

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JANUARY 11, 2000 MINUTES
7:02 p.m. to 10:40 p.m.

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chairman John Elmer. The public hearing was held at Two Rivers Convention Center.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were John Elmer (Chairman), Joe Grout, Terri Binder, James Nall, Dr. Paul Dibble, Nick Prinster and Mark Fenn. (Note: Commissioner Prinster arrived after the vote on the minutes.)

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Joe Carter (Assoc. Planner), Tricia Parish (Assoc. Planner), Lori Bowers (Assoc. Planner), Lisa Gerstenberger (Sr. Planner), Dave Thornton (Sr. Planner) and Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor).

Also present were Dave Varley (Acting Community Development Director), John Shaver (Asst. City Attorney), and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 17 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the December 14 and December 21, 1999 public hearings.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, on the minutes for the December 14, 1999 meeting, I move that they are approved as submitted.”

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

Chairman Elmer clarified that on page 8 of the December 21 minutes, second motion, given Planning Commission discussion prior to the motion, he asked that the last sentence be amended to delete the last two words “he could” and replace them with the following: “...for Planning Commission consideration.”

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, on the minutes for December 21, I move that we accept them as modified tonight.”

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

Commissioner Prinster arrived and was present for the remainder of the public hearing.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Chairman Elmer welcomed new planning commissioners, Dr. Paul Dibble and James Nall.

Continued to the January 18, 2000 public hearing were items ANX-1999-271 and the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Offered for placement on the Consent Agenda were items MS-1999-272 and VR-1999-288. No public opposition was expressed for either item.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the Consent Agenda.”

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

GPA-1999-270 GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT/REZONE

A request for: 1) approval to amend the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan to redesignate the parcel from Residential Medium-High Density (8-11.9 dwelling units per acre) to Commercial, and 2) recommend approval of a rezone from RSF-R (Residential Single Family not to exceed 1 unit per 5 acres) to B-1 (Limited Business) to allow single, multi-family, or light business uses of the property.

**Petitioner: James Grady
Location: 640 – 24 ½ Road
Representative: Ron Sechrist, Bray & Company**

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Ron Sechrist, representing the petitioner, requested that this item be continued to the January 18 public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we continue the item for the Grady Property for one week, until next Tuesday.”

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

ANX-1999-269 ZONE OF ANNEXATION/ROBERTSON MINOR SUBDIVISION

A request for: 1) approval of the Zone of Annexation for approximately 3.61 acres from R1B (County) to City RSF-2 (Residential Single Family not to exceed a density of 2 units per acre), and 2) approval of the Robertson Minor Subdivision consisting of 4 single family lots.

**Petitioner: Stephen Robertson
Location: 522 – 20 ½ Road
Representative: Steve Sharpe, Banner Associates**

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Steve Sharpe, representing the petitioner, noted the site’s location, surrounding uses and zoning using an overhead transparency. The house, presently located on Lot 1 of Galbreath Subdivision, with the adjustment of its northern property line, will be Lot 1 of Robertson Minor Subdivision. Additional right-of-way along 20 ½ Road would be dedicated to facilitate future road alignment. Mr. Sharpe said that utilities and sewer are available and the petitioner agreed to pay the required drainage fee. Two shares of Redlands Water & Power water were allotted to the site for irrigation. Homeowners could supplement

available shares with potable water from Ute Water. Xeriscaping could also be encouraged to lessen irrigation water demand.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Prinster asked if irrigation was presently available and accessible to the site. Mr. Sharpe said that it was unclear just where the access point was, but surmised that it was located nearby. Redlands Water & Power would be responsible for getting water to the site.

Chairman Elmer asked if ingress/egress onto 20 ½ Road would be shared. Mr. Sharpe replied affirmatively, adding that a plat note exists delineating shared accesses.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Joe Carter said that after conversations he'd had with representatives of Redlands Water & Power, irrigation water provision was a non-issue. A pedestrian easement would cross the property and continue along the west side of the canal (location noted). The fence currently existing on Lot 1 must be removed from the Redlands Water & Power easement. Having found that the request met bulk standards and other Code criteria, staff recommended approval of the RSF-2 Zone of Annexation and approval of the Minor Subdivision.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Alice Smith (467 Wildwood Drive, Grand Junction) asked for clarification on the location of the subject property in relation to her home, which was provided.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Fenn said that the request represented a fairly straightforward infill project. Chairman Elmer concurred.

Commissioner Binder asked staff if the City generally allowed access directly onto a collector street. Rick Dorris said that while not typical, in the current instance, there was no other alternative. Shared driveways, he said, would minimize safety hazards. This subdivision only added one additional driveway to access off of 20 ½ Road.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-269, Robertson Minor Subdivision, I move that we approve the request for a Minor Subdivision."

