

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 22, 2002 MINUTES
7:08 P.M TO 11:00 P.M**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:08 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, Bill Pitts, Richard Blosser, John Redifer, William Putnam, and John Paulson (1st Alternate). Travis Cox (2nd Alternate) was absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Bob Blanchard (Community Development Director), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Lisa Gerstenberger (Senior Planner), Kristen Ashbeck (Senior Planner), and Senta Costello (Associate Planner).

Also present was Dan Wilson (City Attorney).

Ofelia Vargas was present to record the minutes.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the August 27, 2002 public hearing.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-0 to approve the minutes of August 23, 2002.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR VISITORS

Item VAR-2002-128 was pulled from the agenda.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Available for Consent Agenda Consideration was item ANX-2002-153 (Summit View Meadows Zone of Annexation).

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) “Mr. Chairman, I will move to approve the Consent Agenda, as amended [consideration of item ANX-2002-153 only].”

Commissioner Cole seconded the motion.

At citizen request, item ANX-2002-184 was pulled from consent and placed on the Full Hearing agenda.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of the Consent Agenda, as amended [consideration of item ANX-2002-153 only].”

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

IV. FULL HEARING

ANX-2002-184 LUCAS SUBDIVISION ZONE OF ANNEXATION

A request for approval of a Zone of Annexation of the Lucas Subdivision to Residential Multi Family-4 (RMF-4) for 3.77 acres.

Petitioner: Dennis and Karen Lucas

Location: 2220 Broadway

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Brian Hart, of Land Design, representing the petitioners Dennis and Karen Lucas, noted the location of the property with a PowerPoint Presentation and availed himself for questions.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Pat Cecil overviewed the request and said that the staff recommendation was that the property receive the same zoning (RMF-4) in the City as it currently had in the County. Staff determined that the proposed Zone of Annexation was consistent with the Growth Plan and complied with Code criteria. The preliminary plan will be reviewed by the Commissioners after staff has addressed the preliminary plan issues and public notices have been sent to adjacent property owners. The details of the property and the preliminary plan will be discussed at that time.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at the time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Don Maddy (2226 Kingston Road, Grand Junction) expressed opposition to the annexation occurring in the area. He thought RSF-4 was too high of a density for annexation and expressed concerns about the Preliminary Plan.

Sonny Lang (2230 Kingston Road, Grand Junction) questioned if the annexation would be spot zoning. Pat Cecil explained zoning as properties are annexed to the City from the County and this did not constitute spot zoning.

Zoe Krakowski (2227 Village Court, Grand Junction) questioned what benefit the annexation would be to the developer. Dan Wilson explained the Persigo agreement as it applied to this proposal. Pat Cecil confirmed that the rules of annexation were being complied with.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on the zone of annexation ANX-2002-184, I move that we forward a recommendation of approval of the zone of annexation of RSF-4 to the City Council.”

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

FP-2002-023 APPEAL-RIMROCK MARKETPLACE

Appeal of the Planning Director’s decision to approve a final plan and Site Plan Review for the Rimrock Marketplace (a retail shopping center which will consist of 370,000 square feet on a 54-acre site in a C-2, Heavy Commercial and C-1, Light Commercial zone districts). A round-a-bout to be constructed on the north side of Hwy 6 & 50 in front of Sam’s Club, in conjunction with the rerouting of Independent Avenue.

Petitioner: THF Belleville, LLC

Location: 2526 River Road

APPELLANT’S PRESENTATION

The Petitioner was not present. Dick Scariano, property owner to the east of the proposed roundabout, stated he is not opposed to the development per se but has concerns for traffic safety on Independent Avenue and the round-a-bout. His main concerns are that an east exit off the round-a-bout would be better and he expressed concern about the way traffic will work on Independent Avenue.

Jim Langeford, (307 Dakota Drive, Grand Junction), a local engineer who does a lot of development work, stated his concerns for traffic safety on Independent Avenue and the round-a-bout. Mr. Langeford’s main concerns are the emergency vehicle access, traffic stacking, and cross access agreements.

