

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
AUGUST 10, 1999 MINUTES
7:02 p.m. to 9:44 p.m.

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

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were: John Elmer (Chairman), Joe Grout, Terri Binder, Mark Fenn and Jeff Driscoll.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were: Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Lori Bowers (Associate Planner), Lisa Gerstenberger (Sr. Planner) and Kristen Ashbeck (Sr. Planner).

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes of June 17, July 13, and July 20, 1999.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes of June 17th as written.”

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 3-0, with Chairman Elmer and Commissioner Driscoll abstaining.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes of the July 13th meeting as submitted.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes for the July 20th meeting as submitted.”

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

III. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION UNLESS APPEALED

PP-1999-053 PRELIMINARY PLAN—FRUITVALE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION

A request for approval of the Preliminary Plan for Fruitvale Meadows Subdivision consisting of 29 single family lots on 7.1 acres in an RSF-5 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 5 units per acre) zone district.

Petitioner: Casas del Tierra
Location: Northeast corner of D ½ and 30 ¾ Roads
Representative: Ken Heitt

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Chris Russell, representing the petitioner, presented an overhead transparency of the Preliminary Plan. The site's location, zoning and surrounding uses were noted. He stated that the request met the intent of the Growth Plan. He noted the location of the site's detention pond and said that water would be discharged at one-third the historic rate. Extension of a 6-inch water line would occur at the east end of Canyon Land Drive to the end of the paved surface of the new road. Mr. Russell expressed general agreement with staff's recommendations.

QUESTIONS

When asked by Commissioner Driscoll what the density would be at build-out, Mr. Russell answered that it would be approximately 5 units per acre.

Commissioner Binder asked for additional detail on drainage mitigation. Mr. Russell said that stormwater would not be retained in the detention pond but would be released from it via a drainage pipe. Discharge would be metered so that it didn't exceed historic rates. The Homeowners Association (HOA) would be responsible for maintenance of the open space and drainage equipment.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner overviewed the request as contained in the August 5, 1999 Staff Report. The Preliminary Plan met bulk requirements; however, a drainage plan and report would be required at final which must demonstrate satisfactory mitigation of drainage concerns. Improvements along 30 ¾ Road the length of the property's frontage would be required, and fencing would be limited to options outlined in staff's conditions of approval. Staff recommended approval of the request subject to the following:

1. The final drainage plan and report shall satisfy all requirements as indicated in the City Engineering and Grand Junction Drainage comments.
2. The final plans shall include the extension of the 6-inch water line to the eat end of the pavement of Canyon Land Drive.
3. Proposed perimeter fencing along 30 ¾ Road or D ½ Road must be a part of the Development Improvement Agreement and one of the following:
 - a. A height of 4 feet or less and open (e.g., split rail or picket) placed on property line.
 - b. A height of 4 feet and solid, made of decorative material such as brick or stucco.
 - c. Any other perimeter fencing must be placed at least 5 feet behind the property line with the remaining strip of property to be landscaped with trees and shrubs. Landscaping must be in an easement or tract to be dedicated to and maintained by the HOA.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Binder wondered if the public posting sign had been removed since she hadn't seen it on site. Ms. Portner said that the petitioner had picked up the sign for posting at the required time.

Chairman Elmer referenced the third fencing option listed in the conditions of approval and wondered if both the fence and the landscaping would be the developer's responsibility, to which Ms. Portner responded affirmatively. Chairman Elmer asked if the petitioner would be allowed to erect 6-foot perimeter fencing. Ms. Portner said that if 6-foot fencing was selected, it must be set back from the property line 5 feet, with the 5-foot strip to be landscaped and maintained by the HOA.

Commissioner Binder wondered if the detention pond would be fenced. Ms. Portner said that there were no City requirements for fencing off the detention area; however, the developer may opt to do so if liability was a concern. Commissioner Binder said that if stormwater was not released quickly, the pond could be a hazard.

A brief discussion ensued over the types of detention pond designs available.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Russell said that his preferred option for perimeter fencing would be the 6-foot privacy fence with a 5-foot landscape strip. He reiterated that the detention pond's design would prevent water from standing. Mr. Russell indicated that the public notice sign had been picked up and posted the same day; it had been placed at the corner of 30 ¾ and D ½ Roads.

