

To access the Agenda and Backup Materials electronically, go to [www.gjcity.org](http://www.gjcity.org)



**PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP AGENDA  
CANCELLED**

**Call to Order**

**Other Business**

**Adjournment**

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**March 10, 2026, 5:30 PM**  
**MINUTES**

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair Robert Quintero.

Those present were Planning Commissioners; Ian Moore, Ian Thomas, Gregg Palmer, Caleb Abeloe, and Merritt Sixbey.

Also present were Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney), Thomas Lloyd (Planning Manager), Daniella Acosta Stine (Principal Planner), Eric Mocko (Transportation Engineer), and Madeline Robinson (Planning Technician).

There were 47 members of the public in attendance, and 2 virtually.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

---

**1. Approval of Minutes**

---

Minutes of Previous Meeting(s) from February 24, 2026.

*Commissioner Ehlers moved to approve the Consent Agenda.*

*Commissioner Thomas seconded; motion passed 7-0.*

**REGULAR AGENDA**

---

**1. Camelback Gardens ODP**

**PLD-2023-121**

Consider a request by Camelback Gardens, LLC and Upland Homes, Inc for Review and Approval of a Planned Development (PD) Outline Development Plan (ODP) and the City of Grand Junction for the Camelback Gardens Development Proposed on a total of 25.36 Acres located in Sections 17 and 20, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa being all that land within Camelback Gardens Boundary Line Adjustment same as recorded at Reception Number 3148907, portions of the District Open Space shown on the following four (4) subdivision plats 1) The Ridges Filing No. Six same as recorded at Reception Number 1259706, 2) Cobblestone Ridges same as recorded at Reception Number 1778367, 3) Cobblestone Ridges Phase 2 same as recorded at Reception Number 1778368 and 4) Cobblestone Ridges Phase 2 Replat same as recorded at Reception Number 1789624 said District Open Space also known as Mesa County Parcel Number 2945-202-17-020 and Tract A Public Open Space dedicated on said Cobblestone Ridges Phase 2 Replat also known as Mesa County Parcel Number 2945-174-41-012 over a 17-year timeframe.

**Staff Presentation**

Daniella Acosta Stine, Principal Planner, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

### **Questions for Staff**

Commissioner Moore asked if future development of the subject parcels necessitated a road connection from High Desert Rd to Rana Rd.

Commissioner Thomas asked for more details about the land exchange and use of City-owned open space that were approved by City Council.

Applicant Scott Preisendorf provided some context on his plans for development on Lot 1 of Camelback Gardens.

Applicant Mike Stubbs provided some context on the history of the parcels and his plans for the development of Lot 2 of Camelback Gardens.

Commissioner Moore asked Mike if the viewsheds would be preserved.

Commissioner Ehlers asked Mike what his expected square footage was for an individual unit.

### **Public Hearing**

*The public comment period was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 3, 2026, via [www.gjcity.org](http://www.gjcity.org).*

*Chair Quintero asked Assistant City Attorney Jamie Beard for clarification on the policies for providing a public comment.*

*There was discussion amongst the Commission about allowing the public to give their three minutes to someone else or increasing the time allotted for individual public comments.*

*Commissioner Ehlers moved to keep the public comment at 3 minutes per person.*

*Commissioner Palmer seconded; motion passed 6-1.*

Leanne Mumpy noted her disagreement with allowing the development to use the City-owned open space.

Bill Gulley expressed his concerns with the proposed density and the projected increase in traffic.

John Currier argued that the surrounding neighbors should be compensated for the potential decrease in property values.

Tom Politzer reiterated the previous public comments and asked if the open space would be available to everyone or only the residents of the development.

Chris Mcanany suggested the density of the ODP be limited to 4 units per acre and disallow the use of the City-owned open space in the density calculations. He stated that the staff recommendations conflicted with the goals of the comprehensive plan.

Rick Beauheim argued that City staff were granting special permissions to the developers and provided excerpts from the review comments of the plan case (PLD-2023-121). He had a letter prepared and indicated that the public comments following his would use their time to read the letter in its entirety.

Commissioner Ehlers indicated that the use of the City-owned open space for density calculations was not within the purview of the Planning Commission.

