

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING -- PROPOSED ZONING MAP
JANUARY 25, 2000 MINUTES**

The specially scheduled joint meeting of the Grand Junction City Council and the Grand Junction Planning Commission convened at 7:05 p.m. on January 25, 2000 and was held at Two Rivers Convention Center.

Representing the Grand Junction City Council were Reford Theobald, Jack Scott, Earl Payne, Gene Kinsey (Mayor/Council President), and Janet Terry. Representing the Grand Junction Planning Commission were John Elmer (Chairman), Mark Fenn, Joe Grout, Terry Binder and Dr. Paul Dibble. City Manager Mark Achen, City Attorney Dan Wilson, Asst. City Manager Dave Varley, City Clerk Stephanie Nye, City Planning Manager Kathy Portner, and GIS Specialist Scott List were also present. Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED ZONING MAP

The following information represents the changes proposed for the City of Grand Junction Zoning Map, by area, which were requested by property owners and recommended for inclusion by City Councilmembers and Planning Commissioners.

REDLANDS AREA:

1. The southeast corner of Highway 340 and S. Broadway--**shown as PD (Planned Development).**
2. The Ridge Point area, along Bella Pago Road, between the Ridges and Country Club Park—**shown as RSF-2. The owner has submitted a development proposal to retain the PR zoning on a portion of the property. If approved the proposed map will be changed accordingly.**
3. South Broadway, between Highway 340 and S. Camp Road—**shown as PD.**
4. Ridge Point—**shown as RSF-2. The owner currently has a development proposal in to retain the PR zone on a portion of the property. If approved, the map will be changed accordingly.**
5. The convenience store complex on Highway 340, west of Redlands Parkway—**shown as B-1.**
6. Edwards Subdivision on South Redlands Road—**shown as RMF-5.**
7. Area between the Bluffs Subdivision and South Rim—**shown as RSF-4 and RMF-5.**
8. Northwest corner of South Camp Road and Monument Road—**shown as RSF-E.**
9. Wingate School and park site—**shown as CSR.**

Mayor Kinsey asked for comments from the public; there were none.

ORCHARD MESA AREA:

1. West of Linden—**changed to RMF-16.**
2. **Properties along Unaweep changed to C-1.**
3. Mobile Home Parks—**shown as PD.**
4. Lamplight Subdivision (Santa Clara Avenue)—**shown as PD.**
5. 2672 Highway 50--**changed to C-1.**

Councilmember Terry asked how planned zones would be reflected on the Zoning Map. Ms. Portner said that all planned zones would be designated as PD (Planned Development).

Chairman Elmer asked if the Land Use Map would be changed as well. Ms. Portner said that staff would come back before the Planning Commission with adopted zone changes for inclusion on the Land Use Map.

Mayor Kinsey asked for comments from the public; there were none.

DOWNTOWN AREA:

1. Property northwest of Ultronics on Ouray (west of 22nd Street)—**changed to RMF-12.**
2. 502 and 514 Ouray and 525 Chipeta—**502 and 514 Ouray, as well as the rest of the properties on the north side of Ouray between 5th and 6th, were changed to B-1.**
3. The 900 block of the south side of Main Street—**changed to B-2.**
4. 860 4th Avenue—Castings—**changed to I-2, including additional properties to the north and east that are heavy industrial uses.**
5. 611 S. 7th Street—Dible Oil—**changed to I-1, as well as additional properties to the north and south, the Daily Sentinel property, and the Elam property on 7th and Struthers.**
6. **A portion of the City-owned property southeast of the Riverside neighborhood was changed to I-O (Industrial-Office).**
7. 1765 Main Street, Old World Meat Co.—**changed to C-2, including the surrounding area.**
8. 2060 E. Main—Motorcycle Accessories—**changed to C-2, including the surrounding area.**

9. 1331 Ute Avenue—Sunshine Taxi—**changed to C-2, including the surrounding area.**
10. 415 S. 3rd and 251, 255, 257 and 259 Pitkin—**the south side of Pitkin, between 2nd and 3rd was changed to C-1; the north side of South Ave., between 2nd and 3rd was changed to C-2.**
11. **The north side of Gunnison Avenue between 25 ½ Road and Maldonado Street was changed to C-2.**
12. Northeast corner of 28 Road and I-70B—**changed to C-1.**
13. An area east of 28 ¼ Road and north of Gunnison Avenue—**shown as C-1.**
14. The southwest corner of 29 Road and North Avenue—**shown as C-1.**

