MESA COUNTY

LAND USE ITEMS

Planning Commission

November 19, 2026 - 6:00 p.m.

Hearing date continued from

October 15, 2026 - 6:00 p.m.

544 Rood Avenue
Grand Junction, CO

For accessibility assistance with any part of this document, please visit the Mesa County Americans Disabilities Act Compliance webpage for contact information.

PROJECT REVIEW

PRO2026-0197

REVOCATION OF COMMUNITY NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

MESA COUNTY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION
200 S. Spruce Street • PO Box 20,000-5022 • Grand Junction, Colorado • 81502
Telephone: 970.244.1636 • www.mesacounty.us/planning

PROJECT REVIEW
September 23, 2026

PRO2026-0197 **Revocation of Community/Neighborhood Plans**

Representative: Mesa County Community Development Department
Planner: Greg Moberg, 970-244-1650, greg.moberg@mesacounty.us
Request: Revocation of the following community/neighborhood plans:

Clifton-Fruitvale Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2006-01)
Gateway Rural Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2004-02)
Glade Park Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2014-005)
Loma Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2009-001)
Mack Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2012-001)
Mesa/Powderhorn Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2013-002)
Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2014-002)
Redlands Area Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 1-002)
Whitewater Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2011-004)

Recommendation: Approval

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Plans to be rescinded:

Clifton-Fruitvale Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2006-01)
Gateway Rural Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2004-02)
Glade Park Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2014-005)
Loma Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2009-001)
Mack Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2012-001)
Mesa/Powderhorn Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2013-002)
Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2014-002)
Redlands Area Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 1-002)
Whitewater Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2011-004)

These Plans were originally adopted to provide policy guidance and vision for specific areas within the County. Since their adoption, key elements have been systematically incorporated and codified into the Land Development Code, elevating them from advisory to regulatory status. The inclusions can be found under Section 5.05 Special Purpose Zoning Districts in the Land Development Code. In addition, with the adoption of the Mesa County Master Plan in 2023, many of the goals, policies and action items were incorporated into the Chapter 5: Goals and Strategies of the newly adopted Master Plan.

The remaining uncodified/unincorporated goals, policies, and action items were not deemed necessary for inclusion in the Land Development Code or Master Plan. Consequently, continuing to maintain these legacy plans creates unnecessary redundancy, ambiguity and potential confusion for the following reasons:

- Successful Implementation: The County has already accomplished many of the recommended actions, goals, and strategies.
- Codification and Incorporation: Many of the goals, policies and action items have been codified or incorporated into the Master Plan, Land Development Code and overall policies.
- Superseded Policies: The neighborhood plans have become obsolete as they are now supported within the Land Development Code and Master Plan.
- Jurisdictional Alignment: Some of the original content was completed in conjunction with the City of Grand Junction and included areas within the City's Urban Development Boundary. The County's scope is limited to those areas outside this UDB. Elements within the UDB may be preserved by the City of Grand Junction but are no longer necessary for the County to maintain. In addition, the City of Grand Junction has already rescinded the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan and the Red Lands Area Plan.
- Redundancy: The neighborhood plans contain descriptive information and policies that are now redundant with the Master Plan.

Because the primary objective to review and formally codify preferred elements of the Plans has been achieved, the desired vision for each area is now established and incorporated into the Land Development Code and Master Plan.

II. COMPLIANCE WITH MESA COUNTY REQUIREMENTS

Sections 3.09 and 4.11.C of the Mesa County Land Development Code was used to evaluate this application.

Section 3.09 – General Approval Criteria

A. Complies with all applicable standards, provisions, and Purposes (Section 1.05) of this Land Development Code;

The proposed Master Plan Amendment does comply with applicable standards, provisions, and purposes of the Land Development Code.

This criterion **has been met**.

B. Is consistent with review agency comments; and

There were no comments from outside or internal agencies.

This criterion **has been met**.

