

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

September 15, 2004

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction convened into regular session on the 15th day of September 2004, at 7:30 p.m. in the City Auditorium. Those present were Councilmembers Harry Butler, Dennis Kirtland, Bill McCurry, Gregg Palmer, Jim Spehar and President of the Council Bruce Hill. Absent was Councilmember Cindy Enos-Martinez. Also present were City Manager Kelly Arnold, City Attorney John Shaver, and City Clerk Stephanie Tuin.

Council President Hill called the meeting to order. Councilmember Palmer led in the pledge of allegiance. The audience remained standing for the invocation by Pastor Eldon Coffey, Central Orchard Mesa Community Church.

PROCLAMATIONS / RECOGNITIONS

PROCLAIMING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, 2004 AS "BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH"

PROCLAIMING SEPTEMBER 25, 2004 AS "DIABETES AWARENESS DAY"

PROCLAIMING SEPTEMBER 19TH – 25TH, 2004 AS "YELLOW RIBBON YOUTH SUICIDE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION WEEK"

PROCLAIMING OCTOBER 2, 2004 AS "OKTOBERFEST DAY"

PROCLAIMING OCTOBER 3 - 9, 2004 AS "NATIONAL 4-H WEEK"

PROCLAIMING OCTOBER 3 – 9, 2004 AS "FIRE PREVENTION WEEK"

PROCLAIMING SEPTEMBER 29, 2004 AS "VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS DAY"

RIVERFRONT FOUNDATION REPRESENTATIVE BRIAN MAHONEY PRESENTED THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A COPY OF THE FOUNDATION'S RECENTLY PUBLISHED HISTORY BOOK ENTITLED PEOPLE, PARKS, AND TRAILS

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were none.

CONSENT CALENDAR

It was moved by Councilmember Palmer, seconded by Councilmember Spehar and carried by roll call vote to approve Consent Calendar Items #1 through #11.

1. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Action: Approve the Summary of the August 30, 2004 Workshop and the Minutes of the September 1, 2004 Regular Meeting

2. Appointment of a Designated Voter for the City to Cast a Vote in the Upcoming Special Election and Approving Amendments to the Written Mail Ballot Plan

The City Council has called a Special Election to extend the number of years and the maximum amount of additional debt financing of the Grand Junction Downtown Development Authority (DDA) to be repaid with the revenues derived from Tax Increment Financing (TIF). The City owns several properties in the DDA and is entitled to cast a ballot in the Special Election; however, because only natural persons can vote, the City must designate a representative to do so.

Resolution No. 81-04 – A Resolution Appointing a Designated Voter for the City of Grand Junction to Cast a Vote in the Special Election Scheduled for November 2, 2004 Regarding Tax Increment Financing Debt

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 81-04

3. Three Sub Recipient Contracts for Projects within the City's 2004 Program Year Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

The Sub Recipient Contracts formalize the City's award of a total of \$25,000 to various non-profit organizations via the St. Mary's Foundation as allocated from the City's 2004 CDBG Program as previously approved by Council.

Action: Authorize the City Manager to Sign the Three Sub Recipient Contracts with the St. Mary's Foundation for the City's 2004 Program Year, Community Development Block Grant Program

4. **Setting a Hearing on Zoning the Prairie View Annexation No. 1 and 2, Located at 474 Dodge Street and 3038 Mohawk Avenue to RMF-5** [File # ANX-2004-141]

Introduction of a proposed zoning ordinance to zone the Prairie View Annexation No. 1 and 2, located at 474 Dodge Street and 3038 Mohawk Avenue.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning the Prairie Annexation No. 1 and 2 to RMF-5 Located at 474 Dodge Street and 3038 Mohawk Avenue

Action: Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance and Set a Hearing for October 6, 2004

5. **Setting a Hearing on Vacating a Portion of the D $\frac{3}{4}$ Road Right-of-Way, Located East of Dodge Street and Southwest of Mohawk Avenue** [File # ANX-2004-141]

Introduction of a proposed vacation ordinance to vacate a portion of the D $\frac{3}{4}$ Road right-of-way, located east of Dodge Street and southwest of Mohawk Avenue.

