

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 9, 2001 MINUTES
7:02 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:02 P.M. by Vice-Chairman Dr. Paul Dibble. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were Dr. Paul Dibble (Vice-Chairman), Richard Blosser, William Putnam, John Evans and Terri Binder. John Elmer was absent. (One position plus both alternate positions are vacant)

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

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 12 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the September 11 and September 18 public hearings.

On the September 11 minutes, page 5 under Public Comments, Commissioner Putnam noted that Dr. Tadvick's name had been incorrectly spelled 'Tad Vick.'

MOTION: (Commissioner Putnam) "Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we approve the minutes of the September 18 meeting as presented and the minutes of the September 11 meeting as amended."

Commissioner Evans seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Binder abstaining on the September 11 minutes and by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Blosser abstaining on the September 18 minutes.

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 FPP-1999-201 (Final Plat/Plan—Camelot Gardens); FPP-2001-182 (Final Plat/Plan—Summer Hill Subdivision, Filings #3 and #4); and PP-2001-183 (Preliminary Plan—Interstate Commercial Park II). No objection or commentary was expressed or given by the audience, planning commissioners or staff on any of these items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Putnam) "Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of the Consent Agenda."

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion was approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Walid Boumatar (677 – 25 ½ Road, Grand Junction) asked for clarification on the half-street improvements and on the number of accesses which would be required with his proposal. After a brief discussion, Mr. Shaver advised that Mr. Boumatar’s questions may be better answered in the context of his own development proposal, not PP-2001-183. Vice-Chairman Dibble, based on Mr. Shaver's advice, suggested that Mr. Boumatar meet with staff outside of the public hearing forum to discuss those issues further.

IV. FULL PUBLIC HEARING

FP-2001-181 FINAL PLAN—ST. MARY’S ABULATORY CENTER

A request for approval of the Final Plan to construct a 120,000 square-foot outpatient medical building in a PD (Planned Development) zone district.

Petitioner: St. Mary’s Hospital & Medical Center—Keith Estridge
Location: 7th and Wellington Avenue
Representative: Robert Jenkins

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Rob Jenkins, representing the petitioner, overviewed the request and referenced an overhead of the Site Plan. He noted access points, planned parking areas, the stormwater detention system and landscaping locations. The principles were hoping to begin construction by March 2002 and complete the project by May of 2003.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger said that this proposal represented the latest phase in the implementation of St. Mary’s Master Plan. The current project, she said, had been proposed in two phases. Three entrances into the site were proposed, with two located off Wellington Avenue and one off Patterson Road. She noted that a chain link fence would be erected around the demolition and construction area until such time as construction of the building, parking lots, and detention facility were completed. Staff initially had some concern over co-mingling of patient and construction traffic; however, it appeared that St. Mary’s had addressed this issue. St. Mary's property is zoned PD, but did not have defined development standards. Staff recommended utilizing the B-1, Neighborhood Business zone district as the default zone because it was most compatible with adjacent uses. The building’s height was proposed for 50 feet. While building heights up to 40 feet are allowed in the B-1 default zone, the Code makes provisions for the Planning Commission to be able to approve a height variance of up to 25 percent based on the four criteria of Section 3.2.H.4. Staff felt that the criteria had been sufficiently addressed and that there would not be adverse impacts as a result of the increased height. Staff recommended approval of the increase in height and Final Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed monument-styled sign on Patterson Road must be located outside of the right-of-way.
2. Materials used for the mechanical screening on top of the Pavilion shall be of similar material to those used in the construction of the Pavilion building, but shall not be metal or painted metal.
3. Dedication language for 14-foot multi-purpose easements along Wellington Avenue and Patterson Road must be submitted and approved by the City Real Estate Manager prior to issuance of a Planning Clearance. A deed (or deeds) and the appropriate recording fee shall be provided prior to the issuance of a Planning Clearance.

4. Concerns regarding conformance with TEDs of left-turn ingress and egress movements on/off of Patterson Road and Wellington Avenue must be resolved to the satisfaction of the Development Engineer prior to issuance of a Planning Clearance.

QUESTIONS

Vice-Chairman Dibble asked for clarification on where St. Mary's employees would be able to park during construction. Ms. Gerstenberger said that employees would park in the new parking lots located on the south side of Wellington Avenue. These were the parking lots approved for construction by the Planning Commission last month.

Commissioner Blosser asked why staff was prohibiting St. Mary's from using metal as a roof screening material. Ms. Gerstenberger said that because the project was located within a PD zone, an opportunity exists for additional community amenities; screening materials similar to the building would present a much more aesthetic façade, achieving greater compatibility with the surrounding area and a consequent community benefit.

