

**JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PEAR PARK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN
DECEMBER 9, 2004**

The specially scheduled meeting of the joint City and County Planning Commissions was called to order at 7 p.m. by City/County Planning Commission Chairmans Paul Dibble and Bruce Kreskin, respectively. The public hearing was held in the City Hall auditorium.

City Planning Commission members present included Dr. Paul Dibble (Chairman), John Redifer, Tom Lowrey, Bill Pitts, William Putnam, Patrick Carlow and Reginald Wall.

County Planning Commission members present included Bruce Kresin (Chairman), Bruce Noble, George Domet, Michael Gardner, Terri Binder, and Mark Bonella.

Representing the City Community Development Department were Bob Blanchard, Kathy Portner, Dave Thornton, and Kristen Ashbeck. Other City staff present included Jamie Kreiling, Rick Dorris and Eric Hahn.

Representing the County Planning Department were Kurt Larson and Keith Fife. Other County staff present included Ken Simms and Michael Warren.

There were approximately 24 interested citizens present during the course of the public hearing.

Planning commissioners were introduced, and the pledge of allegiance was recited.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Keith Fife, County Long-Range Planning Director, began by entering into the record Mesa County's Project File 2004-110-MP1 and Grand Junction's Project File #PLN-2004-147. Also entered into the record were the Project Review dated November 29, 2004 and the November 1, 2004 Draft Plan. A Powerpoint presentation was offered, which contained the following slides: 1) project overview; 2) plan process outline; 3) plan process history; 4) photos of historic sites within the area; 5) demographics chart; 6) general services and public safety outline; and 7) plan organization.

Mr. Fife provided a brief history of the plan's process (as outlined in the November 29, 2004 Project Review). The Pear Park area was defined as being situated between 28 and 32 Road, south of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks, and north of the Colorado River. The City of Grand Junction's Growth Plan and the County-wide Land Use Plan had provided the basis for the currently considered neighborhood plan. An advisory committee had been formed (Public Institutional Advisory Group, or PIAG), comprised of service providers, whose task it was to help identify key issues. The Mesa County Board of County Commissioners, City Council, and School District #51 representatives had also met during the review process. Public input had been solicited at open house meetings, which were well advertised and attended. Two newsletters had been mailed to approximately 4,600 area residents apprising them of public open houses and soliciting them for input and comments.

Key issues addressed in the Draft Plan, and outlined in the November 29, 2004 Project Review, included:

- The City and County will work with School District #51 to identify and purchase land for future school and park sites using the Pear Park Neighborhood Parks and Schools Map and school selection criteria found in the Plan.
- The City and County will update the school land dedication fee collected by the City and County.
- Adopt an overlay zone district for the business and commercial zone districts that minimize the number and size of signs and includes architectural and site design standards that heighten the requirements for quality and compatibility.
- Adopt design standards for residential development that encourages mixed densities and innovative designs that minimize "garage-scape" streets.
- Identify key architectural and landscape elements that define the historic aspects of Pear Park and integrate those elements into the design standards and guidelines for residential, institutional, and business/commercial uses.
- Encourage the preservation and adaptive reuse of historic structures.
- Prohibit billboards (Off-premise signs) in the Pear Park neighborhood.
- Adopt street sections that provide safe access for all modes of transportation and incorporate medians and tree lawns wherever possible.
- Maintain and enhance ditches, canals, and drainage facilities to be special features and amenities of the neighborhood and to improve the quality of stormwater runoff.
- Design and install "gateway" features at D Road and 28 Road, 29 Road and the river, 29 Road and the proposed viaduct, 30 Road and the underpass, and 32 Road and D, D 1/2, and E Roads.
- The City and County will improve night lighting of pedestrian trails and trail connections to subdivisions and in parks to provide a better deterrent to crime and illegal activities.
- The City of Grand Junction will identify preferred site(s) for a law enforcement substation or fire station/training facility.
- Develop a plan to resolve the double taxation in annexed areas within the Clifton Fire District.
- The City, County, and 5-2-1 Drainage Authority will work together to develop stormwater best management practices for the Colorado River floodplain within the planning area.
- Develop and adopt Code language (*Mesa County Land Development Code* and the City of Grand Junction's *Zoning and Development Code*) that establishes a Pear Park Colorado River Corridor overlay zone district addressing:

1. Channel stability to assure adequate setbacks are provided to account for the inherent instability of the channel and recognize that river movement across the landscape is a natural process that may be accelerated by development.

