

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 13, 2007 MINUTES
7:02 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chairman 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, Bill Pitts, Reggie Wall, Tom Lowrey and William Putnam.

In attendance, representing the City's Public Works and Planning Department – Planning Division, were Lisa Cox (Planning Manager), Dave Thornton (Principal Planner), Rick Dorris (Development Engineer) and Greg Moberg (Development Services Supervisor). Also present, representing Neighborhood Services, was Kristen Ashbeck (Senior Planner).

Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney) was present.

Wendy Spurr (Planning Technician) was present to record the minutes.

There were 44 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 September 25, 2007.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of the September 25, 2007 minutes as presented.”

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0. Chairman Dibble and Commissioner Lowrey abstained.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Available for consideration were items:

1. **PP-2005-226** **PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Pinnacle Ridge
Subdivision**
2. **PP-2006-194** **PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Thunder Ridge
Estates**

3. CDP-2007-259 CONDO PLAT – Cezanne Court Condominiums

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. At the request of Commissioner Cole, item 1, Preliminary Subdivision Plan for Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision, was pulled for Full Hearing. Chairman Dibble concurred. No objections or revisions were received from the audience or planning commissioners on either of the two remaining Consent Agenda items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move approval of Consent Agenda items numbered 2 and 3.”

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

IV. FULL HEARING

- 1. PP-2005-226 PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN – Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision**
Request approval of the Preliminary Subdivision Plan to develop 69 homes on 45 acres in an R-2 (Residential 2 du/ac) zone district.
PETITIONER: Bob Jones – Two R&D, LLC
LOCATION: NE of Mariposa Drive & Monument Road
STAFF: Dave Thornton, Principal Planner

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Robert Jones II with Vortex Engineering, 255 Vista Valley Drive, Fruita, addressed the Commission as applicant’s representative. Mr. Jones stated that the site is located along the northeast side of Mariposa Drive approximately one-quarter mile northwest of the Monument Road and Mariposa Drive intersection. The Ridges Subdivision is located to the north and west and vacant ground abuts the subject property to the east and south. The property is currently undeveloped and is not used for any specific purpose. Mr. Jones further stated that the property is approximately 46 acres in size. The southwest corner of the property intersects the Mariposa Drive right-of-way. Current City zoning for the property is RSF-2 with a Master Plan zoning of Residential Low of ½ to 2 dwelling units per acre. Applicant has requested approval for 69 single-family lots for an average density of 1.52 dwelling units per acre. Mr. Jones pointed out that the project would be completed in three phases. According to Mr. Jones, the site also conforms with the Grand Valley Circulation Plan and the Urban Trails Master Plan. Furthermore, an unpaved trail system of approximately 3,000 linear feet of off street trail has been incorporated into the development with four connecting points to various places in the existing Ridges trails system and to the future adjacent development to the east. In order to preserve as much open space as possible, approximately 36% open space will be preserved with this development, or 16.3 acres. Mr. Jones stated that the property was annexed into the City in March, 2005, and a Preliminary Plan Subdivision

application was filed and heard on September 12, 2006. At that time, the Preliminary Plan was denied by the Commission. Mr. Jones pointed out that since that time, applicant has worked with staff to redesign the project to produce a better plan. Mr. Jones contrasted the revised plan with the previous plan. He added that some of the revisions include the relocation of the Pinnacle Heights Drive access road to the upper lots; minimization of cuts and fills; redesign of the connection point to the undeveloped Foster property; submission and approval of a TEDS exception; implementation of a more conventional sewer design discharging into the existing Hidden Valley sewer system; and reduction of the subdivision density. Mr. Jones summarized that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Growth Plan and review criteria of the Zoning and Development Code and requested approval of the proposed Preliminary Plan as presented.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if the detention areas would be maintained by an HOA. Mr. Jones stated that they would be.

Commissioner Pitts asked what the maximum depth of the proposed sewer system would be. Mr. Jones stated that he believed it to be approximately 10 feet.