Dana Nkana continued Mr. Beauheim's comments.

Randy Greathouse continued Mr. Beauheim's comments.

Kurt Nelson continued Mr. Beauheim's comments.

Frank Margos continued Mr. Beauheim's comments.

Kimberly Greathouse stated that the granting of City-owned open space for density calculations was unprecedented and requested the property be zoned to RL-4.

Dee Wernette echoed the previous comments and expressed his disagreements with how the public comments were being addressed.

Teresa Edwards expressed her disagreements with the City Council allowing the developer to use the 15-acres of City-owned open space.

Terry Keane commented on the projected increase in traffic and the proposed max height for the PD.

Carol Bierbower echoed Ms. Keane's comments on increased traffic and the dangers it poses to pedestrian safety.

Danny Wenzinger requested this item be remanded back to staff for further review.

Ralph Wahlers commented on Staff's attention during the public comment period.

Todd Hegstrom comment that the proposed development was unfair to the surrounding neighbors.

*The public comment period was closed at 7:07 p.m. on March 10, 2026.*

Mike Stubbs provided his arguments to the public comments.

Commissioner Palmer asked what Council Resolution 13-26 says.

There was discussion about the specific language on the use of City-owned open space granted by Resolution 13-26. Jamie Beard commented that Resolution 13-26 allowed the City-owned open space to be included in the gross acreage of the ODP and the Planning Commission was responsible for determining if they agreed with Staff's findings on the appropriate range of density for the ODP.

Commissioner Moore asked about the land exchange and its impact on the approval or denial of the ODP. He asked the applicant to clarify their proposed unit count.

*The public hearing was closed at 7:20 p.m. on March 10, 2026.*

### **Discussion**

Commissioner Ehlers commented that the density calculation was not something that could be modified by the Planning Commission.

There was additional discussion about the compatibility of the proposed housing types with the surrounding area, alternative development types, property ownership, and the Planning Commission's role in approving or denying the ODP.

### **Motion and Vote**

Commissioner Palmer made the following motion "Mr. Chair, on the Planned Development (PD) Outline Development Plan (ODP) for the proposed Camelback Gardens development that will rezone a property from PD to PD and establish an overall PD ODP for the entire property for the property located at 381 and 409 High Desert Road, City file number PLD-2023-121, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the Findings of Fact and imposition of an expiration date on the ODP of December 31, 2043, as listed in the staff report."

*Commissioner Thomas seconded; motion passed 6-1.*

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

---

### **ADJOURNMENT**

---

Commissioner Ehlers made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

*The vote to adjourn was 7-0.*

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.



**Grand Junction Planning Commission**

**Regular Session**

**Item #1.**

---

<b><u>Meeting Date:</u></b>	March 24, 2026
<b><u>Presented By:</u></b>	Daniella Acosta, Principal Planner
<b><u>Department:</u></b>	Community Development
<b><u>Submitted By:</u></b>	Daniella Acosta, Principal Planner

---

**Information**

**SUBJECT:**

Consider a request by the City of Grand Junction to amend Title 21 of the Zoning and Development Code regarding Open and Undeveloped Spaces and Title 28 (Stormwater Management Manual) of the Grand Junction Municipal Code regarding Groundcover and Landscaping for Drainage Facilities

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this request.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The City of Grand Junction is proposing amendments to Title 21 of the Zoning and Development Code (ZDC) and Title 28 (Stormwater Management Manual – SWMM) of the Grand Junction Municipal Code related to Open and Undeveloped Spaces and landscaping for drainage facilities.

The proposed amendments consolidate standards for stormwater detention and retention basins and other drainage facilities within the Stormwater Management Manual, clarify vegetation expectations for these facilities, and align City regulations with Colorado Senate Bill 24-005, which restricts the installation of non-functional turf in non-residential and common interest community areas. The amendments reinforce that stormwater facilities must remain vegetated to stabilize soils, reduce erosion, and

support water quality treatment functions. However, the amendments clarify that vegetation within these facilities should generally consist of native or regionally adapted grasses and seed mixes, which are appropriate to the semi-arid climate and require less long-term irrigation once established.

