

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 250 NORTH 5<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
SPECIAL MEETING  
AGENDA**

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2003, 6:00 P.M.**

**\*\*\*NOTE SPECIAL DATE AND TIME\*\*\***

**CALL TO ORDER**

1. **Minutes of Previous Meetings** [Attach 1](#)

*Action: Approve the Minutes of the March 26, 2003 Special Meeting*

2. **Canvass of April 8, 2003 Election** [Attach 2](#)

The City Clerk will present the Certificate of Election so that the Council can review and canvass the election returns.

Staff presentation: Stephanie Tuin, City Clerk

3. **Update to the Grand Junction Growth Plan** [File #GPA-2003-018] [Attach 3](#)

The Goals, Policies and Action Items of the 1996 Grand Junction Growth Plan will be discussed and reviewed. A resolution incorporating the changes from the March 26<sup>th</sup> meeting and this discussion will be considered.

Resolution No. 30-03 – A Resolution Amending the Growth Plan of the City of Grand Junction

*\*Action: Adopt Resolution No. 30-03*

Staff presentation: Bob Blanchard, Community Development Director

4. **OTHER BUSINESS**

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Attach 1  
Minutes of March 26, 2003**

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

**March 26, 2003**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction convened into special session on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of March 2003, and President Pro Tem Dennis Kirtland called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m. in the City Auditorium. Those present were Councilmembers Harry Butler, Bill McCurry, Dennis Kirtland, Jim Spehar and Janet Terry. Those absent were President of the Council Cindy Enos-Martinez, Councilmember Reford Theobald and City Manager Kelly Arnold. Also present were City Attorney Dan Wilson and City Clerk Stephanie Tuin.

**UPDATE TO THE GRAND JUNCTION GROWTH PLAN** [File #GPA-2003-018]

A request to adopt amendments to the Future Land Use Map and Goals, Policies and Action Items of the 1996 Grand Junction Growth Plan. Two meetings are scheduled for discussion of the update, the second one being April 9<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m.

Proposed changes to the following maps were discussed at this special meeting:

1. Future Land Use Map – “Housekeeping”
2. Future Land Use Map Changes – Discussion Items
3. Future Land Use Map Changes – Pear Park Area

Mayor Pro Tem Kirtland explained to the audience that Council would only discuss the items located within the City and excluding properties located outside the City boundaries. Planning Manager Kathy Portner concurred. She noted that there over 60 Housekeeping Items, eight Discussion Items, and only one item for discussion in the Pear Park Area that the Council needs to consider.

**1. Changes to the Future Land Use Map – “Housekeeping Items”**

Kathy Portner, Planning Manager, explained that only the items appearing in bold on the revised handouts would be discussed. She then gave an overview of the Housekeeping Items of the proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map.

Mayor Pro Tem Kirtland asked if anyone from the audience wanted to comment on any of the items listed on the Housekeeping List.

Tom Volkmann, representing the W.D. Merkel Family Limited Partnership, asked Council about Item #22 on the Housekeeping Map and stated that it also refers to Item #18 on the Future Land Use Map, Discussion Items. Council requested he wait and comment on these map items when the Discussion Items were discussed.

Phillip Roskowski, 630 Sage Court, said he favors approval of Housekeeping Map Item #22 and agreed that it also relates to Item #18 on the Discussion List. He said a number of people are present to comment on these items. Ms. Portner recommended that this item be moved to the Future Land Use Map, Discussion Items.

Councilmember Spehar moved to accept all items in bold on the Housekeeping List that are located within the City limits, except for Item #22, and move Item #22 to the Discussion List and include it with Item #18. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 - 0.

## **2. Changes to the Future Land Use Map – Discussion Items**

Kathy Portner, Planning Manager, briefly described each discussion item.

ITEM # 13: Ms. Portner said the property falls within the Airport Critical Zone and uses within this area are limited to agriculture, mining, low-density residential and other low density uses. She said due to the potential danger from possible aircraft crashes, and with the limited use of the properties in the area, the Residential Rural designation is the most appropriate land use category for this property.

There were no public comments.

Councilmember Spehar moved to adopt Item #13. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 - 0.

ITEM # 15: Ms. Portner explained that a mobile home park is located on this property and the current zoning is C-1, Light Commercial. She said approval of this item would make the Future Land Use Map consistent with the Zoning Map.

There were no public comments.

Councilmember Terry moved to adopt Item #15. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 - 0.

ITEM # 16: Ms. Portner identified the property located between 28 Road and 28 $\frac{1}{4}$  Road on the map and said the developer requests a change from Residential Medium with four to eight units per acre to Residential Medium High with eight to twelve units per acre. She said the higher density residential area will provide a good buffer

zone between the commercially designated properties to the west and the residential medium properties to the east.

There were no public comments.

Councilmember Terry moved to adopt Item #16. Councilmember Spehar seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 - 0.

ITEM # 17: Ms. Portner pointed out the properties on the map located at 12<sup>th</sup> Street and Horizon Drive. She explained the proposed zone change of one property from Residential High with more than twelve units per acre to Residential Medium with four to eight units per acre, and the owner's request to change the designation from Residential High with more than twelve units per acre to a Mixed Use designation. She said the properties are known as the O'Nan Subdivision, that this property is adjacent to Residential Medium properties to the southeast and that a Residential Medium designation on these properties would finish out the neighborhood.

Tom Volkmann, representing the W.D. Merkel Family Limited Partnership, asked to keep the current density of Residential High with more than twelve units per acre as opposed to the recommendation for Residential Medium with four to eight units per acre. He argued that the City is not meeting its own Growth Plan Amendment criteria for the change being proposed.

Leslie Shafer, 2707 Midway Avenue, said when she attended the meeting in 2000, it was then decided that this was a housekeeping error, and the zoning designation would stay at four to eight units per acre. She said that this subdivision is compatible with the surrounding area. She said former Mayor Linda Afman told her that the property was platted for 20 homes and that the advent of the Safeway store across Horizon Drive has not altered the area. She then read a section from her subdivision's covenants that allows owners to file a lawsuit against anyone if there are any changes to the zoning designation. Ms. Shafer said there was no reason to increase the density.

Mayor Pro Tem Kirtland asked about her use of the word platted and what she meant by it. Ms. Shafer said the development was zoned in 1958 and she held up a copy of the original plat to show it to Council.

Joyce Davis, 2703 Midway Avenue, said the neighbors told her that the area would be single-family homes. She said she and her family lived in their house for 18 months before they bought the house nine months ago. She said she does not want any high-rises or any other commercial development and she wants the area to stay residential.

Karen Steinbock-Fuerst, 2705 Midway Avenue, said she totally agrees with her neighbors and said before purchasing their home their realtor verified the residential zoning and she

was told at that time about the commercial zoning designation across the street. She said they would have never bought their home if the neighborhood would not remain as single-family residential.

Brad Schafer, 2707 Midway Avenue, said he wanted to reiterate all the previous comments and said a lot of people present tonight agree with the zoning of Residential Medium with four to eight units per acre. He turned towards the audience and asked the group to stand up. About twelve people stood up.

J. D. Walker, 662 East Cliff Drive, referred to a letter (see attached *Exhibit "A"*) he mailed to Council and the City Attorney regarding the rezoning request from Residential Medium to Mixed Use. He said he received a call yesterday informing him that the owner would be withdrawing this request.

Larry Beckner, attorney for the landowner, said he called Mr. Walker and told him that his client would not ask for a Mixed Use zoning designation, but at the same time, his client doesn't want the density designation reduced.

Martha May "O'Nan" Ogleberg said she also remembers that meeting in 2000. She said it then was decided that this higher density zoning designation was due to an error made earlier and it was decided to return the zoning designation to the original single-family zoning.

Councilmember Terry asked Ms. Portner to explain the error. Ms. Portner said she didn't have an explanation for the original map designation of Residential High. She said it was flagged when the Zoning Map discussion came up because the Growth Plan designation did not match the platted neighborhood or the previous zoning. Ms. Portner said the Land Use Map changes are just now coming up.

City Attorney Dan Wilson displayed the Growth Plan amendment criteria. He said it has been the practice that the criteria can be considered, but not all criteria have to be met.

Tom Volkmann said he agrees but that his client is still bound by the existing zoning. He cautioned that just because the Growth Plan Map doesn't match the Land Use Map it doesn't make the zoning designation wrong.

Councilmember Terry advised that it has been Council's practice to change the Land Use Map to match the Zoning Map. She said the owner could request a rezoning through the regular re-zoning process. She said she saw no option but to change the map tonight.

Councilmember Spehar concurred and said he supported the recommendation to change the designation to Residential Medium with four to eight units per acre from Residential High with more than twelve units per acre.

Mayor Pro Tem Kirtland asked about the disparity and the procedure Council would have to follow to address an application.

City Attorney Dan Wilson replied that that would be the argument for a rezone and is based on the Growth Plan designation.

Councilmember Spehar moved to adopt the request of Item #17 to change the designation from Residential High with more than twelve units per acre to Residential Medium with four to eight units per acre. Councilmember Terry seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 - 0.

*ITEM #18 [COMIBNED WITH ITEM #22 FROM THE HOUSKEEPING LIST]:*

Ms. Portner reviewed these two items. She explained that the property is north of the canal located between 1<sup>st</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Street in the Sage Court area. She said the purpose for changing the density is to make the Land Use Map consistent with the Zoning Map. She said the canal was the boundary between the higher and lower densities.

Tom Volkmann representing the W.D. Merkel Family Limited Partnership said his client would like to retain the current density designation of the property to preserve the viability of the purpose of his purchase. He said the owner is asking Council that the Residential Medium designation with four to eight units per acre be retained rather than to zone the property Residential Low with two units per acre.

Carol Bergman, 628 Sage Court, asked Council to approve the Residential Low designation with two units per acre. She said she felt that the current designation is in error. She asked that Council support Staff's recommendations for Item #18 and Item #22. She referred to criteria #4 of the Growth Plan and stated that there is no high density in the area. She said criteria #3 has not been met either, since no character change has occurred in the area.

Harry K. Webster, also known as Kenneth, at 629 Sage Court, agreed with Ms. Bergman and reiterated that the residents of that area wanted to retain the two units per acre designation.

Phillip Roskowski also agreed with Ms. Bergman and said he fully supports Staff's recommendation.

Thea Chase Gilman, 627 Sage Court, said she wants to reiterate what her neighbors have said.

Tom Volkmann addressed Council and said he wanted to clarify that his client was neither involved in the setting of the Growth Plan designation nor was he involved in the Zoning hearings.

Councilmember Terry moved to approve and accept Item #22 from the Housekeeping List and Item #18 from the Discussion List. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 – 0.

ITEM # 19: Tom Volkmann representing the W.D. Merkel Family Limited Partnership stated that he is withdrawing this item per his client's request.

ITEM # 20: Ms. Portner reviewed this item. She identified the property's location as the southwest corner of Patterson Road and 1<sup>st</sup> Street. She said the Planning Commission recommends approval of a split use designation with a 300-foot depth along Patterson Road to be zoned for Commercial and to designate the remainder of the property as Residential Medium High with eight to twelve units per acre.

Pat Gormley, 2433 North 1<sup>st</sup> Street, said his family owns the property and has had lengthy discussions with the Planning staff. He said he is satisfied with their recommendation and requests Council's approval.

Councilmember Spehar asked Mr. Gormley if other designations like Residential Office or Planned Unit Development would also be acceptable. Mr. Gormley replied that those options are open for consideration. He told Council that this intersection handles 30,000 cars daily and the noise level on Patterson Road is not conducive to living there. He said there are more appropriate uses along Patterson Road.

Councilmember Spehar said he trusts the Gormleys to develop the property so it is compatible with the neighborhood, but that he would be more comfortable if other options were applied. Mr. Gormley disagreed with Councilmember Spehar and said that residential development facing Patterson Road would not be appealing to the majority of people but some of the mentioned zones are possibilities.

