

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 MINUTES
7:03 P.M. to 10:32 P.M.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:03 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, William Putnam, Nick Prinster, John Evans and Richard Blosser. Terri Binder was absent. Two positions are vacant (resignations by Jim Nall and Mike Denner).

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Community Development Planning Director, Bob Blanchard, Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Kristen Ashbeck (Sr. Planner), Lisa Gerstenberger (Sr. Planner), Bill Nebeker (Sr. Planner) and Ronnie Edwards (Assoc. Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Asst. City Attorney), Rick Dorris and Dave Donohue (Development Engineers), and Mike McDill (Public Works Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 52 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the July 24 and August 14 public hearings were considered. A discussion ensued over the August 14 minutes. On page 7, the third paragraph from the bottom of the page parenthetically referenced the RSF-1 density as being "1/2 to 2 units/acre." This was incorrect and should have been reflected as "½ to 2 acres per unit." The RSF-1 zone would not allow a density greater than 1 unit/acre.

Also, with regard to item RZP-2001-120, The Pines Rezone/Preliminary Plat, Commissioner Putnam recalled making a stronger statement against rezoning such a small parcel now only to have to change the Growth Plan designation for a larger area in conjunction with the Growth Plan's 5-year review. He asked that on page 7, the following statement be added at the end of the second full paragraph: "It didn't make logical sense to create a zoning situation on a small isolated parcel today, if there's to be an amended Growth Plan tomorrow."

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes, as revised and amended, of August 14"

Commissioner Blosser seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion was approved by a vote of 5-0, with Commissioner Prinster abstaining.

MOTION: (Commissioner Putnam) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes as presented from July 24."

Commissioner Prinster seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion was approved by a vote of 4-0, with Chairman Elmer and Commissioner Blosser abstaining.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Offered for placement on the Consent Agenda were items VE-2001-143 (Easement Vacation—Redlands Marketplace, Filing #2), CUP-2001-139 (Conditional use—Wendy’s), VR-2001-144 (Vacation of Right-of-Way—Village Park), CUP-2001-138 (Conditional Use Permit—Headstart), VR-2001-145 (Right-of-Way Vacation/Preliminary Plan—Tuscany Village), PP-2001-150 (Preliminary Plan—Grand Meadows Subdivision), and RZP-2001-155 (Rezone/Preliminary Plan—Rocky Heights Estate Subdivision). At a citizen’s request, item PP-2001-150 was pulled and placed on the full hearing agenda. No objection or commentary was expressed or given by the audience, planning commissioners or staff on the remaining items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Prinster) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the Consent Agenda as stated with the exception of the Grand Meadows Subdivision.”

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

Chairman Elmer announced that since St. Mary’s had been continued from the meeting of August 21st it would be heard first on the regular agenda with Grand Meadows Subdivision to be heard second.

IV. FULL PUBLIC HEARING

RZF-2001-146 REZONE/FINAL PLAN—ST. MARY’S PARKING LOTS/7TH STREET INTERSECTION

A request to 1) rezone 11.6 acres from B-1 (Neighborhood Business) to PD (Planned Development) and 2) approval of a Final Plan to construct three new parking lots.

Petitioner: St. Mary’s Hospital, Keith Estridge
Location: 776 Bookcliff Avenue
Representative: Rob Jenkins

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Dan Prinster, representing the petitioner, presented the proposal, hard copies PowerPoint slides distributed to planning commissioners. The presentation reviewed the Site Master Plan, which included Site Plan Master Goals, a Three-Phase Plan, Evaluation Process for the Intersection at 7th and Wellington, drawings which included a Recommended Intersection Design, Site Plan Based on Recommendations, Proposed Parking Lot Configurations and Construction Phasing. A Rezoning Request Outline was also presented.

Mr. Prinster said that a number of intersection options had been reviewed with the City’s Public Works Department. He then introduced Mike McDill, City Engineer.

Mr. McDill said that various intersection alternatives had been explored, referencing a handout entitled “Decision-Making Grid for a Design Exception at the Intersection of 7th Street and Wellington.” While all agreed that there would be some impact on traffic progression along 7th Street in the area, he felt the level of that impact would be negligible. The preferred option, he said, included construction of a full-motion intersection with a signal light on a new 7th Street alignment. A TEDS manual exception had been required and granted based on concerns for pedestrian safety. Mr. McDill said that the proposed 7th Street realignment would significantly improve the alignment over the present curvature, which should better facilitate traffic progression. He asked that the TEDS manual exception be included and approved as part of the hospital’s proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Blosser noted the point on the proposed Site Plan near Bookcliff Avenue where 7th Street would narrow. He asked, did the City anticipate any negative traffic impacts arising as a result of this narrowing? Mr. McDill said that the street's transitioning conformed to TEDS manual standards.

