

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

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2000, 7:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance
Invocation - Scott Hogue, First Baptist Church

APPOINTMENTS

APPOINTMENT TO THE RIVERFRONT COMMISSION

CITIZEN COMMENTS

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

1. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** [Attach 1](#)
Action: Approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 2, 2000

2. **Setting a Hearing on the Improvements Connected with Alley Improvement District 1999, Phase B** [Attach 2](#)

Reconstruction of the alley, 22nd to 23rd Street, Grand Avenue and Ouray, has been completed in accordance with Resolution No. 47-99 creating Alley Improvement District 1999, Phase B.

Resolution No. 78-00 – A Resolution Approving and Accepting the Improvements Connected with Alley Improvement District No. ST-99, Phase B, and Giving Notice of a Hearing

**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 78-00 and Set a Hearing for September 20, 2000*

Staff presentation: Rick Marcus, Real Estate Technician

3. **Setting a Hearing on the Improvements Connected with Alley Improvement District 2000, Phase A** [Attach 3](#)

Reconstruction of the following alleys has been completed in accordance with Resolution No. 129-99 creating Alley Improvement District 2000, Phase A:

2nd to 3rd Street, Chipeta to Gunnison Avenue
10th to 11th Street, Rood to White Avenue
11th to 12th Street, Main Street to Colorado Avenue
16th to 17th Street, Grand to Ouray Avenue
18th to 19th Street, Grand to Ouray Avenue

Resolution No. 79-00 – A Resolution Approving and Accepting the Improvements Connected with Alley Improvement District No. ST-00, Phase A, and Giving Notice of a Hearing

**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 79-00 and Set a Hearing for September 20, 2000*

Staff presentation: Rick Marcus, Real Estate Technician

4. **Signal Communications Design Contract, Phase 1A** [Attach 4](#)

The design contract is the first step toward the signal communications system. Construction will begin in 2001.

The recommendations of last year's feasibility study resulted in programming funds over the next ten years to implement installation of fiber optic line to connect the traffic signals. This contract will result in a design package for the first construction project which will tie together two identified groups of signals in the feasibility study. Group 2 consists of signals around the mall on F Road and the Business Loop and Group 6 consists of signals on Broadway and First Street from Grand Avenue south.

Action: Award Contract for Signal Communications Design, Phase 1A, to Kimley-Horn Associates, Inc. in the Amount of \$45,000

Staff presentation: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

5. **Change Order No. 2 for Additional Work on 24 and F Roads for the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Project** [Attach 5](#)

Additional work was added to the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Contract awarded to United Companies on April 5, 2000. The revised contract total with the addition of Change Order No. 2 is \$1,367,630.61. The additional work involved additional curb and gutter to connect with Canyon View Park, additional road construction from south of Canyon View Park to north of the existing entrance, addition of a new traffic lane for westbound traffic west of 24 Road on F Road including curb, gutter and sidewalk, and improvements to the intersection of 24 Road and F Road (resurfacing and additional roadway widths).

Action: Approve Change Order No. 2 for Additional Work on 24 and F Roads for the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Project with United Companies in the Amount of \$132,846.11

Staff presentation: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

6. **Amend Engineering Contract with ICON Engineering, Inc. for Leech Creek and Horizon Drive Drainage Plans** [Attach 6](#)

The original contract with ICON Engineering was for the investigation of alternatives and the preparation of a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for the Horizon Drive Channel (Ranchman's Ditch). The amended Engineering contract is for development of additional hydrology and flood plain delineation in the Leech Creek and Horizon Drive Channel basins as well as development of floodplain and detention basins locations in the West Leech Creek basin; and preparation of Conditional LOMR for these basins.

Action: Approve an Addendum to the Existing Base Contract with ICON Engineering, Inc. for an Amount of \$75,000

Staff presentation: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

7. **Setting a Hearing on Rezoning the Kollao Property from RSF-R to RSF-2, Located at 2570 G Road** [File #GPA-2000-109] [Attach 7](#)

Request to rezone the Kollao Property from Residential Single Family Rural, RSF-R, to Residential Single Family-2, RSF-2. A request for a Growth Plan Amendment will be heard at second reading.

Proposed Ordinance Rezoning the Kollao Property to Residential Single Family-2 (RSF-2), Located at 2570 G Road

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for September 6, 2000

Staff presentation: Lisa Gerstenberger, Senior Planner

8. **Setting a Hearing on Rezoning Reimer Minor Subdivision/Spanish Trails from PD to RSF-4, Located at 719 24 1/2 Road** [File #RZP-2000-107] [Attach 8](#)

A request to rezone a .34 acre parcel from PD (Planned Development) to RSF-4 (Residential Single Family, not to exceed 4 units per acre).

Proposed Ordinance Rezoning Property at 719 24 1/2 Road from PD to RSF-4 (Reimer Minor Subdivision/Spanish Trails)

Action: Adopt Proposed Ordinance on First Reading and Set a Hearing for September 6, 2000

Staff presentation: Kathy Portner, Planning Manager

9. **Construction Management Services for the Two Rivers Convention Center Remodel** [Attach 16](#)

Request for Qualifications were received and opened July 20, 2000 for providing professional Construction Management and General Construction Services for the remodel of the Two Rivers Convention Center. Four (4) firms were asked to participate in an oral interview process where the evaluation committee rated the prospective contractors according to predetermined criteria. The final cost for services will be determined after detailed drawings and specifications are developed during the pre-construction process based on a percentage of guaranteed maximum construction price plus a pre-construction services fee.

Action: Authorization to Enter into Negotiations with Shaw Construction, LLC for the Two Rivers Remodel [added "if not with Shaw then with FCI Constructors"]

Staff presentation: Joe Stevens, Director of Parks and Recreation
Ron Watkins, Purchasing Manager

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

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

9. **Public Hearing - Amendments to the 1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan** [File #PLN-2000-111] [Attach 9](#)

Adoption of amendments to the 1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan. The maps and text amendments are as follows:

1. Update future land use map:
 - a. Revisions to the future land use map to reflect current use and zoning in the Unawep Business Area and other inconsistencies between the recently adopted City Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map
 - b. An addition of two land use classifications (RMF-12 and Commercial/Industrial) to reestablish previous zoning that was not reflected in the 1995 plan.

- c. Revisions of the future land use designations to match the City of Grand Junction Growth Plan and the Countywide Land Use Plan
 - d. Revisions of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan future land use map to designate the “Area under Study” as Rural and to extend the Open Land Overlay District
2. Replace the existing mineral resource map with a revised mineral resource map.
 3. Add an addendum to the end of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan that shows the accomplishments of the plan.

Resolution No. 80–00 – A Resolution Adopting Amendments to the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan

**Action: Adopt Resolution No. 80–00*

Staff presentation: David Thornton, Principal Planner

10. **Public Hearing - Annexing G Road North Enclave, Located at 25 1/2 Road and 26 1/2 Road , North of G Road and South of H Road**

[File #ANX-2000-114]

[Attach 10](#)

The 274 acre G Road North Enclave Annexation area consists of 73 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.

Ordinance No. 3282 - An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, the G Road North Enclave Annexation, Located Generally between 25 1/2 Road and 26 1/2 Road, North of G Road and South of H Road but including one property north of H Road, and including but not limited to all or a portion of the following Rights-of-way: 25 1/2 Road, 26 Road, G Road 26 1/2 Road, G 1/2 Road, Elvira Drive, Partridge Court, Kelly Drive, Clarkdell Court, Cottonwood Drive, Lujan Circle and Interstate 70, Consisting of Approximately 274 Acres

**Action: Adopt Ordinance No. 3282 on Second Reading*

Staff presentation: David Thornton, Principal Planner

11. **Public Hearing - Zoning the G Road North Enclave to RSF-R, Located at 25 1/2 Road and 26 1/2 Road, North of G Road and South of H Road**

[File #ANX-2000-114]

[Attach 11](#)

The 274 acre G Road North Enclave Annexation area consists of 73 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. Area property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for enclaves.

Ordinance No. 3283 - An Ordinance Zoning the G Road North Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD, Located Generally between 25 1/2 Road and 26 1/2 Road, North of G Road and South of H Road but including one property north of H Road

**Action: Adopt Ordinance No. 3283 on Second Reading*

Staff presentation: David Thornton, Principal Planner

12. **Public Hearing - Annexing the Chamblee/Boystun Enclave, Located at 714 and 720 24 1/2 Road** [File #ANX-2000-115] [Attach 12](#)

The 9.60 acre Chamblee/Boystun Enclave Annexation area consists of 2 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.

Ordinance No. 3284 - An Ordinance Annexing Territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado - Chamblee/Boystun Enclave Annexation, Located at 714 and 720 24 1/2 Road, Consisting of Approximately 9.60 Acres

**Action: Adopt Ordinance No. 3284 on Second Reading*

Staff presentation: David Thornton, Principal Planner

13. **Public Hearing - Zoning the Chamblee/Boystun Enclave to RSF-R, Located at 714 and 720 24 1/2 Road** [File #ANX-2000-115] [Attach 13](#)

The 9.60 acre Chamblee/Boystun Enclave Annexation area consists of 2 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. Area property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for these enclaves.

Ordinance No. 3285 – An Ordinance Zoning the Chamblee/Boystun Enclave Annexation to RSF-R, Located at 714 and 720 24 1/2 Road

*Action: Adopt Ordinance No. 3285 on Second Reading

Staff presentation: David Thornton, Principal Planner

14. **Public Hearing – Growth Plan Amendment and Rezoning the Knolls Filings 4-7 to PD, Located at the Southeast Corner of 27 1/2 Road and Cortland Road** [File #GPA-2000-103] [Attach 14](#)

The previously approved preliminary plan for the Knolls has expired and the new plan requires a Growth Plan Amendment and Rezone. A Growth Plan Amendment from Residential Medium (4 to 8 du/ac) to Residential Medium Low (2 to 4 du/ac) is requested, as well as a rezone from PD (Planned Development) with a density of 2.7 dwellings per acre to PD with a density of 2.5 dwellings per acre. A mixed-use development with 16 patio homes and 64 single-family homes is proposed.

a. Growth Plan Amendment

Action: Decision on Growth Plan Amendment

b. Zoning Ordinance

Ordinance No. 3286 - An Ordinance Zoning the Knolls Filings 4-7, Located South of the SE Corner of 27 1/2 and Cortland Roads Including 640 and 652 27 1/2 Road, to City PD

*Action: Adopt Ordinance No. 3286 on Second Reading

Staff presentation: Bill Nebeker, Senior Planner

15. **Public Hearing – Appeal of Planning Commission Approval of Preliminary Plan and Zoning the White Willows Annexation, Located at 2856 C 1/2 Road and 2851 and 2863 D Road** [File #PP-2000-106] [Attach 15](#)

An adjacent property owner has appealed the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the requested RSF-4 zoning for the White Willows Annexation. The property has been annexed for several months but has not been given City zoning. County zoning is RSF-R (formerly AFT). An appeal has also been filed on the Planning Commission's decision to approve the White Willows Subdivision, a 122-lot subdivision on 39.56 acres. The appellant cites increased traffic on D Road as the major reason for the appeal. A revised traffic study submitted by the applicant shows a minimal traffic impact on the D Road and 9th Street and 30 Road intersections from this subdivision.

a. Appeal

Action: *Decision on Appeal*

b. Zoning Ordinance

Ordinance No. 3287 - An Ordinance Zoning the White Willows Annexation
Located at 2856 C 1/2 Road, 2851 and 2863 D Road, from County AFT to City
RSF-4

*Action: *Adopt Ordinance No. 3287 on Second Reading*

Staff presentation: Bill Nebeker, Senior Planner

16. **NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS**
17. **OTHER BUSINESS**
18. **ADJOURNMENT**

Attach 1

To be provided Monday night.

Attach 2

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>		
Subject:	Accepting AID 1999, Phase B Improvements	
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000	
Date Prepared:	August 7, 2000	
Author:	Rick Marcus	Real Estate Technician
Presenter Name:	Rick Marcus	Real Estate Technician
Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Resolution approving and accepting the improvements connected with Alley Improvement District 1999, Phase B, and giving notice of a Hearing to consider the Proposed Assessing Ordinance on September 20th, 2000.

Summary: Reconstruction of the following alley has been completed in accordance with Resolution No. 47-99 creating Alley Improvement District 1999, Phase B:

- 22nd Street to 23rd Street, Grand Avenue & Ouray

Background Information: People's Ordinance No. 33 gives the City Council authority to create improvement districts and levy assessments when requested by a majority of the owners of the property to be assessed. This alley was petitioned for construction by more than 50% of the property owners. The proposed assessments are based on the rates stated in the petition, as follows: \$6 per abutting foot for residential single-family properties, \$12 per abutting foot for residential multi-family properties, and \$22.50 per abutting foot for non-residential uses.

Budget:	2000 Budget	\$320,000
	Estimated Cost 1999 Phase B Alley (constructed in 2000)	\$ 57,213
	Estimated Cost 2000 Phase A Alleys	<u>\$203,688</u>
	Total Estimated Cost	\$260,901
	Total Cost to Property Owners	\$ 37,599 (14%)
	Total Cost to City	\$223,302 (86%)
	Anticipated Balance	\$
59,099		

Action Requested/Recommendation: Review and adopt proposed Resolution.

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>
					Workshop

SUMMARY SHEET

ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 1999, PHASE B

22ND STREET TO 23RD STREET
GRAND AVENUE TO OURAY AVENUE

<u>OWNERS</u>	<u>FOOTAGE</u>	<u>COST/FOOT</u>	
	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>		
COLLEEN & JOSEPH CAIN 360.00	60.00	\$ 6.00	\$
TAE SUN SHELEMAN 360.00	60.00	\$ 6.00	\$
• CLAUDETTE EULER (trustee) 360.00	60.00	\$ 6.00	\$
• KAREN MARQUETTE 360.00	60.00	\$ 6.00	\$
• KEVIN REUST 690.00	115.00	\$ 6.00	\$
• MMH PROPERTY JOINT VENTURE	125.00 \$1,500.00	\$12.00	
• MMH PROPERTY JOINT VENTURE	135.70 \$1,628.40	\$12.00	
• GARY & DIANE DERUSH	150.00 \$1,800.00	\$12.00	
• MESA DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES 900.00	75.00	\$12.00	\$
• DARRYL GROSJEAN <u>900.00</u>	<u>75.00</u>	\$12.00	<u>\$</u>
			\$8
,858.40			

ASSESSABLE FOOTAGE 915.70

Estimated Cost to Construct	\$ 57,213.00
Absolute Cost to Owners	<u>\$ 8,858.40</u>
Estimated Cost to City	\$ 48,354.60

Assessments may be paid in full upon completion of project or may be paid over a ten-year period, in which event, a one-time charge of 6% will be added to the principal balance to which simple interest will accrue at the rate of 8% per annum on the declining balance.

- Indicates Property Owners Signing Petition = 8/10 = 80% of Owners & 87% of Abutting Footage

RESOLUTION NO. ____

**APPROVING AND ACCEPTING THE IMPROVEMENTS
CONNECTED WITH ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
NO. ST-99, PHASE B, AND GIVING NOTICE OF A HEARING**

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, has reported the completion of Alley Improvement District No. ST-99, Phase B; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has caused to be prepared a statement showing the assessable cost of the improvements of Alley Improvement District No. ST-99, Phase B, and apportioning the same upon each lot or tract of land to be assessed for the same.

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

1. That the improvements connected therewith in said District be, and the same are hereby approved and accepted; that said statement be, and the same is hereby approved and accepted as the statement of the assessable cost of the improvements of said Alley Improvement District No. ST-99, Phase B;
2. That the same be apportioned on each lot or tract of land to be assessed for the same;
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 so 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 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, Colorado, being Ordinance No. 178, as amended.

NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a hearing is scheduled for September 20th, 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 Alley Improvement District No. ST-99, Phase B, and all persons interested therein as follows:

That the improvements in and for said District ST-99, Phase B, which are authorized by and in accordance with the terms and provisions of Resolution No. 18-99 passed and adopted on the 17th day of February, 1999, declaring the intention of the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, to create a local Alley improvement District to be known as Improvement District No. ST-99, Phase B, with the terms and provisions of Resolution No. 47-99 passed and adopted on the 7th day of April, 1999, creating and establishing said District, all being in accordance with the terms and provisions of Chapter 28 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, being Ordinance No. 178, as amended, have been completed and have been accepted by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado;

The City has inspected and accepted the condition of the improvements installed. The amount to be assessed from those properties benefiting from the improvements is \$9,389.90. Said amount including six percent (6%) for cost 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 should be entitled to an allowance of six percent (6%) for cost 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 the 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 will be heard and determined by the said City Council at a public hearing on Wednesday, September 20th, 2000, at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium, 520 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction, Colorado, before the passage of any ordinance assessing the cost of said improvements against the real estate in said District, and against said owners respectively as by law provided;

That the sum of \$9,389.90 for improvements 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:

22ND STREET TO 23RD STREET, GRAND AVENUE TO OURAY AVENUE:

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-002 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 12, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 381.60

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-004 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 11, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 381.60

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-006 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 10, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 381.60

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-008 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 9, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 381.60

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-010 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 8, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 731.40

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-011 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 1, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,590.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-012 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 7, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,726.10

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-014 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 2 & 3 and the south ½ of Lot 4, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,908.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-977 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: North ½ of Lot 4 & all except the north 15 ft. of Lot 5, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 954.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-131-17-015 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 6, & the north 15 ft. of Lot 5, Block 1, Mesa Gardens Subdivision, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 954.00

PASSED and ADOPTED this 16th day of August, 2000.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Attach 3

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>		
Subject:	Accepting AID 2000, Phase A Improvements	
Meeting Date:	August 16th, 2000	
Date Prepared:	August 7th, 2000	
Author:	Rick Marcus	Real Estate Technician
Presenter Name:	Rick Marcus	Real Estate Technician
	Workshop	X Formal Agenda

Subject: Resolution approving and accepting the improvements connected with Alley Improvement District 2000, Phase A, and giving notice of a Hearing to consider the Proposed Assessing Ordinance on September 20th, 2000.

