

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 26, 2007 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 1:55 a.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), Tom Lowrey, Bill Pitts, William Putnam, Reggie Wall and Patrick Carlow (1st alternate). Commissioner Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh was absent.

In attendance, representing the City's Public Works and Planning Department, were Lisa Cox (Planning Manager), Kristen Ashbeck (Senior Planner), Ronnie Edwards (Associate Planner), Lori Bowers (Senior Planner) and Ken Kovalchik (Senior Planner)

Also present were Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney), Rick Dorris (Development Engineer), Eric Hahn (Development Engineer and Jody Kliska (City Transportation Engineer).

Wendy Spurr (Planning Technician) was present to record the minutes. The minutes were transcribed by Lynn Singer.

There were approximately 200 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. PFP-2007-116 | PRELIMINARY PLAN – St. Mary's Hospital Century Project |
| 2. SS-2005-290 | VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY – Indian Road Subdivision |
| 3. PP-2006-214 | ZONE OF ANNEXATION - Mesa Ayr Subdivision |

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. Lisa Cox, Planning Manager, advised the Commission that applicant has requested a continuance of Consent Agenda item number 2, SS-2005-290, vacation of right-of-way for Indian Road Subdivision, to the July 10, 2007 public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move for the continuance of item 2, SS-2005-290, Vacation of Right-of-Way – Indian Road Subdivision, to the July 10, 2007 Planning Commission hearing.”

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

No objections or revisions were received from the audience or planning commissioners on either of the remaining Consent Agenda items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move approval of the Consent Agenda items 1 and 3 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

4. GPA-2007-051 GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT – Brady South Annexation

Request approval of a Growth Plan Amendment to change the Future Land Use Designation of two parcels from Estate to Commercial/Industrial on 5.25 acres.

PETITIONER: Jennifer Brady – SLB Enterprises LLC
LOCATION: 348 27½ Road and 2457 C½ Road
STAFF: Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner

APPLICANT’S PRESENTATION

Robert Jones II with Vortex Engineering (255 Vista Valley Drive, Fruita) addressed the Commission as applicant’s representative. Mr. Jones made a PowerPoint presentation in support of the requested Growth Plan Amendment. Mr. Jones explained that the request is for a Growth Plan Amendment from Residential Estate, 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre to Commercial/Industrial. He stated that the existing use and zoning of this site has been heavy industrial (I-2) in the County. Mr. Jones pointed out that a drain ditch along the eastern boundary creates a natural barrier. The area is predominantly industrial. Mr. Jones further stated that the proposed Growth Plan Amendment is consistent with the purpose and intent of the applicable Neighborhood Growth Plan and the believes the review criteria of section 2.5.C. of the Zoning and Development Code have been met. According to Mr. Jones, this project will provide the opportunity for

quality infill development in a region that needs commercial and industrial zoned property for development.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck with the Public Works and Planning Department stated that the Brady South annexation included three parcels; however, only the easterly two are the subject of this requested Growth Plan Amendment. She went on to state that the annexation has been completed and the zone of annexation will follow pending the outcome of this Growth Plan Amendment. Ms. Ashbeck stated that these two parcels are shown on the Growth Plan as residential but do not appear conducive to residential because of the past industrial uses and some of the surrounding properties. Since adoption of the Growth Plan there has been increased interest to keep industrial uses in this area partially due to the South Downtown Plan and the Riverside Parkway. Additionally, this is largely seen as an infill area with existing adequate facilities for utilities and roads for this type of development.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if the Commission would see the development plan as it comes forward. Kristen Ashbeck stated that would depend on what the zoning is and what the use is. She further stated that applicant has been working with the Riverfront Commission.

Chairman Dibble asked if this is within the 100 year flood plain. Ms. Ashbeck stated that the 100 year flood plain is associated with the river which does impact the site; however, she does not believe that the 100 year flood plain is associated with the subject property.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Janet Magoon, 2752 Cheyenne Drive, stated that she is concerned about the whole area and in particular would not like to see any more riverfront property to be industrially-zoned.

Candi Clark, 331 Acoma Court, stated that she is concerned with the present zoning and does not believe that industrial zoning would be appropriate for this area. She also pointed out that there is a huge variety of wildlife that lives in this area and sees this property as a riparian habitat. "My summary is, if this Committee feels that we need to go with this zoning, that we really will need some extensive conditional use requirements put on this land for landscaping and berms and strict monitoring of emissions and the very big thing is our contamination through possible fuel spills. We know it's a matter of when and not if something like that would happen on this piece of property."

