1. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

3. AGENDA - ADOPT/AMEND

4. PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
   A. PRESENTATIONS – Fruita teacher and student of the month for February 2020 - Fruita 8/9 School:
      - Student: Lennea Gregg
      - Teacher: Martha Gerstenberger
   B. PROCLAMATION – Proclaiming February 10 – 15th, 2020 as “Kindness is Contagious Week” to be accepted by students of the Fruita 8/9 School

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
   This section is set aside for the City Council to LISTEN to comments by the public regarding items that do not otherwise appear on this agenda. Generally, the City Council will not discuss the issue and will not take an official action under this section of the agenda. Please limit comments to a five-minute period.

CONSENT AGENDA
These are items where all conditions or requirements have been agreed to or met prior to the time they come before the Council for final action. These items will be approved by a single motion of the Council. Members of the Council may ask that an item be removed from the consent section and fully discussed. All items not removed from the consent section will then be approved. A member of the Council may vote no on specific items without asking that they be removed from the consent section for full discussion. Any item that is removed from the consent agenda will be placed at the end of the regular agenda.

   A. MINUTES – A request to approve the minutes of the January 21, 2020 City Council meeting

   B. LIQUOR LICENSE RENEWAL – A request to approve the renewal of a Fermented Malt Beverage (FMB) (off premises) for Maverik, Inc. located at 1103 E US Hwy 6 & 50
C. LIQUOR LICENSE RENEWAL - A request to approve the renewal of a Tavern (City) - Malt, Vinous and Spirituous Liquor License and Dance Hall License for JD’s Bar located at 155 N. Mulberry St.

D. BOARDS & COMMISSIONS APPOINTMENT – A request to approve the appointment of Sarah Brooks to the Livability Commission for a three-year term to expire in February of 2023

E. LETTER OF COMMITMENT – A request to approve a Letter of Commitment to contract with Mesa County for stormwater services

F. GRAND VALLEY ESTATES FILING #2 SUBDIVISION:

1) RESOLUTION 2020-07 - Approving the First Release of the Subdivision Improvements Agreement (SIA) for the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision

2) RESOLUTION 2020-08 - Approving the First Release of the Subdivision Development Agreement (DIA) for the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS
Public hearings are held to obtain input from the public on various items. Public hearings are either Legislative in nature or Quasi-Judicial in nature. Each is described as follows:

- **LEGISLATIVE** – Legislative public hearings are held when the City Council is considering an item that establishes legislation such as an ordinance amending or establishing laws of the city. Interactions by members of the public with the City Council or individual members is permissible on items of a legislative nature.

- **ORDINANCES – SECOND READING.** After introduction of an Ordinance (First Reading), a public hearing date is set and notice of the hearing is published in the newspaper. Staff presents the ordinance and the hearing is opened to the public for comment. After comment from the public, the Mayor will close the hearing to the public and bring the Ordinance back to the City Council for discussion and potential action. The Council will make a motion to approve the Ordinance or take no action. In the event the ordinance is approved, it will become effective 30 days after adoption.

- **QUASI-JUDICIAL** – Quasi-judicial public hearings are held when the City Council is acting in a judicial or judge like manner and a person with a legitimate interest is entitled to an impartial decision made on the basis of information presented and laws in effect. Quasi-judicial hearings are commonly held for land use hearings and liquor license hearings. Since the City Council is acting in a fair and impartial manner, it is NOT permissible for City Council members to have any ex-parte communication (contact between the applicant, members of the public, or among other members of the City Council) outside of the Public Hearings and meetings on the subject application. The City Council must limit its consideration to matters which are placed into evidence and are part of the public record. Quasi-judicial hearings are held in the following manner:

  1) **Staff presentation** (15 minutes max) Staff will present the comments and reports received from review agencies and offer a recommendation.

  2) **Applicant Presentation** (15 minutes max) The petitioner is asked to present the proposal. Presentations should be brief and to the point and cover all of the main points of the project.

  3) **Public Input** (limit of 5 minutes per person. If two people in the audience are willing to cede their time to the speaker, that speaker may receive a total of 10 minutes, referred to as banking time). People speaking should step up to the microphone and state their name and address. Speakers should be to the point and try not to repeat the points others have made.

  4) **The public hearing is closed to public comments.**

  5) **Questions from the Council.** After a Council member is recognized by the Mayor, they may ask questions of the staff, the applicant, or the public.

  6) **Make a motion.** A member of the City Council will make a motion on the issue.

  7) **Discussion on the motion.** The City Council may discuss the motion.

  8) **Vote.** The City Council will then vote on the motion.

A. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARINGS
1) RESOLUTION 2020-05 - Approving a Conditional Use Permit To operate a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed & Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone located at 825 East Ottley Avenue (Vic’s Place VRBO) – presented by City Planner Henry Hemphill

2) RESOLUTION 2020-06 - Approving a Conditional Use Permit To operate a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed & Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone located at 157 South Orchard Street (Ryan & Renee Cook VRBO) - presented by City Planner Henry Hemphill

3) Village at Country Creek North – A request to approve a Preliminary Plan for a 12-lot subdivision located at 1176 18 Road on approximately 3.48 acres – presented by City Planner Henry Hemphill

8. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Scope and prioritization of K.4 Road, Fremont Street and other Capital Projects presented by Public Works Director Ken Haley

B. RESOLUTION 2020-09 – Adoption of “Fruita In Motion” Comprehensive Master Plan presented by Planning & Development Director Dan Caris

9. CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

10. COUNCIL REPORTS AND ACTIONS

11. ADJOURN
BACKGROUND

At the direction of the Fruita City Council, the City of Fruita began recognizing students and teachers in Fruita’s schools as “Students of the Month” or “Teachers of the Month” at the first City Council meeting of the month beginning in February of 2019. The students and teachers are chosen by the Principal of each of the schools as being those that represented their school’s core values during the previous month.

The Students/Teachers of the Month recognition schedule is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>RECOGNITION MONTH</th>
<th>CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruita 8/9 School</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>February 4, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelledy Elementary School</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>March 3, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita Middle School</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>April 7, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rim Rock Elementary School</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>May 5, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita Monument High School</td>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>September 1, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Ridge Elementary School</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
<td>October 6, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mayor will acknowledge each student by name for the month of February (listed on the agenda) and will present them with a certificate of recognition and a one-day individual pass to the Fruita Community Center from the City of Fruita.

No action from the Council is necessary.
CITY OF FRUITA’S STUDENT OF THE MONTH
FOR FEBRUARY 2020

This Certifies That
Lennea Gregg
Of
The Fruita 8/9 School

Is being recognized by The Fruita City Council for outstanding academic achievement and excellence.

Keep up the great work!

February 4, 2020

Joel Kincaid, Mayor
CITY OF FRUITA’S TEACHER OF THE MONTH
FEBRUARY 2020

This certificate is presented to
Martha Gerstenberger

Of
Fruita 8/9 School

In recognition of your dedication, passion and hard
work. Thanks for all you do!

February 4, 2020
Joel Kincaid, Mayor
Proclamation

Proclaiming February 10 - 15, 2020 as:
“Kindness is Contagious (KIC) Week”

WHEREAS, the City of Fruita recognizes the value of simple acts of kindness performed without prompting or reason and how these acts can positively impact the performer, the recipient and onlooker of the good deed; and

WHEREAS, people of any age can participate in “Random Acts of Kindness” at any time, any place and for the unselfish purpose of spreading goodwill; and

WHEREAS, by providing “Random Acts of Kindness” and reaching out to one another regardless of social or economic status, education, gender, origin, religious belief, age, lifestyle or abilities, we extend an opportunity for grace, dignity and acceptance that might not otherwise be offered; and

WHEREAS, the Fruita City Council has challenged each school in Fruita to perform “307 Acts of Kindness” as part of an international week of kindness.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL DOES HERBY PROCLAIM MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10 TO SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2020 AS:

“Kindness is Contagious (KIC) Week”

In the City of Fruita and encourages the citizens of Fruita to observe this day with appropriate activities and programs that encourage kindness, acceptance, and love.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the official Seal of the City of Fruita this 4th day of February, 2020.

Joel Kincaid, Mayor, City of Fruita
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
February 1
Contact: Julie Blevens, julie.blevens@d51schools.org
District 51 KIC

School District 51 is United in Kindness


KIC is a student-run organization that plans and hosts events and activities designed to foster kindness. These students involved are committed to reverse a global trend where one negative act can spiral into millions of similar actions. This year, the group is focusing on uniting students with kindness, acceptance, and inclusion by creating stronger connections between high schools, and bring the whole community together through the power of KINDNESS. Palisade, Central, Grand Junction, Fruita Monument High Schools as well as R-5 and Fruita 8/9 Schools are all represented and active in this year’s KIC Campaign.

KIC’s community events are as follows

  Wednesday, February 12 – Community Speaker, CMU Ballroom
  Friday, February 14 – Free Ice Skating @ Glacier Ice Arena for D51 students and families, 4:45-6 p.m.
  Saturday, February 15 – Join us as we spread Kindness in the GJ Lion’s Club Parade at 1 p.m. in Downtown Grand Junction

In addition to the community events, schools will host activities and spirit days suited to their school culture. Along with many small random acts of kindness throughout the week, participants actively seek out purposeful acts of kindness with the hope their efforts have an enduring effect in their school and our community.

For more information please contact a KIC Committee member, at kicweekteam@gmail.com, or our facebook page @grandvalleykic or follow us on instagram @kic.gv

Kindness is Contagious.
FRUITA CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 21, 2020

1. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

A moment of silence was observed in lieu of the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Council members present were Karen Leonhart, Amanda Ewing, Kyle Harvey, Dave Karisny and Lori Buck. Councilor Ken Kreie was excused absent. Mayor Kincaid called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

3. AGENDA – ADOPT/AMEND

Mayor Kincaid asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Deputy City Clerk Deb Woods responded that there were none.

- COUNCILOR BUCK MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COUNCILOR EWING SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH FIVE YES VOTES.

4. PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

A. PRESENTATION - A PRESENTATION FROM CHRISTIAN BAIRD, COMMANDER OF AMERICAN LEGION POST 2009 CONCERNING A MILITARY PROGRAM AT FRUITA MONUMENT HIGH SCHOOL

Commander of American Legion Post 2009 - Grand Junction/Grand Valley Veterans Christian Baird provided the Council with information about the junior military program at Fruita Monument High School this year. Mr. Baird said he was present to ask the Council for a little help and support so that FMHS will continuously have a military program for years to come.

Mr. Baird was accompanied by student/cadet Logan Perron, the second in command officer for the group. Mr. Perron said he was learning military principles so that when he begins basic training, he will know what’s going on and will get ahead of the game.

Mr. Baird noted that this year, the military group at FMHS will be doing Navy, Coast Guard and Marine Corps Swim Qualification Four, which none of the actual cadet programs have ever done. They will also be doing fast roping, repelling and zip lining taught by a faction of the Colorado National Guard from southern Colorado at the climbing gym on 25 Road. Land navigation will be taught by Staff Sergeant Miller, who is qualified in writing and topographical intelligence for the Marine Corps. The group will also be taking a defensive tactics course with the help of the Fruita Police Department and a blackbelt instructor from the Marine Corps. They also have a mount
house, which is used to teach tactical operations for entering and exiting a residence or building. This will be taught by multiple organizations and police departments.

Mr. Baird stated that for the cadets to be able to do most of the above, they need help from the Fruita community and the City.

Mr. Baird noted that he currently has seven students but with the 8th and 9th graders’ ability to join the group in February, there will hopefully be another ten or eleven kids added at that time.

Councilor Leonhart asked Mr. Baird how he recruits students into the program and Mr. Baird responded that last August, the high school had a “come join our club” event and about ten students signed up for the military program. Six of them actually showed up.

Mr. Baird continued that it is hard to get the word out, but he did write a presentation to the students and parents of the 8/9 School and it will be in the monthly newsletter that goes out to parents from the school in February and March of 2020. He noted that any student between the years of 13 and 18 can join the club.

Councilor Buck asked Councilor Leonhart if this was something that the Rotary Club might get involved in because they are very generous with their fundraising revenues. Councilor Leonhart said the Fruita Rotary Club is all about helping local people and supporting kids and their projects in the community. She offered to provide Mr. Baird with the contact information he would need for that.

Councilor Buck also suggested that Mr. Baird speak with the Fruita Thrift Shop because they give money back into the community all the time.

Councilor Leonhart said she was also thinking about the Fruita Youth Initiative (FYI), which is a group of young people from the 8/9 School and the high school who are trying to find activities that all kids have an interest or can find something that they might be interested in.

Mr. Baird stated that had been in contact with the Fruita Thrift Shop and they are not interested in the military program because they want to do their own thing.

Mr. Baird clarified that he was asking for the City’s help in getting the word out about the program at FMHS and looking closely at some kind of budget and funding for certain training areas. He added that he will possibly be using the pool at the Fruita Community Center for the swim qualifications, but it will require coming up with money and that is why he is having some issues.

Mayor Kincaid stated that Council members or staff would be able to provide Mr. Baird with contact information for the right people such as the Rotary Club.

Councilor Leonhart wrote down Mr. Baird’s phone number and said she would be contacting him.

B. PRESENTATION – MICHAEL PAXSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE COLORADO NATIONAL MONUMENT ASSOCIATION AND SUPERINTENDENT NATHAN SOUDER PRESENT THE CITY OF FRUITA
WITH AN ARROWHEAD PLAQUE TO RECOGNIZE THE CITY’S SUPPORT OF THE COLORADO NATIONAL MONUMENT

Michael Paxson, Executive Director of the Colorado National Monument Association, said that the association wants to show their appreciation to the City of Fruita so he had the idea of presenting the City with an Arrowhead plaque, which is virtually unheard of within the National Park Service because it is normally given internally to employees only.

Mr. Nathan Souder, Superintendent of the Colorado National Monument, introduced himself and gave a little background on the Arrowhead plaque, which has many handwritten sentiments from National Park Service employees on the back. He said there is something special about the collaboration in the Grand Valley and that the Park Service is really looking forward to the opportunity of working with the City of Fruita to make the valley a great place to live.

Mr. Paxson added that the Colorado National Monument Association is very grateful that the City sponsored them two years in a row for a Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) grant and that he couldn’t even get the City of Grand Junction to give them a letter of support. He said it shows that Fruita is an awesome community.

Mayor Kincaid received the Arrowhead plaque on behalf of the City and said staff would find a special place to hang it where everyone can see it.

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were no comments from the public.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

A. MINUTES:

1) A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 17, 2019 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

2) A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2020 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

B. LIQUOR LICENSE RENEWAL – A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE RENEWAL OF A FERMENTED MALT BEVERAGE (FMB) RETAIL LIQUOR LICENSE (OFF PREMISES) FOR PESTER MARKETING COMPANY DBA ALTA 6317 LOCATED AT 555 W. RAPTOR ROAD

C. SPECIAL EVENT LIQUOR PERMIT APPLICATION – A REQUEST TO APPROVE A SPECIAL EVENT LIQUOR PERMIT APPLICATION FROM THE FRUITA AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TO SELL ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (MALT, VINOUS & SPIRITUOUS) AT THE FRUITA CHAMBER ANNUAL AWARDS BANQUET TO BE HELD ON SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2020 FROM 5:00 TO 10:00 P.M. AT THE FRUITA COMMUNITY CENTER
D. BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS LIAISON APPOINTMENT – A REQUEST TO APPOINT FRUITA AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT KODI IMONDI TO THE FRUITA TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL AS THE CHAMBER LIAISON TO THE BOARD TO FULFILL AN UNEXPIRED TERM PLUS AN ADDITIONAL THREE-YEAR TERM TO EXPIRE IN JUNE OF 2024

E. BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS APPOINTMENT – A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF PAVIA JUSTINIAN TO THE ARTS AND CULTURE BOARD TO FULFILL AN UNEXPIRED TERM PLUS AN ADDITIONAL THREE-YEAR TERM TO EXPIRE IN DECEMBER OF 2023

F. ANNUAL REVIEW OF RED FLAG POLICY (IDENTITY THEFT PREVENTION PROGRAM)

G. ASSOCIATE MUNICIPAL JUDGE CONTRACT RENEWAL – A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT WITH GREG MUELLER FOR APPOINTMENT AS ASSOCIATE MUNICIPAL JUDGE FOR THE CITY OF FRUITA

H. FINANCIAL REPORTS – A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL REPORTS FOR DECEMBER 2019

Mayor Kincaid opened the public hearing on the consent agenda. Hearing no comments, he closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Council.

- COUNCILOR EWING MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COUNCILOR BUCK SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH FIVE YES VOTES.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no public hearings on the agenda.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

There were no administrative items on the agenda.

9. CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

City Manager Mike Bennett stated that with the upcoming election in April, he wanted to mention that Mesa County is not able to assist the City of Fruita with the election as they have typically done in the past. The City of Fruita has historically paid the county to count the ballots and complete other various election services. Fruita City staff has tried to work with Mesa County on the potential of paying to use their equipment, but the Elections Office had said that they have to focus on being ready for their November election and the Presidential Primary in March.
Mr. Bennett noted that City Clerk/Finance Director Margaret Sell is currently going through the process of reviewing rental equipment and other options for the City to run the election unassisted by Mesa County and added that at the last Council meeting, part of the process was to allow the City Clerk to appoint Election Judges that can be hired on a temporary basis to help with the ballot counts on Election Day.

Mayor Kincaid asked if the ballot was going to be changed in any way and what the timeframe is for getting everything printed and mailed. He pointed out that if the City is going to use different equipment, then the printing would need to be handled differently, too.

Deputy City Clerk Deb Woods responded that staff will need to work with a company to print and possibly mail the ballots and a separate company that has the rental equipment to count the ballots.

Councilor Buck asked if the cost of the election is going to change due to the situation and Mrs. Sell explained that it would; she had received cost estimates earlier in the day and they are coming in at about $7,000 over the City’s budget. She said that she would be asking the vendor some questions the following day about having staff potentially assembling the ballot packets in-house to reduce the cost by about $2,000 - $3,000 in excess of budget and that staff would be coming back to the Council for a budget amendment that will most likely come from Contingency Funds. She continued that in the past, Mesa County had ordered their supplies and Fruita’s supplies and therefore got quantity discounts. Mrs. Sell is now trying to get answers on why there are also some new fees in place such as $5,000 - $6,000 in set-up fees from both vendors.

Councilor Buck asked when the last time this happened to the City of Fruita. Mrs. Sell said that the last time she hand-counted ballots was probably 30 years ago.

Councilor Buck emphasized the point that for the first time in 30 years, the County is not going to be able to assist the City of Fruita in its municipal election process.

Mayor Kincaid said he wanted to know if this was going to continue to be a problem in the future because Mesa County always has elections the same year the City of Fruita does.

Mrs. Sell explained that the Primary Election this year will be held in March while the City’s regular municipal election is in April, so Mesa County is concerned about the timing of that because they will still be trying to recover from the Primary Election. This is why they said they are unable to assist the City of Fruita in April with their equipment. She added that there has been a lot of changeover in the Elections Division of Mesa County and she thinks it is very much a learning year for them, so they are currently hesitant to take on another entity’s responsibilities. Mrs. Sell reiterated that this is the first time this has happened in 30 years.

Mayor Kincaid said he would like to know what it would cost to buy the equipment. Mrs. Sell responded that she looked at that and the cost to rent two counting machines, the set-up and training is going to run approximately $5,200 and that she would like to use this year as a learning year to look at the machines and see if would be worth purchasing them because she thought they could be bought for just a little bit more than it costs to rent. She wants to see if these are the kind of machines that the City should invest in (or not) going forward depending on how it turns out this year and that also, maybe Mesa County will have a different perception after they get through this
first year for themselves; in the future they might have a machine or two that they could loan the City of Fruita to use.

Mayor Kincaid asked how much the City of Fruita normally pays Mesa County for election assistance. Mrs. Sell answered that the City has paid the County about $6,000 for the printing of ballots, envelopes and secrecy sleeves but they haven’t been charging the City for the use of their equipment. At the last election in 2018, Fruita did pay Mesa County $800 in election assistance and the bids that Mrs. Sell had looked at earlier in the day were at approximately $25,000.

The 2020 Budget for the Election was projected at $16,000 and Mrs. Sell said she thinks she can cut some of the cost if staff and part-time temporary hires assemble the ballot packets in-house. She noted that she was still looking at being over budget by about $2,000 - $3,000 about double what the City has paid in the past elections).

Mrs. Sell added that there will be a lot more staff time involved because in the last few years, the state has passed a law whereby municipal elections require that voter’s signatures be verified. At the last election, Mesa County had a machine that could do that; it electronically verified signatures and if it didn’t recognize them, it would spit them out for a human to look at. Staff will be doing that by hand through an online process with the Secretary of State’s Office, so Mrs. Sell said she imagines it is going to take considerably more time, which means she will probably be hiring some part-time staff and Election Judges to assist with that process.

Councilor Leonhart asked if the City had a contract with Mesa County in the past or if it was just a “gentleman’s agreement” and Mrs. Sell explained that the City would enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with the County every election year in the past, but there will be no IGA this year because of the County’s concerns and issues.

Mrs. Sell assured the Council that staff would work through it and will run a fair and impartial election as always, but it will cost a little bit more and will require more time.

Councilor Karisny asked how the election results would be certified at the end. Mrs. Sell explained that as the Designated Election Official, she always certifies election results after several double- and triple-checks of the unofficial results and then official results and then she files the official election results with the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) for informational purposes. An Election Judge will also be signing off on the Official Certification of Election Results, as will the Deputy City Clerk.

Councilor Buck asked if the City Council needed to look into changing the timeframe for its municipal election so that it doesn’t conflict with the County’s Primary Election in March; perhaps to the end of April or the beginning of May. Mrs. Sell explained that there would be legal aspects to that. Statutory towns hold their elections on the first Tuesday in April of even numbered years and even though Fruita is a home-rule city, the City Charter requires that elections be held in the same way as the statutory towns and Mrs. Sell said she didn’t know if that could be changed.

Mrs. Sell added that she and staff will have a better idea going forward whether Mesa County will be able to go back to assisting the City of Fruita in the future or whether Fruita will begin to stand alone and get its own equipment and processes in place to handle elections.
Mr. Bennett continued with the City Manager’s Report. He reminded the Council that there is a joint workshop session scheduled for the following Tuesday at 6:30 p.m. with the Planning Commission to go over the Comprehensive Plan, Fruita in Motion. He said this will be important as it is the last discussion prior to final adoption of the Plan on February 4th.

Mr. Bennett also reported that staff had a kick-off meeting for the Parks, Health, Recreation, Open Space and Trails (PHROST) Master Plan with all the consultants and schedules for the year will be forthcoming soon. If all goes well, the hope is to wrap up the Plan by November of 2020. The schedule is pretty aggressive and will build off a lot of the Comprehensive Plan engagement as well as other specific areas that will be delved into.

10. COUNCIL REPORTS AND ACTIONS

A. COUNCIL REPORTS AND ACTIONS

COUNCILOR LORI BUCK

Lori made note that she will be late to the joint workshop meeting the following Tuesday, but that she would be there.

Lori said she didn’t have anything to report but that Mike had gone to the Grand Junction Economic Partnership (GJEP) board meeting. She asked him if he had anything worthwhile sharing about the meeting and Mike said he let GJEP know that Fruita is appreciative of the board’s support for incentives for Canfield Bikes.

Lori said she was approached by some folks from Fruita Monument High School (FMHS) and they want to put up a sign in the new roundabout on the J Road side of the campus. They are considering a full color digital sign, which is not allowed in the City’s Land Use Code.

Mayor Joel Kincaid asked if the school had its own state regulations and Lori said she and staff had already checked and those rules don’t apply to a sign. She continued that she could see some differences in the school’s potential sign in that it would be on J Road and not in the downtown or Kokopelli Marketplace and it wouldn’t intend to draw people in or steal business away from anyone; it would just be informative for people who are already there at the school about upcoming events and the like.

Lori said she is willing to consider approving a variance for the sign at the school but she needs to know if it would be worth the school’s time to apply for a variance. She asked how the other Council members would advise FMHS to proceed.

Councilor Dave Karisny said he thought it would certainly be worth them going through the process but that it would be helpful to see what the school was envisioning in a workshop setting to get a sense of what the sign would actually look like.

Mike pointed out that as soon as the school submits an actual project, then it would require a quasi-judicial process through the City.
Lori said that when City Planner Henry Hemphill advised school officials of the size of signs that are allowed in the Code, they said it was no problem to drop the size of the sign to the maximum required height; however, the actual size of the screen they want is larger than that and although nothing has been purchased yet, they are still interested in working with the City to make it happen knowing that it would be a complete exception from all other development in town. Lori said she was visualizing a sign that would be like a big outdoor television with full color. She added that because the sign would be on the J Road side at the main entrance, people wouldn’t be able to see it from the highway.

Lori said it was an interesting thought because FMHS is a somewhat of a flagship school in the valley right now whether they have anything like the sign or not and it would be a nice piece that could enhance the way the school looks. She noted that apparently, the school has already raised $50,000 to do the sign.

Joel said if the school brought their proposal before the Council, they could discuss what size might get approved, which times of day it could be operational and all the other aspects to it. He asked the Council members if they agreed that FMHS should move forward with a variance request.

Mike explained that variance requests only go before the City Council at a public hearing and do not go before the Planning Commission. He noted that the sign being requested will be more than double the size of allowed signs and is the type of sign that is not allowed (digital). Essentially, FMHS would come to the Council with their presentation of what they are asking for with all the specifics at a public hearing and the Council would need to make a decision on whether or not to approve it. Mike noted that the request is much different than a business coming in for a variance because then the comparison would be between a number of other businesses that have already gone through the process and followed the specific requirements of the City’s Sign Code because FMHS is the only high school in the community and they are trying to display information about different community events. He said staff will provide feedback on the request for the Council.

Joel asked for confirmation that there would be the usual public notice (about the public hearing) mailed out to the neighbors within a 350-foot radius. Mike said he was sure that was part of the process, just like when Munchies came through with their sign variance request, which is the only real comparison the City has for this type of request because the City just hasn’t had that many.

Lori asked the other Council members if they thought the school’s request might be unreasonable. Joel said it was hard to say without knowing more. He pointed out that the Council could set regulations for the sign concerning things such as hours of operation, so it was his opinion that FMHS should move forward with their variance request.

Lori said that like it or not, digital is the way signs are going. She also pointed out that there would be many upcoming discussions about the Sign Code during the Land Use Code update process.

Dave said it sounded like the FMHS sign would be more like a sign that an athletic stadium would have (like a SuperTron) and he thought that because the sign would be so unique, it would be good to do a notification to the surrounding neighborhoods. He added that he would like to see the variance request.
COUNCILOR DAVE KARISNY

Dave shared his notes from the draft of the 2045 Grand Valley Regional Transportation Plan, which encompasses the entire valley and is done every five years. The draft reviews are due the following day (January 22nd) and the final revision is scheduled for February 10th. He said he believes the final adoption of the Plan will be at the end of February.

Dave continued that it seems the focus of the Plan is multi-modal, bike-friendly, pedestrian-friendly, connectivity and collaboration with the Mesa County Bike Alliance. He also mentioned Safe Routes to School, Share Mobility (bike sharing/car sharing), reducing congestion over time, and active transportation (bicycling & walking). The Grand Valley Regional Transportation Committee (GVRTC) is talking about inventories of local municipalities and the entire Grand Valley of bicycle and pedestrian paths and there is a sense of going back and re-striping and making the connectivity work. Dave said there seemed to be a real focus that wasn’t there at the last Master Plan meeting that reflects a shift from the 2040 Plan.

COUNCILOR KYLE HARVEY

Kyle reported that the Arts & Culture Board met the previous week and will be meeting every other week in preparations for the Evening of Art Gala fundraising event. He said the board began the “A Year in the Life of Fruita,” which is a contest where people can submit their photographs over the course of the entire year, which will be on display at the Fruita Civic Center and Fruita Community Center if they win. No submissions have been received as of the last meeting.

COUNCILOR AMANDA EWING

Amanda had nothing to report.

COUNCILOR KAREN LEONHART

Karen reported that she had a Police Commission meeting and the board discussed statistics such as the car break-in incidents, which are increasing due to people leaving their cars unlocked. Unfortunately, this sometimes results in the theft of guns that might be kept in vehicles. The board is trying to think of a way to create community awareness on locking your car.

Karen also reported that trespassing citations are also increasing due to high school kids going into the Maverik on Highway 6 & 50 after they have already been kicked out. The Fruita Police Department is currently down two officers; one is in training and should be out in mid-February. Karen said she asked about the Red Flag law and she learned that the Fruita Police Department will comply with the law, but they have concerns.

Karen also reported that she recently attended a School District 51 meeting also attended by Diana Sirko, Brian Hill and Nikki Jost and they discussed boundaries, teaching positions and what is going to happen with the new elementary school and what she got from the meeting is that in the first part of March, the City of Fruita ought to be informed as to what the boundaries will be, how they will affect all area schools and where kids will go to school. Karen said the District is not
going to announce any job openings until the boundaries are set and people know exactly where they are going.

**MAYOR JOEL KINCAID**

Joel reported that the Fruita Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors met a few weeks prior and elected a new President, Kodi Imondi, who was just appointed by the City Council (on the Consent Agenda) to the Fruita Tourism Advisory Council as the Chamber liaison to the board. Travis Robinson is stepping down from his seat on the board at the end of his term and Joel noted that Deputy City Clerk Deb Woods had the vacant seat posted. Staff has received one application, but Joel said he wanted to leave the vacancy open for three to four weeks total in order to potentially receive additional applications.

Joel also reminded the Council members to let Deb know if they wanted to attend the Chamber Annual Awards Banquet coming up on Saturday, February 8th. The City has a table of eight (8) seats and Deb noted that so far, she had received a total of six RSVPs, so there are still two seats left. Dave suggested that staff ask Councilor Ken Kreie (absent) if he and his wife would like to attend.

**B. EXECUTIVE SESSION – DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO CONSIDER A MOTION TO CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING PERSONNEL ISSUES UNDER C.R.S. SECTION 24-6-402(4)(F) – (MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE INFORMAL REVIEW)**

- **COUNCILOR BUCK MOVED TO MEET IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING PERSONNEL ISSUES UNDER C.R.S. SECTION 24-6-402(4)(F). COUNCILOR KARISNY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH FIVE YES VOTES.**

_The Council convened into Executive Session at 7:50 p.m. The regular meeting convened at 9:00 p.m._

**11. ADJOURN**

With no further business before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Woods  
Deputy City Clerk  
City of Fruita
TO: FRUITA CITY COUNCIL AND MAYOR
FROM: DEBRA WOODS, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
DATE: FEBRUARY 4, 2020
RE: LIQUOR LICENSE RENEWAL - A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE RENEWAL OF A FERMENTED MALT BEVERAGE (FMB) RETAIL LIQUOR LICENSE (OFF PREMISES) FOR MAVERIK, INC. LOCATED AT 1103 E. US HIGHWAY 6 & 50

BACKGROUND

The Fermented Malt Beverage (FMB) Retail Liquor License (Off Premises) for Maverik, Inc. located at 1103 E. US Highway 6 & 50 is up for renewal. Their current license expires on April 7, 2020. FMB before January 1, 2019 was defined as an alcohol product (beer) with a maximum alcohol content by weight of no more than 3.2%. SB 16-197 changed the definition of FMB and eliminated the maximum alcohol content to where it is any beer greater than 0.5% alcohol by weight effective January 1, 2019.

The Police Department report indicates that there have not been any violations or incidents reported to them in the last year and there is nothing unusual or of concern that would hinder renewal of the license. The City Clerk’s office has not been advised of any issues or concerns related to the liquor license during the past year. There are no current TIPS certificates on file in the City Clerk’s Office.

The following information is provided as background on the liquor license renewal process:

Pursuant to State Statutes, the local licensing authority (City Council) may cause a hearing on the application for renewal to be held. No renewal hearing shall be held until a notice of hearing has been conspicuously posted on the licensed premises for a period of ten days and notice of the hearing has been provided the applicant at least ten days prior to the hearing. The licensing authority may refuse to renew any license for good cause, subject to judicial review.

This item is placed on the Consent agenda for the Council to determine if there is any cause for a hearing to be held on the renewal of the liquor license. If there is no cause for a hearing, the City Council should approve the renewal of the existing license. If there is cause for a hearing, the City Council should set a date to hold a quasi-judicial hearing to determine if there are sufficient grounds for suspension or revocation of the liquor license. The City Council may also temporarily suspend any license, without notice, pending any prosecution, investigation or public hearing. No
such suspension shall be for a period of more than 15 days.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

**APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

The City of Fruita is charged with protection of the public health, safety and welfare. The review and renewal of liquor licenses ensures that licensed establishments are operating by the rules and regulations adopted by the City and State concerning the sale or service of beer and alcoholic beverages.

**OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COUNCIL**

1. Renew the Fermented Malt Beverage (FMB) Retail Liquor License.

2. Schedule a hearing date to determine if there is good cause for the license to be suspended or revoked.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is the recommendation of staff that the Council move to:

**RENEW THE FERMENTED MALT BEVERAGE (FMB) RETAIL LIQUOR LICENSE FOR MAVERIK, INC. LOCATED AT 1103 E. US HIGHWAY 6 & 50**
**Retail Liquor or Fermented Malt Beverage License Renewal Application**

Please verify & update all information below. Return to city or county licensing authority by due date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensee Name</th>
<th>Doing Business As Name (DBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAVERIK INC</td>
<td>MAVERIK INC #400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquor License #</th>
<th>License Type</th>
<th>Sales Tax License #</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-22730-0002</td>
<td>Fermented Malt</td>
<td>04227300002</td>
<td>04/07/2020</td>
<td>02/22/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business Address**
1103 E US HWY 50 Fruita CO 81521

**Mailing Address**
185 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 800 North Salt Lake UT 84111

**Operating Manager**
Tasha Reichenecker

**Date of Birth**
11/15/91

**Home Address**
31737 Sardine Ave, Grand Junction, CO 81504
970-858-5346

1. Do you have legal possession of the premises at the street address above?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No

2. Are the premises owned or rented?  
   - [x] Owned  
   - [ ] Rented*  
   *If rented, expiration date of lease

3a. Since the date of filing of the last application, has the applicant, including its manager, partners, officer, directors, stockholders, members (LLC), managing members (LLC), or any other person with a 10% or greater financial interest in the applicant, been found in final order of a tax agency to be delinquent in the payment of any state or local taxes, penalties, or interest related to a business?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No

3b. Since the date of filing of the last application, has the applicant, including its manager, partners, officer, directors, stockholders, members (LLC), managing members (LLC), or any other person with a 10% or greater financial interest in the applicant failed to pay any fees or surcharges imposed pursuant to section 44-3-503, C.R.S.?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No

4. Since the date of filing of the last application, has there been any change in financial interest (new notes, loans, owners, etc.) or organizational structure (addition or deletion of officers, directors, managing members or general partners)? If yes, explain in detail and attach a listing of all liquor businesses in which these new lenders, owners (other than licensed financial institutions), officers, directors, managing members, or general partners are materially interested.  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No

5. Since the date of filing of the last application, has the applicant or any of its agents, owners, managers, partners or lenders (other than licensed financial institutions) been convicted of a crime? If yes, attach a detailed explanation.  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No

6. Since the date of filing of the last application, has the applicant or any of its agents, owners, managers, partners or lenders (other than licensed financial institutions) been denied an alcohol beverage license, had an alcohol beverage license suspended or revoked, or had interest in any entity that had an alcohol beverage license denied, suspended or revoked? If yes, attach a detailed explanation.  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No

7. Does the applicant or any of its agents, owners, managers, partners or lenders (other than licensed financial institutions) have a direct or indirect interest in any other Colorado liquor license, including loans to or from any licensee or interest in a loan to any licensee? If yes, attach a detailed explanation.  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No
Tax Check Authorization, Waiver, and Request to Release Information

I, [David B. Hancock], am signing this Tax Check Authorization, Waiver and Request to Release Information (hereinafter "Waiver") on behalf of [Maverik, Inc. # 400] (the "Applicant/Licensee") to permit the Colorado Department of Revenue and any other state or local taxing authority to release information and documentation that may otherwise be confidential, as provided below. If I am signing this Waiver for someone other than myself, including on behalf of a business entity, I certify that I have the authority to execute this Waiver on behalf of the Applicant/Licensee.

The Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Revenue is the State Licensing Authority, and oversees the Colorado Liquor Enforcement Division as his or her agents, clerks, and employees. The information and documentation obtained pursuant to this Waiver may be used in connection with the Applicant/Licensee’s liquor license application and ongoing licensure by the state and local licensing authorities. The Colorado Liquor Code, section 44-3-101. et seq. ("Liquor Code"), and the Colorado Liquor Rules, 1 CCR 203-2 ("Liquor Rules"), require compliance with certain tax obligations, and set forth the investigative, disciplinary and licensure actions the state and local licensing authorities may take for violations of the Liquor Code and Liquor Rules, including failure to meet tax reporting and payment obligations.

The Waiver is made pursuant to section 39-21-113(4), C.R.S., and any other law, regulation, resolution or ordinance concerning the confidentiality of tax information, or any document, report or return filed in connection with state or local taxes. This Waiver shall be valid until the expiration or revocation of a license, or until both the state and local licensing authorities take final action to approve or deny any application(s) for the renewal of the license, whichever is later. Applicant/Licensee agrees to execute a new waiver for each subsequent licensing period in connection with the renewal of any license, if requested.

By signing below, Applicant/Licensee requests that the Colorado Department of Revenue and any other state or local taxing authority or agency in the possession of tax documents or information, release information and documentation to the Colorado Liquor Enforcement Division, and is duly authorized employees, to act as the Applicant’s/Licensee’s duly authorized representative under section 39-21-113(4), C.R.S., solely to allow the state and local licensing authorities, and their duly authorized employees, to investigate compliance with the Liquor Code and Liquor Rules. Applicant/Licensee authorizes the state and local licensing authorities, their duly authorized employees, and their legal representatives, to use the information and documentation obtained using this Waiver in any administrative or judicial action regarding the application or license.

Name (Individual/Business): [Maverik, Inc. # 400]
Social Security Number/Tax Identification Number: 83-0197092
Address: 185 S. State St., Suite 800
City: Salt Lake City
State: UT
Zip: 84111
Home Phone Number: 801-936-5557
Business/Work Phone Number: 801-683-3628
Printed name of person signing on behalf of the Applicant/Licensee: [David B. Hancock]
Applicant/Licensee’s Signature (Signature authorizing the disclosure of confidential tax information): [Signature]
Date signed: 11/14/20

Privacy Act Statement
Providing your Social Security Number is voluntary and no right, benefit or privilege provided by law will be denied as a result of refusal to disclose it. § 7 of Privacy Act, 5 USCS § 552a (note).
**Affirmation & Consent**
I declare under penalty of perjury in the second degree that this application and all attachments are true, correct and complete to the best of my knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type or Print Name of Applicant/Authorized Agent of Business</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maverik, Inc. (LP 400)</td>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David B. Blandad</td>
<td>1/14/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report & Approval of City or County Licensing Authority**
The foregoing application has been examined and the premises, business conducted and character of the applicant are satisfactory, and we do hereby report that such license, if granted, will comply with the provisions of Title 44, Articles 4 and 3, C.R.S., and Liquor Rules. Therefore this application is approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Licensing Authority For</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Attest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF FRUITA
MEMORANDUM

TO: FRUITA POLICE DEPARTMENT
FROM: DEBRA WOODS, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
DATE: JANUARY 17, 2020
RE: Fermented Malt Beverage (Off Premises) Liquor License Renewal (FMB)

License Information
Licensee: Maverik #400
Location: 1103 E. US Highway 6 & 50
Type of License: Fermented Malt Beverage (Off Premises) (FMB)
Expiration Date of Current License: April 7, 2020
City Council Hearing Date: February 4, 2020
DUE DATE FOR POLICE REPORT: January 31, 2020

Tips certificates on File
Employee: Date: Exp.
(None)

Report of Fruita Police Department
A) Have there been any reported violation(s) of the Liquor or Beer Code in the last year? Yes
B) Have there been any incidents reported to the Police Dept in the last year that would pertain to the liquor license and the establishment’s control of alcoholic beverages and their patrons? Yes
C) Are there other concerns that need to be brought to the attention of the City Council? Yes

Please attach documentation to support the above noted violation(s), incidents or comments.

Signed: Paul Rajewski Date: 1-20-20

Fax: 858-0210 e-mail: dwoods@fruita.org
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

TO: FRUITA CITY COUNCIL AND MAYOR
FROM: DEBRA WOODS, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
DATE: FEBRUARY 4, 2020
RE: LIQUOR LICENSE RENEWAL - A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE RENEWAL OF A TAVERN LIQUOR LICENSE – MALT, VINOUS AND SPIRITUOUS AND DANCE HALL LICENSE FOR JD’S BAR LOCATED AT 155 N. MULBERRY STREET

BACKGROUND

The Tavern Liquor License and Dance Hall license for JD’s Bar located at 155 N Mulberry, is up for renewal. Their license will expire on April 5, 2020. Owner John Dee Brach submitted the renewals and the appropriate renewal fees to the City Clerk’s Office on January 20, 2020.

The Police Department report indicates there has been nothing of concern that would hinder the renewal. The Police report is attached hereto.

There are four current TIPS certificate on file at the City Clerk’s Office.

The following information is provided as background on the liquor license renewal process:

Pursuant to State Statutes, the local licensing authority (City Council) may cause a hearing on the application for renewal to be held. No renewal hearing shall be held until a notice of hearing has been conspicuously posted on the licensed premises for a period of ten days and notice of the hearing has been provided the applicant at least ten days prior to the hearing. The licensing authority may refuse to renew any license for good cause, subject to judicial review.

This item is placed on the agenda for the Council to determine if there is any cause for a hearing to be held on the renewal of the liquor license. If there is no cause for a hearing, the City Council should approve the renewal of the existing license. If there is cause for a hearing, the City Council should set a date to hold a quasi-judicial hearing to determine if there are sufficient grounds for suspension or revocation of the liquor license. The City Council may also temporarily suspend any license, without notice, pending any prosecution, investigation or public hearing. No such suspension shall be for a period of more than 15 days.

FISCAL IMPACT
APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The City of Fruita is charged with protection of the public health, safety and welfare. The review and renewal of liquor licenses ensures that licensed establishments are operating by the rules and regulations adopted by the City and State concerning the sale or service of beer and alcoholic beverages.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COUNCIL

- Renew the Tavern Liquor License and Dance Hall License for JD’s Bar located at 155 N Mulberry.

