

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 10, 2001 MINUTES
7:05 P.M. 9:50 P.M.

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:05 P.M. by Chairman John Elmer. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were John Elmer (Chairman), Dr. Paul Dibble, Terri Binder, James Nall, Mike Denner and Nick Prinster. William Putnam was absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Lisa Gerstenberger (Senior Planner), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor) and Bill Nebeker (Senior Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney), Rick Dorris and Eric Hahn (Development Engineers).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 30 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the March 13 and March 20, 2001 public hearings.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes of March 13."

Commissioner Dibble seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-0, with Commissioners Prinster and Denner abstaining.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes of March 20."

Commissioner Dibble seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 3-0, with Commissioners Prinster, Nall and Denner abstaining.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Chairman Elmer introduced and welcomed new Planning Commission member, Mike Denner. Chairman Elmer mentioned that Mr. Denner had served on the Planning Commission once before.

Items pulled from the agenda included ANX-2001-043 (Zoning the Annexation - Sage Properties Subdivision), CUP-2001-054 (Conditional Use Permit - Jenkins Floral Amended), ANX-2001-011 (Preliminary Plan - Westland Subdivision), ANX-2001-052 (Zoning the Annexation - Cantrell Subdivision), and ANX-2001-061 (Annexation/Rezone/Preliminary Plan - Flint Ridge Subdivision).

III. CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda consisted of items CUP-2001-055 (Conditional Use Permit - Standard tire), FP-2001-058 (Final Plat - Grandview Subdivision, Filings 5 & 6), and FPP-1999-280 (Correction of Zoning - Faircloud Subdivision). Clarification on item FP-2001-058 (Final Plat - Grandview Subdivision, Filings 5 & 6) was requested from Dr. William Young (649 West Pagosa, Grand Junction), who wondered if the

development would include any multi-family units. Planning staff responded "no" which satisfied Dr. Young's concern. No objection or commentary was received from any citizen, staff or planning commissioner on any of the items offered for placement on Consent.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the Consent Agenda as presented."

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

IV. FULL PUBLIC HEARING

PP-2001-057 PRELIMINARY PLAN—NORTH CREST INDUSTRIAL PARK

A request for approval of a Preliminary Plat to subdivide 20 acres into 11 lots in an I-O (Industrial Office) zoning district.

Petitioner: North Crest LLC, Greg Cranston
Location: H Road, west of 3D Systems
Representative: LANDesign, Brian Hart

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Brian Hart, representing the petitioner, noted the site's location on an overhead project location map. A second map, denoting subdivision layout and access points was also presented. While no issue was taken with staff conditions 1 and 2, Mr. Hart asked for further discussion and consideration on conditions 3 and 4. He said that since irrigation water was not available to the property, there was no way to water the turf required in condition 3. Ute Water had been contacted about providing a tap for irrigation use only; however, Ute representatives said that potable water taps could not be provided strictly for irrigation. As an alternative, Mr. Hart asked that xeriscaping be considered as a viable alternative to turf, with a plan to be submitted at Final. He agreed with Ute's position that using domestic water for irrigation purposes was not a good use of potable resources.

With regard to condition 4, he said that the word "not" should be placed between the words "does" and "include" to reflect that curb, gutter and sidewalk was *not* included. He stated that a left-turn lane and a right-hand decel lane had been required by the traffic study; however, he felt that full-section improvements along the frontage of H Road were unfair when the Code required only half-street improvements. Offered for consideration was the following verbiage change to condition 4: "The applicant shall bring H Road adjacent to this development up to City standards. This can be accomplished with removal and reconstruction or overlaying the north half of existing H Road to provide a smooth profile plus improvements required by the traffic study."

Mr. Hart also referenced comments made by City Public Works staff regarding sewer line extension to the property. Paraphrasing from a letter written by the petitioner to Greg Trainor, Mr. Hart felt that the extension would pose an undue financial burden on the development. The letter noted that the site's adjacent neighbor, 3D Systems, had not been required to extend sewer across its property to its western boundary. The petitioner would be expected to extend the sewer line across both the 3D property and its own as well to its western property line.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Nall asked what kind of landscaping had been planned for individual lots. Mr. Hart said that landscaping would be addressed during Site Review, depending on the uses proposed by individual lot owners.