2. Scenic views of the river, its natural setting and features, Grand Mesa, Mt. Garfield, the Bookcliffs, and the Uncompahgre Plateau.

3. The Colorado National Heritage Program report as a guiding document for the protection of sensitive species.

4. Recreational features located and designed to avoid or minimize impacts to unique vegetation, wildlife habitats, water quality, and other environmental values.

5. Multiple implementation tools such as conservation easements, land acquisition, enforcement of existing floodplain regulations, and other conservation techniques, to protect the Colorado River's 100-year floodplain.

6. Best management practices for resource protection that considers both on-and off-site impacts from development.

7. Specific, identified high-priority resources and long-term plans for management and protection.

- Gravel extraction shall occur as shown on the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan Mineral Resources Map.

- Mesa County should revise the no shoot boundary along the Colorado River. Specifically, move the existing west boundary, which is just west of Indian Road, east to 29 Road. Move the existing north boundary (D Road) south to C 1/2 Road.

Rick Dorris came forward to address transportation and access management issues. He continued with a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) Access Management Plan; 2) 2030 traffic model; 3) the four access options at 30 and D Roads; and 4) cross-sections of the D and D 1/2 Road, hybrid collector, 31 Road, and E Road intersections. With the possible exception of 29 Road, it was felt that three lanes or less would handle projected traffic to the year 2030. The 29 Road corridor would be five-laned. Mr. Dorris referenced the Access Management Plan which both identified access points that weren't flexible and those areas where access could be more flexible. Limiting access maintained capacity while making travel along roadways safer. He said that some developing properties may be permitted a "temporary access" until adjoining properties were developed; permanent access would then be constructed in conjunction with the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan, and the temporary access would be eliminated. Mr. Dorris noted on the Access Management Plan where interconnectivity between developed and undeveloped neighborhoods would occur, but added that while the map depicted a preferred pattern, that pattern was not cast in stone.

Mr. Dorris noted the four access options at D and 30 Roads and referenced the preferred option. He stated that wider sidewalks and pedestrian paths were planned for the area. The D and D 1/2 Road corridors would have two 8-foot-wide detached sidewalks in addition to its three-laned street section. If future growth should necessitate expansion to five lanes, there was sufficient right-of-way to accommodate the expansion and reduce the width of sidewalks. The 31 Road corridor would have a detached sidewalk along the west only, since a wash was located along the

east. The south side of the E Road corridor was already developed with an attached walk, curb, and gutter. An 8-foot-wide detached sidewalk would be constructed along its north side. A brief explanation of the hybrid collector street was provided. It would be constructed in areas near schools and in areas where large numbers of pedestrians were expected, more interior to subdivisions and not on main arterials.

Dave Thornton came forward to address land use issues and growth. He continued with a Powerpoint presentation, which contained the following slides: 1) land use and growth issues outline; 2) community image and character outline; 3) photos of housing types and signage; 4) Future Land Use Map; 5) Area 1 land use options; 6) proposed options for other areas; 7) environmental resources outline; 8) Bureau of Reclamation request to change land designation from "Park" to "Conservation"; 9) schools, parks and trails outline; 10) map depicting four areas where parks could be located; 11) Urban Trails and Transportation Map; 12) study area; 13) findings of fact and conclusions; and 14) proposed Plan adoption schedule.

Mr. Thornton said that there were four outstanding land use issues that were unresolved during the last Growth Plan update process. They included:

1. Change to Residential Medium (4 to 8 units per acre) that area north of D 1/2 Road between 29 and 29 1/2 Roads south of the railroad tracks; make the area east of 29 1/2 Road to 30 Road south of the railroad tracks Commercial/Industrial on the north and Residential Medium on the south (Option 3 for Area 1).

2. Increase the density from Residential Medium to Residential Medium High (8 to 12 units per acre) for the area east and south of the neighborhood commercial area at the southeast corner of 29 and D Road, established in 2003 (Option 3 for Area 2).

3. Change from Residential Medium Low (2 to 4 units per acre) to Commercial on the northeast corner of E Road and 30 Road (Option 1 for Area 3).

