

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
February 10, 2026, 5:30 PM
MINUTES

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 5:34 p.m. by Chair Sandra Weckerly.

Those present were Planning Commissioners; Orin Zyvan, Robert Quintero, Ian Moore, Ian Thomas, Greg Palmer, and Caleb Abeloe.

Also present were James Campbell (Staff Attorney), Thomas Lloyd (Planning Manager), Daniella Acosta Stine (Principal Planner), Kathryn Phillips (City Development Engineer), Jacob Kaplan (Planning Technician), and Madeline Robinson (Planning Technician).

There were 48 members of the public in attendance, and 5 virtually.

Chair Weckerly noted that items 5 and 6 were being pulled from this agenda for future consideration at a date uncertain.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of Previous Meeting(s) from January 27, 2026.

Commissioner Quintero moved to approve the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Moore seconded; motion passed 7-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. 370/374 29 Rd Rezone

RZN-2025-466

Consider a Request by Don L. Balerio Sr., Pauline M. Gallegos, and Merle W. Weaver to Rezone Approximately 12.89 Acres From RM-8 (Residential Medium 8) to RM-12 (Residential Medium 12), Located at 370 and 374 29 Road.

Staff Presentation

Thomas Lloyd, Planning Manager, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Kim Kerk, with Kim Kerk Land Consulting and Development, provided some context for the rezone request and was available for questions. She noted that the current request was only for the rezone and there were no plans for future development at this time.

Questions for Staff

Commissioner Palmer asked staff to address a public comment about the viability of 29 Rd to handle any additional traffic generated by future development.

Commissioner Moore clarified that the parcels were currently separate.

Public Hearing

The public comment period was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, via www.gjcity.org.

There were no comments from the public either in attendance or online.

The public comment period was closed at 5:54 p.m. on February 10, 2026.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Commission.

The public hearing was closed at 5:54 p.m. on February 10, 2026.

Discussion

Commissioner Zyvan commented that 29 Rd is an arterial road and should be able to accommodate the additional traffic from future development.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Zyvan made the following motion “Madam Chairman, on the Rezone request for the property located at 370 and 374 29 Road, City file number RZN-2025-466, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Quintero seconded; motion passed 7-0.

2. Kimball-Noland Rezone **RZN-2025-551**

Consider a request by Enlightened Real Estate Fund, LLC to rezone approximately 1.75 acres from Commercial General (CG) lying within the Greater Downtown Commercial Overlay and Industrial Light (I-1) parcels to Mixed-Use Light Commercial (MU-2) including Lots 1 - 16, and Lots 23 – 32 all within Block 10 of the Amended Plat of Benton Canon’s First Subdivision less those portions conveyed to the City of Grand Junction. The parcels are addressed as 711, 717, 721, 739, 741, and 761 Noland Avenue; 706 Kimball Avenue; 1122 S. 7th Street; along with parcels numbered 2945-231-16-004, 2945-231-16-008, 2945-231-16-031, and 2945-231-16-021.

Staff Presentation

Thomas Lloyd, Planning Manager, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Kim Kerk, with Kim Kerk Land Consulting and Development, provided some context for the rezone request and was available for questions.

Questions for Staff

Chair Weckerly asked about the limited access to the parcels on Kimball Ave and if staff thought that would present challenges for future development.

Public Hearing

The public comment period was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, via www.gjcity.org.

There were no comments from the public either in attendance or online.

The public comment period was closed at 6:15 p.m. on February 10, 2026.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Commission.

The public hearing was closed at 6:15 p.m. on February 10, 2026.

Discussion

Commissioners Moore and Quintero indicated their approval of the rezone.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Quintero made the following motion “Madam Chair, on the rezone 1.75 acres from Commercial General (CG) lying within the Greater Downtown Commercial Overlay and Industrial Light (I-1) parcels to Mixed-Use Light Commercial (MU-2) including Lots 1 - 16, and Lots 23 – 32 all within Block 10 of the Amended Plat of Benton Canon’s First Subdivision less those portions conveyed to the City of Grand Junction City file number RZN-2025-551, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Weckerly noted that her earlier question was only to ensure there could be adequate access at time of development.

Commissioner Palmer seconded; motion passed 6-0. Commissioner Thomas did not indicate favor or opposition.

