below are needed for the Dedication placed on the Plat. **The County Attorney 's Office shall review the Dedication. The Planning Comission (l) and Commissioner (m) certificates need to be added or corrected.**

DEDICATION

KNOWN ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene are the owners of that real property situated in Grand County, Colorado, more fully described as follows: **Lots 34 and 35, Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park , according to the plat recorded June 23, 1997 at Reception No . 97005037** ; that they have caused said real property to be laid out and surveyed as, **Amended Final Plat, Amended Lots 3 4A 2nd Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park** and does hereby dedicate and set apart all the streets, alleys and other public ways and places shown on the accompanying plat for the use of the public forever, and does hereby dedicate those portions of said real property which are indicated as easements on the accompanying plat as easements.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene , have caused their name to be hereunto subscribed this _____ day of _____, 20__.

Mitchell D. Greene

Margaret A. Greene

STATE OF COLORADO)
 ss
 COUNTY OF GRAND)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this __ day of _____, 20__ by **Mitchell D. and Margaret A. Greene** .

My Commission Expires:

Notary Public

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I, Warren Ward, a duly licensed land surveyor in the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that this **Amended Final Plat, Amended Lots 3 4A 2nd Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park** truly and correctly represents the results of a survey made by me or under my direction, and that said plat complies with the requirements of Title 38, Article 51, Colorado Revised Statutes, 1973, and that the

monuments required by said Statute and by the Grand County Subdivision Regulations have been placed on the ground.

(Surveyor's Signature)

(Surveyor's stamp and registration number shall appear with this certificate)

PLANNING COMMISSION CERTIFICATE

Approved this ___ day of _____, 20__ by the Grand County Planning Commission, Grand County, Colorado.

Chairman

COMMISSIONER'S CERTIFICATE

Approved and all public dedications accepted this ___ day of _____, 20__ by the Board of County Commissioners of Grand County, Colorado. Acceptance of this platted subdivision by the County of Grand does not constitute an acceptance of the roads and rights-of-way reflected hereon for maintenance by said County. Until such roads and rights-of-way meet County specifications and are specifically accepted for maintenance by Resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Grand County, the maintenance, construction, and all other matters pertaining to or affecting said roads and rights-of-way are the sole responsibility of the owners of the land embraced within the subdivision. This approval does not guarantee that the size or soil conditions of any lot shown herein are such that a Building Permit may be issued.

Chairman
Board of County Commissioners
Grand County, Colorado

Section 4.3 (2) (n) certification by a qualified professional insuring compliance with the design standards is not applicable.

Section 4.3 (2) (o) a two and one-half by three inch (2 ½" x 3") vertical box in the lower right-hand corner shall be provided for use by the County Clerk and Recorder .

Section 4.3 (2) (p) this application complies, covenants are not subject to change because of this proposed Amended Final Plat.

Section 4.3 (2) (q-r) vicinity map has been supplied and shall remain on the proposed Plat. The proposed Plat complies with provisions of (r) any new construction shall follow established criteria for stormwater drainage within each lot.

Section 4.3 (2) (s-u) these provisions are not applicable. No land areas are being dedicated with this Amended Final Plat. No additional studies are being submitted or required to meet engineering requirements. Colorado Land Use Commission no longer exists.

Section 4.3 (2) (w) addresses shall be shown on the Amended Final Plat and a digital copy will be supplied to the Grand County GIS Coordinator. Amended Lot 34A, 390 GCR 4571 (Trail Ridge Dr).

Section 4.3 (2) (x) Statement of taxes due showing current taxes paid for 2018 have been supplied, all taxes due and payable shall be paid prior to recording the Final Plat.

Section 4.3 (2) (y) An electronic copy of the Final Plat in AutoCAD.dwg or AutoCAD.dxf format shall be provided prior to any recording of any Final Plat.

V. PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission review of this application scheduled February 12, 2020.

VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the approval of the 2nd Amended Final Plat, Amended Lots 34A, Amended Final Plat of Grand View Park and vacation of interior lot line easements with the following conditions to be met prior to the recording of the Plat:

1. The title shall be amended to include conveyance to owners with location of Recording and a date of creation (4.3 (2) (a)).
2. This proposed plat shall include primary control points, rights-of-way lines of streets, and easements and widths of rights-of-way, and adjacent property lines. Right of way lines for the full width of GCR 4571 (4.3 (2) (d)).
3. Names of rights of way shall be corrected and total widths shall be shown (4.3 (2) (e)).
4. Pre-existing recorded easements with reference to their location of recording within the Grand County Real Estate records of the Grand County Clerk and Recorders Office (4.3 (2) (f)).

