

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
DECEMBER 21, 1999 MINUTES
7:03 p.m. to 10:05 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 at Two Rivers Convention Center.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were John Elmer (Chairman), Joe Grout, Terri Binder and Mark Fenn. Nick Prinster was absent. Two positions are vacant.

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

Also present were Dave Varley (Acting Community Development Director), John Shaver (Asst. City Attorney), Kent Harbert and Kent Marsh (Development Engineers).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 28 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes available for consideration.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Offered for placement on the Consent Agenda was item MS-1998-248. No public opposition was expressed.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, on item MS-1999-248, a request for a Minor Subdivision, I move that we approve the request subject to the following condition—a plat note shall be provided on the Final Plat restricting access for lot 2, from or onto B ½ Road.”

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

III. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS ON ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR FINAL DECISION

CUP-1999-251 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—COMMUNICATIONS TOWER

A request to construct a telecommunications site consisting of a 100-foot co-locatable monopole, radio equipment, antennas, power, and telephone connections to radio equipment on a portion of an approximately 1.08 acre parcel.

**Petitioner: Dale Reece
Location: 2778 Crossroads Court
Representative: Chuck Ferris, NTCH Colorado, Inc.**

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Chuck Ferris, representing the petitioner (Cleartalk PCS), referenced an overhead transparency of the site and said that the tower would provide a much needed link in the region's wireless service system. He said that a partnership had been formed between Cleartalk and American Tower Corporation, the tower's owner, to provide co-location opportunities on a single tower. AT&T and Airtouch Wireless had already expressed an interest in sharing the site. If co-location opportunities were unavailable on the current tower, he predicted the City would be faced with numerous requests from individual providers for additional towers. Although a 150-foot tower height had been originally requested, staff had encouraged reduction of that height to 100 feet. The current onsite parking area would not be disturbed and safety signage would be installed. Landscaping would be installed per Code requirements.

Mr. Ferris felt that staff, including emergency requirements, could be met. He understood that aesthetics were generally an issue with any tower placement, but noted that surrounding uses were primarily commercial. The tower's monopole construction was of a "sleeker, cleaner" design; the tower's co-location opportunities, he concluded, could prevent the need for additional towers located elsewhere.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Binder wondered what had prompted the tower's reduction from 150 feet to 100 feet. Mr. Ferris said that a reduction in height would lessen visual impacts, a concern expressed by staff. He said that Cleartalk's coverage requirements could still be met with the lesser height.

Chairman Elmer asked for additional detail on the co-location of other provider's antennas on the proposed tower. Mr. Ferris explained that the tower's ownership would be retained by American Tower Corporation. Carrier space would be leased out to individual providers, making it a win-win situation for everyone concerned. However, the more providers there are, the further down the tower they might be located. Thus, allowing for a 10-foot signal separation, a fourth service provider may have to locate its carrier at a 70-foot elevation, which could negate the effectiveness of its service.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Tricia Parish passed out copies of photos depicting a visual representation of the tower's placement on the proposed site. The proposed tower could house up to four separate carriers at varying elevations. An application for an Air Hazard Determination had been submitted by the petitioner to the FAA; however, to date no determination had been made. No lighting would be allowed on the tower unless mandated by the FAA. American Tower Corporation would provide maintenance. Surrounding area uses were noted. Existing trees and landscaping would provide some means of visual buffering. The petitioner had submitted evidence supporting the lack of available relocation options. No interference with other towers or nearby operations was expected. Staff recommended approval of the request subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall submit evidence of additional users (maximum of three other entities as speculated by the applicant) co-locating on the tower and annually report the names, addresses and telephone numbers of every inquiry for co-location as well as the status of such inquiry, as part of an agreement retained by the City.
2. Construction of the tower shall consist of a non-glare finish.
3. The petitioner shall submit evidence of satisfactory structural and engineering standards for the 100-foot tower, prepared and stamped by a registered State of Colorado Professional Engineer prior to obtaining a building permit (as amended).