Summary: Reconstruction of the following alley has been completed in accordance with Resolution No. 129-99 creating Alley Improvement District 2000, Phase A:

- 2nd Street to 3rd Street, Chipeta Avenue to Gunnison Avenue
- 10th Street to 11th Street, Rood Avenue to White Avenue
- 11th Street to 12th Street, Main Street to Colorado Avenue
- 16th Street to 17th Street, Grand Avenue to Ouray Avenue
- 18th Street to 19th Street, Grand Avenue to Ouray Avenue

Background Information: People's Ordinance No. 33 gives the City Council authority to create improvement districts and levy assessments when requested by a majority of the owners of the property to be assessed. This alley was petitioned for construction by more than 50% of the property owners. The proposed assessments are based on the rates stated in the petition, as follows: \$8 per abutting foot for residential single-family properties, \$15 per abutting foot for residential multi-family properties, and \$31.50 per abutting foot for non-residential uses.

Budget:	2000 Budget	\$320,000
	Estimated Cost 1999 Phase B Alley (constructed in 2000)	\$ 57,213
	Estimated Cost 2000 Phase A Alleys	
<u>\$203,688</u>		
	Total Estimated Cost	\$260,901
	Total Cost to Property Owners for 2000 Phase A	\$ 37,999 (19%)
	Total Cost to City for 2000 Phase A	\$165,688 (81%)
	Anticipated Balance	
\$ 59,099		

Action Requested/Recommendation: Review and adopt proposed Resolution.

Citizen Presentation:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop

SUMMARY SHEET

ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 2000, PHASE A 2nd Street to 3rd Street, Chipeta Avenue to Gunnison Avenue

<u>OWNER</u>	<u>FOOTAGE</u>	<u>COST/FOOT</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
• Joe & Doris Mansur	62.50	\$ 8.00	\$ 500.00
• Terry & Christie Ruckman	37.50	\$15.00	\$ 562.50
• Dallas & Donna Nowlin	37.50	\$ 8.00	\$ 300.00
Magoffin Trust	41.50	\$ 8.00	\$ 332.00
• Conrad Cole	46.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 368.00
Dora Sadoris	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Patrick Hunt	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Martin & Martha Smith	75.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 600.00
• Joyce Wittwer	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Robin Adcock	25.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 200.00
• Jacoba Lambert	25.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 200.00
Meindert & Lisa Lambert	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Peter & Cecile Brennan	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Vinton Estate	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• James & Steven Thayer	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• David Miller	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Steven & Julie Lee	<u>50.00</u>	\$ 8.00	<u>\$ 400.00</u>
ASSESSABLE FOOTAGE	800.00		\$6,662.50
Estimated Cost to Construct		\$ 40,500.00	
Absolute Cost to Owners		<u>\$ 6,662.50</u>	
Estimated Cost to City		\$ 33,837.50	

Assessments may be paid in full upon completion of project or may be paid over a ten-year period, in which event, a one-time charge of 6% will be added to the principal balance to which simple interest will accrue at the rate of 8% per annum on the declining balance.

- Indicates property owners signing petition = 10/17 or 59% of owners and 60% of abutting footage.

SUMMARY SHEET

ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 2000, PHASE A
10th Street to 11th Street, Rood Avenue to White Avenue

<u>OWNER</u>	<u>FOOTAGE</u>	<u>COST/FOOT</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
Ann & Corinne Halpin	50.00	\$15.00	\$ 750.00
Genevieve Kruckrnberg	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Jose & Mary Gallegos	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Etrl Enterprises, Ltd	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Alexander & Sina Krasnow	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Lee & Lanette Hunt	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• George & Carrie Euler	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• John Mazzuca	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Steve & Timothy Frame	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• CNB & E. H. Kruger	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Stephen Kessberger	50.00	\$15.00	\$ 750.00
• Larry & Linda Ratton	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Larry & Linda Ratton	50.00	\$15.00	\$ 750.00
• Sven & Riley Osolin	50.00	\$15.00	\$ 750.00
Marcus & Sabrina Bebb-Jones, et.al	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Daniel Neifert	<u>50.00</u>	\$ 8.00	<u>\$ 400.00</u>
			\$7,800.00
 ASSESSABLE FOOTAGE	 800.00		
 Estimated Cost to Construct	 \$ 40,500.00		
Absolute Cost to Owners	<u>\$ 7,800.00</u>		
Estimated Cost to City	\$ 32,700.00		

Assessments may be paid in full upon completion of project or may be paid over a ten-year period, in which event, a one-time charge of 6% will be added to the principal balance to which simple interest will accrue at the rate of 8% per annum on the declining balance.

- Indicates property owners signing petition = 9/16 or 56% of owners and 56% of abutting footage.

SUMMARY SHEET

ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 2000, PHASE A 11th Street to 12th Street, Main Street to Colorado Avenue

<u>OWNER</u>	<u>FOOTAGE</u>	<u>COST/FOOT</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
Theodore & Linda Koeman	75.00	\$15.00	\$1,125.00
• Frank & Christina DeHerrera	50.00	\$15.00	\$ 750.00
• Cynthia Webb	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Kern Copeland	75.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 600.00
• Helen Spehar	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Helen Spehar	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• George Spehar	99.20	\$15.00	\$1,488.00
• Saul Tompkins	49.20	\$31.50	\$1,549.80
• Linda Foster	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Helen Spehar	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Mary Baker	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Anthony Pollack & Hillary Day	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Richard & Mary Jones	50.00	\$15.00	\$ 750.00
• Jerry & Kathleen Harris	75.00	\$15.00	\$1,125.00
• Jerry & Kathleen Harris	<u>75.00</u>	\$15.00	<u>\$1,125.00</u>
			\$11,312.80
ASSESSABLE FOOTAGE	898.40		
Estimated Cost to Construct		\$ 44,928.00	
Absolute Cost to Owners		<u>\$ 11,312.80</u>	
Estimated Cost to City		\$ 33,615.20	

Assessments may be paid in full upon completion of project or may be paid over a ten-year period, in which event, a one-time charge of 6% will be added to the principal balance to which simple interest will accrue at the rate of 8% per annum on the declining balance.

- Indicates property owners signing petition = 14/15 or 93% of owners and 92% of abutting footage.

SUMMARY SHEET

ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 2000, PHASE A 16th Street to 17th Street, Grand Avenue to Ouray Avenue

<u>OWNER</u>	<u>FOOTAGE</u>	<u>COST/FOOT</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
• Stanley & Peggy Conrad	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
Suzanne Carson	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Kenneth & Linda Edwards	62.50	\$ 8.00	\$ 500.00
Lee Dyer & Christine Squassoni	55.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 440.00
• Ila Mae Booles	55.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 440.00
• Richard & Lynn Phegley	45.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 360.00
M. & E. Kronkright	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Stanley & Peggy Conrad	135.00	\$ 8.00	\$1,080.00
• Steven & Charity States	127.00	\$ 8.00	\$1,016.00
• Laura Holbrook	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 400.00
• Dennis Finnessey	<u>84.50</u>	\$ 8.00	<u>\$ 676.00</u>
			\$ 6,112.00

ASSESSABLE FOOTAGE 764.00

Estimated Cost to Construct \$ 38,880.00

Absolute Cost to Owners \$ 6,112.00

Estimated Cost to City \$ 32,768.00

Assessments may be paid in full upon completion of project or may be paid over a ten-year period, in which event, a one-time charge of 6% will be added to the principal balance to which simple interest will accrue at the rate of 8% per annum on the declining balance.

- Indicates property owners signing petition = 8/11 or 73% of owners and 80% of abutting footage.

SUMMARY SHEET

ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 2000, PHASE A 18th Street to 19th Street, Grand Avenue to Ouray Avenue

<u>OWNER</u>	<u>FOOTAGE</u>	<u>COST/FOOT</u>	
	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>		
• Douglas & Cynthia Lowell 500.00	62.50	\$ 8.00	\$
• Maxine Hoey 600.00	75.00	\$ 8.00	\$
• Sharon Felt 400.00	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$
• Clayton & Tammie Binkley 500.00	62.50	\$ 8.00	\$
• Harold & Minnie Hutchison 400.00	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$
• James Ives 500.00	62.50	\$ 8.00	\$
• Charles & Carol Lopas 400.00	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$
• David & Jean Marquardt 500.00	62.50	\$ 8.00	\$
• Oral Cheedle 400.00	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$
• Louis & S M Petrafeso 500.00	62.50	\$ 8.00	\$
• Monte Riggle 400.00	50.00	\$ 8.00	\$
• Beth Cisco 456.00	57.00	\$ 8.00	\$

RESOLUTION NO. ____

**APPROVING AND ACCEPTING THE IMPROVEMENTS
CONNECTED WITH ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
NO. ST-00, PHASE A, AND GIVING NOTICE OF A HEARING**

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, has reported the completion of Alley Improvement District No. ST-00, Phase A; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has caused to be prepared a statement showing the assessable cost of the improvements of Alley Improvement District No. ST-00, Phase A, and apportioning the same upon each lot or tract of land to be assessed for the same.

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

1. That the improvements connected therewith in said District be, and the same are hereby approved and accepted; that said statement be, and the same is hereby approved and accepted as the statement of the assessable cost of the improvements of said Alley Improvement District No. ST-00, Phase A;
2. That the same be apportioned on each lot or tract of land to be assessed for the same;
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 so 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 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, Colorado, being Ordinance No. 178, as amended.

NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a hearing is scheduled for September 20th, 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 Alley Improvement District No. ST-00, Phase A, and all persons interested therein as follows:

That the improvements in and for said District ST-00, Phase A, which are authorized by and in accordance with the terms and provisions of Resolution No. 114-99 passed and adopted on the 6th day of October, 1999, declaring the intention of the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, to create a local Alley improvement District to be known as Improvement District No. ST-00, Phase A, with the terms and provisions of Resolution No. 129-99 passed and adopted on the 17th day of November, 1999, creating and establishing said District, all being in accordance with the terms and provisions of Chapter 28 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, being Ordinance No. 178, as amended, have been completed and have been accepted by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado;

The City has inspected and accepted the condition of the improvements installed. The amount to be assessed from those properties benefiting from the improvements is \$40,278.74. Said amount including six percent (6%) for cost 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 should be entitled to an allowance of six percent (6%) for cost 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 the 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 will be heard and determined by the said City Council at a public hearing on Wednesday, September 20th, 2000, at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium, 520 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction, Colorado, before the passage of any ordinance assessing the cost of said improvements against the real estate in said District, and against said owners respectively as by law provided;

That the sum of \$40,278.74 for improvements 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:

2ND STREET TO 3RD STREET, CHIPETA AVENUE TO GUNNISON AVENUE:

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-001 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 1 & 2 and the west ½ of Lot 3, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 530.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-002 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: East ½ of Lot 3 and all of Lot 4, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 596.25

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-003 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 5 and the west ½ of Lot 6, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 318.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-004 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: East ½ of Lot 6 and all of Lot 7, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 351.92

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-005 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: East 21 ft. of Lot 8 and all of Lot 9, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 390.08

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-006 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 10 & 11, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-007 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 12 & 13, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-010 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: South 50 ft. of Lots 14, 15 & 16, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 636.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-011 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 17 & 18, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-012 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 19, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 212.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-013 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 20, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 212.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-014 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 21 & 22, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-015 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 23 & 24, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-016 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 25 & 26, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-017 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 27 & 28, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-018 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 27 & 28, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-142-26-019 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 31 & 32, Block 54, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

10TH STREET TO 11TH STREET, WHITE AVENUE TO ROOD AVENUE:

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-001 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 1 & 2, Block 90, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 795.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-002 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 3 & 4, Block 90, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-003 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 5 & 6, Block 90, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-004 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 7 & 8, Block 90, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-005 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 9 & 10, Block 90,
City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-006 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 11 & 12, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-007 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 13 & 14, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-008 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 15 & 16, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-009 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: North ½ of Lots 31 &
32, Block 90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-010 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 17 & 18, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-012 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 29 & 30, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 795.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-013 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 27 & 28, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-014 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 25 & 26, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 795.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-015 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 23 & 24, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 795.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-016 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 21 & 22, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-11-017 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 19 & 20, Block
90, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

11TH STREET TO 12TH STREET, MAIN STREET TO COLORADO AVENUE:

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-001 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 1, 2 & 3, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,192.50

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-017 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 4 & 5, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 795.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-003 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 6 & 7, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-004 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 8, 9 & 10, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 636.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-005 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 11 & 12, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-006 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 13 & 14, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-007 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 15, 16 & 17, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,577.28

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-018 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 18, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,642.79

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-013 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 19 & 20, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-012 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 21 & 22, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-011 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 23 & 24, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-010 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 25 & 26, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-009 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 27 & 28, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 795.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-015 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 29, 30 & 31, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,192.50

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-144-24-016 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 32, 33 & 34, Block 111, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,192.50

16TH STREET TO 17TH STREET, GRAND AVENUE TO OURAY AVENUE:

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-001 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 1 & 2, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, plus beginning at the SW corner of Lot 2 to the NW corner of Lot 1; thence west 15 ft.; thence south to a point 15 ft. west of the point of beginning; thence to the point of beginning, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-002 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 29 & 30, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-003 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 5 & 6, & the north 1/2 of Lot 7, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, plus beginning 12.5 ft. north the SW corner of Lot 7; thence north to the NW corner of Lot 5; thence west 15 ft.; thence south to a point 15 ft. west of the point of Beginning; thence east to the point of beginning, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 530.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-004 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 25 & 26 and the south 1/2 of Lot 27, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.
ASSESSMENT..... \$ 466.40

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-005 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: North 5 ft. of Lot 22 and all of Lots 23 & 24, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 466.40

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-006 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: North 20 ft. of Lot 27 and all of Lot 28, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 381.60

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-007 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: North 5 ft. of Lot 20, all of Lot 21 and the south 20 ft. of Lot 22, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-009 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: East 50 ft. of Lots 10 through 15, inclusive, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, except the north 22 ft. of the east 50 ft. of Lot 10, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,144.80

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-010 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: West 42 ft. of Lots 16 through 19, inclusive, plus the south 20 ft. of Lot 20, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 1,076.96

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-012 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 3 & 4, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, plus 15 ft adjusted to the lot on the west side, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-18-013 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: South ½ of Lot 7 and all of Lots 8 through 10, inclusive, plus the west 70 ft of the north 5 ft. of Lot 11, Block 2, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 716.56

18TH STREET TO 19TH STREET, GRAND AVENUE TO OURAY AVENUE:

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-001 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: North ½ of Lot 28 and all of Lots 29 & 30, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 530.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-004 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 26 & 27 and the south ½ of Lot 28, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 530.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-006 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: North ½ of Lot 23 and all of Lots 24 & 25, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 530.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-008 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 21 & 22 and the south ½ of Lot 23, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 530.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-010 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: North ½ of Lot 18 and all of Lots 19 & 20, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 530.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-013 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 16 & 17 and the south ½ of Lot 18, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 589.36

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-002 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 1, 2 & 3, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 636.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-003 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 4 & 5, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-005 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 6 & 7, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-007 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 8 & 9, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-009 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 10 & 11, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-011 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 12 & 13, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 424.00

TAX SCHEDULE NO.: 2945-132-16-012 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 14 & 15, Block 4, Slocomb Addition, City of Grand Junction.

ASSESSMENT..... \$ 483.36

PASSED and ADOPTED this 16th day of August, 2000.

President of the Council

Attest:

City Clerk

Attach 4

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Signal Communications Design Contract		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	July 26, 2000		
Author:	Jody Kliska	Transportation Engineer	
Presenter Name:	Tim Moore	Public Works Manager	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Award of a Professional Services Design Contract for **Signal Communications Design Phase 1a to Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.** in the amount of **\$45,000.00**

Summary: The design contract is the first step toward the signal communications system. Construction will begin in 2001.

Background Information: Last year the City, County and CDOT jointly funded a feasibility study for signal communications in the urban valley. The recommendations of the study resulted in programming funds over the next ten years to implement installation of fiber optic line to connect the traffic signals. This contract will result in a design package for the first construction project, slated for 2001. The first construction project will tie together two identified groups of signals in the feasibility study – group 2 consists of signals around the mall on F Road and the Business Loop and group 6 consists of signals on Broadway and First Street from Grand Avenue south.

Consultants were interviewed last year for the feasibility study. There is a limited selection of consultants in this specialty field. The project team from the firm that did the feasibility study is no longer employed by that firm. Kimley-Horn was interviewed last year and was a close second choice then. Section 10.2 of the City Purchasing Manual allows for procurement of professional services without competition with the approval of City Council. Staff believes the selection process conducted last year allowed for the review of qualifications of the firms and that the Kimley-Horn project team is well-qualified for this contract.

