

**JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
GROWTH PLAN UPDATE  
FEBRUARY 24, 2003**

The specially scheduled meeting of the joint City and County Planning Commissions was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by City/County Planning Commission Chairmans Paul Dibble and Bruce Kresin, respectively. The public hearing, continued from February 20, was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

City Planning Commission members present included Dr. Paul Dibble (Chairman), Richard Blosser, John Paulson, Bill Pitts, Travis Cox and William Putnam.

County Planning Commission members present included Bruce Kresin (Chairman), Tom Foster, Craig Meis, Mark Bonella, Charlie Nystrom and David Caldwell.

Representing the City Community Development Department were Bob Blanchard, Kathy Portner and Dave Thornton.

Representing the County Planning Department were Kurt Larsen, Keith Fife and Michael Warren.

Also present was Assistant City Attorney John Shaver.

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

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAND USE MAP--DISCUSSION MAP**

Item #23 was continued from February 20, 2003. Michael Warren said that he'd researched the property all the way back to 1943 and could find no evidence to support Dr. Merkel's claim that the property had been zoned for commercial. Mr. Warren researched written records, and mylars dating back to 1961 and computer maps dating back to 1962. Given that the property is outside of the Persigo 201 urban planning area, he reiterated staff's recommendation of denial.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments either for or against the request.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Foster said that even though the property did not have a history of commercial uses, he felt the question was more "should it be commercial now?" Kurt Larsen explained that the *Countywide Land Use Plan* encouraged commercial uses to situate within the Persigo 201 urban planning area. He said that sewer was unavailable to the subject property and, therefore, it should not be used for commercial or industrial uses.

Chairman Kresin pointed out an error on the Land Use Map. He noted a small rectangular portion of area 23 was included on the map when it shouldn't have been.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, I move that item #23 stay as-is."**

Commissioner Caldwell seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Foster opposed.

Commissioner Putnam expressed support for staff's recommendation of denial.

Chairman Dibble said that access to the property was questionable; he did not want to see the land use designation change until CDOT gave some clear direction.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the proposal from staff for denial of the project."**

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

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

**PEAR PARK AREA ITEMS #1 AND #2:** Kathy Portner said that item #'s 1 and 2 were tied together, with both parcels located outside the City limits. She said that the proposal includes changing the land use designation on parcel #1 from Industrial to Commercial/Industrial, and changing the designation of parcel #2 from Commercial/Industrial to Residential Medium (4-8 units/acre).

Chairman Kresin asked if parcel #1 is presently Industrial, to which Ms. Portner replied affirmatively. When asked what was located north of parcel #1, Ms. Portner said that the Veteran's Cemetery was located there. She added that a representative for parcel #2 supported the Residential designation although staff didn't have anything in writing.

Chairman Kresin asked staff for clarification on the public notification process, which was given.

Commissioner Pitts asked what the density designation of property located directly to the east was. Ms. Portner said that the older established subdivision directly to the east had a density classification of 2-4 units/acre.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the request.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Nystrom remarked that because no one was present to complain, it appeared that the public supported the requested changes.

Commissioner Bonella said that the change proposed putting Commercial/Industrial property next to property designated Residential seemed to be a rather unbalanced transition.

Commissioner Foster suggested that perhaps a split-designation would be a logical alternative.

Chairman Kresin said that the Growth Plan was just a planning tool, it did not assign actual zoning to any property.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Foster) "Mr. Chairman, concerning parcel #1 and parcel #2, I recommend that we approve them as presented here by staff."**

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

Commissioner Blosser felt that having the transition zones so designated in that area made sense.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we accept the staff's recommendations on items #1 and #2."**

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

PEAR PARK AREA ITEM #3: Denoting an area recommended for redesignation from Estate to Commercial, Ms. Portner said that the commercial designation would provide for the future commercial needs of area residents. Likely, access would come from 29 and D Roads, with future businesses serving not only the immediate area but potentially Orchard Mesa residents as well, once construction of the 29 Road bridge over the Colorado River was completed. Also proposed was redesignation of a portion of this area from Estate to Residential Medium-High.

Chairman Kresin wondered why staff didn't "square off" the land use designation along D Road instead of leaving what appeared to be a "dog-leg." Ms. Portner said that adjustment of the boundary could be considered by the Planning Commissions. Commissioner Foster remarked that straightening out the boundary might better facilitate access off of D Road.