Mayor Pro Tem Kirtland noted that once Council designates the parcel as Commercial then there would be a process requesting a rezone for a more appropriate use later on. Ms. Portner agreed and noted there is a range of commercial options available.

Councilmember Spehar said he was satisfied that the rezone process will address his concerns.

Councilmember Spehar moved to adopt Item #20 with a split land use designation for this parcel. Councilmember Butler seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 – 0.

ITEM # 21: Ms. Portner reviewed this item and identified the property's location on Crossroads Boulevard and the Interstate. She said that this request is a two-part proposal. She said the appropriate zone designation for this property is Residential Single Family with two units per acre and the approval of the proposed change would make the Future Land Use Map consistent with the Zoning Map.

Ms. Portner explained that in the second proposal the owner requests a change from Commercial to Residential High with more than twelve units per acre. She said the Planning Commission recommended to the owner a designation of Residential Medium with four to eight units per acre, which would be the same designation as the adjacent property to the west. She said the owner concurred with Staff's recommendation.

Tom Volkmann representing the W. D. Merkel Family Limited Partnership reiterated that it is his client's desire to have this property designated Residential Medium with four to eight units per acre.

Councilmember Spehar moved to approve Item #21 as presented. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 – 0.

ITEM # 26: Ms. Portner reviewed this item and identified the property's location on Highway 6 & 50 and 23 Road on the map. She said the property was originally platted as a subdivision. She explained that the owner requests a change from Industrial to Commercial so they can submit a rezoning request.

Kirk Rider, 872 Quail Run Drive, an attorney with Younge & Hockensmith, representing the property owner Prime Investments, Ltd., referred to a letter he sent to the Growth Plan Update Steering Committee addressing this item. He told Council that there are good reasons to adopt the Planning Commission's recommendation and that the surrounding property owners have no objections to the rezone request. He said currently there is no need for more industrial property, and that even the better industrial properties in town, located near the railroad and other transport facilities, aren't selling. He reiterated the need for commercially zoned properties.

Tom Nowak, partner of Mike Farris, an operator with Chrysler Jeep Dodge said they would like to buy the property and build a dealership on that property similar to their current facility.

Mr. Rider explained that the dealership is too big to fit on the little parcel and this is why they want to purchase this property.

Councilmember Terry asked if the current zoning of Industrial as shown on the Zoning Map is the same zoning as the designation on the Land Use Map. Ms. Portner said the



surrounding areas are designated as C-1, Light Commercial. She said both designations C-2, Commercial –2, or I-1, Light Industrial could be adopted for the site, and to operate an auto dealership either designation would work.

Mr. Wilson asked Council that the item be tabled to give the parties a chance to discuss their request further.

Mr. Rider asked and received clarification on this item. He said he didn't think the C-1, Light Commercial zoning would be unreasonable.

Councilmember Spehar clarified that lighter commercial uses would not be allowed. Ms. Portner stated that actually almost all C-1, Light Commercial uses are allowed in a C-2, Commercial-2 zoning.

It was agreed upon that this new information would make a new recommendation come forward.

Councilmember Terry said she wanted the audience to know that this is only a discussion and not a negotiation between the parties.

Councilmember Spehar moved to adopt Item #26 of the Discussion Items and change the Land Use designation from Industrial to Industrial/Commercial. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 – 0.

### **3. Changes to the Future Land Use Map – Pear Park Area**

*ITEM # 5:* Ms. Portner explained this request. She identified the property's location and the surrounding parcels on the Land Use Map. She said the property is owned by the Railroad and the existing Land Use Map Designation is Residential Medium Low with two to four units per acre. She said the property is currently zoned in the County as Industrial and it is utilized for commercial/industrial use. She said the property is adjacent to properties zoned from Light Commercial to Industrial.

Councilmember Terry moved to adopt the proposed Land Use Designation to Commercial/ Industrial. Councilmember McCurry seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5 – 0.

### **NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS**

There were none.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

**ADJOURNMENT**

City Council President Pro Tem Kirtland called for the meeting to be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Stephanie Tuin, CMC  
City Clerk

"Exhibit A"

*D's Wilson  
#17*

March 20, 2003

**To: Members of Grand Junction City Council  
And Attorney for City Council**

**Re: Public Hearing Grand Junction Growth  
Plan updated scheduled March 26, 2003  
At 6:30 P. M. at City Auditorium**

We the undersigned Resident/Owners of lots in the Onan Subdivision understand that at above scheduled meeting there will be a request of a non-resident owner of lots now vacant of buildings or structures to change a provision of the Building and Use Restrictions (#1 Provision) from one single family dwelling to multi-family and or commercial buildings per lot.

We therefore now want to notify anyone and everyone involved with this above request that we are opposed and against any such change to this #1 Provision.

We also want to call attention to Provisions # 7 and # 9 which state that these covenants and conditions shall run with the land and shall be binding upon all parties and all persons claiming under them and also that if any parties hereto or their heirs and assignees shall violate or attempt to violate any of the covenants herein or provisions hereof it shall be lawful for any other person or persons owning real property situated in said development or subdivision to prosecute any proceeding at law or in equity against the person or persons violating or attempting to violate any such covenants or provisions and either to prevent him or them from so doing or to recover damages or other dues for such violation.

We have made contact with a local attorney and if Provision # 9 is violated we will proceed with legal action. A copy of Building and Use Restrictions dated June 9, 1958 Filed June 10, 1958 # 720897 Book 734 Page 220 at Mesa County Clerk and Recorder office.

Signatures of Resident/owners of  
ONAN Subdivision

Mr. + Mrs. James D. Walters  
662 East Cliff Dr., G.J. 81506  
242-3108

Mr. + Mrs. Brian M. Bohl  
661 E. Cliff Dr.  
Grand Junction, CO 81506  
243-9016

Mr. + Mrs. Ken & Teelma  
663 E. Cliff Dr  
Grand Jct. CO 81506

Mr. + Mrs. Frank Cooperied 257-0376  
671 CLIFF GRAND JCT.

Thomas H. Hymelhaus  
673 E. CLIFF DR GRAND JCT CO

Conrad & Jacqueline Pyle  
674 East cliff, Grand Jct., CO 81506  
242-2422

June E. Tallent  
667 East cliff Dr  
Grand Jct. Co  
242-0260

Mr. + Mrs. Jim Robby  
665 E. CLIFF DR  
G.J. CO 81506 244-4615

Mr. + Mrs. Bob Walters  
666 Eastcliff Dr.  
G.J., CO 81506  
243-8558

Signatures of Resident Owners of  
ONAN Subdivision

Mr. & Mrs. Edgar W. Joy  
664 Eastcliff Dr.

Grand Junction, Co. 81506  
Phone 970 245 4750

Rodney H Wright  
668 EASTCLIFF DR.

GRAND JUNCT. CO. 81506  
243-1934

Mr + Mrs. Tom +  
Maggie Dennis  
669 East Cliff Dr.  
Grand Junction Co  
81506

243-4227

Sarat and Graham  
Stephenson  
2711 Midway Ave  
Gr. Jct. Co 81506  
242-5236

• Selma and Andrew Wilhelm  
652 Eastcliff Dr.  
Grand Jct., Co. 81506  
241-1506

Rex Barbre  
654 E. CLIFF DR.  
241-5122

• Charles and Sue Bray  
656 Eastcliff Drive  
256-0533

• Mike & Libby McCain  
2716 ~~Par~~ ~~Cam~~ Midway  
241-7497

• Christina Cornelison-Travis  
2715 MIDWAY AVE  
GRAND JCT. CO 81506  
255-7638

• Tom E. Darden  
2712 Midway Ave  
Grand Junction, Co. 81506  
245-6744

• Signatures of Resident/owners of  
ONAN Subdivision

- Karen Steinbeck-Jeunt - 2705 Midway Ave  
243-3613



2705 Midway Ave  
243-3613

- Joyce Davis

2703 Midway Ave  
255-9701

- Edward W. Andrews  
Dannell J. Andrews  
Renee & Janice Rees

656 Deerview Ln  
Grand Jet CO  
243-4335 81506

2714 Fh Rd.  
GRAND JET, CO  
81506  
247-7451

- Linda Whitt  
Kevin Whitt

653 Eastcliff Dr  
Grand Jet, CO  
245-3885 81506

BUILDING AND USE  
RESTRICTIONS  
Dated June 9, 1958  
Filed June 10, 1958  
At 2:55 o'clock P.M.

#720897  
Book 734  
Page 220

We, the undersigned, all of the owners of the following described property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, to-wit: Beginning at the W $\frac{1}{4}$  corner of Sec. 1, Twp. 1S, R. 1W, U.M., thence N 1,318.1 feet, thence N 89°49' E 1,107 feet; thence S 1,318.9 feet; thence S 89°49' W 1,107 feet to the point of beginning ( Said property being formerly Onan Subdivision as it appears in Plat Book 8 at pages 62 and 63 in the records of the County Clerk and Recorder of Mesa County, Colorado, a part of such plat and subdivision having been vacated by Instrument Number 689106, recorded in Book 704 at page 277 of said Clerk and Recorder's records) Being desirous of amending and altering those Building and Use Restrictions placed on said property by Instrument Number 661876, recorded in Book 677 at page 500 in the records of the Mesa County, Colorado, Clerk and Recorder, to provide for the orderly development of the area, do hereby revoke and cancel the Building and Use Restrictions imposed by the above-described Instrument and do impose Building and Use Restrictions on the described property as follows:

1. The property in said blocks shall be known and described as residential lots. No structures shall be erected, altered, placed or permitted to remain on any residential building plot other than one single family dwelling, and a private garage for not more than two cars, and other buildings incidental to residential use of the plot.

2. No building shall be located on any residential lot nearer than 25 feet to the front lot line nor nearer than 15 feet to any side street line. No building except a detached garage or other outbuilding shall be located more than 75 feet or more from the front lot line. No building shall be located nearer than 10 feet to any side lot line.

3. No noxious or offensive trade or activity shall be carried on upon any lot nor shall anything be done thereon which may be or become an annoyance or nuisance to the neighborhood.

4. No animals except domesticated house hold pets such as dogs, cats, etc, shall be maintained, kept or permitted to remain upon the premises.

5. No trailer, basement, tent, shack, garage, barn or other outbuilding erected on any lot shall at any time be used as a residence temporarily or permanently, nor shall any structure of a temporary character be used as a residence.

6. The ground floor area of the main structure, exclusive of one-story open porches and garages, shall not be less than 950 square feet.

7. The restrictive covenants and conditions contained herein shall be covenants running with the land and shall be binding upon all parties and all persons claiming under them.

8. The restrictive covenants and conditions herein established shall apply to that portion of the Onan Subdivision still existing and to any future subdividing done within the area described hereinabove.

9. If the parties hereto, or any of them, or their heirs and assigns shall violate or attempt to violate any of the covenants herein or provisions hereof it shall be lawful for any other person or persons owning real property situated in said development or subdivision to prosecute any proceeding at law or in equity against the person or persons violating or attempting to violate any such covenants or provisions and either to prevent him or them from so doing or to recover damages or other dues for such violation.

10. Invalidation of any one of these covenants or provisions by judgment or court order shall in no wise affect any of the other provisions which shall remain in full force and effect. /s/ L.S. Onan, Lucy N. Onan, Gail T. Hutchinson, Elfreda M. Hutchinson, C.E. Livran, Howard Stewart.

Ack. June 9, 1958 by L.S. Onan, Lucy N. Onan, Gail T. Hutchinson, Elfreda M. Hutchinson, C.E. Livran and Howard Stewart before Gerald J. Ashby, Notary Public, Mesa County, Colorado. ( N.P. Seal)

-O--OO--O-

Commission expires July 26, 1959.

