

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 9, 1999 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the City/County auditorium by Chairman John Elmer.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were: John Elmer (Chairman), Jeff Driscoll, Joe Grout and Paul Coleman. Robert Gordon and Mark Fenn were absent. One position is vacant.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were: Scott Harrington (Community Development Director), Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Dave Thornton (Sr. Planner), Mike Pelletier (Assoc. Planner), Lori Bowers (Assoc. Planner) and Kristen Ashbeck (Sr. Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Asst. City Attorney), Kerrie Ashbeck (Development Engineer) and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 20 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes of February 9 and 16, 1999.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the February 9 minutes as submitted.”

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the February 16 minutes as submitted.”

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Chairman Elmer announced that items RZ-1999-017 and PP-1999-027 had been pulled and would not be heard.

III. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION UNLESS APPEALED

PP-1999-014 PRELIMINARY PLAN—LAS CASITAS

A request for approval of the Preliminary Plan for Las Casitas Subdivision consisting of 9 single family lots on 2.57 acres in an RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre) zone district.

Petitioner: GNT Development Corp.

Location: Northwest corner of 12th Street and G Road
Representative: Dan Garrison

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Dan Garrison, petitioner, recounted a brief history of the project, which had been originally submitted as a PUD in the fall of 1998. Referencing the Preliminary Plan on an overhead transparency, he said that although approved by the Planning Commission, City Council had directed that the project be developed to a density consistent with the RSF-4 zone district. The revised plan proposed development of 9 single family lots with approximately 1,600-square-foot homes and two-car garages. He asked for flexibility on staff’s recommendation on a 4-foot stucco perimeter fencing, saying that a 5-foot fence would afford homeowners more privacy without “tunneling” the street. He further asked that the type of fencing material used and ultimate design be left open pending submission of a fencing plan during the Final Plan development stage.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck indicated that the request met Code requirements, with most of the technical issues having been worked out during the project’s last submission. She said that 4-foot-high fencing had been the maximum allowed for front yards in residential zones; however, given the grade of G Road, staff would consider the petitioner’s request for increased fencing height. Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. A landscape plan for Tracts A and B shall be provided with the Final Plat.
2. The Final Plat and final construction plans shall include details and fencing restrictions on lots 7, 8 and 9 to allow the swale at the rear yards to convey irrigation water and runoff.
3. Perimeter fencing on the rear property/right-of-way line along 27 and G Roads shall be a maximum of 4 feet in height and shall be of a decorative material other than wood (e.g., brick or stucco). A fencing detail shall be required with the Final Plat and final construction plans, and the fence shall be constructed by the developer as with the other required improvements.
4. All other comments by the City Utility and Development Engineers on the original review agency comments shall be addressed at Final Plat.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Coleman wondered why 4-foot fencing was being recommended for the side and rear yards of lots bounding 27 and G Roads. Ms. Ashbeck clarified that where those lots fronted external streets, they were considered front yards by definition.

When asked by Commissioner Driscoll if the project’s location lay within the boundaries of the North Central Valley Area Plan, Ms. Ashbeck responded negatively.

Commissioner Driscoll asked staff for an explanation of why City Council had opted for a lower density. Ms. Ashbeck said that while the petitioner’s original plan had fallen within the mid-range of Growth Plan guidelines, City Council had deemed a lower density more appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

John Faber (711 Daniel Drive, Grand Junction) said that the adjacent Bella Vista Subdivision had been developed to a density of two dwelling units/acre and that that density had been carried forward upon the subdivision’s annexation into the City. He felt that if the Growth Plan recommended densities of 4-7.9 units/acre, those recommendations were in error. He asked that consideration be given to re-reviewing the Land Use Plan map for that area.

PETITIONER’S REBUTTAL

Mr. Garrison said that the current proposal complied with both City Council’s recommendation of an RSF-4 zone and applicable bulk standards. He noted the additional 30-foot dedication of G Road right-of-way and said that if the fence were erected further north of the right-of-way, there would be a large piece of open and unusable land created where G Road met 27 Road. Placing the fence on the right-of-way would reduce the size of that tract.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Coleman expressed concern that with City Council’s continued lowering of project densities in areas designated for higher density development, the City was “giving away” its higher density areas. He supported the petitioner’s request for a 5-foot fence and agreed that it would afford homeowners additional privacy.

