

**MESA COUNTY
GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING
MARCH 27, 2007 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 10:47 p.m.**

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

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

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

Representing Mesa County were Keith Fife, Long Range Planning Division Director, and Kurt Larsen, Mesa County Planning Director.

Representing the City of Grand Junction were Jamie Kreiling (Assistant City Attorney), Lisa Cox (Planning Manager), Ken Kovalchik (Senior Planner) and Dave Thornton (Principal Planner).

Lynn Singer was present to record the minutes.

There were 94 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes of February 13, 2007 and February 27, 2007.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I move approval of the February 13, 2007 minutes."

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-0, with Commissioner Carlow abstaining.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) “Mr. Chairman, I move approval of the February 27, 2007 minutes.”

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-0, with Commissioner Putnam abstaining.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Available for consideration were items:

2. **FP-2006-180** **FINAL PLAN – Summer Hill Subdivision, Filing 6**
3. **PFP-2006-325** **PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Countryplace
Townhomes (Continued from February 27, 2007)**
4. **PP-2006-356** **PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Dove Landing
Subdivision**
5. **PFP-2006-296** **PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Logan Creek
Subdivision**
6. **RZ-2007-034** **GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT – West Ouray Rezone**
7. **PLN-2007-032** **INSTITUTIONAL & CIVIC MASTER PLAN – Walker Field
Airport**
8. **ANX-2006-280** **ZONE OF ANNEXATION – The Promontory**

Chairman Dibble briefly explained the Consent Agenda and invited the public, planning commissioners, and staff to speak up if they wanted any of the items pulled for additional discussion. Ken Kovalchik, Senior Planner, addressed the Commission with regard to PFP-2006-296, Preliminary Subdivision Plan for the Logan Creek Subdivision. Mr. Kovalchik stated that there are some difference between the plan sets and the reduced sets. He identified the three tracts that are included in the proposal but do not show up on the reduced sets. He further confirmed that there were no differences in either the lot sizes or lot configurations. No objections or revisions were received from the audience or planning commissioners on any of the remaining Consent Agenda items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move approval of Consent Agenda items 2 through 8 as presented.”

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

(Mesa County) Chairman Mark Bonella introduced the Mesa County Planning Commission members and announced the hearing rules and format.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 2007-027-MP1 (Mesa County) and GPA-2007-025 (City of Grand Junction)

GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT – H Road Northwest Area Plan

A request to amend the Joint Urban Area Future Land Use Plan, an element of Mesa County Master Plan, and a part of the Grand Junction Growth Plan in recognition that the area was added to the Persigo Sewer Service area in 2006. Amending the Grand Valley Circulation Plan to include this study area as well as amending the Grand Valley Circulation Plan south of the study area to US Hwy 6 is also being requested.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction
LOCATION: Northwest area – North of H Road to H½ Road between 22 Road and 21½ Road and 5 parcels at the Southeast Corner of 22 Road and H Road
CITY STAFF: Dave Thornton – City of Grand Junction
COUNTY STAFF: Keith Fife – Mesa County

STAFF PRESENTATION

Keith Fife, Long Range Planning Director for Mesa County, entered into the record the project files for the plan amendment as well as the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Mesa County Land Development Code, the Mesa County Master Plan and the Grand Junction Growth Plan.

Mr. Fife gave an overview of the location, the purpose, the history and the process of the plan amendment. The study area is south of the H½ Road alignment and north of H Road between 21¼ Road and 22 Road in addition to five parcels on the southeast corner of 22 and H Roads. The study area includes approximately 250 acres with an existing mixture of land uses in the area.

Mr. Fife restated the items being considered: (1) Amend the Future Land Use Map for this plan area with a recommendation to change the entire area to commercial/industrial; (2) adopt policies to help implement that Future Land Use Map; and (3) amend the Grand Valley Circulation Plan to address transportation circulation within the area.

