

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 8, 2005 MINUTES
7 p.m. to 7:57 p.m.

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Paul Dibble (Chairman), Roland Cole, Tom Lowrey, Bill Pitts, Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh, John Redifer and Patrick Carlow.

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, were Bob Blanchard (Community Development Director), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Ronnie Edwards (Assoc. Planner), and Lori Bowers (Sr. Planner).

Also present were Jamie Kreiling (Asst. City Attorney) and Eric Hahn (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 19 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 the February 8, 2005 public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I'd move they [the minutes of the February 8, 2005] be approved as presented."

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-0, with Commissioner Carlow abstaining.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Available for consideration were items PP-2004-254 (Preliminary Plat--Chipeta Glen, Filing #2), FP-2004-258 (Final Plan--The Knolls Subdivision, Filing #7), ANX-2005-003 (Zone of Annexation--Unawep Heights, Filing #4), ANX-2005-010 (Zone of Annexation--Whaley Annexation), ANX-2005-022 (Zone of Annexation--Barker Annexation #3), and PP-2004-287 (Preliminary Plat--Cloverglenn Subdivision). Chairman Dibble briefly explained the nature of the Consent Agenda and invited the public, planning commissioners, and staff to speak up if they wanted one or more of the items pulled for additional discussion.

Mr. Blanchard asked that item FP-2004-258 be pulled from Consent and continued to the March 22, 2005 public hearing.

At citizen request, item PP-2004-287 was pulled from Consent and placed on the Full Hearing Agenda. No objections were received from the audience, planning commissioners, or staff on any of the remaining items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I would move [for] continuance of the item FP-2004-258 to the March 8 meeting."

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, I would move [for] approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of items 2 and 6 [FP-2004-258 and PP-2004-287]."

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, I would move to continue item 2, FP-2004-258, to the March 22 meeting."

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion.

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

IV. FULL HEARING

Chairman Dibble referenced a letter received from the petitioner on item VAR-2005-011 dated March 8, 2005 asking that the item be removed from the Full Hearing Agenda. The petitioner was in agreement with staff's requirement of constructing a masonry wall; therefore, no public hearing of the item would be required.

PP-2004-287 PRELIMINARY PLAT--CLOVERGLEN SUBDIVISION

A request for approval of the Preliminary Plat to develop 29 single-family lots on 7.2 acres in an RMF-5 (Residential Multi-Family, 5 units/acre) zone district.

Petitioner: Calvin Coley

Location: 2938 F 1/2 Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Trevor Brown, representing the petitioner, utilized staff's Powerpoint presentation to point out the site's location and surrounding zoning. The actual density of the project would be 4.17 units/acre, consistent with the 4 to 8 units/acre recommended by the Growth Plan and as shown on the Future Land Use Map. The Preliminary Plat was also referenced, and a brief overview of the request was provided. An irrigation pond would be constructed in the northeast corner of the property, and irrigation water would be provided by the Palisade Irrigation Company. A detention pond would be constructed in the southeast corner of the property. He'd spoken with John Ballagh of the Grand Junction Drainage District about installing 12-inch pipe along the east side of the property to convey stormwater runoff, and the entire irrigation system would be enclosed. A TEDS exception had been requested and granted for the looped road located in the middle of the proposed subdivision.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lori Bowers gave a Powerpoint presentation which contained the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo map; 3) Future Land Use Map; and 4) Existing City and County Zoning Map. She noted that most of the area to the north and some parcels to the south of the property were zoned RMF-5, with one parcel directly to the south zoned RMF-8. She briefly outlined zoning criteria and concurred that the request met both Growth Plan recommendations and Code criteria. Staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Frank Oldland (668 Welig Court, Grand Junction) said that he and other homeowners in the area were concerned about the construction of irrigation and detention ponds. What were the specific plans for the ponds? With all the concern over West Nile Virus, were there any plans for mosquito abatement? Mr. Oldland said that his subdivision had gone to a gravity-feed irrigation system two years prior, which worked just fine. He thought that a similar system would work as well for the Cloverglen Subdivision; the petitioner didn't need to install a pressurized system.

Les Bean (656 Welig Court, Grand Junction) referenced the notification cards sent to he and his neighbors, which put the proposal's density at only 12 units for the 7.2-acre parcel. The addition of another 17 units changed the entire character of the request. He maintained that had the request been accurately represented, more of his neighbors would likely have come out in opposition. He noted the lack of any proposed open space or parks. He also wondered if the proposed loop road would be wide enough to accommodate emergency vehicles.

Fred Barton (664 Welig Court, Grand Junction) also thought that more people would have been present to voice concerns had the proposal been accurately represented on their notification cards. He suggested the City continue the item and reissue notification cards with the correct information.

Commissioner Redifer noted that his agenda also reflected 12 units on the 7.2-acre parcel.

Mr. Oldland came forward and said that he'd come down to the Community Development Department to talk with them about the notification. When staff had referenced the Preliminary Plat, they'd confirmed that 29, not 12, units were being proposed.

Commissioner Cole said that his agenda also reflected a proposal for 12 units. He felt that it would be most appropriate to postpone consideration of the item and reissue corrected notification cards.

