

**MESA COUNTY & GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING
OCTOBER 19, 2006 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 9:10 p.m.**

The Mesa County & Grand Junction Planning Commission Joint Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by (Grand Junction) Vice-Chairman Roland Cole. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Roland Cole (Vice-Chairman), Patrick Carlow (1st alternate), William E. Putnam, and Bill Pitts. Absent were Dr. Paul A. Dibble (Chairman) and Commissioners Reginald Wall, Thomas Lowrey and Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh.

In attendance, representing the County Planning Commission, were Mark Bonella (Chair), John Justman (Vice-Chair), Christi Flynn, Terri Binder (Secretary), Thomas Kenyon (Alternate), Sam Susuras (Alternate) and Bruce Noble. Absent were Commissioners Michael Gardner and George Domet.

Representing Mesa County were Keith Fife, Long Range Planning Division Director, Todd Hollenbeck, Regional Transportation Planning Office, Michael Warren, Senior Planner, and Kurt Larsen, Mesa County Planning and Economic Development Director.

Representing the City of Grand Junction were Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner, Jamie Kreiling, (Assistant City Attorney, and Sheryl Trent, Interim Community Development Director.

Lynn Singer was present to record the minutes.
There were 38 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

(Mesa County) Chairman Mark Bonella introduced the Mesa County Planning Commission members. (Grand Junction) Vice-Chairman Roland Cole announced the hearing rules and format.

II. PUBLIC HEARING - CLIFTON/FRUITVALE COMMUNITY PLAN

Mesa County Project # 2006-008-MP1 County Master Plan	An amendment to the Mesa
--	---------------------------------

Grand Junction Project #PLN-2006-258 Junction Growth Plan	As an element of the Grand
--	-----------------------------------

STAFF PRESENTATION

Keith Fife, Mesa County Long Range Planning Division Director, entered into the record the Mesa County Master Plan and the Grand Junction City Growth Plan, the Mesa County Land Development Code, the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code and the project files . Also entered into the record was the PowerPoint presentation as exhibit A. Mr. Fife referenced three additional handouts - the draft plan appendices, an updated letter from Genie, Inc. dated October 13, 2006 and a copy of the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Fife noted that the purpose of the hearing this evening is to take formal comment on the second draft of the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan for consideration of adoption by the Commissions. He stated that the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan will be a guide for future development.

Mr. Fife stated that the Clifton area was part of a large planning effort in 1985 as one of the first neighborhood plans adopted. It also included Fruitvale and Pear Park. In 2000 the County Planning Commission abolished that plan except for the old Clifton section (the old downtown section). By 1996 the City and County jointly adopted the joint urban area plan. That plan from its initial adoption in 1996 had an action item that said that a more detailed Clifton area plan was necessary.

The Pear Park Plan was adopted jointly in 2004. That plan covered the area west of 32 Road to 28 Road between the Business Loop and the river . The Clifton/Fruitvale area is an area that is entirely unincorporated and outside of the Persigo sewer service area. Presently none of the area is annexable to the City of Grand Junction. It includes all of the area that is serviced by the Clifton Sanitation District except that portion that is in Pear Park and it includes the eastern expansion area, the area between Clifton Sanitation District's boundaries and the Palisade buffer area.

Mr. Fife informed the Commissions that extensive community outreach and neighborhood participation was conducted. Several newsletters were sent to 17,000 addresses. Concurrently with this planning effort the County worked with the Regional Transportation Planning Office on their circulation plan for pedestrians. That study went from 30 Road 34 Road and the interstate to the river. Additionally, there were radio and newspaper ads, television and radio interviews, press releases, and two community open houses. Mr. Fife mentioned that over the course of the spring 18 neighborhood meetings were conducted – three in each of the six neighborhoods.

Mr. Fife stated that the plan is organized first by talking about community governance options. As it is all an unincorporated area, not annexable to the City of Grand Junction presently, it is an urban area that is desiring more urban services. Various options that are available to help the community become more

self-sufficient were discussed. Next discussed is the inventory of existing conditions and findings that have been addressed in 15 different topic areas.

Mr. Fife pointed out three techniques that are necessary to realize this plan's goals and vision. The first is partnership. The role of the County is to help foster and facilitate leadership in the community. Next is resources and Mr. Fife stated that the County has put together a capital improvements plan budget for the Clifton-Fruitvale community. Finally, are the regulatory and incentive programs.

This plan is based on the goals and policies in the Joint Urban Area Plan. The plan provides more specific and focused direction in the community.