Budget:

Project Costs:

Design Contract	\$45,000.00
Total Project Costs	\$45,000.00

Funding:

2000 Budget Activity F 33800

\$45,000.00

Balance remaining

\$0.00

Staff is pursuing a reimbursement contract from CDOT in the amount of \$20,000.00 for the design work, as a number of the signals included in the design are on the state highway system.

Action Requested/Recommendation: Council approve award of contract for the Signal Communications Design Phase 1a to Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc. in the amount of \$45,000.00.

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 5

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Change Order No. 2 approval for additional work on 24 Road and F Road for the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Project to United Companies of Mesa County, Inc. in the amount of \$132,891.61.		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	August 9, 2000		
Author:	Mike Curtis		
Presenter Name:	Tim Moore	Mike Curtis	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Change Order No. 2 approval for additional work on 24 Road and F Road for the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Project to United Companies of Mesa County, Inc. in the amount of \$132,891.61.

Summary: Additional work was added to the 24 Road and Bridge Widening Contract awarded to United Companies on April 5, 2000. The revised contract total with the addition of Change Order No. 2 is \$1,368,036.11.

Background Information:

During construction of the 24 and Bridge Widening Project three design changes were made. The first design change was at the direction of the Public Works Director due to future traffic improvements on F Road and 24 Road. A second left turn lane is planned for the east side of the intersection of F Road and 24 Road for southbound traffic on to 24 Road. In anticipation of this second left turn lane F Road west of the intersection with 24 Road was widened to the north and curb, gutter and sidewalk added to the F Road entrance to Stop N' Save.

The second design change resulted from discussions with the Colorado Department of Transportation and the contractor, United Companies. Due to the difference between the existing roadway cross-section at the Canyon View Park entrance that drained to the west and the new 24 Road three-lane cross section that drained to the east, a rough transition would have been created if the road improvements were built as designed. To eliminate this rough transition project improvements that were originally planned to stop just south of the entrance into Canyon View Park were extended approximately 300 feet to the north. The Colorado Department of Transportation approved this design change and additional federal funding was obtained. This second design change allowed the redesign of 24 Road to north of the Canyon View Park entrance and added

curb and gutter and storm drain inlets on the east side of 24 Road for the additional 300 feet in length.

The third design change was to the design section of the roadway; 6 inches of asphalt on 16 inches of base course on geo-textile fabric. Due to poor existing subgrade in some areas along 24 Road and G Road, a geogrid fabric was added to strengthen the subgrade or the poor subgrade was excavated out and replaced with stabilization material.

Budget:

Financial Summary:

2000 Project Costs:

Original Construction Contract Amount	\$1,236,595.50
Change Order No. 1	-\$1,451.00
Change Order No. 2	\$132,891.61
<u>Engineering and Administration Costs (estimated)</u>	<u>\$138,563.89</u>
Total 2000 Project Costs	\$1,506,600.00

2000 Funding Sources:

Original Federal Funds in 2000 Budget	\$1,179,705.00
Additional Federal Funds not in 2000 Budget	\$101,600.00
City Funds (Budgeted in Fund 2011 for 2000)	\$93,428.00
<u>County Funds (direct pay to United Companies)</u>	<u>\$204,000.00</u>
Total 2000 Funding	\$1,578,733.00

Surplus City Funds	\$72,133.00
--------------------	-------------

Action Requested/Recommendation:

Approve Change Order No. 2.

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

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

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

Attach 6

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>		
Subject:	Amend Engineering Contract with ICON Engineering, Inc. for Leech Creek and Horizon Drive Drainage Plans	
Meeting Date:	August 16,2000	
Date Prepared:	August 10, 2000	
Author:	Greg Trainor	Utility Manager
Presenter Name:	Tim Moore	Public Works Manager
	Workshop	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Formal Agenda

Subject: Amend Engineering Contract with ICON Engineering, Inc. for Leech Creek and Horizon Drive Drainage Plans and CLOMR applications to FEMA. Contract amount \$75,000.

Summary: Original contract with ICON Engineering was for the investigation of alternatives and the preparation of a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for the Horizon Drive Channel (Ranchman’s Ditch). Amended Engineering contract is for development of additional hydrology and flood plain delineation in the Leech Creek and Horizon Drive Channel basins as well as development of flood plain and detention basins locations in the West Leech Creek basin; and preparation of CLOMR for these basins.

Background Information: In October 1999, the City of Grand Junction determined that development in the floodplains and floodways in the Ranchman’s Ditch and Leech Creek basins, near Mesa Mall, were in violation of City-adopted floodplain regulations. The City retained ICON Engineering, Inc. to look at the floodplain situation in these two basins and determine if there were solutions to the problem. The City had, in the 10-year financial plan, funded detention basins in these areas and ICON’s scope of work was to prepare Conditional Letters of Map Revisions (CLOMR) to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for Leech Creek and Ranchman’s Ditch, based on the construction of City detention basins. Continued commercial developments in these areas were in jeopardy without a floodplain map revision. During the investigations ICON determined that FEMA did not have sufficient hydrologic information and supporting data for their 1992 FIRM maps to develop a CLOMR. In addition, ICON recommended that the City take a short term step and develop new information and floodplain maps the *floodways* on 14.5 Road and prepared a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for 24.5 Road so that development could continue in this area.

Based on these findings, ICON's scope for the original contract was changed and the new work completed in mid-July 2000 with a LOMR request submittal to FEMA. The purposes of this amendment is to now development new hydrologic information for Leech Creek, West Leech Creek, and Ranchman's Ditch basins, delineate revised floodplains in these basins as well as in the basin, and prepared a CLOMR application to FEMA.

Budget:

ICON Original Contract: **\$52,647**
 Work billed to date/FEMA comments: **\$42,118**
New work as per this amended contract: \$75,000
 Additional Request: **\$64,471**

Action Requested/Recommendation:

Authorize the City Manager to sign an addendum the existing base contract with ICON Engineering, Inc. for an amount of \$75,000.

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

Report results back to Council:	<input 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:	GPA-2000-109, KOLLAO GPA and REZONE		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	August 16, 2000		
Author:	Lisa Gerstenberger	Senior Planner	
Presenter Name:	As above	As above	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: First reading of an Ordinance to rezone the Kollao Property to RSF-2, located at 2570 G Road.

Summary: Request to rezone the Kollao Property from Residential Single Family Rural, RSF-R, to Residential Single Family-2, RSF-2.

Background Information: [See attached](#)

Budget: [N/A](#)

Action Requested/Recommendation: Consideration of first reading of an Ordinance to rezone the Kollao Property from RSF-R to RSF-2.

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
-----------------------------	----------	---------	--	----------------------	--	----------

AGENDA TOPIC: GPA-2000-109, Kollao Rezone request.

SUMMARY: First reading of an Ordinance to rezone the southern parcel of the Kollao property to Residential Single Family-2 dwelling units per acre (RSF-2).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
Location:		2570 G Road	
Applicants:		Cheryl E. Roberts, Owner Mike Joyce, Representative	
Existing Land Use:		Residential/Vacant	
Proposed Land Use:		Residential	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Vacant	
	South	Residential	
	East	Residential	
	West	Residential	
Existing Zoning:		RSF-R	
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-2	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	City PR 4.4, County RSF-2 (4 du/ac)	
	South	City RSF-2, County R1A	
	East	County RSF-2 (4 du/ac)	
	West	City RSF-4, County AFT	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium, 4 to 7.9 units per acre; GPA requested for Residential Low, ½ to 1.9 acres per unit	
Zoning within density range?		Yes	X No

ACTION REQUESTED: Rezoning the southern parcel to Residential Single Family-2, RSF-2, to be consistent with the proposed Growth Plan amendment. The proposed Growth Plan Amendment will be considered at the September 6, 2000, City Council meeting.

Relationship to Comprehensive Plan: The Growth Plan Future Land Use Map designates this area as Residential Medium, 4 – 7.9 units per acre. The applicant has requested a Growth Plan Amendment to redesignate this property as Residential Low, ½ - 1.9 acres per unit.

Staff Analysis:

REZONE

The Kollao property is located within an enclave area which was recently annexed by the City. The zone of annexation approved for the Kollao property at the time of annexation was Residential Single Family-Rural, RSF-R, 1 unit per 5 acres. Due to the physical constraints of the property which include areas of wetlands and flood plain, knoll areas with moderate slopes and two property lines bordered by Leach Creek and the Highline Canal, there is a significant portion of this property which is not developable.

The applicant has requested a Growth Plan Amendment to redesignate the property Residential Low, $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1.9 acres per unit. The proposed rezone for the southern parcel of the Kollao property is Residential Single Family-2, RSF-2, with a density not to exceed 2 units per acre. The proposed density would be in keeping with the goals of the Growth Plan if the amendment is approved.

REZONING CRITERIA:

The rezone must be evaluated using the criteria noted in Section 2.6(A) of the Zoning and Development Code. The criteria are as follows:

- 1. The existing zoning was in error at the time of adoption.** This property is being annexed into the City and has not been previously considered for zoning, therefore, there has not been an error in zoning.
- 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. Development has occurred in the surrounding areas adjacent to this property recently, however, densities vary. Given the physical constraints of the property and the development densities of the area south of G Road, the requested zone appears to be appropriate for consideration.**
- 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. Given the physical constraints of the property and the lower density of development on the southern side of G Road, the rezone would be compatible with existing development and would provide a buffer between the neighborhoods.**
- 4. The proposal conforms with and furthers the goals and policies of the Growth Plan, other adopted plans, and the policies, the requirements of the Code and other City regulations and guidelines. The proposal is in conformance with the Growth Plan, and the policies and requirements of the 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. **Adequate public facilities and services are available at this time.**

6. There is not an adequate supply of land available in the neighborhood and surrounding area to accommodate the zoning and community needs. **An adequate supply of land is available in the community, however, the basis for the requested rezone is made given the physical constraints of the property and the desire to provide a buffer between the proposed development and existing subdivisions.**

7. The community or neighborhood will benefit from the proposed zone. **The surrounding neighborhood and community would benefit from the proposed rezone by providing a development which meets the goals and policies of the Growth Plan, and provides a buffer between developments.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff makes the following recommendations:

Rezone to RSF-2: Staff recommends approval of the Residential Single Family-2, RSF-2 zone district, with the finding that the rezoning is consistent with the Growth Plan land use designation as amended, and with Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code and adjacent property zoning.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission voted to forward the rezone request with a recommendation of approval with the findings that the rezone request would be consistent with the Growth Plan, as amended, and with Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code and adjacent property zoning.

Attachments: Tax Assessor's site map
Site constraints map
Applicant's General Narrative Report

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE No. _____

**Ordinance Rezoning the Kollao Property to Residential Single Family-2
(RSF-2),
Located at 2570 G 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 rezoning the Kollao property to the **RSF-2** zone district for the following reasons:

- The zone district meets the recommended land use category as shown on the future land use map of the Growth Plan and the Growth Plan's goals and policies and/or are generally compatible with appropriate lands uses located in the surrounding area.
- The zone district meets the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

After public notice and public hearing before the Grand Junction City Council, City Council finds that the **RSF-2** zone district be established.

The Planning Commission and City Council find that the **RSF-2** zoning is in conformance with the stated criteria of Section 2.6 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code.

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

The following property shall be rezoned RSF-2, Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 2 units per acre, zone district:

A parcel of land situated in the SE ¼ of Section 34, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point 363 feet East of the South Quarter corner of said Section 34;

Thence along the South bank of Leach Creek North 35°19' East 320 feet;

Thence North 1°51' East 119.87 feet;

Thence North 14°48' East 152.52 feet;

Thence North 23°01' East 173.58 feet to the East line of the W 1/2SW1/4SE1/4 of said Section 34;

Thence North 23°01' East 114.82 feet;

Thence North 73°38' East 174.67 feet;

Thence North 47°25' East 271.65 feet;

Thence North 37°29' East 370.07 feet to the North line of the SW1/4SE1/4;
Thence East 21 feet to the West line of the SE1/4SE1/4;
Thence South 128 feet;
Thence East 782.1 feet to the West line of the Grand Valley Canal;
Thence South 22227°19' West 149.50 feet;
Thence South 68°11' West 344.1 feet;
Thence South 98.79 feet;
Thence West 50.0 feet;
Thence along the arc of a 50 foot radius curve to the left a distance of 157.08 feet;
Thence South 34°25' West 29.72 feet;
Thence South 63°00' West 91.41 feet;
Thence South 52°33' West 56.31 feet;
Thence South 38°40' West 59.87 feet;
Thence South 17°04' East 28.76 feet;
Thence South 1°44' West 133.9 feet;
Thence South 23°51' West 209 feet;
Thence South 40°36' West 135.84 feet;
Thence South 77°17' West 37.52 feet;
Thence South 39°14' West 55.39 feet;
Thence South 22°55' East 53.42 feet;
Thence South 30 feet to the South line of Section 34;
Thence West 899.54 feet more or less to the point of beginning.

Housing type, density and bulk standards shall be for the **RSF-2** zone district.

Introduced on first reading this 16th day of August, 2000.

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

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Attach 8

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL			
Subject:	Rezone—Reimer Minor Subdivision/Spanish Trails		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	July 21, 2000		
Author:	Kathy Portner	Planning Manager	
Presenter Name:	Kathy Portner	Planning Manager	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Workshop	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal Agenda

Subject: [RZP-2000-107 Rezone—Reimer Minor Subdivision/Spanish Trails](#)

Summary: [A request to rezone .34 acres from PD to RSF-4 \(Single Family Residential not to exceed 4 units per acre\).](#)

Background Information: [See Attached](#)

Budget: [N/A](#)

Action Requested/Recommendation: [It is recommended that City Council approve the first reading of the ordinance for the rezone to RSF-4 and set a hearing for September 6, 2000.](#)

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

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

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

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

DATE: July 21, 2000

CITY COUNCIL

STAFF PRESENTATION: Kathy Portner

AGENDA TOPIC: RZP-2000-107 Rezone—Reimer Minor Subdivision/Spanish Trails
SUMMARY: Request to rezone .34 acres from PD to RSF-4 (Single Family Residential not to exceed 4 units per acre).

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>					
Location:		719 24 ½ Road			
Applicants:		Reimer Development—Steve and Kevin Reimer			
Existing Land Use:		Single Family home and undeveloped			
Proposed Land Use:		Residential subdivision			
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Canyon View Park			
	South	Large lot residential			
	East	Proposed Church			
	West	Residential and Canyon View Park			
Existing Zoning:		PD (Planned Development, 6 to 7.2 units per acre)			
Proposed Zoning:		PD and RSF-4			
Surrounding Zoning:	North	CSR (Community Services and Recreation)			
	South	RSF-R			
	East	RSF-2			
	West	RSF-2			
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium, 4 to 7.9 units per acre			
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes		No

ACTION REQUESTED: Council approval of the ordinance rezoning lot 2 of the proposed Reimer Minor Subdivision from PD to RSF-4.

Staff Analysis:

The proposed Spanish Trails development was annexed and received approval of a Planned Development (PD) zoning and Outline Development Plan (ODP) on July 21, 1999. The ODP included 212 residential units on approximately 30 acres, including an existing house along 24 ½ Road. The applicant is now requesting to remove the existing house from the Planned Development through a minor subdivision and to rezone the proposed .34 acre lot with the house to RSF-4. The developer had also submitted a Preliminary Plan for the remainder of the property, Spanish Trails, but will be bringing that forward to Planning Commission at a future hearing.

Rezoning Criteria

Since this project is being reviewed under the *old Zoning and Development Code*, the rezone must be evaluated using the criteria noted in Section 4-4-4 of the Zoning and Development Code. The criteria are as follows for Section 4-4-4:

- A. Was the existing zone an error at the time of adoption?** The existing zoning of PD was not an error, but was requested by the developer as a part of the Spanish Trails ODP. They have since decided to eliminate the lot and existing home from the overall development.
- B. Has there been a change in character in the area due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc.?** The area around this parcel has been changing with the development of Canyon View Park and a proposed church. At the time the property was annexed to the City, the County zoning was a PUD for 20 units per acre.
- C. Is there an area of community need for the proposed rezone?** The proposed rezone to RSF-4 will accommodate the existing house.
- D. Is the proposed rezone compatible with the surrounding area or will there be adverse impacts?** The proposed rezone is compatible with the surrounding area.
- E. Will there be benefits derived by the community, or area, by granting the proposed rezone?** The proposed rezone will allow the existing house to remain.
- F. Is the proposal in conformance with the policies, intents and requirements of this Code, with the City Master Plan (Comprehensive Plan), and other adopted plans and policies?** The proposed rezone to RSF-4 is in conformance with the Growth Plan land use designation of 4 to 7.9 units per acre.
- G. Are adequate facilities available to serve development for the type and scope suggested by the proposed zone? If utilities are not available, could they be reasonably extended?** Adequate facilities are available in the area and could reasonably be extended.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends [approval of the rezone of the proposed lot 2 from PD to RSF-4.](#)

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

At their July 18th hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezone to RSF-4.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

Ordinance No.

**REZONING PROPERTY AT 719 24 ½ ROAD FROM PD TO RSF-4
(Reimer Minor Subdivision/Spanish Trails)**

Recitals:

The proposed Spanish Trails development was annexed and received approval of a Planned Development (PD) zoning and Outline Development Plan (ODP) on July 21, 1999. The ODP included 212 residential units on approximately 30 acres, including an existing house along 24 ½ Road. The applicant is now requesting to remove the existing house from the Planned Development through a minor subdivision and to rezone the proposed .34 acre lot with the house to RSF-4.