Councilmember Theobald asked if the uses lining Ute and Pitkin Avenues were primarily C-1, to which Ms. Portner responded affirmatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Bill Jarvis Jr. (no address given), representing his parents who own the property along the west side of 5th Street from the river to the viaduct, said that the City’s proposed zoning change to C-2 reduced the property’s value and represented a “taking without due compensation.” Eventually the property would be redeveloped, but development options were reduced with a C-2 zone. He wanted retention of its current Industrial zoning.

Councilmember Terry asked staff to distinguish differences in uses between the two zones, which was given. When asked by Councilmember Theobald if an Industrial zone would allow residential uses, Ms. Portner responded negatively. Multi-family uses would not be allowed in either Industrial or C-2 zones.

Rob Katzenson (259 Grand Avenue, Grand Junction), representing LANDesign, referenced the downtown area currently zoned RMF-32 where zoning of RMF-8 was recommended. The reduced density would limit development and impact the property’s value, he said. He noted specific lot configurations and said that only single family units could be placed on those lots without prior approval of a Growth Plan Amendment (GPA). If a property owner wanted to place even a duplex on such a lot, he/she would have to go through the GPA process and still may not be successful. The density decrease, he contended, represented a 400% change, which seemed to go against Smart Growth, Persigo 201, and urban growth boundary recommendations designating the area as prime for infill development. He suggested an RMF-12 zone be placed on those properties instead.

When asked by Councilmember Terry if Mr. Katzenson represented any specific property owner(s), he responded negatively. Mr. Katzenson said that the RMF-8 zone would be a disincentive to developers who may be interested in redevelopment of those properties.

Councilmember Terry asked for a brief explanation on the City’s handling of “granny units,” which was provided by Ms. Portner.

Councilmember Theobold recalled that previous input from neighbors in the subject area had been to keep it as single family. They hadn't wanted more multi-family development in their neighborhood. Multi-family developments would only perpetuate deterioration of the neighborhood. He supported the proposed RMF-8 zone recommendation.

Councilmember Terry recalled that residents in the 5th and Chipeta area had voiced strong opposition to density increases. Most of the single family lots were currently showing signs of aesthetic improvement. Councilmember Theobold noted similar improvement in the downtown area along Gunnison Avenue. Councilmember Payne concurred.

Neither Council nor Planning Commission voiced objection to retaining the proposed RMF-8 zone for the subject area, as proposed.

John Bonella (no address given) referenced #7 in the Staff Report which indicated a PC zoning for 1101 Kimball. He said that when he'd purchased the property it had been I-2 but upon annexation into the City, it had been changed to PC. The building, he said, would be ideal for the Investment Cast Foundry or Die Cast Foundry currently under consideration. He noted that surrounding uses were all industrial and asked that it be returned to its original I-2 zone.

Commissioner Fenn asked for the rationale behind making the property a planned zone when no plan existed.

Ms. Portner said that when annexed and rezoned to PC there had been discussions concerning uses, outdoor storage, and screening. At that time a buffer between the publicly-owned riverfront properties to the south and the adjacent property had been deemed necessary. A straight zone would allow additional flexibility, which was the property owner's preference.

Councilman Theobold said that given the concern for buffering, he was more inclined to support the property's current PC zone. The PC zone also provided for some industrial uses. Ms. Portner said that the PC zone would limit the types of outdoor operations and storage allowed. If Mr. Bonella brought forth a request for a use other than what was currently allowed under the PC "umbrella," the plan could be amended.

Councilmember Terry suggested that Mr. Bonella go through the planning process with a specific plan for the property. She also thought that an IO zone designation might be appropriate and suggested that staff investigate this option further.

Councilmember Payne said that zone designations were sometimes changed when properties were annexed. There must have been a reason why buffering had been a factor.

Councilman Theobold said that screening and buffering should be considered and should match the properties across the street.

