

To access the Agenda and Backup Materials electronically, go to www.gjcity.org



**PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP AGENDA
Virtual Meeting**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2021 @ 12:00 PM

[Join Meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 841 0731 6964

Passcode: 263101

Call to Order - 12:00 PM

1. Review and Finalize Recommendations for Land-Use Regulations for Marijuana Businesses
2. Patterson Road Access Control Plan Discussion

Other Business

Adjournment



Grand Junction Planning Commission

Workshop Session

Item #1.

Meeting Date: February 18, 2021

Presented By: Lance Gloss, Senior Planner

Department: Community Development

Submitted By: Lance Gloss, Senior Planner

Information

SUBJECT:

Review and Finalize Recommendations for Land-Use Regulations for Marijuana Businesses

RECOMMENDATION:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Planning Commission has considered land-use regulations for marijuana businesses at several of their recent workshops, with emphasis on marijuana stores, cultivations, and products manufacturers. At this workshop, the Commission will review their recommendations and provide direction to staff on the outlining of regulations to be presented to the City Council on March 1, 2021.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

The Planning Commission has considered land-use regulations for marijuana businesses at several of their recent workshops, with emphasis on marijuana stores, cultivations, and products manufacturers. At this February 18th workshop, the Commission will consider their preliminary recommendations in the context of their exposure to real operations of such businesses in the Grand Valley, and discuss the impact of any additional issues that arose during the tour.

Previous Planning Commission workshops on this subject have resulted in several draft recommendations which may be currently summarized as follows. Given the anticipated limitation of marijuana store licenses to six retail stores and a maximum

equivalent number of co-located medical store licenses, the Planning Commission's recommendations have largely called for zoning of marijuana businesses that parallels regulations for similar businesses that are not marijuana-related. Specifically, the Commission has recommended that marijuana stores be allowed in all zone districts that currently allow for retail sales (i.e. in C-1, C-2, B-2, MU, MXS, MXOC zone districts), subject to use-specific standards for site planning and operations. Additionally, the Commission has recommended that a 500 feet buffer from stores and schools (public and parochial) and from main campus of a university/college (closest distance along public ROW) be maintained.

Similarly, the Commission has recommended that marijuana cultivations and products manufacturers be treated similarly to other industrial uses, subject to additional regulations to reduce nuisance, particularly odors. Such an approach would generally allow indoor operations for products manufacturing only in I-O, I-1, I-2, C-2 zone districts, subject to Conditional Use Permit requirements for hazardous uses when applicable. Cultivations would be allowed only in I-1 and I-2 zone districts to reduce the potential for odor impacts.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

Discuss and Finalize Recommendation

Attachments

None



Grand Junction Planning Commission

Workshop Session

Item #2.

Meeting Date: February 18, 2021

Presented By: David Thornton, Principal Planner, Trent Prall, Public Works Director

Department: Community Development

Submitted By: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

Information

SUBJECT:

Patterson Road Access Control Plan Discussion

RECOMMENDATION:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Planning Commission will hear and recommend a decision to City Council on the Patterson Road Access Control Plan at their February 23, 2021 meeting. Staff will provide an overview of the Plan and discuss public comments that have been received.

The plan can be reviewed at: www.gjspeaks.org.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

SUGGESTED MOTION:

Attachments

1. GJS Published Comments for Patterson Road Access Control Plan

Grand Junction Speaks

Published Comments for February 23, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

Patterson Road Access Control Plan

As someone who already lives on a street that is used as a pass through to other neighborhoods so that people can avoid sitting at a light, I am extremely displeased to find that my street will become an even bigger pass through. Our street is 20mph, but people regularly speed at upwards of 45mph. This will only create problems in residential neighborhoods that are used to redirect traffic to a light. This plan is moronic, it will create neighborhoods that are used by people trying to get home and/or out of their street. The traffic is not that bad, money could be better used to improve North Ave, which is an ugly pot hole filled disaster.

02/12/2021 9:24 am

Heather Pool
609 Starlight Drive
Grand Junction, 81504

I'm against restricting any access with the use of medians regardless of traffic congestion. Roads within the core of the city like Patterson and North Avenue should maintain access at all cost and be expanded to include shared bicycle lanes or separate bicycle lanes to relieve the congestion. Along with reduced speed limits, cut thru traffic should go around the city center not cut thru. Also finish phase 1 of north avenue, before starting new projects like this...come on man, you have gray plastic trash cans at bus stops on north Ave.....Do Better! Lower speed limits on north Ave as well as Bike lanes, landscaping, bus stop benches, remove the river rock in the parkways etc...raise your standard.

02/12/2021 9:22 am

William ferguson
1320 N 21st street
Grand junction, 81501

I understand the need and appreciate the information provided by Trent Prall but I am hoping that part of this plan will extend the length of turn lanes because you will be funneling use. I'm also concerned about the ability to merge across two lanes and move into a third turn lane within a relatively short distance depending on where your access point is in relation to a large intersection. Will the allotted time for left turn signals be increased? Changed to flashing yellow? I understand the need but I'm hoping that steps are taken to mitigate the impact of this change.