Ms. Portner reviewed the City's legal requirements for posting. John Shaver added that if planning commissioners felt there to be insufficient public notification, options included a continuance or denial of the item based on lack of jurisdiction. Ms. Portner said that the office had received both phone calls and visits from interested citizens. She passed out the notification list of residents who had received individual notification as well.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Driscoll noted that the item had gone through both the County and City planning processes as a result of the Persigo Agreement. The proposal reflected the lower end of the zone's allowed density range, which was consistent with densities in the surrounding area.

Chairman Elmer expressed some concern over the number of double-frontaged lots contained in the plan. Ms. Portner said that staff had had similar concerns; however, the County had not shared that view.

Commissioner Binder asked if sidewalk would be required along 30 ¾ and D ½ Roads, to which Ms. Portner replied affirmatively.

General agreement was expressed by planning commissioners that sufficient notification had occurred.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-1999-053, Preliminary Plan for Fruitvale Meadows, I move we approve the request subject to staff conditions."

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

FPP-1999-164 FINAL PLAT/PLAN—VALLEY MEADOWS WEST SUBDIVISION

A request for approval of the Final Plat/Plan of Valley Meadows West consisting of 8 single family detached lots on approximately 4.027 acres in a PR-2.7 (Planned Residential with a density not to exceed 2.7 units per acre) zone district.

**Petitioner: VMW Development LLC
Location: West end of Westwood Drive
Representative: Banner Associates, David Chase**

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

David Hartman, representing the petitioner, said that the Final Plat/Plan conformed closely to the Preliminary Plan. An indemnification agreement had been signed and recorded, holding the City harmless over any potential drainage issues. A discharge agreement had been signed and submitted to the drainage district as well.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger briefly reviewed the project’s history and concurred that only minor changes had been made to the Final Plat. With no outstanding issues, staff recommended approval subject to the petitioner’s submission of revised plans in accordance with the Development Engineer’s comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer commented that the request seemed straightforward, with the Final Plat conforming to the Preliminary Plan.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-1999-164, I move that we approve the Final Plat/Plan with the condition that the provision of the revised plans be in accordance with the comments of the Development Engineer.”

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

CUP-1999-168 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—DRIVE-THRU ESPRESSO

A request to approve a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a drive-thru espresso establishment in a C-1 (Light Commercial) zone district.

**Petitioner: Scott Cunningham
Location: 417 Monument Road
Representative: Stacy Cook**

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Scott Cunningham, petitioner, overviewed his request and said that hours of operation would be limited to 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. during the winter and 6 a.m. to 2 p.m. in the summer. The current request reflected a second similar business. Vehicle stacking was not expected to exceed three vehicles.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if circulation issues had been resolved with staff. Had a parking agreement with Ultimate Fitness Center been submitted? Mr. Cunningham responded affirmatively to both questions.

Commissioner Binder asked if the building could be easily removed, to which Mr. Cunningham again replied affirmatively.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lori Bowers explained that the Site Plan review was running concurrently with the CUP request. Even with the reduction of 7 parking spaces from Ultimate Fitness, adequate parking would still be available. Staff still had concerns over traffic flows to and from the site off of Highway 340, even with the revised Site Plan. Additional circulation information would be required and the petitioner must satisfactorily demonstrate how traffic conflicts would be avoided. She suggested limiting traffic into the site to one-way only. Staff recommended approval of the request pending the satisfactory resolution of circulation issues prior to issuance of a Planning Clearance.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Driscoll wondered if any negative comments had been received from the public on the petitioner's 7th street business location, to which Ms. Bowers responded negatively. She had never seen more than two vehicles stacked at the business at any given time.

General discussion ensued over the site's location and possible ingress/egress conflicts which could result. Rick Dorris said that his biggest concern was over eastbound traffic.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Cunningham expressed some confusion over the circulation discussion. He intended traffic into the site be one-way from Highway 340, adding that a revised Site Plan had been submitted to staff. Vehicles would be routed to the north side of the business and then exit. He agreed there would be instances of two way traffic on-site but he felt that conflicts could be mitigated with appropriate signage and striping.

Mr. Shaver said that circulation is a valid legal issue for Planning Commission discussion when considering a CUP.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer supported the use and said that circulation details could be worked out between the petitioner and staff.

Commissioner Fenn agreed, adding that appropriate signage could be posted to direct traffic.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) "Mr. Chairman, on item CUP-1999-168, a request for a Conditional Use Permit for Espresso Depot, I recommend approval with the condition that the traffic flow issue be resolved to staff's satisfaction prior to the issuance of a Planning Clearance."

