

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JANUARY 23, 2007 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 7:55 p.m.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Commissioner William Putnam. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were William Putnam, Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh, Tom Lowrey, Bill Pitts, Patrick Carlow (1st Alternate) and Ken Sublett (2nd Alternate). Absent were Dr. Paul Dibble (Chairman), Roland Cole (Vice-Chairman) and Reggie Wall.

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, was Kathy Portner (Assistant Community Development Director).

Also present were Jamie Kreiling (Assistant City Attorney) and Ken Kovalchik (Senior Planner).

Lynn Singer was present to record the minutes.
There were 37 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes of December 12, 2006.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I would move approval of the December 12, 2006 minutes."

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0 with Commissioner Sublett abstaining.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Available for consideration were items:

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1. PFP-2005-276 | PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Beach Subdivision |
| 2. ANX-2006-344 | ZONE OF ANNEXATION – Shetland Meadows Annexation |
| 3. ANX-2006-347 | ZONE OF ANNEXATION – Jobsite Annexation |

- 4. PP-2006-250 **PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – Hilltop Commons Cottages**
- 5. CUP-2006-318 **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – Rio Blanco Stone Company**
- 6. ANX-2006-328 **ZONE OF ANNEXATION – Costopoulos Annexation**
- 7. VE-2006-351 **VACATION OF EASEMENT – Vacation of Temporary Turnaround**
- 8. PP-2005-179 **PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Erica Estates Subdivision**

Commissioner Putnam briefly explained the Consent Agenda and invited the public, planning commissioners, and staff to speak up if they wanted any of the items pulled for additional discussion. No objections or revisions were received from the audience or planning commissioners on any of the Consent Agenda items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) “Mr. Chairman, I would move approval of Consent Agenda items 1 through 8 as presented.”

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

IV. FULL HEARING

Commissioner Putnam announced that item 10, ANX-2006-100, Zone of Annexation – Gummin Annexation, has been pulled at the request of applicant.

- 9. **GPA-2006-248 ZONE OF ANNEXATION – Pacheco-Woodring Annexation**
Request approval to zone 10.13 acres from a County RSF-R (Residential Single Family Rural) to a City M-U (Mixed Use) zoning district.
PETITIONER: Lillian Pacheco and Howard Woodring
LOCATION: 2814 C³/₄ Road
STAFF: Ken Kovalchik

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Ken Kovalchik made a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Pacheco-Woodring Annexation. The PowerPoint presentation included a Site Location Map; Aerial Photo Map; Future Land Use Map; and Existing City and County Zoning map. Mr. Kovalchik stated that four zone districts can be considered by the Commission: C-2; I-O; I-1 and M-U. Applicant is requesting approval of the M-U zone district. Staff is recommending denial of the M-U zone district as they cannot support any type of residential use on this parcel. Staff does recommend approval of an I-O zone district.

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

There was no representation by or on behalf of applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Pitts stated, “Inasmuch as the applicant isn’t here, there is a recommendation of two other zones for the district, but without hearing from the applicant, I can see no reason to approve the application. I just suggest a denial of the application.” Commissioner Carlow agreed as this application has already been tabled once. Commissioner Lowrey also concurs and finds that staff’s report is persuasive and the recommendations made in the report regarding buffering and the lack of stub streets that this site is more appropriate for an industrial office.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) “Mr. Chairman, on zone of annexation, ANX-2006-248, I move that the Planning Commission forward to the City Council a recommendation of approval of the M-U (Mixed Use) zone district for the Pacheco-Woodring Annexation with the finding it to be consistent with the Growth Plan and the Zoning and Development Code.”

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion was denied by a vote of 0-6.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) “Mr. Chairman, on zone of annexation, ANX-2006-248, I move that the Planning Commission forward to the City Council a recommendation of approval of the I-O (Industrial-Office) zone district with the facts and conclusions listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

11. TAC-2007-006 TEXT AMENDMENT – CODE – Zoning and Development Code Text Amendments

A request to amend various sections of the Zoning and Development Code, including Non-conforming Structures and Sites, Drive-through Retail Establishments, Zoning of Annexed Properties, Residential Zone Designations, Alternative Surfacing of Vehicular Traffic Areas and Lot Size and Setbacks Adjacent to Tracts.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

STAFF: Kathy Portner

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner of the Community Development Department addressed the Commission with regard to a request to amend certain sections of the Zoning and Development Code. Ms. Portner requested the Planning Commission have the hearing with respect to the proposed Text Amendments but continue a decision until the February 13, 2007 public hearing to allow staff the opportunity to finalize some of the wording of the actual

amendments. Ms. Portner stated that many of the amendments are a result of continuing work between the department and a focus group which consists of a group of consultants, developers, landowners, among others.