- Schedule a hearing date to determine if there is good cause for the license to be suspended or revoked.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of staff that the Council move to:

- RENEW THE TAVERN LIQUOR LICENSE AND DANCE HALL LICENSE FOR JD’S BAR LOCATED AT 155 N. MULBERRY
Retail Liquor or Fermented Malt Beverage License Renewal Application

Please verify & update all information below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licenser Name</th>
<th>JD'S BAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN DEE BRACH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquor License #</th>
<th>License Type</th>
<th>Sales Tax License #</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-06264</td>
<td>TAVERN (CITY)</td>
<td>040970150000</td>
<td>04/05/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business Address
155 N MULBERRY ST., FRUITA CO 81521

Mailing Address
155 N MULBERRY ST., FRUITA CO 81521

Operating Manager
JD BRACH

Home Address
207 E PABOR AVE., FRUITA CO 81521

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/20/54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Do you have legal possession of the premises at the street address above? ☑ Yes ☐ No
   Are the premises owned or rented? ☑ Owned ☐ Rented* (*If rented, expiration date of lease)

2. Are you renewing a storage permit, additional optional premises, sidewalk service area, or related facility? If yes, please see the table in upper right hand corner and include all fees due. ☑ Yes ☐ No

3a. Since the date of filing of the last application, has the applicant, including its manager, partners, officer, directors, stockholders, members (LLC), managing members (LLC), or any other person with a 10% or greater financial interest in the applicant, been found in final order of a tax agency to be delinquent in the payment of any state or local taxes, penalties, or interest related to a business? ☑ Yes ☐ No

3b. Since the date of filing of the last application, has the applicant, including its manager, partners, officer, directors, stockholders, members (LLC), managing members (LLC), or any other person with a 10% or greater financial interest in the applicant failed to pay any fees or surcharges imposed pursuant to section 44-3-503, C.R.S.? ☑ Yes ☐ No

4. Since the date of filing of the last application, has there been any change in financial interest (new notes, loans, owners, etc.) or organizational structure (addition or deletion of officers, directors, managing members or general partners)? If yes, explain in detail and attach a listing of all liquor businesses in which these new lenders, owners (other than licensed financial institutions), officers, directors, managing members, or general partners are materially interested. ☑ Yes ☐ No

5. Since the date of filing of the last application, has the applicant or any of its agents, owners, managers, partners or lenders (other than licensed financial institutions) been convicted of a crime? If yes, attach a detailed explanation. ☐ Yes ☑ No

6. Since the date of filing of the last application, has the applicant or any of its agents, owners, managers, partners or lenders (other than licensed financial institutions) been denied an alcohol beverage license, had an alcohol beverage license suspended or revoked, or had interest in any entity that had an alcohol beverage license denied, suspended or revoked? If yes, attach a detailed explanation. ☐ Yes ☑ No

7. Does the applicant or any of its agents, owners, managers, partners or lenders (other than licensed financial institutions) have a direct or indirect interest in any other Colorado liquor license, including loans to or from any licensee or interest in a loan to any licensee? If yes, attach a detailed explanation. ☐ Yes ☑ No

---

**Fees Due**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Fee</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Permit $100 X</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Service Area $75.00</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Optional Premise Hotel &amp; Restaurant $100 X</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Facility - Campus Liquor Complex $160.00 per facility</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Make check payable to: Colorado Department of Revenue. The State may convert your check to a one-time electronic banking transaction. Your bank account may be debited as early as the same day received by the State. If converted, your check will not be returned. If your check is rejected due to insufficient or uncollected funds, the Department may collect the payment amount directly from your banking account electronically.
Affirmation & Consent
I declare under penalty of perjury in the second degree that this application and all attachments are true, correct and complete to the best of my knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type or Print Name of Applicant/Authorized Agent of Business</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN DEE BRACH</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>1-20-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report & Approval of City or County Licensing Authority
The foregoing application has been examined and the premises, business conducted and character of the applicant are satisfactory, and we do hereby report that such license, if granted, will comply with the provisions of Title 44, Articles 4 and 3, C.R.S., and Liquor Rules. Therefore this application is approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensing Authority For</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE CITY OF FRUITA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Attest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>JOEL KINCAID, MAYOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF FRUITA
DANCE HALL LICENSE
RENEWAL APPLICATION

Pursuant to Chapter 5.12 of the Fruita Municipal Code, an annual license is required, and must be approved by the City Council for the operation of a dance hall. Dance Hall renewals are due with the Liquor License Renewal. The fee for a Dance Hall license is $25.00 and is payable to the City of Fruita.

Name of Applicant: JOHN DEE BRACH

Trade Name: JD'S BAR

Location of Hall: 155 N MULBERRY ST.

Owned ☐ Rented ☐

Years in Business: 23

Phone Number (970) 250-3365

Manager of Hall: JOHN DEE BRACH

Hours of Operation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM 11:00</td>
<td>AM 11:00</td>
<td>AM 11:00</td>
<td>AM 11:00</td>
<td>AM 11:00</td>
<td>AM 11:00</td>
<td>AM 11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 10:00</td>
<td>PM 10:00</td>
<td>PM 10:00</td>
<td>PM 10:00</td>
<td>PM 10:00</td>
<td>AM 1:30</td>
<td>AM 1:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has the applicant been convicted of a felony or a crime in any court of the United States? If so, when and what? NA

Signature of Applicant [Signature] Date 1/20/20

OFFICE USE ONLY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received: 1/20/20</th>
<th>Amount Paid: $25</th>
<th>Date License Sent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business License #:</td>
<td>Check #: 24154</td>
<td>Approved ☑ Denied ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor License #: DANCE</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Credit Card (Visa/Master Card Only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF FRUITA
MEMORANDUM

TO: FRUITA POLICE DEPARTMENT
FROM: DEBRA WOODS, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
DATE: JANUARY 20, 2020
RE: TAVERN LIQUOR LICENSE RENEWAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensee:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of License:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration Date of Current License:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Hearing Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUE DATE FOR POLICE REPORT:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tips certificates on File</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Brunell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Barber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Manee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2017</td>
<td>9/25/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2017</td>
<td>9/25/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2017</td>
<td>10/25/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A) Have there been any reported violation(s) of the Liquor or Beer Code in the last year? | Yes | No |
| B) Have there been any incidents reported to the Police Dept in the last year that would pertain to the liquor license and the establishment’s control of alcoholic beverages and their patrons? | Yes | No |
| C) Are there other concerns that need to be brought to the attention of the City Council? | Yes | No |

Please attach documentation to support the above noted violation(s), incidents or comments.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 1-21-20

Fax: 858-0210  e-mail: dwoods@fruita.org
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

TO: FRUITA CITY COUNCIL
FROM: DEPUTY CITY CLERK DEBRA WOODS FOR MAYOR KINCAID AND COUNCILOR BUCK
DATE: FEBRUARY 4, 2020
RE: BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS APPOINTMENT – A REQUEST TO APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF SARAH BROOKS TO THE LIVABILITY COMMISSION FOR A THREE-YEAR TERM TO EXPIRE IN FEBRUARY OF 2023

BACKGROUND

In December of 2019, Livability Commission member Douglas Diekman resigned from board, therefore creating a vacancy. His term was due to expire in December of 2019.

On January 10, 2020, Sarah Brooks submitted her application for the vacant seat on the Livability Commission.

On January 21, 2020, Mayor Kincaid and Councilor Buck interviewed Sarah and subsequently recommended her appointment to the Livability Commission for a three-year term to expire in February of 2023.

The membership guidelines of the Livability Commission call for a minimum of seven and a maximum of twenty-one members. There are currently twelve (12) members on the board, so if Sarah Brooks is appointed, there is still the potential for nine (9) remaining vacancies on the board.

FISCAL IMPACT

N/A

APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Boards and Commissions provide valuable input to the City and help establish goals and objectives. They provide a link between citizens of Fruita and city government.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COUNCIL
1. Appoint Sarah Brooks to the Livability Commission for a three-year term to expire in February of 2023

2. Instruct staff to publish a notice of vacancy and repeat the interview process.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is the recommendation of Mayor Kincaid and Councilor Buck that the following appointment be made:

- Sarah Brooks to the Livability Commission for a three-year term to expire in January of 2023
CITY OF FRUITA
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS
MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Livability Commission
NAME: Sarah Brooks
MAILING ADDRESS: 525 S 6th Street
                     Grand Junction, CO 81501
RESIDENCE ADDRESS: City
                     Grand Junction
                     State
                     CO
                     Zip
                     81504
PHONE NUMBER: 970-623-1195
               970-244-1830
E-MAIL ADDRESS: Home
                 sarah.brooks@mesacounty.us

How long have you been a resident of Fruita? Grew up in Fruita and resided there for 26 years.
Occupation/Employer: Mobility Manager - Mesa County RTPO

List any volunteer and/or work experience:

Worked in Parks and Recreation for 22 years; MS in Parks Recreation & Tourism. Planned senior activities, trips, and hikes. Teach bike and pedestrian safety from 2011-present. Currently work as Mobility Manager and teach people about public transit, how to ride the bus, trip planning, and navigation. Work to identify areas that need improvement in Mesa County, to help with increased mobility of seniors and individuals with disabilities. 16 years of grant writing experience. 18 years of experience with marketing including brochure design, poster design, event merchandising, social media, radio, TV, and media buys. Photography. Volunteer annually with GJ Off-road. Previous volunteer for JUCO. Mike the Headless Chicken and GJ Rec Center Campaign.

Are you presently serving on a board or commission? If so, which one(s)?

No

Why do you want to be a member of this board or commission?

I love Fruita and hope to relocate back to Fruita within the next few years. I am passionate about community development and providing opportunities and public places that enhance the overall quality of life for both citizens and visitors. I am also passionate about promoting healthy lifestyles and have a BA in Sports & Exercise Science. In my current role as Mobility Manager, I work to help people become more comfortable using public transportation and I see need for increased bus service in Fruita and throughout Mesa County.

List any abilities, skills, or interests which are applicable to the board or commission for which you are applying.

City of Fruita
Boards and Commissions Application
Page 2

Are you committed to attending meetings?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Are you committed to serving an entire term?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Please specify any activities which might create serious conflict of interest if you should be appointed to a particular board or commission. (If unsure, please call the City Manager’s office at 858-3663)

☐ The only conflict of interest would be to vote for something that was directly related to my role with Mesa County RTPO.

List any licenses, certificates or other specialized training applicable to the board or commission for which you are applying.

☐ Certified Parks and Recreation Professional (CPRP)
☐ Bike Safety & Safe Routes to School

Additional information or references you believe may be helpful in considering your application.

☐ Ture Nycum - Director, Fruita Parks & Recreation 970-433-8625
☐ Terri Potente - Volunteer, AARP & Fruita Livability Commission 970-201-1865
☐ Dana Brosig - Current Supervisor, Director of Grand Valley MPO 970-244-7187
☐ Terri Ahern - Retired RN, former Recreation program participant - 970-361-7255

Signature  Sarah J Brooks  Date  1/10/2020

All applicants are strongly encouraged to attend a regularly scheduled meeting of the board or commission for which they are applying. Frequent non-attendance may result in termination of the appointment.

ATTACHMENTS TO APPLICATION MUST BE LIMITED TO TWO PAGES

Please feel free to submit a resume along with this application. Application and any attachments should be returned to the Fruita City Council c/o the City Clerk, 325 E. Aspen, Fruita, CO 81521. Although we have indicated the best time to apply for a particular board, we accept applications for any of the boards year-round. Thank you.
Sarah J. Brooks  
354 Hancock St  
Grand Junction, CO 81504  
sarah.brooks@mesacounty.us  
Phone: (970) 244-1830

OBJECTIVE  
Fruita Livability Commission

EDUCATION  
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT  
MS - Parks Recreation and Tourism  
Graduation: December 2010  
GPA: 3.95

University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO  
BS - Sports and Exercise Science  
Graduation: May 2005  
GPA: 3.4

EXPERIENCE

April 1, 2019-Present  
Mesa County RTPO (Mobility Manager)  
- Community Outreach and Education for GVT Services  
- Travel Training – teaching seniors and people with disabilities how to successfully navigate local public transit and how to get to where they want to go.  
- Safe Routes to School – Local liaison for Mesa County. Coordinate bike and walk to school days, educate community on Safe Routes and bike and pedestrian safety, collaborate with District 51 on SRTS efforts, research funding sources.  
- Oversee all marketing for GVT services, programs, and community info for the Regional Transportation Planning Office, manage social media, oversee marketing budget, schedule advertising with various venues.  
- Manage revenue advertising contracts for exterior bus ads and bus stops.  
- Assist with the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan, coordinate community outreach efforts to increase citizen input, and social media marketing.  
- Grant administration – complete regular grant reports and reimbursement forms.

March 2011-Nov 2018  
Town of Palisade (Recreation & Events Coordinator)  
- Recreation Programming – Coordinate and instruct a variety of community recreation programs including outdoor recreation, day and overnight trips, fitness classes, youth programs, sports, and personal enrichment programs for adults and seniors. Develop and implement program curriculums.  
- Special Events – Plan and implement a variety of community events including Bluegrass Festival, Trick or Treat Street, and fundraising events for park and trail projects. Secure funding and sponsorships, recruit volunteers, design and order merchandise, community engagement, logistics and permitting, and marketing.  
- Marketing & Promotions – Manage social media and content creation, program and event photography, produce weekly newsletter, create posters and flyers, draft press & media release, format and design seasonal recreation activity catalog, and public relations including news and radio interviews.  
- Aquatics – Pool operations, coordinate seasonal schedule, oversee IGA with Grand Junction Parks and Rec for day to day operations and staffing of the pool.  
- Budgets – Manage budget line items for supplies and equipment, marketing, special events, and pool operations.  
- Internship Program – Developed an internship program with Colorado Mesa University Sports Management program. Hire, train, and advise interns, communicate with CMU staff, and guest lecturer in CMU classes.  
- Fundraising & Grant Writing – Seek matching fund sources for park projects, collaborate with partners and outside agencies, plan fundraising events, strategic planning, grant writing, and assist in budget development for park projects.
EXPERIENCE (CONTINUED)

Sept 2008- Feb 2011  **University of Utah Campus Recreation** (Program Supervisor)
- Coordinate special events through campus recreation
- Assist with marketing plan and oversee outreach at pop-up events
- Manage staff of 20 and assist with leadership development training
- Present Campus Recreation info at student orientation sessions
- Campus Recreation consumer survey data analysis and statistics
- Guest services, membership sales, equipment rental

May 1997- Aug 2008  **City of Fruita Parks and Recreation** (Recreation Coordinator)
- **Special Events** – Volunteer recruitment and appreciation, merchandising, event logistics, secure donations, race course layouts, registration, booking entertainment acts and managing entertainer contracts.
- **Marketing & Promotions** – production of flyers and brochures, event marketing, news and radio interviews, draft press and media releases.
- **Group Fitness & Wellness** – Instruct fitness classes, seasonal fitness schedule, and manage instructor contracts.
- **Aquatics** – pool operations, budget, facility reservation, risk management, hiring, staff training, lifeguard certification, coordinate aquatics programs, lifeguard, swim lesson instructor, and coach youth swim team.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS & CONFERENCES

- T.H.E Trail Summit Mountain Bike Conference - Conference Attendance – 2018
- CASTA (Colorado Assoc. of Transit Agencies) – Conference Attendance – 2019 Spring & Fall

CERTIFICATIONS

- CPRP – Certified Park & Recreation Professional, expires 09/20

VOLUNTEER/COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Volunteer at Junior College World Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017-Nov 2018</td>
<td>Palisade Plunge Project – fundraising efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-Present</td>
<td>CMU Sports Management Professionals Committee – advise on future curriculum or course suggestions for CMU Sports Management students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2018</td>
<td>Volunteer at GJ Off-Road – Hot Tomato Aid Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-Present</td>
<td>Grand Valley Bike Month Committee – planning, promotions, and donations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERESTS

Hiking, mountain biking, cycling, running, triathlons, camping, photography, travel, sustainable tourism, watching/ attending sporting events, taking my pups to the local NCAs.
REFERENCES

Frank Watt, Former Supervisor
Former Public Works Director, Town of Palisade
frankwatt413@yahoo.com
(970) 250-4643

Richard Bell, M.A., J.D., Ed.D.
Sport Management Program Coordinator
Colorado Mesa University
rbell@coloradomesa.edu
(970) 248-1365

Dean Bressler, P.E., Colleague
Traffic Engineer, Mesa County RTPO
dean.bressler@mesacounty.us
(970) 623-8479

Terri Ahern, Recreation Program Participant
RN, BSN; now retired
ahernterri@msn.com
(970) 361-7255
BACKGROUND
The Fruita City Council approved Resolution 2019-70 on December 17, 2019 to terminate the intergovernmental agreement that formed the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority. As part of that action, Council directed staff to work with Mesa County to provide stormwater compliance services moving forward. Staff is in the process of refining the scope for these services with Mesa County and reviewing agreements that are scheduled to be brought before City Council in March of 2020.

To make the transition from contracting with the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority, Mesa County has scheduled public hearings for the budget amendments necessary and would like to begin the staffing recruitment/training as soon as possible. Since the Mesa County public hearing is required before the parties can enter into an intergovernmental agreement for the services, Mesa County is requesting a letter of commitment from the contracting municipalities. This request seems to follow direction previously provided by Council and a draft letter of commitment is being provided for consideration.

FISCAL IMPACT
Providing a letter of commitment for this does not make any formal commitments to funding at this time. An intergovernmental agreement between the City of Fruita and Mesa County will be presented at a future Council meeting once scope and terms of service are further refined.

APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
Providing stormwater quality compliance services is mandated by the State and is a core service of the local agency in order to protect the environment from pollutants. The City strives to provide these services as cost effective as possible. Staff believes that contracting directly with Mesa County to provide stormwater compliance services is the most cost effective alternative and will provide the most customer-friendly solution as stormwater permitting will be centrally located in the same office as building permits.
OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO COUNCIL

1. APPROVE THE LETTER OF COMMITMENT TO MESA COUNTY AND AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SIGN AS DRAFTED.

2. APPROVE THE LETTER OF COMMITMENT TO MESA COUNTY WITH CHANGES AND AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SIGN AS AMENDED.

3. DENY THE LETTER OF COMMITMENT TO MESA COUNTY.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of staff that Council:

APPROVE THE LETTER OF COMMITMENT TO MESA COUNTY AND AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SIGN AS DRAFTED.
February 4, 2020

Mesa County
Board of County Commissioners
Department 5010
P.O. Box 20,000
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Re: Letter of Commitment for Stormwater Services

Dear Commissioners Justman, McInnis, & Pugliese,

In order to meet the growing demands of providing stormwater services for our community, the City of Fruita desires to consolidate the CDPS, MS4, and related stormwater permitting services that are necessary for compliance with the applicable stormwater regulations. The City of Fruita has a long history of partnering with Mesa County and other agencies to provide stormwater compliance services. Increasing regulations and changes in dynamics have resulted in a need to modify how these services are being provided.

The City of Fruita’s preferred alternative would include contracting directly with Mesa County for these services as it appears to be the most cost effective alternative and is believed to provide the most customer-friendly solution by being centrally located. We recognize that transitioning these services can be challenging and understand that this transition would likely not occur until the end of March 2020. As such, please consider this letter as a formal request from the City of Fruita to contract with Mesa County for these services and a commitment that we will assist in this transition as much as we are able.

Sincerely,

Joel Kincaid
Mayor
TO: FRUITA CITY COUNCIL AND MAYOR
FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
DATE: FEBRUARY 4, 2020

RE: RESOLUTION 2020-07, A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL APPROVING THE FIRST RELEASE OF THE SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT (SIA) FOR THE GRAND VALLEY ESTATES FILING #2 SUBDIVISION.

RESOLUTION 2020-08, A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL APPROVING THE FIRST RELEASE OF THE DEVELOPMENT IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT (DIA) FOR THE GRAND VALLEY ESTATES FILING #2 SUBDIVISION.

BACKGROUND:

This is a request for approval of the 1st Release of both the Subdivision Improvements Agreement (SIA) (Reception # 2906059) and Development Improvements Agreement (DIA) (Reception # 2906060) for the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision. The City Council approved the SIA and DIA for Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision on August 6, 2019. A request for first release has been received. The required improvements have been inspected and the improvements appear to have been completed as required by the subdivision approval, the SIA, and DIA. The improvements have been found to be free of defects in materials and workmanship as required.

The SIA and DIA requires that upon the 1st Release, the developer retain ten percent of the cost of the required improvements for the subdivision for the required two-year warranty period. The two years allows the public improvements to go through at least one freeze-thaw cycle. After the two-year warranty period is complete, City Staff will conduct a final walk-through of the subdivision. The purpose of this walk-through is to ensure that all public improvements are free from defects in materials and workmanship.

FISCAL IMPACT
Approving a first release of a Subdivision Improvements Agreement and Development Improvements Agreement has a fiscal impact on the City because the City would then be responsible for maintenance of the public improvements. Ten percent of the costs of all improvements in the subdivision is held by the City for two years to ensure defects in materials and workmanship for the improvements will be corrected. Within the two-year warranty period, the City will inspect the improvements and if found to be free from defects in materials and workmanship, a final release of the funding guarantee can be requested.

Additionally, Impact fees are collected at the time of planning clearance to help offset the costs of development.

**APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

The process of approving and releasing Subdivision Improvements Agreements and Development Improvements Agreements helps ensure that the City’s goal of requiring development to pay its own way is met and that residents and taxpayers of the City are not subsidizing growth.

**OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO COUNCIL**

**SIA**

2. Direct staff to research any area of the improvements on which Council has concerns or questions.

**DIA**

1. Adopt Resolution 2020-08, approving the 1st Release of the Development Improvements Agreement for the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision.
2. Direct staff to research any area of the improvements on which Council has concerns or questions.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the City Council by motion:

ADOPT RESOLUTION 2020-07, A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL APPROVING THE FIRST RELEASE OF THE SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT (SIA) FOR THE GRAND VALLEY ESTATES FILING #2 SUBDIVISION.

ADOPT RESOLUTION 2020-08, A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL APPROVING THE FIRST RELEASE OF THE DEVELOPMENT IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT (DIA) FOR THE GRAND VALLEY ESTATES FILING #2 SUBDIVISION.
RESOLUTION 2020-07

A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL APPROVING THE FIRST RELEASE OF THE SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT FOR THE GRAND VALLEY ESTATES FILING #2 SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, the developer of the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision entered into a Subdivision Improvements Agreement recorded in the records of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder at Reception #2906059 to guarantee that required improvements would be completed within a certain time period, and

WHEREAS, the developer has requested a 1st release of the performance guarantee and to start the two-year warranty period for the subdivision improvements, and

WHEREAS, improvements required by the Subdivision Improvements Agreement for the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision have been inspected and have been sufficiently completed to allow a 1st release of the SIA, and

WHEREAS, a bill of sale for the required public improvements that will belong to the City of Fruita has been provided and is attached as Exhibit A.

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

THAT the required subdivision improvements for the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision are approved for 1st release of the Subdivision Improvements Agreement, subject to 10% of the total cost of improvements being retained for the required two-year warranty period as required by the Subdivision Improvements Agreement.


ATTEST: City of Fruita

______________________________ ____________________________________
Margaret Sell, City Clerk Joel Kincaid, Mayor
EXHIBIT A TO RESOLUTION 2020-07
BIL OF SALE

Grand Valley Estates Subdivision Filing 2
Development Name

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that Grand Valley Estates Development, LLC AND Grand Valley Estates Development, LLC (Property Owner Name AND Developer Name) of the County of Mesa, State of Colorado (Seller), for and in good and sufficient consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, has bargained and sold and by these presents does grant and convey unto the City of Fruita, Colorado, a municipal corporation (Buyer), its successors and assigns, the following property, goods and chattels, to wit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>City Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior to subdivision</td>
<td></td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite street improvements</td>
<td>J.2 Sewer</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbs, gutters and sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lights</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>6&quot; ADS</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlets</td>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Lines and Appurtenances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines, Mains</td>
<td>SDR 35 &amp; C900</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Manholes</td>
<td>4' Diameter</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space dedicated to City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transferred FREE AND CLEAR OF ALL LIENS AND ENCUMBRANCES located at: 1849 J 2/10 Road, Fruita, Colorado.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the same unto the said Buyer, its successors and assigns, forever. The said Seller covenants and agrees to and with the Buyer, its successors and assigns, to WARRANT AND DEFEND the sale of said property, goods and chattels, against all and every person or persons whomever. When used herein, the singular shall include the plural, the plural the singular, and the use of any gender shall be applicable to all genders.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Seller has executed this Bill of Sale this 31st day of January, 2020

[Signature of Seller - Property Owner]
[Signature of Seller - Developer]

STATE OF COLORADO  )
COUNTY OF MESA    )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 31st day of January, 2020 by
Linda Daly, Managing Member
(Sellers name).

WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL

My Commission Expires: 11/12/2022 Notary Public: Tracy A. States

[Notary Public Signature]
RESOLUTION 2020-08

A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL APPROVING THE FIRST RELEASE OF THE DEVELOPMENT IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT FOR THE GRAND VALLEY ESTATES FILING #2 SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, the developer of the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision entered into a Development Improvements Agreement (DIA) recorded in the records of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder at Reception #2906060 to guarantee that required improvements would be completed within a certain time period, and

WHEREAS, the developer has requested a 1st release of the performance guarantee and to start the two-year warranty period for the subdivision improvements, and

WHEREAS, improvements required by the Development Improvements Agreement for the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision have been inspected and have been sufficiently completed to allow a 1st release of the DIA, and

WHEREAS, a bill of sale for the required public improvements that will belong to the City of Fruita has been provided and is attached as Exhibit A.

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

THAT the required subdivision improvements for the Grand Valley Estates Filing #2 Subdivision are approved for 1st release of the Development Improvements Agreement, subject to 10% of the total cost of improvements being retained for the required two-year warranty period as required by the Development Improvements Agreement.


ATTEST: City of Fruita

______________________________ ____________________________________
Margaret Sell, City Clerk Joel Kincaid, Mayor
EXHIBIT A TO RESOLUTION 2020-08
BILL OF SALE

Grand Valley Estates Subdivision Filing 2
Development Name

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that Grand Valley Estates Development, LLC AND Grand Valley Estates Development, LLC (Property Owner Name AND Developer Name) of the County of Mesa, State of Colorado (Seller), for and in good and sufficient consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, has bargained and sold and by these presents does grant and convey unto the City of Fruita, Colorado, a municipal corporation (Buyer), its successors and assigns, the following property, goods and chattels, to wit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>City Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior to subdivision</td>
<td></td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite street improvements</td>
<td>J.2 Sewer</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbs, gutters and sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lights</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>6&quot; ADS</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlets</td>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Lines and Appurtenances:</td>
<td>SDR 35 &amp; C900</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manholes</td>
<td>4' Diameter</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space dedicated to City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transferred FREE AND CLEAR OF ALL LIENS AND ENCUMBRANCES located at:
1849 J 2/10 Road, Fruita, Colorado.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the same unto the said Buyer, its successors and assigns, forever. The said Seller covenants and agrees to and with the Buyer, its successors and assigns, to WARRANT AND DEFEND the sale of said property, goods and chattels, against all and every person or persons whomever. When used herein, the singular shall include the plural, the plural the singular, and the use of any gender shall be applicable to all genders.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Seller has executed this Bill of Sale this 31st day of January 2020.

[Signature of Seller - Property Owner]

[Signature of Seller - Developer]

STATE OF COLORADO  )
COUNTY OF MESA  )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 31st day of January 2020 by

[Signature of Notary Public]

WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL

My Commission Expires: 1/22/2022
Notary Public: Tracy A. States
BACKGROUND

The subject property contains a 1,696 square foot detached single-family dwelling unit on an approximately 4.9-acre lot located behind the Country Village Mobile Home Park on East Ottley Avenue. The property owner has requested a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to use the property for a vacation rental by owner.

The entire home is intended to be available for rent on a less than month-to-month basis. The Land Use Code defines this type of use as a Bed & Breakfast which requires a CUP in the Community Residential (CR) zone.

This CUP meets or can meet all approval criteria and standards that must be considered for CUP’s. There were review comments from Lower Valley Fire District (LVFD) with concerns about the fire department responding to any emergencies at the subject property. After further discussion with the Fire Marshal, their concerns are still present regardless of the type of use.

At their January 14, 2020 public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of this application to the City Council by a vote of 7-0.

Conditions of approval before the business becomes operational:

1. Lodger’s tax be paid to the City of Fruita pursuant to Chapter 3.18 of the Fruita Municipal Code.
2. Maintain a current City of Fruita business license.
3. Limited to 4 bedrooms.
4. All bedrooms shall contain fire and carbon monoxide alarms.
5. Annual review of the Conditional Use Permit by the Fruita Code Compliance Officer.
6. Compliance with all laws and regulations as applicable.
FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed CUP should have a positive fiscal impact on the city. The use appears to be compatible with the surrounding area and should generate sales and lodger’s taxes which are used to market and promote the city.

APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This CUP application meets or can meet all approval criteria and standards of Fruita’s Land Use Code. The Land Use Code (along with other regulatory documents such as Fruita’s Design Criteria and Construction Specifications Manual) implement the city’s goals and policies as outlined in the city’s Master Plan including the Fruita Community Plan.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COUNCIL:

1. Approve the proposed Conditional Use Permit.
2. Deny the proposed Conditional Use Permit.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the recommendation of staff that the Council by motion:

APPROVE RESOLUTION 2020-05, A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A VACATION RENTAL BY OWNER (BED & BREAKFAST) IN A COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE LOCATED AT 825 EAST OTTLEY AVENUE.
RESOLUTION 2020-05

A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A VACATION RENTAL BY OWNER (BED & BREAKFAST) IN A COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE LOCATED AT 825 EAST OTTLEY AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the property owner at 825 East Ottley Avenue has submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed & Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone, and

WHEREAS, the City of Fruita requires a Conditional Use Permit to operate a vacation rental by owner (Bed & Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone, and

WHEREAS, the Fruita Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 14, 2020 and recommended approval to the Fruita City Council of the Conditional Use Permit with conditions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL:

A. The Conditional Use Permit to operate a Vacation Rental by Owner at 825 East Ottley Avenue is hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Lodger’s tax be paid to the City of Fruita pursuant to Chapter 3.18 of the Fruita Municipal Code.
2. Maintain a current City of Fruita business license.
3. Limited to 4 bedrooms.
4. All bedrooms shall contain fire and carbon monoxide alarms.
5. Annual review of the Conditional Use Permit by the Fruita Code Compliance Officer.
6. Compliance with all laws and regulations as applicable.

B. The City Clerk shall record this Resolution with the Mesa County Clerk & Recorder’s Office.

C. If the Conditional Use is inactive for a period of 1 year or more the permit will be automatically revoked.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL


ATTEST: City of Fruita

______________________________ ____________________________________
Margaret Sell, City Clerk Joel Kincaid, Mayor
Application #: 2019-38
Application Name: Vic’s Place VRBO
Application Type: Conditional Use Permit
Representative: William Barlow
Location: 825 E. Ottley Avenue (Rear House)
Zone: Community Residential
Description: This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in the Community Residential zone.

Project Description:

The subject property contains a 1,696 square foot detached single-family dwelling unit on an approximately 4.9-acre lot located behind the Country Village Mobile Home Park on East Ottley Avenue. The property owner has requested a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to use the property for a vacation rental by owner.

The entire home is intended to be available for rent on a less than month-to-month basis. The Land Use Code defines this type of use as a Bed & Breakfast which requires a CUP in the Community Residential (CR) zone.

Surrounding Land Uses and Zoning:

Surrounding zoning consists of Community Residential and Community Services & Recreation. Land uses to the south of the subject property are single family detached mobile home dwelling units. To the east of the subject property is the Little Salt Wash Park.
LAND USE/ZONING MAP
Review of Applicable Land Use Code Requirements:

Table 17.07.060(F) of the Land Use Code requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Bed & Breakfast type of land use in the Community Residential zone. The Land Use Code defines a Bed & Breakfast as a facility of residential character that provides sleeping accommodations with or without meals for hire on a day-to-day basis with no more than four guest rooms. It is not required to be owner occupied.
Section 17.07.070, Supplemental Zoning Regulations and Standards, Section A, identifies conditions and standards that must be met for a Bed & Breakfast use:

1. **Where the applicable zoning district allows bed and breakfast uses as a Conditional Use, the use must be a residential dwelling that contains no more than four (4) guest bedrooms where overnight lodging, with or without meals, is provided for compensation. Bed and Breakfast uses with more than four (4) guest bedrooms are considered hotels or motels;**

   The entire dwelling unit is intended to be used as the Bed and Breakfast. According to the Mesa County Assessor, this house contains 3 bedrooms and 1 bathroom. **This criteria has been met.**

2. **Kitchen and dining facilities in bed and breakfast dwellings may serve only residents and guests and shall not be operated or used for any commercial activity other than that necessary for bed and breakfast purposes;**

   The applicants are aware that the kitchen and dining facilities may only serve the guests even though this is not directly expressed in the project narrative. **This criteria can be met.**

3. **The bed and breakfast use shall not change the residential character of the dwelling if located in a residential zone or area;**

   The applicant specifically expressed that there will be no change to the residential character of the subject property in the project narrative. **This criteria can be met.**

4. **In residential zones (including residential developments in the CMU zone), there shall be no advertising display or other indication of the bed and breakfast use on the premises other than a sign that is in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 17.41;**

   Chapter 17.41 of the Land Use Code permits an Address or Identification Sign, identifying the address and/or the occupants of a dwelling unit or of an establishment, with a maximum size of two square feet and a maximum height of four feet for a sign in this zone. No illumination of this sign is permitted. There are no signs on the subject property at this time.

   The Sign Code requires that signs be reviewed in conjunction with the Conditional Use Permit. The project narrative addressed signage by saying that there will be no signs on the property for advertisement purposes. If a sign were to be proposed, there would need to be an amendment to this Conditional Use Permit. Amendments to CUP’s require hearings by both the Planning Commission and City Council. **This criteria is not applicable because no sign is being proposed at this time.**
5. **A minimum of one parking space per guest bedroom and resident bedroom shall be required. Screening may also be required;**

It appears that this property has at least 3 off street parking spaces as required. The project narrative states that the property offers a private parking area that measures 103 feet by 18.5 feet. Additionally, there are open areas around the yard and in front of the yard that could be utilized for parking without use of or interference to through streets or right of ways. No screening is recommended by Staff. **This criteria has been met.**

6. **The bed and breakfast facility shall comply with all Building Codes adopted by the city;**

The dwelling unit was originally constructed in 1972 according to the Mesa County Assessors website. There appears to have been a gas line added for a gas dryer in 1992. It appears that the required building permits for this gas line addition were obtained and meet the current building codes. It does not appear that there are any outstanding building permits. **This criteria has been met at this time.**

7. **It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that the relevant subdivision's declarations, covenants, conditions or restrictions allow for a bed and breakfast use and/or associated signing; and**

There does not appear to be any covenants associated with this property. All property owners within 350 feet of the subject property have been notified of this CUP application. At this time, staff has received no written public comments regarding this application. **This criteria has been met at this time.**

8. **Where a bed and breakfast use is subject to Conditional Use Permit approval, any existing or proposed uses in addition to that of a dwelling unit (e.g. home occupation, accessory dwelling unit, etc.) are considered as part of the conditional use review.**

Staff is unaware of any other existing or intended use of this property other than as a dwelling unit and/or as a short-term rental as proposed by this CUP request.

Based on this information, this CUP request for a Bed & Breakfast **meets or can meet the supplemental zoning regulations and standards** of the Land Use Code.

---

Chapter 13 of the Land Use Code identifies the approval criteria that must be considered for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) requests. The Code defines a CUP as a use which, because of its unique or varying characteristics, cannot be properly classified as an allowed use in a particular zone district. After due consideration, as provided for in
Section 17.13.040 of the Land Use Code, of the impact upon neighboring land and of the public need for the particular use at a particular location, such conditional use may or may not be approved.

According to Section 17.13.040 (C) of the Land Use Code, a Conditional Use Permit may be granted for a conditional use in a particular zone provided the City Council finds as follows:

Section 17.13.040, Conditional Uses, of the Land Development Code requires that a conditional use be approved after considering the following:

1. **The proposed use is consistent with the provisions and purposes of this Title, with the purposes of the zone in which it is located, and with the city's Master Plan;**

   Based on this review, the proposed conditional use can be consistent with the provisions and purposes of this Title (the Land Use Code), which is to promote the health, safety and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the community, and with the purposes of the Community Residential zone, which is to allow for moderate density single-family neighborhoods. If the supplemental zoning regulations and standards (identified above) are met along with the approval criteria for CUPs, this criterion can be met. The Land Use Code is one of the main documents used to implement the goals and policies of the City's Master Plan.

2. **The proposed use is compatible with existing and allowed uses surrounding or affected by the proposed use, pursuant to the criteria in Section 17.07.080;**

   Section 17.07.080 requires that a proposed development be compatible with adjacent properties, considering both existing and potential land uses on adjacent properties. For all land uses, “compatibility” is provided when a proposed land use can coexist with other existing uses in the vicinity without one use having a disproportionate or severe impact on the other use(s). The city decision-making body may consider other uses existing and approved and may consider all potential impacts relative to what customarily occurs in the applicable zone and those which are foreseeable, given the range of land uses allowed in the zone. The review authority may require conditions of approval to promote compatibility between a proposed use and existing uses in the vicinity to ensure compatibility.

   Although there are no short term rentals nearby, it appears that this proposed vacation rental can be compatible with surrounding land uses. Compliance with the regulations for vacation rentals should allow this business to coexist with other existing houses in the area without having a disproportionate or severe impact on the neighborhood. This criterion can be met.
3. **The proposed use will not materially endanger the public health or safety; and**

Staff received review comments from the Lower Valley Fire District (LVFD) about concerns with access to the subject property in the case of an emergency. Since there are concerns from the LVFD, Staff encourages the applicant to develop an emergency plan (this plan should be available to all guests) in case issues arise and work with the LFVD on any solutions they may have in order to address concerns.

The property does not take direct access from Ottley Avenue but does have a recorded (reception #1520402) access easement through the Country Village Mobile Home Park. However, since it doesn’t appear that the use itself will materially endanger the public health or safety, Staff does believe this criteria can be met.

If the Conditional Use Permit is approved, Staff and the LVFD recommend that all guest bedrooms contain carbon monoxide and smoke alarms.

4. **Public services and facilities including, but not limited to, transportation systems, wastewater disposal and treatment, domestic water, fire protection, police protection, and storm drainage facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use.**

Public services and facilities have been available to this property and will continue to be available to this property while it is used as a vacation rental with the exception of any dedication right-of-way. The subject property has access through the mobile home park via an easement agreement. The city is not part of this agreement as it’s between private property owners. Any impacts related to the proposed use are not expected to be any greater than those generated by a single-family residence. This criterion has been met.

Based on this information, this requested Conditional Use Permit has met or can meet all approval criteria for Conditional Use Permits and all supplemental zoning standards.

---

Legal Notice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcards</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>12/20/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Fruita Planning Commission will hold a public hearing **Tuesday, January 14, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.** at the Fruita Civic Center, 2nd Floor Council Chambers, 325 E. Aspen Avenue. The following item will be presented at the public hearings. The Planning Commission will formulate a recommendation, which will be forwarded to the Fruita City Council. If the item listed below is acted on by the Planning Commission, the Fruita City Council will hold a public hearing on this same item on **Tuesday, February 4, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.** at the Fruita Civic Center, 2nd Floor Council Chambers. If you have an interest on the item please call 858-0786 or come to the Planning & Development Department office located at 325 E. Aspen Avenue to review the information in the file. Your appearance at both hearings is encouraged to ensure your concerns are accurately represented or you can write a letter outlining your concerns and submit it to the Planning & Development Department.

**Application #**  2019-38
**Application Name**  Vic’s Place VRBO
**Application Type**  Conditional Use Permit
**Location**  825 E. Ottley Avenue
**Zone**  Community Residential (CR)
**Description**  This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.

Physically disadvantaged persons who wish to obtain information or need assistance in attending the Public Hearing, may call (970) 858-0786, the hearing impaired may call Relay Colorado at 1-800-659-2656, or visit our website: www.fruita.org

**Review Comments:**

- Lower Valley Fire District expressed concerns about responding to emergencies to the subject property.

- Conditions of approval by Staff:
  1. Lodger’s tax be paid to the City of Fruita pursuant to Chapter 3.18 of the Fruita Municipal Code.
  2. Maintain a current City of Fruita business license.
  3. Limited to 4 bedrooms.
  4. All bedrooms shall contain fire and carbon monoxide alarms.
  5. Annual review of the Conditional Use Permit by the Fruita Code Compliance Officer.
  6. Compliance with all laws and regulations as applicable.

**Public Comments:**

No written public comments have been received regarding this application at this time.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Because all of the approval criteria for Conditional Use Permits and all supplemental zoning standards and regulations either are or can be met, staff recommends approval of the proposed Bed & Breakfast with the condition that all review comments are met before the business becomes operational.

**Fruita Planning Commission:** January 14, 2020.
**Fruita City Council:** February 4, 2020.
Thanks for checking. We don’t have any issues with it.

Hey Dave,

Hope all is well. I didn’t know if you had a chance to review this application/project but just thought I’d check in to see if you had any comments or saw any issues with it? Attached is an aerial photo, this is the property in the very rear of the Mobile Home Park on Ottley Avenue, the use proposed is for a Short Term Rental/VRBO.

Call me if you have any questions.

Thanks!

HENRY HEMPHILL
CITY PLANNER
CITY OF FRUITA
970-858-0786
December 4, 2019

Fruita Planning Department
325 E. Aspen Avenue
Fruita, CO 81521

Re: Comments for 2019-38 Vic’s Place VRBO

1. Fire extinguisher, carbon monoxide detector and smoke detector/fire alarms must be in place.

2. There does not appear to be a dedicated driveway to 825 E. Ottley. LVFD has a concern that vacation renters would not know how to report access in an emergency and if 911 dispatch sends fire or police to 825 E. Ottley it could delay the response while figuring out access that access is through the trailer park.

Richard Pippenger
Fire Marshal
Kelli McLean

From: Darrell Bay <darrell.bay@mesacounty.us>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 10:15 AM
To: Kelli McLean
Subject: Re: 2019-38 Vic's Place VRBO

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Kelli,
MCBD has no objections.
If inspections are required a building permit must be obtained prior to the inspection.
Thanks

Darrell Bay
Building Official
970-244-1651

On Tue, Nov 26, 2019 at 2:41 PM Kelli McLean <kmclean@fruita.org> wrote:

Hello,

Please send us your review comments for project 2019-38 Vic’s Place VRBO by Tuesday, December 17. I have included a link to the project below for your convenience.


Thank you!

Kelli McLean
Planning Technician
City of Fruita
970-858-0786
LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

Project Name: Vicki’s Place, VRBO
Project Location: 885 E. Ottley Avenue, Bear House, Fruita 81521
Current Zoning District: Required Zone: 
Tax Parcel Number(s): 21A7-084-00-080 Number of Acres: 4.88
Project Type: VRBO Bed and Breakfast

Property Owner: Max V. Barlow
Property Owner: Melissa M. Barlow
Address: 885 E. Ottley Avenue
City/State/Zip: Fruita, Co. 81521
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:

Developer:
Contact:
Address:
City/State/Zip:
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Please designate a representative as the coordinator for this application. The representative should attend all conferences/hearings, will receive all correspondence, and communicate all information to the property owners.

Owner Rep: William W. Barlow
Contact:
Address: 175 18.5 Road
City/State/Zip: Fruita, Co. 81521
Phone: 970-389-8439 Fax:
E-mail: barlow.leslie82@gmail.com

Engineer:
Contact:
Address:
City/State/Zip:
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

This Notarized application authorizes the owner’s representative, if designated, to act on behalf of the property owners regarding this application.

The above information is correct and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Name of Legal Owner: William W. Barlow
Signature: Date: 10-4-19

Name of Legal Owner: Signature: Date:

Name of Legal Owner: Signature: Date:

STATE OF COLORADO
) ss.
COUNTY OF MESA

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 44th day of October, 2019

My Commission expires: May 12, 2022

Notary Public

KELLI MCLEAN
Notary Public - State of Colorado
Notary ID 2014616505
My Commission Expires May 12, 2022
City of Fruita

Conditional Use Permit Application

825 East Ottley Avenue, Rear House, Fruita, Co. 81521

Vic’s Place VRBO

Project Narrative

The goal of this project is to provide Fruita visitors a private and comfortable space to relax as they vacation or fulfill a temporary work assignment. This property is within walking distance of downtown, Fruita, entertainment and attractions. It is also within an hour driving distance of most recreation attractions that surround our beautiful area. The property is completely furnished and provides several amenities that allow families to enjoy a carefree stay.