The Planning Commission found that the requested rezone meets the criteria of section 4-4-4 of the Zoning and Development Code and recommended approval.

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

That the land described below is hereby rezoned to RSF-4.

A parcel of land situated in Lot 52 of Pomona Park, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the C-S 1/16 corner of Section 33, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian;

Thence along the East line of the SE1/4 SW1/4 of said Section 33, South 00°03'21" East, a distance of 457.25 feet;

Thence North 89°54'31" West, a distance of 30.00 feet to the Point of Beginning;

Thence North 89°54'31" West, a distance of 169.79 feet;

Thence South 00°05'29" West, a distance of 87.90 feet;

Thence South 89°54'31" East, a distance of 170.02 feet;

Thence North 00°03'21" West, a distance of 87.90 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 0.343 Acres, more or less.

INTRODUCED for FIRST READING and PUBLICATION this 16th day of August, 2000.

PASSED on SECOND READING this ____ day of _____, 2000.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

President of City Council

Attach 16

Attach 9

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan (PLN-2000-111)		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	August 9, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Joe Carter	Associate Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Resolution for accepting amendments to the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan.

Summary: Adoption of amendments to the 1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan. The maps and text amendments are as follows:

1. Updated future land use map.
 - a. Revisions to the future land use map to reflect current use and zoning in the Unawep Business Area and other inconsistencies between the recently adopted City Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map.
 - b. An addition of two land use classifications (RMF-12 and Commercial / Industrial to reestablish previous zoning that was not reflected in the 1995 plan.
 - c. Revisions of the future land use designations to match the City of Grand Junction Growth Plan and the Countywide Land Use Plan.
 - d. Revisions of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan future land use map to designate the "Area under Study" as Rural and to extend the Open Land Overlay District.
2. Replace the existing mineral resource map with a revised mineral resource map.
3. Add an addendum to the end of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan that shows the accomplishments of the plan.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve the resolution for the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan.

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 type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Indiv. Consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Workshop

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>	
Location:	Orchard Mesa from City of Grand Junction east to 33 Road and between the Colorado and Gunnison Rivers.
Applicants:	City of Grand Junction

Staff Analysis:

HISTORY OF THE ORCHARD MESA NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

In 1993 the Orchard Mesa Citizens Review Committee (CRC) was created to assist in the development and presentation of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan (OMNP). The Board of County Commissions selected the CRC to represent Orchard Mesa residents and businesses concerns throughout the initial stages of the plan’s development. The CRC met with various agencies, service providers and interest groups to obtain an understanding of the issues these entities held regarding Orchard Mesa. The outcome of the CRC work was a draft of the OMNP.

After review and adoption by a joint session of the City and County Planning Commissions in March of 1995, a resolution adopting the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan was passed and adopted by the City Council in April of 1995. On September 1, 1999 City Council Adopted a Resolution amending the City’s Growth Plan to include the 1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan’s Future Land Use Map as an overlay.

Rationale for updating the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan is articulated in the plan itself; it states that “ there may be occasion to review and revise all or any portion of the plan before 2005.” Similarly, the Mesa Countywide Land Use Plan and Grand Junction Growth Plan of 1996 contains similar language that directs staff to periodically review and update the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan. Amendments are also consistent with Section 2.5.C of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, adoption date April 2000.

In addition, in March 2000, the County Commissioners directed County Staff to seek public input on the 201 Study Area located south of B Road and east of 30 Road in the Valle Vista Area. During the past year while the City has held area meetings on the new City Zoning Map, City Council requested of City Staff to begin the amendment process of the Future Land Use Map. Staff’s responsibility was to correct inconsistencies with the new zoning map such as the Business area located at 27 Road and Unawep Avenue.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Staff requested comments from the public at two open houses held on May 24 and June 14. Staff also mailed two newsletters to every property owner in the planning area soliciting input and comments. The newsletters contained phone numbers and addresses to which property owners could respond. Staff received 16 written responses, two phone calls and one petition with 25 signatures (enclosed)

The petition and the public comment taken at the open houses heavily favored retaining a rural designation in the "Area under Study."

JOINT CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION / MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING

A joint City/County Public Hearing with the City of Grand Junction Planning Commissioners and Mesa County Planning Commissioners was held on July 13, 2000 to approve and recommend approval of the amendments of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan. See attached minutes from the joint Planning Commission hearing.

Both Planning Commissions unanimously recommended approval of the following amendments to the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The proposed map and text amendments include the following:

1. Updated Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan Future Land Use Map

- a. Revision to the future land use map to reflect current use and zoning in the Unawep business area and other inconsistencies between the recently adopted City Zoning Map and the Growth Plan. This would amend the future land use map to reassign single family/multi-family, 8 units per acre (original designation) to commercial designation (historical, existing, and zoned use) in the Unawep Business Area. Amend the future land use map to reflect RMF-12 zoning within the City limits. This also corrects other inconsistencies between actual zoning and the adopted Growth Plan. Examples include the 5th Street Hill area, shown as commercial instead of open space and Residential High Densities for the South Gate Commons Area, which was shown as a lower density in the 1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan.
- b. An addition of two land-use classifications (RMF-12 and Commercial/Industrial) to reestablish previous zoning that was not reflected in the 1995 plan. These two land use classifications allow the current zoning to be in compliance with the Growth Plan Future Land Use Map.
- c. Revisions of the future land use designations to match the City of Grand Junction Growth Plan and Countywide Land Use Plan. The attached land use category table designates the existing and proposed categories. These proposed revisions to the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood plan would match those designated in the City Growth Plan and the Countywide Land Use Plan. The amendment would only change the land use designations of the Orchard Mesa Land Use Map.

- d. Revision of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan Land Use Map. In the area designated as "Area under Study". The "Area under Study" is defined as that area south of B Road to Highway 50 from 30 Road to 32 Road with the exception of the Valle Vista Subdivision. The proposed changes include the existing future land use map designations from RSF-4 to Rural (5 to 35 acres) and extend the Open Land Overlay District to encompass all of the land in the "Area under Study". The Open Land Overlay District would provide a density bonus that allows 2.5 acre lots if 50% of the total land is left in deeded open space. By designating the "Area under Study" as Rural, there would be no urban services provided excluding the Valle Vista Subdivision that is currently sewerred.
2. **Replace the existing mineral resource map with a new mineral resource map for the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan area.** With input from gravel industry representatives and the *1978 Mineral Resource Survey of Mesa County*, staff used GIS modeling to create the proposed map. The proposed map identifies parcels that have the potential for gravel extraction. By applying constraints identified by the gravel industry and self prescribed constraints, such as property owned by the City of Grand Junction, School District 51, etc, in addition the gravel industry eliminated all parcels that were not considered suitable for gravel extraction. The intention is to use this map only as a guide for future gravel extraction. The gravel industry identified all parcels being used for gravel extraction and parcels that are currently owned for future extraction.
3. **Add an addendum to the 1995 plan that depicts accomplishments of the implementation items of the plan.** This addendum would be placed at the end of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan and serve as an accomplishment reference for the remaining 5 years of the plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

The planning staffs of Mesa County and City of Grand Junction have reviewed and recommended revision of the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood plan as part of a five-year update. The Grand Junction and Mesa County Planning Commissions recommended approval on July 13, 2000.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution
2. Updated Orchard Mesa Future Land Use Map
3. 1995 Orchard Mesa Future Land Use Map
4. Land Use Category Table
5. Unaweeep Business Area Map
6. Updated Orchard Mesa Mineral Resources Map
7. 1995 Orchard Mesa Mineral Resources Map
8. Addendum to the plan identifying the accomplishments of the plan to date.
9. Minutes from the July 13, 2000 Joint City/County Planning Commission Public Hearing.

10. Public Comments received during the public review period.

ATTACHMENT 1

RESOLUTION NO.

**ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO
THE ORCHARD MESA NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**

WHEREAS, The City of Grand Junction and Mesa County Planning Commissions and planning staffs have diligently worked jointly and cooperatively in a process updating the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan; AND

WHEREAS, City Staff has reviewed and recommends approval of the amendments to the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan; AND

WHEREAS, two public open houses were conducted to obtain public input on the amendments and received comment on the proposed amendments; AND

WHEREAS, two mailings to all residents within the planning area were sent to obtain public input and comment on the proposed amendments; AND

WHEREAS, the City and County Planning Commissions sitting in joint session:

1. heard public testimony on the amendments to the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan on 13 July 2000; AND

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction has authority to adopt master plans for the City of Grand Junction; AND

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary and important to plan for the future of the neighborhoods within the City limits and finds this Neighborhood Plan an important element of the City Comprehensive Plan.

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

That the updated amendments of the "Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan" adopted jointly by the Planning Commission and the Mesa County Planning Commission on 13 July 2000 is hereby adopted as part of the Neighborhood Plan Component of the Growth Plan of the City of Grand Junction.

Passed and adopted this 16th day of August, 2000

Mayor of the City of Grand Junction

ATTEST:

City Clerk

ATTACHMENT 2

**Updated Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan
Future Land Use Map**

See Color "Paper" Copy

ATTACHMENT 3

**1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan
Future Land Use Map**

See Color "Paper" Copy

ATTACHMENT 4

LAND USE CATEGORIES	
ORCHARD MESA PLAN DESIGNATION	PROPOSED CATEGORIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COMMERCIAL • LIGHT COMMERCIAL • HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL 	COMMERCIAL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFT 	RURAL (5 to 35 Acres)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFT OVERLAY 	ORCHARD MESA OPEN LAND OVERLAY DISTRICT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOBILE HOME PARK 	RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM DENSITY (4 to 7.9 Units per Acre)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (4 Units per Acre) 	RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM-LOW DENSITY (2 to 3.9 Units per Acre)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (5 Units per Acre) • SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (8 Units per Acre) 	RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM DENSITY (4 to 7.9 Units per Acre)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCHOOL • EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH FACILITY 	PUBLIC / INSTITUTIONAL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPEN SPACE 	CONSERVATION
NEW CATEGORIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADDITION 	COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADDITION 	RESIDENTIAL HIGH DENSITY (12 + Units per Acre)

ATTACHMENT 6

**Updated Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan
Mineral Resources Map**

See Color "Paper" Copy

ATTACHMENT 7

**1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan
Mineral Resources Map**

See Color "Paper" Copy

ATTACHMENT 9

**GRAND JUNCTION/MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS
JOINT MEETING -- ORCHARD MESA NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN
JULY 13, 2000 MINUTES
7:05 P.M. to 9:48 P.M.**

The specially scheduled joint meeting of the Grand Junction and Mesa County Planning Commissions convened at 7:05 P.M. on July 13, 2000 and was held at Two Rivers Convention Center.

Representing the Grand Junction Planning Commission were Joe Grout (Vice-Chairman), James Nall, Jerry Ainsworth, Dr. Paul Dibble and William Putnam (Alternate). John Elmer, Terri Binder, Nick Prinster and Vicki Boutilier (Alternate) were absent.

Representing the Mesa County Planning Commission were Charlie Nystrom (Chairman), Mary Fuller, Tom Foster, Gene Norris, Bob Gobbo, Bruce Kresin, Jean Moores and David Caldwell.

Representing the City’s Community Development Department were Joe Carter (Associate Planner) and Dave Thornton (Principal Planner). Representing the County’s Planning Department were Michael Warren (Long-Range Planner) and Keith Fife (Long-Range Planning Director).

The minutes were recorded by Bobbie Paulson and transcribed by Terri Troutner.

There were approximately 16 citizens present during the course of the meeting.

STAFF DISCUSSION

Joe Carter overviewed the Plan, noting its area boundary and briefly recalling its history. Copies of a matrix outlining completed implementation items identified in the 5-year update were distributed and reviewed. The matrix would be placed at the end of the existing Plan for public reference.

Michael Warren introduced a new Mineral Resource Map. Staff had met with members of the gravel industry and together had mapped existing pits, areas which had already received extraction permits, and targeted areas of future extraction where no permits had yet been secured. Schools, City property, parks and small parcels (10 acres or less) were deemed “absolute” barriers to mineral extraction. Other parcels were identified as having lesser constraints. This information was incorporated into Absolute Constraints and Relative Constraints Maps to derive a final Resource Map.

Chairman Nystrom wondered if several property owners, with parcels less than 10 acres in size, could join together and secure a mineral extraction permit. Mr. Warren said that this represented an acceptable scenario.

Dave Thornton proposed amending the land use designations identified in the Plan to match designations listed in both the City's Growth Plan and the Mesa Countywide Land Use Map. Areas designated Commercial, Light Commercial and Highway Commercial would be redesignated Commercial. AFT-zoned areas would become Rural. AFT overlay areas would be more appropriately named the Orchard Mesa Open Land Overlay District. Mobile home parks would be designated Residential Medium (4-7.9 du/ac). For example, a location at B Road and Highway 50 where mobile homes exist was noted. Single-Family Residential identified under the old Orchard Mesa (OM) Plan as 4 units/acre would be redesignated as Residential, Medium-Low (2-3.9 du/ac); Single-Family Residential identified as 5 units/acre and 8 units/acre would be redesignated Single-Family Residential (4-7.9 du/ac); school, educational, and research facilities would become Public/Institutional; open space would become Conservation; and other areas identified in the recently adopted Zoning Map would be designated Commercial/Industrial and Residential, High (12+ du/ac). An error in the original Plan had erroneously designated the existing business areas of Unaweep Avenue and 27 Road as Residential. These areas would be redesignated as Commercial in the new Plan. Parcels in the 5th Street Hill area would continue to reflect existing and current zones. Mr. Thornton noted the addition of the RMF-16 zone, located near the 27 Road/Highway 50 corridor, to the Future Land Use Map. He asked that changes be adopted in conjunction with adoption of the new Orchard Mesa Plan.

Chairman Nystrom asked if staff had reviewed each parcel along Highway 50 for discrepancies, to which Mr. Thornton replied affirmatively.

Mr. Warren requested adoption of the area under study, adoption of changes to the Future Land Use Map designations including Single-Family (4 du/ac) to Rural (5 to 35 acres), and adoption of changes to the proposed overlay district boundary, encompassing all of the area under study, with the exception of the Valle Vista Subdivision. He briefly synopsised tables for new housing from 1990-1999. He recommended changing the future land use for a designated area under study (location noted) to AFT (5 to 35 acres) and extend the overlay to the entire area, giving property owners the option of increasing the density up to 1 du/2.5 acres.

Mr. Thornton referenced copies of public comments received by staff via the two open houses held for public input.

Chairman Nystrom wondered how an area previously zoned AFT (5 to 35 acres) could be justifiably redesignated to a one du/2.5 acre zone district. Mr. Warren said that the base zoning would remain the same even though the area lay within an overlay district. The overlay provided property owners with the option of increased density.

Commissioner Foster referenced the study area and asked what the original recommendation for that area (location noted) had been. In the single-family area, if it were to go to a 5 to 35 acre density, was this in effect a downzoning? Mr. Warren referenced the Land Use Map and said that this represented a land use recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mark Bonella (1033 – 22 Road, Grand Junction) expressed concern over a short-term implementation plan notation which read, “Create a map with the assistance of local gravel industries which identifies areas of commercial...gravel deposits which should be preserved for gravel extraction...and prohibited from residential development until such time as the resources are removed and the land is appropriately reclaimed.” What about the property owner’s rights? If undeveloped property were owned west of 32 Road, no extraction would be possible because gravel extraction was encouraged only to the east of 32 Road, south of the Orchard Mesa Irrigation Canal and north of Highway 50. On the one hand, he said that the property owner is not allowed to develop his land; on the other, if his land does not fit into the parameters established east of 32 Road, “...you can’t take a mine and deed it.” In the long term, he expected that this would make mining harder for gravel companies in the future because restrictions on residential mining would encourage surrounding properties without gravel deposits to develop. People moving into those developments would generate complaints about future gravel operations, etc. He suggested taking out line 3 and replace it with verbiage to the effect that “if you’ve got a gravel deposit, we’re going to look at that no matter where it’s located, taking it case by case.”

Jim Rooks (155 – 31 Road, Grand Junction) said that he had a permitted gravel pit outside of the established area noted on the Mineral Resource Map. He noted several parcels outside of the study area which had not been included on maps presented by staff.

Brian Harris (3026 A ½ Road, Grand Junction), representing his parents, wondered how the proposed overlay would affect the established Persigo 201 overlay area. Mr. Thornton said that the only parcel within the study area currently in the Persigo overlay area was Valle Vista Subdivision and the sewer trunkline which extended to that subdivision from 31 Road. Other areas were under discussion, with no final decision as yet having been reached. Mr. Harris said that he understood from the joint City Council/Mesa County Commissioners public hearing that a final decision on the areas under discussion depended upon the outcome of the current OM Plan study area. City Council and Mesa County Commissioners had voted to take the area from 30 to 31 Roads north 400 feet out of the 201 area; everything south of that 400-foot line, including the areas denoted on the Map in red, were still within the 201 area.

Vice-Chairman Grout understood that no final decision had been made, that the question was still under study. Recommendations from this evening would reinforce the need to exclude parcels south of the 400-foot line from the 201 area. The final decision would rest with City Council and the Mesa County Commissioners.

Gretchen Sigufoos (131 – 31 Road, Grand Junction) supported staff's recommendations to redesignate the area where her property was located back to Rural.