THE TITLE GUARANTY COMPANY





**Attach 2  
Canvass of April 8, 2003 Election**

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION**

**APRIL 8, 2003**

I, Stephanie Tuin, City Clerk of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, do hereby certify that the results of the Regular Municipal Election held in the City on Tuesday, April 8, 2003, were as follows:

Total Ballots Cast in District A

Total Ballots Cast in District B

Total Ballots Cast in District C

Total Ballots Cast in District D

Total Ballots Cast in District E

**TOTAL BALLOTS CAST**

**FOR COUNCILPERSON - DISTRICT "B" - FOUR-YEAR TERM**

Candidate	Dist A	Dist B	Dist C	Dist D	Dist E	TOTAL
Jim Spehar						

**FOR COUNCILPERSON - DISTRICT "C" - FOUR-YEAR TERM**

Candidates	Dist A	Dist B	Dist C	Dist D	Dist E	TOTAL
Brian K. McElhiney						
Gregg Palmer						

**FOR COUNCILPERSON - "CITY AT LARGE" - FOUR-YEAR TERM**

Candidates	Dist A	Dist B	Dist C	Dist D	Dist E	TOTAL
Roland E. Cole						
Bruce Hill						

We, the undersigned Canvassing Board, have reviewed the results of the Regular Municipal Election held April 8, 2003, and do hereby conclude:

That \_\_\_\_\_ has been duly elected as Councilperson for District "B" by the greater number of votes.

That \_\_\_\_\_ has been duly elected as Councilperson for District "C" by the greater number of votes.

That \_\_\_\_\_ has been duly elected as Councilperson for "City at Large" by the greater number of votes.

Certified this 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2003.

---

Stephanie Tuin, CMC  
City Clerk

Dated this 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2003.

---

Cindy Enos-Martinez  
Councilmember, District A

---

Juanita Peterson, Notary Public  
Councilmember, District B

---

Reford Theobald  
Councilmember, District C

---

Bill McCurry  
Councilmember, District D

---

Harry Butler  
Councilmember, District E

---

Dennis Kirtland  
Councilmember, At-Large

---

Janet L. Terry  
Councilmember, At-Large

**Attach 3  
Update to the Grand Junction Growth Plan**

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

<b>CITY COUNCIL AGENDA</b>							
<b>Subject</b>	Update to the Grand Junction Growth Plan						
<b>Meeting Date</b>	March 26, 2003 and April 9, 2003						
<b>Date Prepared</b>	March 11, 2003				File # <b>GPA-2003-018</b>		
<b>Author</b>	Kathy Portner		<i>Planning Manager</i>				
<b>Presenter Name</b>	Kathy Portner Bob Blanchard		<i>Planning Manager</i> Community Development Director				
<b>Report results back to Council</b>	X	No		Yes	When		
<b>Citizen Presentation</b>	X	Yes		No	Name		
	Workshop	X	<b>Formal Agenda</b>		Consent	X	<b>Individual Consideration</b>

**Summary:** A request to adopt amendments to the Future Land Use Map and Goals, Policies and Action Items of the 1996 Grand Junction Growth Plan

**Budget:** N/A

**Action Requested/Recommendation:** March 26, 2003--Review changes to the Future Land Use Map and direct staff on changes to be included in a Resolution.  
April 9, 2003—Review changes to the Goals, Policies and Action Items and adopt a Resolution amending the Future Land Use Map and Goals, Policies and Action Items accordingly.

**Attachments:**

1. Staff Report (pgs. 2-18)
2. Listing of Growth Plan Amendments (pgs. 19-20)
3. Proposed Changes to the Future Land Use Map—Housekeeping (pgs. 21-27)
4. Proposed Changes to the Future Land Use Map—Discussion Items (pgs. 28-30)
5. Proposed Changes to the Future Land Use Map—Pear Park Area (pgs. 31-32)

6. Growth Plan Steering Committee Discussion—Likes and Dislikes (pgs. 33-38)
7. Planning Commission Minutes (pgs. 39-73)
8. Letters and Memos from citizens (pgs. 74-168)
9. Draft Resolution (pgs. 169-178)

**Background Information:** See attached staff report

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

MEETING DATE: March 26, 2003  
April 9, 2003

CITY COUNCIL

STAFF PRESENTATION:  
Kathy Portner, Planning Manager

Bob Blanchard, Director

---

AGENDA TOPIC: GPA-2003-018: Update to the Grand Junction Growth Plan

ACTION REQUESTED: Council approval of a Resolution approving the Growth Plan Update

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A request to adopt amendments to the Future Land Use Map and Goals, Policies and Action Items of the 1996 Grand Junction Growth Plan.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval of recommended amendments.

## ANALYSIS

### 1. Background

In 1996 the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County jointly adopted a plan for the urban area of the Valley. The document adopted by the City is "The Growth Plan", which was incorporated as Chapter Five of the Mesa Countywide Land Use Plan. For purposes of this report, the jointly adopted document shall be referred to as the Growth Plan or the Plan.

The Growth Plan is the guiding document for how our community will grow through the year 2010. It is a statement of the community's vision for its future and a roadmap providing direction to achieve that vision. The view of the future expressed in the Growth Plan is shaped by community values, ideals, and aspirations about the best management of the community's resources. The Plan also recommends periodic evaluations every three to five years. An update was jointly adopted by the City and County in 1999. The five year update of the Plan was a goal of the City Council for 2002.

In March of 2002, with the assistance of the City Council committee members Janet Terry, Jim Spehar and Cindy Enos-Martinez, a process to review the Growth Plan was initiated. A 15-member Steering Committee was appointed representing various groups and areas of the Valley as follows:

- Chairman John Elmer
- Organizations
  - Homebuilders/Contractors/Realtors Larry Rasmussen
  - Chamber of Commerce Rob Bickley
  - DDA/DTA (Downtown) Bruce Bengé
  - School District 51 Cathy Zarlingo
  - Mesa County Kurt Larsen
- Areas
  - Redlands Kathy Krohn
  - Orchard Mesa John Denison
  - Mesa State College Area Chris Thomas
  - East Area Gail Yerbic
  - Clifton Area Ivan Wood
  - South Downtown/Riverside/El Poso Juanita Trujillo
  - North Area Dave Zollner
  - East Buffer Area Mike Mechau
  - West Buffer Area Nancy Watkins

Mesa County staff also participated in the update process.

Early discussions with the City Council committee overseeing the Plan update process confirmed a direction that a complete rewrite of the Plan was not needed at this time. The general framework for growth the Plan provides is still relevant and many of the action items have been accomplished. The “Guiding Principles” of the Plan are to concentrate urban growth, support and enhance existing neighborhoods, reinforce existing community centers, provide open spaces throughout the urban area, ensure development pays its own way, disperse higher density housing, continue coordination to implement the plan and retain valued cultural and environmental resources.

The relatively few number of amendments proposed and approved reflect the good foundation of the Plan and the City and County’s willingness to implement the Plan through land use decisions. Below is a summary of amendments proposed within the Urban Growth Boundary since 1996 (see attachment, pgs. 19-20).

- 22 Amendments Proposed
- 7 Denied
- 7 Approved
- 5 Withdrawn
- 3 Found Consistent



Likewise, an impressive number of Action Items outlined in the Plan have been accomplished. Those include:

- New Zoning and Development Code, TEDS and SWMM adopted
- Parks Master Plan
- 24 Road Plan and Design Standards and Guidelines
- Orchard Mesa Plan update
- North Central Valley Plan
- Grand Valley Circulation Plan
- Urban Trails Master Plan
- Lincoln Park Residential Historic District
- Other Historic Designations
- Persigo Agreement
- Community Separators Program—PDR
- TRAC Established
- Clifton Plan Update
- Cooperative Planning Agreements
- Redlands Area Plan and Transportation Plan

In addition, there are a number of projects in progress that address specific Action Items. Those include:

- Standards for Neighborhood Convenience
- Infill/Redevelopment Policy
- Transportation Impact Fee Study
- Westside Downtown Redevelopment Study
- Clifton Transportation Study
- Historic Resources Survey

The update process included:

- Review of the Future Land Use Map
- Review of the Goals and Policies
- Identification of other Issues, Goals and Policies to be considered
- Deletion of accomplished Action Items and new Action Items

Based on input gathered from eight committee meetings, two public meetings, written comments and staff comments, the steering committee is recommending a number of changes to the Future Land Use Map. The most significant changes proposed are in

the Pear Park area. They are also recommending changes to the goals, policies and action items to reinforce a strong commitment to enhance the community's appearance.

#### Future Land Use Map Proposed Changes—"Housekeeping"

There are a number of proposed changes that are perceived as non-controversial and are termed "housekeeping" changes (see attachment, pgs. 21-27). Those changes include properties where the original designation was simply an error, such as a portion of a residential subdivision that was designated as "park". A number of the changes are clarifying the designations of "public" and "park". With the original Growth Plan, many church sites were designated as public. With the adoption of the Redlands Plan, the public designation is to apply to properties that are owned by "tax supported" public entities. Therefore, church sites, or other sites that are not owned by a public entity, are proposed to have the same land use designation as the surrounding privately owned property. Also in keeping with the Redlands Plan designations, properties that are existing or future park sites are proposed to be designated as "Park".

The other category of "housekeeping" changes are those proposed for properties for which a zoning was applied with the City's 2000 zoning map that is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map. For those properties, the City Council made a conscience decision with the zoning map to zone them other than what the land use map shows, with direction to staff to amend the Future Land Use Map.

#### Future Land Use Map Proposed Changes—Discussion Items

Also proposed are a number of Future Land Use Map changes that are termed "Discussion Items" (see attachment, pgs. 28-30). These are changes that were either proposed by property owners, or by staff members, and might be perceived to be more controversial. The Steering Committee went through these items one by one and made a recommendation. Several of the property owner requests have been through the process before, either in conjunction with specific area plans, or as individual requests through the growth plan amendment or rezoning process. They are now asking for reconsideration through this update process.

#### Future Land Use Map Proposed Changes—Pear Park Area

The most significant proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map are in the Pear Park area (see attachment, pgs. 31-32). In 1999 a significant portion of Pear Parks was changed from lower density residential to residential densities of 4 to 8 units per acre. Areas south of D Road and near the railroad, however, were left as lower density. The City and County are now seeing significant development in this area and are recommending some changes to the remaining areas designated at lower densities.

Some of the area south of D Road is recommended for densities of 4 to 8 units per acre to reflect some existing development and to allow for additional development at similar densities. The proposed densities decrease toward the River, with the floodplain area remaining as Estate, Conservation or Park designations. Likewise, proposed changes to densities of 4 to 8 units per acre for the area east of 30 Road and north of E Road would allow for similar development to that south of E Road.

The other significant changes include proposed areas of higher density north of D ½ Road and west of 30 Road, as well as adjacent to a proposed commercial site. The committee discussed the issue of identifying a new site for neighborhood shopping now to meet the future needs of a growing population in the Pear Park area. A commercial site has been identified at the southeast corner of D Road and 29 Road for a future neighborhood shopping center.

The Steering Committee was also concerned with the future needs of this rapidly growing part of the community, especially for parks, schools and other infrastructure. They are, therefore, recommending that an area plan be done for Pear Park.

#### Goals, Policies and Action Item Proposed Changes

The Steering Committee spent a significant amount of time discussing community appearance issues. Input on those issues was also received at the two public meetings. The input was gathered by doing lists of likes and dislikes regarding community appearance (see attachment, pgs. 33-38). The committee based the proposed changes to the goals, policies and action items on those likes and dislikes.

The City's strategic plan also identifies community appearance issues as a top priority for the community. The strategic plan was developed by the City Council and City staff based on the following:

- A review of existing plans and identification of consistent themes and critical issues identified
- A statistically valid random sample telephone survey of residents
- A series of 9 neighborhood meetings

Specifically the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan that relate to many of the Steering Committee recommendations are:

Goal: Develop a culture which values citizen-based planning, adherence to adopted plans and emphasis on high quality development.