3. Zoning Code Amendments – Q1 2026 ZCA-2026-26

Consider a request by the City of Grand Junction to amend Sections of the Zoning and Development Code (Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code) regarding Right-of-way Dedication, Acceptable Plant Material, and Street Frontage Landscape.

Staff Presentation

Tim Lehrbach, Principal Planner, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Questions for Staff

Commissioner Zyvan asked why 14 feet was the standard width for street frontage landscaping. He asked why the landscaping requirement was being preserved for collector and arterial street classifications.

Public Hearing

The public comment period was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, via www.gjcity.org.

There were no comments from the public either in attendance or online.

The public comment period was closed at 6:31 p.m. on February 10, 2026.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Commission.

The public hearing was closed at 6:31 p.m. on February 10, 2026.

Discussion

Commissioners Palmer and Zyvan expressed their appreciation for the staff's efforts.

Commissioner Moore and Chair Weckerly expressed interest in a future discussion about reducing the street frontage landscaping requirements along collector and arterial roads.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Quintero made the following motion "Madam Chair, on the request to amend Title 21 Zoning and Development Code of the Grand Junction Municipal Code, City file number ZCA-2026-26, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the finding of fact listed in the staff report."

Commissioner Zyvan seconded; motion passed 7-0.

4. Camelback Gardens ODP **PLD-2023-121**

Consider a request by Camelback Gardens, LLC and Upland Homes, Inc for Review and Approval of a Planned Development (PD) Outline Development Plan (ODP) for the Camelback Gardens Development Proposed on a Total 10.29 Acres Located at 381 and 409 High Desert Road.

Chair Weckerly stated that she owned property that abutted the subject parcels but did not feel that this would impact her decisions on the request.

Staff Presentation

Daniella Acosta Stine, Principal Planner, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Applicant Mike Stubbs provided some context for the request and was available for questions.

Applicant Scott Preisendorf gave a presentation on the request and was available for questions.

Questions for Staff

Commissioner Quintero asked how preserved open space was evaluated for accessibility and usability.

Commissioner Moore asked for clarification on what land was exchanged between the applicants and the City. He asked why the City-owned open space was used for calculating density within the future PD. He asked what would happen if the ODP was not adopted or if it lapsed in the future.

Commissioner Zyvan asked what the total acreage is for the PD.

Commissioner Abeloe asked if the proposed PD was consistent with the previous PD. He asked what the allowed maximum density was under the previous PD.

Commissioner Palmer asked if the number of variances being requested was unusual. He asked if the 40-foot maximum height was standard.

Public Hearing

The public comment period was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, via www.gjcity.org.

Chris Mcanany commented on the proposed density, compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, and minimum open space requirements. He urged the Commission to vote “no” on the request.

Carol Bierbowe expressed concerns with increased traffic created by this development and inadequate pedestrian infrastructure [sidewalks] on Rana Rd.

Rick Beauheim expressed concerns with increased traffic on Rana Rd. He suggested that High Desert Rd and Rana Rd should terminate in cul-de-sacs on Lots 1 & 2 respectively. He also suggested limiting the allowed density to RL-4 and disallowing the development to include the City-owned open space in the density calculations.

Bill Larsen speculated that future development would adversely impact drainage on Rana Rd. He also advised looking into future challenges with irrigation.

Jane Huston echoed the previous comments on safety, density, irrigation, and drainage and requested the density be capped at RL-4 without consideration of the City-owned open space.

Lisa Howfield commented that this hearing was not appropriately advertised. She shared her concerns about the increased traffic and the incongruity with the surrounding area.

Ken Delay agreed with the previous comments regarding drainage, inadequate pedestrian and vehicle infrastructure, and increased traffic on Rana Rd.

John Hatch agreed with the previous comments and added that Rana Rd doesn't have shoulders nor sidewalks.

Rick Garcia urged the commission to deny the ODP for Camelback Gardens. He disagreed with the use of the City-owned open space for density calculations. He requested a property value study and a traffic impact study be done prior to any development in Camelback Gardens. He argued that connecting High Desert Rd and Rana Rd would increase traffic and pollution for the surrounding area.

Chris Hines expressed his concerns with the use of the City-owned open space to calculate density. He commented that the topography on these parcels is largely undevelopable and the City gained nothing through the land exchange.

Ralph Wahlers expressed concerns with the 40-foot building height possibility. He commented that dead-end streets have lower crime rates due to their limited access and circulation. He echoed the previous comments on the mismatch of proposed development types and drainage on Rana Rd.