Proposed Ordinance Vacating a Portion of D $\frac{3}{4}$ Road Right-of-Way, Located East of Dodge Street and Southwest of Mohawk Avenue

Action: Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance and Set a Hearing for October 6, 2004

6. **Setting a Hearing on D Road Storage Annexation Located at 2755 D Road** [File # ANX-2004-182]

Resolution referring a petition for the annexation and introduction of a proposed ordinance. The 0.985 acre D Road Storage Annexation consists of three (3) parcels of vacant land and adjoining right-of-way located at 2755 D Road. The petitioner's intent is to annex and then develop all three (3) properties in anticipation of future industrial development.

a. Referral of Petition, Setting a Hearing and Exercising Land Use Jurisdiction

Resolution No. 82-04 – A Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation, and Exercising Land Use Control, D Road Storage Annexation Located at 2755 D Road and Including a Portion of the D Road Right-of-Way

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 82-04

b. Setting a Hearing on Proposed Ordinance

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, D Road Storage Annexation, Approximately 0.985 Acres Located at 2755 D Road and Including a Portion of the D Road Right-of-Way

Action: Introduction of Proposed Ordinance and Set a Hearing for October 20, 2004

7. **Setting a Hearing on Kronvall Annexation Located at 2263 Greenbelt Drive**

[File # ANX-2004-175]

Resolution referring a petition for annexation and introduction of a proposed ordinance. The 4.274 acre Kronvall annexation consists of 2 parcels.

a. Referral of Petition, Setting a Hearing and Exercising Land Use Jurisdiction

Resolution No. 83-04 – A Resolution Referring a Petition to the City Council for the Annexation of Lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Setting a Hearing on Such Annexation, and Exercising Land Use Control, Kronvall Annexation, Located at 2263 Greenbelt Drive

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 83-04

b. Setting a Hearing on Proposed Ordinance

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado Kronvall Annexation, Approximately 4.274 Acres, Located at 2263 Greenbelt Drive

Action: Introduction of Proposed Ordinance and Set a Hearing for October 20, 2004

8. **Setting a Hearing on Zoning the Indian Road Annexation Located between C ½ Road and D Road at Indian Road to I-1 (Light Industrial)** [File # ANX-2004-137]

Introduction of a proposed zoning ordinance to zone the Indian Road Annexation I-1 (Light Industrial), located between C ½ Road and D Road at Indian Road.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning the Indian Road Annexation to I-1 Located Between C ½ Road and D Road at Indian Road

Action: Introduction of Proposed Ordinance and Set a Hearing for October 6, 2004

9. **Rename Poplar Avenue to Poplar Drive** [File # MSC-2004-138]

Resolution to rename Poplar Avenue to Poplar Drive.

Resolution No. 84-04 – A Resolution Renaming Poplar Avenue to Poplar Drive Located Between Lorey Drive and Lilac Lane

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 84-04

10. **Setting a Hearing for Alley Improvement District No. ST-04 and ST-04 Phase B Assessments**

Improvements to the following alleys have been completed as petitioned by a majority of the property owners to be assessed:

- East/West Alley from 13th to 15th, between Kennedy Avenue and Elm Avenue.
- East/West Alley from 14th to 15th, between Elm Avenue and Texas Avenue.
- East/West Alley from 2nd to 3rd, between Chipeta Avenue and Ouray Avenue
- East/West Alley from 2nd to 3rd, between Teller Avenue and Belford Avnue.
- “T” shaped Alley from 7th to Cannell, between Kennedy Avenue and Elm Avenue.
- East/West Alley from 8th to Cannell, between Mesa Avenue and Hall Avenue (Alley Improvement District ST-04, Phase B)

Proposed Ordinance Approving the Assessable Cost of the Improvements Made in and for Alley Improvement Districts No. ST-04 and ST-04 Phase B in the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Pursuant to Ordinance No. 178, Adopted and Approved the 11th Day of June, 1910, as Amended; Approving the Apportionment of Said Cost to Each Lot or Tract of Land or Other Real Estate in Said Districts; Assessing the Share of Said Cost Against Each Lot or Tract of Land or Other Real Estate in Said Districts; Approving the Apportionment of Said Cost and Prescribing the Manner for the Collection and Payment of Said Assessment

Action: Introduction of Proposed Ordinance and Set a Hearing for October 6, 2004

11. **Setting a Hearing on Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-46-04 Assessments**

First Reading of a Proposed Assessing Ordinance for the apportionment of costs associated with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-46-04.