4. No lights shall be allowed on the tower except those required by the FAA in the Air Hazard Determination.
5. The petitioner shall adhere to all provisions of the Emergency Ordinance No. 3184, Conditional Use Permit criteria from section 4-8 of the Zoning and Development Code, comments submitted to the petitioner by the Community Development Department, and the Response to Comments and General Project Report submitted by the petitioner.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if the various providers' co-location agreements were between them and the tower's owner, to which Mr. Shaver responded affirmatively. He added that once the tower was constructed, the expectation of the ordinance was that it would be available for provider co-location.

Planning commissioners voiced general concern that limiting the tower's height to 100 feet could result in the proliferation of towers from providers whose service needs couldn't be met by the proposed tower. Mr. Shaver briefly explained the ramification of Emergency Ordinance 3184 and said that the possibility always existed that other tower applications could be submitted.

Chairman Elmer asked if the structure's height was compatible with the H.O. zone, to which Ms. Parish answered affirmatively. She said that structural height in an H.O. zone could be varied up to 25%. When asked, Ms. Parish provided estimated height figures for some of the larger structures in the area (e.g., Horizon Towers, Grand Vista, and Adams Mark Hotel).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Erick Steinman (no address given) reiterated that the lower tower height had been recommended by staff. He agreed that future service providers could be forced to make some coverage concessions. Cleartalk's agreement with American Tower Corp. was for a 100-foot carrier location. If the tower's height was reduced by planning commissioners, or if another carrier required a higher elevation to operate, Cleartalk would agree to relocate to a 90-foot elevation. While Cleartalk's needs could still be met at 90 feet, the needs of subsequent providers could go unmet. The tower's height, he said, should be at least equal to that of the largest structures in the area (appx. 100 feet) to prevent interference.

Lee Hunt (no address given) said that he'd been in the wireless business for the last five years. The biggest complaint by customers, he said, was the lack of coverage area.

Joe Reynolds (1244 Main Street, Grand Junction), a Cleartalk employee, spoke in support of the request and agreed with Mr. Hunt's statement concerning coverage complaints. The company, he said, hired local people at good wages and should be supported by the City.

Tom Bozzo (837 Belford Avenue, Grand Junction), a radio frequency engineer for the petitioner, availed himself for any planning commissioner questions.

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification on the serviceability and coverage problems associated with having more than one provider on a tower. Mr. Bozzo said that the business was obligated to provide solid coverage to its customers. While Cleartalk could not operate below 90 feet, other carriers might be able to, depending on individual signalization requirements and antennas. If AT&T were forced to locate its carrier at a 70-foot elevation, coverage requirements would make such a location ineffective. In that instance, AT&T could feel compelled to present the City with a tower request of its own. Mr. Bozzo added that AT&T had approached the Adams Mark hotel to request placement of its tower on top of the hotel's roof. Negotiations by the two entities, he thought, were still underway.

Commissioner Binder asked if there were a condition within the Emergency Ordinance requiring the tower's height to be at least 100 feet. Ms. Parish responded negatively, adding that staff depended on the Radio Frequency Engineer to tell them how high the tower had to be to be functional and co-locatable. She said that a lower height lessened visual impacts. Mr. Shaver said that like any other development proposal, the current request had been submitted to staff for review to ensure conformance to Code criteria. The current proposal had also been evaluated according to City Council's Telecommunications Facility Ordinance. The 100-foot tower height proposed represented what the petitioner had submitted with the application.

Chairman Elmer noted that the petitioner's original request had been for a 150-foot tower height.

Commissioner Binder observed that the extra 50 feet would provide more co-location opportunities and might prevent the need for additional towers in the future.

Ms. Parish said that if the tower was higher, the FAA could require that it be lit, which would be an issue for surrounding businesses and residents. She reminded planning commissioners that the FAA had not yet rendered a decision on the 100-foot tower.

Mr. Shaver suggested that the proposal be considered as submitted; if altered, there could be public notification questions.

Commissioner Binder supported increasing the tower's height if it meant fewer or no additional towers would be constructed elsewhere.