Commissioner Prinster asked about the type of landscaping proposed for the detention pond area. Mr. Hart said that landscaping plans were generally not required at a Preliminary development stage, so no plan had been submitted. He asked that flexibility be given by Planning Commissioners to allow xeriscaping.

Commissioner Binder said that xeriscaping still required water for its establishment. Mr. Hart agreed but added that this represented a minimal requirement. When Commissioner Binder asked who would be responsible for the detention pond's maintenance, Mr. Hart said that this responsibility would be borne by a property owners group (similar to a homeowners association). A less desirable alternative would be to attach the pond to a particular lot, which could then obligate a single property owner to shoulder the burden of its maintenance. Mr. Shaver confirmed that this option could be legally accomplished if Planning Commissioners so chose.

Chairman Elmer asked the petitioner to clarify its alternative to staff's stated condition. Mr. Hart explained that their alternative would include overlay to the north of the H Road centerline plus anything south of the existing H Road required to accommodate turn lanes. When asked how overlay of the north half of H Road would be accomplished, Mr. Hart acknowledged several ways of accomplishing this task, with the most practical being the grinding down of existing pavement.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker read from the Code the description of I-O zoning. He said that the 3D detention pond had been landscaped with turf and a narrow strip of river rock; detention ponds lined with large river rock and/or cobble were unsightly, and such would not promote an appropriate business park atmosphere. He agreed that xeriscaping would require a water tap for initial irrigation. Since he knew of instances where Ute had granted taps solely for irrigation purposes, Mr. Nebeker contended that Ute had made exceptions when no other water source was available. Mr. Nebeker agreed that xeriscaping might provide an acceptable alternative if planning commissioners so permitted. Mr. Nebeker acknowledged that condition #4 should indicate that curb, gutter and sidewalk on the south side of H Road. Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. The 65 ldn noise contour shall be shown on the Final Plat with a note referencing the Conditional Use Permits required in Table 7.3.
2. No lots within this subdivision shall have direct access to H Road. A note to this effect shall be placed on the Final Plat.
3. The detention pond in Tract A shall be improved with turf at Final approval rather than a more unsightly alternative.
4. The applicant shall bring H Road adjacent to this development up to City standards. This can be accomplished with removal and reconstruction or overlaying to provide a smooth profile. This condition does include curb, gutter or sidewalk on the south side.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dibble noted the seeming contradiction between the petitioner's understanding of Ute Water's position and that of staff. Mr. Nebeker recalled two specific examples where Ute Water had provided water taps solely for irrigation purposes.

Chairman Elmer noted that an avigation easement was required of the petitioner, yet it hadn't been mentioned as a condition of approval. Mr. Nebeker acknowledged the oversight and suggested that it be added as a fifth condition.

Chairman Elmer asked if FAA review should have been undertaken. Mr. Nebeker responded negatively. FAA review would only be required as specific uses are proposed for the industrial park. This understanding was confirmed by Mr. Shaver.

Rick Dorris presented an overhead drawing of the street configuration in front of the proposed development and a cross-section of H Road's existing profile. He said that H Road would require widening on both the north and south sides to accommodate both turn lanes. The uneven and irregular profile of H Road was noted. The only way to effectively match the asphalt laid down during the widening process with existing asphalt and meet both City standards and engineering/construction standards, would be either to grind down existing undulations and overlay with new asphalt or remove the asphalt altogether and start over. Code sections 6.2.A.1 and 6.2.B.1.d, he said, provided adequate justification for these additional street improvement requirements. Mr. Dorris questioned whether the Planning Commission could legally consider deviation of these standards given that the petitioner's contention was based solely on financial hardship? The question was deferred to Mr. Shaver.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked where existing asphalt would be retained. Mr. Dorris answered that existing asphalt would be retained in the left-turn lane and perhaps half of each through lane.