Chairman Dibble asked if applicant was required to put in a fire system or sprinkler system within a number of the homes. Robert Jones stated that as part of the condition of the TEDS exception, the upper lots would be required to have a sprinkler system installed.

Chairman Dibble asked what the deepest cut would be in the roadway system. Mr. Jones stated that there are still some good cuts in this project; however, without researching it, he was unable to give a figure.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton with the Public Works and Planning Department gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision. Mr. Thornton recapped the revisions from the previously submitted Preliminary Subdivision Plan. He further stated that he believes there is adequate offsite pedestrian access. He also stated that all 69 lots meet the requirements of both the hillside development as well as the clustering provision. Also discussed by Mr. Thornton were issues regarding access, location of alternative entrances, stub streets, detention, ridgeline development and vacation of certain rights-of-way. Mr. Thornton summarized that staff finds the Preliminary Subdivision Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the Growth Plan and the Redlands Area Plan and satisfies the review criteria in the Zoning and Development Code and recommended approval with the following conditions: That it be subject to City Council approval for private streets, and vehicular routes that traverse greater than 30% slopes, and acquisition of the Mariposa Drive right-of-way and that all existing and dedicated easements be vacated.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if there would be sidewalks along Pinnacle Heights Drive. Dave Thornton confirmed that there would be a sidewalk along one side of the street as well as the detached pedestrian path.

Commissioner Cole asked when the other access would be built. Mr. Thornton stated that would be part of Phase II.

Commissioner Pitts asked where the detention ponds are and also where runoff water would go. Rick Dorris, City Development Engineer, pointed out the location of the detention ponds. He stated that the detention ponds would reduce the historic runoff that naturally occurs in the area.

Chairman Dibble asked if there is a rock rollout hazard on the north-south cul-de-sac. Rick Dorris stated that he does not believe rock rollout to be an issue according to the geotechnical report as the potential hazards have previously been taken care of by applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Jordan, 2399 Ridgeway Court, asked for a description of the detention ponds.

Ted Munkres, 121 Chipeta Avenue, stated that he thinks this project has made some major changes since a year ago especially with the elimination of large cuts and deep sewer. He encouraged approval of the project. He stated that he does not see any negative impacts.

Dale Lund, 2399 East Plateau Court, stated that there was still a visual clutter problem as back lots will face the front lots on East Plateau Court.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Robert Jones II requested that the proposed connection to Hidden Valley Drive be identified prior to recording of Filing II. Mr. Jones stated that the storm water basins are several hundred feet long and would essentially be rock-lined with a pipe discharging into the Road Side Swale and Ridgeway Court. He further stated that the homes entering off of Mariposa are designed as walk-outs with the bottoms of the homes utilized as retaining walls to reduce the elevation difference between the existing homes off of Plateau and Ridgeway Court.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if applicant could provide confirmation of the location of the second access prior to Filing I. Mr. Jones stated that four options were identified in the TEDS exception but requested further time to finalize.

Commissioner Pitts asked how much water could be carried by Ridgeway Court. Mr. Jones stated that it will be detained and released at greater than historic flow rates.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Dibble stated that he thinks this project meets the need of infill development.

Commissioner Cole stated that he believes the project should be approved.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move that the Planning Commission approve the subdivision plan for the Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision, PP-2005-226, with the findings, conclusions and conditions listed in the staff report.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on Item PP-2005-226, I move we recommend approval to City Council of the private streets, the vehicular routes traversing greater than 30% slopes and the provision that this development receive approval by City Council to acquire the necessary right-of-way for access to Mariposa Drive.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) “Mr. Chairman, I move that on Item PP-2005-226 that existing right-of-ways and dedicated easements will be vacated prior to the recording of the final Pinnacle Ridge Plat.”

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

A brief recess was taken.

