

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
MARCH 23, 2004 MINUTES  
7:00 P.M. to 7:37 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), John Evans, John Redifer, Bill Pitts, Travis Cox (alternate) and Tom Lowry (alternate). Roland Cole, William Putnam and John Paulson were absent.

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

Also present were John Shaver (Acting City Attorney) and Laura Lamberty (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were 32 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Available for consideration were the minutes from the February 24, 2004 public hearing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cox) "I move that we accept the minutes of February 24, 2004 as submitted."**

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

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS**

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

Staff requested that items PLN-2004-029 (Grand Valley Circulation Plan Updates) and TAC-2004-040 (Text Amendment--Zoning and Development Code, Amendments to Section 6.5) be placed on Consent for the purpose of deferring them to the May 25, 2004 and April 13, 2004 public hearings, respectively. A brief clarification of this action was provided to the citizenry present. No opposition was received from citizens, staff, or planning commissioners; however, Commissioner Lowry commented that item TAC-2004-040, changes to landscaping requirements, merited additional review by landscape architects, local nurseries, and the public who would be most affected by proposed changes. He felt that their expertise should be considered and incorporated wherever possible.

Chairman Dibble said that proposed landscaping changes had been reviewed by a focus group comprised of representatives from each of the groups mentioned by Commissioner Lowry as well as by City and Mesa County staffs. He asked staff if minutes taken at those meetings were available for Commissioner Lowry's review.

Ms. Portner said that copies of focus group minutes had been provided to each planning commissioner as part of previously distributed materials. Notice had also been sent to each person attending the focus group, and a formal presentation had been made to a fairly well attended local landscaping group. She said that copies of all information would be provided to Commissioner Lowry.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Evans) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we move item 5., PLN-2004-029, and item 6, TAC-2004-040 to a later consideration [May 25, 2004 and April 13, 2004, respectively] for review."**

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion.

Offered for placement on the Consent Agenda were items RZ-2004-038 (Rezone--Blue Heron Rezone), FPA-2003-228 (Final Plan Amendment--Faircloud Subdivision), TAC-2004-043 (Text Amendment--Transportation Engineering Design Standards Update), PLN-2004-029 (Grand Valley Circulation Plan Updates, defer to the May 25, 2004 public hearing) and TAC-2004-040 (Text Amendment--Zoning and Development Code, Amendments to Section 6.5, defer to the April 13, 2004 public hearing). No objection was expressed from citizens, staff, or planning commissioners.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move [for] the approval of the Consent Agenda, items 1, 2, 3, and, as amended, items 5 and 6."**

Commissioner Cox seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

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

##### **PP-2003-271 PRELIMINARY PLAN--SUMMIT VIEW ESTATES**

**A request for approval of a Preliminary Plan to develop 41 lots on 9.05 acres in an RMF-8 (Residential Multi-Family, 8 units/acre) zone district.**

**Petitioner: Carl Marchun**  
**Location: 649 29 1/2 Road**

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

Rebekah Wilmarth, representing the petitioner, gave a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) Preliminary Plan; 2) overview of the request; 3) Future Land Use Map; 4) photos of proposed sample housing types; 5) statement of compatibility with the surrounding area; 6) statement on the presence of utilities and other urban infrastructure; 7) Growth Plan compliance; and 8) summary.

Ms. Wilmarth noted the property's location and said that the project had received staff's support. Lots would be between 6,000 and 8,500 square feet in size, and only single-family homes were proposed. The project's 41-lot density averaged 4.5 units per acre, which was compatible with the surrounding area. A 6-foot privacy fence would be erected along the property's southern border to screen the Holton property. Proposed open space tracts and pedestrian path locations were noted, with low picket (30-36" high) or open split-rail fencing to be provided along those tracts. A homeowners association would be responsible for maintenance of all open space. She noted that approximately 10% of the project would be retained as open space. A soils and geotechnical report had been submitted to staff, with no adverse findings. The request complied with Growth Plan recommendations and Code requirements, and she asked that approval be granted.

**STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Lisa Cox gave a PowerPoint presentation containing 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 Plan; and 6) findings and conclusions. A house currently situated on the property would be removed prior to new construction. A north-south drainage ditch traversing the property would be tiled and partially incorporated as open space. Staff concurred that the request met both Growth Plan recommendations and Code criteria, and approval was recommended.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**FOR:**

There were no comments for the request.

**AGAINST:**

Louise Burns (662 Welig Court, Grand Junction) asked for clarification of the 10% open space claim made by the petitioner. Was that being provided just to accommodate a drainage ditch?

**PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Ms. Wilmarth provided additional detail on the locations of proposed open space. While some would overlay the Marchun Drain, Tract A had been provided for stormwater detention, and grass would be planted there. Other landscape areas and pedestrian paths were again noted.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Evans asked if "the canal would be buried." Ms. Wilmarth said that it was not currently a ditch; rather, it was a pipe that had been buried.

Commissioner Cox asked if there would be anything to prevent vehicles from using the north-south tracts to travel between Joan Way and Trinity Peaks Way. Ms. Wilmarth said that shared driveways for lots 4 through 9 would not be continuous, and landscaping would divide them midway between lots 5 and 8.

Chairman Dibble asked if the petitioner intended to install playground equipment in any of the open space areas. Ms. Wilmarth indicated it was not the petitioner's intent to construct parks, nor to provide play equipment; however, pedestrian paths would be constructed within many of the open space areas. The homeowners association could always opt to purchase and place picnic tables in those areas.

Commissioner Lowry asked for clarification on the strip of easement from Mount Julian Drive to the western property line along the southern border. Ms. Wilmarth noted the presence of an existing 20-foot irrigation easement and said that a 20-foot temporary turnaround easement would be provided to accommodate development of a hammerhead turnaround. The turnaround was necessary since the Joan Way stub street would not be developed until later. Commissioner Lowry asked if it were possible to at some point develop the turnaround easement as another street stub extending to the western property line. Ms. Cox said that doing so would conflict with the adjacent lot's building envelope to the west. It was highly unlikely there would ever be any interconnectivity of trails or streets via that particular location. Ms. Cox pointed out that the majority of open space being provided by the petitioner had not been required by the City, nor had it been provided in lieu of parks and recreation fees. The petitioner was still obligated to pay the 10% open space fee.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Pitts commented that the request met both Growth Plan and Code requirements. The project would be a good addition to the community. This drew unilateral assent by other planning commissioners.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Evans) "Mr. Chairman, on item PP-2003-271, a request for Preliminary Plan approval for the Summit View Estates, I move that we approve, with the findings and conclusions as outlined by staff above."**

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

With no further business to discuss, the public hearing was adjourned at 7:37 P.M.