Mr. Jenkins was asked to come forward and comment on the screening alternative. A letter was received from him concerning the steel-supported metal screen that is being requested by St. Mary's. He referenced an overhead of an architectural drawing and said that screening was intended to hide rooftop mechanical equipment. He explained the benefits (as outlined in his letter) and reiterated his assertion that his was the better alternative. Mr. Blanchard said that staff's recommendation of using similar building materials for the mechanical screening would result in the appearance of another, smaller story on top of the building, similar in appearance to the main structure. This had been done successfully at Barnes & Noble.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Jenkins said that the proposed material would deemphasize the appearance of the screen, not make it look like another story on top of the building. He noted that the proposed material was similar to that which had been utilized at the Grand Valley Surgical Center. If masonry screening were used as staff suggested, Mr. Jenkins said that the handling of runoff from the roof would be more difficult. Additional and unnecessary roof loads would result and a solid masonry screen would act as a "sail" with regard to wind resistance. He felt that a masonry screen wall would dominate the structure and conflict with the building's design.

QUESTIONS

When asked by Vice-Chairman Dibble if the proposed material would have a painted surface, Mr. Jenkins clarified that it would be prepainted using the same building color. It would give total concealment without drawing the eye.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Binder said that she'd driven by the Grand Valley Surgical Center and never even noticed its rooftop screening. She took no issue with allowing the petitioner's request to allow the prepainted metal screening, provided that it blended with the rest of the building. Given that the proposal offered less wind resistance and better drainage of rooftop runoff, she felt that amendment of the staff condition was reasonable.

Both Commissioners Blosser and Evans concurred. This material made sense and would blend in better with the building and surrounding area. Commissioner Evans suggested that condition 2 be deleted altogether.

Vice-Chairman Dibble remarked that the height variance request also seemed reasonable, to which Commissioner Putnam agreed.

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) “Mr. Chairman, on item FP-2001-181, request for Final Plan approval for the Advanced Medicine Pavilion, I move that we approve subject to staff conditions, with the findings as outlined by staff with the removal of condition 2.”

Mr. Shaver suggested, as an alternative to deleting the entire condition, that the sentence end after the word “building” and delete everything following that word. Mr. Shaver said that this would better ensure consistency. The revised condition would read: “Materials used for the mechanical screening on top of the Pavilion shall be of similar material to those used in the construction of the Pavilion building.”

The planning commissioners accepted Mr. Shaver's suggestion and included it in a revised motion, reading as follows:

MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) “Mr. Chairman, on item FP-2001-181, request for Final Plan approval for the Advanced Medicine Pavilion, I move that we approve subject to staff conditions, with the findings as outlined by staff with the revision of condition 2 [to read: ‘Materials used for the mechanical screening on top of the Pavilion shall be of similar material to those used in the construction of the Pavilion building.’]”

Commissioner Blosser seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

V. NON-HEARING ITEM

CP-2001-198 CONCEPT PLAN—THE PINES SUBDIVISION

A request from the petitioner for guidance on developing 10 units on 5.08 acres in a proposed RSF-2 (Single-Family Residential, not to exceed 2 units per acre) zone district.

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

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Ted Ciavonne, representing the petitioner, said that last time the plan had been submitted, the rezone request had been for an RSF-4 zone, which was denied by the Planning Commission. He noted that because the rezone failed, the plan proposal had never been heard. Upon resubmission, the development request would be in conjunction with an RSF-2 zone proposal.

Cliff Anson, petitioner, added that the overall number of units had been reduced from 13 to 10. The RSF-2 zone was thought to be more compatible with the surrounding area, had received neighborhood support and seemed to be more consistent with Planning Commission direction. He submitted copies of various letters of support received from surrounding residents.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Pat Cecil agreed that an RSF-2 proposed zone district would be more compatible with surrounding neighborhoods. He outlined RSF-2 criteria and felt that the new development proposal would be more consistent with both Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations.

Mr. Blanchard confirmed that staff would be more inclined to support the development if proposed in conjunction with RSF-2 zoning.

QUESTIONS

Vice-Chairman Dibble asked staff if there were any concerns over the petitioner's proposal of shared driveways, to which Mr. Cecil responded negatively. Mr. Cecil added that a development density consistent with RSF-2 zoning was more representative of what surrounding neighbors were looking for. Staff took no issue with the proposed zone and Concept Plan.

Mr. Anson acknowledged neighborhood resistance to the previously proposed RSF-4 zone. In talking with surrounding residents about the proposal in the context of an RSF-2 zone, this current plan seemed to be much more supported. He referenced an overhead of an area zoning map and noted the location of a nearby canal location. Mr. Anson said that RSF-2 zoning would eliminate the possibility of higher density development occurring on the site in the future.

DISCUSSION

Planning Commissioners universally expressed support for the Concept Plan and revised zone district proposal. Commissioner Blosser noted that this concept represented a move in the right direction.

Commissioner Evans felt that the RSF-4 rezone request hadn't been right for the area.

Vice-Chairman Dibble noted that the Concept Plan's density accommodated the site's topographic constraints.

For the record, Mr. Shaver stated that this discussion was advisory only. Expressed support did not automatically guarantee approval of a Preliminary Plan.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 P.M.