Kurt Larsen, Mesa County Planning Director, cautioned the Commissioners against including the two smaller parcels. He felt it could lead to "piece-meal" development.

Commissioner Paulson asked for clarification of the floodplain boundary, which was provided.

When asked how big the commercially designated area was, Ms. Portner estimated it to be roughly 20 acres in size.

Commissioner Bonella wondered why a Residential Medium-High was being suggested directly adjacent to the Commercial designation, with a Residential-Low designation being requested directly adjacent to the south. He felt that the Residential Medium (4-8 units/acre) designation would be a more appropriate transition zone than Residential Medium-High (8-12 units/acre). Commissioner Foster concurred.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Dave Austin (532 E. Valley Drive, Grand Junction), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, said that staff's recommendations represented a huge density increase for the subject area, an area for which Clifton Fire was "stretched to its limits" in service provision.

Ms. Portner said that the Residential Medium-High designation would allow for future cluster development and for the provision of open space.

Chairman Kresin agreed with previous comments that the Residential Medium-High overlay seemed too intense a transition.

Commissioner Foster commented that the existence of a commercial node in the Pear Park area could potentially lower traffic volumes because many people would be able to then walk to the site to do their shopping.

Dick Lewis (3429 G Road, Grand Junction), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, reiterated that the "huge" density increases would greatly impact the provision of fire and EMS

services. Higher-density, he said, tended to attract people who were lower income, many of whom could not afford insurance nor could they afford to pay for emergency services. Last year, Mr. Lewis said, the District could collect only 63% of its total billings for ambulance services.

Commissioner Bonella asked at what point the City would assume service provision responsibilities. Could the City contract with the District to help pay for those services? Mr. Lewis explained the concept of "De-Brucing" and said that the District would be more adversely affected, financially, in a contract service provision scenario.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, I would move that we accept the staff's recommendation on that piece of Commercial."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move we accept the staff's recommendation of part A of the Commercial designation in the Pear Park area."**

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

Further discussion ensued over the residential portion of the request. Commissioner Bonella reiterated that placing Residential Medium-High between Commercial and Residential Low did not reflect a suitable transition. Commissioner Nystrom agreed that Residential Medium density made more sense.

Commissioner Cox felt that Residential Medium was perhaps a more appropriate designation for the property directly to the south as well. When asked if the property could be split-designated, Ms. Portner cautioned against it, considering the property's shape and its limited frontage.

Commissioner Blosser supported a designation lower even than Residential Medium for the subject property. He noted that the City often annexed without first ensuring that the necessary infrastructure was in place to support more urban density.

Commissioner Paulson supported staff's recommendation, saying that if the City planned to annex the area eventually, it was likely the level of growth projected would actually occur.

Chairman Dibble agreed that growth was heading into the subject area. He suggested that how development would occur would be dependent upon the individual plan submittals. While there was a rationale to support the Residential Medium-High designation proposed by staff, he would not be adverse to a Residential Medium designation either.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, I would move that those two parcels that we've been discussing, that one directly to the east and the five parcels to the south, and including a couple around the Commercial and the dog-leg up there, would all be designated Residential Medium, which would be 4-8 units/acre."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cox) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we designate the Future Land Use designation for the parcels five to the south of the Commercial, one to the east, and the three to the north of the Commercial as Residential Medium."**

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 3-3, with Commissioners Paulson, Blosser and Putnam opposing.

Additional discussion ensued. Commissioner Foster felt that the Residential Medium-High classification was too dense and out of character with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Cox suggested consideration of a Residential Medium-Low (2-4 units/acre) for parcels to the south, with the parcels directly adjacent to the Commercial designated Residential Medium (4-8 units/acre). This drew general consensus among Planning Commissioners.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, I would move that the property to the east and the north of the Commercial parcel be changed to Residential Medium, which would be 4-8 units/acre."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, I would move that those [5 parcels to the south of the Commercial property] be designated Residential Medium-Low, which would be 2-4 units/acre."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, on the parcels to the east of the Commercial designation, I move that we designate that Residential Medium, 4-8 units per acre."**

Commissioner Cox seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Paulson opposing and Commissioner Putnam abstaining.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cox) "Mr. Chairman, for the five parcels south of the commercially designated land, I move that we designate these Residential Medium-Low."**

Commissioner Blosser seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Paulson opposed and Commissioner Putnam abstaining.