C. Is consistent with applicable intergovernmental agreements between the County and other entities.

The proposed Master Plan Amendment does comply with applicable

intergovernmental agreements between the County and other entities.

This criterion **has been met**.

<u>Section 4.11.C</u> In evaluating a proposed amendment, the following shall be considered:

1. There was an error in the original Master plan such that then-existing facts, projects, or trend (that were reasonably foreseeable) were not accounted for;

   There was no error in the original Master plan such that then-existing facts, projects, or trend were not accounted for.

   This criterion **has been met**.

2. Events subsequent to the adoption of the Master Plan have invalidated the original premises and findings;

   Following the adoption of the Plans, Mesa County undertook a comprehensive rewrite of its Master Plan in 2023. Key goals, policies, and actions from the Plans have now been integrated into the Goals and Strategies found in Chapter 5 of the Mesa County Master Plan.

   This criterion **has been met**.

3. The character and/or condition of the area has changed enough that the amendment is acceptable;

   The character and conditions throughout the County have evolved since the adoption of the Plans. Because these changes are comprehensively addressed within the Chapter 5: Goals and Strategies of the Mesa County Master Plan, the need to maintain these Plans is no longer required.

   This criterion **has been met**.

4. The amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the Master Plan, including applicable special area, neighborhood, and corridor plans;

   This amendment request is consistent with the goals and policies of the Master Plan.

   This criterion **has been met**.

5. The amendment is consistent with any intergovernmental agreements in effect between the County and any other unit of government;

   The amendment is consistent with existing intergovernmental agreements.

   This criterion **has been met**.

6. Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed;

   This criterion is not applicable.

7. An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the community,

as defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use; and

This criterion is not applicable.

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

   The revocation of the Plans will benefit the County by removing redundant and confusing goals and policies, ultimately establishing a clearer and more efficient regulatory environment for future development.

   This criterion **has been met**.

III. REVIEW AGENCY COMMENTS

Several review agency comments were received and are included on a Review Agency Report as an attachement to this report.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Public comments in the form of emails and letters were received and are included in addition to an Review Agency Report as attachements to this report.

V. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Division recommends APPROVAL of the proposed Master Plan Amendment rescinding the following Community/Neighborhood plans:

- Clifton-Fruitvale Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2006-01)
- Gateway Rural Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2004-02)
- Glade Park Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2014-005)
- Loma Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2009-001)
- Mack Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2012-001)
- Mesa/Powderhorn Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2013-002)
- Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2014-002)
- Redlands Area Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 1-002)
- Whitewater Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2011-004)

On the basis that:

- The proposed amendment satisfies the majority of the Master Plan Amendment approval criteria in Section 4.11.C of the Mesa County 2020 Land Development Code (as amended); and
- The proposed amendment satisfies the General Approval Criteria in Section 3.09 of the Mesa County 2020 Land Development Code (as amended)

Summary

<u>General Approval Criteria</u>

3.09.A Compliance with the Land Development Code	Has been met
3.09.B Consistency with review agency comments	Has been met
3.09.C Consistency with applicable IGAs	Has been met

Master Plan Amendment Approval Criteria

4.11.C.1 Previous error	Has been met
4.11.C.2 Invalidation	Has been met
4.11.C.3 Change of conditions	Has been met
4.11.C.4 Consistency w/MP	Has been met
4.11.C.5 Consistency w/IGAs	Has been met
4.11.C.6 Availability of facilities	Not applicable
4.11.C.7 Other suitable locations	Not applicable
4.11.C.8 Community benefits	Has been met

VI. Planning Commission ACTION: October 15, 2026 - Continued to November 19, 2026

VII. Board of County Commissioner ACTION: Not Applicable

REVIEW AGENCY COMMENTS

MESA COUNTY

Community Development Department

Planning Division

200 S. Spruce Street • PO Box 20,000-5022 • Grand Junction, Colorado • 81502

Telephone: 970.244.1636 • www.mesacounty.us/planning

Project ID: PRO2026-0197

Project Name: Revocation of Community/Neighborhood Plans

Review Cycle:7/29/2026 - 8/19/2026

Agency Review Comments and Feedback

Your project has been reviewed. Comments from plan reviewers are compiled below for your reference. Please respond to the comments and submit necessary documents.

