

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



**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2023
250 NORTH 5TH STREET - CITY HALL AUDITORIUM
[VIRTUAL MEETING](#) - [LIVE STREAMED](#)
BROADCAST ON CABLE CHANNEL 191
5:30 PM – REGULAR MEETING**

Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Moment of Silence

Citizen Comments

Individuals may comment regarding items scheduled on the Consent Agenda and items not specifically scheduled on the agenda. This time may be used to address City Council about items that were discussed at a previous City Council Workshop.

Citizens have four options for providing Citizen Comments: 1) in person during the meeting, 2) virtually during the meeting (registration required), 3) via phone by leaving a message at 970-244-1504 until noon on Wednesday, February 1, 2023 or 4) submitting comments [online](#) until noon on Wednesday, February 1, 2023 by completing this form. Please reference the agenda item and all comments will be forwarded to City Council.

City Manager Report

Council Reports

CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda includes items that are considered routine and will be approved by a single motion. Items on the Consent Agenda will not be discussed by City Council, unless an item is removed for individual consideration.

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. Summary of the January 9, 2023 Workshop
- b. Minutes of the January 18, 2023 Regular Meeting

REVISED

2. Resolutions

- a. A Resolution Declaring Intent to Create Alley Improvement District No. ST-23 and Setting a Public Hearing for March 15, 2023
- b. A Resolution Approving the Notice of Election for the Regular Municipal Election April 4, 2023

REGULAR AGENDA

If any item is removed from the Consent Agenda by City Council, it will be considered here.

3. Procurements

- a. Resuming Design and Planning for Orchard Mesa Pool Renovation

4. Public Hearings

- a. Legislative
 - i. An Ordinance Establishing a Moratorium to Prohibit the Establishment of any New or Relocation of Existing Gaming Establishments
- b. Quasi-judicial
 - i. Ordinances Accepting Inclusion of 905 Struthers Avenue to the Downtown Development Authority and Downtown Business Improvement District
 - ii. A Resolution Accepting the Petition for the Annexation of 17.42 Acres of Land and Ordinances Annexing and Zoning the Grand Valley Estates Annexation to R-12 (Residential - 12 du/ac), Located at the Northeast Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road **(Continued from January 18, 2023)**

5. Non-Scheduled Citizens & Visitors**6. Other Business****7. Adjournment**

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP SUMMARY January 9, 2023

Meeting Convened: 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held in person at the Fire Department Training Room, 625 Ute Avenue, and live streamed via GoToWebinar.

City Councilmembers Present: Councilmembers Chuck McDaniel (virtual), Phil Pe'a, Randall Reitz, Dennis Simpson, Mayor Pro Tem Abe Herman, and Mayor Anna Stout.

Staff present: City Manager Greg Caton, City Attorney John Shaver, Assistant to the City Manager Johnny McFarland, Communications and Engagement Director Sara Spaulding, Finance Director Jodi Welch, Parks and Recreation Director Ken Sherbenou, Fire Chief Ken Watkins, Interim Police Chief Matt Smith, City Clerk Amy Phillips, and Deputy Clerk Selestina Sandoval

1. Discussion Topics

a. City of Grand Junction 2022 Community Satisfaction Survey

Sara Spaulding, Communications and Engagement Director introduced Sean Maher representing RRC Associates, who were hired to conduct the City of Grand Junction's 2022 Community Satisfaction Survey. She reported that the survey was mailed to a random sample of 5,000 residents within City limits with the option to complete the survey on paper or online through a password protected website (1 response per household). The online survey was also available in Spanish. There were 658 invitation surveys completed with a response rate of 13.5 percent Response Rate and +/- 3.8 percent Margin of Error. Two weeks after mailing the statistically valid survey, the Open Link survey was made available to all Grand Junction stakeholders, including non-county residents (e.g. commuters, residents of nearby communities) and 258 Open Link surveys were completed. A response rate of 13.5 percent is extremely robust compared to a typical rate of 8-10 percent for community surveys. We received 658 responses to the statistically valid survey. The goal was 400.

The Community Satisfaction Survey is conducted every two years to obtain feedback from a representative sample of City of Grand Junction residents on multiple topics including:

- Satisfaction with City-provided services, facilities, and amenities
- Ratings of overall and specific quality-of-life factors in Grand Junction
- Priorities for issues to be addressed along with allocation of future City funding
- Level of satisfaction with specific neighborhoods and input on desired improvements
- An opportunity to provide comments on the quality of life in Grand Junction and ideas on needed improvements or policies in the City
- While planned for every two years to gather comparative data, the survey was not distributed in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the most recent data available for comparison with the results from the 2022 survey was presented in a report to City Council in 2018. Weighted by age.

- With the delay in the survey from 2020 to 2022, questions with a focus on recent City initiatives were added, including affordable housing, homelessness, sustainable resource management, roadway infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and the pace of growth and development.

Mr. Maher reported on the key findings of the statistically valid survey.

- Overall sentiment on Grand Junction is quite positive with 60 percent saying the City is moving in the “right direction” compared to 22 percent reporting the opposite. Seventeen percent have no opinion about how the City is doing.
- Concerns about crime, homelessness and growth were the dominant concerns of those expressing negative sentiments on the direction of Grand Junction.
- Addressing public safety and crime was the top priority of residents followed closely by the need to manage resources, including the supply of water. Improving roads and dealing with homelessness also rated high as priorities.
- Regarding homelessness, residents strongly support funding for the GJPD co-responder program along with increased enforcement of the camping ban. Investing more in local nonprofits that are helping the homeless was also seen positively. There does not appear to be strong interest from residents in getting directly involved with the issue. Overall satisfaction with City services is positive with 61 percent giving a rating of 4 or 5. Twelve percent of respondents reported overall dissatisfaction. A significant portion (28 percent) were neutral.
- Public Works ratings were mostly positive. The only function of Public Works that received a negative rating was the condition of City streets. This correlates with the high priority given to improving roads in the City.
- On average, all categories related to Police services rated positively (3.4 and above) except for enforcement of violations against cars, cyclists, and pedestrians.
- There is strong support for a Community Recreation Center as well as additional trails in the City. Improved river access was also noted by more than half of respondents.
- Parks & Recreation facilities and programs all received net positive ratings from respondents. Staff friendliness, proximity of parks and City trails all rated very highly. While still positive, ratings for recreational facilities received the weakest feedback. This correlates with the support noted above for a new City Community Recreation Center.
- Residents are very satisfied with the neighborhoods where they live. Sixty-three percent say things are the same or better as when they moved in. Just 13 percent say conditions have declined.
- In terms of negative neighborhood attributes, the major issues are noise, traffic, and limited ability to walk and bike to frequent destinations in the City.
- When asked to rank priorities for Grand Junction, residents cited improving street safety, improving/building roads, access to high-speed internet and their desire for a Community Recreation Center.

- When asked about priorities in City funding, the top choices were adding more high-speed internet, expanding sustainability efforts, and improving streets and roads. The new Community Recreation Center also garnered support.
- Support for new housing was mixed. Adding apartments and condominiums showed the most support, while additional mobile homes was by far the least popular choice.

Discussion ensued regarding data collected showing an average decline in most areas but one, and how COVID could have affected outcomes, whether the survey was statistically valid, qualifications of RRC Associates and how many statisticians worked on the City's survey, the community's request for better broadband/fiber network and how to get more responses from all demographics.

b. Moratorium to Prohibit the Establishment of any New or Relocation of Existing Gaming Establishments

Police Chief Matt Smith and City Attorney John Shaver explained that gaming establishments are businesses engaged in gambling-type activities that use technology to operate in a "gray area" of the law that distinguishes between games of skill (legal) and games of chance (illegal). These establishments are in commercial and residential areas in the City with examples of locations ranging from garages to storefronts. Currently there are approximately 15 businesses, however, they often go out of business in one area and relocate to another very quickly, making them difficult to track. They primarily operate in the nighttime hours (8pm to 5am) and are attracting increased criminal activity including theft, assault, drug trafficking, and prostitution to the area. Residents are continually coming to staff explaining the negative impact this type of activity is having on their business and/or residential community.

Under HB22-1412, the State Gaming Commission has the power to investigate and prosecute crimes and enforce regulations pertaining to unlicensed gaming establishments throughout Colorado; however, the Colorado Division of Gaming Enforcement and Investigations Section has advised the City that the Division will not operate/provide enforcement outside of the cities authorized for limited gaming in Article XVIII, Section 9 of the Colorado Constitution (Blackhawk, Central City, and Cripple Creek).

Currently, there are no City laws to restrict these types of business and land uses, and due to the technology, the investigation and prosecution of tech businesses as illegal gambling (games of chance) is almost impossible. Accordingly, the businesses continue to operate in the City. Staff recommended a temporary (18 to 24 month) moratorium disallowing new skilled gaming businesses and the relocation of any existing skilled gaming businesses to allow the opportunity to evaluate potential regulation, licensure, and other options, including coordination with the State, to better limit the negative impact on the community. This temporary moratorium is narrowly tailored and will further the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the City of Grand Junction.

Discussion ensued, resulting in consensus to move the item forward to the January 18, 2023 City Council Meeting.

The Mayor called for a 10-minutes break at 6:43 p.m.

c. Orchard Mesa Recreational Amenity

Ken Sherbenou, Parks and Recreation Director, recognizing the need for additional recreational services in the Orchard Mesa area, presented this item. He stated that it is in alignment with the priorities set forth in the PROS Master Plan, staff would like direction on the concept of developing an indoor turf Field House on Orchard Mesa. This type of amenity would expand recreational opportunities for Orchard Mesa residents while providing access to indoor space for turf sports and other uses currently lacking in the community.

The 2021 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan has identified the Orchard Mesa community as having a lower level of service. To address this challenge, the idea of an alternative recreational amenity on Orchard Mesa surfaced. He reported the trajectory of indoor recreational facility development in communities often includes an indoor pool (usually phased out), followed by a multi-purpose indoor CRC, and then finally an indoor Field House to complement the CRC. Field Houses can offer a wide array of recreational amenities including, first and foremost, indoor turf for field sports such as soccer and lacrosse. Field Houses do not have an aquatic component. As such, they are less expensive to build and operate, and complement a multi-purpose CRC that is heavy on aquatics. Furthermore, field sports such as soccer and lacrosse, are on the rise with thousands of participants in Grand Junction. There is a lack of indoor space for these users, which has worsened with the recent closure of the privately run Skyline Sports next to Sam's Club, 2522 Highway 6 and 50.

As shown in the PROS Master Plan, the pursuit of a Field House in Orchard Mesa fits the PROS Master Plan vision. Should Council provide direction to pursue this opportunity, the next step would be to engage with an architectural firm to conduct a planning process to include site selection, concept design and an operational plan. Several sites should be considered but there is one leading contender given an initial examination: Burkey Park South.

Discussion revealed that Council was not supportive of the proposal at this time.

2. City Council Communication

Discussion regarding the Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration and the reading of the proclamation by Council, the recent Anti-Semitic event, and follow-up regarding the next ARPA discussion.

3. Next Workshop Topics

City Manager Caton stated that the next workshop items are Zoning and Development Code Update and ADU Incentives on January 30th, followed by Cannabis Cultivation / MIPs and ARPA on February 13th.

4. Adjournment

There being no Council Communication or further business, the Workshop adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

January 18, 2023

Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Moment of Silence

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction convened into regular session on the 18th day of January 2023 at 5:30 p.m. Those present were Councilmembers Phil Pe'a, Randall Reitz, Dennis Simpson, Council President Pro Tem Abe Herman and Council President Anna Stout. Councilmember Chuck McDaniel was absent.

Also present were City Manager Greg Caton, City Attorney John Shaver, City Clerk Amy Phillips, Deputy City Clerk Janet Harrell, Sustainability Coordinator Jennifer Nitzky, Parks & Recreation Director Ken Sherbenou and Housing Manager Ashley Chambers.

Council President Stout called the meeting to order and Councilmember Simpson led the Pledge of Allegiance, followed by a moment of silence.

A Resolution Accepting the Petition for the Annexation of 17.42 Acres of Land and Ordinances Annexing and Zoning the Grand Valley Estates Annexation to R-12 (Residential - 12 du/ac), Located at the Northeast Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road – Continued to February 1, 2023

City Attorney John Shaver explained the request to continue this item was due to a noticing error and therefore did not meet statutory requirements. Continuance of the item would allow the noticing to be corrected.

Councilmember Reitz moved and Councilmember Pe'a seconded to continue Agenda Item 4.b.ii., accepting a petition to the City Council for the annexation of lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and annexing and zoning the Grand Valley Estates Annexation, approximately 17.42 acres, located at the northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road, to February 1, 2023. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Proclamations

Proclaiming January 2023 as National Crime Stoppers Month in the City of Grand Junction

Councilmember Pe'a read the proclamation and Mesa County Crime Stoppers Boardmember Shari Zen accepted the proclamation.

Support for Statement**Request from the League of Women Voters (LWV) of Mesa County to Sign Statement Condemning Recent Anti-Semitic Event in Grand Junction**

Council President Stout read the statement being considered by Council.

Deb Stetler of the LWV provided additional information on anti-semitic acts committed in 2021 and requested City Council's support.

Council President Pro Tem Herman moved and Councilmember Pe'a seconded to approve signing a statement condemning the recent anti-semitic events in Grand Junction. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Citizen Comments

Bruce Lohmiller requested help to get people off the streets, said he wrote a letter to HomewardBound regarding a person who had their personal items thrown away and talked about Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech.

Heather Healey spoke about the availability and cost of housing in the state.

Peyton Sanders asked for an Orchard Mesa Pool negotiation update and then said local pool supporters will reach out to Mesa County about their decision to no longer support the pool.

City Manager Report

City Manager Caton announced Grand Junction was listed in The New York Times "52 Places to Go in 2023" and recognized the Visit Grand Junction staff who have worked hard for this type of national recognition. He also congratulated new Chief of Police Matt Smith on his appointment and reviewed the recruitment process.

Council Reports

Councilmember Reitz attended the Homeless Coalition meeting.

Councilmember Pe'a recognized the Visit Grand Junction Board for The New York Times listing and attended the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.

Councilmember Simpson thanked staff for showing citizens speaking during the meeting on the projection screens and asked if the Canyon View tennis court maintenance is on schedule.

Council President Pro Tem Herman attended the Urban Trails Committee, Downtown Development Authority/Business Improvement District and Grand Junction Economic

Partnership meetings and talked about “211” which is a local information and referral service for community resources (wc211.org).

Council President Stout noted the state legislative session had begun and she will be attending the Colorado Municipal League Policy, Policing & Municipal Courts, Associated Governments of Northwest Colorado, the Chamber Legislative committee meetings and the Colorado Water Congress with City Utilities Director Randi Kim. Council President Stout said there are no updates regarding the Orchard Mesa Pool.

CONSENT AGENDA

Councilmember Pe’a moved and Council President Pro Tem Herman seconded to adopt Consent Agenda items #1 - #3. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. Summary of the December 20, 2022 Special Workshop
- b. Minutes of the January 4, 2023 Special Meeting
- c. Minutes of the January 4, 2023 Regular Meeting

2. Set Public Hearings

- a. Quasi-judicial
 - i. Introduction of Ordinances Accepting Inclusion of 905 Struthers Avenue to the Downtown Development Authority and Downtown Business Improvement District and Setting a Public Hearing for February 1, 2023
 - ii. Introduction of an Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 4482 for the Casas de Luz Planned Development to Adjust the Maximum Building Height for only Unit 4 from 24 Feet to 34 Feet, Located at 365 W. Ridges Boulevard in the Redlands and Setting a Public Hearing for February 15, 2023
 - iii. Introduction of an Ordinance for Zoning Approximately 1.45 Acres from County RSF-R (Residential Single Family Rural) to I-1 (Light Industrial) for the Roy's RV Annexation, Located at 2795 Riverside Parkway, and Setting a Public Hearing for February 15, 2023
- b. Legislative
 - i. Introduction of an Ordinance Establishing a Moratorium to Prohibit the Establishment of any New or Relocation of Existing Gaming

Establishments and Setting a Public Hearing for February 1, 2023

3. Procurements

- a. 2023 Spending Authorization for Utility Billing Printing and Mailing Services Contract
- b. Contract for 24 Road Multi-Modal Path Construction

REGULAR AGENDA**An Ordinance Amending the Mandatory Quarterly Remittance Date for Plastic and Paper Bag Fees as Found in HB21-1161 "Management of Plastic Products" from Starting on April 1, 2024 to Starting on April 1, 2023**

In 2021, the Colorado General Assembly passed HB21-1162 "Management of Plastic Products" with the stated purpose of phasing out single-use plastic carryout bags and expanded polystyrene food containers. Beginning January 2023, "Large Stores" (those with more than three locations and/or that are part of a franchise, corporation, or partnership with a physical location outside of Colorado) may provide single-use plastic or recycled paper carryout bags for a 10-cent per bag fee and remit 60 percent (6 cents) of the carryout bag fee revenue to the municipality or county in which the store is located on a quarterly basis, beginning April 1, 2024. According to the Colorado Municipal League, a typographical error was published in the bill, stating quarterly remittance of the fee will begin April 1, 2024, instead of April 1, 2023.

Sustainability Coordinator Jennifer Nitzky presented this item.

Discussion included the projected revenue (\$280,000/annually), this revenue will go to the Enterprise Fund to be used for recycling/sustainability initiatives and clarification that this ordinance only changes the remittance start date.

The public hearing opened at 6:16 p.m.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing closed at 6:16 p.m.

Councilmember Reitz moved and Councilmember Pe'a seconded to adopt Ordinance No. 5122, an ordinance incorporating and adopting certain provisions of HB 21-1162 into the Grand Junction Municipal Code concerning bag fees and establishing the commencement of bag fee remittance to begin April 1, 2023 on final passage and ordered final publication in pamphlet form. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

A Resolution Setting Winter Hours for the City's Parks Based on the Classification of the Park

City parks have been faced with increased instances of trespassing after hours, vandalism and other undesirable activities. To help further curb these activities, staff proposed to reduce the hours during the winter months, from November 1 to March 1 which coincides with daylight savings time. The rest of the year, community, regional and neighborhood parks with programmable spaces will close at 11 p.m. and all other park facilities will close at 10 p.m.

Parks and Recreation Director Ken Sherbenou presented this item.

Discussion included that the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board support this change.

The public comment period opened at 6:20 p.m.

There were no public comments.

The public comment period closed at 6:20 p.m.

Councilmember Simpson moved and Councilmember Pe'a seconded to adopt Resolution No. 12-23, a resolution setting winter hours for the City's Parks based on the classification of the park. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Councilmember Simpson asked for clarification that resolutions do not require public hearings.

City Attorney John Shaver said they do not, but it was decided to allow public comment on some items for public engagement purposes.

A Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Submit a Grant Request to the Department of Local Affairs for the Land Acquisition of 15 Acres for Future Development by the Grand Junction Housing Authority for Affordable Housing Rental Units

In 2022, Grand Junction City Council approved \$1 million in the budget to support the implementation of the adopted housing strategies. More specifically, Housing Strategy 6: Allocate city-owned land (and/or strategically acquire vacant or underutilized properties) for affordable and mixed-income housing, which enables additional units to be built as land is a major component of the cost of developing affordable housing and would provide a significant number of units for affordable housing.

The \$1 million allocated in the 2022 budget was unused and therefore re-budgeted in 2023. Also included in the 2023 budget is an anticipated \$502,500 from the 2% sales tax on Cannabis sales. The total of \$1,502,500 is available to support the implementation of the adopted housing strategies. Of these funds, \$750,000 will be

utilized for a cash match for the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) Affordable Housing Incentive Grant. In September 2022, a Letter of Interest was submitted to DOLA for the Innovative Affordable Housing Incentives Grant to purchase a 15-acre property for Grand Junction Housing Authority ("The project") for future affordable housing construction. DOLA notified City Staff in late December 2022 of the invitation to apply for the official grant application.

Housing Manager Ashley Chambers and Grand Junction Housing Authority (GJHA) Chief Executive Officer Jody Kole presented this item.

Discussion included that a Letter of Intent was submitted to DOLA in September regarding this opportunity, DOLA invited the City to apply due to the City's affordable housing goals/initiatives, the GJHA is better suited to own/build this type of project (the City is limited by a 25-year lease Charter restriction), a ballot question would be required to sell park property, the hope that future lease extension ballot questions will be supported by non-profit/housing partners and disappointment that affordable housing community partners were not present for this item.

The public comment period opened at 6:41 p.m.

There were no public comments.

The public comment period closed at 6:41 p.m.

Councilmember Pe'a moved and Council President Pro Tem Herman seconded to adopt Resolution No. 13-23, a resolution authorizing the City Manager to submit a Grant Request to the Department of Local Affairs for the land acquisition of 15 acres for future development by the Grand Junction Housing Authority. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Non-Scheduled Citizens & Visitors

There were none.

Other Business

Councilmember Reitz recommended the City Manager and City Attorney annual reviews be finalized prior to the April election.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

Amy Phillips, CMC
City Clerk





Grand Junction City Council

Regular Session

Item #2.a.

Meeting Date: February 1, 2023
Presented By: Trenton Prall, Public Works Director
Department: Public Works - Engineering
Submitted By: Trent Prall, Public Works Director

Information

SUBJECT:

A Resolution Declaring Intent to Create Alley Improvement District No. ST-23 and Setting a Public Hearing for March 15, 2023

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff Recommends the City Council adopt the proposed resolution declaring the intent to create Alley Improvement District No. ST-23 and conduct a public hearing and review for March 15, 2023.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A successful petition has been submitted requesting a Local Improvement District be created to reconstruct the following alley:

North/South Alley between 6th Street and 7th Street and Tiger Avenue and Orchard Avenue east of Grand Junction High School.

The public hearing to form the district is scheduled for March 15, 2023. City code requires 30 days from the date of notification to the public hearing.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

People's Ordinance No. 33 authorizes the City Council to create improvement districts and levy assessments when requested by a majority of the owners of the property to be assessed. Council may also establish assessment rates by resolution. Assessment rates for alleys are based on percentages of total assessable costs the City will contribute for three property uses: 85 percent per abutting foot for residential single-family uses, 75 percent per abutting foot for residential multi-family uses, and 50 percent per abutting foot for non-residential uses.

A summary of the process that follows submittal of the petition is provided below.

Date	Steps	Action
February 1, 2023	1.	City Council passes a Resolution declaring its intent to create an improvement district. The Resolution acknowledges receipt of the petition and gives notice of a public hearing.
Proposed for March 15, 2023	2.	Council conducts a public hearing and passes a Resolution creating the Improvement District. The public hearing is for questions regarding validity of the submitted petitions.
	3.	Council awards the construction contract.
	4.	Construction.
	5.	After construction is complete, the project engineer prepares a Statement of Completion identifying all costs associated with the Improvement District.
	6.	Council passes a Resolution approving and accepting the improvements, gives notice of a public hearing concerning a proposed Assessing Ordinance, and conducts a first reading of a proposed Assessing Ordinance.
	7.	Council conducts a public hearing and second reading of the proposed Assessing Ordinance. The public hearing is for questions about the assessments.
	8.	The adopted Ordinance is published.
	9.	The property owners have 30 days from final publication to pay their assessment in full. Assessments not paid in full will be amortized over a ten-year period. Amortized assessments may be paid in full at anytime during the ten-year period.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The costs of the alley improvement project are shared by the property owners and the City. The cost of the alley improvement is \$650,000 and the property owners portion is \$236,954.40. The expenses and revenue for this project are included in the 2023 Adopted Budget.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

I move to (adopt/deny) Resolution No. 14-23, a resolution declaring the intention of the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, to create within said City Alley Improvement District No. ST- 23 and authorizing the City engineer to prepare details and specifications for the same and set a public hearing for March 15, 2023.

