

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2000 MINUTES
7:03 p.m. to 11:45 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, Terri Binder, Nick Prinster, Joe Grout, James Nall and William Putnam. Jerry Ainsworth and Vicki Boutilier were absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner (Acting Community Development Director/Planning Manager), Lisa Gerstenberger (Senior Planner), Joe Carter (Associate Planner) and Kristen Ashbeck (Senior Planner).

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 16 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the September 12 and September 19, 2000 public hearings.

Commissioner Binder referenced page 5 on the September 12 minutes. Under the Questions paragraph, she remembered asking if there were any plans for an overpass/underpass in the Master Plan. She asked to have this question mentioned after the third sentence in the first paragraph, to read as follows: "Commissioner Binder asked if any plans to overpass or underpass underneath 12th Street were in the Master Plan."

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes [of September 12, 2000] as amended tonight."

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

With regard to the September 19 minutes and the motion made on FPP-2000-142 (Fountain Greens), Chairman Elmer said that while the motion referenced a density variance of 10 percent, discussions preceding the motion referenced 20 percent. Commissioner Grout remembered referencing a 10 percent variance in his motion. John Shaver suggested that approval of the minutes subject to verification of the motion as recorded by the video tape.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes subject to review of the video tape of the September 19 meeting."

Commissioner Dibble seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-0, with Commissioner Prinster 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 ANX-2000-172 (Annexation/Rezone – Route 30 Partners at 520 30 Road) and ANX-2000-177 (Annexation/Site Plan Review – Mesa Moving at 2225 River Rd and 681 Railroad Boulevard). No objections were raised by either the audience or planning commissioners.

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

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

IV. FULL PUBLIC HEARING

RZP-2000-107 PRELIMINARY PLAN—SPANISH TRAILS

A request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for Spanish Trails Subdivision consisting of 170 units on 28.6 acres.

Petitioner: Reimer Development, Kevin Reimer
Location: 719 – 24 ½ Road
Representative: PA/DS Architecture, Bryan Sims

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Kevin Reimer, petitioner, referenced an overhead visual of the Preliminary Plan. He said that a traffic study, undertaken approximately a year ago, determined a need for improvements to the intersection of G and 24 ½ Roads. Mr. Reimer viewed improvements to this intersection as more a regional improvement since traffic from a number of area developments, churches and Canyon View Park used the intersection. He wondered if the City had in place any “right of recovery” to help him recoup a portion of improvement costs. He also asked for deferral of the financing requirement at Phase I given that build-out of the project wouldn’t occur for another 3-4 years. Feeling that piping/filling of the off-site Mitchell Drain was also a regional improvement, he asked for cost-sharing from the City on that expense as well.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer wondered how much of the ditch bordering the northern portion of the property was within the site’s property line. Mr. Reimer said that the ditch lay entirely outside the site’s property line.

Chairman Elmer referenced the project’s ODP and asked if the proposed housing type and density conformed with properties located to the southwest. Mr. Reimer replied affirmatively, confirming the project’s current density of 6 units/acre. The housing style had been altered somewhat from the clustered housing approach to include more attached and detached and zero lot line single-family homes.

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification of the petitioner’s request to defer financing intersection improvements. Mr. Reimer said that Phase I would pose a financial burden and didn’t make sense when build-out wouldn’t occur for a number of years. He said that he was already responsible for a number of off-site improvements during Phase I. When Chairman Elmer pointed out that only a guarantee was

required for future improvements, Mr. Reimer said that guaranteeing improvement was the same as writing a check. He noted that since all phases came before the Planning Commission for consideration, it made more sense to him to defer this requirement until Phase IV.

Commissioner Prinster wondered when Jack Creek Road would be constructed to connect with 24 ½ Road. Mr. Reimer preferred that this be done during the fourth phase but would agree to providing the connection during the third phase if the Planning Commission so chose. If the latter, he asked for consideration of constructing improvements less sidewalks prior to Phase IV.

Commissioner Binder asked about the RV parking provided for the subdivision. Mr. Reimer noted its location (Tract H). Internal ingress/egress would be provided off of the East Fork Road cul-de-sac. Mr. Reimer also pointed out the location for perimeter fencing, proposed with the project.

Commissioner Dibble asked for clarification on the project's phasing, which was given. When asked, Mr. Reimer confirmed development of 44 lots in both Phases I and II.

