

**MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
May 7, 2002, Public Hearing
MINUTES**

Call to order at 7:01 p.m. by Chairman Paul Dibble of the City of Grand Junction Planning Commission and Chairman Jeff Over of the Mesa County Planning Commission. The hearing was held at City Hall Auditorium, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Chairman Dibble explained tonight's presentation would be devoted to the public testimony, recommendation and proposal of the Redlands Area Plan. The County will decide upon adoption of the Plan and the City will decide upon recommendation to the City Council. The Redlands Area Transportation Plan will not be discussed tonight. It will be heard on June 6, at the Whitman Building, Museum of Western Colorado, at 7:00 p.m.

In attendance, representing the Mesa County Planning Commission, were: Mark Bonella, David Caldwell, Thomas Foster, Bruce Kresin, and Jeff Over.

In attendance, representing the City of Grand Junction Planning Commission, were: Richard Blosser, Roland Cole, Paul Dibble, John Evans, Bill Pitts, and John Redifer.

In attendance, representing the Department of Planning and Development, were: Kurt Larsen, Director, Department of Planning and Development; and Keith Fife and Michael Warren, Mesa County Long Range Planning Division, were in attendance. Kristy Pauley was present to record the minutes.

In attendance, representing the City of Grand Junction Community Development Department, were: Bob Blanchard, Director of Community Development, Kathy Portner, and Dave Thornton.

There were approximately 20 citizens present throughout the course of the hearing.

**2001-258
PLN-2002-060**

REDLANDS AREA PLAN

Petitioner:
Location:

City of Grand Junction & Mesa County
South and west of the Colorado River, from the Highway 340 Colorado River Bridge at Fruita on the northwest, the Colorado National Monument on the south and the Gunnison River on the east.

The Redlands Area Plan is an update of the 1986 Redlands Goals and Policies Plan. The Mesa Countywide Land Use Plan and City of Grand Junction Growth Plan, adopted in 1996, as well as the Fruita Community Plan, provide the basis for this more detailed

neighborhood plan. The Redlands Area Plan was developed in conjunction with the Redlands Transportation Plan.

Staff's Presentation: Michael Warren, Senior Planner, Long Range Planning, Mesa County. Mr. Warren introduced the City and County representatives. Mr. Warren entered into the record the Redlands Area Plan Master plan amendment, County file #2001-258 MP1 and City file #PLN-2002-060. Staff prepared this plan concurrently with the Redlands Area Transportation Plan. That Plan will be heard on June 6, 2002. Guidelines for the Joint City/County Master Plan amendment are in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.6 of the Mesa County Land Development Code and Chapter 2, Section 2.4 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code. A Powerpoint slide presentation was the basis for the remaining staff presentation. A map depicting the Redlands Area boundary was exhibited. The planning process began in spring of 2001 and the purpose is to adopt the Redlands Area plan as an amendment to the Mesa County Master Plan and as an element of Grand Junction's Growth Plan. There was extensive citizen participation, numerous public forums and briefings. Process involved open houses, well attended from a planning perspective. Obtained numerous comments via e-mail, phone calls, letters and personal communication. There were mailings of newsletters to residents of the planning area. A website was maintained for contact.

The Plan is organized into six chapters of action plans: General Services, Community Image/Visual Character; Land Use/Growth Management; Parks, Recreation and Open Space; Housing; Historic Preservation. Numerous key issues were identified throughout the process. There were concerns about setback, aesthetics, geological hazards, ridgelines and bluffs. Site design for commercial development was discussed. Light pollution, both residential and commercial was a concern. The rural character of the area was expressed as a desire to maintain. An overlay for the community separator or buffer area was encouraged. Mr. Warren discussed the inconsistencies of the Future Land Use Map, i.e., mapping errors and conservation areas. The Swan Lane area was recommended for a change in the future land use density. The designation of Three Sisters was discussed and representative of that property withdrew his intent for a change and staff recommended to stay with the conservation designation in that area of the Redlands.

