

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

July 20, 2011

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction convened into regular session on the 20th day of July, 2011 at 7:02 p.m. in the City Auditorium. Those present were Councilmembers Bennett Boeschstein, Jim Doody, Laura Luke, Bill Pitts, and Council President Tom Kenyon. Councilmembers Teresa Coons and Sam Susuras were absent. Also present were City Manager Laurie Kadrich, City Attorney John Shaver, and City Clerk Stephanie Tuin.

Council President Kenyon called the meeting to order. Councilmember Pitts led the Pledge of Allegiance, followed by a moment of silence.

Presentations

Yard of the Month for June

Tom Ziola, Forestry Supervisor, and Kami Long, Forestry Board Chair, introduced Don and Buzzie Aust who were June's winners of the Yard of the Month. Mr. Aust gave credit to his wife for doing most of the work.

Council President Kenyon expressed appreciation to the winners for all their hard work and said that the community shines due to efforts such as these.

Appointments

Councilmember Boeschstein moved to re-appoint Frank Watt and appoint Brad Taylor, John Pabst, and Karen Jefferson for three year terms expiring July 2014 and appoint John Heideman to a partial term expiring July 2012 to the Riverfront Commission. Council President Kenyon declared the appointments are adopted unanimously.

Certificates of Appointments

Cynthia Burke was present to receive her Certificate of Appointment to the Downtown Development Authority/Downtown Grand Junction Business Improvement District.

Council Comments

Councilmember Boeschstein mentioned that he and Steve Acquafresca met to interview Riverfront Commission candidates. He attended the Downtown Development Authority meeting. He also attended the League of Conservation Voters meeting.

There were no other Council comments.

Citizen Comments

There were none.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Luke read the Consent Calendar Items #1 through #3 and then moved for approval of the Consent Calendar. Councilmember Pitts seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

1. **Minutes of Previous Meetings**

Action: Approve the Minutes of the July 5, 2011 Joint Persigo Meeting and the July 6, 2011 Regular Meeting

2. **Setting a Hearing Amending the Grand Junction Municipal Code to Authorize the Issuance of Special Events Permits by the Local Licensing Authority**

A new State law allows a local jurisdiction to consider and issue Special Events Permits. The law allows non-profits and political candidates that receive a Special Event Permit to serve alcoholic beverages on non-licensed premises for up to fifteen events per year providing all requirements are met. Under the prior law the Local Licensing Authority reviewed and approved a Special Event Permit application but the State issued the license.

Proposed Ordinance Amending the Grand Junction Municipal Code Section 5.12.240 to Authorize the Issuance of Special Event Permits by and Through the Local Authority

Action: Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance and Set a Hearing for August 3, 2011

3. **Amber Floral 2nd Floor Balcony Revocable Permit, Located at 516 Main Street**
[File #RVP-2011-706]

Amber Floral, Inc. is remodeling the interior and façade of their building at 516 Main Street. The proposed design for the façade remodel includes a 2nd story balcony which extends over the Main Street right-of-way. Amber Floral, Inc. is therefore requesting a Revocable Permit for the proposed encroachment. The proposed balcony is an arc 14'8" long and extends 3'6" into the right-of-way.

Resolution No. 38-11—A Resolution Concerning the Issuance of a Revocable Permit to Amber Floral, Inc., 516 Main Street

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 38-11

ITEMS NEEDING INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION

Public Hearing—F Road Name Change to Patterson Road, Located between I-70 B (west side) to 26 Road and between 28 Road and I-70 B (east side) [File #SNC-2011-928]

The City and County Addressing Committee recommends that the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County officially change the F Road/Patterson Road corridor from I-70 Business Loop on the West to I-70 Business Loop on the East (approximately 9 miles) to Patterson Road. Approval of this name change will require renumbering 378 of 454 addresses along the corridor according to Mesa County's numbering grid.

The public hearing was opened at 7:11 p.m.

David Thornton, Principal Planner, presented this item. He explained the request and the background noting this is a joint project with Mesa County and introduced Linda Danneberger with the County who is the co-chair on the committee. The committee is comprised of about twenty members. The committee addressed the nine mile corridor from I-70 Business Loop on the west side of town to the I-70 Business Loop on the east. That roadway is called Patterson Road from 1st Street (26 Road) to 28 Road (28th Street). However, there are a checkerboard of Patterson Road and F Road addresses to both the east and west of that section. Some are using County numbering and some are using City numbering. It leads to confusion with the Post Office, visitors, and emergency services. The proposal is to change the street name to Patterson Road for the entire nine miles. The result of that street name change will also change some of the address numbers. Using the County numbering system made more sense due to the number of addresses and that will eliminate the fractional addresses. The impact on the property owner is recognized and the committee has heard from some property owners that object. However, the inconsistencies create confusion and difficulties from a variety of service providers as well as visitors and newcomers.

