

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
June 28, 2016 MINUTES
6:00 p.m. to 8:18 p.m.**

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Bill Wade. The hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium located at 250 N. 5th Street, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Also in attendance representing the City Planning Commission were Jon Buschhorn, Kathy Deppe, Keith Ehlers, Ebe Eslami, George Gatseos, and Steve Tolle.

In attendance, representing the City’s Administration Department - Community Development, was Greg Moberg, (Development Services Manager), Rick Dorris (Development Engineer), Lori Bowers, (Senior Planner), Senta Costello, (Senior Planner) and Brian Rusche (Senior Planner).

Also present was Shelly Dackonish (Staff Attorney).

Lydia Reynolds was present to record the minutes.

There were 33 citizens in attendance during the hearing.

Consent Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Action: Approve the minutes from the May 10, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting.

2. Amending a Section of the Zoning and Development Code [File# ZCA-2016-197]

Request to amend the Grand Junction Municipal Code, Section 21.06.080(b) regarding the applicability of outdoor lighting standards.

Action: Recommendation to City Council

Applicant: City of Grand Junction
 Location: Citywide
 Staff Presentation: Lori V. Bowers, Sr. Planner

3. Kojo Rezone [File# RZN-2016-203]

Request to rezone 0.2761 acres from an R-24 (Residential 24 du/ac) to a B-1 (Neighborhood Business) zone district.

Action: Recommendation to City Council

Applicant: Kojo, LLC - Owner
 Location: 2140 N. 12th Street
 Staff Presentation: Brian Rusche, Sr. Planner

4. Retherford Zone of Annexation File# ANX-2016-194]

Request for approval of a Zone of Annexation from County RSF-4 (Residential Single Family – 4 du/ac) to a City R-4 (Residential – 4 du/ac) on 0.48+/- acres.

Action: Recommendation to City Council

Applicant: Terry, Doug and Dennis Retherford, Owners
Location: 2089 Broadway
Staff Presentation: Scott Peterson, Sr. Planner

Vice-Chairman Wade briefly explained the Consent Agenda and invited the public, Planning Commissioners and staff to speak if they wanted the item pulled for a full hearing.

Commissioner Eslami requested that item number two of the Agenda, “*Amending Sections of the Zoning and Development Code, File# ZCA-2016-197*” be pulled for a full hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Eslami) “I move that the Planning Commission approve the consent agenda with the exception, of item two, which will move to a full hearing.”

Commissioner Gatseos seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

Commissioner Ebe asked staff if they wanted to hear item two first. Mr. Moberg suggested that it be moved to the end of the agenda so that the public attending could get to the hearing they came for and would not have to wait until the end.

Vice-Chair Wade explained that the staff report will be given and a chance for the applicant to speak and then the public will have a chance to make comments.

*****INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION*****

5. Grand Junction Lodge Outline Development Plan [File #PLD-2016-33]

Request to rezone from R-4 (Residential 4 du/ac) to PD (Planned Development) and of an Outline Development Plan to develop a 50,000 square foot Senior Living Facility on 2.069 acres in a PD (Planned Development) zone district.

Action: Recommendation to City Council

Applicant: Joe W. and Carol J. Ott, Trustees – Owner
Location: 2656 Patterson Road
Staff Presentation: Brian Rusche, Sr. Planner [File #ZCA-2016-64]

Brian Rusche, Senior Planner showed a slide of the proposed site and explained that the applicant is requesting approval of an Outline Development Plan (ODP) to develop a 50,000 square foot Senior Living Facility, under a Planned Development (PD) zone district with default zone of MXOC (Mixed Use Opportunity Corridor), located at 2656 Patterson Road.

Mr. Rusche described the location as a 2.069 acre site that is located at the northeast corner of Patterson Road and North 8th Court. The surrounding land uses include single family residential to the west and north, as well as across the canal to the east. On the opposite side of Patterson Rd. are medical complexes that are all affiliated with St. Mary's Regional Medical Center.

Mr. Rusche stated that the applicant has requested to rezone the property from R-4 (Residential 4 du/ac), to a PD. The applicants are proposing a two story assisted living facility, not to exceed 50,000 square feet, with no direct access to Patterson Rd.

