

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
TWO RIVERS CONVENTION CENTER, 159 MAIN STREET
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2000, 7:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance
Invocation - Joe M. Jones
Redlands Pentecostal Church of God

PROCLAMATIONS / RECOGNITIONS

DECLARING JULY, 2000, AS "PARKS AND RECREATION MONTH" IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

APPOINTMENT

***APPOINTMENT TO THE COMMISSION ON ARTS AND CULTURE

*** * * CONSENT CALENDAR * * ***

1. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** [Attach 1](#)
Action: Approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting June 7, 2000

2. **Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant** [Attach 2](#)

In 1999, the City, along with the City of Fruita, City of Palisade and Mesa County, was awarded the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant. The decision was made that the funds would be best used for additional supervisors with the Partners Program who would be able to supervise Mesa County Court cases, and the three cities' cases, when useful public service was sentenced.

Resolution No. 57-00 – A Resolution Accepting the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant

**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 57-00*

Staff presentation: Stephanie Rubinstein, Staff City Attorney

3. **Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99** [Attach 3](#)

Sanitary sewer facilities have been installed as petitioned by the owners of seven properties located in the vicinity of Marsh Lane and North 12th Street. The proposed resolution is the required first step in the process to levy assessments against the benefiting properties.

Resolution No. 58-00 – A Resolution Approving and Accepting the Improvements Connected with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99, and Giving Notice of a Hearing

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 58-00 and Set a Hearing for August 2, 2000

Staff presentation: Rick Marcus, Real Estate Technician

4. **FY2001 Regional Transportation Planning Contract** [Attach 4](#)

The Regional Transportation Planning Contract allows the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization to continue transportation planning activities for the Grand Junction/Mesa County Transportation Planning Region. This money is a 100% grant from the Colorado Department of Transportation and requires no local match.

Resolution No. 59-00 – A Joint Resolution of the County of Mesa and the City of Grand Junction Whereby the Board of County Commissioners and the City of Grand Junction Enter into an Agreement with the Colorado Department of Transportation, Division of Transportation Development for the Provision of Transportation Services

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 59-00

Staff presentation: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

5. **Amending the Persigo 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary** [Attach 5](#)

During late 1999 and early 2000 the City Council and Board of County Commissioners conducted a series of public hearings concerning additions and deletions of property to the 201 Sewer Service Area. This joint City and County resolution reflects all decisions reached during these public hearings. The County adopted the joint resolution on May 22, 2000.

Resolution No. 60-00 – A Joint Resolution Amending Persigo 201 Service Area

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 60-00

Staff presentation: Mark Relph, Public Works & Utilities Director

6. **Columbine Sewer Design Services** [Attach 6](#)

The following qualified, lump sum fee proposals were received on June 12, 2000:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Lump Sum Fee</u>
Williams Engineering	Fruita	\$30,900
Balaz and Associates	Palisade	\$32,400
Banner and Associates	Grand Junction	\$36,500

Action: Award Contract for Columbine Sewer Design Services to Williams Engineering in the Amount of \$30,900 Contingent upon County Commissioner Approval

Staff presentation: Trent Prall, Utility Engineer

7. **Desert Hills Trunk Extension Project Revision** [Attach 7](#)

City staff is requesting revising the budget for the Desert Hills Trunk Extension from \$75,000 to \$150,000 to accommodate a trunk extension south of the proposed Desert Hills Estates property to South Broadway to serve the Wildwood area.

Action: Approve Revision of the Budget on the Desert Hills Trunk Extension to \$150,000 to Accommodate a Trunk Extension South of the Proposed Desert Hills Estates Property to South Broadway to Serve the Wildwood Area

Staff presentation: Trent Prall, Utility Engineer

8. **Federal Funds for Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail adjacent to South Camp Road** [Attach 8](#)

A City Council Resolution is required for the City to enter into a contract with the Colorado Department of Transportation and to participate in a Federally funded project to construct a Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail on the west side of South Camp Road. Total funding for this project is \$220,000 including 80% (\$176,000) Federal-aid funds and 20% (\$44,000) City funds. Both City and Federal funding for this project will be transferred from the 24 Road Trail Project budget.

Resolution No. 61-00 – A Resolution Concerning Federal-Aid Enhancement Funds from the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 for the Project Identified as STE M55-013 (13300) South Camp Phase 1, Sub=13300, for a Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail adjacent to South Camp Road

**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 61-00*

Staff presentation: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

9. **Revocable Permit for Fence in Right-of-Way, Westwood Ranch Subdivision Located at the Northwest Corner of F 1/2 and 25 1/2 Roads**
[File #RVP-2000-025] [Attach 9](#)

The developer of Westwood Ranch Subdivision has requested a revocable permit to allow an existing subdivision perimeter fence to remain in the City right-of-way. A portion of the fence is being relocated outside of the right-of-way for sight distance and future sign placement requirements. Staff recommends approval.

Resolution No. 62-00 – A Resolution Concerning the Issuance of a Revocable Permit to Westwood Ranch Homeowner's Association

**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 62-00*

Staff presentation: Bill Nebeker, Senior Planner

10. **Setting a Hearing on Annexing the G Road South Enclave, Located between 25 1/2 Road and 26 1/2 Road between G Road and F Road, with a Portion Extending East of 26 1/2 Road Near Round Hill Drive and Horizon Drive**
[File #ANX-2000-087] [Attach 10](#)

The 383.71-acre G Road South Enclave Annexation area consists of 221 parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, G Road South Enclave Annexation, Located Generally between 25 1/2 Road and 26 1/2 Road and North of Patterson (F) Road and South of G Road and Including a Portion of Land Extending East of 26 1/2 Road near Round Hill Drive and Horizon Drive, and Including but Not Limited to All or a Portion of the Following Rights-of-Way: Fruitridge Drive, Meander Drive, Music Lane, Music Court, Braemar Circle, Fletcher Lane, F 1/2 Road, Young Street, Young Court, Galley Lane, F 3/4 Road, 26 Road, Knoll Ridge Lane, Glen Caro Drive, Cloverdale Drive, Stepside Drive, Myrtle Lane, Dahlia Drive, Larkspur Drive, Crest Ridge Drive, G Road, 26 1/2 Road, and Horizon Drive, Consisting of Approximately 383.71 Acres

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

11. **Setting a Hearing on Zoning G Road South Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, RSF-1 and RSF-2, Located between 25 1/2 Road and 26 1/2 Road between G**

Road and F Road, with a Portion Extending East of 26 1/2 Road Near Round Hill Drive and Horizon Drive [File #ANX-2000-087] [Attach 11](#)

The 383.71-acre G Road South Enclave Annexation area consists of 221 parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law requires a City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of annexation. Property owners have requested that proposed city zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for their properties. Request for approval of zoning for approximately 383.71 acres from County RSF-R, RSF-1 and PUD to City RSF-R (Residential Single Family 1 unit/5 acres), RSF-1 (Residential Single Family 1 unit/acre) and RSF-2 (Residential Single Family 1 unit/acre) zone districts.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning the G Road South Enclave Annexation RSF-R, RSF-1 and RSF-2

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

12. **Setting a Hearing on Annexing the Clark/Wilson Enclave, Located at 2522 and 2524 F 1/2 Road** [File #ANX-2000-088] [Attach 12](#)

The 4.85-acre Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation area consists of two parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado – Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation Located at 2522 and 2524 F $\frac{1}{2}$ Road and Including a Portion of the F $\frac{1}{2}$ Road Right-of-Way, Consisting of Approximately 4.85 Acres

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

13. **Setting a Hearing on Zoning the Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, Located at 2522 and 2524 F 1/2 Road** [File #ANX-2000-088] [Attach 13](#)

The 4.85-acre Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation area consists of two parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation.

Property owners have requested that proposed city zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for their properties.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning the Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation to RSF-R

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

14. **Setting a Hearing on Annexing the Sutton/Rickerd Enclave, Located at 2543 G Road and 689 25 1/2 Road** [File #ANX-2000-089] [Attach 14](#)

The 5.73-acre Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation area consists of two parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado - Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation Located at 2543 G Road and 689 25½ Road and Including a Portion of the G Road and 25½ Road Rights-of-Way, Consisting of Approximately 5.73 Acres

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

15. **Setting a Hearing on Zoning Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, Located at 2543 G Road and 689 25 ½ Road** [File #ANX-2000-089] [Attach 15](#)

The 5.73-acre Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation area consists of two parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law requires a City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of annexation. Property owners have requested that proposed city zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for their properties. Request for approval of zoning for approximately 5.73 acres from County RSF-R to City RSF-R (Residential Single Family 1 unit/5 acres) zone district.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation RSF-R, Located at 2543 G Road and 689 25½ Road

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

16. **Setting a Hearing on Annexing the P.S. Substation Enclave, Located at the Southwest Corner of 25 1/2 Road and F 1/2 Road** [File #ANX-2000-090]

[Attach 16](#)

The 2.13-acre P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation area consists of one parcel of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado - P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation Located at the Southwest Corner of 25½ Road and F½ Road, Consisting of Approximately 2.13 Acres

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

17. **Setting a Hearing on Zoning the P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation to I-O, Located at the Southwest Corner of 25 1/2 Road and F 1/2 Road**

[File #ANX-2000-090]

[Attach 17](#)

The 2.13-acre P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation area consists of one parcel of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law requires a City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of annexation. Request for approval of zoning for approximately 2.13 acres from County PI to City I-O (Industrial Office Park) zone district.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation to I-O (Industrial Office Park), Located at the Southwest Corner of 25½ Road and F½ Road

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

18. **Setting a Hearing on Annexing the Puckett Enclave, Located at 2563 F 1/2 Road** [File #ANX-2000-091]

[Attach 18](#)

The 1.00-acre Puckett Enclave Annexation area consists of one parcel of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of

three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado - Puckett Enclave Annexation Located at 2563 F $\frac{1}{2}$ Road and Including a Portion of the F $\frac{1}{2}$ Road Right-of-Way, Consisting of Approximately 1.00 Acre

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

19. **Setting a Hearing on Zoning the Puckett Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, Located at 2563 F 1/2 Road** [File #ANX-2000-091] [Attach 19](#)

The 1.00-acre Puckett Enclave Annexation area consists of one parcel of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction city limits. State law requires a City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of annexation. Property owners have requested that proposed city zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for their properties. Request for approval of the zoning for approximately 1.00 acre from County RSF-R to City RSF-R (Residential Single Family 1 unit/5 acres) zone district.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning the Puckett Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, Located at 2563 F $\frac{1}{2}$ Road

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

20. **Setting a Hearing on Mercer Annexation Located at 2884 and 2884 1/2 Highway 50** [File #ANX-2000-059] [Attach 20](#)

The Mercer Annexation is located at 2884 and 2884 1/2 Highway 50 on Orchard Mesa. The parcel has single family structures which will be subdivided to create 2 single lots in a proposed RSF-4 zone. The owners of the properties have signed a petition for annexation.

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

~~Resolution No. 63-00—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—Mercer Annexation Located at 2884 and 2884 $\frac{1}{2}$ Highway 50~~

~~**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 63-00 and Set a Hearing for August 2, 2000*~~

~~**b. Set a Hearing on Annexation Ordinance**~~

~~Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Mercer Annexation, Approximately 1.638 Acres, Located at 2884 and 2884½ Highway 50~~

~~*Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for August 2, 2000*~~

~~Staff presentation: Joe Carter, Associate Planner~~

20. **Setting a Hearing on Morrill Annexation Located at 2980 Gunnison Avenue**

[File #ANX-2000-108]

[Attach 21](#)

The petitioner is requesting annexation of a .689-acre parcel in order to construct an industrial building on the site. Under the terms of the Persigo Agreement, the petitioner must be annexed to the City of Grand Junction prior to issuance of a Planning Clearance for a building permit.

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

Resolution No. 64-00 – 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 – Morrill Annexation Located at 2980 Gunnison Avenue

~~**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 64-00 and Set a Hearing for August 2, 2000*~~

b. Set a Hearing on Annexation Ordinance

Proposed Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Morrill Annexation, Approximately .689 Acres, Located at 2980 Gunnison Avenue,

~~*Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for August 2, 2000*~~

Staff presentation: Pat Cecil, Development Services Supervisor

21. **Setting a Hearing on Rezoning The Legends Subdivision from RSF-5 to PD, Located at the Southeast Corner of 28 1/2 Road and Patterson Road**

[File #RZP-2000-067]

[Attach 22](#)

The Planning Commission at the hearing of June 13, 2000, recommended that the City Council rezone The Legends Subdivision to the PD district. The rezone area is comprised of approximately 35 acres. The site will ultimately be developed with 178 residential dwelling units comprised of a mix of single family detached, single family attached and four-unit condominium structures.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning Two Parcels of Land Located South of Patterson Road and East of 28 ½ Road to PD (The Legends Subdivision)

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: Pat Cecil, Development Services Supervisor

22.*** **City Council Assignments to Board and Organizations** [Attach 27](#)

Resolution No. 64-0 - A Resolution Appointing city Councilmembers to Represent the City on Various boards and Organizations

**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 64-00*

Staff presentation: Mark Achen, City Manager

23. **Setting a Hearing on Amending Ordinance No. 3220 Concerning the Salary of the City Manager** [Attach 23](#)

On June 7, 2000 the City Council named David A. Varley as interim City Manager. This ordinance is being proposed to amend the City Manager's salary that was set by Ordinance 3220. Ordinance 3220 set the salary of City Manager Mark Achen. This ordinance establishes the salary for City Manager Varley.

Proposed Ordinance Amending Ordinance 3220 Concerning the Salary of the City Manager

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for July 5, 2000

Staff presentation: John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney

***** END OF CONSENT CALENDAR *****

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

24. **Public Hearing – Amending Chapter 6, Animals, of the City Code of Ordinances** [Attach 24](#)

In Ordinance 3248, concerning animal control, adopted by Council on May 17, 2000 Section 6-63 repealed four subsections instead of one. This ordinance seeks to correct those changes. No substantive changes have been made.

Ordinance No. 3262 – An Ordinance Amending Chapter 6, Article III of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado

**Action: Adopt Ordinance No. 3262 on Second Reading*

Staff presentation: Stephanie Rubinstein, City Staff Attorney

25. **Public Hearing - Zoning The Commons Assisted Living Facility PD, Located at 616 27 1/2 Road** [File #RZP-2000-064] [Attach 25](#)

Proposal to rezone approximately 18.8 acres from Residential Multifamily 8 units per acre (RMF-8) to Planned Development (PD) in order to develop an assisted living complex with a 306-bed building, 14 duplex cottages and an 82,186-square foot Senior Enrichment Center.

Ordinance No. 3263 – An Ordinance Zoning Three Parcels of Land Located North of Patterson Road between North 15th Street and 27½ Road to PD (The Commons Assisted Living Facility)

**Action: Adopt Ordinance No. 3263 on Second Reading*

Staff presentation: Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner

26. **Public Hearing – Appeal of Planning Commission’s Denial for the Grand Village Growth Plan Amendment to Redesignate a 15-Acre Parcel at 766 24 Road (North of the Northeast Corner of I-70 and 24 Road) from Residential Estate to Commercial** [File #GPA-2000-029] [Attach 26](#)

The applicant is appealing the Planning Commission’s recommendation of denial for a Growth Plan Amendment to redesignate a 15-acre parcel at 766 24 Road from Residential Estate (2-5 acres per dwelling) to Commercial. At its April 18, 2000 hearing, the Planning Commission found that the proposed amendment did not conform to applicable Growth Plan Amendment criteria and recommended denial. A super majority vote is required of the Council to overturn the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

Action: Decision on Appeal

Staff presentation: Bill Nebeker, Senior Planner

27. **NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS**

28. **OTHER BUSINESS**
29. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** on Attorney/client Discussion Regarding Development Negotiation
30. **ADJOURNMENT**

Attach 1

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

June 7, 2000

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, convened into regular session the 7th day of June, 2000, at 7:35 p.m. (late due to technical difficulties) at Two Rivers Convention Center. Those present were Cindy Enos-Martinez, Earl Payne, Jim Spehar, Janet Terry and President of the Council Gene Kinsey. Jack Scott and Reford Theobald were absent. Also present were Assistant City Manager David Varley, City Attorney Dan Wilson, and City Clerk Stephanie Nye.

Council President Kinsey called the meeting to order and Councilmember Enos-Martinez led in the Pledge of Allegiance. The audience remained standing during the invocation by Rev. Jim Hale, Spirit of Life Christian Fellowship.

BOY SCOUT TROOP 316

Mayor Kinsey recognized Boy Scout Troop 316 in attendance.

PROCLAMATION DECLARING JUNE 14, 2000 AS "FLAG DAY" IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMISSION ON ARTS & CULTURE

Upon motion by Councilmember Payne, seconded by Councilmember Spehar and carried, Janet Prell was appointed and Leroy Donegan was reappointed to the Commission on Arts and Culture for three-year terms.

CONSENT ITEMS

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Enos-Martinez and carried by roll call vote, the following Consent Calendar items #1 through #9 were approved, with item #5 being amended by adding the following condition:

“The utility easement vacation resolution shall not be effective until the existing sewer line is relocated to the satisfaction of the Utility Engineer and a new utility easement is approved by the City and recorded for the relocated sewer line.”

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Action: Approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting May 17, 2000

2. **Street Pavement Overlays**

The following bids were received on May 16, 2000:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Bid</u>
Elam Construction, Inc.	Grand Junction	\$569,770
United Companies	Grand Junction	\$575,970
Engineer's Estimate		\$582,625

Action: Award Contract for Street Pavement Overlays to Elam Construction, Inc. in the Amount of \$569,770

3. **Persigo Final Clarifier Addition**

The following bids were received for this project on May 23, 2000:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
Moltz Construction	Salida	\$1,555,000
Helm Group	Carbondale	\$1,595,499
Grimm Construction	Louviers, CO	\$1,616,614
Engineer's Estimate		\$1,500,000

Action: Award Contract for Persigo Final Clarifier Addition to Moltz Construction in the Amount of \$1,555,000

4. **Glen Caro/North Field Estates Sewer Design Services**

The following bids were received on May 25, 2000:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Lump Sum Fee</u>
Williams Engineering	Fruita	\$30,900
Balaz and Associates	Palisade	\$34,600
Atkins and Associates	Grand Junction	\$57,275
Rolland Engineering	Grand Junction	\$67,160

Action: Award Contract for Glen Caro/North Field Estates Sewer Design Services to Williams Engineering in the Amount of \$30,900

5. **Vacation of a Sewer Line Easement for the Proposed Mesa Village Marketplace Project** [File #VE-2000-061]

The project petitioner is requesting the vacation of an existing sewer line easement that crosses through the middle of a proposed building pad. A new easement will be established within a proposed parking area.

Resolution No. 48-00 – A Resolution Vacating a Utility Easement on the Mesa Village Marketplace, Located at the Northeast Corner of Patterson Road and 24 Road

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 48-00

6. **Extension Request for Arrowhead Acres II, Filing 2 Vacation of Temporary Access Easement and Vacation of Cul-de-sac on B.4 Road**
[File #FP-2000-008]

Request for approval of an extension to recording ordinances for (1) vacation of a temporary access easement for the cul-de-sac turnaround at the end of B.4 Road; and (2) vacation of the remainder of the cul-de-sac right-of-way at the end of B.4 Road

Action: Approve the Extension Request to Record the Final Plat for Arrowhead Acres II, Filing 2, to February 8, 2001

6. **Setting a Hearing on Zoning The Commons Assisted Living Facility PD, Located at 616 27 ½ Road** [File #RZP-2000-064]

Proposal to rezone approximately 18.8 acres from Residential Multifamily 8 units per acre (RMF-8) to Planned Development (PD) in order to develop an assisted living complex with a 306-bed building, 14 duplex cottages and an 82,126-square foot Senior Enrichment Center.

Proposed Ordinance Zoning Three Parcels of Land Located North of Patterson Road between North 15th Street and 27 ½ Road (The Commons Assisted Living Facility) to PD

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for June 21, 2000

7. **Animal Control Regulations**

a. Repeal of Fee Resolution

On May 17, 2000, the City Council passed Resolution No. 47-00 regarding Animal Control Fees. However, the language of this Resolution was such that it sought to amend the City of Grand Junction Code of Ordinances. The Code of Ordinances can be amended only by ordinance after public hearing. Resolution 47-00, as it was not adopted by the correct procedure, has no effect. This new resolution repeals Resolution 47-00 to ensure that there is no confusion as to the effect of Resolution 47-00. The Fees are currently in effect, so no additional resolution will need to be adopted.

Resolution No. 52-00 – A Resolution Repealing Resolution No. 47-00

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 52-00

b. Setting a Hearing on Proposed Ordinance Amending Chapter 6, Animals, of the City Code of Ordinances

In Ordinance 3248, Animal Control, adopted by Council on May 17, 2000 Section 6-63 arguably repealed four subsections instead of one. This ordinance seeks to correct those changes. No substantive changes have been made.

Proposed Ordinance Amending Chapter 6, Article III of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on first reading and Set a Hearing for June 21, 2000

9. **Appointment of David A. Varley as Interim City Manager**

City Manager Mark Achen is resigning his position effective July 7, 2000. Mr. Varley will serve as interim City Manager until such time as a permanent replacement for Mr. Achen is named.

Resolution No. 56-00 Appointing David A. Varley as City Manager

Action: Adopt Resolution No. 56-00

***** END OF CONSENT CALENDAR *****

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

PUBLIC HEARING - ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. ST-00, PHASE B

A petition has been submitted requesting a Local Improvement District be created to reconstruct the east-west alley from 10th to 11th between Colorado to Ute Avenues. This petition has been signed by 59% of the owners of the properties that would be assessed. The City Council passed a resolution on May 3, 2000, stating its intent to create the proposed improvement district. Notice of a public hearing was published in the Daily Sentinel and copies of the publication were delivered by certified mail to all owners of the property within the limits of the proposed district.

A public hearing was opened at 7:45 p.m.

Rick Marcus, Real Estate Technician, reviewed this item. The estimated cost for this improvement district is \$40,500.

There were no public comments. The hearing was closed at 7:46 p.m.

Resolution No. 53-00 – A Resolution Creating and Establishing Alley Improvement District No. ST-00, Phase B, within the Corporate Limits of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Authorizing the Reconstruction of Certain Alleys, Adopting Details, Plans and Specifications for the Paving Thereon and Providing for the Payment Thereof

Upon motion by Councilmember Spehar, seconded by Councilmember Payne and carried by roll call vote, Resolution No. 53-00 was adopted.

PUBLIC HEARING – CITY’S ANNUAL UPDATE TO THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND 2000 ACTION PLAN

This public hearing is to receive public input regarding the City’s Annual Update to its Five-Year Consolidated Plan which must be submitted to HUD prior to the start of the City’s 2000 CDBG Program Year.

A public hearing was opened at 7:47 p.m.

David Varley, Acting Community Development Director, reviewed this item. He outlined the purpose of the public hearing which is to get input from the public on the spending of the funds as per the Action Plan or the five-year plan. The program year begins September 31, 2000.

There were no public comments. The hearing was closed at 7:48 p.m. Upon motion by Councilmember Payne, seconded by Councilmember Enos-Martinez and carried, the City’s Annual Update to the Consolidated Plan and 2000 Action Plan was approved.

PUBLIC HEARING - HEADSTART ANNEXATION LOCATED AT 3093 E 1/4 ROAD [FILE #ANX-2000-062]

The 0.88-acre Headstart Annexation area consists of one parcel. There are no existing structures on the site. The applicant is proposing a day school for the children of migrant workers. The owners of the property have signed a petition for annexation.

The public hearing was opened at 7:49 p.m.

Joe Carter, Associate Planner, Community Development Department, reviewed this item. He stated the location of the annexation and the Growth Plan designation. The petition is in compliance with State Law, and Staff recommended approval of the petition to annex.

Tere Keller-Amaya, Director of the Migrant Headstart Program, the petitioner, thanked Council for their consideration.

Mary Huber, 590 1/2 Melrose Court, had concerns. She could not find a signed petition for annexation in the staff reports on this item. She questioned the rationale for Weld County doing Headstart in Mesa County for migrant service. She asked why this location.

Mayor Kinsey clarified that the annexation is the only issue, whether the owner has requested annexation and that all the papers are in order.

Ms. Huber asked if the Mayor has seen the signed petition. Joe Carter had the petition and offered to share it with Ms. Huber.

Councilmember Terry clarified that this is not a consent item. Tonight a full hearing is being conducted.

Ms. Huber had other comments about several inconsistencies on the annexation map.

Councilmember Terry asked Staff to check the map for accuracy.

Councilmember Enos-Martinez asked about the ownership of the Headstart program. Ms. Keller-Amaya explained that this migrant program is a specialized component of the Headstart program and the Federal Government has determined that the best use of the funds is to have two grantees in the State of Colorado, i.e., Weld County and Otero Community College. She clarified that her organization wants to enhance and work with the existing community program.

The Mayor reminded Council and the audience that annexation is the only issue at this time.

There were no other comments. The hearing was closed at 7:56 p.m.

a. Resolution Accepting Petition

Resolution No. 54-00 – A Resolution Accepting a Petition for Annexation, Making Certain Findings, Determining that Property Known as Headstart Annexation is Eligible for Annexation, Located at 3093 E 1/4 Road

b. Annexation Ordinance

Ordinance No. 3249 – An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Headstart Annexation, Approximately 0.88 Acres Located at 3093 E 1/4 Road

Upon motion by Councilmember, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried by roll call vote, Resolution No. 54-00 was adopted and Ordinance No. 3249 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING - ZONING HEADSTART ANNEXATION TO C-1, LOCATED AT 3093 E 1/4 ROAD [FILE #ANX-2000-062]

Request for a Zone of Annexation from County ILCB (Limited Industrial) to C-1 (Light Commercial). The 0.88-acre Headstart Annexation area consists of one parcel. There are no existing structures on the site. The applicant is proposing a day school for the children of migrant workers. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation.

The public hearing opened at 7:56 p.m.

Joe Carter, Associate Planner, reviewed this item. This 0.88-acre parcel is located north of the I-70 Business Loop and west of 31 Road. The zone request meets the criteria of Section 4-11 of the old Zoning & Development Code. Staff recommended approval.

The petitioner declined the opportunity for additional comment.

There were no public comments. The hearing was closed at 7:58 p.m.

Ordinance No. 3250 – An Ordinance Zoning the Headstart Annexation to C-1 (Light Commercial)

Upon motion by Councilmember Spehar, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 3250 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING - GODBY ANNEXATIONS NO. 1 AND NO. 2, LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF F 1/2 AND 30 1/2 ROADS (3048 F 1/2 ROAD)

[FILE #ANX-2000-063]

The applicant proposes to annex a 9.3-acre parcel into the City of Grand Junction. The annexation consists of one parcel of land and portions of F ½ Road. The application has been filed in conjunction with a minor subdivision request for two lots.

The public hearing opened at 7:59 p.m.

Joe Carter, Associate Planner, reviewed this item on behalf of Bill Nebeker. This serial annexation is in compliance with State Law and Staff recommends acceptance of the petition to annex and adoption of the annexation ordinances.

Mike McGinnis, representing the petitioner, was present and had no comment.

There were no public comments. The hearing was closed at 8:00 p.m.

a. Resolution Accepting Petition

Resolution No. 55-00 – A Resolution Accepting Petitions for Annexation, Making Certain Findings, Determining that Property Known as Godby Annexation, a Serial Annexation Comprising Godby Annexation No. 1 and Godby Annexation No. 2, is Eligible for

Annexation, Located at the Northwest Corner of F 1/2 and 30 1/2 Road (3048 F 1/2 Road) and Including Portions of the F 1/2 Road Right-of-Way

b. Annexation Ordinances

- (1) Ordinance No. 3259 – An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Godby Annexation No. 1, Approximately 0.50 Acres Located Exclusively in the F ½ Road Right-of-way East of 30 Road
- (2) Ordinance No. 3260 – An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Godby Annexation No. 2, Approximately 10.11 Acres Located at the Northwest Corner of F ½ Road and 30 ½ Road, Including Portions of the F ½ Road and Unplatted 30 ½ Road Rights-of-Way

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Enos-Martinez and carried by roll call vote, Resolution No. 55-00 was adopted and Ordinances No. 3259 and 3260 were adopted on second reading and ordered published.

PUBLIC HEARING - ZONING GODBY ANNEXATION TO RSF-R AND RSF-E, LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF F 1/2 AND 30 1/2 ROADS (3048 F 1/2 ROAD) [FILE #ANX-2000-063]

The applicant proposes to annex a 9.3-acre parcel into the City of Grand Junction to allow for a 2-lot minor subdivision. Requested zoning of RSF-R and RSF-E is in conformance with zoning in Airport Critical Zone, which transverses this property. The Planning Commission recommends approval of this request.

A public hearing was opened at 8:00 p.m.

Mike McGinnis, representing the petitioner, said the owners accept the proposed zoning.

Associate Planner Joe Carter reviewed this item, noting it is in the airport critical zone. The proposed zoning is configured to comply with critical zone regulations.

There were no public comments. The hearing was closed at 8:03 p.m.