The change will impact 454 addresses; 76 addresses will see no change, 72 will have a street number change but not a road name change, 292 will have a street name change but the street number will not change, and lastly 7 have a fractional address which will have a street number change.

There has been a lot of publicity about this change. Several meetings have occurred and advertising for this public hearing did occur. Notices were sent to various review

agencies and, of course, those property owners that will be impacted. There will also be a public hearing before the County Commissioners on August 9th at 9:05 a.m.

Comments received included some in strong support of the change to some that are strongly opposed as they are long time property owners and will incur some financial impact with the change. All comments received as of that date of packet distribution were included; additional comments have been received both against and strongly in favor since then. Comments from a telephone directory company were positive and in favor of the change in order to stop confusion when giving directions. Out of all the review agencies, none responded unfavorably. The 911 Communications Center is in favor of an addressing system that allows emergency service providers to respond quickly. The new addressing will also prevent any identical numbering.

The addressing committee will make sure all agencies are notified of the change including utilities, service providers, directory companies, and the postal service. The property owners will have to notify their service providers and magazine subscriptions. Also the postal service will keep both addresses on file for a one year period to make sure people still get their mail.

The proposal meets Goal 9 of the Comprehensive Plan regarding an effective transportation system. The recommendation of City Staff is that the City Council approve the name change.

Councilmember Pitts asked why the street was named Patterson from F Road. Mr. Thornton said it was changed about fifty years ago for the two miles in the City to Patterson Road. Councilmember Pitts noted that more addresses will need to be changed to Patterson than if they stayed with F Road. Mr. Thornton responded that much of the business community said they preferred Patterson Road versus F Road. However, some do want it to remain F Road.

Councilmember Boeschstein thanked Mr. Thornton, applauded the effort and concurred that change can be difficult. He confirmed that the Post Office will deliver to both addresses for a year. Traditionally, as the City has expanded, the City has taken the street names out of the alpha (letter) names.

Council President Kenyon clarified what fractional addresses are and that they will be eliminated. Mr. Thornton confirmed that they will be eliminated.

Council President Kenyon asked for public comment.

Brandi Pollock, owner of Fisher Liquor Barn, 2438 F Road, said her grandfather purchased this property over 70 years ago and they have been a liquor store for thirty years. She has lived in Grand Junction her entire life and it has been F Road. She

thinks it has been easy to find areas based on the F Road address in this particular area. She is concerned about the name change and cost to make the change. She would like it to stay F Road.

Darlene Swenson, retired from the Post Office, has worked with the addressing system for over twenty years. The fractional addresses really cause a problem. Many automated addresses will not include the fraction. Postal carriers are not allowed to make adjustments. Many businesses use Patterson Road when they are technically still F Road and it really causes an issue. The Post Office is going to have more part-time people and they will not know people by name. Readdressing with a consistent numbering system will aid in delivery. She supported the change. Also GPS does not work on Patterson Road; it will send you to the wrong place.

Linda Danneberger, Mesa County Planning Division Director, said she is pleased to be co-chairing the effort. Some folks do like the County mile system but they think it is correct to honor the Patterson Road name (Patterson was a local doctor). All notices sent out were signed jointly by the City and the County. It has been a great joint, coordinated project. The County Commissioners are aware and their public hearing is August 9, 2011. Without the City going forward, there would be no point in going forward on the remainder of the roadway.

Pam Folsom, 3066 F Road, said her address is going to be completely changed to 3068 Patterson and does not think it is fair to have an address that has been this way for 30 years to something completely different.

Jim Baughman, 2579 F Road, said his family has lived at that location since 1928 so he has a lot of history on that property. His father told him the change occurred when the City annexed that section and the street numbers were changed. He explained the numbering system. The confusion came as the City began annexing into the County areas. The County system starts at the Utah line and proceeds east. He had phone books from 1939, 1957, and 1962. The annexation must have happened between 1962 and 1963, as the 1960 book shows the start of the change. He contended that the change will not clear up the confusion as there will still be portions called F Road. He said it was the wrong thing to change this name back then as it had too much of an impact. He supports changing the numbering system to the County system, noting it makes total sense. He asked the Council to consider naming the entire corridor F Road. He added this is not an isolated incident as he thinks the City has numbering problems on other streets such as 1st Street and 12th Street due to the interface between the City and County numbering systems.

There were no other public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:02 p.m.

Council President Kenyon asked Mr. Thornton to address any of the comments that were made. Mr. Thornton, Public Works and Planning, responded to the speaker whose street number was completely changing, and said this can probably be addressed on an administrative level. Regarding Mr. Baughman's comments, both he and Ms. Danneberger are aware that there are many other areas that have such issues but it is not easy to make a change, and they are not addressing all of those issues at the same time.

