

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
AUGUST 9, 2011 MINUTES  
6:00 p.m. to 7:28 p.m.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Wall. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Reggie Wall (Chair), Lynn Pavelka (Vice Chair), Pat Carlow, Ebe Eslami, Rob Burnett, Lyn Benoit, and Greg Williams (Alternate). Commissioner Mark Abbott was absent.

In attendance, representing the City's Public Works and Planning Department – Planning Division, were Greg Moberg (Planning Services Supervisor), Scott Peterson (Senior Planner) and Eric Hahn (Development Engineer).

Also present was Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney).

Lynn Singer was present to record the minutes.

There were 25 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

**Announcements, Presentations, and/or Prescheduled Visitors**

None.

**Consent Agenda**

**1. Minutes of Previous Meetings**

Approve the minutes of the June 14, 2011 Regular Meeting.

**2. Community Hospital Rezone - Rezone**

Request a recommendation of approval to City Council to rezone 40 acres from a City MU (Mixed Use) to a City BP (Business Park Mixed Use) zone district.

**FILE #:** RZN-2011-990  
**PETITIONER:** Chris Thomas – Colorado West Health Care System  
**LOCATION:** 2373 G Road  
**STAFF:** Greg Moberg

**3. Off-Premise Sign (Billboard) Appeal – Appeal of Director's Decision – Continued from June 28, 2011 Planning Commission Hearing – moved to Consent Agenda**

Appeal of Director's Decision pursuant to Section 21.02.210(c), Appeal of Final Action on Administrative Development Permits, regarding denial for an administrative permit to construct a sign at 515 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

**FILE #:** APL-2011-863  
**PETITIONER:** Thomas Volkmann – Spiecker, Hanlon, Gormley and Volkmann  
**LOCATION:** 515 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
**STAFF:** Lisa Cox

**4. Off-Premise Sign (Billboard) Appeal – Appeal of Director’s Decision – Continued from June 28, 2011 Planning Commission Hearing – moved to Consent Agenda**

Appeal of Director’s Decision pursuant to Section 21.02.210(c), Appeal of Final Action on Administrative Development Permits, regarding denial for an administrative permit to construct a sign at 610 West Gunnison Avenue.

**FILE #:** APL-2011-864  
**PETITIONER:** Tim Murray – CWOA Inc.  
**LOCATION:** 610 West Gunnison Avenue  
**STAFF:** Lisa Cox

**5. Off-Premise Sign (Billboard) Appeal – Appeal of Director’s Decision – moved to Consent Agenda**

Appeal of Director’s Decision pursuant to Section 21.02.210(c), Appeal of Final Action on Administrative Development Permits, regarding revocation of an administrative permit to construct a sign at 715 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

**FILE #:** APL-2011-927  
**PETITIONER:** Thomas Volkmann – Spiecker, Hanlon, Gormley and Volkmann  
**LOCATION:** 715 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
**STAFF:** Lisa Cox

**MOTION: (Commissioner Benoit) “Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that the Consent Agenda be approved as submitted.”**

Commissioner Pavelka seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7 - 0.

**NOTE: Regarding items 3) APL-2011-863, 4) APL-2011-864 and 5) APL-2011-927: These items are not approved but have been postponed to a date uncertain.**

**Public Hearing Items**

**6. Casas de Luz – Planned Development**

Request recommendation of approval to City Council of an Amendment to the previously Amended Zoning Ordinance 2596 for the Ridges Planned Development to develop a total of 20 dwelling units on 1.88 acres and request a recommendation of approval to City Council to Vacate a Public Right-of-Way and Utility and Drainage Easement.

**FILE #:** PLD-2010-259  
**PETITIONER:** Robert Stubbs – Dynamic Investments Inc.  
**LOCATION:** West Ridges Blvd at School Ridge Road  
**STAFF:** Scott Peterson

A PowerPoint presentation was made by Scott Peterson, Senior Planner with the Public Works and Planning Department, regarding the request to amend the original Planned Development Zoning Ordinance for the Ridges Subdivision for 10 existing lots for a new residential development. In addition, the applicant had requested vacation of excess right-of-way and utility and drainage easements no longer necessary as part of the residential development. Mr. Peterson identified that the existing properties were located along West Ridges Boulevard near the Redlands Mesa Golf Course. The aerial photo showed that the subject properties were adjacent to current single-family attached and one detached housing unit directly to the north. The photo also showed that the area of the requested right-of-way vacation along West Ridges Boulevard.