Ordinance No. 3261 – An Ordinance Zoning the Godby Annexation to RSF-R and RSF-E, Located at the Northwest Corner of F½ Road and 30½ Road (3048 F½ Road)

Upon motion by Councilmember Terry, seconded by Councilmember Payne and carried by roll call vote, Ordinance No. 3261 was adopted on second reading and ordered published.

SEWER AND FIRE HYDRANT WAIVER FOR GODBY ANNEXATION
[FILE #ANX-2000-063]

The applicant requests to waive the requirement to provide sewer and a fire hydrant for the Godby Minor Subdivision. At its May 9, 2000 hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of this request.

Joe Carter, Associate Planner, explained the reason for the request. The annexation triggers the requirement for sewer and a fire hydrant, but there is no sewer within 400 feet of the parcel. The Planning Commission is supportive of the waiver of the sewer requirement. The site will support septic and there is room for replacement septic in case of failure in the future.

Regarding the fire hydrant waiver, Clifton Water District estimates the cost of a fire hydrant will exceed \$10,000. The waiver of the fire hydrant requirement is recommended if other fire suppression is installed in any new structure.

Councilmember Terry questioned the waiver with the existing septic elimination program going on. Pat Cecil, Development Services Supervisor, stated that the septic systems in the ground are working and there is sufficient room for replacement systems. It has been the policy in the past when sewer is over 400 feet away, there is lot size sufficiency, and the ability to replace, a waiver is considered.

David Varley, Acting Community Development Director, added that having two existing dwellings and no new development also played a part in the recommendation.

Councilmember Spehar clarified that a fire suppression system would be required in any new structure on either lot. Joe Carter said that is correct and the system must be approved by the City's Fire Department.

Mike McGinnis, representing the petitioner, clarified that the property owners are aware of the fire suppression requirement. They would want sewer but hooking up to the closest sewer at Stonegate Subdivision would require a lift station.

Upon motion by Councilmember Spehar, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried, the Sewer and Fire Hydrant Waiver for Godby Annexation was approved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion by Councilmember Spehar, seconded by Councilmember Terry and carried, Council went into executive session at 8:10 p.m. to discuss property negotiations, legal issues and pending litigation, with no intention of returning to open session.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Stephanie Nye, CMC
City Clerk

Attach 2

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 9, 2000		
Author:	Stephanie Rubinstein	Staff City Attorney	
Presenter Name:	Stephanie Rubinstein	Staff City Attorney	
	Workshop	xx	Formal Agenda

Subject: Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant

Summary/Background Information: In 1999, the City, along with the City of Fruita, City of Palisade and Mesa County were awarded the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant. The decision was made that the funds would be best used for additional supervisors with the Partners program who would be able to supervise Mesa County court cases, and the three cities' cases, when Useful Public Service was sentenced.

The collaboration has proven to be a success with 385 Municipal Court Juvenile cases being supervised and 4,811 hours of Useful Public Service being completed. Additionally, the load has been lightened for the Municipal Court clerks who no longer have to spend time trying to track down who has completed their hours and who has not. Less than ten juveniles have been non-compliant in the last year with their community service.

In the first year of this alliance, the juveniles who have been sentenced to community service from Grand Junction Municipal Court, Fruita Municipal Court, Palisade Municipal Court, Mesa County Court and Grand Junction Teen Court have been supervised by the Partners program. Partners has worked to arrange community service availability, monitored each juvenile's compliance with his/her sentence and have worked to find effective methods of ensuring that these juveniles learn from their mistakes and receive an education beyond simple punishment for their offense.

Budget: A cash match of \$3,190 has been budgeted in the Police Department Budget.

Action Requested/Recommendation: Approval of Resolution on Consent.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
------------------------------	----------	-----------	------------	----------------

Name:						
Purpose:						
Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop

City of Grand Junction, Colorado

Resolution No. _____

**A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE
JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY INCENTIVE BLOCK GRANT**

Recitals. The City Council makes the following findings:

- a. In 1999, the City, in conjunction with the City of Fruita, City of Palisade and Mesa County, were awarded the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant.
- b. A gap in the juvenile justice system was perceived where juveniles who were sentenced to community service had no place to go to complete their service and were not being held accountable for their actions.
- c. After a collaborative meeting between these groups, and other interested members of the community, the decision was made to use the funds for additional case supervisors in the Partners program, so that more juveniles in our community can have the benefit of participating in the Partners program if they are sentenced to Useful Public Service.
- d. The City is committed to the youth of our community and feels this program is an effective means to reduce the rising occurrence of juvenile offenses.
- e. The first year of grant funding has been highly successful with Partners providing supervision for 385 juveniles who have completed 4, 811 hours of Useful Public Service.
- f. Federal funding has been awarded to the City, Mesa County, City of Fruita, and City of Palisade in the form of a \$54,997 Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant for the purpose of funding additional personnel at Partners who provide supervision for these groups of juveniles.
- g. The City will provide a cash match of \$3190.00 which has been budgeted into the Police Department budget.

NOW THEREFORE, ON _____ DAY OF _____, 2000,

The Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant which has been awarded to the City of Grand Junction, in conjunction with Mesa County, City of Fruita, and City of Palisade for the purpose of providing supervision for the juveniles sentenced to community service by the Partners program, in the amount of \$54,997 is approved and accepted.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on this _____ day of _____, 2000.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Attach 3

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Resolution Accepting the Improvements connected with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 13, 3000		
Author:	Tim Woodmansee	Real Estate Manager	
Presenter Name:	Rick Marcus	Real Estate Technician	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Resolution Approving and Accepting the Improvements connected with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99, and giving notice of a hearing to consider a proposed Assessing Ordinance.

Summary: Sanitary sewer facilities have been installed as petitioned by the owners of seven properties located in the vicinity of Marsh Lane and North 12th Street. The proposed resolution is the required first step in the process to levy assessments against the benefiting properties.

Background Information: The petition requesting the improvements provides that all costs associated with this District be assessed against and upon the benefiting properties. Assessable costs include design, construction and inspection to provide sanitary sewer main lines, manholes and service lines to property boundaries, plus administration and compensation for easements.

The total project costs have been definitely ascertained to be \$83,187.78. The proposed Assessing Ordinance, to be first read by the City Council on July 5, 2000, and considered at a public hearing on August 2, 2000, will propose to assess each benefiting property the sum of \$83,187.78.

Budget: The 906 sewer fund will be reimbursed by the assessments to be levied.

Action Requested/Recommendation: Pass and adopt proposed resolution and give notice of a public hearing.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
------------------------------	----------	-----------	------------	----------------

Name:							
Purpose:							
Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:		
Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop	

RESOLUTION NO. _____

**APPROVING AND ACCEPTING THE IMPROVEMENTS CONNECTED WITH
SANITARY SEWER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. SS-43-99 AND
GIVING NOTICE OF A PUBLIC HEARING**

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, has reported the completion of Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has caused to be prepared a statement showing the total assessable costs associated with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99 to be apportioned upon and levied against the real property comprising the District Lands which specifically benefit from the improvements associated with said District.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

1. That the improvements connected with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99 be, and the same are hereby, approved and accepted; that the statement showing the total assessable costs associated with said District be, and the same is hereby, approved and accepted as the statement of the assessable costs of said Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99.
2. That the costs connected with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99 be apportioned upon and levied against the real property comprising the District Lands.
3. That the City Clerk shall immediately advertise for three (3) days in the Daily Sentinel, a newspaper of general circulation published in said City, a Notice to the owners of the real estate to be assessed, and all persons interested generally without naming such owner or owners, which Notice shall be in substantially the form set forth in the attached "NOTICE", that said improvements have been completed and accepted, specifying the assessable cost of the improvements and the share to be apportioned to each lot or tract of land; that any complaints or objections that may be made in writing by such owners or persons shall be made to the City Council and filed with the City Clerk within thirty (30) days from the first publication of said Notice; that any objections may be heard and determined by the City Council at its first regular meeting after said thirty (30) days and before the passage of the ordinance assessing the cost of the improvements, all being in accordance with the terms and provisions of Chapter 28 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, being Ordinance No. 178, as amended, and People's Ordinance No. 33.

NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a hearing is scheduled for August 2, 2000, at 7:30 p.m., to hear complaints or objections of the owners of the real estate hereinafter described, said real estate comprising the district of lands known as Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99, and all persons interested therein, as follows:

That the City of Grand Junction has completed and the Grand Junction City Council has accepted the improvements connected with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99. Said District and improvements are authorized by and in accordance with the terms and provisions of City Resolution No. 150-99, passed and adopted by the Grand Junction City Council on the 15th day of December, 1999, whereby said City Council declared its intention to create said District, and by City Resolution No. 8-00, passed and adopted by the Grand Junction City Council on the 19th day of January, 2000, whereby the Grand Junction City Council created and established said District, all being in accordance with the terms and provisions of Chapter 28 of the Code of Ordinances of said City, being Ordinance No. 178, as amended.

That the whole cost of the improvements connected with said District and to be assessed against the District Lands, as hereinafter described, has been definitely ascertained and is in the sum of \$88,179.05. Said sum includes a one-time charge of six percent (6%) for costs of collection and other incidentals; that the part apportioned to and upon each lot or tract of land within said District and assessable for said improvements is hereinafter set forth; that payment may be made to the Finance Director of the city of Grand Junction at any time within thirty (30) days after the final publication of the assessing ordinance assessing the real estate in said District for the cost of said improvements; and that the owner(s) so paying shall be entitled to an allowance of six percent (6%) for costs of collection and other incidentals.

That any complaints or objections that may be made in writing by the said owner or owners of land within said District and assessable for said improvements, or by any person interested, may be made to the City Council and filed in the office of the City Clerk of said City within thirty (30) days from the first publication of this Notice; that any such complaints or objections will be heard and determined by the said City Council at a public hearing on Wednesday, August 2, 2000, at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers located at Grand Junction City Hall, 250 North 5th Street in Grand Junction, Colorado, at which time the said City Council will consider passage of a proposed ordinance to assess the cost of said improvements against the real estate in said District, and against the respective owners of said real estate, as by law provided.

That the sum of \$88,179.05 for improvements connected with Sanitary Sewer Improvement District No. SS-43-99 is to be apportioned against the real estate in said District and against the owners respectively as by law provided in the following proportions and amounts severally, as follows, to wit:

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2701-362-00-009 / LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Beginning 586.48 feet North of the W ¼ corner of Section 36, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian; thence North 60.6 feet; thence S 88°25' E 480.7 feet; thence N 83°03' E 202.2 feet; thence S 88°25' E 34 feet to the Highline Lateral No. 6; thence Southwesterly along said Lateral to a point 670 feet east of the point of beginning; thence West to the point of beginning.
ASSESSMENT.....\$12,597.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2701-362-00-010 / LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Beginning 586.48 feet North and 30 feet East of the Southwest corner of the NW ¼ of Section 36, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian; thence East 650 feet; thence South 100 feet; thence West 650 feet; thence North to the point of beginning.
ASSESSMENT.....\$12,597.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2701-362-00-011 / LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Beginning 386.48 feet North and 30 feet East of the Southwest corner of the NW ¼ of Section 36, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian; thence North 100 feet; thence East 553.25 feet; thence S 58°21' W 191 feet; thence West 391 feet to the point of beginning.
ASSESSMENT.....\$12,597.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2701-362-00-012 / LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Beginning 286.48 feet North and 30 feet East of the Southwest corner of the NW ¼ of Section 36, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian; thence North 100 feet; thence East 391 feet; thence S 50°26' E 156.9 feet; thence West 512 feet to the point of beginning.
ASSESSMENT.....\$12,597.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2701-362-00-013 / LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Beginning 286.48 feet North of the Southwest corner of the SW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 36, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian; thence East 325 feet; thence South 50 feet; thence West 145 feet; thence South 100 feet; thence West 180 feet to the point of beginning, except road and part of cul-de-sac on north.
ASSESSMENT.....\$12,597.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2701-362-00-014 / LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Beginning 236.48 feet North and 180 feet East of the Southwest corner of the SW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 36, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian; thence East 145 feet; thence South 100 feet; thence West 145 feet; thence North 100 feet to the point of beginning, except cul-de-sac.
ASSESSMENT.....\$12,597.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2701-362-00-015 / LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Beginning 286.48 feet North and 325 feet East of the Southwest corner of the SW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 36, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian; thence East 187

feet; thence S 50°51' E 82.2 feet; thence S 21°10' W 53.1 feet; thence S 20°26' E 51.9 feet; thence West 249.6 feet; thence North 150 feet to the point of beginning.
ASSESSMENT\$12,597.00

Dated at Grand Junction, Colorado, this 21st day of June, 2000.

BY ORDER OF THE CITY COUNCIL,
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

BY: _____
City Clerk

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of June, 2000.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Attach 4

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>		
Subject:	FY2001 Regional Transportation Planning Contract	
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000	
Date Prepared:	June 5, 2000	
Author:	Cliff Davidson	RTPO Director
Presenter Name:	TIM MOORE	Public Works Manager
	Workshop	x Formal Agenda -X-

Subject:

FY2001 Regional Transportation Planning Contract between the Grand Junction/ Mesa County Transportation Planning Region and Colorado Dept. of Transportation for regional planning activities.

Summary:

The Regional Transportation Planning Contract allows the Grand Junction/ Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to continue transportation planning activities for the Grand Junction/Mesa County Transportation Planning Region. This money is a 100% grant from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and requires no local match.

Background Information:

Planning activities for the Statewide Transportation Planning Process are conducted each year by CDOT to satisfy requirements of the Federal Highway Administration and TEA-21 legislative provisions. The Transportation Planning Region (TPR) has been identified by CDOT as an appropriate vehicle for carrying out these statewide responsibilities with local input to the process. Mesa County has been designated one of 15 TPR=s in the state and the Grand Junction/Mesa County MPO has been given the responsibility for accomplishing tasks in the Regional Transportation Planning Contract on behalf of the TPR.

Budget:

Approval of this joint resolution will result in the Colorado Department of Transportation furnishing \$8,500 for the Regional Transportation Planning effort with no matching funds required by either the City of Grand Junction nor Mesa County.

Action Requested/Recommendation:

Council motion to approve the joint resolution with Mesa County and sign the contract with the Colorado Dept. of Transportation for FY2001 Regional Planning on behalf of the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop

MCC# _____
GJCC# _____

RESOLUTION

A JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY OF MESA AND THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION WHEREBY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT, FOR THE PROVISION OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.

WHEREAS, the City and County have been designated by the Governor as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Grand Junction/Mesa County Urbanized Area; and

WHEREAS, Part 2 of Article 1 of Title 29, Colorado Revised Statutes authorizes the parties to contract with one another to make the most efficient and effective use of their powers and responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, the City and County realize the importance of both short and long range planning in the development of an efficient transportation system, and are both aware that it is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Planning Organization to perform those planning functions; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado desires to delegate its responsibility for assessing the transportation needs for any jurisdictions within the Grand Junction/Mesa County Transportation Planning Region (TPR) not participating in the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization to the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization desires to conduct regional transportation planning for any jurisdiction within the Grand Junction/Mesa County TPR not participating in the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization desires to receive SPR funds apportioned to the State by the Federal Government in accordance with

23 U.S.C. Sections 104 and 307 (c) to be administered by the State and to be spent by the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization on activities associated with the statewide transportation planning process carried out in accordance with 23 U.S.C. Section 135 and 43-1-1103 C.R.S.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT JOINTLY RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF MESA, COLORADO AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the FY2001 Regional Transportation Planning Assistance Contract, hereunto attached, is approved by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Mesa, Colorado on _____, and by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado on _____.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

COUNTY OF MESA

Mayor
Grand Junction City Council

Chairman of the Board
Mesa County Board of Commissioners

_____ day of _____, 2000

_____ day of _____, 2000

Attest:

Attest:

City Clerk

County Clerk

Routing No: _____

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
Grand Junction/Mesa County MPO-TPR

CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT, made this ____ day of _____ 2000, by and between the State of Colorado for the use and benefit of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), Division of Transportation Development, hereinafter referred to as "the State", and the Grand Junction/Mesa County MPO, PO Box 20000-5013, Grand Junction, CO 81502-5013, created under powers set forth in §§43-1-1102(5) and 30-28-105 C.R.S., hereinafter referred to as "the contractor".

WHEREAS, authority exists in the law and funds have been budgeted, appropriated, and otherwise made available to FEIN Number 846000783, in COFRS Fund 400, Organization 9991, Appropriation Code 010, Program 5000, Function 1441 Object 5180-1 (P), Reporting Category 0510, Project 13285, Phase 2, TOTAL ENCUMBRANCE IS \$8,500.00 EXACTLY; and

WHEREAS, required approval, clearance, and coordination has been accomplished from and with appropriate agencies; and,

WHEREAS, general purpose local governments within the Transportation Planning Region (TPR) as defined in the intergovernmental agreement of the contractor, have agreed that the Contractor shall assume responsibilities, in cooperation with the State and in accordance with §§30-28-105 and 43-1-1103(1) C.R.S. and 23 U.S.C. Section 135; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. Section 134, federal legislation provides for the designation of metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) for urbanized areas of more than 50,000 population by agreement among the Governor and units of general purpose local government to carry out the transportation planning process; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. Section 135, federal legislation requires the Colorado Department of Transportation to develop a long-range State transportation plan which incorporates the regional transportation plans prepared by the MPOs; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to §43-1-1103 (5) C.R.S., state legislation requires the CDOT to integrate and consolidate regional transportation plans into a comprehensive state transportation plan; and,

WHEREAS, §43-1-1101 C.R.S. identifies RPCs for the TPRs as the proper forum for regional transportation planning; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to §43-1-1103(3)(a) C.R.S., the RPCs, in cooperation with the State and other governmental agencies, are responsible for carrying out continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning for the TPRs; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to §§43-1-1102(7) and 43-1-1103(5) C.R.S., the State has developed Rules at 2 CCR 604-2 ("the Rules") which identify the TPRs and set forth the process through which RPCs for the TPRs can develop, amend, and update regional transportation plans for integration by the CDOT into a comprehensive state transportation plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Plan is complete and will be updated on a six year cycle pursuant to Section VII of the Rules; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Plan may be amended pursuant to Section VII of the Rules during intervening years so as to reflect changing conditions and maintain consistency with the long range state transportation plan and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); and,

WHEREAS, the State receives on an annual basis federal State Planning and Research funds (SPR funds) for purposes including statewide planning, the planning of future highway programs and local public transportation systems, and plans for the implementation of such programs: and,

WHEREAS, the State desires to delegate its responsibility for assessing the transportation needs for any jurisdictions within the Grand Junction/Mesa County TPR not participating on the Grand Junction/Mesa County RPC; and,

WHEREAS, the Grand Junction/Mesa County RPC desires to conduct regional transportation planning for any jurisdiction within the Grand Junction/Mesa County TPR not participating on the Grand Junction/Mesa County RPC; and,

WHEREAS, the Contractor desires to receive SPR funds apportioned to the State by the Federal Government in accordance with 23 U.S.C. Sections 104 and 307(C) to be administered by the State and to be spent by the Contractor on activities associated with the statewide transportation planning process carried out in accordance with 23 U.S.C. Section 135 and §43-1-1103 C.R.S.; and,

WHEREAS, the funding has been approved and budgeted for use by the Contractor in the Fiscal Year 2001 SPR PR01-002 and the Federal Fiscal Year_2001 SPR PR 01-002 Work Program; and,

WHEREAS, the Contractor desires to be responsible for the expenditure of the SPR funds for carrying out activities associated with the statewide transportation planning process, for the period beginning with the executed date of the contract through June 30, 2001 (the Program Period); and,

WHEREAS, the Contractor desires to perform the work described in the Rural Planning Work Program (Exhibit A) and has agreed to monitor the progress and costs of the work in order to stop performance prior to incurring costs in excess of \$8,500.00; and is the only entity empowered with this responsibility; and,

WHEREAS, this contract is entered into pursuant to the authority of §§43-1-106, 43-1-224, 30-28-105, 29-1-203, and 24-103-205 C.R.S.;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto mutually agree to carry out the necessary continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning within the Grand Junction/Mesa County TPR as more specifically described herein. The parties agree:

I. SCOPE OF WORK

- A. The intergovernmental agreement creating the Contractor under C.R.S. 30-28-105, the Statewide Transportation Planning Process and Transportation Planning Regions rules (2 CCR 604-2, "the Rules"), and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR 23, Part 172 and CFR 49, Part 18) regarding administration of negotiated contracts are made a part of this contract by reference. Also, the State Special Provisions and Exhibit A (the Rural Planning Work Program) are attached hereto and incorporated herein as terms and conditions of this contract by this reference:
- B. In the event of a conflict between CFR 23, Part 172 and/or CFR 49, Part 18 and the provisions of this contract proper of the attachments hereto; CFR 23, Part 172 and CFR 49, Part 18 shall control to the extent of such conflict. However, the provisions of 23 U.S.C. Section 135 take precedence over any conflicting terms of this contract. The provisions of this paragraph do not constitute a waiver of legal and administrative appeals available to the Contractor or the State.
- C. The contractor shall cooperatively undertake the activities related to the statewide transportation planning process, set forth in Sections IV, V, VI, VII and VIII of the Rules and perform the tasks identified in Exhibit A for the expenditure of SPR funds during the Program Period.
- D. The contractor shall provide the mechanism for funding the tasks during the Program Period for the SPR funds to be expended to implement the planning process in the TPR.

- E. The contractor shall assure that SPR funds spent during the Program Period for those tasks identified in Exhibit A are spent in accordance with all applicable State and Federal requirements and with the terms of this contract.
- F. The contractor shall assure that the management of the Rural Planning Work Program will be accomplished.
- G. The Contractor shall provide the products and services identified in Exhibit A to the State by the specified date(s).
- H. The Contractor shall take all reasonable steps to obtain the necessary staff or consultant services required to carry out all tasks described and identified in Exhibit A and Section I. The selection for consultant services shall be in compliance with all federal procurement requirements. In addition, any Request for Proposal (RFP) used by the Contractor to secure consultant services must be reviewed and approved by the State prior to release. The Contractor shall obtain written authorization from the State before executing any contract for consultant services which utilizes SPR funds.
- I. Within 30 days after the end of the Program Period, the Contractor will provide to the State a final accomplishment report of the Rural Planning Work Program tasks performed under this contract. It shall include, but not be limited to: (1) final accomplishments by task; (2) status of uncompleted products; and, (3) actual expenditures for the Program Period. The State Contract Administrator has the right to disallow any costs incurred by the Contractor which are not consistent with or in compliance with the authorized tasks of Exhibit A.
- J. The progress and cost data associated with tasks described in Exhibit A and Section I shall be monitored by the State at least quarterly. The State will provide at least one week's notice the date and time of any meeting.

II. COMPENSATION (Obligation, Billing)

- A. The contractor shall bill the State for the allowable cost of those tasks eligible for SPR funds identified in Exhibit A. Billings shall be rendered by the contractor to the State on a regular basis, provided that such basis shall be at least quarterly. All billings shall include a statement of direct charges, and an invoice for the amount of reimbursable SPR expenditures by Work Program task incurred during the reporting period. The State shall promptly pay the Contractor's bills for expenditures incurred in performance of tasks described in Section I, and subject to conditions specified in Section II, Paragraphs B and C.
- B. The State's obligation under this contract shall not exceed the maximum amount of \$8,500.00 unless a supplemental agreement is executed to increase such amount prior to additional costs being incurred. The contractor shall be solely

responsible for all expenses incurred before the execution of this contract. In addition, the contractor shall be solely responsible for all costs incurred which are either not allowable or which exceed the total estimated costs without a prior executed supplemental agreement.

- C. Allowable costs shall be limited to those necessary to carry out the tasks described in Exhibit A, Section I, and as provided in applicable Federal Regulations as determined by the State. These include direct costs such as the costs of computer services, salaries, technical supplies, and reproduction; public participation-related costs including mailing costs, and public opinion surveys; State Transportation Advisory Committee Member travel costs; and consultant contracts.
- D. Federal Funding. This contract is subject to and contingent upon the continuing availability of Federal funds for the purposes hereof. The parties hereto expressly recognize that the contractor is to be paid, reimbursed, or otherwise compensated with funds provided to the State by the Federal Government for the purpose of contracting for the services provided for herein, and therefore, the contractor expressly understands and agrees that all its rights, demands and claims to compensation arising under this contract are contingent upon receipt of such funds by the State. In the event that such funds or any part thereof are not received by the State, the State may immediately terminate this contract without liability, including liability for termination costs.

III. GENERAL PROVISIONS

- A. For the purpose of this Contract, Mr. George Ventura is hereby designated representative of the State and Cliff Davidson is hereby designated representative of the contractor. Either party may from time to time designate in writing new or substitute representatives or new addresses where notices shall be sent. All notices required to be given by the parties hereunder shall be given by certified or registered mail to the individuals at the addresses set forth below:

To CDOT:

George Ventura
DTD/Transportation Planning Branch
Colorado Department of Transportation
4201 E. Arkansas Avenue, EP-B606
Denver, CO 80222

To The Contractor:

Cliff Davidson
Grand Junction/Mesa County MPO
PO Box 20,000-5013
Grand Junction, CO 81502-5013

- B. The parties aver that, to their knowledge, their employees have no interest in and shall not acquire an interest in, directly or indirectly, which would conflict in any manner or degree with the performance and services required to be performed under this contract. The parties further promise that they will not employ any person having an outside interest in the performance of this contract.

C. The Contractor warrants that it has the authority to enter into this contract under the intergovernmental agreement which forms the RPC within the Grand Junction/Mesa County TPR and that it has taken all appropriate actions to lawfully execute such authority. The Contractor shall be responsible for all claims and liabilities resulting from the Contractor's acts or omissions, or the acts or omissions of consultants, subcontractors, agents, or employees of the Contractor.

D. (1) Data, studies, surveys, drawings, maps, models, photographs, reports, and any other materials produced or developed pursuant to this contract shall become the property of the Contractor, except as set forth herein; also, the Contractor is hereby authorized to copyright and market computer software produced under this contract. All proceeds from the sale of products or services developed under this contract must be returned to the Statewide Transportation Planning Process.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the State and FHWA shall, without costs to them, have the royalty-free, non-exclusive and irrevocable right to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use and to authorize others to use, all such materials for State and U.S. Government purposes. In addition, the State and U.S. Government shall have the right to use, duplicate, or disclose technical data and computer software produced under this contract in whole or in part, in any manner and for any purpose whatsoever, and to have or permit others to do so. However, should the Contractor choose to market computer files and/or software produced under this project, the State agrees to refer inquiries concerning such materials to the Contractor.

(2) All information, data, reports, records, and maps which are developed by the Contractor for carrying out the Rural Planning Work Program within the Grand Junction/Mesa County TPR, shall be made available in sufficient copies (not to exceed fifteen) to the State and FHWA, and directed by the State.

(3) All reports pertaining to the performance of this contract shall be reviewed and approved pursuant to the procedures established under the Rules, but no report will be published without the prior approval of FHWA. Any published material shall acknowledge the participation of the State and the FHWA in recognition of the cooperative nature of the Statewide Transportation Planning Process.

(4) The Contractor and any consultants shall maintain all books, records, and other documentation pertaining to authorized Rural Planning Work Program tasks and to completely substantiate all costs incurred during the Program Period for a period of three years from the date of termination of

this contract. These records shall be made available for inspection and audit to the State, FHWA, or the Comptroller General of the United States, and copies thereof shall be furnished, if requested. The Contractor shall include this record keeping/audit requirement in any contract with any consultant employed to perform Rural Planning Work Program tasks by expressly requiring the Consultant to comply with this requirement.

- (5) The State and FHWA are specifically authorized to review and inspect at all reasonable times all such records, and all technical and financial aspects of the tasks described in Exhibit A. FHWA will arrange such reviews and inspections through the State.
- E. The Special Provisions attached hereto are incorporated herein by this reference.
- F. Either party has the right to withdraw from this contract by giving written notice to the other party at least 60 days in advance of such withdrawal, whereupon the contract shall terminate at the expiration of the period of notice.
- G. Officers, members, or employees of the parties and members of the governing body of the localities in which the planning program is situated or being carried out, who exercise any function or responsibility in the review or approval of the undertaking or carrying out of this contract, shall not: (1) participate in any decision related to this contract which affects their personal interest or the interest of any corporation, partnership, or association in which they are directly or indirectly interested; or, (2) have any interest, directly or indirectly, in this contract or the proceeds thereof.
- H. The term of this contract shall begin on the executed date and extend through June 30, 2001.
- I. To the extent that this Contract may be executed and performance of the obligations of the parties may be accomplished within the intent of the Contract, the terms of this Contract are severable, and should any term or provision hereof be declared invalid or become inoperative for any reason, such invalidity or failure shall not affect the validity of any other term or provision hereof. The waiver of any breach of a term hereof shall not be construed as waiver of any other term.
- J. This Contract is intended as the complete integration of all understanding between the parties. No prior or contemporaneous addition, deletion, or other amendment hereto shall have any force or effect whatsoever, unless embodied herein in writing. No subsequent novation, renewal, addition, deletion, or other amendment hereto shall have any force or effect unless embodied in a written contract executed and approved pursuant to the State Fiscal rules.

