

Housing Affordability Code Task Force — Executive Summary January 22, 2026

General Recap & Work in Progress

- Staff provided a comprehensive overview of some of the active code amendments currently moving through Planning Commission and City Council. Due to the TF discussion staff was unable to cover all of the items on the spreadsheet.
- Members acknowledged progress across multiple fronts, including pre-application reform, pedestrian access, bicycle parking, and other targeted amendments.
- Recognition that while many changes are moving forward successfully, process alignment remains the primary challenge.

City Council Process Clarification (Pre-Application Item)

- First Task Force–originated item advanced and was approved by City Council (pre-application meetings).
- Issue identified during the public hearing was HACTF representative was not called upon as the applicant and instead provided comment during public comment. Staff met with the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem after the meeting, and this will be corrected for the next item coming before Council from the HACTF.
- Resolution:
 - For City Council Process moving forward, all Task Force items will follow standard process:

Staff report/presentation → HACTF presentation → public hearing → Council deliberation.

Introduction of Interim City Attorney

- Jeremiah Bois introduced as Interim City Attorney
- Background includes:
 - Former Grand Junction Police Department officer.
 - Private legal practice in Denver.
 - Former Senior Staff Attorney for Public Safety.
- Transition acknowledged as significant following long tenure of prior City Attorney.
- Task Force welcomed Jeremiah and emphasized importance of legal coordination in process reforms.

Core Issue: Task Force ↔ Staff Feedback Loop

- Task Force expressed concern over “dueling documents” and different process for different recommendations. There was discussion of TF recommendations advancing to

Planning Commission alongside staff alternatives without prior discussion between staff and TF.

- Impacts:
 - Planning Commission placed in uncomfortable position of choosing between Task Force vs. staff.
 - TF members given insufficient time to review lengthy staff reports before hearings.

Consensus:

- Once a TF recommendation is received, staff will review and come back to the TF to provide initial comments and engage in a discussion with the TF prior to advancing to the Planning Commission.
 - Goal is alignment or understanding of where disagreement exists.
 - Agreement that iteration and collaboration produce better policy and may reduce conflict during public hearing process.

Planning Commission Workshops & Participation Limits

- Clarified that Task Force members cannot formally participate in Planning Commission workshops.
- Concern raised that relying on Planning Commission members who also sit on the Task Force (e.g., Sandra, Keith) creates:
 - Incomplete representation
 - Unfair pressure on individuals to speak for the entire committee
- Reinforced need for pre-workshop alignment

Treatment of Specific Amendments

Bicycle Parking & Pedestrian Access

- Bicycle parking is highlighted as example where:
 - Staff alternative improved code clarity overall.
 - However, long-term indoor bike parking remains a major point of disagreement.
- Pedestrian access cited as a success case where Task Force and staff aligned through iteration.

Significant Trees

- Staff taking a neutral position (neither recommending approval nor denial)
- Scheduled for Planning Commission hearing.
- Task Force concern:
 - Neutral stance still shapes outcomes by limiting criteria analysis
 - Request for clarity on how decision-makers evaluate recommendations without staff findings.

- Agreement:
 - Kevin will review the staff report and determine whether to request delay or allow item to proceed.
 - Update-Item has been continued to next PC hearing

Certified Irrigation Designer (CID)

- Staff preview:
 - Likely recommendation to retain CID, with possible delayed implementation date.
- Task Force emphasized original intent:
 - CID introduced for irrigation capacity and tree health, not water conservation alone.
- Consensus:
 - CID recommendation and staff feedback will return to Task Force before Planning Commission hearing.

Agreement on Process

Key procedural agreement

- When a Task Force recommendation is received:
 1. Staff reviews and identifies agreement or concerns.
 2. Staff returns to Task Force with:
 - Specific code or Comprehensive Plan references.
 - Proposed redlines or alternatives.
 3. Task Force and staff discuss before scheduling Planning Commission action.

Metrics Framework

- Keith presented a draft metrics matrix to evaluate recommendations based on:
 - Cost
 - Time
 - Risk / predictability
 - Infrastructure
 - Market conditions
- Matrix uses positive / neutral / negative impact instead of dollar figures.
- Strong support for:
 - Simple version as primary tool.
 - Adding:
 - Comprehensive Plan alignment grid.
 - City Council Strategic Plan priorities (housing, infrastructure).
- Purpose:
 - Capture “death by a thousand cuts” reality.
 - Show cumulative housing cost impacts without false precision.
- Keith will refine and circulate matrix before next meeting for comment.

- Recognition that:
 - Many requested changes are low-impact individually.
 - But cumulatively have meaningful effects on housing cost and predictability.
- Reinforced value of:
 - Packaging amendments
 - Early collaboration
 - Clear outcome-driven evaluation

Key Takeaways

- Feedback loop clarity is essential to Task Force success.
- Iteration before public hearings leads to better policy and less friction.
- Metrics framework is critical to communicating housing affordability impacts.
- Progress is occurring on major items (TEDS, survey process, revocable permits) through focused breakout work.