Mr. Fife itemized and elaborated on each of the Key Plan Implementation Items listed below:

1. Governance;
2. Neighborhoods;
3. Historic Places;
4. Economy/Employment;
5. Public Safety;
6. Public Health;
7. Code Enforcement;
8. Human Services;
9. Housing Assistance;
10. Community Services/Facilities;
11. Land Use and Zoning;
12. Schools, Parks and Trails;
13. Transportation;
14. Utilities and Special Districts; and
15. Natural Resources and Environment.

Mr. Fife requested that the County provide staff with a reasonable period of time to amend the Land Development Code to implement the plan. He further stated that the biggest focus of the Future Land Use Map was on the eastern expansion area. Citizens would like to see a transition into the buffer. In other words, they do not want high density up to the edge of the buffer on 33³/₄ Road. Staff is recommending that a transferable development rights/ credit program be incorporated. As with Fruita, people who own land in the buffer area between Palisade and Clifton could sell their development rights to someone who wants the higher density in the eastern expansion area of Clifton. A range of future land uses would be allowed throughout the plan.

Mr. Fife next addressed a letter from Ciavonne, Roberts & Associates with regard to Otter Creek properties south of D Road. As referenced in the letter, the existing Future Land Use Map is inconsistent with their zoning and also states that a portion of their property is within the urban growth boundary.

Staff is suggesting that those areas that are outside of the urban growth boundary would remain as recommended in the draft plan, Residential Low. For those areas within the urban growth boundary, staff is recommending a change of the Future Land Use Map to Residential Medium Low, 2 to 4 units per acre. Additionally, they are recommending that any property inside the urban growth boundary not have to participate in the TDR program to achieve planned densities.

Mr. Fife reiterated that implementation of the plan will require partnerships between City and County, neighborhoods, and neighborhood and business leaders.

It is staff's recommendation that the Planning Commissions approve the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan with the revisions regarding the Otter Creek properties, adopt those as an amendment to the Mesa County Master Plan and to the Grand Junction Growth Plan.

QUESTIONS

- (Mesa County) Commissioner Kenyon inquired as to the amount of time spent with the landowners in the eastern expansion area and what their comments were regarding the plan. Mr. Fife stated that the eastern expansion area included parts of at least three neighborhoods with a very good turnout to neighborhood meetings.
- (Mesa County) Commissioner Kenyon asked if there would be a "time-out" in development applications in the eastern expansion area. If so, how long the time-out would be. Mr. Fife stated that the time necessary has not been worked out. Mr. Fife advised the Commissions that any projects that are pending would continue forward. Mr. Kurt Larsen, Mesa County Planning Director, addressed the issue of timeframes by stating that things that need to be done would have to be identified and then a work program identified with specific timeframes at that point.
- (Mesa County) Commissioner Justman raised a question regarding the TDR. He further stated that he believes there are a lot of small parcels already in the area and it was his understanding that 10 acres were necessary to sell development rights. Mr. Fife stated that the program would have to be customized to the Clifton area and the Palisade buffer.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Don Mosby, 3348 E $\frac{1}{4}$ Road, Clifton, stated that he and his family own 27 acres in the eastern expansion area. The draft plan recommends to zone half of the property as RSF-4 and the other half 1 to 2. Mr. Mosby would like the entire parcel to be zoned RSF-4. He would like to put a neighborhood park in with walkways and improvements to include irrigation for 33 $\frac{1}{2}$ Road as well as

improve it for Clifton Sanitation District and Clifton water. In response to a question posed by (Mesa County) Commissioner Flynn, Mr. Mosby stated that he has spoken with representatives of both Clifton Sanitation District and the Clifton water district.

Richard Livingston, 2808 North Avenue, Grand Junction, appeared on behalf of Otter Creek. Mr. Livingston stated that part of the issues involve the boundary line for the urban growth area on the east boundary. He noted that there is a discrepancy with regard to the boundary line shown by the City and by the County. Mr. Livingston provided the Commissions with a diagram depicting the property owned by Otter Creek, and surrounding properties identified as parcels A, B, C and D., He is requesting that the boundary line issue be resolved prior to finalization with respect to the Otter Creek properties. Mr. Livingston commended the City and County for their efforts in taking a long term look at the entire area. Also with specific reference to the Otter Creek property, the current zoning on parcels A, B and D are a planned development that in theory upon appropriate application could be developed out at over 8 units per acre, however, Otter Creek recognizes that the best interest of this area of Clifton is better served by less density. He stated that a considerable amount of money has been expended to acquire property based upon existing zoning and existing information in the public records. With this proposal, however, "better than half of the zoning density that historical zoning would allow" would be eliminated. It is his belief that a more reasonable and fair approach is to recognize that on parcels A, B and D a substantial density existed, and, if parcel C is currently within the urban growth area, then the density from parcels A, B, C and D should be spread out over the entire area.