- K. Except as herein otherwise provided, this Contract shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns.
- L. Neither party may assign its rights or duties under this Contract without the prior written consent of the other party.
- M. The Contractor represents and warrants that it has taken all actions that are necessary or required by internal procedures and bylaws, and applicable law, to properly authorize the undersigned signatory for the Contractor to lawfully execute this Contract on behalf of the Contractor and to bind the Contractor to its terms.

IV INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR RELATIONSHIP

The contractor shall perform its duties hereunder as an independent contractor and not as an employee. Neither the contractor nor any agent or employee of the contractor shall be or shall be deemed to be an agent or employee of the state. Contractor shall pay when due all required employment taxes and income tax and local head tax on any moneys paid pursuant to this contract. Contractor acknowledges that the contractor and its employees are not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits unless the contractor or a third party provides such coverage and that the state does not pay for or otherwise provide such coverage. Contractor shall have no authorization, express or implied, to bind the state to any agreements, liability, or understanding except as expressly set forth herein. Contractor shall provide and keep in force worker's compensation (and show proof of such insurance) and unemployment compensation insurance in the amounts required by law, and shall be solely responsible for the acts of the contractor, its employees and agents.

V GRANT ASSURANCES

- A. Since this grant contract involves the expenditure of federal funds, the grantee/local agency/contractor shall at all times during the execution of this contract strictly adhere to and comply with all applicable federal laws and regulations, as they currently exist and may hereafter be amended, which are incorporated herein by this reference as terms and conditions of this contract. The grantee/local agency/contractor shall also require compliance with these statutes and regulations in subgrant agreements entered into under this contract. Federal laws and regulations that may be applicable include:
- B. The Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments" (Common Rule), at 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 18, or the "Uniform Administrative

Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Non-Profit Organizations”, at 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 19, as applicable. The requirements of 49 CFR Part 18, or Part 19, include, without limitation:

- (1) the Contractor shall follow applicable procurement procedures, as required by section 18.36(d) or 19.36(d);
 - (2) the Contractor shall request and obtain prior CDOT approval of changes to any subcontracts in the manner, and to the extent required by, applicable provisions of section 18.30 or section 19.30;
 - (3) the Contractor shall comply with section 18.37 or section 19.37 concerning any subgrants;
 - (4) to expedite any CDOT approval, the Contractor's attorney, or other authorized representative, shall also submit a letter to CDOT certifying Contractor compliance with section 18.30 or section 19.30 change order procedures, and with 18.36(d) or section 19.36(d) procurement procedures, and with section 18.37 or section 19.37 subgrant procedures, as applicable;
 - (5) the Contractor shall incorporate the specific contract provisions described in section 18.36(i) or section 19.36(i) (which are also deemed incorporated herein) into any subcontract(s) for such services as terms and conditions of those subcontracts.
- C. Title 23, United States Code, Part 172, and Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 172, if the contract work includes professional engineering or architectural services.
- D. Title 23, United States Code, Part 112, and Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 633 and 635, if the contract work includes construction services.
- E. Provided, however, that to the extent that other applicable federal requirements (including the provisions of Title 23) are more specific than provisions of Title 49, Part 18 or 19, those requirements shall supersede such Part 18 or 19 provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this agreement on the day first above written.

STATE OF COLORADO, COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ATTEST:

By: _____

Tom Norton
Executive Director, CDOT

By: _____
Chief Clerk

By: _____
Jennifer Finch
Director, DTD

APPROVED:

Ken Salazar
Attorney General

By: _____
Arthur Barnhart
State Controller

By: _____
Greg Jamieson
Assistant Attorney General
Natural Resources Division

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

By: _____
Chairman
Board of County Commissioners

By: _____
Mayor
City of Grand Junction

By: _____
County Clerk and Recorder

By: _____
City Clerk

EXHIBIT A

RURAL PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

The purpose of this exhibit is to present detailed procedures for the continuation of the statewide transportation planning process within the Transportation Planning Regions.

TASK I - STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (STAC)

Purpose: For the STAC representative from the Grand Junction/Mesa County MPO to attend regularly scheduled meetings and carry out the other duties of the STAC pursuant to Section 43-1-1104 C.R.S., as amended, and to Section V. of the Rules for the Statewide Planning Process (2 CCR 604-2).

Method:

1. Review and comment on Regional Transportation Plans.
2. Review and provide a recommendation to the Department on whether the plans, amendments, and updates to these plans meet the requirements of sections V-A of the Rules.
3. Assist in resolving conflicts which arise between TPRs, or between the Department and a TPR.
4. Make recommendations to the Department concerning the integration and consolidation of Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) into the State Transportation Plan.
5. Provide advice to the Department on Colorado's mobility requirements by furnishing regional perspectives on transportation problems requiring statewide solutions.
6. Make recommendations to Planning Organizations and the Department that will improve modal choice, linkages between modes, and transportation system continuity.

TASK 2 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Purpose: For the Grand Junction/Mesa County MPO in cooperation with the Department in carrying out the Statewide Public Participation Process for Transportation Planning pursuant to Section VI-A of the Rules for the Statewide Planning Process (2 CCR 604-2).

1. Cooperate with the Department in providing reasonable notice and opportunity to comment on upcoming state transportation planning related activities and meetings.

2. Provide annual recommendations on the TPR project priorities for the STIP through the Project Priority Programming Process.
3. Cooperate with the Department in facilitating public meetings in the TPR pursuant to Section VI-A (6) of the Rules for the Statewide Planning Process (2 CCR 604-2).
4. Review and comment on draft Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs.
5. Prepare responses to significant issues raised at required public meetings within the TPR concerning the RTP pursuant to Section VI-A of the Rules for the Statewide Planning process (2 CCR 604-2).

TASK 3 - STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN REVIEW

Purpose: Provide input on the integration and consolidation of regional plans with the Statewide Transportation Plan.

Method: Review and provide comment, through the STAC representative, on elements of the Statewide Transportation Plan, including proposed criteria for incorporating projects into the Statewide Transportation Plan, drafts of the Statewide Transportation Plan, and the final Statewide Transportation Plan pursuant to Section 43-1-1103 (3) (a) C.R.S.

TASK 4 - REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENTS

Purpose: Circumstances altering the transportation systems planning factors upon which the RTP is based may change the TPRs project priority recommendations to the Department and require amending the RTP.

Method: Amend the RTP as necessary to make additions or deletions on review and analysis of the RTP to insure successful implementation throughout the Statewide Transportation Plan pursuant to Section VIII of the Rules for the Statewide Planning Process (2 CCR 604-2).

Attach 5

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	City-County Joint Resolution Amending Persigo 201 Service Area		
Meeting Date:	June 21,2000		
Date Prepared:	June 12, 2000		
Author:	Greg Trainor	Utilities Manager	
Presenter Name:	Mark Relph	Public Works Director	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: City-County Joint Resolution: Amending Persigo 201 Sewer Service Area Boundary.

Summary: During late1999 and early 2000 the City Council and Board of County Commissioners conducted a series of public hearings concerning additions and deletions of property to the 201 Sewer Service Area. The attached resolution is being adopted jointly between the City and the County reflecting all decisions reached during these public hearings. The County adopted the joint resolution on May 22, 2000.

Background Information:

On October 13, 1998, the City of Grand Junction and the Mesa County entered into an intergovernmental agreement relating to City Growth and Joint Policy making for the Persigo Sewer System. One of the common goals in the agreement was to agree upon and jointly adopt the boundaries of the 201 Sewer Service Area.

Both entities met and held public hearings on the boundary on October 26, 1999, December 13, 1999, and on March 13, 2000. Testimony was heard and motions were made concerning specific parcels to be included into the 201 boundary and deleted from the 201 boundary. These specific additions and deletions are identified as Exhibit A of the Joint Resolution attached.

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: Adopt the joint resolution and authorize the Mayor to sign

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
------------------------------	----------	-----------	------------	----------------

Name:	N/A				
Purpose:	N/A				
Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

JOINT RESOLUTION AMENDING PERSIGO 201 SERVICE AREA
Grand Junction Resolution No. _____
Mesa County Resolution No. MCM 2000-74 _____

WHEREAS, on October 13, 1998, the City of Grand Junction ("City") and Mesa County ("County") entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement relating to City Growth and Joint Policy Making for the Persigo Sewer System ("Agreement"); and

WHEREAS, the Agreement provides for the following:

1. A common goal and community value between the City and the County is to agree on, and adopt, the boundaries of the Persigo 201 sewer service area.
2. The City and County shall jointly establish and provide policy direction relating to the System, including acting jointly regarding any changes to the Persigo 201 sewer service area.
3. The parties agree that the Urban Growth Area (UGA) and the 201 should be the same, although amendments are required to accomplish this consistency, except that Clifton Sanitation District I and II will be excluded from the Persigo 201 sewer service area.
4. Within one year of the effective date of the Agreement, the parties agree to, in good faith, amend the Urban Growth Boundary, or the 201, or both, so that such boundaries and areas are identical; and

WHEREAS, on July 29, 1999, the Mesa County Planning Commission and the Grand Junction Planning Commission held a joint public hearing and amended the definition of the UGA to be the same as the Persigo 201 sewer service area and Clifton Sanitation Districts I and II, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the City and County held joint public hearings on October 26, 1999, December 13, 1999, and March 13, 2000 to discuss changes to the Persigo 201 sewer service area boundary; and

WHEREAS, legal descriptions for Clifton Sanitation Districts I and II and Orchard Mesa Sanitation District have been used to define portions of the Persigo 201 sewer service area boundary.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT JOINTLY RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF MESA, COLORADO AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

1. The Persigo 201 sewer service area boundary is hereby amended as reflected on the attached Exhibit A.

2. The attached Exhibit A replaces Exhibit A previously attached to the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County relating to City growth and joint policy making for the Persigo Sewer System.

3. Both the City and County recognize that their joint decision and recommendation regarding the Persigo 201 sewer service area boundary amendment is subject to the approval of others pursuant to the Federal Clean Water Act and implementing regulations.

4. City and County staffs are directed to submit the attached map to the appropriate agencies for approval.

Passed and Adopted this _____ day of May, 2000, by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction.

Attest:

Stephanie Nye, Grand Junction
City Clerk

Gene Kinsey,
President of the Council

Passed and Adopted this __22__ day of May, 2000, by the Board of County Commissioners of Mesa County.

MESA COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS:

By: __/s/_____
Doralyn B. Genova, Chairman

Attest:

/s/_____
Monika Todd, Mesa County Clerk &
Recorder

Attach 6

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>		
Subject:	Award of Contract of Columbine Sewer Design Services	
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000	
Date Prepared:	June 13, 2000	
Author:	Trent Prall	Title: Utility Engineer
Presenter Name:	Greg Trainor	Title: Utility Manager
	Workshop	X Formal Agenda

Subject: Award of a design services Contract for the Columbine Sewer Improvement District to Williams Engineering in the amount of \$30,900.

Summary: Lump sum fee proposals were received and opened on June 12, 2000 for the Columbine Sewer Improvement District. The lowest qualified, lump sum fee proposal was submitted by Williams Engineering in the amount of **\$30,900**.

Background Information: This project calls for the design and preparation of bid documents as outlined in the "Request for Proposals" for the extension of 6800 linear feet of 8" sewer main to benefit 64 homes in the Columbine Subdivision. The subdivision is located northeast of Broadway, east of Redlands Parkway on the Redlands. This work is preparatory to the creation of a sewer improvement district to eliminate septic systems.

The following qualified, lump sum fee proposals were received on June 12, 2000:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Lump Sum Fee</u>
Williams Engineering	Fruita	\$30,900
Balaz and Associates	Palisade	\$32,400
Banner and Associates	Grand	\$36,500

On April 18, staff met with the residents of Columbine to discuss the creation of a sewer improvement district in their neighborhood. An informal petition was submitted to Pete Baier of Mesa County on May 11, 2000, where 35 of 64 (55%) of the residents requested that the City move forward and design and bid out the proposed sanitary sewer improvements that would provide service to the Columbine Subdivision.

In order to avoid past problems, staff is requesting to award the design and receive bids PRIOR to actual formation of the improvement district. There is some risk that the bids may be higher than anticipated and that the owners within the proposed district may elect

to not move forward with the district. However, everyone will know actual costs prior to formation of the district.

The design is to be completed by September 22, 2000 with the construction bids scheduled to be received on October 10, 2000. The final petition and easement documents will be created with the actual bid numbers. Pending submittal of the petition by November 17, County Commissioner formation of the district and contract award for the construction could happen as soon as January 20, 2001. Construction would then occur February through May 2001.

As this will be a County Local Improvement District, the award is contingent upon County Commissioner approval.

Budget: The project will be paid for out of Sewer Fund 906 - Sewer Improvement Districts. Although the petition was submitted prior to the announcement of the City/County Septic System Elimination Program, this project will be handled under the parameters set up for that program including the sewer fund underwriting 30% of the project costs.

As the project was not budgeted for this year, the project will need to be accounted for this fall in the supplemental appropriations.

Action Requested / Recommendation: City Council motion authorizing the City Manager to execute a Design Services Contract for the Columbine Sewer Improvement District with Williams Engineering in the amount of \$30,900 contingent upon County Commissioner approval.

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
-----------------------	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----

Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----	-------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
----------------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

Attach 7

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>		
Subject:	Desert Hills Trunk Extension scope revision	
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000	
Date Prepared:	June 15, 2000	
Author:	Trent Prall	Title: Utility Engineer
Presenter Name:	Trent Prall	Title: Utility Engineer
	Workshop	X Formal Agenda

Subject: Revise the budget on the Desert Hills Trunk Extension to \$150,000 to accommodate an trunk extension south of the proposed Desert Hills Estates property to South Broadway to serve the Wildwood area.

Background: City staff is requesting revising the budget for the Desert Hills Trunk Extension from \$75,000 to \$150,000 to accommodate the following:

1. Sewer line within the proposed Desert Hills Estates Subdivision should be extended south to South Broadway to facilitate new development south of that point in the Wildwood Drive area. With the County Commissioners / City Council decision to leave the Wildwood Drive area inside the 201, future growth would gravity sewer this direction. If this work was not completed at this time, any new development south of this point would have to dig up the entrance road to Desert Hills Estates in order to connect to sewer.
2. Extend the originally proposed and approved 2465 foot trunk extension in Desert Hills Road an additional 415 feet further west to the intersection of Desert Hills Road and South Broadway. The line was originally proposed to end at one of the proposed cul-de-sacs on the Keesee property. With the clustering of lots proposed with the new subdivision, the preferred alignment for the Season's lift station elimination project shifted to South Broadway in order to avoid tearing up proposed open space. The requested additional sewer line will also serve the vacant property to the north of the Seasons.
3. Add a 6 inch force main, to be laid in the same trench as the developer's 4 inch force main. With the additional demand from the Wildwood area, the 4 inch force main currently proposed would be inadequate at buildout. However, simply upgrading the 4 inch force main to a 6 inch main at this time with such a small number of homes on the system would mean the sewage would sit in the line for a long period of time in between pump cycles. The sewage would most likely turn septic and lead to additional odor problems.

All new development south and west of the area will be responsible for trunk extension fees in accordance with Resolution 47-93.

Budget:

On February 16, 2000 the City Council approved the use of \$75,000 from the Trunk Extension Fund (Fund 903). This request is for an additional \$75,000 to bring the total budget for the project to **\$150,000**.

Item	\$/unit	Qty	Unit	Extended
Desert Hills Extension 8"	\$ 16.00	2465	LF	\$ 39,440.00
Desert Hills Extensions MH	\$ 1,500.00	6	EA	\$ 9,000.00
Oversize of lift station	\$15,000.00	1	LS	\$ 15,000.00
Design	\$10,000.00	1	LS	\$ 10,000.00
Contingency				\$ 1,560.00
Original budget (approved 2/16/00)				\$ 75,000.00

Additional Work

Desert Hills additional extension	\$ 16.00	410	LF	\$ 6,560.00
Wildwood Extension	\$ 16.00	1084	LF	\$ 17,344.00
Wildwood Extension MH	\$ 1,500.00	5	EA	\$ 7,500.00
Desert Hills 6" forcemain	\$ 10.00	3540	LS	\$ 35,400.00
Additional oversize of lift station	\$ 4,000.00	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00
Additional Design	\$ 4,000.00	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00
Additional budget requested				\$ 74,804.00

Revised project budget **\$ 150,000.00**

Revenue. All future development, outside of the Desert Hills Estates will be required to pay trunk extension fees in accordance with Resolution No. 47-93. These fees will continue to be charged to help recover the cost of this extension. The total revenue from this investment is estimated at \$180,000

To date the Trunk Extension Fund has approximately \$1,100,000 of which only \$110,100 has been earmarked for the Red Canyon Trunk Extension (part of the Redlands Mesa golf course)

Action Requested / Recommendation: Public Works staff recommends that the additional work be approved for 2000 construction. The revised engineer's estimate for the total project is \$150,000 which includes design, admin, inspection and construction. Pending Council Approval and construction should be started by early July.

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----

Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
--	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

Attach 8

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Resolution concerning Federal funds for the South Camp Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail, Phase I		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	Don Newton	Engineering Projects Manager	
Presenter Name:	Tim Moore	Public Works Manager	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: A Resolution concerning the use of Federal-Aid Enhancement Funds for a project identified as STE M555-013 (13300), **South Camp Phase I, SUB=13300 for a Bike/Ped Trail adjacent to South Camp Road.**

Summary: A City Council Resolution is required for the City to enter into a contract with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and to participate in a Federally funded project to construct a Bike/Ped Trail on the west side of South Camp Road. Total funding for this project is \$220,000 including 80% (\$176,000) Federal-aid funds and 20% (\$44,000) City funds. Both City and Federal funding for this project will be transferred from the 24 Road Trail Project budget.

Background Information: Attempts to acquire right-of-way for the 24 Road Trail along the east side of Leach Creek have been unsuccessful and the property owner has not provided an alternative alignment for the trail. To avoid losing \$300,000 in Federal funding, staff has asked CDOT to transfer Federal funds from the 24 Road Trail Project to the Horizon Drive Trail (7th to 12th) Project and the South Camp Road Trail Project in amounts of \$124,000 and \$176,000 respectively.

The Horizon Drive Trail and South Camp Trail projects are currently being designed and will be advertised for bids before September 30, 2000.

Budget: The 24 Road Trail Project was budgeted in 2000 at \$490,446 including \$315,000 Federal Enhancement Funds and \$175,446 City funds. The Federal share has since been reduced to \$300,000. The proposed transfer Federal funds to the Horizon Drive and South Camp Trail projects, would result in the following budget revisions:

	<u>Original Budget</u>		<u>Revised Budget</u>		<u>Total</u>
	City	Federal	City	Federal	
Horizon Trail (7 th -12 th)	24,000	80,000	55,000	204,000	254,000
S. Camp Trail	-0-	-0-	176,000	44,000	220,000

The total amount to be transferred from the 24 Road Trail budget is \$375,000 including \$300,000 Federal and \$75,000 City funds. This will result in a remaining balance of \$115,446 (City funds) in the 24 Road Trail Project that can be returned to the 2011 fund balance.

Action Requested/Recommendation: Adopt resolution to enter into a contract with CDOT to participate in a Federally funded project to construct a bike/pedestrian trail adjacent to South Camp Road.

Citizen Presentation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
--	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	------------	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
-----------------------------	--------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

southcamp1

RESOLUTION NO. __-00

**A RESOLUTION CONCERNING FEDERAL-AID ENHANCEMENT FUNDS
FROM THE INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT
OF 1991 FOR THE PROJECT IDENTIFIED AS
STE M55-013 (13300) SOUTH CAMP PHASE I, SUB =13300,
FOR A BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAL TRAIL ADJACENT TO
SOUTH CAMP ROAD**

RECITALS:

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, hereby resolved in Resolution -00, to enter into a contract with the State of Colorado, Department of Transportation to participate in a Federally funded project to construct a bike pedestrian trail adjacent to South Camp Road.

The total of the preliminary engineering, material and construction of the path are to be funded as follows:

a.	Federal participating funds (80% of \$220,000)	\$176,000
b.	Local Agency Share	<u>\$ 44,000</u>
	TOTAL PROJECT FUNDS	\$220,000

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
GRAND JUNCTION, AS FOLLOWS:**

The City Council approves the matching of Federal funds with City funds in the amount of \$44,000.00

PASSED and APPROVED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

Mayor, City of Grand Junction

Attest:

City Clerk

Attach 9

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Westwood Ranch Revocable Permit		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	Bill Nebeker	Senior Planner	
Presenter Name:	Bill Nebeker	Senior Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Revocable Permit - Fence in City right-of-way; located at Westwood Ranch Subdivision, northwest corner of 25 ½ Road and F ½ Road; file #RVP-2000-025.

Summary: The developer of Westwood Ranch Subdivision has requested a revocable permit to allow an existing subdivision perimeter fence to remain in the City right-of-way. A portion of the fence is being relocated outside of the right-of-way for sight distance and future sign placement requirements. Staff recommends approval.

Background Information: [See Attached](#)

Budget: [N/A](#)

Action Requested/Recommendation: Adopt resolution allowing fence to remain in City right-of-way.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	----	-----	-------	--

Placement on Agenda:	X	Consent	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------	---------	----------------------	----------

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>			
Location:		Westwood Ranch Subdivision; NW Corner F ½ & 25 ½ Roads	
Applicants:		Sonshine Construction LLC	
Existing Land Use:		Residential subdivision	
Proposed Land Use:		No change proposed	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Single family residential	
	South	PSCO service yard (industrial)	
	East	Single family residential	
	West	Low density SF residential	
Existing Zoning:		Planned Residential	
Proposed Zoning:		No change proposed	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	Planned Residential	
	South	Industrial/Office Park	
	East	Planned Residential	
	West	Planned Residential	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium: 4 to 8 units per acre	
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes
			No

Recommendation: Adopt resolution allowing fence to remain in City right-of-way.

Staff Analysis:

As part of subdivision approval for Westwood Ranch the applicant was required to construct a six-foot cedar fence along 25 ½ and F ½ Road. The fence was inadvertently placed in the right-of-way rather than one foot behind the sidewalk per the standard street section. The fence was constructed outside of the sight distance triangle at the corner of 25 ½ and F ½, but inside a portion of the sight triangle at Laredo Street and F ½ Road.

The Public Works Department has concerns with the fence in the right-of-way because it limits the future placement of traffic signs. The sight distance at the Laredo Street intersection is a concern. To avoid the expense of moving the entire fence just one-foot out of the right-of-way, staff has agreed to allow the fence to remain in some places, while being located out of other places needed for future sign placement and sight distance. The developer has agreed to remove the fence to the property line within

approximately 100 feet of the 25 ½ and F ½ intersection for sign placement and outside of the sight distance triangle at the Laredo Street entrance onto F ½ Road.

As a condition of approval, the applicant has agreed to provide weed mat and gravel over the unimproved right-of-way where the fence is relocated.

The City Charter gives Council authority to allow private use of public property provided such use is substantiated by resolution. The revocable permit essentially gives the adjacent landowners, a license to use the public property. The City may revoke the permit and require restoration of the property to meet the original condition (*i.e.*, fence one-foot back of walk) by giving 30 days written notice. This project meets the criteria for a revocable permit.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval

RESOLUTION NO. _____

**CONCERNING THE ISSUANCE OF A REVOCABLE PERMIT TO
WESTWOOD RANCH HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION**

Recitals

1. Westwood Ranch Homeowner's Association, for and on behalf of itself and the owners of the certain property in the Westwood Ranch Subdivision hereinafter referred to as the Petitioners, represent that it and the owners of certain real property described as Lot 10, Block 1, & Lots 3, 6, 7, 9A, 10A, 10B, 11A, 11B, 12A, 12B, Block 4, & Tract B, FILING 1; and Lots 1A, 1B, Block 4 & Lots 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, Block 5, FILING 2, situate in the SE ¼ NW ¼ of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, hereinafter referred to as the "Property" have requested that the City Council of the City of Grand Junction issue a Revocable Permit to allow the installation, maintenance, repair and replacement of a 6' privacy fence within the limits of the following described real property owned by the City, to wit:

PARCEL ONE

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the west right of way line for 25 1/2 Road which is identical with the northeast corner of Tract D of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One as recorded in Plat Book 16 at Page 294-295 in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder, with all bearings contained herein being relative to the recorded plat of said Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;

Thence S 77°38'30" E a distance of 1.02 feet to a point;

Thence S 00°00'00" W along a line 1.00 feet east of and parallel with the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 68.71 feet to a point;

Thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road which is identical with the angle point on the east boundary line of Lot 10, Block 1 of said Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;

Thence N 00°00'00" E along the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 68.93 feet to the point of beginning, containing 68.82 square feet more or less.

PARCEL TWO

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the west right of way line for 25 1/2 Road which is identical with the southeast corner of Lot 7, Block 4 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One as recorded in Plat Book 16 at Page 294-295 in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder, with all bearings contained herein being relative to the recorded plat of said Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;

Thence N 00°00'00" E along the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 275.97 feet to the angle point on the east boundary line of Lot 3, Block 4 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One A as recorded in Plat Book 17 at Page 47 in the office of said Mesa County Clerk and Recorder;

Thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point;

Thence S 00°00'00" W along a line 1.00 feet east of and parallel with the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 275.97 feet to a point;

Thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 1.00 feet to the point of beginning, containing 275.97 square feet more or less.

PARCEL THREE

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north right of way line for F 1/2 Road which is identical with the southeast corner of Lot 9A, Block 4 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One as recorded in Plat Book 16, Page 294-295 in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder, with all bearings contained herein being relative with the recorded Plat of said Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;

Thence N 90°00'00" W along the north right of way line for said F 1/2 Road a distance of 418.21 feet to a point on the south boundary line for Lot 1A, Block 4 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. Two as recorded in Plat Book 17 at Page 154-155 in the office of said Mesa County Clerk and Recorder;

Thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point;

Thence S 90°00'00" E along a line 1.00 feet south of and parallel with the north right of way line for said F 1/2 Road a distance of 418.21 feet to a point;

Thence N 00°00'00" E a distance of 1.00 feet to the point of beginning, containing 418.21 square feet more or less.

PARCEL FOUR

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north right of way line for F 1/2 Road which is identical with southwest corner of Tract B of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One A as recorded in Plat Book 17, Page 47 in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder,

with all bearings contained herein being relative with the recorded Plat of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;

Thence S 90°00'00" E along the north right of way line for said F 1/2 Road a distance of 491.87 feet to a point on the south boundary line of Lot 4B, Block 5 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. Two as recorded in Plat Book 17 at Page 154-155 in the office of said Mesa County Clerk and Recorder;

Thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point;

Thence N 90°00'00" W along a line 1.00 feet south of and parallel with the north right of way line for said F 1/2 Road a distance of 491.87 feet to a point;

Thence N 00°02'24" E a distance of 1.00 feet to the point of beginning, containing 491.87 square feet more or less.

2. Based on the foregoing, the City Council has determined that such action would not at this time be detrimental to the inhabitants of the City of Grand Junction.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the City Manager, on behalf of the City and as the act of the City, is hereby authorized and directed to issue the attached Revocable Permit to the above-named Petitioners for the purposes aforescribed and within the limits of the City owned property aforescribed, subject to each and every term and condition contained in the attached Revocable Permit.

PASSED and ADOPTED this _____ day of June 2000.

Attest:

President of the City Council

City Clerk

Westwood1 westwood2 westwood3

REVOCABLE PERMIT

1. Westwood Ranch Homeowner's Association, for and on behalf of itself and the owners of the certain property in the Westwood Ranch Subdivision hereinafter referred to as the Petitioners, represent that it and the owners of certain real property described Lot 10, Block 1, & Lots 3, 6, 7, 9A, 10A, 10B, 11A, 11B, 12A, 12B, Block 4, & Tract B, FILING 1; and Lots 1A, 1B, Block 4 & Lots 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, Block 5, FILING 2, situate in the SE ¼ NW ¼ of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, also known as * , hereinafter referred to as the "Property" have requested that the City Council of the City of Grand Junction issue a Revocable Permit to allow the installation, maintenance, repair and replacement of a 6' privacy fence within the limits of real property owned by the City, to wit:

PARCEL ONE

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the west right of way line for 25 1/2 Road which is identical with the northeast corner of Tract D of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One as recorded in Plat Book 16 at Page 294-295 in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder, with all bearings contained herein being relative to the recorded plat of said Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;

Thence S 77°38'30" E a distance of 1.02 feet to a point;

Thence S 00°00'00" W along a line 1.00 feet east of and parallel with the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 68.71 feet to a point;

Thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road which is identical with the angle point on the east boundary line of Lot 10, Block 1 of said Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;

Thence N 00°00'00" E along the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 68.93 feet to the point of beginning, containing 68.82 square feet more or less.

PARCEL TWO

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the west right of way line for 25 1/2 Road which is identical with the southeast corner of Lot 7, Block 4 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One as recorded in Plat Book 16 at Page 294-295 in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and

Recorder, with all bearings contained herein being relative to the recorded plat of said Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;
Thence N 00°00'00" E along the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 275.97 feet to the angle point on the east boundary line of Lot 3, Block 4 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One A as recorded in Plat Book 17 at Page 47 in the office of said Mesa County Clerk and Recorder;
Thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point;
Thence S 00°00'00" W along a line 1.00 feet east of and parallel with the west right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 275.97 feet to a point;
Thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 1.00 feet to the point of beginning, containing 275.97 square feet more or less.