NORTHWEST AREA:

1. North side of Independent Avenue between Bass and Poplar—**shown as C-2.**
2. South Side of Franklin Avenue—**shown as RMF-24.**

3. North side of Franklin Avenue—**shown as recommended.**
4. Northeast corner of 25 ½ Road and Independent Avenue—**shown as C-1.**
5. Northwest corner of 1st Street and Patterson Road—**shown as B-1, however, Community Hospital recently received plan approval for a surgical center and wants to retain the PB zoning.**
6. Southwest corner of 1st Street and Patterson Road—**changed to RMF-12.**
7. 2558 F Road—**changed to PD.**
8. 2486 Commerce Blvd.—**changed to C-2.**
9. Harbert Lumber and BMC Lumber, 3rd and North Avenue and 5th and North Avenue—**changed to C-2.**
10. 2426 G Road—**shown as RMF-5, however, RMF-8 should be considered pending the final outcome of the 24 Road Corridor plan.**
11. Sage Court/Northacres area—**shown as RSF-2.**
12. Westwood Ranch, Northwest corner of 25 ½ Road and F ½ Road—**shown as PD.**
13. Diamond Ridge, west of Westwood Ranch—**shown as PD.**
14. Entire property off 24 ½ Road, north of F ¼ Road—**This property has an approved development plan extension for another two years. Need to place PD zoning back on this property.**
15. River Road, between 24 Road and 24 ½ Road—**shown as I-2.**
16. 24 Road Study Area —**awaiting the results of the 24 Road Corridor Plan.**
17. Southwest of I-70 and HWY 6 & 50—**changed to I-1 and C-2.**
18. Sanford Drive, north of Highway 6 & 50—**changed to C-2.**
19. **Foresight Industrial Park has been changed to IO.**
20. **Many areas that were previously shown as RMF-5 zoning were changed to RSF-4 zoning.**

Councilmember Theobald asked if both sides of North Avenue to 5th Street were zoned C-1, to which Ms. Portner replied affirmatively.

Chairman Elmer expressed concern over the southwest corner of 1st Street and Patterson Road. Was it more feasible to have access off of 1st Street versus Patterson Road? Ms. Portner said that

when the site developed, she expected that Patterson Road access would be limited. Further development specifics were needed.

A brief discussion ensued over whether or not to allow public commentary on the 24 Road Corridor since the corridor study had not yet been completed. Councilmember Payne suggested leaving current zoning as it was; zoning for the corridor could be revisited later. Council President Kinsey and Councilmember Terry concurred.

Ms. Portner said that properties currently zoned H.O. in the 24 Road Corridor area would be zoned C-1 prior to completion of the study since the H.O. zone would soon not exist. When asked, she expected that completion of the study would take another 2-3 months.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Tim Stubbs (3202 Snowberry Court, Grand Junction), owner of property at 23 ¾ and G Roads, said that this property was currently zoned C-2. He needed that zoning to remain in order to proceed with his development plans. Having just purchased the property, he asked that he be included on the 24 Road Corridor Study notification list. He referenced another property owned at 415 South 3rd Street in the downtown area and said that that property had originally been zoned Industrial but C-1 was being proposed by the City. Noting the latter property on an overhead transparency of the area, he pointed out that his was the only C-1 zoned property in the subject area. This didn't make sense, he said. He needed the outdoor storage allowance available in at least a C-2 zone.

Chairman Elmer asked if the property owner's current use in the downtown area would be deemed non-conforming. Ms. Portner said that no use currently existed on the property.

Councilmember Theobald asked if there were other properties near to Mr. Stubbs' downtown parcel that were also inconsistent with C-1 zoning. Why had C-1 rather than C-2 been placed on his property? Ms. Portner said that the C-1 zoning had been applied along Pitkin Avenue to provide buffering along that heavily-traveled corridor. Since C-2 uses were much more intense and usually brought with them increased traffic, parking, and aesthetic issues, the less intense C-1 zone had been deemed more appropriate.

After a brief discussion, there was general agreement that the C-1 zone was more appropriate for the downtown property. Councilmember Theobald said that had there been an existing use on the property, his position may have been different.