5. Location and description of monuments shall be included with a legend on the proposed plat (4.3 (2) (i)).
6. Corrections to the dedication statement shown on the plat to be reviewed by the County Attorney's Office prior to recording the Plat Mylar (4.3 (2) (k)).
7. Corrections to the surveyors certificate shown on the plat prior to recording the Plat Mylar (4.3 (2) (l)).
8. Planning Commission and Commissioners certificate shall be correctly shown on the plat prior to recording the Plat Mylar (4.3 (2) (m)).
9. A statement of taxes that shows all taxes due and payable shall be paid prior to recording the plat. (4.3 (2) (x)).
10. An electronic copy in AutoCAD.dwg or AutoCAD.dxf of the Final Plat shall be submitted (4.3 (2) (y)).
11. All recording fees are to be paid by the Applicant.
- 12.

Chairman Marcus Davis noted, Deborah Fitch, Commissioners needed to step out, however we still have a quorum.

Commissioners asked if the subject lots were non-conforming lots to begin with. Then it has been sub-divided and replatted but still non-conforming lots? Would think that the County would develop something that says, whenever something is replatted it has to conform.

Staff replied that, the report at the time stated it was increasing the conformity but not to the full extent needed. Staff agreed and is pushing for the replatting to make the property conform.

Commissioners stated the Certificate states the owners would like to construct a Single Family Home, but stated tonight the owners are building a garage.

Staff replied that is was a mistake, the applicant is wanting to build a garage.

Commissioners stated when we replat original subdivisions, the goal is to decrease non-conformity where we can, but the lots are already drawn. We cannot bring the entire subdivision up to conformity, though we try to make adjustments reasonable with the existing houses and infrastructure that is in place. We are not allowed to increase non-conformity. We have had discussion about accessory buildings without a primary structure on a lot. We are wanting to combine the lots so a garage can be added. Are we doing that because by putting up the garage there will not be room for a primary structure ever?

Staff replied the applicant's proposal was to build a garage where it encroaches over the property line.

Commissioners added, so not necessarily separate on Lot 34A. Where the garage is to be placed will be over the lot line. The applicant realizes this lot cannot be sold separately and moving a lot line would increase non-conformity on one lot and decrease non-conformity on the other lot. By removing the lot line, it is the best of both worlds. The applicant still owns

Lot 47.

Additional recommendation added, A title commitment dated within 6 months shall be provided prior to Board of County Commissioners Meeting (4.3) (2) (j).

Motion to recommend approval by Kim Shepton for Lots 34 & 35, Grand View Park – Amended Final Plat with 11 conditions as presented plus 1. Seconded by Will MacDonald, No Discussion. All in favor "aye", none opposed.

Headwater Trails Alliance – Master Plan

Presented by: Alexander Taft, Planner, LEED Green Associate

CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission February 12, 2020; Board of County Commissioners T.B.D.

PROJECT NAME: Headwaters Trails Alliance (HTA) Master Plan

APPLICANT: Grand County Community Development

LOCATION: Unincorporated Grand County

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: Grand County Master Plan, 30-28-106 C.R.S.

EXHIBITS: Headwaters Trails Alliance Strategic Trails Plan

STAFF PLANNER: Community Development Staff

REQUEST: Community Development is introducing a plan to be ultimately incorporated to the Grand County Master Plan

I. DISCUSSION

Staff is frequently in the process of analyzing our guiding documents from regulations to adopted plans. Recently Headwaters Trails Alliance (HTA) updated their Master Plan beginning in 2015 and adopted in May 2019. Internally, staff has discussed making the completed HTA Master Plan part of the Grand County Master Plan since HTA is referenced many times and an old plan was incorporated by reference. The HTA Master Plan analyzes critical components of trails and network which over time will need work. The plan itself identifies approximately \$6 Million dollars' worth of construction and maintenance over the next ten (10) years.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

Headwaters Trails Alliance (HTA) is a 501(c)3 not-for-profit organization registered in Grand County, Colorado. The organization was formed in 1996 following the development of the Headwaters Master Trails Plan, with the charge of administering that Plan.