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-269, Robertson Minor Subdivision, I move that we make a recommendation of approval of RSF-2 zoning to the City Council."

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

Due to the potential for conflict of interest, Commissioner Binder recused herself from consideration of the following item.

RZ-1999-278 REZONE—COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

A request to: 1) amend the PB (Planned Business) zone district list of permitted uses to allow a hospital/day surgery center, and 2) Preliminary Plan approval for the Site Plan in a PB (Planned Business) zone district.

Petitioner: Community Hospital
Location: Northwest corner of 1st and Patterson
Representative: Richard Krohn

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Richard Krohn, representing the petitioner, introduced other persons involved with the project. A brief history of the site's annexation was presented. He stressed that only the addition of a similar use to the list of pre-approved uses was being requested. The request, he said, only applied to Phase I of the project. An overhead transparency of the Site Plan was presented. Tract A would contain a detention pond. He briefly explained how the facility would be used for outpatient surgeries only, with no overnight stays, no emergency room, and no walk-in traffic. There would be no ambulance service unless an emergency occurred on site. The building's appearance would blend in with the neighborhood and would in no way look institutional. Hours of operation would be from 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Traffic flow patterns were noted. A 5-foot wooden fence would be installed along the northern boundary of lot 1. Approximately double the required number of parking spaces would be provided initially; however, upon completion of Phase II, both phases would jointly share the parking area.

Overhead transparencies and graphic representations of the building's proposed architectural design and elevation were presented. No noise was expected from the site, and its design was felt to be non-intrusive. Irrigation water would be provided through Grand Valley Irrigation. Drainage would be handled by an existing stormwater sewer system and flow to Tract A where it would ultimately discharge into the Ranchman's Ditch. An overhead transparency depicting the concept plan for Phase II was presented, but little detail was available. Construction of Phase II was not expected to occur for another 3-5 years. The entrance into the site from 1st Street had been realigned, and he noted the existence of a "pork chop" entrance into the site from Patterson Road.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dibble noted that the only entrance delineated for Phase II was located in the western portion of the property. Would another access be proposed? Mr. Krohn said that no detail was available for Phase II since its development was not under consideration. It was unclear what staff would require upon submission of the proposal, but traffic flow issues would be addressed.

Commissioner Dibble wondered if patients could be apprised in advance of the appropriate route to take upon entering the site. Mr. Krohn said that patients could be advised, but he doubted the effectiveness of doing so. Mr. Dorris presented an overhead transparency of the Site Plan which depicted the pork chop intersection in greater detail. Its deep cut and long arms, he said, should deter people from crossing Patterson Road.

Chairman Elmer noted the need for a blanket easement between the two phases to accommodate the shared parking area and common accesses.

Commissioner Prinster asked if the parking lot would be lit. Mr. Krohn responded that the project's lighting package would include external lighting on the building, pole lighting in the parking lot, and at least two street lights. When asked, Mr. Krohn added that signage would be included at the pork chop egress point to reflect right turns only.

Commissioner Prinster asked for clarification on why a 5-foot, instead of a 6-foot, fence was being proposed. Mark Gibbons, a member of the project's design team, said that due to the property's increased elevation along the northern boundary, a 5-foot fence would provide the same level of screening as a 6-foot fence.

Commissioner Prinster asked if grass would be planted under the treed areas, to which Mr. Gibbons replied affirmatively. He noted other landscaping areas on the Site Plan as well.

Chairman Elmer asked if architectural drawings accurately represented the plan. If the request were approved, the drawings would be made a part of the record. Mr. Krohn agreed to include the drawings as submitted. A sign package would be submitted at Final for consideration.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger said that the request was compatible with the Growth Plan and met Code criteria. With no outstanding issues, staff recommended approval of the rezone request and approval of the Preliminary Plan with no conditions.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if the Planning Commission was charged with consideration of the concept plan for Phase II, to which Mr. Shaver responded negatively.

Commissioner Dibble asked if sufficient stacking room existed at the 1st Street entrance, to which Mr. Dorris responded affirmatively. When asked for the length of the turn lane, Mr. Dorris said that the turn lane's taper was approximately 110-120 feet in length, with approximately 80 feet of available stacking room. This, he said, met City criteria but he noted that the petitioner would be required to re-review trip generation figures at the time Phase II was proposed.