NORTHEAST AREA:

1. The Mesa State College campus is currently zoned PZ (Public Zone). **The zoning options have been discussed with MSC representatives and they prefer the CSR zoning. The map shows the CSR zoning and includes the additional properties the College has purchased.**
2. The North Avenue frontage is currently zoned C-1 and will remain C-1, with the exception of the Taco Bell property, which is zoned PB (Planned Business). We are proposing to retain the PB zoning for the property because it includes their property along Glenwood

Avenue that was rezoned to PB for a parking lot. We don't want to encourage further encroachment of commercial uses along Glenwood Avenue. **Shown as PD.**

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification on the CSR zone, which was given. Chairman Elmer said that in the case of Mesa College, a planned zone would give the City more development control than what was offered in a CSR zone. Ms. Portner agreed that planned zones afforded additional control. However, the college had been working closely with the City on development of its Master Plan.

Councilmember Theobold commented that the CSR zone didn't really seem to capture the true range of available uses. He agreed that a PD zone was probably more appropriate for Mesa College. Ms. Portner said that college representatives were concerned over the lack of flexibility in PD zones, which they feared would limit development of their Master Plan and restrict funding options. Due to the time it takes to amend a plan in a PD zone, funds could be lost for some projects. That is why the college favored the CSR zone.

Councilmember Theobold said that City Council probably wouldn't be comfortable with giving the college the type of flexibility allowed in a CSR zone. Ms. Portner said that if a PD zone was viewed as a better option, staff could discuss it further with college representatives.

Chairman Elmer expressed the need for City control over any college expansion to the west.

Councilmember Theobold said that he wanted to see the college's Master Plan go through the same scrutiny as had St. Mary's. Councilmember Terry agreed.

After a brief discussion, the general consensus was to allow the CSR zone recommendation to remain.

3. St. Mary's properties on the southeast corner of 7th Street and Patterson Road—**shown as PD.**
4. Most of the existing zoning along the 12th Street corridor is being retained, with the exception of the west side of 12th from Walnut to the Canal. **The proposed zoning for those properties is RO (Residential/Office).** However, the northwest corner of 12th Street and Bookcliff Avenue was recently rezoned to B-1 to allow for the future construction of an office building. **Staff is recommending that the proposed zoning be B-1. NW corner of 12th Street and Bookcliff is shown as B-1.**
5. Miller Homestead—East side of 12th Street, north of Bonita and south of F ½ Road. **This property is now shown as PD.**
6. The Cottonwood Meadows Mobile Home Park, located in the 28 ½ Road, Mesa Avenue area, staff proposes that a **Planned Zone be applied to the entire subdivision with the following setbacks: 14' front, 10' rear and 5' side. A garage or carport would be required to have a front yard setback of 20'. Shown as PD.**

Councilmember Theobold said that if a change were requested by a lot owner, would the entire development plan require alteration? Ms. Portner noted that the City's variance process would allow individual changes to occur without any alteration to the overall plan. Chairman Elmer,

Chairman for the Board of Appeals, said that the Board had seen many variance requests for lots in Cottonwood Meadows.

7. The property on the northwest corner of Horizon Drive and 12th Street —**changed to PD.**
8. Additional properties north of the Foster property, at the northwest corner of Horizon Drive and 12th Street, are currently zoned RSF-4 and RSF-2. **Lots along 12th Street changed to RMF-8. Lot between Cascade Drive and 12th Street changed to RSF-4.**
9. The properties on the northwest corner of 12th Street and G Road are currently zoned RSF-4. **Lots along G Road left as RSF-4. Lots to the north changed to RSF-2.**

When Chairman Elmer asked if the property owners themselves had asked for the change, Ms. Portner responded affirmatively. Noting the L-shaped parcel zoned RSF-4 and the level of concern expressed by surrounding residents, Chairman Elmer felt that this parcel should be zoned RSF-2.

A nearby property owner, Doug Clary, provided a brief description of the subject parcel. The property owner seemed to be there very seldom but he noticed some improvement being made to the property.

Following a brief discussion, there was general agreement to rezone the property located at the northeast corner of Victor Drive and G Road from RSF-4 to RSF-2.

10. 2697 G Road is currently zoned RSF-2—**changed to RMF-8.**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Larry Beckner (1241 Gunnison Avenue, Grand Junction) referenced a property owned by the Bank of Grand Junction located at the corner of 27 ½ and F Roads. He briefly outlined their plans for development of the property, which had been previously brought before Planning Commission and City Council. He thought that the character of the area had changed sufficiently to warrant the property's rezone to PB.