PEAR PARK AREA ITEM #4: Ms. Portner provided an overview. Proposed were portions of the area to be designated from Estate to Residential Low, with other portions of the area to be designated from Estate to Residential Medium.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the request.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioners Nystrom and Blosser expressed support for staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Bonella thought that a more appropriate designation would be Residential Medium-Low; however, he would support a Residential Low classification if there was a consensus. Commissioner Meis concurred. Commissioner Cox expressed a preference, also, for the Residential Medium-Low density classification.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, the Residential Medium south of D Road, I would move that those parcels directly south of D Road be Residential Medium, the ones that are next to the, I think that's probably, Willow, Globe Willow, and all the streets in that subdivision that's got the fairly high density mobile home parks. Everything north of the sewer line and including that developed subdivision [area noted on Future Land Use Map] be designated Residential Medium, which would be 4-8 units/acre."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Caldwell) "Mr. Chairman, I recommend that we go with staff's recommendation of Residential Low, which is 1/2 to 2 acres for those three Residential Low-designated areas there [shown on Future Land Use Map]."**

Commissioner Nystrom seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 3-3, with Commissioners Meis, Foster and Bonella opposing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Meis) "Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion that, for item #4, change it from Estate, 2-5 acres/unit, to Residential Medium-Low, which is 2-4 units/acre for those same parcels."**

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

Commissioner Cox asked if this southern property could be sewerred given that it ran against grade going north. If not, wouldn't a Residential Medium-Low designation preclude allowance of septic systems? Ms. Portner was unsure what the grades are; she reaffirmed that new septic systems were not permitted within City limits. Presumably, property owners would be required to pump/install a lift station.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cox) "Mr. Chairman, I would move that the northern part of item #4 be designated Residential Medium as per staff's recommendation, to include the designated subdivision as well."**

Commissioner Paulson seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Pitts opposing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, on the three southern areas, I would make a motion that we approve the staff recommendation that we keep that land use at Residential Low."**

Commissioner Cox seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 1-5, with all but Commissioner Blosser opposing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cox) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we have a future land use designation of Residential Medium-Low for the roughly 110-acre area in item #4."**

Commissioner Blosser seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Blosser opposing.

PEAR PARK AREA ITEM #5: Dave Thornton reviewed this item. The proposal included redesignating this property, which is owned by the railroad, from Residential Medium-Low to Commercial/Industrial. The redesignation was consistent with the adjacent parcel.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments received either for or against the request.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "I move that we accept staff's recommendation on that future land use designation."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, hearing no opposition, I move that we accept staff's recommendation to change item #5, Residential Medium-Low to Commercial/Industrial."**

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

A brief recess was called at 8:00 P.M. The public hearing reconvened at 8:08 P.M.

PEAR PARK AREA ITEM #6: Dave Thornton said that many of the parcels in the area were originally split-designated, which had not proven to be the best choice. The Steering Committee considered what would be most appropriate and had determined that given the lack of any high density designations in this area, combined with the Growth Plan's goal of distributing higher densities throughout the Valley, the Residential High land use classification seemed the most appropriate.

Chairman Kresin asked how big an area this comprised. Mr. Thornton responded that the subject area was approximately 40-60 acres in size. Chairman Kresin said that build-out could add another 500 dwelling units to the area.

Commissioner Blosser asked if various housing types could be incorporated into a development proposal within such a land use designation, to which Mr. Thornton replied affirmatively.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Warren Detmer (no address given) said that he'd spent thousands of dollars to draft and submit a development proposal, one that had included residential uses along D 1/2 Road, commercial uses and industrial uses near the railroad tracks. Mr. Detmer said that the City's screening and landscaping requirements killed the proposal because requirements included construction of an 8-foot-high wall and landscaping to buffer adjacent properties. The northeast corner was already developed with industrial uses. Given his own experience, he predicted that developers would probably not view development of these parcels, as residential, favorably and that complying with the City's screening and landscaping requirements would prove too costly.

Dick Lewis (3429 G Road, Grand Junction), representing the Clifton Fire District, said that build-out could result in an additional 23,000 people living in this area. With the potential for so many new calls and the lack of available staff and financial resources, how were they expected to provide services? He said that this land use designation represented a huge future impact to the District. A Commercial designation would be preferable, if that option could be explored.

