

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO  
MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested

Yes  No

Date

August 26, 1982

To: (From:) Jim Patterson From: (To:) Jack Reutzel

COMMENTS ON MESA COUNTY LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

The following questions were prompted by some contradictory and confusing statements made in the above referenced document.

Policy #2

As Grand Junction is the largest municipal entity in Mesa County, as well as one of the largest water suppliers, I find it strange that the City was not included as one of the major municipal suppliers of domestic water. Additionally, I believe that we can expect conflicts to arise in the near future between the County and the various domestic water suppliers as to the availability of domestic water for development. Instead of the County "relying to the greatest extent possible" on the recommendations of the particular district, the affected district should have the absolute authority to decide on any proposed development, from a water supply standpoint, without being subjected to the developer influence in the County.

Policy #3

It seems that this particular policy is formed more as a rationale for the County not doing anything about Fire Protection rather than having a real concern for the public health, safety, and welfare of the residents.

By allowing low density residential development to take place (up to 500 units within a half mile radius) without adequate minimum flow fire protection, developments similar to that of Spring Valley can be built with no provision for active fire protection. That is roughly 1500 people living in an area with no adequate protection.

Mr. Kelly states that if the development is multi-family, then there is some minimal fire flow required. Keeping this in mind, what happens if within the half mile radius of development the developer builds various combinations of single family units and multi-family units, not exceeding the 500 unit limit? Is a waterline then required to serve the multi-family portion? Or is the entire area excused because it does not fit the definition of an "urbanizing area"?

Additionally, the definitions given for "urbanizing area" and "reasonable distance" are two excellent examples of planning terminology that could mean 100 different things to 100 different people. Mr. Kelly provides no support or reasoning for assigning the numbers he does. Some clarification is needed, if these policies are to be enforced in any way.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested

Yes  No

Date

August 26, 1982

To: (From:) Jim Patterson

From: (To:)

Jack Reutzel

Comments on Mesa County Land Use and Development Policies (page 2)

Policy #4

This policy is not a necessary part of a land-use document. Had there been some discussion of street patterns and dimensions facilitating the movement of emergency vehicles into an area, or the maximum distance that a development could be from a fully equipped fire station (new or existing), this policy would be more applicable to a land-use document. Recommending bedroom escape windows and smoke detectors is not a land-use issue, it is a building code issue and should be adequately discussed in the Building Code. This policy simply provides a rationale for the County's inadequate planning of fire protection response time, again failing to address the public health, safety and welfare.

Policy #5

This policy takes the approach of a popular laissez-faire planning technique: "The Market will dictate the planning". In certain instances this is a desirable approach, but in this case it is not a logical planning tool. By letting the private sector dictate when and where commercial centers are to be provided, the County is encouraging

- . Scattered land use practices which would not result in densities sufficient to instigate other urban services,
- . leap frogging development and land acquisition by speculators, anticipating future growth,
- . existing commercial stores to operate at less than capacity, hurting the local economy.

Policy #6

During the past several years many local governments have attempted to define the "growing needs of a growing County". When established, the County is the "201" Boundary. When established, the County is a fair growth area for the next 20 years. Recent evidence shows no evidence that the criteria used in forming the boundary. Therefore, at least, County land around the City of Grand Junction has been incorporated into a developable stage by its inclusion in the "201" sewer boundary.

Additionally, Mr. Kelly makes reference that "Septic tanks may also be appropriate to serve domestic water needs of small and isolated industrial plants". I believe that is impossible.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO  
MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested  
Yes  No

#10 - was land use stds

To: (From:) Jim Patterson From: (To:) Ji

Comments on Mesa County Land Use and Development Po

Policy #10

This policy makes reference to "performance standards" that must be adhered to as a requirement for development. Upon conversation with the Planning Department, there exists no performance standards for developers to follow. The idea of this type of land use and site planning standards is a good one, but the City should take an active role in deciding these performance standards, so that when the land is eventually annexed, items such as street widths, block sizes and access points are similar to allow the safe and efficient movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Policy #12

Although this policy is an attempt to discourage land speculation, it seems to only be attacking a portion of the problem. Once an Official Development Plan is submitted, the developer only has one year to receive approval of the final plat. However there is no time limit imposed on the developer to present his O.D.P. Therefore, speculation can still continue until the O.D.P. is submitted. Mr. Kelly offers an attractive loophole to the time requirement discussed above for "large" developments. What is meant by a large development? There is no time limit for the large development only a "schedule" that they are supposed to adhere to.

Policy #15

My only questions concern the use and definition of terms used.

Major Capitol Improvements - what is major?

Initial fee of \$225 per res. unit - Is this a typical standard used in other cities?

Policy #17

For a policy statement this particular policy seems very complicated. After drawing the particular zones, two questions surfaced:

1. If development is allowed, in varying densities, all around the airport and runways, where would the airport ever expand?
2. There is no clear zone at the end of each runway that positively prohibits development. I think that such a zone is required by FAA and the failure to include one is endangering the public health, safety, and welfare.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO  
MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested  
Yes  No

Date  
August 26, 1982

To: (From:) Jim Patterson From: (To:) Jack Reutzel

Comments on Mesa County Land Use and Development Policies (page 4)

Additionally, the discussion of transfer of density is so confusing that no developer would want to undertake it in its present form. Traditionally T.D.R.'s have worked in large urban areas where the land to develop is no longer available. As long as there is adequate land to develop inside a development boundary, T.D.R.'s success is limited.

Policy #18

The first paragraph has no reason for being included in a policy statement. The editorializing by Mr. Kelly should not be included in a policy. Throughout this document, Mr. Kelly has advocated reduced design controls allowing for innovative and efficient construction and design of residential units. Therefore it seems odd that in this policy he sets design standards so rigid so as to make a mobile or modular home look like every other home in the area.