Non-conforming structures and sites

Kathy Portner stated that these are sites that were developed prior to the existence of certain codes and may not meet certain standards such as landscaping, parking or buffering. This proposed amendment is to allow a mechanism of relief. Staff is suggesting the creation of a design exception process, similar to a TEDS exception, to consider individual requests.

Drive-through retail establishments

Ms. Portner stated that staff is suggesting the creation of a new category, drive-through retail establishments. Presently there are two categories of drive-through type facilities, drive-through offices such as bank facilities, and all others, which typically have been drive-through restaurants. Restaurant and retail drive-throughs are not allowed in the B-1 (Neighborhood Business) zone district. This category would separate out the drive-through retail establishments, such as drive-through windows at a pharmacy, from drive-through restaurant establishments. A conditional use permit would be required for drive through retail in the B-1 zone district and would be site specific.

QUESTIONS

- Commissioner Sublett asked what type of standards are applied with regard to the design, specifically concerning a number of drive-throughs whereby it is difficult to exit. Ms. Portner stated that there are standards in TEDS that deal with the amount of stacking that is needed within those drive-through lanes so they do not impede other throughways. She also stated that there are not specific standards as to the exact geometry.
- Commissioner Pitts asked whether video stores would be included in this category. Ms. Portner confirmed that they would be.

Zoning of Annexed Property

Kathy Portner stated that staff is recommending the deletion of criterion no. 5 for zones of annexation.

Residential Zone Designations

Ms. Portner stated that staff is recommending a change of all residential zone districts due to the changes in housing types. Staff's recommendation is to make them all residential zone districts with the appropriate density.

Alternative Surfacing of Vehicular Traffic Areas

At present, Code requires that surfaces that are used for parking areas and vehicular circulation be paved or in some type of hard surface except for low volume storage yards. A number of industrial yards that accommodate heavy equipment do not meet the definition of a low volume storage yard but paving is not practical because of the

damage caused by that type of traffic. Staff is proposing that for those types of facilities that they be allowed to use some other type of surfacing.

Lot Size and Setbacks to Tracts

Kathy Portner stated that this amendment would be to allow, in some instances, for the design of lots that are adjacent to tracts which contain some type of common facility such as a trail, a detention pond, or a landscaping strip, to use that portion of the tract adjacent to their lot to meet part of their minimum lot size, setback or minimum lot width. They would be allowed to use that as if it were an easement rather than a tract.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Rebekah Zeck, 1950 Highway 6 and 50, Fruita, spoke in support of the recommended proposals. She stated that she is a member of the task force group that worked on the proposed changes. “They are definitely a step in the right direction and the area that we have been going toward in our meetings and attempts with the zoning and development code task force group.”

Larry Rasmussen, 3086 Bookcliff, Grand Junction, also addressed the Commission as a member of the focus group. “We’re glad that we’ve had the opportunity to sit down with the entire group and we have really had some very, very serious discussion.” Mr. Rasmussen stated that he anticipates a lot of additional recommended changes particularly as it relates to density. “We’re of a consensus that this part should be adopted.”

Mike Markus, 2350 G Road, Grand Junction, also spoke in support of the proposed changes. “It’s just very gratifying to see the relationship of the city planning staff and the planning commission to consider those proposed changes. I think this is a very positive step.”

AGAINST:

There were no comments against the request.

DISCUSSION

- Commissioner Carlow stated that he is glad to see these proposed changes.
- Commissioner Lowrey stated that he thinks they are good improvements. “I applaud these efforts and I am sincere the effort that people put in from the committees to work on this, I really do appreciate because it makes our city work better.”
- Commissioner Putnam stated that he agrees with Commissioner Lowrey. “The people who are instrumental in doing that deserve gratitude and support.”

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) “Mr. Chairman, on Text Amendment, TAC-2007-006, I move that the Planning Commission support this report that has been presented and continue for approval to the February 13, 2007 public hearing.”

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

With no further business to discuss, the public hearing was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.