He stated that in 1996 the City and the County adopted the Future Land Use Map for the Joint Urban Planning Area. Since that time there have been various amendments in the vicinity. Mr. Fife advised that in 2006 the Persigo 201 boundary was changed to include the subject property in the future service area. The process for this Study included two newsletters to affected property owners, three focus group meetings, public notices, media coverage and a public open house. The focus groups focused on transportation, economic development and the transition area. Three different options were presented for consideration by the public – the entire area be commercial/industrial; commercial/industrial for the southeast corner of 22 and H Roads and all areas west of Pritchard Wash and a wide range of urban residential densities for the area east of Pritchard Wash; and commercial/industrial in the southeast corner and

to the west of Pritchard Wash and a combination of urban residential and commercial/industrial to the east of Pritchard Wash.

Jody Kliska, City Transportation Engineer, next addressed the Commissions. Ms. Kliska confirmed that the Grand Valley Circulation Plan is a vital tool. She stated that more street connections in the subject area are being recommended. She stated that the key part of the plan is to show some control on Highway 6 & 50. The plan entails signal control on 21½ Road and Highway 6 & 50 and then some limiting control at Valley Court and 22 Road.

Ken Simms, Regional Transportation Planning Office, stated that one of his primary responsibilities is to provide traffic modeling data for Mesa County. He stated that he studied the three scenarios and estimated traffic trips for the year 2030. After running the scenarios with population and employment data, daily trips were estimated to be: existing uses - 8,900; commercial/industrial - 7,600; and commercial/industrial plus residential - 11,000. Therefore, he concluded that the least traffic impact would result from the commercial/industrial scenario. Daily trips were calculated as follows: 10 trips per single-family dwelling and commercial/industrial is based on 15 employees per acre.

Dave Thornton of the City of Grand Junction Public Works and Planning Department addressed the economic development, transitioning and traffic issues. He stated that within the City limits there are currently 592 acres zoned industrial/office; 1,285 acres zoned light industrial; and 684 acres zoned general industrial. Total industrial is 2,561 acres. Mr. Thornton also stated that there are currently 249 acres that are vacant in the I-O zone district and 234 acres vacant in the I-1 zone district (29% of the total I-O and I-1 zoning). Also studied were the amounts of commercial/industrial and industrial properties currently available for sale.

Mr. Thornton identified certain performance standards to help mitigate some of the impacts. It is their goal to create a transitioning by use of landscaping, architecture, and transition between residential and industrial. Corridor policies were discussed pertaining to loading docks and fleet parking; outdoor storage and display; trash dumpsters; parking lots; architectural standards; and signage.

QUESTIONS

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Carlow inquired what the percentage of the total area is residential, commercial, and industrial and what is considered to be an appropriate mix or percentage. Mr. Thornton stated that the percentages vary community by community. Mr. Thornton stated that there is currently a need for larger parcels zoned I-1.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Pitts asked why the area covered by 22 Road and H Road is designated as a study area when it is rural with existing commercial uses and, therefore, already changed. Dave Thornton clarified that that area is in Mesa County and was recently added to the Persigo 201. According to the existing Future Land Use Map it is rural. Mr. Thornton stated that the boundaries of the study area were dictated by the area that was expanded into the 201 sewer service area and served by the Persigo Waste Water Treatment Plant.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Cole asked whether all of the property currently shown as rural would have to apply for a zoning change. Dave Thornton confirmed that what is now being sought is a change in the Future Land Use Map which would allow individual property owners to request annexation and zoning.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Lowrey asked if they could approximate how many acres are being developed on a yearly basis as either I-O or I-1. Mr. Thornton stated that has not been analyzed.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Lowrey next asked if there were any corresponding numbers from the County with regard to the same. Keith Fife stated that countywide there is not very much acreage available.

(Mesa County) Chairman Bonella asked if the Fruita Industrial Park is undeveloped. Mr. Fife stated that it is slowly being developed.

(Grand Junction) Chairman Dibble asked what kind of analysis had been done with regard to demand for large industrial acreage. Mr. Thornton stated that several representatives in the focus group meetings were adamant that the supply of these properties is not there, especially those larger than 10 acres.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Putnam asked whether commercial/industrial was present prior to residential or vice-versa. Mr. Thornton stated that many of those properties were zoned for commercial or industrial uses in the early 1980's and during the late 1980's and early 1990's residential development started along the 22 Road corridor.

(Mesa County) Terri Binder asked for clarification between I-O and I-1. As explained by Mr. Thornton, I-O would be industrial-office and I-1 would be limited or light industrial.

