

# GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP

January 13, 2003

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado met on Monday, January 13, 2003 at 7:11 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium to discuss workshop items. Those present were Harry Butler, Dennis Kirtland, Bill McCurry, Jim Spehar, Janet Terry, Reford Theobald and President of the Council Cindy Enos-Martinez.

## Summaries and action on the following topics:

1. **VARIOUS PLANNING ITEMS WILL BE DISCUSSED INCLUDING THE GROWTH PLAN UPDATE:** Community Development Director Bob Blanchard introduced the update for City Council on a variety of issues. Chair of the Citizen Committee for the Growth Plan Update John Elmer reviewed with Council the work done on the Growth Plan update. Planning Manager Kathy Portner addressed Council on the recommendations of the committee. The transition areas were discussed. There was some discussion on adding some areas to those buffers areas. Under appearance, a review of the Sign Code was recommended. View corridors were also discussed. Infill and redevelopment policies were incorporated into the proposed revision. Councilmember Kirtland inquired about credits for sustainable communities. Ms. Portner noted that for discussion but stated the Committee has not discussed that issue. Ms. Portner stated there were other "housekeeping" items that were obvious errors in the initial plan, consistency with the Zoning Map and consistency with actually what is built. The potential growth in the Pear Park resulted in the Committee recommending an area plan, the planning for neighborhood commercial, school and parks. Anyone whose property will be affected will be notified. Councilmember Spehar suggested that in some cases surrounding property owners also should be notified. Larry Rasmussen, a committee member, said he will continue to work with Staff to ensure that the document brought forward accurately reflects the consensus of the committee.

Planning Manager Portner then reviewed the proposed change to the zoning categories to include a Residential Business District to only be used for a commercial use in a residential area. A list of uses being proposed was provided to Council. Councilmember Terry voiced concerns that tying this allowance to the Growth Plan would allow the possibility of a commercial node in a neighborhood that is built at 4 units per acre. Councilmember Spehar expressed that the 30,000 square foot maximum for office space and maximum of 8 acres for the site seems too big. The proposal for this zone district will be a separate item before Council.

CD Director Blanchard reviewed Growth Plan consistency genesis and how the current policy became part of the Code. It was questioned why there is a consistency review when consistency of any proposal with the

Growth Plan is standard procedure. The issue is when the Director deems something as consistent and then the majority of Council disagrees and denies the request. Various triggers were discussed for a Growth Plan amendment requirement. It was suggested that the Growth Plan consistency process be eliminated. City Attorney Dan Wilson summarized how the consistency review issue came up because there were times when a proposal may have been an issue and the consistency review process was in place to bring it before Council early on. It was suggested that Growth Plan Amendments should be possible more often than twice a year. Council said they will see if there is a need. **Council directed the deletion of this section and an explanatory statement as suggested by City Attorney Wilson.**

Mr. Blanchard then addressed rehearings. It was inserted into the Code to allow the opportunity to present new information since appeals only are a review of the record. Councilmember Terry explained the purpose was to allow the applicant to amend the plan to comply with the concerns for which he was denied. The City Attorney pointed out that the criteria never made it into the Code. Mr. Blanchard noted that the development review process cannot be circumvented. **Staff was directed to craft a new section of the Code to allow a re-review of a plan once amended without a new application being required. It will still go back through the process.**

Mr. Blanchard then addressed the Council on requests for single lot annexation. Council reiterated that if a lot is part of a subdivision then annexation cannot occur as the policy is not to split subdivisions. An isolated lot, not in a subdivision and where the owner desires annexation, then the answer is yes.

The remaining items include 3 items brought forward by Councilmember Spehar (#7, 8 & 9). Council thought they should be for another workshop. Councilmember Terry suggested that since one of the Coffee Kiosks owners is present the issue should be discussed. The two being considered were developed under two different Codes. Council was comfortable with the current situation once the review process was explained.

Conditional approval amendments must go through the development process. It is not in the Code but it is a policy. **Staff was directed to bring a Code Amendment to reflect that policy.**

Regarding the proposal for staff report templates, Council liked the proposal. There was discussion on the disclaimer regarding Mesa County zoning designations. Council also wanted the relevant discussion portion of the Planning Commission minutes.

Regarding the Chamber exit survey, Council was in favor of the implementation.

Items 6, 8, 12 & 13 will be scheduled for a later time. Councilmember Spehar wanted the number of lots left to develop in the City to be included in the development review report.

**Action summary:**

1. Council directed the deletion of the consistency review section and an explanation by the legal department.
2. Staff was directed to craft a new section of the Code to allow a re-review of a plan once amended without a new application being required. It will still go back through the process.
3. Staff was directed to bring a Code Amendment to reflect the conditional approval policy.
4. Reschedule discussion of items 6, 8, 12 & 13.

Adjourn at 9:44 p.m.

