

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
JANUARY 28, 2003 MINUTES  
7:00 P.M. to 9:20 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 Planning Commission, were Paul Dibble (Chairman), John Evans, Roland Cole, Richard Blosser, John Redifer, Bill Pitts and William Putnam. Travis Cox (2<sup>nd</sup> Alternate) was also present. John Paulson (1<sup>st</sup> Alternate) was absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Bob Blanchard (Community Development Director), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), and Scott Peterson (Associate Planner).

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 44 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Available for consideration were the minutes from the January 14, 2003 public hearing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of the minutes of January 14."**

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

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

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

Available for placement on the Consent Agenda were items ANX-2002-230 (Zone of Annexation--Red Tail Ridge Annexation) and ANX-2002-243 (Zone of Annexation--North Avenue Center Annexation). At citizen request, item ANX-2002-230 was removed from Consent and placed on the Full Hearing Agenda.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the Consent Agenda as modified."**

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

**IV. FULL HEARING**

**ANX-2003-230 ZONE OF ANNEXATION--RED TAIL RIDGE ANNEXATION**

**A request for approval for a Zone of Annexation for 9.88 acres from County Residential Single-Family Rural (RSF-R) to Residential Single-Family, 4 units per acre (RSF-4).**

**Petitioner: La Cima I, Inc., Jay Kee Jacobson**

**Location: Highway 50 at the south end of Buena Vista Drive**

**STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Pat Cecil offered a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) location map, 2) aerial photo and 3) Future Land Use Map. He said that the only question before the Planning Commission was the Zone of Annexation; a Preliminary Plan would be submitted at some future date, but is not a part of the current request. Having determined that the request met Code criteria and was consistent with Growth Plan guidelines, Mr. Cecil recommended approval of the RSF-4 zone district.

**QUESTIONS**

Chairman Dibble asked for clarification on surrounding zoning. Mr. Cecil responded that the subject property is currently zoned in the County as RSF-R, but this was inconsistent with Growth Plan recommendations. The surrounding area was zoned as Residential-Rural.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Jay Kee Jacobson, petitioner, offered no additional testimony but availed himself for questions.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**FOR:**

There were no comments for the request.

**AGAINST:**

Linda Sparks (141 Buena Vista Drive, Grand Junction) felt that the City's RSF-4 density was too high and wasn't consistent with the densities of surrounding neighborhoods.

Shauna Wells (143 Buena Vista Drive, Grand Junction) said that the petitioner was only proposing one access for the project. She was concerned about the amount of traffic the project would generate and the ability of emergency vehicles to be able to navigate the proposed subdivision, given a single access. She asked that speed bumps be incorporated into the project's street design.

Carter Bair (2966 A 1/4 Road, Grand Junction) felt that any subdivision built to an RSF-4 density would add too many children to nearby schools, which he said are already overcrowded. The petitioner had also not planned for any play areas in the new subdivisions; this omission would force children to play out in the streets. He asked for clarification of the annexation process, which was provided by Mr. Shaver.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Pitts asked staff if A1/4 Road dead-ended at the subject property. Mr. Cecil responded affirmatively, but added that during the development process, staff would consider the need for two access points.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Cole said that while he understood the concerns of the neighbors, most of those concerns would be better voiced during the development process. Given that the Zone of Annexation met Growth Plan guidelines and Code criteria, he could see no reason not to support the zone request.

Commissioner Blosser concurred and urged citizens to submit their comments and concerns at the Preliminary Plan development stage. He, too, expressed support for the zone request.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on Zone of Annexation ANX-2002-230, I move for a recommendation of approval of a Zone of Annexation of RSF-4 to City Council, with the findings as listed in the above staff recommendation."**

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

At petitioner request, item FP-2002-173 (Final Plan--The Legends, Filings #4 and 5) was continued to the February 25 Planning Commission public hearing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I move to continue this item [FP-2002-173] to the February 25 meeting."**

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

**PLN-2002-161 MAJOR STREET PLAN**

**A request for approval of a Major Street Plan, to identify the existing and future arterial and collector street system, the on-street and off-street pedestrian and bicycle path system in the area bounded on the east by 25 1/2 Road, west by 26 Road, south by F 3/4 Road, and north by G Road.**