Dr. Enno Heuscher of 330 Mountain View Court stated the he wanted to correct the Mr. Jones who ignored the City residential adjacent property sites directly across the river as well as Eagle Rim Park, Las Colonias Park and the approved athletic facility on the east portion of Las Colonias Park. He suggests that this matter be tabled to ensure

proper berms, landscaping, and flood control as well as conditional use permitting is done.

APPLICANT’S REBUTTAL

Robert Jones II readdressed the Commission. He reaffirmed that it is applicant’s belief that that this Growth Plan Amendment meets the criteria of section 2.5.C. In terms of some of the comments raised, many are addressed in the Zoning and Development Code through the site plan review process.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Cole stated that he believes an amendment to the Growth Plan is appropriate as the property is basically surrounded by industrial and the Growth Plan criteria have been met.

Commissioner Putnam also finds that the criteria have been met and is in favor of supporting the Growth Plan Amendment.

Commissioner Pitts stated that the riverfront trail issue has been addressed to his satisfaction and believes the issues raised by the public will be taken into consideration. He is in favor of the amendment.

Commissioner Carlow stated that he has no problem with the change itself.

Commissioner Wall stated that, “I don’t think today or tomorrow this would make sense as having any kind of industrial on it.”

Commissioner Lowrey stated that he agrees with Commissioner Wall. “It’s residential to the east and a park to the west and residential to the south. It’s only industrial to the north.” He also stated that he does not believe the criteria have been met. He believes a lighter use would be better use of this area.

Chairman Dibble asked for clarification regarding current County zoning for the parcel to the west as depicted on the Future Land Use Map. Kristen Asbeck stated that that parcel is currently zoned I-2 and the Land Use Plan shows it as industrial.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on Item GPA-207-051, the Brady South Annexation Growth Plan Amendment, I move that we forward a recommendation of approval of the amendment from Residential Estate to Commercial/Industrial.”

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-2 with Commissioners Lowrey and Wall opposed.

5. RZ-2007-112

REZONE – Amorelli Rezone

Request approval to rezone 5.3 acres from a City R-1 (Residential, 1 du/ac) to City R-2 (Residential, 2 du/ac) zone district.

PETITIONER: Joseph Amorelli

LOCATION: 2719 H Road

STAFF: Ronnie Edwards, Associate Planner

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Ronnie Edwards of the Public Works and Planning Department made a PowerPoint presentation regarding the requested rezone from an R-1 zone district to a R-2 zone district. Ronnie explained that the property was annexed in 1996 with the Airport West Enclave annexation. At that time, it was zoned RSF-R. She further explained that the area north of the canal and south of H Road was changed to RSF-R even though it created non-conforming lots and did not match the Future Land Use recommended density. The area south of the canal remained RSF-2. The Growth Plan designation for the property and parcels to the east are Residential Low. According to the minutes of the March 7, 2000 City Council meeting for the adoption of the new zoning map, RSF-R was to become RSF-2 in order that it would be conforming with the Future Land Use Map. The map did not reflect this as it shows RSF-1. Ms. Edwards went on to state that the properties in the area have developed residentially consistent with the Growth Plan and the Future Land Use Map. The requested zoning of R-2 is seen as a transitional zone between various densities and would allow infill development within an urban area. Also, any development in this area will require extending sewer services from the Bookcliff Tech Park. The subject property is also included in the urban growth boundary of the North Central Valley Plan which was adopted in 1998. She finds that the request meets the goals and policies of the Growth Plan and the North Central Valley Plan.

APPLICANT’S PRESENTATION

Applicant Joseph Amorelli addressed the Commission in support of his request for a rezone from R-1 to R-2. He expressed concern that some of his neighbors are opposed to the request.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gail Redin, 2723 H Road, spoke against the rezone as she is opposed to the density.

Jan Kohles of 2933 B Bunting Avenue clarified that the Skyline Subdivision lots are one acre lots.

APPLICANT’S REBUTTAL

Joseph Amorelli believes that this rezone would create a good transition.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Pitts does not believe this would be a buffer as there are larger parcels to the north, east and south of the subject property. He also does not believe it fits the neighborhood and, therefore, opposes the proposition.

Commissioner Carlow stated that he does not have a problem with the proposal.

Chairman Dibble believes this is a correctional item and conforms to the initial intention of the zoning and Future Land Use Map as designated in 2000.