Mr. Peterson said that the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the Blended Residential Map indicated the area to be designated as Residential Medium – 4 to 8 dwelling units per acre – and the Blended Residential Map also indicated the Residential Medium category of 4 to 16 dwelling units per acre. He stated the current zoning was Planned Development and under the current Ridges Planned Development each platted lot as part of the development application was designated for a maximum of 2 dwelling units within the overall PD.

The Ridges, originally approved as a Planned Unit Development by Mesa County in the late 1970s, provided approximately 85 acres of open space in Filings 1 through 6, numerous parks of various sizes and a network of detached multi-use trails throughout the development. The approved PUD included a mix of land uses, included a variety of housing types, offices and neighborhood Commercial uses. In 1992 the developed and undeveloped areas of the Ridges were annexed into the City limits and upon annexation an amended plan and zoning ordinance for the Ridges were adopted. The plan allocated the remaining allowable dwelling units to the undeveloped parcels including the multi-family parcels.

Mr. Peterson said the Casas de Luz properties were designated as A lots with a density of 2 family dwelling units per each platted lot; however, it was specifically noted on the plat that the same area could be developed also as a multi-family area. The proposed site plan depicted four filings or phases. He advised the Commission that the applicant had requested to re-subdivide the existing 10 lots and create new residential lots, tracts and stacked condominium units for a total of 20 dwelling units. It was anticipated the new subdivision would be completed over 4 phases.

The proposed development would be subject to the provisions of the Zoning and Development Code except as deviated by the approved Casas de Luz plan to be adopted as part of this amended ordinance. Mr. Peterson said the proposed plan would have a mixture of two family, multi-family and/or single-family detached dwelling units.

As proposed, some of the multi-family dwellings would be stacked and would require approval of a Condominium Map if individual units would be sold. He said the building footprint for each dwelling unit in Filings 1, 2 and 4 would be a lot with the multi-family lots as proposed as stacked dwelling units in Filing 3. All areas outside the building footprint would be dedicated as tracts for maintenance responsibilities by the homeowner's association.

Access for the proposed plan would be from West Ridges Boulevard in three distinct locations with proposed internal access by way of shared drives and parking areas or tracts maintained by the homeowner's association. Mr. Peterson outlined the proposed phasing schedule as: The first phase to be completed on or before December 31, 2014; second phase by December 2017; the third phase by 2019; and the fourth phase by 2021.

He next pointed out that as this was an amendment to the original Planned Development Ordinance for the Ridges, a community benefit was not required for this development; however, an amendment for the subject property provided a community benefit by providing a needed housing type with innovative design and utilization of the topography of the site. The design would incorporate elements of cluster units to allow for a more private open space within the development. The development would also provide for more effective use of infrastructure by eliminating public right-of-way and using the three shared accesses to serve the 20 dwelling units which would significantly minimize the impact onto West Ridges Boulevard.

The default zoning for the PD zone, if the first phases for the development were not completed and the amended plan lapsed, then the amended ordinance for Casas de Luz would have no force and effect and the previous ordinance from 1992 would then be in full force and effect; however, if the first phase was completed but the entire plan was not completed, then the Casas de Luz development plan proposed a default zone of R-8.

Mr. Peterson next identified the dimensional standards for the R-8 zone district would then be in effect. He advised that applicant had requested certain deviations regarding the building setbacks whereby the proposed plan applied the front and rear setbacks to the exterior boundary of the subject property rather than individual lots. The front yard setbacks were proposed to be deviated further – the front yard setback would be 15 feet for Filing 1; 11 feet for Filing 2; and 16 feet for Filing 4. Standard setbacks to the exterior boundary would apply. He said that staff found the reduced setbacks were reasonable as there was additional right-of-way along the Casas de Luz property and it was not likely to be developed as roadway because of the detached trail that was in part of the Ridges plan for the Planned Development.

The trail and additional green space would provide a similar appearance to the area as would the standard setbacks. He next advised that the West Ridges Boulevard was dedicated as an 80-foot wide right-of-way whereas normal residential streets would

typically be a 52-foot right-of-way and, therefore, staff recommended approval of the setback deviations to the front yard.

