

Part I – Policy Framework

Alternative Scenarios

“Towards a Sustainable Future”

Scenario	Scenario A –Corridors and Centers	Scenario B—Near Towns	Scenario C—Current Trends
A. General Growth Patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth outside existing communities is encouraged in SOI/UAI’s at existing centers and rural centers located along major infrastructure corridors Existing and new rural centers would allow commercial and residential and allowable industrial uses based on established criteria Cluster residential development would be strongly encouraged in unincorporated UAI’s 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development at greater than rural densities (1 du/10 ac) is strongly directed to occur within existing centers and UGA’s, complying with local land use plans and subject to annexation Mixed use and clustering development patterns are encouraged in AUJ’s: areas outside the AUJ’s would develop at rural, low density levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current broad range of development patterns is allowed throughout County (7500 sf to 35 ac+ parcels)
B. Clustering, Water and Sewer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower valley density is adjusted to reflect 1du/10 ac and clustering is encouraged through incentives to preserve open space and rural character Cluster Incentives (could include): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2ac/unit w/clustering and using open space for septic requirements UGB clustering w/future diversity on remainder land area (land in waiting) Extra lots (density bonus) for natural resource framework (floodplain, wetlands, community separators, hydrology, unstable slopes) No new subdivision allowed without internal water supply and sewer service Small lot subdivisions with private water and sewer are permitted in SOI/UAI’s (if consistent with municipal UGB plans), as well as existing and proposed centers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower valley density is adjusted to reflect 1du/10 ac and clustering is encouraged through incentives to preserve open space and rural character Cluster Incentives (could include): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2ac/unit w/clustering and using open space for septic requirements UGB clustering w/future diversity on remainder land area (land in waiting) Extra lots (density bonus) for natural resource framework (floodplain, wetlands, community separators, hydrology, unstable slopes) Small lot subdivisions permitted within SOI/UAI’s consistent with local plans provided that municipal services are extended or private water and sewer systems are provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clustering occurs in the Roaring Fork Valley in areas designated for 1 du/10 and 1 du/6 ac. No clustering occurs in lower valley due to 1du/2 ac density allowance Small lot subdivisions allowed anywhere <u>with</u> provisions for private water and sewer
C. Planning Guidance/Study Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCCP identifies existing and potential centers, with flexible locations, and some criteria for compatibility and visual impact Land uses and densities would be assigned to unincorporated areas emphasizing corridors and rural centers throughout the RF valley and lower valley No separate Study Areas: one county-wide policy approach to land use planning (lower valley is treated the same as RF valley) Outlying rural/public lands addressed as a section in the Comp Plan Increased coordination w/special districts would be required for water and sewer services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land uses assigned to unincorporated areas of lower valley, similar to approach for RF valley GCCP identifies expansion potential of existing centers, and criteria for compatibility and visual impact No separate Study Areas: one county-wide policy approach to land use planning (lower valley is treated the same as RF valley): outlying rural/public lands addressed as a section in the Comp Plan Increased coordination w/special districts would be required (e.g. mid Valley Metro for water and sewer and others) SOI/UAI’s are defined to be consistent with municipal Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB’s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential/ commercial/industrial uses/patterns continue as is; minimal proactive direction provided by County Five designated Study Area approach is maintained: Roaring Fork Valley (Study Area 1) and lower valley (Study Area 2 and 3) and outlying public land and rural unincorporated emphasis (Study Area 4 and 5): maintain distinctively separate land use designations/policies, and practices County and local municipalities within the County use different terms referencing cross jurisdictional planning areas, e.g. Annexation Boundaries, Sphere of Influence (SOI), Urban Area of Influence (UAI) and Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB’s)

