Table of Contents

File_1		87-0019 Project Name: Open Spaces, Public Spaces, Parks – Amending Section 5-4-6								
P r e s e n t	S c a n n e d	A few items are denoted with an asterisk (*), which means they are to be scanned for permanent record on the in some instances, not all entries designated to be scanned by the department are present in the file. There are also documents specific to certain files, not found on the standard list. For this reason, a checklist has been provided. Remaining items, (not selected for scanning), will be marked present on the checklist. This index can serve as a quick guide for the contents of each file. Files denoted with (**) are to be located using the ISYS Query System. Planning Clearance will need to be typed in full, as well as other entries such as Ordinances, Resolutions. Board of Appeals, and etc.								
X	X	Table of Contents								
		Review Sheet Summary								
		Application form								
		Review Sheets								
		Receipts for fees paid for anything								
		*Submittal checklist								
		*General project report								
		Reduced copy of final plans or drawings								
	-	Reduction of assessor's map								
		Evidence of title, deeds, easements								
		*Mailing list to adjacent property owners								
		Public notice cards								
		Record of certified mail								
		Legal description								
		Appraisal of raw land								
		Reduction of any maps – final copy								
		*Final reports for drainage and soils (geotechnical reports)								
		Other bound or non-bound reports								
		Traffic studies								
		*Petitioner's response to comments								
		*Staff Reports								
		*Planning Commission staff report and exhibits								
		*City Council staff report and exhibits								
		*Summary sheet of final conditions								
		*Letters and correspondence dated after the date of final approval (pertaining to change in conditions or expiration date)								
		DOCUMENTS SPECIFIC TO THIS DEVELOPMENT FILE:								
	1									
		Text to be changed								
	+									
⊢										
<u> </u>	ļ									
	┼									
\vdash	+									
	+									
	+									
-										
1	1									

AMENDING THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE BY DELETING THE EXISTING SECTION 5-4-6 AND ADOPTING NEW SECTION 5-4-6 READING AS FOLLOWS:

5-4-6 Public Sites, Parks and Open Spaces

- A. All new development which requires processing through the rezoning, subdivision, planned development, conditional use, or special use procedures of this Code shall require payment to the escrow fund for Parks/Open Space acquisition and/or development. For the purpose of this section (5-4-6) only, new development shall be considered construction of principal structures where the addition constitutes 35% or more of the existing floor area of the structure, or a change of use category for an existing structure or for a parcel of land.
- B. The fee schedule for compliance with 5-4-6A shall be as follows:
 - 1. All residential uses \$225 per dwelling unit.
 - 2. All business/commercial/industrial uses 5% of the appraised raw land value. The value shall be determined, at the developer's expense, by an accredited real estate appraiser (member of American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers) not otherwise involved in the development.
 - 3. All uses in the Use/Zone Matrix (sec. 4-3-4) which are classed under the general categories of Community Facilities - Public and Private, and Human Care/Treatment Facilities which are non-profit uses shall not be charged a fee. All other uses in these categories shall be charged 2.5% of appraised raw land value as determined in paragraph B.2 above. Proof of non-profit status may be required.
- C. Fees shall be paid at the time of final approval and prior to commencement of the use. Fees for subdivision shall be paid at the time of final plat recording.
- D. Private open spaces or recreational areas in planned developments shall not be a substitute for the required fee or dedication.
- E. The Governing Body may, after recommendation by the Planning Commission, waive or defer the provisions of this section (5-4-6). In considering such a waiver or deferment, the Governing Body shall use the criteria established in Section 10-1-1B.2. The Governing Body may also consider the dedication of public sites, parks, and/or open space areas in lieu of payment to the escrow fund. The dedication of land area shall not be less than equal in value to the payment that would be required under B above and in accordance with adopted plans and policies.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS

New developments are expected to offset certain costs they incur to the community in order that existing taxpayers do not have to pay the costs of this new development. Many of the impacts may be offset by the developer actually constructing certain improvements such as sewer and water lines or roads. In some cases, however, construction may not be appropriate because of location, timing, or other factors. In those cases the developer is expected to pay fees that the City can use to cover the costs that will be incurred. For example, it would be inappropriate for a developer to improve a section of road bordering his development if the City had plans for improving a larger section of that road the following year.