Chairman Elmer wondered if any benefit would be derived if left turns onto Patterson Road from Meander Drive were eliminated. Mr. Dorris said that the question could be revisited at the time of Phase II development.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

Jackie Moran (623 – 26 Road, Grand Junction) expressed concern over left turns into the site from 1st Street. She also noted that the fence on her property was set back to accommodate future widening of 1st Street. She wondered if the City still planned on widening the road, and if so, wouldn't the petitioner's proposed placement of the 5-foot fence conflict? Mr. Dorris said that the width at the intersection would be extended to the north property line. Ms. Moran expressed concern that the 5-foot fence would impede sight distance at the 1st Street entrance. Mr. Dorris said that this could be further discussed with the petitioner at final site plan review.

Bonnie Harris (602 Meander Drive, Grand Junction) shared similar concerns as Ms. Moran.

Joe Carroll (537 Kirby Lane, Grand Junction) acknowledged the need for the proposed facility, but he felt that there was insufficient parking for both phases.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Krohn said that the proposed sign package could include one additional sign off of F Road for Phase II. Approximately 15-20 surgeries per day would be undertaken, with between 12-15 employees on site. He expected traffic flow to and from the site to be extremely low. The fence would extend beyond the property line and would be set back from the curb, gutter and sidewalk so as not to impede sight distance. He felt that staff's issues had been addressed and that the project would be a good one.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dibble asked how many of the 81 proposed parking spaces were needed for the first filing, to which Mr. Krohn answered that only 40 were required. That number, he added, also included required employee parking.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer noted that the request met the intent of the Growth Plan. He commended the petitioner's efforts to mitigate concerns with Phase I and hoped the same efforts would extend into Phase II of the project.

Commissioner Prinster agreed with Ms. Moran's comments and suggested that staff carefully review sight distance concerns at the 1st Street entrance. If necessary, the fence may need to be tapered or the removal of a tree may be required. Mr. Dorris said that staff had a number of options available.

Commissioner Dibble wondered if the pork chop would contain landscaping or concrete at its center, to which Mr. Dorris replied that it would probably be concrete but could have other options. He was unsure at this point whether reflective signage/markers would be necessary.

Commissioner Nall asked if two access points were required by the Fire Department. Mr. Dorris explained briefly how that requirement could vary.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZ-1999-278, rezone to amend the list of permitted uses for the Planned Business zone district, I move that we forward the request to City Council with the recommendation to include a day surgery center."

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZ-1999-278, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plan."

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

A brief recess was called at 8:28 p.m. The hearing reconvened at 8:37 p.m.

Commissioner Binder returned and was present for the remainder of the hearing.

GPA-1999-275 RUMP GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT/ZONE OF ANNEXATION

A request for approval to: 1) amend the Growth Plan to redesignate parcel #1 from Residential Rural to Residential Estate; from Park to Residential Estate on parcel #2; and Residential-Low to Residential Estate on parcel #3; and 2) apply a Zone of Annexation for parcel #1 from R-2 (County) to RSF-E; from R-2 (County) to RSF-E for parcel #2; and from R1B (County) to RSF-E on parcel #3.

Petitioner: Marilyn Schiveley
Location: South Broadway at Riggs Hill
Representative: Robert Katzenson, LanDesign

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Rob Katzenson, representing the petitioner, noted the site’s location using an overhead transparency. Other parcels in the area, he stated, were also classified as Estate. He referenced previous submittals and discussions of both planning commissioners and City Council members. Each of the Rump’s three parcels was reviewed separately.

Parcel #1: A rock rollout analysis had been performed to determine extent of rock fall. There was still sufficient buildable area on site to comply with the Estate classification and meet the Growth Plan’s goals and policies. However, he took issue with some of staff’s findings and recommendations, including a restriction limiting the number of lots that may be served by Desert Hills Circle to 25. Mr. Katzenson handed out packets containing a traffic analysis and letter to Traffic Engineer Jody Kliska, which indicated 29 lots were considered/analyzed for Desert Hills Drive. The access issue, he said, was not a self-inflicted hardship and he presented his arguments for why figures generated by the TEDS manual were inaccurate.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Fenn asked how much buildable area was available for parcel 1, to which Mr. Katzenson replied that 6-10 acres were available for clustered development. The actual layout could be discussed further once a plan was submitted, but he surmised that 4-6 lots could be developed in approximately one-half acre sizes, resulting in a 2-acre average density. The remaining property could be held in a conservation easement.

Parcel #2: Mr. Katzenson said that this 5.28-acre parcel had been erroneously classified as a park. He felt that the Estate classification was a more appropriate designation. The City, he said, had recommended that this redesignation request accompany the other two requests.