The proposed landscaping plan included a total of 33 trees and 212 shrubs along with granite, stone mulch and dry land grass seed mix in the open space tract areas which were in conformance with the Zoning Code.

Mr. Peterson next brought up another deviation requested by applicant – building height. By the existing PD ordinance, the maximum height for a multi-family dwelling was 40 feet and for a single-family attached and detached, including a two-family dwelling unit, was 25 feet. With the proposed plan, only two single-family detached and attached dwellings were taller than originally allowed by the Ridges PD; however, the multi-family units were shorter than what would be allowed. The clustering of the buildings opened more space between the buildings to reduce the overall obstruction of views. In addition, the applicant had taken into consideration the appropriate height for each building within the development. Applicant and staff agreed that the development as proposed was reasonable considering the topography of the site. The immediate surrounding area and all buildings were at least 5 feet below the allowable possible 40-foot height for a multi-family unit.

Mr. Peterson advised that the applicant had also requested the vacation of a dedicated frontage road and utility and drainage easements that were not needed with the proposed development. The City would retain the existing 10-foot utility easement adjacent to West Ridges Boulevard. The existing frontage road provided access for 7 of the existing 10 lots; the frontage road provided a separate ingress/egress point for each lot without impacting traffic movements on West Ridges Boulevard; however, since this development modified existing lot configuration with three access points, the frontage road was no longer necessary with the exception of maintaining of the multi-purpose easement along the remaining right-of-way for utilities. With regard to the easements, he said that they were not necessary for development and some interfered with the location of buildings with the proposed development. Also, existing easements did not contain any public utilities in the areas to be vacated.

In conclusion, he stated the requested amendments to the amended Ridges Planned Development Ordinance were consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the applicable review criteria of the Zoning Code had been met for the amendment of the PD ordinance and the review criteria had also been met as pertaining to the vacation of those portions of the utility and drainage easements identified and the right-of-way for the frontage road and further conditioned on recordation with the Clerk and Recorder of the plat with the first phase of the plan retaining an existing 10-foot multi-purpose easement.

**QUESTIONS**

Chairman Wall asked for clarification pertaining to the building heights and asked if the whole portion would be underground or if it would just be the front part. Scott Peterson

said that the stacked units would be part of the garage and they would be level on the front but then recessed in the back.

Chairman Wall asked for a review of the setbacks related to Filings 1, 2 and 4 and wanted to know what the difference applicant had asked for. Mr. Peterson said normally in a residential zone the front yard setback would be 20 feet; however, since there was excess right-of-way plus a detached sidewalk with a landscaping strip, staff found the requested deviation for the front yard setback to be appropriate.

Commissioner Williams also asked for clarification regarding the current zoning code and would it allow a single-family to be a maximum of 25 feet. Mr. Peterson said that was per the Ridges Planned Ordinance but with the straight R-8 zone it could be up to 40 feet. The applicant was basically requesting a deviation from the Ridges Planned Development zone to be specific to each property.

### **APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION**

Rebekah Mandrop, 251 West Water Circle, Fruita, stated there was a public benefit that was offered with the proposal – mainly the ideals presented in architectural design they would be able to cluster the units rather than have duplex units across the board. This would allow for open corridors between the buildings and would allow for the landscaping for the overall development. The drainage too was overall rather than individual units. Ms. Mandrop confirmed that it was the owner's intent to create a community that was rich in beauty that had visual appeal and was a public benefit. According to Rebekah, a neighborhood meeting was held on September 8, 2010. The impact of the neighbors was considered by the proposal. Pockets of landscaping would be allowed with this proposal that would not be allowed if the duplex units were installed as currently platted.

### **QUESTIONS**

Chairman Wall asked for an explanation regarding the drainage being overall rather than individual. Ms. Mandrop said that all of the drainage was incorporated. She added that right now they were separately platted lots so each individual lot would need to take care of their own drainage; however, the drainage of the whole site had been incorporated both in the landscaping plan, into the design of the buildings, the topography was also taken into consideration. There would be some stream beds that went all the way across the length of the property which would be landscaped around with different features.

Commissioner Eslami asked if there would be just one lot. Ms. Mandrop said that was her understanding as well. Eric Hahn, City Development Engineer, said the easiest way to compare would be single-family residential lots as a standard subdivision as compared to a site plan for the entire site as one incorporated drainage plan.