Chairman Dibble understood that the agendas originally issued with the 12-unit reference had been corrected and reprinted. Whether the item had been advertised as 12 units or 29 units, it still met Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations. He asked legal counsel for an opinion. Ms. Kreiling said that it was within the Planning Commission's purview to continue the item if it so chose.

Commissioner Lowrey agreed that the item should be continued; an increased density of 17 units was fairly substantial.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I would move to continue the hearing on this item until the next regular meeting [March 22, 2005]."

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion.

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

PFP-2004-181 REZONE--HANSON EQUIPMENT REZONE

A request for approval to rezone 20.14 acres from PD (Planned Development) to I-1 (Light Industrial) and RSF-E (Residential Single-Family Estate).

Petitioner: Michael Staenberg, THF Belleville, LLC

Location: 2340 I-70 Frontage Road

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lori Bowers offered a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo map; and 3) Future Land Use Map. A Growth Plan amendment had been approved in 1999 to accommodate the location of Webb Crane. In 2000 the property had been annexed and a subsequent Growth Plan amendment had been approved which changed the land use classification of the northern parcel to Commercial/Industrial based on the County PUD zoning for both parcels and conditioned upon Webb Crane constructing two additional housing units on the northern parcel along 23 1/2 Road. The additional residential units were to be for onsite staff housing and could not be resubdivided. The units were never constructed and Webb Crane had since gone out of business. In February of 2005, City Council amended the Growth Plan, which reverted the 2-acre parcel back to its original land use classification of Estate.

Approval of the current rezone request would eliminate the site's PD zoning and allow Hanson Equipment to locate its business on the property. An I-1 zoning designation was necessary to accommodate the business. Since not all of the property was needed for the business, the request also included a request to rezone the existing 2-acre parcel back to its original RSF-E zone district.

Staff concluded that the request met both Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations, and approval was recommended.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble remarked that approval of the request would just return the site to its former land use classifications. Ms. Bowers confirmed that to be the case.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jo Mason, representing the petitioner, agreed with staff's conclusions that the request met all established criteria. She availed herself for questions.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole said that planning commissioners had received letters from citizens asking whether the berm along the north side of the subject property would remain. Ms. Mason replied that existing berms would remain intact.

Chairman Dibble asked if the petitioner had any plans to construct an outside speaker system, to which she replied negatively. Staff would carry and use walkie-talkies as a means of onsite communication.

When asked if there were any plans to construct additional homes on the property, Ms. Mason again responded negatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Dick Pennington (780 23 7/10 Road, Grand Junction) referenced his letter and said that he represented the interests of himself and Alan Pennington, who had also submitted a letter of opposition. He referenced the existing berms on the northern and eastern sides of the subject parcel. He asked that they be retained, and that there be no installation of outside speakers. He also felt that the original conditions of the Webb Crane PUD should be enforced, namely that the two additional housing units be constructed as a buffer between uses.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked legal counsel if the recordation of testimony affirming that the berms would remain was sufficient; did the issue need to be addressed specifically in a motion? Ms. Kreiling said that it should be addressed specifically within a motion; however, that condition could be deferred until the time of plan submittal. It was not necessary to address it as part of the rezone request.

Commissioner Cole asked if the petitioner would need approval to leave the existing structure intact. Ms. Kreiling said that it depended on the petitioner's plans.

Ms. Mason came forward and reiterated that the existing berms would remain on the property along the northern and eastern property lines. The single existing home would remain and while there were no plans to construct additional housing units, if the Planning Commission made it a requirement, the petitioner was willing to construct another home on the property. She noted, however, that if the RSF-E zone were approved, the single existing home would comply with both the RSF-E zoning criteria and Growth Plan recommendations. She reiterated that there would be no construction of an outside speaker system, and that walkie-talkies would be used.

Ms. Bowers confirmed that the single existing structure would comply with both Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations. Adding another unit to the property would create a non-conforming situation.

Commissioner Pitts asked staff for some additional elaboration on just when the existing structure was built. Ms. Bowers said that the house was already there when the owners of Webb Crane expressed an interest in expanding the business. The house had just been "absorbed" as part of the PUD; Webb Crane had thought to use it as employee housing. As a condition of the PUD, however, the house could not be subdivided and resold.

Chairman Dibble asked how staff would address the residential use being directly adjacent to an industrial use if the RSF-E were approved. Ms. Bowers said that the petitioner would be required to construct a masonry wall and install landscaping to divide the two uses. Staff could also require another wall along the northern side of the RSF-E zoned property, depending on how the property to the north developed.

Commissioner Redifer agreed that the current request would just return the property to the way it had been. The individual issues of berms, etc., were better addressed during the development review stage.

MOTION: (Commissioner Redifer) "Mr. Chairman, on item PFP-2004-181, I move that we find the request for rezoning the old Webb Crane Planned Development site consistent with the Growth Plan, section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code, and the adjacent property zoning, and recommend approval of the rezoning ordinance from the PD zone to the I-1 zone district, and RSF-E for the two acre residential portion of the property, to the City Council."

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion.

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

With no further business to discuss, the public hearing was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.