HTA moved forward with a geographic regional approach to defining specific priorities and goals, splitting the county into the Winter Park-Fraser, Granby-Grand Lake, and Kremmling-Hot Sulphur Springs Sub-Areas.

The first portion of this plan presents a countywide overview of trails and related facilities, other plans, opportunities/constraints, and demographics that have bearing on the overall plan, the mission, goals, and objectives of Headwaters Trails Alliance.

The second portion of this plan is the Strategic Trails Plan for the three aforementioned sub-areas. Through significant stakeholder outreach and internal deliberation, HTA's Trail Planning Subcommittee distilled four overarching goals for improving the trail system, including:

- Goal 1: Improve the interconnectivity between federal lands and municipal/residential centers throughout Grand County.
- Goal 2: Provide enhanced outreach/education to trail users, residents, and visitors.
- Goal 3: Redevelop the area trails into a diverse, four-season system that provides high-quality experiences while minimizing conflicts.
- Goal 4: Enhance the community focus of the trail system to provide quality of life and potential economic activity improvements throughout the area.

The HTA Plan incorporates a multitude of jurisdictions providing recreational amenities in Grand County including the US Forest Service trails/ trailheads/campgrounds, Bureau of Land Management trails and facilities, National Park Service trails and facilities, multijurisdictional trails and other trails:

- The USFS incorporates 459 miles of non-motorized, motorized and wilderness trails, maintains more than 40 trailheads and maintains 430 designated campsites.
- The BLM manages more than 75 miles of motorized and non-motorized trails in Grand County.
- Rocky Mountain National Park provides approximately 100 miles of hiking and equestrian trail opportunities within Grand County.
- Multi-jurisdictional trails include paved, six-mile Fraser River Trail which begins just north of Winter Park Resort in Old Town Winter Park, a seventeen-mile Fraser to Granby Trail which begins at the Fraser Valley Sports Complex on County Road and the 80-mile Colorado Headwaters Scenic Byway which runs south on US 34 from Grand Lake, turning west on US 40 paralleling the Colorado River through Hot Sulphur Springs to Kremmling and continuing on a gravel route to the south end of Gore Canyon and to State Bridge.

a. **Grand County Master Plan**

The State of Colorado gives counties the authority to adopt a master plan through Planning Commission via 30-28-106 C.R.S. The goal of a master plan is to engage the public to guide decision making processes over an established length of time.

The most current version of the Grand County Master Plan makes reference to the following documents:

“The 1998 plan was a compilation of various portions of two previously accepted documents: 1997 Grand County Strategic Growth Plan and the Fraser Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (adopted 1979). Relevant portions of those two: documents, along with refinements that had been made by the Grand County Planning Commission and ‘Growth Area’ maps prepared by each community and the county, formed the basis for that plan. In addition the 208 Water Quality Standards, Grand County Headwaters Trails Master Plan, Fraser

Valley Master Road Plan, and the Specialized Transit Development Plan were adopted by reference as components of the Grand County Master Plan.”

We have interpreted this to mean that any future updates of the plans require an adoption that follows State Statute. We bring forward this plan as a ‘heads up’ for Planning Commission consideration and familiarity as we may reference this document in any future development proposal.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending that Planning Commission consider this document as development projects come forward. The intent is to insure consistency of the development projects with the recommendations of the HTA Master Plan.

At this time, Staff and the County Attorney are researching the appropriate process for amending the Master Plan to incorporate in the HTA Plan. Staff proposes to provide proper public notice and will bring this plan back for formal adoption by the Planning Commission. At this time no vote or motion is need to adopt.

Disclosure, Alexander Taft does sit on the Board for the Headwater Trails Alliance, (HTA). The County would like to support the trails and open space and utilize an Inter-Government Agreement, (IGA) with Fraser and Winter Park.

Commissioners ask for clarification regarding this presentation. Is the goal for a future vote or just informative so you know, where are we at on this presentation?

Staff replied it is informative for a future vote. We cannot make any changes to the Headwater Trails Alliance, (HTA) Master Plan in itself, but we would like to amend the Master Plan at some point in the future.

Commissioners stated it could be phrased as, the current version of x,y,z. The plan is looking at this as reformulating the Master Plan as well as for adoption of the Master Plan.

Staff replied correct.

Commissioners asked, what are some of the highlights of the Master Plan for HTA?

