

**MCGC Neighbors' Notes to Provide Context: A portion of this article appeared in the [April 6, 2016](#), edition of the MCGC Neighbors News Blast. The complete article is below, along with a list of pertinent links on this subject at the end of the article.**

---

### **Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Permit Annexation – Q & A**

**QUESTION:** Why would a landowner want his property to be annexed into the city? **ANSWER:** So he can be assured of reliable water delivery, sanitary sewer utilities, and police and fire protection services for his new development area, instead of having to provide those services on his own. Isn't this what we all want? Yes, but we also want **ENOUGH** water to go around, **ENOUGH** sanitary sewer utilities to service the population, and **TIMELY** police and fire protection services, without the costs becoming so great that current and future residents can no longer afford to live here.

**QUESTION:** What determines whether or not land can be annexed into the city? **ANSWER:** The city's Comprehensive Plan. Right now, the Comprehensive Plan **doesn't allow** for the expansion of the city's planning boundaries to include the 51 square miles of land that has been under study for the past year. That seems pretty clear – it's not allowed.

**QUESTION:** Since the Comprehensive Plan is currently being rewritten and is scheduled for completion in mid- 2017, and since development in the proposed annexation area is not anticipated for at least 8-10 years, why is an **AMENDMENT** to the current Plan even being considered? **ANSWER:** That's a good question!!

**It could be that the city is just doing its due diligence and examining all aspects of the issue in order to make an informed decision. This is best case, and it is our hope!!**

However, it could also be that the city's "All 4 Business" initiative is going overboard to make things easier for developers. Permits and fees have been lowered to make things less expensive for developers (i.e. lower water tap fees for homebuilders – just one example). The concept of Metropolitan Districts has been implemented to make things less expensive for developers by pushing infrastructure costs onto homeowners (i.e. the Murphy Creek Metro District 3 debt obligation that can't be paid back within the homeowners' lifetimes – just one example). Zoning designations have been changed, in spite of public outcry, to make things less expensive and easier for developers (i.e. the zoning changes to SIR or TOD – just one example). Zoning restrictions have been changed, in spite of public outcry, to make things less expensive and easier for developers (i.e. the 2 conditions and a waiver going up on the corner of Gun Club Road and Highway 30 – just one example). Zoning codes have been amended, in spite of public outcry, to make things less expensive and easier for developers (i.e. the change in the amount of masonry required on new homes – just one example). General Development Plans have been amended, in spite of public outcry, to make things less expensive and easier for developers (i.e. the recent changes to the GDP of the Danbury Park, Shamrock Park, and Chateaux neighborhoods – just one example). The list goes on...

So, it's not that much of a stretch to think that an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is still being discussed and considered for this 51 square mile area in order to make things easier and less expensive

for developers, starting with the developer group of four (CCSC) who want to annex 3 square miles of land and whose request triggered the \$531,000 study. There will be a public hearing to decide on an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on **Wednesday, April 13, 2016**. This meeting will take place in the Council Chambers at the Municipal Center beginning at 6PM. If you have comments, either for or against this amendment, this would be the time to speak. MCGC Neighbors wants to hear from you as well, so if you haven't done so already, please respond to our short [survey](#) on this subject. Also, you can read the [comments](#) that MCGC Neighbors submitted to the Planning Department on March 31, 2016.

The caveat that is always attached to this potential amendment is, "Even if the Comprehensive Plan is amended to expand the city's planning boundaries to include this annexation area, it doesn't necessarily mean that any annexations will take place." Just so you know, there are 5 annexation petitions from the developer group (CCSC) that will **ALSO** be heard at the Planning Commission meeting on April 13. You can read the [comments](#) that MCGC Neighbors submitted regarding these applications on October 28, 2015.

**QUESTION:** Doesn't this seem a bit premature? **ANSWER:** Yes. But, if the Planning Commission denies the amendment, the developers will simply appeal the ruling to City Council. One of their arguments for the appeal could very likely include the fact that they have already spent many thousands of dollars to submit their applications. Although that's unfortunate, they knew the Comprehensive Plan would have to be amended **BEFORE** their land could be annexed, so it was their choice to spend the money prematurely. However, because the city tries to make things easier and less expensive for developers, no matter the cost to the rest of us, the money the CCSC group has already spent will probably be given a lot of consideration by City Council, should this issue reach them.

If you want additional information, here are links to some websites and articles.

City of Aurora's East Aurora Annexation Study [website](#)

Aurora Sentinel article on Reduced Water Tap Fees for Homebuilders – [October 29, 2013](#)

MCGC Neighbors News Blast – [June 10, 2015](#)

MCGC Neighbors News Blast – [August 12, 2015](#)

MCGC Neighbors News Blast – [August 19, 2015](#)

MCGC Neighbors News Blast – [September 30, 2015](#)

MCGC Neighbors News Blast – [October 21, 2015](#)

MCGC Neighbors News Blast – [March 30, 2016](#)

MCGC Neighbors [Comments](#) regarding CCSC's annexation petitions – October 28, 2015

MCGC Neighbors [Comments](#) regarding an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – March 31, 2016

MCGC Neighbors [Survey](#) regarding an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan