



*Jim Patterson
City*

CITY - COUNTY PLANNING

grand junction-mesa county 559 white ave. rm. 60 grand jct.,colo. 8150

(303) 244-1628

MEMO

TO: Mesa County Commissioners/Curt Wiedeman

FROM: Daryl Shrum, Karl Metzner *KGM*

DATE: March 4, 1982

RE: Review of Development Activity North of I-70 and East of 22 Road

A. Sewerage

The area in question is outside of the adopted "201" Facilities Planning Area. Sewer cannot be made available unless the "201" is expanded. The new Persigo Wastewater Treatment facility has been sized to accommodate a reasonable rate of growth within the present "201" area and the Joint Sewage Service Agreement (1 May 1980) is effective only for service within the "201". At a meeting with the County Commissioners on May 19, 1981, Jim Patterson, City Public Works Director, "recommended that service to areas outside the "201" boundary be held to a minimum as the new plant is designed with the capacity to serve only the area identified in the 201 Plan".

Within the last year sanitation districts have been approved for the developing area south of I-70. These districts represent a considerable public and private investment. The adopted Goals and Policies for Mesa County (XI Policy #3) states: "The use of existing facilities and services should be maximized to insure the use of present public investments before undertaking new ones". This policy would indicate that development should occur in the newly formed sanitation districts south of I-70 prior to approving development activity (rezones) north of I-70.

Another policy established by the County Commissioners on October 9, 1979, (in conjunction with the Logos Construction Application) noted that Planned Commercial zoning would be appropriate for users needing direct access to the interstate because of the existence of the frontage road. Since the frontage road represented a public investment it should be used.

Recent proposals north of I-70 have proposed on-site septic systems. The adopted goals and objectives (VIII Objective #2 for Industrial Land Uses) states: "Industrial uses are encouraged to locate where there is minimal adverse impact on residential business and public uses;

where Transportation access, sewer, water and other facilities are available; where large parcels of land use can be assembled; or where industrial development is a logical extension of existing industrial areas."

These policies seem to support, in a general way, a policy adopted by the Commissioners on March 23, 1977, which said: "Submittals of subdivisions proposing on-site sewage treatment facilities will not be accepted."

General soil conditions for septic systems are poor in the area north of I-70. Developments which have been approved in the area have usually had to go with engineered systems or vaults. The County Health Department had very adverse comments on the recently proposed Bookcliffs Commercial Park.

Certain types of industrial uses may also not be appropriate for septic systems due to the quantity and/or type of wastes discharged into these systems.

B. The status of development proposals in the subject area is as follows:
(Also see attached map.)

- AFT to PC Colo. Kenworth (C116-78)
Approved by resolution, 4 Dec. 78
Zoning approved because of frontage road and proximity to 24 Road interchange, uses were service rather than sales, specific use required I-70 access.
- AFT to PC Williamson Trucking (C58-79)
Approved Aug. 28, 1979
Same reasons as Colo. Kenworth.
- AFT to PC Joy Manufacturing (C90-79)
Approved 9 Oct. 79
Approval of this development generated the policy on rezoning along the frontage road in this area.
- AFT to PC Logos Const. (Elder, Quinn & McGill) (C101-80)
Approved 18 Nov. 80
Meets policy established by C90-79.
- AFT to PC Appleton West Commercial Park (C66-81)
Approved preliminary plan Dec. 8, 1981
Zoning was approved with the Joy Manufacturing approval.
- AFT to PC Bethel Commercial Sub. (C183-81)
Recommendation for denial from MCPC on 15 Oct. 81.
Petitioner chose not to appeal to MCC. Recommendation for denial based on spot zoning, premature, not in accordance with policy.

- AFT to PC Mays Precast (C65-81)
Denied 15 Sept. 1981 by MCC.
Denial based on - did not fit policy, need for change not demonstrated, no plan for the area, not in the public interest.
- AFT to PI W. R. Hall Ind. Park (C7-81)
Approved 26 May 81
No specific reasons for approval given.
- AFT to PI Energy Park Plaza (C177-81)
Motion for approval 2/23/82, resolution not yet signed.
MCC motion indicated that the project "tie to sewer if possible".
- AFT to PI Bookcliffs Commercial Park
Same status as Energy Park Plaza.

Valley West Commercial Park (C46-79) (just west of the proposed projects) was not allowed to install individual disposal systems based on information provided by the Mesa County Health Department. It was stipulated that septic tanks were not appropriate, and a package plant was only permitted on a temporary basis until the project could be connected to the new Persigo plant. Furthermore, Colorado Revised Statutes 66-28 as amended, Section 704(2) state "In determining the suitability of a site location for any sewage treatment works, the Water Quality Control Commission shall consider the long range comprehensive planning for the area and the consolidation of sewerage treatment works to avoid a proliferation of small sewage treatment works."

C. Land Use

The basic questions regarding development of the area east of 22 and north of I-70 are:

1. How should the overall area develop? No plan, study or overall development scheme has been established in this area.
2. What should be the limits for development? At first I-70 was the limit, then development was allowed along the frontage road between 23 and 24 Roads, then the W. R. Hall development went to H Road east of 22, presently the two developments recently heard would go up to H Road to 23 Road.
3. What are the public costs to existing service agencies by expanding large acreages of commercial/industrial development in this area when large areas of vacant commercial/industrial property are available within the "201" area where services are or can be provided?
4. What will be the cost of upgrading rural county road sections to handle industrial truck traffic? Developers would undoubtedly

pay for upgrading of roads adjacent to their developments. Who would pay for upgrading roads leading to the developments?

D. Other adopted objectives or policies which pertain to the development of this area:

- IV Objective #1 - "New development should be cost effective; areas contiguous to Grand Junction and to existing unincorporated urbanized areas are encouraged to be developed first, in order to avoid development which results in the uneconomical and inefficient provision of public services and facilities."
- X Objective #8 - "Encourage a compact development pattern which will promote better use of the existing routes, optimize future demand for public transit and minimize pollution by reducing the need for auto travel."
- XI Objective #10 - "Provide sanitary sewer facilities and services that meet and anticipate public requirements and which abate water pollution."
- XI Policy #3 - "The provision of utilities should guide the location of new development and should be supportive of planned land use patterns. The use of existing facilities and services should be maximized to insure the use of present public investments before undertaking new ones."

In summary, the Planning Department recommends that the Rezone and Preliminary Plan public hearings for Energy Park Plaza (C177-81) and Book-cliff Commercial Park should be re-opened.

mm

cc: Mark Eckert
Cliff Davidson

PC

26

PC

PC

PC

PI

PI

AFT

C

W101B

W.R. HALL
18-80

Balkeliff
Com. PK.
C172-81

ENERGY PK.
PLAZA
C177-81

BETHEL SUB.
Com. 50B.
C183-81

WATER & Sewer
Dist. SQU.

Appleton
Com. PK.
C26-81
McGILL
C101-80

Col. KENWORTH
Edert,
C55-79

WILLIAMSON
TRUCKING
C58-79

18-81
C45-81

AFT

PB

PR-17