Commissioner Prinster asked about the signalization of 7th and Wellington. Mr. Prinster said that no signalization was currently in place at this intersection, although a signal light would be installed as part of the proposed plan. The signal timed with a pedestrian-activated crossing signal, which should encourage maximum traffic progression along 7th Street.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION (con't)

Mr. Prinster passed out copies of drawings depicting two parking options for Center Avenue, which included the closure of Center Avenue west of 6th Street. The majority of Center Avenue west of 6th Street is on private property owned by St. Mary's, and its closure and redevelopment would benefit both St. Mary's and adjacent businesses by providing additional parking. Neighbors had been asked to comment on the two options (parallel versus angled parking).

Rob Jenkins, an architect also representing the petitioner, reviewed the rezone request and parking lot proposal. The rezone request for PD zoning, he said, would conform to the existing St. Mary's campus, Code requirements and Growth Plan recommendations. Benefits would be more evident with the redevelopment of the property. With regard to parking lot construction, two of the three proposed lots would be located east of 7th Street and gated. These two lots would be exclusive to hospital staff use. Referencing construction phasing drawings, he noted that the reconstruction of 7th Street and construction of the St. Mary's Pavilion would begin early in the year 2002. An onsite parking garage, which would provide an additional 400 parking spaces, was planned for construction in June of 2002.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if shuttle service would still be provided from the eastern parking lots to the main St. Mary's campus. Mr. Jenkins said that shuttle service would serve staff crossing 7th Street during some of the "mismatching" of construction schedules. The best alternative had been to shuttle pedestrians to the corner of 7th and Patterson until such time as the 7th and Wellington intersection could be completed.

Mr. Jenkins said that last month's hearing delay put the project behind schedule a month. If the weather turned inclement and asphalt could not be laid on the parking lots until spring, he asked for the City's permission to be able to construct parking lots to "temporary parking" standards, which included construction of all concrete, graveling the lot, and installation of landscaping and irrigation. Shuttling would then take place from all St. Mary's parking lots located east of 7th Street, including those that were gated.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION (con't)

Mr. Jenkins said that future issues such as the parking garage or helipad could be discussed at greater detail as construction phases progressed and as site plans were submitted. Surrounding residents would have a chance to comment on those and other elements as the redevelopment progressed.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger said that the request met the Code's rezone criteria. Referencing the August 6, 2001 Staff Report, she said that staff recommended approval of the rezone request and approval of the Final Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Fourteen-foot multi-purpose easements may be needed along all streets pending the applicant's evaluation of existing easements. St. Mary's shall provide where necessary.

2. St. Mary's must either guarantee its portion of the 7th Street relocation with this project or negotiate a different arrangement with the Public Works Department.
3. Determine if an easement is needed for the sanitary sewer running through the parking lot on sheet C2.1. Provide a 20-foot easement, if necessary.
4. Shuttle arrangements to move employees from the west campus to the parking lots located on the east campus must be finalized and approved by the City before the new parking lots can be utilized.

Ms. Gerstenberger emphasized the importance of acquiring City approval of the hospital's shuttle service prior to utilization of the gated eastern parking lots. She noted that this was the first time she had heard of the request to allow the parking lots to be used without surfacing; however, after discussing the matter briefly with Development Engineer, Rick Dorris, she did not have a problem with the request so long as the other Code provisions for temporary parking lots were followed and a DIA was posted with the City. The DIA should not only include asphaltting but any dust abatement treatments necessary for maintenance of the parking lots in their "temporary" states. With regard to the closure of a portion of Center Avenue, she was unsure if the request was to formally change the Master Plan or to informally solicit feedback from planning commissioners on the concept. Allowing that St. Mary's had been considering a variety of designs during the preceding week, this was the first she'd heard of the proposal and City Planning hadn't had a chance to review the newly submitted documentation.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked Mr. Shaver if St. Mary's request to close Center Avenue west of 6th Street should be considered an informal request for input. Mr. Shaver said that it was within Planning Commission's purview to consider the design exception either way. Mr. Blanchard agreed, suggesting that Mr. McDill or Mr. Dorris provide additional engineering input. Mr. McDill said that because the extension of Center Avenue west of 6th Street was not wholly a City-owned street, but was instead located on St. Mary's-owned property, the City's determination was limited.