Attachments

1. Alley ID ST-23 Summary Sheet
2. Alley ID ST-23 Exhibit
3. Alley ID ST-23 Resolution and Notice

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COSTS


PROPOSED ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT 6th STREET TO 7th STREET TIGER AVENUE TO ORCHARD AVENUE

	Owner	Property Address	Footage	Estimated Assessment
*	SCHOOL DISTRICT 51 2115 GRAND AVE GRAND JUNCTION CO 81501	1400 N 5th St	1,305.00	\$ 128,881.80
*	RODGER POLLEY AND DEBBIE POLLEY, 502 HILLTOP DR RANGELY CO 81648	605 Orchard Ave	74.50	\$ 2,207.44
	JOE GARCIA, 1830 N 6TH ST	1830 N 6th St	74.00	\$ 2,192.62
	DAVID P RANKIN, 1820 N 6TH ST, 1820 N 6TH ST	1820 N 6th St	65.75	\$ 1,948.17
*	LINDA L LEE, PO BOX 397, GRAND JCT 81502	1810 N 6th St	65.75	\$ 1,948.17
	NEIL AND KIMBERLY SITKO; 1325 N 7TH ST	1325 N 7th St	39.00	\$ 1,155.57
*	TERI L THOMAS AND LON A THOMAS 1327 N 7TH ST	1327 N 7th St	36.00	\$ 1,066.68
	PAMELA S NOONAN, 1337 N 7TH ST	1337 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
	DIANE L ANDREJCZUK, 1421 N 7TH ST	1421 N 7th St	46.00	\$ 1,362.98
	ANDREW J MCKENZIE AND STEVEN A MCKENZIE 1425 N 7TH ST	1425 N 7th St	46.00	\$ 1,362.98
	YOUNKER 1445 GJ LLC, 1445 N 7TH ST	1445 N 7th St	125.00	\$ 12,345.00
*	SCHOOL DISTRICT 51 2115 GRAND AVE GRAND JUNCTION CO 81501	2945-114-00-053	50.00	\$ 4,938.00
*	LIGRANI FAMILY TRUST, 13491 ANTLERS ST BROOMFIELD CO 80020	1503 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
	ALICE E ROBINSON, 3260 ZEPHYR CT, WHEAT RIDGE, CO 80033	1507 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
*	ASHLEY MERCEDES BENSON, 1511 N 7TH ST	1511 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
*	NATHAN AND SARA LOHMEYER, 1515 N 7TH ST	1515 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
	CORPORATON OF THE PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS 50 E NORTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84150-0002	1521 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 4,938.00
	CHIMCO 1525 N 7TH LLC, 3 CARRIAGE LN LITTLETON, CO 80121	1525 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
	EMILEE, CASTLETON, 1605 N 7th Street	1605 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
*	BRANDON BEARDEN AND ANGELA FULLERTON, 564 GRACE DR, CARBONDALE, CO 81623	1615 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
*	BRANDON BEARDEN AND ANGELA FULLERTON, 564 GRACE DR, CARBONDALE, CO 81623	1621 N 7th St	51.00	\$ 1,511.13

	JAMES L MCSPADDEN 1623 N 7TH ST	1623 N 7th St	51.00	\$ 2,518.38
	TOM HAMANN AND LYNN HAMANN, 3236 E GRAND AVE UNIT I618 LARAMIE, WY 82070	1639 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
*	1645 N 7TH STREET LLC c/o JANICE M BURTIS, 322 HEARTHSTONE CT GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81507	1645 N 7th St	53.63	\$ 2,648.25
*	1705 N 7TH STREET LLC, 322 HEARTHSTONE CT GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81507	1705 N 7th St	53.62	\$ 2,647.76
*	1715 N 7TH STREET LLC, 322 HEARTHSTONE CT GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81507	1715 N 7th St	53.87	\$ 2,660.10
*	1725 N 7TH STREET LLC C/O JANICE M BURTIS 322 HEARTHSTONE CT GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81507	1725 N 7th St	53.63	\$ 2,648.25
	THOMAS E HUGHES AND ANDREA F HUGHES 1735 N 7TH ST	1735 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 1,481.50
*	WESTERN COLORADO CENTER FOR THE ARTS INC 1803 N 7TH ST GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81501-3009	1745 N 7th St	50.00	\$ 4,938.00
*	WESTERN COLORADO CENTER FOR THE ARTS INC 1803 N 7TH ST GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81501-3009	1803 N 7th St	387.00	\$ 38,220.12
		Total	3,230.75	\$ 236,954.40
	Estimated Cost to Construct			\$ 650,000.00
	Maximum Cost to Owners			\$ 236,954.40
	Estimated Cost to City			\$ 413,045.61

Assessments may be paid in full upon completion of project or may be paid over a ten-year period, in which event, a one-time charge of 6% will be added to the principal balance to which simple interest will accrue at the rate of 6% per annum on the declining balance.

“ * ” Represents owners signing in favor of the improvements. 53% of the owners representing (16/30) are in favor or 75% of the assessable footage.



RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE INTENTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, TO CREATE CITY ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. ST- 23 AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY ENGINEER TO PREPARE DETAILS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE SAME.

WHEREAS, a majority of the property owners to be assessed have petitioned the City Council, under the provisions of Chapter 28 of the City of Grand Junction Municipal Code, as amended, and People's Ordinance No. 33, to create an Alley Improvement District for the construction of improvements as follows:

Location of Improvements:

- North/South Alleway between 6th Street and 7th Street and Tiger Avenue and Orchard Avenue east of Grand Junction High School.

Type of Improvements - Base course material under a mat of Concrete Paving together with the construction or reconstruction of adjacent concrete alley driveway sections as deemed necessary by the City Engineer.

WHEREAS, the City Council deems it advisable to take the necessary preliminary steps and proceedings to and for the creation of a Local Improvement District ("District.")

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

1. That the District lands to be assessed are described as follows:

Lots 1 through 5, inclusive, Block 1, High School Addition (Reception Number 450288),
AND ALSO

That portion of Hall Avenue Right-of-Way South of Block 1, High School Addition
(Reception Number 450288),

AND ALSO

Block 3, High School Addition (Reception Number 450288) except that sixty (60) foot
Right-of-Way deeded to the City of Grand Junction at Reception Number 551766,

AND ALSO

Lot 22, Capitol Hill Subdivision (Reception Number 28174) except the North thirty (30)
feet thereof,

AND ALSO

Lots 1 through 4 inclusive, Haney Subdivision (Reception Number 2961257),

AND ALSO

Lot 21, Capitol Hill Subdivision (Reception Number 28174) except the North two hundred
fifteen (215) feet thereof,

AND ALSO

Lot 20, Capitol Hill Subdivision (Reception Number 28174)

AND ALSO

Lot 19, Capitol Hill Subdivision (Reception Number 28174) except the south one
hundred and fifty (150) feet thereof,

AND ALSO

Lot 1, Community First National Bank Simple Subdivision (Reception Number 2246848)

All located in the South Half of Section 11, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, Mesa County, Colorado.

2. That the assessment levied against the respective properties will be as follows per each linear foot directly abutting the alley right-of-way:

Properties located within any zone other than residential and properties which are used and occupied for any purpose other than residential shall be assessed 50 percent of the assessable cost per abutting foot; provided, however, that existing multi-family uses within a non-residential zone shall be assessed at the multi-family rate of 25 percent of the assessable cost per abutting foot;

Properties located in a residential multi-family zone shall be assessed at the residential multi-family rate of 25 percent of the assessable cost per abutting foot.

Properties located in a single-family residential zone shall be assessed at 15 percent of the assessable cost per abutting foot.

Properties having alley frontage on more than one side shall be assessed the applicable assessment rate for the frontage on the longest side only.

If the use of any property changes, or if a property is rezoned any time prior to the assessment hearing, the assessment shall reflect that change.

The total amount of assessable footage for properties receiving the single-family residential rate is estimated to be 998.00 feet; and the total amount of assessable footage for properties receiving the multi-family residential rate is estimated to be 265.75 feet; and the total amount of assessable footage receiving the non-residential rate is 1,967.00 feet.

3. That the assessments to be levied against the properties in the District to pay the cost of such improvements shall be due and payable, without demand, within thirty (30) days after the ordinance assessing such costs becomes final, and, if paid during this period, the amount added for costs of collection and other incidentals shall be deducted; provided, however, that failure by any owner(s) to pay the whole assessment within said thirty (30) day period shall be conclusively considered as an election on the part of said owner(s) to pay the assessment, together with an additional six percent (6%) one-time charge for cost of collection and other incidentals, as required by the Mesa County Treasurer's office, which shall be added to the principal payable in ten (10) annual installments, the first of which shall be payable at the time the next installment of general taxes, by the laws of the State of Colorado, is payable, and each annual installment shall be paid on or before the same date each year thereafter, along with simple interest which has accrued at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the unpaid principal, payable annually.

4. That the City Engineer is hereby authorized and directed to prepare full details, plans and specifications for such paving; and a map of the district depicting the real property to be

assessed from which the amount of assessment to be levied against each individual property may be readily ascertained, all as required by Ordinance No. 178, as amended, City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

5. That Notice of Intention to Create said Alley Improvement District No. ST-23, and of a hearing thereon, shall be given by advertisement in one issue of The Daily Sentinel, a newspaper of general circulation published in said City, which Notice shall be in substantially the form set forth in the attached "**NOTICE**".

NOTICE

OF INTENTION TO CREATE ALLEY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. ST-23, IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, AND OF A HEARING THEREON

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, pursuant to the request of a majority of the affected property owners, to the owners of real estate in the district hereinafter described and to all persons generally interested that the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, intends to create Alley Improvement District No. ST-23, in said City for the purpose of reconstructing and paving certain alleys to serve the property hereinafter described which lands are to be assessed with the cost of the improvements, to wit:

Lots 1 through 5, inclusive, Block 1, High School Addition (Reception Number 450288),
AND ALSO

That portion of Hall Avenue Right-of-Way South of Block 1, High School Addition
(Reception Number 450288),

AND ALSO

Block 3, High School Addition (Reception Number 450288) except that sixty (60) foot
Right-of-Way deeded to the City of Grand Junction at Reception Number 551766,

AND ALSO

Lot 22, Capitol Hill Subdivision (Reception Number 28174) except the North thirty (30)
feet thereof,

AND ALSO

Lots 1 through 4 inclusive, Haney Subdivision (Reception Number 2961257),

AND ALSO

Lot 21, Capitol Hill Subdivision (Reception Number 28174) except the North two hundred
fifteen (215) feet thereof,

AND ALSO

Lot 20, Capitol Hill Subdivision (Reception Number 28174)

AND ALSO

Lot 19, Capitol Hill Subdivision (Reception Number 28174) except the south one
hundred and fifty (150) feet thereof,

AND ALSO

Lot 1, Community First National Bank Simple Subdivision (Reception Number 2246848)

All located in the South Half of Section 11, Township 1 South, Range 1 West of the Ute
Meridian, City of Grand Junction, Mesa County, Colorado.

Location of Improvements:

- North/South Alleyway between 6th Street and 7th Street and Tiger Avenue and Orchard Avenue east of Grand Junction High School.

Type of Improvements: To include base course material under a mat of Concrete Pavement and construction or reconstruction of concrete approaches as deemed necessary by the City Engineer.

The assessment levied against the respective properties will be as follows per each linear foot directly abutting the alley right-of-way:

Properties located within any zone other than residential and properties which are used and occupied for any purpose other than residential shall be assessed 50 percent of the assessable cost per abutting foot; provided, however, that existing multi-family uses within a non-residential zone shall be assessed at the multi-family rate of 25 percent of the assessable cost per abutting foot;

Properties located in a residential multi-family zone shall be assessed at the residential multi-family rate of 25 percent of the assessable cost per abutting foot.

Properties located in a single-family residential zone shall be assessed at 15 percent of the assessable cost per abutting foot.

Properties having alley frontage on more than one side shall be assessed the applicable assessment rate for the frontage on the longest side only.

If the use of any property changes, or if a property is rezoned any time prior to the assessment hearing, the assessment shall reflect that change.

The total amount of assessable footage for properties receiving the single-family residential rate is estimated to be 998.00 feet; and the total amount of assessable footage for properties receiving the multi-family residential rate is estimated to be 265.75 feet; and the total amount of assessable footage receiving the non-residential rate is 1,967.00 feet.

To the total assessable cost of \$236,954.40 to be borne by the property owners, there shall be, as required by the Mesa County Treasurer's Office, added six (6) percent for costs of collection and incidentals. The said assessment shall be due and payable, without demand, within thirty (30) days after the ordinance assessing such cost shall have become final, and if paid during such period, the amount added for costs of collection and incidentals shall be deducted; provided however, that failure by any owner(s) to pay the whole assessment within said thirty (30) day period shall be conclusively considered as an election on the part of said owner(s) to pay the assessment, together with an additional six percent (6%) one-time charge for cost of collection and other incidentals, as required by the Mesa County Treasurer's Office, which shall be added to the principal payable in ten (10) annual installments which shall become due upon the same date upon which general taxes, or the first installment thereof, are by the laws of the State of Colorado, made payable. Simple interest at the rate of six (6) percent per annum shall be charged on unpaid installments.

On March 15th, 2023, at the hour of 5:30 o'clock P.M. in the City Council Chambers in City Hall located at 250 North 5th Street in said City, the Council will consider testimony that may be made for or against the proposed improvements by the owners of any real estate to be assessed, or by any person interested.

A map of the district, from which the share of the total cost to be assessed upon each parcel of real estate in the district may be readily ascertained, and all proceedings of the Council, are on file and can be seen and examined by any person interested therein in the office of the City Clerk during business hours, at any time prior to said hearing.

Dated at Grand Junction, Colorado, this _____ day of _____, 2023.

**BY ORDER OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

By: _____
City Clerk

PASSED and **ADOPTED** this ____ day of _____, 2023.

President of the City Council

Attest:

City Clerk



Grand Junction City Council

Regular Session

Item #2.b.

Meeting Date: February 1, 2023

Presented By: Amy Phillips, City Clerk

Department: City Clerk

Submitted By: Amy Phillips, City Clerk

Information

SUBJECT:

A Resolution Approving the Notice of Election for the Regular Municipal Election April 4, 2023

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends adoption of the resolution.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this item is to approve the election notice for the April 4, 2023 Regular Municipal Election.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

Both the Charter and Municipal Election Code (MEC) have specific content and publication requirements for a **Notice of Election**:

-Charter Section 17: publish three consecutive days within the ten days prior to the election

-MEC: publish ten days prior to Election Day

To meet these requirements, the **Notice** will be published in *The Daily Sentinel* on March 19, and April 1 - April 3.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Publication costs for this *Notice* are estimated at \$2,500. Staff included this estimate when budgeting for the April 2023 election.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

I move to (adopt/deny) Resolution No. 15-23, a resolution setting forth the Notice of Election for the regular municipal election to be held on April 4, 2023 in the City of Grand Junction.

Attachments

1. Resolution Ballot Content_Notice

RESOLUTION NO. xx-23

**A RESOLUTION SETTING FORTH THE NOTICE OF ELECTION
FOR THE REGULAR MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD
ON APRIL 4, 2023 IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO THAT:

The Election Notice hereinafter be the Notice of the Regular Municipal Election to be held in the City on April 4, 2023 and further that the same be published in accordance with election procedures:

ELECTION NOTICE

**CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO
NOTICE OF REGULAR MUNICIPAL ELECTION
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 4th DAY OF APRIL, 2023**

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A REGULAR MUNICIPAL ELECTION WILL BE HELD BY MAIL-IN BALLOT ON TUESDAY, THE 4th DAY OF APRIL, 2023, IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO.

Ballot packages will be mailed on March 17, 2023, and must be returned to the Grand Junction City Clerk via mail or at a location listed below no later than 7:00 p.m. on Election Day, Tuesday, April 4th, 2023. NO voting devices will be provided at any location.

**AVAILABLE 24-HOURS AND
UNTIL 7:00 P.M. ON ELECTION DAY**

- Grand Junction City Hall (outside ballot drop box)
250 North 5th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501
- Grand Valley Transit - West Transfer Facility (outside ballot drop box)
612 24 1/2 Road
Grand Junction, CO 81505
- Department of Human Services (outside ballot drop box)
510 29 1/2 Road
Grand Junction, CO 81504
- Mesa County Central Services (drive up ballot drop box in parking lot)
200 South Spruce Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501
- Colorado Mesa University (ballot drop box outside Robinson Theatre)
1299 N. 12th St, Grand Junction, CO 81501

**AVAILABLE 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday - Friday (except legal holidays)
and 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Election Day**

- **Election Office** - Grand Junction City Hall (City Clerk's Office)
250 N. 5th Street, Grand Junction, CO 81501, 970-244-1509, cityclerk@gjcity.org.

The Grand Junction City Hall, City Clerk's Office will be the official Election Office for issue of ballots to "inactive voters", or the reissue of ballots to those who have spoiled, lost, moved, or for some reason did not receive a ballot. Monday through Friday, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. (or by appointment) and on Tuesday, April 4th, 2023 from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (Election Day).

Persons desiring to vote in said Election must meet the following qualifications: be at least eighteen (18) years of age, a citizen of the United States, a resident of the State of Colorado for at least twenty-two (22) days before the Election, and duly registered to vote within the Grand Junction city limits.

CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT A – SPECIAL ELECTION

**Two-Year Term
(Vote for One)**

**Cody Kennedy
Jamie Porta
Sandra Weckerly
Write In _____**

CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT B

**Four-Year Term
(Vote for One)**

**Michael Deuel
Greg Haitz
Jason Nguyen
Write In _____**

CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT C

**Four-Year Term
(Vote for One)**

**Anna Stout
Write In _____**

CITY COUNCIL AT-LARGE

**Four-Year Term
(Vote for One)**

**Scott Beilfuss
Diane Schwenke
Write In _____**

At such election, two (2) ballot questions will be submitted to the voters as follows:

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION REFERRED MEASURE 1A

SHALL CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION TAXES BE INCREASED \$2,300,000 IN 2023 (BEGINNING IN JULY 2023) AND \$4,600,000 in 2024 (THE FIRST FULL FISCAL YEAR) AND BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS

AS ARE GENERATED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER UNTIL DECEMBER 31, 2054 BY INCREASING THE CITY'S SALES AND USE TAX RATE FROM 3.25% TO 3.39% BEGINNING JULY 1, 2023 FOR THE PURPOSE OF GENERATING REVENUE TO FINANCE THE COSTS OF DEBT SERVICE, CONSTRUCTION, EQUIPPING, AND FURNISHING, AND IF AVAILABLE, OPERATING AND MAINTAINING, AN INDOOR COMMUNITY RECREATION CENTER (CRC) AT MATCHETT PARK WHICH AS DESCRIBED IN THE ADOPTED 2022 CRC PLAN IS PROJECTED TO PROVIDE AND MAY INCLUDE BUT NOT NECESSARILY BE LIMITED TO A MULTI-GENERATIONAL AQUATIC CENTER WITH A WARM WATER LEISURE POOL CONSISTING OF A LAZY RIVER, ZERO DEPTH ENTRY, WATER PLAYGROUND AND SLIDES, A COOL WATER LAP POOL, AND A WARM WATER THERAPY POOL, A MULTI-SPORT GYMNASIUM, AN INDOOR WALK/JOG TRACK, A FITNESS AND WEIGHTS AREA, MULTI-PURPOSE MEETING ROOMS, AND OTHER COMMUNITY GATHERING AND RECREATION SPACES, AND SHALL CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION DEBT BE INCREASED \$70,000,000 WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$148,500,000 TO PROVIDE FINANCING FOR THE COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE COMMUNITY RECREATION CENTER (CRC) WITH THE DEBT BEING PAYABLE FROM THE TAX INCREASE OR ANY OTHER GENERAL REVENUE OF THE CITY, PROVIDED THAT THE SPECIFIC TERMS OF THE DEBT, INCLUDING A PROVISION FOR EARLY REPAYMENT WITH OR WITHOUT A PREMIUM, AND THE PRICE AT WHICH IT WILL BE SOLD BEING DETERMINED BY THE CITY AS NECESSARY AND PRUDENT WITH THE CITY BEING AUTHORIZED TO IMPOSE, COLLECT, RETAIN AND SPEND SUCH REVENUES AND ANY INVESTMENT EARNINGS AND INTEREST ON SUCH REVENUES, AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

☐ Yes ☐ No

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION REFERRED MEASURE 1B
City of Grand Junction

Shall there be an amendment to Article XIV, Section 124 of the City Charter, as amended, to increase the authorized lease term for 1.1169 acres (48,621 square feet) of property to Colorado Discover Ability, a non-profit organization offering adaptive outdoor recreation for people with disabilities, located at 599/601 Struthers Avenue in and near Las Colonias Park from 25 years to a term not to exceed a total of 99 years?

If approved, Section 124 will read, in relevant part, and without amendment of the balance of the Section, as follows:

124. "No franchise, lease or right to use the streets or the public places, or property of the city, shall be granted by the city, except as in this Charter provided, for a period longer than twenty-five years. The City may lease, for a term not to exceed 99 years, approximately 1.1169 acres of property located at 599/601 Struthers Avenue, Grand Junction Colorado in or near the Las Colonias Park to Colorado Discover Ability, all as described in and for the purposes as stated in Ordinance No. 5116."

☐ **FOR THE AMENDMENT**

☐ **AGAINST THE AMENDMENT**

BY ORDER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Dated at Grand Junction, Colorado, this 1st day of February, 2023.

/s/ Amy Phillips

Amy Phillips
City Clerk

Published in *The Daily Sentinel* on

- March 19, 2023
- April 1 – April 3, 2023

PASSED and ADOPTED this 1st day of February, 2023.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk



Grand Junction City Council

Regular Session

Item #3.a.

Meeting Date: February 1, 2023

Presented By: Ken Sherbenou, Parks and Recreation Director

Department: Parks and Recreation

Submitted By: Ken Sherbenou

Information

SUBJECT:

Resuming Design and Planning for Orchard Mesa Pool Renovation

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends resuming the contract for Professional Architectural/Engineering Services with OLC for design and engineering services for renovations and planning for the Orchard Mesa Pool Facility.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Orchard Mesa Pool was originally built in 1983 as a partnership between Mesa County School District #51, who donated the land and is the owner of the facility, and Mesa County, who split the capital cost of construction with the City. Nearing 40 years old, a renovation is required.

On Monday January 30th, City Council expressed an interest in considering the action of resuming the contract for architect & engineer services with Ohlson Lavoie Corporation (OLC). Since then, staff has connected with OLC and they were excited to hear of the prospect of resuming the design and planning for the potential Orchard Mesa Pool renovation. Before pausing the design, \$41,184 had been expended on the \$523,722 contract. Resuming the design will include evaluating different levels of renovation and associated costs. These different levels or options will be defined, ranging from identifying the most immediate needs to ensure continued short-term operation to a complete reimagining of the facility to ensure relevancy should the Community Recreation Center (CRC) currently on the ballot be built. If approved by voters, the CRC is planned to come to fruition by late 2025.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

The contract with OLC and their design group was approved by City Council on September 7th after a competitive selection process. The sub-consultants to OLC include Counsilman-Hunsaker (Aquatic Designer), SGM Engineering (Mechanical, Lighting, Electrical, Plumbing, Structural and

Civil and Traffic), and Censeo (IT, Audio Visual and Security). The final negotiated not-to-exceed price for professional design and engineering services is \$523,722, a \$75,026 reduction in their original proposal.

This scope includes \$162,050 for the Design Development Phase. The scope for Construction Manager-General Contractor selection, Construction Documents, Bidding Assistance and Construction Administration, comprise the bulk of the \$523,722 contract at \$361,672. Depending on the direction from Council on what level of renovation is ultimately decided upon, these elements of the current scope may or may not be expended.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Based on Council's authorization of supplemental appropriations on August 17th 2022, the cost for this contract is included in the 2022 amended budget. This appropriation and budget authorization is planned to be proposed as a carry forward to 2023.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

I move to (authorize/not authorize) resuming the design and planning services specified in the contract with OLC originally approved on September 7, 2022 in the not to exceed amount of \$523,722 for professional architectural/engineering services to plan for the renovation of the Orchard Mesa Pool Facility.

Attachments

None



Grand Junction City Council

Regular Session

Item #4.a.i.