Paul Bibeau (2941 D 1/2 Road, Grand Junction) said that with the property located so close to the railroad tracks, he agreed that a Commercial land use designation made more sense. He added that because D 1/2 Road was still a two-lane local street, traffic volumes from any high-density development would significantly impact the area. He also noted that many new developments were not providing irrigation water to homesites; thus, any high-density development in this area would likely be forced to use potable water for irrigation. Considering the years of drought Colorado has been experiencing, this too represented a significant impact on a valued resource.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Caldwell asked for the rationale of not designating the area Industrial. Ms. Portner said that designating it Industrial was still a possibility. The Steering Committee felt that this had been an opportunity to diversify housing types. The necessary infrastructure would have to be present before consideration could be given to any development at maximum density.

Commissioner Pitts observed that the density increases proposed for the entire Pear Park area were overwhelming. He was inclined to designate the entire area #6 as Industrial all the way to D 1/2 Road.

Chairman Dibble disagreed and felt that industrial uses were inappropriate along D 1/2 Road in that area. Commissioner Putnam concurred. He acknowledged that higher-density living areas were necessary to accommodate those people who needed or wanted to live in apartments.

Commissioner Cox expressed agreement with staff's recommendation. The current land use designations for area #6 wouldn't work because it would result in industrial traffic moving through residential neighborhoods. He agreed that higher-density housing was necessary for the community, but he thought that this represented an ideal location for a school.

Chairman Dibble agreed that parks and schools often fit where other land uses couldn't. He suggested assigning a Mixed-Use or some other designation that would appeal to the school district.

Commissioner Cox wondered if this particular item could be tabled, to allow for additional discussion. Chairman Kresin agreed with the suggestion to table the recommendation, and also with the concept of using the land for school development. He said that the influx of another 1,500 people on 40 acres was just too much given the lack of available infrastructure. Ms. Portner said that tabling the item would only permit the current land issues to continue. She noted that a school district representative had participated on the Steering Committee. Ms. Portner said that while school sites were being sought in the area, designating a school site without school district participation was inappropriate.

Mr. Thornton added that in order to make the area a viable site for school construction, the school district would have to aggregate the smaller parcels. Typically, schools need 10 acres for an elementary school, 20 acres for a middle school and 40 acres for a high school.

Commissioner Nystrom questioned the rationale of placing higher density residential uses so close to the railroad tracks. He expected that noise and safety would be of concern to anyone contemplating residing there.

Chairman Kresin and Commissioner Foster both reiterated their feelings that the Residential Medium-High density classification was just too intense given the number of issues that had arisen. Given the limited number of options, Commissioner Foster felt that a Commercial designation made the most sense.

Commissioner Meis reminded Planning Commissioners that the Steering Committee had been made up of the community's stakeholders, persons who had discussed areas and options such as this one at length. It seemed as though due consideration wasn't being given to the thought that had gone into the Steering Committee's recommendation. He expressed support for staff's proposal. Commissioners Putnam and Paulson agreed. Chairman Dibble remarked that the school district or a developer could always come back before the Planning Commission with a rezone request.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Foster) "Mr. Chairman, I would agree that we should give our recommendation according to the way the staff and Steering Committee has presented it to us and give it a favorable nod and go from there."**

Commissioner Meis seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a split vote of 3-3, with Chairman Kresin and Commissioners Nystrom and Bonella opposing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "I move that we table this particular item for further study."**

Commissioner Foster seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Meis opposing.

Commissioner Blosser said that this was one of the more difficult areas given the small sizes of the area's parcels. Based on the work undertaken by staff and the Steering Committee, he felt a Residential High designation could be supported. He agreed that if the school district or a developer wanted to come before the Planning Commission with something specific, reconsideration could be given at that time. Commissioner Paulson agreed.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cox) "Mr. Chairman, on item #6, I move we accept the staff's recommendation of Residential High for these parcels."**

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

Given the impasse, a legal opinion was sought. Mr. Shaver said that because a consensus in this case was required to effect an action, so the impasse resulted in *No Action* being taken.

PEAR PARK AREA ITEM #7: Dave Thornton reviewed the proposal, which included redesignating the area from Residential Medium-Low (2-4 units/acre) to Commercial/Industrial.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No comments were received from the public either for or against the request.