Parcel #3: There remained some question over sewer service provision to this parcel. No wetlands delineation of this parcel had occurred to date, nor had any soils evaluation been performed. He doubted that any more than two lots could be created on that parcel.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Grout asked if there were any access constraints inherent to parcel #3. Mr. Katzenson said that access may be available to parcel #3 but not off of South Broadway.

Commissioner Binder wondered why the Museum had turned down the Rump’s donation offer of parcel #2. Mr. Katzenson was unsure.

Commissioner Dibble wondered if there were any problems with groundwater or standing water on parcel #3. Mr. Katzenson acknowledged that there was some evidence of a drainage pathway which bisected the property; however, sufficient buildable area seemed to exist on the eastern side of the parcel.

Commissioner Dibble asked if access to parcel #3 could be provided along the western section of the property. Mr. Katzenson conjectured that a clustered development would be proposed along the eastern portion of the property where it would receive reasonable proximity access to the right-of-way off of South Broadway.

Commissioner Binder asked how access to parcel #2 would be provided. Mr. Katzenson said that while specific plans were not yet available, he thought that access to the parcel would be derived from South Broadway.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger reviewed the proposal as contained in the January 11, 2000 Staff Report. While the Rump property had already been annexed, no City zone designation had yet been applied to the property. The petitioner had provided only limited information justifying the higher land use classification, and no development plans had been submitted with the request. Staff determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate the need for the Growth Plan amendment and instead recommended a residential rural land use classification and zone of annexation of RSF-R for all three parcels.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dibble asked for a brief elaboration on the concept of clustered development, which was provided. Mr. Shaver commented that clustering was seen more often in planned zones because of the contract nature of the zoning and the planning.

Commissioner Prinster asked if staff felt that lowering the density classification for parcel #3 was justified, to which Ms. Gerstenberger replied affirmatively, given the physical constraints of the property.

Commissioner Grout acknowledged that there had been some discussion on eliminating parcel #3 from the Persigo 201 boundary. Mr. Shaver indicated that a determination had yet been reached.

Commissioner Binder wondered if the City could contact the museum and ask them why they were not interested in parcel #2. Mr. Shaver said that while the City could call museum representatives and ask, the donation or sale of private property was between the parties involved.

Commissioner Grout asked for clarification on the Desert Hills cul-de-sac with regard to the TEDS manual determination. Mr. Dorris agreed that Desert Hills Drive could handle more traffic since it had been constructed to local street standards. Dedicated right-of-way was available along the road to the west, which had not been granted previously. The City's standard had been to allow a maximum of 25 lots per dead-end road (i.e., cul-de-sac). If a stub street were proposed for future connection to another property, additional lots could be allowed.

Chairman Elmer wondered if the parcels should be considered separately or as one. Mr. Shaver said that planning commissioners could approach the motion either way.

Commissioner Nall asked where the Desert Hills cul-de-sac came into the Rump property, which was noted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Darlene Gunnerson (2184 Dinosaur Court, Grand Junction) noted the wetlands area south of South Broadway and said that the presence of so much bentonite in the soil may compromise foundation integrity. The Rump property, she said, contained steep hillsides, a number of large boulders, and other physical constraints which would make construction difficult. She wondered if South Broadway would be widened to accommodate a turn lane into the property. She objected to further development in the Redlands pending widening of South Broadway.

Ed Arnos (2102 South Broadway, Grand Junction) thought that the goals and policies of the Growth Plan should be upheld unless the petitioner could justify the need for something different. He felt that approval of the Growth Plan amendment and higher land use classification would create a “domino effect” and encourage higher overall densities in the area. He agreed with Ms. Gunnerson’s comments on traffic.

Alice Smith (467 Wildwood Drive, Grand Junction) expressed concern over periodic flooding which occurred on the subject property and in the area. She also lamented the loss of more open space.

PETITIONER’S REBUTTAL

Mr. Katzenson said that South Broadway still had adequate carrying capacity to address safety concerns. With regard to parcel #3’s topographic constraints, he suggested that a future property owner could bring in fill. The biggest issue with the current request, he felt, was correcting previous inconsistencies and the Growth Plan amendment process allowed for correction of those inconsistencies. Mr. Katzenson cited a number of areas where hillside construction had taken place and been very successful. The request was consistent with the Persigo Agreement, and depending on the plan submitted, the Planning Commission could still base its recommendation on the allowable Estate range of between 2 and 5 acres/unit. The requested density classification, he felt, was reasonable, and he reiterated the Rumps’ intent to place a portion of the property in a conservation easement. He asked that 29 lots be allowed off of Desert Hills Drive.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Prinster asked for clarification on the Persigo boundary and agreement and zone of annexation issues, which was provided by Mr. Shaver.