02/11/2021 3:02 pm

Peter Firmin
2923 WAGON WAY
Grand Junction, 81504

The thing that came to mind for me is not only access to businesses and neighborhoods but also emergency vehicles trying to navigate through traffic. Right now they have a full middle lane available when traffic is unable to yield the right of way. Traffic will continue to become more congested as our city grows and this will add to the difficulty of getting care and help in any emergency situation.

02/10/2021 9:58 am

Nova Tucker
642 1/2 Ian Ct.
Grand Junction, 81504

What is going on with our Planning Department? This was done once before - this stopping of left hand turns. All of the medians had to be torn out because it was extremely difficult for business and the public. (Huge waste of money!) By attempting to do this again and without proper notice is fools play. Of the people I have talked to, who were to get notice about this, nearly everyone said they didn't know anything about it. I can understand why. Notice was on an Orange postcard that I am sure most people tossed away thinking it was one of the many cards we all get asking us if we want to sell our homes. I don't feel there was proper notice given. There are other, more effective ways to get notice out. This was not one of the best ways to do so. Your public has not been appropriately informed and you stand to suffer a huge backlash because of it.

No left hand turns off Patterson for 7 miles will cause a larger traffic problem in the neighborhoods where streets are narrow putting many neighborhood children in jeopardy. Not the wisest of choices. Please rethink this. I believe there has to be a better solution to a traffic problem that hasn't really manifested itself yet. Let the public help brainstorm for a better solution.

02/09/2021 4:18 pm

Ruth Kinnett
581 Grand Valley Drive
Grand Junction, 81504

Very dismayed to hear the plan to stop all left turns on Patterson for 7 miles. Does anyone remember: this was done before? By constructing a median down the center of Patterson Road to stop left turns? It was so difficult for businesses and for the public to access, that there was another huge expense to remove the median. Yes, you asked for input, City. Some residents received notice a day after the meeting. Some of us did not receive any notice that must access Patterson to our homes. How many accidents have YOU seen - left turns? None here. Have seen left turns at signal lights. There was an extensive traffic study done regarding the Lodge at Grand Junction. The study showed there is a minimum time of traffic that would impede left turns. Most of the time, left turns can be done safely. There is maybe 1.5 hrs morning & evening that it isn't possible to turn left. Please don't over-react on this. There are not a lot of streets to "go around the block" to get to our destination making only right turns. There's a lot of businesses, homes, senior centers, medical facilities, post office which will be adversely affected. Much bigger cities than Grand Junction allow left turns.

02/09/2021 3:12 pm

Lois Dunn
PO Box 1889
Grand Junction, 81502

Grand Junction Speaks

Published Comments for February 9, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

Patterson Road Access Control Plan

Hi. I am still concerned about the access to my driveway. It has changed to "C" instead of closed but from what I understand it is conditional and could still be closed. As I expressed at the in person meeting in October, this is the only entrance you can use to access the garage. The garage doors face Patterson. If this access is closed it extremely devalues our house. If this proceeds as it currently is we will need to speak to the city ROW agent about compensation for the tens of thousands of dollars that we will lose. What good is a garage if you can't park in it. We also currently have a drive-thru drive way, again we will lose value when we resell, if we no longer have that. My house is the corner house on Patterson and Partee. The suggested entrance to be closed is east of Partee. My address is 2918 Patterson Road. I also disagree with the right in/right out. We currently have so much traffic that comes out of Safeway (right only) that crosses two lanes of traffic in a short distance that then turns onto our street (Partee) and then does a U-turn on our property so that they can turn right and head west on Patterson. I point this out because the roads you do not make right in/right out will have the same issues I now face. The traffic is a mess and it is tearing up my property. To recap, I strongly oppose closing my Patterson Road driveway and the right in/right out proposal.

02/08/2021 1:08 pm

Merton m Fisher
2918 Patterson Road
Grand Junction, 81504

I have looked carefully at this plan and beyond the scope of what you see on the pages via the GIS maps.

I am concerned about point 64 being conditional. The homeowners off of Meander need guaranteed access. Planned Access 34 is concerning. There is potential for a significant cost to the property or future property owner to make this happen.

Construct the final leg at 27 1/2 road (North East Christian). Close the existing NECC access. Route properties to west of NECC to Wellington, do not force the proposed access at #138.

Make 149 RI/RO, 150 - No, instead route access to the existing ROW that connects El Corona to Santa Fe Dr. The reroute Santa Fe Dr to Camino Del Ray and reroute Camino Del Ray across 115 Camino Del Ray (Boundary Adj) to connect cleanly to Rio Grande.

Make 196 RI/RO. I have a concern about 195, 197 & 198. Instead continue Cascade Av to the East and South to connect into 29 Rd.

#234 Broken Spoke collects alot of traffic to north and east, and connects to F 1/2. Should be a 3/4 access.