Commissioner Cole stated that he believes R-2 zoning is appropriate based in large part on past actions of City Council.

Commissioner Lowrey stated that he has no problem with a R-2 zoning.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on Rezone, #RZ-2007-112, I move that the Planning Commission forward the request to rezone to City Council with the recommendation of approval for the R-2 zone district for the Amorelli Rezone with the findings of facts and conclusions listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Wall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-2 with Commissioners Putnam and Pitts opposed.

A brief recess was taken.

- 6. ANX-2006-108 ANNEXATION – Fletcher Annexation**
 Request approval to zone 139 acres from a County PD (Planned Development) to a City Planned Development district.
PETITIONER: Redlands Valley Cache LLC
LOCATION: South Camp Road & ½ Mile West Monument Road
STAFF: Lori Bowers, Senior Planner

- 7. PP-2006-217 PRELIMINARY PLAN – Red Rocks Valley Subdivision**
 Request approval of the Preliminary Development Plan to develop 155 lots on 139 acres in a PD (Planned Development) zone district.
PETITIONER: Redlands Valley Cache LLC
LOCATION: South Camp Road & ½ Mile West Monument Road
STAFF: Lori Bowers, Senior Planner

APPLICANT’S PRESENTATION

Sid Squirrell appeared on behalf of applicant. Mr. Squirrell stated that a neighborhood meeting was conducted with regard to the Fletcher Annexation and Red Rocks Valley

Subdivision. He stated that this project is located north of South Camp Road, west of Monument Road and south of Redlands Mesa Golf Course and Subdivision. He stated that it was zoned under the County plan at 3 units per acre. The Growth Plan Amendment is zoned ½ acre to 2 acre sites. Applicant is proposing a total of 155 lots on the 139 acre site. He also pointed out that there are two drainages on the property which will not be built upon; however, a jogging trail and a bike trail will be built through the drainages. Mr. Squirrell stated that ½ acre lots will be on the outside of the property and patio homes would be clustered in the center of the property. Additionally, he pointed out that there would be 46 acres (33%) of open space in this project. He also stated that all utilities are existing and in place and were designed to accommodate 3 units per acre. He addressed the expansive soils and rockslide issues by stating that each site will have a designed drainage system that will incorporate and coordinate other lots. Additionally, drainage structures and berms will be built during construction to serve multiple lots so that water is collected above the lots and brought down between lots which will be maintained by the homeowners' association. Mr. Squirrell next stated that there will be 5 phases of the project. He also addressed architectural controls and street lighting that will be put in place.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Putnam asked if applicant is proposing to complete all infrastructure before houses are constructed. Mr. Squirrell stated that they do not anticipate that lots will be sold and built upon immediately.

Commissioner Cole asked if there is only one access off of South Camp Road and if a traffic study has been performed. Mr. Squirrell stated that there will be only one entrance up until the 100th lot is sold. At that time, there will be a second entrance. Applicant has performed a traffic study.

Commissioner Wall asked how many of the 46 acres that will be dedicated as open space are buildable lots. Sid Squirrell stated that he was not sure but believed it would be a small percentage.

Commissioner Lowrey suggested that there should be a sidewalk on the proposed street that will provide the second access for safety concerns.

Chairman Dibble asked about the traffic study that has been performed. Mr. Squirrell stated that the traffic engineer is not present.

Commissioner Carlow asked if applicant believes the proposed reduced lighting will be adequate. Mr. Squirrell stated that applicant believes it will be adequate for this project.

Chairman Dibble asked what the minimum lot size is. Mr. Squirrell stated that the single-family lots are half acre lots.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lori Bowers of the Public Works and Planning Department spoke first about the annexation criteria. She stated that the requested zone of annexation to the PD district is consistent with the Growth Plan density of Residential Low. The existing County zoning on this property was PD-3 although there was no approved plan. She further stated that the proposed zone is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood if developed at a density not exceeding 1.12 dwelling units per acre. Applicant has requested the underlying default zoning of R-2. Ms. Bowers finds that adequate public facilities are available or will be supplied at a time of further development of the property. Ms. Bowers stated that due to the size of the property, applicant was required to perform a site analysis of the property. She also stated that the final plat will require building envelopes for geotechnical reasons, part of the mitigation of the rockfall and drainage areas will be the construction of small drainage berms combined with boulder barriers. As part of the ordinance, applicant is required to have an inspector be on site during the construction of the berms and drainage pathways. She stated that staff is requesting that there be sidewalks around the entire perimeter of this area. Alternate street standards are being proposed by applicant. Staff is suggesting that all lots should have direct access either to a sidewalk or to a pedestrian path.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if there was any need for an accel/decal lane at the entrance of the property. Ms. Bowers stated that according to the information she has received an accel/decal lane is not warranted.