Commissioner Dibble asked if 3D Systems had been required to undertake the same street improvements for its section of H Road. Mr. Dorris was unsure since that development had occurred while in the County's jurisdiction. He didn't believe that 3D had either a right- or left-turn lane from H Road.

Commissioner Dibble asked if H Road west of the subject property was in the same substandard condition, to which Mr. Dorris responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Dibble asked if H Road improvements were included in the City's CIP budget, to which Mr. Dorris replied negatively.

Commissioner Nall felt that this was a good case for longitudinal joints. A brief discussion among Planning Commissioners ensued over this aspect.

Commissioner Dibble wondered why sewer extension across its property hadn't been required of 3D Systems. Mr. Nebeker said that in discussions with the City's utility engineer, he understood that 3D Systems had developed under county jurisdiction. Because there was such a significant expense in bringing the line so far at a depth to its eastern boundary they had not been required to extend the line to the western property line. Also he understood that 3D's establishment in Grand Junction was promoted by the MCEDC. He noted, however, that extension of the sewer line to its current location made development of the current site feasible.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Gregg Cranston, petitioner, said that Ute Water representatives had told him that water tap exceptions were only granted for residential uses. Ute's position, he reiterated, was that no exception would be made for the industrial park.

Mr. Hart added that developers of this property relied on the Code for guidance. The Code, he maintained, clearly required only half-street improvements. Those and the ones required by the traffic study should be the petitioner's only street improvements obligations. He expressed no objection to the inclusion of a condition requiring an avigation easement since he had expected to provide one anyway. He acknowledged that discussions over the sewer line extension issue would continue with Public Works staff, with a decision to be rendered at Final. Mr. Hart reiterated that the combination of sewer extension and additional off-site street improvements would pose a significant financial burden.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Shaver said that the Planning Commission had no legal impediment to addressing the petitioner's request for deviation in street standards. He concurred with Mr. Dorris's presentation and said that the development engineer was justified in requiring additional improvements to ensure compliance with City and engineering/construction standards. Mr. Shaver cited two additional Code sections. These additional requirements were supported both by the Code and the petitioner's own traffic study. As to the addition of the word "not" between the words "does" and "include," Mr. Shaver suggested the amendment was proper.

Chairman Elmer asked if the petitioner would receive any TCP credit for off-site street improvements. Mr. Dorris said that curb, gutter and sidewalk on the north side would be eligible for TCP credit. He said that the TCP was generally assessed to each lot and addressed during individual site plan review. Additional improvements to H Road may be considered eligible for TCP credit. Mr. Shaver concurred with statements regarding curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements; however, he disagreed with credit given towards street improvements because street improvements, he emphasized, may not be "capacity improvements" and thus may not fall within Code criteria for credit. He suggested approving staff conditions as written or with slight modification to provide clarification.

Chairman Elmer offered the following verbiage change to staff condition 4: "The applicant shall bring existing asphalt of H Road adjacent to this development up to City standards per the City Engineer's comments. This condition does not include curb, gutter or sidewalk on the south side."

When asked if the sewer line issue should be discussed further by planning commissioners, Mr. Shaver said that, legally, there was no problem to be addressed.

Chairman Elmer agreed with Mr. Shaver's assessment. He also noted that even if an exception had been granted to 3D regarding sewer line extension, it was now a moot point.

When Commissioner Dibble asked if water tap/landscaping issues should be discussed by Planning Commissioners during Preliminary, Mr. Shaver remarked that providing direction to the petitioner now would put him on notice and would provide guidance to staff for the final design.

Planning commissioners were in general agreement that a rock or cobbled detention pond would not be acceptable. Commissioner Binder preferred turf substantial landscaping using xeriscape may be acceptable. Chairman Elmer said that options for bringing water to the site were available even if turf landscaping was preferred; however, he expressed concern over requiring this type of specificity in landscaping when straight zones did not mandate it.

Chairman Elmer suggested amending condition 3 to delete current verbiage after the word “turf” and add the following replacement verbiage: “...or xeriscaping that minimizes the use of gravel.” This met with general planning commissioner approval.