4. Change from Residential Medium (4 to 8 units per acre) to Commercial the southeast corner of 31 Road and D 1/2 Road as a future site for neighborhood commercial (Area 4). This would accommodate a development similar in size to the Safeway shopping center at 29 and F Roads.

Staff was also proposing to change the land use designation from "Park" to "Conservation" for the Bureau of Reclamation property located between 30 and 31 Roads south of D Road. Its current designation of "Park" did not accurately reflect the property's use.

With regard to community image and character, there had been concerns expressed at public open houses over some of the development plans occurring in the area. The proposed Plan would incorporate higher design standards for both residential and commercial development. As the area became more urban, there would be a focus on making the area's drainageways and ditches more like amenities. The Plan addressed the need to give the area an identity, to identify historic structures and perhaps incorporate some of those architectural characteristics into new developments. Mr. Thornton referenced photos of signage and a cell tower and said that the Plan identified preferred signage options in commercial areas.

Mr. Thornton said that the School District had been very involved in the Pear Park planning process. Identifying new school sites was a high priority, and Mr. Thornton referenced a slide outlining site selection criteria. Another two elementary schools were needed for the area.

Neighborhood parks were also necessary amenities, and four areas were identified as possible park sites. School property often doubled as park sites, and combining school and park sites could lessen overall costs. Rocky Mtn. Elementary School would be used as a model.

Mr. Thornton said that planning commissioners would hear testimony from the public asking to change the land use designations on the Future Land Use Map for certain parcels between 30 and 32 Roads, south of D Road. Planning commissioners could opt to approve the requests and change the map with this evening's public hearing; they could choose to take no action at this time; or they could direct staff to create a planning process used to focus on the proposed changes, and in early 2005 staff would meet with property owners to review possible benefits and impacts from their requested changes. Staff would then submit findings to both planning commissions for their consideration.

Mr. Thornton referenced several review agency comments and a petition submitted by property owners in Area 1 asking for a change in land use designation on the Future Land Use Map. Those items had not been submitted with the original Project Review Staff Report but were being made available for planning commissioner consideration.

Both City and County staffs concluded that the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan, as proposed, met Code and Growth Plan criteria, and was consistent with the intent of the Persigo 201 Agreement. Approval of the Plan was requested, with the following conditions, and a proposed approval schedule was briefly outlined.

1. Incorporate comments received from the Bureau of Reclamation, letter dated November 16, 2004.
2. Incorporate comments received from mesa State College as per e-mail on November 9, 2004 from Erik van de Boogaard.
3. Revise the "Future Land Use Study Area" map (p. 49) to show only the approved Future Land Use Map changes.
4. Insert the corresponding approved street circulation into the "Transportation and Access Management Plan" map (p. 21, and the "Conceptual Local Street Network Plan" map (p. 25) in the final plan document and remove the "Four Land Use Options Proposed Street Circulation" map (p. 27) from the final plan document.
5. On the Future Land Use Map (p. 49), change the Colorado River Wildlife Area/Orchard Mesa Wildlife Area from "Park" designation to "Conservation" and include an implementation strategy and background information in the final plan document.
6. Add language to the background section of the "Land Use and Growth Chapter" (p. 44) regarding annexation incentives discussed in the 1998 City/County Persigo Agreement.
7. Correct minor formatting errors, grammar, word choice, typos, etc. throughout the final plan document.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Kresin asked if any members of the PIAG were in attendance, and those that were present identified themselves by standing. They were thanked for their participation in the planning process.

Chairman Kresin asked Mr. Dorris why the 32 Road access points hadn't been referenced on the Access Management Plan. Mr. Dorris said that those intersections were fairly well established, and anything fronting 32 Road could likely gain access from a secondary street (e.g., D, D 1/2 or E Roads).

Chairman Kresin asked for clarification on the number of lanes expected for 29 Road. Mr. Dorris said that there would be two through lanes for each direction with one center turning lane, for a total of five lanes.