- 4. PLN-2007-292 AREA PLAN – South Downtown Neighborhood Plan**
Request approval to adopt the South Downtown Neighborhood Plan as an element of the City of Grand Junction Growth Plan and recommend approval to City Council to amend the City Zoning Map and zoning and Development Code accordingly.
PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction
LOCATION: Generally located between the Riverside Neighborhood on the west; 28 Road on the East; Colorado River on the South; and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks on the North
STAFF: Kristen Ashbeck, Senior Planner

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

By way of a PowerPoint presentation, Kristen Ashbeck addressed the Commission regarding the proposed South Downtown Neighborhood Plan. She stated that several public meetings were held. She added that the results were presented at a public open house in February 2007 and a menu of design concepts presented for participants to evaluate the ideas. Ms. Ashbeck stated that there were four major elements of the proposal which she identified as land use, circulation, economic development and visual character. She further stated that the results of the evaluation showed strong community support for the waterfront. The plan also should recognize the existing heavy industry in the area and the rail service that supports that industry. According to Ms. Ashbeck, the plan should distinguish between streets in the area that are primarily used by the general public versus the streets that primarily handle the commercial and industrial. The plan should promote higher quality, cleaner uses especially in the central core which is primarily between 5th and 9th Streets and Struthers to the railroad tracks. Ms. Ashbeck stated that one of the goals of the plan would be to enhance the entries to the area and improve connections to downtown. Another goal is to create new opportunities for light industrial uses and then also create transitional areas that screen the heavy industries between the recreational users south of the parkway and heavy industries that are north of the parkway. And the last goal of the plan is to create new and take advantage of existing opportunities for public-private partnerships that support the redevelopment in south downtown. She further stated that the plan includes the basic strategies that are the first phases of the plan which would include a future land use plan, a zoning map, circulation and trails plans, overlay standards for some areas and establishes goals and policies for economic redevelopment. The land use plan basically came down to six categories – state residential, parks and open space, mixed use, corridor-commercial, commercial-industrial and industrial. The proposed categories are intended to replace the categories that currently exist on the Land Use Map and the Growth Plan. She further stated that the next phase of implementation was to rezone the properties that are currently within the City limits according to the proposed Future Land Use Plan. Another element of the South Downtown Plan is the development of plans for various modes of transportation. She stated that the three main goals of the Circulation Plan are to improve the existing street grid in the central area, establish a new grid in the eastern area and try to keep traffic separated as much as possible from the industrial traffic and the lower density residential area. Also included in the Circulation Plan are amendments to the Urban Trails Plan. She pointed out that most of the area is within the Mesa County Enterprise Zone. Another element of the proposed South Downtown Neighborhood Plan was the adoption of the zoning overlay which addresses primarily the commercial core. Ms. Ashbeck stated that the overlay includes standards for landscaping, parking, outdoor storage, signage and architectural elements. Ms. Ashbeck pointed out that there is private property on the south side of the parkway that is surrounded by open space and park uses, such as the Botanical Gardens and Los Colonias. She stated that the proposal is to support higher quality structures of mixed use with the overall goal of creating a higher quality image along the street as well as viewed along the trail. Additionally, there would be guidelines for the parcels that have frontage facing the parkway that would address the architectural character of the facades as well as screening requirements for outdoor

storage and signage. She also discussed the need for land to be designated for various land uses. Ms. Ashbeck next reviewed the criteria of the Growth Plan.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if properties not presently in conformance with the plan would be zoned to conform. Kristen Ashbeck stated that those properties would be rezoned.

Chairman Dibble asked if sign codes were addressed in the overlay. Ms. Ashbeck said the sign code in the overlay is different than the Code but if not specifically addressed, the Code would be the default. She further pointed out that the specific requirements are outlined for each of the Commercial and Industrial core areas along the parkway.

Commissioner Wall asked if the Brady property had previously been zoned Industrial. Ms. Ashbeck advised that the Brady property has not been zoned yet.