Meeting Date: February 1, 2023

Presented By: Matt Smith, Interim Chief of Police, John Shaver, City Attorney

Department: City Attorney

Submitted By: John Shaver

Information

SUBJECT:

An Ordinance Establishing a Moratorium to Prohibit the Establishment of any New or Relocation of Existing Gaming Establishments

RECOMMENDATION:

Council consideration of Ordinance No. 5125 on second reading, conduct a public hearing and adopt the Ordinance and order publication in pamphlet form.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A temporary moratorium disallowing new or relocated *skilled gaming* businesses in the City will allow time for the City Attorney's Office and the Grand Junction Police Department, and/or other legal authority(ies) to conduct a review of existing *skilled gaming* establishments(s) and will help preclude other businesses from opening in the City. A temporary moratorium will allow the City an opportunity to evaluate potential regulations, licensure, and other avenues, including coordination with the State, to better limit the impact these businesses are having on the community.

This temporary moratorium is narrowly tailored and will further the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the City of Grand Junction.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

A new type of "gray casino" business has been operating in the City and throughout Colorado. The businesses look, feel, and operate much like Las Vegas-style casinos. The businesses use technology to operate in a gray area of the law which purports to distinguish *games of skill* from *games of chance*. Because some businesses have had criminal activities occur at or near the businesses and because of the technological complications with the investigation and prosecution of businesses/business activities as illegal gambling, the City has proposed this moratorium to preclude additional

businesses from opening and/or to disallow existing businesses from relocating so that the City can better understand the reason for the criminal activity that has been occurring in some locations and as appropriate, create regulatory mechanisms regarding *games of skill* as opposed to *games of chance*, with the former being legal and the latter being illegal.

With the passage of HB22-1412 the State's Gaming Commission was empowered to investigate and prosecute crimes and enforce regulations pertaining to unlicensed gaming establishments throughout Colorado; however, the Colorado Division of Gaming Enforcement and Investigations Section has advised the City that the Division will not operate/provide enforcement outside of the cities authorized for limited gaming in Article XVIII, Section 9 of the Colorado Constitution (Blackhawk, Central City, and Cripple Creek).

The *games of skill* typically offered by these businesses are video machines, similar to video slot machines, in which the player may win money, cryptocurrency, or other value. Because these businesses operate in a gray area of the law, sometimes known as *simulated gambling*, they are unregulated and uncontrolled under Colorado law. The businesses often bring increased crime and lack public health oversight, and regulation of the flow of money. Because the businesses typically do not sell products, a City sales tax license is not required.

A temporary moratorium disallowing new or relocated *skilled gaming* businesses will allow time for the City Attorney's Office and the Grand Junction Police Department, and/or other legal authority(ies) to conduct a review of existing *skilled gaming* establishments(s) and will help preclude other businesses from opening in the City. A temporary moratorium will allow the City an opportunity to evaluate potential regulations, licensure, and other avenues, including coordination with the State, to better limit the potential of a negative impact by these businesses on the community.

This temporary moratorium is narrowly tailored and will further the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the City of Grand Junction.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no direct fiscal impact from the adoption of the ordinance; however, there will be costs of surveying the existing establishments and developing possible future actions. Those costs will be covered within the 2023 Adopted Budget.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

I move to (adopt/deny) Ordinance No. 5125, an ordinance enacting a moratorium to prohibit the establishment of any new or relocation of existing gaming arcades or gaming uses within the City of Grand Junction; providing that the moratorium shall be in effect for a period which shall terminate at the earliest of the City's adoption of amendment(s) to 21.04.030 use-specific standards; and/or Title 9, public peace, morals and welfare of the Grand Junction Municipal Code or the expiration of 365 days from

the effective date of this ordinance; providing for findings, intent and purpose; providing for definitions; and providing repealing clauses, on final passage and order final publication in pamphlet form.

Attachments

1. ORD-Gaming Moratorium 011023

1 **CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO**

2 **ORDINANCE NO. XXXX**

3 **AN ORDINANCE ENACTING A MORATORIUM TO PROHIBIT THE**
4 **ESTABLISHMENT OF ANY NEW OR RELOCATION OF EXISTING GAMING**
5 **ARCADES OR GAMING USES WITHIN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION;**
6 **PROVIDING THAT THE MORATORIUM SHALL BE IN EFFECT FOR A PERIOD**
7 **WHICH SHALL TERMINATE AT THE EARLIEST OF THE CITY'S ADOPTION OF**
8 **AMENDMENT(S) TO 21.04.030 USE- SPECIFIC STANDARDS; AND/OR TITLE 9,**
9 **PUBLIC PEACE, MORALS AND WELFARE OF THE GRAND JUNCTION**
10 **MUNICIPAL CODE OR THE EXPIRATION OF 365 DAYS FROM THE EFFECTIVE**
11 **DATE OF THIS ORDINANCE; PROVIDING FOR FINDINGS, INTENT AND**
12 **PURPOSE; PROVIDING FOR DEFINITIONS; AND PROVIDING REPEALING**
13 **CLAUSES**

14 **RECITALS:**

15 A new type of "gray casino" business has been operating in the City of Grand Junction
16 (City) and throughout Colorado. The businesses look, feel, and operate much like Las
17 Vegas style casinos. The businesses use technology to operate in a gray area of the
18 law which purports to distinguish games of skill from games of chance.

19 Due to the technology, the investigation and prosecution of the businesses as illegal
20 gambling, i.e., games of chance, is almost impossible and accordingly the businesses
21 continue to operate in the City.

22 With the passage of HB22-1412 the State's Gaming Commission was empowered to
23 investigate and prosecute crimes and enforce regulations pertaining to unlicensed
24 gaming establishments throughout Colorado; however, the Colorado Division of Gaming
25 Enforcement and Investigations Section has advised the City that the Division will not
26 operate/provide enforcement outside of the cities authorized for limited gaming in Article
27 XVIII, Section 9 of the Colorado Constitution (Blackhawk, Central City, and Cripple
28 Creek).

29 The games of skill typically offered by these businesses are video machines, similar to
30 video slot machines, which the player may win money, cryptocurrency, or other value.
31 Because these businesses operate in a gray area of the law, sometimes known as
32 simulated gambling, they are unregulated and uncontrolled under Colorado law. The
33 businesses often bring problems of increased crime, no public health oversight, and no
34 regulation of the flow of money. Because the businesses typically do not sell products, a
35 City sales tax license is not required.

36 A temporary moratorium disallowing new skilled gaming businesses will allow time for
37 the City Attorney's Office and the Grand Junction Police Department, and/or other legal
38 authority(ies) to conduct a review of existing skilled gaming establishment(s) and will
39 help preclude other businesses from opening in the City. A temporary moratorium will

allow the City an opportunity to evaluate potential regulation, licensure, and other avenues, including coordination with the State, to better limit the impact the businesses are having on the community.

This temporary moratorium is narrowly tailored and will further the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the City of Grand Junction.

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

Chapter 21.04 Section 030 shall be revised in relevant part as follows (additions are underlined and deletions marked with strike through notations):

(b) Adult Entertainment.

(1) The City Council finds that the concentration of certain adult entertainment establishments in cities tends to result in the blighting and deterioration of the areas of such concentration. Accordingly, it is necessary that these establishments be regulated in a manner as to prevent the erosion of the character of affected neighborhoods.

(5) Definitions.

(i) (E) Gaming arcade (aka skilled gaming business) means any business location, including a private club, that is owned, leased, or otherwise possessed, in whole or in part, by a person or by that person's partners, affiliates, subsidiaries, agents, or contractors which features (i) slot machine(s), (ii) gambling device(s), (iii) simulated gambling device(s), or (iv) any mechanical, electrical, video, electronic, or other device, contrivance or machine which after insertion or conveyance of a coin, debit card, credit card, cash, token or similar object or upon payment of any required consideration whatsoever by a player, is available to be played or operated, and which, whether by reason of the skill of the player or application of the element of chance, or both, may deliver or entitle the player operating the machine to receive monetary compensation and/or redeemable game credits, or any other thing of value. This definition expressly includes 'fish game' 'fish game table' 'fish game gambling table' however denominated that consists of a tabletop electronic display with one or more stations featuring buttons, joysticks, or other control(s) that delivers to the player cash, cash premiums, redeemable game credits or any other thing of value for successful play, whether the redeemable payout is made from the machine, another machine, or from an employee of the business. This definition expressly excludes any business location which features bona fide amusement devices that pay nothing of value, cannot be adjusted to pay anything of value, provide only unredeemable free games, or provide only tickets redeemable for nonmonetary prizes consisting of toys or novelties of nominal value; crane games; BINGO operations, coin-operated music machines; or any bona fide amusement device authorized within restaurants by C.R.S 44-3-103(47).

(a) Slot machine: any mechanical, electrical, video, electronic, or other device, contrivance, or machine which, after insertion of a coin, token, or similar object, or upon

79 payment of any required consideration whatsoever by a player, is available to be played
80 or operated, and which, whether by reason of the skill of the player or application of the
81 element of chance, or both, may deliver or entitle the player operating the machine to
82 receive cash premiums, merchandise, tokens, redeemable game credits, or any other
83 thing of value other than unredeemable free games, whether the payoff is made
84 automatically from the machines or in any other manner; except that the term does not
85 include a crane game or vintage slot machine models introduced on the market in 1984,
86 does not contain component parts manufactured in 1984 or thereafter and is not used
87 for gambling purposes or limited gaming purposes.

88 (b) Gambling Device means any device, machine, paraphernalia, or equipment that
89 is used or usable in the playing phases of any professional gambling activity, whether
90 that activity consists of gambling between persons or gambling by a person involving
91 the playing of a machine; except that the term does not include a crane game.

92 (c) Simulated Gambling Device: a mechanically or electronically operated machine,
93 network, system, program, or device that is used by an entrant and that displays
94 simulated gambling displays on a screen or other mechanism at a business location,
95 including a private club, that is owned, leased, or otherwise possessed, in whole or in
96 part, by a person conducting the game or by that person's partners, affiliates,
97 subsidiaries, agents, or contractors; except that the term does not include bona fide
98 amusement devices, as authorized in C.R.S. 44-3-103 (47), that pay nothing of value
99 and cannot be adjusted to pay anything of value. "Simulated gambling device" includes:

100 (I) A video poker game or any other kind of video card game; (II) A video bingo game;
101 (III) A video craps game; (IV) A video keno game; (V) A video lotto game; (VI) A video
102 roulette game; (VII) A pot-of-gold; (VIII) An eight-liner; (IX) A video game based on or
103 involving the random or chance matching of different pictures, words, numbers, or
104 symbols; (X) An electronic gaming machine, including a personal computer of any size
105 or configuration that performs any of the functions of an electronic gaming machine; (XI)
106 A slot machine, where results are determined by reason of the skill of the player or the
107 application of the element of chance, or both, as provided by Article XVIII, § 9(4)(c) of
108 the Colorado constitution; and (XII) A device that functions as, or simulates the play of,
109 a slot machine, where results are determined by reason of the skill of the player or the
110 application of the element of chance, or both, as provided by Article XVIII, § 9(4)(c) of
111 the Colorado constitution. (b) "Simulated gambling device" does not include any
112 parimutuel totalizator equipment that is used for pari-mutuel wagering on live or
113 simulcast racing events and that has been approved by the director of the division of
114 racing events for entities authorized and licensed under article 32 of title 44 of the
115 Colorado Revised Statutes.

116 (d) Crane Game means an amusement machine that, upon insertion of a coin, bill,
117 token, or similar object, allows the player to use one or more buttons, joysticks, or other
118 controls to maneuver a crane or claw over a nonmonetary prize, toy, or novelty, none of

which shall have a cost to the arcade of more than twenty-five dollars per item, and then, using the crane or claw, to attempt to retrieve the prize, toy, or novelty for the player.

(8) Gaming Arcades: The City Council finds that it is necessary to preserve the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the residents and businesses of the City by affording time for City staff to evaluate the impact of Gaming Arcades, whether such uses are legal and, if so, can be appropriately sited within the City with appropriate regulation, or whether such uses are or should be prohibited.

(i) Imposition of Moratorium. A moratorium period is hereby declared on all new establishments not in existence or the relocation of existing establishments as of [DATE (THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDINANCE)], constituting Gaming Arcades (aka skilled gaming businesses), Slot Machine(s), Gambling Device(s) and Simulated Gambling Device(s) from the effective date of this Ordinance, [DATE], for the period of three hundred sixty five (365) days to [DATE] (inclusive), or until further action of the City Council ending, modifying or extending this moratorium, whichever occurs first. Such further action shall be taken accordingly by ordinance of the City Council. No applications pertaining to sales and use tax, amendments to the official zoning map, site development, liquor license, sign permit, building permit, any development permit, or renewal or transfer of any of the aforementioned shall be accepted for review by the City for the moratorium period as defined herein.

(ii) Repeal. Section 21.04.030(8) and subsections contained therein is repealed effective [DATE].

ALL OTHER PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 21.04 SECTION 030 SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

Introduced on first reading this 18th day of January 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

Adopted on second reading this _____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

155 ATTEST:

156

157

158 _____

159 Anna M. Stout

160 President of City Council

161

162 _____

163 Amy Phillips

164 City Clerk

165

DRAFT



Grand Junction City Council

Regular Session

Item #4.b.i.

Meeting Date: February 1, 2023

Presented By: Brandon Stam, DDA Executive Director

Department: Downtown Development Authority

Submitted By: Brandon Stam, Executive Director Downtown Development Authority and Business Improvement District

Information

SUBJECT:

Ordinances Accepting Inclusion of 905 Struthers Avenue to the Downtown Development Authority and Downtown Business Improvement District

RECOMMENDATION:

Conduct second reading of and hold a public hearing on Ordinance Nos. 5126 and 5127 for inclusion of 905 Struthers into DDA and BID boundaries and on approval, publish in pamphlet form.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Approval of Ordinance Nos. 5126 and 5127 will expand the boundary of and include property located at and known as 905 Struthers Avenue into the Downtown Grand Junction Downtown Development Authority boundaries and the Downtown Grand Junction Business Improvement District boundaries.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

The owner of 905 Struthers Avenue has proposed inclusion into the DDA and BID and the Board has considered the matter and requests the Council's approval to expand the boundaries to include the Property at 905 Struthers and to expand the Authority to receive a portion or increment of *ad valorem* and sales taxes collected within the Plan area in accordance with State law, the Plan and other applicable law, rules or regulations. The DDA and BID Board of Directors reviewed the request to expand the boundary and determined the boundaries for both districts should be expanded to include 905 Struthers.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no direct fiscal impact from this action. If City Council authorizes inclusion in the DDA and tax increment district, the property value and sales tax revenue will add to the overall increment of the district.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

I move to (adopt/deny) Ordinance No. 5126, an ordinance expanding the boundary of the Grand Junction Colorado Downtown Development Authority to include the property located at and known as 905 Struthers Avenue and Ordinance No. 5127, an ordinance expanding the boundary of and including property located at and known as 905 Struthers Avenue into the Downtown Grand Junction Business Improvement District on final passage and order final publication in pamphlet form.

Attachments

1. 905 Struthers_Inclusion Documents
2. ORD-DDA and BID Inclusion 905 Struthers 1_5_23
3. Exhibit A_905 Struthers_DDA Boundary
4. Exhibit A_905 Struthers_BID Boundary

905 STRUTHERS LLC

905 STRUTHERS AVE,
GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81501
Phone 970.201.6781 Fax 970.243.0712

October 11, 2022

Brandon Stam
Downtown Development Authority
101 South 3rd St., Suite 100
Grand Junction, CO 81501

RE: Request for Entry into DDA

Dear Mr. Stam:

905 Struthers LLC enthusiastically requests entry of our parcel into the Grand Junction Downtown Authority (DDA). Having owned the property at 905 Struthers Ave since 1997 we have seen the improvements and developments that have taken place in the South Downtown Area and wish to become more involved in it's continued evolution.

Please enroll Parcel #: 2945-234-002 into the DDA so we can contribute to the ongoing efforts happening in the Las Colonias area.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,



James P. Jeffryes
President

**VERIFIED PETITION FOR INCLUSION OF PROPERTY
INTO THE
DOWNTOWN GRAND JUNCTION BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT**

TO: City Council, City of Grand Junction, Colorado

The undersigned Petitioner, 905 Struthers LLC, own, as tenants in common, the following described property located within the boundaries of the City of Grand Junction, in the County of Mesa, Colorado:

LOT 2 JEFFRYES SIMPLE SUBDIVISION SEC 23 1S 1W

(the "Property"). The address of the Property is **905 Struthers Ave.**

The Petitioners hereby respectfully petition the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado pursuant to Section 31-25-1220, C.R.S. for the inclusion of the Property into the Downtown Grand Junction Business Improvement District ("the District").

The Petitioners hereby request that the Property be included in the District and that an Ordinance be adopted by the City Council including the Property into the District, and that a certified copy of said Ordinance be recorded with the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder on or about the effective date of said Ordinance, and that from and after the recording of the certified copy of the Ordinance, the Property shall be subject to the levy of taxes for payment of its proportionate share of any indebtedness of the District outstanding at the time of inclusion and liable for assessments for any obligations of the District.

The Petitioners hereby represent to the City Council and verify that they are the owners of the Property described above and that no other persons, entity or entities own an interest therein except as holders of encumbrances.

Acceptance of this Petition shall be deemed to have occurred at the time when the City Council sets the date (by publication of notice thereof) for the public hearing for consideration of the Petition.

In accordance with Section 31-25-1220(1), C.R.S., this Petition is accompanied by a deposit of monies sufficient to pay all costs of the inclusion proceedings.

PETITIONERS:

905 Struthers LLC

[Signature]
Address: 905 Struthers Ave, GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81501

STATE OF COLORADO)

) ss.

COUNTY OF MESA)


The foregoing instrument was acknowledged and sworn to before me this 12 day of October, 2022 by 905 Struthers LLC.

Witness my hand and official seal.

My commission expires:

May 20, 2026 *Rose Medina*
Notary Public

905 Struthers LLC



Address: 905 Struthers LLC, GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81506

STATE OF COLORADO)

) ss.

COUNTY OF MESA)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged and sworn to before me this ____ day of _____, 2022, by 905 Struthers LLC

Witness my hand and official seal.

My commission expires: _____

Notary Public

ORDINANCE NO. ____

**AN ORDINANCE EXPANDING THE BOUNDARY OF THE GRAND JUNCTION,
COLORADO DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY TO INCLUDE THE
PROPERTY LOCATED AT AND KNOWN AS 905 STRUTHERS AVENUE**

The Grand Junction, Colorado, Downtown Development Authority (“the Authority” or “DDA”) has adopted a Plan of Development (“Plan”) for the boundaries of the Authority. The Plan and boundaries were initially approved by the Grand Junction, Colorado, City Council (“the Council”) on in 1981 and subsequently updated and amended in 2019 and 2020 (“Plan.”)

Pursuant to Section 31-25-822, C.R.S. and the Authority’s Plan, the Owner of the property has petitioned for inclusion into the Authority’s boundary.

The Board of the Authority reviewed the proposed inclusion and has determined that the boundary of the DDA should be expanded. With the expansion the Tax Increment Financing (“TIF”) district will be coterminous with the Authority boundary.

The owner of 905 Struthers Avenue (“the Property” or “Property”)has proposed inclusion into the DDA and the Authority Board has considered the matter and requests the Council’s approval to expand the Authority’s boundary to include the Property, a description of which is included by reference in this ordinance and to expand the Authority to receive a portion or increment of *ad valorem* and sales taxes collected within the Plan area in accordance with State law, the Plan and other applicable law, rules or regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, that

1. The Council finds the existence of blight within the boundary of the Authority, within the meaning of C.R.S. 31-25-802(1.5).
2. The Council hereby finds and determines that the approval of the expansion of the boundary for the Authority and the Plan, as shown on the attached Exhibit A, will serve a public use; will promote the health, safety, prosperity, security and general welfare of the inhabitants of the City and of its central business district; will halt or prevent the deterioration of property values or structures; will halt or prevent the growth of blighted area; will assist the City and the Authority in the development and redevelopment of the district and in the overall planning to restore or provide for the continuance of the economic health; and will be of specific benefit to the property to be included within the amended boundary of the Authority and the TIF district.
3. The expansion of the Authority’s boundary, as shown on the attached Exhibit A describing the Property is hereby approved by the Council and incorporated into the Plan for TIF, both sales tax and *ad valorem* tax, purposes. The Authority is hereby authorized to undertake development projects as described in the Plan and to act

consistently with the Plan including, but not necessarily limited to, receiving, and expending for development and redevelopment efforts a portion or increment of *ad valorem* and sales taxes generated in the area in accordance with C.R.S. 31-25-801 *et. seq.* and other applicable law.

4. The City Council hereby request that the County Assessor certify the valuation for the assessment of the Property included by this Ordinance within the Authority's boundaries and the TIF district as of the date of the last certification. The City Finance Director is hereby directed to certify the sales tax receipts for the Property included in and described by the attached Exhibit A for the twelve (12) months prior to the inclusion.

5. Adoption of this Ordinance and amendment to, or expansion of the boundary of the Authority and the TIF District, does not, shall not and will not provide for or allow or authorize receipt or expenditure of tax increments without requisite statutory and Plan compliance.

6. If any provision of the Ordinance is judicially adjudged invalid or unenforceable, such judgment shall not affect the remaining provisions hereof, it being the intention of the City Council that the provisions hereof are severable.

INTRODUCED on first reading the 18th day of January 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

PASSED and ADOPTED on second reading the ____ day of _____ 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

Anna M. Stout
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

Amy Phillips
City Clerk

Exhibit A

LOT 2 JEFFRYES SIMPLE SUBDIVISION CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION SEC 23 1S
1W UM

905 Struthers Avenue, Grand Junction Colorado

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE EXPANDING THE BOUNDARY OF AND INCLUDING PROPERTY
LOCATED AT AND KNOWN AS 905 STRUTHERS AVENUE INTO THE DOWNTOWN
GRAND JUNCTION BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT**

Recitals:

The Downtown Grand Junction Business Improvement District (District) was formed by the Grand Junction City Council by Ordinance No. 3815 in 2005 in accordance with the Business Improvement District Act, Part 12 of Article 25 of Title 31 of the Colorado Revised Statutes (the Act). In 2014 the District's term was extended to twenty years by Ordinance No. 4651.

The District consists of taxable real property that is not classified for property tax purposes as either residential or agricultural (together with the improvements thereon). It was formed to provide resources to promote business activity and improve the economic vitality and overall commercial appeal of the Downtown area. Since its inception the District has operated in compliance with the Act.

The owner of the property at 905 Struthers Avenue (Property) seeks to have it included into the boundary of the District. The owner (Petitioner) has submitted a Verified Petition for Inclusion of Property into the Downtown Grand Junction Business Improvement District (Petition).

The District's Board of Directors supports inclusion of the Property and finds that the rights, contracts, obligations, liens and charges of the District will not be impaired by the expansion of its boundary to include the Property, and believes that the District will benefit from the inclusion.

Notice was posted in accordance with C.R.S. 31-25-1220 informing all persons having objection to appear at the time and place stated in the notice and show cause why the petition should not be granted.

The City Council finds that:

- The Petitioner owns the Property requested to be included;
- The Petition is sufficient;
- The Property is not classified for property tax purposes as either agricultural or residential;
- The District will not be adversely affected by the inclusion of the Property;
- The failure of persons to appear and show cause against inclusion of the Property into the boundary of the District is deemed to be assent to the inclusion;
- No cause has been shown that the Property should not be included;

- Expansion of the boundary of the District to include the Property furthers the goals and policies of the City and DDA plans and serves the interests of the District and the community.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

The following real property together with improvements thereon shall be included in the Downtown Grand Junction Business Improvement District:

LOT 2 JEFFRYES SIMPLE SUBDIVISION CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION SEC 23 1S 1W UM

905 Struthers Avenue, Grand Junction Colorado

The City Clerk is directed to file a certified copy of this Ordinance with the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder.

The Property shall thereafter be subject to the levy of taxes and assessments for the payment of its proportionate share of any indebtedness and expenses of the District outstanding at the time of inclusion and thereafter.

Introduced on first reading this 18th day of January 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

Adopted on second reading this ____ day of _____ 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

Anna M. Stout
President of the City Council

ATTEST:

Amy Phillips
City Clerk


Exhibit A 905 Struthers-DDA Boundary



0 0.13 0.25
mi

Printed: 1/17/2023
1 inch equals 376 feet
Scale: 1:4,514
Packet Page 52

Exhibit A 905 Struthers-BID Boundary



0 0.13 0.25
mi

Printed: 1/17/2023
1 inch equals 376 feet
Scale: 1:4,514
Packet Page 53



Grand Junction City Council

Regular Session

Item #4.b.ii.