Commissioner Redifer asked how traffic projection data had been obtained for the 2030 Model. Mr. Dorris explained that there would be more connectivity coming into the area via 30 Road and 29 Road. The 31 1/2 Road connection could eventually be closed off and another connection made from I-70B to the Pear Park area via 31 Road. It was expected that future traffic dispersion would be better than it was presently. When asked if it was thought that most of the Pear Park traffic would be directed to 29 Road, Mr. Dorris replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Lowrey felt that most of the people living in the Pear Park area traveled to other parts of the City for employment, shopping, recreation, etc. He hoped that there would be a sufficient number of commercial areas developed where people could obtain goods and services without so much traveling across town. If not, he felt that traffic projections for D, D 1/2, and E Roads were probably too low. If that were the case, was there sufficient right-of-way to expand those corridors to five lanes? Mr. Dorris said that the 80-foot-wide rights-of-way along D and D 1/2 Roads would accommodate future lane expansion along those corridors should the need dictate; however, the 2030 model projected that three lanes would accommodate traffic along D, D 1/2, and E Roads well into 2050. With regard to neighborhood commercial sites, Mr. Dorris said that they would not offer movie theatres and mall-scale shopping.

Chairman Kresin asked if traffic projections would still result in some levels of intersection failure, i.e., traffic sitting through two or more red lights at a single intersection. Mr. Simms said that a model on that scenario had not been done. If requested, he could undertake one and come back before the planning commissions with his findings. Mr. Simms expounded on how a traffic model was formulated, using the projections of population, employment and other factors. Given all of those factors, and with build-out of the area expected by 2030, he felt comfortable with the numbers reflected on the 2030 model. He also offered to provide a directional traffic model if that would help provide planning commissioners with additional clarification. Chairman Dibble said that a directional model would indeed be helpful.

Mr. Dorris reminded planning commissioners that with completion of the 29 Road extension, much of the area's traffic would be through traffic from Orchard Mesa and other parts of Grand Junction.

Commissioner Lowrey asked if the same 80-foot-wide right-of-way existed along E Road, to which Mr. Dorris responded negatively.

Commissioner Bonella wondered what would happen to the bike paths along D and D 1/2 Roads if they were expanded to five lanes. Mr. Dorris said that there would still be attached bike paths there.

Commissioner Bonella asked if there were sufficient easements already procured from property owners to expand street widths to five lanes, to which Mr. Simms replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Binder wondered why so little focus was being given to developing neighborhood commercial business centers. By locating the majority of businesses in or near the mall, North Avenue, or other larger nodes away from residential areas, it forced people to incur more trips per day, resulting in more miles traveled, increased pollution, and more traffic impacts. Mr. Simms said that while neighborhood commercial nodes had been identified, businesses typically wanted to locate in areas with higher traffic volumes. Also, people seemed to generally prefer living in one area and doing their business elsewhere.

Mr. Thornton offered some additional clarification on the various commercial options explored for the 29 and D Road intersection. If expanded according to Option 2, approximately 70 acres would be designated Commercial. Development to so large a scale would result in a commercial center appealing to a more regional area, versus a neighborhood area. He cited the Safeway complex at 29 and F Roads, an approximately 11-acre parcel that served that area with a variety of businesses but ones that were smaller in scale. Commissioner Binder said that commercial development in the Pear Park area would likely be used by Orchard Mesa residents as well. If not planned for, she said, it would never occur. Mr. Thornton referenced the large amount of commercial property along the 24 Road corridor. Plenty of land was there; yet, little new commercial development had actually taken place.

Commissioner Lowrey shared Commissioner Binder's concerns but agreed with Mr. Simms that businesses typically wanted to be located next to other businesses. Since people apparently liked living in one place and traveling to other areas for goods and services, he just wanted to make sure that those personal preferences were accounted for in the traffic model.

Mr. Thornton pointed out that with completion of the 29 Road expansion, North Avenue businesses would be very close and easily accessible by Pear Park and Orchard Mesa residents.

Chairman Kresin asked if the model accounted for internal traffic patterns generated by new schools, and did it take into consideration the new Riverside Parkway? Mr. Simms replied affirmatively to both questions.

A brief recess was called at 8:37 p.m. The public hearing reconvened at 8:50 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Marianne Traver (2967 D 1/2 Road, Grand Junction) felt that 8-foot-wide sidewalks were excessive, especially along 29 Road. She felt that 5 to 6-foot-wide sidewalks would be sufficient and be more appealing. She expressed concerns over what she felt were "ugly" developments being constructed in the Pear Park area. Was there any way to ensure more aesthetically-designed developments in the future, ones more in keeping with the intent of the Pear Park Plan? Also, was there any way to require developers of projects currently under consideration to adhere to the Plan's more aesthetic design approach?