Steve Cline (3158 XL Spur, Grand Junction) supported staff's recommendation to include his property in the AFT overlay.

STAFF DISCUSSION (continued)

Mr. Warren said that the Mineral Extraction Map was not regulatory; it was merely a tool to be referenced by the public and used for guiding future land use decisions. Wording from State statutes had been included but the State did not expressly prohibit development on lands that contained mineral resources.

Vice-Chairman Grout asked if the gravel pit referenced by Mr. Rooks was relevant to the Map. Mr. Warren said that Mr. Rooks' gravel pit had been included on the Map, (noted as hatched in yellow). If other pits had been overlooked, staff would make the necessary corrections.

Commissioner Gobbo asked if an onsite study had been undertaken for each parcel within the mineral resource study area. Mr. Warren responded negatively, adding that staff used the resources available to them produced by the experts in their field.

Chairman Nystrom shared concerns expressed by Mr. Bonella and cited instances where property owners had been denied development of their properties by the County because mineral extraction had not yet occurred on their properties. In those instances, the mineral resources were not at a mineable depth nor were they of the same quality as could be found in many of the other gravel pits. Although not regulatory, the Map had been used in those instances to affect the development rights of property owners. Mr. Warren said that a new criterion in the County's new Land Development Code required property owners to identify ownership of mineral resources on their properties.

JOINT DISCUSSION

Commissioner Dibble asked for clarification on how the AFT overlay would work, which was given.

Commissioner Foster observed that the overlay would be used to conform with City and County Master Plans.

Vice-Chairman Grout reiterated that while extending the overlay boundary would not interfere with the existing 201 overlay, tonight's recommendations would probably affect the final decision of City Council and Mesa County Commissioners on inclusion/exclusion of parcels within the 201.

Commissioner Moores wondered if the AFT overlay and the overlay allowing densities of one du/2.5 acres were two separate overlays or one and the same. Mr. Warren said

that only the extension of the existing AFT overlay boundary was being proposed; this overlay would allow increased densities of 1 du/2.5 acres.

Commissioner Kresin asked if there was any way to reinforce the position that the Mineral Resource Map was to be used as an administrative tool and not regulatory mandate.

Vice-Chairman Grout thought that at least a portion of the verbiage from item 3 was included in the City's newly adopted Development Code. If item 3 were deleted, would it create a conflict with the Code? Mr. Thornton said that any deletion would not be in conformance with the Zoning and Development Code. Item 3, he said, was strictly advisory.

Commissioner Caldwell said that item 1 stated that if a parcel was identified on the Map as having a gravel deposit, nothing else could be done with it. That seemed very restrictive and sounded more regulatory than advisory.

Chairman Nystrom suggested deleting all verbiage in item 1 following "...commercially viable and retrievable gravel deposits." This met with general approval from both boards.

Commissioner Kresin suggested revising item 3 to read, "Encourage the extraction of gravel deposits as shown on the Orchard Mesa Mineral Resources Map." This also met with general approval from both boards.

Commissioner Foster thought that a statement should be made and added to the end of the preamble reading, "The effect of the overlay, as amended to conform with the City and County Land Use Plans, is not mandatory but is merely advisory."

Vice-Chairman Grout supported the recommendations made by County Planning Commissioners, but said that the preamble would not be acceptable to City Council members. He suggested the County make the initial motion.

Commissioner Dibble felt it the City's and County's duty to inform the public of the guideline's consequences and its relationship to State statutes prior to their moving forward with development proposals.

Commissioner Foster asked for final clarification on the Residential, High (12+ du/ac) and Commercial/Industrial zone districts. Mr. Carter said that proposed changes would only update the OM Plan to conform with the Zoning Map.

MOTION: (Commissioner Foster) "On project C175-00, PLN-2000-111, Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan, 5-year Update Amendment, I would make a motion that we recommend this to the County Commissioners in this manner. This is a request to adopt amendments to the 1995 Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan, proposed map and text amendments, including the following: 1) revision of the

future land use designation to match the City Growth Plan and the Countywide Land Use Plan; 2) revision to the Future Land Use Map to reflect current use and zoning in the Unawep business area, and update the Future Land Use Plan; 3) a revised Mineral Resource Map as indicated, changing #1 in the Mineral Resources section, the short-term 1995-1997 and ongoing [to read] 'Create a map with the assistance of the local gravel industry which identifies areas of commercially viable and retrievable gravel deposits.' Number 2 is okay. Number 3 [change to read] 'Encourage gravel extraction as shown on the Orchard Mesa Mineral Resource Map.' Number 4 and number 5 fall into that also. Then, the next one, #4, revision of the Future Land Use Plan Map to signify as Rural and extend the open land overlay district to encompass all of the land in the area south of B Road on Highway 50 from 30 Road to 32 Road, with the exception of the Valle Vista Subdivision. Number 5, an addendum to the 1995 Plan that depicts accomplishments of implementation items of the plan. Since the last one is in the City totally, I'll leave that portion out. If I may add a post-amble to it in this case, 'This document is recognized to be an advisory document, simply to guide the development and the decision-making process through the future as this land develops and before we make that major change to the Land Use Plan.'"

Commissioner Caldwell seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Ainsworth) "To accept the County's motion as adopted with the addition of #6, an addendum to the 1995 Plan that depicts the accomplishments of implementation items of the Plan, and #7, an addition of two land use classifications, RMF-12 and Commercial/Industrial to reestablish previous zoning that was not reflected in the 1995 Plan, and to delete the post-amble recommended by the County in its motion."

Commissioner Nall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	G Road North Enclave Annexation		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	August 7, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Second reading of the Ordinance to Annex the G Road North Enclave Annexation. The proposed annexation area is generally located between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road north of G Road and south of H Road, but including one property north of H Road. File ANX-2000-114

Summary: The 274 acre G Road North Enclave Annexation area consists of 73 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 second reading the annexation ordinance for the G Road North Enclave Annexation.

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
-----------------------------	--	----------------	----------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION					
Location:		Located generally between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road and north of G Road and south of H Road, but including one property north of H 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	Residential and Agricultural			
	East	Residential			
	West	Residential and Agricultural			
Existing County Zoning:		RSF-R, RSF-2, PUD at approx. 2 units/acre (County)			
Proposed City Zoning:		RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD			
Surrounding Zoning:	North	RSF-1			
	South	RSF-1			
	East	RSF-1 and RSF-4			
	West	RSF-1			
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			
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes	X	No

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing 274 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 North Enclave has been enclaved since May 7, 1995

The G Road North Enclave is one of two annexations located north of G Road being considered at the same time for annexation.

Members of City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners met with affected property owners and residents on May 25th. Letters have been sent to affected property owners and residents throughout the process.

G ROAD NORTH ENCLAVE ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:	ANX-2000-114	
Location:	Located generally between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road and north of G Road and south of H Road, but including one property north of H Road.	
Tax ID Number:	See address list	
Parcels:	73	
Estimated Population:	108	
# of Parcels (owner occupied):	38	
# of Dwelling Units:	47	
Acres land annexed:	274 acres for annexation area	
Developable Acres Remaining:	Approx. 175 acres	
Right-of-way in Annexation:	See Map	
Previous County Zoning:	RSF-R, RSF-2, PUD at approx. 1 unit per 2 acres (County)	
Proposed City Zoning:	(RSF-R) Residential Single Family Rural not to exceed 1 unit per 5 acres (RSF-2) Residential Single Family not to exceed 2 unit per acre (PD) Residential Single Family at approx. 1 unit per 2 acres	
Current Land Use:	Residential and Agricultural	
Future Land Use:	Same	
Values:	Assessed:	= \$ 1,031,927
	Actual:	= \$ 9,708,200
Census Tract:	10 and 16	
Address Ranges:	See Map	
Special Districts:	Water:	Ute Water
	Sewer:	
	Fire:	Grand Junction Rural Fire
	Drainage:	Grand Junction Drainage District
	School:	District 51
	Pest:	

ANNEXATION SCHEDULE	
July 5th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
July 11th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
August 2nd	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
August 16th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
Sept. 17th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve the G Road North Annexation.

Attachments:

- Annexation Ordinance
- G Road North Enclave Annexation Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

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

G ROAD NORTH ENCLAVE ANNEXATION

**LOCATED GENERALLY BETWEEN 25 ½ ROAD AND 26 ½ ROAD AND NORTH OF
G ROAD AND SOUTH OF H ROAD, BUT INCLUDING ONE PROPERTY NORTH OF
H ROAD**

**AND INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ALL OR A PORTION OF THE FOLLOWING
RIGHTS-OF-WAYS: 25 ½ ROAD, 26 ROAD, G ROAD, 26 ½ ROAD, G ½ ROAD,
ELVIRA DRIVE, PARTRIDGE COURT, KELLY DRIVE, CLARKDELL COURT,
COTTONWOOD DRIVE, LUJAN CIRCLE, AND INTERSTATE-70**

CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 274 ACRES

WHEREAS, on the 5th day of July, 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 North Enclave, and more particularly described as follows:

A parcel of land situate in Sections 26, 34 & 35, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the SW 1/16 corner of said Section 35, Township 1 North, Range 1 West; thence S 00°00'00" E along the west line of the SE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 496.50 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 509.74 feet to a point; thence S 18°42'28" W a distance of 466.13 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 55.85 feet to a point; thence S 00°00'00" E a distance of 350.65 feet to a point on the north right of way line for G Road; thence N 89°52'19" W along the north right of way line for said G Road a distance of 2936.60 feet to a point; thence N 35°19'00" E a distance of 284.26 feet to a point; thence N 01°51'00" E a distance of 119.87 feet to a point; thence S 90°00'00" W a distance of 526.90 feet to a point on the east right of way line for 25 1/2 Road; thence N 00°00'00" E along the east right of way line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 299.25 feet to a point; thence N 74°10'00" E a distance of 36.41 feet to a point; thence N 88°01'10" E a distance of 596.93 feet to a point on the east bank of a Drain Ditch; thence along the east bank of said Drain Ditch the following 4 courses:

- 1) N 23°01'00" E a distance of 88.18 feet to a point;
- 2) N 73°38'00" E a distance of 174.67 feet to a point;

3) N 47°25'00" E a distance of 271.65 feet to a point;
4) N 37°29'00" E a distance of 370.07 feet to a point;
thence S 89°56'30" E a distance of 23.45 feet to the SE 1/16 corner of Section 34,
Township 1 North, Range 1 West; thence N 00°13'29" E along the east line of the NW
1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 34 a distance of 1320.25 feet to the CE 1/16 corner of said
Section 34; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 25.52 feet to a point on the centerline for
the Grand Valley Canal; thence along the centerline for said Grand Valley Canal the
following 6 courses:

- 1) N 29°34'51" E a distance of 30.01 feet to a point;
- 2) N 45°25'42" E a distance of 125.11 feet to a point;
- 3) N 61°21'09" E a distance of 89.95 feet to a point;
- 4) N 79°34'22" E a distance of 41.76 feet to a point;
- 5) N 88°41'25" E a distance of 35.29 feet to a point;
- 6) S 64°03'24" E a distance of 59.02 feet to a point on the centerline for Leach Creek;
thence N 55°42'53" E along the centerline for said Leach Creek a distance of 60.40 feet
to a point on the north right of way line for G 1/2 Road; thence along the north right of
way line for said G 1/2 Road the following 6 courses:

- 1) S 46°51'15" E a distance of 271.87 feet to a point;
- 2) S 38°24'46" E a distance of 235.17 feet to a point;
- 3) S 51°46'49" E a distance of 111.57 feet to a point;
- 4) S 86°06'20" E a distance of 122.96 feet to a point;
- 5) N 74°01'57" E a distance of 257.85 feet to a point;
- 6) N 63°49'52" E a distance of 67.07 feet to a point on the southerly right of way line for
I-70; thence N

05°22'00" W along said southerly right of way line a distance of 409.20 feet to a point;
thence crossing said I-70 N 04°09'39" E a distance of 435.39 to a point on the northerly
right of way line for said I-70; thence along the northerly right of way line for said I-70
the following 2 courses:

- 1) N 10°44'00" E a distance of 242.30 feet to a point;
- 2) S 89°33'00" E a distance of 80.00 feet to a point;

thence N 47°29'58" E a distance of 603.31 feet to a point on the north line of the SW 1/4
NW 1/4 of Section 35, Township 1 North, Range 1 West; thence S 88°14'45" E along
the north line of said SW 1/4 NW 1/4 a distance of 34.48 feet to a point; thence N
00°00'00" E a distance of 36.54 feet to the southeast corner of Lot 2 of Replat of Sunny
Knoll Subdivision; thence N 46°53'23" W along the northeasterly boundary line of said
Lot 2 a distance of 330.62 feet to the northeast corner of said Lot 2; thence N 19°41'44"
W a distance of 53.85 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line for Kelly Drive;
thence along the northerly right of way line for said Kelly Drive the following 2 courses:

- 1) N 53°53'00" E a distance of 119.00 feet to a point;
- 2) N 59°41'00" E a distance of 114.39 feet to a point;

thence N 14°31'00" W a distance of 355.84 feet to a point on the centerline for Rice
Wash; thence along the centerline for said Rice Wash the following 6 courses:

- 1) N 52°09'00" E a distance of 43.31 feet to a point;
- 2) N 26°41'14" W a distance of 258.09 feet to a point;
- 3) N 24°22'00" E a distance of 261.30 feet to a point;
- 4) N 00°39'35" E a distance of 59.69 feet to a point;

5) N 40°07'00" E a distance of 498.81 feet to a point;
6) N 36°06'10" E a distance of 152.56 feet to a point;
thence S 01°43'40" W a distance of 528.21 feet to a point on the north line of said Section 35; thence S 89°55'00" E along the north line of said Section 35 a distance of 112.92 feet to a point; thence S 00°05'00" W a distance of 501.66 feet to a point; thence N 66°08'00" E a distance of 90.30 feet to a point; thence N 88°15'00" E a distance of 122.90 feet to a point; thence S 59°49'00" E a distance of 106.20 feet to a point; thence N 88°42'00" E a distance of 88.70 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 4 of Replat of Lot 2, Saccomanno Minor Subdivision; thence S 00°00'28" W along the west boundary line of said Lot 4 a distance of 817.31 feet to the southwest corner of said Lot 4; thence S 89°49'51" E along the south line of the NE 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 1315.95 feet to the northwest corner of the N 1/2 SW 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 35; thence S 89°52'42" E along the north line of the N 1/2 SW 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 30.00 feet to a point; thence S 00°07'46" E a distance of 714.63 feet to a point on the southeasterly right of way line for I-70; thence along the southeasterly right of way line for said I-70 the following 3 courses:
1) S 69°23'47" W a distance of 90.65 feet to a point;
2) S 69°32'00" W a distance of 125.00 feet to a point;
3) S 70°32'30" W a distance of 174.24 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 9 of North Rolling Acres Subdivision;

thence S 34°18'29" E along the westerly boundary line of said Lot 9 a distance of 167.57 feet to the southwest corner of said Lot 9; thence S 40°58'30" E a distance of 56.00 feet to a point on the southerly right of way line for Cottonwood Drive; thence along the southerly right of way line for said Cottonwood Drive the following 3 courses:

1) N 49°01'30" E a distance of 128.32 feet to a point;
2) 81.08 feet along the arc of a curve concave to the southeast, having a radius of 131.35 feet, a delta angle of 35°22'05" and a long chord bearing N 66°30'56" E a distance of 79.80 feet to a point;
3) N 76°56'00" E a distance of 33.88 feet to a point on the north-south centerline for said Section 35;

thence S 00°00'00" E along said north-south centerline a distance of 397.60 feet to the C 1/4 corner of said Section 35; thence N 90°00'00" W along the north line of the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 428.70 feet to a point; thence S 05°49'21" W a distance of 165.56 feet to the centerline of a Drain Ditch; thence along the centerline of said Drain Ditch the following 4 courses:

1) S 76°03'00" W a distance of 135.20 feet to a point;
2) S 73°07'00" W a distance of 170.00 feet to a point;
3) S 61°03'00" W a distance of 445.00 feet to a point;
4) S 80°35'00" W a distance of 193.33 feet to a point;

thence S 00°02'01" E along the west line of the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 826.04 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 G Road North Enclave, is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 2nd day August, 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:	G Road North Enclave Annexation Zoning		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	August 7, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Second reading of the Ordinance for the zone of annexation to Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one unit per five acres (RSF-R), Single Family Residential with a maximum density of two units per acre (RSF-2), and Planned Development with an approximate residential density of one unit per two acres (PD) for the G Road North Enclave Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located generally between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road and north of G Road and south of H Road, but including one property north of H Road. File #ANX-2000-114

Summary: The 274 acre G Road North Enclave Annexation area consists of 73 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. Area property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for enclaves.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on second reading the Zone of Annexation Ordinance for the G Road North Enclave Annexation.