Mr. Rusche explained that in 2010, the City of Grand Junction along with Mesa County, adopted a comprehensive plan. As part of the plan, both sides of Patterson were designated a "Mixed Use Opportunity Corridor". A new form-based zone district, MXOC (Mixed Use Opportunity Corridor) was established in 2014. The proposed ODP (Outline Development Plan) will utilize the MXOC as the default zone for the standards related to the development of the facility. Mr. Rusche noted that the applicants are not proposing any deviations from those standards.

Mr. Rusche explained the impetus for using the Planned Development vs. the Form Zone is the fact that the Form Zone allows a variety of Commercial uses in addition to Group Living Facilities. The proposed assisted living facility would be classified as a Group Living Facility. By establishing the use of the PD as only an assisted living facility, limiting the size to 50,000 square feet, the future use of the property would be known as opposed to what one might consider a "speculative rezone". Mr. Rusche added that the most prevalent zone along this portion of the corridor is B-1 (Neighborhood Business).

Mr. Rusche displayed a slide depicting the ODP, which is to be adopted concurrently with the ordinance that would rezone the property, should it be approved. This document is recorded as part of the ordinance and outlines all the pertinent information which sets up the parameters such as access locations, size and location of building, parking etc.

Mr. Rusche gave an overview of the long term community benefits of the project which included the following:

- More effective infrastructure, due to the fact that this is an infill lot, major roadway and significant utilities already in place.
- Reduced traffic demands when compared to other commercial uses

- Needed housing types and/or mix. The proposed facility will provide a much needed and diverse housing type in the form of senior assisted living and memory care units.
- Innovative designs with the use of sustainable materials.

Mr. Rusche displayed a conceptual site plan and a landscaping plan that the applicant has provided that would eventually be included in the Final Development Plan which is the next step of the process should the rezone be approved.

Mr. Rusche stated that after reviewing the Grand Junction Lodge application, PLD-2016-33, a request for approval of an Outline Development Plan and Planned Development (PD) Ordinance, to construct a 50,000 square foot Assisted Living Facility, it is in his professional opinion that the following findings of fact and conclusions have been determined:

1. The request is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The review criteria in the Grand Junction Municipal Code have been addressed.
3. The review criteria for Planned Development have been addressed.

Applicants Presentation

Terry Claassen, 650 Lariat Lane, Glenwood Springs CO stated that he is representing Sopris Lodge which is the manager for Grand Junction Senior Living LLC, the entity that is under contract to acquire this property. Mr. Claassen noted that Mark Osweiler is in attendance who represents the operating partner “Vivage”, a Colorado based operator of Senior housing facilities that currently operate two other assisted living facilities in the area, one by the VA Hospital in Grand Junction and one in Olathe. Also in attendance was Mr. Claassen’s business partner Eric Fisher, representing Aspen Built Homes which is the construction consultant for this project. Mr. Claassen noted that Tracy States, representing River City, a local civil engineering firm is also present to answer questions.

Mr. Claassen emphasized that they tried to design a project that fits in nicely with the community and neighborhood and showed a rendering of the area. Mr. Claassen stated that his company is called Rocky Mountain Senior Housing and their purpose is to develop community based and environmentally friendly senior living communities in the Rocky Mountain Region with Vivage Senior Living as their operating partner.

Mr. Claassen displayed a slide listing their other current projects in various cities in Colorado. He explained that the first step in the project was to have a demand/feasibility study done. This study was done about a year ago by The Highland Group, a Colorado based firm that exclusively does studies for senior housing.

Mr. Claassen explained that the proximity to St. Mary’s Hospital was an important factor in choosing the location. They have designed a high-quality environmentally friendly

community that will include 12 memory care units and 48 units of assisted living. Mr. Claassen noted that that for the most part, the residents will not have vehicles. Mr. Claassen stated that this facility will be low impact on traffic and there is sufficient parking for staff and visitors. A traffic study was completed and given to City Staff. At peak hours, it is estimated that there will be 8 to 10 additional cars, which is mostly employees.

Mr. Claassen showed a slide of the development team that includes firms both local and statewide. Another slide was displayed illustrating the components and amenities of the Memory Care Unit. The next slide illustrated the components and amenities of the Assisted Living portion of the facility. Mr. Claassen showed elevation renderings and a few site plans that included a greenhouse.

Questions for Applicant

Commissioner Buschhorn noted that he understands that there are 12 memory care units that can be single or double occupancy so there could be up to 24 residents in the memory care unit. Mr. Claassen stated that for the most part, they would be single occupancy units, however every once in a while a couple may share a unit when they both have Alzheimer's or dementia. Commissioner Buschhorn asked if the assisted living units were one bedroom that could be made two or three bedrooms by combining other units. Mr. Claassen replied that was correct.