Commissioner Williams asked if the height restriction was 40 feet to the very top of every structure on the multi-family structures. Ms. Mandrop confirmed the height shown in staff's presentation showed the very top of any feature.

Commissioner Benoit asked if they were essentially four-story structures. Ms. Mandrop confirmed there was a garage and structures on top of that.

Commissioner Benoit asked how one would access their condominium unit and was there only one access point in each building. Ms. Mandrop said she was not sure that had been finalized at this point but there were access points of stairwells as well as an elevator in each building.

Chairman Wall asked how far the entrance and exit for Filing 1 were down from the median in the middle of the road. As there were some significant concerns raised regarding site distance at that point, Mr. Hahn advised that the City Transportation Engineer was asked to send out a technician to do an analysis and their conclusion was that the site distance would be fine provided that all landscaping was continued to be kept under 30 inches in height.

Chairman Wall voiced his concern that the existing landscaping covered a lot of length of the median and was concerned with cars coming down the hill and someone exiting left out of the entrance. Eric Hahn stated he believed the analysis at the Transportation engineer's office was a requirement to see at least 325 feet which in this instance could easily be done. He stated that provided the landscaping stayed below 30 inches, the visibility was surprisingly good.

Commissioner Benoit asked if the existing shrubbery at the curb line at Ridges Boulevard would remain there. Eric Hahn said that was also analyzed and addressed in the analysis from the City's Transportation Engineer's Office with the same conclusion – that it would have to be removed and/or lowered but, provided that occurred, the site distance was very good.

Chairman Wall asked if that would be more of the responsibility of the homeowner's association or a City responsibility. Eric Hahn said that in reality in most cases it was the City that would be called to take care of that.

### **APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION**

Mike Stubbs, president of Dynamic Investments, the applicant, said that he had 25 years of history with this. It was his understanding that under the Ridges Amended Plan, heights were established for the existing A, B and C lots at 25 feet. The standard for multi-family development was purposefully not adopted in the Amended Plan and it was also his understanding that it was the staff's and the City's opinion that they wanted to not have different sets of rules going forward with new development but rather they should follow the current City code and current City standards. He read into the record two pertinent paragraphs within the Amended Plan. He reiterated that current City standards for both an R-4 and an R-8 were 40-foot height limitations for both single-family, duplex and multi-family. They had proposed far lower on all of the buildings. He believed the lots were no longer A lots due to the re-platting and, therefore, there was no height standard established. Taking into consideration the topography, they made

sure that homes were at the 28-foot height standard for Filing 1 and all of the units behind were developed to a multi-family replat. He discussed the height limitations and standards and how they were applied to this development. Also, with regard to the condominium buildings, there would be a drive-in underground garage with two and one-half stories which could be seen by the neighbors behind.

### **QUESTIONS**

Rick Thurtle, 2343 B Rattlesnake Court, adjacent to the proposed subdivision, said both he and his wife had attended the neighborhood meeting and stated that in some ways they agreed that in some ways it would be good for the community but in many ways believed it was not. He read into the record a letter previously provided to the Commission which was a formal request by some citizens of the Rattlesnake Court community for denial of the requested proposed Planned Development. Some points cited were that the applicant had not established how the proposed development would benefit current Rattlesnake residents. It was their opinion that it would adversely affect residents due to lack of adequate buffering from existing homes; lack of privacy; and may have a negative effect on passive solar capabilities.

Additionally, the proposal violated the adopted bulk standards of the Ridges Planned Development. He added that the site plan was not consistent with the covenants which allowed for no more than two units per lot. Mr. Thurtle next discussed the building height of some of the proposed buildings as well as the elevators.

An additional concern was impending traffic on West Ridges Boulevard and ingress and egress in the area could lead to traffic safety issues for those entering and exiting Redlands Mesa Golf Course and the surrounding homes.

Concerns were also raised regarding whether the proposed development was adequately funded to carry through to completion and the requested timetable was simply too long for residents in the area to be living in a construction zone. The recent economic downturn in Mesa County had caused a decline in real estate values in the area and a more than 10-year window to complete the project was not acceptable to nearby residents.

