

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 22, 2003 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), Roland Cole, John Evans, John Redifer, Richard Blosser, William Putnam and Bill Pitts.

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, were Bob Blanchard (Community Development Director), Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Ronnie Edwards (Associate Planner), Senta Costello (Associate Planner), and Lori Bowers (Senior Planner).

Also present was John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney) as well as Eric Hahn, Laura Lamberty and Mike McDill (Development Engineers).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 16 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the June 24, 2003 public hearing.

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

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

The proposed Consent Agenda items were read: PP-2003-022 (Preliminary Plan--Unawweep Heights Subdivision), ANX-2003-113 (Zone of Annexation--Monument Presbyterian Church), FPP-2003-108 (Final Plat/Plan--Redlands Mesa, Filing #5), and ANX-2003-116 (Zone of Annexation--Carville Annexation). At citizen request, item PP-203-022 was pulled 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 Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

IV. FULL HEARING

PP-2003-022 PRELIMINARY PLAN--UNAWEEP HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION

A request for approval of: 1) the Preliminary Plan to develop 30.33 acres currently zoned RSF-4 (Residential Single-Family, 4 units per acre) into 109 lots in two phases, and 2) the vacation of right-of-way along a portion of the newly aligned UnawEEP Avenue.

Petitioner: Bud Himes

Location: 2857 UnawEEP Avenue

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lori Bowers amended the agenda's description of the request to reflect development of 109 lots. She offered a Powerpoint presentation which included the following slides: 1) RSF-4 designation map, denoting excess right-of-way; 2) site location map, 3) aerial photo of the site and 4) a plat map showing street configuration. The only areas of concern, she said, were located in the northeast portion of the property where the presence of steep slopes necessitated a slope analysis report. Ms. Bowers noted that the lot configurations located along that ridgeline had been adjusted accordingly to that report. Staff determined that the request met both Growth Plan recommendations and Code requirements, and approval was recommended.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Blosser asked for a clarification on the location of right-of-way to be vacated. Clarification was provided. Ms. Bowers further stated that this had resulted in the realignment of Rocky Point Road.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Doug Theis, representing the petitioner, noted areas affected by the vacation request. Mr. Theis said that a private drive to the northeast would be constructed to full street specifications to complete internal traffic circulation. The UnawEEP Avenue realignment was nearly completed; lots would average approximately 10K square feet, which was consistent with the surrounding area although there were a few larger lots located to the north. Mr. Theis noted that the City's RSF-4 zoning was consistent with the previous County zoning of RSF-4. He also said that he had worked with an adjacent property owner to ensure continued irrigation water delivery.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Putnam wondered if UnawEEP Court would continue along the ridgeline following completion of the realignment of C Road? Mr. Theis said that extra right-of-way had been deeded to the County should the County want the street extended. UnawEEP Court would most likely be used for local traffic because the street was not currently in very good shape. Minor improvements would be undertaken on the west end of UnawEEP Court is (i.e., curb, gutter, sidewalk and overlay) because sanitary sewer had been installed there.

Commissioner Pitts asked what would be done with the open space area situated between lots 1 and 4 near the Snyder Creek Court cul-de-sac? Mr. Theis said that the area would be retained as open space, with a pedestrian path constructed to connect UnawEEP Avenue with the Snyder Creek Court cul-de-sac. Both would be maintained by the subdivision's homeowners association.

Commissioner Blosser asked if any subdivision lots were slated to receive their accesses from UnawEEP Court? Mr. Theis responded "no."

Ms. Bowers amended Mr. Theis's statement regarding the improvement of the private drive to full street standards. Ms. Bowers said that it had been originally proposed by the petitioner to connect Snyder Creek Court to Horizon Court but staff had insisted that it be deleted from the plan. Mr. Theis apologized and confirmed that the connection had indeed been deleted from the current plat.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

John Dennison (no address given) said that if the plat had been overlaid onto the aerial photo of the property, planning commissioners would better see that the proposed lot sizes do not conform to those in the surrounding area. He also wondered if C Road could continue as C Road instead of Unawep Court past the juncture where Unawep Avenue veered to the southeast. Mr. Dennison said that residents in that area had established addresses that they did not want to change. He referenced a triangular portion of property located at the Unawep Avenue/Unawep Court intersection where people were driving over the cul-de-sac to access Unawep Avenue. This, he said, had compacted soils over a water petcock, which could create future irrigation problems. He asked that large boulders or some other barrier be placed there to deter drivers. Mr. Dennison also offered to plant some trees there. He wondered if the developer intended to install landscaping along Unawep Avenue throughout the subdivision.