Noting that it was estimated that 8 to 10 employee cars during peak hours, Commissioner Buschhorn asked how they are able to measure that they were employees and not visitors. Mr. Claassen stated that visitors come at different hours than what the traffic study shows. Commissioner Buschhorn asked how many parking spots were provided by the site plan. Mr. Claassen stated that there were 32 parking spots. Commissioner Buschhorn asked how many staff would be on site during peak times. Mr. Claassen answered that 8 to 10 employees were anticipated at those times. Commissioner Buschhorn thought the parking was light given the fact that there were only 20 spots left for visitors of the 72 residents and expressed concern that the visitors would be parking in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Buschhorn stated that he had personal experience trying to park, as a visitor to a similar facility, where there appeared to be enough parking and he couldn't get a spot in peak hours. Mr. Claassen stated that at their other facilities, they have provided shuttle or off-site parking when there was a special event. In addition, they provide incentives such as bus tickets for employees to take mass transit as an option.

Commissioner Tolle noted that he does not see a bus stop near the facility. Mr. Rusche stated that there were two bus stops within a block on the North side of the street as well as the South side. Commissioner Tolle asked Mr. Claassen if they would consider working with other entities such as the RTD, City, CDOT to design a pull out for busses for their employees, visitors and residents in front of, or on the property. Mr. Claassen explained that they did consider it and after discussion with staff they concluded a traffic

study was needed, which they completed. Mr. Claassen stated that due to the constraints of the site and the proximity to Patterson, they felt it was not an option.

Noting that the site plan discussion was premature at this time, Commissioner Gatseos asked if it was possible to add maybe 6 more parking spots in the Northwest corner of the property where the detention pond is proposed. Mr. Claassen explained that detention ponds are engineered to handle runoff and sizing down is probably not an option. Commissioner Ehlers added that the Commission is hearing a proposed plan and questioned their role to be considering design changes.

Commissioner Tolle stated for the record that based on his professional background in transportation planning, he feels the traffic/bus situation will not get better over time and expressed that concern to staff.

Commissioner Ehlers asked the applicant if they needed to dedicate additional Right-of-Way other than what was there. Mr. Claassen stated that they have agreed to provide some additional infrastructure at the intersection. Commissioner Ehlers asked Mr. Dorris if there a future plan and cross-section plans for that area that may address increases in traffic. Mr. Dorris explained that he is the Development Engineer assigned to this project. Patterson is a principal arterial and the standard cross-section for this is a 110 foot right-of-way. Ideally, future build-out would include a median in the center, a detached sidewalk and wider lanes. The City does not currently have plans to implement the standards along Patterson Rd., but as new development occurs, and condition warrants, the City obtain right-of-way for future improvements.

Regarding the detention basin, Mr. Dorris explained that by creating more parking lots and rooftops with new development, there is a need to accommodate runoff and detention ponds are sized and engineered to address the site.

Referring the question of a possible bus pull-out, Mr. Dorris stated that there are signed bus-stops close to the proposed site and a pull-out at or on the site was deemed not necessary as part of this project.

Commissioner Wade asked Mr. Dorris if he did an independent traffic study or did he review the traffic study that was done by outside engineers and validate it. Mr. Dorris stated that this is a simple analysis and that it does not generate as much traffic compared to other uses that would be allowed with the MXOC zoning. Mr. Dorris went on to explain possible solutions for the future if traffic along Patterson reaches certain thresholds.

Commissioner Wade asked Mr. Claassen if the parking is the same at other facilities they have built, or are they all too unique to make comparisons. Mr. Claassen replied that in general, these facilities have less need for parking as most residents don't drive. Mr. Claassen noted that most communities are trying to be more "green" and limiting parking can create opportunities to encourage mass transit, ride-sharing and other modes of transportation.

Commissioner Buschhorn asked Mr. Rusche what the required number of parking spaces was for this development. Mr. Rusche replied that 19 spaces were required and the applicant is proposing 32.

Vice-Chairman Wade opened the public hearing portion of the meeting and asked if anyone in favor of the proposal would like to speak. With no one coming forth, Vice-Chairman Wade asked those in opposition to the proposal to come forward and sign in to speak.