Meeting Date: February 1, 2023
Presented By: Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner
Department: Community Development
Submitted By: Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner

Information

SUBJECT:

A Resolution Accepting the Petition for the Annexation of 17.42 Acres of Land and Ordinances Annexing and Zoning the Grand Valley Estates Annexation to R-12 (Residential - 12 du/ac), Located at the Northeast Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road
(Continued from January 18, 2023)

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends adoption of a resolution accepting the petition for the Grand Valley Estates Annexation, and approval of the annexation and zone of annexation ordinances. The Planning Commission heard the zoning request at its January 10, 2023 meeting. A motion to recommend R-12 zoning was defeated 1-6. Because the motion did not pass/the Planning Commission recommended denial, an affirmative vote of five members of the City Council is required to approve the rezone.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Applicant, Grand Junction Venture LLC is requesting annexation of land and a zone of annexation to R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) for the Grand Valley Estates Annexation. The approximately 17.42-acre annexation is located at the northeast corner of 31 Rd and E ½ Rd. The subject property is undeveloped.

The property is Annexable Development per the Persigo Agreement. The Applicants are requesting annexation into the City limits. Annexation is being sought in anticipation of developing this property. The proposed zone district of R-12 is consistent with the Residential Medium (5.5 to 12 du/ac) Land Use category of the Comprehensive Plan. The request for annexation is being considered concurrently by City Council with the zone of annexation request. Both are included in this staff report.

At the Planning Commission's January 10, 2023, meeting, there was significant discussion on safety and traffic along E 1/2 Rd., deteriorating roadway conditions,

capacity of schools as well as the impact of the new charter school, and compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan.

This item was scheduled for the January 18, City Council meeting and was continued to the February 1, 2023, meeting to ensure sufficient notice.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

Annexation Request:

The Applicant, Grand Junction Venture LLC is requesting annexation of approximately 17.42 acres of land located at the northeast corner of 31 Rd and E ½ Rd. The subject property borders on three sides a property owned by Mesa County that contains portions of the Lewis Wash; this property is not under consideration for annexation at this time. The subject property is located west of Long Park and is undeveloped.

The property is Annexable Development per the Persigo Agreement. The Applicant is requesting annexation into the city limits. Annexation is being sought in anticipation of developing this property. The request for zoning will be considered separately by City Council, but concurrently with the annexation request and will be heard in a future Council action.

The schedule for the annexation and zoning is as follows:

- Referral of Petition (30 Day Notice), Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance, Exercising Land Use – December 7, 2022.
- Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation – December 13, 2022.
- Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance on Zoning by City Council – January 4, 2023.
- Acceptance of Petition and Public Hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council – February 1, 2023.
- Effective date of Annexation and Zoning – March 5, 2023.

Zone of Annexation Request:

The Applicants are requesting a zone district of R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac). The property is currently zoned in the County as Residential Single Family – 4 (RSF-4). The proposed zone district of R-12 is consistent with the Residential Medium (5.5 to 12 du/ac) Land Use category of the Comprehensive Plan.

Development to the west and north of the subject property in the County are zoned RSF-4 and consist mostly of single-family residential lots averaging a density close to 2.6 dwelling units per acre. The property to the east is Long Park. Property to the south is split between County zoned RSF-4 and City zoned Light Commercial (C-1); all of the properties to the south have a Future Land Use designation of Commercial. Zoning will be considered in a future action by City Council and requires review and recommendation by the Planning Commission.

The annexation area has sewer service and all other urban amenities to the property. It is located within Tier 2 on the Intensification and Growth Tiers Map of the Comprehensive Plan. The goal to “encourage infill and redevelopment to leverage existing infrastructure” supports the Applicant’s request of a zone of annexation of R-12.

The R-12 zoning establishes densities between 8 and 12 dwelling units per acre. The R-12 requested zoning implements the Comprehensive Plan’s Residential Medium Land Use category. This land use designation was amended during the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan process, when the subject property was identified as being a location where increased density would be desired.

The purpose of the R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) zone district is to provide for high density development allowing several types of residential units within specified densities. R-12 may serve as a transitional district between single-family and trade districts. This district is intended to allow a mix of residential unit types and densities to provide a balance of housing opportunities in a neighborhood. This zone may be appropriate as part of a mixed use center. This property is located in a transitional location between the commercial uses along the I-70B corridor and the residential neighborhoods on the west side of the Lewis Wash and 31 Road. The increased separation provided by the wash adds to the compatibility with surrounding zone districts.

In addition to the R-12 zoning requested by the petitioner, the following zone districts would also be consistent with the proposed Comprehensive Plan designation of Residential Medium (5.5 to 12 du/ac).

- a. R-8 (Residential – 8 du/ac)
- b. CSR (Community Services and Recreation)
- c. Mixed Use Residential (MXR-3)
- d. Mixed Use General (MXG)
- e. Mixed Use Shopfront (MXS)

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

A Neighborhood Meeting regarding the proposed Annexation and Zoning was held on Zoom on June 8, 2022, in accordance with Section 21.02.080 (e) of the Zoning and Development Code. The Applicant’s representative and City staff were in attendance, along with approximately 13 participants.

An official development application was submitted to the City of Grand Junction for review on July 7, 2022. After submitting the application, the Applicant modified the request for zoning and held a second neighborhood meeting to ensure compliance with notification requirements. That meeting was held on September 12, 2022 via Zoom. The Applicant’s representative and City staff were in attendance, along with approximately 7 participants.

During the June neighborhood meeting, concerns on the project were raised about traffic, access, and what is permitted in the R-8 zone district, specifically about height restrictions. In September, the neighborhood concerns were again primarily focused on traffic impacts on E ½ Rd along with access to the site. Additional concerns raised at this meeting were about the presence of floodplain, the lack of a development plan at the annexation stage, impacts on emergency services, and the increase in density.

Notice was completed consistent with the provisions in Section 21.02.080(g) of the City's Zoning and Development Code. The subject property was posted with an application sign on November 22, 2022. Mailed notice of the public hearings before Planning Commission and City Council in the form of notification cards was sent to surrounding property owners within 500 feet of the subject property on December 2, 2022. The notice of the Planning Commission public hearing was published December 6, 2022 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel.

It was brought to the attention of staff that the property posting had come down at an unknown date prior to the December 13, 2022 Planning Commission hearing. In addition, there was a flaw on the notification cards that listed the proposed zoning at the original request of R-8 instead of the revised request of R-12. The item was requested to be rescheduled so that notice could be redone to ensure absolute compliance with Section 21.02.080(g).

Revised notice was completed consistent with the provisions in Section 21.02.080 (g) of the City's Zoning and Development Code. The subject property was posted with an application sign on December 13, 2022. Mailed notice of the public hearings before Planning Commission and City Council in the form of notification cards was sent to surrounding property owners within 500 feet of the subject property on December 29, 2022. The notice of the Planning Commission public hearing was published January 3, 2023 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel.

Following the January 10, 2023 public hearing with the Planning Commission staff was notified that the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel did not publish the legal notice for the Planning Commission hearing on January 3, 2023; it was run on January 4, 2023. This does not meet the provision of Section 21.02.080(g) for published notice to be provided 7 days in advance of the hearing. As a result, the scheduled public hearing was continued from the January 18, 2023 City Council agenda to the February 1, 2023 City Council agenda to allow for the item to be published again. A new notice of a public hearing was printed in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel on January 25, 2023.

An online public hearing was conducted on the GJSpeaks platform.

ANALYSIS

Annexation Analysis

The property is currently adjacent to existing city limits to the south. The necessary one sixth contiguity requirements of State Statutes for annexation is met through a serial

annexation. The property owner has signed a petition for annexation.

Staff has found, based on review of the petition and knowledge of applicable state law, including the Municipal Annexation Act Pursuant to C.R.S. 31-12-104, that the Grand Valley Estates Annexation is eligible to be annexed because of compliance with the following:

- a) A proper petition has been signed by more than 50% of the owners and more than 50% of the property described. The petition has been signed by the owners of all properties or 100% of the owners and includes 100% of the property described excluding right-of-way.
- b) Not less than one-sixth of the perimeter of the area to be annexed is contiguous with the existing City limits. The Grand Valley Estates Annexation meets the 1/6 contiguity requirements for annexation through a serial annexation process. Annexation No. 1 has 16.7% contiguity; Annexation No. 2 has 16.7% contiguity; Annexation No. 3 has 17.9% contiguity.
- c) A community of interest exists between the area to be annexed and the City. This is so in part because the Central Grand Valley is essentially a single demographic and economic unit and occupants of the area can be expected to, and regularly do, use City streets, parks, and other urban facilities.
- d) The area is or will be urbanized in the near future. The property has existing urban utilities available is located near major developments along the I-70B corridor and established residential neighborhoods. The Applicant has stated that the requested annexation is anticipation of residential development.
- e) The area is capable of being integrated with the City. The proposed annexation area is adjacent to the city limits on the south side and is currently interconnected with existing urban services. Utilities and City services are available and currently serve the existing urban area adjacent to this site.
- f) No land held in identical ownership is being divided by the proposed annexation. The entire property owned by the applicant is being annexed.
- g) No land held in identical ownership comprising 20 contiguous acres or more with an assessed valuation of \$200,000 or more for tax purposes is included without the owner's consent. The entire property owned by the applicant is being annexed.

Please note that the annexation petition was prepared by the City.

Zone of Annexation Analysis

The criteria for review are set forth in Section 21.02.140 (a) and includes that the City may rezone property if the proposed changes are consistent with the vision, goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and must meet one or more of the following rezone

criteria as identified:

- (1) Subsequent events have invalidated the original premises and findings; and/or

The property owners have petitioned for annexation into the City limits and requested zoning of R-12 which is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designation of Residential Medium (5.5 to 12 du/ac). Since the Applicant's properties are currently in the County, the annexation of the property is a subsequent event that will invalidate one of these original premises, a county zoning designation. In addition, during the 2020 One Grand Junction process, the land use designation on the property was changed from Residential Medium Low (2 – 4 du/ac) to Residential Medium (5.5 – 12 du/ac). Annexations into the City must be zoned in compliance with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The requested zoning of R-12 both implements the Residential Medium future land use designation and is consistent with the intent of the land use change to increase density. Staff finds this criterion has been met.

- (2) The character and/or condition of the area has changed such that the amendment is consistent with the Plan; and/or

The character or condition of the area has not changed much over the past several decades. The majority of the residential neighborhoods in the vicinity were established between the mid-1980s and the early 2000s. Long Park was built in 2007 and the first commercial development to the south was constructed in 2009. Staff finds that there have not been significant changes and this criterion has not been met.

- (3) Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed; and/or

Existing public and community facilities and services are available to the annexation and are sufficient to serve land uses associated with the proposed R-12 zone district when developed. The property has access from E ½ Road and will construct additional improvements with any further development on the site. Sanitary sewer located within the right-of-way is already available to the site. Domestic water service is available through a Clifton Water District water line to the site in E ½ Road and the area can be served by Xcel Energy for electricity and natural gas.

To the west, just over one mile, is Fruitvale Elementary School. Both Grand Mesa Middle School and Central High School are under 1/3-mile east of the site. The site is located just north of the I-70B corridor, with shopping available in the Clifton commercial district under a mile away. The property is located within the Clifton Fire District, with the closest station located at 3254 F Road, approximately 1.5 miles from the property. Staff has found the public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of the residential land use proposed at the R-12 densities. Therefore, staff have found this criterion has been met.

- (4) An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the community, as

defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use; and/or The subject property and surrounding area are designated on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map as Residential medium (5.5 to 12 du/ac). The proposed zoning designation of R-12 meets the intent of achieving the minimum and desired density for the property with this request, to develop at the high end of the Residential Medium land use category. The closest properties within City limits are across E ½ Road, which are zoned C-1, and to the west of those are properties zoned R-4. For unincorporated areas of the neighborhood, Mesa County has zoned the majority of the area Residential Single Family – 4 (RSF-4) with a few properties having a Residential Office (R-O) or (Planned Unit Development (PUD) zone. The County portions of the neighborhood are largely built out as low density residential, park, and educational facilities. The Land Use Map defines the immediate properties to the north of the site, between the Lewis Wash, F Rd, and Long Park, as Residential Medium and the area south of E 1/2 Road as Commercial. With most of the area already being developed at lower densities or reserved for commercial, civic, and institutional uses, there is a need for the middle-density housing that the R-12 zone district provides. Staff finds that this criterion has been met.

(5) The community or area, as defined by the presiding body, will derive benefits from the proposed amendment.

Annexation and zoning of the property will create additional land within the City limits for growth and help fill in the patchwork of unincorporated and/or urban area that is adjacent to the City limits. The annexation is also consistent with the City and County 1998 Persigo Agreement. The requested zone district provides housing within a range of density that has been defined as urban densities in the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan and is consistent with the needs of the community. This principle is supported and encouraged by the Comprehensive Plan and furthers the plan's goal of promoting a diverse supply of housing types that meet the needs of all ages, abilities, and incomes identified in Plan Principle 5: Strong Neighborhoods and Housing Choice, Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, Staff finds that this criterion has been met.

Section 21.02.160 (f) of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code provides that the zoning of an annexation area shall be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and the criteria set forth. Though the R-8 zone district as well the CSR and Mixed Use zone districts could be considered in a Residential Medium Land Use area, the R-12 zone district is consistent with the recommendations of the Plan's Land Use Map and provides a much-needed missing housing type to benefit the community.

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

In addition to the above criteria, the City may rezone property if the proposed changes are consistent with the vision, goals, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The following provides an analysis of the relevant sections of the Comprehensive Plan that support this request.

Implementing the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezone to R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) implements the following Plan principles, goals, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

- Land Use Plan: *Relationship to Existing Zoning*
 - Requests to rezone properties should be considered based on the Implementing Zone Districts assigned to each Land Use Designation. As a guide to future zoning changes, the Comprehensive Plan states that requests for zoning changes are required to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
 - The 2020 Comprehensive Plan provides the subject property with a land use designation of Residential Medium. As outlined in the background section of this staff report, the R-12 zone district is a permissible district to implement the Residential Medium designation.

- Plan Principle 3: *Responsible and Managed Growth*
 - Goal: Support fiscally responsible growth and annexation policies that promote a compact pattern of growth...and encourage the efficient use of land.
 - Goal: Encourage infill and redevelopment to leverage existing infrastructure.
 - The proposed rezone will provide for a higher density of development in an area of the City where infrastructure is readily available. The higher density implements a more compact pattern of growth, utilizing a smaller footprint for a greater number of residential units.

- Plan Principle 5: *Strong Neighborhoods and Housing Choices*
 - Goal: Promote more opportunities for housing choices that meets the needs of people of all ages, abilities, and incomes.
 - The R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) zone district is an important zone district to provide the 'missing middle' housing product types. The provision of this zone district in this area can help to fill in gaps in available housing for the community.

- Plan Principle 6: *Efficient and Connected Transportation*
 - Goal: Encourage the use of transit, bicycling, walking, and other forms of transportation.
 - The subject property is located at the intersection of 31 Road, which is part of the City's Active Transportation Corridor that connects to the Colorado Riverfront Trail. This is a safe pedestrian and cyclist east-

west route through this part of the City and can connect to other trails into the more central areas. In addition, this infill project is located within an easy walking distance to both a middle and high school, as well as a County park.

- Chapter 3 – *Land Use and Growth: Intensification and Tiered Growth Plan*
 - Subject property is located within Tier 2 (Suburban Infill) – In Tier 2, the City should promote the annexation of those parcels which are surrounded by, and or have direct adjacency to, the City limits of Grand Junction. Annexation and development of these parcels will provide development opportunities while minimizing the impact on infrastructure and City services.
 - This property is a prime example of suburban infill, with much of the area around it having already been developed or in the process of urbanizing. Annexing and zoning this property to R-12 will allow for maximization of existing infrastructure

RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

After reviewing the Grand Valley Estates Zone of Annexation, ANX-2022-478 request for the property located at northeast corner of 31 Rd and E ½ Rd from County Residential Single Family – 4 (RSF-4) to a City R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac), the following findings of facts have been made:

Annexation

1. Based on review of the petition and knowledge of applicable state law, including the Municipal Annexation Act Pursuant to C.R.S. 31-12-104, staff finds the Grand Valley Estates Annexation is eligible to be annexed because of compliance with the seven (7) criteria (a through g) found in the Statutes.

Zone of Annexation

2. The request conforms with Section 21.02.140 of the Zoning and Development Code.

3. The request is consistent with the vision (intent), goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

This item was presented to the Planning Commission at the January 10, 2023 regular meeting. There was significant discussion on safety and traffic along E 1/2 Rd, deteriorating roadway conditions, capacity of schools as well as the impact of the new charter school, and compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan. A motion was made to recommend approval of the request, which failed 1 to 6.

FISCAL IMPACT:

As the property is developed, property tax levies and municipal sales and use tax will be collected, as applicable. For every \$1,000,000 of actual value, City property tax revenue on residential property at the current assessment rate would be approximately \$620 annually. If the property develops at the estimated 137-205 dwelling units with an estimated value of \$375,000 each, the estimated annual property tax revenue (at the current residential assessment rate) would be approximately \$26,660 - \$39,893 per year based on the estimated units built. Sales and use tax revenues will be dependent on construction activity and consumer spending on City taxable items for residential and commercial uses. City services are supported by a combination of property taxes and sales/use taxes.

Fiscal Impacts by City Departments

Police

Based on the proposed annexation, the expected impact on the need for additional officers is an expected increase of .9 (rounded) additional officers to maintain our current ratio of .0021 officers (authorized)/city resident (67,000 residents).

The annexation takes into account the effects of increased calls for service, routine patrol, traffic enforcement, response time impact and reported civil issues such as neighbor disputes, runaways and other non-criminal and non-traffic related calls for service.

This impact is assuming an increase of 171 residences (the middle of the potential increase) with an average of 445 (rounded) people residing in all of that housing. These numbers reflect using 10.6 residences per acre (R-12 proposed zoning of 137-205 units on 16.14 acres) and the Colorado average occupancy per residence of 2.6 people). The proposed buildup of this property does reflect the same density that is currently in the surrounding area.

NOTE:

The daytime population of Grand Junction is much higher than the residential population. Grand Junction is the main transportation hub, shopping hub and medical hub for the entire 155,000 residents of Mesa County and the majority of Northwestern Colorado, Southeastern Utah and is a major vacation travel spot. It is therefore imperative that we maintain the current staffing levels of the police department to meet the demands of city residents, county residents and visitors to the city. mperative that we maintain the current staffing levels of the police department to meet the demands of city residents, county residents and visitors to the city.

Public Works

Public Works - The annexation takes in 555 feet of frontage of E ½ Road (Orchard Ave) that is designated as a collector road on the Grand Valley Circulation Plan. Mesa County is currently under design for the reconstruction of E ½ Road to a full collector at no capital expense to the City. Construction is slated for 2023.

The City will be responsible for maintenance costs associated with the E ½ Road

frontage. Street sweeping, snow removal, striping, and street lighting is estimated at \$420/year. Chip seal is anticipated in 2027 at an expense of \$3600.

The developer will also be constructing the east half of 31 Road along the west side of the development. The City will reimburse the developer for constructing the western 16 feet of 31 Road with Transportation Impact Fees. The City has \$200,000 in the 2023 budget under the transportation impact fee fund.

Fire

Currently, the property is in the Clifton Fire Protection District. The Fire District collects a 11.5520 mill levy that generates \$64.81 per year in property taxes for the 17 acres. If annexed, the property will be excluded from the Clifton Fire Protection District and the City's 8 mills will generate \$44.88 per year.

This area will be served by the new Fire Station 8 at 441 31 Road. This station is planned to open in January 2023 and response times from the station to this annexation area will be within the National Fire Protection Association response time standards.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

I move to (adopt/deny) Resolution No. 11-23, a resolution accepting a petition to the City Council for the annexation of lands to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, the Grand Valley Estates Annexation, approximately 17.42 acres, located at the northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road and adopt Ordinance No. 5123 annexing territory to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, Grand Valley Estates Annexation, approximately 17.42 acres, located at the northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road, on final passage and order final publication in pamphlet form.

I move to (adopt/deny) Ordinance No. 5124, an ordinance zoning the Grand Valley Estates Annexation to R-12 (Residential - 12 du/ac) zone district on final passage and order final publication in pamphlet form.

Attachments

1. Grand Valley Estates Development Application
2. Site Maps and Photo
3. Annexation Schedule - Table - Grand Valley Estates Annexation_Revised
4. Neighborhood Meeting Information
5. Public Correspondence
6. Grand Valley Estates Annexation Plat
7. Sign Posting Summary
8. Resolution Accepting Petition for Annexation
9. Zone of Annexation Ordinance - Grand Valley Estates
10. Planning Commission Minutes - 2022 - December 13 - Draft
11. Planning Commission Minutes - 2023 - January 10 - Draft
12. GVE Annexation Ordinance

Development Application

We, the undersigned, being the owner's of the property adjacent to or situated in the City of Grand Junction, Mesa County, State of Colorado, as described herein do petition this:

Petition For: Annexation/Zone of Annexation

Please fill in blanks below only for Zone of Annexation, Rezones, and Comprehensive Plan Amendments:

Existing Land Use Designation: Residential Medium

Existing Zoning: RSF-4

Proposed Land Use Designation: Residential Medium

Proposed Zoning: R-8

Property Information

Site Location: NE Corner of E 1/2 Road and 31 Road

Site Acreage: 16.14 AC

Site Tax No(s): 2943-102-00-020

Site Zoning: RSF-4 (County)

Project Description: Annex into City of Grand Junction with R-8 Zone

Property Owner Information

Name: Grand Junction Venture LLC

Street Address: 18 Biltmore Estates

City/State/Zip: Phoenix, AZ 85016

Business Phone #: 847-502-3966

E-Mail: joe@metrowestdevelopment.

Fax #: n/a

Contact Person: Joe Gannett

Contact Phone #: 847-502-3966

Applicant Information

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Business Phone #: _____

E-Mail: _____

Fax #: _____

Contact Person: _____

Contact Phone #: _____

Representative Information

Name: Clearwell, PLLC

Street Address: 2135 Blake Blvd SE

City/State/Zip: Cedar Rapids, IA 52403

Business Phone #: 319-654-4911

E-Mail: jmailander@clearwelleng.com

Fax #: n/a

Contact Person: Joseph W Mailander


Contact Phone #: 319-654-4911

NOTE: Legal property owner is owner of record on date of submittal.

We hereby acknowledge that we have familiarized ourselves with the rules and regulations with respect to the preparation of this submittal, that the foregoing information is true and complete to the best of our knowledge, and that we assume the responsibility to monitor the status of the application and the review comments. We recognize that we or our representative(s) must be present at all required hearings. In the event that the petitioner is not represented, the item may be dropped from the agenda and an additional fee may be charged to cover rescheduling expenses before it can again be placed on the agenda.