Commissioner Driscoll agreed, adding that Growth Plan recommendations for the subject area were appropriate and should be preserved. He supported flexibility in the type and height of proposed fencing.

Chairman Elmer added his support for fencing flexibility. The area, he said, was a transition zone; the lower density project better appealed to surrounding residents.

Commissioner Coleman commented that City Council should adhere to established planning practices and guide growth toward those areas designated to handle it.

MOTION: (Commissioner Coleman) “Mr. Chairman, on item PP-1999-014, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plan for the Las Casitas subdivision subject to staff recommendations, with the modification to staff condition 3 that a 5-foot fence height would be considered.”

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

ANX-1999-030 ZONE OF ANNEXATION/PRELIMINARY PLAN—ARROWHEAD ACRES

A request for: 1) approval of the Zone of Annexation for approximately 26 acres from County PD-8 and R-2 to City RSF-5 (Residential Single Family not to exceed a density of 5 units per acre, and 2) approval of the Preliminary Plan for Arrowhead Acres Subdivision consisting of 116 single family detached lots.

**Petitioner: A.C. Rinderle Trust
Location: West of the southwest corner of B ½ and 28 ½ Roads
Representative: Doug Fassbinder**

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Doug Fassbinder, representing the petitioner, submitted maps depicting the location and layout of the project and presented the Preliminary Plan on an overhead transparency. Mr. Fassbinder testified that the project's average density would be 4.5 dwelling unit/acre; the 3 proposed accesses were also noted. He took issue with TCP requirements since the area referenced in staff's comments, extending from B ½ Road/Highway 50 east to 28 Road, lay over one-quarter mile away from the development site. He said that the County's traffic study of 28 ½ and B ½ Roads eliminated any left-hand turn lane at that intersection. He was unsure how the Persigo Agreement would affect City/County street agreements. Lots, he said, complied with zone district bulk standards, and copies of plot plans/house plans were passed out to planning commissioners.

Mr. Fassbinder said that the County had required dedication of 10 feet of property along B ½ Road to allow construction of B ½ Road to a minor arterial status. He noted the location where a drain pipe was to have been installed by the Orchard Mesa Irrigation District. The County had purchased a 48-inch pipe but the District had been unable to handle that large a pipe. Thus, the pipe had never been installed. Until irrigation/drainage issues were resolved, project grades could not be established. The County and Irrigation District preferred not to have fencing; however, they were supposed to have had the pipe installed by now. Mr. Fassbinder explained that drainage/irrigation issues had been moved to the second phase to allow additional mitigation time. If lot lines were put on the property line (location noted) and another 5-foot outlot line (location noted) was added to the easement requirement, it could create an excessive roadway. Per discussions with the Irrigation District, they requested a 20-foot right-of-way (location noted) which would grant sufficient access to allow pipe installation. Mr. Fassbinder asked that consideration be given to erecting a privacy fence along B ½ Road during the second or third phases of the project following installation of the drain pipe.

Mr. Fassbinder did not express objection to staff's requirement for a 5-foot landscaped strip outside the fence along the northern subdivision boundary. The biggest issue, he said, was staff's requirement for another access to be located along the eastern portion of the property near lots designated 9 and 10 of Phase IV. He expected future zoning of the adjacent eastern property to be commercial as had been the adjacent property to the south. Linking a residential subdivision with commercially-zoned property seemed inappropriate, and he asked that consideration be given to waiving this requirement. The entry area would have ponds and landscaping around it and nearby elm trees would be preserved. Curves had been incorporated into the internal street plan to slow traffic.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer noted an area along the eastern subdivision border where the ditch easement seemed to encroach onto proposed lots. Mr. Fassbinder explained that of the 35 feet of total easement, only 10 feet of ditch easement encroached onto the lots. He added that the dirt pile located in the northeast corner had been intended to backfill the drain pipe when installed.