With regard to the parking lot paving, Mr. Dorris said that this situation has been allowed before. A DIA to secure asphaltting and dust abatement would be satisfactory. He added that St. Mary's would also be responsible for clean-up of any mud (temporary surfacing material) tracked out onto 7th Street as a result of the parking lots' not being paved.

Commissioner Blosser asked if the public had been given a chance to review and comment on the proposal to close a portion of Center Street. Ms. Gerstenberger replied negatively, saying that this was new information based on the handout and presentation just received.

When asked by Commissioner Putnam if parking lots were allowed in both the B-1 and PD zones, Ms. Gerstenberger replied affirmatively. Commissioner Putnam added that the request complied with Code Section 2.6.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

John Wolcott (550 Cedar Avenue, Grand Junction) supported the closure of Center Avenue as shown. The reduction of traffic along 6th Street would better ensure the safety of children walking to and from school. He questioned the public notification aspect of this issue and wondered if condo residents, who would be most affected by the street's closure, should be given a chance to comment on the request.

Tom Tad Vick (713 Centauri, Grand Junction) expressed his support and felt that closure of Center Avenue as proposed by St. Mary's would result in additional parking for use by the Marillac Clinic.

Bill Harris (400 Cedar Avenue, Grand Junction) supported the closure of Center Avenue. He noted that one of the proposed parking lots would have direct access to Center Avenue. This, he predicted, would still result in a lot of traffic along Bookcliff and 6th Street. As an alternative, he proposed closing this entrance and limiting access to a point off Wellington Avenue.

AGAINST:

Shari Sjerven (510 Cedar Avenue, Grand Junction) said she would be opposed to any above-ground parking garage located on the elevated portion of the St. Mary's site and any new helipad proposed for the top of it.

Chairman Elmer said that components of St. Mary's Master Plan—the parking garage and helipad—had already been approved. Ms. Sjerven said that she and other residents had not been notified of any public hearing where the Master Plan had been considered. At Chairman Elmer's request, Mr. Shaver briefly outlined the City's legal notice requirements, which included a display ad and sign posting. Individual notification was not legally required, under the former Code, which this project came in under.

Peter Gruendlen (3007 Gunnison Way, Grand Junction) shared Ms. Sjerven's concerns regarding the parking garage.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Prinster said that individual notification cards had been sent out to neighbors when the Master Plan was under consideration. If there were residents who hadn't been notified but wanted to be added to the list for other design submittals, he encouraged them to contact the Community Development Department. Intentions were to relocate the current helipad, not construct an additional one. He noted the level of neighbor support for closure of Center Avenue. Whether formally or informally determined, this was the direction St. Mary's preferred. Mr. Prinster hoped that a positive decision could be rendered this evening.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Dibble expressed his support for the revised plan, adding that the delay in St. Mary's construction schedule had not been their fault. Thus, he supported the delay, if necessary, for asphaltting the proposed parking lots as long as a DIA was secured to the satisfaction of the City. This could be added as an additional condition of approval. He also acknowledged both the need and benefit derived by closing off Center Avenue west of 6th Street. Since this portion of Center Avenue was, in effect, on private property, additional development latitude was available to St. Mary's. Commissioner Dibble suggested that this issue be handled as a formal amendment to the Master Plan.

Chairman Elmer suggested addressing the closure of part of Center Avenue as an additional condition of approval. Mr. Shaver confirmed that the Planning Commission could proceed in this direction. If included as a separate approval condition, he said, it would compel St. Mary's to change its Master Plan accordingly.

Commissioner Prinster wondered if by addressing a change to the Master Plan in an approval condition Planning Commission would be circumventing the public review process. Mr. Shaver said that if the bulk of Center Avenue west of 6th Street was located on St. Mary's property, its closure could be proposed as part of a Site Plan Amendment, which is what in effect, is the current request. Chairman Elmer remarked that this did not represent a significant change to the overall concept.

Commissioners Dibble, Evans and Blosser concurred.

Commissioner Prinster said that the petitioner must ensure that parking lots met the City's "temporary parking" standards.