Many citizens were concerned that the development may cause building shift in the soil under the homes. The landscaping involved would not be a community improvement to everyone and they deemed it to be unacceptable. The multi-family stacked four-story units were a concern and were also deemed to be unacceptable. The views would be taken away. He also believed the density was a little bit too thick, the height was not acceptable and the cost per square foot was concerning.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Carlow asked what covenants Mr. Thurtle made reference to. Mr. Thurtle said it was the Ridges Subdivision. Jamie Beard, Assistant City Attorney, said that these particular lots were originally designated as A lots when they were platted.



However, the plat itself indicated this same area could be developed as multi-family and the plat would have been considered a portion of the original plan.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Rick Thurtle said their main concern was the height issue.

**QUESTIONS**

Chairman Wall wanted clarification regarding the height issue. Rick Thurtle confirmed that the height could be 40 feet. Jamie Beard confirmed that because they can develop this particular area as a multi-family area, the multi-family isn't specific in the amended plan for the Ridges area. It said that it was directed to what the Zoning and Development Code allowed for at that time. As the Zoning and Development Code at this point, based on what they would be allowed to develop in this particular area, would allow for a 40-foot height building.

Chairman Wall asked if he was correct that Mr. Thurtle's position was that the 40-foot height was not consistent with the area. Rick Thurtle said that although it was consistent with current Code, it was not acceptable to the neighbors.

Commissioner Burnett asked a question regarding the sales price as referenced by Mr. Thurtle. Rick Thurtle said that he learned from the September 8<sup>th</sup> meeting that the units would be between \$250-300,000 each with the square footage ranging from 1800 to 2200 including the garage. Chairman Wall interjected that the size and/or cost of the units were irrelevant to this conversation at this time.

Commissioner Benoit asked if there were any other four-story buildings in the area. Mr. Thurtle stated there were none to the best of his knowledge.

Carole Chowen (2342 Rattlesnake Court, Unit B) added that the drawings presented by Mr. Peterson and confirmed by the developer's drawings made the case that Mr. Thurtle presented. She said the people who lived in the solar homes might lose some of their solar capabilities and would literally have to climb up on their roofs to get a view. She added that the areas in between would not benefit from this development. She asked the Commission to look at and consider the solar aspect as well as the high rise development being considered.

Sue Carbone, 2337 B Rattlesnake Court, said that she currently lived behind where Phase 1 would occur and reiterated what Rick Thurtle had stated and added that when she purchased her home in 1987 she never envisioned there would be a two-story home less than 10 feet behind her fence. She asked that the Commission to take a look at this plan and look at building heights and corridors.

Claudia McBride (3092 Hoisington) said that she and her husband had a unit at 2337 Rattlesnake Court #A. She had been a builder and a developer in the Grand Junction area since 1979. She identified her first development in Fruita to be similar in that the garages were down below and the structures were up above. It was also in a very, very

steep location. She explained that the soils and ridges did not have a good reputation so the soils made a lot of cracks and affected the units. She stated one of her major concerns about this project was the erosion from the surface water. She believed there would be a good possibility there would be large ruts which could turn into making the structures unstable. Also, access and the ability to keep railings and walkways in good condition may also be affected. She hoped that a reasonable thing to do was to go with a lower density and to give the visibility for the primary reason of aesthetics and to keep the community happy especially considering the nearby projects that had been left incomplete. Ms. McBride thought some respect should be shown to Redlands Mesa and that section of housing which had brought a lot of popularity to the area. Adding three driveways with ingress/egress along that road would be more confusing and believed a reasonable project with a lower density would reduce the number of cars and people.

An unidentified male speaker asked the Commission why the City was allowed to change its mind. He remembered when the golf course was being put in and the area surrounding was shown with patio homes. In addition, the golf course was to have provided a trail for people to walk on which it had not done.

### **APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL**

Rebekah Mandrop reiterated that they were not increasing the density at all. The density would stay the same as what it was currently. The height limitation was that the buildings could be taller. She showed an illustration that the four-story units would actually be about two and one-half stories out of the ground with the rest being a drive-in garage to work with the topography. She added that the elevators were being installed in order to be ADA compliant. The drainage had been incorporated into an engineered designed drainage plan.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Carlow asked Ms. Mandrop to expand on the passive solar and asked whether or not a problem existed with that. Ms. Mandrop said that she was not familiar with a solar problem. She confirmed that it had been brought to her attention.