**Petitioner: City of Grand Junction**

**Location: 25 1/2 Road to 26 Road, between F 3/4 and G Roads**

**STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Rick Dorris offered a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) overview of the Grand Valley Circulation Plan; 2) explanation of the district map; 3) slides of the Grand Valley Circulation Plan's area; 4) site location map; 5) aerial photo; 6) Future Land Use Map; 7) existing City zoning map; 8) aerial photo with the names of various property owners in the subject area; 9) response to the question 'Who will build the streets?'; and 10) conclusion. Mr. Dorris clarified that the plan only applied to the area bounded on the west by 25 1/2 Road, on the east by 26 Road, on the south by F 3/4 Road, and on the north by G Road. He acknowledged that the notification cards sent out to area residents weren't very clear on the area's delineation. He said that street locations depicted on aerial photos were conceptual only; actual street placement would depend on if, when, and how a property within this boundary developed.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Blosser asked if actual street placement would be known only at the time of each parcel's development, to which Mr. Dorris replied affirmatively.

When asked for a brief elaboration of parcel densities within the subject area, Mr. Dorris said that they were all currently classified as Residential-Low, with densities not exceeding 2 units/acre. Commissioner Blosser asked if the subject area was under Growth Plan re-review, to which Mr. Blanchard responded negatively.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**FOR:**

Ed Lenhart (2505 Foresight Circle, #4, Grand Junction), owner of the Just Co. property, voiced support for the Plan, saying that it gave a good conceptual idea of where future streets would go. He felt it was especially helpful in guiding future development of his property, and others, within the F 1/2 Road/G Road area. While he'd received comments from Valley Meadows East residents, who had expressed concern over the single access point through their subdivision, he wanted to assure them that two access points would be proposed with any development plan he might submit.

**AGAINST:**

Donald Jones (693 26 Road, Grand Junction) felt that consideration of the Major Street Plan in conceptual form was essentially "putting the cart before the horse."

John Burnell (2575 G Road, Grand Junction) wondered if the street alignments shown on the aerial map could be changed. He felt that Just Co.'s access would be better routed to the south instead of to the north.

Tom Kirkland (698 Glen Caro Drive, Grand Junction) was opposed to routing all future development traffic to G Road; he supported consideration of other access alternatives.

Helen Dunn (2557 McCook Avenue, Grand Junction), president of the Valley Meadows East Homeowners Association, read from a prepared written statement, which was later entered into the record. Representing the majority of Valley Meadows East homeowners, she outlined concerns over expected damages/impacts that would occur if the berm at the end of Kapota Street was breached. She said that the berm provided a stormwater/irrigation water detention benefit. Also, the Major Street Plan presumed extension of Kapota Street to G Road and 26 Road in conjunction with development of the Just Co. property. This would route all Just Co. property traffic, both from construction vehicles/equipment and property owners, through their established neighborhood. Valley Meadows East homeowners felt that this would be hazardous to both the new and existing neighborhoods in an emergency situation (statement from the City's Fire Department read into the record). Extension of Kapota Street without a suitable drainage plan or acceptable access plan would result in a number of problems. She asked planning commissioners not to support the Plan as proposed.

John Chapman (667 Kapota Street, Grand Junction) read from a prepared written statement, which was later entered into the record. He elaborated further on the drainage/flooding history of the Valley Meadows East subdivision. He referenced a prior development proposal by the Just Co. property owner, and referenced his comments made at that Planning Commission meeting (March 12, 2002). Mr. Cecil said that even with the earthen berm in place at the end of Kapota Street, there had been substantial canal and stormwater flooding soon which damaged a number of homes in the Valley Meadows East subdivision. A breach of this berm for the purpose of extending Kapota Drive to the north would not only be "disastrous" to existing home owners but he felt that it went against the principles of drainage law. Mr. Cecil said that breaching the berm in even a single location would render the entire structure (berm) useless. He noted that two development applications from Just Co. had been denied because these issues had not been resolved. Mr. Chapman said that even a conceptual plan should take these very real issues into consideration, because they represented conclusions that were previously supported by both the Planning Commission and City Council.