One of the costs incurred by new development is the demand for additional parks space and facilities. Since most developments are not large enough to require them to actually build an appropriately sized park, the City requires a proportionate fee that can then be used to acquire additional parks, or improve and expand facilities in existing parks.

The following material discusses existing dedication requirements and alternatives.

The City Council had asked that the open space dedication requirement be clarified. In the Zoning and Development Code (section 5-4-6) it appears in part A. that the intent was that <u>all</u> new developments contribute to the open space fund. However, in the following paragraphs, it speaks only about "plats" which seems to limit the requirement to subdivisions. Since some type of amendment is necessary to clarify current requirements, staff recommends that the present requirement be totally revised to more accurately reflect the intent of a dedication requirement.

When the current Code was revised in 1981, the requirement for dedication of 5% land or fee in lieu of land was added. This method was taken from the County regulations at that time, even though all involved acknowledged that this fee was not equitable or responsive to parks' needs. However, since the City had <u>no</u> dedication at all prior to the 1981 Code, it was felt that some type of fee should be established which could then be revised later after a careful study of alternative systems could be completed.

Since the adoption of the Code, the Planning staff has, at various times, studied different dedication requirements and made reports to previous administrations. Because of staff changes and reductions, both within and without the department, implementation of a different system has not occurred.

The Planning Department has an extensive file on this subject and we do not feel it necessary to do another "study" but are prepared at this time to make recommendations on a revised system.

In researching other communities (attachment 1), we have found that all communities surveyed used one of three systems to calculate residential dedication requirements.

- 1. A percentage requirement similar to our existing 5% fee.
- 2. A fee assessed at the time of building permit on <u>all</u> new structures. The type of fee structure varies, but most are either a per unit (or per 1,000 sq. feet) fee or a fee structure based on building value.
- 3. A per unit fee for new residential units in new developments and for commercial developments an acreage fee or percentage fee.

Recommendations

1) Residential

The biggest concern about using a percentage system is the inequity built into the system. For instance, in a 100 acre subdivision, 5 acres of open space (or equivalent dollars) would be required. Not being related to density, these 5 acres could serve 400 units at 4 per acre, or 800 units at 8 per acre. Parks and open space is a service provided to people and should be related to the number of people being served. Under the percentage system, lower density developments pay a great deal more per unit than higher density developments, but higher densities generate a greater demand for parks space (see Table 3).

A fee assessed at the time of building permit might be appropriate for multi-family units but could be a handicap on individual single family residences. This system would also create problems in the building permit process since each application would have to be researched for possible previous dedication. Because of the number of subdivisions which have been annexed, both City and County records would have to be checked.

A per unit fee on new residential development would be the most equitable and most directly related to the need for additional parks space and facilities. I recommend the City adopt a residential dedication fee requirement based on this method. An example of the method of calculation and comparison to the existing system is on the following pages. The costs used are for comparison purposes <u>only</u>. Should Council concur with this methodology, more specific costs can be calculated.

2) Business/Commercial/Industrial

While trade developments do not directly generate a need for parks, there is an indirect effect in that new businesses generate population increases by direct or indirect job creation. It is apparent from Tables One and Two that to require the full cost of parks development from residential developments only would result in potentially prohibitive fees. By requiring dedication fees from both residential and business developments, the financial impacts on each can be brought into a more reasonable range.

We recommend that the 5% dedication requirement be continued for business, commercial and industrial developments.