Objective: Working from recommendations of the citizens committee reviewing Grand Junction's Growth Plan, complete implementation of recommendations for expanded design standards by December 31, 2003.

Goal: Put in place strategies that enhance the attractiveness and character of the community.

Objective: Review the current code requirements and enforcement methods for practicality and take appropriate action.

Goal: Develop and implement a plan for the beautification of entrances to the City of Grand Junction.

Objective: Identify and prioritize the entrances and gateways appropriate for beautification and design a plan that includes common elements for each by November 2003.

Goal: Continue to support the efforts that maintain the buffer zones between Grand Junction, Palisade and Fruita.

Objective: Continue active participation on the Purchase of Development Rights committee.

Objective: Continue financial support based upon budgetary resources and grant opportunities.

Objective: Seek annual review and evaluation by partners in the program.

Goal: Maintain active participation with other entities in efforts that impact the preservation of open spaces in the Grand Valley.

Objective: Develop guidelines for City participation in open space preservation and review guidelines with regional partners by December 31, 2003.

Goal: Continue support of the Parks Master Plan.

Objective: Identify at least two neighborhood park sites for acquisition by April 2003.

Objective: Prioritize Master Plan tier one projects.

Objective: Complete research on school/park development models from comparable communities in other U.S. cities by December 2003.

Goal: Facilitate efforts that sustain the historic character of the community.

Objective: By 2004, complete Phase Two of the historic survey.

The proposed changes to the Goals, Policies and Action Items are as follows:

**GROWTH PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE  
RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE GOALS, POLICIES AND  
ACTION ITEMS OF THE GROWTH PLAN**

**JANUARY 8, 2003**

**Goal 2: To ensure orderly transitions or buffers in areas of joint concern between different communities (i.e., Grand Junction, Fruita, Palisade) that help define distinct communities within Mesa County.**

Policy 2.1: Grand Junction and Mesa County will coordinate with the City of Fruita to establish and maintain a transition area between Grand Junction and Fruita that includes the Cooperative Planning Area as defined in the Cooperative Planning Agreement of February 9, 1998. ~~proposed area of joint concern shown in Exhibit V.4.~~ Additional areas should be considered for inclusion in the Cooperative Planning Area. Mesa County and Grand Junction should coordinate the adoption of specific design standards for this area with Fruita to strengthen the visual transition between these communities.

Policy 2.2: Mesa County and Grand Junction will coordinate with the Town of Palisade ~~and other affected jurisdictions~~ to establish and maintain a transition area between the Clifton area and the Town of Palisade that includes the Cooperative Planning Area as defined in the Cooperative Planning Agreement of February 9, 1998. ~~proposed area of joint concern shown in Exhibit V.5.~~ Additional areas should be considered for inclusion in the Cooperative Planning Area. Mesa County and Grand Junction should coordinate the adoption of specific design standards for this area to strengthen the visual transition.

~~Policy 2.3: The City and County will support public and private investment in community gateway areas that enhance the aesthetic appeal of the community. (Move to Goal 13)~~

**Action Items:**

New Action Item: Conduct the 5-year review of the Cooperative Planning Agreements with Mesa County, Grand Junction, Fruita and Palisade. Consider adding additional areas to the Cooperative Planning Areas.

**Community Appearance and Design**

**Goal 13: To enhance the aesthetic appeal and appearance of the community's built environment. ~~community.~~**

Policy 13.1: The City and County will establish heightened aesthetic standards and guidelines for the gateway areas and high visibility corridors ~~listed in Exhibit V.9 and~~ mapped in Exhibit V.10.

Action Item 7: Adopt standards and guidelines to address the screening of outdoor storage and operations for heavy commercial and industrial uses. Screening and building design standards should vary based on location within the community, with more restrictive standards applied along high visibility corridors.

Policy 13.2: The City and County will enhance the quality of development along key arterial street corridors. ~~Existing corridor plans listed in Exhibit V.9 will remain in effect. Until these plans are updated,~~ The Urban Area Plan will prevail when existing corridor plans, adopted prior to 1996, are inconsistent with this plan.

Action Item 10: Adopt corridor/gateway design guidelines for public and private development, through the use of overlay districts. ~~Establish overlay zoning districts, as identified in Exhibit 10 to designate areas in which the guidelines will be applied.~~ Public enhancements should be coordinated with other capital projects in the overlay districts area.

Action Item 38: Adopt corridor development regulations for the major corridors Highway 6/50, 24 Road and Patterson addressing appropriate uses and development design. Guidelines should address parcel access, building orientation, landscaping, screening, bulk, parking, signage, streetscaping and view corridors.

Policy 13.3: The City and County will foster improved community aesthetics through improved development regulations addressing landscaping, screening of outdoor storage and operations, building orientation, building design signage, parking lot design and other design considerations.

Action Item 53: Revise code standards for location and screening of outdoor storage, streetscaping, landscaping, signage, lighting, building orientation, building materials and parking lot design. ~~Establish gateway and corridor overlay districts for more stringent application of these standards.~~

Policy 13.4: The community's streets and walkways will be planned, built, and maintained as attractive public spaces.

New Action Item: Develop street standards and site design alternatives that incorporate elements, such as street trees, parkway strips, medians and other features, that contribute to the street as an attractive public space.

Action Item 101: Incorporate sidewalks, landscaping and appropriate lighting and bikeway improvements into all roadway improvement projects.

Policy 13.5: Community entryways will be enhanced and accentuated at key entry points to the city including interstate interchange areas, and other major arterial streets leading into the City.

New Action Item: Establish gateway and corridor overlay districts that incorporate high-quality and innovative design requirements that reflect the desired image of the area.

Action Item 55: Prepare a corridor design plan for HWY 50 and South 5<sup>th</sup> Street, extending from the river and north to Grand Avenue that provides for redevelopment of this downtown gateway.

Policy 13.6: Outdoor lighting should be minimized and designed to reduce glare and light spillage, preserving “dark sky” views of the night sky, without compromising safety.

New Action Item: Review and revise the outdoor lighting section of the Code to require lighting that minimizes glare and light-spillage, but does not compromise safety, thus preserving the “dark sky”.

Policy 13.7: Views of Grand Mesa, Colorado National Monument and the Bookcliffs will be preserved from public spaces, such as Canyon View Park and Matchett Park, as well as along major corridors, as identified through specific corridor planning.

Policy 13.8: The City and County will encourage building and landscape designs which enhance the visual appeal of individual projects and the community as a whole. Design guidelines should provide flexibility while promoting aesthetics, traffic safety and land use compatibility.

Policy 13.9: Architectural standards and guidelines will be adopted that encourage well-designed, interesting and distinctive architecture that reinforce and reflect the community’s desire for high quality development.

New Action Item: Adopt architectural standards that encourage well-designed, interesting and distinctive architecture that reinforce/reflect the Community’s overall defined identity/image, using high quality materials and innovative design that varies building heights and styles.



Policy 13.10: The City and County will develop Code provisions that enhance landscape requirements, yet are appropriate to the climate and available plant species of the Grand Valley.

New Action Item: Review/revise Code standards for landscaping to include provisions and incentives for use of xeriscape design and plants well-suited to the climate of the Grand Valley.

New Action Item: Adopt Code standards to address minimum on-going maintenance of landscaping.

Policy 13.11: The City and County will develop Code provisions that minimize the visual impact of telecommunication towers and facilities.

New Action Item: Review and revise the Telecommunications Facilities/Towers section of the Code to implement measures that minimize the visual impacts.

Policy 13.12: Visual clutter along corridors will be minimized through the application of sign regulations and corridor design standards and guidelines.

New Action Item: Review and revise the sign code to address visual clutter along corridors.

## **Cultural/Historic Resources**

**Goal 19: To retain and preserve historic and cultural resources that symbolize the community's identity and uniqueness.**

Policy 19.1: The City and County will support efforts to inventory, designate and protect valued historic structures.

Policy 19.2: The City and County will establish building code provisions that accommodate the safe and efficient use of historic structures, even though the structures may not comply with standards for new construction.

Policy 19.3: The City will consider providing aesthetic improvements (such as historic lighting, specialized pavers and other streetscape improvements) as an incentive for property owners to register and maintain historic structures.

Policy 19.4: The City will develop Code provisions to protect and maintain the historic character of the downtown central business district and other designated historic districts and sites.

### **Action Items:**

Action Item 33: Adopt flexible building code provisions to encourage development of second floor residences in the downtown area.

Action Item 35: Adopt a downtown overlay district that is applicable to all designated historic structures, sites and districts that addresses appropriate architectural materials and features (façade design), color schemes, and signs for historic buildings and new construction in historic areas. ~~establishes appropriate use, setback, height, streetscape and parking standards. Update design guidelines addressing materials and façade design for use with downtown development and redevelopment projects.~~

Action Item 72: Maintain and update the inventory of historic structures.

Action Item 73: Adopt codes to encourage retention and rehabilitation of historic structures throughout the urban area.

Action Item 74: Expand the use of specialized pavers, landscaping, street furniture and lighting fixtures which are appropriate to the character of the historic neighborhoods.

### **Parks and Open Space**

**Goal 26: To develop and maintain an interconnected system of neighborhood and community parks, trails and other recreational facilities throughout the urban area.**

Policy 26.1: The City will update and use the Parks Master Plan to guide future park and recreation development in Grand Junction and surrounding areas in Mesa County.

Policy 26.2: The City will develop and maintain a network of recreation areas and facilities.

Policy 26.3: The City and County will encourage the retention of lands that are not environmentally suitable for construction (e.g. steep grades, unstable soils, floodplains, etc.) for open space areas and, where appropriate, development of recreational uses.

Dedications of land required to meet recreational needs should not include these properties unless they are usable for active recreational purposes.

Policy 26.4: The City and County will help preserve areas of outstanding scenic and/or natural beauty and, where possible, include these areas in the permanent open space system.

Policy 26.5: The City and County will obtain adequate park land needed to meet neighborhood, and community, and regional park needs, as urban development occurs, through the subdivision process and other appropriate mechanisms. Other public, quasi-public and private interests will be encouraged to secure, develop and/or maintain parks.

Policy 26.6: The City and County will coordinate with the school district to achieve cost savings through joint development of school and recreational facilities.

Policy 26.7: The City and County will ensure that medium-high and high density residential projects have adequate usable public or private open space incorporated into the project or linked to the project on adjacent parcels.

Policy 26.8: The City and County will require that provisions be made for on-going maintenance of open space areas by an appropriate public or private entity.

**Action Items:**

Action Item 8: Establish minimum standards for the creation and maintenance of usable public and private open space for various types of residential projects.

Action Item 107: Update and implement the Parks Master Plan, providing an interconnected system of neighborhood and community parks throughout the urbanized area.

New Action Item: Review financing options for implementing the Parks Master Plan and identified open space needs.

**Goal 27: To include open space corridors and areas throughout the planning area for recreational, transportation and environmental purposes.**

Policy 27.1: The City and County will retain existing open space areas, identified in the Parks Master Plan, ~~mapped in Exhibit V.13~~ for environmental and recreational purposes.

Policy 27.2: The City and County will prepare an open space plan to guide development and open space acquisition decisions.

Policy 27.3: The City and County will coordinate with appropriate agencies to mitigate the impact of recreational use of open space on its environmental value.

Policy 27.4: The City and County will seek public and private partnerships in efforts to secure open space.

**Action Items:**

Action Item 110: Adopt an open space plan that is coordinated with the parks and trails master plan. The plan should serve as a basis for site acquisition and to help prepare open space and recreation grants for the Grand Valley.