Project Compliance, Compatibility, and Impact:

- The proposed property is a single-family ranch-style house that includes a large fenced yard and 4.88 acres on the North-East corner of an older trailer park. The property, itself, is not a part of the trailer park. It is adjacent to the trailer park, and utilizes the same access road/right of way. This property is currently zoned “CR” (Community Residential) and is eligible for a Bed & Breakfast (1-4 guests per room) per Section 17.07.060 of the Fruita Land Use Zoning Table in the Fruita Land Use Code.
- The proposed use will not materially endanger the public health and safety.
- The proposed condition use will maintain its compatibility with adjacent properties and will not detract from the surrounding homes nor will it have a severe or disproportionate impact on other uses.
- The property offers a private parking area that measures 103 feet by 18.5 feet. In addition, there are open areas around the yard and in front of the house that can be utilized for parking without use of or interference to through street and right-of-way. This meets the standards set forth in the Fruita Land Use Code 17.07.070.
- There will be no change to the residential character of the residence.
- Use of this property is expected to be lower than a full-time occupant’s use of the residence; including, but not limited to utilities and use of public service roads. Police and fire will not require any more attention with this permit.

Other Pertinent Information:

- There will be no signs on the property for advertisement.
- Rentals will typically range from 2 to 60 days.
- Renters will need to provide valid credit card in order to reserve the property and are screened through AirBnB and HomeAway before a reservation is accepted.
- A list of rules and regulations, along with contact information is posted in the property for all renters.
- The owner/property managers, Bill and Leslie Barlow, are the point of contact for all renters.
A. CALL TO ORDER

Seven Planning Commissioners were in attendance. (Justin Gollob, Jesse Fabula, Mel Mulder, Doug Van Etten, Dave Karisny, Cullen Purser, and Patrick Hummel were present).

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Whitney Rink led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Hearing Item 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental Conditional Use Permit was moved from a Consent Item to a Hearing Item due to the receipt of a public comment.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER MULDER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER PURSER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSES 7-0

E. WITHDRAWN ITEMS

None

F. CONTINUED ITEMS

None

G. CONSENT ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2019-38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Name:</td>
<td>Vic’s Place VRBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Type:</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>825 E. Ottley Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone:</td>
<td>Community Residential (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2019-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Name:</td>
<td>Village at Country Creek North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Type:</td>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Sunshine of the Redlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>1176 18 Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone:</td>
<td>Community Residential (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>This is a request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for 12 single family detached residential lots on approximately 3.4 acres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
COMMISSIONER KARISNY MADE A MOTION TO MOVE CONSENT ITEM 2019-43 COOK SHORT TERM RENTAL TO A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM AND APPROVE THE REMAINING APPLICATIONS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

COMMISSIONER MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 7-0 IN FAVOR TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AND 5-0 IN FAVOR OF APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER VAN ETTEN AND COMMISSIONER KARISNY ABSTAINED FROM VOTING ON APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES DUE TO THEIR ABSENCE AT THE LAST MEETING.

Commissioner Gollob had a clarifying question regarding application 2019-38 Vic’s Place VRBO. He asked about the Fire Department’s recommendation that they have an evacuation plan and he didn’t see it on the letter but that they have some kind of plan drawn up because the fire department was concerned that in the event of a fire they would have a delay getting to the property given the location. He didn’t see it in the conditions of approval by Staff in the review comments.

Henry explained that the concern from Lower Valley Fire in regard to emergency response was not knowing where the property is located. He continued that it was a recommendation from Staff that the owners work with Lower Valley Fire and produce an emergency plan with their guests. He said that after talking to the Fire Marshal it was clear that there was a section in the Fire Code that speaks to the location of properties that can’t be seen from the right-of-way. He added that the residents needed to work with Lower Valley Fire to address those concerns. He said that all parties will be working together toward a commonsense solution, but it didn’t have anything to do with the use.

H. HEARING ITEMS

Application #: 2019-43
Application Name: Cook Short Term Rental
Application Type: Conditional Use Permit
Location: 157 South Orchard Street
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.

Commissioner Van Etten read the description of application 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental Conditional Use Permit to the meeting attendees.

Henry Hemphill, Planner for the City of Fruita, went up to the podium to give the presentation. Mr. Hemphill explained that Staff had received a public comment at the end of the day and after reviewing the comments determined that they didn’t directly correlate with any of the approval criteria. He just wanted to be sure to mention this for the record and that concerns were brought up and that they are addressing those in a Public Hearing.
TO: FRUITA CITY COUNCIL AND MAYOR
FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
DATE: FEBRUARY 4, 2020
RE: RESOLUTION 2020-06, A RESOLUTION APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A VACATION RENTAL BY OWNER (BED & BREAKFAST) IN A COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE LOCATED AT 157 SOUTH ORCHARD STREET.

BACKGROUND

The subject property contains a 1,556 square foot detached single family dwelling unit on an approximately .17-acre lot located on South Orchard Street northwest of the intersection of East McCune Avenue and South Orchard Street. The property owner has requested a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to use the property for a vacation rental by owner.

The applicant is proposing to rent, on a less than month-to-month basis, an attached 393 square foot mother-in-law suite that includes one-bedroom, full kitchen and bathroom. The Land Use Code defines this type of use as a Bed & Breakfast which requires a CUP in the Community Residential (CR) zone.

City Staff did receive written public comments regarding the application and these comments are provided with the Council packet. This CUP meets or can meet all approval criteria and standards that must be considered for CUP’s.

At their January 14, 2020 public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of this application to the City Council by a vote of 7-0.

Conditions of approval before the business becomes operational:

1. Lodger’s tax be paid to the City of Fruita pursuant to Chapter 3.18 of the Fruita Municipal Code.
2. Maintain a current City of Fruita business license.
3. Limited to 1 bedroom.
4. All bedrooms shall contain fire and carbon monoxide alarms.
5. Annual review of the Conditional Use Permit by the Fruita Code Compliance Officer.
6. Compliance with all laws and regulations as applicable.
FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed CUP should have a positive fiscal impact on the city. The use appears to be compatible with the surrounding area and should generate sales and lodger’s taxes which are used to market and promote the city.

APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This CUP application meets or can meet all approval criteria and standards of Fruita’s Land Use Code. The Land Use Code (along with other regulatory documents such as Fruita’s Design Criteria and Construction Specifications Manual) implement the city’s goals and policies as outlined in the city’s Master Plan including the Fruita Community Plan.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COUNCIL:

1. Approve the proposed Conditional Use Permit.
2. Deny the proposed Conditional Use Permit.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the recommendation of staff that the Council by motion:

APPROVE RESOLUTION 2020-06, A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A VACATION RENTAL BY OWNER (BED & BREAKFAST) IN A COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE LOCATED AT 157 SOUTH ORCHARD STREET.
RESOLUTION 2020-06

A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A VACATION RENTAL BY OWNER (BED & BREAKFAST) IN A COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE LOCATED AT 157 SOUTH ORCHARD STREET

WHEREAS, the property owner at 157 South Orchard Street has submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed & Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone, and

WHEREAS, the City of Fruita requires a Conditional Use Permit to operate a vacation rental by owner (Bed & Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone, and

WHEREAS, the Fruita Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 14, 2020 and recommended approval to the Fruita City Council of the Conditional Use Permit with conditions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL:

A. The Conditional Use Permit to operate a Vacation Rental by Owner at 157 South Orchard Street is hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Lodger’s tax be paid to the City of Fruita pursuant to Chapter 3.18 of the Fruita Municipal Code.
2. Maintain a current City of Fruita business license.
3. Limited to 1 bedroom.
4. All bedrooms shall contain fire and carbon monoxide alarms.
5. Annual review of the Conditional Use Permit by the Fruita Code Compliance Officer.
6. Compliance with all laws and regulations as applicable.

B. The City Clerk shall record this Resolution with the Mesa County Clerk & Recorder’s Office.

C. If the Conditional Use is inactive for a period of 1 year or more the permit will be automatically revoked.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL


ATTEST: City of Fruita

______________________________ ____________________________________
Margaret Sell, City Clerk Joel Kincaid, Mayor
Application #: 2019-43
Application Name: Cook Short Term Rental
Application Type: Conditional Use Permit
Representative: Ryan Cook
Property Owner: Renee Cook
Location: 157 S. Orchard Street
Zone: Community Residential
Description: This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast). The Fruita Land Use Code requires a Conditional Use Permit to operate a Bed and Breakfast in a Community Residential zone.

**City Staff received written public comments after the Planning Commission received their packets. The public comments were entered into the record on the day of the Planning Commission meeting. Additions/modifications to the Staff Report have been made to the version presented in the City Council Packets. Any modifications are shown in italics.**

Project Description:

The subject property contains a 1,556 square foot detached single family dwelling unit on an approximately .17-acre lot located on South Orchard Street northwest of the intersection of East McCune Avenue and South Orchard Street. The property owner has requested a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to use the property for a vacation rental by owner.

The applicant is proposing to rent, on a less than month-to-month basis, an attached 393 square foot mother-in-law suite that includes one-bedroom, full kitchen and bathroom. The Land Use Code defines this type of use as a Bed & Breakfast which requires a CUP in the Community Residential (CR) zone.

Surrounding Land Uses and Zoning:
Surrounding zoning consists mostly of Community Residential with one PUD zoned property. Most land uses surrounding the subject property are single family detached dwellings with the exception of one property that consists of multi-family units to the east. There are similar types of uses (Bed & Breakfasts or Short-Term Rentals) nearby.
Review of Applicable Land Use Code Requirements:

Table 17.07.060(F) of the Land Use Code requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Bed & Breakfast type of land use in the Community Residential zone. The Land Use Code defines a Bed & Breakfast as a facility of residential character that provides sleeping accommodations with or without meals for hire on a day-to-day basis with no more than four guest rooms. It is not required to be owner occupied.

Section 17.07.070, Supplemental Zoning Regulations and Standards, Section A, identifies conditions and standards that must be met for a Bed & Breakfast use:

1. **Where the applicable zoning district allows bed and breakfast uses as a Conditional Use, the use must be a residential dwelling that contains no more than four (4) guest bedrooms where overnight lodging, with or without meals, is provided for compensation. Bed and Breakfast uses with more than four (4) guest bedrooms are considered hotels or motels;**

   The request from the applicant is to rent out the portion of the dwelling unit that is considered the mother-in-law suite, or accessory dwelling unit, portion. This portion contains 1 bedroom. **This criteria has been met.**

   It should be noted that the entire dwelling unit, including the attached accessory dwelling unit, contain 4 bedrooms all together.
2. **Kitchen and dining facilities in bed and breakfast dwellings may serve only residents and guests and shall not be operated or used for any commercial activity other than that necessary for bed and breakfast purposes;**

   The applicants are aware that the kitchen and dining facilities may only serve the guests even though this is not directly expressed in the project narrative. **This criteria can be met.**

3. **The bed and breakfast use shall not change the residential character of the dwelling if located in a residential zone or area;**

   Staff believes that the residential character of this property will not change because the application doesn’t propose any changes to the residential character of the dwelling unit. The property will be owner occupied and states that they will be the caretakers for the property monitoring noise, litter, and loitering. Additionally, the applicants stated in the project narrative that they will be taking care of the yard, snow removal and garbage removal. **This criteria can be met.**

4. **In residential zones (including residential developments in the CMU zone), there shall be no advertising display or other indication of the bed and breakfast use on the premises other than a sign that is in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 17.41;**

   Chapter 17.41 of the Land Use Code permits an Address or Identification Sign, identifying the address and/or the occupants of a dwelling unit or of an establishment, with a maximum size of two square feet and a maximum height of four feet for a sign in this zone. No illumination of this sign is permitted. There are no signs on the subject property at this time.

   The Sign Code requires that signs be reviewed in conjunction with the Conditional Use Permit. The applicants addressed signs in their project narrative that states there would be no advertising nor signs in the yard promoting Airbnb or VRBO. Therefore, no signage is being proposed. If a sign were to be proposed, there would need to be an amendment to this Conditional Use Permit. Amendments to CUP’s require hearings by both the Planning Commission and City Council. This criteria **is not applicable because no sign is being proposed at this time.**

5. **A minimum of one parking space per guest bedroom and resident bedroom shall be required. Screening may also be required;**
Since the primary dwelling unit contains 3 bedrooms and the accessory unit contain 1 bedroom, 4 total off street parking paved parking spaces are required under this approval criteria.

The applicant states in the project narrative that there is ample off street parking with 3 spaces in the front and driveway and an additional 4 parking spaces in the side yard. It appears that one of the Site Plan renderings show off street parking being proposed in the front yard. Staff does not support parking vehicles in the front yard area which has not been historically designated as parking and this should not be considered as an appropriate off street parking spot. However, there does appear to be enough off-street parking to meet this criteria. No screening is recommended by Staff. This criteria has been met.

6. The bed and breakfast facility shall comply with all Building Codes adopted by the city;

The dwelling unit was originally constructed in 1961 according to the Mesa County Assessors website. Also according to the Mesa County Assessors website, the subject property underwent a remodel in 1995, added a detach garage in 2010, solar added in 2012, and an attached mother-in-law suite added in 2018. All required building permits were obtained and passed inspections. It does not appear that there are any outstanding building permits. This criteria has been met at this time.

7. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that the relevant subdivision's declarations, covenants, conditions or restrictions allow for a bed and breakfast use and/or associated signing; and

There does not appear to be any covenants associated with this property. Staff believes this criteria is not applicable.

8. Where a bed and breakfast use is subject to Conditional Use Permit approval, any existing or proposed uses in addition to that of a dwelling unit (e.g. home occupation, accessory dwelling unit, etc.) are considered as part of the conditional use review.

Staff is unaware of any other existing or intended use of this property other than as a dwelling unit and/or as a short-term rental as proposed by this CUP request.

Based on this information, this CUP request for a Bed & Breakfast meets or can meet the supplemental zoning regulations and standards of the Land Use Code.

Chapter 13 of the Land Use Code identifies the approval criteria that must be considered for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) requests. The Code defines a CUP as a use which, because of its unique or varying characteristics, cannot be properly classified as an
allowed use in a particular zone district. After due consideration, as provided for in
Section 17.13.040 of the Land Use Code, of the impact upon neighboring land and of the
public need for the particular use at a particular location, such conditional use may or
may not be approved.

According to Section 17.13.40.C of the Land Use Code, a Conditional Use Permit may be
granted for a conditional use in a particular zone provided the City Council finds as
follows:

Section 17.13.040, Conditional Uses, of the Land Development Code requires that a
conditional use be approved after considering the following:

1. The proposed use is consistent with the provisions and purposes of this Title,
   with the purposes of the zone in which it is located, and with the city's Master
   Plan;

   Based on this review, the proposed conditional use can be consistent with the
   provisions and purposes of this Title (the Land Use Code), which is to promote
   the health, safety and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the
   community, and with the purposes of the Community Residential zone, which is
to allow for moderate density single-family neighborhoods. If the supplemental
zoning regulations and standards (identified above) are met along with the
approval criteria for CUPs, this criterion can be met. The Land Use Code is one
of the main documents used to implement the goals and policies of the City's
Master Plan.

2. The proposed use is compatible with existing and allowed uses surrounding
   or affected by the proposed use, pursuant to the criteria in Section 17.07.080;

   Section 17.07.080 requires that a proposed development be compatible with
   adjacent properties, considering both existing and potential land uses on adjacent
   properties. For all land uses, “compatibility” is provided when a proposed land
use can coexist with other existing uses in the vicinity without one use having a
disproportionate or severe impact on the other use(s). The city decision-making
body may consider other uses existing and approved and may consider all
potential impacts relative to what customarily occurs in the applicable zone and
those which are foreseeable, given the range of land uses allowed in the zone. The
review authority may require conditions of approval to promote compatibility
between a proposed use and existing uses in the vicinity to ensure compatibility.

   Although there are short term rentals nearby, it appears that this proposed
vacation rental can be compatible with surrounding land uses. Compliance with
the regulations for vacation rentals should allow this business to coexist with
other existing houses in the area without having a disproportionate or severe
impact on the neighborhood. This criterion can be met.
3. The proposed use will not materially endanger the public health or safety; and

Use of the attached mother-in-law suite for a vacation rental is not expected to endanger the public health or safety. Staff recommends that all guest bedrooms contain carbon monoxide and smoke alarms. This criterion can be met.

4. Public services and facilities including, but not limited to, transportation systems, wastewater disposal and treatment, domestic water, fire protection, police protection, and storm drainage facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use.

Public services and facilities have been available to this property and will continue to be available to this property while it is used as a vacation rental. The impacts are not expected to be any greater than those generated by a single-family residence. This criterion has been met.

Based on this information, this requested Conditional Use Permit meets or can meet all approval criteria for Conditional Use Permits and all supplemental zoning standards.

Legal Notice:

Y N DATE
Postcards ☒ ☐ 12/17/2019
Paper ☒ ☐ 12/20/2019
Property ☒ ☐ 12/17/2019

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Fruita Planning Commission will hold a public hearing Tuesday, January 14, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. at the Fruita Civic Center, 2nd Floor Council Chambers, 325 E. Aspen Avenue. The following item will be presented at the public hearings. The Planning Commission will formulate a recommendation, which will be forwarded to the Fruita City Council. If the item listed below is acted on by the Planning Commission, the Fruita City Council will hold a public hearing on this same item on Tuesday, February 4, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. at the Fruita Civic Center, 2nd Floor Council Chambers. If you have an interest on the item please call 858-0786 or come to the Planning & Development Department office located at 325 E. Aspen Avenue to review the information in the file. Your appearance at both hearings is encouraged to ensure your concerns are accurately represented or you can write a letter outlining your concerns and submit it to the Planning & Development Department.

Application # 2019-43
Application Name Cook Short Term Rental
Application Type Conditional Use Permit
Location 157 South Orchard Street
Zone Community Residential (CR)
Description This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed
And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.

Physically disadvantaged persons who wish to obtain information or need assistance in attending the Public Hearing, may call (970) 858-0786, the hearing impaired may call Relay Colorado at 1-800-659-2656, or visit our website:  www.fruita.org

Review Comments:

- No reviewer expressed concerns over the proposed application.

- Conditions of approval by Staff:
  1. Lodger’s tax be paid to the City of Fruita pursuant to Chapter 3.18 of the Fruita Municipal Code.
  2. Maintain a current City of Fruita business license.
  3. Limited to 1 bedroom.
  4. All bedrooms shall contain fire and carbon monoxide alarms.
  5. Annual review of the Conditional Use Permit by the Fruita Code Compliance Officer.
  6. Compliance with all laws and regulations as applicable.

Public Comments:

City Staff received written public comments after the Planning Commission received their packets. The public comments were entered into the record on the day of the Planning Commission meeting.

No other public comments have been received at this time.

Staff Recommendation:

Because all of the approval criteria for Conditional Use Permits and all supplemental zoning standards and regulations either are or can be met, staff recommends approval of the proposed Bed & Breakfast with the condition that all review comments are met before the business becomes operational.

November 20, 2019

Fruita Planning Department
325 E. Aspen Avenue
Fruita, CO 81521

Re: Comments for 2019-43 1575 Orchard Street -Cook VRBO

1. Fire extinguisher, carbon monoxide detector and smoke detector/alarms must be in place and operational.

Richard Pippenger
Fire Marshal
Kelli McLean

From: Darrell Bay <darrell.bay@mesacounty.us>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2019 4:58 PM
To: Kelli McLean
Subject: Re: 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Kelli,
MCBD has no objections.
If inspections are required a building permit must be obtained prior to the inspection.
Thanks

Darrell Bay
Building Official
970-244-1651

On Thu, Nov 14, 2019 at 3:11 PM Kelli McLean <kmclean@fruita.org> wrote:

Hello,

Please send us your review comments for project 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental by Thursday, December 5. I have attached the link below for your convenience.


Thank you!

KELLI MCLEAN
PLANNING TECHNICIAN
CITY OF FRUITA
970-858-0786

FRUITA COLORADO
To whom it may concern,

We would like to express our highly justified concerns regarding the conditional use permit for vacation rental, BNB permit for 157 South Orchard Street.

We would like to put forth these completely justified objections to this permit.

1. This is a residential neighborhood, not a business zoned area.

2. There is a VERY high level of concern for the safety of all those that live on South Orchard street, including the elders and children. Compete strange, and unknown visitors coming and going night after night, posses many non objectionable safety issues. Our world is increasing unsafe, and to invite unnecessary risks for the children, property, and elderly of this residential street is ridiculous. The people in this neighborhood are already concerned with the increasing violence, damage to property, and thefts in this area. Why invite trouble?

3. There is VERY high level of concern for the current homeowners, and their properties. Transient, night after night renters of the proposed BNB produce not only high levels of safety issues including damage to property, theft, and an increased level of violence, but places yet another burden on the police officers who are already burdened enough.

4. Last but certainly not least, is the parking at said property is already ridiculous, and a problem for current property owners. The current residents already occupying this property are many, and have cleared their front lawn in order to provide parking for themselves. There is extremely limited, and at times, no available parking on the street for even the property owners of the street. There is absolutely! NO available parking for any additional visitors or “guests”. This would not only pose a bigger burden for the current residents, who do park on the street, and whom pay taxes, but could also institute an increase of theft, and equally an increasing rise in the potential for the safety of the children with increased traffic.

There are many reasons to disallow this conditional use permit, and as a residents on south orchard street, we highly disapprove of any conditional use permit at 157 South Orchard Street. We expect the city to disallow this request due to the above reasons and others that are yet unknown, as well as the current increasing violence and history of the safety of BNB’s as see in the nightly news. This alone should be warning enough not to invite trouble.

Sincerely

Concerned resident
LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

Project Name: Ryan & Renee Cook
Project Location: 157 S. ORGANO RD. Fruita, CO
Current Zoning District: Requested Zone: 0
Tax Parcel Number(s): 209-7-17-116-013 Number of Acres: 47.17
Project Type: Conditional Use Permit

Property Owner: Renee Cook
Developer: Ryan Cook
Property Owner: Ryan Cook
Address: 157 S. ORGANO RD. Fruita, CO
Address: 157 S. ORGANO RD. Fruita, CO 81521
City/State/Zip: Fruita, CO
City/State/Zip: Fruita, CO
Phone: 970-589-7713 Fax: 970-589-7713
Phone: 970-589-7713 Fax: 970-589-7713
E-mail: RyanCook@gmail.com E-mail: RyanCook@gmail.com

Please designate a representative as the coordinator for this application. The representative should attend all conferences/hearings, will receive all correspondence, and communicate all information to the property owners.

Owner Rep: Ryan Cook
Contact: Ryan Cook
Address: 157 S. ORGANO RD. Fruita, CO
Address: 157 S. ORGANO RD. Fruita, CO
City/State/Zip: Fruita, CO City/State/Zip: Fruita, CO
Phone: 970-589-7713 Fax: 970-589-7713
Phone: 970-589-7713 Fax: 970-589-7713
E-mail: RyanCook@gmail.com E-mail: RyanCook@gmail.com

This Notarized application authorizes the owner’s representative, if designated, to act on behalf of the property owners regarding this application.

The above information is correct and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Renee S. Cook
Name of Legal Owner Signature Date 10/21/19

Name of Legal Owner Signature Date

Name of Legal Owner Signature Date

STATE OF COLORADO ) ss.
COUNTY OF MESA )

APRIL MARIE VAUGHAN
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF COLORADO
NOTARY ID 20194023639
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JUN 20, 2023

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 21st day of Oct, 2019.
My Commission expires June 20, 2023 Notary Public A. Vaughan
Project Narrative for Conditional Use Permit

We are applying for a conditional use permit to operate a short term rental in accordance to those listed in Airbnb & Vacation Rentals By Owners.

The property is located at 157 South Orchard Street. This is a single dwelling owner occupy house with an attached, under the same roof, Mother in Law Suite (added in 2018). The parcel and tax key is 2697-171-16-013. This is .17 acre lot.

Our main house is a 1000 square foot 3 bedroom house. My family of 4 currently live in the main house.

Our rental is a 393 square foot all self contained apartment, including a full kitchen, shower & all appliances. The suite has 1 bedroom & living room for beds. The rental would not allow more than 4 occupants and most likely to cater to 2 occupants. There will be normal usage of utilities during rent.

The addition was built in 2018 to current Mesa building standards, for our mom & mother in law. Unexpectedly, she passed away this September 2019. This addition was never intended for an AirBnB, a business or anything such. We now have a huge void on our property. We feel blessed to have this space and feel we need to fill it. We also believe this would benefit our local community & economy with a positive impact.

Our homeowners insurance Farmers Insurance covers our house and any short term rentals on our property.

We have ample parking with 3 spaces in front yard & driveway and 4 parking spaces down side yard & in back. There will be no impact on traffic flow or parking.

This is an owner occupy, so we be the caretakers for property. There will be no littering, loitering or excess noise, since we will be monitoring for that. We will take care of all yard, snow & garbage removal. All building codes are up to date. Quite times will be from 10:00pm-7:00am. There is no HOA in our neighborhood.

Guest will be asked to parked in designated driveway area. If vehicle is too long, we have additional off road parking in back.

There will be no advertising nor signs in yard promoting Airbnb or VRBO. We will advertise through Airbnb & VRBO.

We have spoken with many neighbors and they are very supportive of this project.

Christian at 169 South Orchard
Kenton Seth at 151 South Orchard
Ron & Lena at 141 South orchard

We love Fruita & all it has to offer. We think this will help enhance our local community as well as show our love for this town to our guests. Thank you for the consideration.
Built

House Addition 2018

157 South Orchard Ave BNB

Existing Tenant

Owner Occupied Home
A. CALL TO ORDER

Seven Planning Commissioners were in attendance. (Justin Gollob, Jesse Fabula, Mel Mulder, Doug Van Etten, Dave Karisny, Cullen Purser, and Patrick Hummel were present).

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Whitney Rink led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Hearing Item 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental Conditional Use Permit was moved from a Consent Item to a Hearing Item due to the receipt of a public comment.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER MULDER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER PURSER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSES 7-0

E. WITHDRAWN ITEMS

None

F. CONTINUED ITEMS

None

G. CONSENT ITEMS

Application #: 2019-38
Application Name: Vic’s Place VRBO
Application Type: Conditional Use Permit
Location: 825 E. Ottley Avenue
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.

Application #: 2019-44
Application Name: Village at Country Creek North
Application Type: Preliminary Plan
Applicant: Sunshine of the Redlands
Location: 1176 18 Road
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for 12 single family detached residential lots on approximately 3.4 acres.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
November 12, 2019 Planning Commission meeting

COMMISSIONER KARISNY MADE A MOTION TO MOVE CONSENT ITEM 2019-43 COOK SHORT TERM RENTAL TO A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM AND APPROVE THE REMAINING APPLICATIONS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

COMMISSIONER MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 7-0 IN FAVOR TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AND 5-0 IN FAVOR OF APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER VAN ETTEN AND COMMISSIONER KARISNY ABSTAINED FROM VOTING ON APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES DUE TO THEIR ABSENCE AT THE LAST MEETING.

Commissioner Gollob had a clarifying question regarding application 2019-38 Vic’s Place VRBO. He asked about the Fire Department’s recommendation that they have an evacuation plan and he didn’t see it on the letter but that they have some kind of plan drawn up because the fire department was concerned that in the event of a fire they would have a delay getting to the property given the location. He didn’t see it in the conditions of approval by Staff in the review comments.

Henry explained that the concern from Lower Valley Fire in regard to emergency response was not knowing where the property is located. He continued that it was a recommendation from Staff that the owners work with Lower Valley Fire and produce an emergency plan with their guests. He said that after talking to the Fire Marshal it was clear that there was a section in the Fire Code that speaks to the location of properties that can’t be seen from the right-of-way. He added that the residents needed to work with Lower Valley Fire to address those concerns. He said that all parties will be working together toward a commonsense solution, but it didn’t have anything to do with the use.

H. HEARING ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2019-43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Name:</td>
<td>Cook Short Term Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Type:</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>157 South Orchard Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone:</td>
<td>Community Residential (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commissioner Van Etten read the description of application 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental Conditional Use Permit to the meeting attendees.

Henry Hemphill, Planner for the City of Fruita, went up to the podium to give the presentation. Mr. Hemphill explained that Staff had received a public comment at the end of the day and after reviewing the comments determined that they didn’t directly correlate with any of the approval criteria. He just wanted to be sure to mention this for the record and that concerns were brought up and that they are addressing those in a Public Hearing.
Slide 1 – Introduction of Application 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental

Slide 2 – Legal Notice
Mr. Hemphill pointed out the buffer zone in which the legal notice requirement was sent and notified of the meeting. He also pointed to a picture of the property posting.

Slide 3 – Description
- The subject property contains a 1,556 square foot detached single-family dwelling unit on an approximately .17-acre lot.
- Located on South Orchard Street northwest of the intersection of East McCune Avenue and South Orchard Street.
- The applicant is proposing to rent, on a less than month-to-month basis, an attached 393 square foot mother-in-law suite that includes one-bedroom, full kitchen and bathroom.
- The Land Use Code defines this type of use as a Bed & Breakfast which requires a CUP in the Community Residential (CR) zone.

Slide 4 - Review of Land Use Code Requirements
- **Section 17.07.070 (A) Supplemental Zoning Regulations and Standards:**
  1. Where the applicable zoning district allows bed and breakfast uses as a Conditional Use, the use must be a residential dwelling that contains no more than four (4) guest bedrooms where overnight lodging, with or without meals, is provided for compensation. Bed and Breakfast uses with more than four (4) guest bedrooms are considered hotels or motels;
  2. Kitchen and dining facilities in bed and breakfast dwellings may serve only residents and guests and shall not be operated or used for any commercial activity other than that necessary for bed and breakfast purposes;
  3. The bed and breakfast use shall not change the residential character of the dwelling if located in a residential zone or area;
  4. In residential zones (including residential developments in the CMU zone), there shall be no advertising display or other indication of the bed and breakfast use on the premises other than a sign that is in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 17.41;

Slide 5 – Review of Land Use Code Requirements Continued
- **Section 17.07.070 (A) Supplemental Zoning Regulations and Standards:**
  5. A minimum of one parking space per guest bedroom and resident bedroom shall be required. Screening may also be required;
  6. The bed and breakfast facility shall comply with all Building Codes adopted by the city;
  7. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that the relevant subdivision's declarations, covenants, conditions or restrictions allow for a bed and breakfast use and/or associated signing; and
  8. Where a bed and breakfast use is subject to Conditional Use Permit approval, any existing or proposed uses in addition to that of a dwelling unit (e.g. home occupation, accessory dwelling unit, etc.) are considered as part of the conditional use review.

Slide 6 - Review of Land Use Code Requirements Continued
- **Section 17.13.040 Conditional Uses:**
1. The proposed use is consistent with the provisions and purposes of this Title, with the purposes of the zone in which it is located, and with the city's Master Plan;
2. The proposed use is compatible with existing and allowed uses surrounding or affected by the proposed use, pursuant to the criteria in Section 17.07.080;
3. The proposed use will not materially endanger the public health or safety; and
4. Public services and facilities including, but not limited to, transportation systems, wastewater disposal and treatment, domestic water, fire protection, police protection, and storm drainage facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use.

Slide 7 – Review Comments & Public Comments

**Public Comments:**
- No written public comments have been received regarding this application at this time.

**Review Comments:**
- No reviewer expressed concerns over the proposed application.

Slide 8 – Staff Recommendation

- Because all of the approval criteria for Conditional Use Permits and all supplemental zoning standards and regulations either are or can be met, staff recommends approval of the proposed Bed & Breakfast with the condition that all review comments are met before the business becomes operational.

- City Council = February 4, 2020

Mr. Hemphill concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Van Etten invited the applicants to come up to speak.

Ryan and Renee Cook who reside at 154 South Orchard Street went up to speak. She said that she works in the community and they have a high school student that attends Fruita Monument High School. She said that her husband is disabled and at home most of the time. She said that they live in the house and it is their primary dwelling and they have the most interest in protecting who is in and out of the home. She continued that it would not be transients as mentioned in the letter. She said it is their home and they would be there and their daughter lives with them. She said that this is something that they need to do with the space. She said that it was built for her mother who unexpectedly passed away and they are left with the attachment to the home. They don’t want someone there all the time so they don’t want to rent it out as a monthly rental but on occasion they would like to offer the amenities of the town. She thanked them for hearing them and asked if they had any questions for them.

Commissioner Karisny said that if he wanted to give them the opportunity to respond to the letter.
Ryan Cook who lives at 154 South Orchard Street spoke. He said that he wanted to address one item in the letter. He said that he spoke to many of his neighbors and wrote three of them down which are the direct neighbors that this would impact. He got their permission to put their names down. He said that the letter they received was sudden. He said they did try to address every concern with all of their neighbors. He just wanted to be sure they knew that.

Commissioner Van Etten thanked him and said that he appreciated his neighbor outreach efforts. He then asked if anyone else wanted to provide public testimony on the hearing item.

There was none.

Commissioner Van Etten closed the public hearing portion on the item and asked the Planning Commissioners if they had any comments.

Commissioner Purser mentioned that the VRBO’s continued to be a point of discussion for the community. He said that potential solutions and problems in that it can bring healthy people to the community but can also erase the community for various reasons. He felt this was a model situation when the resident is living in the house and they are communicating with their neighborhood. This is what they encourage people to do.

Commissioner Hummel seconded that comment. He asked Mr. Hemphill what kind of oversight existed when you have a situation like this, an attached ADU to a primary residence. He asked if the Conditional Use Permit is only given to the 300 square foot unit, how does this differentiate?

Mr. Hemphill said that it is placed as a condition of approval on a resolution to City Council. He continued that this is approved, and the property owner is telling us that they are going to rent out 1 bedroom and it is encompassing this area, they have shown it in the project narrative, and the site plan. He said that this is the accountability tool that is used to make sure that this is what happens. He said that he could see his point in that they are telling us one thing and doing another. He said that it is hard to police that but as they progress towards these Conditional Use Permits and the placement of conditions via resolution to the City Council, they will get better over time to figure out best practices. He said that this is Fruita and they hope that people are doing the right thing by telling them one thing and following through. He said that this was an accountability measure.

Mr. Dan Caris added another comment. He said that having the Mayor and City Clerk ink the resolution itself, it has those specific performance measures about the limitations for what the application was approved for. He said those provisions are in place to make sure that it is only that unit. He said that there is a path to revoking the permit by taking the formal step of approving it by resolution and then knowing whether or not there are violations you can point to the resolution and number and put that on the record in the event of a revocation in the future.

Commissioner Van Etten asked if there were any other questions, comments or items of discussion.

There were none.

Commissioner Van Etten asked for a motion.
COMMISSIONER KARISNY MOVED TO APPROVE 2019-43 COOK SHORT TERM RENTAL CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

COMMISSIONER PURSER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSES 7-0

Commissioner Van Etten thanked everyone who came, and he welcomed them to stay for the remainder of the meeting if they wanted to.

Other Business

1. Community Development Activity Reports.
   a. Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local Comprehensive Plan

Commissioner Van Etten told the audience that they would be moving to Other Business and discussing Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local Comprehensive Plan.

Dan Caris Planning Director for the City of Fruita went up to give his presentation of the Comprehensive Plan that they have been working on for a year. He mentioned that in their packet was not the entire plan but was the basics of the chapters for review. He wanted them to provide feedback on elements that were discussed at the December 12 workshop for potential changes. He said he presented it with track changes and wanted to have a clarifying question and answer session with the Planning Commission. He felt it would be prudent for the record for the process to go through where they started, who was involved, the outreach efforts, the results they received and then have an informal discussion. He said that way when they have the joint workshop that they were invited to with City Council and the Steering Committee they will have the opportunity to button up the document and put it in software which will then put it in a format they are more traditionally used to seeing. He also wanted to talk about was the design templates at the end of their packets which is the snapshot of what they are planning on doing and any feedback on that would be appreciated.

Slide 1 - Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local Introduction

Slide 2 - Timeline

Slide 3 – Steering Committee - Dates and Who was involved
Mr. Caris said pointed out the consultants that were involved in the document were SE Group, Economic Planning Systems, and Studio Seed.

April 18 – Vision Setting
June 13 – Land Use & Growth
June 20 – Land Use & Growth
July 18 – Economic Development
August 15 – Parks and Rec / Transportation
August 22 – Community Character Workshop
September 12 – Infrastructure
December 12 – Wrap up meeting
BACKGROUND

This is a request for approval of a Preliminary Plan application to subdivide approximately 3.48 acres of land into 12 single family detached residential lots in the Community Residential zone. Lot sizes range between 7,050 to 12,482 square feet and access to the subdivision is proposed from Periwinkle Lane on Snowdrop Court. In 2015 when Village at Country Creek Filing 5 was completed, a Tract of land was set aside with the purposes of access to the subject property. The majority of the lots will take access from Snowdrop Court, while up to 2 lots will take access from a shared driveway to the north. Additionally, a trail connection from Snowdrop Court to the sidewalk on North Pine Street (18 Road) is proposed through Tract A. This Tract is also the location of an onsite detention pond and is proposed to be maintained by the Village at Country Creek Patio Home Association. It should also be noted that this subdivision is proposed to be incorporated into the Village at Country Creek Patio Home Association.

The proposed Preliminary Plan application meets or can meet all approval criteria that must be considered. Review Agencies such as Lower Valley Fire District, Ute Water, and Xcel Energy have had a chance to comment on the proposed subdivision. Their comments, along with other more technical issues, are included with the Staff Report as Consolidated Review Comments. As a condition of approval, all comments and issues must be addressed with the Final Plat application.

At their January 14, 2020 public meeting, the Planning Commission voted 7-0 in favor of recommending approval to the Fruita City Council. There were no public comments at the Planning Commission meeting and no public comments have been received by Staff at this time.

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed Preliminary Plan does not create a fiscal impact to the city at this time. The next
step in the development process is a Final Plat application. With Final Plat approval and the related subdivision improvements agreement (last step before construction takes place), there will be a fiscal impact. As a general rule, residential development usually does not provide enough direct revenue to offset the cost of services, however; impact fees will be required to help offset cost of development.

APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This Preliminary Plan meets or can meet all approval criteria and standards of Fruita’s Land Use Code with the recommended conditions of approval. The Land Use Code (along with other regulatory documents such as Fruita’s Design Criteria and Construction Specifications Manual) implement the city’s goals and policies as outlined in the city’s Master Plan including the Fruita Community Plan.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COUNCIL:

- Approve the Village at Country Creek North Preliminary Plan with the condition that all review comments and issues identified in the Staff Report be adequately resolved with the Final Plat application.

- Deny the Village at Country Creek North Preliminary Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the recommendation of staff that the Council by motion:

APPROVE THE VILLAGE AT COUNTRY CREEK NORTH PRELIMINARY PLAN APPLICATION WITH THE CONDITION THAT ALL REVIEW COMMENTS AND ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE STAFF REPORT BE ADEQUATELY RESOLVED WITH THE FINAL PLAT APPLICATION.
Application #: 2019-44
Project Name: Village at Country Creek North
Application: Preliminary Plan
Representative: Sunshine of the Redlands
Location: 1176 18 Road
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Request: This is a request for approval of a Preliminary Plan application to subdivide approximately 3.48 acres of land into 12 single family detached residential lots.

Project Description:

This is a request for approval of a Preliminary Plan application to subdivide approximately 3.48 acres of land into 12 single family detached residential lots in the Community Residential zone. Lot sizes range between 7,050 to 12,482 square feet and access to the subdivision is proposed from Periwinkle Lane on Snowdrop Court. In 2015 when Village at Country Creek Filing 5 was completed, a Tract of land was set aside with the purposes of access to the subject property. The majority of the lots will take access from Snowdrop Court, while up to 2 lots will take access from a shared driveway to the north. Additionally, a trail connection from Snowdrop Court to the sidewalk on North Pine Street (18 Road) is proposed through Tract A. This Tract is also the location of an onsite detention pond and is proposed to be maintained by the Village at Country Creek Patio Home Association. It should also be noted that this subdivision is proposed to be incorporated into the Village at Country Creek Patio Home Association.

Surrounding Land Uses and Zoning:

Land uses surrounding the subject property consist of mostly residential. Zoning surrounding the subject property is Agricultural Forestry and Transitional (AFT- County zoning) to the north, Large Lot Residential (LLR) to the northeast and Community Residential to the east, south and west.
Review of Applicable Land Use Code Requirements:

MAJOR SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY PLAN

Section 17.15.070.C of the Land Use Code requires the following approval criteria to be considered for Preliminary Plan applications in addition to compliance with all approval criteria required to be considered for Sketch Plan applications:

1. **Adequate resolution of all review comments,**

As discussed below, it appears that review comments can be adequately resolved without a significant redesign of the proposed development. This criterion can be met if all review comments are resolved with the Final Plat application.

2. **Compliance with conditions of approval on the Sketch Plan, if any.**

No Sketch Plan application was submitted or required for this proposed development. This criterion does not apply.

The following are the approval criteria that must be considered for Sketch Plan applications:

1. **Conformance to the City of Fruita’s Master Plan, Land Use Code, Design Criteria and Construction Specifications Manual and other city policies and regulations;**

With some changes, the proposed development can be in conformance with the city's Master Plan, Land Use Code, and all other city policies and regulations based on the more technical responses as expressed in the Consolidated Review Comments included with the Staff Report.

It should be noted that since the proposed subdivision will be incorporated into the existing Village at Country Creek Patio Home Association, that the School Land Dedication impact fee will not apply since the CC&R’s restrict occupants of the dwelling units to 55 years and older. This meets section 17.19.110 (C) (3) of the Land Use Code.

Review comments from the City Engineer, Planning & Development Department, Xcel Energy, Ute Water, Grand Valley Drainage District, and Lower Valley Fire District address technical issues within the development and are attached with this Staff Report. If these issues are adequately resolved with the Final Plat application, then this criterion can be met.

2. **Compatibility with the area around the subject property in accordance with Section 17.07.080;**
Section 17.07.080 of the Code states that for all land uses, “compatibility” is provided when a proposed land use can coexist with other existing uses in the vicinity without one use having a disproportionate or severe impact on the other use(s). The city decision-making body may consider other uses existing and approved, and may consider all potential impacts relative to what customarily occurs in the applicable zone and those which are foreseeable, given the range of land uses allowed in the zone.

There are many single family houses in this area, many of which are on various sized lots ranging from 7,000 square feet to nearly 9 acres. The proposed single family detached residential subdivision proposes lots that are over the 7,000 square foot minimum for the Community Residential zone. In addition to surrounding land uses and zoning, the incorporation of this subdivision into the Village at Country Creek Patio Home Association should strengthen compatibility with the surrounding development and allow this 12 lot subdivision to transition into the Village at Country Creek subdivision effectively. This criterion has been met.

3. Adequate provision of all required services and facilities (roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, parks, police protection, fire protection, domestic water, wastewater services, irrigation water, storm drainage facilities, etc.);

The Village at Country Creek requests that due to the nature of the development being a 55 and older community, that they limit their accesses to the current locations at Sunrose and Primrose Lanes. Typically, a development would be required to construct a 3rd access once the development reaches 75 residents. The basis for that number is the number of trips generated by the units. ITE has defined the trip rates for residential units at approximately 10 trips per day per unit. This would suggest that our threshold for a 3rd access would be at a point where there are approximately 750 trips. Late in 2019, a speed study was conducted within VCC to determine if there were any speed issues. This was at the request of the VCC HOA. As part of the study, the ADT was determined. The ADT’s for Primrose and Sunrose Lanes were 329 and 195, respectfully for a total of 524. By rough count, there are 185 units that have been built with an additional 41 units platted. With the proposed new 12 lots for this subdivision, the total lots would be 238. Prorating future trips to full buildout would suggest that the VCC including the 12 proposed lots would generate 674 trips which falls under the 750 threshold.

