

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
AUGUST 24, 2004 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 8:45 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 and Tom Lowrey. Roland Cole and Bill Putnam were absent.

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Lori Bowers (Senior Planner), Lisa Cox (Senior Planner), Kristen Ashbeck (Senior Planner), and Ronnie Edwards (Associate Planner).

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were 38 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 27, 2004 public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move we accept the minutes as written."

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

III. CONSENT AGENDA

- FPA-2004-107 Final Plan Amendment--Western Colorado Lung Center
- ANX-2004-141 Zone of Annexation--Prairie View Annexation
- PP-2004-069 Preliminary Plan--Columbine Park Subdivision
- ANX-2004-127 Zone of Annexation--Barker Annexation
- VR-2004-133 Vacation of Right-of-Way--The Falls 2004
- PP-2003-042 Preliminary Plan--Woodridge Subdivision

Available for consideration were items FPA-2004-107 (Final Plan Amendment--Western Colorado Lung Center), ANX-2004-141 (Zone of Annexation--Prairie View Annexation), PP-2004-069 (Preliminary Plan--Columbine Park Subdivision), ANX-2004-127 (Zone of Annexation--Barker Annexation), VR-2004-133 (Vacation of Right-of-Way--The Falls 2004), and PP-2003-042 (Preliminary Plan--Woodridge Subdivision). At citizen request, items PP-2004-069, ANX-2004-127, and PP-2003-042 were pulled and placed on the Full Hearing Agenda.

Jamie Kreiling read into the record a clarification for item #5 (VR-2004-133), which exempted vacation of F Road/Patterson Road from the request. A recommended motion was also read into the record.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) "I move we approve the Consent Agenda as modified [to include FPA-2004-107, ANX-2004-141, and VR-2004-133]."

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

IV. FULL HEARING

PP-2004-069 PRELIMINARY PLAN--COLUMBINE PARK SUBDIVISION

A request for approval to develop 16 single-family attached units, one triplex unit, and one existing single-family home on 3.15 acres in an RMF-8 (Residential Multi-Family, 8 units/acre) zone district.

Petitioners: Lila Hughes and David Vindiola

Location: 537 1/2 and 539 28 1/4 Road

PETITIONERS' PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representing the petitioners, expressed agreement with staff's report and recommendation of approval. He noted the site's location adjacent to Columbine Park. He felt the project represented one of the best examples of good infill, adding that all utilities and infrastructure were available.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lori Bowers 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; and 5) the Preliminary Plat. Ms. Bowers said that the request included two properties located at 537 1/2 and 539 28 1/4 Road. Initial issues surrounding ownership of property along an existing fenceline had been resolved. The subdivision would receive its access via 28 1/4 Road. The request was very straightforward, and staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Gary Lucero (1015 North 15th Street, Grand Junction) said that while not necessarily opposed to the request, he was hoping to receive further information on it. Would the proposed units be tri-plexes? Would all the units be attached? What was the proposed configuration? Would units be used as rentals or would they be sold?

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Logue said that units would be arranged in a series of nine attached duplexes. One additional single-family home would be constructed, and one existing single-family home, already situated on the property, would remain. The total number of units would be 20, with 19 new and 1 existing.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked for clarification on the total number of units proposed. The agenda and petitioner's request indicated that only 16 units would be constructed. Mr. Logue referenced a site plan

depicting the layout of proposed units. He said that the originally proposed triplex had been eliminated from the plan. The triplex accounted for three units, which had been reconfigured in the proposal as a result of discussions with City staff and representatives from the Fruitvale Sanitation District. The total overall number of new units proposed had always been 19, with the one existing unit. Units would be sold and not retained as rentals.

Commissioner Redifer asked Ms. Bowers if the proposal as explained by Mr. Logue was the same one reviewed by staff, to which she responded affirmatively. While there had been a slight misunderstanding in how the units were configured on the plat, the calculations and staff's review had been based on accurate data. Approval was still recommended.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #PP-2004-069, the Preliminary Plan for Columbine Park Subdivision, I move that we find the project consistent with the Growth Plan, Section 2.8 of the Zoning and Development Code, and the adjacent property usage, and approve the Preliminary Plan subject to the recommended conditions included in the staff report."