The amendments also introduce limited administrative flexibility for designs where documented site constraints make traditional vegetation approaches impractical, such as extreme soil conditions, such as soil salinity, sodicity or alkalinity, high groundwater tables or irrigation service limitations where taps or water shares are not available.

In summary, the amendments are intended to:

1. Clarify existing standards and reinforce vegetative requirements for drainage facilities.
2. Provide a codified mechanism for consideration of site constraints.
3. Eliminate perceived ambiguities that have allowed unintended use of non-vegetative groundcover, except in clearly defined circumstances.
4. Ensure facilities function as designed while remaining practical to implement.

**BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:**

Stormwater facilities are critical components of the City’s stormwater infrastructure network. The 2020 Comprehensive Plan identifies stormwater infrastructure as part of a broader green infrastructure system intended to manage runoff, protect water quality, and reduce long-term infrastructure costs to residents and taxpayers.

Well-designed drainage facilities perform multiple functions. Vegetation within these basins stabilizes soils, reduces erosion, filters pollutants, slows runoff, and improves the overall performance of the stormwater system. Vegetated drainage facilities are widely recognized as best practice and are consistently recommended by regional technical stormwater management authorities such as the Mile High Flood District, whose stormwater design criteria are used throughout Colorado, including jurisdictions in semi-arid climates.

Drainage facilities are also one of the largest long-term cost drivers in a development’s stormwater system. How these facilities are designed and landscaped directly affects:

- Maintenance cycles
- Repair frequency
- Water quality performance
- Long-term financial burdens on HOAs, residents and taxpayers

**Removal of Section 21.09.60(b) Location and Integration of Open Space**

Historically, the ZDC has included language within the subdivision standards stating that storm drainage, retention, and detention ponds should be located, designed,

maintained, planted, and managed to serve as visual amenities, entryway features, or opportunities for passive recreation within subdivisions. Amenitization of drainage facilities serves functional as well as aesthetic purposes. Integrating stormwater facilities as visual amenities, entry features, or alongside recreational areas can improve long-term maintenance outcomes, as facilities that are visible and integrated into the landscape tend to receive more consistent upkeep and allow operational issues to be identified earlier. In many cases, the natural low point of a site occurs near a perimeter street or public right-of-way, meaning detention facilities often occur where they already interface with the public realm, making them well suited to function as entry features or integrated landscape elements.

However, the provision has recently become an concern raised by the development community regarding expectations that detention facilities serve as visible landscape features or neighborhood amenities in addition to their stormwater function. While the City continues to recognize the functional maintenance and stewardship benefits associated with integrating stormwater facilities into development's landscape, the requirement has proven challenging to retain as a regulatory standard in practice. Furthermore, the City and Mesa County are currently undertaking a comprehensive update to the SWMM, which will provide a more appropriate venue to evaluate and refine stormwater facility design expectations.

In response, the City is removing this language from the ZDC and consolidating stormwater facility standards within the SWMM, where the engineering and functional requirements for drainage facilities are already established.

The elimination of Section 21.09.060(b) also serves as an administrative cleanup. Stormwater facility design provisions currently appear only within the Subdivision Standards chapter of the ZDC, even though such facilities occur across many development types. Removing this section and relying on the SWMM ensures consistent application of stormwater standards while consolidating design guidance within the City's primary engineering document.

*Amendments to Section 28.56.140 Groundcover and Landscaping*

The amendments also propose changes to the SWMM's section on groundcover and landscaping.

The section is revised to apply to drainage facilities rather than specifically detention and retention basins, expanding the language to cover drainage facilities more broadly. Existing language requiring basin slopes and bottoms to be protected from erosion through seeding or sodding is clarified to reinforce vegetation as the default treatment method by adding the terms "planted" and other "vegetative" when referring to groundcover. The amendment also removes the reference to mulching to eliminate the perceived ambiguity that has allowed rock mulch to be interpreted as a default treatment. Finally, the amendments cross-reference the Acceptable Plant Materials list in the Landscape Code, ensuring vegetation used in drainage facilities is compatible with water-wise landscape principles, appropriate to the local climate, and not invasive

or noxious.