(Mesa County) Chairman Bonella asked who would pay for the improvements to the H $\frac{1}{2}$ corridor. Mr. Thornton stated that as it would be a collector, the transportation capacity payment for any new development would be collected as an impact fee for transportation and as development happens capital improvements would be made.

(Mesa County) Chairman Bonella raised a concern with the exclusion of a left-hand turn off of 22 Road.

In summary, Keith Fife stated that the intent of the amendments is consistent with the intent of the Growth Plan and the Master Plan and, therefore, recommends that the Mesa County Planning Commission approve the proposed amendments to the Mesa County Master Plan and adopt a resolution adopting and certifying the amendment to the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners and that the Grand Junction Planning Commission approve the proposed amendments to the Grand Junction Growth Plan and Grand Valley Circulation Plan and forward this as a recommendation to the City Council.

(Mesa County) Chairman Bonella read into the record a petition in opposition to the proposed amendments until all necessary studies have been conducted.

A brief recess was called at 8:50 p.m. The public hearing reconvened at 9:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Doug Colaric (1154 North 4th Street, Grand Junction) spoke on behalf of two property owners, Gay Johnson's (794 22 Road) and the Hall property (748 22 Road). Mr. Colaric stated that they are contemplating development of the Hall property in the near future. "We have no problem with the thought of the property south of H Road and east of 22 Road being designated as commercial/industrial because in fact it is commercial/industrial." Mr. Colaric stated that they do, however, have concerns with regard to the Grand Valley Circulation Plan and, in particular, the proposed movement restricted intersection at 22 Road and Highway 6 & 50.

Betsy Kirschbaum (2207 Lyn Street, Grand Junction) by way of a PowerPoint presentation (Exhibit B), stated that she represents several of the neighbors in the surrounding area as well in the study area and are opposed to the proposal and would like to see the vote tabled until more research can be done. Ms. Kirschbaum stated that there are currently more than 600 commercial zoned acres available for sale in the valley. Other concerns pertained to the Appleton School, proposed roads, existing noise levels, among others. Additionally, she stated that it is their belief that they have not been heard in the focus groups.

Steve Rykin (560 25 Road, Grand Junction- assistant manger for Ute Water Conservancy District) stated that they are in favor of the growth plan amendment. Mr. Rykin advised that Ute Water presently has a contract to buy a 48-acre parcel which is contingent upon annexation to the City and appropriate zoning.

Clifford Henderson (owner of Henderson Heavy Haul and Henderson Equipment) stated that 80% of the truck traffic is on 22 Road. He stated, "So if that light was moved to the south-side of the interstate, and then you could either put a light or a stop sign and that would alleviate your whole problem right there on 22 Road if you would realign 22 Road through the Hall property."

Edward Tolen (district engineer for Ute Water Conservancy District, 560 25 Road, Grand Junction) voiced concerns regarding the proposed performance standards and in particular the dumpster in the back half of the lot and no parking in the front half of the lot except for customers. He believes this would be an inefficient use of the property.

Glen Younger (2176 H Road, Grand Junction) stated that he and his family have watched over 25 businesses surround their property. "I have a piece of commercial property next to commercial property." "We are now next to and involved with industrial. This needs to be industrial."

Scott Clauson (856 21½ Road, Grand Junction) which is directly north of the study area and borders on the proposed H½ Road, stated, "Basically they're talking about taking

acreage from me to build roads so they can develop this property. I'm totally opposed to it along with the other landowners along that strip."

Rebecca Zeck (1950 Highway 6 & 50, Fruita) addressed the Commissions and stated that she works in the planning and development industry in the valley. She commended staff for their negotiation between the neighbors and the business community. She believes that comments from the business sector as well as the neighbors have been incorporated into this proposal.

Robert Jones II (Vortex Engineering, 255 Vista Valley Drive, Fruita) stated that he represents the landowners of three parcels. He stated that, "The growth plan amendment provides the opportunity for quality development in an area that desperately needs industrial-zoned property. Therefore, we support staff's recommendation of the growth plan amendment to commercial/industrial in this area."

