

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 28, 2002 MINUTES
7:03 P.M. to 7:45 P.M.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:03 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), Richard Blosser, John Evans, John Redifer, Richard Cole, Bill Pitts and William Putnam. John Paulson (alternate) was absent. One alternate position is vacant.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Community Development Director Bob Blanchard, Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Lori Bowers (Associate Planner), Lisa Gerstenberger (Senior Planner), and Dave Thornton (Principal Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney) and Eric Hahn (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were nine interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes of the May 14, 2002 Planning Commission public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move we approve the minutes of May 14.”

Commissioner Blosser 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

Placed on the Consent Agenda were items VR-2002-105 (Vacation of Right-of-Way/Crosby Road ROW Vacation), CUP-2001-119 (Conditional Use Permit—High Side Brewery Extension), and CUP-2002-117 (Conditional Use Permit—Boomer’s Restaurant). Item FP-2002-078 (Final Plat—Grand Vista, Phase II) was added to the Consent Agenda. No objection was raised from staff, planning commissioners or the audience to the final Consent Agenda.

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we pass the Consent Agenda as amended.”

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

IV. FULL HEARING

ANX-2002-049 GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT—ISRE (CARA’S PROPERTY)

A request for approval to amend the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan to redesignate the parcel from Residential Medium-Low (2-4 units per acre) to Residential Medium (4-8 units per acre).

Petitioner: ISRE, LLC—Lisa Comstock

Location: 2990 D ½ road

Representative: Jeffory Crane

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Jerry Alvire, representing the petitioner, said that the subject area was generally higher in density (RSF-8) than the petitioner’s property. He pointed out industrial-zoned properties which lay directly north.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble questioned the suggestion that the surrounding area was zoned RSF-8. Is that accurate and does it need to be clarified?

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton offered a PowerPoint presentation which included the following: 1) introduction; 2) project description; 3) vicinity map; 4) Future Land Use Map; 5) aerial photograph showing the site’s location; and 6) an outline of GPA criteria. Mr. Thornton said that the RSF-4 designation had been assigned to the property by City Council at the time of its recent annexation. Referencing the Land Use Map, he noted a couple of land use designation errors. Approval of the amendment would be consistent with goals for urban infill and reduction of sprawl by increasing densities in areas serviced by existing adequate infrastructure. Mr. Thornton indicated that during upcoming Growth Plan review, the entire subject area may be re-reviewed, with the reclassification of some properties to higher land use classifications possible. The petitioner had been apprised of the pending review but hadn’t wanted to wait. Staff recommended approval of the GPA request.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked if most of the properties within this area were still situated within County jurisdiction, to which Mr. Thornton responded affirmatively with one exception which was noted.

Commissioner Putnam referenced the three properties west of 30 Road adjacent to Gunnison Avenue and asked if they were correctly represented as RSF-4 on the Land Use Map. Mr. Thornton replied affirmatively, but added that they would be included in the area’s re-review.

Commissioner Cole asked when the subject property had been annexed. Mr. Thornton said that annexation had occurred within the last month.

Commissioner Redifer wondered if approving a revised land use designation for the subject property would impact other area properties included in the re-review. Mr. Thornton replied that the subject property would merely be excluded from consideration.

Mr. Blanchard offered additional clarification on the first two findings under consideration. Referencing staff’s statement regarding the “Error in Plan” criterion, he said that the area was currently developing as current land use designations showed; however, the staff report mentioned that the Growth Plan had been used for two years, with the subject area designated at a lower density. This was found to be problematic because development was occurring at a higher level than the area’s original designation. Thus, it was important that this finding refer back to the original Plan designation.

With regard to the “Change in Character of Area” criterion, Mr. Blanchard said that the area was developing as intended, the way the land use designations existed currently; however, development is occurring at a level of intensity different from what had been originally anticipated by the Growth Plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Rich Traver (2967 ½ D Road, Grand Junction) disagreed with statements that the area was developing at higher densities. He cited various developments in the area which were at densities of generally 3.15 du/ac to 3.7 du/acre, with the density of Grove Creek Subdivision at 3.8 du/acre. The highest residential development density in the area was only 4.7 du/acre, which was nowhere close to the 8 units/acre allowed by the Residential-Medium land use classification. He asked that consideration of the GPA be deferred until the neighborhood had an opportunity for closer review and consideration. Mr. Traver noted the existence of many “mini-farms” located along D ½ Road. He wondered what type of housing would be proposed for development on the property.

PETITIONER’S REBUTTAL

Mr. Alvire said that affordable single-family homes in the range of between \$115K and \$140K would likely be proposed for the subject property.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cole asked if this request was tantamount to a rezone request. Mr. Thornton replied negatively. The higher-density land use classification would give the petitioner more options; however, the petitioner would still be required to submit a rezone request. Planning Commissioners retained latitude in determining an appropriate density for the development plan. Mr. Thornton added that neighbors would get the chance for closer review during the Preliminary Plan development stage. He said that the petitioner had indicated she’d received financing for the project, which would be proposed at approximately 5 du/acre.

Commissioner Blosser asked for verification that if not approved, the petitioner would be limited to development densities of between 2-4 du/acre only, which was given.

When asked by Commissioner Redifer if it would make more sense to consider the GPA at the same time the development request was submitted, Mr. Blanchard said that GPA requests were to be considered on their own merit. It was unnecessary to consider them in conjunction with a development plan.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Cole didn’t feel there was any reason for delaying the current request, because it seemed relatively straightforward. As long as Mr. Blanchard’s findings were included in any motion made, he felt he could support the request. He agreed that the neighborhood would have ample review time during the Preliminary Plan stage.

Chairman Dibble concurred. Delay of the current request could pose a hardship to the petitioner.

Commissioner Pitts observed that most of the surrounding area was already in higher densities.

Commissioner Blosser cautioned the petitioner that approval of the GPA request didn’t guarantee approval of a subsequent rezone request.

Commissioner Evans agreed that the neighbors would be given ample development submittal review time.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-2002-049, ISRE Growth Plan Amendment, I move that we find the project consistent with the Growth Plan and criteria section 2.5.C of the Zoning and Development Code, and forward the item to City Council with the recommendation of approval, including the findings consistent with the discussion that took place regarding the Error and Change in Character of the Area [i.e., referencing staff’s statement regarding the “Error in Plan” criterion, Mr. Blanchard said that the area was currently developing as current land use designations showed. However, the staff report mentioned that the Growth Plan had been used for two years, with the subject area designated at a lower density. This was found to be problematic because development was occurring at a higher level than the area’s original designation. Thus, it was important that this finding refer back to the original Plan designation. With regard to the “Change in Character of Area” criterion, Mr. Blanchard had said that the area was developing as intended, the way the land use designations existed currently. However, development is occurring at a level of intensity different from what had been originally anticipated by the Growth Plan.]”

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 7:45 P.M.