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZF-2001-146, request to rezone from Neighborhood Business (B-1) zone district to Planned Development (PD) zone district, I move that we forward this request to the City Council with a recommendation to approve, with the findings as outlined by staff."

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

Prior to making the motion on the Final Plan approval, discussion ensued over verbiage for approval of additional conditions numbers 5 and 6. The following was recommended:

Condition 5: "The temporary parking lots may be utilized over the winter if paving cannot be made in time as long as proper surfactant is placed to control mud and that dust is also controlled throughout the winter to staff's satisfaction, and that a DIA is in place to guarantee that the paving takes place the following spring."

Condition 6: "That we approve the parking lot plan that is located north of Center Street that will close Center Street from 6th to Wellington and that the Master Plan will also be amended to reflect that change, and that staff seek a final resolution to the parking configuration on Center Street."

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZF-2001-146, request for Final Plan approval for three parking lots, I move that we approve subject to staff conditions amended, with 5 and 6 [to read: 5. The temporary parking lots may be utilized over the winter if paving cannot be made in time as long as proper surfactant is placed to control dust and that mud is also controlled throughout the winter to staff's satisfaction, and that a DIA is in place to guarantee that the paving takes place the following spring; and 6. That we approve the parking lot plan that is located north of Center Street that will close Center Street from 6th to Wellington and that the Master Plan will also be amended to reflect that change, and that staff seek a final resolution to the parking configuration on Center Street.] with findings as outlined by the staff."

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

A brief recess was called at 8:55 P.M. The public hearing reconvened at 9:06 P.M.

PP-2001-150 PRELIMINARY PLAN—GRAND MEADOWS SUBDIVISION

A request for approval of a Preliminary Plan to develop 41 single-family lots on 9 acres with a minimum lot size of 6,500 square feet in an RMF-5 (Residential Multi-Family not to exceed 5 units per acre) zone district.

Petitioner: Charles Fitzpatrick

Location: East side of 30 Road between D.625 Road and Gunnison Way

Representative: 30 Road LLC, Eric McCracken

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jerry Slaugh, representing the petitioner, presented a brief history of the property and reviewed the current revised proposal. He said that primary access to the subdivision for Phase I would be via Gunnison Way; Grand Meadow Avenue would extend to Dodge Street during Phase II to provide a second street connection. A stub street had been provided directly to the west of Lot 1, Block 1 in Phase I near 30 Road, which would ultimately connect to an as-yet-undeveloped parcel to the south. Access design configurations had been supported by staff. Mr. Slaugh felt that the request met all City bulk requirements and addressed all review agency comments.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dibble observed that the street reconfiguration resulted in the elimination of a 3-sided lot previously located along Gunnison Way. Mr. Slaugh agreed, adding that it also resulted in a reduced overall density of 39 lots, not the 41 lots referenced in the agenda, which was their original request.

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification on how the Gunnison Avenue right-of-way was to be handled. Mr. Slaugh said that pavement would be provided to the south property line, along with stubbed-out utilities. Curb, gutter and sidewalk would be installed along the north side, which would eventually tie into the new County-installed 30 Road improvements. Because insufficient right-of-way existed to construct half-street improvements to 30 Road, this would be accomplished when the property to the south developed. The southern property owner had been approached; property owner had been unable to participate. Mr. Slaugh understood that the property was currently in probate.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger reviewed the request and the Planning Commission denial of a previous submittal. She said that the current submittal better addressed citizens original concerns with access to 30 Road. The project's revised density fell within Growth Plan parameters. A detention pond would be constructed in conjunction with development of Phase I. Having found that the proposal met both Growth Plan recommendations and Code requirements, staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The speed bumps shown may not provide adequate traffic calming. The final traffic-calming structure configuration may include additional features such as chicanes and will be established as part of the Final Plan submittal.
2. Sanitary sewer must be extended to the south property line in both street rights-of-way that stub to the south. This includes Grand Meadow Avenue and Dodge Street.
3. Block and lot numbers should be numbered chronologically to correspond to the phase that will be under construction.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dibble asked if the driveway coming from 30 Road into the property to the west would remain. Ms. Gerstenberger said that intentions were to eliminate this particular access and relocate it directly off the Bluebird Court cul-de-sac. If, however, the parcel developed in the future, permanent access would be relocated again to a point off the new public street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Char Anderson (474 Dodge Court, Grand Junction) said that the revised proposal still did not address the neighborhood's preference that primary access be derived from 30 Road versus Gunnison Way. She asked why had the extension of Grand Meadow Avenue to 30 Road not been given further consideration? She was unclear about what type of alternative traffic-calming measures were proposed. She did not understand why interconnectivity was such an issue because internal streets should be for the benefit and use of the respective subdivision; she said that Gunnison Way and Dodge Street were never intended to be through streets. She suggested approaching the southern parcel's property owner to secure easements through the property to extend street improvements all the way to 30 Road. During the last submittal process she had asked for the petitioner to install a 4-foot fence to keep her livestock from wandering onto the petitioner's property. Since the petitioner intended to remove the existing fence, this seemed a reasonable request but one that had not yet been addressed by the petitioner. She wondered where irrigation water would come from since there was little pressure available for water delivery even to her house on Dodge Street.

