

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 23, 2004 MINUTES
7 p.m. to 7:40 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, Tom Lowrey, John Redifer, William Putnam, Bill Pitts and Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh (alternate).

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Scott Peterson (Assoc. Planner), and Faye Hall (Planning Technician).

Also present was Jamie Kreiling (Asst. City Attorney).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were 26 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 October 26, 2004 public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I would move for approval of the October 26 minutes."

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion.

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

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Available for consideration were items CUP-2004-195 (Conditional Use Permit--SES Americom Colorado), ANX-2004-221 (Zone of Annexation--Water's Edge Annexation), ANX-2004-225 (Zone of Annexation--Campbell/Hyde Annexation), CUP-2004-187 (Conditional Use Permit--Building Blocks Preschool), VE-2004-228 (Vacation of Easement--Summit Meadows West Easement Vacation), and MSC-2004-261 (Miscellaneous--Extension of the Applicability of the Former Zoning and Development Code). No objections were received from the audience, planning commissioners or staff.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "I would move for approval of the Consent Agenda."

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion.

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

IV. FULL HEARING

GPA-2004-205 GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT--MANOR ROAD

A request for approval of a Growth Plan Amendment to change the Future Land Use designation from Rural (5 acres per unit) to Residential Medium-Low (2-4 units per acre) on 11 acres located at the northeast corner of 26 1/2 and I Roads.

Petitioner: Ben Hill, Manor Road

Location: Northeast corner of 26 1/2 and I Roads

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bill Balaz, representing the petitioner, presented an overhead map of the site's location; the site had been recently been included within the Persigo 201 service boundary. Several residential developments, as well as the Walker Field Airport, were located in close proximity to the site. He referenced an overhead map depicting the airport's noise contours and acknowledged that a portion of the property was situated within the airport's critical zone. Mr. Balaz felt that development of the property would represent good infill, and that the Residential Medium-Low land use designation would be compatible with surrounding area densities.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) aerial photo map; 2) Future Land Use Map; and 3) an Existing City and County Zoning Map. She noted the site's location and surrounding land uses. Ms. Portner briefly recounted that the property had been included within the urban growth plan's boundary as part of the 1996 adopted Growth Plan. That presumption had also been acknowledged by the North Central Grand Valley Area Plan. In 1998 the Growth Plan had been amended to tie the urban growth boundary with the Persigo 201 sewer service boundary. With that change, both the Persigo 201 boundary and the urban growth boundary ended at I Road. The petitioner had requested an extension of the Persigo 201 boundary to include his property, which received approval by both the City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners. The sewer service boundary was amended to include just the subject property, with the justification that a sewer line was already present under I Road.

Ms. Portner briefly went over Growth Plan Amendment criteria. She noted that while a majority of the site lay within the airport's 60-65 dB noise contour, a portion of the property was situated within the airport's critical zone. Additional noise mitigation measures would be required for homes built on the property; however, no building would be permitted within the airport's critical zone. Having determined that the request met the criteria outlined in the Code and Growth Plan recommendations, staff recommended approval.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole noted the presence of minutes from a neighborhood meeting and a letter of opposition from Jan Burkhalter contained in planning commissioner packets but not referenced in staff's presentation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Newt Burkhalter (908 26 1/2 Road, Grand Junction) said that traffic from the new development to the south of his property had created a lot of additional congestion in the area. He said that water from the Highline Canal seeped into the adjacent hayfield. He also expressed concerns over possible impacts to his property, driveway and street.

John Trotter (887 26 1/2 Road, Grand Junction) said that it seemed approvals were given to include property within the Persigo 201 boundary without first addressing the issues that would be inherent to their inclusion. That seemed to him a backward way of doing things. He suggested that public input be solicited prior to the City or County including any new properties within the sewer service boundary. By including a parcel within that boundary, it presupposed a higher density since it wouldn't be economical for a developer to bring sewer service to a low-density rural development. He said that during development of the Grand Vista Subdivision there had been fairly significant damage done to sections of area streets from Grand Valley Power during the move of one of its power lines. Some of that damage was still present even after patching, and he felt that additional traffic from the petitioner's development would further denigrate the condition of area streets.

Mr. Trotter added that he'd observed planes flying outside of designated critical zones when they made turns during take-off and landing. He felt that the petitioner's entire parcel should be viewed as falling within the airport's critical zone. He couldn't imagine anyone wanting to buy a home so close to the airport given the noise levels they could expect. Only so much noise mitigation could be attained through building materials for homes; however, nothing could be done to mitigate those impacts when people were outside in their yards.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Balaz reminded planning commissioners that the only issue before them was the Growth Plan Amendment. The development proposal had not been submitted and was not under review. He realized that he would be required to address issues and concerns raised by staff and the public during the site review process, but this was not the time.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Putnam felt that he would be hard pressed to deny the request when the property's inclusion into the Persigo 201 boundary had already been approved by both City Council and the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Redifer found the process "curious" as well and asked staff to elaborate on the procedure by which a property owner could petition for inclusion into the Persigo 201 service area. Ms. Portner briefly elaborated and said that it didn't presuppose any development density. When Commissioner Redifer asked if public notices had been mailed out regarding the property's proposed inclusion, Ms. Portner responded negatively; mailed notification had not been a requirement.

Commissioner Lowrey felt that as Grand Junction continued to grow the airport would probably be required to accommodate larger aircraft. While he didn't oppose the request, living so close to the airport didn't seem very appealing to him.

Commissioner Cole said that he'd had a lot of experience working with LDN boundaries and agreed that the current public hearing was not the appropriate time to discuss noise mitigation. Since the request met established criteria, he could see no reason not to vote for approval.

Chairman Dibble agreed that the issues brought forth would have to be addressed at the appropriate time. He encouraged citizens to participate in the development review process.

Commissioner Putnam remarked that extension of the Persigo 201 boundary across I Road seemed only natural.

Commissioner Pitts said that while not opposed to the petitioner's request for a Growth Plan Amendment, the petitioner would be facing a lot of hurdles during the development review process.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2004-205, a request for a Growth Plan Amendment for the Manor Annexation, I move that we forward a recommendation of approval to change the Future Land Use designation from Rural to Residential Medium-Low."

Commissioner Lowrey 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 7:40 p.m.