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

ANX-2004-127 ZONE OF ANNEXATION--BARKER ANNEXATION

A request for approval to establish a zone district of RSF-4 (Residential Single-Family, 4 units/acre) for property being annexed into the City.

Petitioner: Myron Barker

Location: 172 Lantzer Road, 2934 Highway 50, and 2937 Jon Hall Drive

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lori Bowers gave a PowerPoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo map; 3) Future Land Use Map; and 4) an Existing City and County Zoning Map. The site was surrounded by primarily RSF-4 and RSF-R zoning. The site's annexation had been a prerequisite of the petitioner's Preliminary Plan submittal. The RSF-4 zone district was deemed consistent with Growth Plan recommendations and met both Persigo Agreement and Code criteria. Approval was recommended.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Joe Mims (2918 Jon Hall, Grand Junction) expressed opposition to the site's annexation.

Chairman Dibble briefly explained the difference between the site's annexation and the application of a zone, the latter being the only consideration before the Planning Commission.

Jimmy Farina (no address given) said that the subject property had flooded twice. How did the petitioner plan to address drainage issues?

Chairman Dibble said that drainage would be addressed during the Preliminary Plan review stage. Mr. Farina would be notified once a formal proposal was submitted. He encouraged Mr. Farina and Mr. Mims to meet with staff outside of the public hearing to discuss the item further.

DISCUSSION

There was no discussion of this item.

MOTION: (Commissioner Evans) "Mr. Chairman, on item #ANX-2004-127, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council the zoning designation of RSF-4 (Residential Single-Family, not to exceed 4 units per acre) for the Zone of Annexation of the Barker Annexation locate at 2934 Highway 50, 172 Lantzer Avenue, and 2937 Jon Hall Drive, finding that the project is consistent with the Growth Plan, the Persigo Agreement, and Section 2.6 of the Zoning and Development Code."

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

PP-2003-042 PRELIMINARY PLAN--WOODRIDGE SUBDIVISION

A request for approval of a PD (Planned Development) zoning ordinance to establish the underlying zoning and bulk requirement for the remaining parcels of the Wilson Ranch PD, and a Planned Development Preliminary Development Plan.

Petitioner: Dan Garrison--GNT Development

Location: 2561 G 1/2 Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Phil Hart, representing the petitioner, said that he'd worked with City staff to overcome a number of development challenges. Proposed were a total of 29 units: 19 single-family detached and 10 single-family attached units. The subdivision would be developed around a central theme, with all homes having a similar architectural style.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck 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; 6) background, and 7) conclusions and staff recommendation. Although a PD zone had been requested, the underlying Growth Plan land use classification of Residential Medium (4-8 units/acre) would remain with an underlying zoning of RMF-8. The overall density for the proposed subdivision would be 4.5 units/acre. She briefly overviewed the plans and locations of various designated onsite tracts. Since several of the proposed lots would have two front yards, construction of a 4-foot-high decorative fence or wall would be required along the site's entire perimeter bounding G 1/2 Road.

G 1/2 Road would require relocation and realignment to create a configuration of land more conducive to residential development and to eliminate substandard street curves. The subdivision would receive its access from Woodridge Court via G 1/2 Road. Given the difficult configuration of the parcel and the petitioner's willingness to realign G 1/2 Road, a TEDs exception had been granted for the subdivision's proposed interior street geometry and to require sidewalk on only the south side of G 1/2 Road. The additional traffic from this and other nearby projects would require G 1/2 Road/26 Road intersection improvements, including a left-hand turn lane. The City would be responsible for the construction and cost of the turn lane.

Having determined that the request met both Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations, staff recommended approval of both the zone request and the Preliminary Plan, subject to staff comments and requirements.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Redifer asked for staff's definition of a "decorative fence." Ms. Ashbeck said that staff was primarily looking for consistency of design, something with uniform appearance that the petitioner would install. Materials could include vinyl fencing, a block wall, etc.