Sandy MacDougall (479 Gunnison Way, Grand Junction) agreed with Ms. Anderson's comments and reiterated concerns regarding the additional traffic impacts to Gunnison Way.

Steve Bennett (3005 Gunnison Way, Grand Junction) concurred with expressed traffic-related concerns. He preferred closing off the Gunnison Way access and instead extending Grand Meadow Avenue to 30 Road. He didn't feel that costs for the 30 Road access extension should be left entirely up to the southern property owner.

Dennis Hughes (477 Gunnison Way, Grand Junction) didn't believe that the southern property owner would ever extend access to 30 Road because such alignment would extend through his existing home. He didn't believe that the property owner would be too receptive to removing his home to accommodate a street alignment. He urged the City to consider the existing neighborhood; he didn't want to see degradation of the area's current quality of life.

Bill Colwell (476 Gunnison Court, Grand Junction) mirrored similar concerns over traffic impacts and expressed support for previous neighbor comments.

Verla MacDougall (479 Gunnison Way, Grand Junction) wondered who would be responsible for maintenance of the streets and water lines. She said that since half of the area lay within the city limits and half fell within county jurisdiction, she wondered if there would be further contention over responsibility.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Slaugh said that in actuality two driveways existed for the property with the mobile homes, not just one. Even with the closure of one of those driveways, he said that access would still be ensured. The remaining driveway access would not be extended to Gunnison Court.

Mr. Slaugh said that TEDS Manual standards prohibited extension of Grand Meadow Avenue to 30 Road. If those standards could be waived, he had no objection to extending the street. Staff, however, had not allowed this as an option. He agreed to provide a fence to the east side of the property, to keep Ms. Anderson's livestock on her own property. With regard to traffic-calming discussions, he would work with staff to come up with the best solution.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if street standards for the existing Gunnison Way and Dodge Street would accommodate expected traffic increases, to which Ms. Gerstenberger replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Blosser asked staff why Grand Meadow Avenue couldn't be extended to 30 Road. Mr. Donohue, Development Engineer, briefly explained alignment requirements, which couldn't be met without additional right-of-way. This would have to come from the southern property owner.

Commissioner Dibble asked staff for input on its preferred traffic-calming alternative. Ms. Gerstenberger said that Public Works staff had recommended the possible use of chicanes.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer said that it would be difficult to recommend denial of a project that met City requirements and provided two accesses into the project. Mr. Shaver said that if denial were recommended, Planning Commissioners should make specific findings to support their recommendation. Chairman Elmer commented that while there seemed still to be technical issues regarding the maintenance of streets, the application did conform to City requirements.

Commissioner Prinster said that the biggest neighborhood concern seemed to be regarding traffic patterns; however, the current design did meet TEDS manual requirements. Given that, he said that he would be hard-pressed to find a reason for denying the request.

Chairman Elmer said that the proposed street stub had the potential of not only providing an additional access to the proposed subdivision, it would also provide the southern parcel with access.

Commissioner Dibble asked if funds would be available in the future for extension of the stub street to the south. Mr. Donohue replied affirmatively, saying that funds would be paid in lieu of constructing improvements. Connections with Gunnison Way and Dodge Street were needed, regardless of whether or how the property to the south developed.

Commissioner Evans felt that since the request met City requirements it deserved support.

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, on item PP-2001-150, request for Preliminary Plan approval for the Grand Meadows Subdivision, I move that we approve subject to staff conditions, with the findings as outlined by staff."