Commissioner Putnam asked if the proposed development is adjacent to the Colorado National Monument. Lori Bowers stated that it is not adjacent to the Colorado National Monument.

Chairman Dibble asked what the long term benefits of this development might be. Ms. Bowers enumerated those benefits to be protection of a lot of open space area, innovative design, protection of the flash flood areas, among others.

Chairman Dibble asked what the minimum lot size for the backup zoning would be. Lori said that that smallest lot on this plan is .49 acres with the largest being .89 acres.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Rick Dorris, City Development Engineer, confirmed that a traffic study has been done and turn lanes were not warranted on South Camp Road. A TEDS exception for reduced street lighting was submitted and it was determined the number of required street lights to be 11.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Pitts asked if from an engineering standpoint that water will not come down the two water contributories. Mr. Dorris stated that applicant has analyzed the 100 year flood plain. He also stated that it is applicant's engineer's responsibility to calculate what the 100 year flow rate is to determine how wide that will be.

Chairman Dibble stated that he has a concern with only one entrance until the 100th lot is sold. Mr. Dorris confirmed that you can develop 99 lots with a single access provided there is stubbing for another access in the future. He also stated that applicant has provided a contingency plan to be able to develop the subdivision past the 99 lot threshold.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Karen Urban, 313 Rimrock Court, stated that the numbers the developers are providing are deceiving because of the 46 acres of open space. She believes that a park is needed more than bike paths. She further stated that she believes the density is inappropriate. "It will take away all of the rural feel of that whole end of South Camp Road."

Gary Liljenberg of 2297 Shiprock Road stated that school buses will have a great deal of difficulty turning into the subdivision without turn lanes. He stated his biggest concern is with the widening of Monument Road at the same time of this development and wants to assure that both roads are not closed at the same time.

Nancy Angle (325 Dakota Circle) stated that she has many concerns, some of which are wildlife issues, the drainage off Red Canyon, lights, traffic, density and irrigation.

Gary Pfeufer, 351 Dakota Circle, stated that he does not believe the traffic study. He believes South Camp Road will need to be widened with a third lane in the middle for turning all the way to Monument Road. Additionally, he does not believe the soil engineer's study of the water.

Gregory Urban, 313 Rimrock Court, stated that looking at the most critical portion of where this development is, it's a high density plan. "What this development does is place exceedingly high density housing right in the middle of that migratory pattern which is the only migratory path that these animals have from Monument to Broadway because there's sheer rock walls all of the rest of the distance and that is where all the animals travel." He suggests a review by the Division of Wildlife and National Park Service to see what kind of impact this development will have on the migratory patterns on the animals that come down the wash before any type of high density is approved.

John Frost (2215 Rimrock Road) stated that two items of concern are innovative slope failure control and the open space.

APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL

Sid Squirrell confirmed that they have addressed the wildlife issue with the Division of Wildlife. Further, the culverts will be engineered to allow the water to come through. They are proposing native plantings and xeriscaping using limited irrigation water.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked about the use of sidewalk and gutter around certain portions of the development. Mr. Squirrell stated that, "We're trying to create an urban feel, trying to blend in with our surroundings and instead of having sidewalks, we'll have landscaping up to the roads or gravel. It's just a softer feel than a traditional two sidewalk neighborhood."

Commissioner Carlow asked whether or not South Camp Road would need to be expanded. Rick Dorris addressed the traffic study, which has been reviewed by the City, and stated that turn lanes are not warranted. He believes that ultimately South Camp Road would be expanded to three lanes all the way down to Monument Road. "It's not warranted now and it's not warranted twenty years from now based on the numbers used in the study."

Commissioner Pitts had a question regarding the need for only one entrance. Rick Dorris stated that it is fire code driven. It is necessary to have a second physical access when the 100th dwelling unit is built.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wall stated that he does not think that this planned development is compatible with other neighborhoods. "I think it's an abuse of the planned development code by saying that we're giving 47 acres to open space which basically 46 of it isn't usable."

Commissioner Pitts stated that he concurs with Commissioner Wall. "It doesn't conform with the neighborhood so I cannot support the proposal."