Commissioner Binder said that if the RV Storage area was not slated for construction until a later phase and covenants prohibited RV parking on individual lots, what option would be given to homeowners in the meantime? She commended the petitioner on his provision of such an amenity but thought that the lack of its development with Phase I would pose a problem.

Commissioner Putnam asked if the developer would retain control of the HOA until the end of the project. Mr. Reimer said that control of the HOA would be turned over to homeowners at the appropriate time.

Commissioner Nall commented that intersection improvement requirements were generally triggered by trip generation figures. He wondered whether the petitioner had those figures available? Mr. Reimer said that figures were contained in the report, but he did not have a copy of the report with him. He recollected that improvements would be triggered with development of Phase II but added that his wouldn't be the only development to use the intersection. He again asked for "right of recovery" consideration.

Commissioner Prinster asked for clarification on the specific improvements requested for the G/24 ½ Roads intersection. Mr. Reimer mentioned a left-turn lane on the southbound approach to the intersection on 24 ½ Road.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner passed out copies of comments submitted by School District 51. She presented an overhead visual of the plan's ODP and explained that the ODP was an optional step for the developer. The zoning ordinance adopted by both the Planning Commission and City Council set a minimum density of at least 6 units/acre. Ms. Portner said that between the ODP and Preliminary Plan the petitioner had lost a couple of units as a result of complying with right-of-way requirements. The traffic study indicated that the project's access point onto G Road would require an additional lane. At Final, the petitioner may lose yet another lot. At that point, staff may request amendment of the zoning ordinance since the overall density would be slightly less than the required minimum.

Ms. Portner explained that the half-street improvements payment would include the portion of 24 ½ Road adjacent to the subject property and include additional pavement width along G Road. Turn lanes required by the traffic study would also be included in the DIA. She clarified that the Mitchell Drain, referenced previously, was actually located on City property; however, the petitioner was proposing to

pipe the ditch. While the City required costs to be borne by the petitioner, she understood that the Drainage District had offered to supply the labor if the petitioner supplied materials.

Ms. Portner said that the petitioner proposed directly discharging drainage water into Leach Creek, undetained, during Phase I. This had been deemed acceptable provided that future filings would be reevaluated pending the hydrologic study that the City was conducting on Leach Creek. Should onsite detention be required for future filings, possible detention basin locations had been identified on the Plan.

Ms. Portner outlined proposed trail connections. The Parks Department asked that the western connection be eliminated due to concerns over impacts to both the neighborhood and the park (as outlined in the Staff Review). The Parks Department asked that future buyers be put on notice that their lots were located next to a regional park, which would be used extensively and often until late in the evening (with lighting). She remarked that the developer/HOA would be responsible for the 5-foot landscaping strip outside perimeter fencing.

Staff recommended approval of the proposal subject to the following:

1. Half-street improvements and turn lanes as required by the traffic study for G/24 ½ Roads' proposed Spanish Trail Drive will be required to be built or guaranteed upon the recording of the first filing.
2. If Mitchell Drain is piped, the developer will be responsible for all costs.
3. The RV storage area will be screened by a solid 6-foot fence and/or vegetation.
4. Perimeter fencing and the required 5-foot landscape strip on the outside of the fence shall be included in the Development Improvements Agreement (DIA) and guaranteed with subdivision.
5. Tract B must be eliminated as a pedestrian connection to the park.
6. A 10-foot concrete path shall be built in Tract E, and the pedestrian easement at the end of East Fork Road must be a tract dedicated to the Homeowners Association with a 10-foot concrete path.
7. Provision for proper notice of the potential impacts of Canyon View Park to future buyers of lots in Spanish Trails shall be provided with the Final Plat and Plan.

Rick Dorris acknowledged the petitioner's traffic study was completed during the ODP stage. The Code, he said, required improvement of streets fronting along development property. With the current proposal no curb, gutter and sidewalk was required for G Road. Since the City planned future widening of G Road, the petitioner had been asked to pay in lieu of constructing his portion of the asphalt widening. On 24 ½ Road curb, gutter, and sidewalk, along with asphalt widening would be required, but the petitioner had been asked to pay in-lieu of constructing improvements there as well. Mr. Dorris read a paragraph out of the traffic study which referenced a right-turn decel lane at the G Road site drive, a left-turn decel lane at the 24 ½ Road site drive, and a left-turn lane on the southbound approach of the G/24 ½ Roads intersection. The exit of the G Road access drive should also be designed to include exclusive right and left turn lanes to accommodate traffic exiting the site. Reference was also made to a right turn lane on

eastbound G Road at 24 1/2 Road before the initial phase of the development. Turn lanes, he said, were required in conjunction with the phase triggering the need.

Mr. Dorris said that the collection of funds at the first phase of a project, in lieu of improvements construction, represented a long-standing City policy.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Binder asked for confirmation that no curb, gutter and sidewalk had been required along G Road, which was given.

Commissioner Dibble wondered if Mr. Dorris knew when the River of Life Church would begin construction. He asked would they also be asked to make a payment in lieu of construction? Mr. Dorris said that the church's project was currently moving through the planning process and was very close to breaking ground. They, too, had been asked to make a payment in-lieu. Commissioner Dibble didn't think it made sense to complete a portion of a street and wait for a long period of time before the remaining portion was completed. Why not have improvements for both Spanish Trails and the church constructed at once and at the onset of both projects? Mr. Dorris said that payment in-lieu had been requested because of grading concerns. The City also planned to improve the G/24 Roads intersection in 2009.

Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Dorris to further clarify the City's policy and the expectation for the developer's undertaking of improvements along G Road, Mr. Dorris explained and added that City Council had chosen not to require curb, gutter and sidewalk along G Road; thus, the developer would not be required to pay for those improvements.

Commissioner Nall concurred with the petitioner that traffic from other developments and the City's regional park would all utilize the 24 1/2 and G Roads intersection. Mr. Dorris said that the City's policy was to require payment/construction of the improvements by the development which triggered the need. Chairman Elmer cited the Independence Ranch intersection at Broadway and 20 1/4 Road as an example. Mr. Dorris said that in this case credit would be applied to the developer's TCP obligation. Mr. Shaver cited legal decisions pertaining to this question. Chairman Elmer confirmed that, in his experience, the Planning Commission had routinely supported the City's requirement for guaranteeing or constructing improvements with the first phase of development.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mike Mendicelli (2426 G Road, Grand Junction) noted his property's location adjacent to the Spanish Trails site. Because he planned to develop his property at some point, he wondered if Mr. Reimer could plan for a stub access to the back of his property through the Spanish Trails development. The benefit, he said, would be one access onto G Road instead of two.

When asked if the Mendicelli property would be required to provide two accesses, Ms. Portner said that staff would be recommending a zoning for the Mendicelli property of RSF-4 (ref. PLN-2000-192). Given this zoning designation, up to 30 lots could be constructed using a single access and cul-de-sac.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Steve Reimer, co-petitioner, said that although they were being asked to provide an additional 10 feet of right-of-way along G Road, construction of that extra mat would not occur until 2009. This would create a very unaesthetic area in front of the development, one which would inevitably turn into a weed patch. Having this area located directly adjacent to the project's decorative fencing and landscaping was an undesirable situation. If left with no option, he preferred to construct improvements during Phase I.

Mr. Dorris said that construction of improvements was certainly an acceptable alternative. Chairman Elmer said that staff's condition 1 allowed for either alternative.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Dibble said that both staff and the developers seemed to have come to a mutually acceptable agreement on the street improvements issue. He urged staff to talk with church representatives about their construction of improvements versus a payment in-lieu. He concurred with staff's recommendation on condition 2 and supported leaving the condition as-is. He hoped that the developers and the Drainage District could work together in this endeavor.

Chairman Elmer expressed continued reservation over the developers' location of duplexes next to adjacent R-2 zoned homes. He acknowledged that the plan met the City's ordinance for a minimum density. He felt that further consideration was needed for the RV Storage area; perhaps this should be constructed with the first filing as well. Steve Reimer offered to provide homeowners a temporary RV storage area which would move as the project expanded, to be permanently situated where proposed with Phase IV. The temporary area, he said, could be graded and graveled for use.

Commissioner Grout concurred with both Chairman Elmer's and Commissioner Dibble's comments and expressed his support for the project as well.

Chairman Elmer reiterated staff's intention to consider crediting the TCP towards improvement of the southbound turn lane at 24 ½ and G Roads. He received confirmation from Mr. Shaver that the final decision lays with the Public Works Director.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZP-2000-107, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plan for Spanish Trails Subdivision subject to staff conditions 1-7."

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

A brief recess was called at 8:33 p.m. The hearing reconvened at 8:38 p.m.

PLN-2000-192 PLAN—24 ROAD CORRIDOR SUBAREA PLAN

A request for: 1) approval of the 24 Road Corridor Subarea Plan; 2) approval of an amendment to the Zoning and Development Code, adding a Mixed-Use zoning district; 3) approval of zoning for the 24 Road Corridor subarea; and 4) approval of the 24 Road Corridor Design Standards and Guidelines.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Disclosures were offered by both Commissioners Dibble and Prinster. Commissioner Dibble indicated that he owned land adjacent to the subject area but that he would receive no economic gain by the Plan's adoption. Commissioner Prinster said that he worked for City Market who owns property in the subject area. He also professed to have no financial interest, nor did he expect any financial gain, by the Plan's adoption.

Mr. Shaver said that he had spoken with each planning commissioner individually and could find no basis for conflict of interest. Chairman Elmer asked Commissioner Dibble if his property would receive a different zoning with adoption of the Plan, to which Commissioner Dibble responded negatively.

Having determined that no conflict of interest existed for either planning commissioner, both were permitted to participate in deliberations.

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner presented a brief overview of the Plan and its facets. She recounted the history of the Plan and City Council’s formation of a 24 Road Corridor steering committee. She suggested separate consideration of each facet of the application.

SUBAREA PLAN

Overheads of the 24 Road Mission Statement, Subarea Plan Concept and Subarea Plan Elements were presented (as contained in the file). Elements, she said, had changed from the original vision foreseen by the Growth Plan. Proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map reflected residential uses along 24 ½ Road but did not change uses north of I-70. It included Commercial along F Road, extending along the Hwy 6 & 50 corridor. Industrial would be located along 23 Road, and the bulk of area would be reflected as the newly proposed Mixed-Use zoning. The steering committee defined Mixed-Use as a combination of employment-based uses (e.g., manufacturing/business parks, office, office warehouse) and residential.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Nall asked if there was any provision for commercial uses within the Mixed-Use zone district. Ms. Portner anticipated limited commercial development although the zoning district dictated the uses more specifically than did the Growth Plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

John Beilke (2450 Pheasant Trail, Grand Junction) asked planning commissioners to reconsider zoning at the northeast corner of I-70 and 24 Road. He said that the site’s partial RSF-R zoning did not make sense given the magnitude of street improvements that would be required upon development of that property. “No developer of low-density residential units would be able to pay for the required overpass and other infrastructure improvements with such an impediment.” Mr. Beilke referenced his previous submittal that had contained mixed uses and open space but had been denied by both the Planning Commission and City Council. Mr. Beilke felt that the City had an unrealistic expectation for that corner and again asked for reconsideration of either Mixed-Use or Commercial zoning for the entire tract.

When asked by Commissioner Putnam what Mr. Beilke foresaw for the corner, Mr. Beilke expressed disappointment that his project hadn’t been taken more seriously. His project, he said, would have paid \$1.5M towards infrastructure improvements, provided approximately 150 high paying jobs and provided open space and water features. In keeping with the direction of the North Central Valley Plan, he reiterated that the entire tract should be zoned either Commercial or Mixed-Use. Not doing this, he said, would result in the routing of commercial traffic from the C-1 zoned portion of the tract through the residential portion.

Jim Langford (529 – 25 ½ Road, Grand Junction), representing clients interested in submitting a commercial development proposal within the subject area, said that the City’s intention of providing some mix of residential uses along the north side of F ½ Road would be contrary to his clients’ interests. He contended that residential development would not generate sufficient funds necessary for F ½ Road improvements. He urged consideration of commercial zoning along the north side of F ½ Road of a transitional zone.

Ed Hokanson (2277 Rio Linda, Grand Junction) felt that the market should dictate uses along the 24 Road corridor. Proposed restrictions, he said, would limit shopping opportunities. He said that the City was making it difficult for those who wanted to develop the subject area with more commercial-based

uses. He agreed with previous comments that the high cost of infrastructure improvements could not be offset by residential development. Mr. Hokanson requested greater flexibility from the City.

