

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 8, 2004 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 8:00 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, William Putnam and Roland Cole. Travis Cox and Tom Lowrey were absent.

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, were Bob Blanchard (Community Development Director), Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Lisa Cox (Senior Planner), and Senta Costello (Associate Planner).

Also present were Jamie Kreiling (Assistant City Attorney), and Rick Dorris and Laura Lamberty (Development Engineers).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

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

Due to its apparent non-controversial nature, Chairman Dibble asked if item VE-2004-036 (Zone of Annexation and Vacation of Easement--SGH 27 Road Annexation) could be moved to the Consent Agenda. There were no objections expressed by the citizenry, staff, or planning commissioners.

MOTION: (Commissioner Redifer) "Mr. Chairman, I move that item VE-2004-036 be moved to the Consent Agenda."

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

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 May 11, 2004 public hearing.

Commissioner Putnam noted that while the minutes indicated his presence at the public hearing, his name had erroneously been omitted from the attendance roll.

MOTION: (Commissioner Redifer) "Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of the minutes of May 11, 2004 as written [including the correction reflecting the presence of Commissioner Putnam]."

Commissioner Evans seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Cole abstaining.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Offered for placement on the Consent Agenda were items ANX-2004-060 (Zone of Annexation--Peregrine Estates Annexation) and VE-2004-036 (Zone of Annexation and Vacation of Easement--SGH 27 Road Annexation). At citizen request, item ANX-2004-060 was pulled from Consent and placed on the Full Hearing Agenda.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I would move for approval of the Consent Agenda as corrected."

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

IV. FULL HEARING

ANX-2004-060 ZONE OF ANNEXATION--PEREGRINE ESTATES ANNEXATION

A request for approval to zone 17.87 acres from County RSF-2 (Residential Single-Family, 2 units/acre) to a City RSF-2 (Residential Single-Family, 2 units/acre) zone district.

Petitioner: Guy and Martha Stephens

Location: 2157 South Broadway Boulevard

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Ray Rickard, representing the petitioners, reiterated the request for annexation into the City. The request met Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Senta Costello gave a PowerPoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo map; 3) Future Land Use Map; and 4) Existing City and County Zoning Map. Zoning criteria were reviewed, and staff concurred that the request met both Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations. The City's RSF-2 zone district was equivalent to its County RSF-2 counterpart. She noted that the only consideration before the Planning Commission was the zone of annexation. The development plan had been submitted for review; however, it would not be before Planning Commission for another 6-8 weeks. Staff recommended approval of the current request for RSF-2 zoning.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if the property had already been annexed. Ms. Costello thought that a final reading of the annexation request had been scheduled for the first City Council public hearing in July.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Jim Creasy (2177 Meadows Court, Grand Junction) referenced an area outside the boundaries of the petitioners' parcel and asked how wetland areas would be protected. Staff confirmed that the referenced area was outside the boundaries of the current request.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on Zone of Annexation #ANX-2004-060, I move that the Planning Commission forward the Zone of Annexation to City Council with the recommendation of the Residential Single-Family 2 du/ac (RSF-2) district for the Peregrine Estates Annexation, with the facts and conclusions listed in the staff report."

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

FPP/RZ-2004-028 FINAL PLAT/PLAN/REZONE--SUMMER HILL, FILING 5, REVISED

A request for approval to amend the Preliminary Plan boundary by an additional 1.546 acres and rezone that parcel from RSF-4 (Residential Single-Family, 4 units/acre) to PD-2.5 (Planned Development, 2.5 units/acre); establish underlying zone districts of RSF-4 and RMF-8 for the PD-2.5 zone district; amend setbacks in bulk requirements of the PD-2.5 zone district; establish the August 12, 2003 phasing schedule with City Council; and approval of the Final Plat/Plan of Summer Hill Filing 5, consisting of 27 single-family attached lots.

Petitioner: Kevin Bray--Paradise Hills Partnership

Location: Summer Hill Way

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Kevin Bray, petitioner, acknowledged the fine work that City staff had done in reviewing his submittal. He overviewed the various facets of his request and availed himself for questions.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave a PowerPoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) a project description; 2) site location map; 3) aerial photo map; 4) Future Land Use Map; 5) Existing City and County Zoning Map; 6) Background; 7) amended Preliminary Plan; 8) extended development schedule; 9) rezone overview; 10) amended bulk standards overview; 11) Final Plat/Plan for Filing 5; and 12) staff recommendations.

The petitioner was asking for a phasing extension from December 31, 2004 to June 15, 2008. Ms. Portner briefly elaborated on the request to establish a phasing schedule with City Council. The additional 1.546-acres proposed for rezoning would remain as open space to increase the size of proposed lots; there would be no increase in the number of lots. Staff concluded that the rezone request met Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations. The underlying RSF-4 zone would apply to all detached residential units; the underlying RMF-8 zone would apply to attached units. Approval of setback amendments would allow property owners in future filings as well as those in Filings 1 and 4 to construct patio area shade covers within limited rear and side yard setback areas.

