

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**AUGUST 9, 2005 MINUTES**  
**7:00 p.m. to 7:27 p.m.**

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Dr. Paul Dibble (Chairman), Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh, Bill Pitts, Tom Lowrey, William Putnam, Reginald Wall and Roland Cole.

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

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 9 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 July 12, 2005 City/County Joint Planning Commission public hearing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "I move approval of the minutes of July 12."**

Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-0, with Commissioners Putnam, Pitts, and Lowrey abstaining.

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

Available for consideration were items:

1. CUP-2005-154 (Conditional Use Permit--Joyful Journey Preschool)
2. ANX-2005-162 (Zone of Annexation--Loggains Annexation)
3. RZ-2005-153 (Rezone--Weimer Properties)
4. FPP-2002-205 (Request for Extension--Cimarron Mesa Filing #1)
5. RZ-2005-121 (Rezone--Grand Central Plaza Parking Lot)

Chairman Dibble briefly explained 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. Staff requested that item RZ-2005-153 be continued to the September 13 public hearing. Item FPP-2002-205 was withdrawn from the Agenda. On item CUP-2005-154, Ms. Kreiling referenced the approval condition contained within Planning Commission's suggested motion requiring the dedication of a 20-foot-wide pedestrian trail easement to the City. The staff report's verbiage of the approval condition required the easement to be placed within the existing Redlands Water & Power Company canal

easement on the property. She said that the pedestrian trail easement did not need to be within the canal easement; its location would instead be subject to staff approval. So the verbiage "...within the existing...on the property." would be deleted and replaced with "...dedicated with staff approval." No objections or revisions were received from the audience or planning commissioners on any of the remaining Consent Agenda items.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I would move approval of the Consent Agenda withdrawing item 4 [FPP-2002-205] and continuing item 2 [RZ-2005-153] to the September 13 meeting."**

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

A brief recess was called at 7:10 p.m. The public hearing reconvened at 7:12 p.m.

#### **IV. FULL HEARING**

##### **SPR-2005-131 VARIANCE--BOOKCLIFF COUNTRY CLUB**

**A request for approval of a variance to the standard Zoning Code that requires a 14-foot-wide street frontage landscaping strip as stated in Section 6.5.D.1 of the Zoning and Development Code.**

**Petitioner: Cory Carlson, Bookcliff Country Club**

**Location: 2730 G Road**

##### **STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Scott Peterson gave a PowerPoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo map; 3) Future Land Use Map; 4) Existing City Zoning Map; 5) photos of the existing landscaping near the site's entrance from various angles; 6) proposed site plan; 7) Code variance criteria; and 8) staff synopsis. The petitioner was requesting approval to provide a 7-foot 6-inch wide landscaping strip in lieu of the required 14-foot-wide strip. The site's topography elevated the existing parking lot substantially above G Road, in some places more than 12 feet above the street. The applicant had requested the variance due to existing site constraints within the property, namely existing tee and green locations, clubhouse building location, and standards for minimum parking lot drive aisle widths and dimensions. Staff concluded that the hardship in this case was not self-inflicted since the petitioner was providing as much of a landscaping strip as possible for the existing site. Also, the existing right-of-way was comprised of grass sod from the back of the curb of the street. With the addition of the 7-foot 6-inch landscaping strip, the total amount of landscaped area from the back of the curb of the street would be approximately 17 feet. Unique characteristics of the property included the steep elevation of the property, not present with other properties in the area. Mr. Peterson said that enforcement of the 14-foot landscape requirement would result in a reduction to the overall number of parking spaces available or a possible downsizing in the square footage of the proposed new clubhouse building.

Having found that the request met Code requirements, approval was recommended.

##### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Cole asked how much total grassed-in area currently existed along the G Road frontage. Mr. Peterson said that using the telephone pole as a reference of where the property line was, there would be over 10 feet. The existing retaining walls and grassed-in areas would remain.

Commissioner Pitts referenced one of the photo slides and remarked that given the amount of existing landscaping along the G Road frontage, it would be hard for anyone traveling along G Road to tell whether 14 feet of additional landscaping had been provided versus the requested 7 feet 6 inches. Mr. Peterson agreed.

Commissioner Cole asked if there was a reason why curb, gutter and sidewalk hadn't been requested of the petitioner along the northern G Road frontage. Mr. Blanchard said that G Road improvements were in the City's Capital Improvements Program; however, it would be a number of years before improvements were undertaken. He added that curb, gutter and sidewalk already did exist along the south side of G Road.

#### **PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Roy Blythe, representing the petitioner, concurred with staff's presentation. He added that shrubs, trees and other plantings would be included within the landscape strip. Approval of the variance would enable the petitioner to meet the Code's parking requirements without adversely impacting the golf course, a use that was primarily comprised of landscaping.

#### **QUESTIONS**

Chairman Dibble asked if the grade from the street to the parking area would remain the same, which, at present, was fairly steep. Mr. Blythe said some adjustment would be made to the grade during reconstruction.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the request.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Lowrey felt that owners of the country club were doing the best they could, given the restrictions of the site's topography. He didn't want to see the parking lot's grade brought down too radically since doing so would result in more visual impacts. He expressed support for the request.

Commissioner Pitts also expressed support, adding that the reconstruction and added landscaping strip would enhance G Road and provide a benefit to the community.

Commissioners Cole and Pavelka-Zarkesh concurred.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, on item SPR-2005-131, I move that we approve the variance to Section 6.5.D.1 of the Zoning and Development Code to reduce the required 14-foot-wide landscaping strip adjacent to the public right-of-way to 7 feet 6 inches, finding the request to be consistent with the Growth Plan and Section 2.16.C.4 of the Zoning and Development Code."**

Commissioner Cole 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 7:27 p.m.