

**MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT HEARING
MARCH 31, 2005**

Chairman Bruce Kresin of the Mesa County Planning Commission called the hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. The hearing was held at Grand Junction City Hall Auditorium, 250 North 5th Street, Grand Junction, Colorado.

In attendance, representing the City of Grand Junction Planning Commission, were: Patrick Carlow, Roland Cole, Chairman Paul Dibble, Thomas Lowrey, Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh, and Reginald Wall.

In attendance, representing the Mesa County Planning Commission, were: Terri Binder, George Domet, Michael Gardner, Chairman Bruce Kresin, and John Justman.

In attendance, representing City of Grand Junction Community Development, were: Eric Hahn, Jamie Kreiling, Laura Lamberty, Kathy Portner and David Thornton.

In attendance, representing the Mesa County Department of Planning and Development, were: Kurt Larsen and Keith Fife. Ken Simms, Regional Transportation Planning Office was also present. Kristy Pauley was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 28 citizens present throughout the hearing.

Chairman Kresin announced there were items on the agenda which County Planning Commission needed to continue. These were 2004-250 MP1 Flynn/Young Master Plan Amendment and 2004-248 RZ1 Flynn/Young Rezone.

MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Binder moved to continue these items to 5/24/05 and 6/2/05 respectively. Commissioner Gardner seconded the motion. A vote was called and was approved, 5-0.

Chairman Kresin announced the agenda item for the evening. Mesa County project #2004-110 MP2 Amendments to the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan, an element of the Mesa County Master Plan, aka Grand Junction project #PLN-2004-247 Amendments to the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan, a part of the Grand Junction Growth Plan.

Chairman Kresin outlined the three special study areas.

1. Teller Court Study Area Future Land Use Map
2. D Road (between 30 and 32 Road, south side)
3. D ½ Road Corridor Right-of-Way Study

Chairman Paul Dibble of the Grand Junction Planning Commission welcomed all to the hearing. He gave the locations of the three study areas. He noted these areas were referred back to the Planning Commissions after the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan was

adopted. Staff will present the projects as they relate to each other then will separate each area for discussions. The Planning Commissions will discuss these items with staff. Then the public will comment and the Planning Commissions will discuss them for a recommendation.

David Thornton, Principal Planner, City of Grand Junction. Mr. Thornton presented a PowerPoint presentation. He noted in December, 2004, the Plan went forward with the City Planning Commission recommending the Plan and forwarding it to City Council and the County Planning Commission adopting the Plan. The adopted Plan included direction to conduct special studies in two areas of Pear Park by May 2005. Staff conducted a public input procedure as part of the special studies. The City Council added a third study area in their adoption of the Plan – a review of the D ½ Road corridor and right-of-way. A public open house was conducted in Pear Park and notices were sent to residents. Two focus group meetings were held, as well as individual meetings with property owners upon request. Public input was also solicited through written comments, phone calls, e-mails and personal communications.

Mr. Thornton discussed the Teller Court Area. A Future Land Use Map was shown. There are six parcels within this area. Option 1 recommends the entire area be designated “commercial/industrial” including 489 30 Road. Option 2 – recommends all of the area be designated “commercial/industrial”, except for the northwest corner of the study area, which would be designated “industrial”. Option 3 – expands options 2 by increasing the “industrial” area to include 489 30 road. Staff recommended option 3.

D Road Area. Six sub-areas were identified. Three options were recommended. Staff recommended Option 2. They looked at the area as if they were increasing incrementally the densities. Part of the requests from property owners originally was to increase the density from what was estate density, 2-5 acre lot sizes. Mr. Thornton explained each of the three options.

D ½ Road Right-of-Way Cross Section. Staff recommended no change to the adopted Pear Park Plan. Eric Hahn, City of Grand Junction Public Works Department presented a PowerPoint slide show. He noted there was concern from the neighborhood regarding this cross-section. The Pear Park Plan includes an 80’ right-of-way, 3 lane road section for D ½ Road, including landscaping and 8’ sidewalks detached from the curb. There were many comments during the public process. The Pear Park Plan envisions 3 parks and schools near the D ½ Road corridor. D ½ Road is not safe to walk on. They need more bike paths. Noise pollution is also a problem.