Carol Chapman Berman (628 Sage Court, Grand Junction) read from a prepared written statement, which was later entered into the record. She felt that in all possible development scenarios, the City was, in effect, asking residents of the Valley Meadows East subdivision to bear the brunt of development impacts. Ms. Chapman-Berman asked with the Just Co. property situated closer to 25 1/2 Road than 26 Road, why wasn't an access to 25 1/2 Road proposed? She said that the proposed Master Plan "seemed contrary to east/west traffic flows in the valley," and it failed to "help with the direct and easy flow of traffic the recently funded F 1/2 Road Corridor Study had been charged with examining." The Plan, she continued, seemed to cater to the developer of the Just Co. property, even though his development proposals had been denied twice due to the non-mitigation of major existing problems.

Patti Visconti (659 Janece Drive, Grand Junction), president of the Kay Subdivision, referred to a letter she'd submitted to staff expressing concern over increased traffic into the area near the 25 1/2 and F 1/2 Roads intersection, which would result in increased instances of speeding and accidents and more noise. These problems would only be exacerbated with construction traffic during development of the subject properties.

Ted Watkinson (675 26 Road, Grand Junction) wondered if future streets would be developed with bike lanes or pedestrian paths.

Jim Grisier (690 25 1/2 Road, Grand Junction) expressed support for the comments made by Ms. Dunn. He hoped that the City only consider PUD proposals for the area, to better ensure more quality development as well as mitigation of issues.

Judy Golden (679 26 Road, Grand Junction) said that the Major Street Plan proposed cutting through a great deal of open farmland. She said that she and other family members had purchased their properties adjacent to one another to better ensure preservation of existing wildlife habitat. She noted the presence of a bird habitat on her property that would be directly impacted by street construction in the area. Ms. Golden hoped that planning commissioners would take the preservation of farmland and wildlife into account when considering the adoption of the proposed Plan.

Kristen Beals (679 26 Road, Grand Junction) supported the points expressed by Ms. Golden and she stated her opposition to the Plan.

Larry Ball (2577 Galley Lane, Grand Junction) expressed opposition to any new road construction within the subject area. Such construction would negatively impact the quality of life currently enjoyed by the area's residents. He expressed support for the concerns expressed by residents of the Valley Meadows East subdivision and felt that their issues should be considered before approving any development proposal that would directly impact them.

William Patterson (668 26 Road, Grand Junction) said that with the overwhelming majority of residents in opposition to constructing new roads in the area, the City's Master Plan seemed to benefit only the developer of the Just Co. property.

John Toolen (685 26 Road, Grand Junction) felt that the issues expressed by Valley Meadows East residents should be addressed now instead of at some future date. Even though the City's Plan was conceptual, it established an expectation that could be exploited by the Just Co. developer. He asked how could the City consider a Plan that would result in far-reaching impacts to Valley Meadows East without first mitigating those issues? He felt that he could not support any development request proposing a density of more than 1 unit/acre.

Sharon Trumbetta (2580 Galley Lane, Grand Junction) supported comments expressed by the Goldenes, who are members of her family.

Other letters of opposition received by City staff included those from Pat Brach (663 26 Road, Grand Junction), who supported routing traffic to F 1/2 or H Roads and supported preservation of wildlife and wetland areas; Ken and Twila Carothers (no address given), who expressed concern over increased traffic hazards; Robin Madison (2586 Galley Lane, Grand Junction), who felt that the construction of additional streets in the area went against Growth Plan goals of preserving the characteristics of existing neighborhoods; she opposed any kind of major F 3/4 Road development, because that street was more representative of a driveway than a right-of-way; and Pete Woodbury (2582 Galley Lane, Grand Junction), who felt that consideration should be given to improving the access for Valley Meadows North (as yet undeveloped) from the west through Moonrise East.