Matt Lohof (2875 C Road, Grand Junction) wondered if the developer intended to install fencing along the Snyder Creek Court cul-de-sac. His property abuts the cul-de-sac and he expressed concern over possible trespassing, loss of privacy and vandalism. He also noted the location of a catch basin installed at the corner of his lot by the developer. He asked that drainage from adjacent subdivision lots be piped into that catch basin to avoid having an open ditch.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Theis said that it didn't matter to him what Unawep Court was called. If acceptable to the County, it could remain as C Road. With regard to landscaping the triangle mentioned by Mr. Dennison, he appreciated the offer and would discuss it further with County engineer Pete Baer. Water is available to maintain any plantings, but the property hadn't been annexed as a part of the current project proposal. In addition, safety issues would have to be taken into consideration. Landscaping would be provided along the entire length of Unawep Avenue and secured by a Development Improvements Agreement. No fencing had been proposed to separate Mr. Lohof's property from the Snyder Creek Court cul-de-sac. Mr. Theis said that he would approach the petitioner with the request but nothing was currently proposed. Drainage from the northern lots would be carried to the east and north, ultimately emptying into the Colorado River. There are currently no plans to install pipe in that area.

Chairman Dibble asked what the developer thought of installing boulders or berming the area referenced by Mr. Dennison? Mr. Theis was open to considering options but he didn't want to create a traffic hazard in the process.

Chairman Dibble asked if the Thimble Rock Road street stub to the west would be improved? Mr. Theis responded "yes."

Commissioner Pitts asked for further clarification regarding the separation of the Lohof property from the cul-de-sac by fencing. Mr. Theis said that Mr. Lohof had brought up the issue at a prior neighborhood meeting and the cul-de-sac had been realigned several feet further away as a result. He reiterated that he would discuss the issue further with the petitioner to see if some kind of fencing could be provided.

Commissioner Blosser asked if subdivision covenants would denote acceptable fencing materials? Mr. Theis responded "no."

Ms. Bowers said that specific landscaping plans are not required until the Final Plat stage. She noted that even prior to the Unawep Avenue realignment the street was known by two names--Unawep Avenue inside the

City and C Road outside City limits. She said that it should not be difficult to address the street naming issue with the County.

Commissioner Blosser asked whose responsibility it would be to follow up on the street naming issue. Bob Blanchard suggested that Mr. Dennison talk with Pete Baer of Mesa County's Engineering Department.

Chairman Dibble asked for clarification of setbacks and frontages of those lots abutting more than one street. Mr. Blanchard said that setbacks and frontages were determined based on the lot's placement, not on the placement of the home. A brief discussion of this point ensued.

Chairman Dibble asked for staff's opinion about the piping of drainage water from northern lots. Laura Lamberty answered that drainage elements for that portion of the property had been undertaken by the County and were not the petitioner's responsibility.

Chairman Dibble asked if Lot 12 in Block 2 of Filing 2 would be a flag lot? Ms. Lamberty replied "yes," adding that its access would come from Snyder Creek Court.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Cole said that the proposal is good based on property constraints and street configurations. He urged the developer to work with the neighbors to address the issues brought forth.

Commissioner Putnam wondered if staff would follow up on the promises and comments made by the developer with regard to citizen concerns. Mr. Shaver replied affirmatively; however, he advised that if the Planning Commission so chose, it could address specifics in any motion made.

Chairman Dibble said that he appreciated the developer's willingness to talk with the County regarding traffic and landscaping of the northwest triangle of open space. He suggested that City staff also be involved in those discussions. Commissioner Pitts agreed.