Mr. Hahn agreed that pedestrian and bicycle facilities are lacking along the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods. There are limited connections between the neighborhoods, as well. D ½ Road is currently a two lane road without turn lanes or shoulders. Commissioner Cole asked if these were projected for improvement. Mr. Hahn indicated they were not in the Capital Improvement Plan at this time.

Projected future conditions (2030)

- between 29 and 32 Roads, we are planning for:
- 3 elementary schools and 3 parks
- 15 acre neighborhood commercial area
- over 4000 homes within ¼ of a mile

Population is estimated at 22,000 at build out. D ½ and D Roads will be the only east-west corridors between 29 Road and 32 Road.

D ½ Road corridor goals -

1. Provide capacity for year 2030; up to 8500 vehicles per day
2. Safe transportation corridors for all modes of transportation
3. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities needed

Following are several issues associated with this corridor. There are dangerous left turns. There is close access spacing and too many accesses. There are many residential driveways accessing directly onto D ½ Road. There are limited sidewalks and pedestrian facilities and a lack of bicycle facilities. There is poor interconnectivity in the neighborhoods that forces all types of traffic to D ½ Road. There is also a growing demand for transportation – new schools, parks and commercial areas. Most importantly, there is a growing population. New roadway connections will bring additional traffic through the area. Right-of-way constraints include existing houses on large lots that are not re-developing. Old subdivisions typically have dedicated 60-70' of right-of-way along D ½ Road.

Traffic needs and solutions –

Two thru lanes with a center turn lane combined with access control will safely accommodate all projected traffic with:

- bike lanes
- sidewalks
- landscape buffers
- transit pull-outs

Bicycle facilities -

- dedicated, striped bike lanes are part of every city/county major urban street proposed cross-section
- separating on-street operating space of cyclists from vehicles enhances safety and desirability of corridor
- separating commuter/skilled cyclist from pedestrians and young cyclists provides an added measure of safety

Pedestrian facilities -

School children, parents with strollers, handicapped/mobility impaired, young/leisure cyclists, neighbors, joggers, families, elderly.

Mr. Hahn gave information concerning sidewalk widths.

Landscape buffer/park strip. Separates pedestrians from active traffic lanes, etc.
Tree plantings.

- creates vertical height to street
- aids in traffic calming
- aids in noise reduction
- increases life of asphalt up to 60% in warm climates
- reduces urban air temps in summer months
- treats pollutants at their source
- generally adds to property values

Mr. Hahn listed advocates of detached walks and park strips.

The information given carries projected traffic volumes beyond the year 2030, provides for an excellent pedestrian corridor as well as a good corridor for bicycles. It will provide an attractive appearance with a residential feel. It also allows for transit stops, utilities and intersection widening, etc.

Mr. Hahn emphasized that an 80' right-of-way is the ideal; however, in many locations along D ½ Road this will not be possible due to existing development and conditions. The 80' right-of-way would be required for new development adjacent to D ½ Road and would be built sometime in the future by the City and/or County and funded, in-part, by transportation capacity payments (also known as transportation impact fees) paid by these new developments.

Local examples were shown, demonstrating different types of corridors.

In summary, Mr. Thornton noted again that an open house was held in Pear Park at the beginning of this process. The public had a couple of months to call, or send emails, as well. Regarding the Teller Court area staff heard option 3 was preferred by the focus group. It was approximately half and half at the open house. Staff's evaluation included the zone districts that would be acceptable in each of these categories. Staff recommended option 3.

D Road South Area – option 3 was preferred by the focus group. At the open house many felt no change was needed. Some felt a desire to increase the density to option 3. One goal of the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan looked at the Colorado River as a resource to minimize impacts in that corridor. The goal is to try to transition the intensity of use as you head south towards the river. Staff recommended option 2.

D ½ Road Right-of-Way Cross Section. There were comments on both sides of this area from the public. Some were concerned with wider right-of-ways and what it will do to their properties. Many said we need to plan for the future; cars, pedestrians, bikes, etc. Staff recommended no change from the adoption of the Plan in December.

Chairman Kresin noted the hearing would be broken into the three study areas. Questions would be taken from the Planning Commissions, then the public.

Teller Court Area – there were no comments from the public. Chairman Dibble felt it made a fine transition from industrial to the north rather than strictly a commercial aspect. Option 3 does that and has an industrial buffer. There will be less density of traffic and perhaps less pollution. He was in favor of staff's recommendation of option 3.

MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Gardner moved the Teller Court Area be approved with Option 3 as recommended by staff.

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and approved, 5-0.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Cole moved to adopt Option 3 for the Teller Court Area based on staff recommendations and findings and forward it on to City Council. Commissioner Wall seconded the motion. A vote was called and approved, 6-0.

Dr. Dibble asked for questions regarding the study area of D Road South. There were none from the Planning Commissions.

J.D. Miller and Gabe DeGabriel from Habitat for Humanity presented maps of the area. Mr. Miller stressed the importance of affordable housing and land values. He requested an amendment of the growth plan and Pear Park Plan for this area to option 3. He noted Area A is zoned estate and staff recommended 2-4 du/acre. He requested 4-8 du/acre, option 3. He gave figures on the costs of raw land for different densities. He presented photos of smaller houses on smaller lots in Camelot subdivision for a comparison. He felt the transition to the river is good but other areas should also be considered for transition. He wanted the Pear Park Plan to reflect the RMF 4-8 for the area. He noted it was consistent with much of the existing area.

Man, 3029 D Road. He agreed with the previous speaker and asked the Commissions to consider option 3. Property density would support that amount of homes and would help the area.

Man, 31 5/8 Road. He felt option 3 is the best and would prefer that as a landowner.

Kathy Van Deuser, 515 Sable Drive, Fruita. Realtor. She supported option 3 for the reason of affordable housing. It is difficult for average income families to purchase homes. Many homes are in the \$300,000 range and many cannot afford that. The river and wildlife refuge provide enough natural buffer that these areas that change to 4-8 would be easily supported.

Bernadette Fuoco, 3131 D Road. She is surrounded by Riverbend Subdivision and would like 4-8 zoning. When she purchased it was farm ground around them. At that time, many were against developing. She has 50 acres there. She is finding it a

continuous battle for water, hard to get crops out. She has cattle, and neighbors complain about her roosters crowing and the smell of animals. People want views too. It is becoming increasingly difficult to have her quality of life. She would like the higher density so she could move to another property where she can continue her way of life.

Commissioner Lowrey asked for clarification on sub-area D, west end. Mr. Thornton clarified in option 2, it is residential medium-low, in option 3, the north half is residential medium and the south half is residential-medium low.

Chairman Dibble said they are basically stepping up one land use category with each option. He asked what the differential is between 2-4 build out and 4-8; i.e., what would be the density increase. Mr. Thornton gave figures for the increases. In subarea A, it ranges between 7 and 19 housing units. There is a minimum lot size of 2 acres but you can also have 5 acre lots. Option 1 is 19 to 79 housing units. Option 2 is 79 to 158. Option 3 is 158 and 316 housing units.

Subarea B - Estate is 2 homes. Option 1 is 1-2 homes. Option 2 is 2-4. Option 3 is 4-8 units.

Subarea C - under current land use it is 14 to 33. Option 1 is 33 to 134. Option 2 is 134 to 268. Option 3 is 268 to 536 homes.

Subarea D. - current land use category is 5-11. Option 1 is 11-44. Option 2 is 44 to 89. Option 3 is 55 to 111.

Chairman Dibble asked about topographic problems. Mr. Thornton noted it is relatively flat. The only issue might be the way the properties are carved now and trying to redevelop due to the shape of existing parcels. Chairman Dibble asked given the mixes and what is available in other areas, what would this do or would the impact be if we added another 480 to 900 homes there. Mr. Thornton responded much of the Pear Park area is already residential medium. This would be in the same land use category. They would just be increasing the number of acres that will allow for greater density. Chairman Dibble noted the public said they needed more affordable housing units in the area. His concern was the mix. Would this create more availability? The higher density the wildlife will suffer. This would be 980 under option 3 and about half that under option 2.

Commissioner Binder asked about D Road. There are a large number of homes from option 2 to option 3. She questioned how the roadway would look. Mr. Thornton said D Road would be an 80' right-of-way, the same as D ½. It could handle all that traffic.

Ken Simms, Regional Transportation Planning Office. He noted there was not a problem with the 3 lane road section as planned if going with the higher density option.