AGAINST:

John Hesslink (no address given), adjacent property owner, asked for additional information on the request. If the current site were deemed inappropriate for a higher tower, he said, perhaps another location would be more suitable. If the request was approved, it would preclude locating a tower on another, more suitable site. If the operation failed, how would the site be reclaimed? He wondered who would perform tower maintenance?

Ms. Parish reiterated that American Tower Corporation would provide maintenance. Per Code requirements, if the tower's use were discontinued for a given amount of time, the City would require its removal. Mr. Shaver added that the Code provided protections in certain instances which were discussed.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Eric Steinman, co-representative for the petitioner, said that the company's stock market value was \$1.2M. It would be highly unusual, he said, for so valuable an asset to be abandoned. The tower would be engineered to host four co-locatable carriers; American Tower Corporation was a solid, reputable firm.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Binder asked how high the tower had to be before the FAA would require lighting. Ms. Parish was unsure since the FAA had not yet submitted its determination on the 100-foot tower.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Fenn agreed that the request should be considered as presented, without alteration. He acknowledged, however, that even an additional 20 feet could alleviate any co-location problems.

Chairman Elmer asked if a minimum tower height had to be established for co-locatability. Ms. Parish said that staff relied on the tower’s engineers to provide that information, and they’d said that a 100-foot height would work.

Mr. Shaver said that while the Emergency Ordinance provided an incentive for co-location, it was not mandated. Future tower issues should be deferred until such time as they were brought forth for consideration.

Chairman Elmer suggested that the City address the issue in terms of community-wide need, to prevent future proliferation of towers. Mr. Shaver said that changing technology often dictated the need; what that future need will be cannot necessarily be known.

Chairman Elmer noted that the proposed tower fit in well with the surrounding commercial uses. Visual impacts would be minimal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, on item CUP-1999-251, I move that we approve the Conditional Use Permit for a co-locatable 100-foot telecommunications tower subject to staff’s recommendation and conditions.”

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

ANX-1999-228 ZONE OF ANNEXATION—HIGH POINTE ESTATES

A request for approval of the Zone of Annexation for approximately 16.3 acres from County zoning of R2 to a PR (Planned Residential) zone district and Preliminary Plan approval of a 24 single-family-lot subdivision.

**Petitioner: Conquest Construction
Location: 2464 Broadway
Representative: Trevor Brown, Rolland Engineering**

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Trevor Brown, representing the petitioner, introduced co-petitioners and overviewed the Preliminary Plan using an overhead transparency. Copies of a letter received by adjacent property owner, Imogene Standifer (2458 Broadway, Grand Junction), were distributed to planning commissioners and staff. The letter was read into the record and not only listed a number of conditions imposed on the developer, but included vacation of Mrs. Standifer’s rights to an existing driveway. He disagreed only with Mrs. Standifer’s request for a six-foot privacy fence (condition 6). The site, he said, was challenging topographically. He noted a section of CDOT right-of-way along Highway 340 where a sewer line would traverse; a CDOT permit had been secured for the crossing.

Mr. Shaver said that with regard to Mrs. Standifer’s letter, any agreement made would best be made by and between Mrs. Standifer and the developer, without the need for City involvement.

Mr. Brown said that three issues were inherent to the proposal: 1) access off of Highway 340; 2) sewer provision, and 3) drainage. He felt that some of the Folkstads’ drainage concerns (adjacent neighbors) could be addressed, and the Folkstads had written a letter indicating they were not opposed to the project. A 100-foot decel lane with 50-foot storage would be provided at the project’s entrance. Preliminary design work had been undertaken on the sewer, and the line’s route was noted on the Preliminary Plan. Drainage water from the site would be directed to an onsite detention pond (location noted). A letter of agreement with Redlands Water and Power had been obtained for discharge into its canal.

Mr. Brown said that the 300-foot horizontal radius mandated by the TEDS manual for internal streets put a burden on the project. To comply with those standards, six additional feet of asphalt would be needed, making the total right-of-way width 50 feet. Don Newton of the City's Traffic Engineering Department agreed to allow reduction of the radius to 150 feet, resulting in a true 44-foot cross-section and 28-foot mat. Mr. Brown asked that Mr. Newton's allowance be included in the motion. He also asked for consideration to allow a 33 percent coverage area for lots 0.4 acres and below, versus a 25 percent coverage limitation for all lots. The project, he said, represented good infill.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked for location of the point where the crest of the hill fell off in relation to the rear boundary, which was provided. Mr. Brown briefly explained how houses would be located on hillsides. Many would have walk-out basements. The site's hillsides were less severe than many of those located within the Ridges Subdivision and would not present insurmountable construction impediments.