Tracy Moore, 744 Horizon Court, on behalf of Genie, Inc., is concerned with the property identified as the Business Park area west of the Business Loop. She stated that there is an application in process and is concerned that there is no clear definition of the business park designation and what will be allowed. Ms. Moore stated that "we really feel strongly that that designation should be removed from the map at this point. We don't really understand how they can amend a map with a designation that doesn't have any clear definition as to what it means." Mr. Kurt Larsen advised the Commissions that Genie, Inc. does have a request in that is going through the process for a rezone to C-2. Mr. Larson further stated that as they are in the process, they can continue through the process under the C-2 and simply need to be consistent with that category.

Ken Knavel (699 33 Road, Clifton) also had a question regarding the other business park (east of the Business Loop) and whether it will be zoned commercial and, if so, when. Mr. Keith Fife stated that proposed/potential uses are park, recreation or business park with some Residential Low. Mr. Fife stated that the plan suggests that any of those uses could be allowed. Kurt Larsen also addressed Mr. Knavel's concerns by stating that drainage and access issues need to be resolved prior to any major development. Additionally, Mr. Larsen

stated that it is not suitable for commercial use at this time due to those drainage and access issues.

Bertie Deering, 3251 E Road, Clifton, inquired about sidewalks along E Road. Todd Hollenbeck of the Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office stated that currently sidewalks along E Road is showing as a medium priority. He stated that it is on the priority list but is dependent upon funding. Mr. Hollenbeck further stated that there is an inventory of what pedestrian facilities do and don't exist in this area and as money becomes available, projects will be completed based on priority.

Rudy Fontanari, 3316 E³/₄ Road, Clifton, stated that his family has owned this property since 1937. Over the last 22 years, he has acquired a large inventory of building stone. Mr. Fontanari stated that he has been taxed industrial for the past 5 years. He stated that he would like to continue to operate this property and dispose of the stone. He stated that the County has given him 5 years to move the stone off the property. "It's taken me 22 years to bring this inventory in and there's no way it's going to be out in 5 years unless somebody buys it all. So I'd like to ask the County and the City of Grand Junction to either change the zoning to give me enough time to move this stone out or to work with me whichever way we can so I can continue to make a living here."

Martin Schwartz (784 33 Road) stated that he "gets a real sense of fairness on both sides here."

Fred Aldrich, 601A 28¹/₄ Road, Grand Junction, representing the owners and operators of Central Distributing, stated that this company has been in the community for 60 years. The newly constructed state-of-the-art facility underwent extensive County review. Central Distributing also underwent an extensive traffic study to determine impacts with CDOT. The results of the traffic study were that no traffic control device was necessary. Central Distributing is aware of some neighborhood complaints about the compressors on the northwest side of the building. They are presently working with the County and the neighbors in order to resolve this concern. Mr. Aldrich further noted that no notice of violation has been issued. Also the County has undertaken its own decibel readings which were below state decibel readings. Their concern, however, is with the neighborhood section of the plan that identifies "noise, common traffic from the Budweiser distributor" as a key issue. He voiced a concern with the inclusion of Central Distributing's name in the long range plan with regard to abatement issues. They are simply asking that the reference to Central Distributing be taken out of the long range plan. In addition, he stated that he agrees with Mr. Livingston that this was a massive undertaking and thanked the numerous people involved in the process of developing this plan. (Mesa County) Commissioner Kenyon stated that he too does not see that Central's traffic has an impact on the public and believes that it would be fair to delete the specific name of the company be removed from the plan.