The amendment retains the encouragement of installing trees and shrubs on basin slopes as a best practice. The wording has been simplified for clarity while retaining this design guidance. While not mandatory, retaining this guidance allows the City to continue promoting design consistent with adopted policy documents such as the Comprehensive Plan and the Urban Forestry Management Plan, as well as widely recognized stormwater design manuals. Trees and shrubs can support stormwater facility performance by stabilizing soils, improving landscape durability, and contributing to long-term maintenance outcomes while also enhancing placemaking, neighborhood livability, and overall landscape quality.

Trees also play an important role in improving water efficiency of basin landscapes. Stormwater facilities are designed to capture and temporarily store runoff, thereby naturally concentrating water in areas where vegetation is planted. When trees are incorporated into the design, they take advantage of this periodic stormwater infiltration, effectively functioning as a form of passive irrigation, allowing trees and understory vegetation to persist with less supplemental irrigation once established. In addition, tree canopies provide shade that reduces soil moisture loss and help moderate soil temperatures, further reducing the effects of evapotranspiration.

Recent state legislation also requires updates to local standards. Colorado Senate Bill 24-005 restricts the installation of nonfunctional turf on common interest community property, including HOA-owned tracts and detention facilities, which impacts Section 28.56.140 of the SWMM. Senate Bill 24-005 exempts turf that serves a stormwater or water quality function from restrictions on non-functional turf, provided irrigation is not required. However, the climate in Grand Junction typically requires irrigation during establishment, even for native vegetation. Additionally, the SWMM requires temporary or permanent irrigation for vegetated drainage facilities. To ensure compliance with state law, the SWMM is being updated to clarify that only native or hybridized turfgrass species may be used and that cool-season turfgrass is prohibited unless the facility is designed for functional dual use.

At the same time, staff and the development community have observed site conditions that can complicate vegetation establishment in some locations, including irrigation service limitations, severely unsuitable soils, and shallow groundwater conditions on some properties.

First, irrigation availability can vary significantly depending on the water provider. A large portion of the City's recent growth is occurring within the Ute Water Conservancy District, which does not issue potable water taps for irrigation. Properties within this service area must instead rely on ditch or canal water for irrigation supply. While this can create limitations in some cases, it does not automatically preclude access to irrigation water. Many developments within Ute Water's service area successfully obtain irrigation water through ditch or canal companies. As a result, irrigation limitations must be evaluated based on documented site conditions rather than service area alone.

By contrast, other providers, such as City of Grand Junction Utilities and Clifton Water District do allow irrigation taps. In situations where irrigation water cannot reasonably be obtained, applicants may be unable to meet the irrigation infrastructure typically required to establish and sustain code-required plantings, creating a mismatch between existing landscaping standards, which assume irrigation availability, and the practical limitations imposed by water service providers.

Second, some sites within the community exhibit unsuitable soils, such as severe saline-sodic and alkaline soils, as confirmed through geotechnical and soils analysis. Even with aggressive soil amendment techniques, these soils may not reliably support plant establishment. For example, soils with salinity levels at or above approximately 16 mmhos can present significant challenges for vegetation establishment and long-term plant health.

Third, several areas of the City experience shallow groundwater conditions. High groundwater levels can suffocate plant root systems, contribute to fungal disease, and prevent the successful establishment of trees and shrubs. In many cases, there is no practical engineering solution to address these conditions.

**ANALYSIS**

The criteria for review are set forth in Section 21.02.050(d) of the Zoning and Development Code, which provides that the City may approve an amendment to the text of the Code if the applicant can demonstrate evidence proving each of the following criteria:

(A) Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan recognizes the importance of managing water resources and stormwater risks throughout the community. As noted in the Plan, the City must manage both riverine and localized flood risks, including high water events along the Colorado River and flash flooding within other drainages throughout the City. Stormwater detention and drainage facilities at the development level are an important component of this broader strategy to manage flood risks and reduce the impacts of stormwater runoff.

The proposed amendments support Plan Principle 8.1, which promotes water conservation and the protection of water quality. Strategy 8.1.c (Pervious Surfaces) encourages designing stormwater infrastructure to improve runoff quality and incorporate features that allow infiltration and removal of pollutants. Vegetated detention basins function as a form of green infrastructure by slowing runoff, stabilizing soils, and filtering pollutants before stormwater leaves a site. Clarifying vegetative stabilization requirements within the SWMM reinforces these practices and supports improved stormwater treatment performance.

The amendments also advance Strategy 8.1.d (Groundwater Quality) by promoting

drainage facility design approaches that reduce erosion and limit the transport of pollutants associated with stormwater runoff. Vegetated drainage facilities can improve infiltration and pollutant removal compared to non-vegetated treatments. The amendment also retains guidance encouraging the installation of trees and shrubs on basin slopes as a best practice. Although not mandatory, maintaining this guidance supports Plan Principle 8.c (Tree Installation, Replacement, and Protection), which promotes the incorporation of trees as part of public and private development and recognizes trees as an important component of the City’s green infrastructure network. Trees and shrubs can improve soil stability, conserve water, enhance landscape durability, and contribute to overall community livability when appropriately integrated into stormwater facility design.

By clarifying vegetation standards, aligning drainage facility landscaping with water-wise principles, and consolidating stormwater design requirements within the SWMM, the amendments support the Comprehensive Plan’s goals of protecting water quality, promoting resilient landscapes, and integrating green infrastructure into development.

Staff finds this criterion to be met.

(B) Consistency with Zoning and Development Code Standards

The amendments remove references to detention ponds from the ZDC and regulate these facilities entirely within the SWMM, which is the City’s primary technical document governing stormwater design and performance standards. This change improves regulatory clarity by ensuring stormwater infrastructure is addressed through engineering guidance rather than land use design provisions.

The amendment also resolves perceived ambiguity that previously existed regarding acceptable groundcover treatment and stabilization methods for drainage facilities. By clarifying that vegetation is the default expectation and aligning plant selection with the City’s Acceptable Plant Materials list, the amendments ensure stormwater landscaping standards are clear, consistent with water-wise principles, and appropriate to the local climate.

Finally, the amendment provides an administrative cleanup. Existing drainage facility design provisions were located solely within the Subdivision Standards chapter of the ZDC, even though stormwater facilities occur across many types of development, including commercial, industrial, and multifamily projects. Relocating these standards to the SWMM ensures they apply consistently regardless of development type and places stormwater design guidance within the City’s primary engineering document.

Staff finds this criterion has been met.

(C) Specific Reasons

The proposed Code Text Amendment shall meet at least one of the following specific

reasons:

*a. To address trends in development or regulatory practices*

The amendments respond to evolving regulatory conditions, including the adoption of Senate Bill 24-005, which limits nonfunctional turf on common interest community properties, such as detention ponds and other stormwater facilities.

The amendments also reflect widely recognized best practices in stormwater design, which favor vegetated stabilization and naturalized drainage features that improve system performance while reducing long-term maintenance costs.

*b. To expand, modify, or add requirements for development in general or to address specific development issues*

The amendments address several development issues identified during recent project reviews.

**Clarification of Vegetative Stabilization Requirements**

One purpose of the amendment is to clarify that vegetation is the default expectation for detention and retention basins. The existing language in the SWMM references mulch as an appropriate material in certain landscape contexts. However, this guidance was intended to support vegetated areas, not to serve as a substitute for planting. The ZDC definition of “landscape,” which includes materials such as rock mulch, has at times led to interpretations that rock-only groundcover may satisfy basin landscaping expectations. This interpretation is inconsistent with the existing code language in Section 21.09.60, which requires drainage facilities to be “planted”. The amendment clarifies this relationship between the two documents by reinforcing vegetated basins as the baseline requirement while allowing limited administrative flexibility where documented site constraints make successful vegetation establishment impractical.

The amendments also introduce a limited administrative mechanism to address situations where documented site conditions prevent successful vegetation establishment. These circumstances may include:

- Documented irrigation service limitations
- Shallow groundwater conditions
- Unsuitable and unamendable soils

These provisions are intended to be applied narrowly and are not intended to replace vegetation as the default design approach.

*c. To add, modify or expand zone districts*

This criterion does not apply.