Commissioner Grout asked if the petitioner was in agreement with staff's requirement for the detention area to coincide with Phase I of the development, to which Mr. Fassbinder replied affirmatively.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck said that the property was currently being annexed into the City under the Persigo Agreement. She outlined the project as contained in the March 9, 1999 Project Review and said that the eastern street stub was required as a neighborhood connection. Staff had discussed with Mr. Fassbinder the possibility of relocating the Maverick Court cul-de-sac so that lots would front Arlington. Lots would also be located around the cul-de-sac, eliminating the "double fronting" of lots. Staff had not been given a chance to review the plot/floor plans submitted by the petitioner's representative at the hearing, so no comment could be made on them. Ms. Ashbeck stated that the petitioner had not positively

determined where ditch centerlines were located nor had he denoted where easement limits might be. Ms. Ashbeck said that it was unclear whether the Irrigation District would allow fencing across the requested easements. If the easement for the ditch along the southern boundary substantially encroached upon lots and could not be fenced, the lots along the south side of B 3/10 Road and the provision of a fenced yard on them, would be severely impacted. If the ditch along the northern property line could not be fenced, the perimeter fencing presently shown on the B 1/2 Road property line must be moved south to the width of the easement. In that event, staff recommended that the strip outside the fence be a separate tract rather than being part of the privately-owned lots. The result would be inadequately-sized lots along the north side of Acrin Court.

Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the following conditions:

1. The phasing plan shall be revised such that the entire detention area is within and constructed with Phase I.
2. An improved street stub to the south property line shall be provided, located approximately at the mid-point of B 3/10 Road.
3. The issue regarding irrigation width and fencing of easements for the Orchard Mesa Irrigation District ditches along the north and south property lines must be addressed. If the easement along the north property line cannot be fenced, then 1) the area within the easement shall be dedicated as a separate tract to the Homeowners Association with an easement for the District, and 2) lots along the north side of Acrin Court shall be reconfigured such that they meet minimum bulk standards for the RSF-5 zone. The latter will require elimination of at least one lot.
4. A landscape plan and construction details as needed shall be provided with the respective Final Plats for all private tracts (detention area, Tracts A, B, C and the landscape strip outside privacy fencing for lots 8, 9, and 10 in Phase IV).

Ms. Ashbeck said that staff would be receptive to amending conditions if Planning Commission deemed such appropriate.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Driscoll wondered if it was the City's standard practice to provide street connections between residential and commercial areas. Ms. Ashbeck said that in this instance, staff felt that the connection was needed to ensure neighborhood circulation.

Chairman Elmer asked if the R-2 areas mentioned by Mr. Fassbinder were being considered for commercial zoning as part of the Growth Plan amendment process. Ms. Ashbeck responded negatively but added that the parcel still lay within the County. Mr. Harrington added that as such, the current land use could not be changed by other than the City under the Persigo Agreement.

Chairman Elmer asked if there was any City or public policy which would prevent the extension of Arlington to the frontage road/highway via a road versus a driveway (location noted). Ms. Ashbeck said that staff would first have to review the spacing from 28 1/2 Road, but she reiterated that the proposed street stub location would provide a more neighborhood-oriented connection. Arlington, she said, would be a major connection if allowed to continue straight through; all that was being requested was a street stub, not a through connection to the highway's frontage road.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

Dawn Caruso (241 ½ Beaver Street, Grand Junction) expressed concern over the significant increase in traffic the development would generate. She asked whether City trash truck traffic would be directed along B 4/10 through her subdivision? She noted the location of an irrigation line between northern lots and her rear yard fence line. Would a sufficient easement/buffering be provided?

Don Hitchcock (2843 B 4/10 Road, Grand Junction) expressed concern over the density proposed and traffic increases. As proposed by the petitioner, B 3/10 Road would encourage speeding. Why had no traffic calming measures been proposed for the subdivision? He submitted a plat of his subdivision and noted the location of a bike/pedestrian bath behind his property. Would that path be developed along with the proposed subdivision? Could he have it vacated if not developed? Mr. Hitchcock asked that lot setbacks be consistent with other area subdivisions.

Rich Arcand (230 ½ Beaver Street, Grand Junction) said that routing traffic north along B 3/10 and B 4/10 Roads would impact his neighborhood significantly; he asked that traffic be routed to the south instead. He asked that dust mitigation measures and a regular street cleaning plan be devised and employed by the petitioner during the construction phase of the project. He asked that annexation of the property be deferred until questions were answered.

