

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**APRIL 22, 2003 MINUTES**  
**7:00 P.M. to 9:30 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 Planning Commission, were Paul Dibble (Chairman), John Evans, Roland Cole, John Redifer, William Putnam, Bill Pitts, and Richard Blosser.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Bob Blanchard (Community Development Director), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor) Lori Bowers (Senior Planner) and Ronnie Edwards (Associate Planner).

Also present was John Shaver (Asst. City Attorney) and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

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 March 25, 2003 Planning Commission public hearing.

Chairman Dibble offered a correction to the vote reference on page 4, to take out the word "unanimously."

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I move for approval as corrected."**

Commissioner Blosser seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-0, with Commissioner Putnam abstaining.

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

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

Proposed for the Consent Agenda were items PP-2002-203 (Preliminary Plan--Little Creek Subdivision) and just the vacation portion of FPP-2002-159 (Final Plat/Plan--Independence Ranch Filings #10 and #11). Staff offered placement of additional item GPA-2003-061 (Growth Plan Amendment--Update to the Growth Plan) to the Consent Agenda.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Evans) "Mr. Chairman, I would like to confirm what Mr. Cecil just said and move this housekeeping item, GPA-2003-061, to the Consent Agenda."**

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

Pat Cecil asked that the Final Plat/Plan consideration for item FPP-2002-159 be continued to the May 13, 2003 public hearing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I would move approval of the Consent Agenda, [and] a recommendation of approval of the resolution to vacate various easements within the subdivision of Independence Ranch [FPP-2002-159] as being approved and deferring action to May 13 on the Final Plat/Plan."**

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

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

##### **ANX-2002-182 PRELIMINARY PLAN--430 30 ROAD SUBDIVISION (AUTUMN GLEN SUBDIVISION)**

**A request for approval to develop, in two phases, a total of 60 lots on 11.18 acres currently zoned RMF-8 (Residential Multi-Family, 8 units/acre).**

**Petitioner: Darren Davidson**

**Location: 430 30 Road**

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

Darren Davidson, petitioner, said that the current proposal represented the third plan revision. He recounted a brief history of the development, which included denial by the Planning Commission of the last plan submittal. He noted where, at staff's request, a 30 Road access had been relocated. The number of lots had been reduced from the last proposal to 60, with the overall project density averaging 5.3 units/acre. Noting the location of the site on an overhead map, he pointed out that there were over 247 lots near the development site that were smaller in size than those proposed; 92 lots were a little larger. He felt that the current proposal complied with staff's directives and met both Code and Growth Plan requirements. Photos of existing homes in the area were shown as were photos depicting examples of the type of duplex housing proposed for designated multi-family lots. Mr. Davidson felt that the proposed housing types were an improvement over many of the homes already existing in the area. Referencing the proposed Preliminary Plan, Mr. Davidson said that most of the lots would be sold to people who would construct their own homes. He himself intended to build on very few of the lots. He added that people could always opt to buy more than one lot and construct larger homes if they so chose.

##### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Blosser asked if multi-storied homes were planned for any of the lots. Mr. Davidson said that none were planned.

Chairman Dibble asked if the proposed segment of Colorow Drive would be connected with the existing Colorow cul-de-sac, to which Mr. Davidson replied affirmatively.

##### **STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Lori Bowers offered a PowerPoint presentation which contained the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo of the site; 3) location map; 4) existing City and County zoning map; and 5) the proposed Preliminary Plan. She noted the reconfiguration of Autumn Glen Drive, terminating in a cul-de-sac, and the reconfiguration of proposed lots. The current proposal, she said, represented a reduction in overall site density from the last submittal. The proposed 5.3 units/acre density conformed to both Code and Growth Plan requirements, with the street reconfiguration conforming to TEDS requirements. Staff recommended approval subject to the findings and conclusions listed in the April 22, 2003 staff report.

##### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Putnam asked for clarification of the dark "division line" which bisected a third of the property. Ms. Bowers explained that this line just denoted the project's proposed phasing.

Chairman Dibble asked for verification that the half-street segment of D 1/4 Road connecting to 30 Road, met TEDS standards and would be constructed with curb, gutter and sidewalk; verification was provided by Ms. Bowers.

Chairman Dibble asked why an RMF-5 zoning hadn't been sought for the property? Ms. Bowers said that because the proposed development exceeded RMF-5 density standards, the higher density RMF-8 zone had been previously proposed and approved. She noted that the latter zone allowed for a density range of between 4 and 8 units/acre.