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

FPP-1998-131 FINAL PLAT/PLAN—REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE—HACIENDA/HUNTER’S GLEN

A request for a one-year extension of the development schedule for Hacienda Subdivision consisting of 368 townhome units and 40,000 square feet of commercial development on approximately 29 acres in a PR-17 (Planned Residential with a density not to exceed 17 units per acre) and PB (Planned Business) zone districts.

Petitioner: Mac Cunningham
Location: Southeast corner of 24 ½ and F ¼ Roads
Representative: Peter Carbone

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

No initial presentation testimony was offered by either the petitioner or a representative.

STAFF’S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner overviewed the history of the project and said that Phase I plans had been submitted; the petitioner was awaiting receipt of his financing. It was not unusual to grant extension requests for projects of similar scope, and a revised construction schedule had been submitted (contained in Staff Report). Staff recommended approval of the request.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Driscoll said that granting the extension would be consistent with past Planning Commission actions on similar requests.

Chairman Elmer also noted that since Phase I drawings had been submitted, the project was moving forward. He expressed support for both the extension request and the project.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-1998-131, I move we approve the revised schedule.”

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

Due to the potential for conflict of interest, Commissioner Grout recused himself from deliberations on the following item.

RZP-1999-119 REZONE/PRELIMINARY PLAN—BROOKSIDE SUBDIVISION

A request for: 1) approval to rezone approximately 30 acres from RSF-5 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 5 units/acre) to PR-4.3 (Planned Residential with a density not to exceed 4.3 units/acre) and 2) approval of the Preliminary Plan for Brookside Subdivision consisting of 80 single family lots and 40 attached units.

Petitioner: Grace Homes Construction, Inc.
Location: Northwest corner of 30 and F ½ Roads
Representative: PA/DS, Bryan Sims

John Shaver said that there had been some question raised by the public over proper notification. He explained that the address of the property had been advertised incorrectly; however the legal description

had been correct. There was also a question over whether there had been adequate posting of the public notification sign. He advised the Planning Commission first consider the notification issue prior to consideration of the substantive request.

PETITIONER'S STATEMENT

Brian Sims, representing the petitioner, said that the sign had been posted on the property on July 5, 1999. He explained that because of delays in hearing scheduling, the sign had actually been posted for two months rather than the 10 days required by Code. He had observed on occasion the sign laying down in the grass; however, it had been re-posted in an upright position. While his partner had been the one to initially post the sign, he'd seen the sign there since July 5. The addressing error had originated from the Community Development Department and when realized, he'd contacted staff to correct the error. A subsequent advertisement had then been run.

Chairman Elmer asked if individual notification cards had been sent to surrounding residents, to which Mr. Sims replied affirmatively.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS

Harold Prewett (647 Pinewood Court, Grand Junction) said that his name was incorrectly reflected on the notification card but he'd gotten it anyway.

Eileen Gooch (670 – 30 ½ Road, Grand Junction) said that she walked by the property daily and remembered seeing the sign posted on only one day, July 5, at the corner of 30 and F ½ Roads. After that, she had no longer seen it. She confirmed that the address given in the legal ad had been incorrect.

Francis Blackwell (640 Pinewood, Grand Junction) said that the sign had been posted up until a recent rainstorm when it had blown over. It had then been reerected but disappeared about 10 days ago. She noted that a second notification card had been received, which contained the correct property address.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Binder said that she had been able to find neither the sign nor the property when she visited the area. She felt that the public should be given ample notification on a project that size and supported a postponement of the request.

Mr. Shaver explained the public notification process. It was his opinion that the addressing issue should not prevent the application from moving forward; the sign posting was a separate consideration. At issue, he said, were "fairness" and the definition of "public notice" which requires posting of the property.