Commissioner Cole asked staff for their thinking on the north side of D Road, medium residential. Were they trying to step down coming into the wildlife area? Mr. Thornton

agreed that was their thinking. There was a desire to transition in stepping down density and impacts of the wildlife area.

Chairman Kresin asked about public comments on option 1 or 3. If owners supported 3, then why recommend option 2? Half of the boundary is already transitioning in option 2. Under option 3 it doesn't add that much more additional footage. Basically it looked like a toss-up between staff's comments and public comments, for option 2 and option 3. Mr. Thornton noted they should consider the entire Pear Park Plan future land use map and also implementing the map. Under option 3 there is the ability to transition as you get closer to the river. Both options 2 and 3 allow 4 units per acre.

Commissioner Gardner asked about the area west of parcel C being a 4-8 area (Riverbend Subdivision). How long has it been there? Mr. Thornton thought since the early 80s. Staff looked at densities there. Build out density is just under 6 du/acre. It is a PUD.

Chairman Dibble asked about Riverbend lot sizes. Mr. Thornton noted there were 8-plexes and single family homes.

Commissioner Cole said given the public testimony and comments in the meetings concerning this, it is the public's desire for option 3 and he would support that. Commissioner Lowrey agreed, with the exception of the north half of area D. A and C would go with option 3 but he recommended keeping all of D at 2-4. Anything adjoining D Road could be of higher density.

Chairman Dibble said his first inclination was to protect the wildlife, allowing those to build adequate build outs up to 4 units per acre in option 2. At the same time, there is enough of residential medium (option 3) land available in Pear Park. There is a need for all diversities of building envelopes. There is also a need for \$300,000 homes and adequate affordable housing in Pear Park. If as stated, there is adequate availability, Pear Park in the year 2030; option 2 would be a better way to go. He could support option 3 as well.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Lowrey moved all of parcels A, B and C be allowed to develop at residential medium, 4-8, but all of parcel D be only at medium-low residential at 2-4. Parcels E and F would follow under conservation. This motion to be forwarded to City Council. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion. A vote was called and approved, 6-0.

MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Binder moved on study area 2, option 3 be adopted with the amendment of parcel D being medium-low residential at 2-4 and parcels A, B and C at residential medium, 4-8. Parcels E and F remain as conservation. There was no second. The motion failed.

MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Gardner moved on study area 2 to approve staff's recommendation for option 2. Commissioner Domet

seconded the motion. A vote was called and failed 2-3. Commissioners Binder, Justman and Kresin were opposed.

Chairman Dibble noted the City forwards their recommendation to City Council for final approval and Mesa County is the final approval.

MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Justman moved on study area 2 to approve option 3 with no amendments. Mr. Larsen said if you do not agree there is no change, under the Code. If the County approves this motion, it would be consistent with the City's recommendation without the change of parcel D.

Chairman Dibble clarified that the north part of D consisted of 3 lots and had a difference in build out of 2-3 units. He felt it was not that significant if it builds out at 3 or 6. It is not a parcel that would greatly influence the build out.

Commissioner Justman moved to change parcel D to medium-low residential. Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and approved, 4-1. Commissioner Gardner was opposed.

At this time, a brief recess was called.

D ½ Road Right of Way Corridor. Staff recommended no change.

Public Comments: Janet Hollingsworth, 774 Elm. Member, Urban Trails Committee. She supported the detached sidewalks.

Mike Queally, 1994 Bison Court. He also owns 2953 D ½ Road. He has heard there will be a D ¼ Road, but there was no mention of that tonight. He would agree that detached sidewalks are safer. He would also agree that detached sidewalks create a boulevard look and contributes to higher property values. He asked if 60, 70 or 80 foot right-of-ways create no transitions. Every time there is a curve or angle there is more expense. He would encourage and support a compromise of a 70' right-of-way. That would keep the bike lanes and create a 5' wide street scape and 6' detached sidewalks.

Rich Traver, 667 D ½ Road. He conducted a study in response to a 3/2/05 Daily Sentinel headline. He talked to builders and developers. The study shows the breakdown of land and construction costs and fees, which was labeled and submitted as Exhibit A. He knows someone who wanted to take back acreage and merge with a neighbor next door doing a subdivision. She wanted to do a lot line adjustment but she would lose her driveway frontage and have to put it in the back of her property. He noted there is much unused land on properties at the rear. He was told they would have to put up fences along the street. Who will maintain the strips outside the fence to the street? He noted on Patterson Road, between 29 and 32 Roads, there are 72 direct driveways. He wondered if property owners would lose land and will they be reimbursed? Will their taxes be reduced?