Staff replied from the County’s perspective, there is a lot of development in the Fraser Valley and the County wants to be able to connect to the trails to lessen vehicle trips and ecological impact. The goal is for sustainable and better quality of life, and enjoyment. The County likes the HTA plan, for example, if a large subdivision comes in and uses the HTA plan as a suggestion for connectivity for trails or open space, we would like to adopt the plan. The question is how do we amend the Master Plan? It has to be done by resolution of the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. The list of conditions identified in the Staff Certificate would be the same as a resolution. We are still working with the County Attorney to figure out how that might work. How do we actually amend the Master Plan which is almost 10 years old? We want to develop a scope of work for the Master Plan Update. There are similar efforts going on in the County such as Grand Places 2050. This was started with the US Forest Service because they have a very old Master Plan they are trying to update. Winter Park Ski Resort is involved, Town of Fraser, Grand County, Colorado Fish and Wildlife, and the Town of Winter Park among a few. Ultimately, we will have plans that focus on environmental sustainability while at the same time promoting trails. We have 600 miles of trails, we could say for example, as a Master Plan objective let’s double the amount of

trails in the County. We can look at what other communities are doing. This would create a good framework for us as we plan for sustainable development.

Commissioners stated that it is an interesting question on how do we utilize this Plan without having to update the Master Plan? When we look at our Zoning Regulations or Subdivision Regulations what is interesting is we look at all local, state and federal rules and regulations when we talk about compliance. Does it negate the use of an updated Master Plan for a reference document from Grand County's Master Plan or we can reference another source? The Master Plan calls out HTA, however, HTA has a new Master Plan and we would like to add that as a reference for arguments moving forward. Would encourage consideration that whatever is latest and greatest should be in the Master Plan. Do we have an Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) with HTA? They are also worried about parking for trails and who has to provide the space. They also thought we can add the HTA as a review agency, we can add to our list if needed to bring in when developing subdivisions or trails.

County Attorney stated the Master Plan is an advisory document, so if you are incorporating by reference another plan or document, it is not like when you decide to send it out for review it is more of a planning and guidance document. If we have a document that incorporates by reference the HTA Master Plan, what we would typically do is - ask if this was something that could be enforced by law as a rule or regulation then we might say as amended. We probably would not do that because we don't know what it is going to look like when it is amended, especially if someone else is amending it. Because it is an advisory document, i.e., the Master Plan, it does allow us to exercise some discretion because we are not using it has a regulatory document.

Fire Impact Fees – East Grand Fire District

Presented by: Robert Davis, Director Community Development

DRAFT IMPACT FEES

East Grand Fire Protection
District #4

February 12, 2020



193049-Final Reprint_East Grand Fire Impact Fee_12-20-2019

METHODOLOGY

- Buy in method
 - New development buys into an existing system of infrastructure and facilities paid for by previous residents/businesses/development
 - Impact fee program recoups these costs
 - Based on build out
- 1. Quantify existing land use
- 2. Quantify capital costs
 - Fleet replacement
 - Existing station facilities
 - South station
- 3. Allocate costs to land use
 - Forecast call volume
- 4. Allocate costs to existing and new development
 - Existing as percentage of buildout
 - Percent remaining
- 5. Calculate fee
 - Costs (by land use) divided by remaining development (by land use)

EXISTING LAND USE

Non-Residential Inventory	2018 Square Feet
Use	
Commercial - Condominium	150,365
Commercial - Lodging/Hotel	680,578
Commercial - Merchandising	236,512
Commercial - Mixed Use	337,155
Commercial - Office	43,209
Commercial - Recreation	84,634
Commercial - Special Purpose	265,176
Commercial - Warehouse/Storage	129,121
Non-Residential-Exempt	1,369,701
Industrial - Contracting/Service	2,901
Total	3,299,352

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DDN\93049-East Grand Fire Impact Fee\Impact Fee Model\93049-1

Residential Inventory	2018 Units
Residential Use	
Residential - Single Family	3,300
Residential - Duplex-Triplex	182
Residential - Condominiums	3,300
Residential - Multiple Units 4-8 Units	44
Residential - Multiple Units 9 or more Units	155
Residential - Manufactured Homes	92
Residential - Farm or Ranch Residence	77
Total	7,298

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DDN\93049-East Grand Fire Impact Fee\Impact Fee Model\93049-1 Impact Fee C