Proposed Ordinance Approving the Assessable Cost of the Improvements Made in and for Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-46-04, in the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Pursuant to Ordinance No. 178, Adopted and Approved the 11th Day of June, 1910, as Amended; Approving the Apportionment of Said Cost to Each Lot or Tract of Land or Other Real Estate in Said District; Assessing the Share of Said Cost Against Each Lot or Tract of Land or Other Real Estate in Said District; Approving the Apportionment of Said Cost and Prescribing the Manner for the Collection and Payment of Said Assessment

Action: Introduction of Proposed Ordinance and Set a Hearing for October 6, 2004

***** ITEMS NEEDING INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION *****

Authorizing Support for the Revolving Loan Fund of the Business Incubator Center

A Resolution of the City of Grand Junction, that authorizes the expenditure of \$300,000 from the Economic Development Fund to help recapitalize the Business Incubator Revolving Loan Fund.

Ron Lappi, Administrative Services Director, reviewed this item that was discussed extensively at the workshop on Monday, September 13, 2004. He reviewed the highlights of that discussion.

Councilmember Kirtland suggested, as the City Manager had suggested on Monday, that the Council receive a regular update of the program. Mr. Lappi said, as he and Councilmember Palmer sit on the board, they will make sure that Council receives regular updates.

Resolution No. 88-04 – A Resolution Authorizing the Expenditure of Economic Development Fund to Recapitalize the Revolving Loan Fund of Mesa County

Councilmember Kirtland moved to adopt Resolution No. 88-04. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Public Hearing – Barker Annexation and Zoning Located at 172 Lantzer Avenue, 2934 Highway 50, and 2937 Jon Hall Drive [File # ANX-2004-127]

The Barker Annexation is a serial annexation. The developable area is comprised of 8.89 acres, located at 172 Lantzer Avenue, 2934 Highway 50, and 2937 Jon Hall Drive. The annexation area includes portions of 29 ½ Road; Lantzer Avenue; Jon Hall Drive and Highway 50 rights-of-way. The applicants request approval of the Resolution accepting the annexation petition, and hold a public hearing to consider final passage of the Annexation Ordinance.

The public hearing was opened at 8:14 p.m.

Lori V. Bowers, Senior Planner, reviewed this item. She described the location of the site, the surrounding zoning and uses. Ms. Bowers stated the application meets the criteria for annexation and that both staff and Planning Commission recommend approval. She then reviewed the zoning request and described the neighborhood concerns which were traffic and drainage. They were told that would be addressed at the final plat.

The applicant was not present and there were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:16 p.m.

Councilmember Kirtland noted that as growth continues in that area, at some point access onto and off of Highway 50 will have to be addressed.

Councilmember Palmer asked Ms. Bowers if the difference between RSF-2 and RSF-4 is the setback. Ms. Bowers responded affirmatively.

a. Accepting Petition

Resolution No. 85-04 – A Resolution Accepting a Petition for Annexation, Making Certain Findings, Determining that Property Known as Barker Annexations, No. 1 and 2 is Eligible for Annexation, Located at 172 Lantzer Avenue; 2934 Highway 50; 2937 Jon Hall Drive

b. Annexation Ordinances

Ordinance No. 3665 – An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Barker Annexation No. 1, Approximately 0.16 Acres Located Along a Portion of 29 ½ Road and Highway 50 Rights-of-Way

Ordinance No. 3666 – An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Barker Annexation No. 2, Approximately 10.72 Acres Located at 172 Lantzer Avenue; 2934 Highway 50 and 2937 Jon Hall Drive

c. Zoning Ordinance

Ordinance No. 3667 – An Ordinance Zoning the Barker Annexation to RSF-4 Located at 172 Lantzer Avenue, 2934 Hwy 50, and 2937 Jon Hall Drive

Councilmember Kirtland moved to adopt Resolution No. 85-04, Ordinance No.'s 3665, 3666, and 3667 on Second Reading and ordered them published. Councilmember Spehar seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Public Hearing – Vacating Right-of-Way at the Southwest Corner of Patterson Road and 28 ½ Road Intersection within The Falls Filing One Subdivision [File # VR-2004-133]

Adoption of a proposed ordinance to vacate the public right-of-way, as dedicated in the Falls Filing No. One, as amended, except for F Road also known as Patterson Road, located at the southwest corner of Patterson Road and 28 ½ Road. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the right-of-way vacation on August 24, 2004, making the Findings of Fact/Conclusion identified in the staff report.

The public hearing was opened at 8:19 p.m.