Commissioner Pitts cautioned the developer not to allow the few feet separating the cul-de-sac from Mr. Lohof's property to become a "no man's land." Mr. Theis said that the property could be used by the lot owner or landscaped and left as a buffer. Mr. Theis added that front, side and rear yard setbacks would be denoted on the Final Plat. He also noted the property line for Lot 6 in Block 2 of Filing 2.

Commissioner Putnam noted that the Zoning and Development Code stated that new development proposals could not harm preexisting agricultural operations. Since the proposed subdivision directly abutted such an operation, what protection would there be for that property owner? He cited a similar instance where property owners objected to the agricultural operations of their neighbor that vandalism and harassment was prevalent. Mr. Shaver said that Colorado Statutes recognized the rights of preexisting agricultural operations with the Right-to-Farm Act. Mr. Shaver advised that instances of vandalism or other criminal activities were law enforcement issues and should be reported as such.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on item number PP-2003-022, Unaweeep Heights Subdivision, I move that the Planning Commission adopt the findings and conclusions listed above and approve the Preliminary Plan."

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, on item number PP-2003-022, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the vacation of the excess right-of-way along Unawep Avenue, finding that the vacation is in compliance with Section 2.11 and the conclusions listed in the staff report."

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

PP-2003-060 PRELIMINARY PLAN--MONARCH GLEN SUBDIVISION

A request for approval of the Preliminary Plan proposing 66 lots on 18.479 acres in an RSF-4 (Residential Single-Family, 4 units per acre) zone district.

Petitioner: EDKA Land Company, LLC--Ed Lenhart

Location: 626 30 Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Brian Hart, representing the petitioner, offered a Powerpoint presentation containing a site location map and Preliminary Plan. He reviewed the request, noting that the RSF-4 designation had been placed on the property earlier in the year. The project included two loop roads (locations noted), with open space and extra parking provided. The Fire Department approved the design and the looped roads complied with TEDS requirements. A detention pond location was noted, which would tie into an existing drainage line owned by the Grand Junction Drainage District. The request conformed to Growth Plan density recommendations and the petitioner was in agreement with staff conditions of approval. He introduced Mark Maurer, the project's architect, who continued with the presentation.

Mr. Maurer said that homes would be approximately 1,800 to 2,300 square feet in size, stucco and possess a southwest character. He said that distinctive streetscaping and landscaping would be provided to make the subdivision very attractive.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if lot owners would be provided with irrigation water? Mr. Hart replied "yes." He was unsure whether the system would be gravity-fed or pressurized.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Pat Cecil offered a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo of the site; 3) Future Land Use Map; 4) Existing City and County Zoning Map; and 5) the Preliminary Plan. Mr. Cecil said that the plan and the architect's incorporation of looped lanes/open space was "innovative." When offered the option of either constructing a left-turn lane at the subdivision's entrance or submit cash in-lieu of construction, the petitioner had chosen the latter option. The existing home located on Lot 4 would remain, although a separate structure, which would be situated on a reconfigured property line, would have to be torn down or relocated. A right-of-way fence adjacent to 30 Road would be constructed to prevent adjacent lots from taking their access from 30 Road. The project met both Growth Plan recommendations and Code requirements and staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. A revised Preliminary Plat (3 copies) addressing any previously unresolved issues as addressed in the July 10, 2003 review comments be submitted for file closure of the Preliminary Plat prior to submittal of the Final Plat application.
2. At final platting, cash in-lieu of construction will be paid to the City of Grand Junction for the entire construction cost to construct a left-turn lane with widening occurring entirely to the west side of the existing roadway including, but not limited to, clearing, pavement widening, drainage reestablishment, relocation of private utilities, striping, and all incidentals thereto, specifically including engineering, surveying and testing. The relocation of public utilities will not need to be included in the cost. The

geometry of the turn lane shall consider 12-foot-wide through lanes and a 12-foot-wide left-turn pocket with 50 feet of storage, with all tapers, transitions, reverse curves, and tangents per TEDS.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Blosser wondered who would be impacted by the relocation or removal of the structure mentioned by staff? Mr. Cecil said that the structure belonged to the developer, so removing the structure would not impact any other private property owner.