General Project Comments			
Agency/ Department	**Comment Date**	**Comment**	**Applicant Response**
Planner LDC Review	7/29/2026		
Irrigation- Grand Valley Water Users	7/29/2026		
Water- Ute	7/29/2026		
MC- Traffic	7/29/2026	No comments.	
Irrigation- Palisade	7/29/2026	No Comment from Palisade Irrigation District	
State- CO State Engineer- Water Supply	7/29/2026	The Division of Water Resources has no comments on this referral. Thank you.	
Irrigation- Grand Valley Drainage	7/30/2026	GVDD has no comment.	
MC- Health (Restaurant)	7/30/2026	MCPH has no concerns with this.	
State- CO Parks & Wildlife NW	7/30/2026		
Irrigation- Grand Valley	7/30/2026		
MC- Floodplain	7/30/2026		
MC- ROW Vacation	7/30/2026		
MC- Stormwater	7/30/2026	No comment.	
MC- Surveyor	7/30/2026	I have no comment.	
Water- Clifton	7/31/2026	no comments	

Jurisdiction- Palisade	7/31/2026	No comments or concerns	
MC- Treasurer	8/3/2026		
Fire- Grand Junction Rural Fire Department	8/4/2026	GJFD has no comments.	
Fire- Grand Junction Fire Department	8/4/2026	GJFD has no comments.	
MC- OWTS	8/4/2026		
State- CO DOT Region 3	8/4/2026	CDOT has no comment.	
Irrigation- Redlands Water & Power	8/6/2026	No comment	
Fire- Clifton Department	8/7/2026	The Fire Department has reviewed the proposed rescission of the identified neighborhood and subarea plans and has no objection from a fire code or emergency-response standpoint. This determination is based on the understanding that applicable requirements for fire apparatus access, fire department access roads, water supply, fire flow, hydrant locations, and other applicable fire and life-safety provisions will continue to be addressed through the adopted International Fire Code, Land Development Code, and applicable development review processes. Rescission of these plans shall not be construed as approval or waiver of fire code requirements applicable to future development	
Fire- Palisade Fire Department	8/7/2026	The Fire Department has reviewed the proposed rescission of the identified neighborhood and subarea plans and has no objection from a fire code or emergency-response standpoint. This determination is based on the understanding that applicable requirements for fire apparatus access, fire department access roads, water supply, fire flow, hydrant locations, and other applicable fire and life-safety provisions will continue to be addressed through the adopted International Fire Code, Land Development Code, and applicable development review processes. Rescission of these plans shall not be construed as approval or waiver of fire code requirements applicable to future development	

Fire- Plateau Valley Fire Department	8/7/2026	The Fire Department has reviewed the proposed rescission of the identified neighborhood and subarea plans and has no objection from a fire code or emergency-response standpoint. This determination is based on the understanding that applicable requirements for fire apparatus access, fire department access roads, water supply, fire flow, hydrant locations, and other applicable fire and life-safety provisions will continue to be addressed through the adopted International Fire Code, Land Development Code, and applicable development review processes. Rescission of these plans shall not be construed as approval or waiver of fire code requirements applicable to future development	
Irrigation- Orchard Mesa	8/11/2026	The narrative document does not load up. I am not able to view it.	
Power- GV Rural Power	8/14/2026	GVP Comments Noted	
MC- Addressing	8/14/2026	I don't have any comments	
MC- Building	8/17/2026	No comments	
Sanitation- MC PID	8/18/2026	No Comment	
Fire- Lower Valley Fire Department	8/19/2026	After reviewing document, LVFD has no comment regarding the master plan.	
Fire- Central Orchard Mesa Department	8/19/2026		
MC-Development Engineer	8/19/2026	Development Engineering has no comments on the proposed action.	
MC- TIFF	8/19/2026	Development Engineering has no comments on the proposed action.	
Federal- Aviation Administration	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Federal- BLM	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Federal- Colorado National Monument	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Federal- US Army Corp of Engineers	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Federal- US Forest Service	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Fire- DeBeque Fire Department	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Federal- US Fish & Wildlife	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Fire- East Orchard Mesa Fire Department	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	