Action Item 112: Adopt a Trails Plan that prioritizes trail segments for acquisition and construction based on their transportation and recreational value.

Action Item 113: Establish a fund for open land preservation and acquisition

**Infill/Redevelopment**

**Goal 28: The City of Grand Junction is committed to taking an active role in the facilitation and promotion of infill and redevelopment within the urban growth area of the City.**

Policy 28.1: The City shall adopt precise and enforceable definitions of the terms “infill” and “redevelopment” consistent with the overall goal and shall use those terms consistently in its implementing actions, including any regulatory change.

Policy 28.2: The City shall identify specific geographic areas appropriate to implement the general goal of facilitating infill and redevelopment, while enabling the City to prioritize its focus and target limited resources in as efficient a manner as possible.

Policy 28.3: The City’s elected officials and leadership will consistently advocate and promote the planning, fiscal, and quality of life advantages and benefits achievable through infill and redevelopment.

**Action Items:**

New Action Item: As opportunities arise and when the City is prepared to act, the City shall identify specific redevelopment areas within Grand Junction in which public sector

efforts to encourage and facilitate redevelopment will be given the highest priority and where direct/active public participation will be considered.

New Action Item: The City shall identify the geographical reach of the term “infill”, which is not intended to include the entire city, so that regulatory or other reforms and incentives to encourage/facilitate infill development may be targeted and tailored to the identified locations and/or neighborhoods.

New Action Item: The City’s elected officials and leadership shall ensure that various city agencies’ and departments’ policies, regulations, and practices are consistent with the overall goal to encourage and facilitate infill and redevelopment in Grand Junction.

New Action Item: The City’s leadership will work in partnership with Grand Junction’s relevant civic and nonprofit organizations, the regional development community, and neighborhood organizations to provide information, educate, and promote grassroots advocacy of infill and redevelopment.

New Action Item: The City will gather and coordinate the dissemination of public or other city controlled information that can facilitate infill and redevelopment efforts, such as market studies; inventories of vacant, underutilized, and public-owned parcels in targeted geographic areas; demographic information; and tax and property assessment data.

New Action Item: The City will coordinate public infrastructure improvements with infill and redevelopment development needs, especially in areas identified as infill and redevelopment areas.

New Action Item: Review and evaluate existing land development regulations to ensure the infill and redevelopment policies are supported.

New Action Item: Explore and consider implementing financial incentives to facilitate and encourage infill and redevelopment, to be applied to specific infill and redevelopment projects on a case-by-case basis, consistent with established criteria.

**ADDITIONAL ACTION ITEM:**

Note: The Steering Committee would like to ensure that an area plan be done for the Pear Park area, since it has the potential for so much growth in the future that will require parks, schools and other infrastructure improvements.

New Action Item: Complete and area plan for Pear Park, addressing specific land use, increased traffic needs, park and school sites and other infrastructure needs.



2. Section 2.5.C of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code

The Plan can be amended if the City and County find that the proposed amendments are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Plan and meet the following criteria:

- a. There was an error such that then existing facts, projects or trends (that were reasonably foreseeable) were not accounted for.

*The majority of the proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map—Housekeeping items are errors.*

- b. Subsequent events have invalidated the original premises and findings.

*The basic premises and principles of the Plan have not been invalidated, but some of the proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map are a reflection of development trends and zoning.*

- c. The character and/or condition of the area have changed enough that the amendment is acceptable.

*The Pear Park area is probably the best example of character and condition of an area changing. However, for those requested changes with a recommendation of denial, the Steering Committee felt the character and condition of those areas had not changed substantially.*

- d. The change is consistent with the goals and policies of the plan, including applicable special area, neighborhood and corridor plans.

*The proposed changes, recommended for approval, are consistent with the goals and policies of the plan, as well as applicable area plan. The proposed changes to the goals, policies and action items are also consistent with the City's Strategic Plan. Many of the proposed changes that are recommended for denial are not consistent with applicable area plans.*

- e. Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of the land use proposed.

*Adequate public and community facilities are adequate, or can be provided, to serve the type and scope of land use proposed.*

- f. An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the proposed land use.

*The proposed changes recommended for approval are to meet the needs of areas as they develop.*

- g. The community or area, as defined by the presiding body, will derive benefits from the proposed amendment.

*The community will derive benefits from the proposed changes to the goals, policies and action items, which will provide a higher quality of life for residents.*

## FINDINGS OF FACT/CONCLUSIONS

After reviewing the Growth Plan Update Steering Committee recommendations for changes to the Future Land Use Map and Goals, Policies and Action Items, staff makes the following findings of fact and conclusions:

1. The proposed amendments are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Plan.
2. The review criteria in Section 2.5.C of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code have all been met.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the Steering Committee recommendations for changes to the Future Land Use Map and Goals, Policies and Action Items with the findings and conclusions listed above.

## PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

Planning Commission recommends approval of the Steering Committee recommendations for changes to the Future Land Use Map and Goals, Policies and Action Items with the following modifications:

### Housekeeping Map

- #8—Change to Public designation since it is owned by School District 51
- #17—Change northern parcel to Residential Medium Low (2-4 u/a) and southern parcel to Residential Medium (4-8 u/a)
- #64—Deleted



### Discussion Map

- #8—Deleted
- #14—Deleted
- #20—Approval of Commercial for 300' depth along Patterson Road
- #21—Approval of Residential Medium (4-8 u/a)
- #26—Approval of Commercial

### Pear Park

- #3—Approval of Residential Medium (4-8 u/a) for area east of Commercial; and Residential Medium Low (2-4 u/a) for area south of commercial
- #4—Approval of Residential Medium Low (2-4 u/a) for area south of C <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Road
- #6—No action (therefore, no change)
- #8—No action (therefore, no change)

### Goals, Policies and Action Items

- Insert the words “increased traffic needs” between the words “land use” and “park” in the action item regarding the Pear Park area plan

**ADDITIONAL NOTE:** There has been a request for a rehearing of item #25 on the Discussion Map. The request will go to both the City and County Planning Commissions. If the rehearing is granted, this item will not be considered by the City Council until a future date.

### Attachments:

- Listing of Growth Plan Amendments (pgs. 19-20)
- Proposed Changes to the Future Land Use Map—Housekeeping (pgs. 21-27)
- Proposed Changes to the Future Land Use Map—Discussion Items (pgs. 28-30)
- Proposed Changes to the Future Land Use Map—Pear Park Area (pgs. 31-32)
- Growth Plan Steering Committee Discussion—Likes and Dislikes (pgs. 33-38)
- Planning Commission Minutes (pgs. 39-73)
- Letters and Memos from citizens (pgs. 74-168)
- Draft Resolution (pgs. 169-178)

## FUTURE LAND USE AMENDMENTS THROUGH 2001

<b>FILE NUMBER</b>	<b>PROJECT/ LOCATION</b>	<b>REQUEST</b>	<b>DECISION</b>
GPA-1998-017	201 Franklin	Residential Medium to Residential High	Withdrawn
GPA-1998-130	Meadowlark Gardens/HWY 340 and Redlands Parkway	Residential to Commercial	Denied
GPA-1999-091	Desert Hills/South Broadway	Rural to Estate	Annexation Denied
GPA-1999-092	Vostetek/2558 F Road	Residential Medium-High to Commercial	Denied
GPA-1999-093	Miller Homestead/3090 N. 12 <sup>th</sup> Street	Consistency Review	Found Consistent
GPA-1999-121	Keesee/Desert Hills and South Broadway	Rural to Residential Medium/Low	Approved Change to Estate
GPA-1999-140	Hansen Property/543 Lawrence Avenue	Industrial to Residential Medium	Withdrawn
GPA-1999-141	Texaco/401 30 Road	Residential Low to Commercial	Found Consistent
GPA-1999-144	24 Road Corridor/Usher	Residential High and Commercial to Residential Medium High and Commercial	Withdrawn
GPA-1999-270	640 24 ½ Road	Residential Medium High to Commercial	Denied
GPA-1999-275	Rump/South Broadway	Rural to Estate	Approved

GPA-1999-277	Webb Crane/761 23 ½ Road	Rural to Commercial/ Industrial	Approved
GPA-2000-027	Lewis/2258 S. Broadway	Residential Medium Low to Commercial	Withdrawn
GPA-2000-029	Beilke/766 24 Road	Residential Estate to Commercial	Denied
GPA-2000-103	The Knolls/27 ½ Road	Residential Medium to Residential Medium Low	Approved
GPA-2000-109	Kollao/2570 G Road	Residential Medium to Residential Low	Approved
GPA-2001-042	Gaurmer/2918 G Road	Rural to Residential Medium	Denied
GPA-2001-060	Bank of Grand Junction/601 27 ½ Road	Residential Medium to Commercial	Denied
GPA-2001-177	Mays Concrete/2389 River Road	Industrial and Commercial to Industrial/ Commercial	Withdrawn
GPA-2001-178	Lewis/2258 South Broadway	Residential Medium Low to Commercial	Approved
GPA-2001-179	12 <sup>th</sup> Street Medical Plaza/3090 N. 12 <sup>th</sup> Street	Consistency Review	Found Consistent
ANX-2002-049	2990 D ½ Road	Residential Medium/Low to Residential Medium	PC Recommended Approval

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP  
HOUSEKEEPING**

<b>M A P #</b>	<b>EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNAT ION</b>	<b>PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATI ON</b>	<b>JOINT PC DECIS ION</b>	<b>GENERAL DESCRIPTION</b>
1	Public	Commercial	Approv al	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
2	Public	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Approv al	
3	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approv al	
4	No Designation	Commercial	Approv al	Surrounding properties are designated Commercial.
5	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approv al	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
6	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Commercial	Approv al	Properties are currently developed commercially.
7	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approv al	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
8	Park	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Chang ed to Public since it is owned by School District 51	This property is not a part of the future Matchett Park site. It was noted at the PC hearing that it is owned by School District 51 for a future school site, therefore, it should have a public designation.
9	Public	Residential	Approv	The Public designation is intended for

		Medium (4-8 du/acre)	al	properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
10	Park	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	This property is a developed subdivision with a density that falls within the Residential Medium density range.
11	Public	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
12	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Mixed Use	Approval	This property has an approved Outline Development Plan for a mixed use project.
13	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
14	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	
15	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	
16	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	
17	Residential Low (1/2-2 acres/du) & Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Changed the northern parcel to Residential Medium-Low (2-4 du/a) and the southern parcel	

			to Residential Medium (4-8 u/a)	
18	Park	Residential High (12+ du/acre)	Approval	This property is not a public park. It is private open space within an existing multi-family development.
19	Public	Residential High (12+ du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
20	No designation	Residential Low (1/2-2 acres/du)	Approval	Current zoning on the property is within the Residential Low density range.
21	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
22	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Residential Low (1/2-2 acres/du)	Approval	Through City Council direction, the zoning on the property was changed with the 2000 City wide zoning update to fall within the Residential Low density range.
23	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
24	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	
25	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Public	Approval	Property is site of Appleton Elementary School.
26	Commercial	Commercial/Industrial	Approval	This change is to reflect current County zoning.
27	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Approval	Property is outside the Persigo 201 boundary
28	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Approval	
29	Residential Medium Low	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Approval	

	(2-4 du/acre)			
30	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Approval	
31	Residential Medium High (8-12 du/acre)	Commercial/Industrial	Approval	Property is not developed residentially and is in a Commercial/Industrial area.
32	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Approval	Property is outside the Persigo 201 boundary
33	Cooperative Planning Area – Fruita/GJ	The Cooperative Planning Areas/Community Separators will have a specific designation on the Land Use Map.		
34	No Designation	Commercial/Industrial	Approval	Surrounding properties are designated Commercial/Industrial
35	Commercial, Commercial/Industrial, Industrial	Commercial	Approval	Property is in a Planned Development zone district and developed with a commercial use.
36	Commercial	Residential Low (1/2 – 2 ac/du)	Approval	Per Resolution No. 91-99, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 of this development should be designated Commercial. Lots 6 and 7 should be Residential Low.
37	Public	Residential Low (1/2 – 2 ac/du)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
38	Park	Residential High (12+ du/acre).	Approval	These properties are not public parks.
39	Park	Residential Medium High (8-12 du/acre)	Approval	
40	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
41	Residential Medium High	Residential High (12+)	Approval	This change is to reflect the current zoning.