PARCEL THREE

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north right of way line for F 1/2 Road which is identical with the southeast corner of Lot 9A, Block 4 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One as recorded in Plat Book 16, Page 294-295 in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder, with all bearings contained herein being relative with the recorded Plat of said Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;
Thence N 90°00'00" W along the north right of way line for said F 1/2 Road a distance of 418.21 feet to a point on the south boundary line for Lot 1A, Block 4 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. Two as recorded in Plat Book 17 at Page 154-155 in the office of said Mesa County Clerk and Recorder;
Thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point;
Thence S 90°00'00" E along a line 1.00 feet south of and parallel with the north right of way line for said F 1/2 Road a distance of 418.21 feet to a point;
Thence N 00°00'00" E a distance of 1.00 feet to the point of beginning, containing 418.21 square feet more or less.

PARCEL FOUR

A parcel of land situate in the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north right of way line for F 1/2 Road which is identical with southwest corner of Tract B of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One A as recorded in Plat Book 17, Page 47 in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder, with all bearings contained herein being relative with the recorded Plat of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. One;

Thence S 90°00'00" E along the north right of way line for said F 1/2 Road a distance of 491.87 feet to a point on the south boundary line of Lot 4B, Block 5 of Westwood Ranch Subdivision, Filing No. Two as recorded in Plat Book 17 at Page 154-155 in the office of said Mesa County Clerk and Recorder;

Thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point;

Thence N 90°00'00" W along a line 1.00 feet south of and parallel with the north right of way line for said F 1/2 Road a distance of 491.87 feet to a point;

Thence N 00°02'24" E a distance of 1.00 feet to the point of beginning, containing 491.87 square feet more or less.

2. Based on the foregoing, the City Council has determined that such action would not at this time be detrimental to the inhabitants of the City of Grand Junction.

NOW, THEREFORE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ACTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

There is hereby issued to the above-named Petitioners a Revocable Permit for the purposes aforescribed and within the limits of the City owned property aforescribed; provided, however, that the issuance of this Revocable Permit shall be conditioned upon the following terms and conditions:

1. The City hereby reserves and retains a perpetual right to utilize all or any portion of the aforescribed real property for any purpose whatsoever. The City further reserves and retains the right to revoke this Permit at any time and for any reason.
2. The Petitioners, for themselves and for their heirs, successors and assigns, agree that they shall not hold, nor attempt to hold, the City of Grand Junction, its officers, employees and agents, liable for damages caused to the facilities to be installed by the Petitioners within the limits of said City property (including the removal thereof), or any other property of the Petitioners or any other party, as a result of the Petitioner's occupancy, possession or use of said City Property or as a result of any City activity or use thereof or as a result of the installation, operation, maintenance, repair and replacement of public improvements.
3. The Petitioners agrees that they shall at all times keep the above described City property and the facilities authorized pursuant to this Permit in good condition and repair.
4. This Revocable Permit shall be issued only upon concurrent execution by the Petitioners of an agreement that the Petitioners and the Petitioner's heirs, successors and assigns, shall save and hold the City of Grand Junction, its officers, employees and agents harmless from, and indemnify the City, its officers, employees and agents, with respect to any claim or cause of action however stated arising out of, or in any way related to, the encroachment or use

permitted, and that upon revocation of this Permit by the City the Petitioners shall, at the sole expense and cost of the Petitioners, within thirty (30) days of notice of revocation (which may occur by mailing a first class letter to the last known address), peaceably surrender said City property and, at their own expense, remove any encroachment so as to make the aforescribed City property available for use by the City or the general public. The provisions concerning holding harmless and indemnity shall survive the expiration, revocation, termination or other ending of this Permit.

5. Any agreement and/or action taken by the Homeowners Association for or on its own behalf or on the purported behalf of individual owners shall be presumed by the City to be done with the full and complete authority. The Homeowners Association shall affirm in writing that it has/had sufficient authority. Any claim that it did not have authority, following affirmation in writing that it did have authority, shall not render this agreement or the revocable permit void or voidable against the City.
6. The Petitioners, for themselves and for their heirs, successors and assigns, agree that they shall be solely responsible for maintaining and repairing the condition of facilities authorized pursuant to this Permit.
7. This Revocable Permit, the foregoing Resolution and the following Agreement shall be recorded by the Petitioners, at the Petitioner's expense, in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

The City of Grand Junction,
a Colorado home rule municipality

City Clerk

City Manager

Acceptance:

Westwood Ranch Homeowners Association

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	G Road South Enclave Annexation		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 13, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First reading of the Ordinance to Annex the G Road South Annexation. The proposed annexation area is generally located between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road between G Road and F Road and with a portion of the area extending east of 26 ½ Road near Round Hill Drive and Horizon Drive. File ANX-2000-087

Summary: The 383.71 acre G Road South Enclave Annexation area consists of 221 parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on first reading the annexation ordinance for the G Road South Enclave Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
--	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
Location:		Located generally between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road and north of Patterson (F) Road and south of G Road and including a portion of land extending East of 26 ½ Road near Round Hill Dr. and Horizon Dr.	
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton	
Existing Land Use:		Residential and Agricultural	
Proposed Land Use:		No Change	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential and Agricultural	
	South	Residential	
	East	Residential	
	West	Residential	
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R, RSF-1, PUD at approx. 2 units/acre (County)	
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-R, RSF-1, RSF-2	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	RSF-2 (Mesa County) RSF-4 (City)	
	South	RSF-4 (City)	
	East	RSF-1 and RSF-4 (City)	
	West	RSF-4 and PD (City)	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Low Density: .5 to 2 acre lot sizes Residential Medium Low: 2 to 4 units/acre Residential Medium density: 4 to 8 units/acre Residential Medium High: 8 to 12 units/acre Public/Institutional	
Zoning within density range?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing 383.71 acres of land. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County the City is to annex all Enclave areas within 5 years. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas unilaterally after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The G Road South Enclave has been enclaved since May 7, 1995

The G Road South Enclave is one of five annexations located south of G Road being considered at the same time for annexation. There are two enclave annexations located north of G Road that will also be considered this year and will come before City Council beginning in July.

Members of City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners met with affected property owners and residents on April 27th. Letters have been sent to affected property owners and residents throughout the process.

G ROAD SOUTH ENCLAVE ANNEXATION SUMMARY		
File Number:	ANX-2000-087	
Location:	Located generally between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road and north of Patterson (F) Road and south of G Road and including a portion of land extending East of 26 ½ Road near Round Hill Dr. and Horizon Dr.	
Tax ID Number:	See address list	
Parcels:	221	
Estimated Population:	405	
# of Parcels (owner occupied):	168	
# of Dwelling Units:	176	
Acres land annexed:	383.715 acres for annexation area	
Developable Acres Remaining:	80 acres	
Right-of-way in Annexation:	See Map	
Previous County Zoning:	RSF-R, RSF-1, PUD at approx. 2 units/acre (County)	
Proposed City Zoning:	(RSF-R) Residential Single Family Rural not to exceed 1 unit per 5 acres (RSF-1) Residential Single Family not of exceed 1 unit per acre (RSF-2) residential Single Family not to exceed 2 units/acre	
Current Land Use:	Residential and Agricultural	
Future Land Use:	Same	
Values:	Assessed:	= \$ 3,522,713
	Actual:	= \$ 34,,821,960
Census Tract:	10	
Address Ranges:	See Map	

Special Districts:	Water:	Ute Water
	Sewer:	
	Fire:	Grand Junction Rural Fire
	Drainage:	Grand Junction Drainage District
	School:	District 51
	Pest:	

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the [G Road South Enclave Annexation](#).

Attachments:

- Annexation Ordinance
- G Road South Enclave Annexation Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

G ROAD SOUTH ENCLAVE ANNEXATION

**LOCATED GENERALLY BETWEEN 25 ½ ROAD AND 26 ½ ROAD AND NORTH OF
PATTERSON (F) ROAD AND SOUTH OF G ROAD AND INCLUDING A PORTION
OF LAND EXTENDING EAST OF 26 ½ ROAD
NEAR ROUND HILL DRIVE AND HORIZON DRIVE**

**AND INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ALL OR A PORTION OF THE FOLLOWING
RIGHTS-OF-WAYS: FRUITRIDGE DRIVE, MEANDER DRIVE, MUSIC LANE, MUSIC
COURT, BRAEMAR CIRCLE, FLETCHER LANE,
F ½ ROAD, YOUNG STREET, YOUNG COURT, GALLEY LANE, F ¾ ROAD, 26
ROAD, KNOLL RIDGE LANE, GLEN CARO DRIVE, CLOVERDALE DRIVE,
STEPASIDE DRIVE, MYRTLE LANE, DAHLIA DRIVE, LARKSPUR DRIVE, CREST
RIDGE DRIVE, G ROAD, 26 ½ ROAD, AND HORIZON DRIVE**

CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 383.71 ACRES

WHEREAS, on the 17th day of May, 2000 the City Council of the City of Grand Junction gave notice that they will consider for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, a tract of land in the County of Mesa, State of Colorado, commonly known as the G Road South Enclave, and more particularly described as follows:

A parcel of land situate in Section 2 and 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the N 1/4 corner of said Section 2; thence S 00°00'00" W along the north-south centerline of said Section 2 a distance of 1977.00 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 481.12 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 8 of Round Hill Subdivision; thence S 00°00'00" W along the west line of said Lot 8 a distance of 251.65 feet to the southwest corner of said Lot 8; thence along the northwesterly right of way line for F 1/2 Road the following 3 courses:

- 1) 461.32 feet along the arc of a curve concave to the southeast, having a radius of 560.00 feet, a delta angle of 47°11'58" and a long chord bearing S 55°35'59" W a distance of 448.39 feet to a point;
- 2) S 32°00'00" W a distance of 87.40 feet to a point;

3) 40.32 feet along the arc of a curve to the right, having a radius of 39.83 feet, a delta angle of 58°00'00" and a long chord bearing S 61°00'00" W a distance of 38.62 feet to a point on the east right of way line for 26 1/2 Road;

thence S 00°00'00" W along the east right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road a distance of 60.00 feet to a point; thence N 89°51'00" E a distance of 320.00 feet to the southeast corner of Lot 4 of said Round Hill Subdivision; thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 314.00 feet to the south right of way line for the Grand Valley Highline Canal; thence N 89°45'20" W along the south right of way line for said Grand Valley Highline Canal a distance of 318.54 feet to a point on the east right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road; thence S 00°00'00" W along said east right of way line a distance of 159.52 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 235.46 feet to a point; thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 99.00 feet to a point; thence S 52°30'57" E along the southwesterly right of way of the abandoned Grand River Valley Railroad a distance of 500.30 feet to a point on the southerly right of way line for Horizon Drive; thence S 53°51'00" W along the southerly right of way line for said Horizon Drive a distance of 771.91 feet to a point on the east right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road; thence N 00°00'00" W along said east right of way line a distance of 13.24 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 10.00 feet to a point on said east right of way line; thence N 00°00'00" W along the east right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road a distance of 160.49 feet to a point on the northwesterly edge of the Grand Valley Canal; thence N 53°51'00" E along the northwesterly edge of said Grand Valley Canal a distance of 231.51 feet to a point; thence N 00°00'00" W a distance of 50.00 feet to a point; thence N 84°05'00" W a distance of 143.00 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 104.70 feet to a point on the west right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road; thence N 00°00'00" W along said west right of way line a distance of 292.30 feet to a point intersecting the west right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road and the north right of way line for Northacres Road; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 1131.93 feet to a point; thence N 00°02'00" W a distance of 134.80 feet to a point; thence N 85°37'21" W along the southerly right of way line for the Grand Valley Canal a distance of 151.25 feet to a point; thence N 00°02'00" W a distance of 3.49 feet to a point on the south side of the maintenance road for the Grand Valley Canal; thence along the south side of the maintenance road of said Grand Valley Canal the following 7 courses:

- 1) N 72°35'00" W a distance of 113.28 feet to a point;
- 2) N 48°23'00" W a distance of 354.14 feet to a point;
- 3) N 65°30'00" W a distance of 103.40 feet to a point;
- 4) S 88°23'00" W a distance of 56.66 feet to a point;
- 5) S 58°43'00" W a distance of 109.72 feet to a point;
- 6) S 48°09'00" W a distance of 449.29 feet to a point;
- 7) S 74°09'00" W a distance of 378.13 feet to a point on the section line common with Section 2 and Section 3;

thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 280.50 feet to a point; thence S 00°02'00" E a distance of 656.50 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 66.06 feet to a point; thence S 00°02'00" E a distance of 260.09 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 346.50 feet to a point on the section line common with said Section 2 and Section 3; thence S 00°00'00" W along said common section line a distance of 670.28 feet to a point; thence S 87°41'00" W a distance of 462.25 feet to a point; thence N

00°00'00" W a distance of 90.72 to a point; thence N 34°10'00" W a distance of 21.11 feet to a point; thence N 65°53'00" W a distance of 78.20 feet to a point; thence S 87°57'00" W a distance of 147.62 feet to a point on the centerline for 25 7/8 Road; thence crossing the west 1/2 of said 25 7/8 Road S 88°17'28" W a distance of 31.50 feet to a point; thence along the southerly right of way line for Meander Drive the following 8 courses:

- 1) 21.49 feet along the arc of a curve concave to the southeast, having a radius of 37.50 feet, a delta angle of 32°50'20" and a long chord bearing S 53°33'30" W a distance of 21.20 feet to a point;
- 2) S 37°08'00" W a distance of 102.17 feet to a point;
- 3) 176.75 feet along the arc of a curve to the right, having a radius of 100.00 feet, a delta angle of 101°16'13" and a long chord bearing S 87°46'00" W a distance of 154.60 feet to a point;
- 4) N 41°36'00" W a distance of 72.60 feet to a point;
- 5) 32.14 feet along the arc of a curve to the left, having a radius of 50.00 feet, a delta angle of 36°49'47" and a long chord bearing N 60°00'54" W a distance of 31.39 feet to a point;
- 6) N 78°26'00" W a distance of 70.60 feet to a point;
- 7) 105.50 feet along the arc of a curve to the right, having a radius of 75.00 feet, a delta angle of 80°35'46" and a long chord bearing N 38°08'00" W a distance of 97.00 feet to a point;
- 8) N 02°10'00" E a distance of 34.50 feet to a point;

thence S 48°28'00" W a distance of 210.00 feet to a point on the east line of the SW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3; thence S 79°58'00" W a distance of 405.40 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 261.40 feet to a point on the west line of the E 1/2 SW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3; thence N 00°00'35" W along said west line a distance of 933.43 feet to a point on the south line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3; thence S 89°55'41" E along said south line a distance of 658.51 feet to the SE 1/16 corner of said Section 3; thence N 00°09'22" W along the east line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 1311.06 feet to the CE 1/16 corner of said Section 3; thence N 00°01'06" W a distance of 30.00 feet to a point on the north right of way line for F 1/2 Road; thence N 00°01'06" W a distance of 116.47 feet to a point on the southwesterly right of way line for the Grand Valley Canal; thence N 61°15'48" W along said southwesterly right of way line a distance of 482.36 feet to a point; thence leaving said southwesterly right of way line N 00°27'24" W a distance of 384.66 feet to a point; thence N 29°56'46" W a distance of 195.69 feet to a point; thence N 00°02'42" E a distance of 399.30 feet to a point on the north line of the SW 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 3; thence S 89°59'00" W a distance of 531.70 feet to a point; thence N 00°00'00" W a distance of 617.70 feet to a point on the south boundary line of Grisier-Ritter Minor Subdivision; thence N 89°59'37" E along said south boundary line a distance of 521.00 feet to the southeast corner of said Grisier-Ritter Minor Subdivision; thence N 00°00'00" W along the east boundary line of said Grisier-Ritter Subdivision a distance of 688.50 feet to a point on the north line of the NE 1/4 of Section 3; thence N 89°55'53" E along the north line of said NE 1/4 a distance of 1848.39 feet to the northeast corner of said Section 3; thence N 90°00'00" E along the north line of the NW 1/4 of Section 2 a distance of 2635.76 feet to the N 1/4 corner of said Section 2 and point of beginning, containing 406.83 acres more or less.

Excepting the Patterson/Sholes Enclave Annexation containing 8.92 acres more or less and excepting the Northfield Estates Enclave Annexation containing 14.20 acres more or less.

G Road South Enclave Annexation contains a net acreage of 383.71 acres more or less.

The area proposed to be annexed is entirely contained within the boundaries of the City of Grand Junction and said area has been so surrounded for a period of not less than 3 years, pursuant to 31-12-106(1). C. R S.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and commonly known as the G Road South Enclave, is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

That the effective date of this annexation shall be the effective date of Ordinance No.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 21st day of June, 2000.

ADOPTED and ordered published this ____ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk
Groad1

Attach 11

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL			
Subject:	G Road South Enclave Annexation Zoning		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 13, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First reading of the Ordinance for the Zone of Annexation for the [G Road South Annexation](#). The proposed annexation area is generally located between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road between G Road and F Road and with a portion of the area extending east of 26 ½ Road near Round Hill Drive and Horizon Drive. Consideration of the zone of annexation to Residential Single Family with a maximum density of one unit per acre (RSF-1), Residential Single Family with a maximum of 2 unites per acre (RSF-2) and Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density on 1 unit per 5 acres (RSF-R) for the [G Road South Annexation](#). File ANX-2000-087

Summary: The 383.71 acre G Road South Enclave Annexation area consists of 221 parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law requires a City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of annexation. Property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for their properties.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council [approve on first reading the zone of annexation ordinance](#) for the [G Road South Enclave Annexation](#).

Citizen Presentation:	X	No		Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	X	No		Yes	When:	
--	----------	----	--	-----	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
----------------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION						
Location:		Located generally between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road and north of Patterson (F) Road and south of G Road and including a portion of land extending East of 26 ½ Road near Round Hill Dr. and Horizon Dr.				
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton				
Existing Land Use:		Residential and Agricultural				
Proposed Land Use:		No Change				
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential and Agricultural				
	South	Residential				
	East	Residential				
	West	Residential				
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R, RSF-1, PUD at approx. 2 units/acre (County)				
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-R, RSF-1, RSF-2				
Surrounding Zoning:	North	RSF-2 (Mesa County) RSF-4 (City)				
	South	RSF-4 (City)				
	East	RSF-1 and RSF-4 (City)				
	West	RSF-4 and PD (City)				
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Low Density: .5 to 2 acre lot sizes Residential Medium Low: 2 to 4 units/acre Residential Medium density: 4 to 8 units/acre Residential Medium High: 8 to 12 units/acre Public/Institutional				
Zoning within density range?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	

Staff Analysis:

ZONE OF ANNEXATION:

At a neighborhood meeting with City Council members, County Commissioners and area property owners in attendance, the general request by area residents was for the City to zone this enclave area the same as existing County zoning. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County, the City is allowed to zone newly annexed areas

the same as existing County zoning. City Council has directed staff to propose city zoning identical to and/or compatible with Mesa County zoning for this entire enclave area. Please review the attached "Proposed Zoning Map". The proposed zoning of RSF-R, RSF-1 and RSF-2 is identical to or nearly identical to corresponding Mesa County zoning for each property in this enclave. Please note that some of the proposed zoning does not meet the Growth Plan's Future Land Use Map recommended densities. Future development on these properties may include rezoning to higher densities supported by the Growth Plan Future Land Use map.

RSF-R ZONE DISTRICT

- All properties currently zoned AFT (recently changed to RSF-R with the County's new zoning code) are proposed as RSF-R in the City.
 - None of the proposed RSF-R conforms to the recommended densities found on the Growth Plans Future Land Use map including the Growth Plan's designation of Residential Low: .5 to 2 acre lot sizes or Residential Medium Low: 2 to 4 units/acre or Residential Medium High: 8 to 12 units/acre.
 - Rezone requests for future developments to higher densities within the Future Land Use map's recommended densities can be expected for some or all of these properties that are proposed for RSF-R.

RSF-1 ZONE DISTRICT

- The majority of the area is proposed as RSF-1.
 - The entire area proposed as RSF-1 conforms to the Growth Plan's designation of Residential Low Density: .5 to 2 acre lot sizes, except that area south of F ½ Road and east of 26 Road where the designation is currently Residential Medium density: 4 to 8 units/acre.

RSF-2 ZONE DISTRICT

- There are 2 lots on Meander Drive proposed as RSF-2. What makes these two lots different from the rest of the Meander Drive area is a minor subdivision approved by Mesa County in 1993 that created 3 lots from one lot, making two of the lots less than 1 acre in size. As a result the County rezoned the 3-lot subdivision to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) zone to accommodate the lot sizes. After talking to the owner of the one lot which is over 1 acre in size the property owner requested that his lot be included in the RSF-1 zone district and not the RSF-2. The City's RSF-2 zone district is generally in conformance and compatible with the County PUD zone approved in 1993. The only substantial exceptions are a minor difference in the rear yard setback that only affects a portion of the 607 Meander Drive property and an increase of 5 ft. in the northern side yard setback of 609 Meander Drive. Neither changes in setback affects any existing structures. Both property owners have been consulted and understand the recommendation to RSF-2 for their properties.
- The entire area proposed as RSF-2 conforms to the Growth Plan's designation of Residential Low Density: .5 to 2 acre lot sizes.

Zoning and Development Code criteria:

Section 2.14.F: “Land annexed to the City shall be zoned in accordance with Section 2.6 to a district that is consistent with the adopted Growth Plan or consistent with existing County zoning.”

Section 2.6: Approval Criteria. In order to maintain internal consistency between this code and the Zoning Maps, map amendments must only occur if:

1. The existing zoning was in error at the time of adoption;
2. There has been a change of character in the neighborhood due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc.
3. The proposed rezone is compatible with the neighborhood and will not create adverse impacts such as: capacity or safety of the street network, parking problems, storm water or drainage problems, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other nuisances;
4. The proposal conforms with and furthers the goals and policies of the Growth Plan, other adopted plans, and the policies, the requirements of this Code, and other City regulations and guidelines;
5. Adequate public facilities and services are available or will be made available concurrent with the projected impacts of the proposed development;
6. There is not an adequate supply of land available in the neighborhood and surrounding area to accommodate the zoning and community needs; and
7. The community or neighborhood will benefit from the proposed zone.

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: [Planning Commission recommended approval at their meeting on June 13th](#). It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the zone of annexation to RSF-R, RSF-1 and RSF-2 for the [G Road South Enclave Annexation as shown on the proposed zoning map for the following reasons:](#)

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Attachments:

- Zone of Annexation Ordinance
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Proposed Zoning Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE No. _____

Zoning the G Road South Enclave Annexation to:

- **Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum of 1 units per five acres (RSF-R),**
- **Residential Single Family one with a maximum of 1 unit per acre (RSF-1), and**
- **Residential Single Family Two with a maximum of 2 units per acre (RSF-2)**

Recitals.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of applying RSF-R, RSF-1, and RSF-2 zone districts to this annexation.

After public notice and public hearing before the Grand Junction City Council, City Council finds that the RSF-R, RSF-1, and RSF-2 zone districts be established for the following reasons:

- These zone districts meet the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel.
- These zone districts meet the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

The following properties shall be zoned Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one units per five acres (RSF-R) zone district:

2945-031-00-140

BEG N 0DEG02'24SEC W 173FT + N 61DEG15'48SEC W292.83FT FR SE COR SW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W N 61DEG15'48SEC W 188.57FT N 0DEG27'24SEC W 347.36FT N 29DEG56'46SEC W 195.69FT N 0DEG02'42SEC E 69.30FT S 89DEG56'12SEC E 150FT S 50DEG27'28SEC E 274.99FT S 0DEG02'24SEC E 263.34FT ALG ARC OF CURVE TO LEFT WHOSERADIUS IS 50FT CHORD BEARS S 34DEG26'38SEC W 69.36FTS 89DEG32'36SEC W 58.72FT S 0DEG27'24SEC W 180.90FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-141

BEG N 0DEG02'24SEC W 397.58FT + N 47DEG02'24SEC W136.73FT + N 0DEG02'24SEC W 10.0FT FR SE COR SW4NE4SEC 3 1S 1W ALG ARC OF CURVE

TO LEFT WHOSE RADIUS IS 50FT CHORD BEARS N 31DEG55'02SEC W 56.81FT N
0DEG02'24SEC W 591.50FT N 89DEG58'24SEC W 391.72FT N 0DEG02'42SEC E
180.0FT S 89DEG58'24SEC E 421.45FT S 0DEG02'24SEC E 819.71FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-142

BEG N 0DEG02'24SEC W 173.0FT + N 61DEG15'48SEC W 481.4FT + N
0DEG27'24SEC W 347.36 + N 29DEG56'46SEC W 195.69FT + N 0DEG02'42SEC E
69.3FT FR SE COR SW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W N 0DEG02'42SEC E 150.0FT S
89DEG58'24SEC E 391.72FT S 0DEG02'24SEC E 591.50FT ALG ARC CURVE TO
LEFT WHOSE RADIUS IS 50FT CHORD BEARS N 84DEG05'19SEC W 30.16FT N
0DEG02'24SEC W 263.34FT N 50DEG27'28SEC W 274.99FT N 89DEG56'12SEC
W 150.0FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-143

BEG N 0DEG02'24SEC W 173.0FT FR SE COR SW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W N
61DEG15'48SEC W 292.83FT N 0DEG27'24SEC W 180.90FT N 89DEG32'36SEC E
58.72FT ALG ARC CURVE TO LEFT WHOSE RADIUS IS 50FT CHORD BEAR S
58DEG15'26SEC E 75.23FT S 47DEG02'24SEC E 185.02FT S 0DEG02'24SEC E
156.22FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-123

BEG S 688.5FT + N 89DEG59' E 265FT FR N4 COR SEC 3 1S 1W N 89DEG59' E
521FT S 632.5FT S 89DEG59' W 761FT N 15FT N 89DEG59' E 240FT N 617.5FT TO
POB

2945-031-00-138

BEG NE COR NW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W S 0DEG00'49SEC E 1321.63FT N
89DEG58'41SEC W 531.53FT S 0DEG00'35SEC W 870.80FT E 514.97FT N
0DEG00'49SEC W 450.63FT E 16.50FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-147

BEG 243.60FT W OF NE COR NW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W S 450FT W 290.40FT N 450FT E
290.40FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-148

BEG 16.5FT W OF NE COR NW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W S 450FT TO APT 16.5FT W +
871FT N OF SE COR SD NW4NE4 W 227.1FT N 450FT E TO BEG

2945-034-00-067

BEG NE COR SW4SE4 SEC 3 1S 1W W 662FT S 16MIN E 914.8FT E 261.4FT N
79DEG58MIN E 405.4FT N 11MIN W 843.5FT TO BEG

The following properties shall be zoned Residential Single Family with a maximum
density of one unit per acre (RSF-1) zone district:

A parcel of land situate in Section 2 and 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the N 1/4 corner of said Section 2; thence S 00°00'00" W along the north-south centerline of said Section 2 a distance of 1977.00 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 481.12 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 8 of Round Hill Subdivision; thence S 00°00'00" W along the west line of said Lot 8 a distance of 251.65 feet to the southwest corner of said Lot 8; thence along the northwesterly right of way line for F 1/2 Road the following 3 courses:

- 4) 461.32 feet along the arc of a curve concave to the southeast, having a radius of 560.00 feet, a delta angle of 47°11'58" and a long chord bearing S 55°35'59" W a distance of 448.39 feet to a point;
- 5) S 32°00'00" W a distance of 87.40 feet to a point;
- 6) 40.32 feet along the arc of a curve to the right, having a radius of 39.83 feet, a delta angle of 58°00'00" and a long chord bearing S 61°00'00" W a distance of 38.62 feet to a point on the east right of way line for 26 1/2 Road;

thence S 00°00'00" W along the east right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road a distance of 60.00 feet to a point; thence N 89°51'00" E a distance of 320.00 feet to the southeast corner of Lot 4 of said Round Hill Subdivision; thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 314.00 feet to the south right of way line for the Grand Valley Highline Canal; thence N 89°45'20" W along the south right of way line for said Grand Valley Highline Canal a distance of 318.54 feet to a point on the east right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road; thence S 00°00'00" W along said east right of way line a distance of 159.52 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 235.46 feet to a point; thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 99.00 feet to a point; thence S 52°30'57" E along the southwesterly right of way of the abandoned Grand River Valley Railroad a distance of 500.30 feet to a point on the southerly right of way line for Horizon Drive; thence S 53°51'00" W along the southerly right of way line for said Horizon Drive a distance of 771.91 feet to a point on the east right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road; thence N 00°00'00" W along said east right of way line a distance of 13.24 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 10.00 feet to a point on said east right of way line; thence N 00°00'00" W along the east right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road a distance of 160.49 feet to a point on the northwesterly edge of the Grand Valley Canal; thence N 53°51'00" E along the northwesterly edge of said Grand Valley Canal a distance of 231.51 feet to a point; thence N 00°00'00" W a distance of 50.00 feet to a point; thence N 84°05'00" W a distance of 143.00 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 104.70 feet to a point on the west right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road; thence N 00°00'00" W along said west right of way line a distance of 292.30 feet to a point intersecting the west right of way line for said 26 1/2 Road and the north right of way line for Northacres Road; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 1131.93 feet to a point; thence N 00°02'00" W a distance of 134.80 feet to a point; thence N 85°37'21" W along the southerly right of way line for the Grand Valley Canal a distance of 151.25 feet to a point; thence N 00°02'00" W a distance of 3.49 feet to a point on the south side of the maintenance road for the Grand Valley Canal; thence along the south side of the maintenance road of said Grand Valley Canal the following 7 courses:

