

To access the Agenda and Backup Materials electronically, go to [www.gjcity.org](http://www.gjcity.org)



**PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP AGENDA  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM  
CITY HALL, 250 N 5<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2024 - 12:00 PM  
*Attend virtually:* [bit.ly/GJ-PCW-2024](https://bit.ly/GJ-PCW-2024)**

**Call to Order - 12:00 PM**

1. Discussion Regarding Zone District Setbacks in the Zoning and Development Code

**Other Business**

**Adjournment**



**Grand Junction Planning Commission**

**Workshop Session**

**Item #1.**

---

|                             |                              |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b><u>Meeting Date:</u></b> | November 21, 2024            |
| <b><u>Presented By:</u></b> | Thomas Lloyd, Senior Planner |
| <b><u>Department:</u></b>   | Community Development        |
| <b><u>Submitted By:</u></b> | Thomas Lloyd, Senior Planner |

---

**Information**

**SUBJECT:**

Discussion Regarding Zone District Setbacks in the Zoning and Development Code

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Discussion Regarding Zone District Setbacks in the Zoning and Development Code

**BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:**

With approval of the new Zoning and Development Code, the removal of the Form District Zone process removed some flexibility in terms of setbacks and the opportunity for applicants to reduce their front and street-side setbacks. Since the change, staff have heard from members of the development community who are interested in attaining more flexibility when it comes to front and street-side setbacks for new development in order to develop in ways consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Staff is circling back to this discussion that was previously started earlier this year at the January workshop.

**Options**

At the previous workshop, the Planning Commission identified the need for there to be changes to street-side setbacks on corner lots. The updates to the Zoning and Development Code gave the applicant flexibility to determine the location of the front on

a corner lot, with the intent that this would be beneficial based on site context and the anticipated plans for the site. However, this new provision did not account for the historic street-side setback, which is the same as the front. While choosing the front has other benefits, this precludes any benefits for a side setback reduction.

The first revision for discussion is for the modification of the street-side setback. Staff is proposing two options.

- Removing the street-side setback altogether and just having one consistent side yard setback.
- Keep a street-side setback but reduce it to 1.5 times the side yard setback. This would still create some flexibility in the design of sites but mitigate some potential impacts of having buildings closer to the property line along a roadway at or near an intersection, which is why they were initially created.

The second provision for discussion is regarding the vehicle storage front setback language found in the notes of the bulk standards for the RM-8, RM-12, RH-16, and RH-24, as well as the front-loading garage setback requirements for attached single-family dwellings. The code already has language for off-street parking design and stall dimension, as well as considerations for on-street and off-lot parking requirements. Rather than complicating the setback provisions, staff proposes that the vehicle storage front setback note be removed and for vehicle storage to be governed by off-street parking standards.

The final discussion topic is the reduction of front setbacks in specific or all zone districts. It was discussed how the reduction of the front setback would give applicants more flexibility in how their site is laid out and help the City further realize its goals in the Comprehensive Plan related to improving walkability, increasing density in urban areas, creating a sense of community and belonging, promoting mixed-use development, and promoting economic growth. Staff is providing the following options for consideration:

- **Option 1:** Remove or greatly reduce the front setback requirement in RM-8, RM-12, RH-16, RH-24, MU-1, MU-2, MU-3, and CG Zone Districts. These are the zoning districts with more density and different housing types that could benefit from this flexibility. However, whether there is a need for a MPE for dry utilities would ultimately decide where structures could be built.

While this option appears to provide a great deal of flexibility, the site itself as well as the requirements for utility easements would create constraints that limit the 'setback' of the building. It will be important to consider how this affects predictability in the development process and that accurate communication to applicants about potential requirements is made up-front.

- **Option 2:** Do not revise setbacks and create an Administrative Setback Reduction Process in the Ordinance that requires certain criteria to be met. This process would consider the potential site constraints outlined in Option 1 and create a review process by which the appropriate agencies would sign off on the deviations or elimination of the easements. It would be similar to a TEDS exception or Tract Usage Adjustment.

This process would essentially be the reverse of Option 1 but would allow for the standards in a zone district to be established unless an administrative request can be granted. It would allow for a collaborative approach with staff to work towards providing an exception where the site conditions and proposed design are appropriate.

- **Option 3:** Reduce front setbacks in the aforementioned zoning districts from 15 ft to 10 ft. The minimum MPE per TEDS street section alternatives is 10 ft. This would eliminate concerns about whether the MPE would be affected. There could also be an Administrative Setback Reduction Process in the Ordinance if certain criteria are met.

**SUGGESTED MOTION:**

This item is for discussion purposes only.

**Attachments**

None