Kathy Portner, Planning Manager, City of Grand Junction Community Development, continued the slide presentation. Ms. Portner discussed issues and recommendations for future commercial development of the Redlands. Outcome and recommendation in the Plan is the two large shopping center areas, Albertson's and Safeway, with possibility of expansion, is enough commercial to serve the Redlands for a long time. There is need for only a couple of additional small convenience areas. The Plan proposes goals for commercial development including design standards and guidelines, high quality was important, encourage high quality visual, site planning and architecture, and reduce number of trips and travel for residents. The Redlands is seen as a bedroom community. Using vacant land for expansion of existing centers and not create additional areas for large commercial centers. A map depicting existing commercial areas on the Redlands was exhibited. Neighborhood shopping centers that

exist are Safeway and Albertson's. They may include other employment or office areas. Monument Village (Safeway) and Redlands Marketplace (Albertson's), and Monument Road commercial have been identified as neighborhood shopping centers. Monument Village has 7 additional acres available for development. There has been discussion about other retail or restaurants in that area. Redlands Marketplace has 9.72 acres; 66,000 sf existing retail; 20,000 sf future retail (including Wendy's). Monument Road commercial (Dos Hombres), 10 acres existing commercial. There is potential for additional square footage. The land could be used more efficiently with redevelopment. Neighborhood convenience centers are smaller; less than 8 acres, 4 or more business establishments, for a variety of uses. The Seasons has commercial zoned property that has not developed yet. This Plan would support and maintain that as neighborhood commercial. The 23 Road south area could develop for a small neighborhood convenience area. Existing Meadowlark Gardens has substantial square footage for future development. The Ridges has a small commercial center, with 2 additional lots there. Country Corner has a very small area for future expansion. It is a nice mix of office and neighborhood convenience. The public forums included discussion on whether the Monument and South Camp Road area needed a small commercial center. Residents don't want that. The draft Plan does not include the Monument Road and South Camp Road area for a future commercial site. The Plan calls for developing design standards and guidelines. The proposed Future Land Use Map was exhibited.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed Plan as presented.

Chairman Over inquired why the Future Land Use Map didn't show anything for commercial for the 23 Road area. Ms. Portner said they don't know where in the area it might occur, so there is an area on a separate map showing where existing and future commercial development is recommended. The text of the Plan also includes these recommendations.

Chairman Dibble thanked staff for their presentations. He instructed the public to limit comments to 3 minutes.

Public Comments: Carl Noble, owner of 21 acres off Sequoia. There are 3 parcels; one is 11 acres. It was designated as conservation. They bought the property 9 years ago. He was never notified of four different meetings on the Plan. He was trying to understand how his property is being designated.

Chairman Dibble asked staff to comment on this. Ms. Portner said conservation land use designation is to identify properties with topographic constraints or floodplain constraints and to identify appropriate future land uses. If it is an existing legal lot, he could get a building permit to build home. The conservation designation does not limit that. If it were to be proposed for further subdivision, it would be annexed to City of Grand Junction. Generally they can apply zoning, RSF-R, 1 unit for 5 acres. It wouldn't necessarily limit ability to build more than one structure, but may limit further subdivision of the property. Mr. Fife indicated the property is currently zoned RSF-4.

Carl Noble. 3 properties totaling 21 acres. 3 different deeds. He talked with planning many years ago. He wanted to know what had changed from his designation of RSF-4.

Keith Fife, Long Range Planning. The Future Land Use map designation does not change zoning. If Mr. Noble wanted to develop the property into more lots, he would have to be annexed to the City and apply for City zoning at that time. The conservation designation follows the bluff-line.

Greg Joufflas, 113 Mira Monte Road. His property adjoins the Three Sisters area. It was his understanding to continue with current conservation of area. Change requested by adjacent property owner would change character of their neighborhood.

Chairman Over informed Mr. Joufflas the petitioner rescinded that request.

David Hoefer, 440 Meadows Way. A car wash was recently approved across from the Meadowlark Gardens. Is this a convenience center or commercial development? If the car wash doesn't prove successful, what happens to the property?

Ms. Portner indicated this is a commercial designation. There was a Future Land Use map change to commercial by the City Council recently. That was a separate process from this process. That piece of commercial will remain as a future land use on that corner. The land use plan change has been approved, but zoning has not gone to City Council yet. It will be some type of commercial.

Ken Washburn, 389 Granite Falls Way, Canon Vista Subdivision. Representing HOA, 90 property owners. In this current proposal, pages 11-14, there are references to image, character, and visual. Isolate in this Plan are Monument Road, Broadway, etc. There were two recent approvals on Monument Road and Broadway totally in conflict with this plan. Why? One is the car wash. Much vocal and written opposition. Two is residence with commercial garage that from 100 yards back from Monument Road obliterates the view of the National Monument. If Plan goes through are we going to continue to disregard it?