Public Comment

Karen Troester, 2714 N 8th Court, GJ stated that she lives in the Walker Heights subdivision which is in the immediate area and has presented a letter that the Commissioners now have. Ms. Troester stated that she is in opposition to the proposal. Referring to the applicant's statement that "for the most part" residents would not have cars, Ms. Troester wanted to know if that meant they would or would not have cars. Vice-Commissioner Wade stated that they will address that later in the meeting. Ms. Troester noted that the cul-de-sac she lives in has large lots and there are about 11 nice homes. Ms. Troester displayed some pictures and said the homes were built in the 70s and it is a quiet neighborhood. Ms. Troester explained that the proposed site had been a private residence and at one time they proposed a rezone to Commercial for an eye clinic. Ms. Troester stated that the rezone was turned down at the time by City Council partly for traffic and access concerns. Ms. Troester stated that she feels the traffic in the area is already dangerous and challenges the results of the applicant's traffic study. She feels there will be more visitors than anticipated.

Ms. Troester stated that at the neighborhood meeting that was held for the project early on, the applicant had indicated that no one would want to build residential homes on Patterson. She disagrees and said she would love to have a home there. Ms. Troester spoke with a local appraiser and they indicated that her home would drop 20 to 30 percent in value should this type of development occur.

Troy Gorman, 2712 N 8th Ct. GJ stated that his property is directly north of the project and he is in opposition to the project. Mr. Gorman calculates that 40 parking spaces would be needed just for employees and residents, not including visitors. Mr. Gorman noted that although they may try to encourage transit for employees, they will most likely drive. Mr. Gorman's concern is the lighting of the parking lots. He did not feel that it is necessary to light the parking lots all night and the plans to elevate the building will make it worse. Referring to claims made in a brochure such as canal walking, Mr. Gorman stated that they were misinformed, that use of the canals for trails is not allowed. Mr. Gorman noted that over 10 years ago when an eye-clinic was turned down by City Council, there were only 12 trips per day anticipated.

Dick Anderson, 2721 N 8th Ct. GJ referred to the applicant's brochure where they mentioned both assisted and independent living and he believes the people who are in

the independent living units will have cars. Mr. Anderson stated that the independent living component to the project is what he believes will create traffic issues for the neighborhood and therefore he objects to the proposal.

Seth Anderson, 1412 Ouray Ave. does not feel the area can handle the parking/traffic that will be generated. Mr. Anderson asked who owns the land and how much has been invested so far and he would like to see how the money flows in this project. Vice Chairman Wade noted that these are not issues in front of the Commission at this time. Mr. Anderson stated that he feels this is eminent domain.

Richard Troester, 2714 N 8th Court, GJ expressed concern about all the vendors, and guests that will be generated by this development. His concern is that the cul-de-sac is 1000 feet from 7th and Patterson where there are already a lot of traffic.

Ashley Troester, 2714 N 8th Court, GJ stated that she is in a local club that goes caroling to senior living homes around the holidays and special events such as that will generate a lot of cars going to the facility.

Lori Garrison, 608 Viewpoint Dr., GJ stated that although this would not affect her, it affects her neighbors. Ms. Garrison is concerned about the home values that may depreciate and that she feels this is too big of a development for the size of the lots and home around the area.

Laura Bishop, 612 Viewpoint Dr. GJ stated that she agrees with everyone that has spoken in opposition. She would like to see a smaller size project on that site because of the traffic generated.

Vice-Chairman Wade asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak. Hearing none, he closed the public portion of the meeting and announced there will be a five minute break.

After a break, Vice-Chairman Wade called the meeting to order and asked the applicant to come forward and address some questions that were brought up.

Applicant's Rebuttal

Mr. Claassen explained that the project is a residential use and is not a commercial use. Of all the possible uses that could go in there, this project has a lot less impact in terms of traffic and number of residents. The facility is a State licensed facility and therefore they need to be accountable to the number of people that will live there. With 60 units, most of them will be single occupancy and rarely double occupancy.

Addressing the brochure that indicates "independent living", Mr. Claassen stated that this is a corporate brochure illustrating the types of facilities they have all over the state. He reiterated that this is exclusively an assisted living and memory care facility.

Mr. Claassen stated that he had mentioned use of a canal trail at the neighborhood meeting, but has since learned that this is not an option.

Mr. Claassen noted that if lighting could be a problem with the neighbors, he would be willing to work with city staff to address their concerns.