Ronnie Edwards, Associate Planner, reviewed this item. With the vacation, the property owners will rededicate right-of-way to the proper width. That will be a condition of the vacation. The existing zoning is Planned Development and the application meets all the applicable criteria. The request is consistent with the Growth Plan. The staff recommends approval on the condition of the corresponding right-of-way being dedicated.

Councilmember Kirtland asked if the underlying zoning will remain. Ms. Edwards said yes.

Councilmember Palmer asked for clarification of the reason for the smaller right-of-way dedication. Ms. Edwards said it is unknown why that original width was dedicated; it is more than what is required.

The applicant was present but did not wish to add anything additional.

The public hearing was closed at 8:22 p.m.

City Attorney Shaver said this has been a complicated matter. At first it was discovered that an encroachment into the open space had occurred. He complimented the Homeowners Association for their cooperation.

Ordinance No. 3668 – An Ordinance Vacating Right-of-Way Located in the Falls Filing No. One, as amended, Subdivision on the Southwest Corner of Patterson Road and 28 ½ Road

Councilmember Palmer moved to adopt Ordinance No. 3668 on Second Reading and ordered it published. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion.

Councilmember Butler noted that he remembers using that area as a kid.

Motion carried by roll call vote.

Public Hearing – Growth Plan Amendment from Commercial / Industrial to Park for Five Properties Located at 2515 River Road [File # GPA-2004-125]

Hold a public hearing and consider passage of a resolution, to change the Growth Plan designation from a Commercial / Industrial designation to a Park designation.

The public hearing was opened at 8:24 p.m.

Senta L. Costello, Associate Planner, reviewed this item. She combined the review of this item with the rezoning. Council will address each motion separately. She noted the property is currently vacant and also described the surrounding uses and Growth Plan designations. Ms. Costello described the request and noted that the Staff feels the application meets the Growth Plan amendment criteria and referred Council to the staff report for specific goals and policies.

Councilmember Spehar suggested that the Council keep consideration of the Growth Plan separate.

Councilmember Palmer asked if the Growth Plan designation was an error. Ms. Costello said yes, specifically along the trail. The feel of the area has also changed with the new Fun Park. Riverside Parkway will lend more visibility to the area therefore CSR (Community Services & Recreation) makes more sense than industrial.

The applicant Curt Maki was present but had nothing to add.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:29 p.m.

Councilmember Spehar said, due to the changing nature of the area, the change will meet several of the policies of the Growth Plan and Council President Hill concurred.

Councilmember Kirtland agreed that as things change in the community, Growth Plan amendments will come forward. This is an easy call knowing how things will change. But this does not set any precedence. Councilmember Palmer agreed and especially if it allows for the use that will benefit the community.

Council President Hill said the same kind of changes may be appropriate in the 29 Road areas as the character of the area changes.

Resolution No. 86-04 – A Resolution Amending the City of Grand Junction Growth Plan Future Land Use Map to Re-Designate Approximately 10 Acres Located Generally at 2515 River Road from Commercial / Industrial to Park

Councilmember Palmer moved to adopt Resolution No. 86-04. Councilmember Kirtland seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Public Hearing – Rezoning the Ice Skating Inc. Property, Located at 2515 River Road, from I-1 to CSR (Continued from September 1, 2004) [File # RZ-2004-125]

Hold a public hearing and consider final passage of the zoning ordinance to rezone the Ice Skating Inc. property from I-1 (Light Industrial) to CSR (Community Services & Recreation), located at 2515 River Road.

The public hearing was opened at 8:33 p.m.

Senta L. Costello, Associate Planner, reviewed this item. The request is for the four lots along the trail. She described the surrounding zoning and noted the request meets the criteria of the Zoning and Development Code and the Growth Plan.

The applicant, Curt Maki, President of the Ice Skating Inc., thanked the City for all of the assistance and working out the land trade. The project is moving along pretty quickly.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:35 p.m.

Ordinance No. 3669 – An Ordinance Rezoning the Ice Skating Inc Property to CSR (Community Services and Recreation) Located at 2515 River Road

Councilmember Spehar moved to adopt Ordinance No. 3669 on Second Reading and ordered it published. Councilmember Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call.