- 8) N 72°35'00" W a distance of 113.28 feet to a point;
- 9) N 48°23'00" W a distance of 354.14 feet to a point;
- 10) N 65°30'00" W a distance of 103.40 feet to a point;
- 11) S 88°23'00" W a distance of 56.66 feet to a point;
- 12) S 58°43'00" W a distance of 109.72 feet to a point;
- 13) S 48°09'00" W a distance of 449.29 feet to a point;
- 14) S 74°09'00" W a distance of 378.13 feet to a point on the section line common with Section 2 and Section 3;

thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 280.50 feet to a point; thence S 00°02'00" E a distance of 656.50 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 66.06 feet to a point; thence S 00°02'00" E a distance of 260.09 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 346.50 feet to a point on the section line common with said Section 2 and Section 3; thence S 00°00'00" W along said common section line a distance of 670.28 feet to a point; thence S 87°41'00" W a distance of 462.25 feet to a point; thence N 00°00'00" W a distance of 90.72 to a point; thence N 34°10'00" W a distance of 21.11 feet to a point; thence N 65°53'00" W a distance of 78.20 feet to a point; thence S 87°57'00" W a distance of 147.62 feet to a point on the centerline for 25 7/8 Road; thence crossing the west 1/2 of said 25 7/8 Road S 88°17'28" W a distance of 31.50 feet to a point; thence along the southerly right of way line for Meander Drive the following 8 courses:

- 9) 21.49 feet along the arc of a curve concave to the southeast, having a radius of 37.50 feet, a delta angle of 32°50'20" and a long chord bearing S 53°33'30" W a distance of 21.20 feet to a point;
 - 10) S 37°08'00" W a distance of 102.17 feet to a point;
 - 11) 176.75 feet along the arc of a curve to the right, having a radius of 100.00 feet, a delta angle of 101°16'13" and a long chord bearing S 87°46'00" W a distance of 154.60 feet to a point;
 - 12) N 41°36'00" W a distance of 72.60 feet to a point;
 - 13) 32.14 feet along the arc of a curve to the left, having a radius of 50.00 feet, a delta angle of 36°49'47" and a long chord bearing N 60°00'54" W a distance of 31.39 feet to a point;
 - 14) N 78°26'00" W a distance of 70.60 feet to a point;
 - 15) 105.50 feet along the arc of a curve to the right, having a radius of 75.00 feet, a delta angle of 80°35'46" and a long chord bearing N 38°08'00" W a distance of 97.00 feet to a point;
 - 16) N 02°10'00" E a distance of 34.50 feet to a point;
- thence S 48°28'00" W a distance of 210.00 feet to a point on the east line of the SW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3; thence S 79°58'00" W a distance of 405.40 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 261.40 feet to a point on the west line of the E 1/2 SW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3; thence N 00°00'35" W along said west line a distance of 933.43 feet to a point on the south line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3; thence S 89°55'41" E along said south line a distance of 658.51 feet to the SE 1/16 corner of said Section 3; thence N 00°09'22" W along the east line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 1311.06 feet to the CE 1/16 corner of said Section 3; thence N 00°01'06" W a distance of 30.00 feet to a point on the north right of way line for F 1/2 Road; thence N 00°01'06" W a distance of 116.47 feet to a point on the southwesterly right of way line

for the Grand Valley Canal; thence N 61°15'48" W along said southwesterly right of way line a distance of 482.36 feet to a point; thence leaving said southwesterly right of way line N 00°27'24" W a distance of 384.66 feet to a point; thence N 29°56'46" W a distance of 195.69 feet to a point; thence N 00°02'42" E a distance of 399.30 feet to a point on the north line of the SW 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 3; thence S 89°59'00" W a distance of 531.70 feet to a point; thence N 00°00'00" W a distance of 617.70 feet to a point on the south boundary line of Grisier-Ritter Minor Subdivision; thence N 89°59'37" E along said south boundary line a distance of 521.00 feet to the southeast corner of said Grisier-Ritter Minor Subdivision; thence N 00°00'00" W along the east boundary line of said Grisier-Ritter Subdivision a distance of 688.50 feet to a point on the north line of the NE 1/4 of Section 3; thence N 89°55'53" E along the north line of said NE 1/4 a distance of 1848.39 feet to the northeast corner of said Section 3; thence N 90°00'00" E along the north line of the NW 1/4 of Section 2 a distance of 2635.76 feet to the N 1/4 corner of said Section 2 and point of beginning, containing 406.83 acres more or less.

Excepting out the following parcels formerly annexed into the City limits and already zoned:

LOT 1, 2, 3, 5, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 NORTHFIELD ESTATES SUB SEC 2 1S 1W

LOTS 1, 2 & 3 NORTHFIELD WEST MINOR SUB SEC 2 1S 1W

LOTS 1, 2, & 3 GALLEY MINOR SUB SEC 3 1S 1W

And;

Excepting out the following parcels located within the G Road South Enclave Annexation Area:

2945-031-00-140

BEG N 0DEG02'24SEC W 173FT + N 61DEG15'48SEC W 292.83FT FR SE COR SW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W N 61DEG15'48SEC W 188.57FT N 0DEG27'24SEC W 347.36FT N 29DEG56'46SEC W 195.69FT N 0DEG02'42SEC E 69.30FT S 89DEG56'12SEC E 150FT S 50DEG27'28SEC E 274.99FT S 0DEG02'24SEC E 263.34FT ALG ARC OF CURVE TO LEFT WHOSERADIUS IS 50FT CHORD BEARS S 34DEG26'38SEC W 69.36FTS 89DEG32'36SEC W 58.72FT S 0DEG27'24SEC W 180.90FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-141

BEG N 0DEG02'24SEC W 397.58FT + N 47DEG02'24SEC W 136.73FT + N 0DEG02'24SEC W 10.0FT FR SE COR SW4NE4SEC 3 1S 1W ALG ARC OF CURVE TO LEFT WHOSE RADIUS IS 50FT CHORD BEARS N 31DEG55'02SEC W 56.81FT N 0DEG02'24SEC W 591.50FT N 89DEG58'24SEC W 391.72FTN 0DEG02'42SEC E 180.0FT S 89DEG58'24SEC E 421.45FT S 0DEG02'24SEC E 819.71FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-142

BEG N 0DEG02'24SEC W 173.0FT + N 61DEG15'48SEC W 481.4FT + N
0DEG27'24SEC W 347.36 + N 29DEG56'46SEC W 195.69FT + N 0DEG02'42SEC E
69.3FT FR SE COR SW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W N 0DEG02'42SEC E 150.0FT S
89DEG58'24SEC E 391.72FT S 0DEG02'24SEC E 591.50FT ALG ARC CURVE TO
LEFT WHOSE RADIUS IS 50FT CHORD BEARS N 84DEG05'19SEC W 30.16FT N
0DEG02'24SEC W 263.34FT N 50DEG27'28SEC W 274.99FT N 89DEG56'12SEC
W 150.0FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-143

BEG N 0DEG02'24SEC W 173.0FT FR SE COR SW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W N
61DEG15'48SEC W 292.83FT N 0DEG27'24SEC W 180.90FT N 89DEG32'36SEC E
58.72FT ALG ARC CURVE TO LEFT WHOSE RADIUS IS 50FT CHORD BEAR S
58DEG15'26SEC E 75.23FT S 47DEG02'24SEC E 185.02FT S 0DEG02'24SEC E
156.22FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-123

BEG S 688.5FT + N 89DEG59' E 265FT FR N4 COR SEC 3 1S 1W N 89DEG59' E
521FT S 632.5FT S
89DEG59' W 761FT N 15FT N 89DEG59' E 240FT N 617.5FT TO POB

2945-031-00-138

BEG NE COR NW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W S 0DEG00'49SEC E 1321.63FT N
89DEG58'41SEC W 531.53FT S 0DEG00'35SEC W 870.80FT E 514.97FT N
0DEG00'49SEC W 450.63FT E 16.50FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-147

BEG 243.60FT W OF NE COR NW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W S 450FT W 290.40FT N 450FT
E 290.40FT TO BEG

2945-031-00-148

BEG 16.5FT W OF NE COR NW4NE4 SEC 3 1S 1W S 450FT TO APT 16.5FT W +
871FT N OF SE COR SD NW4NE4 W 227.1FT N 450FT E TO BEG

2945-034-00-067

BEG NE COR SW4SE4 SEC 3 1S 1W W 662FT S 16MIN E 914.8FT E 261.4FT N
79DEG58MIN E 405.4FT N 11MIN W 843.5FT TO BEG

2945-034-23-002

LOT 2 HILLTOP HEIGHTS WEST SUB SEC 3 1S 1W

2945-034-23-003

LOT 3 HILLTOP HEIGHTS WEST SUB SEC 3 1S 1W

The following properties shall be zone Residential Single Family with a maximum density of two units per acre (RSF-2) zone district:

2945-034-23-002

LOT 2 HILLTOP HEIGHTS WEST SUB SEC 3 1S 1W

2945-034-23-003

LOT 3 HILLTOP HEIGHTS WEST SUB SEC 3 1S 1W

Introduced on first reading this 21st day of June, 2000.

PASSED and ADOPTED on second reading this ____ day of July, 2000.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 13, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First Reading of Ordinance to Annex the Clark/Wilson Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at 2522 and 2524 F ½ Road. File ANX-2000-088

Summary: The 4.85 acre Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation area consists of two parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on first reading the annexation ordinance for the Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	----	-----	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	X	Consent	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------	---------	----------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
Location:		2522 and 2524 F ½ Road	
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton	
Existing Land Use:		Residential and Agricultural	
Proposed Land Use:		No Change	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential and Agricultural	
	South	Industrial Park	
	East	Residential	
	West	Residential and Agricultural	
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R (County)	
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-R	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	PD (City)	
	South	Industrial Office Park I-O (City)	
	East	PD (City)	
	West	PD (City)	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium density: 4 to 8 units/acre	
Zoning within density range?		Yes	X No

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing 4.85 acres of land. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County the City is to annex all Enclave areas within 5 years. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas unilaterally after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The Clark/Wilson Enclave has been enclaved since May 7, 1995

The Clark/Wilson Enclave is one of five annexations located south of G Road being considered at the same time for annexation. There are two enclave annexations located north of G Road that will also be considered this year and will come before City Council beginning in six to eight weeks from now.

Members of City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners met with affected property owners and residents on April 27th. Letters have been sent to affected property owners and residents throughout the process.

CLARK/WILSON ENCLAVE ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:	ANX-2000-088
Location:	2522 and 2524 F ½ Road
Tax ID Number:	2945-032-00-026 and 2945-032-00-118
Parcels:	2
Estimated Population:	5
# of Parcels (owner occupied):	2
# of Dwelling Units:	2
Acres land annexed:	4.85 acres for annexation area
Developable Acres Remaining:	2 acres
Right-of-way in Annexation:	346' north of F ½ Rd, See Map
Previous County Zoning:	RSF-R (County)
Proposed City Zoning:	(RSF-R) Residential Single Family Rural not to exceed 1 unit per 5 acres
Current Land Use:	Residential and Agricultural
Future Land Use:	Same
Values:	Assessed: = \$ 12,360
	Actual: = \$ 126,850
Census Tract:	10
Address Ranges:	2522 and 2524 F ½ Road
Special Districts:	Water: Ute Water
	Sewer:
	Fire: Grand Junction Rural Fire Grand Junction Drainage District
	Drainage:
	School: District 51
	Pest:

The following annexation and zoning schedule is being proposed.

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the [Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation](#).

Attachments:

- Annexation Ordinance
- Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Map

([Clark Wilson Enclave Staff Report.doc](#))

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

CLARK/WILSON ENCLAVE ANNEXATION

LOCATED AT 2522 AND 2524 F 1/2 ROAD

**AND INCLUDING A PORTION OF THE
F 1/2 ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY**

CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 4.85 ACRES

WHEREAS, on the 17th day of May, 2000 the City Council of the City of Grand Junction gave notice that they will consider for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, a tract of land in the County of Mesa, State of Colorado, commonly known as the Clark/Wilson Enclave, and more particularly described as follows:

A parcel of land situate in the NW 1/4 and SW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the CW 1/16 corner of Section 3; thence N 89°57'00" W along the south line of the SW 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 165.00 feet to the True Point of Beginning for the parcel described herein; thence N 00°01'03" W a distance of 330.00 feet to a point; thence S 89°57'00" E a distance of 165.00 feet to a point on the west line of the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 3; thence N 00°01'03" W along the west line of said SE 1/4 NW 1/4 a distance of 981.62 feet to the NW 1/16 corner of said Section 3; thence S 89°31'00" E along the north line of the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 64.52 feet to a point on the northeasterly right of way line for the Grand Valley Canal; thence S 13°57'04" E along the northeasterly right of way line for said Grand Valley Canal a distance of 213.81 feet to a point; thence leaving said northeasterly right of way line S 00°01'03" E a distance of 1123.68 feet to a point; thence S 89°57'00" E along a line 20.00' south of and parallel with the north line of the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 64.92 feet to a point; thence S 00°05'40" W a distance of 13.00 feet to a point on the south right of way line for F 1/2 Road; thence N 89°57'00" W along said south right of way line a distance of 345.89 feet to a point; thence N 00°01'03" W a distance of 33.00 feet to a point on the north line of the NW 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 3 and point of beginning.

The area proposed to be annexed is entirely contained within the boundaries of the City of Grand Junction and said area has been so surrounded for a period of not less than 3 years, pursuant to 31-12-106(1). C. R S.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and commonly known as the Clark/Wilson Enclave, is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

That the effective date of this annexation shall be the effective date of Ordinance No.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 21st day June, 2000.

ADOPTED and ordered published this ____ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk

Attach 13

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL		
Subject:	Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation Zoning	
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000	
Date Prepared:	June 13, 2000	
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner
<input type="checkbox"/> Workshop	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal Agenda

Subject: [First Reading of the Ordinance](#) for the Zone of Annexation for the [Clark/Wilson Annexation](#). The proposed annexation area is located at 2522 and 2524 F ½ Road. This is a request to consider a zone to Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one unit per five acres (RSF-R). File ANX-2000-088

Summary: The 4.85 acre [Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation](#) area consists of two parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. Property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for their properties.

Background Information: [See Attached](#)

Budget: [N/A](#)

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council [approve on first reading the Zone of Annexation ordinance](#) for the [Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation](#).

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
--	---------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION				
Location:		2522 and 2524 F ½ Road		
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton		
Existing Land Use:		Residential and Agricultural		
Proposed Land Use:		No Change		
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential and Agricultural		
	South	Industrial Park		
	East	Residential		
	West	Residential and Agricultural		
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R (County)		
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-R		
Surrounding Zoning:	North	PD (City)		
	South	Industrial Office Park I-O (City)		
	East	PD (City)		
	West	PD (City)		
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium density: 4 to 8 units/acre		
Zoning within density range?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Staff Analysis:

ZONE OF ANNEXATION:

At a neighborhood meeting with City Council members, County Commissioners and area property owners in attendance, the general request by area residents was for the City to zone this enclave area the same as existing County zoning. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County, the City is allowed to zone newly annexed areas the same as existing County zoning. City Council has directed staff to propose city zoning identical to and/or compatible with Mesa County zoning for this entire enclave area. Please review the attached "Proposed Zoning Map". The proposed zoning of RSF-R is identical to or nearly identical to corresponding Mesa County zoning for both properties in this enclave. Please note that some of the proposed zoning does not meet the Growth Plan's Future Land Use Map recommended densities. Future development on these properties may include rezoning to higher densities supported by the Growth Plan Future Land Use map.

RSF-R ZONE DISTRICT

- Both properties currently zoned AFT (recently changed to RSF-R with the County's new zoning code) are proposed as RSF-R in the City.
- The proposed RSF-R does not conform to the recommended densities found on the Growth Plan Future Land Use map currently designated as Residential Medium: 4 to 8 units/acre.
- Rezone requests for future developments to higher densities within the Future Land Use map's recommended densities may occur for either or both of these properties that are proposed for RSF-R.

Zoning and Development Code criteria:

Section 2.14.F: "Land annexed to the City shall be zoned in accordance with Section 2.6 to a district that is consistent with the adopted Growth Plan or consistent with existing County zoning."

Section 2.6: Approval Criteria. In order to maintain internal consistency between this code and the Zoning Maps, map amendments must only occur if:

8. The existing zoning was in error at the time of adoption;
9. There has been a change of character in the neighborhood due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc.
10. The proposed rezone is compatible with the neighborhood and will not create adverse impacts such as: capacity or safety of the street network, parking problems, storm water or drainage problems, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other nuisances;
11. The proposal conforms with and furthers the goals and policies of the Growth Plan, other adopted plans, and the policies, the requirements of this Code, and other City regulations and guidelines;
12. Adequate public facilities and services are available or will be made available concurrent with the projected impacts of the proposed development;
13. There is not an adequate supply of land available in the neighborhood and surrounding area to accommodate the zoning and community needs; and
14. The community or neighborhood will benefit from the proposed zone.

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council

August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning
------------------------------	---

Action Requested/Recommendation: Planning Commission recommended approval at their meeting on June 13th. It is recommended that City Council approve the zone of annexation to RSF-R for the Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation for the following reasons:

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Attachments:

- Zone of Annexation Ordinance
- Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Proposed Zoning Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE No. _____

Zoning the Clark/Wilson Enclave Annexation to Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum of 1 units per five acres (RSF-R)

Located at 2522 and 2524 F ½ Road

Recitals.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of applying an RSF-R zone district to this annexation.

After public notice and public hearing before the Grand Junction City Council, City Council finds that the RSF-R zone district be established for the following reasons:

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

The following properties shall be zoned Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one units per five acres (RSF-R) zone district

Includes the following two tax parcels 2945-032-00-026 & 2945-032-00-118

A parcel of land situate in the NW 1/4 and SW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the CW 1/16 corner of Section 3; thence N 89°57'00" W along the south line of the SW 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 165.00 feet to the True Point of Beginning for the parcel described herein; thence N 00°01'03" W a distance of 330.00 feet to a point; thence S 89°57'00" E a distance of 165.00 feet to a point on the west line of the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 3; thence N 00°01'03" W along the west line of said SE 1/4 NW 1/4 a distance of 981.62 feet to the NW 1/16 corner of said Section 3; thence S 89°31'00" E along the north line of the SE 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 64.52 feet to a point on the northeasterly right of way line for the Grand

Valley Canal; thence S 13°57'04" E along the northeasterly right of way line for said Grand Valley Canal a distance of 213.81 feet to a point; thence leaving said northeasterly right of way line S 00°01'03" E a distance of 1123.68 feet to a point; thence S 89°57'00" E along a line 20.00' south of and parallel with the north line of the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 64.92 feet to a point; thence S 00°05'40" W a distance of 13.00 feet to a point on the south right of way line for F 1/2 Road; thence N 89°57'00" W along said south right of way line a distance of 345.89 feet to a point; thence N 00°01'03" W a distance of 33.00 feet to a point on the north line of the NW 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 3 and point of beginning.

Introduced on first reading this 21st day of June, 2000.

PASSED and ADOPTED on second reading this ____ day of July, 2000.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 13, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First Reading of the Ordinance to annex the Sutton/Rickerd Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at 2543 G Road and 689 25 ½ Road. File ANX-2000-089

Summary: The 5.73 acre Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation area consists of two parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on first reading the annexation ordinance for the Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	----	-----	-------	--

Placement on Agenda:	X	Consent	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------	---------	----------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
Location:		2543 G Road and 689 25 ½ Road	
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton	
Existing Land Use:		Residential and Agricultural	
Proposed Land Use:		No Change	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Church, Residential and Agricultural	
	South	Residential	
	East	Residential	
	West	Residential and Agricultural	
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R (County)	
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-R	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	RSF-4 (City)	
	South	PD and RSF-4 (City)	
	East	RSF-2 and RSF-4 (City)	
	West	PD (City)	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium density: 4 to 8 units/acre	
Zoning within density range?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing 5.73 acres of land. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County the City is to annex all Enclave areas within 5 years. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas unilaterally after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The Sutton/Rickerd Enclave has been enclaved since May 7, 1995

The Sutton/Rickerd Enclave is one of five annexations located south of G Road being considered at the same time for annexation. There are two enclave annexations located north of G Road that will also be considered this year and will come before City Council beginning in July.

Members of City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners met with affected property owners and residents on April 27th. Letters have been sent to affected property owners and residents throughout the process.

SUTTON/RICKERD ENCLAVE ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:	ANX-2000-087
Location:	2543 G Road and 689 25 ½ Road
Tax ID Number:	2945-032-00-020 and 2945-032-00-092
Parcels:	2
Estimated Population:	5
# of Parcels (owner occupied):	2
# of Dwelling Units:	2
Acres land annexed:	5.73 acres for annexation area
Developable Acres Remaining:	2 acres
Right-of-way in Annexation:	659' south ½ of G Rd & 558' west ½ of 25 ½ Road, See Map
Previous County Zoning:	RSF-R (County)
Proposed City Zoning:	(RSF-R) Residential Single Family Rural not to exceed 1 unit per 5 acres
Current Land Use:	Residential and Agricultural
Future Land Use:	Same
Values:	Assessed: = \$ 21,180
	Actual: = \$ 217,470
Census Tract:	10
Address Ranges:	2543 thru 2549 G Road (odd only) 689 thru 699 25 ½ Road (odd only)
Special Districts:	Water: Ute Water
	Sewer:
	Fire: Grand Junction Rural Fire
	Drainage: Grand Junction Drainage District
	School: District 51
	Pest:

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the [Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation](#).

Attachments:

- Annexation Ordinance
- Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

SUTTON/RICKERD ENCLAVE ANNEXATION

LOCATED AT 2543 G ROAD AND 689 25 ½ ROAD

**AND INCLUDING A PORTION OF THE
G ROAD AND 25 ½ ROAD RIGHTS-OF-WAYS**

CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 5.73 ACRES

WHEREAS, on the 17th day of May, 2000 the City Council of the City of Grand Junction gave notice that they will consider for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, a tract of land in the County of Mesa, State of Colorado, commonly known as the Sutton/Rickerd Enclave, and more particularly described as follows:

A parcel of land situate in the NE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the N 1/4 corner of Section 3; thence S 00°16'55" E along the north-south centerline of said Section 3 a distance of 558.13 feet to a point; thence S 89°43'05" W a distance of 336.55 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 39 of Moonridge Falls Filing No. One Subdivision; thence N 00°16'55" W a distance of 313.02 feet to the northeast corner of Outlot C of Moonridge Falls Filing No. Two Subdivision; thence along the centerline of Leach Creek the following 5 courses:

- 1) N 69°35'56" W a distance of 54.46 feet to a point;
- 2) N 78°00'00" W a distance of 50.00 feet to a point;
- 3) N 63°00'00" W a distance of 77.00 feet to a point;
- 4) N 78°00'00" W a distance of 120.00 feet to a point;
- 5) S 67°00'00" W a distance of 40.07 feet to a point on the west line of the E 1/2 NE 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 3;

thence N 00°16'09" W along the west line of said E 1/2 NE 1/4 NW 1/4 a distance of 170.01 feet to a point on the north line of said Section 3; thence N 89°43'41" E along the north line of said Section 3 a distance of 658.97 feet to the N 1/4 corner of said Section 3 and point of beginning.

The area proposed to be annexed is entirely contained within the boundaries of the City of Grand Junction and said area has been so surrounded for a period of not less than 3 years, pursuant to 31-12-106(1). C. R S.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and commonly known as the Sutton/Rickerd Enclave, is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

That the effective date of this annexation shall be the effective date of Ordinance No.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 21st day June, 2000.

ADOPTED and ordered published this ____ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk
Suttonrickerd1 suttonrickerd2

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation Zoning		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First Reading of the Zone of Annexation Ordinance for the Sutton/Rickerd Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at 2543 G Road and 689 25 ½ Road. Consideration of the zone of annexation to Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one unit per five acres (RSF-R) for the Sutton/Rickerd Annexation. File ANX-2000-089

Summary: The 5.73 acre Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation area consists of two parcels of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. Property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for their properties.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on first reading the Zone of Annexation ordinance for the Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No		Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	X	No		Yes	When:	
--	----------	-----------	--	------------	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
----------------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION						
Location:		2543 G Road and 689 25 ½ Road				
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton				
Existing Land Use:		Residential and Agricultural				
Proposed Land Use:		No Change				
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Church, Residential and Agricultural				
	South	Residential				
	East	Residential				
	West	Residential and Agricultural				
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R (County)				
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-R				
Surrounding Zoning:	North	RSF-4 (City)				
	South	PD and RSF-4 (City)				
	East	RSF-2 and RSF-4 (City)				
	West	PD (City)				
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium density: 4 to 8 units/acre				
Zoning within density range?		<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Staff Analysis:

ZONE OF ANNEXATION:

At a neighborhood meeting with City Council members, County Commissioners and area property owners in attendance, the general request by area residents was for the City to zone this enclave area the same as existing County zoning. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County, the City is allowed to zone newly annexed areas the same as existing County zoning. City Council has directed staff to propose city zoning identical to and/or compatible with Mesa County zoning for this entire enclave area. Please review the attached "Proposed Zoning Map". The proposed zoning of RSF-R is identical to or nearly identical to corresponding Mesa County zoning for both properties in this enclave. Please note that some of the proposed zoning does not meet the Growth Plan's Future Land Use Map recommended densities. Future development

on these properties may include rezoning to higher densities supported by the Growth Plan Future Land Use map.

RSF-R ZONE DISTRICT

- Both properties currently zoned AFT (recently changed to RSF-R with the County's new zoning code) are proposed as RSF-R in the City.
- The proposed RSF-R does not conform to the recommended densities found on the Growth Plans Future Land Use map currently designated as Residential Medium: 4 to 8 units/acre.
- Rezone requests for future developments to higher densities within the Future Land Use map's recommended densities may occur for either or both of these properties that are proposed for RSF-R.

Zoning and Development Code criteria:

Section 2.14.F: "Land annexed to the City shall be zoned in accordance with Section 2.6 to a district that is consistent with the adopted Growth Plan or consistent with existing County zoning."

Section 2.6: Approval Criteria. In order to maintain internal consistency between this code and the Zoning Maps, map amendments must only occur if:

15. The existing zoning was in error at the time of adoption;
16. There has been a change of character in the neighborhood due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc.
17. The proposed rezone is compatible with the neighborhood and will not create adverse impacts such as: capacity or safety of the street network, parking problems, storm water or drainage problems, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other nuisances;
18. The proposal conforms with and furthers the goals and policies of the Growth Plan, other adopted plans, and the policies, the requirements of this Code, and other City regulations and guidelines;
19. Adequate public facilities and services are available or will be made available concurrent with the projected impacts of the proposed development;
20. There is not an adequate supply of land available in the neighborhood and surrounding area to accommodate the zoning and community needs; and
21. The community or neighborhood will benefit from the proposed zone.

ANNEXATION SCHEDULE	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council

July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: [Planning Commission recommended approval at their meeting on June 13th](#). It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the zone of annexation to RSF-R for the [Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation for the following reasons:](#)

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Attachments:

- Zone of Annexation Ordinance
- Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Proposed Zoning Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE No. _____

Zoning the Sutton/Rickerd Enclave Annexation to Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum of 1 units per five acres (RSF-R)

Located at 2543 G Road and 689 25 ½ Road

Recitals.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of applying an RSF-R zone district to this annexation.

After public notice and public hearing before the Grand Junction City Council, City Council finds that the RSF-R zone district be established for the following reasons:

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

The following properties shall be zoned Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one units per five acres (RSF-R) zone district

Includes the following two tax parcels 2945-032-00-020 & 2945-032-00-092

A parcel of land situate in the NE 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the N 1/4 corner of Section 3; thence S 00°16'55" E along the north-south centerline of said Section 3 a distance of 558.13 feet to a point; thence S 89°43'05" W a distance of 336.55 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 39 of Moonridge Falls Filing No. One Subdivision; thence N 00°16'55" W a distance of 313.02 feet to the northeast corner of Outlot C of Moonridge Falls Filing No. Two Subdivision; thence along the centerline of Leach Creek the following 5 courses:

- 6) N 69°35'56" W a distance of 54.46 feet to a point;
- 7) N 78°00'00" W a distance of 50.00 feet to a point;

- 8) N 63°00'00" W a distance of 77.00 feet to a point;
9) N 78°00'00" W a distance of 120.00 feet to a point;
10) S 67°00'00" W a distance of 40.07 feet to a point on the west line of the E 1/2 NE 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 3;
thence N 00°16'09" W along the west line of said E 1/2 NE 1/4 NW 1/4 a distance of 170.01 feet to a point on the north line of said Section 3; thence N 89°43'41" E along the north line of said Section 3 a distance of 658.97 feet to the N 1/4 corner of said Section 3 and point of beginning.