	(8-12 du/acre)	du/acres)		
42	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
43	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	
44	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	
45	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Public.	Approval	This property has been acquired by the School District for use with the school property to the south.
46	Public	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
47	Public	Commercial	Approval	
48	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Commercial	Approval	Properties are partially developed as commercial properties and are surrounded by properties that are currently designated Commercial.
49	Commercial, Commercial/Industrial	Commercial	Approval	
50	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Public	Approval	This property is owned by the School District and is the site for Chatfield Elementary School.
51	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Approval	This property is a developed subdivision with a density that falls within the Residential Medium Low density range.
52	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Approval	
53	Conservation	Public	Approval	These properties are owned by Public taxing entities.
54	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Commercial/Industrial	Approval	These properties are surrounded by properties that are designated Commercial/Industrial.
55	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or



				used by a non-taxing entity.
56	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Park	Approval	This property is part of the existing/future Riverfront Trail system.
57	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	This property is a developed subdivision with a density that falls within the Residential Medium density range.
58	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Approval	These properties are surrounded by properties that are designated Estate.
59	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Commercial	Approval	These properties are developed commercially.
60	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Park	Approval	This property is part of the existing/future Riverfront Trail system.
61	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Park	Approval	This property is a public neighborhood park.
62	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	These properties are surrounded by Residential Medium designated properties and do not meet the requirements for the Rural designation and corresponding potential zone districts.
63	Public	Residential Medium High (8-12 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
64	Public	<del>Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)</del>	Deleted	
65	Public	Residential Medium High (8-12 du/acre)	Approval	
66	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Commercial	Approval	These properties are developed and zoned commercially.
67	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
68	Public	Residential	Approval	

		Medium (4-8 du/acre)	al	
69	Public	Commercial	Approval	
70	Public	Commercial	Approval	
71	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Commercial	Approval	These properties are developed and zoned commercially.
72	Commercial	Public	Approval	This property is owned by a Public taxing entity.
73	Public	Commercial	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
74	Commercial/Residential Medium High (8-12 du/acre)	Commercial/Industrial	Approval	These properties are developed and zoned compatible with the Commercial/Industrial land use designation.
75	Public	Commercial	Approval	
76	Mesa State College neighborhood area shown as "Public", but privately owned.	Change to RM	Approval	
77	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
78	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	
79	Public	Commercial	Approval	
81	Public	Commercial	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
82	Commercial	Public	Approval	These properties are owned by Public

			al	taxing entities.
83	Commercial	Public	Approval	
84	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/acre)	Commercial (already changed with Orchard Mesa Plan)	Approval	This change will make the property consistent with the Orchard Mesa Plan and existing zoning along Hwy 50.
85	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
86	Conservation	Public	Approval	These properties are owned by Public taxing entities.
87	Conservation	Public	Approval	
88	Cooperative Planning Area – Palisade/GJ	The Cooperative Planning Areas/Community Separators will have a specific designation on the Land Use Map.		
89	Conservation	Public	Approval	These properties are owned by Public taxing entities.
90	Public	Agriculture	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and to be used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
91	Estate (2-5 acres/du)	Public	Approval	These properties are owned by Public taxing entities.
92	Rural (5-35 acres/du)	Public	Approval	
93	Agriculture (35+ acres)	Public	Approval	
94	Agriculture (35+ acres)	Commercial	Approval	This change is to reflect the current zoning.
95	Commercial-Industrial	Commercial	Approval	The Commercial land use designation is more compatible with the residential uses in the area.
96	Residential Medium (4-8 du/acre)/ Commercial/ Public	Public	Approval	These properties are owned by Public taxing entities.

<b><u>New Items</u></b>				
97	Public & Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac)	Park (Long Property)	Approval	Future County Park site.
98	Public	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.
99	Public	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac) (Clifton Shepard of the Valley Church)	Approval	
100	Commercial-Industrial	Industrial (Bonella Property)	Approval	This change is to reflect the current zoning and use of the property.
101	Public	Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac) – On map but not identified (Bockelman property)	Approval	The Public designation is intended for properties owned and used by taxing entities. This property is owned and/or used by a non-taxing entity.

**OTHER ISSUES:**

- Public Designation will be applied to all properties owned and to be used by taxing entities except existing or future park sites (includes BLM land, State land, School District land, and Special Districts)
- Parks Designation will be applied to all existing or future park sites
- All church properties currently designated as Public will be changed to the surrounding land use designation.
- The Cooperative Planning Areas/Community Separators will have a specific designation on the Land Use Map.
- Need to discuss whether all properties within the defined 100-year floodplains and Airport Critical Zones should have a Rural or Conservation land use designation.
- The Clifton Sanitation line must be verified and need to discuss land use designations just to the east and west of the line.
- Need to identify a Neighborhood Shopping Center site of 10 to 15 acres in the Pear Park area to accommodate the large residential population planned.

## PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP DISCUSSION ITEMS

MAP #	PROPOSED CHANGE	RECOMMENDATION		GENERAL COMMENTS
		STEERING COMMITTEE	JOINT PC	
1	Change from Residential Rural 5-35 ac/du to Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac	Approval	Approval	This area falls within the Sanitation District. The current designation is more appropriate.
2	Change from Residential Rural 5-35 ac/du to Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac	Approval	Approval	
3	Change from Residential Rural 5-35 ac/du to Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac	Approval	Approval	
4	Change from Residential Medium High 8-12 du/ac to Commercial	Approval	Approval	The Commercial land use designation matches the current development potential of the lots.
5	Change from Residential Medium 4-8 du/ac to Commercial	Approval	Approval	
6	Change from Industrial to Commercial	Approval	Approval	
7	Change from Public to Commercial	Approval	Approval	This property is leased. It could therefore be more compatible with the Commercial designation.
8	<del>Change from Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac and Residential High 8-12 du/ac to Residential Medium 4-8 du/ac</del>	Approval	Deleted	<del>Staff feels that the Commercial category more closely matches the development potential for the large lots.</del>
9	Change from Residential Low 1/2-2 ac/du to Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac	Approval	Approval	The Residential Medium Low designation closely matches the development potential and the development of the lots.
10	Change from Residential Rural 5-35 ac/du to Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac	Approval	Approval	
11	Change from Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac to Residential Rural 5-35 ac/du	Approval	Approval	These properties fall within the Airport Critical Area. The uses are limited to Airport related residential and other uses. The potential danger of the Airport is a concern.
12	Change from Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac and Residential Low 1/2-2 ac/du to Residential Rural 5-35 ac/du	Approval	Approval	

13	Change from Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac to Residential Rural 5-35 ac/du	Approval	Approval	With the limited use Rural is the most app
44	<del>Change from Residential Medium High 8-12 du/ac to Commercial</del>	<del>Approval</del>	Deleted	<del>The property is (Commercial) and has uses existing.</del>
15	Change from Residential Medium High 8-12 du/ac to Commercial	Approval	Approval	The current zoning Commercial). This Land Use Map consid
16	Developer request for change from Residential Medium 4-8 du/ac to Residential Medium High 8-12 du/ac	Approval	Approval	A higher density res buffer between t properties to the we properties to the east
17	Change from Residential High 12+ du/ac to Residential Medium 4-8 du/ac	Approval	Approval	This property is a properties to the Residential Medium the neighborhood.
	Owner request for change from Residential High 12+ du/ac to Mixed Use	Denial	Denial	
18	Owner request for change from Residential Medium 4-8 du/ac to Residential High 12+ du/ac	Denial	Denial	This property was ch to Residential Low (1 the owner clarified Medium, 4 to 8 u/a.
19	Owner request for change from Residential Medium 4-8 du/ac to Mixed Use	Denial	Denial	County Planning Cor 2; City Planning Com
20	Owner request for change from Residential Medium High 8-12 du/ac to Commercial	Denial	Approval of 300'	At the hearing the ov split designation, with as Commercial and Medium High.
21	Change from Commercial to Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac	Approval	Denial	City Council decided for this property was the Future Land Use Map.
	Owner request for change from Commercial to Residential High 12+ du/ac	Denial	Approval of Residential Medium	At the hearing the ow Residential Medium,
22	Change from Residential Medium 4-8 du/ac to Residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac	Approval	Approval	The Residential Medi closely matches the c and the development lots.

23	Owner request for change from Residential Estate 2-5 ac/du to Commercial. Note: Parcels are outside of the Persigo 201 area.	Denial	Denial	
24	Owner request for change from Residential Estate 2-5 ac/du to Commercial	Denial	Denial	County PC approved request.
25	Owner request for change from Residential Estate 2-5 ac/du to residential Medium Low 2-4 du/ac	Denial	Denial	The owner has requested a planning commission be considered by City
26	Owner request for change from Industrial to Commercial	Denial	Approval	

## PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP PEAR PARK AREA

<b>M A P #</b>	<b>EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATI ON</b>	<b>PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATI ON</b>	<b>JOINT PC DECIS ION</b>	<b>GENERAL DESCRIPTION</b>
1	Industrial	Commercial/Industrial	Approval	This area will serve as a buffer between the more intense Industrial designated properties to the west and the Residentially designated properties to the east
2	Commercial/Industrial	Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac)	Approval	A higher density residential area will provide a good buffer between the Commercial/Industrial designated properties to the west and the Residential Medium Low properties to the east.
3	Estate (2-5 ac/du)	Commercial	Approval	The Pear Park area is a quickly developing area of the valley and is in need of a potential site for a future commercial center. This property was chosen due to it's size and location.
		Residential Medium High (8-12 du/ac)	Approved Reside	A higher density residential area will provide a good buffer between the Commercial designated properties to the

			Residential Medium (4-8) for area east of commercial and Residential Medium-Low (2-4) for area south of commercial.	west and the Residential Medium, Residential Low, and Estate properties to the east and south.
4	Estate (2-5 ac/du)	Residential Low (1/2 - 2 ac/du)	Approved Residential Medium-Low (2-4)	This area will serve as a buffer between the higher density Residentially designated properties to the west and north and the lower density Residentially designated properties to the east and south.
		Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac)	Approval	Staff feels that the Residential Medium Low land use category more closely matches the current development in the area and the development potential for the remaining undeveloped lots.
5	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac)	Commercial/Industrial	Approval	This property is currently zoned Industrial in the County and is utilized for Commercial/Industrial uses.
6	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac) /Commercial-Industrial	Residential High (12+/ac)	No Action	A higher density residential area will provide a good buffer between the Commercial/Industrial designated properties to the east and west and the Residential Medium properties to the east and south.



				County PC tabled the item; City PC approved Residential High
7	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac)	Commercial/Industrial	Approval	All properties along this stretch of Gunnison Avenue are designated as Commercial/Industrial and many are developed this way. The subject properties are currently have uses on them that are compatible with a Commercial/Industrial designation.
8	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac)	Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac)	No Action	Staff feels that the Residential Medium land use category more closely matches the current development in the area and the development potential for the subject properties.  County PC approved commercial; City PC approved Residential Medium.
9	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac)	Commercial	Approval	A portion of these properties is currently zoned PC (Planned Commercial) in the County. In order for the area to feasibly develop with commercial uses, additional properties were added to the proposed Commercial Land Use area.
10	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac)	Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac)	Approval	Staff feels that the Residential Medium land use category more closely matches the current development in the area and the development potential for the subject properties.
11	Residential Medium Low (2-4 du/ac)	Commercial	Approval	Staff feels that the Commercial land use category more closely matches the current development in this area of 31 ½ Road and the development potential for the subject properties.
12	Commercial	Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac)	Approval	Staff feels that the Residential Medium land use category more closely matches the current development in the area and the development potential for the subject properties.

