

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 26, 2002 MINUTES
7:01 P.M. to 7:50 P.M.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:01 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, and William Putnam. John Paulson (1st Alternate) and Travis Cox (2nd Alternate) were absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Lisa Gerstenberger (Sr. Planner), and Scott Peterson (Assoc. Planner).

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 10 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the November 12, 2002 public hearing were considered.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) “Mr. Chairman, hearing no corrections, I move to approve the minutes of November 12, 2002.”

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

Available for placement on the Consent Agenda were items ANX-2002-222 (Zone of Annexation/Rezone—Smith Annexation) and ANX-2002-223 (Zone of Annexation/Rezone—Rowe Annexation). At citizen request, item ANX-2002-223 was removed from Consent and placed on the Full Hearing agenda.

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) “Mr. Chairman, I recommend we approve the Consent Agenda as modified.”

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

IV. FULL HEARING

ANX-2002-223 ZONE OF ANNEXATION/REZONE—ROWE ANNEXATION

A request for approval to annex 7.3892 acres into the City of Grand Junction with a zoning of Residential Single-Family, 4 units per acre (RSF-4).

Petitioner: Ed Hokanson

Location: 176 28 ½ Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Ed Hokanson, petitioner, said that annexation had been required in anticipation of the property's development. He noted that the only request before the Planning Commission was the Zone of Annexation. No Preliminary Plan had been undertaken or submitted. Mr. Hokanson availed himself for questions.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger offered a Powerpoint presentation, which included slides of the annexation/location map and the City's Future Land Use map. The property's location was noted. She confirmed that no Preliminary Plan had been submitted and that the requested RSF-4 zoning was consistent with the site's current County RSF-4 zoning. Having determined that the request met Growth Plan guidelines, Ms. Gerstenberger recommended approval.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Blosser asked for clarification of whether the property to the west of the subject parcel was City-owned. Kathy Portner replied negatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Darrel Minard (168 28 ½ Road, Grand Junction) identified his property on staff's overhead location map. He wondered why the property was being annexed into the City; whether there would be additional road improvements to 28 ½ Road as a result of the petitioner's development request; what kind of housing had been planned; and how the petitioner intended to handle current water issues with the Orchard Mesa Water District.

Joey Blecha (172 28 ½ Road, Grand Junction) wondered if David and Deborah Rowe owned the subject property/requested annexation.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Hokanson replied that the Rowes still own the property and would participate in its development. With regard to more specific development-related questions, Mr. Hokanson said that those questions would be addressed during the Preliminary Plan stage. He anticipated that homes would be in the 1,800-2,400 square foot range.

Ms. Gerstenberger added annexation of the property is in conjunction with the Persigo Agreement; the property owners had to annex once they decided to develop.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Blosser suggested that the public meet with the property's developer/owners during the Preliminary Plan stage and attend the public hearing once the plan is submitted.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-2002-223, Rowe Annexation, a request to rezone to a Residential Single-Family-4 (RSF-4) zone district, I move that we forward the request to City Council with a recommendation to approve, with the findings that the request is

consistent with the goals and policies of the Growth Plan and section 2.6.A. of the Zoning and Development Code.”

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

FP-2002-201 FINAL PLAN—VILLAGE PARK COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION

A request for approval to revise the original Preliminary Plan for 2.92 acres in the Village Park Commercial Development to create an additional lot and to construct office buildings on lots 2A and 2B.

Petitioner: Patterson Road Development, LLC—Alan Parkerson

Location: 28 ¼ and Patterson Road

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Denny Granum, co-petitioner, gave a brief history of the project’s original approval and referenced an overhead drawing of the new Monument Realty building proposed for lot 2, block 1. The property, he said, had changed ownership since the project’s original approval. He asked that Lot 3 be split into two lots and to permit the use of stucco and a rock façade instead of the previously approved lap siding. Mr. Granum said that the requested change in building materials actually represented an upgrade. He submitted for the record a letter dated November 25, 2002 from Alan Parkerson, manager of the Development LLC, clarifying this request. Mr. Granum stated that the storage building proposed for Lot 2A would actually be closer to 300 square feet, not the 3,000 square feet noted in staff’s report. He pointed out the location of the proposed storage building directly to the north of the primary structure’s footprint on Lot 2A and said that it would be used to house mechanical equipment.

With regard to the specific uses of Lots 2A and 2B, Mr. Granum asked that discussions over square footages on those two lots be deferred until plans were submitted for their development.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Evans asked if the roof fixtures seen on the elevation drawings were skylights. Mr. Granum clarified that they were just roof vents.

Commissioner Blosser asked if structures on the site would be constructed to face Patterson Road. Mr. Granum said that the project’s primary frontage was 28 ¼ Road and structures would face that direction. Patterson Road would be approximately 20-30 feet from the nearest structure; however, plans included heavy landscaping along the Patterson Road frontage.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Pat Cecil offered a Powerpoint presentation containing slides which included: 1) zoning map, 2) aerial photo of Village Park Subdivision, 3) revised plat and 4) amended building materials elevation drawings. Staff took no issue with the request to modify building materials and agreed that it represented an upgrade. An additional pedestrian access had been requested by staff and would be provided by the applicants. Mr. Cecil said that the actual square footage of the storage unit is 450 square feet. The additional square footage isn’t a problem as long as the applicants realized that this would be deducted from their maximum structural allowance for that lot. Having found the request to be compliant with Growth Plan recommendations and Code requirements, Mr. Cecil recommended approval subject to staff report conditions.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked if the revised building materials would set the precedent for the entire project, to which Mr. Cecil replied affirmatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

With regard to the storage unit, Mr. Shaver suggested that the motion state "...that the storage unit shall not exceed 450 square feet." He said that this would allow the applicants some flexibility in design. Mr. Granum and his engineer both nodded their assent to suggested verbiage.

Commissioner Blosser concurred that the materials change would represent an upgrade; he expressed agreement with staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Cole also concurred, adding that it would be a most welcome project.

Chairman Dibble asked for additional clarification on where the storage building would be placed, which was provided. Mr. Granum added that a clock tower was planned in lieu of typical signage; again, to upgrade the aesthetics of the project.

A brief discussion ensued over the storage building square footage factoring into the maximum square footage allowance. Mr. Granum said that he had been unaware that the storage building would count towards this maximum. Mr. Cecil said that if enclosed, it was deemed a "structure." Because the lot was already restricted to a maximum structural square footage, he felt that no additional limitation would be necessary in the motion. Mr. Granum expected the size of the storage building to be no more than 8' x 12'. Mr. Cecil said that the estimated 96 square foot structure would have very little impact on the maximum structural allowance.

MOTION: (Commissioner Cole) "Mr. Chairman, on the Preliminary Plan for Village Park Commercial Subdivision, I move that we find the project consistent with the Growth Plan, sections 7.1 and 4.1 of the old Zoning and Development Code, and approve the revised Preliminary Plan subject to the recommended conditions in the staff report dated November 26, 2002."

Commissioner Pitts 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 7:50 P.M.