Economic & Planning Systems

Draft Impact Fees | 3

BUILDOUT ESTIMATE

- Interviews with
 - Town of Fraser
 - Town of Winter Park
 - Grand County
- GIS Parcel analysis

Description	2018	Buildout	New Development	
			Units	% Increase
Residential (DU)	7,298	20,744	13,446	184%
Non-Residential (Sq. Ft.)	3,299,352	4,671,399	1,372,047	42%

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DDN\93049-East Grand Fire Impact Fee\Impact Fee Model\93049 Impact Fee Calculation\Buildout.xlsx\Buildout Gr

Estimated Increase at Buildout	Residential DU	Non-Residential Sq. Ft.
Fraser	3,993	655,237
Winter Park	6,182	122,411
Unincorporated Grand County	3,271	594,389
Total	13,446	1,372,047

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DDN\93049-East Grand Fire Impact Fee\Impact Fee Model\93049 Impact Fee C

- Buildout cost allocation
 - 65% of residential will be new
 - 29% of non-residential will be new

Description	2018	Buildout	New Development	
			Units	% of Total
Residential (DU)	7,298	20,744	13,446	65%
Non-Residential (Sq. Ft.)	3,299,352	4,671,399	1,372,047	29%

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
Z:\Shared\Projects\DDN\93049-East Grand Fire Impact Fee\Impact Fee Model\93049 Impact Fee Calculation\Buildout.xlsx

Economic & Planning Systems

Draft Impact Fees | 4

IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Description	Factor	Amount
Capital Asset Inventory		
Engines and Vehicles		\$5,388,300
Existing HQ and Red Dirt Hill Stations		\$6,043,704
South Station Construction		\$3,000,000
Total Value		\$14,432,004
Cost Allocated by Land Use Type		
	Future Calls	
Residential	91%	\$13,113,611
Non-Residential	9%	\$1,318,393
		\$14,432,004

← See Table 9

IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Buildout Call Forecast

There was an average of 319 incident responses over the past five years. This equates to 0.0302 calls per residential unit and 0.0298 calls per 1,000 square feet of non-residential development as shown in **Table 9**. At buildout, an increase of 447 calls per year is estimated of which 91 percent are assigned to residential development and 9 percent are assigned to non-residential property.

Table 9. Call Forecast at Buildout

Description	2014-2018 Avg.			Buildout			Increase (New Development)		
	Inventory	Calls	Per Unit	Inventory	Per Unit	Calls	Inventory	Calls	Pct. of Calls
Residential (DU)	7,296	221	0.0302	20,744	0.0302	627	13,446	406	91%
Non-Residential (1,000 Sq. Ft.)	3,299	98	0.0298	4,671	0.0298	139	1,372	41	9%
Total Calls		319				766		447	

Source: Economic & Planning Systems

IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Description	Factor	Amount
Cost Allocated by Land Use Type		
	<u>Future Calls</u>	
Residential	91%	\$13,113,611
Non-Residential	9%	\$1,318,393
		\$14,432,004
Cost Allocated to New Development		
	<u>Land Use</u>	
Residential	65%	\$8,500,141
Non-Residential	29%	<u>\$387,228</u>
		\$8,887,369

\$13,113,611 * .65 = \$8,500,141

\$\$\$1,318,393 * .29 = \$387,228

\$8,500,141 / 13,446 = \$632

\$387,228 / 1,372 = \$282 or \$0.28/sq. ft.

Economic & Planning Systems

Draft Impact Fees | 7

Table 10. Impact Fee Calculation

Description	Factor	Amount
Capital Asset Inventory		
Engines and Vehicles		\$5,388,300
Existing HQ and Red Dirt Hill Stations		\$6,043,704
South Station Construction		\$3,000,000
Total Value		\$14,432,004
Buildout Development		
Residential (DU)		13,446
Non-Residential (Sq. Ft.)		1,372,047
Cost Allocated by Land Use Type		
	<u>Future Calls</u>	
Residential	91%	\$13,113,611
Non-Residential	9%	\$1,318,393
		\$14,432,004
Cost Allocated to New Development		
	<u>Land Use</u>	
Residential	65%	\$8,500,141
Non-Residential	29%	<u>\$387,228</u>
		\$8,887,369
Updated Impact Fees		
Fee per Residential DU	13,446	\$632
Fee per 1,000 Sq. Ft. Non-Residential	1,372	\$282
		\$0.28/Sq. Ft.