Terri Binder, 1885 Broadway. Read the plan. Thinks it's good. It is good to clean up inconsistencies. She received all information through the entire process. Did not attend meetings, due to other commitments. Good that plan has been updated since 1986. Supports design standards and guidelines. Believes there is enough commercial at this point in time. Supports overlays with community buffer zone. Lived in Arvada when it was 19,000 people. As time went on, it combined with other towns. Boundaries were not clear. Thinks people would like to preserve Fruita, Grand Junction and Palisade as distinct towns. Needs to be prevented to avoid one big city.

Chairman Dibble asked for any other comments. Seeing none, he closed the public portion of the hearing. Chairman Dibble asked staff for comments on particular points.

Questions: Kathy Portner responded to approval of things inconsistent with this plan. At the time projects are approved, they rely on regulations in place at the time. This Plan sets a framework for establishing better regulations to do some of the things suggested in the way of design and better compatibility. Monument Road overlay would address setbacks and building dimensions. Those projects did not have the benefit of this Plan and recommendations of this Plan, because it was in draft form.

Commissioner Caldwell commented about the facility on Monument Road. In that situation, that lot is in the County limits. It is just a parcel of land so a planning process was not required. Ms. Portner indicated that is correct. He received planning clearance for construction. It is outside the city limits.

Commissioner Redifer asked if any area in the urban planning area would have to be annexed to city, specifically in regard to the owner of the property off Sequoia. Ms. Portner said they can build a house without annexing, but if they want to subdivide, it would have to be annexed. The City can zone in accordance with County zoning or the Land Use Plan. The owner may have different designations on the parcels. Commissioner Redifer said inconsistencies are to be worked out. Ms. Portner said City tried to zone in accordance with the Land Use Plan. Commissioner Blosser asked if each individual parcel or request would use this Plan as guidance? Ms. Portner responded they have to take the map in conjunction with goals and policies of the Plan. Other goals of the Plan may override certain factors. City's approval criteria include consistency with the Plan. It takes the whole Plan, goals and policies into consideration. Commissioner Pitts said neighborhoods are taken into account as well. Ms. Portner said depending on parcel size and what is adjacent to proposed development, densities can be shifted. Commissioner Foster asked about raising the bar on design guidelines on commercial in the Redlands. Does this include parking lots and user friendly atmospheres in parking lots that have been established in other parts of the city? Ms. Portner said 24 Road guidelines could be used as a model when regulations are revised. Commissioner Cole asked if all comments have been taken into consideration with this Plan. Ms. Portner indicated the City uses this when talking with applicants to help fit with their property. Commissioner Kresin asked about the area in the center of the Redlands with 600 acres, west of Redlands Mesa. Ms. Portner said when factoring in the golf course, they are at low end of recommended density. But it is difficult to go to high end due to the topography. Commissioner Caldwell asked about the lack of open space and parks, etc. in the Plan. Commissioner Kresin said there are none. Commissioner Caldwell would like to see more parks and open spaces. It was mentioned in the Plan. Ms. Portner said City has an adopted parks plan to be incorporated into this Plan. Has identified needs for areas for parks. The Parks Department looks at the Plan and determines whether park is needed in that area. They have the right to request a 10% land dedication. Commissioner Kresin asked if it is fair to designate as parks golf courses and open space which will never be developed as parks? Park, is anything owned by a taxing entity, which may or may not be a park. Parks Department is to team with the school district and to use existing school yards as

more developed parks but recognize need for developed parks. Parks Department has acknowledged the need for more parks in the Redlands.

Samuel Basler, 173 Little Park Road. Page 44-45 of Plan, suggesting interconnecting trails to developed parks. He was most involved in 60's and early 70's with the Colorado River Trail. At that time, trail system would follow the river to be a connection park between developed park, and trail, and so forth. Plan generally puts forth this idea, but not specifically. Needs to be a designation of specific corridors for trails and parks in this Plan. Idea is a good one, but not specific enough for a program that is going to be adopted.

Chairman Dibble asked about how the Urban Trails Plan would fit with this.

David Thornton, City Community Development, said the Urban Trail Plan was adopted by the City. Throughout the Redlands, that Plan shows various links to neighborhoods. Public can pick up this Plan at the Community Development Department. Commissioner Foster commented the revisions to the Urban Trails Plan are being worked on very diligently. Worked on canal banks for trails and have gotten bogged down. Suggested turning attention to using trails that could be developed without litigation. Trails Plan can be picked up from the City. Problem with putting it on this map at this point is premature. It is still in progress. Commissioner Caldwell said Redlands Plan does make a reference to the Urban Trails Plan on page 57. Keith Fife told Mr. Basler the revised Urban Trails Plan could be heard in June by the County Planning Commission.