Signature of Person Completing the Application: _____

Date: _____

Signature of Legal Property Owner:  _____

Date: 5/13/22

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION




0 0.1 0.2 Miles

 Annexation

 City Limits


GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION



 Annexation

 City Limits

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION - LAND USE




0 0.1 0.2 Miles



Annexation Boundary

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION - ZONING



0 0.1 0.2 Miles




Annexation

City Zoning

County Zoning

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION - UTILITIES



NON-CITY FIBER

SEWER

CLIFTON WATER

CITY LIMITS

Date Created: 11/22/2022

CITY OF
Grand Junction
COLORADO



View of the subject property
looking north from E ½ Road

February 1, 2023
March 4, 2023

ANNEXATION SCHEDULE				
December 7, 2022		Referral of Petition, Intro Proposed Ordinance, Exercise Land Use		
December 13, 2022		Planning Commission Considers Zone of Annexation		
January 4, 2023		City Council Intro Proposed Zoning Ordinance		
January 11, 2023	January 18, 2023	City Council Accept Petition/Annex and Zoning Public Hearing		
January 18, 2023	February 19, 2023	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning		
ANNEXATION SUMMARY				
File Number		ANX-2022-478		
Location		NE Corner of 31 Rd and E ½ Rd		
Tax ID Number(s)		2943-102-00-020		
Number of Parcel(s)		1		
Existing Population		0		
No. of Parcels Owner Occupied		0		
Number of Dwelling Units		0		
Acres Land Annexed		17.13		
Developable Acres Remaining		17.13		
Right-of-way in Annexation		E ½ Rd		
Previous County Zoning		RSF-4		
Proposed City Zoning		R-12		
Surrounding Zoning:	North:	County RSF-4		
	South:	County RSF-4/City C-1		
	East:	County RSF-4 (Long’s Park)		
	West:	County RSF-4		
Current Land Use		Vacant Land		
Proposed Land Use		Residential Medium		
Surrounding Land Use:	North:	Residential Medium		
	South:	Commercial		
	East:	Parks & Open Space		
	West:	Parks & Open Space/Residential Low		
Comprehensive Plan Designation:		Residential Medium		
Zoning within Comprehensive Plan Designation:		Yes:	X	No:
Values:	Assessed	\$5,610		
	Actual	\$21,240		
Address Ranges		3100 to 3116 E ½ Rd, even only		
Special Districts:	Water	Clifton		
	Sewer	Persigo		
	Fire	Clifton		
	Irrigation/Drainage	Palisade Irrigation/GVDD		
	School	D51		
	Pest	Grand River Mosquito Control District		

Neighborhood Meeting Summary

A neighborhood meeting was held on Monday, June 12th on zoom to inform neighbors about the intent to submit an annexation and zone of annexation application for a property located at the NE corner of E ½ Rd. and 31 Rd. There were 7 participants and the meeting lasted approximately 40 minutes from 5:30–6:10 pm.

Ty Johnson, with Kaart Planning, presented an overview of the annexation and zone of annexation request including an overview of the timeline of events and opportunities for public comment in the future. After the presentation, questions were answered from meeting participants. Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner with the City of Grand Junction, was in attendance and answered questions from participants regarding the City's regulations and development processes.

The following topics were addressed during the discussion portion of the meeting:

- Impacts to traffic in the area, and more specifically on E ½ Rd.
- Future access locations for development on the site.
- Questions regarding annexation and whether other properties in the area would be forced to annex.
- Questions about the presence of floodplain and how development will occur in the presence of floodplain.
- Requests for the property to be vacant and exist as a buffer between Clifton and Grand Junction.
- Questions about the plan for development. Complaints that there is no plan presented with the annexation request.
- Questions about how this property can go from RSF4 zoning in the County to R12.
- Concerns about the impact this development will have on emergency services and whether police and fire will be able to protect additional residents.
- Questions about when public hearings will be scheduled.
- Questions about who was sent a letter about the neighborhood meeting.
- Concerns that nearby residents are losing the country life they once had.
- Questions about why the developer has re-submitted the application with an R12 request, from a previous R8 request.

AREC 12 LLC
PO BOX 29046
PHOENIX AZ 85083-9046

BELLOTTI AARON FRANCIS
BELLOTTI HANNAH KATHLEEN
3094 WALNUT PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5638

BERCHDORF STEVEN DONALD
3096 CEDAR DR
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5624

BONINE ROSEMARY
BONINE RICHARD W
3109 E 1/2 RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-6013

BOWMAN FRANK LEROY
BOWMAN GLENICE K
PO BOX 23939
SILVERTHORNE CO 80498-3939

BROUGHTON ROCHELLE LEA
3098 CEDAR DR
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5624

CASE BARBARA L
CASE DOUGLAS R
3093 EVANSTON AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4309

CASTER CECIL D
CASTER AMY C
3094 PINYON PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5634

CENTRO DE LA FAMILIA DE UTAH
525 S 300 W
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84101-2503

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
NICOLE GALEHOUSE
250 N 5TH ST
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81501-2628

CLEARWELL PLLC
JOSEPH W MAILANDER
2135 BLAKE BLVD SE
CEDAR RAPIDS IA 52403-2823

CLOTE ELISE NICOLE
BISBEE THOMAS CHARLES
580 31 RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5667

DEARBORN DAVID H
DEARBORN JEANETTE E
3093 WALNUT PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5637

DEFRAK MATTHEW JOHN
1926 RUDDY CT
JOHNSTOWN CO 80534-9248

ESPINOZA FRANCISCO
ESPINOZA CLAUDIA A
3658 RIDGE DR
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81506-8497

FRUITVALE ESTATES
REX NYE
542 HOOVER CT
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5896

GALLEGOS KARLA LILIANA MARTINEZ
GALLEGOS VALERIA MARTINEZ
3095 WALNUT PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5637

GIBSON EDWARD R
3092 WALNUT PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5638

GIDEON KEN
GIDEON TUESDAY
3091 EVANSTON AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4309

GRAND JUNCTION VENTURE LLC
18 BILTMORE ESTATES
PHOENIX AZ 85016-2822

HOOVER MELVIN L ESTATE
HOOVER RODNEY WAYNE
3095 E 1/2 RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5608

HUFF ROBERT WADE II
HUFF ROSEMARY PEARSON
3094 CEDAR DR
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5624

KAART PLANNING & LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE
TY JOHNSON
734 MAIN ST
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81501-3598

KILPATRICK OXFORD HOLDINGS LLC
3357 SOPHIA CT
LOVELAND CO 80537-8811

KNEZ PAUL M
KNEZ SHERRIE R
3094 BOOKCLIFF AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4326

LAVEN JOSHUA D
3096 EVANSTON AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5630

LAWS DAVID
LAWS ELISA
3093 BOOKCLIFF AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4323

LINDEMANN GEORGE M
3094 EVANSTON AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5630

MADDALONE RICHARD L
MADDELONE CATHERINE I
3097 CEDAR DR
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5623

MARQUEZ NORMAN G
MARQUEZ CONNIE F
544 31 RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5733

MCDANIEL DILLON
3097 EVANSTON AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4309

MCELWAIN BLAKE E
MCELWAIN SHERI A
542 31 RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5733

MENDOZA LARISA GUADALUPE
RUBALCABA
548 31 RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5733

MESA COUNTY
PUBLIC SITE
PO BOX 20000
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81502-5024

MIRELES SAMANTHA N
MIRELES MELITON M JR
3096 WALNUT PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5638

MONTOYA SAMUEL
MONTOYA MARGARITA
3095 CEDAR DR
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5623

MORELLI CARLA A
MORELLI MICHAEL E
8459 S 1275 E
SANDY UT 84094-1363

OGLESBY CAROL A
3095 EVANSTON AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4309

OTT ADAM C
OTT JENNIFER L
5131 WIGHTMAN CT
HOUSTON TX 77069-2036

PEARCE FAMILY REV TRST DTD JAN
30 2004
3093 PINYON PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5633

PERIMAN KENNETH DOUGLAS
582 31 RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5667

POTTER CORY LEE
2277 L RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81505-9352

ROBERT & VIVIAN MARTINEZ 2004
TRUST
MARTINEZ ROBERT T, VIVIAN J, & RAY
12061 MARBEL AVE
DOWNEY CA 90242-2657

ROBERT CHARLES BUCKLEY REV LIV
TRST
3096 PINYON PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5634

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GUN CLUB LLC
545 31 RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5772

RUPE BRANDON C
3097 WALNUT PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5637

SCOTT MARIA GUADALUPE NARVAEZ
12716 ROSS AVE
CHINO CA 91710-3655

SHARPE FREDERICK M
BROSIG MARIAN RUTH
3097 BOOKCLIFF AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4323

SKARE DOUGLAS D
SKARE MARGARET F
3093 HOISINGTON AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4312

STEWART JARED ODELL
3099 CEDAR DR
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5623

TOLLE GREGORY G
TOLLE DIANE L
3101 F RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5915

WALDSCHMIDT CHARLES D
WALDSCHMIDT SHELLA MARIE
3092 PINYON PL
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5634

WAL-MART REAL ESTATE BUSINESS
TRUST
2001 S E 10TH ST
BENTONVILLE AR 72716-0550

WATSON MARY L
3095 BOOKCLIFF AVE
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-4323

WEBER JOEL C
WEBER LACEY
3092 CEDAR DR
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5624

WELSH EMERY H
WELSH DEBORAH G
3109 F RD
GRAND JUNCTION CO 81504-5915

WOOD THOMAS J
25 ORANGE ST
WEST SPRINGFIELD MA 01089-1129



734 Main Street
Grand Junction
CO 81501
970.241.0745
planning@kaart.com

Note: This is a revised neighborhood meeting update. Please disregard any previous notice you received.

Dear Property Owner,

You are invited to attend a virtual neighborhood meeting on Monday, September 12th at 5:30 pm for a development application for annexation and zone of annexation for a property located at the NE corner of E ½ Rd. and 31 Rd. The subject property is approximately 16.14 acres in size.

A development application for annexation into the city limits of Grand Junction and zone of annexation for the subject property will be submitted to the City of Grand Junction Community Development Department following this neighborhood meeting. The applicant must request a City zone district for the property as a part of the Annexation process. The applicant is requesting a City of Grand Junction zone district of R12 (Residential - 8-12 dwelling units an acre) for the subject property.

An overview of the development application will be presented at the neighborhood meeting and you will have an opportunity to ask questions about the application. The neighborhood meeting will be held on Zoom at 5:30 pm on Monday, September 12th. Please use the link below and then enter the meeting ID and passcode to log into the meeting.

<https://zoom.us/join> or dial in at +1 719 359 4580

Meeting ID: 870 6826 4382

Passcode: 088213

Please reach out directly to me with any questions about attending the meeting, or if you would like me to email you a link for the meeting.

Ty Johnson

Planning Manager

ty.johnson@kaart.com



Subject Property

Public Comment
Received via Email

Nicole Galehouse

From: 1spanishlanguagegirl <broughtonrochelle86@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 2:32 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse
Cc: Jackie Broughton
Subject: Re: Concerns with project ANX-2022-478 Grand Valley Estates Annexation

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

Thank you for your response. I'm just wondering also - did the project get denied or are there still meetings tonight? I noticed on your page online that it said "Denied"

Also, the homeowners don't want a bridge going across the ditch to meet up with Bookcliff. Putting a bridge across the ditch would make it very dangerous for traffic on 31 Road and the increased traffic congestion would make it very difficult for anyone to get out as well as being dangerous. If they put any driveways in, then they need to put it off of E 1/2 or another location closer to the complex - we don't want a bridge over the ditch. Thank you.

On Wed, Jan 11, 2023 at 11:58 AM Nicole Galehouse <nicoleg@gjcity.org> wrote:

Rochelle and Jackie,

Thank you for sending in these concerns. I will make sure they are added to the record.

Nicole Galehouse, AICP

Principal Planner

[970.256.4014](tel:970.256.4014)

nicoleg@gjcity.org



From: 1spanishlanguagegirl <broughtonrochelle86@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 10:44 AM
To: Nicole Galehouse <nicoleg@gjcity.org>

Cc: Jackie Broughton <jackieb@sopris.net>

Subject: Concerns with project ANX-2022-478 Grand Valley Estates Annexation

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

Hi Nicole,

I am reaching out to you regarding the proposed annexation and building you want to do at 31 Rd and E ½ with the Grand Valley Estates. My grandmother and myself are homeowners in the area and we have some concerns that we would like to voice. We tried calling in by phone on 1-10-23 by 5:30 but the line was already closed. I was going to register online to join virtually but was not sure if registration was already closed because I didn't know we had to register.

Having said that, our concerns are as follows:

Issue 1: The traffic on 31 Road is already bad and people already use our road like it's a racetrack to speed on. Our fear is that putting an apartment complex in will only make traffic on 31 Road a lot worse not to mention cause numerous accidents. We have already had to put speed monitors on 31 Road on several occasions. We also have the traffic from Central High School and people going to Walmart Neighborhood to shop. Putting at least 200 more cars and people on the road in this area would be just asking for more accidents to happen.

Issue 2: Emergency vehicles need to be able to get in and out of the area in case of Fire and/or a medical emergency. We have had numerous fires in our ditch which the Fire Department has to be able to access to put out. More traffic also creates a hazard for the Fire Department and makes their job harder when everyone wants to stop and look at what is going on with the fire. This also puts more of the public lives in danger if the fire department is hindered while trying to put the fire out by increased traffic. It is better for emergency vehicles to have 2 access points for entry and exit to a building or a fire lane. Keep in mind they would also need access to a hydrant or some water source. With increased congestion and traffic this would also be a concern. We have had situations in which some homeowners have had to evacuate due to a fire.

Issue 3: Trees – The trees in the ditch do provide privacy to the homeowners on our side of 31 Road. Removal of the trees would reduce fires with the reduction of dead and dried timber; however, it would also mean that our privacy is now reduced also if not taken entirely away. Homeowners have the right to peaceful enjoyment of their property. The lack of trees would mean privacy is gone as well as the noise of construction and building being bothersome to a lot of people.

Like I said, we tried to voice our concerns, but were not able to join the meeting by phone as the line was already closed and we don't drive so we can't attend meetings in-person to voice concerns like the above. If you have any questions for us, please feel free to reach out. Thank you.

Rochelle and Jackie B. 970-434-8004

Nicole Galehouse

From: Jamie Snodgrass <jamied0169@q.com>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 4:45 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse
Subject: ANX-2022-478 Grand Valley Estates Annexation

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

To Whom It May Concern:

I recently was informed by a neighbor of a proposed subdivision going in on [17.42](#) acres East of 31 Road and North of E ½ Rd. It was stated that the proposal is for 205 units.

My family which includes my husband and two sons live on Bookcliff Ave just east of 31 Road, 5 houses in and we were not given any information about this proposal. It was mentioned to me that you only had to contact people/homeowners within 500 feet of the proposed site. With the location of my home I am not sure how fair that is knowing the large amount of vacant land between the site and the established homes so that we would not have to be formally informed.

From the information I was given, the developer is asking to have this area approved for RSF-12, stating it would fit within the current area. From the information I have found the zoning is RSF-4 with a few RSF-8 so I am not sure how that would fit into the surrounding neighborhoods. This also will be additional traffic to our area and with both a High School and a Middle School in close proximity and a new Charter School slated to begin in the old Rocky Mountain Gun Club location our traffic is very high during start and finish times of schools. If they did approve the entrance with a bridge to enter into our subdivision this would add so much traffic to our quiet neighborhood where the kids feel safe to play outside and ride their bikes. I am hoping a traffic and facility/store study was done and could be provided for all of us who are concerned about the proposal.

I am not opposed to development, I know this is going to happen, but please take into consideration the safety of the families and children in the neighborhoods close by. The children want to be able to be kids and be able to play outside and ride their bikes and not have to worry about so many additional cars driving by their front doors. If you would consider it truly being a like development with staying with the RSF-4 zoning I believe we would be more receptive to this.

So please hear my voice for my family. As I stated if you would keep it RSF-4 then I feel you would have less opposition and more support.

Sincerely,

Jamie Snodgrass

Nicole Galehouse

From: Bill and Cheryl Conrod <bcconrod@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 8, 2023 10:06 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse
Subject: comment, ANX-2022-478, January 10 planning hearing

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

I am a home owner near the proposed Grand Valley Estates Annexation north of E 1/2 road and east of 31 Road. My wife and I protest rezoning from 4(RSF-4) to much higher density R-12 during a planning hearing on January 10. The road infrastructure won't handle this and it will impact the neighboring neighborhood quality. High density housing away from jobs just results in more traffic and resulting problems of congestion, pollution, etc. That is bad city planning, or lack of planning.

In general, the process of re-zoning at the request of developer's money is offensive. A plan was made for various reasons, people made decisions based on that, so stick with the original plan of R-4 zoning.

(signed)
William F. and Cheryl M. Conrod
3091 Walnut Place
Grand Junction, CO 81504

970-712-8684
bcconrod@yahoo.com

Nicole Galehouse

From: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 8, 2023 6:14 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse
Cc: stuart@cqlawfirm.net; rcbuckley@ymail.com; Rod Hoover; Rose Bonine; ewelsh@bresnan.net; Janet Rowland; comdev
Subject: Grand Valley Estates Annexation
Attachments: Oppose R-12 Zoning for NE Corner 31 & E.5 Rds.pdf; 205 Units with Notice.pdf


**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

Nicole,

Attached is the petition of neighbors that were contacted regarding the proposed rezoning. Everyone that we had the opportunity to speak with were opposed to this proposal. I scanned these into a pdf that I posted on GJSpeaks. We will submit the originals to the Planning Commission on the 10th unless these need to be delivered to the Planning Department prior to the meeting. Please let me know the proper procedure to submit the originals.

Respectfully,
Greg Tolle
3101 F Road
970-433-9182

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXA



NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

An application for the following request has been received and tentatively scheduled for public hearings, in the City Hall Auditorium.

PLANNING COMMISSION:

Tuesday, January 10, 2023 at 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL:

Wednesday, January 18, 2023 at 5:30 PM

- Attend the meeting at City Hall, 250 N 5th Street
- Meeting information will be available online by 5 PM on January 3, 2023 at www.GJSpeaks.org
- Comment in advance by 5:30 PM on January 9, 2023
- Comment by phone (970) 609-9688 and enter 4448
- Attend virtually: bit.ly/GJ-PC-01-10-2023 (Case-sensitive)
- For information on the City Council hearing visit www.gjcity.org/129/Agendas-Minutes or call 970-244-1509

ANX-2022-478—Grand Valley Estates Annexation North of E 1/2 Road and East of 31 Road

Consider a request by Grand Junction Venture LLC to zone 17.42 acres from County Residential Single Family – 4 (RSF-4) to R-12 (Residential – 12 dwelling units per acre) located at the northeast corner of 31 Rd and E 1/2 Road.

Planner: Nicole Galehouse Phone: 970-256-4014
Email: nicoleg@gjcity.org



0 0.1 0.2 Miles

Annexation

City Limits

Date Created: 11/22/2022





Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence of Eastbrook Subdivision oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Elisa Laws	3093 Bookcliff Ave	970-433-9004	Elisa Laws
CAROL JONES	3092 Bookcliff Ave	253-4282	Carol Jones
Shelby Laird	3091 Bookcliff Ave	970-691-4716	Shelby Laird
Matt Harris	3090 Bookcliff Ave	970-730-9540	Matt Harris
Carol Oglesby	3095 Evanston Ave	970-260-8303	Carol Oglesby
Jamie Snodgrass	3089 Bookcliff Ave	970-234-9423	Jamie Snodgrass
Joseph Burck	3088 Bookcliff Ave	970-712-7482	Joseph Burck
William F. Kuehn	3085 Bookcliff	970 314-9277	William F. Kuehn
Nicholas	" "	" "	Nicholas
Jeffrey	3082 Bookcliff Ave	970-220-6542	Jeffrey

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence of Eastbrook Subdivision oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Stephanie Pomrenke	564 Eastbrook	(970) 434-3022	
Maureen Beam	564 Eastbrook	(970) 434-3022	Maureen Beam
R. Staats	3089 HEATHERTON AVE	970-778-1719	R. Staats
Patrick Heerick	583 31 RD	970-379-5876	
Matt Hayden	583 31 Rd	720 234 5800	
Lynne Andrews	586 31 rd	970-250-7878	
Lisa Cothran	588 31 Rd	970-640-0631	Lisa Cothran
Sharon Jones	590- 31 Rd	970-549-1460	Sharon Jones
Joe Jones	590- 31 Rd	970-549-1460	Joe Jones
Tressa Jones	590 31 Rd	970-433-8740	Tressa Jones

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence of Eastbrook Subdivision oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Jaqueline Broughton	3098 Cedar Dr. Grand Jct. CO 81504	970-434-8004	Jaqueline Broughton
Robb + Rosemary Huff	3094 Cedar Dr. JJ CO 81504	970-986-9194	
Joel + Lacey Weber	3092 Cedar Dr Grand Jct 81504	970-216-9166	Joel Weber
Pete + Wanda McAd	3087 Cedar Dr. GJC 81504		Wanda McAd
Sandy Peers	3085 Cedar Dr. GJ. CO 81504		Sandy Peers
Jim Peers	3085 Cedar Dr GJ. CO 81504		
Aaron Belmont	3094 WALNUT PL 81504		Aaron Belmont
BRANDON RUPE	3097 WALNUT PL 970-250-6812		

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence of Eastbrook Subdivision oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Hannah Bellotti	3094 Walnut Pl	970-216-1258	Hannah Bellotti
Samantha Niveles	3096 Walnut Pl.	303-513-2925	Samantha Niveles
Karla Martinez	3095 Walnut Place	970-312-6104	Karla Martinez
BOB GIBSON	3092 WALNUT PLACE	970-270-5009	Bob Gibson
Jeanette Dearborn	3093 Walnut Place	970-434-8751	Jeanette Dearborn
David Dearborn	3093 Walnut Place	970-434-8751	David Dearborn
WILLIAM F. CONROD	3091 WALNUT Pl.	970-712-8684	William F. Conrod
Cheryl McConrod	3091 Walnut Place	970-712-8686	Cheryl M. Conrod
Kelly Robb	3089 Walnut Pl.	808-639-9567	Kelly Robb
Rochelle Broughton	3098 Cedar Dr.	970-434-8004	Rochelle Broughton

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence of Eastbrook Subdivision oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
LYLE WEBB	3089 Pinion Pl.	970-462-8669	Lyle Webb
Charlotte Pearce	3093 Pinyon Pl.	970-646-0402	Charlotte Pearce
Amy Caster	3094 Pinyon Pl.	970-773-8426	Amy Caster
Shella Waldschmidt	3092 Pinyon Pl.	970-243-2313	Shella Waldschmidt
R.C. Buckley	3096 Pinyon Pl.	970-261-6000	R.C. Buckley
Diane Arocha	3088 Pinyon Pl.	918-902-5867	Diane Arocha
PAUL AROCHA	3088 Pinyon Pl.	918-313-3634	Paul Arocha
Sandra Kaufmanis	3091 Pinyon Pl.	970-434-8492	Sandra J. Kaufmanis
Judy Mantzoff	3090 Heather Ave	970-523-1357	Judy Mantzoff
Naomi Garcia	3082 Heather Ave	970-434-9498	Naomi Garcia

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Jackie Watters	538 Hoover Ct.	970-697-9113	Jackie Watters
Crystal Meyer	536 Hoover Ct	970-314-0551	Crystal Meyer
Laura Smith	539 Hoover CT	513-309-5005	Laura Smith
Patricia Williams	541 Hoover Ct	970-261-2721	Patricia Williams
DENIS & CRIS RYKE	543 HOOVER CT	847-983-1182	Den Ryke
Bob Cress	534 Hoover Court	970-9859670	Bob Cress
Kathy Rossmann	547 Hoover Ct	970-640-2421	Kathy Rossmann
Fredrick M. Ambuleto	549 Hoover CT	970-773-3824	Fredrick M. Ambuleto
Blake McElwan	542 31 Rd	970-216-6025	Blake McElwan
Louis DeRose, Jr.	3046 E ½ Rd. N.	970-434-1105	Louis C. DeRose Jr.




Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Jean Humble	534 31 RD	970 250 1925	<i>Jean Humble</i>
Jane Humble	534 31 Rd	970 250 6301	<i>Jane Humble</i>
Jared Oaks	536 31 RD	970 589 1532	<i>Jared Oaks</i>
Michelle CRAVER	536 31 Rd	970-366-0934	<i>Michelle Craver</i>
Mark Baker	538 31 Rd	970-640-8064	<i>Mark Baker</i>
Malcolm Sanderson	540 31 RD	970 434 0109	<i>Malcolm Sanderson</i>
Norithy J. Sanderson			
Ray Tafaza	548 Hoover		
Doug Alber	546 Hoover Ct.	970-712-7111	<i>Doug Alber</i>
HOWARD CARPENTER	540	970-644-2618	<i>Howard M. Carpenter</i>

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence of Eastbrook Subdivision oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Elise N Clark	5803 Rd	314-458-4139	
Chris Cote	5803 Rd	314-683-4815	
Sharon Knez			
Sharon Knez	3094 Brookcliff Ave.	970-629-2186	
Paul Knez	3094 Brookcliff Ave.	970-629-2186	

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Cheryl Fiegel	562 Grand Valley Dr 81504	910-523-1599	Cheryl Fiegel
William R. Fiegel	562 Grand Valley Dr, 81504	970-523-1599-	William R. Fiegel
Michael Pottorff	551 Grand Valley Dr.	970-712-8864	Michael Pottorff






Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Craig Hendee	3074 Bookcliff Ave	970-215- 6056	Craig Hendee
Susan Henley	3076 Bookcliff Ave	970-274-4046	Susan Henley
Russell R. Dink	3076 Bookcliff	970-274-9983	Russell R. Dink
Tom Hurda	578 So. Asbury Ct	970 640.1207	Tom Hurda
Kari Perez	576 S. Asbury Ct.	(562)544-9865	Kari Perez
Patricia Silvers	577 S. Asbury Ct	970 200-1400	Patricia A. Silvers
Genie Boese	575 S. Asbury Ct.	523-2023 970- 523 20	Genie Boese
Janet Huff	574 S. Asbury Ct	303 944 1359	Janet Huff
Melvin L. Stoltenberg	573 S. Asbury Ct.	970-434-9067	Melvin L. Stoltenberg
Cheryl A. Brown	571 S. Asbury Ct	970-434-3956	Cheryl A. Brown

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Erin Bruyman	565 Sun Valley St 81504	707 246 5627	
Travis Winters	566 Sun Valley St 81504	770 216 4045	
John Lavery	568 Sun Valley	81504	
John Bohl	567 Sun Valley	81504	
NINA HAWKS	569 SUN VALLEY	81504	
CHRISTOPHER HAWKS	569 SUN VALLEY	81504	
Theodore Paddal	570 Sun Valley	81504	
Barbara Brown	572 Sun Valley St	81504	
Donna Meeder	3072 Bookcliff	81504	
Donna Meeder	3072 Bookcliff	81504	

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Rosemary Bonine	3109 E ½ Road	970-314-2686	Romy Boni
Roy Joe Steed	3073 E ½ Road	651-492-9173	Roy Joe Steed
MICHAEL SEARSO	552 SUN VALLEY	970 812 6485	[Signature]
William Vance	555 Sun Valley St.	720-505-1087	William Vance
David Raff	556 sun valley	970 985-0491	David Raff
Darrell Adderley	557 Sun Valley	970 208 5598	[Signature]
Patrick Hutchinson	558 Sun Valley St	970-623-1672	D. H.
Tyler Roberts	559 sun valley st	435-557-6545	Tyler Roberts
James Hurst	562 Sun Valley St	970 208 5344	[Signature]
DIANA HURST	562 Sun Valley St	970 640 2161	Diana Hurst

Oppose R-12 Zoning for Development at the Corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road

We the following residence oppose the rezoning from RSF-4 to R-12 of the proposed development at the Northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½. We feel the appropriate rezoning would be R-4 or R-5 for the proper infill of our community.

Name	Address	Phone Number	Signature
Myra O'Day	567 S. Asbury Ct.	970-260-6516	Myra O'Day
Dan Okerf	564 S. Asbury Ct	970 523 1106	
Bronwyn Beckstead	566 S Asbury Ct.	970-270-1393	Bronwyn Beckstead
Charles Yost	568 S Asbury Ct	719 641- ²⁵⁸¹ 5561	
Byron Brooks	570 S. Asbury Ct	720-934-8827	Byron Brooks
Phil Hobart	563 Eastbrook St	970-773-4379	
Ronald Dennis	559 Eastbrook St	Grand 51584	
Sandy Campbell	553 Eastbrook St	970-523-0670	Sandy Campbell
Josh Rabin	551 Eastbrook St	970 712 2248	

Nicole Galehouse

From: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 4, 2023 1:50 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse; stuart@cqlawfirm.net
Cc: Janet Rowland; MComdev@mesacounty.us; Kevin.Holderness@mesacounty.us; Pam.Hawkins@mesacounty.us; Rose Bonine; Rod Hoover; comdev
Subject: FW: Grand Valley Estates Property Signs
Attachments: 205 Units.pdf

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

Nicole,

The sign that was reposted on December 13 was taken down on the 14th and there has not been any signage until yesterday. With this scheduled for the Planning Commission Meeting on January 10th it still doesn't comply with provisions of Section 21.02.080 (g) (4) of the City's Zoning and Development Code. With the annexation and rezoning extending west to 31 Road, shouldn't there be signage on 31 Road so the residence of Eastbrook Subdivision be notified of this annexation and rezoning?

In your December 7th Staff Report to the City Council under Fiscal Impacts to City Departments you state that ***the proposed buildup of this property does reflect the same density that is in the surrounding area***. Can you please provide examples to justify that statement?

Respectfully,
Greg Tolle
3101 F Road
970-433-9182

From: Greg Tolle
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 3:29 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse <nicoleg@gjcity.org>
Subject: RE: Grand Valley Estates Property Signs

Good afternoon Nicole,

The sign was just posted between 1:45 – 3:00 this afternoon. There have not been any signs up since 11/23 and doesn't comply with provisions of Section 21.02.080 (g) (4) of the City's Zoning and Development Code.

(4) Property Sign.

(i) When required below, the applicant shall post approved signs giving notice of the application. The applicant shall post at least one sign on each street frontage of the property at least 10 calendar days before the initial public hearing and remain posted until the day after the final hearing. The applicant shall maintain the sign on the property until the day after the final public hearing.

(ii) One sign per street frontage is required.

This proposed annexation and zoning will affect a lot of people in this area and they deserve to be notified. I'm not opposed to development but everything in this area is RSF-4 and this zoning doesn't blend with the existing neighborhoods.

Greg

From: Nicole Galehouse <nicoleg@gjcity.org>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 12:07 PM
To: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Subject: Grand Valley Estates Property Signs

Good morning Greg,

Thank you for reaching out on GJ Speaks about the application signs for the Grand Valley Estates annexation/zoning item. The applicant did post the property on November 22, 2022 (see attached photo). I have asked them to confirm if it's still there & replace if necessary. Let me know if you have any questions.

Nicole Galehouse, AICP


Principal Planner

[970.256.4014](tel:970.256.4014)

nicoleg@gjcity.org



GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION



0 0.1 0.2 Miles

 Annexation

 City Limits

Date Created: 11/22/2022



Nicole Galehouse

From: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:13 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse
Subject: RE: Mailing List

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

Will do, thanks

From: Nicole Galehouse <nicoleg@gjcity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 11:59 AM
To: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Cc: Rod Hoover <hoovrod@gmail.com>; richardbonine127@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Mailing List

Greg,

You should have just received an email from Jake, one of our Planning Techs, with the list. It seems like the email for Richard Bonine bounced back, so if you could forward the list to him I would appreciate it. Thank you,

Nicole Galehouse, AICP

Principal Planner

[970.256.4014](tel:970.256.4014)

nicoleg@gjcity.org



From: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 11:09 AM
To: Nicole Galehouse <nicoleg@gjcity.org>
Cc: Rod Hoover <hoovrod@gmail.com>; richardbonine127@gmail.com
Subject: Mailing List

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

Nicole,

Hope your holidays were enjoyable, could you please send us a copy of the mailing list for the last Notice of Public Hearing?

Nicole Galehouse

From: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 8:06 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse
Subject: RE: Grand Valley Estates Property Signs

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

My wife did see the sign on 11/22 on the way to the store and on the way back it wasn't there

From: Nicole Galehouse <nicoleg@gjcity.org>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 12:07 PM
To: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Subject: Grand Valley Estates Property Signs

Good morning Greg,

Thank you for reaching out on GJ Speaks about the application signs for the Grand Valley Estates annexation/zoning item. The applicant did post the property on November 22, 2022 (see attached photo). I have asked them to confirm if it's still there & replace if necessary. Let me know if you have any questions.

Nicole Galehouse, AICP

Principal Planner

[970.256.4014](tel:970.256.4014)

nicoleg@gjcity.org



Nicole Galehouse

From: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 1:24 PM
To: Nicole Galehouse
Subject: RE: Grand Valley Estates Property Signs

**** - EXTERNAL SENDER. Only open links and attachments from known senders. DO NOT provide sensitive information. Check email for threats per risk training. - ****

Nicole

Thanks for the response, it might have been there for a day or two but that's all, I drive E ½ Road every day.

Greg

From: Nicole Galehouse <nicoleg@gjcity.org>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 12:07 PM
To: Greg Tolle <gtolle@currentsolutionsgj.com>
Subject: Grand Valley Estates Property Signs

Good morning Greg,

Thank you for reaching out on GJ Speaks about the application signs for the Grand Valley Estates annexation/zoning item. The applicant did post the property on November 22, 2022 (see attached photo). I have asked them to confirm if it's still there & replace if necessary. Let me know if you have any questions.

Nicole Galehouse, AICP

Principal Planner

[970.256.4014](tel:970.256.4014)

nicoleg@gjcity.org



Public Comment
Received via GJ Speaks

Grand Junction Speaks

Published Comments for January 10, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting

Grand Valley Estates Annexation

Caryn Romeo

• Jan 9, 2023 • 5:04pm

I just heard about this yesterday for the first time and have not had time to adequately research it, but want to voice a couple of requests before the closing of comments. I live one more block to the West than was notified. First, 205 dwelling units is too high of density for this area. It is too close to Central High School. The character of a multistory structure does not fit in this neighborhood. The greatest complaint though has to do with the traffic on E 1/2. It is very difficult to get out on the street right now when School begins and ends. It is in a highly congested place with Wall Mart Neighborhood Market, Central High, Longs Park, and new commercial development across Warrior Way. Please reduce the density to be compatible with the existing size lots in the neighborhood to the West and East of Central. Also, I am totally against being annexed to the City. It looks as if this approved, enclaving of our Fruitvale area will be nearly complete. I want to see maps to see why Patterson North of us City Limits already. Thank you for your consideration of my comments, Caryn Romeo 560 Sol Ln

Address:

560 Sol Ln

Grand Junction, 81504

Jamie Snodgrass

• Jan 9, 2023 • 4:54pm

To Whom It May Concern: I recently was informed by a neighbor of a proposed subdivision going in on 17.42 acres East of 31 Road and North of E ½ Rd. It was stated that the proposal is for 205 units. My family which includes my husband and two sons live on Bookcliff Ave just east of 31 Road, 5 houses in and we were not given any information about this proposal. It was mentioned to me that you only had to contact people/homeowners within 500 feet of the proposed site. With the location of my home I am not sure how fair that is knowing the large amount of vacant land between the site and the established homes so that we would not have to be formally informed. From the information I was given, the developer is asking to have this area approved for RSF-12, stating it would fit within the current area. From the information I have found the zoning is RSF-4 with a few RSF-8 so I am not sure how that would fit into the surrounding neighborhoods. This also will be additional traffic to our area and with both a High School and a Middle School in close proximity and a new Charter School slated to begin in the old Rocky Mountain Gun Club location our traffic is very high during start and finish times of schools. If they did approve the entrance with a bridge to enter into our subdivision this would add so much traffic to our quiet neighborhood where the kids feel safe to play outside and ride their bikes. I am hoping a traffic and facility/store study was done and could be provided for all of us who are concerned about the proposal. I am not opposed to development, I know this is going to happen, but please take into consideration the safety of the families and children in the neighborhoods close by. The children want to be able to be kids and be able to play outside and ride their bikes and not have to worry about so many additional cars driving by their front doors. If you would consider it truly being a like development with staying with the RSF-4 zoning I believe we would be more receptive to this. So please hear my voice for my family. As I stated if you would keep it RSF-4 then I feel you would have less opposition and more support. Jamie Snodgrass

Address:

3089 Bookcliff Avenue

Grand Junction, 81504

Robert Huff

• Jan 9, 2023 • 4:36pm

The increased traffic, the character of our neighborhood, the ingress and egress to the site at E 1/2 Rd all are very troubling to me. I do not think this is an appropriate plan for that site. It is way too dense for this area. A single family home development would likely have my support as it is in keeping with the fit and tone of our neighborhood. I have lived in Eastbrook for 20 years. We do have a very nice vibe here in spite of the occasional traffic jams during peak school and going to

work hours. I have seen some very close calls between pedestrians-mostly school kids at our intersection of E 1/2 and 31 Road. It defies logic to think that this little intersection could handle all that increased traffic. Safety alone is enough to cause me to wonder about such a radical change in zoning. I am against this re-zoning to R-12.

Address:

3094 Cedar Drive
Grand Junction, 81504
Russell Old Wire

• Jan 9, 2023 • 1:06pm

Google Dwyer my living right next to the to that Annex Station and I think that's it should stay like this instead of being. okay well it starts at 4 but I'm going to change while I think it out and maybe not be that big and go to 8 or something like that where it's not as many people live there so.

thank you

Address:

567 South Asbury ASP why are why Court
Grand Junction, 81504

Tressa Jones

• Jan 9, 2023 • 12:55pm

I join my neighbors in expressing concern regarding the rezoning of this area. While I am normally in support of low-income housing, I do not feel that this neighborhood and roads, etc. can support such a large increase in population and traffic. I take E 1/2 to work daily and already find the 31 Rd/ E Rd intersection to be perilous, with students biking to and from the high school without checking both ways before crossing 31 Road. Adding to this traffic is only asking for trouble, unless the County plans to put in an adequate bike path and traffic light at this intersection. This change promises to lower the quality of life of 31 Road residents in numerous ways: road traffic, safety of residents, taxing of the school system, danger to the eco-system, etc. We already have issues with vandalism and crime along the road and would expect the issues to increase if said changes were to move forward. I implore the board to consider other options.

Address:

590 31 Rd
Grand Junction, 81504
Blake McElwain

• Jan 9, 2023 • 5:05am

This area will not find balance by adding R12 zoning. The majority of homeowners prefer the lower population density here. The roads cannot handle more traffic, they are already in disrepair and crossing E 1/2 road or accessing Patterson is already a challenge. Drivers speed up and down an already narrow and busy 31 road. Stoplights and speed bumps will be required in addition to widening the existing streets to accommodate such an influx of people. I can only imagine that the crime rate will grow as well.

Address:

542 31 road
Grand Junction, 81504
Labecca J Jones

• Jan 8, 2023 • 5:19pm

The proposed annexation is poor planning on the part of anyone who would consider establishing apartments or condos in this area. Doing so is deeply concerning in many ways. To add to the concerns of so many well-spoken neighbors and the surrounding community, I am compelled to add my voice. It is such a shock for this peaceful community to think of such a dramatic and long-term change to a piece of land that serves so many purposes which may go unseen to those who are not part of this much-beloved and needed place of refuge for the county, the people, and also wildlife that is dependent on the land for sustainability. I implore the board and county commission to reconsider this agenda for numerous reasons. One of the many pressing concerns is that 31 road has more traffic than one might expect as many non-residential commuters use it as "cut through" between Orchard Avenue and Patterson. Many drivers are careless regarding speed which has led to numerous accidents that are costly to residents whose vehicles are parked in their driveway or safely on the street. Additional traffic would only add to this already-existing issue which is costly to the homeowners, commuters, and the county. Please keep in mind that this area, though small, offers a much-needed refuge for a variety of wildlife including red-tail fox, raccoons, beavers, doves, ducks, geese, two-horned owls, and the endangered screech owl which is under the watchful eye of the Audubon Society. Reducing their much-needed habitat and access to nesting resources would only increase the risk of extinction to a raptor whose population is already

at great risk. In relation to this is the concern about the irrigation ditch in the area. It is a fast-moving, deep irrigation ditch that is not safe for small children or pets. If there is a significant increase in the population of the area that will have access to a bridge of some kind over the ditch, it will be necessary to build and maintain a barrier to keep innocent lives from falling in or exploring the area around the banks which are a sharp 90-degree angle and filled with soft, thick mud. The hazard for slipping and falling in and getting stuck or being swept downstream is significant and concerning as it is difficult (nearly impossible) to climb out. There is also concern that a significant increase in the population of the area will be a burden on the district 51 school zone. The high school and middle school are already struggling to maintain faculty, staff, and administration. Any increase in the student body would only further increase the stress on the local education system which only adds stress to the students body who is already attending and also those who will be admitted. Another point for consideration is the reduction in property values for homeowners who enjoy a wonderful view of the Mesa from their back porch. If an apartment building obstructs this highly desirable view, the value of the homes will decrease which is unfair to the homeowners who will lose money in property values. I ask the board to consider alternatives. The land under discussion is large and there's certainly potential. Has there been a discussion about extending the park which might include a community garden? Given the opportunity, many local people will benefit from coming together for a collective purpose of feeding, not just their own families, but others who may not have access or resources in terms of fresh produce. This open land is an opportunity. There are many options that have possibly gone without consideration. My question is how do we make this land useful for our community? An apartment building or condos will simply limit the potential for this area and hinder those who are already deeply invested financially and otherwise. Again, I ask the board and county commission to reconsider how best to put this land to use and do so setting aside brick and mortar offers coming from far outside our community with no regard for quality of life for those who live and dwell here.

Address:

2949 East Erika Court
Grand Junction, 81504
Greg Tolle

• Jan 8, 2023 • 4:47pm

Please see the attached signed petitions with over 120 of our neighbors opposed to this rezoning. This petition was taken by volunteers, knocking on doors to bring attention to our neighbors of this planned rezoning. Very few of our neighbors were aware of this, and were astonished as to what is being proposed and the impacts it will have on our community and our quality of life. Everyone that we had the opportunity to speak with, signed the petition and will be sharing this information with those we didn't have the opportunity to contact.

Address:

3101 F Road
Grand Junction, 81504
Blake McElwain

• Jan 8, 2023 • 4:34pm

The addition of R12 zoning does not bring balance to our community. This and the surrounding areas should remain R4 or R5. The majority of the people who live here prefer low density populated areas. The streets in this area cannot support more people. They are in disrepair and E 1/2 road is nearly impossible to cross on a school day. I foresee many accidents on E1/2 as well as Patterson. Hopefully someone will have foresight to install stoplights as needed. Speed bumps on 31 road between the highway and Patterson would be great as well, I am surprised someone has not been hit with the number of cars currently speeding on our streets. Has anyone thought about the possibility of crime in the area increasing?

Address:

542 31 road
Grand Junction, 81504
Joe and Sharon Jones

• Jan 8, 2023 • 3:11pm

We are against changing the zone from R4 to R12. We are concerned about the quality of life from over population in our neighborhood. We live on 31 Road and it is a busy street already and have had two car accidents occur in front of our home in the last few months. We have a land license with the county for land next to our home. We have had deer, foxes, owls and other wild life that is a part of the benefit of living on 31 Road. These things could very well change the ascetics and beauty of this area if the land in our back yard is zoned from R4 to R12 to inhabit multifamily dwellings. I would hope that the quality of life of people in our neighborhood and city would be of a

greater importance to our officials making the decisions for their constituency than for business interest of investors that live out of our state. Dear Public Officials, if this project was proposed in your backyard would you change the zoning from R4 to R12? Sincerely, Joe and Sharon Jones
Address:

590 31 Road
Grand Junction, 81504
Richard Bonine

• Jan 8, 2023 • 8:10am

You zoned in Cross Orchard's as an R-4, please reconsider Grand Valley Estates for an R-4 not R-12.
Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road
Grand Junction, 81504
Denis Ryle

• Jan 7, 2023 • 4:37pm

Why so many units on such a small parcel of land ? Were else has the city changed its zoning from RSF4 to R12?? Why not continue to build single family homes. This is a single family community. Who maintains E1/2 road? City or country ? The traffic you will be adding to E1/2 road a two lane road . At 205 units lets say 300 cars daily that's 2100 cars a week 8400 a month that's 100,800 a year !!!!! Do you think E1/2 road can handle that kind of traffic ?????This is a stupid idea !!!!! What does this due to the value of the homeowners adding apartment buildings and not new homes. I thought part of this land is a flood plain . Why would you build on a flood plain ? Looks like the city has little or no concern for the home owners around this parcel of land .Another question who pays for inner structure water sewer gas electric ? What tax breaks are you giving and for how many years . What about the additional students to our school system who pays for that ? Looks like the home owners will get stuck with these bills !! The right think to do is not change the zoning and build single family homes and respect the wishes of the home owners around this land. Denis

Address:

543 Hoover Ct, ,
Grand Junction, 81504
hi Lee Robert

• Jan 7, 2023 • 10:44am

hi I just wanted to say that I do support Urban growth in the area however I do want to specify that I think the gross should come in the form of single family housing in the area rather than low income apartments my understanding is that low income apartments do not actually a long term benefit Residence Inn areas they pulled back the ability for people to be able to purchase her own single family homes and that is ultimately the goal to help resolve the housing crisis that we are currently dealing with him this climate long term housing Solutions such as single family homes can also be rented out short term which I think is going to be more beneficial option for the county and the area as well as it's residence rather than low income short term rental apartments. I would like to recommend that we use the space in that manner rather than building additional short term housing thank you

Address:

5597 Valley Street
Grand Junction, 1504
Tylee Roberts

• Jan 7, 2023 • 10:32am

My husband and I just bought a home in this area. I support the idea of building single family homes but do not want to see low income housing rental apartments developed in the neighborhood. Building more rental apartments does not help the ongoing housing crisis. It continues it. We need more affordable housing that encourages people to own their homes. Even if the owner of the homes rents out their house this is still more beneficial to the neighborhood and those who live in Grand Junction than another apartment complex.

Address:

559 Sun Valley Street
Grand Junction, 81504
Emery Welsh

• Jan 6, 2023 • 5:18pm

My wife Debbie and I have lived here since 1988. We have enjoyed the semi country atmosphere but we are not anti growth. We were blessed to have a great neighbor in Bill Long. He loved his small farm so much that he donated his land in lieu of development. We have a beautiful family park that was his wish that he didn't live to see. We have a beautiful housing development going in

on the east side of the park and We feel that this would fit in on the subject property instead of high density housing. Thank you Emery and Debbie Welsh

Address:

3109 f rd

Grand Junction , 81504

Vanessa Santos

• Jan 6, 2023 • 4:38pm

The application from the developer to Grand Junction specifies R-8. There is continued inconsistencies w regard to this proposal.

Address:

1524 Crest View Way

Grand Junction, 81506

Vanessa Santos

• Jan 6, 2023 • 4:32pm

A density change from R-4 to R-12 for ~17 acres for this neighbourhood is too much. If one considers the areas that would need to be excluded as unsuitable for building including, Army Corp designated flood zone, irrigation canal and right-of-way and hardscape for parking, driveway, bridges and access roads, that packs alot of density in a much smaller acreage. The result, it would seem would be 3+ storied apartment blocks rather than the touted "mixed use" of single family, and condos and light retail. The goal of infill and utilizing existing infrastructure, while admirable, must also acheve the balance for the quality of life for the existing owners/residents which is R-4. In no case, should a high-rise be considered to "balance" this developers plan. Thier goal to maximize the profit on this land purchase should balance the character of this neighbourhood to much less than R-12. Further I see in the planning maps, which seem inconsistent to change properties along E1/2 to "medium" density as well as change some R-4 to Commiecial. As another commenter pointed out, the addition of another school at the former RMGC property will further impact the density of this area.

Address:

1524 Crest View Way

Grand Junction, 81506

Rosemary Bonine

• Jan 6, 2023 • 4:00pm

Has a planner come out to the proposed annexation property to see the existing subdivisions and how it is all R-4? Or are they just going by paperwork being filled out by the developer and what they feel fits the area? R-4, R-5 fits the area come out and see.

Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Rosemary Bonine

• Jan 6, 2023 • 3:13pm

Meeting Date December 13, 2022 The Zone district R-5 is also consistent with the residential medium land use category of the comprehensive plan. How do you recommend approval without our input?

Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Rosemary Bonine

• Jan 6, 2023 • 1:23pm

E 1/2 Road is the overflow road today for Patterson and I-70B. It is one of the three main east-west roads in the area now. What will be done to address the expected increase in traffic? How are you planning on incorporating bike paths, turn off lanes and sidewalks?

Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Rod Hoover

• Jan 6, 2023 • 8:14am

The impacts that are going to be made by these proposals ,are being grossly underestimated in my opinion. I live on the corner of E 1/2 and 31 road. My family has owned the property for over 90 years. The traffic situation that the planner seems to be downplaying is indeed Dire. If anyone doubts that situation, please come down and observe 31 and Orchard Avenue when school is letting out, or around 5:00. I cringe to think how bad it will be if the proposed Charter school,

(grades 1- 12) is passed. 31 Road has always been slated for realignment to the other side of Lewis wash and now all of that is off the table? What about the park and walking path promised for the curvy 31 Road ,north of E 1/2 Road ? Now there is talk of a bridge off of Bookcliff Ave ? At what cost ? Have those Homeowners been contacted? We all understand the need for infill,and progress is inevitable .But to change from R4 to R 12? Perhaps,R5 might be more appropriate?

Address:

3095 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Greg Tolle

• Jan 5, 2023 • 10:11pm

How were the concerns from the required Neighborhood Meetings from June 8th and September 12th addressed by the Planning Department? Are these just requirements that you need to check off your list, how do we get any answers to what your doing to forever change our neighborhood.

Address:

3101 F Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Rosemary Bonine

• Jan 5, 2023 • 1:33pm

Is there anyway we can consider a subdivision like Country Place on 29 1/2 and D 1/4 roads? 105 homes on 15.5 acers? That size fits into the area quite well.

Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Rosemary Bonine

• Jan 5, 2023 • 11:50am

Looking at the map associated with this proposal. It looks like the surrounding area is mainly RSF-4. I am apposed to changing from the counties RSF-4 to the extreme R-12. R-4 or R-5 is more consistent to the surrounding area.

Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Rosemary Bonine

• Jan 5, 2023 • 11:29am

I am concerned that the R-12 proposed annexation does not fit the same density as the surrounding area. I am unable to find any other R-12 subdivisions in the city limits except by Colorado Mesa University. Can you advise as to other subdivisions that have been developed in the city limits zoned R-12?

Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Greg Tolle

• Jan 5, 2023 • 10:50am

In the presentation to City Council on December 7th under Fiscal Impact the following was stated. The developer will also be constructing the east half of 31 Road along the west side of the development. The City will reimburse the developer to construct the 16 feet of 31 Road with Transportation Impact Fees. The City has \$200,000.00 in the proposed 2023 budget under the transportation impact fee fund. What are the plans to access 31 Road from this development?

Address:

3101 F Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Greg Tolle

• Jan 5, 2023 • 10:31am

Will the proposed annexation and rezoning of 545 31 Road (Rocky Mountain Gun Club) to establish a school on 4.5 acres (MTG-2022-858) have any effect on your calculations that the current infrastructure is sufficient for this rezoning to R-12?

Address:

3101 F Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Rosemary Bonine

• Jan 5, 2023 • 8:01am

How do you compare 83.9 Acres with 205 homes to a proposed 205 dwelling units on only 17

Acres?

Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

Rosemary Bonine

• Jan 5, 2023 • 7:55am

I would like to know how you plan on accommodating a minimum of 400 cars onto E 1/2 Road safely?



Address:

3109 E 1/2 Road

Grand Junction, 81504

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO



SITE LOCATION MAP SCALE: 1" = 800'

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North boundary line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860 being the Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said boundary line S89°59'24"W a distance of 131.40 feet to the Northwest Corner of said WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860; thence continuing along said South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 260.60'; thence the following three (3) courses: 1) N00°06'52"W a distance of 1.00 feet 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 392.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 3) S00°07'01"E a distance of 1.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 392 Square Feet or 0.009 Acres, more or less.

AREAS OF ANNEXATION

ANNEXATION PERIMETER	786.00 FT.
CONTIGUOUS PERIMETER	131.40 FT.
AREA IN SQUARE FEET	392.00 FT ²
AREA IN ACRES	0.009
AREA WITHIN R.O.W.	392.00 FT ²
AREA WITHIN DEEDED R.O.W.	0.009 ACRES
	0.00 FT ²
	0.00 ACRES

LEGEND

ANNEXATION BOUNDARY	
ANNEXATION AREA	
EXISTING CITY LIMITS	

SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS

P.O.C.	POINT OF COMMENCEMENT
P.O.B.	POINT OF BEGINNING
R.O.W.	RIGHT OF WAY
SEC.	SECTION
TWP.	TOWNSHIP
RGE.	RANGE
U.M.	UTE MERIDIAN
NO.	NUMBER
REC.	RECEPTION

SQ. FT.	SQUARE FEET
Δ=	CENTRAL ANGLE
RAD.	RADIUS
ARC	ARC LENGTH
CHD.	CHORD LENGTH
CHB.	CHORD BEARING
BLK.	BLOCK
P.B.	PLAT BOOK
BK.	BOOK
PG.	PAGE
HOR. DIST.	HORIZONTAL DISTANCE

ORDINANCE NO.
PRELIMINARY

EFFECTIVE DATE
PRELIMINARY

NOTE:
THE DESCRIPTION(S) CONTAINED HEREIN HAVE BEEN DERIVED FROM SUBDIVISION PLAT, DEED DESCRIPTIONS & DEPOSIT SURVEYS AS THEY APPEAR IN THE OFFICE OF THE MESA COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER. THIS PLAT OF ANNEXATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A LEGAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, AND IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED AS A MEANS OF ESTABLISHING OR VERIFYING PROPERTY BOUNDARY LINES.


PRELIMINARY

RENEE BETH PARENT DATE
STATE OF COLORADO - P.L.S. NO. 38266
FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
333 WEST AVENUE - BLDG. C
GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY

NOTICE:
ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY MUST COMMENCE WITHIN THREE (3) YEARS AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN (10) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.

DRAWN BY: MJH DATE: 10/24/2022
DESIGNED BY: RBP DATE: 10/14/2022
CHECKED BY: RBP DATE: 10/26/2022





PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIVISION

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 2

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO



SITE LOCATION MAP SCALE: 1" = 800'

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Southeast Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1, thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 a distance of 392.00 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1; thence along the West line of said Annexation NO. 1 S00°06'52"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10, said point is also the Southwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1; thence along said South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 163.77 feet to a point on the West line of Reception No. 3027832; thence the following five (5) courses 1) along said West line N00°06'52"W a distance of 2.00 feet 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 554.77 feet 3) N00°07'01"W a distance of 618.00 feet 4) N89°59'24"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 5) along said East line S00°07'01"E a distance of 619.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING **1,337** Square Feet or **0.031** Acres, more or less.

AREAS OF ANNEXATION

ANNEXATION PERIMETER	2,351.54 FT.
CONTIGUOUS PERIMETER	393.00 FT.
AREA IN SQUARE FEET	1,337 FT ²
AREA IN ACRES	0.031
AREA WITHIN R.O.W.	768 FT ²
AREA WITHIN DEEDED R.O.W.	0.018 ACRES
	25 FT ²
	0.001 ACRES

LEGEND

ANNEXATION BOUNDARY	
ANNEXATION AREA	
EXISTING CITY LIMITS	

SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS

P.O.C.	POINT OF COMMENCEMENT	SQ. FT.	SQUARE FEET
P.O.B.	POINT OF BEGINNING	Δ=	CENTRAL ANGLE
R.O.W.	RIGHT OF WAY	RAD.	RADIUS
SEC.	SECTION	ARC	ARC LENGTH
TWP.	TOWNSHIP	CHD.	CHORD LENGTH
RGE.	RANGE	CHB.	CHORD BEARING
U.M.	UTE MERIDIAN	BLK.	BLOCK
NO.	NUMBER	P.B.	PLAT BOOK
REC.	RECEPTION	BK.	BOOK
		PG.	PAGE
		HOR. DIST.	HORIZONTAL DISTANCE

ORDINANCE NO. PRELIMINARY

NOTE: THE DESCRIPTION(S) CONTAINED HEREIN HAVE BEEN DERIVED FROM SUBDIVISION PLAT, DEED DESCRIPTIONS & DEPOSIT SURVEYS AS THEY APPEAR IN THE OFFICE OF THE MESA COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER. THIS PLAT OF ANNEXATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A LEGAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, AND IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED AS A MEANS OF ESTABLISHING OR VERIFYING PROPERTY BOUNDARY LINES.


PRELIMINARY

RENEE BETH PARENT DATE
STATE OF COLORADO - P.L.S. NO. 38266
FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
333 WEST AVENUE - BLDG. C
GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY

NOTICE:
ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY MUST COMMENCE WITHIN THREE (3) YEARS AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN (10) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.

DRAWN BY: MJH DATE: 10/24/2022
DESIGNED BY: RBP DATE: 10/14/2022
CHECKED BY: RBP DATE: 10/26/2022





PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIVISION

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 2
Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 3

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO



SITE LOCATION MAP SCALE: 1" = 800'

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter to a point on the North line of WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Southwest Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1, thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 said point also being the Southeast Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 2; thence along the Eastern Boundary line of said Annexation NO. 2 N00°07'01"W a distance of 619.00 feet to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 2 being the Point of Beginning; thence along the Northern boundary line of said Annexation NO. 2 for the following three (3) courses: 1) S89°59'24"W a distance of 1.00 feet 2) S00°07'01"E a distance of 618.00 feet 3) S89°59'24"W a distance of 554.77 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 2; thence, the following three (3) courses along the boundary of Reception Number 188299, 1) N00°06'53"W a distance of 1306.00 feet 2) S89°59'24"W a distance of 70.00 feet 3) S00°06'52"E a distance of 1308.00 to a point on said south line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 30.00 feet to the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10; thence along the West Line of said Section 10, N00°06'51"W a distance of 1318.07 feet to the North 1/16th Corner of Section 9 & said Section 10; thence along the North line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, N89°58'25"E a distance of 655.71 feet to the northeast corner of Reception 3027832; thence S00°07'01"E a distance of 698.26 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 771,084 Square Feet or 17.702 Acres, more or less.

AREAS OF ANNEXATION

ANNEXATION PERIMETER	6,559.81 FT.
CONTIGUOUS PERIMETER	1,173.77 FT.
AREA IN SQUARE FEET	771,084 FT ²
AREA IN ACRES	17.702
AREA WITHIN R.O.W.	66,168 FT ²
	1.519 ACRES
AREA WITHIN DEEDED R.O.W.	13,869 FT ²
	0.318 ACRES

LEGEND

ANNEXATION BOUNDARY	
ANNEXATION AREA	
EXISTING CITY LIMITS	

SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS

P.O.C.	POINT OF COMMENCEMENT
P.O.B.	POINT OF BEGINNING
R.O.W.	RIGHT OF WAY
SEC.	SECTION
TWP.	TOWNSHIP
REC.	RANGE
U.M.	UTE MERIDIAN
NO.	NUMBER
REC.	RECEPTION

SQ. FT. SQUARE FEET

Δ=	CENTRAL ANGLE
RAD.	RADIUS
ARC	ARC LENGTH
CHD.	CHORD LENGTH
CHB.	CHORD BEARING
BLK.	BLOCK
P.B.	PLAT BOOK
BK.	BOOK
PG.	PAGE
HOR. DIST.	HORIZONTAL DISTANCE

ORDINANCE NO.
PRELIMINARY

EFFECTIVE DATE
PRELIMINARY

NOTE:
THE DESCRIPTION(S) CONTAINED HEREIN HAVE BEEN DERIVED FROM SUBDIVISION PLAT, DEED DESCRIPTIONS & DEPOSIT SURVEYS AS THEY APPEAR IN THE OFFICE OF THE MESA COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER. THIS PLAT OF ANNEXATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A LEGAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, AND IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED AS A MEANS OF ESTABLISHING OR VERIFYING PROPERTY BOUNDARY LINES.


PRELIMINARY

RENEE BETH PARENT DATE
STATE OF COLORADO - P.L.S. NO. 38266
FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
333 WEST AVENUE - BLDG. C
GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY

NOTICE:
ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY MUST COMMENCE WITHIN THREE (3) YEARS AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN (10) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.

DRAWN BY: MJH DATE: 10/24/2022
DESIGNED BY: RBP DATE: 10/14/2022
CHECKED BY: RBP DATE: 10/26/2022



PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIVISION

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 3

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO

3 OF 3



734 Main Street
Grand Junction
CO 81501
970.241.0745
planning@kaart.com

January 5, 2023

Nicole Galehouse
Principal Planner
Grand Junction Community Development

Re: ANX-2022-478 Public Notice Sign on Property

Dear Nicole,

The intent of this letter is to provide a summary of the posting of the public notice sign on the property subject to land use application ANX-2022-478. It is my understanding that there have been public comments related to this matter, and this summary of events will provide clarity on the public notice sign posting that has occurred to this date.

The public notice sign was posted on the subject property's E ½ Rd. frontage on November 22, 2022. Nicole Galehouse reached out to me via email on December 12, 2022 to inform me that she had received two public comments stating that there was no sign posted on the property. I visited the property on December 13, 2023 to investigate the status of the sign. When I arrived, the sign's frame was still in place where it had been originally posted but the sign had been removed and was located on the ground approximately 50 feet away. I reattached the sign to its frame and secured it firmly in the ground that day.

I returned to the site on January 4, 2023 to check the status of the sign. Once again, the metal frame was still in its original place but the yellow sign was not there and could not be located. I immediately informed Nicole and she had a new sign prepared that day. I picked up the new sign and posted it on the afternoon of January 4, 2023. This time I nailed the sign to the wooden fence post using four (4) framing nails. Please see the images on the following pages that correspond to the above descriptions.

Sincerely,

Ty Johnson, AICP



Picture of the sign originally posted on 11/22/22



The sign frame without sign as it was found on 12/13/22



The sign reposted on 12/13/22 after finding the sign approximately 50' away from the frame



New sign nailed to the fence post on 1/4/23 (the original sign frame can be seen still intact to the left of the fence post)

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

RESOLUTION NO. ____

**A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A PETITION
FOR THE ANNEXATION OF LANDS
TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO,
MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS,
AND DETERMINING THAT PROPERTY KNOWN AS THE
GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION**

**APPROXIMATELY 17.42 ACRES
LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 31 ROAD AND E ½ ROAD
IS ELIGIBLE FOR ANNEXATION**

WHEREAS, on the 7th day of December 2022, a petition was referred to the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, for annexation to said City of the following property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described as follows:

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION

PERIMETER BOUNDARY LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A Serial Annexation comprising the Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 1, Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 2, and Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 3

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 1

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North boundary line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860 being the Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said boundary line S89°59'24"W a distance of 131.40 feet to the Northwest Corner of said WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860; thence continuing along said South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 260.60'; thence the following three (3) courses: 1) N00°06'52"W a distance of 1.00 feet 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 392.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 3) S00°07'01"E a distance of 1.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 392 Square Feet or 0.009 Acres, more or less.

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 2

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Southeast Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1, thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 being the Point of Beginning; thence S89° 59'24"W along the North line of said Annexation NO. 1 a distance of 392.00 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1; thence along the West line of said Annexation NO. 1 S00°06'52"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10, said point is also the Southwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1; thence along said South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 163.77 feet to a point on the West line of Reception No. 3027832 ; thence the following five (5) courses 1) along said West line N00°06'52"W a distance of 2.00 feet 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 554.77.00 feet 3) N00°07'01"W a distance of 618.00 feet 4) N89°59'24"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 5) along said East line S00°07'01"E a distance of 619.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 1,337 Square Feet or 0.031 Acres, more or less.

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 3

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter to a point on the North line of WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Southwest Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1 , thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 said point also being the Southeast Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 2; thence along the Eastern Boundary line of said Annexation NO. 2 N00°07'01"W a distance of 619.00 feet to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 2 being the Point of Beginning; thence along the Northern boundary line of said Annexation NO. 2 for the following three (3) courses 1) S89°59'24"W a distance of 1.00 feet 2) S00°07'01"E a distance of 618.00 feet 3)

S89°59'24"W a distance of 554.77 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 2; thence, the following three (3) courses along the boundary of Reception Number 188299, 1) N00°06'53"W a distance of 1306.00 feet 2) S89°59'24"W a distance of 70.00 feet 3) S00°06'52"E a distance of 1308.00 to a point on said south line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 30.00 feet to the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10; thence along the West Line of said Section 10, N00°06'51"W a distance of 1318.07 feet to the North 1/16th Corner of Section 9 & said Section 10; thence along the North line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, N89°58'25"E a distance of 655.71 feet to the northeast corner of Reception 3027832; thence S00°07'01"E a distance of 698.26 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 771,084 Square Feet or 17.702 Acres, more or less.

WHEREAS, a hearing on the petition was duly held after proper notice on the 18th day of January, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the Council has found and determined and does hereby find and determine that said petition is in substantial compliance with statutory requirements therefore, that one-sixth of the perimeter of the area proposed to be annexed is contiguous with the City; that a community of interest exists between the territory and the City; that the territory proposed to be annexed is urban or will be urbanized in the near future; that the said territory is integrated or is capable of being integrated with said City; that no land held in identical ownership has been divided without the consent of the landowner; that no land held in identical ownership comprising more than twenty acres which, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, has an assessed valuation in excess of two hundred thousand dollars is included without the landowner's consent; and that no election is required under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION:

The said territory is eligible for annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado, and should be so annexed by Ordinance.

ADOPTED the 18th day of January, 2023.

President of the Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE ZONING GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION
TO R-12 (RESIDENTIAL – 12 DU/AC) ZONE DISTRICT**

LOCATED ON PROPERTIES AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 31 ROAD & E ½ ROAD

Recitals:

The property owner has petitioned to annex their 17.42 acres into the City limits. The annexation is referred to as the “Grand Valley Estates Annexation.”

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended zoning the Grand Valley Estates Annexation consisting of 17.42 acres from County RSF-4 (Residential Single Family - 4) to R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) finding that both the R-12 zone district conforms with the designation of Residential Medium as shown on the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan and conforms with its designated zone with the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies and is generally compatible with land uses located in the surrounding area.

After public notice and public hearing, the Grand Junction City Council finds that the R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) zone district is in conformance with at least one of the stated criteria of Section 21.02.140 of the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code for the parcel as designated.

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

ZONING FOR THE GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION

The following parcel in the City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado is hereby zoned as follows:

PERIMETER BOUNDARY LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Grand Valley Estates Annexation

A Serial Annexation comprising the Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 1, Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 2, and Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 3

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 1

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North boundary line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860 being the Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said boundary line S89°59'24"W a distance of 131.40 feet to the Northwest Corner of said WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860; thence continuing along said South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 260.60'; thence the following three (3) courses: 1) N00°06'52"W a distance of 1.00 feet 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 392.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 3) S00°07'01"E a distance of 1.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 392 Square Feet or 0.009 Acres, more or less.

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 2

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Southeast Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1, thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 being the Point of Beginning; thence S89° 59'24"W along the North line of said Annexation NO. 1 a distance of 392.00 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1; thence along the West line of said Annexation NO. 1 S00°06'52"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10, said point is also the Southwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1; thence along said South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 163.77 feet to a point on the West line of Reception No. 3027832 ; thence the following five (5) courses 1) along said West line N00°06'52"W a distance of 2.00 feet 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 554.77.00 feet 3) N00°07'01"W a distance of 618.00 feet 4) N89°59'24"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 5) along said East line S00°07'01"E a distance of 619.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 1,337 Square Feet or 0.031 Acres, more or less.

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 3

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter to a point on the North line of WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Southwest Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1 , thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 said point also being the Southeast Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 2; thence along the Eastern Boundary line of said Annexation NO. 2 N00°07'01"W a distance of 619.00 feet to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 2 being the Point of Beginning; thence along the Northern boundary line of said Annexation NO. 2 for the following three (3) courses 1) S89°59'24"W a distance of 1.00 feet 2) S00°07'01"E a distance of 618.00 feet 3) S89°59'24"W a distance of 554.77 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 2; thence, the following three (3) courses along the boundary of Reception Number 188299, 1) N00°06'53"W a distance of 1306.00 feet 2) S89°59'24"W a distance of 70.00 feet 3) S00°06'52"E a distance of 1308.00 to a point on said south line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 30.00 feet to the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10; thence along the West Line of said Section 10, N00°06'51"W a distance of 1318.07 feet to the North 1/16th Corner of Section 9 & said Section 10; thence along the North line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, N89°58'25"E a distance of 655.71 feet to the northeast corner of Reception 3027832; thence S00°07'01"E a distance of 698.26 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 771,084 Square Feet or 17.702 Acres, more or less.

INTRODUCED on first reading this ____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ADOPTED on second reading this ____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

Anna M. Stout
President of the Council

ATTEST:

Amy Phillips
City Clerk

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
December 13, 2022, 5:30 PM
MINUTES

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 5:33 p.m. by Commissioner Ehlers.

Those present were Planning Commissioners; Keith Ehlers, Kimberly Herek, Sandra Weckerly, Shanon Secrest, JB Phillips, and Melanie Duyvejonck.

Also present were Jamie Beard (City Attorney), Felix Landry (Planning Supervisor), Dave Thornton (Principal Planner), Nicole Galehouse (Principal Planner) and Jacob Kaplan (Planning Technician).

There were 11 members of the public in attendance, and 2 virtually.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of Previous Meeting(s) from November 8th, 2022.

2. Brookwillow Village Filing Six-Vacation of Public ROW **VAC-2022-673**

Consider a request by Senergy Builders, Darin Carei, to vacate a portion of Brookwillow Drive Right of Way totaling 660 square feet in a PD (Planned Development) zone district.

3. Brookwillow Village Filing Six-Vacation of Easement **VAC-2022-674**

Consider a request by Senergy Builders, Darin Carei, to vacate two sections of multi-purpose easement paralleling Brookwillow Drive totaling 1332 square feet in a PD (Planned Development) zone district.

4. Horizon Cache-Vacation of Slope Easement **VAC-2022-771**

Consider a request by Bray Commercial LLC - Sid Squirrell to vacate a slope easement on 2.4634 acres in a C-1 (Light Commercial) zone district.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. Grand Valley Estates Annexation **ANX-2022-478**

Consider a request by Grand Junction Venture LLC to zone 17.42 acres from County Residential Single Family – 4 (RSF-4) to R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) located at the northeast corner of 31 Rd and E ½ Rd.

Discussion

Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner, noted a discrepancy in the proposed zoning between the agenda item and the mailed notices. She proposed continuing the item to the next public hearing.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Duyvejonck made the following motion “Mr. Chairman, on the Zone of Annexation request for the property located at the northeast corner of 31 Rd and E ½ Rd, City file number ANX-2022-478, I move that the Planning Commission reschedule the item to the next public hearing.”

Commissioner Weckerly seconded; motion passed 7-0.

2. Lucky You Rezone

RZN-2022-

570

Consider a request by Lucky You Properties, LLC, to rezone 2.11 acres from PD (Planned Development) to C-1 (Light Commercial) located at 2992 Patterson Road.

Staff Presentation

Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Representative Tom Logue was present and available for questions

Questions for staff

Commissioner Ehlers asked if the site conforms to the C-1 zone.

Public Hearing

The public hearing was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 6, 2022, via www.GJSpeaks.org.

The public hearing was closed at 5:50 p.m. on December 13, 2022

Discussion

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Secrest made the following motion “Mr. Chairman, on the Rezone request for the property located at 2992 Patterson Road, City file number RZN-2022-570, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Weckerly seconded; motion passed 7-0.

3. Zoning & Development Code Amendment-Landscaping Standards

ZCA-2022-170

Consider an amendment to the Zoning and Development Code Section 21.06.040 Landscape, Buffering, and Screening Standards; Section 21.10.020 Terms Defined; Section 21.03.030 Measurements; Section 21.03.080 Mixed Use and Industrial Bulk Standards Summary Table; and Section 21.04.030 Use-Specific Standards of the Grand Junction Municipal Code.

Staff Presentation

Felix Landry, Planning Supervisor, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Questions for staff

Commissioner Duyvejonck inquired about the specific requirements for developers seeking to obtain irrigation certification.

Commissioner Weckerly asked what language specifically would be changing with adoption of the proposed code amendment.

Commissioner Ehlers argued that the proposed amendment did not completely align with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. He asked if there were any code requirements for the location of trees in the city. He inquired about how significant trees would impact private homeowners wanting to develop on their property. He asked if the significant trees are specifically required when designing a landscape plan. He remarked on the potential inequity that preserving significant trees posed for developers and wondered if the punitive measures of the amendment should be removed.

Commissioner Secrest gave an example of preserving significant trees having a potentially adverse impact on the value of a property, and how landowners might be incentivized to clearcut in order to maximize the space available to a developer. He inquired as to who were the most vocal stakeholders in discussions about the proposed amendment.