3) Non-commercial and Non-residential Uses

There are a number of uses listed in the Zoning Code which are neither residential or commercial. These uses fall under the broad categories of "Community Facilities - Public and Private" and "Human Care/Treatment Facilities." For the profit-making uses, a reduced percentage fee may be appropriate. For non-profit or recreational uses, no fee may be appropriate. A specific breakdown of these types of uses is as follows:

Dance/Music Schools Boarding Schools Funeral Homes Shooting Ranges Swimming Pools Transportation Facilities Vo-Tech Schools Counseling Centers Foster Homes Hospitals Nursery Schools/Day Care Centers Group Homes Rest Homes/Nursing Homes Churches Colleges Cultural/Educational/ Rec. Facilities Membership Clubs Schools Physical/Mental Rehab. Centers

WORKSHEET

A. Assumptions

Average cost of undeveloped land Average cost for park development \$25,000/acre 8,000/acre

Persons per dwelling unit

2.3 (1980 census)

Standards from National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA)

Minimum park land per 1,000 pop.10 acres(.01a/person)Desirable park land per 1,000 pop.20 acres(.02a/person)Maximum park land per 1,000 pop.30 acres(.03a/person)

Note: It has been argued that because of the large amount of public land available for recreation, our standard should be less than the NRPA recommendations. How much (if any) less is arguable, since distance and type of recreation available may not be usable or desired by some citizens. For this reason the comparison table also gives figures for 7.5, 5, and 2.5 acres per 1,000 population.

B. Tables

Table One gives a cost per unit fee for graduations from 10 acres per 1,000 population to 2.5 acres per 1,000 population for cost of acquisition only and for acquisition and development.

Table Two gives total cost for a 10 acre development at several densities for both 5 and 10 acre standards. From this the 2.5 and 7.5 acre standards may be extrapolated.

C. Formulas

Cost per unit = Acres per unit required x cost per acre Cost per development = Cost per unit x number of units Acres per unit = (Standard used - 1,000) x 2.3 people per unit



		TABLE ONE	- FEES PER D	WELLING UNIT	
		Par) 2.5 (.006 a/u)	x Standard pe 5.0 (.012 a/u)	r 1,000 popula 7.5 (.017 a/u)	ation 10.0 (.023 a/u)
C O					
S T	\$15,000 ⁷	\$ 90	\$180	\$255 ⁻	\$345
Þ	\$20,000	120	240	340	460
E	\$25,000	150	300	425	575
Γ Λ	\$28,000	168	336	476	644
C R E	\$32,000	192	384	544	736



· ·		Density of Development					
			4 u/a	8 u/a	12 u/a	16 u/a	Existing
C 5 0	15,000	5a 10a	7,200 14,000	14,400 27,600	21,600 41,400	28,800 55,200	\$ 750
Σα Τ 1	20,000	5a 10a	9,600 18,400	19,200 36,800	28,800 55,200	38 ,4 00 73,600	1,000
E RA	25,000	5a 10 a	12,000 23,000	24,000 46,000	36,000 69,000	48,000 92,000	1,250
A R C E	28,000	5a 10a	13,440 25,760	26,880 51,520	40,320 77,280	53,760 103,040	1,400
R ES T	32,000	5a 10a	15,360 29,440	30,720 58,880	46,080 88,320	61,440 117,760	1,600
FD OS R.				·			

TABLE TWO COST COMPARISON FOR SAMPLE 10 ACRE DEVELOPMENT

* The Council Growth Committee indicated a preference for a fee which would be close to Mesa County's present fee. A cost figure of \$15,000 per acre and parks standard of 7.5 acres per 1,000 population comes close to the County fee of \$225/ unit (see Table 1). On this basis, an 8 unit per acre development on 10 acres would generate \$21,000 compared to the present rate of \$750.



TABLE THREECOST/IMPACT COMPARISON OF EXISTING SYSTEM

DENSITY OF 10 ACRE PROJECT

recommend de council G.J.P.C. - 4/7/87 for appoind -Ross Y. deserting on amount aly.

CIC 4/15/81 passed consult agenda