Commissioner Binder said that if classified at a lower land use density, the petitioner could always return with a plan and rezone request at a later time.

Chairman Elmer said that under the new Code, there would be minimum density provisions. Mr. Shaver said that if a development application were submitted after adoption of the new Code, new provisions would apply.

Chairman Elmer asked if a stub street had been provided off of Desert Hills Drive cul-de-sac to the east. Mr. Shaver said that the cul-de-sac was for access to the Rump parcel #1 and had been negotiated as part of Desert Hills Estate.

Chairman Elmer said that when Desert Hills Estates development was approved, there had been no representation that he recalled regarding the number of lots that could be served off of Desert Hills Drive. He said that one justification for the higher density had been because of available access to South Broadway, eliminating access to the western right-of-way. Given discussions during that public hearing, the Planning Commission never intended to allow anything other than what the TEDS manual specified.

Commissioner Fenn agreed, although calculations would actually allow 26 lots along Desert Hills Drive, allowing four additional lots to use Desert Hills Drive. The only way to get 4 additional lots out of

parcel #1, he said, would be to classify the property as RSF-E. More control and benefit could be gained over an RSF-E classification. And just because the property was classified RSF-E, planning commissioners were not obligated to approve 2-acre lots. While RSF-E was probably feasible for all three parcels, it was difficult for the Planning Commission to make a decision without first seeing a plan.

Chairman Elmer clarified for new planning commissioners that if RSF-E were recommended, the petitioner could come back with a plan showing 2-acre lots, shared driveway, geological constraints, etc. No clustering would be required, and only bulk standards would apply. He said that the petitioner's intent to propose a 2-acre average density meant that the minimum density allowed would be 2 acres.

Commissioner Grout agreed that parcel #2 had been erroneously classified as a park. He agreed with staff's determination that sufficient justification for the higher density classification hadn't been made. It appeared, also, that parcel #3 would ultimately be deleted from the Persigo boundary.

In the absence of an actual plan, Chairman Elmer suggested that all three parcels be designated as Residential Estate (2-5 acres/unit) but zone them RSF-R. This would put the burden on the petitioner to demonstrate how a higher density could work.

Commissioners Fenn and Grout concurred with the recommendation.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-1999-275, the Growth Plan amendment to: 1) redesignate Rump parcel #1 from Residential Rural, 5-35 acres per unit to Residential Estate, 2-5 acres per unit; 2) redesignate Rump parcel #2 from Park to Residential Estate, 2-5 units per acre; 3) redesignate Rump parcel #3 from Residential Low, ½ -2 acres per unit, to Residential Estate, 2-5 acres per unit, I move that we forward the request to City Council with a recommendation to approve."

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-1999-275, a request for the Zone of Annexation for: 1) Rump parcel #1 would change from R-2 (County) to RSF-R; 2) Rump parcel #2 would go from R-2 in the County to RSF-R; and 3) Rump parcel #3 from R1B to RSF-R, and that we forward the request to City Council with a recommendation to approve."

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

ANX-1999-271 ZONE OF ANNEXATION/GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT

A request for: 1) approval of the Zone of Annexation for approximately 38.91 acres from County AFT to City RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units to the acre) and 2) amend the Growth Plan to redesignate the density from Medium-High to Medium-Low.

Petitioner: Best Buy Homes, LLC
Location: Southeast corner of 26 ½ and I Roads
Representative: Thompson-Langford

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Doug Theis, representing the petitioner, noted the site's location, surrounding zoning and uses on an overhead transparency. The request, he said, was consistent with Growth Plan goals and policies and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if the airport's critical zone traversed the property. Mr. Theis noted a small portion where an LDN zone overlaid the property, which would require some degree of noise mitigation for homes located within the zone's boundary.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton said that given the area's growth, the proposed Zone of Annexation would be a more compatible designation. The request met both the intent of the Growth Plan and Code criteria. With no outstanding issues, staff recommended approval of the Growth Plan amendment to the Residential Medium-Low designation and approval of the RSF-4 Zone of Annexation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Fenn said that the request made sense and noted its compatibility with the surrounding area.

Chairman Elmer said that it also provided a better transition zone for property to the west.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-271, I move that we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval for the Growth Plan amendment to the Residential Medium-Low designation."

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-271, I move that we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval for the Zone of Annexation to RSF-4 for the reasons listed in the staff report."

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

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer asked that some of the smaller, more detailed maps be enlarged by staff to show greater detail. In the case of Community Hospital, it was difficult for planning commissioners to discern many of the site's features from the map in the notebook.

With no further business, the hearing was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.