Greg Schaefer (3845 Horizon Glen Court, Grand Junction), member of the 24 Road Steering Committee, disagreed with Mr. Hokanson's comments. He believed there were a number of creative ways to deal with land uses.

Mary Locke (2322 I Road, Grand Junction), member of the 24 Road Steering Committee, extolled the beautiful views of the National Monument as seen from the north. A lot of people cared about protecting those views, she said. The Committee specifically didn't want to see the area become another Horizon Drive or North Avenue with a proliferation of commercial uses and signage. The Community, she said, should not have to accept what developers say they have to accept. The proposed plan represented a way to show the rest of the valley that quality could be both promoted and achieved. She said that a lot of time and effort went into the proposed Plan and it represented a labor of love. She said that "if developers didn't like the Plan, they wouldn't build there." She didn't feel that that was altogether negative since others could and would locate there.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Nall asked for elucidation on Mr. Beilke's proposal, which was provided by Chairman Elmer.

Commissioner Prinster asked staff if they were prepared to address the residential requirement mentioned by Mr. Langford. Ms. Portner replied that this element would be discussed in a later facet of the Plan.

Commissioner Dibble referenced Mr. Langford's comments and asked staff if his general contention was that "big box" commercial uses would be allowed to the south of F ½ Road while the Mixed-Use zone district to the north may require some residential development. Ms. Portner replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Dibble recollected that the access off of I-70 had been a major issue with regard to development of the northeast corner referenced by Mr. Beilke. He thought there had been discussion over timing of CDOT's work on the overpass, reconstruction of that section of 24 Road and access requirements further north. Ms. Portner said that what had been decided was that until staff had the design of the new overpass, the City didn't know what the access to that property would be. She recalled that discussions from both Planning Commission and City Council, some members seemed to concur that Mr. Beilke's proposal was premature.

Chairman Elmer said that one of the major findings of the corridor study was confirmation that there were sufficient numbers of commercially-zoned properties available in other areas of the valley. Mixed-Use zoning offered greater flexibility and consideration of market conditions.

Commissioner Grout agreed and expressed support for this section of the request as presented. He didn't feel that Mixed-Use zoning would cause any undue stress on development flexibility.

Commissioners Putnam and Nall concurred. Commissioner Putnam didn't feel that development of an area should be entirely market-driven; the City should appropriately have a say in what an area should look like. Commissioner Nall said that the current request basically put forth the notion that "we can do better than average." He too supported this facet as presented.

Commissioner Binder said that in Denver there are huge areas of strip malls; in other towns she'd visited there were more mixed-use development. The mixture of uses, she said, always appeared to be of higher

quality and accommodated people more effectively. She agreed that the Mixed-Use zone district provided the flexibility needed for the 24 Road corridor.

Commissioner Dibble felt that the current Plan would provide an aesthetic entryway into the City, something the community as a whole could be proud of.

Commissioner Binder added that the market study referenced by Chairman Elmer not only verified the existence of sufficient commercially-zoned properties; the study also encouraged commercial development in this area to occur closer to the mall.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2000-192, I move we recommend approval to City Council of the 24 Road Subarea Plan.”

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

MIXED-USE ZONE DISTRICT

Kathy Portner passed out copies of the Mixed-Use (MU) zone district standards proposed for inclusion in the Development Code, the two options for height variance within the MU zone, and a letter from George Pavlakis (5670 East Evans Avenue, #200, Denver). Mr. Pavlakis served on the 24 Road Steering Committee and expressed reservations over making the residential component of the MU zone mandatory. Referencing an overhead outlining key points of the proposal, she noted that the maximum retail building size for this zone would be 30,000 square feet, with no CUP option to allow for increased size. With regard to the residential component, staff was concerned that if the entire MU area were to develop commercially, the City would lose the potential for residential uses in that area. Ms. Portner passed out copies of a table outlining the number of residential units possible within the MU zone. While the approach would differ from that of the Growth Plan, the resultant number of units would be very similar. The MU zone would be available for use in other areas of Grand Junction as well. The two building height variance options were outlined. Both would permit building heights of up to 65 feet, but the first option included specifications for front yard building setback. Under no circumstances could the 65-foot restriction be exceeded.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Prinster asked if the 30,000-square-foot figure applied to just the retail building footprint, or did it apply to all units within a given commercial node (e.g., Eastgate Shopping Center)? Ms. Portner replied that the figure pertained to the gross square footage of any one building. Using Eastgate as an example, staff considered the entire Eastgate Shopping Center as one building.