Discussion ensued over whether the sign had to be posted for 10 days total versus 10 consecutive days, the enforcement of sign posting requirements and whether the sign's posting met the intent of the Code. General consensus was that sufficient notification had been given by virtue of a corrected legal ad, two individual notification cards to each nearby resident on the notification list and two months of sign notification where only 10 days had been required. Commissioner Binder still expressed objection to moving the item forward, but Chairman Elmer and Commissioners Fenn and Driscoll elected to do so by majority.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Brian Sims presented an overhead transparency of the Preliminary Plan. He noted that over 25 percent of the site would be left in open space; open space would include trails, drainage detention areas, easements and parks. The project represented infill, and there was good access to the site. Large ditches made design of the site difficult (ditch locations noted) but the largest ditch along the southern boundary and a

portion of the ditch along the western boundary would be piped. A full survey had been undertaken to determine the location of a water line easement which bisected the property from the north to the south. Two double-frontaged lots existed along the Babbling Brook cul-de-sac, but those lots had been left larger to provide greater flexibility for building envelopes. Staff had requested a reconfiguration of those lots, but he expressed concern over keeping the lot count up. Mr. Sims noted proposed trail locations but expressed concern over staff's requirement to concrete trail segments. He thought that concreting trails would conflict with Ute Water's requirement to keep their easements over water lines free of any such construction. He proposed using either gravel, hard-packed base, or asphalt as alternate material choices. He felt it unfair for staff to request an easement expansion in the northwest portion of the property to accommodate trails development since so much open space was already being provided. The trail segment, he said, could be placed on either the north or south side of the existing ditch without requiring easement modification. He also asked that consideration be given to a meandering trails design rather than constructing them in straight lines. The project would be constructed in three phases.

Mr. Sims said that playground equipment would be provided for park areas but given that only one of the two proposed park areas would be targeted for young children, the amount of equipment recommended by staff seemed excessive. He said that fencing would be limited in height to 4-5 feet but asked that flexibility be given on the type of fencing material used.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification on trails locations, which was given.

Commissioner Driscoll counted 16 double-frontaged lots along F ½ Road. Chairman Elmer clarified that by staff's definition of the term, only two existed along the Babbling Brook cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Binder asked Mr. Sims to point out the locations where ditches would be covered. David Hartman, also representing the petitioner, provided that clarification.

Commissioner Binder asked if open space areas along ditchbanks would be rip-rapped. Mr. Sims said that they would be planted in grass and maintained by the HOA. Mr. Hartman further explained the type of detention areas planned, with swales located along F ½ Road. Since irrigation water would be available to the subdivision, some provision could be made to use one or more of the detention areas for irrigation water storage. Commissioner Binder suggested the petitioner submit a landscape plan for open space areas.

Commissioner Binder asked how large the pipe would be for filled-in ditch areas. Mr. Hartman answered that they would be 48 inches wide. Mr. Sims said that the ditch filling would be a cooperative effort by both the developer and the ditch company.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck outlined the proposal as contained in the August 10, 1999 Staff Report. The rezone request complied with Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations. Staff had recommended eliminating the two double-frontaged lots along the Babbling Brook cul-de-sac by shortening the cul-de-sac and facing some of the lots towards the cul-de-sac and some towards South Brookside Drive. The final drainage report must demonstrate how the downstream runoff condition at the confluence of the Fruitvale and Price-Thayer drains was not worsened. Trail construction requirements were to City standards; staff had no mechanism in place to deviate from established standards. She noted similar instances where trails had been constructed over water lines with no objection from the water provider. The playground equipment recommendation had been based on other similarly-sized developments. If Tract B were used as an irrigation water holding facility, an additional active open space area would be required. Staff recommended approval of the rezone subject to the following conditions:

1. The uses allowed within the zone and use shall include attached single family, detached single family, and open space.
2. The bulk requirements outlined in the staff report shall apply with the exception of the rear yard setback for principal structures, which shall be 20 feet for all lots within the subdivision.

Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Filing 3 shall include design and construction of a street stub to the northwest property line (or as far as possible). The applicant shall be responsible for design and payment fees in lieu of construction of the remainder to the property line (if any) and half the cost of the ditch crossing.
2. All lots shall have rear yard setbacks of 20 feet for principal structures.
3. Eliminate all double-fronting lots.
4. The applicant shall demonstrate that the property has been annexed to the Central Grand Valley Sanitation District prior to Filing I Final Plan/Plat submittal.
5. The applicant shall have surveyed and located the 24-inch Ute Water line. A revised Preliminary Plan shall be submitted with Final Plan/Plat for Filing I if the associated tract/easement, as required by Ute Water, impacts the adjacent lots and/or if the lot configuration needs to be revised.
6. The applicant shall provide a trails phasing plan with the Final Plan/Plat for Filing I. The plan shall demonstrate that the west end of the Price Ditch trail can be feasibly constructed. This may require submittal of a revised Preliminary Plan if the configuration of the open space and the adjacent lots in the vicinity need to be revised.
7. The applicant shall be responsible for design and construction of the north-south Meadowood trail and the Price Ditch trail to the City standard (8-foot concrete in a 12-foot easement).
8. Tracts B and C shall be reconfigured/enlarged as necessary to include construction of the active recreation spaces and equipment listed below. All of these amenities shall be provided between the two spaces: horseshoe pit, 2 each; volleyball court, 1 each; badminton court, 1 each; picnic tables, 4 each; playground equipment equivalent to: primetime swing set #12583 with 2-swing belt set #2955, 2 each; climber—Eagle's Perch #557, 2 each; slide oval tube #CH4010, 2 each.
9. Tract A in Filing I and Tract J in Filing III shall be provided/developed with a standard city trail (8 foot concrete in minimum 12-foot-wide tract) or eliminated from final plans.
10. The Final Plat/Plan and covenants shall address fencing restrictions for lots abutting open space as discussed in the Staff Report.
11. The final drainage report is required to study all upstream basins in their entirety and prove that this development and the piping of the Price-Thayer Drain will not increase runoff to downstream properties. This includes modeling of the existing ditches, the detention provided by them, and establish a precise existing downstream discharge at the confluence in the

southwest corner of the site. The post development modeling must address the remaining existing detention in the ditches, the detention provided on site, and show a total discharge into the existing 24-inch pipe at the southwest corner equal to or less than the existing flow.

12. The lots along the western edge and the northwestern corner of the property shall be reconfigured as requested by the Grand Junction Drainage District so that all property lines are a minimum of 20 feet from the top of the open ditches. This adjustment of property lines may require submittal of a revised Preliminary Plan.

Ms. Ashbeck said that an additional condition could be added to require landscaping plans for open space areas as they were platted.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Fenn wondered if it was typical to request specific types of playground equipment during the Preliminary Plan stage. Ms. Ashbeck said that it had recently become the City's policy to do so.

Commissioner Binder asked Rick Dorris if underground piping in the detention areas would be sufficient to drain water quickly away from them. Mr. Dorris briefly elaborated on the specifics of the petitioner's drainage plan. It would be up to the petitioner to demonstrate in the final drainage report the effectiveness of proposed drainage mitigation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

Harold Prewett (647 Pinewood Court, Grand Junction) asked for clarification on the type of landscaping proposed for swale areas along F ½ Road. Mr. Hartman reiterated that those areas would be planted in grass. Mr. Prewett said that there were problems with weeds and debris plugging drainage flows. He was concerned that detention areas would become breeding grounds for mosquitoes if water was left too long. What kind of homes were proposed for the subdivision? He noted that traffic problems were already inherent to the 30 Road corridor; the proposed subdivision would only exacerbate the problem if no improvements were done to 30 Road.

Ken Richards (2973 Bookcliff Avenue, Grand Junction), representing Highland Park Lateral Ditch Company (HPL), expressed concern over open ditch areas on the property and said that HPL was trying to close in all of its existing irrigation water lines and the lines of the subdivisions it served. An open irrigation pond would oppose those efforts. He noted that HPL's system was nearing capacity so that any current and added customers had to be water wise in their line design and water usage. He recommended that irrigation water be stored in cisterns and dispersed using regulated flow valves (e.g., Cody Subdivision). He asked that the petitioner and/or the development's representatives meet with him to discuss specific design alternatives.

Eileen Gooch (670 – 30 ½ Road, Grand Junction) expressed concern over school impacts to Thunder Mountain Elementary. She also wondered if planning commission decisions were predetermined since she'd heard a comment that led her to believe they were.

Ray Gooch (670 – 30 ½ Road, Grand Junction) said that due to the parcel's proximity to the airport, he recommended that noise attenuating materials be utilized in home construction. He wondered if the parcel lay within the airport's critical zone. He complained that all the recent development in the area

was forcing wildlife (e.g., skunks) into adjacent neighborhoods. Would the City bear responsibility for any unwelcome intrusion?