Holly Cass (266 – 27 ½ Road, Grand Junction) strongly urged that consideration be given to interim traffic mitigation measures pending implementation of the City/County capital improvements plans for B ½ Road. She noted the existence of 11 left-hand turn lanes from Highway 50 to 28 ½ Road and the extreme safety hazard posed by the highway overpass which accessed B ½ Road. The proposed drainage ditch could also pose safety hazards to children walking to and from school. Ms. Cass said that Lincoln-Orchard Mesa Elementary school was nearing capacity; what would impacts from the proposed development be on school enrollment?

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Fassbinder located the centerline of north/south ditches and the areas where lots would be impacted by encroaching easements. With only a couple of exceptions, lot sizes exceeded those found in the nearby area and exceeded bulk standards. Only one lot located at the entrance would prove difficult because of the stub-out street to the west. Still, a 900-square-foot first level could be constructed along with a two-car garage. The bike/pedestrian path mentioned by Mr. Hitchcock had never been developed but the area was barb-wired off and would be used as an irrigation easement for the Arrowhead II subdivision.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer expressed continued reservation over the 10-foot encroachment of the irrigation easement onto lots along the southern boundary.

Commissioner Coleman supported the street stub requested by staff, saying that tying into commercially-zoned property wouldn't adversely impact the subdivision but should relieve congestion at other access points.

Rick Dorris said that the applicant had prepared a traffic study to determine what turn lanes would be needed at Arlington. No right-hand turn lane would be required, and the left-hand turn lane requirement could possibly be deferred to the last development phase. The timing of the subdivision's need for the left-hand turn lane coincided closely with the City's timeframe for B ½ Road improvements.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if the proposed subdivision would increase traffic along B ½ and 28 ½ Roads beyond their carrying capacities, to which Mr. Dorris replied negatively.

Commissioner Coleman asked for clarification on the City's standards for B 3/10 and B 4/10 Roads, which was given. When asked if a southern street stub would adequately relieve traffic pressures, Mr. Dorris said that the potential was there, depending on how the southern parcel was developed. Commissioner Coleman asked if there was any way to provide for additional open space. Ms. Ashbeck said that no provision for requiring open space was included with straight zones.

Commissioner Driscoll wondered if the City had a policy on dust abatement during construction. John Shaver responded affirmatively and went on to say that the tracking of mud is not addressed in the current Code, only the dumping of loads/material falling from trucks is.

Chairman Elmer wondered if the Parks Department had had a chance to review the pedestrian path issue, to which Ms. Ashbeck replied negatively. When he expressed a concern over development of Phase II without clarification of the easement/fencing issue, Ms. Ashbeck said that the area overlaid by the easement should be fenced off from the rest of the property and made a separate tract. Chairman Elmer noted that lots 9, 10 and 11 could not be developed until the fill was removed from those lot areas. Ms. Ashbeck said that no comments had been received from the Irrigation District regarding the fill or pipe installation. Chairman Elmer felt that resolution of that issue was paramount prior to any Final Plan/Plat approval.

Chairman Elmer asked staff if B ½ Road improvements should be attached to Phase IV, regardless of the City's capital improvements timeframe. Mr. Dorris said that planning commissioners could make that a stipulation if it so chose. Mr. Shaver agreed that the requirement would be appropriate and commented about the capital improvement budget.

Chairman Elmer proposed the following stipulation: "The necessary improvements and widening of B ½ Road shall occur concurrent with Phase IV." Mr. Dorris said that further review of the traffic study would dictate which phase would trigger a left turn lane. Mr. Shaver proposed amending the stipulation to read, after the word "occur": "...the earlier of either the construction or the traffic demand that would trigger the improvements." Mr. Dorris asked that the condition be further modified to add, after the word "Road," "...with a left-hand turn lane into Arlington..."

Recorders Note: (The stipulation, added as a fifth condition of approval, reads: "The necessary improvements and widening of B ½ Road, with a left-hand turn lane into Arlington, shall occur the earlier of either the City CIP construction or the traffic demand that would trigger the improvements.")

Chairman Elmer asked if traffic calming measures could be employed within the subdivision; if not the entire subdivision, then nearest the two most difficult lots. Mr. Dorris said that there were no City requirements for internal traffic calming save the reconfiguration of streets. Some modification nearest the two lots mentioned might be possible; that could be reviewed prior to Final.