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
-----------------------------	--	----------------	----------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION					
Location:		Located generally between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road and north of G Road and south of H Road, but including one property north of H 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	Residential and Agricultural			
	East	Residential			
	West	Residential and Agricultural			
Existing County Zoning:		RSF-R, RSF-2, PUD at approx. 2 units/acre (County)			
Proposed City Zoning:		RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD			
Surrounding Zoning:	North	RSF-1			
	South	RSF-1			
	East	RSF-1 and RSF-4			
	West	RSF-1			
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			
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes	X	No

Staff Analysis:

ZONE OF ANNEXATION:

At a neighborhood meeting with City Council members, County Commissioners and area property owners in attendance, it was proposed by the City of Grand Junction 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-2 and PD is identical to or nearly identical to corresponding Mesa County zoning for all properties in this enclave. Please note that the proposed RSF-R and some of the proposed RSF-2 zone districts do not conform to 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.
- 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 and Residential Low Density with lots sizes between ½ acre and 2 acres.
- Rezone requests for future developments to higher densities within the Future Land Use map's recommended densities may occur for some or all of these properties that are proposed for RSF-R.

RSF-2 ZONE DISTRICT

- All properties currently zoned R2B (recently changed to RSF-2 with the County's new zoning code) as well as the 9 lot Starlight Estates Planned Development (platted but not built) is proposed as RSF-2 in the City. Starlight Estates is located on the SW corner of G ½ Road and 26 Road. This subdivision plat was recorded in 1984, but improvements were never constructed. The platted lots are conforming to the RSF-2 zone district.
- The RSF-2 zone district conforms to the Growth Plan's Future Land Use Map's recommended densities of 2 to 4 units per acre in the Cottonwood Drive area and recommended densities of .5 to 2 units per acre on the NW and NE corners of 26 Road and G Road; but does not conform to the recommended densities of 4 to 8 units per acre for the remaining area.
- Rezone requests for future developments to higher densities within the Future Land Use map's recommended densities may occur for some or all of these nonconforming areas that are noted above.

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD) ZONE DISTRICT

- The Partridge Farms Subdivision properties currently zoned PUD in the County is proposed as PD in the City.
- All requirements of Mesa County approval for the Partridge Farms Development Plat and Plan and development file will remain and become a part of this proposed PD zone district. (County file # C119-97)
- The approved densities for (Partridge Farms) PD zone district conforms to the Growth Plan's Future Land Use Map of .5 to 2 acre lot sizes. Each of the 10 residential units in Partridge Farms Subdivision has an average of 1.96 acres.

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.

ANNEXATION SCHEDULE	
July 5th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
July 11th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
August 2nd	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
August 16th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
Sept 17th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: Planning Commission recommended approval at their meeting July 11, 2000 of zones of RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD for the G Road North Enclave Annexation. It is recommended that City Council approve the zones of RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD 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 and conforms to the adopted Growth Plan future land use map.
- These zone districts meet the criteria found in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Attachments:

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

Grdnrth1Grdnrth2

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE No. _____

**Zoning the G Road North Enclave Annexation to:
Residential Single Family Rural (RSF-R);
Residential Single Family with a maximum of two units per acre (RSF-2) and
Planned Development (PD) with an approximate residential density of one unit per
two acres.**

**Located generally between 25 ½ Road and 26 ½ Road and north of G Road and
south of H Road, but including one property north of H 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 the RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD zone districts to
this annexation.**

After public notice and public hearing before the Grand Junction City Council, City
Council finds that RSF-R, RSF-2 and PD 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 and conforms to the adopted Growth Plan
Future Land Use Map.
- 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 zone Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum
density of one unit per five acres (RSF-R)

2701-344-00-190

**BEG 363FT E OF S4 COR SEC 34 1N 1W N 35DEG19' E 320FT N 1DEG51' E
119.87FT N14DEG48' E 152.52FT N 23DEG01' E 288.4FT N 73DEG38' E 174.67FT N
47DEG25' E 271.65FT N 37DEG29' E 370.07FT E 21FT S 128FT E 782.1FT SWLY
ALG LI TO S SDSEC 34 W TO BEG EXC S 30FT FR RD - 23.77AC**

2701-344-00-138

**BEG 380.90FT N FR S4 COR SEC 34 1N 1W N 290.43FTN 74DEG10' E 75FT N
88DEG01'10SEC E**

596.93FT S 23DEG01' W 200.22FT S 14DEG40' W 152.2FT W 551.9FT TO BEGEXC
W 25FT FOR RD

2701-352-00-010

BEG 25FT N + 337FT W OF SE COR N2SE4NW4 SEC 35 1N 1WW 205FT N
20DEG05MIN E 226.7FT N 25DEG E 105.7FT E82.8FT S 308.4FT TO BEG

2701-352-00-012

THAT PT N2SE4NW4 SEC 35 1N 1W W OF CO RD EXC FR N4 CORSEC 35 S
31DEG54.7MIN W 1905.9FT + S 20FT FOR BEG S331.3FT N 89DEG56MIN W 310FT
N 331.3FT S 89DEG56MIN E310FT TO BEG

2701-352-00-015

BEG 440FT W OF NE COR S2SE4NW4 SEC 35 1N 1W W 879FT S TO N LI I-70
NELY ALONGHWY TO A PT 20.4FT S OF BEG N TO BEG EXC ROW B-884 P-419
MESA CO RECORDS

2701-352-00-046

FR N4 COR SEC 35 1N 1W S 31DEG54.7' W 1905.9FT + S20FT FOR BEG S 331.3FT
N 89DEG56MIN W 310FT N 331.3FTS 89DEG56MIN E 310FT TO BEG

2701-352-00-064

BEG 420FT W NE COR N2SE4NW4 SEC 35 1N 1W W 588.8FT S 0DEG21' W
646.9FT S89DEG37' E 469.24FT N 25FT N 20DEG 05' E 226.7FT N 25DEG E
105.7FT N 0DEG11' E318.35FT TO BEG EXC RD IN B-884 P-418 CO CLERKS OFF
& INC THAT PT OF RD VACATED PER B-2084 P-345/346

2701-352-00-066

BEG NE COR N2SE4NW4 SEC 35 1N 1W W 420FT S 0DEG11' W318.35FT E 82.8FT
N 83DEG35' E 49.64FT N 53DEG24' E322.6FT E 30FT N TO BEG EXC E 30FT FOR
ROAD

2701-352-00-106

BEG 345.7FT N OF SE COR N2SE4NW4 SEC 35 1N 1W S 60DEG17' W 246.9FT W
67.1FT N131.1FT N 53DEG24' E 322.6FT E 30FT S 193.7FT TO BEG EXC I-70 ROW
ON E & INCBEG W 420FT & S 0DEG11' W 318.35FT & E 82.8FT FR NE COR

**N2SE4NW4 SD SEC 35 N83DEG35' E 49.64FT S 131.1FT E 67.1FT TO I-70 SWLY
ALG I-70 TO A PT 308.4FT SOF BEG N 308.4FT TO BEG**

2701-263-00-012

**BEG S 89DEG55' E 412FT + N 0DEG05' E 30FT FR SW CORSEC 26 1N 1W N
40DEG07' E 650.4FT ALG C LI RICE WASH S1DEG43'40SEC W 498.21FT N
89DEG55' W 404.06FT TO BEG**

2701-352-01-006

**LOTS 3 & 4 REPLAT OF SUNNY KNOLL SUB SEC 35 1N 1W & BEG SE COR SD
LOT 3 S28DEG23'06SEC E , 135.54FT N 89DEG43' W 170.10FT N 36.54FT TO SW
COR SD LOT 3 N52DEG16' E 133.6FT TO BEG - 2.74AC**

2701-352-00-029

**BEG 30FT S + S 89DEG55MIN E 412FT OF NW COR SEC 351N 1W RECD BK 893
PG 50 MESA CO CLK**

2701-352-00-071

**BEG S 89DEG55' E 682.98FT + S 0DEG05' W 30FT FR NW CORSEC 35 1N 1W S
89DEG55' E 246.0FT S 0DEG05' W 471.66FTS 66DEG08' W 61.50FT S 42DEG21' W
218.39FT N 10DEG W355.74FT N 8DEG51' E 127.12FT N 0DEG05' E 182.66FT
TOBEG EXC BK-1026 PG-250 CO CLERKS OFF**

2701-352-00-101

**BEG S 62DEG54' E 744.9FT FR NW COR SEC 35 1N 1W W 324.95FT S 25DEG55' E
176.5FT S**

**52DEG09' W 43.31FTS 14DEG31' E 355.84FT N 59DEG41' E 114.42FT TO A PT
ONCUL-DE-SAC RAD 50FT CH BEARS N 40DEG58'30SEC E 65.57FTN
48DEG03'18SEC E 131.08FT N 7DEG53'45SEC W 338.13FTTO BEG & BEG S
38DEG46'40SEC E 977.29FT FR NW COR SDSEC 35 N 48DEG00'24SEC E
349.73FT S 35DEG11'02SEC W224.29FT S 48DEG35'17SEC W 109.48FT ALG ARC
OF CVE TOSW RAD 50FT CH BEARS N 65DEG53'19SEC W 53.23FT TO BEG**

2701-352-00-102

**BEG SE COR NW4NW4 SEC 35 1N 1W N 89DEG43' W 412FT N 31DEG15'01SEC E
313.61FT N 0DEG10' E 531.94FT S 88DEG15'W 41.98FT S 66DEG08' W 133.94FT S
47DEG45'14SEC W 322.01FT TO CVE TO LEFT RAD PT BEARS S 57DEG42'36SEC
W 50FT N 47DEG45'14SEC E 351.24FT N 66DEG08' E 151.80FT N88DEG15' E**

122.9FT S 59DEG49' E 106.2FT N 89DEG42' E 88.7FT S 0DEG10' W 801.3FT TO
BEG & BEG N 89DEG45'07SEC W 412FT & N 31DEG13'35SEC E 215.21FT FR SD
SE CORN 5DEG34'39SEC E 539.59FT S 0DEG10' W 452.70FT S 31DEG13'35SEC W
98.62FT TO BEG & ALSO BEG S 40DEG05'48SEC E 1029.24FT FR NW COR SEC 35
N 47DEG45'14SEC E 320.32FTS 34DEG10'58SEC W 216.34FT S 52DEG18'24SEC
W 157.03FTALG CVE RAD 50FT CH BEARS N 8DEG17'14SEC E 60.25FT TOBEG
EXC SWLY COR OF PARCEL DESC B-1216 P-59/62 & ALSO EXC BEG S
38DEG46'40SEC E 977.29FT FR SD NW COR SEC 35N 48DEG00'24SEC E
349.73FT AS DESC B-1693 P-147

2701-352-00-103

BEG N 89DEG43' W 412FT FR SE COR NW4NW4 SEC 35 1N 1W N 89DEG43' W
365.38FT N36.64FT N 52DEG16' E 133.60FT N 44DEG107 E 208.1FT N 45DEG23' W
268.5FT ALGCVE TO LEFT RAD N 30DEG E 50FT ARC LG 132.9FT N
47DEG45'14SEC E 322.01FT N66DEG08' E 133.94FT N 88DEG15' E 41.98FT S
0DEG10' W 531.94FT S 31DEG15'01SECW 313.61FT TO BEG & BEG N
89DEG45'07SEC W 412FT & N 31DEG13'35SEC E 29.23FT FRSD SE COR N
31DEG13'35SEC E 185.98FT AS DESC B-1216 P-62 EXC BEG N89DEG45'07SEC W
412FT & N 31DEG 13'35SEC E 215.21FT FR SD SE COR N5DEG34'39SEC E 539
.59FT AS DESC B-1216 P-59 & ALSO EXC PT DEEDED TO LOT 3SUNNYKNOLL
SUB REPLAT DESC IN B-1510 P-72 & ALSO EXC BEG S 40DEG05'48SEC
E 1029.24FT FR NW COR SD SEC 35 N 47DEG45'14SEC E 320.32FT S
34DEG10'58SEC W216.34FT S 52DEG18'24SEC W 157.03FT ALG CV RAD 50FT CH
BEARS N 8DEG17'14SEC E60.25FT TO BEG

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

A parcel of land situate in Sections 26, 34 & 35, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the SW 1/16 corner of said Section 35, Township 1 North, Range 1 West; thence S 00°00'00" E along the west line of the SE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 496.50 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 509.74 feet to a point; thence S 18°42'28" W a distance of 466.13 feet to a point; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 55.85 feet to a point; thence S 00°00'00" E a distance of 350.65 feet to a point on the north right of way line for G Road; thence N 89°52'19" W along the north right of way line for said G Road a distance of 2936.60 feet to a point; thence N 35°19'00" E a distance of 284.26 feet to a point; thence N 01°51'00" E a distance of 119.87 feet to a point; thence S 90°00'00" W a distance of 526.90 feet to a point on the east right of way line for 25 1/2 Road; thence N 00°00'00" E along the east right of way

line for said 25 1/2 Road a distance of 299.25 feet to a point; thence N 74°10'00" E a distance of 36.41 feet to a point; thence N 88°01'10" E a distance of 596.93 feet to a point on the east bank of a Drain Ditch; thence along the east bank of said Drain Ditch the following 4 courses:

- 5) N 23°01'00" E a distance of 88.18 feet to a point;
- 6) N 73°38'00" E a distance of 174.67 feet to a point;
- 7) N 47°25'00" E a distance of 271.65 feet to a point;
- 8) N 37°29'00" E a distance of 370.07 feet to a point;

thence S 89°56'30" E a distance of 23.45 feet to the SE 1/16 corner of Section 34, Township 1 North, Range 1 West; thence N 00°13'29" E along the east line of the NW 1/4 SE 1/4 of said Section 34 a distance of 1320.25 feet to the CE 1/16 corner of said Section 34; thence N 90°00'00" E a distance of 25.52 feet to a point on the centerline for the Grand Valley Canal; thence along the centerline for said Grand Valley Canal the following 6 courses:

- 7) N 29°34'51" E a distance of 30.01 feet to a point;
- 8) N 45°25'42" E a distance of 125.11 feet to a point;
- 9) N 61°21'09" E a distance of 89.95 feet to a point;
- 10) N 79°34'22" E a distance of 41.76 feet to a point;
- 11) N 88°41'25" E a distance of 35.29 feet to a point;
- 12) S 64°03'24" E a distance of 59.02 feet to a point on the centerline for Leach Creek;

thence N 55°42'53" E along the centerline for said Leach Creek a distance of 60.40 feet to a point on the north right of way line for G 1/2 Road; thence along the north right of way line for said G 1/2 Road the following 6 courses:

- 7) S 46°51'15" E a distance of 271.87 feet to a point;
- 8) S 38°24'46" E a distance of 235.17 feet to a point;
- 9) S 51°46'49" E a distance of 111.57 feet to a point;
- 10) S 86°06'20" E a distance of 122.96 feet to a point;
- 11) N 74°01'57" E a distance of 257.85 feet to a point;
- 12) N 63°49'52" E a distance of 67.07 feet to a point on the southerly right of way line for

I-70; thence N

05°22'00" W along said southerly right of way line a distance of 409.20 feet to a point; thence crossing said I-70 N 04°09'39" E a distance of 435.39 to a point on the northerly right of way line for said I-70; thence along the northerly right of way line for said I-70 the following 2 courses:

- 3) N 10°44'00" E a distance of 242.30 feet to a point;
- 4) S 89°33'00" E a distance of 80.00 feet to a point;

thence N 47°29'58" E a distance of 603.31 feet to a point on the north line of the SW 1/4 NW 1/4 of Section 35, Township 1 North, Range 1 West; thence S 88°14'45" E along the north line of said SW 1/4 NW 1/4 a distance of 34.48 feet to a point; thence N 00°00'00" E a distance of 36.54 feet to the southeast corner of Lot 2 of Replat of Sunny Knoll Subdivision; thence N 46°53'23" W along the northeasterly boundary line of said Lot 2 a distance of 330.62 feet to the northeast corner of said Lot 2; thence N 19°41'44" W a distance of 53.85 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line for Kelly Drive; thence along the northerly right of way line for said Kelly Drive the following 2 courses:

- 3) N 53°53'00" E a distance of 119.00 feet to a point;
- 4) N 59°41'00" E a distance of 114.39 feet to a point;

thence N 14°31'00" W a distance of 355.84 feet to a point on the centerline for Rice Wash; thence along the centerline for said Rice Wash the following 6 courses:

- 7) N 52°09'00" E a distance of 43.31 feet to a point;
- 8) N 26°41'14" W a distance of 258.09 feet to a point;
- 9) N 24°22'00" E a distance of 261.30 feet to a point;
- 10) N 00°39'35" E a distance of 59.69 feet to a point;
- 11) N 40°07'00" E a distance of 498.81 feet to a point;
- 12) N 36°06'10" E a distance of 152.56 feet to a point;

thence S 01°43'40" W a distance of 528.21 feet to a point on the north line of said Section 35; thence S 89°55'00" E along the north line of said Section 35 a distance of 112.92 feet to a point; thence S 00°05'00" W a distance of 501.66 feet to a point; thence N 66°08'00" E a distance of 90.30 feet to a point; thence N 88°15'00" E a distance of 122.90 feet to a point; thence S 59°49'00" E a distance of 106.20 feet to a point; thence N 88°42'00" E a distance of 88.70 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 4 of Replat of Lot 2, Saccomanno Minor Subdivision; thence S 00°00'28" W along the west boundary line of said Lot 4 a distance of 817.31 feet to the southwest corner of said Lot 4; thence S 89°49'51" E along the south line of the NE 1/4 NW 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 1315.95 feet to the northwest corner of the N 1/2 SW 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 35; thence S 89°52'42" E along the north line of the N 1/2 SW 1/4 NE 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 30.00 feet to a point; thence S 00°07'46" E a distance of 714.63 feet to a point on the southeasterly right of way line for I-70; thence along the southeasterly right of way line for said I-70 the following 3 courses:

- 4) S 69°23'47" W a distance of 90.65 feet to a point;
- 5) S 69°32'00" W a distance of 125.00 feet to a point;
- 6) S 70°32'30" W a distance of 174.24 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 9 of North Rolling Acres Subdivision;

thence S 34°18'29" E along the westerly boundary line of said Lot 9 a distance of 167.57 feet to the southwest corner of said Lot 9; thence S 40°58'30" E a distance of 56.00 feet to a point on the southerly right of way line for Cottonwood Drive; thence along the southerly right of way line for said Cottonwood Drive the following 3 courses:

- 4) N 49°01'30" E a distance of 128.32 feet to a point;
- 5) 81.08 feet along the arc of a curve concave to the southeast, having a radius of 131.35 feet, a delta angle of 35°22'05" and a long chord bearing N 66°30'56" E a distance of 79.80 feet to a point;
- 6) N 76°56'00" E a distance of 33.88 feet to a point on the north-south centerline for said Section 35;

thence S 00°00'00" E along said north-south centerline a distance of 397.60 feet to the C 1/4 corner of said Section 35; thence N 90°00'00" W along the north line of the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 428.70 feet to a point; thence S 05°49'21" W a distance of 165.56 feet to the centerline of a Drain Ditch; thence along the centerline of said Drain Ditch the following 4 courses:

- 5) S 76°03'00" W a distance of 135.20 feet to a point;
- 6) S 73°07'00" W a distance of 170.00 feet to a point;
- 7) S 61°03'00" W a distance of 445.00 feet to a point;
- 8) S 80°35'00" W a distance of 193.33 feet to a point;

thence S 00°02'01" E along the west line of the NE 1/4 SW 1/4 of said Section 35 a distance of 826.04 feet to the point of beginning.