Staff responded to commissioner questions and comments.

Public Hearing

The public hearing was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 6, 2022, via www.GJSpeaks.org.

Kamie Long commented that these significant trees mainly grow in high-water areas which are typically seen as undesirable for development. She argued that the ordinance was equitable because there would be a measurable metric instead of evaluating each site on a case-by-case basis.

Kelly Maves argued that the canopy exists because of development. She requested that the commission remove the language on significant trees from the proposed amendment.

Don Pedigro remarked on the increased cost incurred by developers if they need to work around the significant trees.

Ron Abeloe added to the comments about development being the dominant driver of canopy creation in the Valley. He also argued that Cottonwoods were not worth consideration because they require too much water to maintain.

Greg Dahl echoed the concerns about increased cost of development. He commented that there should be incentives for developers who choose to preserve trees.

Kamie Long spoke again on behalf of the Forestry Board and addressed some of the comments made by the other attendants.

The public hearing was closed at 7:22 p.m. on December 13, 2022

Discussion

Staff spoke about the existing incentives for developers who choose to preserve significant trees and noted that the existing regulations protect significant trees, but it is up to the discretion of the Community Development director.

Commissioner Weckerly reiterated that the strike and underline of the existing code was unclear as to the actual proposals of this amendment. She added that the significant tree proposal might be especially detrimental to development in areas with limited water availability and would be counterintuitive to water conservation efforts.

Commissioner Herek voiced her support for keeping the language about significant trees in the amendment.

Commissioner Phillips commented that it would be good to identify who was speaking on behalf of the city prior to opening a public hearing. He wondered if the significant trees would hamper development and who should incur the costs of preserving trees.

Commissioner Duyvejonck argued in favor of preserving existing mature trees and that there should be costs and permits in order to remove trees from a site.

Commissioner Secrest outlined the reasons he both supported and was opposed to the amendment.

Commissioner Ehlers spoke briefly on his own desire to maintain tree canopy. He further argued his opposition to penalties against developers who are removing trees to maximize habitable space.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Weckerly made the following motion "Mr. Chairman, on the request to amend the Zoning and Development Code Section 21.06.040 Landscape, buffering, and screening standards and related sections of the Grand Junction Municipal Code, file number ZCA-2022-170, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact listed in the staff report, with the elimination of all reference to the proposed significant trees language."

Commissioner Ehlers seconded; motion failed 1-5.

Commissioner Duyvejonck made the following motion “Mr. Chairman, On the request to amend the Zoning and Development Code Section 21.06.040 Landscape, buffering, and screening standards and related sections of the Grand Junction Municipal Code, file number ZCA-2022-170, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Herek seconded; motion failed 3-3.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Weckerly moved to adjourn the meeting; Commissioner Ehlers seconded.
The vote to adjourn was 7-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
January 10, 2023, 5:30 PM
MINUTES

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 5:33 p.m. by Commissioner Teske.

Those present were Planning Commissioners; Andrew Teske, Ken Scissors, Kimberly Herek, Sandra Weckerly, Shanon Secrest, JB Phillips, and Melanie Duyvejonck.

Also present were Jamie Beard (City Attorney), Felix Landry (Planning Supervisor), Dave Thornton (Principal Planner), Nicole Galehouse (Principal Planner), Scott Peterson (Senior Planner), Dani Acosta (Senior Planner), and Jacob Kaplan (Planning Technician).

There were 28 members of the public in attendance, and 2 virtually.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of Previous Meeting(s) from December 13, 2022.

2. Eagle Estates Extension Request

SUB-2017-605

Consider a Request by Normal Brothers, LLC to Extend for One-Year until January 11, 2024 the Conditional Administrative Approval to Record the Plat for Eagle Estates, 10 Lots on 5.44 acres in an R-2 (Residential-2 du/ac) zone district.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. Grand Valley Estates Annexation

ANX-2022-478

Consider a request by Grand Junction Venture LLC to zone 17.42 acres from County Residential Single Family – 4 (RSF-4) to R-12 (Residential – 12 du/ac) located at the northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road.

Staff Presentation

Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request. Additionally, she gave a brief history of the public notice activities for this item.

Applicant Ty Johnson was present and available for questions/comments.

Commissioner Secrest made the following motion “I’ll make a motion to approve that the proper notification was provided.”

Commissioner Scissors seconded; motion passed 7-0.

Questions for staff

Commissioner Weckerly asked staff to elaborate on the portion of the presentation pertaining to road improvements.

Commissioner Scissors asked the applicant what the advantages of zoning R-12 are.

Commissioner Teske asked the applicant why they were requesting R-12 instead of the previously requested R-8 zoning.

Public Hearing

The public hearing was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 3, 2023, via www.GJSpeaks.org.

Carroll Aamold remarked on the downsides of the site for development. Specifically, he noted the potential flooding issues from Lewis Wash, the increased traffic/parking issues, and safety for pedestrians trying to cross on E ½ Road.

Stuart Foster commented that the R-12 zone designation would be incompatible with the existing surrounding land uses. He also spoke about the current safety and traffic issues on E ½ Road that may be exacerbated by development. He mentioned the neighborhoods near Colorado Mesa University and noted the differences in character between those neighborhoods and the one in question.

R. C. Buckley introduced a petition opposing the development and spoke about the lack of notification. He noted that the nearest development that matched the size of the one proposed was 3 miles away. He wondered why the acreage of the parcel was increasing over time and compared the proposed number of units for the site with that of the Eastbrook subdivision.

Rosemary Bonine requested that the property be annexed to R-5. She stated that E ½ Road is currently the 3rd largest route for east-west bound traffic and that it is not currently wide enough for turn lanes, sidewalks, and paths. She said the existing infrastructure and amenities are overwhelmed and wondered if police/fire would be able to keep up with the potential rise in crime. She pointed to “East States Garden Orchards” as reason to change the zoning to R-5.

Rod Hoover commented that 31 Road had been planned to be relocated on the East side of Lewis Wash. He said that he had not heard anything about a roundabout at 31 Road and E ½ Road and expressed that he would like to be better informed in the future. He brought up that the owner of the property across E1/2 Road was waiting to see what the plan was for the property in question, and worried that another large development might follow suit.

Lisa Cothrun requested that the planning commissioners visit Long's Park. She mentioned that there was wildlife inhabiting Lewis Wash and asked that the developer factor that into their plans.

Marc Baker commented that he wasn't particularly concerned about an R-8 zoning but was worried about the impact and R-12 zoning might have. He remarked on the size and location of the public notice sign.

Joe Jones brought up the importance of the quality of life in Grand Junction and the impact this subdivision would have. He also spoke about the existing traffic problems in the area.

Dave Dearborn questioned the noticing distance for properties adjacent to the proposed subdivision. He echoed concerns of car accidents at 31 and E ½ Road due to increased traffic.

Labecca Jones spoke with the Audobahn society on the endangered wildlife in the area. She also expressed concerns about the proximity of the new development to Lewis Wash and the dangers it could pose to children and pets.

Scott Rafferty listed a number of accidents he has seen along 31 Road and at the intersection with E ½ Road. He expressed that he would like to see development of single-family homes instead of apartments.

Miles Cothrun noted that 31 Road is the main thoroughfare for traffic moving from Patterson to E ½ Road. He commented on the noise and crime at Long's Park. He also commented on the views from his property.

The public hearing was closed at 7:10 p.m. on January 10, 2023.

Discussion

Applicant Ty Johnson noted that there are pending improvements to 31 Road and E ½ Road. He also noted that there would be an in-depth site plan review prior to any development. He reiterated that the R-12 zone is more desirable than R-8 given the relaxed lot requirements and the site's proximity to amenities. He noted that there is a housing shortage in Grand Junction, and this development would provide many new units for residents.

Commissioner Weckerly inquired about the "sliver" of the parcel as shown on the staff presentation. She requested confirmation that the 31 Road improvements would occur through development of the adjacent properties. She wondered whether the City or County would be responsible for completion of 31 Road improvements. She reiterated that the R-12 zone does not allow for Single-Family detached homes. She listed the approval criteria and elaborated on the ways in which the development met or did not meet them.

Commissioner Duyvejonck asked about the proposed 31 Road extension. She said she the "efficient and connective transportation" would be worth more consideration if the improvements to 31 Road continued all the way to Patterson. She expressed agreement with the community that the new development would not be compatible with the surrounding area. She noted that the existing infrastructure didn't necessarily support development of this kind.

Commissioner Scissors asked what the West boundary of the property is. He spoke to the abundance of public input about the R-12 zoning and their arguments that it would not be compatible with the existing development. He asked what the specific difference in max building

height was between R-8 and R-12. He expressed agreement with the community that the new development would not be compatible with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Phillips asked if the plan was to build 31 Road on top of Lewis Wash. He mentioned that there are many new drivers on 31 Road and E ½ Road due to the proximity to Central High School. He talked about the high crime rate at Long's Park and the surrounding area. He was skeptical that this development would provide people a reason to take alternative forms of transportation. He wondered if the site did not meet the "efficient and connective transportation" standards as stated in the staff presentation. He brought up safety concerns for children crossing E ½ Road to attend the proposed charter school to the South.

Commissioner Herek inquired as to how the City/County ensured that the proposed 31 Road improvements continued beyond the Northern lot line of the property in question. She echoed Commissioner Weckerly's concerns about accountability between the City and County over 31 Road improvements. She said one of the main reasons she did not support the annex to R-12 was its inability to allow single-family homes.

Commissioner Secrest reiterated some of the concerns stated by the other Commissioners and expressed agreement with the community that the new development would not be compatible with the surrounding area.

Development Engineer Rick Dorris spoke about the current plan for improvements to 31 Road. He stated that improvements to 31 Road would likely occur via the Traffic Impact studies/fees as a result of development.

Commissioner Teske mentioned that many of the issues brought up by the public would be addressed during site plan review. He noted that the 2020 One Grand Junction Plan was drafted with community input and one of the main considerations was combatting the housing shortage.

Assistant City Attorney Jamie Beard responded to Commissioner questions.

Felix Landry explained some of the planning considerations around crime and traffic.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Scissors made the following motion "Mr. Chairman, on the Zone of Annexation request for the property located at the northeast corner of 31 Road and E ½ Road, City file number ANX-2022-478, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report."

Commissioner Secrest seconded; motion failed 1-6.

2. Roy's RV Annexation

ANX-2021-770

Consider a request by Roy A. Laplante, III, to zone 1.45 acres from County RSF-R (Residential Single Family Rural - one dwelling per five acres) to City I-1 (Light Industrial) located at 2795 Riverside Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Dani Acosta, Senior Planner, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Representative Eric Slivon was present and available for questions.

Questions for staff

Public Hearing

The public hearing was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 3, 2023, via www.GJSpeaks.org.

The public hearing was closed at 8:06 p.m. on January 10, 2023.

Discussion

Commissioner Teske inquired why the preceding annexation (Grand Valley Estates) met the criteria whereas the current item did not.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Scissors made the following motion “Mr. Chairman, on the Zone of Annexation for the Roy’s RV Annexation to I-1 (Light Industrial) zone district, file number ANX-2021-770, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Secrest seconded; motion passed 7-0.

3. Casas de Luz Unit 4 Building Height Amendment PLD-2022-824

Consider a request by Casas Land Partners LLC, to Amend Ordinance 4482 for the Casa de Luz Planned Development to adjust the maximum building height for only Unit 4 from 24’ to 34’, located at 365 W. Ridges Boulevard.

Staff Presentation

Due to a potential conflict of interest, Commissioner Teske recused himself from deliberating on the item.

Scott Peterson, Senior Planner, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Representative Mike Stubbs was present and available for questions.

Questions for staff

Commissioner Weckerly asked where max building elevation is measured from. She also asked for confirmation that the building heights would not be further increased in the future.

Commissioner Scissors reaffirmed that the proposed building height amendment would not increase the overall building height. He inquired as to the topography of the site and the impact of this amendment on the solar efficiency of the sites to the North.

Representative Mike Stubbs elaborated on the request and responded to the commissioner's questions and comments.

Public Hearing

The public hearing was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 3, 2023, via www.GJSpeaks.org.

Ulrike Magdalenski expressed the challenges that the current Casas de Luz development has brought about and her concern about future building height increases.

Christine Tuthill mentioned the previous covenants restrictions on building heights and viewsheds to maintain aesthetics. She also noted the status of projects under construction in the surrounding area.

Russ Carson requested better methods for indicating to residents what the proposed developments will look like prior to construction.

Kendra Samart spoke about the passive solar heating for the properties to the North of the proposed development and how the new buildings could block sunlight from reaching their homes.

Representative Mike Stubbs remarked that the public comments did not pertain to the amendment in question.

The public hearing was closed at 8:44 p.m. on January 10, 2023.

Discussion

Commissioner Weckerly agreed that the buildings do look larger from the road given the drastic slope of the site. She also agreed that the buildings did have a negative impact on the aesthetic of the area, however the buildings were already approved and to deny the proposed amendment would seem like a punishment to the developer.

Commissioner Secret echoed the comments of Commissioner Weckerly.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Phillips made the following motion "Mr. Chairman, on the request to Amend Ordinance 4482 for the Casa de Luz Planned Development to adjust the maximum building height for only Unit 4 from 24' to 34', I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report."

Commissioner Herek seconded; motion passed 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Felix Landry noted that this would be Scott Peterson's last Planning Commission Hearing before his retirement.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Scissors moved to adjourn the meeting.

The vote to adjourn was 7-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

DRAFT

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO
GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION**

**APPROXIMATELY 17.42 ACRES
LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 31 ROAD AND E ½ ROAD**

WHEREAS, on the 7th day of December, 2022, the City Council of the City of Grand Junction considered a petition for the annexation of the following described territory to the City of Grand Junction; and

WHEREAS, a hearing on the petition was duly held after proper notice on the ___ day of _____, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the City Council determined that said territory was eligible for annexation and that no election was necessary to determine whether such territory should be annexed;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO:

That the property situate in Mesa County, Colorado, and described to wit:

**GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION
EXHIBITS A, B, & C**

PERIMETER BOUNDARY LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A Serial Annexation comprising the Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 1, Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 2, and Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 3

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 1

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North boundary line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860

being the Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said boundary line S89°59'24"W a distance of 131.40 feet to the Northwest Corner of said WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860; thence continuing along said South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 260.60'; thence the following three (3) courses: 1) N00°06'52"W a distance of 1.00 feet 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 392.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 3) S00°07'01"E a distance of 1.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 392 Square Feet or 0.009 Acres, more or less.

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 2

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Southeast Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1, thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 being the Point of Beginning; thence S89° 59'24"W along the North line of said Annexation NO. 1 a distance of 392.00 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1; thence along the West line of said Annexation NO. 1 S00°06'52"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10, said point is also the Southwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1; thence along said South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 163.77 feet to a point on the West line of Reception No. 3027832 ; thence the following five (5) courses 1) along said West line N00°06'52"W a distance of 2.00 feet 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 554.77.00 feet 3) N00°07'01"W a distance of 618.00 feet 4) N89°59'24"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 5) along said East line S00°07'01"E a distance of 619.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 1,337 Square Feet or 0.031 Acres, more or less.

Grand Valley Estates Annexation No. 3

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other

bearings relative thereto; thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter to a point on the North line of WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Southwest Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1 , thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 said point also being the Southeast Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 2; thence along the Eastern Boundary line of said Annexation NO. 2 N00°07'01"W a distance of 619.00 feet to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 2 being the Point of Beginning; thence along the Northern boundary line of said Annexation NO. 2 for the following three (3) courses 1) S89°59'24"W a distance of 1.00 feet 2) S00°07'01"E a distance of 618.00 feet 3) S89°59'24"W a distance of 554.77 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 2; thence, the following three (3) courses along the boundary of Reception Number 188299, 1) N00°06'53"W a distance of 1306.00 feet 2) S89°59'24"W a distance of 70.00 feet 3) S00°06'52"E a distance of 1308.00 to a point on said south line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 30.00 feet to the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10; thence along the West Line of said Section 10, N00°06'51"W a distance of 1318.07 feet to the North 1/16th Corner of Section 9 & said Section 10; thence along the North line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, N89°58'25"E a distance of 655.71 feet to the northeast corner of Reception 3027832; thence S00°07'01"E a distance of 698.26 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 771,084 Square Feet or 17.702 Acres, more or less as described herein is hereby annexed to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado.

INTRODUCED on first reading on the 7th day of December 2022 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ADOPTED on second reading the ____ day of _____ 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

Anna M. Stout
President of the Council



Attest:

Amy Phillips
City Clerk

EXHIBIT A

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 where the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°59'24"W 1,311.54 feet with all other bearings relative thereto, thence S89°59'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North boundary line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, being the Point of Beginning, thence continuing along said boundary line S89°59'24"W a distance of 131.40 feet to the Southwest Corner of said WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, thence continuing along said South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°59'24"W a distance of 200.67 feet, thence the following three (3) corners: 1) N00°00'00"E a distance of 1.00 foot 2) N89°59'24"E a distance of 392.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832 3) S00°00'00"E a distance of 1.00 foot to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 392 Square Feet or 0.009 Acres, more or less.

AREAS OF ANNEXATION	LEGEND
ANNEXATION PERIMETER CONTIGUOUS PERIMETER AREA IN SQUARE FEET AREA IN ACRES AREA WITHIN R.O.W. AREA WITHIN DEEDED R.O.W.	ANNEXATION BOUNDARY ANNEXATION AREA EXISTING CITY LIMITS
SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS P.O.C. POINT OF COMMENCEMENT P.O.B. POINT OF BEGINNING R.O.W. RIGHT OF WAY SEC. SECTION TWP. TOWNSHIP RANGE RANGE UTM. UTE MERIDIAN NO. NUMBER REC. RECEPTION	SO. FT. SQUARE FEET RADIUS ARC CHORD LENGTH CHORD BEARING BLK. BLOCK P.B. PLAT BOOK BK. BOOK PG. PAGE HOR. DIST. HORIZONTAL DISTANCE

ORDINANCE NO. PRELIMINARY

EFFECTIVE DATE PRELIMINARY


PRELIMINARY

RENEE BETH PARENT DATE
STATE OF COLORADO - PLS. NO. 38386
FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
303 WEST AVENUE - BLOCK C
GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY

NOTICE:
ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY MUST COMMENCE WITHIN THREE (3) YEARS AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN (10) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.

DRAWN BY: M.H. DATE: 10/24/2022
DESIGNED BY: RSP DATE: 10/24/2022
CHECKED BY: RSP DATE: 10/24/2022



CITY OF Grand Junction
COLORADO
303 WEST AVENUE - BLOCK C
GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501




PUBLIC WORKS ENGINEERING DIVISION

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1
Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO

EXHIBIT B

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 2

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (SW1/4 NW1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/4 Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°52'24"W a distance of 655.77 feet along the South line of the Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10 to a point on the North line of the WARD-MUDGE ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3860, said point also being the Northwest Corner of GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 1, thence along the East line of said Annexation NO. 1 N00°07'01"W a distance of 1.00 to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation NO. 1 being the Point of Beginning, thence S89°52'24"W along the North line of said Annexation NO. 1 a distance of 1702.00 feet to the Northwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1, thence along the West line of said Annexation NO. 1 S00°06'52"E a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10, said point is also the Southwest Corner of said Annexation NO. 1, thence along said South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter S89°52'24"W a distance of 163.77 feet to a point on the West line of Reception No. 3027832, thence the following five (5) courses: 1) along said West line N00°07'01"W a distance of 2.00 feet to 1) S89°52'24"W a distance of 254.77 feet to 2) N00°07'01"W a distance of 618.00 feet to 3) S89°52'24"W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the East line of said Reception No. 3027832, 4) along said East line S00°07'01"E a distance of 655.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINS NO 1/2 Acres, more or less.

AREAS OF ANNEXATION		LEGEND	
ANNEXATION PERIMETER	2,361.54 FT.	ANNEXATION BOUNDARY	
CONTIGUOUS PERIMETER	360.00 FT.	ANNEXATION AREA	
AREA IN SQUARE FEET	1,307 FT ²	EXISTING CITY LIMITS	
AREA IN ACRES	0.031		
AREA WITHIN R.O.W.	788 FT ²		
AREA WITHIN DECEDED R.O.W.	55 FT ²		
	0.001 ACRES		

ORDINANCE NO. PRELIMINARY

EFFECTIVE DATE PRELIMINARY

NOTICE:

THE DESCRIPTIONS CONTAINED HEREIN HAVE BEEN DERIVED FROM SUBDIVISION PLAT, DEED DESCRIPTIONS AND OTHER SURVEY RECORDS IN THE OFFICE OF THE MESA COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER. THIS PLAT OF ANNEXATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A LEGAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, AND IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED AS A MEANS OF ESTABLISHING OR VERIFYING PROPERTY BOUNDARY LINES.


PRELIMINARY

RENEE BETH PARENT DATE
STATE OF COLORADO - P.L.S. NO. 3860
FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
303 WEST AVENUE - BLDG. C
GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501

NOTICE:

ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY MUST COMMENCE WITHIN THREE (3) YEARS AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN (10) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.

DRAWN BY: MJB DATE: 10/24/2022
DESIGNED BY: RBP DATE: 10/14/2022
CHECKED BY: RBP DATE: 10/20/2022



CITY OF Grand Junction COLORADO

203 WEST AVENUE, BLDG. C
GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501

PUBLIC WORKS ENGINEERING DIVISION



GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 2

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO

EXHIBIT C

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 3

Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being a part of the West Half of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (NW1/4 SW1/4 NE1/4) of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Center-west 1/16 Corner of said Section 10 where the West Quarter Corner of said Section 10 bears S89°52'34\"/>

AREAS OF ANNEXATION		LEGEND	
ANNEXATION PERIMETER	0,559.81 FT.	ANNEXATION BOUNDARY	
CONTIGUOUS PERIMETER	1,173.77 FT.	ANNEXATION AREA	
AREA IN SQUARE FEET	771,084 FT ²	EXISTING CITY LIMITS	
AREA IN ACRES	17.702		
AREA WITHIN R.O.W.	86,148 FT ²		
AREA WITHIN DEEDED R.O.W.	1,518 ACRES		
	13,888 FT ²		
	0.318 ACRES		
SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS		LEGEND	
P.O.C.	POINT OF COMMENCEMENT	SQ. FT.	SQUARE FEET
P.O.B.	POINT OF BEGINNING	AC	ACRES
R.O.W.	RIGHT OF WAY	ARC	ARC LENGTH
SEC.	SECTION	CHD	CHORD LENGTH
TWP.	TOWNSHIP	CHB	CHORD BEARING
RNG.	RANGE	BLK.	BLOCK
UTM.	UTE MERIDIAN	P.B.	PLAT BOOK
NO.	NUMBER	BL.	BOOK
REC.	RECEPTION	P.G.	PAGE
		HOR. DIST.	HORIZONTAL DISTANCE
ORDINANCE NO. PRELIMINARY		EFFECTIVE DATE PRELIMINARY	
NOTE:		PRELIMINARY	
THE DESCRIPTIONS CONTAINED HEREIN HAVE BEEN DERIVED FROM SUBORDINATE PLAT, CERT. DESCRIPTIONS AND AS THEY APPEAR IN THE OFFICE OF THE MESA COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER, THIS PLAT OF ANNEXATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A LEGAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, AND IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED AS A MEANS OF ESTABLISHING OR VERIFYING PROPERTY BOUNDARY LINES.		RENEE BETH PARENT DATE	
		STATE OF COLORADO - P.L.S. NO. 3636	
		FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION	
		303 WEST AVENUE, SUITE C	
		GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501	

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY

NOTICE:
ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY MUST COMMENCE WITHIN THREE (3) YEARS AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN (10) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.

DRAWN BY: M.B. DATE: 10/26/2022
DESIGNED BY: RBP DATE: 10/14/2022
CHECKED BY: RBP DATE: 10/26/2022

1" = 100'
SCALE: 1" = 100'
LINEAL UNITS = U.S. SURVEY FOOT



PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIVISION

GRAND VALLEY ESTATES ANNEXATION NO. 3
Located in the W1/2 SW1/4 NW1/4 SECTION 10,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO