

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
December 9, 2014 MINUTES
6:00 p.m. to 6:41 p.m.

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Reece. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium located at 250 N. 5th Street, Grand Junction, Colorado.

In attendance representing the City Planning Commission were Ebe Eslami (Vice-Chairman), George Gatseos, Jon Buschhorn, Kathy Deppe, Keith Ehlers and Bill Wade.

In attendance, representing the City's Administration Department - Community Development, were Greg Moberg, (Planning Supervisor), Kristen Ashbeck (Senior Planner) Lori Bowers (Senior Planner), Senta Costello (Senior Planner), Scott Peterson (Senior Planner) and Eric Hahn, (Development Engineer).

Also present was Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney).

Lydia Reynolds was present to record the minutes.

There were 5 citizens in attendance during the hearing.

Announcements, Presentations And/or Visitors

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

Consent Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meetings

None available at this time.

2. Baker's Boutique - Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Forward a recommendation to City Council of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the Future Land Use Map Designation from "Park" to "Village Center" on 0.864 acres.

FILE #: CPA-2014-418
APPLICANT: Callie Ash - 726 24 Road LLC
LOCATION: 726 24 Road
STAFF: Scott Peterson

3. Baker's Boutique - Rezone

Forward a recommendation to City Council to rezone 0.86 +/- acres from CSR (Community Services and Recreation) to B-1 (Neighborhood Business) zone district.

FILE #: RZN-2014-419
APPLICANT: Callie Ash - 726 24 Road LLC
LOCATION: 726 24 Road
STAFF: Scott Peterson

Vice Chairman Eslami briefly explained the Consent Agenda and invited the public, Planning Commissioners and staff to speak if they wanted an item pulled for a full hearing. With no amendments to the Consent Agenda, Vice Chairman Eslami called for a motion.

MOTION: (Commissioner Wade) “I move that we approve the Consent Agenda as read.”

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

***** END OF CONSENT CALENDAR *****

***** ITEMS NEEDING INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION *****

Public Hearing Items

On the following item(s) the Grand Junction Planning Commission will make the final decision or a recommendation to City Council. If you have an interest in one of these items or wish to appeal an action taken by the Planning Commission, please call the Planning Division (244-1430) after this hearing to inquire about City Council scheduling.

4. GJHA Senior Housing PD - Highlands Apartments - Planned Development

Forward a recommendation to City Council to rezone property from R-16 (Residential - 16 units per acre) to PD (Planned Development) with a default zone of R-24 (Residential - 24 units per acre) and approve the Outline Development Plan.

FILE #: PLD-2014-447
APPLICANT: Jody Kole - Grand Junction Housing Authority
LOCATION: 805 Bookcliff Avenue
STAFF: Lori Bowers

Staff’s Presentation

Lori Bowers stated that this is a request for approval of an Outline Development Plan through the process of rezoning. Ms. Bowers stated the property is located at 805 Bookcliff Avenue, south of Bookcliff Avenue, east of 7th and west of 9th Street. Ms. Bowers displayed an aerial photo of the vacant lot and noted Tope Elementary is directly to the south. The parcel has been vacant since it was annexed into the City in 1964. The Future Land Use Map shows the parcel as Business Park/Mixed Use and the existing zoning is R-16 (Residential- 16 unit/ac). The property is 3.76 acres and the applicant proposed to develop the property into 128 units of multi-family residential units for seniors. Ms. Bowers explained that this will be done in two phases with each phase having 64 units. An area for indoor amenities, offices for service providers, such as home health care or Veterans Administration would be some allowed uses. Also proposed for the first phase was a common fitness or wellness center and possibly a snack area. Outside, a walking trail is proposed to the east, south and west of the

property. Ms. Bowers explained that there are currently fences to the east and south of the property, and as a condition of the rezone, there would need to be fencing between the B-1 and R-16 to the west.

Ms. Bowers stated that there had been a neighborhood meeting for the proposal. At this meeting, a member of the property owners association of the property to the west, had requested that the required fencing be open, preferably a landscaping berm. Ms. Bowers stated that this would be part of the proposal.

Ms. Bowers stated that the public would benefit from this development as there is a need for moderate to low income housing for seniors. In addition to being a great infill site of a long-standing vacant lot, the development's location is near bus stops, restaurants and St. Mary's Hospital.

How this item relates to the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies

Ms. Bowers stated that in reviewing the planned development, the following two goals of the comprehensive plan were met:

Goal 4: Support the continued development of the downtown area of the City Center into a vibrant and growing area with jobs, housing and tourist attractions.

Goal 5: To provide a broader mix of housing types in the community to meet the needs of a variety of incomes, family types and life stages.

Ms. Bowers stated that in considering a planned development, the criteria of Chapter 21.02.150 is reviewed. The Outline Development Plan needs to meet the Comprehensive Plan, the Grand Valley Circulation Plan and any other adopted plans and policies. The Grand Valley Circulation Plan defines Bookcliff Avenue as a minor collector and there are no major improvements required to Bookcliff Avenue with the proposed use. All access will be interior on the site and there are no proposed streets. There will be drive isles and parking areas.

Ms. Bowers explained that in addition to the ODP criteria, staff feels that the proposal meets the criteria of the rezoning section of the code. The rezoning meets the future land use recommendation of Business Park/Mixed Use and will allow the applicant a higher and better use of this infill site.

The character and condition of the area has changed such, that the amendment is consistent with the plan.

Ms. Bowers explained the rezoning criteria provided in Section 21.02.140 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code (GJMC) was reviewed and noted the following:

- (1) Subsequent events have invalidated the original premises and findings; and/or

The original premise has not been invalidated. The rezone request meets the goals and criteria of the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning that supports the future land use designation of Business Park Mixed Use. The PD zone designation will allow the applicant a higher and better use of this infill site.

(2) The character and/or condition of the area has changed such that the amendment is consistent with the Plan; and/or

The subject parcel has been vacant since it was annexed into the City in 1964. Growth has taken place on all surrounding properties, and some properties have re-developed in this area as the subject parcel remained vacant. This is an infill project in an area where all support and public amenities exist, particularly for this type of proposed use.

(3) Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed; and/or

The vicinity of the subject property contains a variety of uses. St. Mary's Hospital property is located directly north and to the northwest of the subject property. Tope Elementary School and grounds is located immediately to the south. The property to the west is zoned B-1 and developed for business uses. There are restaurants within walking distance to the property and Grand Valley Transit has stops located nearby on Bookcliff Avenue.

(4) An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the community, as defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use; and/or

This is one of the last vacant parcels of land in this highly desirable area in the City Center. To accommodate a Planned Development on the site will allow for better design and utilize the amenities and services of this area more efficiently.

(5) The community or area, as defined by the presiding body, will derive benefits from the proposed amendment.

The community will benefit by a housing type that is needed. This is an ideal location for this type of housing.

c) The planned development requirements of Section 21.05.040(f) GJMC;

1. Setback Standards - The applicant is requesting the setbacks for the property to be the same as those in the R-24 zoning district except for the allowance of zero setbacks for the side setbacks interior to the parcel. It

is anticipated that the parcel will need to be split for financing reasons for development of Phase 2. The development plan anticipates that the buildings constructed in Phases 1 and 2 will be attached, sharing the common interior spaces that are constructed with Phase 1.

2. Open Space - Common open space is to be provided to be shared by Phase 1 and Phase 2, including planned shared active open space between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 buildings and a walking trail around the west, south, and east perimeters of the property.
3. Fencing/Screening - The south and east boundaries of the property have existing fencing. The west boundary of the property will be fenced for B-1 zone compatibility. The Owners Association of the B-1 zoned property request that the required fencing be an open style of fence or provide a landscaping screen/berm for the buffer required by the Zoning and Development Code.
4. Landscaping - Landscaping will be provided as part of the development in compliance with city requirements.
5. Parking - On-site parking will be constructed to meet code requirements for R-24 zoning.
6. Street Development Standards - This requirement is not applicable.

Ms. Bowers stated that the subject parcel does not fall in any overlay district or is it subject to any corridor guidelines.

In Addition, adequate public services and facilities shall be provided concurrent with the projected impacts of the development.

There are existing bus stops on Bookcliff Avenue. City water and sanitary sewer are available within the street and can be extended through the site from Bookcliff Avenue for service. Drainage detention will be addressed with the review of the site plan, which may include detention features on site.

Adequate circulation has been addressed as noted earlier.

Appropriate screening and buffering of adjacent property is required.

An appropriate range of density for the entire property or for each development pod/area to be developed.

The existing parcel is 3.763 acres. By adding in the allowed 1/2 Right-of- Way (30' x 550') an additional 16,500 square feet or .379 acres may be added to the property for the purpose of calculating the allowed density. The total acreage for calculating the

density is then 4.142 acres. The applicant is proposing 128 units, resulting in a density of 30.9 units/acre. The applicant requests, and staff supports, an overall density of between 24 and 32 units per acre.

An appropriate set of “default” or minimum standards for the entire property or for each development pod/area to be developed.

The default zoning for the Planned Development will be R-24. The setback requirements for R-24 will be utilized with one deviation being the side setback for the interior of the parcel. A zero lot line is requested for the purpose of subdividing the parcel in the future for funding purposes.

An appropriate phasing or development schedule for the entire property or for each development pod/area to be developed.

Development is anticipated to consist of two phases. It is anticipated that construction of Phase 1 can begin in late 2015. Timing for Phase 2 will be prior to December 1, 2020. Staff proposes the following phasing/development schedule:

- Phase 1: Planning Clearance shall be pulled no later than December 1, 2015.
- Phase 2: Planning Clearance shall be pulled no later than December 1, 2020.

Ms. Bowers displayed a slide of the requested deviations which included the following:

1. The default zoning will be R-24 (Residential - 24 units per acre).
2. The side setback shall be zero for the interior of the parcel. This will allow for a simple subdivision for future funding purposes.
3. On the western edge of the property, in lieu of a solid fence the required fence buffer can be open style fencing (to see through) or a landscaping berm.
4. The following uses shall also be allowed: Management office, including support offices for resident service providers such as home health care and VA, together with fitness, wellness, and socializing areas. Other indoor amenities may include a coffee shop and/or sandwich shop.
5. The overall density range of the project will be 24 to 32 dwelling units per acre.

Ms. Bowers stated that staff recommends approval based on the requested Planned Development, Outline Development Plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the criteria of the Municipal Codes.

Ms. Bowers noted that Kristen Ashbeck, (Senior Planner) and Eric Hahn (Development Engineer) had helped with the design charette for this proposal and are present to answer questions. Ms. Bowers indicated that the representatives of the proposal are present and have a presentation available.

Questions for Staff

Commissioner Buschhorn asked about a handout that he was given. Ms. Bowers

stated that that is a replacement page of the original staff report. Mr. Buschhorn inquired about the way a criteria was worded and Ms. Bowers clarified that the wording was due to the fact that the particular criteria in question was an an/or criteria.

Commissioner Wade expressed interest in seeing the representative's presentation.

Applicants Presentation

Mr. Rich Krohn, 744 Horizon Ct. stated that he was the representative for the applicant. Mr. Krohn wished to emphasize that this development is not assisted living as it is seniors only apartments, predominately one bedroom apartments. Mr. Krohn stated that this is affordable housing which means that all the occupants will have 60 percent or less of AMI (area median income). It is the intent of this type of development to allow for "aging in place" where services are available on site and will possibly help seniors avoid moving to assisted living.

Mr. Krohn stated that they would like to have one unit available for an on-site manager for security and assistance.

Mr. Krohn noted that the open fencing would be part of the site plan application. If approved, the second reading of the planned development ordinance will be January 7th with City Council.

Mr. Krohn stated that the phasing of the project is due to financing. Mr. Krohn also noted that 64 units per phase is a good size for financing the development. Mr. Krohn displayed an example of a possible configuration of the site. Mr. Krohn noted that there was a three day design charette where staff and several agencies were involved. It was noted that a design/build team had been selected.

Mr. Krohn showed a slide with a conceptual rendering of the two proposed buildings and an example of a desired private, common active area outside the building which faces Tope Elementary School. This area is somewhat private and secure where seniors can enjoy the outdoors with some privacy.

Questions for Applicant

Commissioner Wade noted that the second planning clearance application is scheduled for 2020 and asked if the intent of the housing authority was to expedite the process to have that happen sooner.

Mr. Krohn explained that, in general, development never gets easier or cheaper and that they would like to obtain financing as soon as feasibly possible using the Section 42 financing mechanism.

Commissioner Deppe inquired as to the size of an average unit.

Jody Kole, stated that the approximate size of a 2 bedroom would be 900 square feet and the one bedroom would be 750 square feet. Mr. Krohn reiterated that they would

predominately be one bedrooms as that is the demographic that is most needed. Mr. Krohn stated that the Housing Authority currently has close to 3,000 people looking for housing services.

Ms. Kole added that all units will either be ADA accessible or be able to be converted to ADA accessible.

Commissioner Buschhorn asked if the on-site manager's unit would be in addition to the requested 128 units. Mr. Krohn stated that the managers unit is in addition to the 128 units.

Commissioner Ehlers asked staff if that unit is included in the presentation or would they need to add it to the motion. Ms. Bowers stated that the manager office was not specifically called out as a residential unit. Mr. Krohn stated that they would like to have the managers unit be an additional residential unit under this phase. Commissioner Wade asked Ms. Beard if they would need to add it to the motion. Ms. Beard stated that since the unit would be a residential unit and still fit within the total amount of allowable units, it would not be required to be added to the motion. Ms. Beard added that if the Commission would like to add it to the motion for clarity, that would be fine. Mr. Crone stated that although the additional unit would be permitted by the requested zoning, he wanted to make sure it was understood that the manager may, or may not be, a senior.

Discussion

Commissioner Wade spoke in favor of the project and said he was in support of it due to an infill project and the need for affordable housing. Commissioner Buschhorn agreed. Commissioner Gatseos noted that this was one of the few vacant parcels in the city center. Vice Chairman Eslami agreed with the project as proposed.

MOTION: (Commissioner Wade) “Mr. Chairman, on item PLD-2014-447, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the requested Rezone from R-16 (Residential - 16 units) to PD (Planned Development) and recommend approval of the Outline Development Plan to include a resident apartment for the resident manager, with the findings of fact, conclusions, and conditions listed in the staff report.

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

General Discussion/Other Business

Greg Moberg, Development Services Manager, Supervisor, noted that there will not be a second Planning Commission meeting in December, but there will be a second workshop on December 18th where code amendments will be discussed.

Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 6:41 p.m.