If all review comments and issues identified in this Staff Report are adequately resolved with the Final Plat application, this criterion can be met.

4. Preservation of natural features and adequate environmental protection;

The project narrative states that, “natural features will be preserved to the largest extent possible.” There appears to be some trees on the subject property that are proposed to be kept and pruned. These trees are within Tract A and will be maintained by the Village at Country Creek Patio Home Association.
Any stormwater management issues must be addressed and sedimentation and weed controls will be required as part of the construction process.

This criterion can be met.

5. **Ability to resolve all comments and recommendations from reviewers without a significant redesign of the proposed development.**

Although some redesign will be required in order to meet the minimum requirements of the Land Use Code and other city regulations, it does not appear that resolving concerns necessarily leads to a significant redesign of the development that would require another Preliminary Plan review.

Review comments from City Engineer, Planning & Development Department, Xcel Energy, Ute Water, Grand Valley Drainage District, and Lower Valley Fire District address technical issues within the development and are attached with this Staff Report. If these issues are adequately resolved with the Final Plat application, then this criterion can be met.

Based on this information, the approval criteria that must be considered for Preliminary Plan applications either has been met or can be met if all review comments and issues identified in this Staff Report are adequately resolved with the Final Plat application.

**Legal Notice:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcards</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/20/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTICE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION**

The Fruita Planning Commission will hold a public hearing **TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2020 AT 7:00 P.M.** at the Fruita Civic Center, 2nd Floor Council Chambers, 325 E. Aspen Avenue. The following item will be presented at the public hearings. The Planning Commission will formulate a recommendation, which will be forwarded to the Fruita City Council. If the item listed below is acted on by the Planning Commission, the Fruita City Council will hold a public hearing on this same item on **TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2020 AT 7:00 P.M.** at the Fruita Civic Center, 2nd Floor Council Chambers. If you have an interest in an item on the agenda, please call 858-0786 or come to the Planning & Development Department office located at 325 E. Aspen Avenue to review the information in the file. Your appearance at both hearings is encouraged to ensure your concerns are accurately represented or you can write a letter outlining your concerns and submit it to the Planning & Development Department.

**Application #:** 2019-44  
**Application Name:** Village at Country Creek North  
**Application Type:** Preliminary Plan  
**Applicant:** Sunshine of the Redlands  
**Location:** 1176 18 Road
Zone: Community Residential (CR)

DESCRIPTION: This is a request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for 12 single family detached residential lots on approximately 3.4 acres.

Physically disadvantaged persons who wish to obtain information may call (970) 858-0786. The hearing impaired may call Relay Colorado 1-800-659-2656, or visit our website: www.fruita.org

**Review Comments:**

All review comments received are included with this Staff Report. All review comments must be adequately resolved with the Final Plat application.

**Public Comments:**

No written public comments have been received regarding this application at this time.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval of the Village at Country Creek North Preliminary Plan with the condition that all review comments and all issues identified in the Staff Report are adequately resolved with the Final Plat application.

Fruita Planning Commission: January 14, 2020
Fruita City Council: February 4, 2020
Application Type: Preliminary Plan  
Application Name: Village at Country Creek North  
Application Number: 2019-44  
Location: 1176 18 Road  
Zone: Community Residential

Pre-Application meeting: 7/10/2019  
Application submitted: 11/27/2019  
Application sent out for review: 12/6/2019  
Legal Notice –  
Planning Commission: 1/14/20  
City Council: 2/4/20

This is a review of a Preliminary Plan application to subdivide approximately 3.48 acres of land into 12 single family detached residential lots. The subdivision also includes 4 Tracts over approximately .425 acres and approximately 0.516 acres of dedicated ROW.

**GENERAL:**

1. An updated Title Policy will need to be submitted with the Final Plat application.  
2. How tall is the retaining wall in Tract A?  
3. Section 17.29.030 (B) (7) states that Trails will be required to be paved in most circumstances. Staff is strongly encouraging that the trail contained in Tract A be paved. This could be similar to the trail connection between 18 Road and Marigold Avenue.  
4. Clearance on the sides of the trail in Tract A must be at least 3 feet.  
5. Since Tract B will act as a shared driveway to Lots 7 and 8 and possibly Lot 6 it should be noted that Section 17.43.050 (C) (2) (b) states that there is no parking allowed on shared driveways, and that for the Lots accessing from a shared driveway, one additional off-street parking space is to be provided.  
6. Extend the sidewalk along 18 Road.  
7. To discourage unexpected issues, please provide bollards at the ends of the trail on Tract A.  
8. Please confirm that the existing home on the lot will be removed.
9. Has there been talk about replacing the existing fencing along the west property lines? Looks like a mix of wire fencing and electric fencing.
10. The electrical transformer box in the southwest corner of Lot 1 needs to be relocated if possible. This could result in an unusual situation for the future homeowner.
CITY OF FRUITA
CITY ENGINEER & PUBLIC WORKS REVIEW SHEET

PROJECT: The Village at Country Creek – North

Petitioner: John Moir

Engineer: Rolland Consulting Engineers, LLC
Eric Slivon, 243-8300

Reviewer: Sam Atkins

Date: December 21, 2019

REVIEW TYPE: Minor Subdivision [X] Major Subdivision
(Check One) Lot Line Adjustment Final Plat
Site Design Review Conditional Use Permit
Other: PUD Guide Amendment

REVIEW COMMENTS

1. General: This project consists of the subdivision of twelve (12) single family lots on 3.29 acres and is intended to become a part of the Village at Country Creek Townhome’s HOA.

2. Plat:
The plat has a callout along the west property line as a 10’ ft Drainage Easement at Lot 5 and then both a Drainage and Irrigation easement on Lot 1. Can you consolidate that to be that same?

3. Construction Drawings:

Current standards required the pedestrian connections to be concrete.

The City does not want to be responsible for potential damage to the private drive in Tract B when cleaning the sewer main. Options for Lot 7 and 8 sewer services are either install an additional manhole in the asphalt prior to the lip of gutter creating a private line from the manhole at the lip of gutter to Manhole D, or terminate Manhole D in the asphalt and run both sewer service lines from the cul-de-sac through Tract B.

The water service for Lot 7 shall not cross into Lot 8. Make sure the service and meter can be installed in Tract B/Lot 7.

Call out 4-inch waterline in profile view on sheet 9 where applicable.

Where will the mail delivery be located?
Show the street light locations on the plan.

Call out the street signs and stop sign and where needed no outlet/dead end.

**Subdivision Improvements Agreement:** SIA Exhibit B will be reviewed after first round of comments.

Transportation Impacts Fees will be at the rate at the time of planning clearance for each lot. The Chip Seal Fee is $3.85/sy. Please provide the total square yards of asphalt pavement for fee calculation.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Public Works Department and Engineering Department recommend approval of this Final Plat Plan for this Major Subdivision upon satisfactory response to the comments above.
Grand Valley Drainage District

The district has reviewed the proposed project. We have contacted the engineer: GVDD will accept the outfall from the proposed detention facility at the rates calculated in the drainage report. The District will require a Discharge License for the detention pond. The proposed pipe from the detention pond to GVDD’s manhole will be a private drain and not maintained by the District.

Lower Valley Fire District

Install fire hydrant at intersection of Snowdrop Court and Periwinkle Lane. Ref: Section C103 as amended of Appendix C of the IFC.

Cul-de-sac diameter driving roadway is to be 96 feet. Do not include sidewalks as part of the road surface. Ref: Appendix D of the IFC.

Mesa County Building Department

MCBD has no objections to this project.
The following must be provided to our office in paper form
The city approved Soil report, Drainage plan & TOF tabulation sheet

Ute Water

Village at Country Creek North
• Show dry utilities for further review and coordination of utility placement.
• Eliminate the 45° bend as shown at STA 44+46.00 show C & BO restrain pipe 23’ to the south of line terminus.
• Call out existing service to be abandon and capped at main.
• Show water main on sheet 8 between STA 1+00 and 0+20 to follow grade contour to maintain proper bury depth.

Xcel Energy

I see a couple of conflicts with transformer location and water meter location. Possible lot #1 and tract A. Lot 12 is another one that we should look into as well.

Mesa County Surveyor

Village at Country Creek Filing North - 1st Review
12/19/2019

County Surveyor – Scott Thompson

Sheet 1
1. In the third paragraph, third line, easterly is misspelled
2. In line 5 of the description the bearing S79°42’21”W should be S79°42’21”E
3. A Community Development Director’s certificate may be required – verify with planning

Sheet 2
1. The adjoiner information west of the boundary should be William M Vidmar
2. South of the boundary there is an IRR BOX shown, this should be removed from the plat
3. There is a topographic symbol near the northwest corner that should be removed
4. Found or set monuments with a durable cap and license number should be indicated for all boundary corners
5. The west line of Tract C needs annotation
6. Sufficient annotation to locate the diagonal portion of the 15’ drainage easement within Lot 1 should be provided

See the redlined plat
### LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

**Project Name:** Village at Country Creek North  
**Project Location:** 18.5 and K Roads  
**Current Zoning District:** Community Residential  
**Requested Zone:** Same  
**Tax Parcel Number(s):** 2697-092-00-711  
**Number of Acres:** 3.3  
**Project Type:** Continuation of Village at Country Creek (townhomes and single family homes)

**Property Owner:** Sunshine of the Redlands, Inc.  
**Developer:** Sunshine of the Redlands, Inc.  
**Address:** PO Box 516  
**City/State/Zip:** Fruita, CO 81521  
**Phone:** 970-858-1226  
**E-mail:** moir28@gmail.com

**Property Owner:** Sunshine of the Redlands, Inc.  
**Developer:** Sunshine of the Redlands, Inc.  
**Address:** PO Box 516  
**City/State/Zip:** Fruita, CO 81521  
**Phone:** 970-858-1226  
**E-mail:** moir28@gmail.com

Please designate a representative as the coordinator for this application. The representative should attend all conferences/hearings, will receive all correspondence, and communicate all information to the property owners.

**Owner Rep:** John Moir  
**Engineer:** Rolland Consulting Engineers  
**Contact:** John Moir  
**Address:** 278 N. Mesa St.  
**City/State/Zip:** Fruita, CO 81521  
**Phone:** 970-858-1226  
**E-mail:** moir28@gmail.com

**Contact:** Eric Slivon  
**Address:** 405 Ridges Blvd, Suite A  
**City/State/Zip:** Grand Junction, CO 81507  
**Phone:** 970-243-8300  
**E-mail:** eric@rcegj.com

This Notarized application authorizes the owner's representative, if designated, to act on behalf of the property owners regarding this application.

The above information is correct and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Name of Legal Owner:  
Signature:  
Date: 11/35/19

Name of Legal Owner:  
Signature: John Moir  
Date:  

Name of Legal Owner:  
Signature:  
Date:  

Name of Legal Owner:  
Signature:  
Date:  

STATE OF COLORADO)  
) ss.  
COUNTY OF MESA  

JESSICA VARLEY  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
STATE OF COLORADO  
NOTARY ID 19974023675  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JULY 27, 2020

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 23rd day of November 2019.

My Commission expires: July 27, 2020

Notary Public
Subdivision Application/Narrative

Preliminary Plat

For

THE VILLAGE AT COUNTRY CREEK NORTH
Village at Country Creek North

Petitioner & Owner: Sunshine of the Redlands, John Moir
278 North Mesa St.
Fruita, CO 81521
Ph. (970) 858-1226
e. moir28@gmail.com

Engineer: Rolland Consulting Engineers, Eric Slivon
405 Ridges Blvd #A
Grand Junction, CO 81507
Ph. (970) 243-8300
e. eric@rcgj.com

Parcel # 2697-092-00-711

Project Introduction
This is a proposed project to be annexed into Country Creek Patio Home Association as a part of Village at Country Creek.

Property Description
The property contains approximately 3.3 acres on the east side of 18 Road, just south of L Road. It is bordered on the east by Village at Country Creek Filing #4, on the west by low density agricultural use and on the north by the Grand Valley Canal. The property slopes gently uphill to the northeast, with a few locations around the canal that are slightly steeper.

Development Design
The Final Plat for VACC N includes the following:
- 3.3 Acres
- 12 Single Family Home Lots
- Extension of the pressurized irrigation system throughout the development.
- Open space along the Grand Valley Irrigation Canal and as a buffer between neighboring properties. The open space will be irrigated and landscaped and will be maintained by the Country Creek Patio Home Association.
- Tracts A, C and D dedicated to Country Creek Patio Home Association and set aside for open space, public access and trail easements.
- Tract B dedicated to Country Creek Patio Home Association as a shared driveway for Lots 7 & 8.
- An extension of standard residential sub-collector streets (44’ ROW), all with curb, gutter and sidewalk, and as per Fruita City Standards.
- Snowdrop Court would extend from the intersection of Periwinkle Lane to the west and north ending in a cul de sac.

The Village at Country Creek is an example of what this filing will look like. There will be an extension of the master irrigation system into this filing, providing for pressurized irrigation throughout the community.
The single street (Snowdrop Court) is designed to City of Fruita standards. The street system allows for efficient and safe traffic circulation while providing easy access for emergency vehicles. Snowdrop Court within VACC N shall meet the sub-collector street standards of a 44’ ROW, with 28’ of mat, and a drive-over curb, gutter and sidewalk. The east-west oriented Tract A will provide a pedestrian corridor from 18 Road to Snowdrop Court on the east. Tract D will provide an additional trail connector from the end of Snowdrop Court to the east to an existing trail within the Village at Country Creek.

Already constructed as part of Village at Country Creek is a de-silting basin that is located on high ground south of the canal. This places it in close proximity to the irrigation water source (Grand Valley Irrigation Canal) and feeds two irrigation pump houses, one located along 18 Road and the other, alongside the de-silting basin on the northwest corner of Filing 4. This will provide easy access to irrigation water for this additional filing.

A water quality basin is designed along the southern border of the property within Tract A. This design takes into consideration the runoff from this development. When the basin is completed, it will be fully replanted with grass and the surrounding area revegetated.

The total open space dedication set aside is approximately .425 acres (or 12.5%), adding to the aesthetics of the subdivision.

Meeting Performance Standards

NEIGHBORHOOD IMPACT

The land uses in the surrounding area are transitional urban to rural, with residential subdivisions to the north, south, east and west. According to the land use plan developed by the City of Fruita, Community Plan 2008, the future use of this area is to be a mixture of community residential (4 units/acre) and rural agricultural. The design for this retirement community concept fits well with the City of Fruita’s Community Plan and offers a unique lifestyle alternative to retired people throughout the Grand Valley.

As an extension of the Village at Country Creek, this community is designed for persons 55 and better. The target market has a minimal impact on schools and provides Fruita with an “aging in place” retirement concept. Living within the first six phases, we have a diverse group of people, some still working jobs; others are only part time residents. The current residents are very pleased with the community as it has the feel of a friendly neighborhood.

Each lot accommodates one single family home with garage space for two vehicles as well as sufficient driveway space to accommodate off street parking for another two vehicles. The target price for these units is between $300,000 to $350,000.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

This filing includes 12 new homes and four tracts of dedicated open space. Tract A, C and D include nearly 17,533 square feet and will be dedicated to the PHA as additional open space. Tract B is 980 square feet, is also dedicated to the PHA, and will provide for access off of the end of the cul de sac for the northern two units.
SCHOOL IMPACT FEES
Being a residential neighborhood for retirees only, this community puts no burden on the school district. In all previous filings there have been no school impact fees paid to the school district; similar treatment is proposed for this filing.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC
The principal entries to the existing subdivision (Village at Country Creek) are off of 18 Road located at K.6 Road with the second entrance approximately 500 feet further to the north along 18 Road. All internal street cross-sections and pedestrian paths are consistent with City of Fruita standards. Trail heads are being provided which link 18 Road to the sidewalks along the internal street layout. An additional trail at the mid-block location provides access to other pedestrian trails within Village at County Creek.

PHASING PLAN
This is a single filing development and would become the eighth actual phase within Village at Country Creek. This would bring the total residential unit count to 241.

SEWER
This project connects to the City of Fruita sewer system. Sewer lines have been laid in Periwinkle Lane and the sewer line from Snowdrop Court would flow into this line.

WATER
This project is connected to the Ute Water system in the City of Fruita. An 8” water line extends along 18 Road and there are feeds to the east in Sunrose Lane, Periwinkle Lane and Primrose Lane, looping the system. A single 4” line will extend west and north along Snowdrop Court and provide water service and fire flow into this filing.

DRAINAGE
The drainage on the site is split on either side of Snowdrop Court and then flows to the southwest corner to the detention facility along the south side of Snowdrop Court. All drainage on the property, in excess of historic, is detained on site in this detention area. The collected storm water is then released at historic rates into an existing 12” Grand Valley Drainage line that extends up to the southern edge of the property. This line then runs along 18 Road and eventually flows west and south into Little Salt Wash.

FLOOD HAZARD
According to the FEMA maps, the entire site is out of the 100-year flood plain.

LANDSCAPING
The landscaping for Village at Country Creek has been designed with the intention of creating a friendly environment without creating an undue burden for maintenance. Trees have been planted along all interior roads so as to create some shaded canopies, shrubs have been chosen which flower during the different seasons and lawn areas have been minimized.

IRRIGATION
Irrigation water is provided by the Grand Valley Main Line Canal. There are presently 49 shares of water belonging to the PHA to irrigate 54 acres (gross) developed or under development within Village at Country Creek. Of these 54 acres, approximately 35% (19 acres) is or will be under irrigation, with the remainder in streets, sidewalks, driveways, homes and open space along Little Salt Wash. Sunshine of the Redlands will transfer 2
additional shares to Village at Country Creek for this filing which will increase total irrigated acres to around 20 acres with 51 shares.

A de-silting basin has been constructed near the Grand Valley Canal to provide for water storage and settling of the silts in the irrigation water. A pressurized irrigation system is designed for the entire project, incorporating remote controllers with approximately 140 zones at build out. Connections will be made into that system along Periwinkle Lane, creating a looped system and providing for flows throughout VACC N. The pumping stations along 18 Road and the Grand Valley Canal provide for a consistent flow of approximately 400 GPM at 65 PSI. The system is capable of serving this new filing of approximately 50,000 square feet of irrigated lawns and shrubs along the existing irrigation needs.

FIRE PROTECTION
This project has been designed to meet the standards necessary to provide fire flow for the Lower Valley Fire Protection District. All comments from Lower Valley will be incorporated into the final design.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION
Since there are no historic structures or sites on the property, this standard is not applicable.

NOISE, DUST AND ODOR
This residential development project is being constructed in a single filing and will require minimal ground disturbance. Ground disturbance to natural ground covers, such as along the edge of the canal, will be minimized. The project will also comply with all appropriate local, state and federal air emission and noise statutes. Erosion and sedimentation controls will be in use during and after construction in accordance with the State of Colorado Storm Water Management requirements and in accordance with the Storm Water Management Plan.

NATURAL FEATURES/ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
Natural features will be preserved to the largest extent possible. The only area of concern would be along the northern edge where the property borders the canal.

SOILS AND GEOLOGY
The Huddleston-Berry soils report reveals this site has fewer issues than the average in the Fruita area. The areas of shale will be below underground utilities. The report points out possible problems if an irrigation system is not monitored. We are providing a Country Creek PHA maintained irrigation system, carefully monitored for adequate delivery of water to the different zones. This system will help to minimize soil moisture fluctuations and maintain soil stability.

DECLARATION OF COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS
The Covenants for this new filing will be administered by the Country Creek PHA. There is currently a Board of Directors made up of six residents and the developer. The covenants address the issues of common area maintenance and the fair assessments of those costs, the 55 and older age restriction, architectural control standards, and the enforcement of all the restrictions. A supplement to those covenants has been approved
MARKETING AND IMPACT OF A RETIREMENT COMMUNITY

Traffic Impact

It is important to note that according to statistics from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, traffic generated from retirement communities is usually only 55% of that of a standard subdivision. Our experience within the existing filings has been that (excluding construction traffic) the Village resident averages about three trips per day.

Economic Impact on the City of Fruita

Studies have shown that there is a very positive economic impact from retirement housing on communities. First, retirees have a steady source of income based on savings, retirement accounts, pension funds, etc. Second, in general, most retirees do the largest portion of their shopping locally. Third, they have relatively little impact on schools (many dedicate time doing volunteer work), and add very little additional load to the police department. This subdivision represents a potential source of property and sales tax revenue yet the residents exert only modest demands upon the services of the City of Fruita.
A. CALL TO ORDER

Seven Planning Commissioners were in attendance. (Justin Gollob, Jesse Fabula, Mel Mulder, Doug Van Etten, Dave Karisny, Cullen Purser, and Patrick Hummel were present).

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Whitney Rink led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AMENDENTS TO THE AGENDA

Hearing Item 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental Conditional Use Permit was moved from a Consent Item to a Hearing Item due to the receipt of a public comment.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER MULDER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA
COMMISSIONER PURSER SECONDED THE MOTION
MOTION PASSES 7-0

E. WITHDRAWN ITEMS

None

F. CONTINUED ITEMS

None

G. CONSENT ITEMS

Application #: 2019-38
Application Name: Vic’s Place VRBO
Application Type: Conditional Use Permit
Location: 825 E. Ottley Avenue
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.

Application #: 2019-44
Application Name: Village at Country Creek North
Application Type: Preliminary Plan
Applicant: Sunshine of the Redlands
Location: 1176 18 Road
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for 12 single family detached residential lots on approximately 3.4 acres.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
November 12, 2019 Planning Commission meeting

COMMISSIONER KARISNY MADE A MOTION TO MOVE CONSENT ITEM 2019-43 COOK SHORT TERM RENTAL TO A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM AND APPROVE THE REMAINING APPLICATIONS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

COMMISSIONER MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 7-0 IN FAVOR TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AND 5-0 IN FAVOR OF APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER VAN ETTEN AND COMMISSIONER KARISNY ABSTAINED FROM VOTING ON APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES DUE TO THEIR ABSENCE AT THE LAST MEETING.

Commissioner Gollob had a clarifying question regarding application 2019-38 Vic’s Place VRBO. He asked about the Fire Department’s recommendation that they have an evacuation plan and he didn’t see it on the letter but that they have some kind of plan drawn up because the fire department was concerned that in the event of a fire they would have a delay getting to the property given the location. He didn’t see it in the conditions of approval by Staff in the review comments.

Henry explained that the concern from Lower Valley Fire in regard to emergency response was not knowing where the property is located. He continued that it was a recommendation from Staff that the owners work with Lower Valley Fire and produce an emergency plan with their guests. He said that after talking to the Fire Marshal it was clear that there was a section in the Fire Code that speaks to the location of properties that can’t be seen from the right-of-way. He added that the residents needed to work with Lower Valley Fire to address those concerns. He said that all parties will be working together toward a commonsense solution, but it didn’t have anything to do with the use.

H. HEARING ITEMS

Application #: 2019-43
Application Name: Cook Short Term Rental
Application Type: Conditional Use Permit
Location: 157 South Orchard Street
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.

Commissioner Van Etten read the description of application 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental Conditional Use Permit to the meeting attendees.

Henry Hemphill, Planner for the City of Fruita, went up to the podium to give the presentation. Mr. Hemphill explained that Staff had received a public comment at the end of the day and after reviewing the comments determined that they didn’t directly correlate with any of the approval criteria. He just wanted to be sure to mention this for the record and that concerns were brought up and that they are addressing those in a Public Hearing.
BACKGROUND

Capital projects planned for 2020 were discussed with City Council at the November 5, 2019 City Council meeting as part of the budget process. The resulting capital plan was incorporated in the budget document for 2020 that was adopted by Council on December 3, 2020. The 2020 Budget includes $2,990,000 in funding for Street Improvements in the Capital Projects Fund with $1,705,000 estimated from grants and other sources.

The largest of the planned projects included construction of utilities and complete street improvements along the K.4 Road corridor, which was advanced in priority due to the construction of a new elementary school that had been fast-tracked by the School District and scheduled to open in August of 2020. Unfortunately, the City of Fruita was not successful in being awarded any of the $1,000,000 worth of matching grant funds requested from the Department of Local Affairs for this project and has not been able to identify any other sources of alternate funds at this time. This means that the $500,000 of matching funds from Mesa County for this project may also not be available if not leveraged with other funds. As such, the scope of improvements able to be completed on K.4 and the other proposed street projects in the City of Fruita needs to be reevaluated based on the reduced amount of funds secured. A brief description of some of the alternatives generated by City Staff is included below and will be presented to Council at the meeting. This agenda item is intended to be a discussion with Council that will be looking for feedback on the capital priorities for 2020.

K.4 Road Improvement Project

The 2020 Budget includes $2,000,000 for the installation of a complete street from Pine Street to Fremont Street. The proposed project alternatives that seemed to be the most viable with the reduced levels of funding include improvements at the east end of the corridor where no, or limited, utility work is needed and higher concentrations of traffic (vehicular and pedestrian) are anticipated due to the new elementary school. The project alternatives were, therefore, evaluated based on a reduced funding level of $375,000 or less based on the amount of General Fund and Development Impact Fee revenues that were budgeted and secured for this project. This level of funding would only allow for the complete street section to be completed from
Capricorn Ave. to Fremont St. with an 8-foot sidewalk on the south side. A figure showing the limits of this alternative scope is included in this packet for reference.

**Fremont Street Improvements**

The 2020 Budget included $350,000 to complete the street and pedestrian improvements on the east side of Fremont Street from the Brandon Estates Subdivision to K.4 Road. In evaluating alternatives, the proposed scope still appears to be within budget. However, based on further refinement of design, the full road section and sidewalk would require construction of a retaining wall due to the close proximity of the existing house at 1130 18 ½ Road that would ultimately be removed or buried if the adjacent land were to redevelop. Staff evaluated other alternatives and it appears that existing asphalt could be widened to provide a 6-foot shoulder that may provide the bike/pedestrian connection that is desired until the adjacent land were to develop. This alternative may be worth pursuing as it is estimated to cost only $170,000, would not spend taxpayer funds on sacrificial improvements, and would allow for more flexibility for the development of the adjacent parcel.

In addition to the planned improvements on the east side of Fremont Street, it should be noted that there is also a section on the west side of the street from Ottley to Aquarius that has a missing pedestrian connection. Staff considered this in the capital projects evaluation as it could also be a critical pedestrian connection for the school depending on the attendance boundaries. Completing the full buildout for the west half of the street for this section would be beyond the funding amounts budgeted as there were no funds budgeted in 2020 for this section. However, this section has been identified as a high priority for pedestrians since 2011 and there may be an opportunity to take steps toward addressing this pedestrian need by constructing a detached pedestrian trail for approximately $130,000. A figure showing the areas of needed pedestrian improvements being considered is included with this packet for reference.

**Road Overlay Program**

With the advancement of the K.4 Road project, $100,000 of the General Fund contributions that are would normally be allocated to the City’s road overlay program were allocated to the K.4 Road corridor. Alternatives that reduce the scope on K.4 Road or on Fremont Street could be reallocated to address other streets that are in need of overlays, which would support the City’s goal to prioritize existing infrastructure maintenance. The 2020 Budget does include $200,000 for road overlays. The City has over $1,000,000 worth of overlays that have been identified as high priorities. Of the top ten road sections that require an overlay, roughly half require some type of other utility work or improvements and may not be feasible without combining with funding sources/partners. Even so, increasing the funding for the road overlays in 2020 would allow the City to better keep up with the demands of maintaining our existing street network.

**Big Salt Wash Bank Stabilization**

During the 2020 Budget process, City staff had identified maintenance along Little Salt Wash and Big Salt Wash as the highest, non-street, need in the capital improvement plan. However, the limits and scope of improvements are substantial, and staff has been working to seek partners to develop a comprehensive plan for improvements. In the meantime, staff has been monitoring a section on Big Salt Wash near the Santa Fe Ranches subdivision where bank erosion has
progressed to a point where it is threatening the structural integrity of the regional trail. Staff has submitted a permit application to the Corps of Engineers to install bank protection along a 120-foot section of the wash to protect the trail and is requesting funds to purchase materials necessary to make this repair as no funds were budgeted.

**FISCAL IMPACT**
The budget will need to account for a reduction of $1,500,000 from Intergovernmental Revenues included in the in the Capital Projects Fund for 2020 due to being unsuccessful in securing grant assistance for the K.4 Road Improvements Project. Changes in revenue will also potentially require a transfer of funds between projects and/or reductions in funds budgeted in other funds depending on the reprioritization of projects. Formal action to amend the budget will be brought before Council at a future public hearing based on direction received at this meeting.

**APPLICABILITY TO CITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**
Providing essential infrastructure is a core service of the City that has a tremendous impact on the Quality of Place valued by the community. Quality of city streets and flow of traffic has repeatedly been shown to be the some of the services that residents find to be the most important and should be focused on in the coming years. In developing a capital plan for funding these important infrastructure needs, the City has prioritized projects that maintain existing infrastructure and/or improve safety for the community. These principles were considered in evaluating alternatives and developing a capital improvement plan that corresponds with the funding constraints.

**OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO COUNCIL**
This agenda item is intended to have staff present alternative plans on the scope and schedule of prioritized capital projects. No formal action is required.

**RECOMMENDATION**
Staff has included a draft recommendation on amendments to the Capital Projects Fund for 2020 and is seeking feedback from Council prior to scheduling a public hearing for any budget amendments that may be necessary.
BACKGROUND

It has been an exciting year working on the City of Fruita Comprehensive Plan Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local 2020. Thank you to all those who participated in the open houses throughout the course of the planning effort. Thank you to everyone on the Advisory Steering Committee, the Fruita Planning Commission and all members of the Fruita City Council.

Fruita is an exceptional community. Throughout this comprehensive plan process, residents brought up how much they value living in Fruita, its small-town character, and the City’s commitment to preserve the most desirable community qualities into the future.

This plan is an update of the 2008 Community Plan, to better reflect where the city is today, and its desired growth into the future. The goals, policies, and actions of the plan are intended to support and preserve the community values. In 2014, the City Council developed strategic outcomes to guide and ensure that City’s actions and policies align with Core Services, Quality of Place, Economic Health, and Lifestyle. These four items helped guide this planning process and are embedded in the document to serve as context on how every critical decision was evaluated. The vision of this plan is, “The City of Fruita values quality of place. It’s an inclusive city, with a small-town feel and a vibrant downtown, surrounded by public lands. People love to live, work, and play in Fruita because the city facilitates community, safe neighborhoods, family-friendly events, and walking and biking. The city governs in a way that’s responsive to its citizens and prioritizes high-impact services and projects. Fruita fosters a fun and funky ambiance around the arts, agriculture, and recreation.” Five themes emerged based on the community values and vision which include: efficient development, community first, tourism second, a thriving downtown, connectivity, and strategic economic development.

The plan’s policies and actions include funding strategies for achieving the goals to ensure that all elements of the plan can be implemented as appropriate.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Agenda Item Coversheet
2. Resolution 2020-09
3. Comprehensive Plan Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local 2020
4. Planning Commission minutes from January 14, 2020

OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COUNCIL:

2. Adopt Resolution 2020-09 the Comprehensive Plan Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local 2020 with conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the recommendation of staff that the Council by motion:

RESOLUTION 2020-09

A RESOLUTION OF THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL ADOPTING THE CITY OF FRUITA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FRUITA IN MOTION: PLAN LIKE A LOCAL 2020

WHEREAS, the City of Fruita adopted the Fruita Community Plan 2008 on February 19, 2008, and

WHEREAS, Comprehensive Plans are typically revisited every ten years in order to ensure alignment with the community’s vision and goals, and

WHEREAS, the City determined that the Fruita Community Plan 2008 needed to be revisited to reflect changes in the community and future development opportunities, and

WHEREAS, an Advisory Steering Committee, consisting of members of the City Council, Planning Commission and citizens at large was formed to guide the update. The Committee held several public engagement opportunities between March 2019 and December 2019, and

WHEREAS, the Fruita Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 14, 2020 and recommended approval of the Plan by a vote of 7-0 with additional comments for the City Council to consider, and

WHEREAS, the City Council and Planning Commission held a joint public workshop to discuss the Planning Commissions comments from their January 14, 2020 public meeting, and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a public meeting on February 4, 2020 to adopt the City of Fruita Comprehensive Plan Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local 2020.


ATTEST: City of Fruita

Margaret Sell, City Clerk

Joel Kincaid, Mayor
City of Fruita
Comprehensive Plan

JANUARY 2020
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Chapter 1
Introduction
Introduction

Fruita is an exceptional community. Throughout this comprehensive plan process, residents brought up how much they love living in Fruita, its small-town character, and their desire to preserve the community’s most desirable qualities into the future. This plan starts by declaring what makes Fruita special. In turn, these community values are the foundation of the plan—shaping the plan vision, goals, policies, and actions. The following list represents what Fruita residents value about their community.

Community Values

- Fruita is a place where you run into neighbors, friends, and acquaintances at local stores and restaurants, parks, and the community center.
- Fruita is a place where children, adults, and the elderly feel safe walking and biking to schools, parks, or downtown.
- Family-friendly events and festivals are well-attended and gather the community.
- Fruita is a community where people are invested and constantly work to make the community better.
- Fruita residents appreciate the stunning natural beauty surrounding the city.
- Fruita has incredible access to outdoor recreation. This access supports local businesses and fosters an active, healthy community that inspires visitors to come play like a local.
- Fruita is funky and has a vibrant downtown filled with small businesses.
- Farming is a part of Fruita, from the agricultural lands surrounding the city, to the farmers market that takes place downtown.
- Fruita is innovative and open-minded—the government and its residents are willing to try new things.
- Fruita takes a community-first approach—the City prioritizes residents in making decisions.
- Fruita provides quality services efficiently to its residents and businesses.
- Fruita is a distinct community—geographically separate from others in the Grand Valley.
- Fruita is committed to a land use pattern and supporting policies that promote access to housing across the income spectrum of its residents.
Plan Vision

Influenced heavily by Community Values, the following Vision was created for the City of Fruita:

“The City of Fruita values quality of place. It’s an inclusive city, with a small-town feel and vibrant downtown, surrounded by public lands. People love to live, work, and play in Fruita because the city facilitates community, safe neighborhoods, family-friendly events, and walking and biking. The city governs in a way that’s responsive to its citizens and prioritizes high-impact services and projects. Fruita fosters a fun and funky ambiance around the arts, agriculture, and recreation.”

How values shape the plan:
The community values and vision were informed by the Fruita City Council strategic outcomes. In 2014, City Council developed the strategic outcomes (below) to guide council and ensure that actions and policies that council enacts align. The community values in this plan evoke many of the same ideas and priorities as these strategic outcomes and ensure that the comprehensive plan stays true to both the council and the community’s visions for Fruita.

The City of Fruita focuses on three strategic outcomes built upon a base of providing quality core services. The Community Values, Plan Themes, and Plan Vision are meant to complement the strategic outcomes that the City of Fruita already uses to guide the city.
Plan Organization

This plan begins with Chapter 1, which describes the community values that inform all elements of the plan. From these, an overarching vision statement describes what Fruita wants to be in the future. Chapter 2: Community Snapshot offers the necessary context around where Fruita is today and trends that will influence its future. The remaining chapters of the plan are the plan topic areas, where specific goals, policies, and actions are laid out. These six topic areas or chapters are:

- Chapter 3: Land Use, Growth, + Community Character
- Chapter 4: Economic Development
- Chapter 5: Parks, Health, Recreation, Open Space, + Trails
- Chapter 6: Transportation
- Chapter 7: Infrastructure + Services
- Chapter 8: Education, Arts, + Cultural Resources

Each chapter has a specific vision statement for that topic area that nests within the plan’s overarching vision statement. Each chapter vision has several goals underneath it, broad primary outcomes and strategies for how the city can achieve that vision. The policies and actions to work towards the goal are listed below each goal.

Plan Themes

The goals, policies, and actions of the plan are intended to support and preserve the community values. Based on these values, the following key themes emerged:

- **Efficient Development**
  The City of Fruita encourages infill over sprawl and development within the existing city limits and Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Efficient development reduces the demand for infrastructure and city services, supports community connectivity, and encourages a thriving downtown core.

- **Community First, Tourism Second**
  The City of Fruita prioritizes its residents and provides them a high quality of life. Tourists are attracted to Fruita for this, and the opportunity to “play like a local.”

- **A Thriving Downtown**
  The City of Fruita supports a thriving downtown with strong local businesses, an inviting streetscape, and events and places that encourage the community to gather. Flexible design standards support creative uses of downtown spaces, and higher-than-existing surrounding residential densities creates a variety of housing units and types for residents to frequent businesses.

- **Connectivity**
  It is easy for vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians to get around Fruita and to visit local destinations. The City of Fruita offers a safe, intuitive, and well-connected on- and off-street trail network for pedestrians and cyclists.

- **Strategic Economic Development**
  Fruita’s approach to economic development focuses on expanding existing businesses while also making Fruita an attractive place to live and do business. Rather than compete with Grand Junction, Fruita is strategic in recruiting businesses that are well-suited for the Fruita community.
About this Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan is the city’s guiding document towards land use and other community development decisions. According to the Colorado State Statures Section 31-23-206, “it is the duty of the [planning] commission to make and adopt a master plan for the physical development of the municipality, including any areas outside its boundaries, subject to the approval of the governmental body having jurisdiction thereof [city council].” According to the statute, a master plan, or a comprehensive plan for the City of Fruita, is an “advisory document to guide land development decisions,” and is not binding, unless incorporated into land use regulations. In Fruita, the land use code states that city intends for the planning policies of the comprehensive plan to be incorporated into the land use code.

The plan also provides guidance for city departments and boards: a vision to work towards and goals, actions, and policies to get there. The plan’s policies and actions include funding strategies for achieving the goals or pursuing other actions, to ensure that all elements of the plan can be implemented as appropriate.

The following suggests how different entities should use this plan.

**City Department:** Budgeting, capital improvements, applying for grants, intergovernmental coordination and partnerships, prioritizing, seeking new sources of funding, future planning efforts

**City Council:** Reviewing development proposals, budgeting, approving funding sources

**Planning Commission:** Reviewing development proposals, updating the land use code

**Developers:** Understanding appropriate types of and locations for development

While residents’ use of the plan may be limited, the plan, with its associated public process, is derived from their vision and values, and represents their direction to the city in making decisions.

Update 2020

This plan is an update of the 2008 Community Plan, to better reflect where the city is today and its desired growth into the future. To better understand the changes the city has seen since 2008, see Chapter 2: Community Snapshot. An update should remove already met goals and implemented policies and actions, and establish new policies based on the current community values and new opportunities and challenges. Several of the 2008 plan’s visions policies and actions were retained in this plan, although funding and implementation strategies were added to ensure that the city would be able to implement them in the coming decade. Other actions and policies were modified to match the new plan vision and goals. Comprehensive plans are typically revisited every ten years in order to ensure alignment with the community’s vision and adjust as necessary.
CHAPTER 1  INTRODUCTION

WHAT’S IN A NAME

The Fruita Comprehensive Plan process is entitled “Fruita in Motion: Plan Like a Local.” This title was selected by the advisory committee at the start of the plan process to reflect Fruita’s character and intentions for the process.

Fruita is in motion, ever evolving. The advisory committee members felt that this plan must lead the community into the future, rather than leave it stuck in the past. Motion also connects to Fruita’s logo, the gear, that is based on the City’s agricultural and biking influences.

“Plan Like a Local” is a variation on Fruita’s tourism slogan “Play Like A Local.” This slogan speaks to when visitors come to Fruita, they feel like part of the community and have that local-driven experience, going to friendly coffee shops and riding on locals’ favorite trails. Just like the visitor experience, this plan process must be guided by locals and their vision for the community. This plan seeks to preserve that small-town feel that “play like a local” is all about, amidst growth and tourism.

Public Process

Fruita in Motion: Plan like a Local speaks to the community’s significant role in the planning process. Residents helped shape every element of the plan, from sharing what they valued about Fruita and identifying issues for the plan to address, to reviewing drafts, and providing feedback on goals and policies. The process reached a large swath of the community, through traditional outreach (open houses, an advisory committee) and meeting people where they are, with booths at farmers markets, the art stroll, and other city events and the draft plan tour, where city staff met with HOAs and other local groups to share the plan and hear input from the community. Public engagement for the Plan has included the following:

- **Plan Advisory Committee** - a group consisting of local residents, council members, business owners, and developers met frequently during the process to provide input, feedback, and review initial ideas.

- **Stakeholder Discussions** - the planning team held stakeholder discussions in March 2019 to gather initial ideas about community values and pressing issues from those deeply involved in the community. The planning team met with local service providers, developers, education officials, the livability commission, business owners, and economic development groups.

- **Kickoff Open House** - the planning team held a Kickoff Open House at the Fruita Community Center on May 23, 2019. The open house informed the general public about the comprehensive plan and process and asked residents to provide feedback on the last ten years in Fruita, Fruita’s place in Mesa County, Downtown, the community values, the plan vision statement, and pressing issues. The event drew approximately 100 Fruita residents.

- **Design Workshop** - the planning team held a design workshop on August 22, 2019 with members of the plan advisory committee, city council, and planning commission. The workshop asked participants to think critically about the existing design standards and envision downtown, the 6/50 highway corridor, and the transition zones beyond.
Presence at local events: Farmers Markets, Art Stroll

Draft Plan Party – The planning team held a Draft Plan Party on October 3, 2019 to share the draft comprehensive plan with the public. The event, held at Civic Center Park, informed attendees about the plan’s values and vision, key themes, future land use map, and topic areas. Attendees provided feedback through write-in question responses, dot exercises, and a prioritization dollar exercise. Members of the planning team and advisory committee were available for smaller discussions with attendees as well. 112 people signed in and an estimated 150 people attended.

Plan Road Show – The Planning and Development Director and the City Manager presented the Draft Plan before the Fruita Chamber of Commerce, the Mesa County Planning Commission, the Fruita Rotary Club, the Fruita Lions Club, and held additional Open Houses at various schools throughout the community.

Plan Adoption – A joint meeting between the Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission and City Council was held on December 12, 2019. This meeting discussed all the feedback received from the Draft Plan Party, the Road Show, and from various meeting attendees. The Planning Commission reviewed the edited draft plan on January 14, 2020 and held a joint workshop with city council on January 28, 2020. The final plan was adopted by council on February 4, 2020.
Chapter 2
Community Snapshot
This plan must suit the needs of the current Fruita community and remain relevant as the city changes and grows in the future. Thus, a thorough analysis of city and regional demographic and economic trends was conducted for this plan. This data-driven approach has informed many elements of this plan, from the future land use goals, to economic development strategies and education policies. Key takeaways are presented below, with a full report available as Appendix B.

Mesa County’s economy is showing signs of a sustained recovery and diversification.

Following the 2008 recession, Mesa County shifted away from its historic reliance on energy extraction. The county’s unemployment rate, 11% at the peak of the recession, has dropped to 4.1%. Since 2010, health care has been one of the fastest growing industries in the county, although this aligns with the national trend. Manufacturing is currently a notable growth industry with firms moving to the area due to limited and expensive real estate in the Colorado Front Range. Mesa County has a diverse mix of manufacturing firms making products ranging from machinery, food and beverages, outdoor recreation equipment, aerospace components, electronics, and textiles. Manufacturing’s growth speaks to the county’s relatively affordable real estate compared to other parts of the state and pool of skilled workers that may have previously worked in oil and gas.

Economic growth in Mesa County is accelerating, countering a long trend of slow growth.

In 2018 and 2019, Mesa County experienced job growth over 3% per year. Job growth over the past decade has been concentrated into the last few years. Since 2010, Mesa County has added 7,000 jobs, with about two-thirds of those since 2016. Some of this growth is the result of people, businesses, and jobs relocating from Colorado’s Front Range to Mesa County and its lower cost business and housing environment.