Chairman Dibble asked if staff felt that the proposal's density was consistent with the surrounding area, to which Ms. Bowers replied affirmatively. When asked if she felt the petitioner represented the proposal and surrounding area accurately, Ms. Bowers again responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Blosser asked if the Future Land Use Map indicated 4-8 units/acre for the entire area, to which Ms. Bowers replied affirmatively.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

### **FOR:**

Mike Cooper (3021 D 1/2 Road, Grand Junction), owner of three acres in the subject area, supported the proposal and said that he too may want to develop his property at some point. The subject parcel, he said, has been vacant for quite some time. He said that the petitioner had complied with the City's criteria; the density was compatible with the surrounding area; and the number of lots had been reduced. The parcel seemed to be located within an infill area. Mr. Cooper said that other developers in the area had not had these difficulties in getting their projects approved; there seemed to be a discrepancy in how developers were treated. The current proposal was straightforward and should be approved.

### **AGAINST:**

Pam Brown (no address given), owner of five acres directly adjacent to the proposed development, said that the petitioner had previously said that all constructed homes would be single family and that the price range would be between \$120-\$140K. She asked what are the proposed square footages of the multi-family units? She strongly objected to the creation of another "Clifton Village South" with its slum-like appearance and negative impacts to surrounding property values. She said that a number of people living near to the proposed development failed to receive notices of the public hearing(s).

William Browning (428 30 Road, Grand Junction) objected to the lack of any proposed parks within such a large subdivision. He noted the "total lack of parks in the nearby area" and wondered why the City didn't require development of a play area in conjunction with the proposed development. He said that at least half of those moving to the subdivision would be children; yet, there was no place where they could go and play. He also wondered if fencing would be provided by the petitioner to buffer his property from the development. He stated that kids and pets already harassed his animals; the addition of so many more people and pets to the area would only exacerbate the problem.

Bill Bankster (434 Colorow Drive, Grand Junction) asked for the definition of "multi-family" as it pertained to Lots 3 through 7. He asked how many units could be constructed on these lots? Did this include multi-plex units? While not opposed to development of the subject parcel, he wondered why the petitioner had been allowed to increase the site's density from the originally proposed 54 lots. He asked why did the City encourage increasing the project's density? He felt that the multi-family aspect of the project should be eliminated. Mr. Bankster hoped that the subdivision would contain nice homes.

Michael Flewelling (3018 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction) agreed that as proposed the development looked as though it would turn out to be another Clifton Village South. No parks or amenities of any kind were offered with the development. The only person to benefit from such a development, he said, would be the petitioner.

Connie Bankster (434 Colorow Drive, Grand Junction) said that added traffic from the Colorow extension into her neighborhood was her greatest concern. This would become a real safety hazard.

Jim Nieman (3013 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction) presented several photos showing where he said that the petitioner's contractors had torn out a portion of his irrigation pipe and had run over a fence post. If this was indicative of how the petitioner showed consideration for surrounding residents, he commented that it did not bode well for future construction activities. The petitioner, he said, should have stuck to his original plan. He too objected to the additional traffic that would be created and funneled through the Colorow extension.

Linda Neiman (3013 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction) said that she'd been home one day when the petitioner's contractors burned weeds on the subject parcel. There had been no notice given beforehand and only during the burning did someone bother to tell her what he was doing. In the meantime, the effects of the smoke had been so overwhelming, she'd had to move her horse from her property. The photos shown by the petitioner of existing properties, she said, were skewed. There are a number of very nice homes in the area that the petitioner did not show.

Penny Massay (no address given) agreed that the petitioner's first plan had been much better than the one currently proposed; the lower density of the first proposal was preferred. She felt that the Clifton/Fruitvale areas had more than its share of multi-family units. She said that the higher densities in those areas negatively impacted schools and service provision. She wondered how the City's annexing of the subject property would affect the subdivision's residents in terms of the Clifton Fire District. Would residents be double-taxed?

LaDonna Salamun (433 Colorow Drive, Grand Junction) said that the first proposal of 54 lots would have placed the site's overall density at 4.9 units/acre. In that scenario, an RFM-5 zone could have been applied. The subject property, she said, had originally been zoned AFT. At what point had an RFM-8 zone been applied, and why weren't surrounding residents notified of the rezoning proposal?