Commissioner Dibble wondered about the type of uses this zone would preclude. Ms. Portner gave examples that included drive-thru restaurants, outdoor-oriented operations, indoor manufacturing and production with outdoor storage and operations and manufacturing and production with indoor operations and outdoor storage (the latter requiring a CUP). Vehicle service uses (e.g., car washes, gas stations, quick lubes) would require a CUP, while vehicle repair shops would not be allowed.

Chairman Elmer wondered how someone would interpret the definition of “limited retail.” Ms. Portner said that they would have to refer to building size to make that distinction since 30,000 square feet would preclude larger shopping centers and typical, larger grocery stores. There would be nothing to preclude a proposal containing several smaller-sized retail buildings and a cluster of retail uses on a single property, but Ms. Portner didn’t think that, from a practical standpoint, that option would be desirable to most

commercial developers. To allay concerns, Ms. Portner said that one option available could include requiring a CUP for all general retail sales proposed within a MU zone.

Commissioner Grout wondered how the 25 percent residential figure had been derived. Ms. Portner said that one of the prime motivators for including a residential component was to better ensure that the entire zone would not develop strictly as commercial.

Chairman Elmer said that property owners could utilize the option of transferring density rights within the zone (TDR's). Mr. Shaver confirmed that addressing TDR's within the specific Subarea Plan was possible. Chairman Elmer remarked that TDR specifics could be addressed following adoption of the overall Plan. Mr. Shaver agreed, adding that TDR's could be addressed as an implementation item. Reminding the Commission to require a "giving" and a "receiving" parcel, at the same, was essential. As a member of the Growth Plan Steering Committee, Chairman Elmer said that he wanted to ensure protection of residential uses within this area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jim Langford (529 – 25 ½ Road, Grand Junction) expressed support for the TDR option and felt that it would provide his clients with an equitable solution to their current development dilemma. He said that the biggest problems arising with any development usually involved transportation issues.

Ed Hokanson (2277 Rio Linda, Grand Junction) agreed that the 24 Road corridor served as a gateway into the community but he disagreed with limiting retail building sizes. If the variance options allowed building heights to extend to 65 feet, he felt that the building's "mass" should also be increased to accommodate larger buildings. He again asked the City for flexibility.

Greg Schaefer (3845 Horizon Glen Court, Grand Junction) supported the 65-foot height variance since he thought there were areas where a hotel might be feasible. He felt that the view corridor could still be protected, even with inclusion of this option.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Binder supported the TDR option for property owners/developers within the MU zone. She felt that there were a number of ways available to achieve desired goals of the Plan. She also supported the CUP requirement for all limited retail uses. The height variance would not be a problem as long as the Design Standards and Guidelines were in place to protect the view corridor.

Commissioner Dibble expressed support for height variance option 1 which provided for additional setback. The community, he said, wanted assurances that the view corridor would be protected.

There was general assent among planning commissioners and staff that the first height variance option was preferable.

Commissioner Dibble asked how front yard setback would be determined, which was explained by Ms. Ashbeck.

Commissioner Nall asked staff if there had been any analysis to determine how the 65-foot height variance would impact the view corridor. Kristen Ashbeck explained the rationale behind the first height variance option. Commissioner Nall acknowledged that with the increased setback provision, the view may be better protected, with amenities such as additional landscaping possible.

Commissioner Prinster asked if the 1.5 multiplier for front yard setback applied also to side and rear yard setbacks. Ms. Ashbeck said that planning commissioners may want to consider it; however, the option, as written, only pertained to the front yard setback.

A brief discussion ensued over extending the 1.5 multiplier to side and rear yard setbacks. Chairman Elmer opposed this since it would effectively reduce the area available for parking. Ms. Portner agreed, adding that the Design Standards addressed specific building placement/orientation and buffering between uses.

Planning commissioners discussed formation of the motion. Chairman Elmer acknowledged the close proximity of the residential density figures as outlined in both the new Plan and the current Growth Plan. He felt that the 25 percent residential requirement should remain for the MU zone.