Fruita’s mix of jobs is a reflection of its recreation appeal and its function as a suburb of Grand Junction, with many commuting residents.

Fruita’s economy is similar to Mesa County’s but with higher concentrations of jobs in tourism and related leisure industries including restaurants, hotels, and retail. This is characteristic both of a suburban community and of a recreation gateway community. The majority of Fruita’s employed residents work in Grand Junction, approximately 60 percent. About 15 percent of Fruita’s employed residents work in the City.

Fruita has seen an increase in local businesses, which have had a positive impact on tourism and the economy.
Mesa County’s recent population growth has been concentrated in Grand Junction and unincorporated Mesa County.

Mesa County added nearly 6,500 people since 2010 with 4,700 in Grand Junction, 1,100 in unincorporated areas, and nearly 600 in Fruita. From 2010 through 2018, most of Mesa County’s population growth—nearly 90 percent—has occurred in Grand Junction and unincorporated Mesa County. Grand Junction’s population is growing faster as well, with 1% annual population growth from 2010 to 2018, compared to Fruita’s at 0.6% annually.

Fruita has a higher concentration of young families than the county as a whole.

Fruita’s population has a comparatively younger median age and a larger average household size than Mesa County. The city is seen as very desirable for young families in the county. However, older residents are becoming a larger percentage of city residents, as retirees flock to the area for its desirable climate and community amenities.

Housing growth in Mesa County is accelerating, but Fruita’s housing stock is growing relatively slowly.

Grand Junction issued an average of 280 new construction building permits annually from 2010 to 2018. In 2018, there were nearly 500 new housing starts there. In Unincorporated Mesa County, there were nearly 200 new housing starts annually during this time period and nearly 300 in 2018. In contrast, Fruita has issued an average of 62 new construction building permits per year, with 95 in 2018.

Housing affordability is a growing issue in Fruita and Mesa County, in general. Fruita has some of the highest home prices in Mesa County and home prices are appreciating rapidly.

The average 2018 resale home price in Fruita was $271,684. The quality of life in Fruita, including its schools and small-town feel, are the major factors driving home prices. Home prices are also appreciating throughout Mesa County and the Rocky Mountain region due to other macroeconomic factors such as labor and material costs and an overall shortage of housing.
Price appreciation has been rapid, with nearly 10 percent annual growth in Fruita over the last four years.

1. **The trends in new construction pricing may be the best indicator of the future direction of Fruita’s housing market.**

   New construction pricing in Fruita is rising. The average price for a single family home built in 2018 is estimated at $455,200. The average resale price for a single family home in 2018 was $279,675, or 60% lower than new construction. The average price of new construction single family homes has increased from $364,850 in 2014, an increase of $90,000.

   The rise in new construction pricing shows that there will be fewer options for housing at an attainable or affordable pricepoint if trends continue.

2. **Regardless of price, the dominant housing product in Fruita is single family homes, which comprise 97 percent of new construction from 2010 through 2018.**

   Of the 557 total new homes permitted during this time period, 538 (97 percent) were for single family detached homes. Building exclusively single family homes means limited diversity of housing types and often, few housing options at lower price points.

3. **Housing prices outside city limits are about 10 percent higher, which will affect Fruita’s housing market and costs.**

   The average home price in the 85121 zip code was $327,902 for 2019, as of November of that year and $303,663 in 2018. Within the Fruita City limits, in 2018, the average home price was $271,684, or 11% lower than the zip code average during that same year. Some of the housing inventory outside the city is on large acreages that support higher prices. If at some point any of these areas are annexed, those homes would be in the city and bring up the city average. Housing market boundaries also do not always follow jurisdictional boundaries and some buyers may not differentiate between being inside or outside a city’s incorporated limits.

Housing affordability is also a growing issue for renters in Fruita and Mesa County.

Affordability issues are greatest among renters in Fruita, with about half of all renters paying more than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs. This is defined as being cost burdened, wherein a household is paying too much towards housing.

The rental supply in Fruita is extremely limited with essentially zero vacancy, allowing landlords to charge higher rents. The percentage of renters in Fruita has increased, even though most housing being built is in the form of single-family homes. Some people may be renting single family homes by choice; for others it may be the only option and they would prefer a lower cost option such as an apartment or duplex.

Housing affordability issues affect the ability of local businesses to attract and retain employees. This is a threat to economic sustainability if left unchecked.

These findings point to key areas for the city to address through this plan. This plan seeks to address managing growth at the edges and encouraging development within the city, supporting affordable housing to retain the local workforce, and working with Grand Junction on economic development while promoting a Fruita-specific brand to attract companies that are a good fit.
Chapter 3
Land Use + Growth
Introduction

This chapter includes a vision as well as goals and policies that will guide Fruita’s growth, development, land use and community character in the future. The ideas contained within this chapter were developed from: conversations reflecting on lessons learned in the last ten to twenty years, an analysis of existing land uses and market conditions, and public meetings discussing the desired character for Fruita and how it should grow and change in the future. This chapter includes the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), informed by core concepts that are meant to guide Fruita’s future growth.

Context and Update

Every land use plan is a product of what has happened in the past—where new development has occurred and how much has occurred, what type and character of buildings have been built, how they are used, and where they are located. This section is meant to set the stage for Fruita’s future by reflecting on the lessons learned from the past.

- Very little housing growth has occurred, but trends show that development is picking up again. From 2010 to 2018, on average, Fruita permitted 62 new residential buildings per year. In 2018, the city permitted 95 residential buildings, a 98% increase over the previous year.

- Much of the residential growth that has occurred has been single-family residential. From 2010 to 2018, there was an increase of 464 single-family residential units. Comparatively, there are 27 fewer attached (2 to 4 units) housing units, 53 additional multifamily (5+ units) housing units, and 49 fewer mobile homes. Single-family housing units make up 81% of total housing in Fruita.

- Very little growth has occurred in the downtown. Most of the structures in this area were built prior to 1970. There have been some recent renovations within downtown and a few new structures in the last few years. Many single-family home subdivisions were built at the city’s edge during the 1990s and early 2000s.

- The Grand Valley is growing, with Fruita only taking up a small share of that growth. From 2010 through 2018, most of Mesa County’s population growth—nearly 90 percent—has occurred in Grand Junction and unincorporated areas of the county. Fruita’s population growth represents about 9% of the county’s growth.

- Rigid design standards implemented after the previous comprehensive plan, while intended to preserve downtown character, have restricted development and redevelopment in the Downtown Mixed Use (DMU) zone.

- The Commercially zoned area on south side of I-70, known as “Kokopelli” has filled out over time and most parcels are occupied with businesses.
There is a vibrant downtown with more businesses than were there ten years ago. The streetscape along Aspen Avenue was upgraded by the city and now includes bulb-outs, wider sidewalks, and functional public art such as bike racks, trash cans, and benches.

A new zoning district, CMU, was created out of the last plan. There are very few developments that have gone forward in this zoning category. It hasn’t had the desired effect of creating small neighborhood commercial centers. It is confusing for developers to navigate the development process in this zone.

There has been good balance of residential development and commercial development over the last ten years. With Grand Junction as a nearby commercial center, the development pressure in Fruita is primarily for housing, not for retail or office space.

Affordable housing is becoming an issue as housing prices rise. Median housing prices have gone from $247,865 in 2016 to $328,048 in 2019. There are very few options for those looking to rent, live in smaller houses, or live in multifamily dwellings.

Tourism in both Fruita and the Grand Valley region has increased—drawing visitors, second homeowners, and short-term rental investors. These trends are starting to affect the character of the community and the real estate values.

The State Highway 6/50 corridor continues to be an unattractive gateway into Fruita.

Fruita adopted the 2015 Mesa County Hazard Mitigation Plan as the multi-hazard mitigation plan for the City of Fruita. The plan identified floods and wildfires as high level hazards for the City of Fruita.

Community Process

Community engagement surrounding this topic was robust. The FLUM, and the goals and policies in this chapter were discussed at length, vetted by various groups, and tackled from different angles.

Three Advisory Committee meetings focused on land use (June 13, June 20, and September 12, 2019). The first one was to discuss ideas and considerations for Fruita’s growth. The second meeting was to provide feedback on the draft chapter and FLUM. The main themes were to: keep a rural edge so that Fruita is separate from Grand Junction; protect and enhance downtown as the heart of the community; avoid sprawl, especially eastward towards Grand Junction; and to add housing diversity.

An Open House was held on May 23, 2019 where participants were asked where Fruita should and shouldn’t grow, where the city should be improved, and where it felt you “arrived” in Fruita. Participants were concerned about growth at the northern and eastern edges of the city and wanted to promote growth downtown, in the commercial area south of I-70, and in the industrial wedge between I-70 and State Highway 6/50 heading westward. The areas most in need of improvement were the State Highway 6/50 corridor.

A Draft Plan Party Open House was held on October 3rd, 2019. This event shared the draft Future Land Use Map, and goals, actions and policies for land use, growth and community character. A draft Downtown Subarea map was revealed with activities for participants to choose what housing types were appropriate for each subarea and whether they agreed with the future direction of each subarea.

A Community Character Workshop was held on August 22, 2019. Members of the Fruita in Motion Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, City Council, and the Downtown Advisory Board were invited to participate. The purpose of the workshop was to understand the constraints of the existing land use code and design standards, envision a future character for the downtown, and to define where the boundaries of downtown should be.
## Land Use Analysis

The observed building density of built-out neighborhoods was compared to what is permissible by existing zoning standards in the Land Use Code at the time this plan was written, 2019. DMU densities are well below the zoning maximums with 3.8 buildings/acre observed, compared to the 12 dwelling units/acre permitted. Residential densities in the community residential (CR) zone district are relatively in line with the established maximum, at 3.62 dwelling units per acre compared to the 4 to 6 units allowed. Beyond the community residential, the other zoning districts tend to be very low density, well below their maximums.

### TABLE 1. OBSERVED RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES UNDER 2019 LAND USE CODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>Zone District Name</th>
<th>Maximum Residential Density Allowed by Zoning</th>
<th>Observed Densities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Agriculture Residential</td>
<td>0.1 du/acre</td>
<td>Not enough data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Rural Estate</td>
<td>0.3–0.5 du/acre</td>
<td>0.3 bldgs/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>1–2 du/acre</td>
<td>0.13 bldgs/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Community Residential</td>
<td>~4–6 du/acre based on min lot size</td>
<td>3.62 bldgs/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLR</td>
<td>Large Lot Residential</td>
<td>3 du/acre</td>
<td>1.39 bldgs/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>South Fruita Residential</td>
<td>2–3 du/acre</td>
<td>0.28 bldgs/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMU – Core</td>
<td>Downtown Mixed-Use – Core</td>
<td>12 du/acre</td>
<td>3.8 bldgs/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMU – Outside Core</td>
<td>Downtown Mixed-Use – Outside Core</td>
<td>12 du/acre</td>
<td>3.8 bldgs/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU – Comm</td>
<td>Community Mixed-Use Commercial Development (including Mixed-Use Buildings)</td>
<td>2–5 du/acre</td>
<td>1 bldg total observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU – Res</td>
<td>Community Mixed-Use Residential Development</td>
<td>2–5 du/acre</td>
<td>Not enough data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC – NR</td>
<td>General Commercial – Non-Residential</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC – MF</td>
<td>General Commercial – Multi-family Residential</td>
<td>depends</td>
<td>Not enough data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Monument Preservation</td>
<td>1 du/2 acres</td>
<td>Not enough data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Community Services Recreational</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Planned Unit Development</td>
<td>depends</td>
<td>0.71 bldgs/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Observed densities are based on residential buildings, while the residential densities are based on dwelling units. Given that most residential buildings in Fruita are single family homes, it is expected that real densities, in terms of dwelling units, would be slightly higher.*
The planning team calculated the capacity for new housing within the city limits and within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) boundary from the acreage of vacant parcels (as recorded in the county GIS files). Within the city limits, there are almost 600 vacant acres, offering almost 3,000 potential dwelling units if developed at 5 dwelling units/acre. Including land up the previous UGB, there are over 2,600 vacant acres, for potentially over 13,000 housing units at 5 dwelling units/acre.

MAP 1. UNDEVELOPED AND DEVELOPED RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
The following map shows existing land uses within the city limits. Commercial uses are concentrated in downtown, the Kokopelli Business Park, and along the State Highway 6/50 corridor. The golf course is also classified as commercial. Residential development extends outward from the commercial areas, largely to the north west and east of downtown. Condos, duplexes, triplexes, and multi-family are scattered throughout the residential areas but are few and far between. Agricultural lands exist on the outskirts of residential development and industrial lands are located on the western edge of the city. Exempt properties, largely parkland other public institutions are well dispersed through the city. In downtown, the land area is 51% commercial and 49% residential.

MAP 2. EXISTING LAND USES
The following map shows the city’s built-out parcels by year of construction. Early development largely occurred in the downtown area, with development emanating outward from there over time. There was substantial residential growth to the northwest, north, east, and south between 2001–2010. Minimal development has occurred since 2010, with small developments constructed on the edges of the city.

**MAP 3. BUILDINGS BY YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION**
The planning team conducted an audit of the downtown design standards to understand how existing development aligned with those standards and the opportunities and constraints of the standards going forward.

The following map shows lot coverage in the downtown area. High lot coverages are allowed in the existing LUC (90% in DMU core, 80% in GC, and 60% in DMU outside the core). However, lot coverages are typically well below those maximums except along Aspen Street east of Circle Park. Of residential parcels, 97% have under 60% lot coverage, with the vast majority under 25%. Commercial developments also tend to have a low lot coverage percentage, with almost 50% below 25% coverage.

**MAP 4. PARCELS COVERAGE: DOWNTOWN AREA**
The following map shows lot sizes in the downtown area. Most residential lots in the downtown are between 3,000 and 7,000 square feet. Duplexes and multifamily units are not allowed on those lots, with duplexes requiring 7,500 square feet and multi-family requiring 10,000+ square feet. Only 26 percent of lots are above 10,000 square feet. The average residential lot is 0.16 acre, typically allowing for one to two units per lot. The commercial lots in the DMU core are either modest size (3,000 to 7,000 square feet, or 38%) or larger (above 10,000 square feet, or 44%). With an average lot size of 0.34 acre, four units could typically be included per lot for a multi-family development.
The following map shows the allowed building heights in Fruita. At present, 35 feet tall buildings are allowed in the DMU, CMU, and GC districts, with five stories allowed in DMU core if it is residential over commercial and not within 100 feet of residential. As shown on the map, there are limited places where five stories would be permissible. There has not been significant interest in constructing taller buildings in downtown Fruita and the tallest building in downtown today is about 30 feet.

**MAP 6. BUILDING HEIGHTS IN THE DOWNTOWN CORE**
The following massings show allowed building types in Fruita based on the design standards and identify potential issues.

In the DMU core, five stories are allowed, with a third-story setback required, creating a “wedding cake effect” that limits creativity. A setback is not required and along a narrow sidewalk, that can lead away from “pedestrian-friendly” design. With a maximum density of 12 dwelling units/acre, it would be difficult to build to five stories and utilize the lot.

The model shows a DMU core structure in a transition area, where a five-story building feels out of place next to smaller residential units.
Conclusions

- The current build-out of residential densities well below the densities allowed for and intended by each zoning category contributes to an inefficient development pattern. City service provision (sewer, roads, etc.) is more fiscally prudent at higher density levels. Especially in the DMU area, more dwelling units/acre would create more housing that is within walking distance of shops, restaurants, parks, and civic spaces.

- The vacant parcel analysis shows that there is more than enough land within both the existing city limits and the UGB for Fruita to “growth from within” rather than continue to expand beyond its borders.

- The existing land use analysis shows the core commercial areas in the center of the city surrounded by primarily single-family residential neighborhoods and agricultural uses on the outskirts. The main ideas in this plan are not intended to change this pattern, but to enhance and modify the land uses that currently exist.

- The map showing the age of all buildings within the city shows that very little development has occurred in the downtown since the 1970s. To ensure that Fruita continues to be vibrant, encouraging and allowing new development redevelopment in the downtown is essential.

- The analysis of lot coverage shows that buildings within the DMU could expand their lot coverage under the existing code. This means there is potential for additional residential units or commercial space through redevelopment or upgrades to existing buildings.

- The lot size requirements for various types of development make it hard to build housing types other than single-family homes unless it is on a very large lot. This plan encourages a diversity of housing options. Changes to the Land Use Code to allow different housing types on various lot sizes will help remedy this issue. Set-back requirements and other dimensional standards should be re-examined.

- Even though it is allowed by code, there are no buildings in the DMU over 30-35' tall. Other constraints in the code such as dwelling unit densities and mixed-use requirements (residential over commercial) may be responsible for this. Perhaps other criteria (form, design, etc.) should be substituted for height restrictions in the 2020 land use code update.

- The planning team analyzed conceptual buildings that meeting the existing Level 2 design standards. The allowed buildings do not necessarily fit with the desired character for Downtown Fruita. A re-examination of building types for the downtown both in this plan and the 2020 Land Use Code update will help resolve this issue.
VISION
Fruita is a distinct city within the Grand Valley. It is an efficiently laid-out community with small-town character situated among agricultural lands and a breathtaking desert landscape. It has a thriving downtown vibrant with businesses, residents, and civic gathering spaces. Surrounding the downtown are well-connected neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing sizes, types, and styles.
Future Land Use Map

The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) provides the basis for guiding the type, intensity, and location of different land uses within the current and future city limits. It is a spatial representation of the concepts and ideas discussed throughout the planning process. The goal of this map is to turn the Community Values (from Chapter 1) and the Land Use Vision for the Future into changes on the ground. It will lay the groundwork for future neighborhoods, a thriving downtown, a rural city edge, and a revitalized State Highway 6/50 corridor. Recommendations for potential re-zonings or changes to the land use code within existing zoning categories may follow from the implementation of this Future Land Use Map.

Map 7 (opposite page) shows the three-mile planning area of the City of Fruita. Per the Colorado Revised Statutes 31-12-105(e), municipalities are required to conduct long-range planning around annexation within 3 miles of their boundary. The Future Land Use Map guides growth adjacent to the City within the UGB, to inform the City’s Three-Mile Plan.

Core Concepts of the Future Land Use Map and Land Use Policy

- **Edges.** An urban-rural edge defines Fruita as a freestanding community separate from Grand Junction. Edges discourage sprawling growth, encourage the preservation of rural areas, and allow for a more efficient use of infrastructure and urban services. Undeveloped parcels within the edge are encouraged to develop at higher densities than beyond the edge where rural densities are desired. An Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) depicts where moderate density development ends and rural density development starts.

- **Corridors.** Roads, sidewalks and off-street trails contribute to the sense of small-town character and a high quality of life by ensuring safe travel throughout Fruita. Recognizing that land use and transportation policies have a strong connection to each other, the Future Transportation Map identifies transportation corridors that have different priorities: Downtown Enhanced, Multi-Modal, Safe Route to School, and Enhanced Arterials. Each corridor type is chosen due its surrounding land uses, destinations along the corridor, and its existing ROW width. This plan also identifies high priority future roadways (such as Future Collectors) that will need to be completed as Fruita grows and neighborhoods continue to develop at the city’s edge.

- **Downtown Flexibility.** Very few buildings have been built or parcels redeveloped downtown since 1970. The existing design standards are onerous to development. Creating more flexibility in what types of building forms are allowed may spur both development and redevelopment, encouraging new businesses and homes downtown while maintaining community character.

- **Infill.** The Future Land Use Map prioritizes infill over sprawling residential development at the edge of the city limits. The policies in this plan aim to spur residential development within the existing city limits and UGB. It aims to transform the State Highway 6/50 corridor by allowing and encouraging multifamily housing on parcels and blocks adjacent to this corridor.

- **Strengthen Existing Commercial Areas.** During the public process, many expressed a strong desire to not let commercial sprawl occur between Fruita and Grand Junction, and rather to focus on the existing commercial areas in the center of the city. The market analysis shows that there isn’t a huge need for additional commercial space within Fruita. Therefore, the policies in this plan aim to support the existing commercial areas and the businesses within those areas.
Note:
The urban growth boundary may be amended for parcels that petition to develop on the eastern side of 19 Road on a case by case basis.
Land Use Category Descriptions for Future Land Use Map

**DOWNTOWN**

The Downtown land use category contains a mix of building types and uses. The intent is for the area to be a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented commercial and residential area and act as the civic heart of the community. Mixed-use development, such as commercial on the ground floor and residential above the ground floor, is encouraged within this area. Or alternatively, a block could contain commercial uses next to residential uses. Rather than have a maximum density allowed for this area, design criteria, use, and urban form should be considered instead. Allowing a mix of housing sizes, types, and styles encourages keeping Fruita's “funky” character and while giving flexibility to builders. Inviting streetscapes and multi-modal corridors are a priority in this area to encourage walking and biking to and from downtown destinations.

**RURAL RESIDENTIAL**

The Rural Residential land use category is intended to retain rural character outside of the Fruita city boundary. This designation also functions as a transitional area between increased development and open and resource lands. Continued use of these areas for agriculture is encouraged. The recommended gross density (1 unit per 5-10 acres) can be flexibly applied to result in a variety of lot sizes, with the ultimate goal of retaining some larger parcels for resource preservation or agricultural uses. City sewer will not be provided to these lots. At the recommended density, should these areas be developed in the far future, it will be easier to redevelop than a more sprawling pattern of 1 to 2 units per acre. Clustering-type developments are not encouraged in this land use category.

**SOUTH FRUITA RESIDENTIAL 2–5**

The South Fruita Residential 2–5 land use category is intended for residential neighborhoods south of I-70. Much of this land is already built out at 1–4 units per acre. Being next to the river, some of this area is in the 100-year floodplain and not suitable for higher density development. Additionally, the access to the area from the rest of Fruita is constrained to Highway 340 and a frontage road that crosses under I-70 at 20 Road.
RESIDENTIAL 4–8

The Residential 4–8 land use category is intended for undeveloped areas where public infrastructure and services are available and proximal. This land use is also recommended for developed or semi-developed areas that are built out at a minimum of 2 units per acre. In areas that are currently built out at below the minimum density of this zone, it is expected that the minimum density (4 units per acre) is achieved when redevelopment occurs. This plan recognizes that many already-developed areas will remain in their current form for decades to come. However, there are still re-development opportunities throughout the city. In areas designated as Residential 4–8, there should be a clear and easily recognized pattern with a regular order to the lots and a recognizable geometry to the spaces between buildings. Innovative neighborhood designs in this land use category are encouraged. Neighborhoods in this area can be developed up to 8 units per acre in order to incentivize developers to provide amenities such as parks and trail connections and different types of housing. Rather than a complex bonus density program to get up to the maximum allowed density, the new Land Use Code should outline the requirements so that up to 8 units/acre can be done as a use-by-right.

TYPICAL FRUITA BLOCK
DENSITY - APPROX. 5 DU/AC
LOT SIZES - 7,500 - 10,000 SF
PRODUCT - SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED HOMES
GARAGE - SOME ATTACHED; SOME DETACHED

This view is modeled after a typical block in Fruita. Fruita’s traditional neighborhoods have very modest homes, typically around 1,000 square feet. Some blocks have alleys and some do not. This example shows an alley. Even when an alley is present, the majority of homes have driveways. Some garages are attached and some are detached, behind the home.

A typical block in Fruita (source: Google Earth)
TYPICAL FRUITA BLOCK WITH INFILL
DENSITY - APPROX. 6-8 DU/AC (6.3 DU/AC SHOWN)
LOT SIZES - 7,500 - 10,000 SF
PRODUCT - SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED HOMES +
ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT + TANDEM OR COTTAGE HOME
GARAGE - SOME ATTACHED; SOME DETACHED

This view is showing how a modest increase in density could occur to existing blocks to provide more affordable housing options. Essentially, a second unit could be added to an existing lot, typically in the form of an accessory dwelling unit (a.k.a. “granny flat” or “carriage house”), a cottage or tandem house. These types of housing were the most popular choices in the Community Plan housing choices activity.
This example illustrates what a new, 10-acre housing development might look like at 8 dwelling units per acre (the maximum proposed.) This still allows for single family detached housing, but on smaller lots. This allows for more affordable units because the cost of land is less. It also provides opportunity for a variety of housing types, such as duplexes, cottages and accessory dwelling units.
MONUMENT PRESERVATION

The Monument Preservation category is intended to be a low-density area that is compatible with the surrounding lands of the Colorado National Monument and BLM parcels. The intent is to preserve open space and for recreational uses to be integrated with low-density residential development.

INDUSTRIAL

The purpose of this land use category is to encourage non-polluting industrial, manufacturing, warehousing, and research and development activities designed to meet acceptable state and locally established standards for noise, dust, effluent (e.g., sewage pre-treatment), odor, and other impacts typically associated with industrial uses.

C-1 (COMMERCIAL)

This land use category is intended for land uses that are compatible with the future vision for the State Highway 6/50 Corridor as discussed in this plan. As a heavily traveled corridor for residents, local-serving businesses such as restaurants, retail sales and services are encouraged. Multi-family residential is also encouraged in this zone, especially on side streets adjacent to the highway corridor. Allowed lot sizes may be smaller than the C-2 category with lesser parking requirements. Maintaining walkability and safe bicycle access while also controlling vehicular access from Highway 6/50 is a key consideration for lots in this area. For lots adjacent to the highway itself, an attractive frontage will help improve the character of this corridor.

C-2 (COMMERCIAL)

This land use category is envisioned for commercial uses that may not be as compatible with Downtown Fruita. Hotels, offices, restaurants, and retail are encouraged in this area. With good I-70 access, this area is envisioned as serving both residents, tourists, and pass-through traffic. Lots in this area may be larger than in C-1 and have more parking available.

COMMUNITY/RECREATION

This category includes schools, parks, and the Community Center. It also includes state parks and preserved areas that are located within the city limits but are controlled by state or federal agencies.

INNOVATION/FLEXIBILITY ZONE

This category is currently zoned industrial but has close proximity to both downtown and commercial areas. It has a recently completed paved trail that runs through it, connecting the downtown area and nearby neighborhoods to the Colorado River and recreation opportunities on the south side of the highway. The area still has many barriers to development such as limited road access. It may take a large master development in order to overcome the cost of these barriers. Live/work space and light manufacturing/retail co-spaces are some of the ideas imagined for this area. Innovative multi-family residential could also be appropriate here. This area could be considered for multiple types of underlying zoning to give it maximum flexibility for development.

credit: Scott Belonger/Otak, Inc.
Goal #1.
Remain a “freestanding” community within Mesa County, with distinct municipal borders and a clear separation from other communities in the Grand Valley.

WHY?
A distinct border contributes to Fruita’s identity as a small town separate from other communities in the Grand Valley. An “edge” where one side is more developed, and the other side is more rural allows for a clear understanding of where development is appropriate and where agricultural lands, open space, and preservation are prioritized. Additionally, a boundary contributes to more efficient development, directing growth to where there is already transportation infrastructure and services such as water and sewer.

POLICIES
1.A Continue to have an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) policy that defines desired densities and land uses surrounding the city. This policy is redefined in this plan through the FLUM.

1.B Collaborate and coordinate with Mesa County on land use decisions within the Three Mile Planning area and the area beyond Fruita’s city boundary but within the UGB.

1.C Approve annexation of parcels within the UGB at the desired densities as described in the FLUM. Annexation should help ensure that new development at the edge of the city (or county parcels within the city) is consistent with the goals and policies of this plan.

1.D Encourage the conservation and preservation of agricultural lands and open space surrounding the city. Consider the purchase of open lands, the use of conservation easements, and cluster development as tools to preserve the rural lands outside of Fruita.

ACTIONS
1.A Propose and negotiate an intergovernmental agreement with Mesa County to maintain and/or redefine the “rural edge” low density zoning beyond the Fruita city limits and UGB. Collaborate on an update to the Rural Planning Area Future Land Use Plan for Mesa County as it pertains to the areas that surround Fruita.

1.B Reconsider the value of zoning categories that allow between 1–3 units/acre (LLR, SFR, RR) and consider allowing either higher densities (4–8 units/acre) or lower densities (1 unit/10 acres) in these areas to create a more efficient development pattern with a more distinct edge.

1.C Do not provide city services (sewer, road improvements) beyond the UGB. For developments between the city limits and the UGB, ensure that the provision of services aligns with the goals and policies in this plan.

1.D Consider de-annexing developments beyond the UGB.

1.E Develop a list of “triggers” or special circumstances that would dictate either expanding the UGB beyond that depicted in the FLUM or providing sewer and road improvements beyond the UGB boundary.
Goal #2.
Prioritize infill development over development at the edge of the city limits.

WHY?
There is enough vacant and undeveloped land within the city limits and the UGB to absorb the growth that is projected over the next ten to twenty years. Development within the city boundary is less costly for both the developer and those providing infrastructure and services such as sewer and roads.

Residential development within the city will be able to take advantage of existing nearby roads, parks, trails and community resources. Infill development will create more customers for the existing downtown and commercial centers, rather than customers for sprawling, highway commercial developments. Infill development at a minimum of 4 dwelling units/acre will likely produce more affordable housing products than what has typically been built over the last ten years.

POLICIES
2.A Advocate for design flexibility in building heights and densities for infill parcels in the Downtown land use area. Allow for different bulk standards for different types of housing products. Allow for innovative site plans such as alley-loaded, courtyard style, and multi-family of various architectural styles.

2.B Consider allowing up to 8 units/acre for residential development outside of Downtown. Additional density would be allowed in a new development for performance on the following measures: location (proximity to city center), amenities (open space, trail connections), size and diversity of housing types, and alternative street sections that meet certain criteria.

2.C Consider annexing county enclaves to get land use jurisdiction over these areas and bring them up to City of Fruita standards (roads, sewer, water) and zoning densities.

2.D Promote commercial infill especially in the Downtown and C-1 zones. Encourage buildings to have higher lot coverages, attractive street frontages, and safe bicycle and pedestrian access.

ACTIONS
2.A Adopt the land use categories from this plan into the Land Use Code and rezone accordingly.

2.B Rewrite the Design Standards chapter of the Land Use Code to allow enough flexibility to encourage more infill development.

2.C In the Land Use Code, allow for more flexibility in each category by-right, or with administrative review.

2.D Communicate frequently with the development community regarding what the barriers are to infill development and what would be helpful to overcome these barriers. Start hosting a “Design and Development Roundtable” to make a regular open meeting where community members can discuss character and design ideas for the city.

2.E Identify vacant land or foreclosed properties within city limits and/or UGB and consider buying and then providing this land at low or no-cost to developers as an infill incentive or for affordable housing.
Goal #3.
Build upon the success of Fruita’s downtown as the social and civic hub of the community. Work towards improving existing civic spaces, parks, and streetscapes to be inviting to residents and visitors of all ages; creating more local businesses, and expanding residential options within the walkable, historic downtown area.

WHY?
Fruita’s downtown is the heart of the community with beloved shops, restaurants, and civic spaces. Community members value seeing each other downtown and supporting local businesses. Additionally, downtown densities are far below what the zone district allows. Higher density infill development that helps achieve the allowed densities will contribute to an even more vibrant downtown, with more nearby, walking-distance residents that can support more small businesses.

POLICIES
3.A Adopt the Downtown Subareas Plan as a way to express the desired character for different areas of Downtown. This would take the place of the “Core” versus “Outside Core” distinction that exists presently.

3.B Consider a Downtown Business Improvement District (BID) or Urban Renewal Authority (URA) in Downtown Fruita as a way to support Downtown businesses and infrastructure improvements.

3.C Establish a dedicated funding source and program for downtown streetscape and park improvements and building upgrades.

3.D Consider a Downtown overlay that would expand compatible commercial uses beyond the Downtown along the street corridors of Aspen, Cherry, Pabor, and Maple.

ACTIONS
3.A Rewrite the Design Standards chapter of the Land Use Code to encourage Downtown development of the types of buildings desired by the community that are appropriate in each Downtown Subarea. Heights, setbacks, and lot coverage dimensions may be slightly different for each Subarea.

3.B Amend the Land Use Code to only allow three to four story buildings (down from five) and only in particular Downtown Subareas.
CHAPTER 3 LAND USE + GROWTH

3.C Implement the following key downtown park and civic space projects, incorporating kid-friendly elements:

a. Circle Park Improvements. Establish an implementable action plan to complete improvements to Circle Park. This key public space is the center of Downtown, and therefore the community. Follow concepts from the Downtown Streetscapes Improvement Plan and revisit components, as necessary, based on today’s goals and desires for the community.

b. Other Downtown Park Improvements. Establish a programming plan for downtown parks to ensure that each park includes unique functions. Determine if any programming elements are missing from downtown and if so, where they should be placed. Encourage publicly accessible open spaces in new development, especially in key areas where access to open space is lacking (refer to map for potential locations.) Improve access and encourage shared use of school grounds in downtown for residents to use in off-hours.

c. Downtown Enhanced Street Improvements. Mesa Street, Pabor Avenue and Aspen Avenue are defined as “Downtown Enhanced Corridors.” Since Aspen Avenue has had recent improvements, focus on Mesa Street and Pabor Avenue. Include traffic calming elements, continuous and comfortable sidewalks, and safe bicycle facilities.

d. Multi-Modal Corridor Improvements. Cherry and Maple Streets are key streets that border downtown. Cherry Street is a gateway to downtown from I-70. Additions such as rhythmic lighting with banners, public art in the median, and other pedestrian and bicycle improvements should be considered. Maple Street is a transition street between downtown and adjacent residential neighborhoods. Features such as wider, consistent sidewalks, safe bike facilities, and wayfinding and signage are recommendations.

Goal #4. Allow and encourage a diversity of housing types to fit the needs of the Fruita community and provide the diverse “funky” character that is treasured by residents.

WHY?
Fruita’s housing stock is getting more homogenous and more expensive. As a community that prides itself on being inclusive, this ethos should extend to providing types of housing for people of different ages, income ranges, family structures, and aesthetic preference. Allowing and encouraging more apartments and/or townhomes in appropriate locations could contribute to more affordable housing options.

POLICIES
4.A Update the Land Use Code to encourage a diversity of housing types in both Downtown and residential districts

4.B Consider reducing lot size minimums for some of the residential zone districts as a way to encourage smaller more affordable housing units and add density that is in scale with Fruita’s existing character.

4.C Work with the Grand Junction Housing Authority, Housing Resources of Western Colorado, Habitat for Humanity, and other nonprofit, low/moderate income housing agencies to identify potential affordable housing opportunities for Fruita residents.

ACTIONS
4.A Examine which density caps and dimensional barriers are prohibiting building types that may be desired by the community both in Downtown and in other land use areas.

4.B Change the Land Use Code to allow more than 12 units/acre for apartment buildings in appropriate locations.

4.C Undertake a Housing Needs Assessment to more fully understand the housing needs and gaps for different groups of people within the Fruita community.
The Downtown Subareas Map geographically defines each subarea. Below are descriptions about the future character for each subarea. Start each description with “In 2040…“ to imagine the future, as opposed to today. These subareas were defined and vetted through the Community Character Workshop and Draft Plan Party elements of the public engagement process. Additional information on this topic can be found in Appendix C.

1. **Downtown Core**: The Downtown Core is the heart of downtown. It has the most concentration of businesses, although there is a mix of residential as well. It is the most walkable area within downtown and the sidewalks and streets have lots of activity. There is also a higher concentration of buildings in this area compared to other parts of downtown.

2. **Aspen Avenue**: This specific portion of the Downtown Core is decidedly unique and serves as the primary destination within downtown. As Fruita’s historic “Main Street”, this area has the most activity of anywhere in downtown. New buildings are similar to historic buildings in scale, placement and materiality. Parking is located behind buildings or along the streets and café seating and other activity along the sidewalk is prominent.

3. **Downtown South**: The 6 & 50 corridor is an extension of downtown with a unique character and serves as a “gateway” for those who enter from this corridor. Old buildings have been given new life and new buildings have been added that expands this area’s use of land to take advantage of its location and views. Improvements to the street, such as landscaping and a wide pathway for pedestrians and bicyclists has given new life to this corridor.

4. **Downtown West**: This area has a mixture of housing types and recreation opportunities. The proximity to the Downtown Core, community services, trail access, Little Salt Wash and recreation opportunities is ideal. Properties along Aspen Avenue and Cherry Street, due to their visibility, continue to include a mixture of uses, such as offices, commercial, and residential.

5. **Downtown North**: The area between Cherry and Mesa Streets and Pabor to Ottley includes community services such as the Fruita Library and Community Center, local hospital, elementary school and other small services. Some residential homes are mixed in as well, but for the most part, the character in this area includes buildings set back from the street with large parking areas and lawns.

6. **Downtown East**: Downtown East provides a transition from downtown to Fruita’s single family residential neighborhoods. This area includes a mixture of single family homes, converted homes to professional offices, and new housing types such as duplexes, ADUs, cottages and townhomes. The Fruita Middle School and Reed Park continue to be an anchor for the community and this part of downtown.
Goal #5.
Encourage and support commercial uses in existing commercial areas.

WHY?
Fruita has three distinct commercial areas: Downtown along Aspen Avenue, the commercial district along State Highway 340 south of Interstate 70, and the State Highway 6/50 Corridor. Through the public engagement process, community members expressed concerns about commercial continuing to sprawl between Fruita and Grand Junction. Additionally, the market analysis completed for this plan shows that additional office/retail acreage is not in demand.

POLICIES

5.A Collaborate with the Grand Junction Economic Partnership and the Business Incubator Center to match appropriate businesses within Fruita’s existing commercial spaces.

5.B Continue to collaborate with the Chamber of Commerce and other organizations to foster a positive business culture in Fruita.

ACTIONS

5.A Update the Land Use Code to divide General Commercial into two commercial zones, one that is appropriate for the State Highway 6/50 Corridor and one that is appropriate for South Fruita.

5.B Continue to define the underlying zoning for the Innovation/Flexibility area as identified on the FLUM in the Land Use Code update.

5.C Work with City Market to upgrade or expand their Fruita store.

Goal #6.
Revitalize the State Highway 6/50 Corridor as an important gateway to the community.

WHY?
This corridor has historic significance for the community. It features the railroad and iconic grain elevator and serves as the primary regional thoroughfare for locals. This corridor has incredible visibility and potential for land use changes to help revitalize the corridor and improve access to downtown and regional trails.

POLICIES

6.A Create a State Highway 6/50 Corridor Plan that envisions upgrades to the transportation corridor as well as land uses along both sides of the corridor. Use the ideas in this plan as a starting point.

6.B Collaborate with the Mesa County RTPO and CDOT to advocate for changes on the State Highway 6/50 corridor that fit the vision and goals in this plan.

ACTIONS

6.A Update the commercial zoning along the corridor to reflect the desired uses (multifamily, local-serving businesses, retail and personal services.)

6.B Update the Design Standards chapter of the Land Use Code to encourage unique architecture and a mix of uses in this area.

6.C Create a streetscaping plan for the roadway from Grand Avenue to Coulson Street that:
   a. Implements the missing multi-modal link from Grand Avenue to Coulson Street. Determine the best design solution for this section based on available right-of-way and future land use potential.
   b. Introduces gateway design features and wayfinding signage at key streets such as Coulson, Mesa, and Maple Streets.
   c. Includes beautification elements such as landscaping, lighting, appropriate street furniture, and public art.
Goal #7.
Ensure that development is compatible with the natural landscape and hazard areas and limit the risks of hazards to people and property.

WHY?
The Fruita area has many sensitive natural resources. The following policies ensure that future development is located away from the most sensitive areas and all development review processes consider hazards and natural resources.

POLICIES
7.A Discourage development within the 100-year floodplain as defined and mapped by FEMA or state or local floodplain management entity, whichever has been done most recently.

7.B Place appropriate buffers and setbacks between environmental resources (i.e., canals and drains; washes and creeks and wetlands; and the Colorado River) and proposed development to ensure that the proposed development does not degrade the existing habitat or interfere with environmental resources.

7.C Proposed land uses or development identify hazardous areas, i.e., floodplains, drainage areas, steep slope areas, geologic fault areas, and other areas hazardous to life or property.

7.D Development is not allowed in hazardous areas, to minimize the risk of injury to persons and loss of property, unless appropriate mitigation measures are taken.

7.E Proposed land uses or development address soil, erosion, and surface geologic characteristics of the development site through proper design, engineering, and construction.

7.F If sensitive resources are disturbed, such as wetlands, compensate by on-site or off-site wetland restoration of equal or greater amounts.

7.G Protect buffers and setbacks in perpetuity through development agreements by donating or selling the land, or a conservation easement on the land, to an accredited land trust or relevant public agency.

7.H Maintain the visual integrity of Fruita’s landscape by identifying distinctive scenic or topographic features, such as ridgelines or unique vegetation, and either avoiding them or using innovative design techniques to integrate them cohesively into new development.

7.I Strengthen partnerships towards hazard mitigation with the Lower Valley Fire District, RiversEdge West, Grand Valley Irrigation Company.

7.J Collaborate with the BLM, Mesa County, and Grand Valley communities to identify regional solutions to hazards. Continue to work with Mesa County on hazard mitigation planning and response and work to update the 2015 Mesa County Hazards Mitigation Plan as necessary.

ACTIONS
7.A Update the Land Use Code to establish regulations for stormwater discharge to minimize the detrimental effects of filling and disposal of debris along washes and creeks.

7.B Evaluate the Big Salt Wash drainage structures under US 6, I-70, and the railroad as their suitability in serving as trail underpasses during non-flood periods.

7.C Address gaps identified in the 2015 Mesa County Hazards Mitigation Plan Fruita Capacity Assessment including a formalized public information program around hazards and ensuring that all critical facilities are protected.

7.D Update the Land Use Code with any new best practices and standards for flood provisions to minimize public and private losses and promote public health and safety.
Chapter 4
Economic Development
Introduction

This Chapter provides guidance on economic development, and on the relationship between the land use and community character aspects of the Plan and the long-term economic health of Fruita.

Economic Development Definitions

Economic development has a broad meaning encompassing all of the activities a community engages in to advance the economic and social well-being of its residents. Some activities like business recruitment and retention or incentives are very specific economic development actions. More broadly though, many community development areas are also important to economic development, as illustrated below.

Fruita takes this broad view of economic development and recognizes the importance of building a strong community in its long-term economic success and resilience.
There are three general approaches to economic development described below. Many communities use a combination of each approach, but with more or less emphasis in each area depending on the local needs.

- **Recruit and incentivize** – This is a traditional approach in which economic development staff and city officials proactively market their community to businesses and work to attract new growing or existing businesses to their community. Often this approach is combined with an incentives program which requires a commitment of financial resources or a willingness to contribute a portion of new revenues generated by an employer back to the employer, often to assist with real estate or relocation costs. Recruiting and incentivizing can be a low probability but high reward effort.

- **Place-based or amenity driven** – In this approach, a community places most of its efforts on building a desirable community in which to live and do business. The focus is largely on community development: schools; parks, open space, and recreation; cultural facilities; aesthetics; and overall quality of life. The theory is that businesses, high skilled workers, and entrepreneurs will seek places where they want to live and work, and economic growth will stem from this concentration of talent and ideas. There is truth to the effectiveness of this place-based strategy in the knowledge-based economy. When this is the sole approach however, it can ignore the needs of existing local businesses. It also can focus on the needs of higher wage and income workers resulting in an exclusive community.

- **Economic gardening** – This approach recognizes the fact that most job growth comes from the expansion of existing businesses. It also focuses on supporting new business formation and entrepreneurship. It is a “grow from within” strategy that focuses on leveraging unique local strengths and opportunities. Economic gardening also incorporates place-based aspects and therefore has some overlap with a place-based strategy.

Stakeholders in the Comprehensive Plan process have indicated that Fruita’s economic development approach should be a combination of economic gardening, place-based economic development, but with strategic targeted recruiting as opportunities present themselves.