Dan Salamun (433 Colorow Drive, Grand Junction) said that he didn't understand why the City had insisted on extending Colorow Drive instead of extending Autumn Glen Drive to 30 Road. That would have been a much better plan. Colorow Drive was only 22 feet wide; it would not be able to handle all of the anticipated additional traffic generated by the proposed subdivision. The City's Code, he said, set forth as one of its criterion for development that such development should have "no negative impacts to surrounding neighborhoods." The proposed development did not meet that criterion.

Dave Austin (no address given), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, expressed concern over the multi-family units. He asked would the multi-family lot designation permit 4-plexes? If that were the case, the overall density could potentially increase beyond the 5.3 units/acre (or 60 units) now proposed.

#### **PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Mr. Davidson agreed that another Clifton Village South was undesirable; however, he stated that this subdivision would definitely not be a slum. Constructed homes would likely be in the \$120K to \$140K price range because that was the general cost of housing. Homes would be nice and in the 1,100 to 1,500 square foot range. Mr. Davidson reminded the Commission that if more than one lot was purchased, people could build larger homes. He again referenced photos of existing homes in the area and showed those lots that are possible for the multi-family sites. Neither four-plexes nor units exceeding duplexes were proposed for the multi-family lots. The City had not wanted a park developed with the subdivision because there was insufficient acreage available. Parks fees were still paid, however, presumably for parks construction in the nearby area. With regard to the extension of Colorow Drive, this had been a City requirement, as had been the configuration of Autumn Glen Drive. The D 1/4 Road extension to 30 Road would be constructed to accommodate two-way traffic and would have full street improvements (curb, gutter and sidewalk). If possible, he would ask the City for TCP credit towards widening the D 1/4 Road street segment. He agreed that most of the subdivision's

residents would likely use D 1/4 Road to get to 30 Road. With regard to weed burning on the site, Mr. Davidson said that he'd approved the burning in response to complaints that the weeds were too high and that tumbleweeds were blowing onto neighboring properties. A burn permit had been obtained, and he thought he'd been considerate in sending people around to the various residents to advise them of his intentions. He apologized for any damages done to Mr. Nieman's fence post and irrigation pipe; if he or his contractors were responsible for the damages, he would certainly take care of any repairs.

Mr. Davidson did not feel that duplex units would devalue the area. Single-family homes could still be constructed on the lots if persons buying them so chose. In fact, the lots would perfectly accommodate homes whose owners wanted to construct three car garages. Similarly designed attached homes were currently being constructed in the more exclusive areas of the Redlands and Independence Valley. Existing fencing of surrounding properties would be preserved; however, the City had only required fencing along the 30 Road property line. If children or pets trespassed or harassed neighboring animals, residents still had the option of calling the Police Department.

Mr. Davidson said that the Growth Plan Update for the Pear Park area called for construction of a variety of housing types. He told the Commission that the proposal met both subdivision development and zoning standards. He felt that the proposed subdivision would neither adversely affect adjacent properties nor the surrounding area; rather, it represented an "upgrade." The proposed internal street system would include wider streets than Colorow Drive, with curb, gutter and sidewalk being constructed.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Blosser asked if, when built out on the east end, there would be a through street to D 1/2 Road. Mr. Davidson explained that D 1/2 Road was located to the north. When built out to the east, Autumn Glen Drive would connect to 30 1/4 Road, which would connect to D 1/2 Road.

Chairman Dibble asked staff to explain the City's notification process. An explanation was provided. He also asked if the current proposal was the petitioner's third design. Ms. Bowers responded affirmatively. She added that the current proposal was only the second to have actually been submitted.

Chairman Dibble expressed concern over the increase in density from the original 54 lots to 60 lots. He asked what was the City's rationale in suggesting that? Ms. Bowers answered that the 54 lot submittal did not meet TEDS for its originally proposed 30 Road access. Changes in the access configuration allowed the petitioner to propose a higher density. Because the previous proposal had been denied, the plan had been reconfigured again with fewer lots. When asked if staff had suggested that the petitioner propose more lots, Ms. Bowers reiterated that in conjunction with the street reconfiguration, staff had indicated to the petitioner that the opportunity existed for additional lots. She clarified that the maximum number of units on any of the multi-family designated lots would be two (duplex). If approved as submitted, the overall constructed density of the project could not exceed 60 units (5.3 units/acre). Ms. Bowers added that the maximum density is 65 units.