## **DISCUSSION**

Commissioners Nystrom and Caldwell expressed agreement with staff's recommendations.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, concerning item #7, the Residential Medium-Low, 2-4 units/acre, I move that we accept staff's recommendation of changing the proposed land use designation to Commercial/Industrial on those four parcels."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, on item #7, I make a motion that we accept the staff recommendation to have the land use be Commercial/Industrial."**

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

**PEAR PARK AREA ITEM #8:** Dave Thornton reviewed the proposal, which included redesignating the area from Residential Medium-Low (2-4 units/acre) to Residential Medium (4-8 units/acre). The redesignation, he said, would be consistent with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Paulson asked if staff had considered redesignating the area as Commercial. Mr. Thornton said that an underpass was to be constructed within this area; given the access restrictions and other unknown variables, staff did not feel a Commercial designation was appropriate.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Dick Lewis (3429 G Road, Grand Junction), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, expressed support for a Commercial designation but was opposed to any Residential designation that would increase the area's density. Businesses, he said, used the Fire District's services far less often than did residents and the added tax revenues from businesses helped to pay for service provision.

Dave Austin (532 E. Valley Drive, Grand Junction), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, said that the District always expressed opposition in review agency comments to higher density residential proposals within their boundaries and in each case it seemed as though their concerns were ignored by both staff and Planning Commissioners. He stressed that if higher density classifications were granted, it served as a "green light" to developers to propose higher density developments, ones that tended to have closer setbacks and pose greater fire risks.

## **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Nystrom felt that either Commercial or Residential Medium classifications would fit well.

Chairman Kresin expressed support for staff's recommendation; the parcel, he said, was too large to support Commercial given the constraints mentioned by staff.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Meis) "Mr. Chairman, with regard to item #8, I make the motion we accept staff's opinion of the recommendation of the parcel going to Residential Medium, 4-8 units/acre."**

The motion died for lack of a second.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Caldwell) "Mr. Chairman, I move that on item #8, that instead of Residential Medium, we designate that parcel as Commercial."**

Commissioner Bonella seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Meis opposing.

Commissioner Paulson agreed that while a Commercial designation might be desirable for that area, he'd not heard anything to indicate that the property could actually be used for Commercial. Until such time as an actual plan was submitted and the determination made that the property could support commercial uses, Residential Medium seemed a more appropriate designation. Commissioners Putnam and Cox agreed.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Paulson) "Mr. Chairman, I make the motion we accept the City's recommendation for future land use on this parcel to Residential Medium."**

Commissioner Cox seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Pitts opposing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Foster) "Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we reconsider."**

Commissioner Meis seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 2-4, with Chairman Kresin and Commissioners Caldwell, Bonella and Nystrom opposing.

Mr. Shaver said that because a consensus is required to effect an action, the impasse effectively resulted in *No Action* being taken.

PEAR PARK AREA ITEM #9: Dave Thornton reviewed the request, which proposed to redesignate the area from Residential Medium-Low (2-4 units/acre) to Commercial. Kurt Larsen added that Mesa County's Board of County Commissioners had already approved commercial zoning in that area.

Commissioner Bonella asked if the underpass and intersection configuration would extend to the subject area. Mr. Larsen replied affirmatively. When asked why a Commercial designation made sense for this area and not for the adjacent area (#8), Mr. Larsen said that access was more problematic for area #8 than for area #9.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Dick Lewis (3429 G Road, Grand Junction), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, felt that a Commercial designation made just as much sense in this area as it did in area #8. He supported the Commercial designation because it added to the Fire District's tax base.

There was general consensus among County Planning Commissioners that staff's recommendation for the subject area was appropriate.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, I think it's a great idea to go along with staff's recommendation on this one."**

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

There was general consensus among City Planning Commissioners that staff's recommendation for the subject area was appropriate.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we approve the staff recommendation on item #9 and make it Commercial."**

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

PEAR PARK AREA ITEM #10: Dave Thornton reviewed the proposal, which recommended redesignation of the area from Residential Medium-Low (2-4 units/acre) to Residential Medium. He said that the higher density would allow increased flexibility for clustered development and screening/buffering along the property's side facing the railroad tracks.