Commissioner Lowrey stated that he has a concern where the property goes from Estate to Commercial/Industrial as it is a dramatic change. He asked if it could be Estate, Mixed Use and then Commercial/Industrial. Kristen answered that that would be possible.

Commissioner Cole asked how non-conforming uses would be handled. Ms. Ashbeck stated that the Code already handles non-conformity. She further stated that the homes in the area are currently zoned Industrial and are presently non-conforming. However, with the C-1 zoning that has been proposed, they would be more conforming. She further stated that the intent is not to take away use but to provide more opportunities for those properties of a wider range of uses.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Donna Cline, 388 Bonny Lane, stated that she is concerned about valuation of properties. She also questioned the Estate zoning as it is located in a flood plain.

Rick Krueger, 235 West Fallen Rock Road, stated that he represents the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He wanted to express that the Colorado River, including the 100 year flood plain, is designated critical habitat for two federally endangered species – the Colorado pike minnow and the razorback sucker. Additionally, he also wanted to make the Commission aware that two other federally listed species – the boney tail and the humpback chub – occupy this reach of the river. He stated that the Fish and Wildlife Service supports the creation, maintenance and enhancement of the buffer area along the Colorado River.

Janet Magoon, 2752 Cheyenne Drive, stated that she believes these plans will shape the whole feeling of the City. She stated that no kind of industrial activity belongs on the river. She stated that she is particularly concerned with the Commercial core area that is closest to the river. She stated that her biggest concern is the three parcels of land

along the river, also known as the Brady parcels. She said that there is a radioactive storage bunker in the middle of the three parcels.

Mark Gardner, 2612 H-3/4 Road, stated that he is vice president of White Water Building Materials. He said that 7th and 9th Riverside Parkway are the only truck accesses into the industrial area. He also said that he does not think Mixed Use for residential use is a viable option. He encouraged industrial use to have priority

Hannah Holm, 1800 North 3rd Street, stated that she is the water organizer for Western Colorado Congress. She said that she supports the goal of creating areas for live/work environments and believes that it would help the vitality of the area. She submitted some proposed language regarding the green waterfront concept. According to Ms. Holm, this would include preserving or restoring a buffer of natural vegetation in the 100 year floodplain and at least 100 feet from the edge of the high water mark as well as limiting the immediate waterfront uses to low impact uses. She stated that this would strengthen the goal of green waterfront.

Penny Pauline Heuscher, 330 Mountain View Court, stated that it is exciting that the City is taking a look at improving the south downtown area. She further voiced a concern that the views from Eagle Rim Park should not be ruined with outdoor storage permitted in Industrial zoning. She said that it is not common sense to put Industrial zoning on the river as indicated in the plan. She also stated that she would like the rendering plant pond restored and voiced her concern for the need for riparian habitat. Ms. Heuscher said that over 400 people have signed petitions that ask for a land swap so that Industrial zoning would not be put on the riverfront.

Enno Heuscher, 330 Mountain View Court, noted what he believes to be significant errors of the plan. More particularly, he suggested the deletion of "and along the south side of C $\frac{1}{2}$ Road just west of 28 Road" and instead of "Commercial and Industrial" it should read "Commercial/Industrial" on page 9, paragraph 2.

Randy VanGundy, 2166 Village View Court, stated that he agrees that the issue of truck traffic needs to be taken into consideration. He also said that trails along with the truck traffic would be a problem. Additionally, he said he did not want zoning downgraded from I-1 to Commercial/Industrial.

David Berry, 530 Hall Avenue, stated that he is concerned with the zoning that will be placed on his property. He was directed to discuss his specific concerns with staff. Commissioner Wall asked if a property is zoned Industrial and by this plan the zoning would be changed to Commercial/Industrial, when would they have to come into conformity with the Commercial/Industrial zoning. Jamie Beard, Assistant City Attorney, said that they don't have to change anything on their site unless they want to redevelop in some fashion.