Mike Russell, (200 Grand Avenue, Grand Junction), attorney for Mr. Scariano, stated his concerns for traffic safety on Independent Avenue and the round-a-bout. Mr. Russell’s main concerns are the east exit of the round-a-bout and in general access to Sam’s Club.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Pat Cecil addressed traffic and parking concerns. Jody Kliska, City Traffic Engineer, agreed that this is a complex project. Mike McDill, City Engineer, expressed that this project met City standards.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at the time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the appeal.

AGAINST:

Against the appeal was Tom Volkmann, (225 N 5th Street Suite 620, Grand Junction), he stated that no one has presented any evidence that shows that any aspect of the project is in violation of the City's codes and requirements. He argued that there have been no failures to comply with the code, and believes this project should be allowed to proceed.

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we deny the appeal of item FP-2002-023."

Commissioner Cole seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-1.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept withdrawal, based on the agreement between the appellant, Wollard and the developer of item FP-2002-023."

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

CUP-2002-167 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT-FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF THE ROCKIES

Request approval to build a 2,390 square foot branch bank with drive through facilities.

Petitioner: First Nat'l Bank of Rockies – C. Dennis King

Location: 431 Power Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bryan Sims, representative for the petitioner and architect for the project, expressed that the project has called upon both artistic and technical skills.

Dennis King, petitioner, showed a model to the Planning Commission of what the new bank building would look like.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Senta Costello stated that staff is recommending denial of the application because the architecture did not meet City standards and availed herself for questions.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Pitts asked what the compatibility was between the bank and the Albertson's store.

Ms. Costello said the main thing that tied the whole atmosphere together were the variations in the roof lines.

Mr. Blanchard also mentioned that staff views “compatibility” as not meaning “same as” in buildings.

Mr. Sims said that the colors, trim and building edges served to integrate the bank building into the overall Albertson’s complex.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments.

AGAINST:

There were no comments.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on CUP-2002-167, I move that we find the project consistent with the Growth Plan and the Zoning and Development Code.”

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

RZ-2002-177 REZONE – ISRE REZONE

Request approval to rezone 13.4 acres from RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with no more than four units per acre) to RMF-8 (Residential Multi-family with no more than eight units per acre).

Petitioner: ISRE, LLC – Lisa Comstock

Location: 2990 D ½ Road

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck stated that the applicant is proposing to rezone the property from RSF-4 to RMF-8; the property is located on the northwest corner of D1/2 and 30 Roads; and the proposal meets the City’s rezoning criteria. She availed herself for questions.

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Jeffrey Crane, representative for the petitioner, ISRE, LLC, says they agree completely with staff’s recommendations.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at the time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments.

AGAINST:

There were no comments.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, on ANX-2002-177, I move that we find the proposal consistent with the Growth Plan and the Zoning and Development Code and forward the item to City Council for recommendation of approval.”

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

**ANX-2002-176 ANNEXATION/GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT – ISRE
ANNEXATION NO.2**

Request approval to amend the Growth Plan Future Land Use Map to redesignate this parcel from Residential Medium-Low (2-4 du/ac) to Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac).

Petitioner: ISRE, LLC – Lisa Comstock

Location: 2980 D ½ Road

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck stated that the owner and applicant is the same as the adjacent ISRE property to the east. They are proposing to amend the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan to redesignate the parcel located at 2980 D-1/2 Road from Residential Medium Low (2 to 4 units per acre) to Residential Medium (4 to 8 units per acre). Reviewing the criteria of the Zoning and Development Code, Ms. Ashbeck noted that the current land uses, zoning and trends are a residential intensity higher than the Plan recommends and the adjacent industrial park has also experienced growth. Typically, a higher density such as the 4 to 8 units per acre proposed can provide a better transition between lower density residential to the south and the adjacent commercial/industrial area. Staff finds that the proposed amendment meets the criteria of Section 2.5.C. of the Zoning and Development Code and recommends approval of the amendment.

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Jeffery Crane, representative, says they agree with staff.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at the time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments.

AGAINST:

There were no comments.

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) “Mr. Chairman, on ANX-2002-176, I move that we find the project consistent with the growth plan and forward the item to City Council for recommendation 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 11:00 P.M.