Commissioner Carlow stated that he is reluctant to vote without the Corps of Engineer's decision on this project.

Commissioner Lowrey stated that he can support the project. He believes that the density does conform with the Redlands. He finds the diversity is something that is needed and creates a healthier neighborhood. He also is in favor of applicant not building on geological features.

Commissioner Putnam stated that the patio home feature makes it attractive and supports the project.

Commissioner Cole stated that opponents and proponents of any project need to be considered as well as whether or not it is going to be an asset for the entire community. He believes a tremendous amount of planning has gone into this proposal.

Chairman Dibble stated that with regard to the zone of annexation, a default of R-2 would be appropriate. He believes the planned development overlay fits better because most of the surrounding development is an overlay district of planned

development to utilize the intricate conditions of the area. He also concurs that more sidewalks and pedestrian crosswalks are necessary.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on the Fletcher Zone of Annexation, ANX-2006-108, I move that the Planning Commission forward to the City Council a recommendation of approval of the Planned Development (PD) zone district for the Fletcher Annexation with the facts and conclusions listed in the staff report.”

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-2.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on item number PP-2006-217, I move that we forward to the City Council a recommendation of approval of the Preliminary Development Plan for Redrocks Valley Subdivision conditioned upon the applicant providing direct access to either a sidewalk or path for those lots that do not currently have direct access and a sidewalk on one side of Boulder Road its entire length.”

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-3, with Commissioners Pitts, Wall, and Carlow opposed.

A brief recess was taken.

- 8. **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: SW Corner of N 1st Street and Patterson Road
STAFF: Ken Kovalchik, Senior Planner

APPLICANT’S PRESENTATION

Joe Carter of Ciavonne, Roberts & Associates, 844 Grand Avenue, appeared on behalf of applicant Constructors West, the developer of the project. Mr. Carter explained that the property closed during the preliminary plan review process and is now owned by F&P Land, LLC. Mr. Carter stated that only Phase I of the project will be discussed this evening. Phase I consists of the first four pods along Patterson Road, approximately the first 300 feet. The project is zoned Planned Development. As part of this proposal, applicant is requesting that the overall height of specific architectural elements can exceed the 40-foot buildable height as allowed under the ordinance. Mr. Carter stated that the required neighborhood meeting was held in February 2006 and two subsequent meetings have also been held at the developer’s request. Mr. Carter stated that the proposed access points are a full-movement intersection at North 1st Street and Park Avenue and a three-quarter access at Meander Drive to serve Phase I as well as

compliance with Phase II. A full right-of-way will be dedicated to the City of Grand Junction for 25-3/4 Road. Mr. Carter also discussed parking, signage, landscaping, community features and architecture.

Ken Harshman with Grey Wolf Architecture addressed the Commission regarding the Corner Square Planned Development. Mr. Harshman explained that the project consists of a four building campus which is of a mixed-use development with an identity of similar character but not identical. He stated that the buildings have been designed with 360° architecture because of the prominence along both 1st and Patterson. Mr. Harshman further clarified that Buildings 1 and 3 have parking below grade. He also stated that Park Drive will be extended to the western property line.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if the right-of-way on 25-3/4 Road would be maintained as it is not going to be developed at this time. Joe Carter stated that they would leave it in a weed-free condition and it would be the responsibility of the business owner's association to maintain it in an acceptable manner.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Ken Kovalchik with the Public Works and Planning Department stated that he has been the planner working with the developer on this particular project. He advised that City Council approved an ordinance which rezoned 20.7 acres at the southwest corner of 1st Street and Patterson Road to Planned Development and approved the Outline Development Plan for a mixed use development. Mr. Kovalchik pointed out that existing commercial uses and single-family and multi-family development surrounds the site. There are currently two designated land uses on the site – commercial on the north side and Residential Medium-High on the south side. The current zoning is PD and is surrounded by B-1 as well as some higher density such as R-4, R-5 and R-12. Ken pointed out some of the concerns raised – signalized intersection at Meander Drive and 25-3/4 Road, open space, roundabouts, building heights, traffic volume and traffic safety. Other issues raised were the number of turn lanes onto 1st Street, northbound stacking on 1st Street, 25-3/4 Road intersection improvements and access, building height and PD phasing schedule. Mr. Kovalchik briefly discussed the development standards that were approved with the ODP compared to what is being presented this evening. The maximum height is 40 feet for each pod but as approved, applicant can request a 25% increase in the building height. He stated that applicant is proposing that some of the tower elements go up to a maximum height of 46'5". The traffic study indicates that one access from Meander Drive onto Patterson Road and one access onto North 1st Street is required at this point. As future phases are developed, the 25-3/4 Road access will be needed. Mr. Kovalchik next discussed the changes that were made between a prior proposal and the present proposal. Staff finds that this development comes into compliance with the requirements of the TEDS manual, with the approved ordinance, 3981, with the Growth Plan; and with the relevant sections of the Zoning and Development Code. Accordingly, staff is recommending approval of Phase I of the Corner Square Planned Development with the findings and facts presented.