Commissioner Nall asked if the Code's 10 percent building height variance would also apply to buildings that were granted the 65-foot height variance. Ms. Portner acknowledged that staff had not previously addressed this element. She said that the current Code would allow up to a 25 percent height variance unless the MU zone was included under the "exceptions" category. General assent was received from planning commissioners that staff should include the MU zone as part of the exceptions category, limiting building height to no more than 65 feet under any circumstance.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2000-192, I move that we recommend to City Council approval of the Code amendment to add the Mixed-Use zone district with the following conditions: 1) general retail sales for indoor operations, display, and storage uses will require a Conditional Use Permit; 2) to recommend to City Council some options being presented to allow for density transfers within the residential uses of the Mixed-Use zone only, to achieve a minimum of 2,000 dwelling units for the Mixed-Use subarea as shown on the Subarea Plan, with the maximum number to be as stated in the 1996 Growth Plan; 3) for purposes of the Mixed-Use zone, the maximum building height shall be 65 feet with no increases allowed with the provision for the increased setback if it's above 40 feet as worded by the staff [to read...Maximum building height may be increased to 65 feet provided the building front yard setback is at least 1.5 times the overall height of the building.]."

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

PROPOSED ZONING MAP CHANGES

Kathy Portner presented an overhead visual of proposed zoning changes. She outlined changes and the areas affected. Ms. Portner referred to a section of C-1 zoned property along Hwy 6 & 50 belonging to Mr. Pavlakis. Mr. Pavlakis's letter stated a preference for following the original Growth Plan designation which would extend the commercial zoning diagonally to include a triangular portion of property directly adjacent to the F ½ Road alignment (an area denoted on the currently proposed zoning map as MU). Staff took no issue with Mr. Pavlakis's request. Mr. Pavlakis also requested C-2 zoning for his property instead of C-1. Given the implementation of proposed Design Standards, staff felt this request to be reasonable as well. Ms. Portner noted that property owners within this subarea would still retain the right to come before the City and request a rezoning of their properties.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Grout asked for clarification on the demarcation line for Mr. Pavlakis's property, which was given.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Greg Schaefer (3845 Horizon Glen Court, Grand Junction) referenced the northeast corner of the I-70/24 Road intersection mentioned previously by Mr. Beilke and acknowledged that perhaps it too should be more consistently zoned. He suggested MU zoning for the entire parcel.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Binder agreed with Mr. Schaefer that it made more sense to zone the residential portion of the northeast corner to something other than Residential. The MU zone would provide a viable alternative. Mr. Shaver explained that a rezone for that property had already been considered by both the Planning Commission and City Council within the last year, the request having been denied by both bodies.

Commissioner Dibble concurred with Mr. Schaefer and Commissioner Binder's statements. He did not feel that the corner lent itself well to the split uses of commercial and low-end residential. He acknowledged statements made previously by Mr. Beilke that commercial traffic would end up being routed through a residential area. Noting that the I-70 intersection would be closed for some time in 2006 for improvements, he thought the issue would require revisiting at some point but agreed that now was not the time.

Chairman Elmer expressed support for changing Mr. Pavlakis's property to the alignment and C-2 zone designation requested. Commissioner Binder also supported this request.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2000-192, I move we recommend approval of the Zoning Map of the 24 Road area as proposed by staff with the change as shown by staff tonight, with the diagonal line between 23 ¼ and 23 ¾ Roads, approximately, and the area currently depicted north of that line as Commercial will be designated as Mixed-Use, and the property currently depicted south of that line that's shown as C-1 in the small portion of Mixed-Use would now be shown as C-2."

Commissioner Binder asked if there were enough design criteria in place to control the appearance of the C-2 zone, if approved. Ms. Portner said that if the proposed Design Standards and Guidelines were approved, there would be control over screening of outdoor uses, storage, building height, orientation, etc.

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

24 ROAD DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Kathy Portner referenced the Design Standards and Guidelines booklet passed to planning commissioners previously. Photos of examples of open spaces, public parks, trail systems, roadway systems, storm drainage areas, and streetscaping designs were presented. Photos of examples of key gateways, intersections and entries, architectural design variations, and signage design configurations were also presented. Ms. Portner briefly overviewed this section.