Fire- Glade Park Fire Department	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Fire- Gateway Fire Department	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Fire- Lands End Fire Department	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
GJ Regional Airport	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Irrigation- Bluestone	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Irrigation- Collbran Conserve	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Irrigation- Mesa County	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Jurisdiction- Collbran	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Jurisdiction- DeBeque	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Jurisdiction- Fruita	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Jurisdiction- Grand Junction	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
MC- Assessor	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
MC- Code Compliance	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
MC- Liquor Licensing	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
MC- Public Works	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
MC- Road & Bridge	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
MC- Sheriff	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Power- Black Hills Corp.	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Power- Tri State	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Power- Xcel Energy	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Sanitation- Clifton Sanitation	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Sanitation- Grand Mesa Metro	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Sanitation- Mesa Water & Sanitation	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Sanitation- Persigo	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
School- DeBeque School District 49JT	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
School- Delta Joint School District 50J	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
School- Mesa County Valley School Distict 51	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	

Irrigation- Brown & Campion	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
School- Plateau Valley School District 50	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
State- CDPHE- Solid Waste Division	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
State- CO Geological Survey	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
State- CO Parks & Wildlife SW	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
State- CO State Forest Service	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Water- DeBeque	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Water- Grand Junction (Watershed)	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Water- Grand Junction/ Kannah Creek	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	
Water- Grand Mesa Metro	8/21/2026	No comments received by due date.	

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mesa County Google

Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Community Specific Plans in Plateau Valley

Travis Harless <travis@auxinfotech.com> Tue, Sep 8, 2026 at 8:21 AM
To: greg.moberg@mesacounty.us

Dear Greg,

Your name and information was made available to the local communities of Mesa, Molina, Collbran, and the Powderhorn area regarding their existing local community and neighborhood plans. We've been informed that the county intends to dissolve these plans entirely rather than work with the residents to update them. If this is in fact the case it could pose a grave risk to the way of life in the valley by potentially opening the door to excessive development in a very narrow corridor. As a resident of the valley near Collbran and a transplant from the northern front range I can attest to what unchecked development will do to a rural and agricultural way of life.

Having grown up in Eaton, CO and resided in Wellington, CO prior to moving to PV the changes that occurred in the last 20 years there can only be described as catastrophic. The history, the sense of community, even the moral fabric was simply paved over to make way for the new, and the new was as soulless and unethical as you might imagine. Gone are the days of the passing wave on country roads or the old-timers gathering for coffee and the cafe. The country road is now 4 lanes and the cafe was replaced by a Dollar General. I knew it was time for us to leave the morning I held the door for a young couple entering the new coffee shop in town, smiled, and bid them good morning. They looked at me like I had three heads.

Truth be told, even the changes that have surged in Grand Junction in the past 5-6 years should give the county pause as to their existing master plan. GJ is outgrowing its infrastructure at a frightening rate and doesn't appear to be taking any feasible steps towards future development or population management. With the water wars set to intensify drastically in the coming decades I would think it would be prudent to look towards putting a bulkhead behind our existing water rights and working towards securing any more shares that might be available rather than sidestepping the voting public and putting a shoulder into the 29 interchange.

We relocated here to raise our kids and integrate within the local community. There are those that have followed who want change or control or more or, or, or.... Frankly I don't think they have a clue what they want beyond screaming into the void. My mantra to community has always been - if you don't like it the way you found it then it's probably not for you. If I don't fit in I move on or I keep my nose out of it. The needs of the few should never outweigh the needs of the many.