Chairman Dibble asked if two story units could be constructed. Ms. Bowers said that the maximum height allowance for the RMF-8 zone is 35 feet. In response to Chairman Dibble's request, Ms. Bowers recapped the City's position on parks and open space fees and/or land acquisition. In the current case, the City opted to receive fees in lieu of a land dedication. She added that with regard to fencing, the City did not require construction of fencing to separate like uses. The developer is only required to install fencing along 30 Road. When asked about setbacks, Ms. Bowers said that proposed setbacks were according to Code for the RMF-8 zone district.

Rick Dorris explained why the original 30 Road access had been reconfigured. The new configuration, he said, is now aligned with the existing D 1/4 intersection and traffic flows along 30 Road would be much improved as a result. He concurred that most of the subdivision's traffic would use the D 1/4 access; however, with a 20 foot asphalt mat, it could accommodate two-way traffic. Completion of the D 1/4 Road section would only include

another 8 feet of asphalt. Transfer of TCP credit was not an option because Mr. Davidson did not own the property needed for the additional half-street improvements. The additional 8-foot section would only be required if and when Ms. Brown's property developed. When asked to explain why the Colorow street stub was necessary, Mr. Dorris said that it made sense to connect adjacent subdivisions. Doing so provided greater vehicle and pedestrian access, provided neighborhood interconnectivity, and better facilitated emergency access. It also reduced the amount of traffic traveling along streets at higher speeds. Curb, gutter and sidewalk would be constructed to the end of the stub street. Only if lots to the north of the stub were further redeveloped would additional improvements be required.

Chairman Dibble asked if irrigation ditches would be piped, to which Mr. Davidson replied affirmatively, although doing so had not been required by the City. Mr. Dorris added that final details would be provided with the Final Plan/Plat submittal. Final approval was administrative unless the Planning Commission wanted it brought back before them for consideration. Mr. Shaver reminded planning commissioners that final approval consisted only of ensuring that the requirements of the Preliminary Plan were met.

Mr. Shaver explained the site's zoning change process, which he noted included consideration by the Planning Commission, two readings by the City Council, legal notification in the paper and sign posting on the property. He added that with regard to problems of trespass or damages to personal property, there were civil remedies available. There would be no double taxation imposed as a result of the City's annexation, and he explained the ramifications of the Persigo Agreement.

## **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Cole remarked that over the years he'd heard many of the same concerns being raised, questions over notification, traffic, property values, etc. While relevant concerns, they were primarily emotional ones and hard to prove. With the current submittal, the developer had reworked the plan to address both the City's issues and density concerns. He found no reason not to support the proposal.

Commissioner Pitts concurred and observed that over 50 percent of surrounding lots were smaller than the ones proposed by the petitioner. He still expressed concern over how the multi-family lots would be developed. While perimeter fencing was not a City requirement, he urged the petitioner to consider installing additional fencing. Although still troubled by some of the issues previously raised, he noted that the petitioner met the City's requirements.

Commissioner Putnam agreed with Commissioner Cole's comments saying that there are negligible effects from duplexes on traffic and property values in areas that had them. People should not presume that all duplexes are bad looking or that they contributed to slum conditions. He expressed support for the project.

Commissioner Blosser said that he'd initially been concerned over density, and he'd driven out to the site and through the area to try and gauge impacts from the development. While there would be some impact to the area as a result of the development, the reduction in the number of units proposed, along with the explanations provided assuaged most of his concerns. There are a number of issues affecting the entire Pear Park area, but these could not be addressed by a single developer.

Chairman Dibble noted that the subject area was in transition, and that growth in the Pear Park area was occurring at a rapid pace. He agreed that there are a number of issues inherent to the entire area, and Clifton Fire Department had brought forth a number of them at recent Growth Plan Update hearings. The developer seemed to have addressed the majority of concerns and had been willing to remedy damages that may have occurred in conjunction with the development thusfar. Code criteria and Growth Plan requirements had been met, and there did not appear to be any reason to deny the project.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on the Preliminary Plan for the Autumn Glenn Subdivision, I move that we adopt the findings and conclusions as listed above and approve the Preliminary Plan."**

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

A recess was called at 8:50 P.M. The public hearing reconvened at 8:57 P.M.