Jody Kliska, City Transportation Engineer, stated that the traffic study submitted by the applicant has been reviewed.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Elizabeth Good-Remont of Kimley-Horn & Associates addressed the Commission and stated that she did the traffic analysis for the Phase I development. She stated that 4,000 new trips to the street network are anticipated with 450 new trips during the p.m. peak hour and 200 new trips during the a.m. peak hour. Ms. Good-Remont stated that the development is estimated to generate approximately 6% additional trips south of Park Drive along 1st Street and approximately 15% to the Meander Drive/Patterson Road intersection. She further pointed out that 20% of the exiting traffic will be making a northbound to westbound turn from 1st Street onto Patterson.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Lowrey asked if this project will cause any intersection to fail. Jody Kliska stated that it will not.

Chairman Dibble asked if there would be an increase in slippage from a traffic movement perspective. Jody Kliska stated that the original traffic study that was done contemplated full development of this plus the adjacent property.

PUBLIC COMMENT

James Schenk, 2650 North 1st Street, #1, stated that, "This proposal will make our retirement home into a nightmare." He believes the amount of traffic that will be generated by this project will severely limit access to his property.

Joseph Coleman, 2454 Patterson, appeared on behalf of the Baughman Family on certain issues. Mr. Coleman stated that the difficulty with this project is going to be traffic. He raised the following issues - the boundary issue, traffic, who will bear the cost of the two-lane left turn, and water.

Harlan Mable (2201 Idella Court) stated that he has concerns with Knollwood Drive, proposed underground drainage, an irrigation ditch which could attach to 25-3/4 Road and traffic.

Ben Brower of 2219 Knollwood Lane, has a question regarding a proposed deceleration lane onto Meander Drive.

Jeff Vogel, 725 Hemlock Drive, stated that he was originally in favor of this project and now he has many reservations. One of his concerns deals with the flow of traffic which appears to accommodate the developer only. "I do believe a development on this corner can be done properly. The number of trips and the accommodation of the traffic is my major concern." He also stated that the medium proposed virtually eliminates a left turn from the north side of Meander Drive. He wanted to know if the traffic study on build out was based on the 25-3/4 Road access for the original ODP.

Susan Potts (2206 Ella Court) stated that the traffic study performed by applicant only includes Patterson to Park Drive. She stated that the development will have a great impact on Park Drive. "None of us can be responsible for the lack or poor planning done in the past. What I want to say is that we are responsible for the choices we make today and continued poor planning is just irresponsible. And I think the poor planning on this corner is irresponsible."

Jodie Behrmann, 107 Park Drive, stated that she has some real concerns about the traffic issues. She believes the development is way too intense for the neighborhood and the existing infrastructure cannot support it. Neither applicant nor City staff has addressed the impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

Gary Roahrig, 140 Willow Brook Road, listed what he believes to be the main points at issue: private property rights, water drainage, current development codes and safety, vehicle and pedestrian in particular, students walking to West Middle School. According to the applicant's traffic study, there will be 8,914 driveway departures per day. His concern is that there will be an increase in the accident rate. "We can't forego safety for the sake of development."

Jim Baughman of 2579 F Road stated, "It is evident that the issues that the Baughman Family has raised about the concerns of continued use of our private driveway, the safety concerns and violation of City Traffic Engineering Design Standards, of the spacing of 25-3/4 Road and our existing 80-plus year old private driveway, as well as the need for a deceleration lane that inherently must come from the Baughman property will be delayed for a future public hearing." Mr. Baughman further stated that the developer has not communicated with either his family nor the neighborhood other than several public meetings but no substantial changes were made to address the neighborhood concerns. He believes that the density, intensity, buffering and additional traffic volumes are not compatible with the existing 1st Street and Patterson Road neighborhood. He believes that the applicant has every right to develop his property; however, he would not like his property impacted in the process.