Chairman Elmer also suggested adding a condition 5 requiring an avigation easement prior to Final Plat.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) “Mr. Chairman, on item PP-2001-057, I move that we find the North Crest Industrial Park consistent with the Growth Plan and the requirements of the Zoning and Development Code and approve the Preliminary Plan with the conditions listed in staff’s recommendation and leaving conditions 1 and 2 as written; 3, that the detention pond in Tract A shall be improved with turf or substantial xeriscaping material without a lot of gravel, large rock, or cobble at Final approval rather than a more unsightly alternative; 4, the applicant shall bring the existing asphalt on H Road up to City standards as per the city engineer’s comments adjacent to this development. This can be accomplished with removal and construction of overlay to provide a smooth profile. This condition does not include curb, gutter or sidewalk on the south side; and condition 5, an avigation easement will be required at Final Plat.”

Chairman Elmer suggested altering verbiage of condition 3 in the motion to delete the words “...without...cobble” with the words “...which minimizes the use of gravel or cobble...” This amendment was acceptable to Commissioner Binder.

When asked by Mr. Shaver whether tap availability should be addressed in the motion, Chairman Elmer reaffirmed that a water tap would be required whether turf or xeriscaping were used.

The revised motion reads as follows:

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) “Mr. Chairman, on item PP-2001-057, I move that we find the North Crest Industrial Park consistent with the Growth Plan and the requirements of the Zoning and Development Code and approve the Preliminary Plan with the conditions listed in staff’s recommendation and leaving conditions 1 and 2 as written; 3, that the detention pond in Tract A shall be improved with turf or substantial xeriscaping material which minimizes the use of gravel or cobble at Final approval rather than a more unsightly alternative; 4, the applicant shall bring the existing asphalt on H Road up to City standards as per the city engineer’s comments adjacent to this development. This can be accomplished with removal and reconstruction or overlay to provide a smooth profile. This condition does not include curb, gutter or sidewalk on the south side; and condition 5, an avigation easement will be required at Final Plat.”

Commissioner Denner seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

VR-2001-059 VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY, WHITE WILLOWS FILING #1

A request for approval of: 1) a Final Plat to develop 62 single-family lots on 21.26 acres with a density of 2.96 units/acre in an RSF-4 (Residential Single Family not to exceed 4 units/acre) zoning district, and 2) to vacate a 660-foot portion of the Florida Street right-of-way.

Petitioner: L.A. Enterprises, Gene Patnode
Location: 2851 D Road
Representative: Criterion Engineering, Patrick O’Connor

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Pat O’Connor, representing the petitioner, presented an overhead of the Final Subdivision Plat. The project, which had originally been proposed as a four-phase development would now be developed in

two phases. He noted the more efficient pond layout (Tract A) and said that some of the southern lots had been reconfigured. No additional density had been added to the project, however. Access points and street improvement locations were noted. Florida Street would be vacated and relocated approximately 100 feet to the south. This alignment would then correspond with utility line placement. Review agency comments had been addressed and no issue was taken with any of staff's approval conditions.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Binder wondered if RV storage was still being proposed for an area near the pond, to which Mr. O'Connor replied negatively. He elaborated that a walkway had been proposed for the north side of the pond, while dense vegetation existed along the southern side of the pond. The site would be cleaned up and a picnic table would perhaps be installed. Specific landscaping details were still to be worked out with staff.

Commissioner Binder asked what the walkway and pond would look like. Mr. Shaver interjected that the petitioner was not obligated to provide that level of detail in a straight zone. In fact, he reminded the Commission that no aesthetic provisions were required within straight zones; thus, any landscaping or park amenities provided by the petitioner would exceed Code requirements.

Commissioner Binder strongly discouraged the petitioner from graveling or cobbling the pond. Mr. O'Connor said that the petitioner's intention was to utilize existing vegetation as much as possible to make the pond area an aesthetic addition to the subdivision.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker acknowledged that the Final met conditions imposed at Preliminary. He said that the Florida Street misalignment first became apparent with the Skyler Subdivision proposal; vacation of the current right-of-way and its subsequent realignment 100 feet to the south made the most sense and was supported by staff. He presented a landscaping plan submitted by the petitioner but concurred with Mr. Shaver that the petitioner was not required by Code to provide a park. The pond would be used for irrigation and detention but staff was still unsure about how it would be landscaped. Staff also needed surface treatment particulars for Tract A's flagpole extension to Chamomile Street.