Mary Ann Traver. She presented a photo of the view looking across D ½ Road to her neighbors. She went to Orchard Mesa Middle School yesterday and never found four groups together on sidewalks. Mr. Thornton mentioned it being tight when kids walked from school. There were no masses or mobs. There are only 5 ½' sidewalks there. 6' would be adequate. She thought 8' sidewalks were overkill. In her neighborhood, there are views, with chain link fences. It looks good. Boxing people in would not be good. She enjoys the openness. She would like to have the choice of fences. As for a 40' right-of-way, she had heard properties wouldn't be cut into. There are many properties where the 40' right-of-way couldn't be done. She didn't think it was made clear about fencing and also questioned on-street parking. There are 18 wheelers and buses that people drive. Where will they park? She didn't understand the comment regarding street quieting. There will be the same amount of traffic. The numbers for traffic on 30 Road now is higher than the projected traffic for D ½ Road later on. Bookcliff Middle School sidewalks work fine and they're not 8'. Not all people are in the same place at the same time. Many pictures staff showed with detached sidewalks showed weeds. Who will take care of these? It might be safer, but she felt sidewalks were not needed at 8'. Her section in the west end was to be addressed separately. She thought it sounded like a blanket decision on the whole thing. It was mentioned that D and D ½ are the only roads going east/west, but many people will use I-70 B.

Tom Holly, 2936 D ½ Road. There were pictures shown of 8' sidewalks that didn't have many people on them. He felt staff should look at 60' right-of-ways and nice sidewalks. He was not asking to make do with less, just do the same as done elsewhere in the city and county. D Road density is substantially more than D ½, yet staff still wants the 80' right-of-way. There are less people living on D ½ Road. He wondered about grass and trees along the sidewalks. Where will the water come from? Who will be liable for this? At another City Council meeting, it was recommended for staff to go to a public meeting, but staff didn't want to listen to the public. He hasn't been given a reason for the 80' right-of-way. It was mentioned that there would be pull outs for buses. Why doesn't staff listen to people who have objections? A detached sidewalk can be made with a 60' right-of-way. There don't have to be 8' sidewalks. Kids don't always walk on the sidewalk, no matter what size it is. He felt a 60' right-of-way is adequate.

Vicki Holly, 2936 D ½ Road. Many people have small acres. They are taking a lot of property for the right-of-way. If this happens, it would be in their front room and they could spit on the road.

Mike Queally. He wondered if there was a proposal for D 1/4. Road. He also asked what will happen with the driveways for existing homes. If people want to sell the back portions of their property will they be forced to give up their driveways?

Eric Hahn. Mr. Hahn could not speak to the issue of the fences. Regarding 60' vs. 80' right-of-ways, vehicular capacity is essentially the same. Vehicular capacity is diminished by the number of accesses on that street. Traffic studies show significant diminishing of the capacity if accesses are not controlled on that corridor. That is why they want to reduce accesses. Chairman Dibble asked about the width of the asphalt.

60' right-of-way, 12' center turn lanes, two 12' thru lanes, and 4' additional on each side striped for bike lanes. It is still 44' of pavement width, regardless of which section you're looking at. Right-of-way width varies now. There was continuing discussion on widths. Access control is crucial. When possible they will eliminate driveways. The capacity of the street is diminished by accesses. Two thru lanes with a center turn lane will safely accommodate all projected traffic with the adopted access management policies, major intersection widening and transit improvements/turn outs.

Chairman Kresin asked when elimination of driveways would take place. Mr. Hahn said it would be on a case by case basis. The issue is a future planning issue. Chairman Dibble asked about the future scenario. Mr. Hahn indicated there would be some cases where driveways will remain. Mailboxes should stay put. Commissioner Wall asked what happens if the City asks someone to move their driveway. Mr. Hahn said they will try to have the area designed to access a development itself, or at least an easement dedication to the new internal street. If a lot is not part of a subdivision, they can't force a developer to go to a resident and ask them to get rid of a driveway. There are flexible tools for future situations.