### Context and Update

Since the 2008 Plan, several important trends and changes have emerged as summarized below.

- **Resurgence of job growth** – Mesa County had a slow recovery from the Great Recession. In 2009, there were 61,900 jobs which fell to 58,000 in 2010. Mesa County added approximately 7,000 jobs since 2010, however 4,500 (just under two-thirds) of the new jobs were added between 2016 and the second quarter of 2019 indicating the acceleration in growth that is occurring. See Chart 1.

- **Diversifying economy** – Extractive industries (oil and gas and mining) have been historically the primary economic drivers in Mesa County and along the Western Slope. Employment in extractive sectors have been declining since 2010, with a loss of over 400 jobs. The largest industries in Mesa County are education and health services comprised mainly of health care jobs. This sector grew by nearly 2,000 employees since 2010 accounting for 44 percent of new jobs. In addition, manufacturing has gained approximately 500 jobs and is poised for continued growth with outdoor and precision manufacturers expanding to and within Mesa County. See Chart 2.
**CHART 1. JOB GROWTH IN MESA COUNTY (2009–2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>61,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>58,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>59,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>59,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>61,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>61,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>61,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>62,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>64,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>65,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; Economic & Planning Systems*

**CHART 2. MESA COUNTY EMPLOYMENT GROWTH BY INDUSTRY, 2010–2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Job Growth 2010-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education/Health Services</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure/Hospitality</td>
<td>-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Utilities</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof./Business Services</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources/Mining</td>
<td>-202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: QCEW; Economic & Planning Systems*
Retail evolution – Since the previous 2008 Plan, the retail industry has undergone a downsizing and transformation resulting from the rise of e-commerce. The year 2017 was labeled by the retail industry as the “Retail Apocalypse” when there were a record number of store chain and brand closings and bankruptcies. In Colorado municipalities, sales tax often comprises about two thirds of General Fund revenues; it is 54 percent of Fruita’s General Fund. Attracting major retail anchors was often a central part of local economic development in many communities. The 2008 Plan included recommendations on attracting anchor retailers as well. Retail recruitment is increasingly competitive, as the number of major stores who are actively expanding has been reduced dramatically. The market is also shifting to food and beverage including dining out and congregating in coffee shops, casual eateries, and breweries. Operating a successful retail business now requires strong skills in merchandising, activity/experience programming, and marketing to compete.

Dual economic roles – Fruita has two roles within Mesa County and Western Colorado. Part of Fruita’s growth has been as a desirable bedroom community to Grand Junction. The majority of employed Fruita residents work in Grand Junction—between 55 to 60 percent. Fruita is also an international destination for mountain biking and cycling and is a gateway or jumping off point for Colorado National Monument; Moab and other Utah national parks. These visitors have economic impacts in local restaurants, hotels, short term rentals, and bike shops and other specialty retailers. For the many visitors who camp however, their economic impacts are lower. Fruita has developed brand and community identity around cycling and other outdoor recreation. Fruita is also experiencing an increase in remote workers who live and work in Fruita but are tied to other employers or other regional economies through communications technology.

Large and expanding employers – A few large employers have located in Fruita. FHE is a manufacturing firm that designs highly specialized equipment for the safety of oil, gas, and mining drilling operations. FHE is expanding and adding approximately 100 jobs in Fruita. Family Health West has been in Fruita for over 60 years providing health care and employs over 280 people. Colorado Canyons Hospital is owned by Family Health West and provides a full-service hospital and emergency department in Fruita.

Fiscal sustainability – As Fruita has grown and matured it has assembled more infrastructure that needs to be maintained including roads, trails, parks, and a new recreation center. Due to Colorado’s tax structure under the Gallagher Amendment, residential property generates about a third of the property tax on the same value as commercial property and often does not cover its full cost of services. Commercial property is assessed at a higher rate and is needed to balance out the costs and revenues of growth. Fruita needs to strategically pursue commercial development opportunities while at the same time managing the costs of residential growth. Commercial development also generates important sales and lodging tax revenues. See Chart 3.
**Community Process and Analysis**

**Public Engagement**

Several economic themes were identified in the engagement process with the plan advisory committee, business owners, and the public.

- **Workforce** – Local businesses are experiencing a shortage of workers especially in retail, food and beverage, and tourism sector jobs. This affects customer service and visitors’ and residents’ experience at local businesses. The availability and cost of suitable rental housing was cited as a major factor.

- **Downtown** – Many in the community desire a more vibrant downtown with a larger mix of business, particularly restaurants, plus activities for children and families.

- **Grocery and Food Stores** – The community would like to see improved grocery and food store options in Fruita. The City has one full-service supermarket now.

- **Living wage jobs** – More good paying jobs are needed in Fruita to offer opportunities beyond service and tourism economy jobs.

- **Quality of life and community character** – People value Fruita’s identity and quality of life. If or as the community grows, it will need to ensure that City revenues keep up with growth in order to maintain a high quality of life. Quality commercial development that maintains community character is needed to help balance the City’s revenues.

---

**Chart 3. Tax Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>10.0%</th>
<th>20.0%</th>
<th>30.0%</th>
<th>40.0%</th>
<th>50.0%</th>
<th>60.0%</th>
<th>70.0%</th>
<th>80.0%</th>
<th>90.0%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fees, Charges for Service, &amp; Other Tax</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Tax &amp; Specific Ownership Tax</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Sales Tax</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Sales Tax</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Fruita 2019 Budget; Economic & Planning Systems*
STRENGTHS, CHALLENGES, AND OPPORTUNITIES

Fruita’s economic development strategy is also informed by an evaluation of strengths and opportunities and challenges summarized below.

Strengths and Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growing region</td>
<td>Mesa County’s economy and population are growing. Managed well, Fruita can leverage the growing economy and population to achieve community benefits and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality of life</td>
<td>Economic developers have stated that business owners moving to the Grand Valley often live in Fruita even if their business is in Grand Junction or elsewhere. The lifestyle, quality of life, and schools are major attractors in Fruita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand and identity</td>
<td>Fruita’s brand may be attractive to businesses in the outdoor products and services industries as consumers, especially young consumers, are increasingly interested in brands that are compatible with their identity and values. Other successful brands have associated themselves with their host communities as part of their marketing strategy such as Smartwool and Moots Cycles (Steamboat Springs, CO); Simms Fishing and Oboz Shoes (Bozeman, MT); New Belgium Brewers (Ft. Collins, CO); and Mountainsmith (Golden, CO).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct interstate access</td>
<td>Fruita and the Fruita Business Park have direct access and excellent visibility from I-70. Buildings with highway visibility can showcase their logos and presence in Fruita. Proximity to the interstate also facilitates shipping and truck access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>The Fruita Business Park is roughly 100 acres between US-50 and I-70 on the west side of Fruita. It has full utilities available including fiber optic and three phase heavy power. These sites are excellent opportunities for attracting employment in good paying economic base industries, and for diversifying the City’s tax base away from residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Fruita has a downtown that can be strengthened into a more vibrant center of the community and component of its identity. There has been a trend of suburban communities trying to create new downtown areas when none existed; Fruita already has a recognized center of the community to build on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

In implementing a community plan, it is useful to consider market-based challenges or constraints so that efforts and resources can be prioritized to achieve realistic goals and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGE</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promixity to Grand Junction</strong></td>
<td>As a larger community with a larger labor force at the center of the region, Grand Junction has approximately 90 percent of the commercial real estate in retail, office, and industrial space. Cities tend to attract the most development due to the economic principle of agglomeration in which jobs and development catalyze additional jobs and development. With a larger population and workforce than Fruita, Grand Junction is a more competitive location for most retail and commercial development. Fruita should therefore be strategic and target businesses that fit Fruita’s identity and local market. See Chart 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Costs and Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>Today for many businesses considering Fruita it has been more cost effective for them to lease existing buildings in and around Grand Junction than to build a new building in Fruita. There has been a large inventory of vacant industrial buildings as the energy industry has contracted, and lease rates are competitive. This inventory is absorbing however, and demand will trigger the need for new construction. In Fruita, developers are not building speculative space as it is not yet a major proven location for office and industrial space due to the agglomerations in Grand Junction. A business that wants to locate in Fruita however because of the identity and brand may look at these economics differently. In downtown, small businesses cannot afford the rents needed to support the construction of new space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Scale</strong></td>
<td>Fruita is a small community with a small labor force at the edge of the Grand Valley region. It will struggle attracting large employers who require access to a large labor force. This is not so much a constraint as a recognition that Fruita should prioritize its efforts and focus on attracting small businesses and growing existing businesses in Fruita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downtown Critical Mass</strong></td>
<td>To be more vibrant and create a stronger draw and center for locals and visitors, the number of businesses in Downtown needs to be expanded. “Critical mass” refers to the co-location of a sufficient number of businesses and activities in a downtown to create a stronger draw that results in people visiting downtown more frequently and spending more time there during their visits. To achieve critical mass in downtown, a combination of economic and community development efforts are needed to attract and grow businesses and improve the physical and real estate development environment. To achieve critical mass, a minimum of 3 to 6 blocks of contiguous ground floor retail/commercial and mixed-use space is recommended, on both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals, Policies and Actions

Goal #1.
Explore formal organization and funding and financing options for Downtown.

WHY
Implementing the Improvement Plan will be costly. The City’s General Fund and Capital Funds are already overcommitted in capital project and maintenance needs. There are funding and financing tools that could be used to invest in the Downtown area. A more formal organization of Downtown business advocates could also work with the City on Downtown management, marketing, real estate, and business development efforts.

POLICIES

1.A Explore the feasibility of establishing a Business Improvement District, Downtown Development Authority, or Urban Renewal Area.

a. A Business Improvement District (BID) can collect property tax and assessments on commercial property within the district upon approval through a vote of affected property owners. Is a separate political subdivision with the capacity to construct and maintain facilities as well as assume marketing and promotion activities. BID’s may authorize the construction and maintenance of a range of public improvements (streets, sidewalks, drainage facilities, decorative structures and art, parking facilities, public meeting facilities). BID’s may also provide a range of economic development and promotion activities such as marketing, special events, business recruiting, security, and design review. A BID can also be used to complement URA’s and DDA’s, as neither of those entities is authorized to oversee marketing and promotion programs.

b. Tax increment financing can be use through either a Downtown Development Authority (DDA) or Urban Renewal Authority or URA (in an Urban Renewal Area). In tax increment financing a base level of tax revenue is set at a defined date and any new tax revenue resulting from new development, new businesses, or property value appreciation is directed to the Authority for a period of 25 to 30 years. These are powerful financing tools when established and used strategically. The revenues and associated financing proceeds (bonds or a loan) can be used to build improvements and rectify blighted conditions. There are pros and cons to both types of Authorities that can be evaluated in more detail at the appropriate time. Both are widely used in Colorado.

1.B Consider a formal program to reimburse or waive impact fees on new buildings and expansions in Downtown. This would help incentivize development and redevelopment by lowering development costs.

1.C Establish a revolving loan (low interest) or grant fund for assisting with Downtown business real estate costs. Eligible costs could be renovating or expanding existing space, façade and sidewalk improvements, and rebating (or waiving) impact fees.
Goal #2.
Fund and implement the Downtown Streetscape Improvements Plan.

WHY?
Public investment to improve the look and feel of a downtown can encourage private investment in the form of new businesses, new development, and improvements to existing buildings. Downtown Fruita would benefit from investments to manage parking, improve the streetscape, and add amenities (benches, play/entertainment features for families, landscaping). Reconfiguration of the paving and travel lanes surrounding Civic Center Memorial Park could create new development parcels or improve customer access to the area which may strengthen business conditions around the Park and create a perception of a larger Downtown, as the current configuration creates a perceived barrier or separation.

Goal #3.
Work with City Market representatives and other property owners and businesses to expand and improve food and grocery shopping options in Fruita.

WHY?
Stakeholders in the plan process expressed desire for better grocery options in Fruita to reduce shopping trips to Grand Junction. Having quality grocery stores is a key factor in quality of life.

POLICIES
3.A Work with City Market representatives on options for renovating, expanding, or possibly relocating.
3.B Support any efforts to establish a specialty foods store or market in Downtown.

Goal #4.
Collaborate with other economic development organizations including the Fruita Chamber of Commerce and Grand Junction Economic Partnership.

WHY?
Economic Development requires coordination with the public and private sectors and with other economic development and related organizations. Each organization or entity should focus on its strengths and avoid overlap to make the most of limited resources.

ACTION
4.A Clearly define the City’s relationship with GJEP and their mutual expectations.

GJEP is the regional economic development group that represents the Grand Valley region. It is often on the front end of marketing and recruitment activities and fields many prospects and tours from businesses interested in locating in Mesa County. Due to Grand Junction’s critical mass in the real estate market and larger labor market, much of the new economic development activity ultimately lands in or just outside Grand Junction. However, Fruita is part of the Grand Valley economy and can compete for many of the same targeted industries. GJEP has adopted 7 targeted industries which are the focus of its marketing, recruitment, and retention efforts:

• Agriculture, Food and Beverage;
• Aviation and Aerospace;
• Energy and Renewables;
• Information and Creative Technology;
• Medical and Healthcare; and
• Outdoor Recreation (largely manufacturing, and product design and marketing)
Fruita can attract many of these industries as well and could benefit from representation at GJEP. Fruita should develop a more intentional policy on how it wishes to be involved with GJEP, its level of funding, and what it expects from GJEP given that GJEP is organized to represent the region, not individual communities.

4.B Support and collaborate with the Fruita Chamber of Commerce on addressing local business growth and retention.

The Chamber represents the largest group of Fruita businesses and organizes and promotes numerous community events. The Chamber’s role with the City could be adjusted to put additional focus on understanding the needs of local businesses and determining where the City has the power or ability to address impediments. A business retention program could be comprised of regular check-ins with the Chamber and follow-up with individual businesses to identify new business prospects as well as issues to be resolved (e.g. building code, tax reporting, parking, marketing, workforce development).

Goal #5.
Continue refining Fruita’s strategy and targeted business types for proactive marketing and recruiting. Balance recruiting and marketing with essential community development activities and supporting local businesses.

WHY?
Some amount of marketing and recruiting could be worthwhile for Fruita to continue building name and place recognition, especially among outdoor products brands and services. Business recruiting however is a high effort and low probability endeavor. Fruita can continue its targeted work in this area and determine the appropriate balance given staff and financial resources.

ACTIONS
5.A Consider refining the GJEP targeted industry list to a shorter and more specific list of business types that Fruita is interested in attracting. Tying this short list to the community’s values and identity would help further focus recruitment efforts.

Goal #6.
Define an incentives policy appropriate for targeted industries and specific areas of the City.

WHY?
Fruita could use limited and targeted incentives to help attract and expand businesses (and associated real estate) in the Business Park and Downtown.

> Fruita should develop and incentives policy that guides the targeted use of incentives. Initial guidelines are that incentives can be considered when there are mutual benefits to the City and Public and the recipient. Examples of public benefits include:

> » Partnerships and cost sharing on infrastructure;
> » Substantial net new sales and use and property tax;
> » Redevelops/reinvests in obsolete, vacant, or blighted property;
> » Creates living wage jobs;
> » Will be recouped within a reasonable time period; and
> » “But for” the public investment, the project would not proceed.
Incentives in the Business Park and for other economic base employers could include tools such as personal property tax rebates, sales and use tax rebates or sharing, and/or impact fee reimbursements.

In the Downtown area, consider formal programs to assist businesses.

**ACTIONS**

6.A Determine the incentive types and tools to be used in specific areas of the City.

6.B Define criteria for receiving each incentive (e.g., job wage levels, construction quality, public benefit requirements, overall tax base contribution and payback period and ROI, etc.)

6.C Establish a rigorous review process for incentive requests following best practices. In particular, consider a “but for” test for tax increment financing wherein a project would not proceed “but for” the public investment. Ensure that public benefit requirements are met, particularly with tax increment financing.

6.D Promote Fruita and Mesa County as an Enterprise Zone

**Goal #7.**

Support local business growth through business retention and support programs and assistance with real estate.

**WHY?**

Existing local businesses are often the greatest source of job and economic growth.

7.A Within the context of an incentives, loan, or grant program, define a means and criteria of assisting with renovation, expansion, and redevelopment costs for businesses in Downtown and the Business Park.

7.B Conduct regular business outreach to determine if there are issues the City can assist with to help expand and retain local businesses.

7.C Promote the programs managed by the Grand Junction Incubator and GJEP including their several revolving loan funds, the Maker Space, and Business Incubator Center which provides coaching, advising, and mentoring.

**Goal #8.**

Reserve areas for commercial development towards long term growth.

**WHY?**

Fruita has a strong residential market and may experience pressure to rezone important commercial land to allow for residential development. Fruita, like other cities, needs to think long term about its fiscal sustainability and ensuring that there are opportunities for future commercial development is part of this strategy. A strong tax base is needed to keep up with the infrastructure, maintenance, amenities, and high-quality municipal services needed to maintain quality of life.

**ACTIONS**

8.A Every five to ten years assess the commercially-zoned land within the City and the Three Mile Plan area against market conditions and assess whether the amount of space is appropriate.

8.B Periodically identify the best commercial development sites for marketing, in partnership with local real estate brokerages.

8.C Create a policy that defines criteria for rezoning applications on prime commercial sites. Criteria could include creating affordable housing or redeveloping economically obsolete or long-vacant property.
**Goal #9.**
Support flexibility in zoning and the development of diverse housing types as part of an economic sustainability strategy.

**WHY?**
The availability of workforce housing is now an economic development issue in Fruita. Additionally, businesses are looking for the right fit in terms of buildings, land, and space to move, expand, or start businesses. Fruita can look to the experience of high cost mountain resort towns to observe the risks of waiting too long to act. Local businesses are experiencing workforce shortages. The Land Use chapter of this plan contains strategies and policies on increasing the diversity and supply of housing in Fruita. For workforce housing, emphasis is on market rate and affordable (income restricted) rental housing and attainably priced ownership housing. For commercial spaces, Land Use Code changes can lay the groundwork for being an attractive place for a new or existing business. Flexibility in the design and types of buildings that can be built would be a business-friendly approach.

**POLICIES**
9.A Support changes in the Land Use Code update that will promote a business-friendly environment

9.B Support changes in the Land Use Code update that will promote a diversity of housing types that will keep existing residents in Fruita and attract future employees.

**Goal #10.**
Align City budget priorities with community and economic development values.

**WHY?**
The City implements policy through its budgeting and spending priorities. The City should annually review its capital projects and operations funding priorities for conformance with this Plan.
Housing affordability remains a top priority.
Chapter 5
Parks, Health, Recreation, Open Space + Trails
Introduction

This chapter includes a vision as well as goals, policies, and actions to guide parks, health, recreation, open space, and trails in and around Fruita. The ideas contained in this chapter were developed from: conversations around the current state of recreation and upcoming needs, an analysis of existing parkland, and community engagement. This chapter includes the Future Parks, Recreation, Open Space, Trails, and Connectivity Map, informed by past planning, recent growth, and emerging needs.

Context and Update

In the past ten years, the City of Fruita has elevated its recreational offering and partnerships. With a new community center, the city now holds a wide range of recreational programming. The city’s programs and events bring the community together and draw people to the City. Fruita has also taken a leading role in efforts to enhance the surrounding trail systems and regional connectivity.

- The Community Center opened in 2011. This has completely changed the recreational landscape of Fruita. Through the center, the City has been able to vastly expand its recreational programming for all ages, from youth to seniors. The center includes a gymnasium, senior center, library, meeting space, indoor and outdoor pools, and fitness spaces.

- The City has expanded the number of events it holds and the number of local events that come through. This increase has placed pressure on existing event space (Civic Center Park) and outside groups have expressed interested in holding larger events in Fruita. However, the City does not have the appropriate facilities to accommodate those events.

- The City has not acquired or developed parks as proscribed in the 2008 Community Plan and 2009 Parks, Open Space, and Trails (POST) plan. If development continues around the perimeter of the city, acquisition of land for parks will be vital. The City acquired 5 acres of land adjacent to Little Salt Wash Park for future expansion.

- Several new parks facilities have been completed in the past ten years on previously owned lands: Fruita Riverfront Park (Disc Golf Course), Fruita Bike Park. Residents have requested new types of park facilities such as a dog park, upgraded skate park, and pickleball courts.

- The City currently provides 1.94 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents (including the three city-maintained pocket parks and five acres of Little Salt Wash that acts as a neighborhood park). This is below the standard of 4.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents established in the 2008 plan.

- According to the Trust for Public Land, 76% of Fruita residents are within a 10 minute walk of parkland. However, only 3% of land within City limits is parkland – the national average is 15%. City parks are important, even if Fruita is lucky to be surrounded by public land which provides additional recreation opportunities.

- Funding proved to be a major obstacle in implementing many of the actions and policies of the 2008 community plan and the 2009 POST plan.

- The City’s parks and recreation impact fee was created 10 years ago, but the city has significantly increased what they provide since that time. The current POST impact fee is $1,850 per new dwelling unit constructed.
The Fruita Community Center opened in 2011 and hosts a gymnasium, senior center, library, meeting space, pools, and fitness spaces.

The City has completed numerous new trail segments including the Kokopelli Trail, the Colorado Riverfront Trail, Monument View, and a short section of the Lower Little Salt Wash Trail (about 10 miles of new paved trails) thanks to grants and partnerships with the Colorado Riverfront Commission, Grand Junction, Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO), and CDOT. The City has not been able to develop the wash/irrigation canal trail system as outlined in the POST plan.

Many of the washes are in need of maintenance and there is uncertainty around who is responsible and how maintenance is provided.

The City has supported and funded regional trail projects on public lands, namely BLM lands at 18 Road and at the Kokopelli trailhead. A Fruita Trails Initiative group was recently founded as an informal group for the local mountain biking trail systems.

The Parks and Recreation department recently began initiatives around community health in partnership with the school district and Mesa County Public Health department.

Parks and Recreation is one of the city’s highest rated departments. However, staff is becoming concerned about being able to maintain facilities as programming, events, and facilities expand.

The City has a lot of big recreation projects planned for the future and needs to prioritize and budget for them in the short, medium, and long term.

The City has received a grant to support an update to the POST plan in the coming year, 2020. This plan will be known as the Parks, Health, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PHROST) plan.
Community Process and Analysis

The planning team analyzed residents’ distance to parks and the park acreage per 1,000 residents. These analyses found that most residents live relatively close to a park, but there is limited park acreage for the city’s residents. The city has 1.94 acres of parkland for a 1,000 residents, well below the standard of 4.0 set in the 2008 Community Plan and the 9.5 acres on average as reported in the 2016 National Recreation and Park Association Field Report.

The Trust for Public Land’s Parkscore analysis was used as well. Parkscore, a nationwide analysis of city park systems, found that 76 percent of Fruita’s residents live within a 10-minute walk of a park. This is well above the national average of 54 percent within a 10-minute walk. Only 3 percent of Fruita’s city land is used for parks and recreation compared to the national median of 15 percent. Map 7 identifies where parks are located and high priority areas for adding parks.

The Plan Kickoff Open House touched on topics contained in this chapter. Many attendees mentioned the walkability, recreation opportunities, outdoor recreation access, community center, and events as elements of Fruita they really value. In terms of issues, many residents marked “difficult to bike” as an issue and a small number also named “difficult to walk” and “parks” as issues. Others brought up overcrowding at the community center, crossing I-70 on foot or bike is challenging, and the lack of connections to the bike park. Many felt Fruita should be known as the recreation center of the Grand Valley.

The plan advisory committee and livability commission met to discuss the vision, goals, and policies for this chapter.
MAP 10. PARKS SERVICE AREA
VISION
The City of Fruita leads the Grand Valley in parks, health, recreation, open space and trails. The City provides unparalleled recreational programming and events, well-maintained parks and recreational facilities that are accessible to all residents, and a well-connected network of bike and pedestrian facilities. The City drives local efforts for world-class outdoor recreation opportunities and regional connectivity. The recreational programming, events, and outdoor recreation opportunities bring the community together around a lifestyle to positively impact the community’s health. The City takes initiative to protect the natural environment within and surrounding Fruita.

Goal #1.
Put on recreational programming and events that provide opportunities for residents to be mentally, physically, and socially active.

WHY?
Supporting residents active and healthy lifestyles and holding events and programs where residents can gather is a key priority for the city. However, there are concerns about accessibility, sufficient funding and facilities, and the appropriate balance of events. Many of these items will be further explored in the upcoming PHROST plan.

POLICIES
1.A Provide recreational programming and events that are accessible for all ages and financial backgrounds.

1.B Clearly communicate to the community what recreational offerings are available.

.ACTIONS
1.A Explore opportunities for new event space that will enhance the appeal of Fruita for events. Ensure that the new space has connectivity to downtown and other key destinations.

1.B Develop standards and solicit feedback to ensure that recreational programming meets the needs of all residents.

1.C Through the PHROST Plan, identify a funding source for recreational programming and develop a cost recovery model. Create a program pricing model for programs and events that encourages participation while achieving set cost recovery ratios. Set higher cost recovery ratios for specialized/individualized programs and lower cost recovery ratios for community-based and benefit programs.
CHAPTER 5 PARKS, HEALTH, RECREATION, OPEN SPACE + TRAILS

MAP 11. PARKS, RECREATION, OPEN SPACE, TRAILS, AND CONNECTIVITY

Legend:
- City limits
- River channel
- National Monument
- Existing bike lane
- Road
- Existing Revenues
  - Local market
  - School district
  - Community Center & Library
  - Recreational Park
  - Marina
  - Commercial
- Future Revenues
  - Improved bike lane
  - Agency/municipality ownership
  - Nature Area
  - Flood plain
  - Flooded area
- Potential Revenues
  - Bike trail

McNINNIS CANYONS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA

SALIENCIA CANYONS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA

SCENIC ROUTE 12

May 2020

SE Group

SCALE (FT)

1000 1500 2000 2500
1.D Consider increasing or restructuring the POST impact fee to incorporate and provide necessary funding for recreational programming and events.

1.E Develop and provide informational resources to the community on events, programs, and facilities. This includes, but is not limited to, trail maps, activity guides, and enhanced electronic resources such as websites, social media, and interactive maps.

1.F Look for alternative locations to host programs and events. Work with schools as places for events and programming.

1.G Develop a continual vetting process for new and existing events.

1.H Analyze the capacity of Civic Center Park for events in terms of frequency and size of events.

1.I Address the limited recreational facility space for hosting and providing programming through feasibility studies of a Fruita Community Center expansion, fieldhouse, and additional athletic fields.

**Goal #2.**

**Invest in the health of the local community and make a positive impact through programming initiatives, partnerships, and infrastructure.**

**WHY?**

The City of Fruita, in supporting healthy lifestyles for its residents, has recently started developing initiatives and partnerships around community health. This plan offers initial policies and actions for the City before health-related guiding principles, policies, and initiatives are fully developed through the PHROST plan. Supporting community health in Fruita extends across many of the plan topics, such as walkability and education.

**POLICIES**

2.A Continue partnerships with the school district, Family Health West, and Mesa County Public Health and identify opportunities for new partners. Consider forming a coalition with those partners to tackle health issues in the city.

2.B Ensure that recreational programming is accessible to all residents (location, cost, timing, etc.)

2.C Ensure that health initiatives and other recreational programming engage all ages, especially older youth (13-18).

2.D Collaborate with the Community Alliance for Education and Hunger Relief, the Mesa County Leadership Forum on Hunger, and other partners to ensure that all Fruita residents have access to enough food for an active and healthy life.

2.E Support the Mesa County Public Health Department and its Child Care 8,000 initiative in seeking to increase the number of available spaces for childcare in the county.

**ACTIONS**

2.A Develop guiding principles, policies, and initiatives to promote health through the PHROST plan.

2.B Develop initiatives that encourage healthy habits among residents.

2.C Develop measurable goals around health through the PHROST plan.

2.D Develop pedestrian and bicycle facilities to encourage residents to walk and bike.

2.A Find a funding source for health initiatives and pursue grants to supplement funding.
Goal #3.
Enhance the city’s trail system to allow residents and visitors to walk and ride safely within the city and to surrounding trail systems.

WHY?
Fruita residents value their access to outdoor recreation and ability to walk and bike safely around the city. The city should act as a trailhead, where residents and visitors can easily walk/ride out their door to surrounding trail systems or city destinations. This has been a key focus for the city with many connectivity enhancements in the past decade. However, further enhancements are essential to plan for and implement over the coming decade. The map in this chapter showcases future trail, connectivity and recreation ideas.

POLICIES
3.A Encourage new schools to be located on well-connected parcels and develop safe routes to the new and existing schools.
3.B Continue to collaborate on regionally important trail projects with the BLM, One Riverfront, and COPMOBA.
3.C Continue to develop the primary trail system within the City of Fruita as identified on the 2009 POST plan, this plan, and the 2020 PHROST plan.

ACTIONS
3.A Develop wash and irrigation canal trails to enhance local connectivity. Work with oversight agencies to secure easements.
3.B Prioritize major trail projects through the upcoming PHROST plan (i.e., connection to North Fruita Desert Trails, bridge over I-70, wash and irrigation canal trails). Base prioritization on level of improvement to community connectivity.
3.C Improve access to Snooks Bottom and McInnis Canyon through bridges and other connectivity projects.

3.D Integrate off-street trails with on-street trails and bike routes and add wayfinding signage.
3.E If development expands at the perimeter of the city, expand the trail system to connect the new neighborhoods. Add infrastructure on State Highway 6/50 to accommodate a multi-use trail safely separated from the road.

Goal #4.
Strengthen outdoor recreation in greater Fruita through partnerships, funding, and city facilities.

WHY?
The Fruita area is renowned for its outdoor recreation opportunities. While most opportunities are outside the city limits, it is important for the city to support and maintain the opportunities for its residents, visitors, and economy. These efforts should not detract from Fruita’s community-first ethos.

POLICIES
4.A Actively partner with the BLM, USFS, CPW, COPMOBA, and local businesses to support the trail and river-based outdoor recreation opportunities on surrounding public lands.
4.B Support outdoor recreation initiatives with the potential for economic development.
4.C Fund trail development, a trail maintenance crew, and trail studies/plans for to maintain and enhance local trail systems.
4.D Make the city the trailhead for the surrounding outdoor recreation opportunities. Continue to maintain area trailheads but focus on strong connectivity to bike or walk from the city.
4.E Continue to develop partnerships to make Mountain Properties open to the public for outdoor recreation. Explore alternate opportunities to manage the Mountain Properties.
**ACTIONS**

4.A Formalize the Fruita Trails Initiative into an organization that works to support the trail systems and connect them to the City of Fruita.

4.B Explore a funding source that supports outdoor recreation initiatives such as a lodging tax. Continue to be creative around funding for these initiatives.

**Goal #5.**

Ensure the city’s parks and recreational facilities are a well-maintained, accessible resource of active and passive recreation spaces for all residents.

**WHY?**

Parks and recreational facilities are important spaces for Fruita residents to be active and gather. The City of Fruita is below the national standards in terms of parkland and existing facilities are overtaxed. As the city continues to develop and grow, proving sufficient parks and recreational facilities and expanding existing facilities will be increasingly important.

**POLICIES**

5.A Develop new neighborhood and community parks and upgrade existing to provide sufficient parkland within an easily accessible distance for all residents.

5.B Continue to encourage development to include pocket parks, open space areas, and connector/secondary trails. These pocket parks should be open for community use but maintained through the HOA, with the maintenance plan incorporated in the development review. The City will then primarily focus on community and neighborhood parks, open space, and the trail system. In the development review, ensure that the pocket parks are usable space that will be enjoyed by the development’s residents.

5.C Maintain the high quality and high citizen rating for the parks and recreational facilities of Fruita.

5.D Be proactive to acquire land as development occurs or beforehand for parkland.

5.E Develop new parks and update existing parks taking the irrigation demand and water conservation into account.

5.F Locate new parks along washes or other areas with strong connectivity to local neighborhoods and work to enhance connectivity to existing parks.

5.G Continue working with the school district to share and develop recreational spaces as needed.

5.H In the Land Use Code Update, explore adjusting the impact fee and fee-in-lieu to further support the development of parks.

**ACTIONS**

5.A Consider raising or restructuring impact fees in order to fund the development of new parks and the upgrading and maintenance of existing parks.

5.B Explore opportunities to expand the community center or develop a new indoor facility to meet existing and future demand.

5.C Explore opportunities for a new community park and athletic fields with lighting and a synthetic surface.

5.D Actively seek new funding sources for park development and maintenance, especially through grants.

5.E Further understand the Fruita parks and recreational needs through the public engagement process of the PHROST plan.

5.F Explore the potential of public-private partnerships, foundational support, and other donations for the development of future parks.
Goal #6.
Preserve the natural features of the city and surrounding landscape through partnerships with local land managers and organizations.

WHY?
The City of Fruita has important natural features both within and beyond the city limits. Preserving and protecting these natural features is a key responsibility of its residents. Especially for the features beyond the city limits, working with partners is essential.

POLICIES
6.A Conserve water quality, natural hydrology and habitat, and preserve biodiversity through conservation of the Colorado River, major stream corridors and washes, as well as associated wetlands, floodplains, drains, and riparian areas as important green spaces, wildlife habitat, waterway corridors, and trail linkages.

6.B Actively manage the washes by determining who at the city should be responsible for this, allocating resources, securing easements to clean up the washes, stabilizing the banks, and maintaining the washes. Work closely with RiversEdge West, Grand Valley Drainage District, and private landowners.

6.C Protect sensitive resources by preserving natural buffers from the edge of natural features or 100-year floodplain (whichever is greater). Recommended buffers include: Ponds, creeks, streams, drainages, canals, and wetlands at 50 feet; Adobe Creek, Reed Wash, Little Salt Wash, Big Salt Wash, rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife habitat at 100 feet; the Colorado River at 300 feet.

6.D Protect sensitive areas and other important resource values within Fruita’s Three Mile Planning Area. These may include:
   a. Lands that are constrained due to environmental sensitivity or geologic hazards
   b. 100-year floodplains designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
   c. Lands with important scenic values or that contribute to the visual quality of Fruita
   d. Lands with important cultural and historic values
   e. Rare vegetation
   f. Wetlands
   g. Severe slopes
   h. Land with important wildlife habitat or other natural value such as nesting and production areas
   i. Winter ranges, feeding areas, and concentration areas for threatened and endangered species, species of special concern, or indicator species
   j. Wildlife movement corridors
   k. Lands that have important recreational values

6.E Work closely with regional land managers (CPW, BLM, Mesa County) to preserve natural features in the lands surrounding Fruita

ACTIONS
6.A Consider implementing a drainage fee that would create an enterprise utility fund to pay for some of the policies listed under this goal.
Events in Fruita are popular and generally well attended by residents and visitors, alike.
Chapter 6
Transportation
Introduction

This chapter includes a vision as well as goals, policies, and actions to guide Fruita’s transportation infrastructure planning and implementation. The ideas contained within this chapter are developed from: conversations on gaps, safety concerns, and other pressing needs; an analysis of the existing street and bike-ped network, a review of existing area transportation-related plans; and public meetings to discuss key corridors and priorities for improvements. This chapter includes the Road Classifications and Future Transportation Map which highlight important driving and pedestrian routes around the city.

Context and Update

What has happened in the past ten years? What are the pressing issues?

- The 2013 Land Use Code Update lowered downtown parking requirements. South of I-70, the parking minimums are higher for commercial properties and are frequently exceeded.
- A 2017 study of downtown parking found that there is ample parking around downtown.
- The City completed a Pedestrian Bicycle Circulation Study in 2011 and has been able to implement many of the projects.
- Following the financial crisis and facing slow growth, in 2008, the Public Works department had a constrained budget yet still used reserves to fund projects that had a lot of momentum.
- The 2008 Community Plan Land Use Framework encouraged development in areas that required significant new infrastructure, including roadways.
- The 2008 Community Plan designated certain roadways as Enhanced Travel Corridors but did not fully define that term. No enhancements were made to those corridors.
- The City completed a Gateway Enhancements and Wayfinding Plan in 2016. The City has implemented wayfinding around the interstate interchange and the hospital/community center. Additional wayfinding signage may be needed around downtown and Little Salt Wash Park.
- Traffic is well dispersed through the City. However, as traffic increases, close attention will be paid to certain intersections to maintain traffic flow.
- A study of State Highway 6/50 found that the highway would have adequate capacity going forward. The highway does have issues at some intersections, where a turn lane may be necessary. The highway could also be enhanced through beautification projects. CDOT has a large Right-of-Way to make such changes and enhancements.
- The 2008 Community Plan named 19 Road as an enhanced travel corridor. However, the full build out of 19 Road is unlikely to happen in the next 10 years. As it builds out, it may take on a more arterial like form in the southern portion while remaining more like a rural collector in the northern portion. Managing the evolving cross-section of this road as development occurs will be important.
near the intersection of 18.5 Road and K.4 Road. Enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be needed on both roadways. K.4 Road currently has no pedestrian facilities and 18.5 does have sidewalks in some sections, but the road is not fully built out. In existing sections, residential driveways back out onto the sidewalk.

The existing I-70 interchange area is challenging for both vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists. State Highway 340 across the interstate has more traffic than it was designed for and there is little space for pedestrians and cyclists on the bridge. Vehicular circulation around the interstate is also challenging, especially towards State Highway 6/50 is hard. CDOT has not planned for new interchanges through Fruita.

The City needs to replace the bridges over Little Salt Wash and repave many road sections throughout the city. This presents an opportunity for restriping with bicycle and pedestrian accommodation.

The City adopted a Downtown Streetscape Improvements Plan in 2013. The City did improve a few blocks of Aspen Street but that was very expensive, and funding has not been available to implement other items in the plan.

The City developed a designated truck route map. Trucks are only allowed to use State Highway 6/50, 16 Road, and 19 Road.

In 2018, a study was conducted on the appropriate level of transportation impact fee for new development in the county and its municipalities. The City and county have not raised the impact fee yet and discussions are ongoing. As it currently stands, the impact fee does not fully cover the costs of improvements.

City Council has encouraged the Public Works department to prioritize maintenance of existing infrastructure over new construction. Recent new construction has been funded by grants and there is concern towards funding new projects in the future, as grants are not a consistent funding source. These new projects, once completed, will add to the City’s maintenance load as well.

The City has a long list of maintenance project but is not keeping pace with the projects at the current rate of funding.

The Fruita Trail has improved connectivity and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

credit: Scott Belonger/Otak, Inc.
A Safe Routes to School audit was conducted of Shelledy Elementary, Rim Rock Elementary, and Fruita Middle School in 2016. The audit found that a high percentage of students received rides to school, with few students carpooling. At Fruita Middle School, near downtown, few students biked to and from school, and many students walked home but drove in the morning. Traffic around the schools is increasingly an issue, with school drop-off and pick-up times aligning with peak commuting periods. The Safe Routes to School audit suggested intersection and sidewalk improvements for the City to complete.

Community Process and Analysis

The advisory committee discussed the Future Transportation Map and other important transportation priorities. Committee members expressed that connectivity, wayfinding, and enhancements to State Highway 6/50 must be important elements of this chapter.

An open house was held where participants were asked about issues facing Fruita and areas in need of improvement. “Difficult to bike” was a top issue among participants. A moderate number of participants selected “traffic” and “parking” as issues, with very few participants selecting “difficult to walk.” Areas marked as in need of transportation improvements included the State Highway 6/50 corridor just east of Cherry Street, the intersection of 19 and K Road, and along Highway 340 near the Colorado River crossing.

The planning team analyzed the existing conditions of the city’s roadways in terms of level of traffic and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The analysis identified key roads, sidewalks and trails that would make the city easy to get around on foot, by bike, or by car. The planning team also reviewed past transportation studies and reports to incorporate previously identified gaps and recommendations under a comprehensive vision and develop implementation strategies.

The following Road Classifications Map shows the existing road system and what is planned for. The Future Transportation Map shows the key roads towards enhancing connectivity in the City.

VISION

The City of Fruita has well-maintained and safe roadways, intersections, sidewalks and trails. It has a transportation system that balances access and mobility through multimodal improvements on existing roads as well as coordinated planning with new development. Transportation facilities contribute to the character of the community by providing inviting streetscapes, off-street connections, and attractive gateways to the community.
**Goal #1.**
Design the city's streets for their level of traffic, adjacent land uses, and connectivity context.

**WHY?**
Fruita's grid system allows people to get around the city easily. Residents especially value feeling safe while walking and biking to schools, parks, and downtown. The following designated streets are intended to facilitate safe walking and biking, with easy vehicular travel as well.

**POLICIES**
1.A Downtown Enhanced Corridor – these corridors have slow speeds through traffic calming projects, easy access to downtown businesses, good sidewalks and bike facilities (Mesa St., Pabor Avenue, Aspen Avenue)

1.B Safe Route to School – this corridor along 18.5 road, includes traffic calming, good sidewalks and bike facilities (18.5 Road/Fremont Street). Many schools are along this route so it was identified as a key street for safe walking and biking.

1.C Multi-modal Corridor – These streets supports higher vehicular traffic volumes, bikes, and pedestrians, and often connect to off street trails. (Highway 340/Cherry Street, Mesa north of Ottley, Aspen west of the circle, Maple Street/17 ½ road, Pine Street/18 road, Ottley Road)

1.D Enhanced Arterial – This designation is given to Highway 6/50. It is envisioned to feature safe intersections, easy access to and from side streets, and beautification through landscaping and hardscaping.

1.E Future Collector – existing truck routes that will be built out as development occurs around it. Corridor plans should be completed for each road corridor to ensure they develop as envisioned rather than in a haphazard manner.

**ACTIONS**
1.A Establish minimum construction standards and cross-sections for trail and bike lanes.

1.B Conduct a circulation study of the City in light of the land use changes associated with this comprehensive plan in 2020. Incorporate new design standards and cross sections into the updated Land Use Code.
Downtown Enhanced Corridor
Angled parking may vary depending on street segment

Safe Route to School Corridor
Safe crossing every two blocks; two-way turn lane would alternate with median; left-hand sidewalk is a multi-use path
Multi-Modal Corridor

Parking may be eliminated from one side as ROW width varies

Future Collector Corridor
The 6/50 Corridor from Maple to Plum streets has great potential to transform from an auto-oriented and service-related “pass through” into a destination with a mix of uses. The visibility of the corridor from I-70 and connection to downtown is a major opportunity. Working with CDOT to make safety improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists and connecting to the trail networks will help catalyze land use changes.

BEFORE

AFTER

Locate parking to the rear and sides of properties instead of all in front.

Create “bulb-outs” on streets that intersect with 6/50 and allow on-street parking. This helps define where parking is allowed and shortens the crossing distance for pedestrians and bicyclists. It also slows down travel speeds of cars.

The future vision for the corridor includes reusing existing buildings where feasible, while adding new structures that contribute new uses to help enliven the corridor and support downtown.

Locate parking to the rear and sides of properties instead of all in front.

Generally, promote more pervious surfaces (less asphalt and concrete) that reduce stormwater runoff and beautify and “soften” the corridor experience.

The future vision for the corridor allows properties to evolve and change over time. Some properties may choose to redevelop while others may not. Merging new and old is part of the desired character of the corridor.

Connecting the trail system along 6 & 50 with a multi-use path protected from the roadway with landscaping and trees (like the pathway to the east along 6 & 50, but straight) is desired. The City should work with CDOT to develop a design and path to implementation.

Continue to allow parking in the CDOT right-of-way. Also allow other “non-structure” improvements to occur, such as patios, lawns, landscaping, and signage.
Goal #2.
Create and maintain safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists to go from their door to local destinations (school, downtown, the Community Center, local parks, Kokopelli Business Park, and local trail systems).