Commissioner Pitts asked for clarification on the location of the canal, which was provided.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Dick Lewis (3429 G Road, Grand Junction), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, reiterated that if the property were rezoned and then annexed by the City, then the Clifton Fire Protection District would still be expected to serve it. He reiterated that with shrinking resources, serving these higher density areas was becoming increasingly difficult.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Nystrom expressed agreement with staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Bonella was concerned that County Planning Commissioners were being put in a position of having to agree with City recommendations for higher densities in areas where infrastructure and service provision issues were prevalent. The County Planning Commission, he said, typically denied requests that came before them when those issues weren't satisfactorily addressed. He said that the Clifton Fire Protection District was trying to stress the critical nature of its position; yet, the City had not spoken up to say that relief is on its way.

Commissioner Nystrom thought that the District's financial issues could be addressed through increases to the mill levy. He said that just because a parcel had a higher density classification didn't mean that it would build out overnight or that it would build out to the highest density possible.

Commissioner Caldwell sympathized with the plight of the Fire District, but said that the responsibilities of the Planning Commissions were to consider the best uses for the land.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "Mr. Chairman, concerning this item #10, the Residential Medium-Low, 2-4 units/acre to Residential Medium, 4-8, I would move that we pass this on to the City with the staff recommendation."**

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

Commissioner Pitts suggested a split designation for the property, using the canal as the dividing line, with a Commercial given to the area north of the canal. Chairman Dibble cautioned against that because it would result in commercial traffic being routed through a residential neighborhood.

Commissioner Cox expressed support for staff's recommendation.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cox) "Mr. Chairman, I recommend we approve the staff recommendation for item #10, to change it to Residential Medium from Residential Medium-Low."**

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

PEAR PARK AREA ITEMS #11 AND #12: Dave Thornton said that these two items were closely tied together and could be considered together. He reviewed the request, which included redesignating area #11 from Residential Medium-Low (2-4 units/acre) to Commercial, and redesignating area #12 from Commercial to Residential Medium (4-8 units/acre).

When asked by Commissioner Paulson if the commercial use was built out in area #12, Mr. Thornton replied negatively.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Dick Lewis (3429 G Road, Grand Junction), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, said that a saw sharpening business was presently located on the commercial parcel. Given that the area had significant access issues, staff's recommendation didn't make sense.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Nystrom supported staff's recommendation; Commissioner Foster thought it a good location for a car wash.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nystrom) "I would move that staff did a good job on this and go for it."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Putnam) "Mr. Chairman, on item #11 and #12, approval be given to staff's recommendations."**

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

A recess was called at 9:53 P.M. The public hearing reconvened at 10:00 P.M.

#### **GOALS, POLICIES AND ACTION ITEM PROPOSED CHANGES**

Kathy Portner offered a PowerPoint presentation identifying the five areas of focus, which included: 1) the cooperative planning area; 2) community appearance and design; 3) cultural and historic resources; 4) parks and open space; and 5) infill/redevelopment. She stressed that changes set the stage for drafting new regulations; she stressed that changes here did not constitute actual regulations.

GROWTH PLAN GOAL #2: Ms. Portner reviewed changes as contained in Planning Commissioner packets.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one commented either for or against the request.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Caldwell) "Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that Goal #2, as presented by the staff, be ratified by this committee."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to accept the staff recommendation for Goal #2."**

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

**GROWTH PLAN GOAL #13:** Ms. Portner reviewed changes as contained in Planning Commissioner packets.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Pitts was concerned over the addition of so many new landscaping requirements given the drought conditions the Valley had been experiencing over the last few years. Ms. Portner said that landscaping options included xeriscaping.

Chairman Kresin wondered if there were any plans to revisit landscaping requirements in industrial areas. Ms. Portner said that future review of the requirements might be zone specific.

Commissioner Cox referenced Policy 13.12 and wondered how the policy would apply to North Avenue. Would new development have the same character as existing development along that corridor? Ms. Portner stated that any new Code provisions could be corridor specific and could include specifics on non-conforming sites.

Chairman Kresin referenced policy 13.11 and asked if there was a preference to construct one taller tower versus several smaller towers. Ms. Portner said that that would be discussed in greater detail when review of that Code section was undertaken.

Commissioner Nystrom asked if sidewalks were required in all urban areas. Ms. Portner replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Bonella said that he hoped the City would take into account the costs associated with ensuring "high quality growth" as it pertained to building materials. Ms. Portner said that consideration would be given, dependent on the area in which the development was located.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Terri Binder (1885 Broadway, Grand Junction) said that design standards and guidelines needed to consider the entire community. Even Wal-Marts, she said, came in different shapes and sizes. The community would end up with developments they could be proud of if the criteria were in place. She said that even a metal building could be designed and built aesthetically.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Foster) "I would make a motion we accept Goal #13 as presented."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept Goal #13 as presented by staff."**

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

GROWTH PLAN GOAL #19: Kathy Portner said that very few changes had been made to that section. She briefly reviewed the changes proposed.