#244 RI/RO - why is it Conditional Safety. Look beyond your detail area to see what is already happening there.

#252 - RI/RO

Re: pts 25-34 - Access to Flat Top Ln should be mandatory and Flat Top Ln widened on the south side to accommodate traffic flow.

Pt 33 Should remain open as there is not space to allow parking lot traffic flow to the two properties to the south.

Personally, I feel that 70-80% of the plan will meet your stated safety goals for the future. However, the plan will create frustrated drivers if 3/4 turn options are not used appropriately.

02/08/2021 11:01 am

Virginia Brown
2526 Patterson Rd, #101
Grand Junction, 81505

Leave Patterson alone until the City does something with the whole of North Ave. In a quote from this evening comes this example of local-attitude when it comes to doing anything before plans are made. "The City "gods," are not going to do anything with North Ave until hell freezes over. The Name change from North to University was going to cost the businesses on North in excessive over 500K over all. when that was proven to the City gods of GJ, they put in a U-Haul command center, that utterly ruined North Ave. (the city gods of GJ) ain't gonna do ____!" This is the sentiment of many locals and it has been for years. Look at "Reverse-Parking," how well did that go over? If we have the money to repair our roads and walkways, let's look at the whole of the city/county, fix what needs it the most, then gradually move up to Patterson Ave. which needs more traffic cops on duty then it does street lights. Issues with Patterson is like trying to fix mistakes of the past. If actual repairs are going to be made on that stretch of road, someone is going to loose their property along the way. Think carefully of what you are planning on doing to Patterson. Ave.

02/05/2021 7:24 pm

John A Edwards
2668 B 1/2 Rd.
Grand Junction, 81503

What is the current status of the I-70/29 Road Interchange? If and when that exit is created, how much traffic is expected to use 29 Road South to Orchard & North Avenues and points south instead of using Patterson Road between St. Mary's and Clifton/BL-70?

That should be taken into consideration for the Patterson Road plans as that will reduce the reliance of Patterson Road for many.

02/05/2021 3:23 pm

Tim Kubat
489 Sheldon Road
Grand Junction, 81504

Hi, I am not in favor of medians. I think sometimes you cannot turn where you need to. Also there are few places which allow you to make a U Turn when not being able to cross the road. I think that medians help with bicycle traffic if there is not a way to go left.

Please get on a bicycle and ride this portion of Patterson and see if you think it is hard to

turn left.

How many times have you gone through the exit at a store or restaurant on Patterson and discovered that you can't cross.

There are other ways (roundabouts for example which will be better.

02/05/2021 1:54 pm

Patricia Johns
2217 MESCALERO AVE
GRAND JUNCTION, 81507

If you are thinking of putting in raised medians, then that is a HORRIBLE idea for Patterson Rd. A lot of people need to be able to access the middle lane in order to cross traffic (ie: when trying to turn left onto Patterson when it's busy from 28 Rd or any of the other streets). Raised medians will be a waste of time and money, especially with a smaller budget and when other streets in this town need more funding to improve potholes, etc. If this is put forth, then more traffic lights will also be needed along Patterson, so it will be more accessible. Research other towns that have put in the raised medians along major roadways against their town's majority wishes and still have more problems with them (ie: Cortez). Also, try accessing Patterson from a road that doesn't have a traffic light, without using the middle lane, on a busy day. It's almost impossible. Leave Patterson alone.

02/05/2021 1:17 pm

KJ Kraich
2809 Cottage Ln
Grand Junction, 81506

On behalf of Northeast Christian Church, I would like to address the proposed Patterson Road Access Control Plan. We understand and agree with the safety concerns and need to better control traffic entering and exiting Patterson Road. However, due to the proposed restriction/loss of "left-hand turns" exiting our property onto Patterson Road, I would like to formally speak against the plan in that regard. It is our understanding entering our property at 2751 Patterson Road will also be restricted to only eastbound traffic. This will make it unreasonably difficult to both enter and exit our property... We are in favor of opening the 27 1/2 RD intersection on the south side of Patterson, which would be a signaled intersection and the safest option. However, due to utility company XCel Energy owning a gas regulator station at that location it is cost prohibitive. We would respectfully ask the city to leverage any influence they have to working a better solution with XCel to open that intersection. We would be favorable to vacating land necessary for the relocation of the gas regulator to the west of the current location if that would help with the situation. So, again, we understand and agree with the safety concern, and want to find a workable solution, however, losing both the ability to enter our property while westbound and not being able to exit our property westbound will greatly restrict access. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

02/04/2021 2:10 pm

Seth Thomas
2751 Patterson RD
Grand Junction, 81506

I would like to see the Patterson corridor median to be better than the ones on North Avenue and Horizon Drive and the Riverside Parkway. We need to address lighting for the nighttime also zero-maintenance vegetation and any sound reduction for the area.

02/02/2021 6:07 pm

Robert Garrison
2778 Patterson Road
Grand Junction, 15006