Mr. Shaver advised that on page 2, under "Guidelines," language be modified to make it very clear what a guideline was. He suggested verbiage to suggest that guidelines were something more akin to mandatory standards. This addition, he said, would clarify for both the staff and the community. Also on page 2, second paragraph under "Administration of the Design Standards and Guidelines," he suggested amending this section to preclude what these things aren't but to say instead what they are. He recommended deletion of the paragraph, replacing it with the following verbiage, "These standards and

guidelines supplement City minimum requirements and may be more restrictive than other developed regulations.” On page 8, the note at the bottom of Figure 2.2 referenced slope ratios; however, he could find no text to support them. He proposed having staff provide the Planning Commission with additional clarification. On page 29, Table 3.1, the parking setback referencing Leach Creek Corridor was unclear. What was the Leach Creek Corridor? Similarly, reference to Figure 2.3 in the Notes section of that table was also unclear since Figure 2.3 had no dimension. He suggested either adding a dimension or deleting the notation altogether. Page 30, paragraph 3 under “Standards,” he felt that clarification was needed for the term “higher traffic streets.” Page 32, paragraph 1 under “Standards,” the last full line of the paragraph should be reworded to say either that driveways either are or aren’t allowed. The term “shall minimize” wasn’t clear. On page 38, there was a strange symbol included next to the number 50 when referencing a typical commercial setback. He surmised that this symbol was included in error. On page 42, number 2, references to two-way bikeways were probably a misnomer because it suggested that there was such a thing as a one-way bikeway. On page 50, number 5, references to “first floors” were probably meant to reference “first stories.” He indicated a number of other small “fixes” may be required.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jim Langford (529 – 25 ½ Road, Grand Junction) suggested that the City needed to come up with ways to pay for its vision of recommended improvements. He said that for improvements that were more of a community benefit, the City should take the burden off of the individual developer and spread it out over a wider area (e.g., via special districts). He thought that perhaps now was the time for the City to consider acquiring additional right-of-way to better ensure that some of these desired amenities would come to fruition.

Ed Hokanson (2277 Rio Linda, Grand Junction) reiterated his request for flexibility and latitude. The property owner, he said, should have some say in how his land developed. He urged adoption of clear and definable standards.

Greg Schaefer (3845 Horizon Glen Court, Grand Junction) was convinced that the type of quality development sought for the corridor could and would be built.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Portner agreed that the City needed to consider other mechanisms for accommodating infrastructure; she said that a number of options are currently under investigation. Mr. Shaver reminded planning commissioners that the TEDS manual was also undergoing revision.

Commissioner Putnam supported the City’s investigation of other payment options for development of infrastructure. He wondered how best to address Mr. Shaver’s revision comments. Mr. Shaver said that with the exception, perhaps, of defining “guidelines,” all other issues could be directed to staff for clarification between now and the City Council hearing.

A brief discussion ensued over defining the term “guidelines.” The following verbiage was recommended by Mr. Shaver: Changes to the “Guideline” paragraph on page 2, to read “Guidelines promote the goals defined by the Purpose statements. Achieving guidelines may help in identifying alternative approaches to achieving standards. While the term ‘guidelines’ is used, guidelines shall be applied unless the Director and/or Planning Commission otherwise determine.” He also recommended the following verbiage changes for the second paragraph under “Administration...” on page 2: “These standards and guidelines supplement City minimum regulations and may be more restrictive than other development regulations.”

Commissioner Grout noted that if a term was “negotiable” and the Planning Director was authorized to make the final decision, the Planning Commission would only be involved if the decision were appealed. This idea met with general assent by planning commissioners.

Commissioner Nall acknowledged that the development community needed some idea of what there costs would be in complying with adopted Design Standards and Guidelines.

Discussion over how best to handle Leach Creek standards ensued. Chairman Elmer said that direction on this issue would have to originate with City Council and fell outside the purview of the Planning Commission.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2000-192, I move we recommend approval to the City Council of the 24 Road Corridor Design Standards and Guidelines with the additions of Mr. Shaver’s verbiage [Changes to the “Guideline” paragraph on page 2 to read ‘Guidelines promote the goals defined by the Purpose statements. Achieving guidelines may help in identifying alternative approaches to achieving standards. While the term ‘guidelines’ is used, guidelines shall be applied unless the Director and/or Planning Commission otherwise determine.’ and the following verbiage changes for the second paragraph under ‘Administration...’ on page 2: ‘These standards and guidelines supplement City minimum regulations and may be more restrictive than other development regulations.’] and also that the staff look at details to further define the document in part by some issues.”

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

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 P.M.