Josh Comfort, who is an architect and planner from Denver, commented that from his observation, this area is an area in transit. "I'm impressed in a positive way that the visuals that I see on this project – the architectural aspects to it, the site plan that was done on it and so forth – seem to be pretty sensitively done in my judgment relative to the existing development and, of course, at the same time looking ahead towards the future development as this area does continue to change over time."

Craig Bowman, 120 Bookcliff, stated that he is really concerned about the safety of the children going to West Middle School. He believes there are too many variables.

Nyla Kladder (2601 Cider Mill Road) stated that traffic is the primary concern.

Jim Nall, 340 Lorey Drive, stated that he is a traffic engineer. He stated that he would like to see what the future projections are with regard to traffic.

Ken Frankhouser, 2239 Knollwood Lane, stated that his concern is that eventually Knollwood Lane, among others, will be developed and used for access.

Ron Taylor stated that he has concerns with traffic.

John Gormley stated that he and his family are in favor of this project. "The City has adopted a Growth Plan and a Zoning and Development Code in order to encourage development in an orderly fashion and in a fashion that encourages development of both residential and commercial projects within the central portion of the City to avoid unnecessary extension of roads and infrastructure to outline agricultural lands and minimize the distance that people have to travel to and from home, to work, to places they shop, to hospitals and the other necessities that they need on a daily basis." He further stated that this plan complies with the Growth Plan and with the Zoning and Development Code as well as the City's infill policy. He also stated that the traffic issues must be resolved globally.

Tom Benton, 2151 M Road, stated that this project is aesthetically pleasing and will be a good landmark for the community. He did, however, voice his concern regarding safety on the 25-3/4 intersection. He believes that intersection needs to be signalized and it must be a paved ingress and egress.

Randy Christensen, 608 Meander Drive, would like clarification of hours of operation of proposed businesses. He also had a question with regard to lighting.

Kelli Vanderhooper, 2104 Linda Lane, stated, "We have desperately been looking for a Class A commercial space for about the last two years. We are looking to become a tenant with this new development and are very excited with the growth for our business as well as bringing in new employment and more business."

Doug Simons, 653 Round Hill Drive, concurs with John Gormley and stated that this is a model project for the City. "There are so many benefits to this project and I think if we can encourage people to work together and focus on the positives here and this marvelous project really needs to go forward and I encourage your support."

Sharon Dixon (2044 M Road) stated that her business is looking to be a tenant in this facility which will allow for future growth and employment opportunities. She believes the traffic is beneficial from a business standpoint.

JoAnn Seele (731 Galaxy Court) stated that change is growth and traffic will always be a problem with growth. She believes this development will aid the community because it addresses the needs for housing and is a blend of businesses that are essential for the needs of the community. "In conclusion, not only does this project fulfill the needs of our community, it will enhance the property values and the aesthetic quality of the

neighborhood in general. I am very convinced this will be only a positive outcome and I'm excited to be involved in this project as I plan to move my business here."

Buzz Moore, 687 Step Aside Drive, pointed out that there are concerns and issues with any development. He stated that he believes this development has very good qualities to go forward. He encouraged the Commission to vote favorably for this development.

Mark Ryan, 2582 Patterson Road, stated with regard to traffic, "It's going to be up to the City traffic engineers to really come up with some new ideas on how to handle this."

Steve Olsen (2203 Knollwood Lane) stated that he too is concerned about the increased traffic that will be generated from this development.

Joanna Little, 896 Overview Road, encouraged the Commission to continue to work with the developer to make this project work. "It's a great infill project. It's much needed, very well designed and will really enhance this community."

Kent Baughman, 2662 Cambridge Road, stated, "Infill projects are difficult at best and this has one of the highest traffic counts in the City and most likely will continue to get worse before it gets better...." He believes the City has failed to develop the additional infrastructure needed for an east-west corridor. He further stated that the new bypass will have little, if any, impact on mitigating the traffic concerns at 1st, 7th and 12th.

Brad Higginbotham, 664 Jubilee Court, stated that the ultimate outcome will benefit the entire community and increase property values.

A brief recess was taken.

APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL

Joe Carter addressed public concern and comment as follows:

- A traffic light is not proposed at Park and North 1st Street.
- The distance between Park and Patterson is at least 400 feet.
- The developer is dedicating a right-of-way along Patterson for deceleration lanes and North 1st Street for deceleration into the project at Park.
- The distance between Meander and 1st Street is 600 feet or greater. The distance between Meander and the western boundary is approximately 620 feet. The 25-3/4 Road is approximately a quarter mile spacing along Patterson.
- It is his understanding that the boundary issue has been resolved with an agreement with the Baughmans.
- Water quality will be dealt with in the next stage of development.
- 25-3/4 Road will serve the entire development as well as the Baughman property of 17 acres.
- An estimate for full build-out, maximum potential build-out of this property and maximum potential build-out per the zoning of the Baughman property totals 8,914.
- The default standard of the ODP is B-1 and hours of operation are 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

- Applicant is not looking to exceed City of Grand Junction lighting standards.

Mr. Carter stated that applicant believes the preliminary plan for Phase I and the infrastructure of the development is compatible with the development standards of the ODP, the approved zoning ordinance in the Zoning and Development Code. He also stated that the height deviation will add character, breaks the horizontal plan of the building and believes it is a reasonable request. "We believe that architecturally it's above and beyond. We know that landscaping will be above and beyond. We've got large setbacks on Patterson Road. We really feel we've gone to the greatest extent possible to make this a quality development."

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Carlow asked if Park Drive will have a grade to it down to 1st Street. Mr. Carter stated that Park Drive abuts 1st Street at grade and then will descend into the site.

APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL

Rich Livingston, 2801 North Avenue, stated that he is the attorney for the project. "This is a good project. It complies. And if you look at chapter 2 and the standards by which this Commission as tonight's decision-maker is obligated to review this project, there is nothing under those review criteria that we haven't satisfied."

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked if it is applicant's intention for a taking of the property to the west to provide an access/egress. Mr. Livingston stated that it has never been a part of this application to condemn any private property right. "In fairness to the Baughman Family, they believe that should there be an ultimate development of a second point of access onto Patterson without their property developed, even if their driveway is not condemned, the practical effect would be that their driveway is not usable and that is, as I understand it, has been their concern. In reaction to that concern, we agreed, once we knew that we had sufficient data to assure the public that Meander on Patterson and Park on 1st Street was adequate to support the highest level of traffic counts from Phase I and Phase II, that we would defer 25-3/4 Road to some point in the future. And by granting now this 52-foot full width right-of-way for 25-3/4, we're guaranteeing that same public that if and when traffic demands and traffic safety requires another Patterson Road point of intersection, the City has the ability to get that because they own that right-of-way."

Commissioner Lowrey asked if Phase I will cause any failures of traffic or breaking of any City rules, ordinances regarding the volume of traffic. Eric Hahn, City Development Engineer, said that, "This phase is adequately served by the accesses that you see."

STAFF'S REBUTTAL

Eric Hahn pointed out that City staff is very aware of the limited capacity of the existing streets further to the south. The primary purpose of the stub is to provide access to that parcel for its potential development.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if they would be dedicated streets to the City. Mr. Hahn stated that they are all public streets built per City standard or better.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Putnam stated that there has been much discussion about traffic; however, he also pointed out that this Commission recommended to the City Council a change in the Growth Plan and recommended zoning that is compatible with that amendment. It was further pointed out that an Outline Development Plan was approved. He wonders how the public can now so adamantly oppose the project based almost entirely on traffic. "These approvals necessarily imply that traffic situation will be dealt with. I think this is a good, a really fine plan and should be approved."

Commissioner Pitts stated that he believes the issue with the Baughman Family has been adequately resolved. "We're going to continue to grow and with that in mind, and the traffic issue being I'm convinced it will be resolved, I will support the proposal."

Commissioner Wall stated, "I think this plan is fantastic. I think the design of it is fantastic and I think it's exactly what we're looking for and what we need in the City of Grand Junction so I would definitely support this plan."

Commissioner Cole stated that he too believes it is a good plan and would support it.

Commissioner Carlow stated that integrity has been shown by everyone involved.

Commissioner Lowrey stated that he supports the project. "It fits within the rules and the ordinances and the laws that govern Grand Junction that have been passed by numerous City Council over the years."

Chairman Dibble stated, "Growth is what it's about and growth triggers the other things like traffic and a lot of the other things that we have as a society and we have the responsibility to enforce the City zoning and maintenance codes and to protect the ownership's bundle of rights – his right to develop – but it has to be within the confines of the direction that the City has given through its elected and appointed officials."

MOTION: (Commissioner Wall) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plan for Corner Square Planned Development Phase I, PP-2007-064, with the findings 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.

With no objection, the public hearing was adjourned at 1:55 a.m.