Chairman Dibble asked if there would be any interconnectivity between the proposed subdivision and Wilson Ranch, to which Ms. Ashbeck replied negatively. Pedestrians and vehicles alike could only gain access into Wilson Ranch via G 1/2 Road.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Ebe Eslami (583 28 1/2 Road, Grand Junction), developer of the nearby Blue Heron Project, adjacent to the proposed Woodridge subdivision, expressed his support for the project and was especially pleased with the proposed G 1/2 Road street improvements, which he felt would be a benefit to everyone.

AGAINST:

William Rockwood (739 Wilson Court, Grand Junction), president of the Wilson Ranch Homeowners Association, said that while not opposed to the project, he and other homeowners had some suggestions, which they felt would make the project better. Wilson Ranch Subdivision, he said, had a density of approximately 3 units/acre. If the proposed development were allowed to build out to a maximum of 8 units/acre, it would represent a dramatic disparity in the two densities. Homeowners were concerned about potential impacts the proposed subdivision would have on Wilson Ranch.

Mr. Rockwood pointed out that the notification signage had been erected only two weeks prior to the public meeting. He'd called Community Development the day it had been installed and had been told by staff that the item had not yet been scheduled for public hearing. Two days later he found out that it had been scheduled for public hearing only a week later. He'd spoken to a number of homeowners within the 500-foot notification boundary and many of them said that they'd not received notification nor did they know what was going on.

As far as he knew, no covenants had yet been developed for the proposed subdivision. Wilson Ranch homeowners wanted assurance that the Woodridge covenants would closely reflect those of the Wilson Ranch Subdivision. That would help preserve property values. It was unclear what sizes the lots would be, what sizes the homes would be, or what the quality of those homes would be. Would garages be attached or detached? The lots in block 3, he said, were very small. What kind of homes would be placed on those lots? He hoped that homes in the proposed subdivision would mirror the quality construction of those in Wilson Ranch. He recognized the higher costs associated with the new subdivision's construction, given the extensive road improvement requirements, and he wondered if that would translate into the developer "cutting corners" when it came to actual home construction. Mr. Rockwood wondered whether anyone would even want to buy homes so closely situated to I-70.

Another concern included the 4-foot retaining wall located along the south side of the development. Not only would Wilson Ranch residents lose their view of the Bookcliffs, it also appeared that the Woodridge lots along that perimeter would have to be significantly graded and elevated to a point where drainage could run towards Woodridge Court. Homes situated that high would be able to see directly into the backyards and windows of Wilson Ranch homeowners living on the other side of the canal. That represented a significant loss of privacy.

Mr. Rockwood noted the large park located within and enjoyed by Wilson Ranch residents. Homeowners paid for its maintenance, insurance, taxes, etc. He asked for some assurance that a portion

of the new subdivision's homeowners fees would be directed to the Wilson Ranch Homeowners Association since it was more than likely those residents would use it.

Another concern included safety. With increased traffic through the subdivision from G 1/2 Road to G 3/8 Road, even the City's Police Department acknowledged the problem. The Code required 500 feet of running street before consideration could be given to the installation of speed bumps or traffic-calming devices. Wilson Ranch only had 350 feet of running street. If the current subdivision was approved, he hoped that some type of traffic-calming device could be considered, given the likelihood that residents from the new subdivision would also use Wilson Ranch as a short cut.

Mr. Rockwood noticed an absence of turnouts for lots 1 and 2 in block 1 from G 1/2 Road. He also wondered if CDOT approval would be required before any realignment of G 1/2 Road could be undertaken, given its proximity to I-70. He noted that the realignment would result in the headlights of cars coming down G 1/2 Road meeting those of traffic traveling in the opposite direction down I-70. That could necessitate the elevation of G 1/2 Road.

The only other concern he had involved whether there would be sufficient water pressure to ensure adequate fire flows but he thought that perhaps the issue had been resolved.

Elsa Daugherty (750 Wilson Drive, Grand Junction), owner of a large lot in Wilson Ranch (location noted), wondered if the 29 proposed units were "set in stone." Could the petitioner construct additional units if he so chose? She didn't believe that the developer would construct homes in the new subdivision to the same quality and standard as those in Wilson Ranch, and she expressed concern over negative property value impacts.