# I. GROWTH PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

## DISCUSSION—JUNE 25 & JULY 11, 2002

### **OPEN SPACE AND PARKS**

#### Likes and Dislikes:

- Need more open space on Orchard Mesa
- Like Watson Island and the Botanical Gardens
- Dislike sprawl into unique farmland
- Like the agricultural character of the Valley
- Like the River trail corridor
- Like the parks, need more
- Need to implement the Parks Plan
- Dislike the under-utilization of the River corridor

#### Discussion:

- Need an open space program (tied to the community identity)
- Incorporate other open space areas, such as drainages, buffers in the urban area (multi-use)
- Need to continue to implement the separators program
- Need to provide information and resources for landscaping (types, alkali soil...)

### **DETENTION PONDS / DRAINAGES / NATURAL AREAS**

#### Likes and Dislikes:

- Dislike the old development along the urban stretch of the River
- Like the River corridor as an amenity
- Dislike not using the River as an asset—turned our back on the River

#### Discussion:

- There is currently a steering committee looking at a Regional Detention/Stormwater Plan

- Maintain and respect the natural drainageways on the Redlands
- Allow direct discharge where possible—detention facilities are difficult to maintain
- The Railroad is a barrier to drainage getting to the River in many areas (undersized pipes)

## **BUILDING MATERIALS AND DESIGN**

Likes and Dislikes:

- Like the building scale on Main Street
- Dislike metal buildings in commercial zones (i.e. Bishops Furniture)
- Dislike unscreened junk
- Dislike finished facades on only one side
- Dislike cookie-cutter design
- Like individuality of design for both commercial and residential
- Like a mixture of architectural design
- Like creative design, such as the Main Street Shopping Park
- Like buffers and transitions between rural and urban

Discussion:

- Encourage individuality in design
- Need to create a community identity and have minimum standards
- Over-regulation creates “sameness”
- High quality materials
- Create parameters for design, but allow flexibility
- More regulations in high demand areas

## **STREETSCAPE**

Likes and Dislikes:

- Like Art-on-the-Corner
- Need more control of night lighting
- Like trees in the downtown area

- Like planters
- Like landscape between streets and buildings
- Like to see the trees as coming into the Valley
- Like the Downtown walking mall
- Dislike the lack of street-side appearance
- Dislike bark in the planters on Main Street
- Behind Justice Center needs improvements
- Like Main Street furniture
- Like serpentine design of Main Street
- Need to define the City identity
- Like that it takes only 15 minutes to go all the way across town

#### Discussion:

- Detached walks are desirable, but might be based on density
- Detached walks create a sense of openness
- Right-of-Way landscaping alternatives should include vegetation that suits the climate
- Maintenance issue of right-of-way (City vs. property owner)
- Promote street tree program for both residential and commercial
- Offer incentives for property owners to landscape the right-of-way
- Code Enforcement – educational role
- Some signage has historic/small town character value (i.e. old motel signs on North Avenue)
- Round-about design should be larger and appropriate for the level of traffic

## **ENTRYWAYS**

#### Likes and Dislikes:

- Dislike the 5<sup>th</sup> Street entrance
- Landscaping types need to be adaptable to our climate
- Dislike ugly entryways
- Dislike Horizon Drive
- Move junkyards away from entryways
- Dislike Highway 50 corridor

- Dislike 6 & 50 turning movements

Discussion:

- Need to look at the role of other entities
- Funding sources
- Incorporate Public Art / Art on the Corner

## **NIGHT LIGHTING**

Likes and Dislikes:

- Like being able to see the stars at night
- Dislike light standards that are too tall
- Dislike not enough lighting

Discussion:

- Committee viewed this as a fairly high priority item
- Look into the Police/Sheriff Departments' criteria/minimum lighting needed for security/neighborhood watch
- Explore lighting types/options to require "filtered" lighting on sites. e.g. Canyon View Park
- Research American Planning Association (APA) information for security and other lighting
- Look into use of timing devices/sensors for lighting along major street corridors
- Adopt specific lighting standards for certain types of uses
- Architectural up-lighting is okay if no "spillover"

## **VIEW CORRIDORS**

Likes and Dislikes:

- Dislike "pollution" of visual backdrops with tall buildings, billboards, and signs
- Like views of surrounding areas

- Like to maintain views along major streets, from public spaces (i.e. views from Eagle Rim Park)

Discussion:

- Also considered a fairly high priority item by the steering committee. Views of Colorado National Monument, Bookcliffs and Grand Mesa
- Maintain views from public open spaces e.g. Canyon View, Matchett and Eagle Rim Parks
- Maintain views along major road corridors – eliminate intrusion of billboards and communication towers (Monument Road, Patterson)
- Building height considerations – area-specific flexibility e.g. downtown (less sensitive) vs. outlying areas (more sensitive)
- At time of development of residential subdivisions, consider lower heights of homes on perimeter so as not to block views from homes within interior of subdivision
- Consider height of structures along ridgelines – define more ridgelines?
- When looking at building heights, consider location along corridors – if increasing building height, increase building setbacks (similar to 24 Road Guidelines)
- Create a view analysis map

## **SIGNS**

Likes and Dislikes:

- Dislike large freestanding signs in commercial areas
- Like the downtown area signage
- Dislike billboards
- Dislike the excessive signage along Highway 6 & 50

Discussion:

- Also considered fairly high priority issue by Steering Committee
- Relates to concern with creating a “Community Identity”
- Overlap with view corridors – create consistency/same character along major corridors e.g. Patterson & 25 Roads
- Billboards – require removal? Large/tall signs, consider scale within a corridor
- Maintain some “historic” signs e.g. North Avenue “Palomino” but adopt maintenance standards
- Are broad Code revisions/updates needed? Review policies

## HISTORIC CHARACTER / RESOURCES

### Likes and Dislikes:

- Like historic district with detached sidewalks
- Like 7<sup>th</sup> Street
- Like the landscaping along 7<sup>th</sup> Street
- Like the crosswalks on 7<sup>th</sup> Street
- Like the historic lighting on 7<sup>th</sup> Street
- Like the building scale on Main Street
- Like the 50s-60s look of North Avenue

### Discussion:

- Protect/maintain Central Business District character
- Protect/maintain other surrounding areas / specific sites

## **LANDSCAPING**

### Likes and Dislikes:

- Like new parking lot landscaping
- Like trees and planters
- Like new commercial development standards
- Dislikes the lost opportunities on Orchard Mesa
- Like subdivision perimeter fencing with landscape strip
- Like the tree canopy of the community
- Dislike dead, scraggly landscaping (species that do not do well)
- Dislike large parking lots without landscaping (and large lots all in front of the building)
- Like more landscaping
- Like landscaping, but need to allow more creativity
- Like Main Street landscaping

### Discussion:

- Review existing Code for number of plants required – possible need for refinement
- Place greater emphasis on xeriscape species and design
- Explore need for ongoing landscaping maintenance standards e.g. tree trimming

## **STREETS / CROSS-SECTIONS**

Likes and Dislikes:

- Dislike lack of sidewalks
- Dislike small roundabouts
- Need more sidewalks
- Like roundabouts if big enough
- Dislike lack of pedestrian and bicycle access to Canyon View Park
- Like parkway-type design

Discussion:

- “Park strips” (area between property line and detached sidewalks) are a good amenity, should be encouraged (in some areas – see below), but maintenance responsibility is a concern
- Density / intensity of uses along street should influence type of sidewalk / path
- Provide incentives to maintain these areas
- Allow options / flexibility for placement of sidewalk on one side and not the other



CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

Resolution No.

AMENDING THE GROWTH PLAN OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

Recitals:

The City of Grand Junction and Mesa County Planning Commissions and planning staffs have diligently worked jointly and cooperatively to amend the *Growth Plan* for the urban area of the Grand Valley. After months of extensive public involvement and input gathered from eight Growth Plan Steering Committee (Committee) meetings, two public meetings, written comments and staff counsel, the Committee recommended a number of changes to the Plan.

The Committee also recommended changes to the Goals, Policies and Action Items to reinforce a strong commitment to enhance the community's appearance. Those recommended changes help to define the community's view of its future and propose actions the community can take to achieve that view. The amended Goals, Policies and Action Items use text to establish guiding principles and courses of action that the City will use to address the many physical, economic and social issues facing the community.

The Grand Junction Planning Commission met jointly with the Mesa County Planning Commission and approved the Committee's recommendations with some modifications.

The City Council, having held public hearings and considering the recommendations made to it, finds that the proposed amendments to the *Growth Plan* are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Plan and meet the review criteria in Section 2.5.C of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code.

The City Council further finds that the Plan, as amended, is a guide to public and private growth decisions through the year 2010. It is a statement of the community's vision for its own future and a road map providing direction to achieve that vision. The view of the future expressed in the amended *Growth Plan* is shaped by community values, ideals and aspirations about the best management of the community and its resources.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT THE GRAND JUNCTION GROWTH PLAN IS AMENDED AS STATED HEREIN AND AS DEPICTED AND DESCRIBED IN THE FOLLOWING MAPS WHICH ARE EXHIBITS HERETO OR AS THE SAME MAY BE MAINTAINED ELECTRONICALLY BY THE CITY CLERK:

## 1. Future Land Use Map Amendments

Housekeeping Map items 1-105:

- #8—Change to Public designation
- #17—Change northern parcel to Residential Medium Low (2-4 u/a) and southern parcel to Residential Medium (4-8 u/a)
- #64—Deleted

## 2. Discussion Map

Discussion Map items 1—26:

- #8—Deleted
- #14—Deleted
- #17—Approval of Residential Medium (4-8 u/a)
- #19—Withdrawn by applicant
- #20—Approval of Commercial for 300' depth along Patterson Road
- #21—Approval of Residential Medium (4-8 u/a)
- #26—Approval of Commercial/Industrial

## 3. Pear Park Map

Pear Park Map items 1-12:

- #3—Approval of Residential Medium (4-8 u/a) for area east of Commercial; and Residential Medium Low (2-4 u/a) for area south of Commercial
- #4—Approval of Residential Medium Low (2-4 u/a) for area south of C  $\frac{3}{4}$  Road
- #6—No Action (therefore, no change)
- #8—No Action (therefore, no change)

## 4. Goals, Policies and Action Items

Approval of the following Goals, Policies and Action Items stated verbatim as determined by City Council. All Action Items that are complete are to be deleted from the Growth Plan. Action Items to be deleted are not restated herein.

Underlining and strikethroughs are shown as legislative history only:

Goal 2: To ensure orderly transitions or buffers in areas of joint concern between different communities (i.e., Grand Junction, Fruita, and Palisade) that help define distinct communities within Mesa County.

Policy 2.1: Grand Junction and Mesa County will coordinate with the City of Fruita to establish and maintain a transition area between Grand Junction and Fruita that includes the Cooperative Planning Area as defined in the Cooperative Planning Agreement of February 9, 1998. ~~proposed area of joint concern shown in Exhibit V.4.~~ Additional areas should be considered for inclusion in the Cooperative Planning Area.

Mesa County and Grand Junction should coordinate the adoption of specific design standards for this area with Fruita to strengthen the visual transition between these communities.

Policy 2.2: ~~Mesa County and Grand Junction will coordinate with the Town of Palisade and other affected jurisdictions to establish and maintain a transition area between the Clifton area and the Town of Palisade that includes the Cooperative Planning Area as defined in the Cooperative Planning Agreement of February 9, 1998. proposed area of joint concern shown in Exhibit V.5.~~ Additional areas should be considered for inclusion in the Cooperative Planning Area. Mesa County and Grand Junction should coordinate the adoption of specific design standards for this area to strengthen the visual transition.