Appeal of the Record of a Planning Commission Decision Regarding the Denial of a Variance Request Located at 2938 North Avenue, Palace Pointe Market Place (Continued from July 7, 2004) [File # VAR-2004-056]

The appellant, North Avenue Center, LLC, wishes to appeal the Planning Commission's decision of May 11, 2004 regarding the denial of their variance request of the Zoning & Development Code's requirement to provide a six foot (6') masonry wall between a C-1, Light Commercial and a RMF-8, Residential Multi-Family – 8 units / acre (County) Zoning District. This appeal is per Section 2.18 E. of the Zoning & Development Code which specifies that the City Council is the appellant body of the Planning Commission.

Council President Hill described the agenda item and stated that Council has chosen not to take additional testimony on the issue. City Councilmembers have been provided the entire record of the Planning Commission meeting where the decision was made. He asked the City Attorney to review the procedure.

City Attorney John Shaver stated that the purpose of the appeal is to review the record and determine if the Planning Commission had the evidence needed to make the decision they made. It does not substitute a decision for the Planning Commission.

Council President Hill read a portion of the request for an appeal that the Planning Commission reviewed May 11, 2004. He read the findings that would have to be found to grant the appeal, which states if the City Council would grant the appeal, the following approval criteria as expressed in Section 2.18 E. 1. of the Zoning & Development Code would have to be found. (1) The decision maker may have acted in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of this code. (2) The decision maker may have made erroneous findings of fact based on the evidence and testimony on the record. (3) The decision maker may have failed to fully consider mitigating measures or revisions offered by the applicant that would have brought the proposed project into compliance. (4) The decision maker may have acted arbitrarily, acted capriciously, and/or abused its discretion. He then read the section out of the Code that is being appealed.

Section 6.5.F, 1 -

Fences and Walls – Nothing in this Code shall require the “back-to-back” placement of fences and/or walls. If an existing fence or wall substantially meets the requirements of this section, an additional fence on the adjacent developing property shall not be required.

Note that Table 6.5 specifically requires a Type A Buffer (an 8 foot wide landscape strip with trees and shrubs) and a wall between C-1, Light Commercial and a RMF-8, Residential Multi-Family – 8 units/acre (county) Zoning District.

Council President Hill continued to say that in his review of the record transcripts and video tape, a lot of emphasis was put on just a portion of the Code, not the Code in full. He therefore found there was no basis to grant the appeal, no basis for items 2, 3, or 4 and therefore, would deny the appeal.

Councilmember Kirtland said in his review he would come to the same conclusions. The variance request as it went forward was contrary to the Code, and reading further in the Code, it was clear in the testimony, the Planning Commission members were on track as to their understanding of the Code and therefore he too would vote to deny the appeal.

Councilmember Palmer said he spent a lot of time reading and visited the area. Codes are to protect residential from commercial areas. He came to the same conclusion that the hearing was conducted fairly and he finds no reason to support the rehearing or the appeal.

Councilmember Spehar agreed, adding the decision maker did not act inconsistently with the Code and the existing fence does not meet the standards.

Councilmember Butler and Councilmember McCurry agreed.

Councilmember Spehar moved to deny the Appeal of the Record of a Planning Commission Decision Regarding the Denial of a Variance Request Located at 2938 North Avenue, Palace Pointe Market Place. Councilmember Kirtland seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Adopting the Implementation of the Infill/Redevelopment Program

In September, 2002, City Council approved an infill / redevelopment policy which consisted of definitions of “Infill,” “Redevelopment,” and “Redevelopment Area.” Early in 2003, the policy was formally adopted as part of the Growth Plan update. Following that, Leslie Bethel Design and Planning was contracted to develop an implementation program. Working with Council and the Planning Commission, the final implementation report was completed in March, 2004. This proposed resolution adopts Council’s direction provided at the July 19, 2004 workshop at which time the definitions were reaffirmed and the proposed infill and redevelopment area maps, proposed incentives and the information required of applicants were approved.

Bob Blanchard, Community Development Director, reviewed this item. He reviewed the history of the development of this policy and development of the implementation program.

It has been a long term project. He restated the definition of infill - a vacant parcel or assemblage of parcels bordered by already developed property on three-fourths of the border. The redevelopment areas definition is a developing area, a minimum of 2 acres or an assemblage that is under utilized and thereby ripe for redevelopment. Boundaries were then identified. For infill, the boundaries are Patterson Road on the north, Highway 50 on the south, the river to the west and 29 Road on the east. For redevelopment, it is a little more complicated to describe, but is shown on Attachment 3. Specific parcels have been identified that would meet the criteria.