Discussion: Commissioner Caldwell said he finds objection to the 23 Road connection to South Camp Road. One objection to Plan is referencing this new proposed road. To state that particular item and several others proposed in the Redlands Area Transportation Plan should be spoken to as a separate issue in the Transportation Plan. Chairman Dibble said if the transportation plan would be denied, that these references would be superceded. If there are inconsistencies between the two Plans, then they would have to be in correlation. Ms. Portner said staff recommends the summary not be included in the Final Plan. It was only a reference point. Pages 56 and 57, except for the first two paragraphs, are recommended for removal. Reference the Transportation Plan as adopted.

Commissioner Bonella asked about mineral resources on the Redlands. Any future mining where there is residential development is a concern. He would like a reference to existing resources that have been identified, residential development should only be developed with minimal impact on the extraction of mineral resources. Keith Fife indicated page 38 refers to that in first paragraph. Commissioner Bonella asked about trying to identify areas for future development that have resources on it now. Mr. Fife indicated page 39 refers to the intent to give people advance notice that when they develop the land they recognize it is a mineral resource area. New development must comply with the Mineral Extraction Policy. Chairman Over asked how you could force a developer to wait to develop if gravel can't be extracted for a long period of time?

Commissioner Caldwell said even if developer is aware of resources, he sells lots and goes away, and owners have no realization that resources are nearby, then how is that solved? Chairman Over said a developer should know about resources, i.e. gravel. Chairman Dibble said developers should look into this as well as the homeowners. Caveat emptor. It behooves the City and County to make this type of information readily available. Mr. Fife indicated the vast majority of sand and gravel not developed on the Redlands is in the community separator.

Commissioner Over commented it is a good Plan. Staff did a good job. Agreed with Mr. Noble. Would like to see why would we want to change zoning on Mr. Noble's land if development standards are in place. Should leave as RSF-4 or RMLF 2-4. If Mr. Noble tries to develop he'll have to annex into the City. Chairman Dibble asked if staff could identify Mr. Noble's parcels and how many other parcels may fall in this category. Mr. Noble showed these areas on the Future Land Use Map and indicated the area is along the river and on the bluff. Mr. Noble said if clustering were done, the County told him they would look at it more favorably.

Commissioner Foster commented on limited flexibility of the Plan once it is accepted. It is possible to change the Plan. Car wash went through 3 or 4 different requests and appeals. Finally got to City Council and succeeded in getting a change to the Land Use Plan. Hopes when Transportation Plan is viewed this situation will be considered. It is possible to change the Plan. It is not carved in granite.

Commissioner Blosser commended staff. Comprehensive in many issues. Not cast in concrete. Will be looked at over the years and if needs to be changed they can change it. It lays out groundwork for the area. Commissioner Pitts said staff did a good job with many hearings and forums. Commissioner Evans commented this is a basic outline. It needed upgrading from 1986. Long overdue. Not cut in stone, but gives direction with new updates. Chairman Dibble said Grand Junction is in need of a Plan. The Valley is changing. Annexation occurs and is taking place. Need stable way of changing. Subject to change and subject to changing times. Staff did a fine job of putting this together. Public input has been good. It is not planned to make everyone happy but is a place to start and a place to ground ourselves toward goals. Brings into land classifications that have existed. In favor of proposals with adjustments that have been noted. They will next tackle the Transportation Plan.

MOTION: Commissioner Caldwell moved that project 2002-258 MP1, Redlands Area Plan, be adopted as part of the Mesa County Master Plan in accordance with Section 30-28-108 of the Colorado Revised Statutes as presented, with the exception of page 56 and 57 of the proposed Plan. The first two paragraphs on page 56 will be retained and reference made to the adoption of the Redlands Area Transportation Plan and Urban Trails Master Plan. Commissioner Kresin seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously 5-0.

MOTION: Commissioner Blosser moved that project PLN-2002-060, Redlands Area Plan, be forwarded to the City Council, as modified by the County Planning

Commission, but only including the first two paragraphs on page 56 and referencing the Redlands Transportation Plan and Urban Trails Plan as similarly to the motion by the County. Commissioner Evans seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously 6-0.

Chairman Dibble adjourned the hearing at 8:36 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Kresin, Secretary
Mesa County Planning Commission

Date