Introduced on first reading this 21st day of June, 2000.

PASSED and ADOPTED on second reading this ____ day of July, 2000.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First Reading of Ordinance to Annex the P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at the SW corner of 25 ½ Road and F ½ Road. File ANX-2000-090

Summary: The 2.13 acre P.S Substation Enclave Annexation area consists of one parcel of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on first reading the annexation ordinance for the P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	----	-----	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	X	Consent	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------	---------	----------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
Location:		SW corner of 25 ½ Road F ½ Road	
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton	
Existing Land Use:		Public Service Substation	
Proposed Land Use:		No Change	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential	
	South	Industrial/Office	
	East	Residential	
	West	Industrial/Office	
Existing Zoning:		Planned Industrial (County)	
Proposed Zoning:		Industrial Office Park (I-O)	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	Planned Development (PD)	
	South	Industrial Office Park (I-O)	
	East	Industrial Office Park (I-O)	
	West	Planned Development (PD)	
Growth Plan Designation:		Commercial/Industrial	
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes
			No

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing 2.13 acres of land. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County the City is to annex all Enclave areas within 5 years. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas unilaterally after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The P.S. Substation Enclave has been enclaved since May 7, 1995

The P.S. Substation Enclave is one of five annexations located south of G Road being considered at the same time for annexation. There are two enclave annexations located north of G Road that will also be considered this year and will come before City Council beginning in July.

Members of City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners met with affected property owners and residents on April 27th. Letters have been sent to affected property owners and residents throughout the process.

P.S. SUBSTATION ENCLAVE ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:	ANX-2000-090
Location:	SW corner 25 ½ Road and F ½ Road
Tax ID Number:	2945-033-00-158
Parcels:	1
Estimated Population:	0
# of Parcels (owner occupied):	0
# of Dwelling Units:	0
Acres land annexed:	2.123 acres for annexation area
Developable Acres Remaining:	0
Right-of-way in Annexation:	None
Previous County Zoning:	Planned Industrial
Proposed City Zoning:	Industrial Office Park (I-O)
Current Land Use:	Public Service Substation
Future Land Use:	Same
Values:	Assessed: = \$ Unknown
	Actual: = \$ Unknown
Census Tract:	10
Address Ranges:	Up to 2549 F ½ Road (odd only) Up to 649 25 ½ Road (odd only)
Special Districts:	Water: Ute Water
	Sewer:
	Fire: Grand Junction Rural Fire Grand Junction Drainage District
	Drainage:
	School: District 51
	Pest:

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the [P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation](#)

Attachments:

- Annexation Ordinance
- P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

P.S. SUBSTATION ENCLAVE ANNEXATION

LOCATED AT THE SW CORNER OF 25 ½ ROAD AND F ½ ROAD

CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 2.13 ACRES

WHEREAS, on the 17th day of May, 2000 the City Council of the City of Grand Junction gave notice that they will consider for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, a tract of land in the County of Mesa, State of Colorado, commonly known as the P.S. Substation Enclave, and more particularly described as follows:

A parcel of land situate in the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the C 1/4 corner of Section 3; thence N 90°00'00" W along the north line of the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 30.00 feet to a point; thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 20.00 feet to the True Point of Beginning of the parcel described herein; thence S 00°00'00" W along the west right of way line for 25 1/2 Road a distance of 315.00 feet to a point; thence leaving said west right of way line N 90°00'00" W a distance of 295.00 feet to a point; thence N 00°00'00" E a distance of 315.00 feet to a point on the south right of way line for F 1/2 Road; thence N 90°00'00" E along said south right of way line a distance of 295.00 feet to the point of beginning.

The area proposed to be annexed is entirely contained within the boundaries of the City of Grand Junction and said area has been so surrounded for a period of not less than 3 years, pursuant to 31-12-106(1). C. R S.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and commonly known as the P.S. Substation Enclave, is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

That the effective date of this annexation shall be the effective date of Ordinance No.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 21st day June, 2000.

ADOPTED and ordered published this ____ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk

Pssub1

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation Zoning		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First Reading of the Ordinance for the Zone of Annexation for the P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at the SW corner of 25 ½ Road and F ½ Road. This is a request to consider a zone of annexation to Industrial Office Park (I-O) for the P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation. File ANX-2000-090

Summary: The 2.13 acre P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation area consists of one parcel of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on first reading the Zone of Annexation Ordinance for the P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	-----------	------------	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	X	Consent	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------	----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION					
Location:		SW corner of 25 ½ Road F ½ Road			
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton			
Existing Land Use:		Public Service Substation			
Proposed Land Use:		No Change			
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential			
	South	Industrial/Office			
	East	Residential			
	West	Industrial/Office			
Existing Zoning:		Planned Industrial (County)			
Proposed Zoning:		Industrial Office Park (I-O)			
Surrounding Zoning:	North	Planned Development (PD)			
	South	Industrial Office Park (I-O)			
	East	Industrial Office Park (I-O)			
	West	Planned Development (PD)			
Growth Plan Designation:		Commercial/Industrial			
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes		No

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

At a neighborhood meeting with City Council members, County Commissioners and area property owners in attendance, the general request by area residents was for the City to zone this enclave area the same as existing County zoning. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County, the City is allowed to zone newly annexed areas the same as existing County zoning. City Council has directed staff to propose city zoning identical to and/or compatible with Mesa County zoning for this entire enclave area. Please review the attached "Proposed Zoning Map".

The proposed zoning of Industrial Office (I-O) is identical to or nearly identical to corresponding Mesa County Planned Industrial zoning for this property and also conforms to the adopted Growth Plan future land use map.

INDUSTRIAL OFFICE PARK (I-O) ZONE DISTRICT

- Previous to the recent adoption of the new City zoning map and Development Code, City zoning for Forsight Industrial Park was Planned Industrial (PI), the same zoning as existing Mesa County zoning for this property.
- Public Service's main facility is located in the Forsight Industrial Park area and zoned I-O. Public Service has a substation located on this property which is located adjacent to the main facility and the only parcel located within the Forsight Industrial Park area being annexed.
- This property's zoning should be the same zone district as the Forsight Industrial Park area.

Zoning and Development Code criteria:

Section 2.14.F: "Land annexed to the City shall be zoned in accordance with Section 2.6 to a district that is consistent with the adopted Growth Plan or consistent with existing County zoning."

Section 2.6: Approval Criteria. In order to maintain internal consistency between this code and the Zoning Maps, map amendments must only occur if:

22. The existing zoning was in error at the time of adoption;
23. There has been a change of character in the neighborhood due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc.
24. The proposed rezone is compatible with the neighborhood and will not create adverse impacts such as: capacity or safety of the street network, parking problems, storm water or drainage problems, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other nuisances;
25. The proposal conforms with and furthers the goals and policies of the Growth Plan, other adopted plans, and the policies, the requirements of this Code, and other City regulations and guidelines;
26. Adequate public facilities and services are available or will be made available concurrent with the projected impacts of the proposed development;
27. There is not an adequate supply of land available in the neighborhood and surrounding area to accommodate the zoning and community needs; and
28. The community or neighborhood will benefit from the proposed zone.

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: Planning Commission recommended approval at their meeting on June 13th. It is recommended that City Council approve the zone of annexation to I-0 for the P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation for the following reasons:

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel and conforms to the adopted Growth Plan future land use map.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Attachments:

- Zone of Annexation Ordinance
- P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Proposed Zoning Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE No. _____

Zoning the P.S. Substation Enclave Annexation to Industrial Office Park (I-O)

Located at the SW Corner of 25 ½ Road and F ½ Road

Recitals.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of applying an I-O zone district to this annexation.

After public notice and public hearing before the Grand Junction City Council, City Council finds that the I-O zone district be established for the following reasons:

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel and conforms to the adopted Growth Plan Future Land Use Map.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

The following property shall be zoned Industrial Office Park (I-O) zone district

Includes the following tax parcel 2945-033-00-158

A parcel of land situate in the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the C 1/4 corner of Section 3; thence N 90°00'00" W along the north line of the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 30.00 feet to a point; thence S 00°00'00" W a distance of 20.00 feet to the True Point of Beginning of the parcel described herein; thence S 00°00'00" W along the west right of way line for 25 1/2 Road a distance of 315.00 feet to a point; thence leaving said west right of way line N 90°00'00" W a distance of 295.00 feet to a point; thence N 00°00'00" E a distance of 315.00 feet to a point on the south right of way line for F 1/2 Road; thence N 90°00'00" E along said south right of way line a distance of 295.00 feet to the point of beginning.

Introduced on first reading this 21st day of June, 2000.

PASSED and ADOPTED on second reading this ___ day of July, 2000.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Puckett Enclave Annexation		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First Reading of the Ordinance to Annex the Puckett Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at 2563 F ½ Road. File ANX-2000-091

Summary: The 1.00 acre Puckett Enclave Annexation area consists of one parcel of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County requires the City to annex enclave areas within 5 years.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on first reading the annexation ordinance for the Puckett Enclave Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	----	-----	-------	--

Placement on Agenda:	X	Consent	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------	---------	----------------------	----------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
Location:		2563 F ½ Road	
Applicants:		City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton	
Existing Land Use:		Residential	
Proposed Land Use:		No Change	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential	
	South	Residential	
	East	Residential	
	West	Residential	
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R (County)	
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-R	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	PD (residential)	
	South	PD (residential)	
	East	PD (residential)	
	West	PD (residential)	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium Low density: 2 to 4 units/acre	
Zoning within density range?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing one acre of land. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County the City is to annex all Enclave areas within 5 years. State law allows a municipality to annex enclave areas unilaterally after they have been enclaved for a period of three years. The Puckett Enclave has been enclaved since May 7, 1995

The Puckett Enclave is one of five annexations located south of G Road being considered at the same time for annexation. There are two enclave annexations located north of G Road that will also be considered this year and will come before City Council beginning in July.

Members of City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners met with affected property owners and residents on April 27th. Letters have been sent to affected property owners and residents throughout the process.

PUCKETT ENCLAVE ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:	ANX-2000-091
Location:	2563 F ½ Road
Tax ID Number:	2945-034-00-125
Parcels:	1
Estimated Population:	2
# of Parcels (owner occupied):	1
# of Dwelling Units:	1
Acres land annexed:	1.00 acres for annexation area
Developable Acres Remaining:	None
Right-of-way in Annexation:	194' south ½ of F ½ Road, See Map
Previous County Zoning:	RSF-R (County)
Proposed City Zoning:	(RSF-R) Residential Single Family Rural not to exceed 1 unit per 5 acres
Current Land Use:	Residential
Future Land Use:	Same
Values:	Assessed: = \$ 10,110
	Actual: = \$ 103,780
Census Tract:	10
Address Ranges:	2563 F ½ Road
Special Districts:	Water: Ute Water
	Sewer:
	Fire: Grand Junction Rural Fire Grand Junction Drainage District
	Drainage:
	School: District 51
	Pest:

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the [Puckett Enclave Annexation](#).

Attachments:

- Zone of Annexation Ordinance
- Puckett Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

PUCKETT ENCLAVE ANNEXATION

LOCATED AT 2563 F ½ ROAD

**AND INCLUDING A PORTION OF THE
F ½ ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY**

CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 1.00 ACRES

WHEREAS, on the 17th day of May, 2000 the City Council of the City of Grand Junction gave notice that they will consider for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, a tract of land in the County of Mesa, State of Colorado, commonly known as the Puckett Enclave, and more particularly described as follows:

A parcel of land situate in the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the C 1/4 corner of Section 3; thence N 89°53'37" E along the north line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 478.29 feet to the True Point of Beginning of the parcel described herein; thence N 89°53'37" E along the north line of said NW 1/4 SE 1/4 a distance of 193.60 feet to a point; thence leaving said north line S 00°06'23" E a distance of 225.00 feet to a point; thence S 89°53'37" W a distance of 193.60 feet to a point; thence N 00°06'23" W a distance of 225.00 feet to the point on the north line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3 and point of beginning.

The area proposed to be annexed is entirely contained within the boundaries of the City of Grand Junction and said area has been so surrounded for a period of not less than 3 years, pursuant to 31-12-106(1). C. R S.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and commonly known as the Puckett Enclave, is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

That the effective date of this annexation shall be the effective date of Ordinance No.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 21st day of June, 2000.

ADOPTED and ordered published this ___ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk
Puckett1

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Puckett Enclave Annexation Zoning		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First Reading of the Ordinance for the Zone of Annexation for the Puckett Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at 2563 F ½ Road. This is a request to consider a zone of annexation to Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one unit per five acres (RSF-R) for the Puckett Annexation. File ANX-2000-091

Summary: The 1.00 acre Puckett Enclave Annexation area consists of one parcel of land completely surrounded by existing Grand Junction City limits. State law requires the City to zone newly annexed areas within 90 days of the annexation. Property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for their properties.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on first reading the Zone of Annexation ordinance for the Puckett Enclave Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	-----------	------------	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
----------------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>		
Location:	2563 F ½ Road	
Applicants:	City of Grand Junction Staff Rep: Dave Thornton	
Existing Land Use:	Residential	
Proposed Land Use:	No Change	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential
	South	Residential
	East	Residential
	West	Residential
Existing Zoning:	RSF-R (County)	
Proposed Zoning:	RSF-R	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	PD (residential)
	South	PD (residential)
	East	PD (residential)
	West	PD (residential)
Growth Plan Designation:	Residential Medium Low density: 2 to 4 units/acre	
Zoning within density range?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

Staff Analysis:

ZONE OF ANNEXATION:

At a neighborhood meeting with City Council members, County Commissioners and area property owners in attendance, the general request by area residents was for the City to zone this enclave area the same as existing County zoning. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County, the City is allowed to zone newly annexed areas the same as existing County zoning. City Council has directed staff to propose city zoning identical to and/or compatible with Mesa County zoning for this entire enclave area. Please review the attached "Proposed Zoning Map". The proposed zoning of RSF-R is identical to or nearly identical to corresponding Mesa County zoning for this property in this enclave. Please note that the proposed zoning does not meet the Growth Plan's Future Land Use Map recommended densities for the Puckett Enclave. Future development on this property may include rezoning to a higher density supported by the Growth Plan Future Land Use map.

RSF-R ZONE DISTRICT

- This property currently zoned AFT (recently changed to RSF-R with the County's new zoning code) is proposed as RSF-R in the City.
- The proposed RSF-R does not conform to the recommended densities found on the Growth Plans Future Land Use map currently designated as Residential Low: 2 to 4 units/acre.
- Rezone requests for future development to a higher density within the Future Land Use map's recommended density may occur for this property.

Zoning and Development Code criteria:

Section 2.14.F: "Land annexed to the City shall be zoned in accordance with Section 2.6 to a district that is consistent with the adopted Growth Plan or consistent with existing County zoning."

Section 2.6: Approval Criteria. In order to maintain internal consistency between this code and the Zoning Maps, map amendments must only occur if:

29. The existing zoning was in error at the time of adoption;
30. There has been a change of character in the neighborhood due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc.
31. The proposed rezone is compatible with the neighborhood and will not create adverse impacts such as: capacity or safety of the street network, parking problems, storm water or drainage problems, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other nuisances;
32. The proposal conforms with and furthers the goals and policies of the Growth Plan, other adopted plans, and the policies, the requirements of this Code, and other City regulations and guidelines;
33. Adequate public facilities and services are available or will be made available concurrent with the projected impacts of the proposed development;
34. There is not an adequate supply of land available in the neighborhood and surrounding area to accommodate the zoning and community needs; and
35. The community or neighborhood will benefit from the proposed zone.

ANNEXATION SCHEDULE	
May 17th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
June 13th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
June 21st	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
July 5th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
August 6th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: [Planning Commission recommended approval at their meeting on June 13th](#). It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the zone of annexation to RSF-R for the [Puckett Enclave Annexation for the following reasons](#):

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Attachments:

- Zone of Annexation Ordinance
- Puckett Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road South Area Proposed Zoning Map

[\(Puckett Enclave Staff Zoning PC Report.doc\)](#)

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE No. _____

Zoning the Puckett Enclave Annexation to Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum of 1 unit per five acres (RSF-R)

Located at 2563 F 1/2 Road

Recitals.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of applying an RSF-R zone district to this annexation.

After public notice and public hearing before the Grand Junction City Council, City Council finds that the RSF-R zone district be established for the following reasons:

- This zone district meets the criteria of Section 2.14.F of the Zoning and Development Code by being identical to or nearly identical to the former Mesa County zoning for each parcel.
- This zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

The following properties shall be zoned Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one unit per five acres (RSF-R) zone district

Includes the following tax parcel 2945-034-00-125

A parcel of land situate in the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of Section 3, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the C 1/4 corner of Section 3; thence N 89°53'37" E along the north line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3 a distance of 478.29 feet to the True Point of Beginning of the parcel described herein; thence N 89°53'37" E along the north line of said NW 1/4 SE 1/4 a distance of 193.60 feet to a point; thence leaving said north line S 00°06'23" E a distance of 225.00 feet to a point; thence S 89°53'37" W a distance of 193.60 feet to a point; thence N 00°06'23" W a distance of 225.00 feet to the point on the north line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 3 and point of beginning.

Introduced on first reading this 21st day of June, 2000.

PASSED and ADOPTED on second reading this ____ day of July, 2000.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Mercer Annexation		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	Joe Carter	Associate Planner	
Presenter Name:	Joe Carter	Associate Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Resolution for Referral of Petition to Annex/**First** reading of the annexation ordinance/Exercising land use jurisdiction immediately for the **Mercer Annexation** located at 2884 and 2884 ½ Hwy 50.

Summary: The Mercer Annexation consists of 1.638 acres along Hwy 50 on Orchard Mesa. The parcel has 2 existing single-family structures, which will be subdivided to create 2 single lots in a proposed RSF-4 zone. The owners of the properties have signed a petition for annexation.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council **approve** the resolution for the referral of petition to annex, first reading of the annexation ordinance and exercise land use immediately for the **Mercer Annexation** and set a hearing for August 2, 2000.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	----	-----	-------	--

Placement on Agenda:	X	Consent	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------	---------	----------------------	----------

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

DATE: May 3, 2000

CITY COUNCIL

STAFF PRESENTATION: Joe Carter

AGENDA TOPIC: Resolution for Referral of Petition to Annex/First reading of the annexation ordinance/Exercising land use jurisdiction immediately for the Mercer Annexation located at 2884 and 2884 ½ Hwy 50.

SUMMARY: The Mercer Annexation consists of 1.638 acres along Hwy 50 on Orchard Mesa. The parcel has 2 existing single-family structures, which will be subdivided to create 2 single lots in a proposed RSF-4 zone. The owners of the properties have signed a petition for annexation

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>			
Location:		2884 & 2884 ½ Hwy. 50	
Applicants:		Thomas & Marla Mercer, Owners Patrick Green, LANDesign, Representative	
Existing Land Use:		Residential	
Proposed Land Use:		Residential	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential	
	South	Residential	
	East	Residential	
	West	Residential	
Existing Zoning:		R-2 (Mesa County) – 4 units per acre	
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-4	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	R-2 (Mesa County) – 4 units per acre	
	South	R-2 (Mesa County) – 4 units per acre	
	East	R-2 (Mesa County) – 4 units per acre	
	West	R-2 (Mesa County) – 4 units per acre	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Med.- Low: 2 to 4 units per acre	
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes
			No

ACTION REQUESTED: It is recommended that City Council [approve](#) the resolution for the referral of petition to annex, first reading of the annexation ordinance and exercise land use immediately for the [Mercer Annexation and set a hearing for August 2, 2000](#).

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing [1.638 acres of land](#). The property is now being annexed into the City of Grand Junction.

It is staff's professional opinion, based on review of the petition and knowledge of applicable state law, including the Municipal Annexation Act Pursuant to C.R.S. 31-12-104, that the [Mercer Annexation](#) is eligible to be annexed because of compliance with the following:

- a) A proper petition has been signed by more than 50% of the owners and more than 50% of the property described;
- b) Not less than one-sixth of the perimeter of the area to be annexed is contiguous with the existing City limits;
- c) A community of interest exists between the area to be annexed and the City. This is so in part because the Central Grand Valley is essentially a single demographic and economic unit and occupants of the area can be expected to, and regularly do, use City streets, parks and other urban facilities;
- d) The area is or will be urbanized in the near future;
- e) The area is capable of being integrated with the City;
- f) No land held in identical ownership is being divided by the proposed annexation;
- g) No land held in identical ownership comprising 20 contiguous acres or more with an assessed valuation of \$200,000 or more for tax purposes is included without the owners consent.

The following annexation schedule is being proposed.

ANNEXATION SCHEDULE	
June 21st	Referral of Petition to Annex & 1 st Read (30 Day Notice)
July 11th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
July 19th	First Reading on Zoning by City Council
August 2nd	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
September 3rd	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

MERCER ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:	ANX-2000-059	
Location:	2884 & 2884 ½ Hwy 50	
Tax ID Number:	2943-311-00-055	
Parcels:	1	
Estimated Population:	5	
# of Parcels (owner occupied):	1	
# of Dwelling Units:	2	
Acres land annexed:	1.638 acres for annexation area	
Developable Acres Remaining:	0	
Right-of-way in Annexation:	No right-of-way annexed	
Previous County Zoning:	County R-2 (4 units per acre)	
Proposed City Zoning:	(RSF-4) Residential Single-family 4 units per acre	
Current Land Use:	Residential	
Future Land Use:	Residential	
Values:	Assessed:	= \$ 12,470
	Actual:	= \$ 127,930
Census Tract:	10	
Address Ranges:	2884 & 2884 ½ Hwy 50	
Special Districts:	Water:	Ute Water
	Sewer:	Orchard Mesa Sanitation District
	Fire:	Grand Junction Rural Fire
	Drainage:	
	School:	District 51
	Pest:	

**NOTICE OF HEARING
ON PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF LANDS
TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, held on the [21st day of June, 2000](#), the following Resolution was adopted:

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

RESOLUTION NO.

**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**

MERCER ANNEXATION

LOCATED at 2884 & 2884 ½ Hwy 50

WHEREAS, on the 21st day of June, 2000, a petition was referred to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described as follows:

A parcel of land situate in Section 30 and 31, Township 1 South, Range 1 East of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the northeast corner of Section 31; thence S 00°00'58" E along the east line of the NE 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 31 a distance of 1305.90 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line for U.S. Highway 50; thence N 62°12'00" W along the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 a distance of 814.80 feet to the True Point of Beginning of the parcel described herein; thence leaving said northerly right of way line S 01°00'00" W a distance of 11.20 feet to a point; thence along a line 10.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 the following 5 courses:

- 1) N 62°12'00" W a distance of 1499.47 feet to a point;
- 2) N 52°56'00" W a distance of 176.92 feet to a point;
- 3) N 46°07'30" W a distance of 70.04 feet to a point;
- 4) N 19°28'30" E a distance of 60.63 feet to a point;
- 5) N 00°05'00" E a distance of 43.29 feet to a point;

thence along a line 15.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 the following 5 courses:

- 1) N 89°55'00" W a distance of 147.55 feet to a point;
- 2) N 50°57'57" W a distance of 334.18 feet to a point;
- 3) N 00°10'47" E a distance of 98.73 feet to a point;
- 4) N 89°49'13" W a distance of 30.81 feet to a point;
- 5) S 58°57'00" W a distance of 100.95 feet to a point;

thence N 69°31'30" W along a line 20.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 a distance of 888.50 feet to a point; thence N 20°26'38" E a distance of 10.00 feet to a point; thence S 69°31'30" E along a line 10.00

feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 a distance of 865.24 feet to a point; thence N 20°28'30" E a distance of 5.00 feet to a point; thence along a line 5.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 the following 6 courses:

- 1) S 69°31'30" E a distance of 22.41 feet to a point;
- 2) N 58°57'00" E a distance of 92.53 feet to a point;
- 3) S 89°49'13" E a distance of 43.60 feet to a point;
- 4) S 00°10'47" W a distance of 103.95 feet to a point;
- 5) S 50°57'57" E a distance of 325.85 feet to a point;
- 6) S 89°55'00" E a distance of 154.02 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50;

thence along the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 the following 5 courses:

- 1) S 00°05'00" W a distance of 55.00 feet to a point;
- 2) S 19°28'30" W a distance of 55.90 feet to a point;
- 3) S 46°07'30" E a distance of 63.00 feet to a point;
- 4) S 52°56'00" E a distance of 175.52 feet to a point;
- 5) S 62°12'00" E a distance of 1335.11 feet to a point;

thence leaving said northerly right of way line N 00°00'00" W a distance of 513.47 to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 47.14 feet to a point; thence S 30°03'00" E a distance of 181.37 feet to a point; thence N 78°15'00" E a distance of 10.00 feet to a point; thence S 01°00'00" W a distance of 203.99 feet to a point; thence N 89°00'00" W a distance of 4.00 feet to a point; thence S 01°00'00" W a distance of 23.50 feet to a point; thence S 89°00'00" E a distance of 4.00 feet to a point; thence S 01°00'00" W a distance of 205.01 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 and point of beginning.

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined that the petition complies substantially with the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act and a hearing should be held to determine whether or not the lands should be annexed to the City by Ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION:

1. That a hearing will be held on the **2nd day of August, 2000, in City Hall, 250 N. 5th Street, Grand Junction, Colorado, at 7:30 p.m.** to determine whether one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City; whether a community of interest exists between the territory and the city; whether the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future; whether the territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City; whether any land in single ownership has been divided by the proposed annexation without the consent of the landowner; whether any land held in identical ownership comprising more than twenty acres which, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, has an assessed valuation in excess of two hundred thousand dollars is included without the landowner's consent; whether any of the land is now subject to other annexation proceedings; and whether an election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965.
2. Pursuant to the State's Annexation Act, the City Council determines that the City may now, and hereby does, exercise jurisdiction over land use issues in the said territory. Requests for building permits, subdivision approvals and zoning approvals shall, as of this date, be submitted to the Community Development Department of the City.

ADOPTED this ___ day of _____, **2000**.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that a hearing will be held in accordance with the Resolution on the date and at the time and place set forth in the Resolution.

City Clerk

<i>PUBLISHED</i>
June 23, 2000
June 30, 2000
July 7, 2000
July 14, 2000

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

MERCER ANNEXATION

APPROXIMATELY 1.638 ACRES

LOCATED AT 2884 & 2884 ½ Hwy 50

WHEREAS, on the 21st day of June, 2000 the City Council of the City of Grand Junction considered a petition for the annexation of the following described territory to the City of Grand Junction; and

WHEREAS, a hearing on the petition was duly held after proper notice on the 2nd day of August, 2000; and

WHEREAS, the City Council determined that said territory was eligible for annexation and that no election was necessary to determine whether such territory should be annexed.;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described to wit:

A parcel of land situate in Section 30 and 31, Township 1 South, Range 1 East of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the northeast corner of Section 31; thence S 00°00'58" E along the east line of the NE 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 31 a distance of 1305.90 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line for U.S. Highway 50; thence N 62°12'00" W along the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 a distance of 814.80 feet to the True Point of Beginning of the parcel described herein; thence leaving said northerly right of way line S 01°00'00" W a distance of 11.20 feet to a point; thence along a line 10.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 the following 5 courses:

6) N 62°12'00" W a distance of 1499.47 feet to a point;
7) N 52°56'00" W a distance of 176.92 feet to a point;
8) N 46°07'30" W a distance of 70.04 feet to a point;
9) N 19°28'30" E a distance of 60.63 feet to a point;
10) N 00°05'00" E a distance of 43.29 feet to a point;
thence along a line 15.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 the following 5 courses:
6) N 89°55'00" W a distance of 147.55 feet to a point;
7) N 50°57'57" W a distance of 334.18 feet to a point;
8) N 00°10'47" E a distance of 98.73 feet to a point;
9) N 89°49'13" W a distance of 30.81 feet to a point;
10) S 58°57'00" W a distance of 100.95 feet to a point;
thence N 69°31'30" W along a line 20.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 a distance of 888.50 feet to a point; thence N 20°26'38" E a distance of 10.00 feet to a point; thence S 69°31'30" E along a line 10.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 a distance of 865.24 feet to a point; thence N 20°28'30" E a distance of 5.00 feet to a point; thence along a line 5.00 feet south of and parallel with the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 the following 6 courses:
7) S 69°31'30" E a distance of 22.41 feet to a point;
8) N 58°57'00" E a distance of 92.53 feet to a point;
9) S 89°49'13" E a distance of 43.60 feet to a point;
10) S 00°10'47" W a distance of 103.95 feet to a point;
11) S 50°57'57" E a distance of 325.85 feet to a point;
12) S 89°55'00" E a distance of 154.02 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50;
thence along the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 the following 5 courses:
6) S 00°05'00" W a distance of 55.00 feet to a point;
7) S 19°28'30" W a distance of 55.90 feet to a point;
8) S 46°07'30" E a distance of 63.00 feet to a point;
9) S 52°56'00" E a distance of 175.52 feet to a point;
10) S 62°12'00" E a distance of 1335.11 feet to a point;
thence leaving said northerly right of way line N 00°00'00" W a distance of 513.47 to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 47.14 feet to a point; thence S 30°03'00" E a distance of 181.37 feet to a point; thence N 78°15'00" E a distance of 10.00 feet to a point; thence S 01°00'00" W a distance of 203.99 feet to a point; thence N 89°00'00" W a distance of 4.00 feet to a point; thence S 01°00'00" W a distance of 23.50 feet to a point; thence S 89°00'00" E a distance of 4.00 feet to a point; thence S 01°00'00" W a distance of 205.01 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line for said U.S. Highway 50 and point of beginning.

be and is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 21st day of June, 2000.