#### **STAFF'S REBUTTAL**

Mr. Dorris thanked residents for their comments and explained that the Master Plan is proposed because of what could potentially occur in the future. If current property owners didn't develop their properties, then no street construction would be necessary; however, even though current property owners may not want to develop their land, the City must plan decades into the future for the contingency that those properties may be sold to others who would want to develop or pass to heirs who might want to develop. He did not expect that bike lanes would be required with street construction and he expected that any traffic generated by development of the subject area would be light. He said that the City needed to ensure interconnectivity of the area if/when development occurred. If only the Just Co. and Burnell properties developed, traffic would be routed through Valley Meadows East via Kapota Street. Development of the Moonrise East subdivision off 25 1/2 Road negated the possibility of extending an access point from the Just Co. property to 25 1/2 Road without destroying an existing home in that subdivision.

**QUESTIONS**

When asked by Commissioner Cole if there was another option of extending access from the Just Co. property to 25 1/2 Road, Mr. Dorris responded that pursuing such an option would require the purchase and demolition of at least one home in the Moonrise East subdivision. He mentioned ADTs (average daily trips) and felt that any traffic routed into the Valley Meadows East subdivision from the Just Co. property would still not exceed the street's carrying capacity.

Mr. Shaver explained the law regarding street planning.

Chairman Dibble said that drainage from the Just Co. property had been and would continue to be a major issue in conjunction with any development of that property. He urged the developer to mitigate that issue prior to any development submittal.

Mr. Dorris agreed that drainage mitigation had to meet the 100-year flood criteria, which represented an engineering industry standard. The canal's overflow path would be taken into account as properties within the subject area developed.

Chairman Dibble asked about the ramifications of breaching the berm at Kapota Street. Mr. Dorris said that any extension of Kapota Street would require breaching the berm at that location. Grading the site to accommodate drainage flows was possible but efforts would likely be extensive and costly. Any drainage mitigation necessitated by the berm's breach would have to be factored into any Just Co. development submittal; however, these issues were better addressed during Preliminary Plan review.

Chairman Dibble asked if Kapota Street had always been intended to connect to northern properties, to which Mr. Dorris replied affirmatively.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Pitts said that he appreciates the City's efforts to try and anticipate and plan for future development. He noted that whether or not development occurred depended solely on the property owners themselves. He said that he understood that the Master Plan served only as a conceptual idea of where streets might possibly be located if and when development occurred. He reiterated that actual street placement would depend on the development proposal itself.

Chairman Dibble said that the Plan represented a tool for use in more long-range planning.

Commissioner Cole said that he would feel more comfortable if there were a way to extend an access from the Just Co. to 25 1/2 Road through Moonrise East subdivision. Mr. Dorris explained that even if an access were extended in that location, a number of Valley Meadows East homes would be faced with double-frontaged lots, with double the traffic.

Commissioner Blosser noted that the Master Plan was not representative of any final proposal.

Commissioner Pitts said the Plan confirmed that none of the properties in the area would be landlocked.

Commissioner Evans acknowledged that the subject area was growing. If the area's property owners did decide to develop their lands, having some kind of conceptual street plan in place would be necessary.

Commissioner Putnam reiterated that while current property owners may not want to develop their properties, the next generation could feel differently. He said that while it was never an easy thing to consider having construction traffic routed through an existing neighborhood, it was often necessary to accommodate a developing area.

Commissioner Redifer wondered why the Master Plan was called a "plan" when it didn't represent any actual proposal. He expressed concern over the extension of Kapota Street, with so many issues outstanding. He asked about the flagpole access currently serving the Burnell property. He asked "how could that property be developed when its access didn't meet City standards?" Mr. Dorris said that while the Burnells could access their property via the narrow flagpole access, in terms of development potential, the property was landlocked without other access alternatives. Mr. Shaver addressed Commissioner Redifer's concern that the City may condemn right-of-way based on the plan by saying exclusive of other properties developing, the property owner would have to negotiate with surrounding property owners to secure the necessary right(s)-of-way. Mr. Shaver added that the purpose and benefit of the plan is apparent from the situation with Valley Meadows North.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2002-161, I move that we approve the proposed district map for the area from 25 1/2 Road to 26 Road and between F 3/4 Road and G Road."**

Commissioner Evans 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 9:20 P.M.