PETITIONER’S REBUTTAL

Mr. Sims said that the character of the area would be more greatly enhanced by the subdivision’s design of shorter streets and cul-de-sacs. He also thought that there were plans to extend F ½ Road to 29 Road, which would provide another access to local residents. Attached and detached units were segregated into their own respective on-site “communities.” He had no objection to the suggestion for irrigation cisterns and expressed a willingness to work with HPL on irrigation system design. He noted that the allowable density had been greatly reduced. The parcel was already cultivated; thus, no tangible wildlife habitat would be eliminated as a result of the development. He said that the parcel lay within the airport’s zone of influence at the 60 decibel noise contour. While not required by the airport to do so, sound attenuating measures would be investigated.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Binder wondered if sidewalk would be installed along the ditch on the southern side of the property, to which Mr. Sims responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Binder asked about the potential line clogging problem mentioned by Mr. Prewett. Mr. Sims was unsure how grass from swale areas could cause clogging of the lines. He asked that rip-rapping not be required as he thought it an unsightly landscaping alternative. If designed correctly, water would not be left to stand in detention areas.

Mr. Hartman added that Ute Water’s engineer had told him personally that nothing was to be constructed over water lines. He thought that there may be a conflict in requirements between the water provider and the City but agreed to comply with the City’s requirement.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Driscoll asked if a plat note should be required since the subject property lay so close to the airport. Ms. Ashbeck confirmed that the property lay within the airport’s Zone of Influence. At the 60 db contour, no noise-proofing measures were required; however, they could be recommended.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if the subdivision would generate enough traffic to exceed street capacities in the area. Mr. Dorris noted the subdivision’s three access points and said that numbers generated within the traffic study would not exceed street carrying capacities. Frontage improvements would address specific impacts resulting from the subdivision itself. Mr. Dorris briefly highlighted various traffic study elements.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if comments had been received from the school district, to which Ms. Ashbeck replied negatively.

Commissioner Binder asked if the City’s Major Street Plan took into account areas where development was likely to occur, to which Mr. Dorris responded affirmatively.

Chairman Elmer asked if there was likely to be any opposition by the water provider over placing concrete trails over water lines. Mr. Dorris reiterated that there were already a number of instances in other areas where concrete trails had been constructed over existing water lines. He didn’t foresee any problems with Ute Water. Ms. Ashbeck said that some flexibility as to path placement was available; staff just wanted a north-south connection somewhere in the subdivision.

Chairman Elmer recommended adding the words "...or equivalent..." between the words "amenities" and "shall" in the second sentence of staff condition 8. This met with general agreement by other planning commissioners.

Commissioner Binder suggested adding another condition (13) to require landscaping in the large southern ditch area. Chairman Elmer said that staff's condition to require a landscaping plan for all open space areas would be more inclusive, to which Commissioner Binder assented.

Chairman Elmer suggested adding a condition 14 to require that an avigation easement be recorded with the plat. He also clarified to Ms. Gooch that no planning commission decision was ever predetermined.

Planning commissioners again asked staff to stress the need for input from the school district with regard to school impacts. Mr. Shaver recommended that a letter be drafted to the school district; Chairman Elmer asked staff to draft and send the correspondence.

Commissioner Fenn remarked that alternatives were available which would address the double-frontaged lot situation.

Commissioner Driscoll commented that the proposal met rezone criteria and Growth Plan recommendations. The development's density would be consistent with other subdivisions in the area. Topographic constraints would make a higher density difficult. He agreed that there were a number of issues which still needed resolution prior to Final approval, to which Chairman Elmer concurred.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZP-1999-119, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plan for the Brookside Subdivision subject to staff recommendations with the addition of condition 13, that a landscape plan be submitted for all open space that's been designated on the plan, and also condition 14, that an avigation easement be provided."

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZP-1999-119, I move that we forward the rezone request for the Brookside Subdivision from RSF-5 to PR-4.3 to City Council with a recommendation of approval subject to staff recommendations."

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

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Kathy Portner said that staff was looking for guidance on how much detail would be required for planning commissioners to render a decision on the upcoming Redlands Mesa Golf Course submittal. While general elements such as drainage, clubhouse detail, driving range layout, etc. would be reviewed, other elements such as a detailed grading plan and detailed tee and green areas would not be requested unless planning commissioners thought the information would be helpful. Specific areas of potential hazard would also be addressed.

Commissioner Binder asked that any proposed lighting plan also be submitted.

A brief discussion ensued over the status of the Consent Agenda. While scheduled for consideration with the new City Development Code, Commissioner Fenn said that if adoption of the Code were forestalled, the Consent Agenda issue should move forward independently.

Ms. Portner noted that a meeting to go over the Northeast Zoning Map would be held tomorrow night.

With no further business, the hearing was adjourned at 9:44 p.m.