Noting that there was a citizen concern regarding the commercial traffic that would come in and out of the facility, Vice-Chairman Wade asked where the loading dock was located. Mr. Claassen pointed to the loading dock and noted that a facility this size may average three food service deliveries per week. They do the linen in-house and trash service is once a week. The applicant would be willing to work out a schedule that would minimize disturbance to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Gatseos noted that there were a couple of trees that were shown to come down and asked if they could stay to mitigate lighting concerns. Mr. Claassen stated that the lighting plan was done to code, however he would be willing to revisit the lighting to see if they could address neighbors' concerns. Mr. Claassen said they had decide to leave all the trees on the north side standing.

Commissioner Eslami thanked the applicant for providing the draft site plan early on, even though it was not required to do so at this time.

Addressing concerns that were brought up during the public hearing portion, Vice-Chairman Wade asked Mr. Dorris if there was enough room to widen Patterson in the future and if a bus turn out lane was possible. Mr. Dorris stated that the project includes the dedication of additional right-of-way, therefore it was possible to widen Patterson in the future. In addition, it would be possible to have a bus turn out in the interim if needed.

Commissioner Deppe asked Mr. Rusche what the current zoning is. Mr. Rusche stated that the current zoning is R-4 (Residential 4 du/ac).

Commissioner Gatseos asked Mr. Rusche to clarify the parking requirements. Mr. Rusche explained the formulas used to determine required parking according to the code. The total required parking is 19 and the applicant has provided 32.

Commissioner Discussion

After reviewing the information presented, Commissioner Gatseos concludes that the proposal is a compatible and appropriate use of the property. Noting that the applicant has exceeded parking according to requirements in the municipal code, Commissioner Gatseos stated that he did observe traffic congestion at 7th and Patterson during peak times.

Commissioner Gatseos stated that he feels the applicant has shown that they want to be a good neighbor and has designed a nice facility that meets community needs of

retirement care, therefore he is in favor of the proposal.

Commissioner Ehlers commented that in evaluating this proposal he considers community plans, future land use plans, and comprehensive plans as well as public comments. Commissioner Ehlers explained that the planning policies and documents all went through a public process. This development meets the required standards without asking for any variances and meets a community need. Commissioner Ehlers stated that the proposal fits with the corridor plan and traffic will be an issue the community deals with whether or not the proposal moves forward. Commissioner Ehlers pointed out that this is the ODP and issues such as lighting can be addressed when the site plan is reviewed. Commissioner Ehlers encouraged the public to stay involved and work with the developer as the project move forward.

Commissioner Eslami stated that he is in agreement with the comments that the other Commissioners have just made.

Commissioner Deppe stated that she has been faced with the same scenario with where she lives which used to be in the County and now is City. She has a group home go in two doors down from her which is why she originally got involved with the Planning Commission. She now understands the process, however she acknowledged that this is a tough decision.

Commissioner Tolle stated that he understands that the proposal meets all required criteria. He thanked the public for coming out and expressing concerns. Commissioner Tolle's main concern is safety and requested that the neighbors in the area work with Mr. Dorris and Mr. Rusche as the project moves forward. Because of the traffic safety concerns, Commissioner Tolle is leaning toward not approving the proposal.

Commissioner Buschhorn stated that although he has concerns about traffic and parking, the Commission is bound by the code and the applicant has met all the requirements of the zoning code and is not asking for any variances. Commission Buschhorn commented that the Commissioners are all volunteers and he feels as part of the Community, he has a duty to serve and make difficult decisions.

Commissioner Tolle announced that he will be abstaining from the vote for personal reasons.

Vice-Chairman Wade commented that this site has come in as a PD (Planned Development) and a number of other proposals with more impact could be proposed. He likes the fact that the ODP restricts what can be done. Vice-Chairman Wade encouraged the public to follow the proposal as it works its way through City Council.

MOTION: (Commissioner Eslami) "Mister Chairman, on item PLD-2016-33, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council on the requested Outline Development Plan as a Planned Development

Ordinance for Grand Junction Lodge, with the findings of fact, conclusions, and conditions identified within the staff report including the concept landscaping plan.”

Commissioner Gatseos seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-0 with 1 abstaining.

6. Amending Sections of the Zoning and Development Code to Amend Table 21.04.010 to Add a New Category for Stand Alone Crematories

Request to amend the Grand Junction Municipal Code, Section 21.04.010 Use Table, Section 21.06.050(c) and Section 21.10.020 Terms defined.