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

RZP-2001-120 REHEARING REQUEST FOR THE REZONE/PRELIMINARY PLAN—THE PINES SUBDIVISION

A request for a rehearing of the Rezone/Preliminary Plan for the Pines Subdivision. At the August 14 hearing, Planning Commission denied the rezone request.

Petitioner: Grand Valley Development LLC, Cliff Anson
Location: 2645 F ½ Road
Representative: Ciavonne & Associates, Ted Ciavonne

Mr. Shaver said that this was the first rehearing request since adoption of the new Code. He outlined what this meant and referenced documentation submitted by the petitioner's representatives, which sought to justify the rehearing. He advised at Planning Commission discretion, members of the Commission could elect to rehear the item or not. If no rehearing was granted, he said that an appeal process would still be available to the petitioner. Mr. Shaver said that any motion for rehearing must be made by one of the four members who were in the majority at the last public hearing. No motion was made so no rehearing was granted. The lack of rehearing precluded any further consideration of item RZP-2001-120 as listed on the agenda.

ANX-2001-147 ZONE OF ANNEXATION/PRELIMINARY PLAN—RUBY MEADOWS

A request for approval of: 1) a Zone of Annexation from County PR 4.4 to City RMF-8 (Residential Multi-Family, 8 units/acre) and 2) a Preliminary Plan consisting of 19 single-family detached lots and 8 single-family attached lots, for a total of 31 dwelling units on 5.67 acres.

Petitioner: Grace Homes, Inc., Terry Lawrence
Location: Gunnison Avenue at 30 ¾ Road
Representative: PA/DS Architecture, Brian Sims

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Pat Cecil corrected the agenda to accurately reflect the request for 4, not 8, single-family attached lots, for a revised total of 27 dwelling units on 5.67 acres. The petitioner had redesigned the subdivision, and staff felt that the current proposal reflected a much better layout. He noted the location of the detention basin proposed for Tract A. A drainage release agreement from the Grand Junction Drainage District would be required. The request met City requirements and conformed to Growth Plan recommendations. Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. At the time of submittal of the Final Plat, a fully executed drainage release agreement with the Grand Junction Drainage District shall be submitted for recordation.
2. All "Tracts" shall be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association.
3. The remaining technical items identified by the Development Engineer in the July 30, 2001 comments shall be addressed on the final improvement plans.
4. The zero side yard lot line setback for those lots identified for single-family attached development shall be noted on the Final Plat.
5. Subdivision sign location and details shall be submitted with the Final Plat.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if the petitioner was in agreement with approval conditions. Mr. Cecil said that the petitioner hadn't voiced any objection to staff. The conditions, he added, were very minor in scope.

Commissioner Prinster asked if the density was compatible with both the Code and Growth Plan, to which Mr. Cecil replied affirmatively (attached single-family lots were denoted on the Preliminary Plan).

Commissioner Dibble asked if extension of Morning Dove Drive was planned, to which Mr. Cecil again responded affirmatively. When asked if there were any drainage concerns, Mr. Cecil replied negatively.

Chairman Elmer asked staff if there were any concerns over the higher zone. If the petitioner came back with a revised plan at a higher density, would streets be able to handle the higher traffic volumes? Mr. Cecil said that if a higher density plan were proposed, staff would re-review it to determine if a traffic study were warranted.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Brian Sims, representing the petitioner, felt that the project is "infill" and its density fits well with the surrounding area. He took no issue with any of staff's approval conditions.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dibble asked for additional clarification on the Hill Avenue configuration. Mr. Sims said that the Hill Avenue alignment was askew (location noted). To facilitate the Hill Avenue connection with the northern property, it would have to connect with a future cul-de-sac planned for the northern property. No further eastern extension was anticipated. A brief discussion ensued over the location of the Hill Avenue stub street. Mr. Sims acknowledged responsibility for half-street improvements to the stub.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Prinster commented that the project represented nice infill development.

Chairman Elmer said that his only concern was that the lower-density request was being made in a higher-density zone. The current request, however, met City requirements and no outstanding issues were apparent.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, on Annexation ANX-2001-147, I move that we forward a recommendation of approval of the zone amendment to the City Council with the findings as listed in the above staff recommendation."

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, on the Preliminary Plan for the Ruby Meadows Subdivision, ANX-2001-147, I move that we approve the subdivision, making the findings as listed in the above staff recommendation, subject to the conditions attached to the staff report."

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

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:32 P.M.