The petitioner had also requested a 60-day period, during which, construction traffic would be able to utilize both Catalina Drive and Lanai Drive in order to effect permanent street improvements on Summer Hill Way and Spring Crossing. A variance to street lighting requirements had been requested for Filing 5 to reduce light pollution impacts by reducing the number of installed street lights. Approval of that request would be consistent with approvals given for the first four filings. Approval of the Final Plat/Plan for Filing 5 was being sought. Staff concluded that Code criteria had been satisfied for all requests, and approval was recommended, with the following conditions:

1. All Preliminary Plan requirements established by the City of Grand Junction shall remain in full effect upon Filing 5, as well as all agreements executed between the developer and the City of Grand Junction.

2. All review comments shall be adequately addressed by the petitioner prior to recordation of the Final Plat.
3. The final CC&R's shall be reviewed and approved by the City and recorded with the Final Plats.
4. Modify streetlight requirement from one light every 250 feet to one light at intersections only.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble noted that some open space acreage is situated within an airport critical zone. When asked if there were any plans to erect any structures on that land, Ms. Portner responded negatively.

Commissioner Putnam observed that as residential development encroached closer to airports, the number of noise complaints always increased. Ms. Portner acknowledged that portions of the site were situated within the airport's 65 lds contour. She surmised that some noise mitigation would be required; however, she suggested directing the question to the petitioner for his response.

Chairman Dibble asked how far into established setbacks patio covers would encroach. She replied that they could extend to within one foot of side and/or rear yard property lines. Clarification was requested on the petitioner's verbiage regarding side yard setback delineation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

There were no comments against the request.

GENERAL:

David Krogh (892 Overview Road, Grand Junction), resident of the Grand Vista Subdivision, understood that Bray & Company was responsible for Leach Creek. He cited its standing waters, which he feared were breeding grounds for mosquitoes, and drainage issues, and wondered if the petitioner intended to address Leach Creek's problems. He hoped that Summer Hill would not be connected to Grand Vista Subdivision since traffic in the area was already bad.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Robert Bray, co-petitioner, said that Bray & Company did own the fee rights to Leach Creek, and he expressed similar concerns over maintenance, flood risks, etc. In conversations with City staff, he understood that a detention pond was planned for construction north of the canal and west of the airport. He believed that it was both under study, had received funding approval, and would be constructed either this year or next. Because Leach Creek was a wetlands area, the Corps of Engineers was the designated overseeing body. It was hoped that the Grand Junction Drainage District (GJDD) would ultimately take over maintenance; however, it wasn't currently possible because no portion of Leach Creek running through Summer Hill did connected with any GJDD-owned drainageways. He noted that closer to the canal, where Leach Creek originated under the canal, the Grand Valley Irrigation District had a maintenance easement both at that tributary and another one further to the southeast.

There was a street connection planned for Summer Hill and Grand Vista Subdivision, which would be completed with Filing 7. He noted that its construction was a City interconnectivity requirement (location noted on map) and would involve extending a roadway across Leach Creek.

With regard to the setback verbiage discussed earlier, he provided clarification. The variance in bulk requirements was necessary because rear yards in applicable filings were very small, and setbacks often encompassed the entire rear yard area. The verbiage regarding side yard setbacks primarily addressed side yard fencing issues as outlined in the subdivision's CC&R's.

Ms. Portner said that with regard to side yard setbacks, patio shade covers could still not extend beyond 1 foot of the side yard property line. When asked by Commissioner Cole if this could potentially result in two properties having adjacent shade structures within two feet of each other, Ms. Portner agreed that that could be a possibility. The only stipulation made by the City was that no deck or patio could be enclosed and made into additional living space.

Mr. Bray continued that he was aware of FAA regulations regarding sound mitigation of homes within airport sound contours, and he fully intended to comply with FAA requirements.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Cole felt that the developer had satisfactorily addressed the majority of stated concerns, and he expressed support for the project.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZ/FPP-2004-028, I move that we recommend to City Council approval of: 1) rezoning to PD the 1.546-acre parcel; 2) establishing revised bulk requirements in the zoning ordinance; 3) establishing the underlying zoning of RSF-4 and RMF-8 in the zoning ordinance; 4) extending the development schedule beyond December 31, 2004; and allowing construction traffic to use Lanai Drive and/or Catalina Drive for a 60-day construction period. We grant final approval of the revised Preliminary Plan and the Final Plan/Plat for Filing 5, Summer Hill Subdivision, as proposed, with conditions as recommended by staff."

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 8:00 p.m.