**PDR-2003-036 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW--HOSPICE MEDICAL CAMPUS**

**A request for approval of a Preliminary Development Plan to build a medical campus, including office/clinics, community services, and group living on 12.23 acres in a Planned Development zone district, and to amend Ordinance #3391 to increase the overall square footage.**

**Petitioners: West Tocol Development, LLC--Larry Jokerst and Hospice & Palliative Care of Western Colorado--Christy Whitney**

**Location: 3090 and 3150 North 12th Street**

**PETITIONERS' PRESENTATION**

Roy Blythe, representing the petitioners, provided a history of the project and its prior approval, referencing a number of overhead maps and elevation drawings. Many meetings, both with the neighbors and City staff, had been undertaken, and the petitioners had engaged City staff and architects in a design charrette, to help ensure a quality end product. The 47,579 square foot increase in office space would better accommodate facility needs. The proposal included constructing a portion of the Hospice building into the sloping hillside to create a basement level. Mr. Blythe said that the traffic study had been updated, with no additional impacts created by the added square footage and an internal loop road had been deleted and taken off the City's Transportation Plan Map. Development partners had tried to be sensitive to the needs and concerns of adjacent Bonito Avenue residents. To this end, building scales and profiles had been carefully considered; a large quantity of green space and vegetative buffering had been proposed; and attractive water features (ponds) were incorporated into the overall site design. Other amenities included a vegetative labyrinth, picnic areas, a system of pedestrian paths/sidewalks and bus stops. While the proposed parking area was sufficient for expected needs, an area to the rear of the property had been targeted for additional parking lot development should it be needed. Until that time, it would be landscaped and retained as open space.

The architectural style of buildings would remain residential and be composed primarily of brick and stucco. Exam rooms would be constructed to the rear of buildings. The Hetland House would be renovated to accommodate a counseling center. Mr. Blythe said that all comments received thusfar on the project had been positive.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Putnam wondered whose views would be the most impacted by construction of the new buildings. Mr. Blythe thought that some Lakeside and Atrium residents might be affected; however, with all of the green space, vegetation and water features planned, those residents would be provided with a view that is/will be very aesthetic.

**STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Lori Bowers offered a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo of the site; 3) Future Land Use Plan map; and 4) an existing City and County zoning map. The Planned Development zone and initial plan had been approved in 2001. A brief history of the approval process was recounted. She reiterated that an internal loop road had been deleted following initial approval and the City's Transportation Plan map had been updated. The petitioners had been very receptive to staff ideas and suggestions. The currently proposed plan anticipated build-out over the next 20 years. Grand Valley Transit (GVT) had been very supportive and although there were no stops planned for the site currently, the GVT

expected that its route would be expanded to include stops at that location. The drainage ditch would be piped; a bike/pedestrian path system was planned; and buildings would reflect a residential character. She acknowledged the design to be innovative, one that would accommodate a state-of-the-art medical facility. The proposal complied with Code criteria and Growth Plan requirements and was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Staff recommended approval.

**QUESTIONS**

Chairman Dibble asked if deceleration lanes were planned at both entrances. Ms. Bowers replied affirmatively. When asked if the internal street system would be privately owned, Ms. Bowers again responded affirmatively.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**FOR:**

Christy Whitney (no address given), co-petitioner representing Hospice, expressed appreciation for the process and for the great collaborative work undertaken by many folks to come up with what she felt was a wonderful plan. She said that the plan offered a number of amenities and would be something the community could be proud of.

Larry Jokerst (no address given), co-petitioner, outlined a number of the various people and entities involved in the facility's planning, all of whom, he said, are very active in the community. Approval of the plan would allow the medical community to better provide for the long-term needs of the community.

**AGAINST:**

There were no comments against the request.

**PETITIONERS' REBUTTAL**

No rebuttal testimony was offered.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Blosser thought the project to be a good one at a good location, and he expressed support.

Commissioner Cole thought the project to be an exciting one, and he agreed that it would provide the community with a real amenity.

Commissioner Pitts thought the proposal would be a great addition to the surrounding area.

Commissioner Evans thought that the facility was just what was needed and that it represented a great project.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on item #PDR-2003-036, I move that we adopt the findings and conclusions listed above and recommend approval to the City Council of the Preliminary Plan and the amendment to Ordinance #3391."**

Commissioner Blosser 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 9:30 P.M.