WHY?
Residents explicitly stated the ability to walk and bike safely to local destinations as a key community value. This goal and the subsequent policies and actions are measures the city can take towards preserving and further strengthening this community value. While residents appreciate the existing walkability and bike-ability, physical improvements and programs are necessary to create a fully connected network and encourage safe behavior from pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

POLICIES
2.A Encourage the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in existing developments and require them to be included as an integral element of transportation plans for new developments.

2.B Support educational programs to enhance cyclist safety such as motorist awareness programs and K-12 bike education programs.

2.C Encourage off-street trails within new developments with connections to existing or proposed trails.

ACTIONS
2.A Develop wash and irrigation canal trails to enhance local connectivity. Work with oversight agencies to secure easements where development has already occurred. For new development, ensure that these easements are dedicated during the site planning process.

2.B Create policy to encourage bicycle accommodations when restriping a roadway in consideration of expected use.

2.C Consider additional measures to keep up with sidewalk maintenance such as local block-by-block beautification competitions, enforcement, etc.

2.D Add design amenities to improve the safety and comfort of all road users, with a particular focus on behaviors and attitudes that cause motor vehicle/bicycle crashes.

2.E Continue implementation of the 2011 Fruita Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation Study.

2.F Integrate on-street trail system with off-street trail system.

2.G Explore bicycle and pedestrian improvements south of the interstate in the PHROST plan.

2.H Update Land Use Code to consider alternative street sections in conjunction with other provided amenities in development review.

2.I Maintain and update a city connections map that includes safe existing routes (off-street trails and designated on-street routes) with trail type. This would be appropriate as part of the 2020 PHROST Plan effort. Currently some routes are on transportation maps and others are on trail maps.
Goal #3.
Make Downtown pedestrian-oriented and easy for visitors and vehicles to navigate.

WHY?
Throughout the planning process, residents expressed their love for downtown and its friendly and welcoming atmosphere. They appreciated the public art, running into neighbors and friends, and the busy, active feeling of Aspen Avenue. The following policies and actions seek to preserve that experience and make downtown more conducive and pleasant to walk around.

ACTIONS
3.A Implement the Downtown Streetscape Improvements Plan. Additional actions around this plan are in Chapters 3 and 4.
3.B Implement parts or all of the 2016 Gateway Enhancement and Wayfinding Plan.
3.C Add wayfinding signage downtown and on designated bicycling and walking routes through the City to lead to destinations and connect the on and off-street networks.
3.D Explore parking solutions to support a park once strategy and pleasant walking experiences in downtown (i.e., fee-in-lieu, shared parking lot).

Goal #4.
Support safe and efficient circulation through the city from I-70 and along State Highway 6/50.

WHY?
The two major transportation corridors of Fruita, I-70 and State Highway 6/50, currently present challenges to circulation for residents and visitors. For pedestrians and cyclists, crossing I-70 along Highway 340, the only option, is dangerous. North of I-70, it is not straightforward to get from Highway 30/Cherry Street to State Highway 6/50. Access to Highway 6/50 is difficult from many of its cross-streets and the streetscape is lacking. During the planning process, residents frequently brought up improving Highway 6/50 and the interstate interchange area as community priorities.

POLICIES
4.A Collaborate with CDOT on future planning, including upgrades to the I-70 interchange and possible future interchanges, State Highway 6/50 access control.

ACTIONS
4.A Explore a bicycle/pedestrian overpass over I-70, either near Highway 340 and/or near the High School.
4.C Enhance the pedestrian/cyclist facilities on the current Highway 340 bridge over the interstate.
4.D Create a State Highway 6/50 Corridor Plan that includes how to better interface with the I-70 interchange, streetscape enhancements, and access and intersection improvements.
Goal #5.
Maintain existing transportation infrastructure and services. Implement new transportation infrastructure, as appropriate.

WHY?
The city has both a long list of deferred maintenance and new infrastructure projects on the horizon. In recent years, limited funding has made completing maintenance projects and implementing new projects and plans challenging. The following policies and actions are strategies to allow the city to provide well-maintained and new transportation infrastructure.

POLICIES
5.A Continue to monitor traffic volumes and add traffic control devices as necessary.
5.B Work through deferred maintenance projects to be able to be more proactive with respect to maintenance.
5.C Continue to support the Grand Valley Transit dial-a-ride service for seniors in Fruita.
5.D Continue to support the Grand Valley Transit Fruita route and look for ways to encourage ridership.

ACTIONS
5.A Restructure the Transportation Impact Fee to provide adequate funding for transportation impacts associated with development.
5.B Examine the Gateway Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation Study, and Downtown Streetscape Improvements Plan to identify small project phases that can be implemented as funding allows.
5.C Update the Land Use Code to encourage new development in areas with fewer road construction demands.
5.D Use the PHROST plan to identify and prioritize off-street connectivity routes.
5.E Update Land Use Code to require EV charging stations at larger commercial businesses.
Roundabouts, like the one at Circle Park, help improve traffic flow.
Chapter 7
Services and Infrastructure
Introduction

This chapter includes a vision as well as goals and policies to address services and infrastructure within and surrounding Fruita. The ideas contained within this chapter were developed from conversations with relevant departments and service providers, reflections on past and current opportunities and challenges, and public meetings to vet the goals and policies contained within.

Context and Update

What is different now than 10 years ago? What has been accomplished? What has changed? What worked and what didn’t?

- A new wastewater treatment plant was constructed on the west side of the city. However, development pressure is greatest on the east side. A new trunk line was completed eastward to serve the Iron Wheel development and other developments along 19 Road.

- City departments collaborate well with each other and regional partners (CPW, Lower Valley Fire District, BLM, etc.).

- Current impact fees are higher for residential development than commercial; however, this has not spurred significant commercial development.

- The Public Works department upgraded electrical wiring downtown to limit the need for generators during events.

- The Lower Valley Fire District works closely with the City and is hoping to achieve a Class 3 ISO rating.

- Maintaining the mountain water system is becoming increasingly expensive for Public Works.

- After the 2008 recession, the Public Works department had a constrained budget and used reserves to fund the projects with a lot of momentum.

Community Process and Analysis

The planning team met with the city Public Works Department, Mesa County, Lower Valley Fire District, and the Fruita Police Department to discuss infrastructure and service needs in the area. An audit of the 2008 plan was completed to bring relevant goals and policies forward into this plan while leaving irrelevant or completed goals out.

- Fruita is considered a very safe community and it is why many people choose to live here.
VISION
Fruita provides efficient and effective public services to its residents and businesses. Service providers and agencies both within the city and beyond its borders collaborate towards regional goals. Infrastructure is planned in accordance with the city’s land use and transportation goals and policies.

Goal #1.
Provide services efficiently to residents through collaborations with local entities and regional partnerships (Grand Valley Irrigation Company, Lower Valley Fire District, Ute Water Conservancy District, Mesa County etc.)

WHY?
The community values that Fruita provides quality services efficiently to its residents and businesses. However, the city is not responsible for many of these key services (i.e., water, fire protection, etc.) and must work with the local entities and other regional partners that provide those services.

POLICIES
1.A Continue to seek ways to capitalize on the mountain water system and have it pay for its maintenance. Consider fee-based recreation or irrigation options.

1.B Maintain the irrigation distribution system and expand where appropriate in collaboration with the Grand Valley Irrigation Company.

1.C Encourage the connection of neighborhoods to centralized water and wastewater providers. Do not encourage separate metro districts that provide their own services.

1.D Maintain long-term infrastructure expansion plans, which will indicate where growth can be most efficiently accommodated and what the associated costs are.

1.E Participate in conversations with regional partners (water district, fire district) to advocate for Fruita’s needs and to collaborate on regional issues and solutions.

Goal #2.
Require new developments to support the efficient provision of infrastructure and services.

WHY?
The primary goals of this plan are to promote efficient development and infill in order to keep Fruita from sprawling, especially eastward towards Grand Junction. Providing services to new homes and businesses in existing neighborhoods and to nearby new neighborhoods is much less expensive for the community than providing services to lower density sprawling neighborhoods.

POLICIES
2.A Encourage developers and landowners to landscape with low-water plants and to develop sustainable, energy-efficient buildings.

2.B Ensure development impact fees are adequate to support the community’s need for upgraded infrastructure.
2.C Do not provide infrastructure to development beyond the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Collaborate with Mesa County to keep development beyond the UGB at a low density that will not need urban-level services.

2.D New developments within the UGB should demonstrate the provision of adequate infrastructure during the subdivision and site plan review process.

2.E Ensure that new development pays its own way and does not burden the existing community with additional capital or operating costs. Ensure that new annexations at the city’s edge share appropriately in the costs of connecting all utility, park, drainage, pedestrian and road systems.

2.F Consider shouldering more of the infrastructure cost of inholding annexations that are proposed to be developed at the appropriate density as recommended by the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) as a way to encourage infill.

2.G Avoid “leapfrog” developments that leave discontinuous street and utility systems. Consider annexation proposals on the basis of the logical and cost-effective extension of utilities, pedestrian connections, parks, drainage and road systems. Also consider the fiscal burden of the annexation in terms of major capital investments that would be needed by the city (wastewater, roads).

**Goal #3.**
Keep existing infrastructure well-maintained by prioritizing maintenance projects over new infrastructure.

**WHY?**
The city has both a long list of deferred maintenance and new infrastructure projects on the horizon. In recent years, limited funding has made completing maintenance projects and implementing new projects and plans challenging. The following policies and actions are strategies to allow the city to continue to provide well-maintained infrastructure, with new infrastructure added as appropriate.

**POLICIES**

3.A In all city department planning, fund maintenance in the short, medium, and long term as much if not more than budgeting for new project.
Chapter 8
Education, Arts, and Historic Preservation
Introduction

This chapter includes a vision as well as goals and policies to address education, the arts, and cultural resources within the City of Fruita. The ideas contained within this chapter were developed from conversations with various stakeholders in the community, reflections on past and current opportunities and challenges, and public meetings to vet the goals and policies contained within.

Context and Update

What is different now than 10 years ago? What has been accomplished?

- Pabor Day and the Fruita History Fair are an annual celebration, begun in 2013, to inform residents and visitors about the city’s past.
- The Historic Preservation Board has inventoried many of the historic buildings around Fruita, with the exception of downtown buildings.
- Funding has proved a barrier to the preservation and/or restoration of many of Fruita’s historic buildings.
- The Arts and Culture Board was founded in 2008 to create and enhance art and culture in the City of Fruita. The board began as an advisory board but has become a working board in order to raise funds for the arts in Fruita. The board primarily raises funds through the annual Arts Stroll.
- The board works to bring the arts, in all forms, to the residents and visitors of Fruita and support the local arts community. The board is leading initiatives around murals, art education scholarships, and adding artwork at the Community Center and other local buildings.
- The City has installed public art on Aspen Street in conjunction with other streetscape improvements and as funds become available.
- The grain elevator was painted in 2016 to serve as a gateway into Fruita.
- The new Community Center has become a space for after school enrichment and senior programs.
- Arts education programs in the city are relatively limited but expanding. The City is starting to offer programs and there may be opportunities to expand school students’ participation in the City arts offerings.
- There are limited public venues for the performing arts in Fruita.
- The schools in Fruita are highly regarded but also overcrowded. Fruita’s schools serve students from the city and the surrounding communities.
- An increasing number of Fruita school students are on free or reduced lunch.
- The school district is building a new elementary school in Fruita near the intersection of K.4 Road and 18.5 Road.
- The Mesa County Regional Transportation Office and City of Fruita conducted a “Safe Routes to Schools” audit of Fruita Middle School, Shelledy Elementary, and Rim Rock Elementary in 2016. The audits identified walk routes and students’ frequent mode of transit to school, surveyed parents, and suggested solutions. The audits found that a high percentage of students ride to school in a family vehicle typically due to distance and traffic along the route.
- The Fruita Youth Action Council was formed to provide youth input on community issues and programming, support area schools, and promote activities, programs, and events among youth. The council also advises on the Fruita Youth Initiative, a new community effort to decrease youth substance use and promote mental health awareness.
Community Process and Analysis

Representatives of the Arts and Culture Board, Historic Preservation Board, and the education community were actively involved in the planning process. Each group reviewed the 2008 plan, described what has changed, and provided current priorities and funding needs.

VISION

Historic preservation, the arts, and educational opportunities enrich the lives of Fruita residents of all ages and preserve what makes Fruita special: its landscape, family-friendly community, artistic talent, and heritage.
Goal #1.
Keep Fruita’s history alive through the preservation of historic structures and education to teach residents and visitors about the area’s past. Identify new funding sources towards historic preservation and education.

WHY?
Honoring the past is in Fruita’s motto. The city has many historic structures and a rich history to share with residents and visitors. These policies and actions are intended to help preserve and restore historic buildings and support educational opportunities related to Fruita’s history.

POLICIES
1.A Ensure that the updated design standards in the Land Use Code support architecture and development that would be compatible with Fruita’s historic structures and character.
1.B Provide incentives for the restoration of historic buildings, through the use of grants and other funding sources.
1.C Prioritize and provide funds for historic restorations that positively contribute to Fruita’s character such as Circle Park or the downtown core.
1.D Promote and educate visitors about Fruita’s history and historic resources. This includes events, interpretive signage and walking tours, and supporting new and existing museums.

ACTIONS
1.A Explore the creation of a historic district to allow for board review of restorations of Fruita’s historic buildings and projects adjacent to historic sites in order to maintain the character.
1.B Explore additional funding sources to facilitate restoration projects and incentivize re-use over teardowns, such as a lodging tax.
1.C Utilize the historic preservation board to inventory downtown historic buildings. Explore grant opportunities to conduct a full assessment of downtown structures.
1.D Develop a cultural/historic tourism brochure and webpage that promotes cultural and historic tourism in the area.
1.E Nominate properties for the local, state, or national historic register.
1.F Partner with public and private organizations that could assist in identifying and preserving Fruita’s historic structures. Potential organizations include Colorado Historical Society, Colorado Historical Foundation, Colorado Preservation, inc., Colorado Archaeological Society, or the Colorado Council of Professional Archaeologists.
Goal #2.
Celebrate the artistic talent and heritage of the community through public art, performances, educational programming, and festivals.

WHY?
Fruita has a talented local arts community and a rich cultural heritage to share with residents and visitors. The following policies and actions seek to provide greater financial support, to enhance the visibility and accessibility of the arts, and to engage residents in arts programming.

POLICIES
2.A Include public art funding in streetscape and new facility projects.

2.B Engage the Arts and Culture Board and the City to work on public art installations and future maintenance.

2.C Display art and support artists whose work celebrates the community identity, scenery, and city heritage (i.e., dinosaurs, agriculture, recreation).

2.D Work with the school district to support arts education in schools and explore opportunities to include students in art programming and installations around the city.

2.E Work with the Parks and Recreation department on arts programming for residents of all ages.

2.F Work to expand fundraising for the arts in Fruita through grant applications, arts and culture board fundraisers, foundations, and a dedicated funding source.

2.G Provide incentives and encourage collaboration among businesses and private organizations to use existing facilities for events and educational programming.

ACTIONS
2.A Add public art across the city, including extending art south of the interstate. Key focus areas include the SH-340 roundabout, Welcome Center, the Dinosaur Journey Museum, and the bike paths.

2.B Explore opportunities to better integrate local art into existing festivals and for new arts-related festivals and fundraisers.

2.C Explore the feasibility of a dedicated community space for visual and performing arts with spaces for classes, studios, display, and indoor events.

2.D Inventory and publicize the public art and art events around the city online and through brochures.

2.E Explore a requirement in the Land Use Code for public art in larger commercial and residential developments.

2.F Explore obtaining Colorado Creative District Certification from Colorado Creative Industries (CCI) for an area(s) of Fruita that meets certification guidelines.
Goal #3.
Support excellent school education and educational facilities in Fruita that integrate with the community

WHY?
The schools in Fruita are highly regarded and a reason many people choose to move to Fruita. The city must work with the district to maintain the high quality of education. Given the schools’ desirability and potential population growth in the area, new schools may be necessary. These schools should be located carefully and easy to walk and bike to. In addition, school recreation facilities present a key opportunity for the city Parks and Recreation department.

POLICIES
3.A Encourage the school district to improve the education system by supporting a high level of education programs, staff retention, training, and citizen involvement.
3.B Support the school district in improving and expanding Fruita’s schools as necessary to keep pace with the growing student population and provide high quality facilities.
3.C Work with the school district to select appropriate locations for new schools in Fruita. New schools should be located near residential neighborhoods and with the potential for multi-modal connectivity.
3.D Provide appropriate bicycle and pedestrian facilities and safety features to support walking and biking to new and existing schools.
3.E Work with the school district to develop school recreational facilities that can meet the needs of the city’s parks and recreation department and departmental programming.

Goal #4.
Provide educationally enriching opportunities for residents of all ages.

WHY?
The following policies for lifelong learning support high quality of life, community engagement, and economic development for the city. Early childcare opportunities improve long-term educational attainment and encourage greater parental participation in the workforce.

POLICIES
4.A Continue to provide educational programming through the senior center.
4.B Hold programming to support the health and wellbeing of Fruita’s youth through the Youth Initiative and Youth Action Council.
4.C Offer educational programming to make Fruita’s recreational and cultural resources accessible to residents of all ages (i.e., learn to mountain bike, archaeological programs).
4.D Support ample, affordable early learning and childcare centers for city residents.
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1. Introduction and Summary

This Report provides an analysis of Fruita and Mesa County economic, demographic, and real estate market data to inform the stakeholders and City staff involved in updating the City’s Comprehensive Plan: Fruita in Motion. The Report identifies several trends, both positive and potentially negative for the community that should be considered in the planning process and especially in the development of policies and strategies.

The Report is organized into four chapters including this Introduction:

- **Regional Trends and Context** – Presents trend data on growth trends and patterns in population, housing, and jobs within Mesa County. This section illustrates how the pace and location of growth varies throughout the County compared to Fruita.
- **Fruita Economy** – Presents more detail on Fruita’s local economy compared to Mesa County.
- **Fruita Demographics and Housing** – Documents Fruita’s housing mix, prices, and presents affordability metrics for renters and owners.

**Growth Trends and Patterns**

1. *Economic and population growth in Mesa County are accelerating, countering a long trend of slow growth.*
   
   Mesa County had job growth over 3.0 percent per year in 2018 and 2019 YTD. Mesa County added approximately 7,000 jobs since 2010. Illustrating the acceleration in growth, 4,500 (just under two-thirds) of new jobs were added between 2016 and the second quarter of 2019. Some of this growth is the result of people, businesses, and jobs migrating from Colorado’s Front Range to the lower cost business and housing environment offered in Mesa County. Mesa County added nearly 6,500 people since 2010 with 4,700 in Grand Junction, 1,100 in unincorporated areas, and nearly 600 in Fruita.

2. *While population and housing growth in Mesa County overall are accelerating, Fruita is growing relatively slowly.*
   
   Grand Junction issued an average of 280 new construction building permits annually from 2010 to 2018. In 2018, there were nearly 500 new housing starts. In Unincorporated Mesa County, there were nearly 200 new housing starts annually during this time period and nearly 300 in 2018. In contrast, Fruita has issued an average of 62 new construction building permits per year, with 95 in 2018.
3. **Growth in Unincorporated Mesa County around Fruita may have an impact on community identity and character.**

   A little more than a third of Mesa County’s growth is occurring in unincorporated areas such as Clifton, Fruitvale, and Orchard Mesa. Some of this growth is also in the area around Fruita’s edges. Fruita’s control over land use in this area is limited. Fruita still has a distinct separation from the City of Grand Junction, which contributes to its small town rural feel and identity. As unmanaged unincorporated growth encroaches on Fruita, the community character will change. Strategies are needed to work with Mesa County to better manage growth on the edges of Fruita.

### Economy

4. **Mesa County’s economy is showing signs of sustained recovery and diversification from its historic reliance on energy extraction.**

   Health care was one of the fastest growing industries, although this reflects a national trend rather than a unique specialty for Mesa County. Manufacturing is currently a notable growth industry. Firms are moving to the area due to real estate supply constraints in Metro Denver and Boulder and the much lower cost of real estate and housing in Mesa County. Mesa County has a diverse mix of manufacturing firms making products ranging from machinery, food and beverages, outdoor recreation equipment, aerospace components, electronics, and textiles. Some of Mesa County’s pool of skilled labor in manufacturing and machining comes from the energy industry that has declined in total jobs over the years. This labor force is adaptable to many types of manufacturing.

5. **Fruita’s mix of jobs reflects both its draw as a recreation destination and its function in the larger Mesa County economy.**

   Fruita’s economy is similar to Mesa County’s but with higher concentrations of jobs in tourism and related leisure industries including restaurants, hotels, and retail. This is characteristic of a small town, some suburban communities, and of a recreation gateway community. The majority of Fruita’s employed residents work in Grand Junction, at approximately 55 to 60 percent. About 15 percent of Fruita’s employed workforce lives and works in Fruita.
Housing

6. **Home prices in Fruita are appreciating rapidly, and new construction prices have risen to a level 63 percent higher than the overall average price.**

   Fruita and the 85121 zip code are on the upper end of Mesa County home prices. The average home price in 85121 was $327,902 as of November 2019. Data for Fruita City limits was only available through 2018, which shows an average price of $271,684 in City limits which is 11 percent lower than the average in 85121 of $303,663 (in 2018). The average price in Grand Junction in 2018 was $201,031 which is 35 percent lower than Fruita. The quality of life in Fruita, including its schools and small-town feel, are the major factors driving home prices. Home prices are also appreciating throughout Mesa County and the Rocky Mountain region due to other macroeconomic factors such as labor and material costs and an overall shortage of housing.

   New construction pricing in Fruita is also rising. New construction values are a strong indicator of the direction of a housing market as it shows the prices a market can support. The average price for single family homes built in 2018 is estimated at $455,200 which is over 60 percent higher than the average single family resale price of $279,675 in 2018. In comparison, the average price of single family homes built in 2014 is estimated at $364,850, an increase of $90,000. Data for 2019 was not available as of this writing.

7. **Housing affordability is a growing issue in Fruita and Mesa County in general.**

   Affordability issues are greatest among renters, with about half of all renters paying more than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs. This is defined as being cost burdened, wherein a household is paying too much towards housing which takes away money available for other needs such as healthcare, transportation, and healthy food.

   The rental supply in Fruita is extremely tight with essentially zero vacancy. The fundamentals of supply and demand allow landlords to charge higher rents. Fruita has not built a significant number of apartments, which creates constrained supply conditions. The percentage of renters in Fruita has increased, even though most housing being built is in the form of single family homes. Some people may be renting single family homes by choice; for others it may be the only option and they would prefer a lower cost choice.

   Constraints in the housing market are affecting the workforce supply and retention for local businesses. This is a threat to economic sustainability if left unchecked.
2. Regional Trends and Context

This Chapter presents data on growth and economic trends in Mesa County to put the City of Fruita in context with the rest of the Grand Valley region. The chapter covers:

- Trends in population and housing growth and residential construction;
- The Mesa County economic base;
- Commuting patterns; and
- Commercial real estate construction trends.

Mesa County Geography

Fruita is located along Interstate 70 and 10 miles west of Grand Junction. Fruita is the second largest incorporated city within Mesa County with a current population of 13,398 residents. Grand Junction is the largest city with a population of over 64,000. Given the proximity and I-70 access, many Fruita residents work in Grand Junction or elsewhere in the Grand Valley. As an amenity, Fruita offers easy access to many outdoor attractions such as the Colorado National Monument, the Book Cliffs, and the Colorado River. Additionally, it is one of the premier mountain biking destinations in the U.S., drawing national and international visitors.

Population Trends

Mesa County reached a population of 153,629 in 2018, which is an increase of over 37,000 residents since 2000 as shown in Table 1. Most of this growth occurred prior to 2010 when Mesa County grew by approximately 3,000 residents per year or an average annual rate of 2.4 percent. Households over this time period grew by 1,200 households per year or an average annual rate of 2.4 percent. A household is a group of people, related or unrelated, living in one occupied housing unit. From 2010 to 2018 population growth slowed to an average of 800 new residents per year or an average annual rate of 0.5 percent. Over the same time period, households grew by about 300 households per year or an average annual growth rate of 0.5 percent.

From 2010 through 2018, most of Mesa County’s growth—nearly 90 percent—has occurred in Grand Junction and Unincorporated Mesa County. Over 70 percent of the population growth occurred in the Grand Junction, and nearly 20 percent occurred in Unincorporated Mesa County.
Figure 1. Fruita and Grand Junction
Table 1. Population and Households, 2000-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2000-2010</th>
<th>2010-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ann. #</td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ann. #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td>6,781</td>
<td>12,803</td>
<td>13,398</td>
<td>6,022</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collbran</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Beque</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palisade</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>48,130</td>
<td>59,502</td>
<td>64,191</td>
<td>11,372</td>
<td>4,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorp. Mesa County</td>
<td>57,642</td>
<td>70,888</td>
<td>72,036</td>
<td>13,246</td>
<td>6,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mesa County</td>
<td>116,255</td>
<td>147,155</td>
<td>153,629</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td>6,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>4,779</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collbran</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Beque</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palisade</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>20,128</td>
<td>24,374</td>
<td>26,141</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td>1,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorp. Mesa County</td>
<td>21,725</td>
<td>27,225</td>
<td>27,661</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mesa County</td>
<td>45,823</td>
<td>57,947</td>
<td>60,387</td>
<td>12,124</td>
<td>2,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DOLA; ESRI; Economic & Planning Systems

Fruita makes up 8.7 percent of the County’s total population and had a population of 13,398 in 2018. Similar to the County as a whole, much of this growth occurred from 2000 to 2010, with an average of 600 new residents per year or an average annual growth rate of 6.6 percent. Households over this time grew by about 200 households per year or an average annual growth rate of 6.4 percent. From 2010 to 2018 Fruita’s growth slowed to 74 residents per year or an average annual growth rate of 0.6 percent and the household growth rate fell to only 28 new households per year or an average annual growth rate of 0.6 percent. In recent years, Fruita has grown more slowly despite an increase in growth in the surrounding region. Currently, most of the growth in Mesa County is occurring in Grand Junction and in Unincorporated Mesa County.
**Housing Growth Trends**

This section presents data on regional housing growth trends. Chapter 4 provides more detail on Fruita’s housing market and housing characteristics. As with population and households, there was a large amount of growth in housing units from 2000 to 2010 in each jurisdiction. During this time Fruita gained approximately 2,392 housing units, to have just over 5,000 housing units in 2010, as shown in Figure 2. Since 2010, the construction of new units has slowed.

**Figure 2. Housing Unit Trend, 2010-2018**

From 2010 to 2018 Fruita had a total of 557 residential building permits issued or an average of 62 residential building permits per year, as shown in Table 2. In comparison, Grand Junction issued a total of 2,533 permits over this time period or an average of 281 permits per year. Unincorporated Mesa County issued 1,705 total permits or an average of 189 permits per year. Grand Junction and Unincorporated Mesa County are the fastest growing areas within Mesa County for residential development. Overall in Mesa County, most residential development consists of single family detached units, followed by manufactured homes.

The “market share” of new housing construction in each community from 2010 to 2018 was as follows:

- Fruita accounted for 11 percent of new housing construction in Mesa County;
- Grand Junction had 52 percent;
- Unincorporated Mesa County was 35 percent; and
- Palisade, Debeque, and Collbran made up the remaining 2 percent of new housing construction in the County.
Table 2. Residential Building Permit Trends, 2010-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fruita</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (3+ units)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Junction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (3+ units)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palisade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (3+ units)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorp. Mesa County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (3+ units)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mesa County Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>4,311</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (3+ units)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mesa County; Economic & Planning Systems
Mesa County Economy

Unemployment Rate

Mesa County has made a strong recovery from the Great Recession when unemployment peaked at 11 percent. It has since dropped to 4.1 percent, as shown in Figure 3. Mesa County followed a trend similar to the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood MSA with the unemployment rate rising during the recession. The unemployment rate in Mesa County has typically been higher than the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood MSA, but the gap may potentially be narrowing as Mesa County’s economy continues to diversify.

Figure 3. Annual Unemployment Rate Trend, 2000-2018

Employment

Total employment in Mesa County from 2009 to 2019 Q2 (April, May, and June) is shown in Figure 4. Since 2010, employment has grown to reach a total of 66,000 jobs in the second quarter of 2019. Mesa County added approximately 7,000 jobs since 2010. Illustrating the acceleration in growth, 4,500 (just under two-thirds) of new jobs were added between 2016 and the second quarter of 2019.
Major Industries

The largest industries in Mesa County are education and health services, which have grown by 2,000 employees since 2010—mostly in the health care segment—as shown in Figure 5. During this time, Mesa County has gained about 4,500 jobs, with education and health services providing almost half of those new jobs. Mining (principally oil and gas) historically has been a top industry in the County but has been in decline since 2010, losing about 400 jobs. On the other hand, manufacturing has gained about 500 jobs and is on the rise with outdoor manufacturers and precision manufacturers expanding to and within Mesa County.

Figure 5. Mesa County Employment Growth by Industry, 2010-2017

Source: QCEW; Economic & Planning Systems
The energy industry supported a workforce highly skilled in machining, mechanical engineering, and other aspects of manufacturing. The presence of this skilled workforce is appealing to manufacturing industries. Some of the new firms that have located in Mesa County have relocated from Metro Denver and Boulder due to space and real estate supply constraints as well as high housing costs there.

Manufacturing in Mesa County covers a range of markets and product types. Notable firms include the following:

- **Leitner-Poma** – Engineering, manufacturing, and installation of ropeway transportation systems for the ski industry (ski lifts and gondolas), amusement parks, and urban transport (aerial tramways).
- **Manufactured housing** – Modular housing and commercial structures manufacturing, and assembly from imported components.
- **FHE** – Based in Fruita, FHE designs and manufactures highly specialized equipment that increases safety in oil and gas and mining drilling operations. FHE is expanding and adding approximately 100 jobs in Fruita.
- **Outdoor Equipment** – Outdoor recreation products are in the “miscellaneous manufacturing” category. Firms in this category include DT Swiss, a high end bicycle component manufacturer; Rocky Mounts, a vehicle rack manufacturer that relocated from the Boulder, CO area; and Mountain Racing Suspension, another high-end cycling components firm.
- **Bonsai Design** – Adventure course providers based in Grand Junction. Bonsai develops and manages a wide variety of aerial adventures.
- **Wiggy’s** – Manufacturer of sleeping bags, boots, and outdoor clothing and outerwear. Wiggy’s corporate office, factory, and a retail store are located in Grand Junction.
- **Reynolds Polymer Technology, Inc.** – Manufacturing firm specializing in acrylic and polymer material products. The firm provides products for aquarium, architectural, signage, furniture, and scientific industries. Reynolds is an international firm headquartered in Grand Junction.
- **Coors Tek Inc.** – A manufacturing firm that produces technical ceramics for various industries including aerospace, energy, medical, and agriculture.
- **Capco Inc.** – A manufacturing firm of energetics, weapons and accessories, and electronics. Capco produces various products for the U.S. military. The Capco Inc. headquarters is located in Grand Junction.
- **United Companies** – Manufacturing firm that produces sand and rock products, ready-mixed concrete, and hot mixed asphalt. United Companies also offers construction services including grading and paving of highways streets, parking lots, and driveways.
- **Western Filament, Inc.** – Manufacturing company in Grand Junction that specializes in industrial oriented products using synthetic materials such as polyester, nylon, and ceramic. These products are used in motor manufacturing, automotive, aerospace, medical, and recreational industry markets.
The industry subsectors within the manufacturing industry are shown in Figure 6 by employment growth in Mesa County. The manufacturing subsector in Mesa County with the largest increase in employees from 2011 to 2018 is fabricated metal products with 260 employees, followed by textile products with 163 employees. Additionally, the machinery subsector has grown by 69 employees. Outdoor equipment firms are typically classified under “miscellaneous manufacturing,” which added about 40 jobs through 2018. This figure does not account for some recent relocations to the Grand Valley such as Rocky Mounts, a sports equipment roof rack manufacturer.

Figure 6. Manufacturing Employment, Mesa County, 2011-2018
Largest Employers

Nine of the top 10 employers in Mesa County are public institutions, as shown in Table 3. The largest employer is Mesa County Valley School District 51 with over 2,700 employees. St. Mary’s Hospital is the second largest employer with 2,300 employees followed by Mesa County with 1,025 employees. Ten of the major employers are in the health care industry, which corresponds to Health Care being one of the largest industries in Mesa County.

Table 3. Mesa County Major Employers, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mesa County Valley School District 51</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Hospital</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mesa County</td>
<td>Public Admin</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>State of Colorado</td>
<td>Public Admin</td>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Colorado Mesa University</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community Hospital</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VA Medical Center - Grand Junction</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Star Tek Inc.</td>
<td>Prof. &amp; Tech Services</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City of Grand Junction</td>
<td>Public Admin</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hilltop Community Resources</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>West Star Aviation</td>
<td>Prof. &amp; Tech Services</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Health Plans</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>HopeWest</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>STRIVE</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Primary Care Partners</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mind Springs Health</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Capco Inc.</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>United Companies</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
<td>Prof. &amp; Tech Services</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Coors Tek Inc.</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Daily Sentinel</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>Transport./Warehousing</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reynolds Polymer Technology</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mantey Heights Rehab &amp; Care</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excludes Hotel/Restaurant related businesses

Source: Grand Junction Economic Partnership; Economic & Planning Systems
**Proprietors Employment**

Total employment consists of wage and salary employment and proprietor employment (self-employed). In Mesa County, proprietor employment is about one-quarter of total employment. From 2001 to 2017, proprietor employment has steadily increased from 24 percent to 27 percent of total employment, as shown in **Figure 7**. Proprietors are a significant amount of the overall economy in Mesa County. Proprietors work mainly in construction (13 percent), retail (10 percent), real estate (15 percent), and professional and business services (20 percent). The proportion of proprietors in Mesa County is similar to that of Metro Denver, and has followed the same trend of proprietors making up a larger share of employment. Part of this is due to the nature of the “gig economy” in which many workers piece together multiple jobs or “gigs” to make ends meet. Also, the growth in reliance on independent contractor labor rather than salaried employees contributes to this trend.

**Figure 7.  Proprietors Employment, 2001-2017**

Source: IB&E Economic & Planning Systems
Commuting Patterns

The Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) program is part of the Center for Economic Studies at the U.S. Census Bureau. States agree to share Unemployment Insurance earnings data, and the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) data with the Census Bureau. LEHD uses this data to create statistics on employment, earnings, and job flows at detailed geography. This allows for LEHD to create data on workers’ residential patterns. The job flows in relation to a worker’s residents are the in and out commuting patterns described below for Fruita’s residents and workers.

Fruita has about 1,764 people who commute into Fruita for work, as shown in Figure 8. There are about 800 people who live and work in Fruita. Approximately 4,442 people commute out of Fruita for work.

The majority of employed Fruita residents work in Grand Junction—between 55 to 60 percent in 2015, the latest data available. About 15 percent of Fruita’s employed workforce lives and works in Fruita, as shown in Table 4. Since 2002, there have been minor changes in these commuting patterns, likely due to other employment growth in Mesa County outside of Grand Junction. An interesting figure is the increase in workers whose paycheck is associated with a Metro Denver-based firm. These workers could be working remotely out of their home or working for a firm based in Metro Denver with an office in Mesa County.

Table 4. Fruita Residents Place of Work, 2002-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Work</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LEHD; Economic & Planning Systems
For businesses located in Fruita, approximately 30 percent of their workers also live in Fruita. The other 70 percent of workers commute from other areas. About 20 percent of Fruita’s workforce lives in Grand Junction, as shown in Table 5. The remaining 50 percent, approximately, come from other areas of Mesa County and some from outside Mesa County. The data does not provide sufficient detail beyond the primary sources of commuting.

Table 5.  Fruita Workers Place of Residence, 2002-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>2002 Amount</th>
<th>2002 % Total</th>
<th>2015 Amount</th>
<th>2015 % Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,348</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,577</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LEHD; Economic & Planning Systems
Commercial Real Estate

Fruita has about 4 percent of the commercial real estate market in Mesa County with approximately 747,000 square feet of development. Since 2007, Fruita has gained about 96,000 square feet of commercial development, most of which has been retail development in the Kokopelli commercial area with 41,000 square feet constructed over this time period, as shown in Table 6. There has also been 33,000 square feet of new office space built. From 2007 to 2018, office development in Fruita has grown at an average annual growth rate of 5.6 percent and retail development has grown at an average annual growth rate of 1.1 percent. From 2007 to 2010, Fruita gained 22,000 square feet of industrial space.

Grand Junction has about 91 percent of the commercial real estate market in Mesa County with about 17 million square feet of development. Since 2007, Grand Junction has gained about 900,000 square feet of commercial development for an average annual growth rate of 0.5 percent.

Table 6. Commercial Development Inventory, 2007-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>39,545</td>
<td>72,349</td>
<td>72,349</td>
<td>32,804</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>319,635</td>
<td>334,125</td>
<td>360,570</td>
<td>40,935</td>
<td>3,721</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>292,336</td>
<td>314,336</td>
<td>314,336</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>651,516</td>
<td>720,810</td>
<td>747,255</td>
<td>95,739</td>
<td>8,704</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2,850,678</td>
<td>2,954,387</td>
<td>3,049,125</td>
<td>198,447</td>
<td>18,041</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>6,771,405</td>
<td>6,971,238</td>
<td>7,188,832</td>
<td>417,427</td>
<td>37,948</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>6,033,992</td>
<td>6,196,807</td>
<td>6,316,436</td>
<td>282,444</td>
<td>25,677</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>15,656,075</td>
<td>16,122,432</td>
<td>16,554,393</td>
<td>898,318</td>
<td>81,665</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2,944,420</td>
<td>3,080,933</td>
<td>3,175,671</td>
<td>231,251</td>
<td>21,023</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>7,686,860</td>
<td>7,910,248</td>
<td>8,163,527</td>
<td>476,667</td>
<td>43,333</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>6,619,092</td>
<td>6,811,587</td>
<td>6,933,776</td>
<td>314,684</td>
<td>28,608</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,250,372</td>
<td>17,802,768</td>
<td>18,272,974</td>
<td>1,022,602</td>
<td>92,964</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar; Economic & Planning Systems

Grand Junction’s dominance in the commercial real estate market is likely to continue. For office and industrial development, it has a larger local labor force and is more central than Fruita to the even larger Grand Valley labor force. Office and industrial developers and firms are often averse to risk and look for proven locations where other firms have located. This results in an agglomeration effect in which business districts form and grow. Fruita however can still be competitive for office and industrial businesses that want to be closely associated with the Fruita brand. The Fruita Business Park has available sites with good interstate access and visibility, and is a good long term strategic asset.
3. Fruita Economy

This Chapter provides more economic information specific to Fruita. The data show that Fruita’s economy largely mirrors the larger Mesa County economy, but with a larger concentration (percentage) of jobs in leisure tourism-related industries such as hotels and restaurants. Fruita’s economy has the characteristics of both a satellite community outside a larger central city and a recreation and tourism destination.

Economic Base

The largest industry in Fruita, like Mesa County, is education and health services which is 23 percent of all jobs in Fruita and 25 percent in Mesa County, as shown in Figure 9. The Family Health West hospital is one of the largest employers in the City with approximately 500 jobs. Leisure and hospitality is the second largest industry in Fruita with about 20 percent of all jobs. This is higher than in the County as a whole, where 12 percent of all jobs are in leisure and hospitality. Small and suburban communities tend to have a higher concentration of retail and service jobs than the central city areas that often contain more of the economic base type jobs. Additionally, Fruita has a similar percentage of jobs in government, manufacturing, and natural resources. Fruita has a lower percentage of jobs in professional and business services, financial activities, and information compared to the County.

Figure 9. Wage and Salary Employment by Industry, 2015

Source: LEHD; QCEW; Economic & Planning Systems
The industry mix of active businesses within the City is shown in Table 7. In 2018, Fruita approved or renewed 260 business licenses. The trade, transportation, and utilities industry supersector has 55 businesses or 21 percent of all the businesses in Fruita. Additionally, education and health services has 39 businesses or 15 percent of the total and construction has 38 businesses or 14.6 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Business License</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag./Forest/Hunting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Transportation/Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport/Warehousing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof./Business Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof./Tech Services</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Waste Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure/Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Rec</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Restaurant</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census; Economic & Planning Systems*
**Tax and Revenue Base**

As in many Colorado municipalities, most of Fruita’s revenue base is sales tax. In Fruita’s 2019 budget, sales tax represents 53 percent of the total revenues. Fruita charges a 3.0 percent sales tax. The first 2.0 percent goes into the general fund and represents 21.8 percent of the total revenues as shown in Figure 10. The remaining 1.0 percent is dedicated to the Community Center Fund (debt service). The General Fund supports general governmental operations including public safety, administration, community development, general government, recreation programs, and maintenance of roads, parks, trails, and public buildings. The City also receives 1/10 of 1.0 percent of the County’s 2.0 percent sales tax, and 4.01 percent of the County’s 0.37 percent public safety sales tax. The County sales tax is 31.2 percent of general fund revenues.

Property tax represents 14 percent of the total revenues, followed by use tax and specific ownership tax at 12 percent. The other sources of revenues include licenses and permits, fines and forfeits, miscellaneous, and transfers.

**Figure 10. Fruita General Fund Revenues, 2019**

Source: City of Fruita 2019 Budget; Economic & Planning Systems
Beginning in 2016, Fruita’s total revenue has steadily increased each year. This increase is largely due to the growth in sales tax, as shown in Figure 11. Property tax has been flat since 2012.

**Figure 11. Fruita Revenue Trend, 2012-2019**

The amount of sales tax revenue Fruita receives from each industry is shown in Table 8. In 2018, Fruita received $2.9 million in sales tax revenue. This is an increase of $500,000 over the last four years or an average annual growth rate of 5.2 percent. The largest contributing industry is retail trade accounting for 41 percent of sales tax, which increased by $270,000 from 2014 to 2018. The second largest sales tax contributor is leisure and hospitality, which increased by $179,000 over this time period.

**Table 8. Fruita Sales Tax Revenue by Industry, 2014-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources/Mining</td>
<td>$136,193</td>
<td>$36,209</td>
<td>$15,816</td>
<td>$19,872</td>
<td>$223,477</td>
<td>$87,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$10,707</td>
<td>$19,812</td>
<td>$16,362</td>
<td>$11,763</td>
<td>$15,704</td>
<td>4,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$15,124</td>
<td>$15,835</td>
<td>$21,518</td>
<td>$25,572</td>
<td>$25,208</td>
<td>10,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$901,319</td>
<td>$915,043</td>
<td>$977,757</td>
<td>$1,126,796</td>
<td>$1,171,871</td>
<td>270,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Transportation/Utilities</td>
<td>$308,120</td>
<td>$284,165</td>
<td>$264,904</td>
<td>$310,214</td>
<td>$299,623</td>
<td>20,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$184,245</td>
<td>$173,106</td>
<td>$156,329</td>
<td>$161,511</td>
<td>$161,522</td>
<td>22,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>$148,390</td>
<td>$102,207</td>
<td>$102,866</td>
<td>$104,148</td>
<td>$143,195</td>
<td>-5,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof./Business Services</td>
<td>$13,355</td>
<td>$10,995</td>
<td>$10,534</td>
<td>$11,909</td>
<td>$12,799</td>
<td>9,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Health Services</td>
<td>$7,922</td>
<td>$9,573</td>
<td>$11,747</td>
<td>$11,909</td>
<td>$12,799</td>
<td>4,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure/Hospitality</td>
<td>$578,444</td>
<td>$588,205</td>
<td>$645,900</td>
<td>$703,189</td>
<td>$757,351</td>
<td>176,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$49,281</td>
<td>$40,024</td>
<td>$39,984</td>
<td>$46,845</td>
<td>$53,240</td>
<td>3,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>$438</td>
<td>$439</td>
<td>$471</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>$748</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,353,538</td>
<td>$2,195,614</td>
<td>$2,264,208</td>
<td>$2,534,413</td>
<td>$2,880,993</td>
<td>$527,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Fruita; Economic & Planning Systems
4. Fruita Demographics and Housing

This Chapter provides an overview of demographics and housing conditions in Fruita. Most attention is given to housing conditions, which have a large influence on the demographics of community.