Mr. Hahn noted there would be no parking on the D ½ Road corridor, regardless of the width. Commissioner Binder asked if existing sections of D ½ Road adjacent to development with existing 60' right-of-way, had sidewalks. Mr. Hahn indicated there were in some places. Right-of-ways and sidewalk locations and widths vary in the area. Commissioner Binder also asked if there are areas without sidewalks that have homes there, then how would that sidewalk get built. Mr. Hahn responded they would have to deal with each area differently. Commissioner Gardner asked about the maintenance of the streetscapes. Mr. Hahn said in terms of subdivisions, the HOAs would be required to maintain them. Each residence would be required to maintain their strip when not in a subdivision. Not all areas would be grass or trees. Many things could occur, rocks or xeriscaping.

Mr. Hahn noted there are many corridor areas that are adequate but they are trying to take things a step further and make them better. Chairman Dibble said safety of the children is a great issue. The further away from vehicular traffic, the better. Traffic growth projections of 1024% is huge between 29 and 30 Roads. The west end of D ½ Road does end at 29 Road. It will connect to 29 Road in some way. Ken Simms said that number is because there are 1000 or less cars/day at this time. This is projecting 8500 in 2030. He was comfortable with the volume.

Mr. Hahn commented on noise abatements. The question was asked how can detached paths give noise abatement. If there is vertical landscaping, it can deflect sound. They have an opportunity to muffle noise somewhat.

If adopted, there won't be an 80' right-of-way overnight. It is a tool. Can we put detached sidewalks in a 60' right-of-way? They can try. They could do a detached sidewalk on one side and attached on the other. It would be tight, and is not easy to do. They could do some sections with both. They could reduce the 8' sidewalk. 8' was

suggested to allow multiple uses on the sidewalks. People will also leisure walk. 80' right-of-way and 8' width sidewalks are flexible.

Chairman Dibble asked about transit turnouts and the safety aspects. Mr. Thornton replied Grand Valley Transit only goes as far west as 30 Road in Pear Park. They do anticipate as the area builds out they will have new routes. D and D ½ would be logical corridors.

Kathy Portner, City Community Development, said because a road is classified as a minor arterial they wouldn't require anyone to fence their front yard. City code allows for fencing at the time of subdivision development. Perimeter fences are where lots back up to a collector or arterial. City Planning Commission determines what type of fence is appropriate. Typically they will require fences along back yards in that case, but wouldn't require front yards. Subdivision fences are the responsibility of the HOA. A 14' landscape strip between the fence and the sidewalk could be reduced to 5 feet with a detached sidewalk. Street trees put into the public right-of-way and in City limits can be maintained by the City's forestry division. The HOA must water them, however.

Mr. Thornton said they are looking at D ½ as a different corridor. It is going to be a Pear Park "main street". They are hoping to encourage an environment for walking as well, especially with the planned schools and parks in the area.

Commissioner Cole asked for clarification of staff recommendation. Mr. Thornton said they recommend no action to the Plan as adopted in December.

Commissioner Carlow said there is an undertone of the 80' right-of-way being required everywhere and immediately. He didn't hear that at all from the staff. If they drop back to 60' or 70' it would benefit developers. He didn't hear that at all. He would be reluctant of cutting 80' paths anywhere.

Chairman Kresin presented a letter dated 2/24/05 addressed to City Council and Planning Commission members from 8 homeowners on D ½ Road and asked that it be entered into the record as Exhibit B.

MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Binder moved for no change to the road cross section as per staff's recommendation. Commissioner Gardner seconded the motion. A vote was called and approved, 5-0.

Chairman Dibble was in favor because it deals with transportation and safety issues.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION MOTION: Commissioner Cole moved to adopt staff's recommendation of no change and forward it on to City Council. Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and approved, 6-0.

MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: Commissioner Binder moved regarding 2004-110 MP2 Amendments to the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan to approve the resolution for amendments as recommended by the Mesa County Planning Commission and adopt Resolution MCPC 2005-002 and certify to the Board of County Commissioners. Commissioner Domet seconded the motion. A vote was called and approved, 5-0.

Commissioner Binder moved to adjourn. Chairman Kresin seconded the motion. The hearing was adjourned at 10:07 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Terri Binder, Secretary

No signature required from City of Grand Junction Planning Commission.