

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 12, 2007 MINUTES  
7:00 p.m. to 8:29 p.m.**

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Dr. Paul A. Dibble (Chairman), Roland Cole (Vice-Chairman), Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh Tom Lowrey, Bill Pitts, William Putnam and Ken Sublett (2<sup>nd</sup> alternate). Commissioner Reggie Wall was absent.

In attendance, representing the City's Public Works & Planning Department, Planning Division, were Lisa Cox (Planning Manager), Ken Kovalchik (Senior Planner), Faye Hall (Associate Planner) and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

Also present was Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney).

Lynn Singer was present to record the minutes.

There were 33 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**

There were no minutes available for consideration.

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

Available for consideration were items:

- 1. FP-2007-133 REZONE – Grand West Business Park**
- 2. VE-2007-047 VACATION OF EASEMENT – Beehive Estates**

Chairman Dibble 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 either of the Consent Agenda items.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move approval of the Consent Agenda as presented.”**

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

**IV. FULL HEARING**

**3. PP-2007-064 PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Corner Square Planned Development**

Request approval of a Preliminary Planned Development on 20.7 acres in a PD Zone District.

**PETITIONER:** Patrick Gormley

**LOCATION:** S.W. corner of N. 1<sup>st</sup> Street and Patterson Road

**STAFF:** Ken Kovalchik, Senior Planner

**STAFF’S PRESENTATION**

Ken Kovalchik addressed the Commission with regard to the proposed Corner Square Planned Development. Mr. Kovalchik advised that applicant has made request to continue this matter to the June 26<sup>th</sup> hearing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move continuance of item number PP-2007-064 to the June 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.”**

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. However, prior to a vote, Commissioner Lowrey asked Lisa Cox, Planning Manager, how many items were presently scheduled to be heard on June 26. Ms. Cox stated that with the inclusion of this item, there are two items on the Consent Agenda and six items for the Full Hearing agenda. There was next discussion regarding where on the agenda this matter would be. Ms. Cox advised that it would be the first hearing item at that time. Commissioner Lowrey believes that any matters continued at applicant’s request should be placed last on the agenda rather than first. Jamie Beard, Assistant City Attorney, stated that the Planning Commission is entitled to set the agenda in the manner in which it chooses. It was the consensus of the Commission that this matter would be last on the agenda rather than first. Commissioner Lowrey suggested that this should be policy. The Commission concurred.

Accordingly, the motion was amended as follows:

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move continuance of item number PP-2007-064 to the June 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. This item will be placed at the end of the June 26<sup>th</sup> agenda.”**

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

**4. ANX-2007-057ANNEXATION – Sutton Family Annexation**

Request approval to annex and zone 53.69 acres from a County RSF-2 to a City RSF-2 (Residential Single Family-2 units/acre) zone district.

**PETITIONER:** Bob Sutton

**LOCATION:** 413 South Camp Road

**STAFF:** Faye Hall, Associate Planner

Commissioner Sublett noted that he lives in one of the adjacent subdivisions; however, he stated that he is reasonably confident that he can vote on this issue. Ms. Beard stated that as Commissioner Sublett does not have a financial interest in this project, there does not appear to be a conflict.

**STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Faye Hall with the Public Works and Planning Department gave a PowerPoint presentation with regard to the Sutton Family Annexation. She stated that it consists of two parcels; one is a small parcel and includes the canal right-of-way. The larger parcel is 52.28 acres. She finds that the proposed zone is compatible with the neighborhood. Adequate public facilities will be supplied at the time of development of this property. Ms. Hall further stated that the requested zone is consistent with the goals and policies of the Growth Plan as well as the review criteria of the Zoning and Development Code.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Cole asked if the present County zoning is 2 units per acre. Ms. Hall confirmed that it is 2 dwelling units per acre.

Commissioner Putnam asked if this property has already been annexed. Faye Hall stated that the annexation is in process with a final determination of zoning and annexation to be on July 18<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Sublett asked Ms. Hall to explain why this request is being made. Ms. Hall stated that applicant has requested annexation in order to develop the property. Pursuant to the 1998 Persigo Agreement, any development within the Persigo boundary requires annexation to the City in order to develop.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Tracey Moore with Riverside Consultants appeared on behalf of applicant.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**For:** No one spoke in favor of this request.

**Against:**

Ben Johnson (2183 Standing Rock Drive, Grand Junction CO) speaking on behalf of the residents of Canyon Vista Subdivision, stated that their primary concerns are with the stub street as well as the proposed density and, in particular, with the cluster provision which they believe will increase the traffic on Standing Rock Drive.

**QUESTIONS**

Chairman Dibble asked for clarification regarding the number of stub streets that would be entering the property directly. Rick Dorris, Development Engineer, stated that South Camp Road has no stub streets into this parcel at this time. He stated that there will be sufficient access to the site and interconnectivity will be required of the developer.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Against:**

Betty Brown (388 Tallus Lane, Grand Junction CO) asked that the Commission to consider the quality of life of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Richard Nelson (2175 Standing Rock Drive, Grand Junction CO) stated that according to a 2003 traffic study, 633 vehicles travel Standing Rock Drive on a daily basis. Accordingly, he believes that there will be a significant increase of travel on Standing Rock with the proposed development. He further stated that two accesses to the Sutton property would be helpful.