Robert Fulcher (2991 and 2996 Teller Avenue, Grand Junction) referenced his property at the corner of 30 Road and I-70B, the one the City wanted to "downzone" from I-2 to Commercial. He wondered what mediation was available to him to keep this from happening.

J.D. Miller, president of Habitat for Humanity, (P.O. Box 4947, Grand Junction) made a brief presentation on the benefits provided to the community through the efforts of Habitat for Humanity, and he passed out copies of his letter and a site location map to planning commissioners.

Jerry Tucker, also with Habitat for Humanity, said that in early November they had been approached about buying a piece of property in the Pear Park area. For the development of the property to be viable, he asked planning commissioners to consider changing the land use designation from Estate to Residential Medium (4-8 units/acre). A higher density would allow them to construct more homes, help more people, keep costs down, and lower the taxes that homeowners would have to bear. Their development would be aesthetically pleasing and would be consistent with both the City's and County's goals of providing affordable housing. Their project would represent good infill and provide a number of community benefits.

Commissioner Lowrey said that he'd had ex parte discussions with the folks from Habitat for Humanity outside the public hearing venue. He was privy to other information that other planning commissioners may not have.

Commissioner Redifer explained that he too had had independent conversations with the Habitat folks, but he didn't feel that his interaction posed any conflict of interest.

After a brief discussion, it was concluded that no conflict of interest existed in either commissioner's case.

Chairman Kresin asked why Habitat's representatives had not participated in the neighborhood planning process until now. Mr. Miller explained that the subject parcel had only been made available to them in November and by that time the planning process had almost been completed.

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Mr. Thornton said that 8-foot-wide sidewalks had been deemed better by experts for pedestrian usability. People could walk side by side or pass each other without anyone having to step out into the street to avoid oncoming pedestrian traffic. Smaller width sidewalks were effective along streets such as 7th Street because of the wide park-like strip located between the sidewalk and street. Based on the findings of experts, staff concluded that 8-foot-wide sidewalks were better if the goal was to try and build a better community.

Chairman Kresin asked if all proposed sidewalks would be 8 feet wide. Mr. Hahn said that 6-foot-wide sidewalks were the standard, if attached. Detached sidewalks were typically 8 feet wide.

Mr. Thornton said that with regard to Ms. Travers' concern over design standards, there were no actual standards incorporated into the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan. The Plan did, however, identify the need to implement design standards. The next step would be for both City and County planning staffs to determine just what standards would be appropriate.

Chairman Kresin asked if this would likely result in changes to both the City and County Zoning and Development Codes, Mr. Thornton responded affirmatively.

When Chairman Kresin asked about Mr. Fulcher's concerns over the land use designation of his property, Mr. Thornton referenced an available slide of the area in question and said that no zoning changes were being proposed for Mr. Fulcher's property. The land use classification on the Future Land Use Map for his property had been previously designated commercial, and the surrounding area commercial industrial. No changes were proposed with the Pear Park Plan. The land use designation did not impose any actual changes in zoning. His property would remain unaffected unless its current use changed. Mr. Fulcher interjected that his property had always

been I-2, and he wanted it to remain I-2, both in zoning and in land use classification. He intended to bring a rail spur up to his business. Mr. Thornton said that without knowing the nature of Mr. Fulcher's business, he could not say with certainty that there would be an issue if a less intense zoning classification was applied. He added that rail spurs were not exclusive to I-2 zoning.

Chairman Kresin felt that due consideration should be given to the zoning already there in place on Mr. Fulcher's property. If the use was heavy industrial and the zoning had been I-2, why wouldn't the land use map reflect what was there? Mr. Thornton explained that with the Land Use Map's adoption in 1996 it designated the area as a mixture of commercial and commercial/industrial. The City's primary concern was over the potential for heavy commercial truck traffic traveling between the commercial/industrial uses and the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

With Chairman Kresin's permission, Mr. Fulcher came forward and stated that a lot of time and research had gone into finding his property, and he'd put a lot of money into his business. He wanted assurances that his business would be unaffected in any way by the City's changing the land use classification from I-2 to Commercial/Industrial. If his property were deemed non-conforming under the current land use designation, it would affect any attempts to expand the business or sell his property. Also, if destroyed by fire, he could not rebuild, so it would affect his insurance coverage. Chairman Kresin suggested that perhaps Mr. Fulcher could submit a request for a Growth Plan Amendment.