Action: Recommendation to City Council

Applicant: City of Grand Junction
Location: Citywide
Staff Presentation: Senta Costello, Sr. Planner

Senta Costello (Senior Planner) stated that the proposed ordinance amends the Zoning and Development Code, Title 21, of the Grand Junction Municipal Code (GJMC) by adding a new category for stand-alone crematories. This request originally came before the Commission at the May 10th 2016 hearing and proceeded forward to City Council with a recommendation for approval. Ms. Costello explained that after the hearing but prior to the City Council hearing there were additional discussions regarding the appropriateness of allowing for stand-alone crematories in some of the zone districts that had originally been proposed during the 1st Planning Commission hearing. Those zone districts were B-2, C-1, MU, and BP which allows for high density residential development as well as commercial mixed-use developments. Therefore, it is recommended that the Use Table be amended to remove the stand alone crematories from those zone districts. Crematories would still be allowed as an accessory use to existing or proposed Funeral Homes and Mortuaries.

Ms. Costello noted that the parking requirements have not changed and showed a slide of the definitions for Crematory and Funeral Home/Mortuary. Research was done regarding odors, smoke and other emissions that crematories may produce and it was determined that there typically is no odors, smoke and emissions are minimal, and the performance standards for the zone districts where they are allowed would address those types of concerns.

MOTION: (Commissioner Eslami) “Mister Chairman, I move that we forward a recommendation to City Council to amend the Grand Junction Municipal Code, Section 21.04.010 Use Table, Section 21.06.050(c) and Section 21.10.020 Terms defined.”

Commissioner Ehlers seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 7-0.

2. Amending a Section of the Zoning and Development Code

[File# ZCA-2016-197]

Request to amend the Grand Junction Municipal Code, Section 21.06.080(b) regarding the applicability of outdoor lighting standards.

Action: Recommendation to City Council

Applicant: City of Grand Junction
Location: Citywide
Staff Presentation: Lori V. Bowers, Sr. Planner

Lori Bowers (Senior Planner) gave a brief history of how illumination was previously defined by code. The most recent definition came in the 2010 when nighttime light pollution was added as follows

1. Floodlights shall not be used to light all or any portion of any building facade between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.
2. No outdoor lights shall be mounted more than 35 feet above the ground unless as a part of an approved outdoor recreational facility.
3. All outdoor lights mounted on poles, buildings or trees that are lit between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. shall use full cutoff light fixtures.
4. All lights used for illumination of signs, parking areas, security or for any other purpose shall be arranged so as to confine direct light beams to the lighted property and away from adjacent residential properties and out of the direct vision of motorists passing on adjacent streets.

In 2010 the electronic on-line Code was reorganized and expanded to include the following:

- Purpose Statement
- Applicability Statement
- Lighting Standards - with examples of:
 - fixtures, hours for illumination, encouraging sensor activated lights, restrictions on search lights and canopy lighting.

Ms. Bowers explained that the 2010 Code has similar provisions to the 2000 Code, but, unfortunately, was inadvertently changed to only apply to new development, rather than “all outside light sources” as stated in the 2000 Code as follows:

- 21.06.080(b) Outdoor Lighting Applicability: All new land uses, structures or building additions shall meet the requirements of this section for the entire property.

Ms. Bowers added that during the City Council Agenda Review meeting yesterday, the Parks and Recreation Director inquired about stadium lighting. After discussion, by the

request of the Parks and Recreation Department, additional wording, also under the “Applicability” section, has been requested. The additional language should read:

“Lighting for approved outdoor recreational facilities are exempt from these standards.” The current reference in the Code, under subsection (2) reads: “No outdoor lights shall be mounted more than 35 feet above the ground *unless as a part of an approved outdoor recreational facility.*”

This has not been an issue but the Parks department would like to be proactive in adding the language to the Applicability statement.

Vice-Chairman Wade asked for a motion.

MOTION: (Commissioner Eslami) “Mister Chairman, Forward a recommendation to City Council to amend the Grand Junction Municipal Code, Section 21.06.080(b) regarding the applicability of outdoor lighting standards with the findings of facts and conditions as found in the staff report.”

Commissioner Gatseos seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 7-0.

7. Other Business

Mr. Moberg noted that there will be a workshop this month on July 7th and the next Planning Commission meeting will be July 12. There will not be a second meeting in July, however there will be a second workshop to go over group living facilities.

8. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.