ADOPTED and ordered published this ___ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Morrill Annexation - ANX-2000-108		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 7, 2000		
Author:	Pat Cecil	Development Services Supervisor	
Presenter Name:	Pat Cecil	Development Services Supervisor	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Resolution for a Referral Petition to Annex, first reading of the annexation ordinance and exercising land use jurisdiction immediately for the Morrill Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at 2980 Gunnison Avenue. File ANX-2000-108

Summary: The petitioner is requesting annexation of a .689 acre parcel in order to construct an industrial building on the site. Under the terms of the Presigo Agreement, the petitioner must be annexed to the City of Grand Junction prior to issuance of a Planning Clearance for a building permit.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve the resolution for the Referral Petition to annex, approve on first reading the annexation ordinance and exercise land use immediately for the Morrill Annexation.

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	When:	
--	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

DATE: June 21, 2000

CITY COUNCIL

STAFF PRESENTATION: Pat Cecil

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>			
Location:		2980 Gunnison Avenue	
Applicants:		Earl Morrill Mike Graham	
Existing Land Use:		Vacant land	
Proposed Land Use:		Construction of a sheet metal fabrication shop and office for a heating and air conditioning business.	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Residential/Agricultural	
	South	Vacant Industrial	
	East	Vacant Industrial	
	West	Vacant Industrial but approved for a gymnastic studio (ANX-2000-037)	
Existing Zoning:		Industrial-Mesa County	
Proposed Zoning:		Light Industrial (I-1)	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	Industrial-Mesa County	
	South	Industrial-Mesa County	
	East	Industrial-Mesa County	
	West	Light Industrial (I-1)- City	
Growth Plan Designation:		Commercial Industrial	
Zoning within density range?		Yes	No
N/A			

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing .689 acres of land. Under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County the City is to annex all areas for which development permits are requested. The petitioner is requesting the annexation in conjunction with a Site Plan Review to construct an approximately 5,000 square foot

building to house a sheet metal fabrication shop and office for a heating and air conditioning business.

The annexation area is located in an industrial subdivision, and the proposed use is consistent with the surrounding property usage.

The following annexation and zoning schedule is being proposed.

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
6/ 21/2000	Referral of Petition , Exercising Land Use and First Reading (30 Day Notice)
7/11/200	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
7/19/2000	First Reading on Zoning by City Council
8/2/2000	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
9/3/2000	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that City Council approve the resolution for the Referral Petition to annex and exercise land use immediately for the Morrill Annexation.

- Attachments:
- a. Annexation summary
 - b. Notice of hearing
 - c. Resolution exercising land use control
 - d. Annexation ordinance
 - e. General location map
 - f. Annexation map

MORRILL ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:		ANX-2000-108
Location:		2980 Gunnison Avenue
Tax ID Number:		2943-171-07-009
Parcels:		1
Estimated Population:		0
# of Parcels (owner occupied):		0
# of Dwelling Units:		0
Acres land annexed:		.689 acres
Developable Acres Remaining:		.689 acres
Right-of-way in Annexation:		0
Previous County Zoning:		Industrial
Proposed City Zoning:		Light Industrial
Current Land Use:		Vacant industrial land
Future Land Use:		Sheet metal fabrication with an office for a heating and air conditioning business.
Values:	Assessed:	= \$ 5,750
	Actual:	= \$ 19,840
Census Tract:		8
Address Ranges:		2980 Gunnison Avenue
Special Districts:	Water:	Ute Water
	Sewer:	Central Grand Valley
	Fire:	Grand Junction Rural Fire
	Drainage:	Grand Junction Drainage
	School:	District 51
	Pest:	-
	Irrigation:	Grand Valley Irrigation District

**NOTICE OF HEARING
ON PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF LANDS
TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, held on June 21, 2000, the following Resolution was adopted:

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

RESOLUTION NO. __ - 00

**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**

MORRILL ANNEXATION

LOCATED AT 2980 Gunnison Avenue

WHEREAS, on the 21st day of June, 2000, a petition was referred to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described as follows:

Lot 9, Banner Industrial Park (Plat Book 11, Page 362) situated in the SE ¼ NE ¼, Section 17, T1S, R1E, U.M., County of Mesa, State of Colorado.

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined that the petition complies substantially with the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act and a hearing should be held to determine whether or not the lands should be annexed to the City by Ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION:

1. That a hearing will be held on the 21st day of June, 2000, in Two Rivers Convention Center, 159 Main Street, Grand Junction, Colorado, at 7:30 p.m. to determine whether one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City; whether a community of interest exists between the territory and the city; whether the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future; whether the territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City; whether any land in single ownership has been divided by the proposed annexation without the consent of the landowner; whether any land held in identical ownership comprising more than twenty acres which, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, has an assessed valuation in excess of two hundred thousand dollars is included without the landowner's consent; whether any of the land is now subject to other annexation proceedings; and whether an election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965.
2. Pursuant to the State's Annexation Act, the City Council determines that the City

may now, and hereby does, exercise jurisdiction over land use issues in the said territory. Requests for building permits, subdivision approvals and zoning approvals shall, as of this date, be submitted to the Community Development Department of the City.

ADOPTED this ___ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that a hearing will be held in accordance with the Resolution on the date and at the time and place set forth in the Resolution.

City Clerk

<i>PUBLISHED</i>
June 23, 2000
June 30, 2000
July 07, 2000
July 14, 2000

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

MORRILL ANNEXATION

APPROXIMATELY .689 ACRES

LOCATED AT 2980 GUNNISON AVENUE

WHEREAS, on the 21st day of June, 2000 the City Council of the City of Grand Junction considered a petition for the annexation of the following described territory to the City of Grand Junction; and

WHEREAS, a hearing on the petition was duly held after proper notice on the 2nd day of August, 2000; and

WHEREAS, the City Council determined that said territory was eligible for annexation and that no election was necessary to determine whether such territory should be annexed.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:**

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described to wit:

Lot 9, Banner Industrial Park (Plat Book 11, Page 362) situated in the SE ¼ NE ¼, Section 17, T1S, R1E, U.M., County of Mesa, State of Colorado.

be and is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 21st day of June, 2000.

ADOPTED and ordered published this ___ day of _____, 2000.

Attest:

President of the Council

City Clerk
Morrill1 morrill2

Attach 22

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL			
Subject:	RZP-2000-067, The Legends Subdivision		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 15, 2000		
Author:	Pat Cecil	Development Services Supervisor	
Presenter Name:	Pat Cecil	Development Services Supervisor	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Formal Agenda

Subject: RZP-2000-067, First reading of the ordinance to rezone The Legends Subdivision to the Planned Development (PD) district .

Summary: The Planning Commission at the hearing of June 13, 2000, recommended that the City Council rezone The Legends Subdivision to the PD district. The rezone area is comprised of approximately 35 acres. The site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of 28 ½ Road and Patterson Road. The site will ultimately be developed with 178 residential dwelling units comprised of a mix of single family detached, single family attached and four unit condominium structures.

Background Information: See attached.

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation:, That the City Council conduct the first reading of the ordinance to rezone The Legends Subdivision to the PD district, making the findings that the rezoning is consistent with the Growth Plan, the zoning of adjacent properties and Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	When:	
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

AGENDA TOPIC: RZP-20000-067, The Legends Subdivision

SUMMARY: A rezoning of approximately 35 acres from the Residential Single Family not to exceed five dwelling units per acre (RSF-5) district to a Planned Development (PD) district.

ACTION REQUESTED: First reading of the ordinance to rezone the 35 acres to the Planned Development (PD) district.

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>					
Location:		At the southeast corner of 28 ½ Road and Patterson Road.			
Applicants:		Abell Partners, LLC RG Consulting Engineers, Inc.			
Existing Land Use:		Undeveloped commercial property			
Proposed Land Use:		Mixture of detached and attached single family residences with townhouse development (four-plexes) in the northerly end of the site.			
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Existing residential and future park site			
	South				
	East	Vacant residentially designated land			
	West				
Existing Zoning:		Planned Development (PD) and Residential Single Family not to exceed five dwellings per acre (RSF-5)			
Proposed Zoning:		Planned Development			
Surrounding Zoning:	North	CSR and RMF-5			
	South	RMF-5			
	East	RMF-12			
	West	PD			
Growth Plan Designation:		North 20.78 acres: Residential Medium High (8-12 dwelling units per acre) South 11.49 acres: Residential Medium (4-8 dwelling units per acre)			
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes		No

Project Analysis:

Rezoning: The petitioner is requesting approval of a rezoning of approximately 11.5 acres from the Residential Single Family not to exceed five dwelling units per acre (RSF-5) district to a Planned Development not to exceed three dwelling units per acre (PD-3) district in order to incorporate the acreage into the preliminary plat for the Legends Subdivision. The Legends Subdivision (previously 23.5 acres in area) was zoned to a Planned Residential-6.5 dwelling units per acre (PR-6.5) district at the time of annexation of the project site by the City.

With the adoption of the new Zoning and Development Code and the associated new zoning map, the project area was rezoned to a Planned Development (PD) district.

At this time, it is recommended that the additional acreage be rezoned to the Planned Development (PD) district, consistent with the bulk of the subdivision. A Planned Development ordinance has been prepared, based on the overall project design. The PD ordinance includes the area of Filing 1. The total acreage of the PD area is approximately 35 acres.

In order for the rezoning to occur, the following questions must be answered and a finding of consistency with the Zoning and Development Code must be made per Section 2.6 as follows:

1. The existing zoning was in error at the time of adoption;

The zoning at the time of adoption was not in error, but to maintain project consistency, the additional acreage should be rezoned to the PD district.

2. There has been a change of character in the neighborhood due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, ect.;

There has been a change in the aspect that the project petitioner has acquired the additional acreage and desires to incorporate it into the overall development plan.

3. The proposed rezone is compatible with the neighborhood and will not create adverse impacts such as: capacity or safety of the street network, parking problems, storm water or drainage problems, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or nuisances;

The proposed zoning will be consistent with the zoning of The Legends subdivision and the subdivision located northwest of the rezone area. The proposed rezoning will not create adverse impacts as identified above.

4. The proposal conforms with and furthers the goals and policies of the Growth Plan, other adopted plans and policies, the requirements of this Code, and other City regulations and guidelines;

The project as submitted is consistent with the Growth Plan and other plans, policies, codes and other regulations of the City.

5. Adequate public facilities and services are available or will be made available concurrent with the projected impacts of the proposed development;

Public water and sewer are currently available to the project site. Additional sewer line capacity is currently being planned by the sewer district which is anticipated to be in place prior to line capacity being reached.

6. There is not an adequate supply of land available in the neighborhood and surrounding area to accommodate the zoning and community needs; and

While there may be adequate land available, the proposed rezoning is not for additional density, but to maintain project consistency.

7. The community or neighborhood will benefit from the proposed zone.

There will be a benefit to the community and neighborhood by providing a consistent zoning pattern and as a result of improvements that are required of the project that ultimately will result in improved east/west traffic movements.

Preliminary Plan: The petitioner has submitted a revised preliminary plan, adding 11.49 acres to the preliminary plan area. The area of filings 2 through 7 of the previous plan have been redesigned to accommodate the additional acreage and to reduce the amount of grading that will be required to develop the project.

The project will be developed in eight phases, with Filing #1 currently in the process of being recorded. With the additional acreage, the overall project will contain a total of 178 residential dwelling units, comprised of 98 single family attached and detached dwelling units and 80 townhouse units in four-plex type buildings to be located in the northerly portion of the project site.

Lot sizes will range from 5,323 square feet to 11,246 square feet. The site is served with water for domestic and fire suppression purposes by the Ute Water district, and will receive sewer service from the Central Grand Valley Sanitation District.

Open Space/Recreation: The project is supplying approximately 12.23 acres of open space of which approximately .59 acres is dedicated for active recreation space comprised of two locations. The northerly area will be developed with a barbecue area and volleyball court (Tract B) and the southerly area will be developed with a playground and picnic area (Tract H).

In additions, the project will be dedicating a pedestrian path easement to the City adjacent to the Grand Valley Canal, and area for a bike path adjacent to Indian Wash along the property's east line as requested by the Parks Department. An additional path is proposed within Tract D which will provide additional passive recreational opportunities. Access to the canal path will be supplied from 28 ½ Road, Norma Jean Court and Cagney Court.

The Homeowners Association will be responsible for owning and maintaining the open space areas with the exception of the path improvements within the easements required by the City.

Lot Configuration and Bulk Requirements:

Townhouse Development:

1. Minimum street frontage..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.
2. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
3. Minimum lot width..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.
4. Minimum setbacks..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.

Single Family Dwelling (detached)

1. Minimum street frontage..... 15 feet.
2. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
3. Minimum lot width..... 40 feet.
4. Minimum side yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 5 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
5. Minimum rear yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 10 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
6. Minimum front yard setback..... 15 feet from the front property line for the residence and 20 feet from the front property line for the garage.

Single Family Dwellings (attached)

1. Minimum street frontage.....15 feet.
2. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
3. Minimum lot width..... 40 feet.
4. Minimum side yard setback
 - Principal structure.....5/0 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
5. Minimum rear yard setback
 - Principal structure.....10 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.

6. Minimum front yard setback.....15 feet from the front property line for the residence and 20 feet from the front property line for the garage.

Project Background/Summary: The original preliminary plat for The Legends Subdivision (formally known as The Vistas) permitted the development of 152 dwelling units, comprised of attached and detached single family units and townhouse units in four-plex blocks on approximately 23.5 acres. The original preliminary plan would have required massive grading of the site. The plan provided a total of 4.36 acres of active and passive open space.

As part of the original preliminary plan, 28 ½ Road was to be closed off, and a new road (Legends Drive) would be constructed through the northerly part of the subdivision to Patterson Road. As part of the Final Plat review of Filing 1, the applicant requested that construction of this road and closure of 28 ½ Road occur at the time of future filings. This request was granted by the Planning Commission. Other conditions of the original preliminary plan have been carried over to the current project as appropriate.

Drainage: The project is proposing to utilize a drainage detention basin to be located in the southwest corner of the project site. This detention basin will discharge into the Grand Valley Canal. A drainage release agreement with the Grand Valley Canal company will be required to be submitted with the submittal of the final plat for Filing 2. The southwesterly portion of the project will discharge storm water directly into Indian Wash.

Access/Streets: The project site will be accessed from Grand Falls Drive which will be extended through the site, a new connection to Patterson Road, and the road to be constructed at the southerly end of the subdivision (Presley Avenue) from 28 ½ Road, that is being designed to ultimately cross Indian Wash and connect to 29 Road at some future date. 28 ½ Road is proposed to be closed off at Patterson Road due to sight distance problems. The petitioner is requesting that this closure be deferred until the filing of the final plat for Filing 4, when they propose to construct the Legends Way connection to Patterson Road.

Preliminary Plan: The petitioner has submitted a revised preliminary plan, adding 11.49 acres to the preliminary plan area. The area of filings 2 through 7 of the previous plan have been redesigned to accommodate the additional acreage and to reduce the amount of grading that will be required to develop the project.

The project will be developed in eight phases, with Filing #1 currently in the process of being recorded. With the additional acreage, the overall project will contain a total of 178 residential dwelling units, comprised of 98 single family attached and detached dwelling units and 80 townhouse units in four-plex type buildings to be located in the northerly portion of the project site.

Lot sizes will range from 5,323 square feet to 11,246 square feet. The site is served with water for domestic and fire suppression purposes by the Ute Water district, and will receive sewer service from the Central Grand Valley Sanitation District.

Open Space/Recreation: The project is supplying approximately 12.23 acres of open space of which approximately .59 acres is dedicated for active recreation space comprised of two locations. The northerly area will be developed with a barbecue area and volleyball court (Tract B) and the southerly area will be developed with a playground and picnic area (Tract H).

In additions, the project will be dedicating a pedestrian path easement to the City adjacent to the Grand Valley Canal, and area for a bike path adjacent to Indian Wash along the property's east line as requested by the Parks Department. An additional path is proposed within Tract D which will provide additional passive recreational opportunities. Access to the canal path will be supplied from 28 ½ Road, Norma Jean Court and Cagney Court.

The Homeowners Association will be responsible for owning and maintaining the open space areas with the exception of the path improvements within the easements required by the City.

Lot Configuration and Bulk Requirements:

Townhouse Development:

- 5. Minimum street frontage..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.
- 6. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
- 7. Minimum lot width..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.
- 8. Minimum setbacks..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.

Single Family Dwelling (detached)

- 6. Minimum street frontage..... 15 feet.
- 7. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
- 8. Minimum lot width..... 40 feet.
- 9. Minimum side yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 5 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
- 10. Minimum rear yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 10 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
- 6. Minimum front yard setback..... 15 feet from the front property line for the residence and 20 feet from the front property line for the garage.

Single Family Dwellings (attached)

- 7. Minimum street frontage.....15 feet.
- 8. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
- 9. Minimum lot width..... 40 feet.
- 10. Minimum side yard setback
 - Principal structure.....5/0 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
- 11. Minimum rear yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 10 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
- 12. Minimum front yard setback.....15 feet from the front property line for the residence and 20 feet from the front property line for the garage.

Project Background/Summary: The original preliminary plat for The Legends Subdivision (formally known as The Vistas) permitted the development of 152 dwelling units, comprised of attached and detached single family units and townhouse units in four-plex blocks on approximately 23.5 acres. The original preliminary plan would have required massive grading of the site. The plan provided a total of 4.36 acres of active and passive open space.

As part of the original preliminary plan, 28 ½ Road was to be closed off, and a new road (Legends Drive) would be constructed through the northerly part of the subdivision to Patterson Road. As part of the Final Plat review of Filing 1, the applicant requested that construction of this road and closure of 28 ½ Road occur at the time of future filings. This request was granted by the Planning Commission. Other conditions of the original preliminary plan have been carried over to the current project as appropriate.

Drainage: The project is proposing to utilize a drainage detention basin to be located in the southwest corner of the project site. This detention basin will discharge into the Grand Valley Canal. A drainage release agreement with the Grand Valley Canal company will be required to be submitted with the submittal of the final plat for Filing 2. The southwesterly portion of the project will discharge storm water directly into Indian Wash.

Access/Streets: The project site will be accessed from Grand Falls Drive which will be extended through the site, a new connection to Patterson Road, and the road to be constructed at the southerly end of the subdivision (Presley Avenue) from 28 ½ Road, that is being designed to ultimately cross Indian Wash and connect to 29 Road at some future date. 28 ½ Road is proposed to be closed off at Patterson Road due to sight distance problems. The petitioner is requesting that this closure be deferred until the filing of the final plat for Filing 4, when they propose to construct the Legends Way connection to Patterson Road.

The Planning Commission at the time of approval of the original preliminary plan placed a condition on the project that required that all construction traffic enter and exit the site

via the future connection to Patterson Road, after hearing testimony from adjacent property owners.

The petitioner is also required to provide acceleration and deceleration lanes on Patterson Road at the new Legends Way road connection when this road is developed.

- a. Planned Development Ordinance
- b. General Location map
- c. Preliminary Plat map
- d. General Project Report

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

Ordinance No. _____

**ZONING TWO PARCELS OF LAND LOCATED
SOUTH OF PATTERSON ROAD AND EAST OF 28 ½ ROAD
(The Legends Subdivision)**

Recitals.

A rezone from the Planned Development (PD) district and the Residential Single Family not to exceed five dwellings per acre (RSF-5) district to the Planned Development (PD) has been requested for the properties located at the Southeast corner of Patterson Road and 28 ½ Road for purposes of developing a 178 dwelling unit subdivision. The City Council finds that the request meets the goals and policies and future land use set forth by the *Growth Plan* (4-8 dwelling units per acres and 8-12 dwelling units per acre). City Council also finds that the requirements for a rezone as set forth in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code have been satisfied.

The Grand Junction Planning Commission, at its June 13, 2000 hearing, recommended approval of the rezone request from the PD and RSF-5 districts to the PD district.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT THE PARCELS DESCRIBED BELOW IS HEREBY ZONED TO THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD) DISTRICT:

Beginning at the North ¼ Section 7 T1S R1E UM; thence South 00° 17' 43" East, a distance of 50.00' to the true point of beginning; thence South 00° 17' 43" East, a distance of 65.23'; thence North 89° 42' 17" East, a distance of 115.00'; thence South 00° 17' 43" East, a distance of 1199.43'; thence South 89° 58' 50" West, a distance of 90.00'; thence South 00° 17' 25" East, a distance of 250.90'; thence North 80° 34' 38" East, a distance of 94.68'; thence South 79° 02' 22" East, a distance of 676.00'; thence North 58° 39' 38" East, a distance of 195.00'; thence South 87° 52' 22" East, a distance of 138.00'; thence South 56° 03' 22" East, a distance of 263.00'; thence North 85° 29' 34" East, a distance of 12.96'; thence North 00° 10' 31" West, a distance of 44.70'; thence South 72° 36' 18" East, a distance of 24.93'; thence South 72° 36' 18" East a distance of 75.07'; thence North 42° 33' 42" East, a distance of 543.00'; thence South 89° 53' 42" West, a distance of 464.00'; thence South 89° 58' 57" West, a distance of 494.02'; thence North 00° 12' 21" West, a distance of 1266.55'; thence South 89° 48' 34" West, a distance of 825.42'; which is the point of beginning, having an area of 1405719.71 square feet, 32.271 acres.

1) The use allowed for this zone and property shall be mixed residential (98 single family attached and detached dwelling units and 80 single family townhouse units in four unit blocks) along with .59 acres of active recreational open space, consisting of a volleyball court with barbecue facilities (Tract B) and a children's playground with picnic

facilities (Tract G) and 11.64 acres of passive open space with various trails and a detention facility as described in applicant's project narrative and reflected on the preliminary plat contained in City Community Development Department File RZP-2000-067.

2) The bulk requirements allowance for this zone and property shall be as follows:

Townhouse Development:

- a. Minimum street frontage..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.
- b. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
- c. Minimum lot width..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.
- d. Minimum setbacks..... As designated on the Preliminary Plan.

Single Family Dwelling (detached)

- a. Minimum street frontage..... 15 feet.
- b. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
- c. Minimum lot width..... 40 feet.
- d. Minimum side yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 5 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
- e. Minimum rear yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 10 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
- f. Minimum front yard setback..... 15 feet from the front property line for the residence and 20 feet from the front property line for the garage.

Single Family Dwellings (attached)

- a. Minimum street frontage..... 15 feet.
- b. Maximum height of structures..... 32 feet.
- c. Minimum lot width..... 40 feet.
- d. Minimum side yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 5/0 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
- e. Minimum rear yard setback
 - Principal structure..... 10 feet.
 - Accessory structure..... 3 feet.
- f. Minimum front yard setback..... 15 feet from the front property line for the residence and 20 feet from the front property line for the garage.

INTRODUCED for FIRST READING and PUBLICATION this 21st day of June, 2000.

PASSED on SECOND READING this 19th day of June, 2000.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

President of Council

Legends1 legends2

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AMENDING ORDINANCE 3220 CONCERNING THE SALARY OF THE CITY
MANAGER**

RECITALS. On June 7, 2000 the City Council named David A. Varley Acting City Manager. Mr. Varley will assume the position of City Manager following the resignation of Mark K. Achen. Mr. Achen's resignation becomes effective on July 7, 2000.

Pursuant to the City Charter the salary of the City Manager is set by ordinance. The salary for Mr. Achen was most recently established by Ordinance 3220. This Ordinance amends Ordinance 3220 and sets the salary of Mr. Varley as the Acting City Manager.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND
JUNCTION:**

That the portion of Ordinance 3220 setting the salary of the City Manager is amended, repealed and replaced by this Ordinance and the salary of the Acting City Manager David A. Varley shall be set as of July 8, 2000 at \$93,786.00 per year and as customarily prorated if he serves less than one year, to compensate him for his service to the City of Grand Junction. The balance of Ordinance 3220 is unchanged.

Introduced on first reading this 21st day of June 2000.

Passed and adopted on second reading this _____ day of _____, 2000.

President of the Council

Attest:

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Animal Control Ordinance Revisions		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	May 30, 2000		
Author:	Stephanie Rubinstein	Staff City Attorney	
Presenter Name:	Stephanie Rubinstein	Staff City Attorney	
	Workshop	xx	Formal Agenda

Subject: Animal Control Ordinance

Summary: In Ordinance 3248 Animal Control ordinance, adopted by Council on May 17, 2000 Section 6-63 arguably repealed 4 subsections instead of one. This ordinance seeks to correct those changes. No substantive changes have been made. The changes are as follows:

1. Section 6-63 (d) was completely repealed, and a new section added. The intention was to repeal only one subsection and leave the other subsections intact. This ordinance resolves any such argument.
2. This ordinance adds summary titles to two sections (6-71 and 6-72) for ease of reference, referring specifically to the “summons” process rather than the penalty assessment fine schedule.

Background Information: On May 17, 2000 the City Council adopted Ordinance 3248 amending the Animal Control regulations. This ordinance makes minor administrative changes to that ordinance.

Budget: None

Action Requested/Recommendation: Approval of Ordinance on First Reading

Citizen Presentation:	X	No		Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					
Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
Placement on Agenda:	Consent	X	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop	

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 6, ARTICLE III OF THE
CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION,
COLORADO**

RECITALS: On May 17, 2000, the City Council passed an ordinance amending the Animal Control Regulations for the City of Grand Junction. Within that ordinance were administrative errors, which are corrected by this new ordinance.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

Chapter 6, Article III of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, is amended as follows:

1. Section 6-63 (d) is repealed and replaced by a new Section 6-63 (d) to read:

- (a) Minimum period. Any animal impounded at Animal Control which is not reclaimed by the owner shall be held by Animal Control for a minimum of five (5) days after acquisition by Animal Control, before it may become available for adoption or otherwise disposed of at the discretion of Animal Control. If the owner does not properly claim and redeem the animal within this period of impoundment, the animal may be subject to disposition under Section 6-64.
- (b) Sick or injured animal. An impounded animal which is sick or injured and in pain or contagious to other animals, and which is not identifiable to an owner is subject to a minimal impoundment period and may immediately be humanely disposed of through euthanasia, if (a) in the opinion of a veterinarian the animal is experiencing extreme pain or suffering; and (b) Animal Control has exhausted reasonable efforts to contact the owner for up to 24 hours.
- (c) Vicious dog. A vicious dog shall not be released from impoundment during the pendency of any criminal proceeding for violation of section 6-60(a). If no such action has been or will be commenced, such dog shall be disposed of pursuant to section 6-64.
- (d) Observation period. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section to the contrary, any dog or cat which is known or credibly alleged to have bitten any person shall be immediately impounded or quarantined for observation for rabies infection until ten days after the date of the bite and for such further time as deemed necessary by the director. During the observation period, the dog or cat shall not have any physical contact with any other person or animal outside the immediate family, nor shall it be removed from the location of quarantine unless authorized by animal control personnel. Additionally, the dog or cat shall not be vaccinated against rabies, have ownership transferred, or be destroyed or euthanized unless authorized by animal control personnel.
- (e) Dogs of wild extraction. Any dog of wild extraction which is known or credibly alleged to have bitten any person shall be immediately impounded. Unless

otherwise ordered, dogs of wild extraction shall, at the discretion of the sergeant or director, be quarantined according to the direction of the state health department or killed by humane euthanasia, avoiding damage to the brain, and the remains tested for rabies as provided by state law.

- (f) Release from quarantine; failure to comply with quarantine order or conditions. Any owner of an animal, or person harboring or keeping an animal, who has been ordered by an animal control officer to quarantine such animal shall release such animal only to the animal control officer according to the quarantine. The animal control officer may allow the owner of the animal to board the animal at a licensed and approved animal hospital, kennel or veterinary facility approved by the animal control center. The animal control officer may allow the owner to quarantine the animal at the owner's residence provided the owner can establish or maintain conditions of the ten-day quarantine period to the satisfaction of animal control. No person or owner shall fail to meet the conditions established pursuant to subsection (d)(4) of this section. Failure to comply with a quarantine order or comply with the conditions of quarantine shall result in the animal being impounded by animal control and shall be a violation of this article.

2. Section 6-71, titled "Violations not involving bodily injury," is amended to add "...where a summons and complaint are issued..." after "...thereof..." in the first sentence.

3. Section 6-72, titled "Violations involving bodily injury," is amended to add, "...where a summons and complaint are issued..." after "...thereof..." in the first sentence.

4. Section 6-74 is renumbered as Section 6-72 and titled "Severability Clause."

5. Sections 6-73 and 6-75 are repealed.

Introduced this 7th day of June, 2000.