Council President Kinsey said that major zoning change requests must still be brought before the Planning Commission and City Council for individual consideration.

Doug Clary (2691 Kimberly Drive, Grand Junction) referenced property located at G Road and 12th Street. He expressed concern over its rezone recommendation from RSF-2 to RMF-8. This represented an almost 400% increase in density, he said. The area currently proposed for rezone from RSF-4 to RMF-8 represented a doubling of its current density. This seemed excessive and inconsistent with the City's direction to zone to the most compatible alternative. Mr. Clary said that so dramatic a density increase would change the character of the area and bring increased traffic impacts. He suggested rezoning the entire subject area to RSF-4.

Councilmember Terry said that one of the Growth Plan's goals was to identify areas where higher densities could be accommodated. This was one such area.

Doug Fassbinder (368 Independent Avenue, #5, Grand Junction) did not feel that the college was being responsive to the community. As an independent contractor, he objected to perceived slights by the college in hiring out-of-town contractors. Those contractors, he said, were being held to a different standard and seemed able to cut corners and not adhere to City requirements. This made it difficult for him to compete for college contracting jobs. Why should the college be held to a different standard and not be forced to comply with the City's landscaping, parking and setback criteria as well as federal ADA requirements? He felt that the college should be more closely scrutinized and suggested that a PD zone be applied to college property.

Councilmember Terry said that there existed between the City and Mesa State College a spirit of cooperation.

Council President Kinsey said that both boards needed to be cognizant of the college's impacts on local businesses and surrounding neighborhoods. He said that there was also some question over whether the college could legally be forced to comply with City requirements. Given that, he felt it better to foster a relationship of cooperation.

Councilmember Theobald wasn't sure if the college, specifically the dormitories, were viewed as a publicly-funded or privately-funded entity.

11. The properties bounded by 12th Street, Horizon Drive, Budlong Street and Midway Avenue—**changed to RSF-4.**
12. The property south of Horizon Drive, west of 27 ½ Road—**changed to PD.**
13. CH-4 Commercial Park is currently zoned PC. **There was some discussion of leaving the property zoned PC to allow for a mix of uses and additional height. However, IO (Industrial-Office) is proposed that would allow for the same mix of uses and a height of up to 65' because of the special provisions for the Horizon Drive corridor.**
14. The property south of H Road and west of CH-4 Commercial Park—**changed to IO.**
15. The property north of H Road and east of 27 ¼ Road—**changed to IO.**
16. The Paradise Hills Subdivision—staff is recommending that the RSF-4 zoning, or an approved planned zone, be applied to the future filings. **Changed to PD.**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Gail Reddin (2723 H Road, Grand Junction) asked that the 1 unit/5 acres zone district be retained for her property. She didn't understand why her property was subject to a zone change and felt that the higher density would encourage more development to occur around her. Since she owned dog training and upholstery businesses, she felt that increased numbers of people would put her businesses at risk.

Councilmember Theobald noted Ms. Reddin's property location within the Persigo 201 boundary. The urban boundary required a density of at least 1 unit per 2 acres.

Council President Kinsey remarked that due to Ms. Reddin's proximity to the airport, perhaps her property could qualify for estate zoning. Ms. Portner said that the estate zone district had been adopted after discussions on Ms. Reddin's property. While currently zoned RSF-R, her property would be suitable for either an RSF-E or RSF-2 zone designation.

Chairman Elmer stated that a density higher than RSF-R would provide a better transition.

Councilmember Terry expressed support for the RSF-E zone designation.

After a brief discussion, the decision was made to leave Ms. Reddin's property at its current density of 1 unit per acre.

Bruce Phillips (562 White Avenue, Grand Junction), representing Jimmie Etter and Emanuel Epstein, who owned property in the area south of Horizon Drive, referenced the parcel north of Cliff Drive and south of Horizon Drive. He understood that all of the Etter/Epstein property in this area would be changed to PD. The triangular portion of property north of Cliff Drive and south of Horizon Drive seemed to have been omitted. Ms. Portner said that she would check and make sure that all the referenced PB-zoned property had been included in the PD zone district.

Brad Shafer (2707 Midway, Grand Junction) was pleased with the RSF-4 zone designation for properties noted south of Horizon Drive (#1 in staff report).

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Stephanie Nye, CMC
City Clerk