D. Development Coordination w/Local Jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local municipal plans in SOI/UAI's are adopted into GCCP and implemented via joint planning commission reviews (annexations may or may not be considered) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local municipal plans in SOI/UAI's are adopted into GCCP and annexation is required in conjunction with development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conformance with County UAI plans is encouraged but voluntary Continuation of current development referral process within SOI/UAI The current GARCO Comp Plan acknowledges municipal UGB's (New Castle, Silt, Rifle [Annexation Boundary] and Parachute) – yet these boundaries are inconsistent with the Counties SOI/UAI's
E. Commercial/Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General commercial and light industrial uses allowed in designated rural centers and along corridors adjacent to existing cities/towns General commercial and light industrial uses are in designated areas only allowed along corridors and rural center, locations based on appropriate use criteria (access, compatibility, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General commercial and light industrial uses allowed in designated locations within unincorporated UAI's: specific regulations would be identified General commercial and light industrial uses are only allowed in SOI/UAI's, locations based on appropriate use criteria (access, compatibility, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General commercial and light industrial uses are allowed anywhere in unincorporated County
F. Rural Character /Agricultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ag preservation occurs through cluster incentives, as well as voluntary and land trust efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ag preservation occurs through cluster incentives, as well as voluntary and land trust efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ag preservation occurs through voluntary efforts and acquisition by land trusts
G. Open Space, Natural Resources/Extraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural resource preservation occurs through natural resource land development code, cluster development incentives and land trust efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space preservation occurs through cluster incentives, as well as voluntary and land trust efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No formally recognized open space program currently exists at the County Slopes and floodplain resources protected through existing land use development and zoning code and land trust efforts
H. Road Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County road maintenance/improvements are focused on serving existing and new centers, as well as adjacent to existing and new subdivisions The County does not maintain internal subdivision road in unincorporated County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County road maintenance/improvements focus on serving unincorporated SOI/UAI's and adjacent to existing and new subdivisions The County does not maintain internal subdivision road in unincorporated County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County road maintenance/improvement is spread throughout county to serve existing and new development in random expansion Priority roads are defined in the (un-adopted) County Transportation Master Plan (2006) and the Adopted 1997 Capital Improvement Plan The County does not maintain internal subdivision road in unincorporated County
I. Public Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County participates in a new lower valley transit service by 3rd party transit vendor or supporting extension of RFTA service areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County participates in a new lower valley transit service by 3rd party transit vendor or supporting extension of RFTA service areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County is not a member of RFTA system but contributes funding for the operation of the Hogback Line

Part II – Impacts/Implications *(observations affecting each scenario)*

“Towards a Sustainable Future”

Alternative Scenarios

Scenarios	Scenario A –Corridors and Centers	Scenario B—Near Towns	Scenario C—Current Trends
<p>A. Economy Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rural centers serve as convenience commercial centers supporting needs of nearby neighborhoods help balance jobs/housing and diversifies employment base ▪ Commercial/industrial uses in rural centers may compete with local cities/towns ▪ County more likely to recognize and respond to local municipal UGB’s ▪ Glenwood and Carbondale are nearly built-out w/real physical limitations and the Roaring Fork Valley land is too expensive to serve local residents ▪ Development will be dictated by resort/high-end retirement development in the Valley ▪ Expanding upon Cattle Creek as a growth center may have validity Glenwood and Carbondale are agreeable ▪ Growth in the I-70 corridor will be dictated by oil/gas jobs, most residential and commercial pressure will occur in and around Rifle, Silt New Castle and Parachute ▪ Growth can obviously be better accommodated in and around existing cities/towns vs. rural county areas ▪ The lure of the large lot rural homes will likely remain resulting in more expensive homes with limited demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mixed uses (commercial/industrial/residential uses) are concentrated at existing and proposed UGB areas ▪ Economic development strategies are focused at city/town and UGB areas ▪ Greater economic development efficiencies ▪ High level of support by County for implementing local UGB plans ▪ Assumes towns agrees to growth directed toward towns, including slightly less desirable uses such as low-end apartment and mobile homes accommodating housing needs during boom periods (housing for workers) ▪ Growth can obviously be better accommodated in and around existing cities/towns vs. rural county areas ▪ The lure of the large lot rural homes will likely remain resulting in more expensive homes with limited demand ▪ The County could partner with local municipalities to explore economic opportunities associated with the airport business park (target market needs assessment studies) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ County economic development strategies focuses on land adjacent to airport ▪ Rural ranchland and agricultural uses continue to be threatened as development opportunities outcompetes prime agriculture lands in the County ▪ Future school locations and special districts influence land use patterns in unincorporated County ▪ The lure of the large lot rural homes will likely remain resulting in more expensive homes with limited demand ▪ The County has ample revenues to provide basic services to rural areas; but if growth sprawls significantly (per unit road and police protection) costs will rise but not excessively ▪ The County could probably address road maintenance costs with special districts (if they choose), but if the oil/gas industry returns (necessary for growth), the County should have ample financial resources to provide services
<p>B. Land Use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Growth is directed along Interstate 70/US Highway 82 corridors: more cost-effective use of infrastructure ▪ Designated commercial/industrial and cluster residential rural centers allowed beyond the UAI’s within the County ▪ Min. 2 acre lot size is amended to encourage cluster development beyond the SOI/UAI’s ▪ Cluster subdivision development options are allowed beyond SOI/UAI’s in unincorporated areas of the County based on specific unit/per ac density thresholds ▪ Locations of new rural centers are identified along with development restrictions/standards ▪ Reduces ‘development value’ of agricultural lands further from towns and centers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development is focused more cost-effectively to areas of existing infrastructure ▪ 1du/10ac in rural areas allows greater incentives to cluster ▪ Unit/acre density averages may increase w/in municipal UGB’s and SOI/UAI’s ▪ Min. 2 acre lot size amended to encourage cluster development beyond the SOI/UAI’s ▪ Cluster subdivision development options are allowed beyond SOI/UAI’s in unincorporated areas of the County based on specific unit/per ac density thresholds ▪ Subdivisions adjacent to towns encouraged to infill and increase density ▪ Less pressure to convert agricultural uses outside SOI/UAI’s: reduces ‘development value’ of ag land further from towns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintains spread out low density development patterns throughout County ▪ Continuation of current 6-acre/unit average density dispersed throughout County is inefficient for road maintenance and public safety ▪ Min. 2 acre lot size remains in effect (including w/in UGB areas) ▪ Community enclaves (subdivisions and rural commercial centers) may continue to occur anywhere (as PUD’s) ▪ Growth patterns develop relatively unplanned as a reactionary approach is used to determine County land use planning decisions ▪ Potential visual impacts due to ridgeline development, lack of community buffers and open spaces