Source: Economic & Planning Systems

Thank you!



CALL ALLOCATIONS

Description	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015-2018 Average	Residential	Non-Residential
Structure Fires							
Private Dwellings	1	7	2	1	3	100.0%	0.0%
Apartments	4	1	5	4	4	100.0%	0.0%
Hotels and Motels	1	0	1	1	1	0.0%	100.0%
All Other Residential	0	0	2	3	1	100.0%	0.0%
Public Assembly	2	2	1	3	2	0.0%	100.0%
Stores and Offices	0	0	1	2	1		
Subtotal	8	10	12	14	11		
Other Fires and Incidents [1]							
Highway Vehicles	1	1	1	0	1	0.0%	30.0%
Other Vehicles	1	0	0	1	1	0.0%	30.0%
Non-Structure/Non-Vehicle	2	5	4	4	4	0.0%	30.0%
Brush/Grazing/Wildland	0	3	1	4	2	0.0%	30.0%
Rubbish/Dumpsters	5	1	3	4	3	0.0%	30.0%
All Other Fires	1	6	5	5	4	0.0%	30.0%
Subtotal	10	14	14	18	14		
Other Incidents							
Rescue/Emergency/Medical [1]	82	73	69	88	76	0.0%	30.0%
False Alarms	137	127	121	130	129	0.0%	10.0%
Hazardous Responses	19	30	39	26	29	0.0%	100.0%
Other Hazardous Responses	9	8	10	11	10	10.0%	0.0%
All Other Responses [1]	57	42	50	56	52	0.0%	30.0%
Subtotal	294	280	299	305	295		
Total	312	304	325	337	320	222	97
Percent					100.0%	69.5%	30.2%
Mutual Aid - Not Incl.	0	8	12	20			

[1] Allocated on a service population basis

Source: Economic & Planning Systems

2:\0\proj\proj\2015-2018 Impact Fee\Grand County Impact Fee\Grand County Impact Fee Calculations\Subtotal\TC.xlsx

SERVICE POPULATION

Description	Factors	2016	Percent	Land Use
Population	A	4,762	23.1%	Residential
Commissioners				
Jobs		3,670		
Employees (adjusted for multiple job holders)	1.20	3,984		
In-Commuting Employees (1)	85%	2,594		
In-Commuting Employee Impact	50%	1,297	6.3%	Commercial
Second Homes				
Vacant Housing Units		4,327		
Vacant for Sale or in Use	87%	3,770		
Short-Term Rentals				
Guests per Unit	2.0	1,945		
Peak Occupancy	85%			
Peak Short-Term Rental Population	C	4,629	22.4%	Residential
Non-Rental Second Homes				
Guests per Unit	2.4	2,382		
Peak Occupancy	85%			
Peak Second Home Population	D	4,880	23.5%	Residential
Hotels				
Rooms		195		
Guests per Unit	2.0			
Peak Occupancy	80%			
Peak Hotel Guest Population	E	390	1.9%	Commercial
Daily Skier Visits				
Peak weekend day		2,430		
Day Skiers	80%	4,780	22.9%	Commercial
Service Population	A+B+C+D+E+F	28,637		
Residential Share			89.1%	
Commercial Share			10.9%	
Total			100.0%	

Source: Economic & Planning Systems

Economic & Planning Systems

Draft Impact Fees | 11

Todd Holzwarth, East Grand Fire Protection Chief, was present and able to answer any questions for the Commissioners. This is Round 4 for impact fees. We are using a new method to calculate the fees. A little history, the impact fee was established in 2001. The impact fees help defray costs. The taxes do not take effect until the home is built. The impact fee is imposed by the county and or town. The funds are used for capital items not operational items. We can use it for land, new trucks, buildings, etc. For 19 years the impact fees have helped defray these costs.

Commissioners asked how the fees will apply. Will it be like an annual fee for a single family dwelling?

Chief Holzwarth replied that it is a onetime fee, collected when applying for a building permit.

Commissioners asked about the projected building of 13,446 new residential units. A home owner wouldn't pay any part of this fee, because they would not start paying tax until they owned the home and get their first tax bill. So the person that pays this impact fee is either the developer or contractor doing the construction and it is paid for through their building permit.

Chief Holzwarth replied the way we have handled this in the past is before they apply for a building permit, they come to the Fire District and pay the impact fee, the Fire District stamps their plans, so when they turn in the plans to the County the fees have already been collected.