Gayle Lyman, property manager for Elam Construction, 556 Struthers Avenue, voiced a concern regarding the truck traffic on 7th and 9th Streets. He also wanted to make sure that they would not be downgrading their property from an I-1 to I-O.

Mark Bonella, 11973 21½ Road, stated that he is president of Castings, Inc. as well as chairman of the Mesa County Planning Commission. He stated that he is concerned with the amount of industrially zoned properties. He went on to state that not long ago it was identified that there was a lack of Industrial properties in the community. As a result, over 100 acres of Agricultural property was changed to Industrial. Now, pursuant to this plan, there would be more Industrial property being taken out. He stated that the parkway acts as a buffer between the river and the Industrial and no further buffer is needed. He also stated that Residential has no business where there is Industrial. He said that there is a great need for industrially zoned properties.

STAFF'S REBUTTAL

Kristen Ashbeck stated that the Code contemplates looking specifically at issues of preserving habitat when a property develops. She further said that staff was hesitant to try to create a 300 foot swath limited to this portion of the riverfront when the river runs through the entire valley. She stated that Fish and Wildlife Service would be included for review of each project along this area. She also said that there would not be any Industrial zoning on the river with this plan. Also, truck traffic would not be precluded from 7th and 9th Streets. Ms. Ashbeck confirmed that there is no proposed change for the VanGundy property. With regard to the landscaping along 7th Street, the C-1 zone district as adopted allows some lessening of landscape requirements.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if the zoning along 10th Street and Winters Avenue would be changed from I-2 to I-1. Ms. Ashbeck confirmed that I-1 is more compatible with existing uses.

Chairman Dibble asked if the stair step affects the land use changes from Industrial to Commercial makes good sense for transitioning into the park area. Kristen stated that was a major premise of the plan to make that change both from a land use as well as a zoning perspective.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Cole stated that he is not comfortable with the whole plan in its entirety but believes he can support it.

Commissioner Pitts stated that the plan is overwhelming. He stated that he has concerns regarding landscaping, proposed residential development, infill and redevelopment incentives, and architectural control. He said that while he was in favor of improvements and overlays, he cannot support the plan's overall concept.

Commissioner Putnam stated that he would approve the plan.

Commissioner Lowrey likewise said that he would approve the plan. He added that there were protections to the river which he finds to be important. Also of importance, the plan would preserve a vast amount of the Industrial land and would preserve the uses for the businesses that presently exist. He added that he would like to see a buffering along the Estate zoning.

Commissioner Wall stated that he too can support the plan; however, with regard to Industrial, the goal is not to take away Industrial.

Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh also stated that she supports the plan. She said that Industrial would be preserved in an area with an appropriate and existing infrastructure, while preserving the river corridor.

Chairman Dibble stated that he can support the plan. He stated that the plan has a lot of good sense in it, there have been many opportunities for the public to comment on the proposal, provides more flexibility and he can support forwarding this onto City Council.

Commissioner Pitts stated that he believes his concerns would be alleviated and taken care of by demand and standards and therefore, stated that he too can support the plan.

A brief recess was taken.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh) “Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2007-292, I move that we forward to City Council our recommendation of approval of the South Downtown Neighborhood Plan including the changes to the circulation plan and urban trails map with the facts and conclusions listed as #1 and #2 in the staff report.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2007-292, I move that we forward to City Council our recommendation of approval of the amendments to the Zoning Map with the facts and conclusions listed as #1 and #3 in the staff report.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh) “Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2007-292, I move that we forward to City Council our recommendation of approval of the text amendments to the Zoning and Development Code including those set forth in the Zoning Overlay for South Downtown and the changes to the Table 3.5 Use/Zone Matrix based on the information included within the staff report and provided as testimony this evening.”

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

Chairman Dibble announced that the City Council has approved changing the time Planning Commission hearings begin to 6:00 p.m. Therefore, commencing in January, 2008, the Planning Commission hearings, generally held on the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month, will begin at 6:00 p.m. rather than 7:00 p.m. With no objection and no further business, the public hearing was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.