Chairman Dibble asked for clarification of an easement along Starlight Drive denoted as Tract B. Mr. Cecil said that Tract B represented a landscaping strip provided to keep adjacent lots from becoming double frontaged. The landscaping plan would be submitted during the Final Plat stage.

Commissioner Evans asked for additional detail on the looped lanes and open space? Mr. Cecil said that streets would be posted with No Parking signs; additional parking would be provided along the northern portion of each looped lane; and additional setbacks had been provided. Mr. Cecil added that a TEDS exception had been granted for Imperial Lane.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Kevin Gallegos (2998 F 1/4 Road, Grand Junction) said that he wasn't really against the proposal but did have some concerns. He said that there would be a "lot" of additional traffic generated by the proposed subdivision and funneled onto 30 Road. With so much new traffic generated also from the newly developed Brookside Subdivision and other recently approved projects, he felt that additional widening and other improvements to 30 Road should be required. For the currently proposed subdivision, he felt that both right and left-turn lanes would be warranted. The portion of proposed sidewalk along 30 Road should be extended past the petitioner's property southward to connect with Patterson Road. If not, he felt that the safety of children walking to school would be jeopardized. He felt that the speed limit of 40 mph is too high given the lack of sidewalks and residential character of the area. To preserve existing views, he asked that the homes constructed on Lots 1-4 in Block 1 be single-story only.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Hart said that the locations of two-story homes had not yet been determined, and he would like to keep options open. He noted that the property along 30 Road mentioned by Mr. Gallegos for sidewalk did not belong to the petitioner. He reiterated that staff had given the option of constructing a left-turn lane or paying a fee in-lieu; the petitioner had chosen the latter option. Thus, the City would determine if and when the lane was warranted.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked if any street lighting had been planned? Mr. Hart said that neighbors at the corner of F 3/10 and 30 Roads had complained about a light pole situated on their property, saying that the light shown brightly into their bedroom at night. It was later removed. The location of street lighting was not within his purview.

Chairman Dibble asked if traffic calming along 30 Road should be considered. Mr. Hart said that because 30 Road is a major collector, the installation of traffic calming measures would not be a good idea. He added that 30 Road would be widened to accommodate the turn lane.

When asked by Commissioner Pitts about the safety of children walking to school, Mr. Hart said he thinks that kids would most likely take Starlight Drive to F 1/2 Road to get to school.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Putnam said that he felt confident that staff would address traffic and other outstanding issues with the developer prior to Final Plat approval.

Commissioner Pitts acknowledged the thoughtful planning that had gone into the project's design. He agreed that the looped lanes were a unique design feature.

Chairman Dibble noted that the project represented good infill.

Commissioner Blosser asked what would happen to the fee paid in-lieu. Mr. Shaver said that the City was required to track the money but that it is not required to be spent on the project for which it was collected.

Mike McDill said that monies were allocated from the 207 Fund to support collector street improvements. The fee in-lieu had been accepted because construction of a left-turn lane was contingent upon the connection of F 1/2 Road to 29 Road. The F 1/2 Road connection would have to occur prior to the construction of additional improvements along 30 Road.

Commissioner Cole remarked that this was a good location for this project. Commissioner Blosser concurred.

Commissioner Redifer agreed that the plan was a good one but expressed some reservation over the City's accepting a fee in-lieu when it wasn't even known whether or when the F 1/2 Road connection to 29 Road would occur. He said that it seemed as though the City was holding the developer "hostage."

Commissioner Cole asked if the private open space areas within the looped lanes met the City's parks requirements. Mr. Cecil answered that the only open space required was in conjunction with development of the looped lanes. No additional open space was required for the development. The developer is still obligated to pay the \$225/lot parks and open space (impact) fees.

MOTION: (Commissioner Evans) "Mr. Chairman, on the Preliminary Plat for the Monarch Glen Subdivision, PP-2003-060, I move that the Planning Commission adopt the findings and conclusions listed in the staff report and approve the Preliminary Plan subject to the recommended conditions of approval."

Commissioner Cole 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 8:45 P.M.