Staff recommended approval of the vacation and approval of the Final Plat subject to the following conditions:

1. The landscape plan for Tract A shall include a proper surface treatment for the sides of the detention/irrigation pond and the flagpole extension to Chamomile Drive. Temporary or permanent irrigation shall be provided, depending on the type of landscaping proposed.
2. A temporary irrigation system shall be required for the native seed mix along the D Road right-of-way.
3. Temporary irrigation shall be included for the native grass seed proposed on Tract A.
4. Eight additional shrubs shall be added to the landscape plan along D Road.
5. Technical planning and engineering review comments shall be incorporated into the plan set.

Mr. Nebeker concurred that the petitioner was providing more landscaping along D road than the Code required; picnic tables would be a nice amenity but they could be provided at the petitioner's discretion.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification on the term “surface treatment.” He also asked for a brief history of Preliminary Plan approval, which were both given.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request. Mark Fugere (382 Evergreen, Grand Junction) asked only for clarification on the first filing’s location.

PETITIONER’S REBUTTAL

Mr. O’Connor noted the location of the 'flagpole' to the pond tract. This would, he said, be dedicated to the homeowners association for maintenance. One of the flagpole extension’s main purposes was for conveyance of stormwater from the subdivision to the pond; however, Mr. O'Connor said pedestrians would be welcome to use it. No hard surface was being proposed for the flagpole tract. The pond, he conjectured, would be half-filled with irrigation water almost constantly. The lower half of the pond would be lined with bentonite. Lower portions of the pond’s sides could be planted with native grasses, with native or turf grasses used for the upper bank.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if runoff would be routed to the pond from east to west, to which Mr. O’Connor replied affirmatively; Mr. O'Connor said that sufficient area was available to accommodate a swale, overflow and vehicular access for maintenance.

DISCUSSION

Planning commissioners agreed that the Final Plat conformed with Preliminary Plan conditions. No objection was expressed. Commissioner Dibble felt that the Florida Street vacation made good sense.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) “Mr. Chairman, on item VR-2001-059, I move that we approve the recommendation as submitted with the appropriate planning conditions as amended by staff.”

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) “Mr. Chairman, on item VR-2001-059, I move that we find the vacation of the Florida Street right-of-way consistent with section 2.11 of the Zoning and Development Code and forward a recommendation to the City Council for approval.”

Commissioner Denner seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

A brief recess was called at 8:50 P.M. The public hearing reconvened at 9:00 P.M.

GPA-2001-042 GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT—GAURMER PROPERTY

A request for approval of: 1) a Growth Plan amendment from Residential Rural (one unit/5-35 acres) to Residential Medium (4-8 units/acre); and 2) a rezone from RSF-R (Residential Single-Family Rural not to exceed one unit/5 acres) to RMF-5 (Residential Multi-Family not to exceed 5 units/acre) zone district.

Petitioner: Sally Gaurmer
Location: 2918 G Road
Representative: Lyle Gaurmer

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Lyle Gaurmer, representing the petitioner, said that his family had owned the property for the last 50 years; rezoning the property and development of a small subdivision would allow his mother to derive greater use and benefit from it. Copies of a site location map were passed out to planning commissioners for review. At the time of the property’s annexation into the City, Mr. Gaurmer said that he had not fully understood the ramifications of retaining the property’s rural zoning. Addressing Growth Plan Amendment (GPA) criteria, he noted that while properties to the north of G Road reflected properties containing 5 acres or more, properties to the south of G Road reflected smaller lots and higher densities. Approval of the GPA would be consistent with properties directly south of G Road and provide an appropriate transition zone. The airport’s critical zone boundary was noted, although his family’s property is not within the critical zone.