Dave Carlo (2566 Ranch Road, Grand Junction) thought that perhaps the new subdivision would serve to buffer Wilson Ranch residents from the sounds of traffic traveling the I-70 corridor. He agreed with previous resident comments, expressing similar concerns over drainage, loss of privacy, safety, home construction quality and traffic impacts. In the event that one of the elevated homes along the canal caught fire, the added elevation could potentially result in a "blow over" of the fire to Wilson Ranch properties. Mr. Carlo pointed out that 26 Road had a hill to the north and another to the south, which made sight distances bad coming from either direction. He felt that the sight distance issue should be addressed to prevent further accidents from occurring at the G 1/2 Road intersection.

Jeff Mace (2574 Ranch Court, Grand Junction) said he shared many of the same concerns previously expressed. The heights of lots along the canal, once graded and elevated, could potentially extend 8-10 feet above the canal. Since the current request was part of the original Wilson Ranch planned development, he asked that planning commissioners consider allowing the Wilson Ranch Homeowners Association (HOA) to take part in the Woodridge Subdivision's architectural control committee or to allow members of the Wilson Ranch HOA to be involved with the Woodridge HOA. That would help ensure consistency between the two developments.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Hart said that the development's actual density would be 4.7 units/acre. That was not much greater than the overall planned development density for Wilson Ranch of 4.3 units/acre. The design of proposed units hadn't yet been undertaken; however, lots would not be available to general builders. Perhaps 1-3 builders would be designated but they would be building according to a predetermined design standard. He agreed that it was important that both the Woodridge and Wilson Ranch Subdivisions reflect similar architectural styles and coloring. Homes would have attached garages. The quality of homes would have to be high if they were to appeal to buyers. He agreed that the subdivision

would be costly to build; cutting corners would be counter-productive. Building so close to the I-70 corridor had been the choice made by the property owner. The 4-foot sloping retaining wall to the south of the property allowed for sufficient grading to accommodate drainage.

Covenants would pertain to the entire subdivision. He wasn't sure whether a provision could be made to allocate funds from one HOA to another for park maintenance. Certainly that was open to further discussion. He noted that covenants had not yet been written. Mr. Hart did not feel that the subdivision would require an architectural control committee since it would be completely designed prior to any construction.

A left-hand turn lane would be constructed at the G 1/2 Road/26 Road intersection. He didn't believe that approval had to be received from CDOT before the realignment of G 1/2 Road could commence, adding that G 1/2 Road would be above-grade of I-70. The water provision and pressure issue had been resolved. Ute Water had agreed to extend its 8-inch water line across 26 Road from Cambridge Subdivision to tie into the Wilson Ranch water line. That would not only provide adequate fire flows to Woodridge Subdivision, it would also increase the pressure available to Wilson Ranch Subdivision. Mr. Hart confirmed that only 29 units were proposed. The minimum lot size required in an RMF-8 zone was 4,500 square feet; the smallest proposed lot had at least 6,500 square feet of buildable area available.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked Mr. Hart if he was willing to work with the Wilson Ranch HOA. Mr. Hart said that while he couldn't speak for the property owner on the matter, he didn't foresee any problem with the request.

At the request of Chairman Dibble, Eric Hahn came forward to clarify the sight distance limitations along 26 Road. Mr. Hahn agreed that the problem existed both to the north and south of the G 1/2 Road intersection along 26 Road. The City was currently investigating a possible vertical realignment of 26 Road in the subject area to improve safety and sight distance. Mr. Hahn clarified that the new TCP ordinance placed responsibility for construction of the proposed left-hand turn lane with the City. It was unclear, however, whether the turn lane would be constructed with the proposed development or at the time Mr. Eslami's property was developed.

Chairman Dibble asked if CDOT had returned any comments regarding the realignment of G 1/2 Road and the potential impacts from vehicle headlights at night. Mr. Hahn said that CDOT had originally not offered any comments; however, the headlight issue had not been mentioned. He expected to contact CDOT staff about that particular issue for comment.