*d. To clarify or modify procedures for processing development applications*

The amendments improve clarity and predictability in the development review process by:

- Consolidating stormwater basin standards within the SWMM
- Clarifying vegetation expectations for stormwater facilities
- Cross-referencing the Acceptable Plant List for appropriate plant selection
- Establishing a defined administrative process for evaluating documented site constraints

These changes reduce ambiguity during development review and provide clearer expectations for developers, engineers, and landscape architects designing stormwater infrastructure.

Reasons (a), (b), and (d) are satisfied. Staff find this criterion has been met.

**FINDING OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATION**

After reviewing the proposed amendments, the following finding of fact has been made:

In accordance with Section 21.02.050(d) of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the proposed text amendments to Title 21 and Title 28 are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning & Development Code and meet at least one of the specific reasons outlined.

Therefore, staff recommends approval.

**SUGGESTED MOTION:**

ZCA-2026-143

**Attachments**

1. Draft Ordinance

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

**ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS OF THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE (TITLE 21 OF THE GRAND JUNCTION MUNICIPAL CODE) AND OF THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT MANUAL (TITLE 28 OF THE GRAND JUNCTION MUNICIPAL CODE) REGARDING LANDSCAPING FOR DRAINAGE FACILITIES**

Recitals

The City Council desires to maintain effective zoning, landscaping, and stormwater regulations that protect public health, safety, and welfare while implementing the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan, including resilient infrastructure and responsible water use.

The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to the Stormwater Management Manual (Title 28), including evaluation of drainage facility landscaping standards and conditions such as unsuitable soils, shallow groundwater, and water availability. Completion of that update is anticipated in by the end of July 2026.

In the interim, the City has identified the need to clarify and amend existing provisions of the Zoning and Development Code (Title 21) and Stormwater Management Manual (Title 28) to: (1) establish clear standards for vegetative stabilization of detention and retention basins; (2) provide a codified mechanism for consideration of site constraints; (3) eliminate ambiguities that have allowed unintended use of non-vegetative groundcover; and (4) ensure drainage facilities function as designed while remaining practical to implement.

The amendments are intended to clarify that vegetative stabilization is the standard method of erosion control for drainage facilities, to define limited circumstances under which alternative stabilization methods may be approved, and to provide direction regarding irrigation necessary for vegetation establishment, consistent with state water conservation requirements.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendments.

After public notice and public hearing, the Grand Junction City Council finds that the amendments to Titles 21 and 28 promote effective stormwater management, provide clear and predictable standards for development, support responsible water use, and advance and protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the City and its residents.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:**

The following sections of the Zoning and Development Code (Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code) are amended as follows (deletions struck through, added language underlined):

**21.09.60 OPEN AND UNDEVELOPED SPACES.**

---

...

(b) Location and Integration of Open Space

...

~~(3) Storm drainage, retention, and detention ponds shall be located, designed, maintained, planted, and managed to serve as visual amenities, entryway features, or opportunities for passive recreation within the subdivision.~~

**28.56.140 GROUNDCOVER AND LANDSCAPING.**

---

After final grading, the slopes and bottom of a drainage facility of each detention and retention basin shall be protected from erosion by seeding, ~~planting and mulching,~~ sodding or other vegetative groundcover in accordance with ~~jurisdictional specifications~~ the Acceptable Plant Materials as provided in §21.07.030(c). Only native or hybridized turfgrass may be used. Cool season turfgrass species are prohibited unless the basin is designed and approved for functional use.

~~The planting of trees and shrubs on the slopes of stormwater basins is also encouraged. Trees and shrubs are encouraged on slopes. Temporary and/or permanent irrigation systems shall be provided as required for the type of groundcover and landscape installed and approved. Temporary or permanent irrigation systems shall be provided for vegetated basins.~~

The Director may approve the use of rock mulch only if vegetation is infeasible due to unsuitable soils, high groundwater table conditions, or the site does not have reasonable access (legal and/or physical) to water.

**INTRODUCED** on first reading this 1st day of April 2026 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

**ADOPTED** on second reading this 15th day of April 2026 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ATTEST:

---

Cody Kennedy  
President of the City Council

---

Selestina Sandoval  
City Clerk

DRAFT