Passed and adopted this _____ day of _____, 2000.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL			
Subject:	RZP-2000-064 The Commons Assisted Living Facility		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 15, 2000		
Author:	Kristen Ashbeck	Senior Planner	
Presenter Name:	Same		
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Zoning Ordinance for the proposed The Commons Assisted Living Facility and Enrichment Center located at 616 27-1/2 Road.

Summary: Proposal to rezone approximately 18.8 acres from Residential Multifamily 8 units per acre (RMF-8) to Planned Development (PD) in order to develop an assisted living complex with a 306-bed building, 14 duplex cottages and an 82,186-square foot Senior Enrichment Center.

Background Information: [See Attached Staff Report](#)

Budget: [N/A](#)

Action Requested/Recommendation: Adopt zoning ordinance for The Commons Assisted Living Facility.

Citizen Presentation:	X	No	Yes	If Yes,
Name:				
Purpose:				

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	-----------	------------	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	Consent	X	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------------	----------	-----------------------------	-----------------

AGENDA TOPIC: RZP-2000-064 The Commons Assisted Living Facility

SUMMARY: The property at 616 27-1/2 Road consists of three parcels of land that lie north of Patterson Road between 27-1/2 Road on the east and North 15th Street on the west. The applicant is proposing to develop the parcels into a single assisted living complex comprised of a 306-bed building, 14 duplex cottages and an 82,186-square foot Senior Enrichment Center. The resulting residential density of the project is 8.9 units per acre.

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>			
Location:		616 27-1/2 Road	
Applicant:		Grand Valley Atrium, Inc. Representative: Thomas D. Piper	
Existing Land Use:		Vacant	
Proposed Land Use:		Assisted Living Complex	
Surrounding Use:	Land	North	Church & Multifamily Residential (Nellie Bechtel Gardens)
		South	Vacant & Large Lot Residential
		East	Single Family Residential (Spring Valley)
		West	Single Family Residential (Fairmount North)
Existing Zoning:		RMF-8	
Proposed Zoning:		Planned Development (PD)	
Surrounding Zoning:	Land	North	RMF-8
		South	RMF-8
		East	RMF-5
		West	RMF-8
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium High (8 to 12 units per acre)	
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes
			No

ACTION REQUESTED: Adopt ordinance rezoning three parcels of land for The Commons Assisted Living Facility.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project Background/Summary: The applicant is proposing to construct an assisted living complex on the vacant 18.8-acre site just north of Patterson Road between 15th Street and 27-1/2 Road. The complex would include a 306-bed (254 units) assisted living building, 14 cottages and an 82,186-square foot senior enrichment center.

The project is to be developed in two phases: Phase 1 – Eastern portions of the Assisted Living building (130 units) and western portion of the Enrichment Center (aquatics and lockers). Phase 2 – Remainder of Assisted Living building (124 units) and Enrichment Center and the cottages. Applying a multiplier of 1 unit per 2 beds, the resulting residential density of the project is 8.9 units per acre, which is within the density range of the Future Land Use Plan of the Growth Plan (8-11.9 units per acre).

Access/Interior Circulation: Per the adopted Minor Street Plan for this area, proposed access to the project will primarily be from a new local residential street constructed as an extension of Hermosa Avenue east-west across the property between 15th Street and 27-1/2 Road. Private drives and parking area entrances off the public street will then access the various components of the project. The spacing of these drives as shown on the Preliminary Plan meets requirements of the Transportation and Engineering Design Standards (TEDS). A secondary access off of 27-1/2 Road is provided for the front entrance of the assisted living building.

The Preliminary Plan shows a “Possible Future Road” just off of North 15th Street on the extension of Hermosa Avenue. The applicant is required to provide for a public street stub to the south property line for access to the undeveloped parcel to the south. This parcel presently has only a narrow flag to 15th Street, which could not be used to access the lot once the extension of Hermosa is constructed.

Parking: The number of parking stalls provided for the assisted living building and the cottages is adequate as proposed. By Code, which is based on number of patrons or 1 space per 250 square feet, the enrichment center could require as many as 800 parking spaces. The Preliminary Plan shows 221 parking spaces dedicated for use by patrons of the enrichment center. The applicant has provided a thorough analysis of the proposed use of the enrichment center based on a bussing assumption (49%) from other senior facilities, class/activities sizes and scheduling and a comparison with comparable senior recreation facilities in other communities. Based on this analysis, and the limitations placed on the PD zone relative to the use of the building, staff is comfortable with the parking for the facility as proposed.

The parking areas as shown on the Preliminary Plan have been designed to meet all landscape, lighting and buffer requirements.

Bulk Standards/Signage: The following bulk standards are proposed for the PD zone district:

Parking and Building Setbacks: As shown on Preliminary Plan

Maximum Building Height:

Cottages – 1 story; 20 feet

Enrichment Center – 2 stories; 40 feet

Assisted Living Building, 2 story wings – 40 feet

Assisted Living Building, 3 story areas – 50 feet

Signage: 4 freestanding signs as shown on Preliminary Plan.
Each sign shall not exceed 12-feet wide x 5-feet high, with the maximum height of 6 feet.
Signs shall not be illuminated.

For comparison purposes, the maximum height in a comparable straight zone is 40 feet (RMF-12). Per Code, the maximum height for structures may be increased by up to twenty-five percent (25%) of the allowed height by the Planning Commission. This would result in the 50-foot maximum height proposed for this project.

Utilities/Irrigation/Drainage: Since this is an infill site, all utilities are available or can be extended in the right-of-way for the extension of Hermosa Avenue to service the proposed complex. The various utilities made no comments of significance regarding the proposed project at this preliminary phase. The site is to be irrigated with existing rights for the property.

Stormwater runoff from the developed site is proposed to be directed to two detention facilities in the south central and eastern portions of the site and released at historic rates. The detention facilities are proposed in the general vicinity of historic discharge from this site. The Grand Valley Water Users Association (GVWUA) commented that storm drainage from this development needs to be retained on the site since discharge into the Drain D drainage system will not be allowed due to existing capacity problems and water quality concerns. The applicant will continue to work with the GVWUA regarding this concern in subsequent phases of the project.

Site Amenities: The primary amenity on the site will be the proposed Senior Enrichment Center. The facility will include two swimming pools, an indoor walking track, locker facilities, a gymnasium, treatment and rehabilitation facilities, fitness equipment rooms, and activities and meeting rooms. It is intended that the Enrichment Center would serve all seniors in the Grand Junction community as well as those living at the Commons project.

In addition, there are adequate open areas are proposed around the various buildings in the project to provide for required buffering and landscaping. Detailed landscape plans will be required with the final plans for each phase. A system of private walkways

connected to the on-street public sidewalks will provide for pedestrian access between the proposed facilities. As requested by neighboring property owners to the south for security purposes, the southern boundary of the site will be fenced. Some decorative fencing may be provided along the roadways as well.

FINDINGS OF REVIEW

Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code lists criteria by which a rezone application shall be reviewed. Staff's findings relative to the criteria are listed below.

Existing Zoning in Error. The existing zoning of RMF-8 was not in error at the time of adoption as it is consistent with the low end of the residential density shown on the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan (8-12 units per acre). However, a slightly higher density (8.9 units per acre) and a Planned Development zone district as proposed are more conducive to the an assisted living facility and the mix of residential and recreational uses proposed for the site.

Change of Character in the Neighborhood. This property is one of only a limited number of sites available for infill density of higher density residential use such as that proposed. Over time, the surrounding area has had similar infill projects develop such as as Nellie Bechtel Gardens directly adjacent to the north, The Fountains assisted living facility north and west of this project, and the Larchwood Inn elderly care facility across North 15th Street from this site.

Compatible with Neighborhood. The proposed project is compatible with the surrounding area, particularly with the very similar facilities that already exist in the neighborhood as noted above.

Conforms with Growth Plan and Other Applicable Regulations. As noted above, the proposed project density of 8.9 units per acre is consistent with the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan. The project also furthers the goals of the Plan regarding infill development and provision of a mix of housing types and densities in the community. The proposed project also conforms with the adopted Minor Street Plan for this area.

Adequate Public Facilities and Services. Since this is an infill site, adequate public facilities and services are available to serve this proposed project.

Not an Adequate Supply of Land with this Zoning. The applicant has demonstrated that a project of a higher density than existing zoning allows is feasible and compatible. In addition, the existing zoning of RMF-8 does not accommodate the mixed use of cottages, assisted living and enrichment center as well as the proposed Planned Development zone district.

Community Benefit. The proposed project will provide for a variety of housing opportunities for elderly persons as well as include a recreation element for senior citizens throughout the Grand Junction area.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION (6/13/00 – Vote 7 to 0):

Planning Commission approved the Preliminary Plan subject to the following:

1. In regards to the street stub to the adjacent southwestern property, either:
 - Dedicate the right-of-way and construct the street to City Standard.

-or-

 - Dedicate the right-of-way, apply for a Revocable Permit in order to construct a walkway and landscaping within the right-of-way, and pay cash in lieu of constructing the improvements (cost to include sidewalk, cross-pan and asphalt).
2. Document the hours of operation and total number of memberships for the Senior Enrichment Center.
3. The applicant, wherever spacing will allow along the new extension of Hermosa Drive, shall consider a detached sidewalk. The applicant realizes that any deviation of the City Street Standards must first be approved by City Council. (A local residential street currently calls for attached sidewalks in the City Street Standards).
4. The applicant shall demonstrate if traffic-calming measures are needed for the new extension of Hermosa Drive between 15th Street and 27 ½ Road.

Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezone for The Commons Assisted Living Complex.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

Ordinance No. _____

**ZONING THREE PARCELS OF LAND LOCATED
NORTH OF PATTERSON ROAD BETWEEN
NORTH 15th STREET AND 27-1/2 ROAD TO PD
(THE COMMONS ASSISTED LIVING FACILITY)**

Recitals.

A rezone from Residential Multifamily 8 units per acre (RMF-8) to Planned Development (PD) has been requested for the property located at 616 27-1/2 Road for purposes of developing an assisted living complex. The City Council finds that the request meets the goals and policies and future land use set forth by the *Growth Plan* (8-11.9 units per acre). City Council also finds that the requirements for a rezone as set forth in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code have been satisfied.

The Grand Junction Planning Commission, at its June 13, 2000 hearing, recommended approval of the rezone request from RMF-8 to PD.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT THE PARCELS DESCRIBED BELOW IS HEREBY ZONED PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD):

The S1/2N1/2SE1/4SW1/4 Sec 1 T1SR1W of the UM, EXC therefrom that portion thereof conveyed to the City of Grand Junction, by instrument recd April 12, 1985 Bk 1535 Pg 388-389, and also the S 100' of the N1/2S1/2SE1/4SW1/4 Sec 1 T1SR1W of the UM; EXC the S 88' of the E 238', and EXC the E 25' as conveyed to Mesa Co in instrument recd February 4, 1959 Bk 749 Pg 491, and also EXC Treehaven Subdivision; and also the E 698' of the N1/2S1/2SE1/4SW1/4 of Sec 1 T1SR1W of the UM, EXC the S 100'; and EXC Beg 100' N of the SE cor of the N1/2S1/2SE1/4SW1/4 of Sec 1, thence W 150'; thence N 75'; thence E 150'; thence S to beg; EXC the E 25' as conveyed to Mesa Co in instrument recd February 4, 1959 in Bk 749 Pg 491.

1) The use allowed for this zone and property shall be mixed residential (14 attached single family cottages), assisted living (306 beds) and senior recreation center as described in applicant's project narrative contained in City Community Development Department File RZP-2000-064.

2) The bulk requirements and signage allowance for this zone and property shall be as follows:

Parking and Building Setbacks: As shown on Preliminary Plan

Maximum Building Height:

Cottages – 1 story; 20 feet

Enrichment Center – 2 stories; 40 feet
Assisted Living Building, 2 story wings – 40 feet
Assisted Living Building, 3 story areas – 50 feet

Signage: 4 freestanding signs as shown on Preliminary Plan.
Each sign shall not exceed 12-feet wide x 5-feet high, with the maximum
height of 6 feet.
Signs shall not be illuminated.

INTRODUCED for FIRST READING and PUBLICATION this 7th day of June, 2000.

PASSED on SECOND READING this _____ day of _____, 2000.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

President of Council

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	The Grand Village - 24 Road Growth Plan Amendment		
Meeting Date:	June 21, 2000		
Date Prepared:	June 14, 2000		
Author:	Bill Nebeker	Senior Planner	
Presenter Name:	Bill Nebeker	Senior Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Appeal of Planning Commission’s Recommendation of Denial – The Grand Village Growth Plan Amendment from Estate to Commercial, located at 766 24 Road (north of the northeast corner of I-70 & 24 Road); File # GPA-2000-029.

Summary: The applicant is appealing the Planning Commission’s recommendation of denial for a Growth Plan Amendment to redesignate a 15 acre parcel at 766 24 Road from Residential Estate (2-5 acres per dwelling) to Commercial. At its April 18, 2000 hearing, the Planning Commission found that the proposed amendment did not conform to applicable Growth Plan Amendment criteria and recommended denial. A super majority vote is required of the Council to overturn the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

Background Information: [See Attached](#)

Budget: [N/A](#)

Action Requested/Recommendation: Decision on appeal.

Citizen Presentation:		No	X	Yes	If Yes,
Name:					
Purpose:					

Report results back to Council:	X	No	Yes	When:	
--	----------	-----------	------------	--------------	--

Placement on Agenda:	Consent	X	Indiv. Consideration	Workshop
-----------------------------	----------------	----------	-----------------------------	-----------------

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>				
Location:		766 24 Road (North of NE Cor I-70 & 24 Rd)		
Applicant:		John Beilke		
Existing Land Use:		Vacant/Agricultural		
Proposed Land Use:		Commercial		
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Agricultural		
	South	Agricultural		
	East	Agricultural		
	West	Fellowship Church		
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R		
Proposed Zoning:		No change proposed at this time		
Surrounding Zoning:	North	County AFT		
	South	City RSF-R		
	East	County AFT		
	West	City RSF-R		
Existing Growth Plan Designation:		Estate		
Proposed Growth Plan Designation		Commercial		
Surrounding Growth Plan Designation:	North	Estate (2-5 acres per lot)		
	South	Commercial		
	East	Estate (2-5 acres per lot)		
	West	Estate (2-5 acres per lot)		
Zoning within density range?		NA	Yes	No

ACTION REQUESTED: Decision on appeal.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The applicant is appealing the Planning Commission's recommendation of denial for a Growth Plan Amendment to redesignate a 15 acre parcel at 766 24 Road from Residential Estate (2-5 acres per dwelling) to Commercial. The parcel is the third parcel north of Interstate 70 on the east side of 24 Road. Currently the Growth Plan shows a commercial land use designation for the first two parcels, hereafter described as parcels C and B. The subject parcel is parcel A. With a redesignation to commercial, the applicant proposes to develop The Grand Village, a mixed-use planned development with upscale restaurants, a hotel, a multi-plex movie theater and offices. The applicant has not submitted a plan for these uses and is not proposing rezoning at this time. If the Growth Plan Amendment is approved, the applicant is under no obligation to develop any of the above listed uses.

Facts that exist to this case are as follows. Staff analysis of this information is shown in italicized text.

1. City of Grand Junction Growth Plan adopted October 1996. Future Land Use Map designated parcels A-C for Rural land use. Rural allows for parcels from 5 to 35 acres in size. This designation includes most of the North Valley Area west of 25 Road and north of I-70, except for existing commercial and industrial land uses and a few other exceptions.
2. The more specific North Central Valley Plan (NCVP) adopted in March 1998 designated parcels B and C as Commercial, and parcel A and the surrounding area as Estate. *The designation of commercial land uses on the Future Land Use plan in the NCVP, is somewhat confusing due to the scale of the Future Land Use map. However compared with the size of commercially designated parcels to the west, it is clear that the map only included parcels B and C, the two parcels closest to the interstate.* The Future Land Use map does not stand alone, but must be used in concert with the goals and policies of the plan.
3. NCVP - Implementation Section of Land Use/Growth Management Goals & Policies; page 8, Section 8C states the following: "Northeast corner of Interstate 70 and 24 Road – allow highway service oriented commercial development at this major entrance to Grand Junction area (e.g., hotel, automobile service station, restaurant, etc.). The City should adopt strict design guidelines to maintain the aesthetic appeal of this important interchange."

Key Elements of Future Land Use Map (page 13 & 14) states the following: "Non-residential highway oriented services on properties within the City of Grand Junction at the northeast corner of I-70 and 24 Road." *(The key question is: How many parcels north of I-70 are considered to be included in the northeast corner. There are 3 parcels within City boundaries north of I-70 and east of 24 Road - parcels A, B. & C).*

4. All three parcels were outside the 201 Sewer Service area when the NCVP was adopted. Since then the boundaries have been amended to include all three parcels and other areas up to and including the north side of H Road approximately west of 24 ½ Road.
5. The 24 Road Corridor Subarea Plan has yet to be adopted but the Future Land Use map in this plan mimics the land use in the NCVP for all of the areas north of I-70. *According to accounts of the meetings, the steering committee did not have detailed discussions of the land use north of I-70. However there is no evidence to support the claim by the applicant that, "committee members of the 24 Road Corridor Plan privately recommended our 15 acres be zoned commercial along with the two other parcels to the south."*
6. Page 8 of the draft 24 Road Plan states that the plans allows for a commercial node in the northeast corner of I-70 interchange.
7. Workshop compilation of draft 24 Road Corridor Plan (page 38) states: "Provides for commercial uses where market forces have traditionally demanded such uses."

The applicant contends that the only access to the southern two parcels (B & C) is through the northern parcel. However, he has not submitted any evidence substantiating this claim. Staff agree that the *most appropriate* entrance to a commercial node at this corner would be via a driveway opposite the Fellowship Church driveway via parcel A and that this *may* be the most appropriate location for a new traffic signal. However the TEDS Manual does allow a driveway off 24 Road to parcel B as long as it is 300 feet from the intersection of the frontage road.

Findings: Section D4 of Administrative Regulation 2-99 states that the parties (City, and County where applicable) shall only amend the Plan if they find that the amendment is consistent with the overall purpose and intent of the adopted Plan. Staff finds that the applicant has not shown that the requested Growth Plan Amendment is consistent with the adopted plan, as evidenced by the findings of review criteria listed below. The Planning Commission agreed with these findings. The applicant's findings of compliance with these criteria are listed directly following this staff report.

- A. Was there an error in the original plan such that then existing facts, projects or trends (that were reasonably unforeseen) were not accounted for?

The North Central Valley Plan is the governing document for this amendment regarding the Future Land Use Map since it changed the original Growth Plan Future Land Use Map. Depending on the definition of "northeast corner of I-70 and 24 Road" the map could be in conflict with the plan text. The map shows commercial at the two southern parcels at the corner. The depth of commercial uses to the north of I-70 is consistent with much of the commercial development north of I-70 to the west of the Fellowship Church site. However, if "northeast corner" includes all three parcels that are located within the City, then perhaps there was an error in the map. However, if this is the case, what prevents an argument that the parcel north of these parcels is

not also a portion of the northeast corner? The question is, how far does the northeast corner extend to the north and to the east?

At issue is also whether the Map erred in not designating commercial for the subject parcel due to reasonable unforeseen facts, projects or trends. It is a foreseen fact and trend that commercial development prefers to locate at freeway interchanges due to the volume of traffic at such sites. It *is not* a fact that the most appropriate land use at all freeway interchanges is commercial however. Two of the corners at this intersection are not commercial land uses (Canyon View Park and Fellowship Church). Both the Canyon View Park and the Fellowship Church developments were known at the time the NCVP was adopted. It was also reasonably foreseen that 24 Road would be widened at some point in the future.

Staff finds that although there may be some conflict between the plan Map and Text, there was no error in the plan in designating only the southern 18 acres of land at the northeast corner to commercial.

- B. Have events subsequent to the adoption of the Plan invalidated the original premises and findings?

The North Central Valley Plan was adopted in March 1998. Since that time the 201 Persigo Sewer area has been changed to include this and additional area to the north as appropriate for sewer. Much of this change came about from the extension of sewer to the Appleton School. If the change in the 201 boundaries is indicative of a change in the subject parcel to commercial urban intensities, then does the same argument apply to the parcel north of this site? How far north is it appropriate to extend commercial land uses from I-70?

Other events subsequent to the adoption of the Plan include the draft 24 Road Corridor Plan which has proposed to redesignate many areas adjacent to 24 Road *south* of I-70 to non-residential land uses, the plan for widening 24 Road *south* of the interstate to 3 lanes and future plans to widen the I-70 bridge. The only new commercial development on 24 Road to date is the convenience store/gasoline station/car wash at the northwest corner of Patterson Road and 24 Road. Development including the Fellowship Church and Canyon View Park were taken into consideration when preparing the North Central Valley Plan Future Land Use Map.

Staff does not find that these events invalidate the original premises and findings of the Growth Plan and NCVP to require commercial on the subject parcel.

- C. Has the character and/or condition of the area changed enough that the amendment is acceptable?

The actual character and condition of the area has changed little since the Growth Plan was adopted in 1996 and the NCVP in 1998. With the exception of the Fellowship Church and Canyon View Park, there has been little change. These non-residential land uses don't typically trigger the need for increased commercial development in an area. 24 Road is in the process of being widened to a 3-lane

section *south* of I-70, but this widening is being done for safety reasons more than one of accommodating large amounts of traffic.

CDOT (Colorado Department of Transportation) has scheduled the reconstruction of the 24 Road overpass in 2005 and 2006. This will eliminate access to 24 Road south from the interstate during reconstruction. Temporary access across the interstate at 24 Road during construction is not part of the reconstruction. A major commercial node at this intersection prior to that reconstruction may suffer economically during this time.

Staff finds that there has not been a change in the character or condition of the area since the adoption of the Growth Plan or NCVP Plan.

- D. Is the change consistent with the goals and policies of the Plan, including applicable special area, neighborhood and corridor plans?

The change does not appear to be consistent with the Preferred Land Use Scenario of the Growth Plan that includes principles of Concentrating Urban Growth and Reinforcing Existing Community Centers. A 12-plex movie theatre and other commercial development does not appear to be consistent with the principle to Reinforce Existing Community Centers found in Chapter 5, Section E.c.3 & 4. Specifically the plan requires that: 3 – There may be a need for some new neighborhood-scale centers in some areas, and 4 – No major new community centers will be included in the plan.

The NCVP designated 18 acres for highway oriented commercial services at the northeast corner of I-70 and 24 Road. That commercial area has not developed to date. No evidence has been submitted that shows that an additional 15 acres is needed at that location. Also the additional commercial acreage certainly moves this corner outside of the range of neighborhood-scale commercial centers envisioned in the Plan. The Plan also states, "Other existing centers (Clifton, the Mall, the Airport area) should be recognized and allowed to grow." The mall is located over 1.5 miles from this site and should not be construed to be part of this area

Other Growth Plan policies that do not support this plan amendment are as follows:

Policy 4.1: ...The City and County will limit urban development in the Joint Planning Area to locations within the Urbanizing Area with adequate public facilities as defined in the City and County Codes...

The need for a reconstructed 24 Road overpass may signal the need to delay development on the subject parcel until after completion.

Policy 5.3: ...Development that is separate from existing urban services ("leap-frog" development) will be discouraged.

Development on this 15-acre parcel is at the northern fringes of the City and could be termed “leap-frog development”.

The applicant has not identified any Growth Plan Goals or Policies that support this proposal.

NCVP Goals and Policies which do not support this Growth Plan Amendment:

Page 6

Policy 7 – Coordinate the timing, location and intensity of growth with the provision of adequate public facilities.

Policy 11 – Ensure that future development occurs in an orderly fashion, avoiding and minimizing non-contiguous, scattered development throughout the county.

Page 12

Policy 3 - ...Development that is separate from existing urban services (leapfrog development) will be discouraged.

The applicant has not identified any Goals or Policies in the NCVP that support this proposal.

- E. Are public and community facilities adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed?

As listed above, the 24 Road bridge over I-70 is scheduled for replacement in 2005 and 2006. The bridge is narrow and contains no provisions for pedestrian access. Links between recreational uses on the south side of the interstate and commercial uses on the north are limited until the bridge is replaced and 24 Road widened north and south of the interstate. It is clear that urban intensities on the north side of the interstate, including the development of existing parcels designated for commercial development (parcels B and C) are premature until after the bridge is reconstructed. Even more so, additional commercial development is not justified until adequate public transportation facilities are available to serve the development.

- F. Is there an inadequate supply of suitable designated land available in the community, as defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use?

The following paragraph is taken from the draft market analysis of the 24 Road Corridor Plan, page 6.

“The City’s concern that large-scale commercial development might undermine existing activity centers is valid. There appears to be a sufficient supply of existing commercially zoned land and built space to meet projected demands over the next

ten years. The market study concluded that the Corridor might receive as much as a 25% share of future non-residential development, which could begin to compete with other locations in Grand Junction. To address this, an important element of the 24 Road Subarea Plan and implementation will be to limit the types of retail commercial uses in the area, as there does not appear to be a conflict regarding office, industrial and other employment uses. This would avoid undermining existing regional retail centers while allowing for neighborhood retail uses and some regional employment/commercial uses for which there is suitable alternative sites (i.e. large acreage) in the Grand Junction area.”

The commercial development proposed by the applicant is neither neighborhood retail nor regional employment/commercial in nature.

Also it is difficult to find that there is an inadequate supply of commercial land at a freeway intersection when the parcel the applicant is seeking to change lies directly adjacent to 18 acres of commercially designated vacant land.

G. Will the community or area, as defined by the presiding body, derive benefits from the proposed amendment?

The applicant has not submitted evidence that there will be substantial benefits to the community in allowing this amendment, other than the typical benefits that are associated with commercial development, i.e. increased tax base, new jobs (low-paying in nature), convenient services, etc. In all discussions with the applicant there has always been a reluctance to accept any responsibilities to participate in the improvement of public facilities such as the reconstruction of the 24 Road overpass, widening of 24 Road or other traffic improvements other than the installation of a traffic signal, if warranted, that benefit the 24 Road Corridor area. (A traffic study has not been submitted showing the impact of this development on existing facilities and the level of participation required by this development.)

On the other hand, the approval of this amendment adds to urban sprawl and sets a precedent for additional commercially zoned areas even further from the northeast corner of this intersection. Development at this site prior to reconstruction of the overpass will be inconvenient and a nuisance to surrounding lower density/intensity development (along H, 23 & 24 ½ Roads) when traffic is diverted through these areas when the bridge is reconstructed.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Commission finds that the applicant has not shown that the requested Growth Plan Amendment is consistent with the adopted plan, as evidenced by the above findings. The applicant’s findings of compliance with these criteria are listed directly following this staff report.

Attach 27

RESOLUTION NO. 64-00

**A RESOLUTION APPOINTING AND ASSIGNING
CITY COUNCILMEMBERS TO REPRESENT THE CITY
ON VARIOUS BOARDS AND ORGANIZATIONS**

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction that:

1. Until further action by the City Council, the appointments and assignments of the members of the City Council are as attached.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 21st day of June, 2000

ATTEST:

City Clerk

President of the Council

Date: December 16, 2011

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Mark K. Achen, City Manager

Re: City Council Assignments

The various committees/commissions/authorities are described below for your use in making individual Member's assignments for the upcoming year.

CITY COUNCIL FORMAL ASSIGNMENTS

Individual Members will be assigned for each of the following:

Representative:

Downtown Development Authority

Meets 1st & 3rd Friday of the month at 7:30am (Reed Building)

Grand Junction Housing Authority

Meets 4th Monday of the month @ 11:00am @ Norwest Bank

Walker Field Airport Authority

Meets 3rd Tuesday of the month @ 5:15pm @ Airport/3rd floor

Associated Governments of NW Colorado

Meets 1st Thursday of the month moves from City to City

Parks Improvements Advisory Board (PIAB)

Meets 3rd Thursday of the month (or as needed) @ noon @ P&R

VOLUNTARY AND TEMPORARY ASSIGNMENTS

Individual Members will either volunteer or be temporarily assigned to represent the Council on the following:

Representative:

Volunteer

Colorado Assn. of Ski Towns (CAST)

Meets 6 times per year (1 CML Conf.)

CML Policy Committee

Meets 2 - 3 times per year in Denver

CML Growth Committee

Meets on demand

Colorado Water Congress

Meets 12 times annually

Nat'l League of Cities Bds. & Committees

Meets on demand

CML Board of Directors

Meets on demand

Temporary Assignment

Air Service Task Force

Meets on demand

MC Community Transit Steering Committee

Meets on demand

FEMA Funding Board

Meets quarterly

Canal Trails Task Force

Meets on demand

COUNCIL AD HOC COMMITTEE

Utilities (Three CC Members required)

Meets on demand

NO COUNCIL MEMBER ASSIGNMENTS

Individual Members will not be assigned to serve as a liaison to the following. To assure good communications the entire City Council will meet with these on an annual or as needed basis as indicated.

Meet with Annually

VCB

GJ/MC Riverfront Commission

Meet with as Needed

MCEDC

MC Transportation Policy Advisory Comm.

Museum of Western Colorado

MC Enterprise Zone Comm.

MC Air Quality Comm.