Rather than continuing to ramble I'll close with the simple statement that we like things the way they are up here and I hope the leadership in the county will respect that and see fit to help us maintain the foundations contributing to our peace and tranquility.

Sincerely,

Travis Harless
58480 OE Road
Collbran, CO
(970)481-7117

Mesa County Google

Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Fwd: Do not scrap our community plans!!

1 message

MC Comdev <mccomdev@mesacounty.us> Thu, Oct 15, 2026 at 1:53 PM
To: Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Have a good day!

Community Development Support Services
970-255-7169
mccomdev@mesacounty.us

Building – Planning – OWTS – Code Compliance

Mesa County recognizes the need for digital document accessibility. If you experience inaccessible content and require assistance, please contact us by replying to this email.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Julia Stockemer** <julia@laddercreek.com>
Date: Thu, Oct 15, 2026 at 1:25 PM
Subject: Do not scrap our community plans!!
To: mccomdev@mesacounty.us <mccomdev@mesacounty.us>

The various communities in Mesa County are unique in character how dare you decide to lump us all together??
We want to keep our neighborhood plans, so listen to those of us wh9 live here and hold the line!!!!

Julia
Resident of Glade Park

Julia Stockemer, LMT
Ladder Creek Massage
333 1/2 Rosevale Rd.
Grand Jct., CO
81507
mobile (970) 433-6431
Julia@laddercreek.com

Mesa County Google

Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Idea for a pre-retirement informal evaluation of neighborhood plans

Catherine Ventling <catherine.ventling@gmail.com> Thu, Oct 8, 2026 at 7:19 PM
To: Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Thanks again for everyone's hard work on this complex process. Please pass this along to the planning commission.

It seems the intention of the master plan was to replace neighborhood plans. I don't know how that intention was followed through if that is the case. However it makes sense but it was not explicit during execution of the last master plan update. That can be remedied with an amendment to the master plan if desired.

It would behoove the county to evaluate the usefulness of the current neighborhood plans regarless of vintage. Not only should the county request public input and provide notice before retiring the plans individually, but the county should request input from the planning staff itself to understand best if any parts of the plans retain value, or have potential sections that if codified may solve current issues or concerns.

This might identify high value parts that maybe candidates for amendment to the master plan rather than keeping neighborhood plans.

Catherine Ventling
970.242 6655

Mesa County Google

Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

LDC comment edit: Reference and updates to Community Plans

Catherine Ventling <catherine.ventling@gmail.com> Mon, Jun 8, 2026 at 1:13 PM
To: Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Community Planning Areas

Clifton	Collbran and Plateau Valley	De Beque
Fruita	Gateway	Glade Park
Grand Junction	Loma	Mack
Mesa and Powderhorn	Orchard Mesa	Palisade
Redlands	Whitewater	

Through the 2026 version of the LDC updates, because all the Mesa County Area Community Plans (see above) are scheduled to be removed from the County's active planning framework and website, I believe an effort should be made to preserve the valuable community planning work they contain. **I recommend making some reference to the community plans in the LDC for awareness and creating an appendix to the Comprehensive Plan or Master Plan that retains relevant only portions of each Area Plan, including geographic descriptions, community values, natural and agricultural resources, and other locally significant characteristics.**

While regulatory provisions may be incorporated into the LDC over time, these Area Plans contain important historical context and community visioning that should remain available as a resource for future residents, property owners, elected officials, and planners.

Thank you for your consideration,

Catherine Ventling
970-242-6655

Mesa County Google

Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Request for adjustment to PRO2026-0197 Revocation of Community Neighborhood Plans

1 message

Suzanne <mesapzc@gmail.com> Sun, Sep 6, 2026 at 1:42 PM
To: Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Hi Greg,

Please submit this request for adjustments regarding above PRO#, as related to rescinding the Mesa/Powderhorn Plan specifically.