Dee Wernette commented on the bottleneck of traffic at the intersection of Ridges Blvd and Broadway and that it would be exacerbated by connection of Rana Rd. He wondered about the precedent being set for future density of similar areas.

Tyler Urnquist echoed the previous comments on crime statistics, lack of pedestrian infrastructure, increased noise, the City-owned open space being used in density calculations, and erosion on Rana Rd. He added that small parks/open spaces often go unused by the surrounding property owners. He suggested no high-density housing, no multifamily units, and no attached units.

Leanne Mumpy commented on the wildlife and suggested wildlife corridors.

Bill Gulley noted that he likes his yard and outdoor recreation. He agreed with the suggestion of cul-de-sacs. He echoed concerns about stormwater runoff and suggested an engineering firm be hired to evaluate underground detention.

Susan Bierman commented on the limited parking availability on Rockwood Ln. She noted there was no public or guest parking shown in Mr. Preisendorf's presentation.

Brendon Shuey agreed with the previous comments on setbacks, building height, grading, density along property edges, and character of outdoor spaces. He proposed increased setbacks, stronger buffering, or density stepdown.

Dana Nkana commented that he moved to the area because it was quiet and had a low volume of traffic.

The public comment period was closed at 8:25 p.m. on February 10, 2026.

Mike Stubbs stated that many of the issues brought up in the public's comments would be addressed at time of subdivision.

Jamie Beard noted that the amended plat for The Ridges Filing 6 showed a proposed density for the subject parcels as 4 dwelling units per acre and that she was not aware of any amendments to allow 120 units to be constructed as Mr. Stubbs had indicated previously. She elaborated that the 2 lots that are now "Camelback Gardens" were never designated as multifamily or high-density developments on any previous plat.

The Commissioners asked Jamie about the approved density of the previous PD and the use of the City-owned open space to meet the open space requirements for clustering and other deviations from bulk standards.

Commissioner Quintero asked Kathryn Phillips if a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) had been done to evaluate the impact on Rana Rd. He asked what happens if a TIS shows a traffic impact beyond what the existing and proposed infrastructure could accommodate.

Chair Weckerly asked Kathryn Phillips if the City would require the developer to construct a connection between High Desert Rd and Rana Rd. She asked if clustering had an impact on the allowed density.

Commissioner Moore asked about the standards for using open space to calculate density and if using the City-owned open space was unusual.

Commissioner Palmer asked about the differences between the RL-4 and RL-5 zone districts.

Commissioner Abeloe asked if this request would have been approved under the previous PD. He asked what the maximum allowed unit count would be at the RL-4 density when including the City-owned open space.

Commissioner Zyvan asked for clarification on the conditional approval stated in the staff report. He also asked for clarification on what City Council had already approved for this ODP.

Commissioner Thomas asked about sidewalk requirements.

The public hearing was closed at 8:59 p.m. on February 10, 2026.

Discussion

There were comments from the Commission regarding infill development, concerns over traffic accidents, the TEDS exception for sidewalks, interconnectivity and pedestrian infrastructure, City Council approving the use of City-owned open space, building heights, and the specific design and density outlined in the ODP.

Commissioner Moore clarified for the record that the public comments and staff recommendations would be re-reviewed before this item was brought to City Council.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Quintero made the following motion “Madam Chair, on the Planned Development (PD) Outline Development Plan (ODP) for the proposed Camelback Gardens development that will rezone a property from PD to PD and establish an overall PD ODP for the entire property for the property located at 381 and 409 High Desert Road, City file number PLD-2023-121, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the Findings of Fact and imposition of an expiration date on the ODP of December 31, 2043, as listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Abeloe seconded; motion passed 6-1.

5. Zoning Code Amendment – Significant Trees ZCA-2026-51

Consider a request by the Housing Affordability Code Task Force to amend Sections of the Zoning and Development Code (Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code) regarding Significant Trees.

The applicant requested this item be pulled from this agenda for future consideration at a date uncertain.

6. Zoning Code Amendment – Certified Irrigation Designers ZCA-2026-50

Consider a request by the Housing Affordability Code Task Force to amend Sections of the Zoning and Development Code (Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code) regarding Certified Irrigation Designer.

The applicant requested this item be pulled from this agenda for future consideration at a date uncertain.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Quintero made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

The vote to adjourn was 7-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.