Except that area lying north of Interstate 70; and Excepting out the following parcels located within the G Road North Enclave Annexation Area:

2701-344-00-190

BEG 363FT E OF S4 COR SEC 34 1N 1W N 35DEG19' E 320FT N 1DEG51' E 119.87FT N14DEG48' E 152.52FT N 23DEG01' E 288.4FT N 73DEG38' E 174.67FT N 47DEG25' E 271.65FT N 37DEG29' E 370.07FT E 21FT S 128FT E 782.1FT SWLY ALG LI TO S SDSEC 34 W TO BEG EXC S 30FT FR RD - 23.77AC

2701-344-00-138

BEG 380.90FT N FR S4 COR SEC 34 1N 1W N 290.43FTN 74DEG10' E 75FT N 88DEG01'10SEC E 596.93FT S 23DEG01' W 200.22FT S 14DEG40' W 152.2FT W 551.9FT TO BEGEXC W 25FT FOR RD

The following properties shall be zone Planned Development with all conditions of approval by Mesa County as per Mesa County file C-119-97 (Partridge Farms Subdivision)

2701-352-61-001 though 2701-352-61-010

Lots 1 through 10, and Tracts A, B, C, D of Partridge Farms Subdivision, Section 35, Township 1 North, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado.

Introduced on first reading this 2nd day of August, 2000.

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

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<i>CITY COUNCIL</i>			
Subject:	Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	August 7, 2000		
Author:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
Presenter Name:	David Thornton	Principal Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Second reading of the Ordinance to Annex the Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at 714 and 720 24 ½ Road. File ANX-2000-115

Summary: The 9.60 acre Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation area consists of 2 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 second reading the annexation ordinance for the Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation.

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
-----------------------------	--	----------------	----------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
Location:		714 and 720 24 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 Church	
	South	Residential and Agricultural	
	East	Residential	
	West	Residential, Agricultural and Park	
Existing County Zoning:		RSF-R	
Proposed City Zoning:		RSF-R	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	RMF-8	
	South	RMF-5	
	East	RMF-5	
	West	PD, RSF-4, and CSR	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium density: 4 to 8 units/acre	
Zoning within density range?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X <input type="checkbox"/> No

Staff Analysis:

ANNEXATION:

This annexation area consists of annexing 9.6 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 Chamblee/Boydston Enclave has been enclaved since May 7, 1995

The Chamblee/Boydston Enclave is one of two annexations located north of G Road being considered at the same time for annexation.

Members of City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners met with affected property owners and residents on May 25th. Letters have been sent to affected property owners and residents throughout the process.

CHAMBLEE/BOYDSTUN ENCLAVE ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:		ANX-2000-115
Location:		714 and 720 24 ½ Road
Tax ID Number:		2701-334-00-123 and 2701-334-00-048
Parcels:		2
Estimated Population:		5
# of Parcels (owner occupied):		2
# of Dwelling Units:		2
Acres land annexed:		9.60 acres for annexation area
Developable Acres Remaining:		7 acres
Right-of-way in Annexation:		None
Previous County Zoning:		RSF-R
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:	= \$ 33,150
	Actual:	= \$ 332,040
Census Tract:		9
Address Ranges:		714 through 720 24 ½ Road (even only)
Special Districts:	Water:	Ute Water
	Sewer:	
	Fire:	Grand Junction Rural Fire
	Drainage:	Grand Junction Drainage District
	School:	District 51
	Pest:	

Annexation and Zoning schedule.

<i>ANNEXATION SCHEDULE</i>	
July 5th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
July 11th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
August 2nd	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
August 16th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
Sept.17th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve the Chamblee/Boydston Annexation.

Attachments:

- Annexation Ordinance
- Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation Maps (2)

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

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

CHAMBLEE/BOYDSTUN ENCLAVE ANNEXATION

LOCATED AT 714 AND 720 24 ½ ROAD

CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 9.60 ACRES

WHEREAS, on the 5th day of July, 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 Chamblee/Boydston Enclave, and more particularly described as follows:

Lot 50, Pomona Park Subdivision, County of Mesa, State of Colorado.

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 Chamblee/Boystun Enclave, is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 2nd day August, 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:	Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation Zoning		
Meeting Date:	August 2, 2000		
Date Prepared:	July 24, 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 to Residential Single Family Rural with a maximum density of one unit per five acres (RSF-R) for the Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation. The proposed annexation area is located at 714 and 720 24 ½ Road. File #ANX-2000-115

Summary: The 9.60 acre Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation area consists of 2 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. Area property owners have requested that proposed City zoning be identical with existing Mesa County zoning for these enclaves.

Background Information: See Attached

Budget: N/A

Action Requested/Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council approve on second reading the Zone of Annexation Ordinance for the Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation.

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
-----------------------------	----------------	----------	-----------------------------	-----------------

BACKGROUND INFORMATION				
Location:		714 and 720 24 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 Church		
	South	Residential and Agricultural		
	East	Residential		
	West	Residential, Agricultural and Park		
Existing County Zoning:		RSF-R		
Proposed City Zoning:		RSF-R		
Surrounding Zoning:	North	RMF-8		
	South	RMF-5		
	East	RMF-5		
	West	PD, RSF-4, and CSR		
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, it was proposed by the City of Grand Junction 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 this 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:

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.

ANNEXATION SCHEDULE	
July 5th	Notice of Intent to Annex & (30 Day Notice)
July 11th	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
August 2nd	First Reading on Annexation & Zoning by City Council
August 16th	Public hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
Sept 17th	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

Action Requested/Recommendation: Planning Commission recommended approval at their meeting July 11, 2000 of a zone of RSF-R for the Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation. It is recommended that City Council approve the zone of RSF-R 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
- Chamblee/Boydston Enclave Annexation Map
- Pomona Park Enclaves/G Road North Area Proposed Zoning Map

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE No. ____

**Zoning the Chamblee/Boydstun Enclave Annexation to
Residential Single Family Rural (RSF-R)**

Located at 714 and 720 24 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 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 the Residential Single Family Rural (RSF-R) zone district

Includes the following tax parcels 2701-334-00-123 and 2701-334-00-048

Lot 50, Pomona Park Subdivision, County of Mesa, State of Colorado.

Introduced on first reading this 2nd day of August, 2000.

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

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Attach 14

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL			
Subject:	The Knolls Filings 4-7 Rezone		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	August 10, 2000		
Author:	Bill Nebeker	Senior Planner	
Presenter Name:	Bill Nebeker	Senior Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: The Knolls Filings 4-7 Planned Development – Growth Plan Amendment and Rezone, located south of the southeast corner of 27 ½ Road and Cortland Road; File #GPA-2000-103.

Summary: The previously approved preliminary plan for the Knolls has expired and the new plan requires a Growth Plan Amendment and Rezone. A Growth Plan Amendment from Residential Medium (4 to 8 du/ac) to Residential Medium Low (2 to 4 du/ac) is requested, as well as a rezone from PD (Planned Development) with a density of 2.7 dwellings per acre to PD with a density of 2.5 dwellings per acre. A mixed-use development with 16 patio homes and 64 single-family homes is proposed.

Background Information: [See Attached](#)

Budget: [N/A](#)

Action Requested/Recommendation: Decision on Growth Plan Amendment and Adopt ordinance on second reading for rezone.

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
-----------------------------	---------	----------	----------------------	--	----------

<i>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</i>			
Location:		South of SE Corner 27 ½ & Cortland Road	
Applicants:		O.P. Development Co. LLC	
Existing Land Use:		Vacant & 1 Single Family Home	
Proposed Land Use:		Residential (Patio Homes & SF Homes)	
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Single Family (The Knolls)	
	South	Single Family (Spring Valley)	
	East	Single Family (Spring Valley)	
	West	Single family residential & vacant	
Existing Zoning:		RSF-4 & PD (formerly PR-2.7)	
Proposed Zoning:		Planned Development	
Surrounding Zoning:	North	Planned Development	
	South	RMF-5	
	East	RSF-4 & RMF-5	
	West	RMF-5	
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Medium 4 to 8 units per acre	
Zoning within density range?		Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Staff Analysis

Background: The Knolls Planned Development, originally approved in 1997, was 66 acres in size. It included 33.8 acres in Filings 1-3 located north of this site, including a 4.8-acre church site, and 25.87 acres to the south that encompasses a portion of this development application. There were single family and patio homes in both the north and south portions of the development. A portion of the site to the north is located in the Airport Critical Zone, which at the time allowed residential development at densities up to 4 dwellings per acre with a Special Use Permit. Roughly the northern portion of the site was in the Residential Medium Low 2 to 4 dwellings per acre land use designation and the southern portion was in the higher 4 to 8 dwellings per acre area. Despite this difference the entire development, excluding the church site, was zoned to a planned residential zone of 2.7 dwellings per acre.

The preliminary plan for the Knolls has since expired and the developer has acquired an additional 6.6-acre parcel. The overall density now proposed by the applicant is only slightly less at 2.5 dwellings per acre. However, since the preliminary plan expired and a lesser density is requested, a rezone to a new Planned Development is required. A

Growth Plan Amendment is also required which will be heard at the public hearing for the second reading of the ordinance for the rezone.

Growth Plan Amendment: The applicant has provided extensive written analysis in the project report and response to comments on why this amendment meets the criteria required for a change in the Future Land Use Map. No attempt will be made in this report to summarize that analysis, other than in the findings listed below.

Staff finds that the proposed Growth Plan Amendment meets the criteria, as set forth in Section 2.5C of the Zoning and Development Code, as noted below.

1. **There was an error such that then existing facts, projects, or trends (that were reasonably foreseeable) were not accounted for:** The Growth Plan density designation for these parcels was influenced by the RSF-5 zone designation of Spring Valley and other subdivisions in the area. In actuality the overall density in Spring Valley is in the 2 to 4 dwellings per acre range. Most likely Spring Valley was zone RSF-5 because it provided greater flexibility in setbacks. The error in the map occurred when the land use was determined based upon the higher density zoning in the area.
2. **Subsequent events have invalidated the original premises and findings:** Despite the designation of 4 to 8 dwellings on these parcels, the southernmost portion of the preliminary plan was rezoned to PR 2.7 in 1997. Had the preliminary plan not expired the approved density would have de facto changed the density of the Growth Plan. The revised plan, at only slightly less the density, proposes a similar development pattern on the southern portion of the site.
3. **The character and/or condition of the area has changed enough that the amendment is acceptable:** Other than a few vacant parcels to the west of this site, the area has built out at the lower density range of the Growth Plan (2 to 4 du/ac). This is an infill parcel and development at the higher density (4 to 8) would be out of character with the rest of the neighborhood.
4. **The change is consistent with the goals and policies of the plan, including applicable special area, neighborhood and corridor plans:** See page 4 of the applicant's response to comments, which lists several goals and policies that this plan is consistent with. Also there are no applicable special area, neighborhood or corridor plans for this area.
5. **Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed:** The recently widened 27 ½ Road and other street improvements in this area provide good access to this site. Adequate utilities are available to the site. Schools that serve this site are under capacity. A fire station is located within one mile of this site.

6. **An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the community, as defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use:** With the higher land use designations required in many areas with the Future Land Use Map and minimum densities imposed under the new Zoning and Development Code, there is an inadequate supply of land for the type of development that is requested under this proposal.
7. **The community or area, as defined by the presiding body, will derive benefits from the proposed amendment:** The Knolls subdivision is a mixed-use development with patio homes and single-family homes. The developer of Filings 1-3 has done an outstanding job of assuring quality in the development. If the same product is continued in these phases this development should be one that the community can be proud of. Benefits derived from the amendment include increased property values and a stable residential neighborhood.

Rezone: The applicant has proposed a change in zoning from Planned Development (formerly PR 2.7) to Planned Development with a density not to exceed 2.5 dwellings per acre. Even though this development is being proposed under the former Zoning and Development Code the new zoning districts apply to a rezone since there is only one official zoning map. The underlying zoning for bulk standards not mentioned in the applicant's preliminary plan is RSF-4. The following bulk standards as proposed by the applicant and modified by staff shall be listed in the rezone ordinance for this development:

THE KNOLLS	BULK STANDARDS	
Minimum Lot Area		
	Single Family	9500 s.f.
	Patio Homes	4800 s.f.
Minimum Street Frontage		
	Single Family	20 ft
	Patio Homes	N/A
Maximum Lot Coverage	(per definition in former code)	
	Single Family	35%
	Patio Homes	100%
Maximum Structure Height		32 ft
Minimum Front Yard Setback		
	Single Family	20 ft
	Patio Homes	0 ft
Minimum Side Yard Setback		
	Principal Structure - Single Family	10 ft
(see note below)	Principal Structure - Patio Homes	0 ft *
	Accessory Structure – Single Family	5 ft
Minimum Rear Yard Setback		
	Principal Structure - Single Family	20 ft
	Principal Structure - Patio Homes	0 ft
	Accessory Structure – Single Family	5 ft

	Accessory Structure – Patio Homes	0 ft
Maximum Units per Gross Acre		2.5

***5-foot side yard setbacks are required along common lot line for dwellings that are not attached.**

The Planning Commission found that the proposed Planned Development zoning meets the criteria established in Section 2.6 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code. Because these findings and criteria are so closely related to the findings and criteria for the Growth Plan Amendment, they have not been repeated here. Findings regarding the conformance of this rezone request to the criteria established in the Zoning and Development Code are outlined in the applicant's general project report, not included in this report.

Attachments to this report include the following:

1. Aerial photo
2. Vicinity Map
3. Growth Plan Map
4. Preliminary Plan

Attachments 1-2 & 4, previously scanned for first reading; attachment 3 scanned...

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

Ordinance No. _____

**ZONING THE KNOLLS FILINGS 4-7
LOCATED SOUTH OF THE SE CORNER OF 27 ½ & CORTLAND ROADS
INCLUDING 640 & 652 27 ½ ROAD, TO CITY PD**

Recitals.

The applicant has proposed to rezone the Knolls Filings 4-7 from a Planned Development residential (PD) zone of 2.7 dwellings per acre to a PD zone of 2.5 dwellings per acre. Zoning is pursuant to the new Zoning and Development Code. The Knolls Filings 4-7 proposes a mixed-use development with 16 patio homes and 64 single-family homes. The rezone is required because the preliminary plan for the Knolls expired; a lower density is proposed for the remainder of the undeveloped subdivision with a new preliminary plan.

The Planning Commission recommended approval of a request to change the City of Grand Junction Growth Plan Future Land Use Map to Residential Medium-Low Density 2-4 dwelling units per acre for this site. The City Council will consider the land use map/plan amendment prior to adoption of this ordinance. The rezone, if granted, will be in conformance with the density proposed in the Future Land Use Map, as amended.

After public notice and hearing the Planning Commission found that the proposed zoning is in conformance with Section 2.6 of Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code and recommended approval of the zone change at its July 18, 2000 hearing.

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

That the City Council finds that the proposed rezone meets the criteria set forth in Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code. In accordance therewith the following described parcel of land is hereby zoned PD with the following bulk standards:

THE KNOLLS	BULK STANDARDS	
Minimum Lot Area		
	Single Family	9500 s.f.
	Patio Homes	4800 s.f.
Minimum Street Frontage		
	Single Family	20 ft
	Patio Homes	N/A
Maximum Lot Coverage	(per definition in former code)	

	Single Family	35%
	Patio Homes	100%
Maximum Structure Height		32 ft
Minimum Front Yard Setback		
	Single Family	20 ft
	Patio Homes	0 ft
Minimum Side Yard Setback		
	Principal Structure - Single Family	10 ft
(see note below)	Principal Structure - Patio Homes	0 ft *
	Accessory Structure – Single Family	5 ft
Minimum Rear Yard Setback		
	Principal Structure - Single Family	20 ft
	Principal Structure - Patio Homes	0 ft
	Accessory Structure – Single Family	5 ft
	Accessory Structure – Patio Homes	0 ft
Maximum Units per Gross Acre		2.5

*5-foot side yard setbacks are required along common lot line for dwellings that are not attached.