With regard to Habitat for Humanity's request, Mr. Thornton said that given Habitat's recently received submittal, staff had not had a chance to sufficiently review the request. Other properties within the designated study areas, those also seeking Growth Plan Amendments, had already had or would have their general meetings prior to February's submittal deadline. Habitat's representatives indicated that they too would like to submit at the end of February. Mr. Thornton reiterated that one planning commission option included hearing all of the Growth Plan Amendment requests at the same time.

Chairman Dibble said that he would be in favor of postponing consideration of the individual land use reclassification requests until such time as planning commissioners could consider the area as a whole.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Gardner referenced a letter in planning commissioner packets from Mr. Aldrich, legal counsel for the Grand Valley Canal Company, who continued to express strong opposition to the inclusion of canal banks as part of the urban trails system. Pending resolution of their dispute with the City, Commissioner Gardner asked if perhaps references to canal banks as future trails on the Urban Trails Map, a portion of which had been included as part of the Pear Park proposal, could be deleted. Mr. Thornton said that everything on the portion of the Urban Trails Map referenced previously had already been adopted. Changes would have to be brought forth and considered in a separate public hearing. While everyone hoped that issues between the City and the Grand Valley Canal Company could be resolved, from a planning perspective, it was prudent to reflect all possible trail segments.

Chairman Kresin recalled that during deliberations on the Urban Trails Master Plan, the City had voted for the plan but the County had voted against it as it pertained to County-situated trail segments. Mr. Fife came forward and said that changes to the Urban Trails Master Plan had been adopted in 2000. At that time the City's Planning Commission had agreed to adopt the changes

but the County's Planning Commission had opted to reject the proposed changes. Thus, while the Master Plan was left unchanged for lands within County jurisdiction, the Master Plan itself had not been rescinded. Future trail segments shown along canal banks within County-jurisdictioned lands had been reflected on the adopted Master Plan since 1993.

Commissioner Gardner felt that changing the verbiage to reflect "potential path" versus "future path" gave less assurance to the public that a path would be constructed or legally recognized there. He acknowledged and agreed with the canal company's concerns over liability.

Mr. Fife said that having a plan for possible trail connections was no different than having a plan for possible street connections. Nothing was cast in stone until it actually occurred, and the Master Plan had disclaimers over future trail segments stating that no connections could be used without having first received permission from all parties.

Commissioner Bonella wondered why anyone would want a trail connection so close to a hazard. He agreed with the canal company's liability concerns and felt that all references to canal bank trails should be removed from the Master Plan.

Commissioner Lowrey said that in the City of Sacramento, California, highways and pedestrian paths were routinely constructed over the City's many levees.

Mr. Fife said that staff intended to bring the Urban Trails Plan back before planning commissioners. He suggested that a broader discussion of trails could be undertaken at that time.

Chairman Kresin remarked that making trails viable along canal banks would require the permission of every property owner along those proposed trail segments. Mr. Fife reiterated his suggestion that planning commissioners consider the bigger trails picture when they could see the entire Urban Trails Plan.

Commissioner Redifer felt that this was not the time nor the place to propose piecemeal changes to the Master Plan when only a portion of it had been included with the Pear Park Plan and only as a means of reference. Changes to any part of the Urban Trails Master Plan was outside the scope of the current Pear Park Neighborhood Plan proposal.

Commissioner Nobel concurred and thought that trails issues would be better addressed at another time.

Additional discussion over reflected canal bank trail segments ensued. Chairman Kresin asked that the same legend adopted as part of the Urban Trails Master Plan be reflected on the portion included as a reference in the Pear Park proposal.

Commissioner Binder wondered why planning commissioners were even discussing this, since the Urban Trails Master Plan had already been adopted.

Chairman Kresin asked for clarification on the land use designation change request submitted by Mr. Beagley for his property at 29 and D 1/2 Roads. Mr. Thornton said that Mr. Beagley had canvassed the neighborhood and had secured the support of 8 of the neighborhood's 15 property owners for option 3.