Councilmember Palmer clarified that the City is not targeting any specific parcels. The incentives will help in the redevelopment even on the difficult parcels. He then reviewed the potential forms of involvement that are incentives. Mr. Blanchard expressed that he is not recommending the automatic expedited process due to the continued heavy work load of the department. He then reviewed the other possible incentives.

Councilmember Palmer asked for clarification on density bonuses. Mr. Blanchard said specifics have not been developed. Approval of the concept was needed first. It will likely be a formula based on units. Councilmember Spehar added that such bonuses will be based on the benefit to the community. Councilmember Palmer said he wants to be assured that a vacant parcel within the boundary will not be guaranteed such bonuses.

Council President Hill stated the potential options for the City's involvement. He asked if the process to get the incentives will actually slow down the process at that point if granted. Could it then be expedited? Mr. Blanchard said the expedited process is still on the list. Council President Hill said if the City wants to incentivize, that should be the first thing to occur and then does it go to the top of the pile? Mr. Blanchard said yes and described a situation where it could work if someone were to come to the City that could really use the help from the incentives; they would proceed and apply with the Council. But only if they were in need of the incentive program.

Mr. Blanchard then reviewed the evaluation criteria of Attachment 5 and described the review team that would be evaluating that criteria. Mr. Blanchard then displayed a map that identified a number of parcels that would be sites of possible infill projects. A second map identified possible redevelopment areas.

Councilmember Palmer asked if there are specific bonuses for affordable housing. Mr. Blanchard said not specifically, there are other benefits within the infill area.

City Manager Arnold inquired about the discussion on the additional components that would be considered for incentives. Mr. Blanchard said the only item deleted from the original list was the sales tax deferral. City Manager Arnold noted those components were points for the Staff to use when bringing a project to Council.

Councilmember Spehar said that nothing prohibits Council from using incentives for an infill affordable housing project.

City Manager Arnold said it will be a challenge initially to make this work within the process to prevent it from getting bogged down, it will take some fine tuning.

Councilmember Palmer feared the appearance of being arbitrary without a standard set of criteria but agreed that flexibility is desired.

Councilmember Spehar argued there is a value to that, the focus could be on affordable housing now, and that in the future another focus might emerge.

Councilmember Kirtland noted that he agrees with a written public comment that the City is in this for the long haul. It will be interesting to see how it develops and how the developers become educated on this process.

Councilmember Palmer said the number of vacant properties speaks to the need for this policy.

Councilmember Spehar said that it is imperative the Council make sure that a budget is in place in order to provide these incentives. There will be a need for a budget discussion.

Council President Hill stated that he enjoyed the comments received in the feedback. It is Council's biggest challenge to deal with the flexibility and that is the great benefit of the program. At the same time, Council has the flexibility to make their focus on what is needed at the time. Also, this is a huge step but feels that the City is ready for such a program.

City Attorney Shaver commented that he supports the adoption of this resolution but wondered if there should be consideration of a review or expiration date or a date where the policy would be codified. Council President Hill suggested it be tied into the review of another policy document. Any change to it would need to be done by a resolution.

Councilmember Spehar said he would like to see the Council have some experience with the policy first.

Councilmember Kirtland agreed with coupling it with the other reviews of plan documents.

Councilmember Spehar said this was one of the Strategic Plan Goals, and that Council periodically reviews the Strategic Plan, so they will have a chance to have a more formal discussion about it.

City Manager Arnold said it could also be reviewed in conjunction with the budget.

City Manager Arnold wanted to make sure that the Staff has a complete record of the development of this policy and that the City Clerk make sure this discussion is very clear in the minutes and all points are captured. He also urged the Council to review the minutes to ensure all points are included.

Resolution No. 87-04 – A Resolution Adopting an Infill/Redevelopment Implementation Program

Councilmember Spehar moved to adopt Resolution No. 87-04. Councilmember Palmer seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS

There were none.

OTHER BUSINESS

There were none.

EXECUTIVE SESSION – RELATIVE TO MATTERS THAT MAY BE SUBJECT TO NEGOTIATIONS, DEVELOPING STRATEGY FOR NEGOTIATIONS, AND/OR INSTRUCTING NEGOTIATORS UNDER C.R.S. SECTION 24-6-402(4)(e), RELATIVE TO GRAND MESA RESERVOIR COMPANY PROPOSALS

It was moved by Councilmember Butler, seconded by Councilmember Spehar to adjourn into executive session and Council will not return to open session. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned to executive session at 9:40 p.m.

Stephanie Tuin, MMC
City Clerk