- In the proposed update for the Mesa Co Land Development Code, I recognize Village of Mesa Overlay District has its own callout.
- I urge the Planning Commission to understand inclusion is needed for the Mesa/Powderhorn connection as this community resides and works it as one.
- Page 40 of the Mesa/Powderhorn Plan has an important section on Visual Character. Given the large blocks of open land and historic/ongoing ranching operations, it's in the county's best interest to properly assist in sustaining this heritage, while growing this quality.
- Throughout the Mesa/Powderhorn Plan, the distinguishing key is understanding both ends of this area, Village of Mesa and Powderhorn, are the commercial areas. In-between is respected to keep its rural characteristic given its varying topography, ranching/farming operations, and scenic vistas.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarification.

Thanks,
Suzanne Malom

Mesa County Google

Greg Moberg <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Request to Retain and Update Plateau Valley Community Plans

Taylor Kelly <taylor@bluebirdranchconsulting.tech> Tue, Sep 1, 2026 at 7:57 AM
To: "greg.moberg@mesacounty.us" <greg.moberg@mesacounty.us>

Dear Mr. Moberg,

I am writing regarding Mesa County's proposed rescission of the existing community and neighborhood plans as part of the Land Development Code update.

I live in Plateau Valley, and I am asking the County not to simply rescind the community-specific planning guidance for Mesa, Powderhorn, Collbran, Grand Mesa, and the surrounding rural areas. Where these plans are outdated, I believe they should be updated with renewed community participation rather than eliminated.

I understand the County's position that portions of these older plans have been incorporated into the current Mesa County Master Plan and Land Development Code. However, incorporation of broad objectives is not necessarily the same as preservation of the locally specific policies contained in the original plans.

That distinction is particularly important in Plateau Valley.

Our communities are surrounded by working agricultural land, irrigation systems, limited groundwater resources, wildlife habitat, mountain terrain, narrow rural roads, and areas with limited infrastructure and emergency-service capacity. Mesa, Molina, Collbran, Powderhorn, and the unincorporated areas between them also have very different development patterns and needs.

The existing community plans recognize those differences in a way a countywide document cannot necessarily replicate.

For example, the Mesa/Powderhorn Community Plan establishes a planning area of approximately 29,096 acres while identifying the Mesa Rural Community as only approximately 257 acres and the Powderhorn Rural Community as approximately 2,560 acres. The remaining approximately 26,279 acres — more than 90% of the planning area — lie outside those designated rural communities.

That distinction provides important context for future development decisions. It recognizes that development appropriate within an established rural community may not necessarily be appropriate at the same scale or intensity throughout the surrounding agricultural and rural landscape.

The community plans also contain locally developed guidance concerning agriculture, rural character, wildlife and natural resources, transportation, infrastructure, economic development, community identity, and the appropriate location and intensity of future growth.

These are not abstract concerns for Plateau Valley residents. Decisions about development here can directly affect wells and water resources, irrigation, agricultural operations, traffic on rural roads, emergency response, schools, wildlife habitat, and the character of the valley.

I am particularly concerned because the current Mesa County Master Plan itself recognizes the value of this more detailed planning. In discussing existing rural community plans, the Master Plan acknowledges that they received more specific attention from their local communities than could be provided through a countywide planning process and states that existing community plans should be revisited to confirm alignment with the Master Plan.

I believe "revisited" is the appropriate approach.

If portions of these plans conflict with current regulations, update them.

If some provisions truly duplicate the Master Plan or Land Development Code, consolidate those provisions.

If circumstances or community priorities have changed since the plans were adopted, come back to Plateau Valley and ask residents what our priorities are today.

But where locally specific policies, geographic distinctions, development guidance, or community objectives have NOT been carried forward into the current Master Plan or Land Development Code, I respectfully ask that they not be

eliminated simply because the document containing them is old.