Under the Zoning and Development Code PD's are based on straight zones. The underlying straight zone for the Knolls Filing 4-7 PD is RSF-4. The PD zoning when adopted is integral to and a part of the approved development plan. Most all of the bulk standards in this PD zone have been varied from the RSF-4 zone due to specific design considerations. Those design considerations were evaluated by the Planning Commission and City Development staff and were found to be appropriate. The Planning Commission and staff have recommended approval of the zoning.

The property being zoned is a tract of land located in the SW4NE4 & the NW4SE4 Sec 1 T1S R1W UM Mesa Co, CO and is more particularly described as follows: Beg at the NW cor of a tract of land whence the C4 cor Sec1 T1S R1W UM bears S29°38'50"W 82.93' and considering the N ln of the SW4NE4 Sec 1 to bear S89°57'11"E, with all other bearings contained herein relative thereto: 1) N50°15'06"E 196.30'; 2) N81°59'06"E 299.62'; 3) N68°06'13"E 282.69'; 4) NWLY 5.06' along the arc of a circular curve to the left with a rad of 244.00', an delta of 01°11'16" and a chord bearing N37°54'10"W, 5.06'; 5) N65°53'00"E 153.94'; 6) S54°34'00"E 134.54'; 7) S35°59'00"E 317.84'; 8) S02°05'43"W 78.50'; 9) S89°54'17"E 139.00'; 10) S00°01'22"E 875.30'; 11) N89°51'56"W 1288.44'; 12) N00°00'59"E 167.22'; 13) N02°06'59"E 218.35'; 14) N00°00'59"E 561.12' to the POB. The tract described above contains 32.518 acres more or less.

INTRODUCED for FIRST READING and PUBLICATION this day of 2000.

PASSED on SECOND READING this day of 2000.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

President of City Council

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

CITY COUNCIL			
Subject:	White Willows Zone of Annexation		
Meeting Date:	August 16, 2000		
Date Prepared:	August 10, 2000		
Author:	Bill Nebeker	Senior Planner	
Presenter Name:	Bill Nebeker	Senior Planner	
	Workshop	X	Formal Agenda

Subject: Appeal of Planning Commission’s Approval – White Willows Zone of Annexation and Preliminary Plan, located at 2856 C ½ Road and 2851 and 2863 D Road; File #PP-2000-106.

Summary: An adjacent property owner has appealed the Planning Commission’s recommendation to approve the requested RSF-4 zoning for the White Willows Annexation. The property has been annexed for several months but has not been given City zoning. County zoning is RSF-R (formerly AFT). An appeal has also been filed on the Commission’s decision to approve the White Willows Subdivision, a 122-lot subdivision on 39.56 acres. The appellant cites increased traffic on D Road as the major reason for the appeal. A revised traffic study submitted by the applicant shows a minimal traffic impact on the D and 9th Street and 30 Road intersections from this subdivision.

Background Information: [See Attached](#)

Budget: [N/A](#)

Action Requested/Recommendation: Public hearing on Appeals, Adopt ordinance on second reading.

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:		2856 C ½ Road, 2851 and 2863 D Road			
Applicants:		Robert J. & Marvella F. Smith; Patricia B. McBride; & The Patnode Family Trust, Owners Gene Patnode, Applicant			
Existing Land Use:		Agricultural/Vacant/Single Family			
Proposed Land Use:		Residential			
Surrounding Land Use:	North	Vacant & agricultural			
	South	Residential, agricultural & vacant			
	East	Agricultural & vacant (Skyler Subdivision)			
	West	Single family residential			
Existing Zoning:		AFT (County) – 5 acre lot minimum			
Proposed Zoning:		RSF-4 – 4 units per acre			
Surrounding Zoning:	North	PE (Mesa County) – Planned Education			
	South	AFT (Mesa County) – 5 acre lot minimum			
	East	PR-4 (City) – 4 units per acre			
	West	R1-B (Mesa County) – 2 units per acre			
Growth Plan Designation:		Residential Med Low: 2 to 4 units per acre			
Zoning within density range?		X	Yes		No

ACTION REQUESTED: Public hearing on appeals, Adopt ordinance on second reading.

Staff Analysis:

Zone of Annexation: The applicant is requesting a zone of annexation of RSF-4. At the time of annexation the Planning Commission had recommended a zone of annexation at half this density (RSF-2) based upon the applicant's failure to provide sufficient information to show the traffic impact of this subdivision on D Road and the 9th Street and 30 Road intersections. The City Council allowed the applicant to withdraw the zone of annexation request, with the understanding that a new request would be submitted after the expanded traffic study was completed. The applicant has submitted a new application which includes a slightly modified preliminary plan and the expanded traffic study information requested by staff. The traffic study shows that the impact of this subdivision's traffic is not as significant as previously thought. The cumulative impact of

traffic from this subdivision and others developing along the D Road corridor is still at issue.

The requested RSF-4 zone allows a density no greater than 4 dwellings per acre. The actual density of the White Willows preliminary plan is 3.1 dwellings per acre. Zoning of the Pine Estates Subdivision in the county to the west is R1-B, which allows two dwellings per acre. Lot sizes in Pine Estates vary in size with the smallest lot being about 35,000 square feet. The actual density of Pine Estates is about 1.15 dwellings per acre. The RSF-4 zone provides a transition between the lower density Pine Estates Subdivision to the west and the slightly higher density Skyler Subdivision (4 du/ac) to the east.

The Growth Plan Future Land Use Map recommends Residential Medium Low Density between 2 and 4 dwellings per acre for this area

At its July 18, 2000 hearing the Planning Commission found that the proposed RSF-4 zoning meets the criteria established in Section 4-11 and 4-4-4 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code as noted below:

Section 4-11

- A. Adverse impacts to the developed density of established neighborhoods shall be considered.** See response to D below.
- B. The relationship of the property to the urban core area or to established subcores shall be considered.** The property is located within the Urban Growth Boundary and is expected to develop at urban densities.

Section 4-4-4

- A. Was the existing zone an error at the time of adoption?** No. Existing County zoning of RSF-R (formerly AFT) is appropriate for the historical agricultural nature of these parcels
- B. Has there been a change in character in the area due to the installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc.?** Yes. The City has approved higher densities to the east in the Skyler Subdivision and other properties in the area have developed at urban densities. Increased commercialization and industrialization of the areas to the west of this site prompt higher density on these parcels.
- C. Is there an area of community need for the proposed rezone?** The project is a response to an anticipated market demand for the proposed residential uses.
- D. Is the proposed rezone compatible with the surrounding area or will there be adverse impacts?** There is always some conflict when new development is constructed adjacent to existing subdivisions, especially if no development has

occurred in the area for awhile. The conflict is intensified as predominantly rural areas develop or redevelop with urban densities. These impacts occur whether the property is zoned RSF-2, the low end of the Growth Plan range or RSF-4, the higher end. The proposed subdivision is mid-range. The impacts from this subdivision – increased traffic, loss of views, noise, etc. must be balanced with the goals of the Growth Plan to concentrate urban growth.

- D. Will there be benefits derived by the community, or area, by granting the proposed rezone?** In addition to criteria previously responded to, D Road will be widened adjacent to this development per the Major Street Plan.
- E. Is the proposal in conformance with the policies, intents and requirements of this Code, with the City Master Plan (Comprehensive Plan), and other adopted plans and policies?** Yes. The rezone is in conformance with the Growth Plan Future Land Use Map. It is also in conformance with the goal to concentrate urban growth. Per page V.12 of the Growth Plan, “a key objective of this growth pattern is to use infrastructure (existing and planned) most efficiently and cost-effectively.” Low-density development does not use infrastructure efficiently or cost-effectively.
- G. Are adequate public facilities available to serve development for the type and scope suggested by the proposed zone?** According to the traffic study submitted by the developer, immediate traffic impacts of White Willows Subdivision on surrounding roadways and intersections will be relatively minor. The greater impact is the cumulative effect of traffic from many subdivisions on D Road. Other utilities are available to serve this development.

Preliminary Plan: The attached materials show the proposed layout of the White Willows Subdivision. The subdivision proposes 122 lots on 39.56 acres at an overall density of 3.1 dwellings per acre.

Traffic Impact: Immediate traffic impacts of the subdivision on surrounding roadways and intersections will be relatively minor, according to a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) submitted to the City of Grand Junction by Transportation Initiatives, Inc. This study investigated the level of service along the D Road corridor from 9th Street to 30 Road, prior to development of White Willows Subdivision, immediately following development and 20 years into the future. Levels of service were calculated for D Road and the following intersections: 9th Street and D Road, and 30 and D Road. Level of Service (LOS) is a definition of the delay time encountered by each vehicle when traveling through an intersection or along a roadway.

Current traffic volumes along the D Road corridor are 5,700 ADT (average daily traffic) and do not significantly impact the LOS at any of the above-mentioned intersections (all LOS calculations indicate LOS B or higher). See attached page 4, Method of Analysis, from traffic study for more information. However, the traffic study indicates D Road currently operates at a LOS D. This may be due in part to the narrow shoulder width

and percentage of trucks along the corridor. Some improvement to the service flow rate along D Road may be accomplished by widening the road and including a center turn lane/striped median. Widening D Road to accommodate the above-mentioned improvements has been proposed by the applicant along their D Road frontage. Further shoulder widening, pedestrian and capacity improvements along D Road from 29 Road to 30 Road are scheduled to begin in 2005.

Traffic impacts on the surrounding road system due to development of White Willows Subdivision also appear to be relatively minor. D Road will remain at LOS D, while only one of the previously mentioned intersections (9th Street and D Road) will notice any decrease in LOS. The LOS at the 9th Street intersection will drop from LOS B to LOS C due to development of White Willows. Traffic from the proposed subdivision pushes the 9th Street intersection into LOS C by 0.9 seconds.

The applicants traffic consultant also evaluated future levels of service and traffic impacts along the D Road corridor. Year 2020 traffic impacts show a significant decrease in the level of service at both the 9th Street and 30 Road intersections. Without signaling each intersection, the LOS at 9th Street will drop from LOS C to LOS F, while the LOS at 30 Road will drop from LOS B to LOS D (signaling the 9th Street intersection will increase the LOS from F to C, while the LOS at 30 Road will remain at LOS D). It should be noted that the drop in LOS at the unsignalized intersection anticipated by the traffic study would occur with or without development of White Willows Subdivision at the density proposed by the developer. The decrease in LOS is due to general growth of traffic from within the D Road traffic basin over the next 20 years.

Year 2005 traffic impacts associated with construction of the 29 Road Bridge over the Colorado River to D Road were also evaluated. The applicants traffic consultant assumed the overpass to Interstate 70 Business would not be completed, and that eighty percent of the 29 Road traffic would turn west on D Road towards the downtown area. The resulting LOS on D Road is E, while the LOS for all intersections along D Road will immediately drop to LOS F. The most feasible solution to avoid this LOS decrease would be to construct the bridge and overpass at the same time.

In summary, traffic solely from this subdivision will have a minor impact on D Road and at the 9th Street and 30 Road intersections. Instead, the cumulative effect of increased development that accesses the D Road corridor eventually creates a Level of Service that will be unacceptable per City policy.

Access: Only one entrance is allowed on D Road to provide sufficient spacing between other intersections on the road. The Fire Department requires a second access to the subdivision before the 30th lot is platted. The phasing plan includes a connection to Skyler Subdivision to the east via Mason Street in the second phase for this purpose. The subdivision will also provide street stubs to the east, west and south for future street connections as adjacent areas develops.

Florida Street is proposed to be relocated about 100 feet to the south to align with the existing sewer and water line. Florida Street stubs are provided at the east and west property lines. The existing Florida Street right-of-way will be vacated during final plat approval that contains that portion of the street.

Thyme Street is provided as a street stub to the south for future development. The developer has chosen to only construct the street 140 feet past the Chamomile Drive intersection to avoid having to construct a temporary turnaround at the south property line. The developer will be required to escrow funds now to pay the costs of future extension when the property to the south develops.

Bulk Standards: The bulk standards of the RSF-4 zone district of the new code apply to this subdivision. Minimum lot size within this zone is 8000-sq. ft. Lot sizes in this subdivision vary between 8504 sq. ft. to 89,377-sq. ft. (2.05 acres). The larger lot is designed for future subdivision into several smaller parcels. The developer has increased the size of the lots along the west property line adjacent to the Pine Estates Subdivision to approximately 12,500 square feet (per lot) to provide a more appropriate transition between the two subdivisions. Typical setbacks shown on the preliminary plan are incorrect.

Irrigation & Drainage: The site drains to the south where a combination pond catches runoff and provides storage for irrigation water.

Fencing: No special fencing requirements have been proposed by the applicant except for a six-foot privacy fence along the D Road. Fencing along the backside of double-frontage lots (lots with front and rear property lines on a street) is required to be approved at the time of subdivision approval. A five-foot wide landscaped setback is required between the street right-of-way and the fence, to be installed by the developer and maintained by the homeowner's association.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION: At its July 18, 2000 hearing, the Planning Commission approved the preliminary plan with the following conditions:

1. A six-foot high solid fence shall be constructed by the developer along the D Road frontage behind a five-foot wide irrigated and landscaped setback with trees and shrubs provided by the developer in a tract or easement. The tract or easement shall be conveyed to the Homeowner's Association for maintenance.
2. Provide road width transition tapers per Table 10, Page 31 of the TEDS manual, east and west of the proposed improvements along the D Road frontage.

Attachments to this report include the following:

5. Page 4 of Traffic Study showing Method of Analysis. (Particularly shows delays associated with Level of Service (LOS))

6. Page 10 & 11, Traffic Study showing conclusions and recommendations of traffic study
7. Pages 1 & 2, Addendum to Traffic Study showing additional traffic recommendations
8. Vicinity map
9. Aerial photo
10. White Willows preliminary plat (3 pages)
11. White Willows Subdivision General Project Report (2 pages)
12. Letter of appeal and letters from citizens opposed to this proposal (4 pages)
13. Zone of Annexation Ordinance (2 pages)

Bill\h\pp\00106-ww(2nd)-2ndccr.doc\report prepared081000

Insert attachments here

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

Ordinance No. _____

**ZONE OF ANNEXATION FOR THE
WHITE WILLOWS ANNEXATION
LOCATED AT 2856 C ½ ROAD, 2851 AND 2863 D ROAD,
FROM COUNTY AFT TO CITY RSF-4**

Recitals.

The following property has been annexed to the City of Grand Junction as the White Willows Annexation and requires a zone of annexation.

The petitioner has requested that the property be zoned from County AFT to RSF-4 (Residential single family with a density not to exceed four dwellings per acre). With this zoning the applicant proposes to develop White Willows Subdivision, a 122-lot residential development on 39.56 acres. The density of the subdivision is approximately 3.1 dwellings per acre.

The City of Grand Junction Growth Plan Future Land Use Map designates this area for Residential Medium Low-Density 2-4 dwelling units per acre. This rezone is in conformance with the density proposed in the Future Land Use Map.

After public notice and public hearing, the City Planning Commission found that the proposed zoning is in conformance with Section 4-11 and 4-4-4 of Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code and recommended approval of this zone change to RSF-4 at its July 18, 2000 hearing.

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

Council finds that the proposed Zone of Annexation meets the criteria as set forth in Section 4-11 and 4-4-4 of the Zoning and Development Code and in accordance therewith the following described parcel is hereby rezoned from County AFT to City RSF-4:

The following description from Warranty deed located at Bk 2629, Pg 878 Mesa County Records: 2943-191-00-043: Lots 7 & 8 lying N of the Drain, Bevier's Subdivision; EXCEPT beginning at the SW cor of the N2 of Lot 8; N 137'; E 22.5'; S 137'; W 22.5' to the beginning; Also described as follows: A tract of land located in the SW4NE4 Sec 19, T1S R1E of the UM Mesa County CO. Beginning at the SWLY cor of a tract of land, which is identical with the NWLY cor of Lot 8 Bevier Subdivision as recorded in Bk 2, Pg 9 of Mesa County Clerk and Recorders; 1) E 660' to the NELY cor Lot 7, Bevier Subdivision; 2) N 40' to the N line of the SW4NE4 Sec 19; 3) W 660' to the C-N 1/16 cor of Sec 19; 4) S 40'

along the W line of the SW4NE4 Sec 19 to POB. 2943-191-00-006: The W4 NW4NE4 Sec 19, T1S R1E of the UM Mesa County CO. Also the following description from Warranty deed in Bk 1763, Pg 489 of Mesa County Records: 2943-191-00-136: The E 3/4 of NW4NE4 Sec 19, T1S R1E of the UM, Except the following described property to wit: That part of the N2NE4 Sec 19, T1S, R1E of the UM, beginning at a point on the N boundary of Sec 19, whence the NE cor of Sep 19 bears S89°45'E, 1320'; S 1326.83' to S boundary of the N2NE4 Sec 19; N 89°39'W 330' along S boundary; N 1326.26' to the N boundary of Sec 19; S 89°45'E 330' along N boundary to POB. All in Mesa County CO.

INTRODUCED for FIRST READING and PUBLICATION this day of 2000.

PASSED on SECOND READING this day of 2000.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

President of City Council