Staff added that the lots developed prior to 2001 have not paid the impact fees. After 2001 as part of the subdivision process, the developer has pre-paid the fire impact fees prior to the final plat being recorded.

Commissioners asked what is changing in the existing fee structure (compared to the new proposed fee structure), is it a different percentage?

Chief Holzwarth replied it is a different methodology than last time. Last time we had our Capital Improvements Plan and we tried to establish how many units or square footage for commercial or

single family dwellings there would be. This time around, one of the rules is we cannot do the study ourselves. We hired a consultant that received our input and they came up with the calculations (we agreed to this method). The consultants used a different system and the costs did go up. More single family dwellings than commercial is being built which is creating imbalances. Each home is paying less proportionately of the taxes for the value. The County is doubling the homes, we don't necessarily double our workload but it is definitely going up. We had 399 calls last year which was up over 10% from the year before. In 5 years we could see a doubling in our calls. It is mostly an operational cost not a capital cost but we have to be able to keep up with the increase.

Commissioner stated this new method is an iterative method. You look historically in 2018 how many units or homes were built, then you look at a projection of how many are going to be built to meet the demands of the market, then you look at what are your capital expenses and budget.

Chief Holzwarth replied that the consultants calculated using all the information collected. They are familiar with the county and have done our study in the past. We have a statue to follow.

Commissioners asked to understand the rationale between the non-residential and commercial fees.

Chief Holzwarth replied non-residential is anything that is not residential including commercial. We are looking at replacing more than adding new equipment. The commercial businesses pay more taxes than residential.

Commissioners asked about the build out, does it go under the premise that we only have so much land left to build on.

Chief Holzwarth replied that this is an estimate and the agreement is every 5 years this will be revisited. If the estimates are not as accurate as we hoped in 5 years we will be back.

Commissioners asked if anyone has talked to the water people to make sure we have the water needed for the future build out?

Chief Holzwarth stated studies can be made to be almost anything you want it to be depending on who is doing the studies.

Commissioner asked what the reasoning behind the square footage for commercial and not residential.

Chief Holzwarth replied the general consensus that we have we believe that statue supports being different on those. For non-residential, you go by square footage calculation for houses. The size of the house does not matter, it has been calculate the same since we started impact fees. In 5 years it will be revisited again along with what the capital needs might be. East Grand is in maintenance mode, we don't add new trucks, we replace them once they get to be about 15-16 years old. There is new technology, the trucks do not wear out but we are tough on them. Starting them cold and driving them hard, they sit idling then return and get shut down.

Commissioners asked about false alarms.

Chief Holzwarth replied they are really not false alarms, most of them there is a reason the alarms have gone off. Could be a CO monitor system alarm or the system is interpreted something that thinks it is an alarm, may not be a fire could be dust, the systems are getting better and smarter. Legislators passed a law that all structures have to have a CO system. We did not have this 15

years ago now we go out on carbon monoxide calls. Sometimes we find a reason for the CO system to call the alarm sometimes we don't but it does save lives.

Commissioner stated they like this study better than the previous studies. Fascinated that there is so much non-residential in this district and 9% calls are non-residential but 91% of calls are residential. That is a staggering difference.

Chief Holzwarth stated roughly 86% of revenue is from residential.

Commissioners continued this makes sense there are two (2) different buckets. There is the upfront cost of purchasing your capital and knowing you have a foundation to stay afloat and then there is ongoing taxes that help pay for your expenses and operations. Before this goes to Board of County Commissioners, Mr. Davis on page 9, above table 1 (file error reference please remove).

Chief Holzwarth replied ultimate build out, there is land trades with the Forest Service and there is agricultural land.

Commissioner offered a suggestion - would you consider an exemption for people that meet exceptional fire protection with new build? Could avoid this impact fee if they have indoor sprinklers, to help avoid extra service calls that the fire department is getting?

Chief Holzwarth replied that he does not believe this option would be supported by the statute. They do get a break on their homeowner insurance with extra precautions built into the new homes. These benefits are also building code requirements.

Motion to recommend approval by Ingrid Karlstrom for The East Grand Fire District, Fire Impact Fees. Seconded by Sally Bleu. No Discussion. All in favor "aye", none opposed.

Motion to adjourn the meeting, Ingrid Karlstrom. Seconded by Sally Bleu. No Discussion. All in favor "aye", none opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.