Before rescinding these plans, I would specifically ask the Community Development Department and Planning Commission to provide a comparison identifying:

• Which objectives and policies from each Plateau Valley-area community plan have been incorporated into the current Master Plan or Land Development Code;

• Where those provisions can now be found;

• Which locally specific policies, maps, boundaries, development patterns, or objectives would no longer constitute adopted planning guidance if the plans are rescinded; and

• Why rescission is preferable to formally updating and reconciling the existing community plans through a new public process.

If the County believes these plans are truly redundant, a provision-by-provision comparison should demonstrate that clearly.

If that comparison reveals that locally specific guidance would disappear, however, I believe residents deserve an opportunity to decide whether that guidance remains important before it is removed.

I would also encourage Mesa County to conduct outreach here in Plateau Valley before taking final action. A public hearing in Grand Junction is valuable, but it is not a substitute for engaging the communities whose individual plans are being eliminated.

Please consider holding a public meeting in Plateau Valley — ideally accessible to residents of Mesa, Molina, Collbran, Powderhorn, and the surrounding unincorporated areas — specifically addressing the future of these community plans.

This is not an argument against development or against updating Mesa County's Land Development Code.

It is an argument for maintaining meaningful local input in how development occurs.

Mesa County's own description of this process says these changes "set the framework for how future development happens across Mesa County."

That is precisely why I believe removing community-specific planning guidance deserves more scrutiny, not less.

Please update and revisit our community plans with the communities they represent rather than simply rescinding them.

The people who live, farm, ranch, work, raise families, and own property in Plateau Valley should continue to have a meaningful role in defining what appropriate growth looks like here.

Thank you for considering my comments and for forwarding them to the Mesa County Planning Commission as part of the public process.

Sincerely,

Taylor Kelly-Lottman
Plateau Valley Resident
CEO & Founder
Bluebird Ranch & Consulting

PROPOSED DRAFT RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL

MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION PC2026-2

REVOCATION OF COMMUNITY/NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

WHEREAS, the Mesa County Planning Commission is charged with the duty to prepare and adopt master plans for the Mesa County in accordance with C.R.S 30-28-108, and;

WHEREAS, the following Community, Area and Neighborhood Plans, herein known as the "Plans", are components of the Master Plan:

Clifton-Fruitvale Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2006-01)
Gateway Rural Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2004-02)
Glade Park Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2014-005)
Loma Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2009-001)
Mack Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2012-001)
Mesa/Powderhorn Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2013-002)
Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2014-002)
Redlands Area Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 1-002)
Whitewater Community Plan (Resolution No. MCPC 2011-004); and

WHEREAS, the Mesa County Planning Commission adopted these Plans; and

WHEREAS, circumstances, community needs, and planning priorities within the subject areas have evolved, rendering the goals, policies, objectives, and action items of the aforementioned plan outdated; and

WHEREAS, the Plans were adopted to provide policy guidance and visions for the development of the areas; and

WHEREAS, since the adoptions, key goals, policies, objectives, and action items of the Plans have been systematically incorporated and codified into the Land Development and the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the codification of the specific goals, policies, objectives, and action items elevates them from advisory to regulatory; and

WHEREAS, maintaining the Plans creates unnecessary regulatory redundancy and potential ambiguity between the advisory documents and enforceable code; and

WHEREAS, the primary objective of the Plans was, over time, to review the goals, policies, objectives, and action items and codify those preferred elements formally establishing the desired vision;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION IN THE COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO:

Draft

THAT the with the adoption of this resolution, Mesa County Planning Commission Resolution No. MCPC 2006-01, Resolution No. MCPC 2004-02, Resolution No. MCPC 2014-005), Resolution No. MCPC 2009-001, Resolution No. MCPC 2012-001, Resolution No. MCPC 2013-002, Resolution No. MCPC 2014-002, Resolution No. MCPC 1-002, and Resolution No. MCPC 2011-004 are rescinded

.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 19th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026.

CLIFTON ANSON, CHAIR MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION	NINA HUTCHINS, SECRETARY MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Draft