~~Policy 2.3: The City and County will support public and private investment in community gateway areas that enhance the aesthetic appeal of the community. (Move to Goal 13)~~

#### Action Items:

New Action Item: Conduct the 5-year review of the Cooperative Planning Agreements with Mesa County, Grand Junction, Fruita and Palisade. Consider adding additional areas to the Cooperative Planning Areas.

#### Community Appearance and Design

Goal 13: To enhance the aesthetic appeal and appearance of the community's built environment. ~~community.~~

Policy 13.1: The City and County will establish heightened aesthetic standards and guidelines for the gateway areas and high visibility corridors ~~listed in Exhibit V.9 and mapped in Exhibit V.10.~~

Action Item 7: Adopt standards and guidelines to address the screening of outdoor storage and operations for heavy commercial and industrial uses. Screening and building design standards should vary based on location within the community, with more restrictive standards applied along high visibility corridors.

Policy 13.2: The City and County will enhance the quality of development along key arterial street corridors. ~~Existing corridor plans listed in Exhibit V.9 will remain in effect. Until these plans are updated,~~ The Urban Area Plan will prevail when existing corridor plans, adopted prior to 1996, are inconsistent with this plan.

Action Item 10: Adopt corridor/gateway design guidelines for public and private development, through the use of overlay districts. ~~Establish overlay zoning districts, as~~

~~identified in Exhibit 10 to designate areas in which the guidelines will be applied.~~ Public enhancements should be coordinated with other capital projects in the overlay districts area.

Action Item 38: Adopt corridor development regulations for the major corridors Highway 6/50, 24 Road and Patterson addressing appropriate uses and development design. Guidelines should address parcel access, building orientation, landscaping, screening, bulk, parking, signage, streetscaping and view corridors.

Policy 13.3: The City and County will foster improved community aesthetics through improved development regulations addressing landscaping, screening of outdoor storage and operations, building orientation, building design signage, parking lot design and other design considerations.

Action Item 53: Revise code standards for location and screening of outdoor storage, streetscaping, landscaping, signage, lighting, building orientation, building materials and parking lot design. ~~Establish gateway and corridor overlay districts for more stringent application of these standards.~~

Policy 13.4: The community's streets and walkways will be planned, built, and maintained as attractive public spaces.

New Action Item: Develop street standards and site design alternatives that incorporate elements, such as street trees, parkway strips, medians and other features, that contribute to the street as an attractive public space.

Action Item 101: Incorporate sidewalks, landscaping and appropriate lighting and bikeway improvements into all roadway improvement projects.

Policy 13.5: Community entryways will be enhanced and accentuated at key entry points to the city including interstate interchange areas, and other major arterial streets leading into the City.

New Action Item: Establish gateway and corridor overlay districts that incorporate high-quality and innovative design requirements that reflect the desired image of the area.

Action Item 55: Prepare a corridor design plan for HWY 50 and South 5<sup>th</sup> Street, extending from the river and north to Grand Avenue that provides for redevelopment of this downtown gateway.

Policy 13.6: Outdoor lighting should be minimized and designed to reduce glare and light spillage, preserving "dark sky" views of the night sky, without compromising safety.

New Action Item: Review and revise the outdoor lighting section of the Code to require lighting that minimizes glare and light-spillage, but does not compromise safety, thus preserving the “dark sky”.

Policy 13.7: Views of Grand Mesa, Colorado National Monument and the Bookcliffs will be preserved from public spaces, such as Canyon View Park and Matchett Park, as well as along major corridors, as identified through specific corridor planning.

Policy 13.8: The City and County will encourage building and landscape designs which enhance the visual appeal of individual projects and the community as a whole. Design guidelines should provide flexibility while promoting aesthetics, traffic safety and land use compatibility.

Policy 13.9: Architectural standards and guidelines will be adopted that encourage well-designed, interesting and distinctive architecture that reinforce and reflect the community’s desire for high quality development.

New Action Item: Adopt architectural standards that encourage well-designed, interesting and distinctive architecture that reinforce/reflect the Community’s overall defined identity/image, using high quality materials and innovative design that varies building heights and styles.

Policy 13.10: The City and County will develop Code provisions that enhance landscape requirements, yet are appropriate to the climate and available plant species of the Grand Valley.

New Action Item: Review/revise Code standards for landscaping to include provisions and incentives for use of xeriscape design and plants well-suited to the climate of the Grand Valley.

New Action Item: Adopt Code standards to address minimum on-going maintenance of landscaping.

Policy 13.11: The City and County will develop Code provisions that minimize the visual impact of telecommunication towers and facilities.

New Action Item: Review and revise the Telecommunications Facilities/Towers section of the Code to implement measures that minimize the visual impacts.

Policy 13.12: Visual clutter along corridors will be minimized through the application of sign regulations and corridor design standards and guidelines.

New Action Item: Review and revise the sign code to address visual clutter along corridors.

## Cultural/Historic Resources

Goal 19: To retain and preserve historic and cultural resources that symbolize the community's identity and uniqueness.

Policy 19.1: The City and County will support efforts to inventory, designate and protect valued historic structures.

Policy 19.2: The City and County will establish building code provisions that accommodate the safe and efficient use of historic structures, even though the structures may not comply with standards for new construction.

Policy 19.3: The City will consider providing aesthetic improvements (such as historic lighting, specialized pavers and other streetscape improvements) as an incentive for property owners to register and maintain historic structures.

Policy 19.4: The City will develop Code provisions to protect and maintain the historic character of the downtown central business district and other designated historic districts and sites.

### Action Items:

Action Item 33: Adopt flexible building code provisions to encourage development of second floor residences in the downtown area.

Action Item 35: Adopt a downtown overlay district that is applicable to all designated historic structures, sites and districts that addresses appropriate architectural materials and features (façade design), color schemes, and signs for historic buildings and new construction in historic areas. ~~establishes appropriate use, setback, height, streetscape and parking standards. Update design guidelines addressing materials and façade design for use with downtown development and redevelopment projects.~~

Action Item 72: Maintain and update the inventory of historic structures.

Action Item 73: Adopt codes to encourage retention and rehabilitation of historic structures throughout the urban area.

Action Item 74: Expand the use of specialized pavers, landscaping, street furniture and lighting fixtures which are appropriate to the character of the historic neighborhoods.

## Parks and Open Space

Goal 26: To develop and maintain an interconnected system of neighborhood and community parks, trails and other recreational facilities throughout the urban area.

Policy 26.1: The City will update and use the Parks Master Plan to guide future park and recreation development in Grand Junction and surrounding areas in Mesa County.

Policy 26.2: The City will develop and maintain a network of recreation areas and facilities.

Policy 26.3: The City and County will encourage the retention of lands that are not environmentally suitable for construction (e.g. steep grades, unstable soils, floodplains, etc.) for open space areas and, where appropriate, development of recreational uses. Dedications of land required to meet recreational needs should not include these properties unless they are usable for active recreational purposes.

Policy 26.4: The City and County will help preserve areas of outstanding scenic and/or natural beauty and, where possible, include these areas in the permanent open space system.

Policy 26.5: The City and County will obtain adequate park land needed to meet neighborhood, ~~and~~ community, and regional park needs, as urban development occurs, through the subdivision process and other appropriate mechanisms. Other public, quasi-public and private interests will be encouraged to secure, develop and/or maintain parks.

Policy 26.6: The City and County will coordinate with the school district to achieve cost savings through joint development of school and recreational facilities.

Policy 26.7: The City and County will ensure that medium-high and high density residential projects have adequate usable public or private open space incorporated into the project or linked to the project on adjacent parcels.

Policy 26.8: The City and County will require that provisions be made for on-going maintenance of open space areas by an appropriate public or private entity.

## Action Items:

Action Item 8: Establish minimum standards for the creation and maintenance of usable public and private open space for various types of residential projects.

Action Item 107: Update and implement the Parks Master Plan, providing an interconnected system of neighborhood and community parks throughout the urbanized area.

New Action Item: Review financing options for implementing the Parks Master Plan and identified open space needs.

Goal 27: To include open space corridors and areas throughout the planning area for recreational, transportation and environmental purposes.

Policy 27.1: The City and County will retain existing open space areas, identified in the Parks Master Plan, ~~mapped in Exhibit V.13~~ for environmental and recreational purposes.

Policy 27.2: The City and County will prepare an open space plan to guide development and open space acquisition decisions.

Policy 27.3: The City and County will coordinate with appropriate agencies to mitigate the impact of recreational use of open space on its environmental value.

Policy 27.4: The City and County will seek public and private partnerships in efforts to secure open space.

#### Action Items:

Action Item 110: Adopt an open space plan that is coordinated with the parks and trails master plan. The plan should serve as a basis for site acquisition and to help prepare open space and recreation grants for the Grand Valley.

Action Item 112: Adopt a Trails Plan that prioritizes trail segments for acquisition and construction based on their transportation and recreational value.

Action Item 113: Establish a fund for open land preservation and acquisition

#### Infill/Redevelopment

Goal 28: The City of Grand Junction is committed to taking an active role in the facilitation and promotion of infill and redevelopment within the urban growth area of the City.



Policy 28.1: The City shall adopt precise and enforceable definitions of the terms “infill” and “redevelopment” consistent with the overall goal and shall use those terms consistently in its implementing actions, including any regulatory change.

Policy 28.2: The City shall identify specific geographic areas appropriate to implement the general goal of facilitating infill and redevelopment, while enabling the City to prioritize its focus and target limited resources in as efficient a manner as possible.

Policy 28.3: The City’s elected officials and leadership will consistently advocate and promote the planning, fiscal, and quality of life advantages and benefits achievable through infill and redevelopment.

Action Items:

New Action Item: As opportunities arise and when the City is prepared to act, the City shall identify specific redevelopment areas within Grand Junction in which public sector efforts to encourage and facilitate redevelopment will be given the highest priority and where direct/active public participation will be considered.

New Action Item: The City shall identify the geographical reach of the term “infill”, which is not intended to include the entire city, so that regulatory or other reforms and incentives to encourage/facilitate infill development may be targeted and tailored to the identified locations and/or neighborhoods.

New Action Item: The City’s elected officials and leadership shall ensure that various city agencies’ and departments’ policies, regulations, and practices are consistent with the overall goal to encourage and facilitate infill and redevelopment in Grand Junction.

New Action Item: The City’s leadership will work in partnership with Grand Junction’s relevant civic and nonprofit organizations, the regional development community, and neighborhood organizations to provide information, educate, and promote grassroots advocacy of infill and redevelopment.

New Action Item: The City will gather and coordinate the dissemination of public or other city controlled information that can facilitate infill and redevelopment efforts, such as market studies; inventories of vacant, underutilized, and public-owned parcels in targeted geographic areas; demographic information; and tax and property assessment data.

New Action Item: The City will coordinate public infrastructure improvements with infill and redevelopment development needs, especially in areas identified as infill and redevelopment areas.

New Action Item: Review and evaluate existing land development regulations to ensure the infill and redevelopment policies are supported.

New Action Item: Explore and consider implementing financial incentives to facilitate and encourage infill and redevelopment, to be applied to specific infill and redevelopment projects on a case-by-case basis, consistent with established criteria.

ADDITIONAL ACTION ITEM:

Note: The Steering Committee would like to ensure that an area plan be done for the Pear Park area, since it has the potential for so much growth in the future that will require parks, schools and other infrastructure improvements.

New Action Item: Complete and area plan for Pear Park, addressing specific land use, increased traffic needs, park and school sites and other infrastructure needs.

The amendments to the City of Grand Junction Growth Plan provided herein are hereby adopted.

This Resolution is PASSED on this 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2003.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
President of Council