<p>C. Natural Resources/ Extraction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to river corridor may be impacted as growth is directed toward sensitive lands and habitat areas ▪ Wildlife conflicts likely to increase as growth is directed toward sensitive lands and habitat areas; although clustering and rural centers with low density could preserve critical wildlife corridors ▪ Sand/gravel operations continue to function along river corridors (w/ improved mitigation standards and enforcement efforts after operations cease to exist) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wildlife conflicts are minimized as growth is directed toward existing city/towns with low density clustering in between 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to river corridor may be threatened as unplanned and incompatible growth impacts sensitive lands and habitat areas ▪ Wildlife corridors are impacted with unplanned and incompatible growth patterns ▪ Oil/gas and growth development impacts/conflicts persist, surface land uses are driven by mineral estate allowances ▪ Sand/gravel operations continue to function along river corridors (related to discussions on mitigation standards and enforcement efforts after operations cease to exist)
<p>D. Transportation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ability to direct transportation priorities w/in growth corridors ▪ Ability to direct public transit service to access/ serve all cities/towns along the major corridors ▪ Lower priority roads beyond the growth corridors would likely be impacted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roadway design standards and costs for prioritized road improvements can be managed more effectively ▪ Traffic will likely increase in city/town/UGB areas ▪ On-street bike lane and pedestrian infrastructure improvements likely to be included in areas close to cities/towns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain existing CIP/County Road maintenance system ▪ Difficult to extend public transit services to outlying residential and job locations ▪ On-street bike lane and pedestrian infrastructure improvements is limited due to low density development patterns
<p>E. Water Resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water resources serving new growth areas are managed more appropriately ▪ Focus on using new central water systems for future developments (more robust approach providing more reliable water supply and good water quality) ▪ Extension of both private and existing municipal systems may be required to meet the future water supply demands ▪ Scenario seeks to reduce emphasis on rural subdivisions where poor water quality and quantity may exist ▪ Difficulties in securing individual water supply systems will persist (but is not insurmountable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water resources are managed more appropriately in conjunction with city/town planning efforts ▪ Focus on central water systems w/the feasibility of extensions of both private and existing municipal systems to meet future demands ▪ Scenario seeks to reduce emphasis on rural subdivisions where poor water quality and quantity may exist ▪ Difficulties in securing individual water supply systems will persist (but is not insurmountable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Growth patterns will continue to be dispersed throughout the County and reliable water resources will be more difficult to secure ▪ Inadequate water systems will be more prevalent due to lack of sufficient supply; potential for increased trend to haul water to supply demands in rural areas ▪ Unless new development of major water treatment infrastructure occurs (e.g. reservoirs), many area will be subject to poor water quality, inadequate supply and limited fire protection ▪ Lack of reliable water quality and quantity supply will limit/govern development and density outside Colorado and Roaring Form River corridors and Silt Mesa area ▪ Widespread growth may lead to the requirement of individual water systems (districts) and many of these systems may be subject to poor water quality and quantity
<p>F. Public Land Interface</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Growth impacts are directed away from public lands (for the most part) and access to public lands is maintained and/or improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Growth impacts are directed away from public lands (for the most part) and access to public lands is maintained and/or improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remains as is ▪ Land use activity on public lands is unregulated which has impacts on County land uses
<p>G. Recreation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opportunity to create river corridor zone and plan for recreational amenities, access and watershed protection ▪ Opportunity for the County to actively assist with parks and recreation issues and/or partner to explore parks opportunities throughout the County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opportunity to create river corridor zone and plan for recreational amenities, access and watershed protection ▪ Opportunity for the County to go into the parks and recreation business and/or partner to explore parks opportunities throughout the County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recreational/tourism opportunities remain as is ▪ Access to recreational activities along major river corridors potentially impacted as increased growth goes unchecked ▪ Comprehensive trails planning and coordination is difficult