Chairman Dibble asked if grading the lots nearest the canal would result in water being directed towards the street, to flow eastward towards the detention pond. Mr. Hahn replied affirmatively. Detained water would be released into Leach Creek at historic rates. Another option not yet discussed could include grading a high point at a given location (location noted on map), allowing some of the lots to drain directly into the canal, and overly restrict the flow coming from the detention pond so that the grand total amount of water being released from the subdivision would essentially be the same as historic. While possible to do in concept, he was unsure whether the site's geometry would accommodate the alternative. In the alternative scenario a discharge agreement would also be required between the developer and the canal company.

Chairman Dibble asked if Tract A would be left as open space. Mr. Hahn said that the tract was just shown as an extra retention or detention area, if deemed necessary.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Pitts said that he was quite familiar with the site and agreed that safety along 26 Road was a big concern. It appeared to him that the development would serve as a buffer against I-70 noise for Wilson Ranch residents. He agreed that given the eventual high cost of the lots, buyers were not likely to construct low quality homes on them. Since all major objections and issues seemed to have been addressed, he felt he could support the request.

Commissioner Lowrey urged the petitioner to consider the drainage alternative mentioned by Mr. Hahn. Utilizing that alternative could negate the need for such high lot elevations, solving a number of other issues previously discussed and resulting in a cost savings to the developer.

Commissioner Redifer concurred. While a challenging piece of real estate, he felt that the project would be a good one.

Chairman Dibble acknowledged that the City actively promoted good infill development, and the current request was just that. Safety was always a concern, and he was pleased that the City was considering a vertical realignment of 26 Road in conjunction with construction of the left-turn lane. He agreed that all concerns seemed to have been addressed. The additional water pressure from the extended water line would be a benefit to Wilson Ranch residents as would the realignment of G 1/2 Road. He urged the developer to cooperate with the Wilson Ranch HOA to ensure consistency between the two developments.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, on item PP-2003-042, the Woodridge Subdivision, I move that we forward a recommendation of approval of the requested Planned Development zoning ordinance to the City Council and approve the Planned Development Preliminary Development Plan for the Woodridge Subdivision (PP-2003-042), with the findings and conclusions listed above, including the requirement for a 4-foot [high] decorative wall or fence along the length of G 1/2 Road adjacent to the site."

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

PLN-2003-237 INSTITUTIONAL & CIVIC FACILITY MASTER PLAN--WALKER FIELD AIRPORT

A request for approval of an Institutional and Civic Facility Master Plan for the Walker Field Airport and a PD (Planned Development) zoning ordinance establishing requirements for future development.

Petitioner: Gary Mancuso

Location: Walker Field Airport

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave a PowerPoint presentation which contained the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) Future Land Use Map; 3) Existing City and County Zoning Map; and 4) a map of Walker Field Airport properties depicting the land use designations of aeronautical, aeronautical/commercial, and non-aeronautical/commercial. Ms. Portner overviewed the request and recommended approval of the airport's Master Plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Gary Mancuso gave a PowerPoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) mission statement; 2) airport services outline; 3) airport overview; 4) photos of airport property and facilities; 5) land use

overview; 6) review process for aeronautical classification; and 7) review processes for non aeronautical/commercial and aeronautical/commercial. Mr. Mancuso overviewed the request and outlined various benefits the airport provided to the community and said that airport property was leased to service providers, generally for 20 years at a time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Lowrey asked if the Airport Authority owned the Walker Field property, to which Mr. Mancuso replied affirmatively. David Anderson, representing the petitioner, came forward and provided a brief history of the Authority's origination, adding that it was subject to local, state and federal regulations. The Authority had a good working relationship with both the City and Mesa County governments.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Pitts was pleased to see the airport's Master Plan come before the Planning Commission. He expressed support for the request.

Commissioner Lowrey acknowledged the many contributions made by the airport to the community.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2003-237, an Institutional and Civic Facility Master Plan and Planned Development for Walker Field Airport, I move we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval."

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

With no further business to discuss, the public hearing was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.