Demographics

In this section, the demographics of Fruita are summarized and compared to Mesa County as a whole and to Metro Denver. The Metro Denver comparison is included to compare two large metro areas in Colorado, and because of the recent increase in people and businesses moving from Metro Denver to Mesa County.

Household incomes are slightly higher in Fruita compared to Mesa County overall with average household income at $79,190 and median household income at $63,819, shown in Table 9. Fruita’s average household size is 2.67 people, which is larger than that of both Mesa County and the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood Metro area. This indicates a younger and more family-weighted household composition. Compared to Mesa County, Fruita’s median age is lower at 36.5 years old, than 39 years old in the County.

In both Fruita and Mesa County, about 36 percent of the population 25 years and older have a college degree or above. That is lower than the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood Metro area where 51 percent of that population has a college degree or above. Fruita has a higher rate of homeownership than both areas with 70 percent of the housing units being owner-occupied and 30 percent renter-occupied.
As shown above, families with children under 18 make up 31 percent of Fruita’s households compared to 26 percent in Mesa County, highlighting Fruita’s appeal to young families. This is also reflected in the age distribution shown in Figure 12. The largest population groups are people 0-9 years old at 15.5 percent of the total population, and people between 10 and 19 at 14 percent.

Figure 12. Fruita Age Distribution Trend, 2010-2018
Housing Stock

The majority of housing units in Fruita are single family homes. In 2018, there were 4,486 single family homes, which represent 80.6 percent of all units, as shown in Table 10 and Figure 13. From 2010 to 2018 multifamily units have increased by a total of 53 units, resulting in an inventory of 165 units in 2018. In contrast, 464 new single family homes were built during that time.

Table 10. Fruita Housing Types, 2010-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2010-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached (2 to 4 units)</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,127</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,429</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census; DOLA; Economic & Planning Systems

Figure 13. Fruita Housing Types, 2010-2018
**Housing Occupancy and Tenure**

As would be expected, household growth closely parallels housing unit growth, but household growth is slightly slower due to the inclusion of vacant units (built but not yet sold or occupied) in unit growth. Since 2010, renter households have been growing at a faster rate than owner households in each jurisdiction of Mesa County, as shown in **Table 11**. From 2010 to 2018, owner occupied housing has declined at an average annual rate of 0.4 percent in Fruita and 0.3 percent in Grand Junction and Mesa County. This slight decline is a national trend that reflects growth in low wage service jobs and lower levels of wealth or savings, especially for younger people and recent graduates. These income and wealth trends favor renting over home ownership.

**Table 11. Housing Occupancy, 2010-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2010-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fruita</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>3,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>1,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,127</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Junction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>15,285</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>15,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>9,077</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>11,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,207</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>29,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorp. Mesa County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>21,482</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>21,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>5,691</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>7,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29,353</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mesa County Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>41,350</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>41,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>16,527</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>21,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62,409</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>67,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DOLA; ESRI; Economic & Planning Systems
The percentage of owner occupied housing units in Fruita has declined over the last eight years, decreasing by 5.5 percentage points. Renter occupied housing in Fruita has increased to 30 percent of the total housing inventory, as shown in Figure 14. This trend indicates that many new renters are renting single family homes, as that product type has dominated the new housing construction in Fruita.

**Figure 14. Fruita Housing Tenure, 2000-2018**

![Housing Tenure Chart](image-url)
Housing Prices and Affordability

A person or household is defined as “cost burdened” if they spend 30 percent or more of their monthly income on housing costs. This is the standard established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In 2018, 29 percent of home owners in Fruita were cost burdened, which is higher than Mesa County where 24 percent of owners were cost burdened, as shown in Table 12. The cost burdened are likely a mix of people on fixed incomes aging in place, working families, and people who recently purchased their first home that they anticipate will become more affordable based on their future jobs and earnings potential.

For renters, however, the picture is different. Nearly half of the renters in Fruita—48 percent—were cost burdened, which is similar to the 51 percent of renters cost burdened across Mesa County. It is common for renters to have more challenges affording housing than owners. Factors that affect cost burden levels for renters include:

- A tight supply of rental housing that supports higher rents (supply and demand;
- Younger demographics, which often translates to lower household incomes; and
- Growth in lower wage service jobs.

Table 12. Monthly Housing Cost as a Percentage of Household Income, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fruita Amount</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Mesa County Amount</th>
<th>%Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner-Occupied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>22,696</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 percent</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>8,734</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent or more</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>9,879</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>41,671</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renter-Occupied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>4,503</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 percent</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>4,702</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent or more</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>10,853</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>21,394</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DOLA; U.S. Census; Economic & Planning Systems
The Grand Junction office of Land Title maintains housing market statistics for areas in Mesa County back to 2016. Land Title’s data for Fruita is for the city limits plus the larger 81521 zip code that includes some of unincorporated Mesa County. The 81521 zip code has an average price of nearly $330,000 year to date as of November 2019, as shown in Table 13. The average price in this zip code is about $100,000 higher than Grand Junction which had an average price of $229,644. Price appreciation has been rapid, with 7.4 percent annual growth in 81521 over the last four years. These figures represent mostly re-sales of existing homes as new construction is typically direct to a buyer from a builder and does not usually go through the same process.

### Table 13. Grand Valley Home Prices, All Unit Types, 2016-November 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Unit Types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita (81521 Zipcode)</td>
<td>$247,865</td>
<td>$260,983</td>
<td>$303,663</td>
<td>$327,902</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita City Limits</td>
<td>$204,390</td>
<td>$217,279</td>
<td>$221,003</td>
<td>$249,787</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>$349,225</td>
<td>$356,253</td>
<td>$377,923</td>
<td>$446,676</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collbran, Plateau Valley, Molina, Mesa</td>
<td>$427,669</td>
<td>$274,491</td>
<td>$314,245</td>
<td>$379,417</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palisade</td>
<td>$271,522</td>
<td>$291,411</td>
<td>$319,552</td>
<td>$465,663</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Mesa &amp; East Orchard Mesa</td>
<td>$214,272</td>
<td>$218,726</td>
<td>$246,350</td>
<td>$278,421</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale</td>
<td>$186,181</td>
<td>$203,034</td>
<td>$219,260</td>
<td>$239,751</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>$169,871</td>
<td>$187,499</td>
<td>$201,013</td>
<td>$229,644</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>$155,096</td>
<td>$155,619</td>
<td>$182,030</td>
<td>$200,430</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Family Detached</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita (81521 Zipcode)</td>
<td>$253,662</td>
<td>$266,952</td>
<td>$308,698</td>
<td>$337,605</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita City Limits</td>
<td>$208,866</td>
<td>$224,023</td>
<td>$226,442</td>
<td>$248,784</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>$365,591</td>
<td>$373,283</td>
<td>$399,552</td>
<td>$441,814</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collbran, Plateau Valley, Molina, Mesa</td>
<td>$441,853</td>
<td>$281,062</td>
<td>$318,431</td>
<td>$315,888</td>
<td>-28.6%</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palisade</td>
<td>$279,124</td>
<td>$295,206</td>
<td>$322,141</td>
<td>$364,927</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Mesa &amp; East Orchard Mesa</td>
<td>$218,575</td>
<td>$225,631</td>
<td>$250,802</td>
<td>$272,175</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale</td>
<td>$188,989</td>
<td>$205,972</td>
<td>$223,307</td>
<td>$239,235</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>$174,504</td>
<td>$191,751</td>
<td>$205,970</td>
<td>$225,989</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>$164,767</td>
<td>$163,282</td>
<td>$193,116</td>
<td>$201,086</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grand Junction Land Title Office; Economic & Planning Systems
The 81521 zip code includes areas with homes on large acreages which are priced higher and influence the average. Using data from the Mesa County Assessor’s Office, EPS estimated the average home price within City limits from 2014 through 2018. The Assessor’s data portal does not have 2019 data available as of this writing. As shown in Table 14, the average price within City limits is $271,675 for all unit types as of the end of 2018. This is 11 percent lower than the 2018 average price of $303,663 in all of 81521. In 2018, the average single family detached home price was $279,675 which is 9 percent lower than in 81521. Appreciation rates within City limits were about the same, at 7.6 percent per year.

Table 14. Home Prices in Fruita City Limits, 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg. Sale Price</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$208,866</td>
<td>$224,023</td>
<td>$226,442</td>
<td>$248,784</td>
<td>$279,675</td>
<td>$70,809</td>
<td>$17,702</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>$175,329</td>
<td>$183,995</td>
<td>$203,504</td>
<td>$224,057</td>
<td>$236,418</td>
<td>$61,089</td>
<td>$15,272</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex/Triplex</td>
<td>$198,000</td>
<td>$199,167</td>
<td>$189,375</td>
<td>$266,667</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>$87,782</td>
<td>$93,270</td>
<td>$258,529</td>
<td>$141,033</td>
<td>$62,033</td>
<td>$15,508</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$1,347,500</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$204,390</td>
<td>$217,279</td>
<td>$221,003</td>
<td>$249,787</td>
<td>$271,684</td>
<td>$67,295</td>
<td>$16,824</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mesa County Assessor; Economic & Planning Systems

Prices for newer construction in Fruita city limits are trending upward and are significantly higher than the average resale price. New construction pricing is a strong indicator of the direction of a housing market as it shows the prices a market can support; new construction is often more expensive than resales. Using Mesa County assessor records, EPS calculated the average price for homes built and sold from 2014 through 2018. In other words, the 2017 column in Table 15 shows the average price of a home built in 2017 and sold during 2017 and 2018, or the average price of a home built in 2014 and sold anytime between 2014 and 2018. The average price for single family homes built in 2018 is estimated at $455,200 as shown in Table 15, which is over 60 percent higher than the average single family resale price of $279,675 in 2018 shown above in Table 14.

Table 15. Average Sale Price for Homes Built and Sold 2014 through 2018, Fruita City Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$364,850</td>
<td>$339,900</td>
<td>$344,100</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$455,200</td>
<td>$90,350</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>$237,900</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$275,550</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$339,460</td>
<td>$339,900</td>
<td>$344,100</td>
<td>$310,275</td>
<td>$455,200</td>
<td>$115,740</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mesa County Assessor; Economic & Planning Systems
Housing Market Observations

This section offers some qualitative observations from Economic & Planning Systems gained from interviews with local professionals in the residential building and development, economic development, and real estate professions.

- Fruita commands higher home prices because of the quality of its schools and the amenities. The trails and parks are particularly attractive to existing and prospective residents.

- Fruita is seeing a modest increase in residents bringing jobs from other locations and working remotely. Cash buyers comprise a larger percentage of these purchases than local area residents. Some are also moving from higher cost areas such as Metro Denver where housing costs are substantially higher, enabling them to bring more equity into their home in Fruita. Retirees moving to Fruita also make up a portion of these new buyers.

- There is a tight supply of multifamily rental housing (apartments) in Fruita which contributes to affordability issues for renters. It is also affecting the workforce supply for local businesses.
Appendix C: Community Character
Appendix C: Community Character

Introduction

The triangular boundary of Downtown, as defined by the FLUM and current zoning, consists of approximately 250 acres of land. While the primary goal for future growth is to direct new development inward, there is also a strong desire to maintain the quaint and quirky character of downtown. Therefore, new development should respond to the traditional character in ways that reflect appreciation of the past. With such a large area that could experience new development, it is important that a context-sensitive approach, rather than a one-size-fits-all set of rules, is taken.

The concept of “character subareas” was tested during the planning process and community members responded positively to this idea. Community members then helped define the future character of each subarea as well as list which types of buildings and uses they thought were appropriate for each subarea.

Intent

It is the intent of this section to elaborate on the downtown subareas in an effort to direct future zoning and design standards updates to properly reflect the true community character and desires of the community.

Community Process

Community Character Workshop

In August 2019, property owners, developers, city employees and community members gathered to discuss the character and desires for new development within downtown and the 6 & 50 corridor. Attendees were asked to define boundaries for what they considered to be the “downtown core” and the “6 & 50 corridor.” Then, they defined a “transition area” that serves as the blocks and properties between downtown and residential neighborhoods. The exercise included using words and pictures to describe the future vision for each area.

This exercise and discussion led to the idea that downtown is made up of a few distinct areas that each have their own unique character and potential for fulfilling future growth.

Draft Plan Workshop

In October 2019, a draft “Downtown Character Subareas” map was revealed showing six different subareas within downtown. Community members responded to descriptions of each area and then chose appropriate housing types that would be appropriate for each area. A “road show” of the community workshop had the same exercises at various community functions.

The refinement of the subarea descriptions, as well as the feedback on appropriate land uses and building types is defined in this segment of the plan.

Feedback on character subarea descriptions are shown below. The majority of respondents agreed with the future visioning descriptions for: Downtown Core, Aspen Avenue, Downtown South and Downtown North. There was more disagreement and neutrality for Downtown West and Downtown East descriptions. These subarea descriptions were amended before the final plan document to reflect the feedback received at the Draft Plan Party.
Feedback on Housing Types for each subarea are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accessory Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Tandem House/Duplex</th>
<th>Cottage Cluster</th>
<th>Multi-plex</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Rowhouse</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>Mixed Use Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - D'town Core</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Aspen Ave</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - D'town South</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - D'town West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - D'town North</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - D'town East</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the top three housing choices include:

1) Mixed Use Residential
2) Cottage Cluster
3) Accessory Dwelling units

This indicates that there is a strong desire to meet housing demands by infilling with higher density mixed use buildings, where appropriate, as well as providing smaller-scale, sensitive infill to existing residential lots in downtown.

The top three housing types by Character Area are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown Core</th>
<th>Aspen Avenue</th>
<th>Downtown South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. ADUs</td>
<td>2. Cottage Cluster</td>
<td>2. Cottage Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mixed Use Residential</td>
<td>3. ADUs</td>
<td>3. Apartments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown West</th>
<th>Downtown North</th>
<th>Downtown East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ADUs</td>
<td>1. Tandem House/Duplex</td>
<td>1. ADUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ADUs</td>
<td>3. Cottage Cluster/Mixed Use Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accessory Dwelling Unit or “Granny Flat”
ADUs can be detached from or attached to the primary home. They are a “sensitive” way to add a unit to a lot, which often cannot be seen from the street. These are often used to house extended family or as a way for the original owner to downsize, but remain on-site.

Tandem House, Twin House or Duplex
These types are like ADUs in that there are two units on a lot, but they are often of similar size and scale. They can be attached to one another or detached. They can also be beside one another or one in the front half of the lot and one in the rear half of the lot.

Cottage Cluster or “Wee Homes”
These are smaller-than-average homes that are clustered together on a large lot. They often share a central courtyard and other amenities.
Multiplex
These are buildings that include multiple units under one roof. The forms are compatible to single family residential homes, but they include more than one unit. Open space is usually shared amongst units.

Townhouse
Townhouses are attached single family units. They often include a detached garage and small back yard for each unit and are generally set back from the sidewalk with a small front yard with landscaping.

Rowhouse
Rowhouses differ from Townhouses in that they are often more vertical and include attached garages. Individual yards are not as common and setbacks are fewer.
Small-Scale Apartment Complex

These buildings include multiple units with varying sizes within a single building or cluster of buildings. They usually include shared open space for residents and parking is usually in a surface lot.

Mixed Use Residential

These are buildings that include commercial uses on the ground floor and residential units on upper floors. Open space is generally in the form of balconies, terraces and roof decks.
A. CALL TO ORDER

Seven Planning Commissioners were in attendance. (Justin Gollob, Jesse Fabula, Mel Mulder, Doug Van Etten, Dave Karisny, Cullen Purser, and Patrick Hummel were present).

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Whitney Rink led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Hearing Item 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental Conditional Use Permit was moved from a Consent Item to a Hearing Item due to the receipt of a public comment.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER MULDER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA
COMMISSIONER PURSER SECONDED THE MOTION
MOTION PASSES 7-0

E. WITHDRAWN ITEMS

None

F. CONTINUED ITEMS

None

G. CONSENT ITEMS

Application #: 2019-38
Application Name: Vic’s Place VRBO
Application Type: Conditional Use Permit
Location: 825 E. Ottley Avenue
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.

Application #: 2019-44
Application Name: Village at Country Creek North
Application Type: Preliminary Plan
Applicant: Sunshine of the Redlands
Location: 1176 18 Road
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for 12 single family detached residential lots on approximately 3.4 acres.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
COMMISSIONER KARISNY MADE A MOTION TO MOVE CONSENT ITEM 2019-43 COOK SHORT TERM RENTAL TO A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM AND APPROVE THE REMAINING APPLICATIONS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

COMMISSIONER MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 7-0 IN FAVOR TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AND 5-0 IN FAVOR OF APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER VAN ETTEN AND COMMISSIONER KARISNY ABSTAINED FROM VOTING ON APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES DUE TO THEIR ABSENCE AT THE LAST MEETING.

Commissioner Gollob had a clarifying question regarding application 2019-38 Vic’s Place VRBO. He asked about the Fire Department’s recommendation that they have an evacuation plan and he didn’t see it on the letter but that they have some kind of plan drawn up because the fire department was concerned that in the event of a fire they would have a delay getting to the property given the location. He didn’t see it in the conditions of approval by Staff in the review comments.

Henry explained that the concern from Lower Valley Fire in regard to emergency response was not knowing where the property is located. He continued that it was a recommendation from Staff that the owners work with Lower Valley Fire and produce an emergency plan with their guests. He said that after talking to the Fire Marshal it was clear that there was a section in the Fire Code that speaks to the location of properties that can’t be seen from the right-of-way. He added that the residents needed to work with Lower Valley Fire to address those concerns. He said that all parties will be working together toward a commonsense solution, but it didn’t have anything to do with the use.

H. HEARING ITEMS

Application #: 2019-43
Application Name: Cook Short Term Rental
Application Type: Conditional Use Permit
Location: 157 South Orchard Street
Zone: Community Residential (CR)
Description: This is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Vacation Rental by Owner (Bed And Breakfast) in a Community Residential zone.

Commissioner Van Etten read the description of application 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental Conditional Use Permit to the meeting attendees.

Henry Hemphill, Planner for the City of Fruita, went up to the podium to give the presentation. Mr. Hemphill explained that Staff had received a public comment at the end of the day and after reviewing the comments determined that they didn’t directly correlate with any of the approval criteria. He just wanted to be sure to mention this for the record and that concerns were brought up and that they are addressing those in a Public Hearing.
Slide 1 – Introduction of Application 2019-43 Cook Short Term Rental

Slide 2 – Legal Notice
Mr. Hemphill pointed out the buffer zone in which the legal notice requirement was sent and notified of the meeting. He also pointed to a picture of the property posting.

Slide 3 – Description
- The subject property contains a 1,556 square foot detached single-family dwelling unit on an approximately .17-acre lot.
- Located on South Orchard Street northwest of the intersection of East McCune Avenue and South Orchard Street.
- The applicant is proposing to rent, on a less than month-to-month basis, an attached 393 square foot mother-in-law suite that includes one-bedroom, full kitchen and bathroom.
- The Land Use Code defines this type of use as a Bed & Breakfast which requires a CUP in the Community Residential (CR) zone.

Slide 4 - Review of Land Use Code Requirements
- Section 17.07.070 (A) Supplemental Zoning Regulations and Standards:
  1. Where the applicable zoning district allows bed and breakfast uses as a Conditional Use, the use must be a residential dwelling that contains no more than four (4) guest bedrooms where overnight lodging, with or without meals, is provided for compensation. Bed and Breakfast uses with more than four (4) guest bedrooms are considered hotels or motels;
  2. Kitchen and dining facilities in bed and breakfast dwellings may serve only residents and guests and shall not be operated or used for any commercial activity other than that necessary for bed and breakfast purposes;
  3. The bed and breakfast use shall not change the residential character of the dwelling if located in a residential zone or area;
  4. In residential zones (including residential developments in the CMU zone), there shall be no advertising display or other indication of the bed and breakfast use on the premises other than a sign that is in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 17.41;

Slide 5 – Review of Land Use Code Requirements Continued
- Section 17.07.070 (A) Supplemental Zoning Regulations and Standards:
  5. A minimum of one parking space per guest bedroom and resident bedroom shall be required. Screening may also be required;
  6. The bed and breakfast facility shall comply with all Building Codes adopted by the city;
  7. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that the relevant subdivision's declarations, covenants, conditions or restrictions allow for a bed and breakfast use and/or associated signing; and
  8. Where a bed and breakfast use is subject to Conditional Use Permit approval, any existing or proposed uses in addition to that of a dwelling unit (e.g. home occupation, accessory dwelling unit, etc.) are considered as part of the conditional use review.

Slide 6 - Review of Land Use Code Requirements Continued
- Section 17.13.040 Conditional Uses:
1. The proposed use is consistent with the provisions and purposes of this Title, with the purposes of the zone in which it is located, and with the city's Master Plan;
2. The proposed use is compatible with existing and allowed uses surrounding or affected by the proposed use, pursuant to the criteria in Section 17.07.080;
3. The proposed use will not materially endanger the public health or safety; and
4. Public services and facilities including, but not limited to, transportation systems, wastewater disposal and treatment, domestic water, fire protection, police protection, and storm drainage facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use.

Slide 7 – Review Comments & Public Comments

**Public Comments:**
- No written public comments have been received regarding this application at this time.

**Review Comments:**
- No reviewer expressed concerns over the proposed application.

Slide 8 – Staff Recommendation
- Because all of the approval criteria for Conditional Use Permits and all supplemental zoning standards and regulations either are or can be met, staff recommends approval of the proposed Bed & Breakfast with the condition that all review comments are met before the business becomes operational.
- City Council = February 4, 2020

Mr. Hemphill concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Van Etten invited the applicants to come up to speak.

Ryan and Renee Cook who reside at 154 South Orchard Street went up to speak. She said that she works in the community and they have a high school student that attends Fruita Monument High School. She said that her husband is disabled and at home most of the time. She said that they live in the house and it is their primary dwelling and they have the most interest in protecting who is in and out of the home. She continued that it would not be transients as mentioned in the letter. She said it is their home and they would be there and their daughter lives with them. She said that this is something that they need to do with the space. She said that it was built for her mother who unexpectedly passed away and they are left with the attachment to the home. They don’t want someone there all the time so they don’t want to rent it out as a monthly rental but on occasion they would like to offer the amenities of the town. She thanked them for hearing them and asked if they had any questions for them.

Commissioner Karisny said that if he wanted to give them the opportunity to respond to the letter.
Ryan Cook who lives at 154 South Orchard Street spoke. He said that he wanted to address one item in the letter. He said that he spoke to many of his neighbors and wrote three of them down which are the direct neighbors that this would impact. He got their permission to put their names down. He said that the letter they received was sudden. He said they did try to address every concern with all of their neighbors. He just wanted to be sure they knew that.

Commissioner Van Etten thanked him and said that he appreciated his neighbor outreach efforts. He then asked if anyone else wanted to provide public testimony on the hearing item.

There was none.

Commissioner Van Etten closed the public hearing portion on the item and asked the Planning Commissioners if they had any comments.

Commissioner Purser mentioned that the VRBO’s continued to be a point of discussion for the community. He said that potential solutions and problems in that it can bring healthy people to the community but can also erase the community for various reasons. He felt this was a model situation when the resident is living in the house and they are communicating with their neighborhood. This is what they encourage people to do.

Commissioner Hummel seconded that comment. He asked Mr. Hemphill what kind of oversight existed when you have a situation like this, an attached ADU to a primary residence. He asked if the Conditional Use Permit is only given to the 300 square foot unit, how does this differentiate?

Mr. Hemphill said that it is placed as a condition of approval on a resolution to City Council. He continued that this is approved, and the property owner is telling us that they are going to rent out 1 bedroom and it is encompassing this area, they have shown it in the project narrative, and the site plan. He said that this is the accountability tool that is used to make sure that this is what happens. He said that he could see his point in that they are telling us one thing and doing another. He said that it is hard to police that but as they progress towards these Conditional Use Permits and the placement of conditions via resolution to the City Council, they will get better over time to figure out best practices. He said that this is Fruita and they hope that people are doing the right thing by telling them one thing and following through. He said that this was an accountability measure.

Mr. Dan Caris added another comment. He said that having the Mayor and City Clerk ink the resolution itself, it has those specific performance measures about the limitations for what the application was approved for. He said those provisions are in place to make sure that it is only that unit. He said that there is a path to revoking the permit by taking the formal step of approving it by resolution and then knowing whether or not there are violations you can point to the resolution and number and put that on the record in the event of a revocation in the future.

Commissioner Van Etten asked if there were any other questions, comments or items of discussion.

There were none.

Commissioner Van Etten asked for a motion.
COMMISSIONER KARISNY MOVED TO APPROVE 2019-43 COOK SHORT TERM RENTAL CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

COMMISSIONER PURSER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSES 7-0

Commissioner Van Etten thanked everyone who came, and he welcomed them to stay for the remainder of the meeting if they wanted to.

Other Business

1. Community Development Activity Reports.
   a. Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local Comprehensive Plan

Commissioner Van Etten told the audience that they would be moving to Other Business and discussing Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local Comprehensive Plan.

Dan Caris Planning Director for the City of Fruita went up to give his presentation of the Comprehensive Plan that they have been working on for a year. He mentioned that in their packet was not the entire plan but was the basics of the chapters for review. He wanted them to provide feedback on elements that were discussed at the December 12 workshop for potential changes. He said he presented it with track changes and wanted to have a clarifying question and answer session with the Planning Commission. He felt it would be prudent for the record for the process to go through where they started, who was involved, the outreach efforts, the results they received and then have an informal discussion. He said that way when they have the joint workshop that they were invited to with City Council and the Steering Committee they will have the opportunity to button up the document and put it in software which will then put it in a format they are more traditionally used to seeing. He also wanted to talk about was the design templates at the end of their packets which is the snapshot of what they are planning on doing and any feedback on that would be appreciated.

Slide 1 - Fruita In Motion: Plan Like A Local Introduction

Slide 2 - Timeline

Slide 3 – Steering Committee - Dates and Who was involved
Mr. Caris said pointed out the consultants that were involved in the document were SE Group, Economic Planning Systems, and Studio Seed.
   April 18 – Vision Setting
   June 13 – Land Use & Growth
   June 20 – Land Use & Growth
   July 18 – Economic Development
   August 15 – Parks and Rec / Transportation
   August 22 – Community Character Workshop
   September 12 – Infrastructure
   December 12 – Wrap up meeting
Slide 4 – Public Engagement
  March 9 – Art Stroll
  March 14-15 – Stakeholder discussions
  May 23 – Open House Kick off
  October 3 – Draft Plan Party

Slide 5 – Road Show
Mr. Caris pointed out that this does not include the City Manager engagement series.
  October 8 – Fruita Lions Club
  October 9 – Rotary Club
  October 9 – Fruita Chamber of Commerce
  October 10 – Mesa County Planning Commission
  October 17 – Fruita Chamber of Commerce Economic Development Forum
  October 24 – Rimrock Elementary School
  October 29 – Fruita Middle School
  October 30 – Fruita Youth Action Council
  November 7 – Senior Potluck – Community Center
  November 18 – Fruita Monument High School & The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
  November 7 – 18 – Board presentation at Fruita Community Center
  November 22 – December 2 - Board presentation at Fruita Community Center

Commissioner Fabula asked if there was a point in time that the City was so far along in the process that feedback was no longer being brought into the plan or was feedback being constantly gathered?

Mr. Caris said that up until December 12 it was a living document. He added that there were different materials being presented at each check point. The questions narrowed and refined. This happened with the public and the Steering Committee.

Slide 6 – Highlights & Focus Areas
  • Focus on the community character without losing our identity and small-town feel
  • Continue connecting neighborhoods with off-street trail corridors.
  • Additional commercial zoning districts to capture varying uses and differing lots sizes
  • Growth Boundaries (Urban Development Boundary)
    • Density and Scale
    • Amenities
  • Downtown allowed uses and design
  • Housing variations vs demographics and how interacts with Fruita values (missing middle, workforce housing, senior housing, etc)
Mr. Caris asked the Planning Commission that as they reviewed the document if it made sense, was it in order, and did they feel that a citizen could read through it and say that this is Fruita and what we want. Mr. Caris said that he would continue to go on through the presentation and through the chapters, context and goals applicable to each section, but he would like to get their feedback and if they had achieved what they set out to achieve. He opened it up to the Planning Commission to gather their feedback.

Commission Gollob said he felt it represented the community and he felt it did capture that. He also felt it was organized but cautioned against the use of acronyms from a readability perspective. He thought the document sounded repetitive with the Why questions but thought it did make sense. He said he had questions on the maps.

Mr. Caris said that they wanted to make sure that they didn’t just have two open houses and adopt it and to share iterations and how they had changed. Part of the reason they saw circles on the maps is on December 12 they wanted to be sure it was on the record. He said that he didn’t just want to hand out a planning document that looked finished because he wanted feedback and didn’t want people to say they didn’t want to change a finished product. He said it is still an active document even in the search for a recommendation.

Commissioner Karisny complimented SE Group, Gabby, Ellie, Brian and the City Staff on their job of communicating with the public. He felt the outreach was unprecedented and it made a difference. He said that as someone who has been participating in it, he saw changes that he questioned. He said that in the Community Snapshot, which is a fiscal snapshot, he felt that there were statements that didn’t sound right. He said it uses Grand Junction as an example. He felt it would be misleading to put information in it that wasn’t right. He used the example of housing prices in Fruita versus Grand Junction and questioned it. He said that there needed to be some factual accountability. He said that there was a regional home price thing that Brian did that is based on the Land Title office and that could be a factual comparison. He wanted to footnote the things he was talking about and he understood that this leads into single family homes are really expensive.

Mr. Caris clarified that this was the reason that was highlighted. He said that those were bold statements that they wanted to have confidence in. They need to provide an appendix were the data came from supporting those claims.

Commissioner Karisny pointed out by page number where the bold statements were in the document.

Commissioner Fabula asked Commissioner Karisny if he just wanted it to be more accurate.

Commissioner Karisny confirmed that it was. He said to footnote what you are doing and show where the information is coming from.

Commissioner Mulder had an identical comment. He also felt it was inaccurate.
Commissioner Karisny said that a lot of the information came from 2017 and there was a big difference between 2017 and now.

Mr. Caris invited more comments on the document.

Commissioner Karisny wanted to make note on page 3 table X, the residential densities, and he pointed out the Monument Preservation area. He gave a brief history on the Monument Preservation zone. He said right now it is one dwelling per two acres. He pointed out a map of when the subdivisions were developed and briefly talked about that. He said that on the Fruita In Motion website under Community Character there is the same map and he talked about it being building by year. He said that there were conclusions and there were familiar themes and he recalled this was talked about with Iron Wheel. It has to do with compact development. He said that it seemed to be a driving force before the Land Use Code. He talked about a major land use area called 4-8 and they have the downtown area that got a lot of attention and has been broken up into 6 areas. He said that the 4-8 is just a big area everywhere and he felt it was a one size fits all. He thought this was a response to the lack of choices in house types and not enough affordable homes. He wanted to know where we got to the big leap to making the rest of Fruita the rest of Fruita being this 4-8? He asked if this was really the right direction to be going? He said that prior to doing this he would like to look at some of those areas to differentiate some of that rather than just blanket it. He said that when they looked at the 4-8 area, they talked about density bonuses. He talked about the Land Use Code as being Use by Right. He said the density is more efficient, better for the City, and the process referring to use by right is a smoother planning process. He said it left out some crucial parts, and he referred to the Planning Commission and City Council. He went back to the new zoning area which is 4-8 and talked about it covering everything. He felt that they needed to look at this more.

Mr. Caris said that this was a Future Land Use map not a zoning ordinance. He said that there will still be a public process through the annexation and rezoning process. He said that petitioners will need to provide those amenities to get to the max density. It is the subdivision process that they will be proposing for a more administrative process.

Commissioner Karisny talked about previous Use by Right projects. He said that there was little that they could participate in. He talked about the Oak Creek Subdivision. He said he would like to take smaller steps as opposed to leaping into it.

Mr. Caris asked if he felt that this might work in some areas but not all?

Commissioner Karisny said that was correct and it shouldn’t encompass the entire Fruita Community. He asked about existing developments and then saying they can develop at 4-8 acres. He talked about those subdivisions. He said the downtown area made sense but when you are going into existing subdivisions where can you put something else in there?

Mr. Caris said that those neighborhoods are already built out. He when they were having their discussions with the Steering Committee there were requests for what had been built out and they generated the map that shows that and the unannexed area to the City the same color. He asked if they were really creating another zone district or setting up zone districts and do they
want to keep the Community Residential zone in that color? He said that was a potential option. He talked about up zoning areas that had not been built out, they would have to go through the zoning process. He talked about the CC&Rs either allowing or disallowing this. Are they creating something that could be absorbed into the neighborhood? It seemed to them that in order to provide flexibility that the 4-8 even with Community Residential zoning and a minimum lot size of 7000 square feet, the raw gross density is 6 dwelling units per acre. He said that this is a consideration that should be brought up at the workshop.

Commissioner Karisny asked for clarification. He said the narrative suggested the dark green brown area in the middle is 4-8 on the map. He said that there were dozens of subdivisions that were built out in that area. He said that they weren’t going to subdivide. He asked if that was misleading?

Mr. Caris talked about the difference between a Future Land Use Map and a Zoning Map. He said that those were entitlements versus what could potentially happen. He said that when they go to zone property while trying to create the 4-8 thresholds was so the Planning Commission and City Council could deference what fits in what neighborhood.

Commissioner Fabula asked if a Legacy Zoning Map would solve the problem?

Mr. Caris talked about the Community Residential zoned areas that were not covenant controlled and that in the future they could be demoed and completely different neighborhoods.

Commissioner Karisny said to argue that they have a map showing when they were built, and would that be a more accurate map when talking about the potential 4-8? He had concerns about the Community Residential subdivisions and if they will be designated as 4-8 instead of their current zoning.

Mr. Caris said this is for the Future Land Use Map not as a Zoning Map.

Commissioner Karisny felt that this was misleading.

Commissioner Fabula commented that this was how he interpreted it as this zoning will be that in the future.

Mr. Caris said that 50% of the map isn’t in Fruita. The need to have a 3-mile plan, a plan for infrastructure, and a plan for the transportation network. He spoke more about Legacy Zoning. He also talked about taking some of those neighborhoods and designating them as built out neighborhoods with the zoning of Community Residential.

Commissioner Karisny felt this 4-8 area needed more attention. He reminded everyone that this was a 10-year plan. He talked about the Monument Preservation area which includes King’s View and other areas. He said he remembered that this area was part of Fruita in past plans. He felt Mr. Moir’s area needed to have a designation other than South Fruita. He talked about all of the points of interest within that area.
Mr. Caris talked about the December 12 meeting in which the King’s View and the Monument Preservation areas were discussed. He asked if this had an underlying future land use. He also felt the South Fruita designation was misleading there. He said that there was topography issues and a need for a lift station in this area. He said that there was discussion with the Steering Committee that this didn’t make sense to keep in the 201. He said that it is currently Mesa County.

Commissioner Van Etten asked Commissioner Karisny if his point about Mr. Moir’s land is that it rather than it being South Fruita Residential 2-5 it should be somewhere between that and Rural Residential.

Commissioner Karisny said somewhere between Monument Preservation.

Mr. Caris asked for more comments about the land use categories or descriptions.

Commissioner Hummel felt that the 4-8 was a big enough change to be concerned. He talked about the downtown residential area to make his point. He agreed that there could be a Legacy overlay, but he felt that there wouldn’t be much of a difference and he would like to see higher density.

Commissioner Mulder expressed that he didn’t like 4-8. He said that Fruita is taking the leading edge and he was not disappointed with what had been presented. He compared the central east part of the valley and 4-8 density and talked about his experience in this type density and his dislike of it. He also pointed out that this is a 10-year plan and the potential to create an 8 unit per acre designation in a project as a bonus density. He then talked about affordable housing. He talked about wanting to know what was considered affordable housing and what the income of the citizens are compared to home prices in Fruita. He talked about quality of life and he felt that 8 units per acre didn’t go with that. He used Aspen Village as an example of this. He also made note of the acronyms and the need for an appendix. He commented on trails along the irrigation ditches. He brought up police patrol. He addressed building height.

Mr. Caris said the elements he mentioned must be considered for the Land Use Code. He said their recommendations will set the stage for mass and bulk standards. He added context to what was being discussed by making mention of the downtown area and the placement of a duplex and what the density is.

Commissioner Mulder said that this needs to be defined and refined.

Mr. Caris asked if he felt it needed to be defined in this plan or the Land Use Code?

Commissioner Mulder said this plan.

Mr. Caris asked if the question was how to get there?

Commissioner Mulder acknowledged this. He then mentioned Commissioner Karisny’s comment on the radical price difference between Fruita and Grand Junction and he said he was
correct.

Mr. Caris brought up points about why this may have been skewed. He talked about what was being compared could be considered in the calculations.

Commissioner Mulder had a problem with the comparison to Grand Junction. He said that Fruita stood alone in their plans and their progress. He added that plans and definitions were very important.

Commissioner Karisny thought that citing resources would be adequate.

Commissioner Purser spoke generally that it would be nice to have a different strata of options in housing prices and affordable housing. He talked about the idea of small spaces and affordable spaces for the variety of people who wanted that. He would like to see that they do everything they can in the design processes to maintain creative answers to developers.

Commissioner Karisny asked if they could modify the document to include this idea.

Commissioner Purser thought that they could include a smaller, more affordable existence.

Mr. Caris talked about how to deal with density and sprawl.

Commissioner Mulder asked if the community understood what 8 units per acre would look like?

Mr. Caris believed that the people he talked to did understand what that meant and talked more about density. He used Village at Country Creek as an example.

Commissioner Mulder talked about Fruita Community values and read what it said in the proposed Comprehensive Update regarding the topic. He said that this was his understanding of the City of Fruita and he wanted it to continue. He said that the document is an extremely thoughtful document for the most part but there were some issues.

Commissioner Karisny talked about the boundaries to the east of Fruita on 19 Road. He talked about the 201 and a block to the east of 19 Road where sewer was going to end and then that was URR. He asked if they will be continuing to move out to 20 Road or stopping there?

Mr. Caris responded that people felt the need for absorption to the west of 18 ½ Road to consider going east of 19 Road. He talked about the investment in the trunk line extension and the properties it will serve. He then moved on to a discussion about the future and 201 boundary and urban development boundary up to J.2 to match the recapture area for Iron Wheel. He asked if they wanted to move it along the Adobe Wash alignment and include the area they included in the recapture?

Commissioner Karisny talked about his thoughts on it and thought it felt like sprawl.

Commissioner Purser said it made sense to him.
Mr. Caris suggested that they could put procedural steps in the Comp Plan about amending those lines when it made sense. He then brought up the To Be Determined area and talked about making it into a Flex Zoning district. He brought up the Lagoons area and Greenway Business Park. He felt this area should all be the same future land use and clearly defined in the Land Use Code.

Commissioner Fabula asked when it was anticipated to take place referring to the Land Use Code update defining that area.

Mr. Caris responded that this would be in the next 8-10 months. He then asked the Planning Commission for clear direction on the 4-8. He talked a feathered edge versus a defined hard edge that has a future land use of 4-8.

Commissioner Karisny asked if they could approve it but that they were not at a consensus on the 4-8 and then turn that into a discussion at the workshop?

Mr. Caris confirmed this.

Commissioner Gollob felt that there was not consensus on the 4-8 and he thought it should be on the agenda.

Commissioner Fabula questioned the type of edge Fruita would have and he liked the idea of a hard edge and having distinct boundaries. He asked if the other Commissioners could get behind that idea.

Commissioner Mulder and Commissioner Purser said they did.

Commissioner Karisny brought up that it is 4-8 everywhere and everywhere isn’t the same. He wanted a more in-depth discussion about the 4-8, Use by Right, what it looked like and the existing subdivisions.

Commissioner Hummel asked Staff for a report of examples of dwellings that were around the 4-8 dwelling units per acre to see what there was and examples they can look towards and see if they like it or not.

Commissioner Fabula talked about some of the attractive townhomes he saw images of at the workshop and was comfortable with the idea of higher density.

Mr. Caris commented that in the Land Use Code there could be different scenarios in order to get to that 8. He described several possibilities of these conditions of approval and these numbers would need to be petitioned for.

Commissioner Mulder talked about the workshop and he saw that discussion would be on hard or soft boundaries and 4-8. He said once the borders were determined they would be able to make the map.
Mr. Caris said that they could say that they had concerns about the residential densities in the Future Land Use map and wanted examples and they wanted a discussion with City Council and the Steering Committee on it. He said that this could be a recommendation of approval with that caveat. He then talked about the December 12 meeting.

Commissioner Gollob made comments about Mr. Caris’ points and that he thought they had a strong agenda.

Mr. Caris said they would put the agenda together and send it out and they can send in comments and that would be a part of the agenda for the workshop.

Commissioner Gollob talked about project funding and funding mechanisms. He also brought up intergovernmental cooperation and steps towards building it into the processes. He talked about the document saying that Fruita was a suburb of Grand Junction and thought the narrative didn’t match the goal they were trying to achieve.

Commissioner Karisny confirmed that Fruita is doing a good job with their intergovernmental agreements and he gave examples.

Mr. Caris reiterated what he heard. He said they needed to talk about the Lagoons with Greenway Business Park, the 4-8 Future Land Use, demographic data for real estate and market analysis for home prices, hard edge versus a soft edge and the 19 Road corridor as it relates to Future Land Use and infrastructure.

Commissioner added getting a read on existing developments and identifying them as 4-8.

Mr. Caris said 4-8 existing versus future.

Commissioner Fabula asked if the Monument Preservation area was settled.

It appeared it was.

Commissioner Gollob asked who was going to be at the meeting.

Mr. Caris told them who would be there.

Commissioner Mulder asked if they would see the finished document after the council meetings.

Mr. Caris confirmed that they would and said that everyone would be invited to everything until the conclusion of the adoption.

Mr. Caris asked for a motion.

**COMMISSIONER KARISNY MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE FRUITA IN MOTION PLAN LIKE A LOCAL COMP PLAN WITH THE EXCEPTION OF LANGUAGE PERTAINING TO 4-8 DWELLING UNITS AS IT RELATES**
TO EXISTING VERSUS FUTURE LAND USE, THE HARD AND SOFT EDGE, A REVIEW OF THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS THAT WAS PROVIDED BY EPS, AND FURTHER DISCUSSION REGARDING THE BOUNDARIES ON 19 ROAD.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOB SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSES 7-0

2. Visitors and Guests.

Mr. John Moir who lives at 278 North Mesa Street went up to speak. He said that he has been involved with the Comprehensive Plan and he said that he is concerned about affordable housing. He said that there is no identification on the maps where the existing affordable housing inventory is. He felt that it is important to know where that is and said that that was the areas of opportunity where they can place affordable housing. He asked how they zoned affordable housing? He talked about density and lot size. He gave a hypothetical example of this and asked where would they do this? He said that right now it is blank, there is nothing that speaks to affordable housing. He said as a builder costs have gone up. He said they used to sell houses at $180,000.00 and that same house today sells around $280,000.00. He talked about the average income in Mesa County that this wasn’t obtainable housing. He wanted to bring this to their attention. He thanked them.

The Planning Commissioners discussed Mr. Moir’s comments.

Adjournment 9:33 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Kelli McLean
Planning Technician, City of Fruita