Council President Kenyon asked why the nine miles were selected. Mr. Thornton said it goes from Business Loop to Business Loop and that section is a four lane thoroughfare and is clearly urban.

Councilmember Luke asked how far F Road goes into the Redlands, and has noticed the road has been widened in the east. Are there plans to widen F Road in the Clifton area? Mr. Thornton said the area east of the Business Loop is being widened for access into the shopping center. It is more of a transition from a four lane road into a two lane road.

Linda Danneberger, County Planning Director, said east of the Business Loop, F Road is State maintained. CDOT is trying to move cars and the County wants to address pedestrian movement in that area.

Councilmember Luke asked about F Road past the Mall into the Redlands area. Mr. Thornton said there is just a short section and it is undedicated right-of-way and has one address listed as F Road.

Councilmember Pitts noted the good intentions of laying out the grid system when the town was laid out. He supports consistency but preferred the use of F Road throughout the length.

Councilmember Boeschstein noted that, as the area becomes urbanized, urban street names should be used. There should be consistent street names. There are a lot of good reasons that were testified too. He applauded the work done.

Councilmember Doody agreed with the Staff recommendations. The uniformity of changing it to Patterson has been justified. He has opposed name changes in the past. He remembers the change being for Dr. Patterson being honored. He agreed with expanding it to the nine mile corridor.

Councilmember Luke agreed it is a difficult issue. She feels strongly about not reversing decisions on name changes. It will be easier once the work is done, a year from now. This change is important to make things run smoother.

Resolution No. 39-11—A Resolution Renaming F Road to Patterson Road Between I-70 B (on the west) to 26 Road and Between 28 Road and I-70 B (on the east)

Councilmember Pitts moved to make the road name consistent and adopt Resolution No. 39-11. Councilmember Boeschstein seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote with Councilmember Pitts voting NO.

Public Hearing—JR Enclave Annexation and Zoning, Located at 247 Arlington Drive
[File #ANX-2011-755]

A request to annex 6.80 acres of enclaved property known as the JR Enclave and to zone the annexation, consisting of one (1) parcel to an R-5 (Residential 5 du/ac) zone district.

The public hearing opened at 8:16 p.m.

Brian Rusche, Senior Planner, presented this item. He described the request and the location and asked that the Staff Report and attachments be entered into the record. The Persigo Agreement mandates annexation of enclaves after five years of the property being enclaved. The State law allows for annexation of enclaves after three years. Mr. Rusche described the zoning proposed and the Comprehensive Plan designation. There is no development proposed for this property. The City is the applicant since it is an enclave. The proposal is in compliance with the annexation requirement in State law and the zoning being requested is in compliance with the Zoning and Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan. Staff recommends approval.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:20 p.m.

a. Annexation Ordinance

Ordinance No. 4471—An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, JR Enclave Annexation, Located at 247 Arlington Drive, Consisting of Approximately 6.80 Acres

b. Zoning Ordinance

Ordinance No. 4472—An Ordinance Zoning the JR Enclave Annexation to R-5 (Residential 5 du/ac), Located at 247 Arlington Drive

Councilmember Pitts moved to adopt Ordinance Nos. 4471 and 4472 and ordered them published in pamphlet form. Councilmember Luke seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Public Hearing—Zoning the Hatch Annexation, Located at 2063 S. Broadway [File #ANX-2011-698]

Request to zone the 4.39 acre Hatch Annexation that will consist of two (2) parcels located at 2063 S. Broadway to an R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) and B-1, (Neighborhood Business) zone district in anticipation of future residential and optional small commercial development.

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

Scott D. Peterson, Senior Planner, presented this item. He described the request and the location. The annexation was completed previously. The Planning Commission has recommended approval of the zoning proposed. The applicants are proposing developing the property as multi-family residential units. The applicant proposes to combine the five parcels into two. They are requesting B-1 for Phase II of the project that leaves the option of commercial (office and professional services and limited retail) although no specific project is proposed. These requested zones are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the criteria of the Zoning and Development Code have been met.

Councilmember Boeschstein asked if the old pool and swimming club are still in existence but vacant. Mr. Peterson confirmed noting the applicant will demolish the building, pool, and tennis courts.

Les Crawford, Professional Engineer, who works for Vortex Engineering, 2394 Patterson Road, was present representing the applicants, Mr. and Mrs. Hatch. He concurred with the Staff's presentation.

Councilmember Boeschstein asked if the swimming pool will be secured so as not to be a nuisance. Mr. Crawford said the pool will be demolished this summer and filled in so it will not be an issue.

There were no public comments.

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

Councilmember Doody asked how many units will there be? Mr. Peterson said 39 units on build out. Councilmember Doody asked about a traffic study. Mr. Peterson said the existing road can accommodate Phase I. Councilmember Doody expressed concerns

about the traffic so he is questioning the density. He was also concerned about the pressure on the schools with the possibility of Scenic Elementary closing. Mr. Peterson said the road curves are traffic calming, but according to the traffic engineers, the road can handle those densities.

Ordinance No. 4473—An Ordinance Zoning the Hatch Annexation to R-12, (Residential – 12 du/ac) and B-1, (Neighborhood Business), Located at 2063 S. Broadway

Councilmember Pitts moved to adopt Ordinance No. 4473 and ordered it published in pamphlet form. Councilmember Boeschstein seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote with Councilmember Doody voting NO.

Public Hearing—Crossroads United Methodist Annexation and Zoning, Located at 599 30 Road [File #ANX-2011-712]

A request to annex and zone 3.9 acres, to R-4 (Residential – 4 units/acre) located at 599 30 Road. The Crossroads United Methodist Annexation consists of one parcel, which includes 20,463 square feet of 30 Road Right-of-Way.

The public hearing was opened at 8:31 p.m.

Lori V. Bowers, Senior Planner, presented this item. She described the request, the location and the reason for the request. The Church was approached about installing a cell tower on their property which creates a change in use and thus causes the need for an annexation and zoning. They have requested a zoning of R-4 which complies with the Comprehensive Plan. Since the proposed tower is a stealth tower, no conditional use permit is required. The applicant's representative is in attendance.

Council President Kenyon asked what a stealth tower is. Ms Bowers advised it is a disguised cell tower, and in this case, it will look like a light pole.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:37 p.m.

a. Accepting Petition

Resolution No. 40-11—A Resolution Accepting a Petition for Annexation, Making Certain Findings, Determining that Property Known as the Crossroads United Methodist Annexation, Located at 599 30 Road is Eligible for Annexation

b. Annexation Ordinance

Ordinance No. 4474—An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado Crossroads United Methodist Annexation, Approximately 3.90 Acres, Located at 599 30 Road

c. Zoning Ordinance

Ordinance No. 4475—An Ordinance Zoning the Crossroads United Methodist Annexation to R-4 (Residential 4 du/ac), Located at 599 30 Road

Councilmember Doody moved to adopt Resolution No. 40-11 and Ordinance Nos. 4474 and 4475 and ordered them published in pamphlet form. Councilmember Luke seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Public Hearing—Amending the Grand Junction Municipal Code Regarding the Waste Hauler Service Charge

Section 13.04.300(h) of the Grand Junction Municipal Code, Wastewater Section, allows for the assessment of service charges to tank truck operators (waste haulers) for septage and grease disposal at the Persigo Wastewater Treatment Facility. The current Code assesses service charges based on the tank size of the waste hauler truck. The proposed revision would allow charges to be assessed on either tank size or gallons discharged, not just truck tank size.

The public hearing was opened at 8:38 p.m.

Dan Tonello, Wastewater Services Manager, presented this item. He described the purpose of the ordinance is to charge the waste hauler on the actual amount rather than on the size of the tank. He described the process and how a flow measuring device was recently installed. The truck size option for charging will remain in the Code.

Councilmember Doody asked how the grease is measured. Mr. Tonello said one system takes septage waste; the grease is disposed at a different site. The grease is solidified and then hauled to the dump.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:41 p.m.

Ordinance No. 4476—An Ordinance Amending Section 13.04.300(h) of the Grand Junction Municipal Code Concerning Waste Hauler Service Charges

Councilmember Doody moved to adopt Ordinance No. 4476 and ordered it published in pamphlet form. Councilmember Pitts seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Public Hearing—Amending the Grand Junction Municipal Code to Provide Limited Free Parking to Purple Heart Medal Veterans

This ordinance proposes to extend to Purple Heart medal veterans limited free City parking. The City Council requested that the ordinance be drafted.

The public hearing was opened at 8:43 p.m.

John Shaver, City Attorney, presented this item. He described the proposal and the reason behind the request. It will allow Purple Heart Medal Veterans to park for free at meters and in the City's parking garage.

Councilmember Luke asked what the limitations are. Mr. Shaver said it will apply to any space or any meter and includes spaces in the parking garage.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed at 8:45 p.m.

Councilmember Doody explained how this came forward and that the Purple Heart Veterans were wounded in battle. A Purple Heart Veteran brought the matter to the Mayor for consideration.

Council President Kenyon said all the veterans he spoke with said they will pay anyway but certainly appreciated the offer.

Ordinance No. 4477—An Ordinance Adding Section 10.040.380 to the Grand Junction Municipal Code Concerning Limited Free Parking for Purple Heart Medal Veterans

Councilmember Doody moved to adopt Ordinance No. 4477 and ordered it published in pamphlet form. Councilmember Pitts seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Non-Scheduled Citizens & Visitors

There were none.

Other Business

There was none.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Stephanie Tuin, MMC
City Clerk