

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 10, 2005 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 7:25 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, Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh, William Putnam, John Redifer, Tom Lowrey, and Reginald Wall (1st Alternate). Commissioner Bill Pitts was not present.

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Senta Costello (Associate Planner), Ronnie Edwards (Associate Planner), and Scott Peterson (Associate Planner).

Also present were Jamie Kreiling (Asst. City Attorney) and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 14 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 from the April 12, 2005 public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I would move [for] approval of the minutes as printed."

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

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Available for consideration were items:

1. ANX-2004-249 (Zone of Annexation--Swan Lane Annexation)
2. ANX-2005-054 (Zone of Annexation--Hutto Annexation)
3. ANX-2005-057 (Zone of Annexation--Chatfield III Annexation)
4. CUP-2004-200 (Conditional Use Permit--McDonald's Twin Drive-Thru Remodel)

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. No objections were received from the audience, planning commissioners, or staff on any of the items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) "Mr. Chairman, I move we approve the Consent Agenda, items 1 through 4."

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

IV. FULL HEARING

PFP-2004-278 PRELIMINARY PLAT—REDLANDS GROVE SUBDIVISION

A request for approval to develop 6 lots on 1.78 acres in an RSF-4 (Residential Single-Family, 4 units/acre) zone district.

Petitioner: Cliff Anson—South Camp, LLC

Location: 424 South Camp Road

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Scott Peterson gave a PowerPoint presentation which contained the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo map; 3) Future Land Use Map; 4) Existing City and County Zoning Map; 5) Preliminary Plat; and 6) findings and conclusions. Five new lots would be created, and an existing single-family home would remain on a sixth lot. Existing accessory buildings would, however, be removed prior to recordation of the final plat. The site would be developed to a density of 3.37 du/acre, which was consistent with surrounding neighborhood densities.

Referencing the Preliminary Plat, Mr. Peterson noted the various tracts, access point, and lot configuration. Tract A would serve as a private driveway accessible by lots 2, 3, 4 and 5. Lots 1 and 6 would derive their accesses from the Avenal Court cul-de-sac. Tract B had been designated a drainage easement. All tracts would be landscaped, with ongoing maintenance provided by the subdivision’s homeowners association (HOA). As proposed, lots 2, 3, 4, and 5 did not meet the 75-foot minimum lot width requirement at the front setback line for the RSF-4 zone district. It was within the Planning Commission’s purview to grant relief from that requirement for irregularly shaped lots, which staff supported.

Having concluded that the request met Growth Plan recommendations and all other Code requirements, staff recommended approval of the request, including deviation from the established 75-foot lot width requirement.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole referenced an area directly to the north of where the existing house was located and asked for clarification on just what that was. Mr. Peterson explained that it was currently an existing driveway originating from South Camp Road. Once the proposed subdivision was developed, that driveway would be closed off, and the house would then derive its access from Tract A.

Commissioner Putnam referenced the Existing City and County Zoning Map and wondered what the strip between the proposed subdivision and the Renaissance Subdivision was. Mr. Peterson said that that strip served as a drainage easement for the Renaissance Subdivision and was maintained by that subdivision’s HOA. Once Tract B was developed, the two easements would coexist side by side.

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Ted Ciavonne, representing the petitioner, agreed with staff’s report and comments. He said that the only reason the item hadn’t made the Consent Agenda was that special consideration had been required for deviation of the 75-foot lot width requirement for lots 2, 3, 4, and 5.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked who would be responsible for maintaining Tract B. Mr. Ciavonne responded that the Redland’s Grove Subdivision’s HOA would retain ownership and be responsible for

maintenance. When asked who would take care of the other drainage easement in the Renaissance Subdivision, Mr. Ciavonne said that since that drainage easement was part of the Renaissance Subdivision, their HOA was responsible for its maintenance.

Since there was some confusion expressed over the actual ownership of Tract B, Ms. Kreiling clarified that verbiage would be included on the recorded plat to indicate that a drainage easement had been dedicated to the City across Tract B; however, actual ownership of the tract would remain with the Redlands Grove HOA. The easement dedication would grant the City access should additional maintenance be necessary.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Nola Brock (2201 Renaissance Blvd., Grand Junction) asked about the proposed Avenal Court road alignment. Would another intersection be created in another location? Was there a plan or other document available that she could review? Also, how many total lots would be created on the property, 5 or 6?

Chairman Dibble explained that 6 total lots would be created; however, only 5 of them were new. The lot with the existing house would remain as one of the 6 total lots.

Mr. Peterson came forward and explained that no new intersections would be created with construction of Avenal Court. The new street would be aligned directly across from the existing Avenal Lane. He gave Ms. Brock a copy of the Preliminary Plat to show where and how the proposed street would be aligned.

Vern Brock (2201 Renaissance Blvd., Grand Junction) asked if the creation of Tract A would result in a cul-de-sac coming off of another cul-de-sac. Was it wide enough for emergency vehicle access? Mr. Peterson said that Tract A served as a private driveway, not a cul-de-sac, adding that it did meet emergency vehicle access requirements.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Ciavonne offered nothing further but gave the Brocks another full-colored version of the Preliminary Plat for their reference.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Cole remarked that it looked as though the proposal was reasonable, and he felt he could support it.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on item PFP-2004-278, Preliminary Plat for Redlands Grove Subdivision, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plat and including reducing the required 75-foot lot width at the front setback line for lots 2, 3, 4, and 5, with the findings and conclusions as outlined by staff."

Commissioner Wall 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 7:25 p.m.