Commissioner Coleman asked if the cul-de-sacs were at the legal limit for length. Ms. Ashbeck said that they were only about 600 feet in length; the limit was 1,000 feet.

Chairman Elmer remarked that the proposed density did meet Code requirements and Growth Plan recommendations; it was also consistent with surrounding densities.

A brief discussion ensued over the modified wording of condition 3 regarding ditches and corresponding fencing as well as the buildability of the odd-shaped lots. Scott Harrington asked if planning

commissioners could give guidance on “buildability,” but the discussion resulted in leaving that definition up to staff. Mr. Harrington said that plot plans would be reviewed, with options and/or a final determination presented before the Commission during Final.

Chairman Elmer proposed amending condition 3 to add at the end of the paragraph, “The ditch on the south side of the property shall demonstrate that the berm and ditch fall outside of the real property line.” Mr. Shaver suggested adding the following verbiage to that condition, “The petitioner shall demonstrate to staff’s satisfaction that the ditch and road/maintenance easement does not encumber the lots.”

Recorder’s Note: (The revised condition 3 reads as follows: “The ditch on the south side of the property shall demonstrate that the berm and ditch fall outside of the real property line. The petitioner shall demonstrate to staff’s satisfaction that the ditch, the berm, the spoil and road/maintenance easement does not encumber the lots.”)

Mr. Chairman then proposed adding a sixth condition to read, “The petitioner needs to demonstrate the buildability of the lots that have been questioned in the staff report before Final, to the satisfaction of the staff.”

MOTION: (Commissioner Coleman) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-030, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plan for the Arrowhead Acres II subdivision subject to staff recommendations 1-6 as amended tonight.”

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Coleman) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-030, I move that we forward the Zone of Annexation for the Arrowhead Acres Annexation to City Council with a recommendation of approval of the RSF-5 zoning.”

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

VE-1999-031 VACATION OF EASEMENT—SHERWOOD PLAZA

A request for approval to vacate an easement that crosses lot 1, Sherwood Park Minor Subdivision, in order to build a two-story medical and professional complex.

Petitioner: Sherwood Park Plaza LLC

Location: 1114 North 1st Street

Representative: Ford Construction

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Kelly Ford, representing the petitioner, noted the site plan using an overhead transparency and said that the property had presented several design challenges. Requested for vacation was 10 feet of a 20-foot easement. No utilities were present, although Public Service had asked for relocation of a power pole.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Coleman asked what type of siding would be used on the structure, to which Mr. Ford replied that stucco would be used.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Lori Bowers said that since the request represented only the reduction of an existing easement, it was not a true vacation. The request met Code criteria and staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Coleman remarked that the plan looked good; Commissioner Driscoll added that it met Code criteria.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, on item VE-1999-031, I move that we recommend approval to the City Council for the request to partially vacate the utility easement 70 feet in length, located along South Sherwood Drive, to accommodate the future development of the Sherwood Plaza Medical and Professional Complex.”

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

ANX-1999-039 ZONE OF ANNEXATION—DOS RIOS ANNEXATION

A request for approval to zone a parcel of land approximately 15 acres currently being annexed to the City to RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre).

**Petitioner: Mesa County School District #51
Location: 265 Linden Street
Representative: Gary Carr**

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Gary Carr, representing the petitioner, availed himself for questions.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton said that upon adoption of the new Code, the PZ zone would no longer exist. Concurrent with approval of the Zone of Annexation, the School District would be issued a Special Use Permit. Having met Code requirements and with no outstanding issues, staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer noted that the request seemed very straightforward.

He advised Mr. Carr that the school district had not been submitting review agency comments to staff on other proposals. He noted that having the information helps planning commissioners and staff determine impacts of new developments on area schools. Mr. Carr said that he would relay that information back to the School District and would forward a copy of the District’s capacity report to staff when completed.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-039, I move that we forward the Zone of Annexation to City Council with the recommendation of Residential Single

Family with a maximum density of four units per acre (RSF-4 zone district) for the following reasons: 1) the RSF-4 zone district meets the recommended densities as shown on the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan and the Growth Plan’s goals and policies; and 2) the RSF-4 zone district meets the criteria found in sections 4-4-4 and 4-11 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

ANX-1999-040 ZONE OF ANNEXATION—HONNEN ANNEXATION

A request for approval to zone two parcels of land containing approximately 5.39 acres currently being annexed to the City to C-2 (Heavy Commercial).