Mary Gonzalez, 726 33 Road, asked if anything would be done with the 33 and G Road intersection regarding safety. Keith Fife addressed the concern and stated that presently he cannot give an exact timeframe but acknowledged that it is a well recognized safety problem.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Keith Fife addressed public comments as follows:

- Central Distributing: He recognized that the inclusion of this particular name was inappropriate; however, it was inadvertently left in the second draft and agrees the name should be removed, by motion.
- Fontaneri property: He stated that this property is in an area where the land use is not being changed from what it is currently, Residential Medium Low.
- Genie, Inc.: There is presently a pending application and current regulations will be utilized.
- Mosby property: It is Mr. Fife's understanding that this property has been subdivided through a rural density bonus subdivision and there is a parcel that has a 40-year restriction on it. Staff has been working with the Mosbys and have suggested that, after this planning process, they bring a request forward for the removal of that restriction.
- Otter Creek properties: Mr. Fife stated that the TDR program would apply to areas that are outside of the urban growth boundary. He stated that if it is determined that the entirety of the Otter Creek property is inside the urban growth boundary, they would not have a problem with the higher density in general. Brian Woods, on behalf of the Clifton Sanitation District, addressed the Commissions and confirmed that the southern parcel in question is not within the boundaries of the Clifton Sanitation District. In addition, Mr. Woods stated that he is unsure of whether or not the two parcels above it are within the boundaries. Brian Woods also stated that the sewer lagoons are currently being de-commissioned. (Mesa County) Chairman Bonella stated that it is his understanding that the lower piece is not within the Clifton Sanitation District (parcel D); parcels A and B are partially within the boundaries; and all of parcel C is within the Clifton Sanitation District. Mr. Woods stated that he cannot say with clarity whether or not parcels A and B are within the Clifton Sanitation District.

QUESTIONS

- (Grand Junction) Commissioner Putnam voiced his concern that the plan identifies a number of goals, however, it does not identify what entity would be taking the initiative, leadership and action – City or County. (Mesa County) Chairman Bonella stated that he believes ultimately the current and future Mesa County Commissioners would be addressing the needs identified. With respect to actual implementation of the plan, it will go through the Mesa County Planning Commission and then the County Commissioners ultimately.

DISCUSSION

(Mesa County) Commissioner Noble stated that he believes it is a great plan. He further stated that a lot of work has gone into this project on both a City and a County level. He also thanked the community and believes the majority of issues can be addressed. Mr. Noble stated that he would be in favor of the plan.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Susuras agrees that “the adoption of the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan will result in a more detailed direction for future planning for this area and I support it...” Mr. Susuras also thanked staff for their hard work.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Kenyon stated that “the county staff did an amazing job of pulling together the communities and listening to the communities’ interest and listening to the landowners. To have no more debate or discussion tonight than what we’ve heard is a truly amazing accomplishment.” He is, however, concerned about the actual ability to invest the funds in this community and does not want a plan that promises more than what can be delivered.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Binder also thanked the County staff for their work and the City staff. She stated that she would be supportive of this plan. Further, she stated that it is something that is needed and gives good direction.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Flynn stated that she thinks it looks like a pretty good plan and, accordingly, agrees with it.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Justman stated that he can support the plan. He went on to state that staff has spent a lot of time on it and through a lot of meetings have gotten a lot of input.

(Mesa County) Chairman Bonella thanked the community for their support. He too supports the plan. With respect to the Otter Creek properties, he agrees that parcel C needs to be put into the RML.

Assistant City Attorney Jamie Kreiling asked that the exhibit presented by Mr. Livingston which references parcels A, B, C and D be included as part of the record. This exhibit was identified as exhibit 1.

MOTION: (Commissioner Putnam) “Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2006-258, Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan, we approve the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan as recommended in the staff project report, as an amendment to the Grand Junction Growth Plan with the change that the reference to the Budweiser distributor be changed to warehouse and that those parcels shown in yellow on option # 3 as staff’s recommendation shows be Residential Medium Low and that those portions of parcel C and

parcel D in the exhibit presented by Mr. Livingston, labeled as exhibit number 1, actually included within the Clifton Sanitation District be Residential Medium Low and those portions not included be designated as Residential Low.

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Kenyon): “Mr. Chairman, on item 2006-008-MP1, Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan, we approve the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan as recommended in the staff project report, as an amendment to the Mesa County Master Plan with the change that the reference to the Budweiser distributor be changed to warehouse and that those parcels shown in yellow on option # 3 as staff’s recommendation shows be Residential Medium Low and that those portions of parcel C and parcel D in the exhibit presented by Mr. Livingston, labeled as exhibit number 1, actually included within the Clifton Sanitation District be Residential Medium Low and those portions not included be designated as Residential Low, and adopt a resolution (No. MCPC-2006-01) adopting and certifying the amendment to the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners.

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Kenyon): “Mr. Chairman, we move for the adoption a resolution adopting the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan, as amended.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Carlow) “Mr. Chairman, we move for the adoption of a resolution adopting the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan, as amended.”

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

With no further business to discuss, the public hearing was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.