

**GRAND JUNCTION
CITY COUNCIL ADDITIONAL WORKSHOP
SUMMARY**

December 13, 2004

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado met on Monday, December 13, 2004 at 11:30 a.m. at Two Rivers Convention Center, 159 Main Street, to discuss workshop items. Those present were Councilmembers Harry Butler, Cindy Enos-Martinez, Dennis Kirtland, Jim Spehar and President of the Council Bruce Hill. Absent were Councilmembers Bill McCurry and Gregg Palmer.

Summaries and action on the following topics:

1. **DEVELOPMENT ISSUES UPDATE IN THE MARIPOSA AND MONUMENT ROAD AREAS:** City staff presented information regarding a request by Redlands Mesa developers to renegotiate the existing agreement for the construction of Mariposa. In addition, staff wanted to discuss a request by Pinnacle Ridge developers for access to Mariposa and the proposed annexation of the anticipated Pinnacle Ridge subdivision.

Tim Moore, Public Works Manager, advised that there are five issues regarding development in this area that he would like to discuss with the City Council. The first is a renegotiation with the Redlands Mesa developers on the funding and cost sharing options for the building of Mariposa Road. The existing reimbursement agreement is not well-defined and both sides would like to negotiate a new method. The adoption of the new TCP policy allows for different methods. Staff recommends that the specific benefiting lots for the reimbursement be identified, the new TCP be collected, the developer pay for the construction of the road with repayment to occur through the collection of the new TCP fees of these defined lots.

The second item is access to the Pinnacle Ridge Development. Planning Manager Kathy Portner explained that the Pinnacle Ridge Development, located between the Bella Pago area and Mariposa Road, is virtually landlocked except for access onto Bella Pago Road, which is a non-standard street, very steep and winding. The area is currently in the process of being annexed. The developers would like the City to grant access across City property (Painted Bowl) onto Mariposa. It is not recommended that the primary access be Bella Pago Road. Ms. Portner advised that annexation of this property will create an enclave of the adjacent Foster property. A zoning of RSF-2 is being proposed for the development. The City Council advised the annexation should go forward and they will negotiate an access easement in the development process.

The third item for discussion was a similar request from the Redlands Mesa developers on the other side of Mariposa for access. The access will be across Ridges open space. Assistant City Attorney Jamie Kreiling

suggested that with both these requests, perhaps a policy should be developed so that staff knows how to react to such requests. Council favored a policy but wanted staff to check with Parks first to determine the feasibility of providing such easements.

The fourth item is a request for a land trade between the City and Conquest Development (Pat & Jerry Tucker) for development of the Three Sisters property. The developer wants to assemble a more practical parcel (square up) by trading property with the City on a 2 to 1 basis. Ms. Portner advised that there may be an impact on the Lunch Loop trail area. City Manager Arnold suggested that some conditions on housing might be imposed in addition to the land trade. Staff was directed to work with the three entities affected (the City, BLM, and Mesa County).

The last matter is regarding reimbursement agreements in general. The old ones are a thing of the past and the new TCP policy has paved the way for new methods. Staff asked for concurrence of Council that the new methods and use for the new TCP fees are targeted specifically for collector roads and above, not to be used for local roads within a subdivision. However, the use of TCP may be an additional tool that could be put in the infill-redevelopment policy toolbox. If City Council concurs, then staff can respond to requests for use of the TCP on local roads with a denial unless it is within either an infill or redevelopment area as defined by that policy. Although Council was generally supportive of that concept they preferred to deal with it at this time on a case by case basis. Therefore no change was to be made to the existing policy.

Action summary: Staff is to pursue a renegotiated agreement with the developers of Redland Mesa in which the developer will construct Mariposa. The new agreement will clarify that the new TCP will be paid per unit and how it will be repaid to the developer which will eliminate the need to recapture a portion of the Mariposa Road construction costs from surrounding properties via the original reimbursement agreement. Staff is to proceed with annexation of the Pinnacle Ridge property and bring specific access easement requests to them for both this development and the Redlands Mesa development once alignments and feasibility are determined. Staff is to work with the property owners of the Three Sisters area and the Lunch Loop area to see what types of property trades are being requested, determine their feasibility and the impacts. Lastly, although in general Council agreed that the TCP should be reserved for construction of collector roads, they did not, at this time, want to change the policy and would rather review requests on a case by case basis.

2. **City Council/Voting District Boundaries:** Councilmember Spehar asked that Councilmembers consider some adjustments to the City Council District boundaries as long as any boundary shifts do not impact currently seated Councilmembers, it does not take land or population away from any District whose representative will be up for election in 2005

and it keeps communities of interest together. He opined that there are simple adjustments that can be made to better balance the population in each District that will not require an inordinate amount of staff time. He suggested three areas for staff to look at: the area south of I-70 B (east), the downtown area of District C to the west, and the area south of Patterson in District B, west of 1st Street.

Action summary: Since present Council was divided, Council President Hill said he would check with those not present to determine the direction staff should be given.

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.