Jack Wernet (756 Goldenrod Court, Grand Junction) stated that he is the president of the Bookcliff Ranches Homeowner's Association consisting of approximately 30 homes. He questioned the demand for commercial/industrial property. Mr. Wernet stated that he is against the Growth Plan amendment.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Keith Fife addressed public comments as follows:

- Staff suggests the removal of the proposed movement restriction currently shown on the proposed Grand Valley Circulation Plan District Map amendment.
- With regard to the dumpsters in the rear half of the lot and parking lots, staff suggests language which would provide that dumpsters be in the rear half of the lot or behind the principal structure. With regard to customer parking, they would suggest that it be located in the front of the building or in the front half of the parcel.

Ken Simms also addressed public comments especially with regard to the traffic concerns.

Jody Kliska stated that more roads are necessary in that area. The circulation plan projects traffic and traffic patterns into 2030. Ms. Kliska stated that, "As properties develop, we'll get the right-of-way for future streets." She wanted to reiterate that the current circulation plan as it stands today only shows 22 Road and H Road. What is being proposed is for future development.

DISCUSSION

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Lowrey recommends approval of the circulation plan but for the access areas to Highway 6 & 50, and particularly 22 Road pending further study.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Pitts stated that additional information and input needs to be obtained before a decision can be made.

(Mesa County) Chairman Bonella stated that there are three items for consideration – amendment to the Land Use Plan; performance standards; and circulation plan.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Wall agreed that the three portions need to be decided on separately.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Lowrey stated that he believes the Growth Plan should be amended and that the entire study area be zoned commercial/industrial. He further stated that he is disappointed that more evidence was not presented regarding the need for more commercial/industrial zoning.

(Grand Junction) Commissioner Cole stated that he believes that it is appropriate to amend the Growth Plan.

(Grand Junction) Chairman Dibble stated that he believes there is a need for light industrial in the valley.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Binder stated that there is a need for light industrial. “No matter what you do, you’re going to create traffic.” She further stated that this area has been transitioning and mitigation factors have been built in. She stated that she believes it is appropriate to amend the Mesa County Master Plan.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Kenyon stated that this area is transitioning and he sees the need for additional commercial/industrial property. He is, however, concerned with the 22 Road traffic situation and with the Appleton School and associated increase of traffic.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Domet also voiced a concern regarding the roads.

(Mesa County) Commissioner Robson stated that he is in agreement with amending the Land Use Map and adopting some form of policy. Mr. Thornton addressed Commissioner Robson’s questions regarding the taking of land.

(Mesa County) Chairman Bonella voiced a concern with regard to the intersection at 22 Road and Highway 6 & 50. Chairman Bonella stated that he would be abstaining from voting due to a potential conflict.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) “Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2007-025, H Road Northwest Area Growth Plan Amendment, I move that we recommend approval to City Council these amendments as recommended in the staff project report, as amendments to the Grand Junction Growth Plan.”

Commissioner Wall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Pitts opposed, and one abstention.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey): “Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2007-025, H Road Northwest Area, I move that we recommend to the City Council the adoption of the overlay district for the study area in the 22 Road and H½ Road corridors with the flexibility proposed by staff regarding the parking and the dumpster areas on the properties.”

Commissioner Cole seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Pitts opposed, and one abstention.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey): “Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2007-025, H Road Northwest Area Grand Valley Circulation Plan Amendment, I move that we recommend approval to City Council these recommendations in the staff report of the Grand Valley Circulation Plan but excepting the access areas to Highway 6/50 and particularly 22 Road pending further study.”

Commissioner Wall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-1, with Commissioner Pitts opposed.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder): “Mr. Chairman, on item 2007-027 MP1, H Road Northwest Area Plan Amendment, I propose that we approve the plan amendments as recommended in the staff project report, as amendments to the Mesa County Master Plan separating out the overlay adoption performance standards and adopt a resolution (No. MCPC-2007-01) adopting and certifying the amendment to the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners.”

Commissioner Kenyon seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-0, with Chairman Bonella abstaining.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) “Mr. Chairman, on item 2007-027 MP1, H Road Northwest Area Plan Amendment, I propose that we approve the performance standards as amendments to the Mesa County Master Plan and adopt a resolution (No. MCPC-2007-01) adopting and certifying the amendment to the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners with the modifications as stated by staff in the earlier report.”

Commissioner Kenyon seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0, with Chairman Bonella abstaining.

With no further business to discuss, the public hearing was adjourned at 10:47 p.m.