H. Floodplain Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Growth patterns may negatively impact visual and access to river corridors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ River corridors can be planned for and better managed ▪ Floodplain standards would be developed by the County in conjunction w/city Growth patterns may negatively impact visual and access to River corridors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacted by river corridor development ▪ Limited comprehensive floodway planning opportunities due in part to poor baseline mapping for Colorado River ▪ Allows development within a floodplain, but has to be 35 from edge of waterway
I. Special Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Special district needs are identified along designated growth corridors and at rural centers ▪ Improved coordination required between special districts and the County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Special districts needs can be programmed more efficiently over time: services may be better integrated w/municipal growth plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Services frequently provided by special districts ▪ Schools and other utility and special districts establish development patterns in the unincorporated County
J. Rural Character/ Agriculture Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US Highway 82 corridor is concentrated with major developments: Valley floor is already visually impacted ▪ Agricultural uses along the major corridors will be impacted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allows for protection of rural agricultural resources ▪ Owners of large land areas and agricultural use lands in select growth areas outside designated UGB areas would be allowed consider possible commercial or residential cluster development uses in unincorporated County ▪ Community character w/in existing city/towns will change over time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rural character is threatened as growth continues in scattered fashion: does little to address core value of preserving/maintaining rural qualities over time ▪ Preserves property rights as currently defined, no new regulations (although current land use regulations are upheld) ▪ Agriculture/ranchers and farmers retain development options within framework of existing County Land Use Code ▪ Remaining rural agricultural character/open spaces may erode over time: incentives to protect this land use are not used
K. Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City/towns may be viewed as growing together—no distinct boundaries along the major corridors ▪ Visual impacts from Interstate and highway corridors ▪ Improved opportunities for identifying critical opens spaces beyond primary infrastructure corridors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Distinct boundaries in between city/towns and unincorporated County areas provides additional opportunities for open space conservation ▪ Opportunities for open space conservation along river corridors is available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allows for the proliferation of low density growth patterns impacting open spaces (defined as undeveloped land) ▪ No clear direction is provided on what is ‘open space’ and what open space resources should be prioritized for conservation (if any)
L. Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ County could take a more active role in creating job/housing balance county-wide ▪ Improved cohesiveness in regional housing activities: possibly better coordination amount city/towns and not-for-profits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Job/housing balance more likely to be achieved if land values and home prices can be managed ▪ County could take a more active role in creating job/housing balance county-wide ▪ Improved cohesiveness in regional housing activities: possibly better coordination amount city/towns and not-for-profits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communities continue to pursue affordable/attainable housing opportunities independently ▪ Regional Housing Authority maintains present role administering and coordinating w/housing non-profits and local jurisdictions on regional housing needs/programs ▪ Challenges remain in creating job/housing balance ▪ Limited cohesiveness in regional housing activities
M. Cost of Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Growth is directed along major infrastructure corridors: increases efficiency w/cost of services ▪ Interstate 70 serves as major east/west corridor. Additional growth can be accommodated along this corridor ▪ Utility infrastructure is accessible with minimal costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Growth is directed to city/town and UGB areas ▪ Cost of services is optimized by concentrating growth patterns ▪ More efficient use of resources (fiscal costs and infrastructure needs) ▪ Measurable results can be defined through reduced cost of services and more efficient infrastructure needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost of services/efficiencies is impacted as needs are dispersed throughout the County ▪ Costly subdivisions and PUD’s are considered on a first come-first serve basis extending special districts and infrastructure needs ▪ Limited planning/programming opportunities

<p>N. Intergovernmental Cooperation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ County formally recognizes municipality UGB area's ▪ More effective joint planning partnership/review process is developed to manage growth within each community and SOI/UAI ▪ IGA's between municipalities and the County could clarify specific agreements as needed/desired ▪ Regional transit system planning is prioritized to address County-wide needs: County takes leadership role in bringing RFTA and local area municipalities together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As UGB areas are maximized, appropriate extensions to the current 2-mile SOI/UAI's may be considered over time beyond the 20 year scope of the GCCP ▪ IGA's required to clarify services, infrastructure requirements and annexation agreement procedures ▪ Increase cooperation/predictability between city/towns and the County: County is positioned to manage UGB areas in conjunction with city/town needs: able to meet public's expressed desire to manage growth in the County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jurisdictional cooperation could remain as is, OR ▪ County could move to formally recognize municipal UGB's and clarify inconsistencies with boundaries related to UAI's and individual UGB's ▪ IGA's between municipalities and the County limited to non-binding joint review of projects
--	---	--	---

DRAFT