Ralph Cerbone (396 Granite Falls, Grand Junction CO) stated that a number of traffic studies were done by the City with regard to Standing Rock Drive. As a result, five speed bumps were initially installed to help limit speeding.

Jane Linden (387 Cascada Drive, Grand Junction CO) stated that her main concern is with construction traffic. She asked that if the stub road on Granite Falls is connected that it be done only during the last stage of development.

Fred Smokoski (2182 Overlook Road, Grand Junction CO) stated that when Canyon Vista Subdivision was developed, no other area was impacted by the construction traffic. He also stated that he is concerned with increased traffic on South Camp Road.

Toni Strand (2185 Standing Rock Drive, Grand Junction CO) stated that she has two main issues. The first is that she believes 10 or 11 acres cannot be built on which will ultimately result in a greater density on that property which is developable. Secondly, she is also concerned with connectivity and in particular where it crosses the canal. She suggested that the Granite Falls entrance into Standing Rock not become the main road.

Judy Bowman stated that she believes that this subdivision should have separate entrances rather than being forced to come into another neighborhood.

Darold Stafford (2189 McKinley Drive, Grand Junction CO) stated that he believes there is a big issue with safety and traffic on South Camp Road.

Ben Johnson re-addressed the Commission and asked for clarification regarding the requirement for interconnectivity.

### **STAFF'S REBUTTAL**

Lisa Cox, Planning Manager, stated that the requirement for interconnectivity is found in Chapter 6 of the Zoning and Development Code. It is part of the development standards for subdivisions where the City seeks to encourage interconnectivity from one neighborhood to another which results in reduced vehicle miles being driven out of a subdivision, down a major thoroughfare and into an adjoining subdivision.

Rick Dorris, Development Engineer, addressed the issue raised regarding traffic on Standing Rock Drive. Mr. Dorris stated that the rule of thumb for residential streets is a thousand vehicles per day with each single-family house having roughly ten trips per day. He also addressed traffic calming, such as speed bumps, etc. With regard to interconnectivity, Mr. Dorris stated, "It's perceived as good by planners nationwide, by engineers nationwide, for neighborhoods to connect between each other." He also stated that the street stub from Canyon View was done intentionally to connect with this property when it develops.

### **QUESTIONS**

Chairman Dibble asked what type of safety abatements could be utilized with regard to the canal. Rick Dorris stated that in this instance it would typically be either a box culvert or a circular culvert that would cross underneath the road. The headwall over the culvert will provide a curb on each end of it.

Commissioner Lowrey asked if it is customary to have a chain link fence on both sides. Mr. Dorris stated that it is not. He further stated that a culvert over this canal would be a small safety risk.

### **PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Tracey Moore pointed out that they are trying to be proactive in working with the neighbors. Two neighborhood meetings have been held.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Cole stated that he does not have a problem with the requested zoning.

Commissioner Putnam agreed as it is already zoned RSF-2 in the County.

Commissioner Pitts concurred that the issue at this time is solely the zone of annexation. He stated that he would like to see two entrances to South Camp Road.

Commissioner Sublett concurred and stated that he was in favor of this zone of annexation. He also assured the public that safety concerns will be carefully considered.

Commissioners Lowrey and Pavelka-Zarkesh concurred.

Chairman Dibble also stated that he would be in favor of the zone of annexation.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Sublett) “Mr. Chairman, on the Sutton Zone of Annexation, #ANX-2007-057, I move that the Planning Commission forward to the City Council a recommendation of approval of the R-2 (Residential, 2 units per acre) zone district for the Sutton Annexation 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 7-0.

#### **IV. GENERAL DISCUSSION/OTHER BUSINESS**

Chairman Dibble stated that Commissioner Putnam had an additional item he would like to be discussed regarding the Conservation land use designation. Commissioner Putnam suggests that the Commission seek the help of City Council with regard to whether or not they feel that a Conservation designation is appropriate for private property.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Pitts agreed that there needs to be clarification on this issue. Ms. Beard explained that the Conservation designation is part of the Growth Plan. The actual designation when it comes to zoning is not the conservation – it’s Community Services and Recreation and under that section they are allowed to have residential, among many other options as far as development is concerned. The conservation is the definition; the actual zone is something other than conservation. Lisa Cox added that the designation does not restrict the development of the property. It may limit construction on the property and will limit residential development; however, actual uses vary within that land use designation.

#### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Sublett asked if there are other areas that are in exactly the same situation. Ms. Cox stated that there may be some large privately held parcels that bear that designation. She is not, however, specifically aware of what they may be at this time.

Commissioner Sublett asked if staff believes it necessary for the Planning Commission to make such a motion or recommendation to City Council. Lisa Cox stated that she thinks it warrants discussion among the Planning Commission prior to a recommendation being sent to City Council.

Commissioner Sublett asked when the Monument property application would be before the Planning Commission again. Ms. Cox stated that she would anticipate the Monument application being heard again in the fall after a re-submittal in August.

#### **DISCUSSION**

It was the consensus that this issue should be more fully discussed at a workshop. Ms. Beard confirmed that it would be appropriate to discuss this at a workshop because the

discussion is in general and not specific to a particular project. Staff will schedule this item for discussion at a Planning Commission workshop in late July or early August, depending on the schedules and availability of the Commissioners.

With no objection, the public hearing was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.