Commissioner Caldwell asked how the City would regard the construction of new buildings located near the older downtown area (e.g., Hawthorne Suites Hotel). Was there any policy requiring the matching of structural styles and appearances? Ms. Portner said that if an overlay district was created, it could also cover new construction so that there would be some design standards for new construction to blend in.

Chairman Kresin asked if Goal #19 implied a financial commitment from either the City or County. Ms. Portner said that the City had for many years set aside an annual budget used for undertaking historic inventories. The benefits to the property owners came in the form of grants and loans made available through federal programs. When asked if CDBG monies were available to help property owners fund restoration of historically-designated properties, Ms. Portner said that discussions had not yet taken place to determine if CDBG dollars were available for historic preservation.

Commissioner Nystrom asked for clarification of Goal #19.2, which was provided.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments either for or against the request.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Caldwell) "Mr. Chairman, I recommend we approve Goal #19 as presented by staff."**

Commissioner Foster seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Nystrom opposing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move we approve Goal #19 as presented by staff."**

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

GROWTH PLAN GOALS # 26 AND #27: Kathy Portner said that very few changes had been made to that section. A brief review of the section was given.

Commissioner Cox asked for clarification of policy #26.7, which was provided.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments either for or against the request.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Foster) "Mr. Chairman, I recommend we approve and ratify and pass on to the City Goals #26 and #27 as written and as presented here tonight."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move for the acceptance of Goal #26 and #27 as presented by staff."**

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

GROWTH PLAN GOAL #28: Kathy Portner said that all of Goal #28 was new. The City had hired a consultant to undertake a study. City Council members had been briefed on the study and had accepted the basic premise of it.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments either for or against the request.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Caldwell) "Mr. Chairman, regarding Goal #28, I recommend we approve Goal #28 as presented to us by the City."**

Commissioner Nystrom seconded the motion.

Commissioner Foster referenced the last Action Item beginning with "Explore and consider implementing financial incentives..." and said that he hoped that this particular item would be taken further than just exploring and considering. He said if there are incentives for infill development, there would be a better case against any development proposal which promoted urban sprawl.

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

Commissioner Cox remarked that infill development represented the most beneficial type of growth available to the City.

Commissioner Paulson said that the City Council had already identified how important infill is; staff would work on the details to determine how best to promote it.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve Goal #28 as presented by the staff."**

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

ADDITIONAL ACTION ITEM--PEAR PARK AREA: Kathy Portner reviewed this proposed Action Item as outlined in Planning Commissioner packets.

Commissioner Foster hoped that interest could be sparked among Pear Park residents to actively participate in addressing the future needs of the area.

Commissioner Nystrom remembered those who'd previously come forth against prior development proposals; those folks had not wanted any growth at all and were disillusioned when so much had been thrust upon them.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Terri Binder (1885 Broadway, Grand Junction) expressed her support for a Pear Park area plan.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Cox asked that the words "...increased traffic needs..." be inserted between the words "land use" and "park" and be made a part of the new Action Item. His suggestion received general support from other Planning Commissioners.

Chairman Dibble hoped that the appropriate and affected entities, such as the fire and school districts, would also be active participants.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Meis) "So moved [to approve the action item regarding the Pear Park area plan with the words '...increased traffic needs...' inserted between the words 'land use' and 'park']."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cox) "Mr. Chairman, I move we approve the new action item as modified."**

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

### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS/CITY COUNCIL COVERING ALL ACTIONS/NO ACTIONS TAKEN BY JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS**

Commissioner Cox said that he still had questions concerning the level of involvement the City would have in its future dealings with the issues raised by the Clifton Fire Protection District. He hoped those issues and the City's position could be further discussed during Planning Commission workshops.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Meis) "Mr. Chairman, staff recommends that the Mesa County Planning Commission approve 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 and as modified."**

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

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move that the Grand Junction Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval of the Steering Committee recommendations for changing the Future Land Use Map and Goals, Policies, and Action Items to the City Council with the findings and conclusions as we have modified."**

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

With no further business, the public hearing was adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Bruce Kresin, Acting Chair/Secretary