Chairman Wall raised a question regarding closeness of the buildings to the fence in Filing 1. Scott Peterson showed that Filing 1 was on the west side of the property. He commented on the setback requirements in relation to the existing R-8 type of zoning district. The R-8 zone for a rear yard setback was 10 feet. He believed there was a 10-foot utility easement in the back and so the corridors would be 12 to 13 feet from the north property line. Also, the building footprint in essence became the property line; therefore, the outer boundary was what was looked at as far as setbacks were concerned. In essence, the West Ridges Boulevard property line was the front yard setback and the north property line would be the rear yard setback. Accordingly, a 10-foot setback from the north property line would be in conformance with the current Zoning Code for the R-8 zone district.

Chairman Wall asked if it were developed as drawn previously as A lots, what would the setbacks be. Scott Peterson said he believed the Amended Ridges PD for an A lot was also 10 feet in the rear.

Chairman Wall asked if it was a single-story or two-story for Filing 1. Mr. Peterson said they were two stories.

Chairman Wall asked Mr. Stubbs how the Commission could possibly ensure that when the digging and moving the ground was begun that it would not cause the other ground above to start to shift and possibly move. Mike Stubbs said that a number of builders in the Ridges took the overall soils report for 1100 acres and planned many foundations on that. He explained that they had geologic soils reports done through the area. In addition, they had a review performed by the Colorado Geologic Society and a soils engineer reviewed that information. They also had done additional digging and testing of the soils. He confirmed that each foundation would be individually designed based on the soils test in that location by a professional engineer. He assured they were taking advantage of the technology that had been improved on over the years as far as foundation design.

Commissioner Pavelka asked if there was anything specific within the Code with respect to solar access. Greg Moberg, Planning Services Supervisor, answered that basically there was nothing in the Code that would restrict someone from building within a perceived solar access.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Pavelka said that she realized that it was difficult when something was being built in a back yard. However, when you consider what could be put on that land such as strict multi-family, there were some unique features that were respective to the terrain. She addressed the solar access issue and was unsure whether it was enough to impact or degrade from the solar. She believed there were a lot of features that would make this fit in to enhance the area. She did not believe there would be a visibility standpoint out of the three drives. She thought this development could work and thought it was much more creative and desirable than just a straight line of multi-family units. She stated that she would be in favor of the project.

Commissioner Williams also did not believe the sight visibility would be an issue. The design of the plot and the layout of the buildings were innovative. He thought the project accompanied the Comprehensive Plan and the goals and the valley's effort to grow up rather than continue urban sprawl. He too would be in favor of this plan.

Chairman Wall said this particular project was interesting mainly because of the ground. He commended the public who lived in the neighborhood for how they had planned and organized their time and comments for this project. He addressed the concerns raised and stated that the setbacks met Code. With regard to the heights of the buildings, they could build up to 40 feet and unfortunately when there was a Code that a developer went by, it wasn't fair for the Commission to say that it was unacceptable to build within

Code. He was not concerned about the amount of traffic. He was, however, concerned about the entrance just before the median. He deferred to the traffic engineers on that point. Whether or not the project was adequately funded could not be taken into consideration. Also, he considered property values to be a matter of opinion. Every property being developed had to be done correctly for it to positively influence the development around it. The stability of the ground was a concern; however, with testing of each individual pad site helped to alleviate some of those concerns. Chairman Wall concluded that the project met Code, was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and was consistent with the Zoning Code and he would be in approval of this project.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Williams) “Mr. Chairman, on Item PLD-2010-259, I move we forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council on the request to vacate the portions of utility easements requested and the drainage easement with the findings of fact and conclusions as identified in the staff report.”**

Commissioner Pavelka seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7 - 0.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Williams) “Mr. Chairman, on Item PLD-2010-259, the request to amend the Ridges Planned Development Ordinance with the Casas de Luz plan, I move that the Planning Commission forward to the City Council a recommendation of approval of the Amendment with the findings of fact and conclusions as identified in the staff report.”**

Commissioner Pavelka seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7 - 0.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Williams) “Mr. Chairman, on Item PLD-2010-259, I move we forward a recommendation of conditional approval to the City Council on the request to vacate the frontage road with the findings of fact, conclusions and conditions as identified in the staff report.”**

Commissioner Pavelka seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7 - 0.

**General Discussion/Other Business**

None.

**Nonscheduled Citizens and/or Visitors**

None.

**Adjournment**

With no objection and no further business, the Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.