Commissioner Pitts referenced Mr. Fulcher's property and asked if annexation would be triggered with any expansion of that business. Mr. Thornton said that the current use could be expanded up to another 10,000 square feet without triggering annexation.

Chairman Dibble asked if any other conditions were added to the list outlined in the Project Review Staff Report. Mr. Thornton said that only if planning commissioners chose the option of grouping the land use classification change requests into a study area would there be another condition.

At Chairman Dibble's request, Mr. Thornton read into the record the verbiage that would comprise the eighth condition of approval, to read as follows: "City and County planning staff shall conduct a planning process to focus on the potential changes, if any, for the area defined by 30 Road to 32 Road, south of D Road to the Colorado River, in addition to the Teller Court area west of 30 Road. The study would occur in the first quarter of 2005 and involve a focus group comprised of various interests (property owners, etc.), with alternatives and recommendations coming back to the joint planning commissions in the spring of 2005." This verbiage drew general assent from both City and County planning commissioners.

Commissioner Binder referenced school siting criteria item 4 and expressed concern that new schools would be situated on arterial streets. She felt that this could create long-term traffic and safety concerns. Mr. Thornton said that while the siting criteria would be used as a guideline, it did not mean that each criterion would be perfectly followed. When asked, Mr. Thornton said that several sites were currently under School District review.

Chairman Dibble spoke on behalf of the Grand Junction Planning Commission and made the following findings: "Planning staff of the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County find that the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan is consistent with the review and approval criteria of the respective regulations of each entity and recommends with the additions/corrections identified in this staff report that:

1. The Mesa County Planning Commission approves the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan as an amendment to the Master Plan and adopt a resolution adopting and certifying the amendment to the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners; and

2. The Grand Junction Planning Commission recommends approval of the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan to the Grand Junction City Council."

With that, the following motions were made:

Grand Junction Planning Commission:

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2004-247, Pear Park Neighborhood Plan, I propose that we forward to City Council our recommendation of approval, with the additions and corrections as stated in the staff report [including approval condition 8, to read, 'City and County planning staff shall conduct a planning process to focus on the potential changes, if any, for the area defined by 30 Road to 32 Road, south of D Road to the Colorado River, in addition to the Teller Court area west of 30 Road. The study would occur in the first quarter of 2005 and involve a focus group comprised of various interests (property owners, etc.), with alternatives and recommendations coming back to the joint planning commissions in the spring of 2005.']"

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion.

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

Mesa County Planning Commission:

MOTION: (Commissioner Bonella) "Mr. Chairman, on item 2004-110-MP1, Pear Park Neighborhood Plan, I propose that we approve the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan with the additions and corrections as stated in the staff report, as an amendment to the Master Plan, and adopt a resolution (No. MCPC-2004-03) adopting and certifying the amendment to the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners. For the attachments, please refer to the copy of Staff Report dated November 29, 2004, a copy of the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan, the November 16, 2004 letter from the Bureau of Reclamation, the November 9th e-mail from Mesa State College, Mesa County Resolution No. MCPC-2004-03, City Council Resolution, also the additions and changes to the Urban Trails Map as proposed tonight [to reflect on that portion of the Urban Trails Map referenced in the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan presentation and depicting existing and proposed trail segments in the Pear Park area the applicable legend, disclaimers and references shown on the larger Urban Trails Master Plan] and [the addition of condition 8, to read, 'City and County planning staff shall conduct a planning process to focus on the potential changes, if any, for the area defined by 30 Road to 32 Road, south of D Road to the Colorado River, in addition to the Teller Court area west of 30 Road. The study would occur in the first quarter of 2005 and involve a focus group comprised of various interests (property owners, etc.), with alternatives and recommendations coming back to the joint planning commissions in the spring of 2005.']"

Commissioner Domet seconded the motion.

Chairman Dibble asked if the County's inclusion of the Urban Trails Map modification should be reflected in the City's motion as well. Ms. Kreiling came forward and said that the County's motion only asked that what was shown on the Master Plan was also shown on the smaller excerpt; no changes were actually being made to either map, so no additional City motion would be necessary.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

The public hearing was adjourned at 10 p.m.