Petitioner: New Georgia Sound Development Co.

Location: 2358/2360 I-70 Frontage Road

Representative: Bill Miles

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Mike Pelletier noted the site’s location, surrounding uses and zoning on offered exhibits. The recommended C-2 zone would be appropriate for the type of business proposed and was consistent with the surrounding area. During the site plan review process, lighting and noise mitigation measures would be employed. Having found that the request met Code criteria and with no outstanding issues, staff recommended approval.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer noted that according to the Future Land Use Map, the parcel was located outside the urban growth boundary. He asked why it was subject to annexation? Mr. Harrington explained that since sewer had been brought to the area, it fell within the City’s annexation parameters. He said that “special areas” (201 inclusions and exclusions) had been identified in the Persigo Agreement.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer noted that the zone was both appropriate and met Code criteria.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-040, I move that we recommend to the City Council that this annexation be zoned Heavy Commercial (C-2).

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

ANX-1999-043 ZONE OF ANNEXATION—WESTERN SLOPE WAREHOUSE ANNEXATION

A request for approval to zone a parcel of land of approximately 5.86 acres currently being annexed to the City to I-2 (Heavy Industrial).

Petitioner: Steve Patterson

Location: 380 – 28 Road

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner indicated that the property fell within the Persigo Agreement guidelines. The I-2 zone was consistent with Growth Plan recommendations and met Code criteria. The petitioner concurred with staff’s recommendation and approval was requested.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Driscoll reiterated that the request was consistent with Growth Plan recommendations and met Code requirements.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-043, Zone of Annexation for the Western Slope Warehouse Annexation, I move we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval of the I-2 zoning.”

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

ANX-1999-044 ZONE OF ANNEXATION—EBERHART ANNEXATION

A request for approval to zone a parcel of land containing approximately .75 acre currently being annexed to the City to C-1 (Light Commercial).

Petitioner: Lee and Cathy Eberhart

Location: 543 – 31 Road

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton presented a brief history of the property. The recommended zone was consistent with Growth Plan recommendations and met Code criteria. A site plan from the petitioners was forthcoming. Staff recommended approval.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if there were residential lots located to the east, to which Mr. Thornton replied affirmatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Merv Heinecke (571 Peachwood Drive, Grand Junction) said that a drainage plan had already been submitted and approved by the County. He asked that the City consider approving the same plan. He would try to make the building placed on the lot compatible with the surrounding area, and a 6-foot-high screen fence would be installed. He had spoken with most of the neighbors and they supported the project.

Chairman Elmer asked staff if the Planning Commission needed to consider the drainage plan concurrently with the Zone of Annexation. Mr. Thornton said that while having the information ahead of time was good, specific details would be reviewed by staff when the site plan was submitted.

AGAINST:

There were no comments against the request.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer commended Mr. Heinecke for choosing to work with the neighbors on his request.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-044, I move that we forward the zone of annexation to City Council with the recommendation of Light Commercial (C-1 zone district) for the following reasons: 1) the C-1 zone district meets the recommended land uses as shown on the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan and the Growth Plan’s goals and policies; and 2) the C-1 zone district meets the criteria found in sections 4-4-4 and 4-11 of the Zoning and Development Code.”

Commissioner Grout seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

ANX-1999-045 ZONE OF ANNEXATION—ARMANTROUT ANNEXATION

A request for approval to zone a parcel of land containing approximately .57 acre currently being annexed to the City to RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre).

Petitioner: Bob Armantrout

Location: 274 – 28 ½ Road

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner presented a brief history of the parcel and said that it was subject to Persigo Agreement guidelines. Having found that the zone met Code requirements and Growth Plan recommendations, staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Driscoll concurred with staff’s recommendation and noted that the zone was similar to its County zone equivalent.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-045, Zone of Annexation for the Armantrout Annexation, I move we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval of the RSF-4 zoning.”

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Harrington indicated that planning commissioner Robert Gordon had resigned, leaving two vacated positions. City Council had received several applications for the first position and would be reviewing individual qualifications.

Commissioner Grout asked for updated information on the Growth Plan amendment process, which was given.

With no further business, the hearing was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.