Mr. Gaurmer said that surrounding neighbors had all been contacted; neighbor comments had all been positive. He acknowledged that his family had collected a large quantity of junk over the years. Subdivision of the property would provide revenue to help clean it up. This was supported and encouraged by surrounding residents. He said that the business currently operating on the property would be disallowed in the RMF zone. Referencing City development engineer comments, sewer line extension would be required. Mr. Gaurmer said that the area’s high water table and irregular topography made this requirement impractical if not impossible. He asked that the Planning Commission permit flexibility to allow investigation into other options (*e.g.*, a denitrification system).

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Denner asked for clarification on the nature of a denitrification system. Mr. Gaurmer likened it to an individual sewer treatment plant installed for each subdivision lot, purifying water and waste onsite.

Chairman Elmer said that individual systems were not permitted on half-acre sites.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger corrected the staff report to reflect surrounding zoning as follows: north, RSF-R; S, RMF-5; E, RSF-R, and west, RSF-R/PD. She reviewed the request and responded to individual GPA criteria as contained in the April 4, 2001 staff report. Sewer provision, she said, was a significant issue; sewer service must be made available prior to any development occurring on the subject property. Septic systems are not appropriate or permitted on lots less than 2 acres in size. The applicant’s contention that other, higher density development existed nearby was not sufficient justification for the subject property to rezone to a higher density. The burden of proof to change a Growth Plan designation, she said, was on the petitioner. She did not feel that sufficient evidence had been presented to override the zone currently in place. Ms. Gerstenberger said that she had also recommended to Mr. Gaurmer that he meet with surrounding neighbors to include a larger area in his GPA request, but this had not been done. She was also concerned with the property’s proximity to the airport’s 60 ldn contour. A higher density would only result in greater noise impacts to more residents. Staff recommended denial of both the GPA and rezone request based on insufficient justification by the applicant.

QUESTIONS

Mr. Shaver stated that the applicant had indicated to staff that he would be making a presentation to the Planning Commission which further explained and justified his GPA/rezone requests. Mr. Shaver then asked Ms. Gerstenberger if there had been any new evidence brought forth in Mr. Gaurmer's presentation to alter her initial recommendation, to which she replied negatively.

Mr. Shaver asked what the County's zoning had been for the property, to which Ms. Gerstenberger replied that it had been AFT (5 to 35 acre parcels). When he asked about the minimum density for an RMF-5 zone, she replied that 2 units/acre was the minimum, with 5 units/acre as a maximum density.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Gaurmer said that he'd spoken with his neighbors about inclusion into the GPA process. Since they were satisfied with their current property zonings, they had not wanted to be included.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer said that Growth Plan Amendments are intended to review and consider larger areas of land uses and not individual properties unless there was a very obvious error. In the current request, no error was apparent. And while there may be a transition zone suitable to buffer the north and south sides of G Road, RMF-5 is not it. Given noise concerns, the area's high water table, airport proximity, sewer extension difficulties, etc., the subject property was not suitable for a higher density. He agreed with staff that Growth Plan Amendment criteria had not been met.

Commissioner Dibble concurred. No compelling argument had been presented sufficient to change the property's current zoning.

Commissioner Nall agreed that sufficient justification must be evident before a GPA is approved. In the current instance, sufficient justification had not been demonstrated by the petitioner. He concurred with previous comments that the property would not support higher density development and that no error had occurred with the property's original zoning.

MOTION: (Commissioner Prinster) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2001-042, a request for a Growth Plan Amendment to designate 2918 G Road from Residential Rural (one unit/5-35 acres) to Residential Medium (4-7.9 units/acre), I move that we forward this request to City Council with the recommendation to approve."

Commissioner Nall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 0-6, with all planning commissioners opposing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Prinster) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2001-042, the request to rezone from Residential Rural (RSF-R, one unit/5 acres) to Residential Multi-Family 5 (RMF-5 zone district), I move that we forward the request to City Council with the recommendation to approve."

Commissioner Denner seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 0-6, with all planning commissioners opposing.

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Since Chairman Elmer would be absent for the May 8 Planning Commission hearing and no vice-chair would be present, he selected Commissioner Binder to chair the meeting in his stead.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 P.M.