Commissioner Grout said that based on Mr. Brown's testimony and given that the height restriction would be 32 feet, based on the lowest elevation, he inquired whether homes could be constructed to comply with those standards. Mr. Brown said that a profile had been completed, and he understood that the height restriction had been measured from the highest point of ground. Commissioner Grout asked where elevations were typically measured--from the highest point or lowest point of the lot? Mr. Shaver said that while the City typically used "average" grade, a specific measuring point could be specified. When Mr. Brown noted the point he'd used in his measurement of grade, Commissioner Grout seemed satisfied with the response.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Lisa Gerstenberger reviewed the request and noted the various open space areas to be provided. Zoning and Preliminary Plan criteria had been met. Recommendations included a maximum building height of 32 feet and a maximum lot coverage area of 25 percent. Fencing standards would be established during Final review. Steep slopes could limit the amount of buildable area on some of the lots. The detention pond was noted, and irrigation water would be provided. Approval of a PR-2 zone was recommended, and staff also recommended approval of the Preliminary Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Revised Preliminary Plan with revisions as requested by the Development Engineer (report dated November 22, 1999) and Utility Engineer (report dated October 17, 1999).
2. A geotechnical report must be submitted with the Final Plan/Plat.
3. Maximum height is 32 feet; maximum lot coverage is 25 percent.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked staff if they anticipated any problems with expanding the lot coverage area for smaller lots to 33 percent, to which Ms. Gerstenberger replied negatively. She added that lots so affected should be specifically identified by the petitioner.

Commissioner Grout asked for staff's confirmation that reduction of the street's horizontal radius to 150 feet was acceptable. Mr. Marsh concurred that while the reduction had been okayed by Mr. Newton, he was not wholly convinced that the street curvatures, as noted on the Preliminary Plan, could be accomplished.

Commissioner Binder asked if the existing lift station would be capable of handling the proposed subdivision. Mr. Marsh said that no concerns had been expressed by Trent Prall.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Cary Standifer (2458 Broadway, Grand Junction), representing his mother, who drafted the aforementioned letter, said that his mother was concerned that residents of the proposed subdivision would complain about her agricultural operation. She currently bred and raised horses for sale, and many of the nuisances normally associated with such operations were subject to complaint by residential neighbors. The letter was an attempt to protect herself from those complaints and address the relocation of her driveway. If fencing wasn't provided as requested, her livestock was subject to potential harassment by children and pets.

Mr. Shaver said that while the relocation of Mrs. Standifer's driveway was a legitimate development issue in the details of any agreement were best determined by and between her and the developer.

Terry Anderson (no address given), adjacent property owner, just asked for clarification on how far into his property an access would be provided.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Brown attempted to answer Mr. Anderson's question but discovered he was referencing another, unrelated driveway location. He said that Mr. Prall had been satisfied with the profile submitted on the lift station.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer said that his biggest concern lay in the buildability of some of the lots.

Commissioner Grout also expressed concern over the height issue. Measuring according to the City's standard (i.e., "average grade") would satisfy that concern. Mr. Shaver said that planning commissioners could propose revised verbiage. Chairman Elmer suggested that if the petitioner so chose, he could submit revised verbiage during Final for consideration; otherwise, the City's definition of "average grade" would apply.

Commissioner Fenn acknowledged that oftentimes builders measured elevation based on the final grade achieved after grading was completed.

Commissioner Binder asked if fencing could be addressed further during Final, to which Mr. Shaver replied affirmatively. He advised that fencing be initially addressed with the Preliminary Plan, with possible refinement occurring at Final. Chairman Elmer said that fencing was typically addressed when compatibility of uses was at issue. He felt that fencing was appropriate at least on the north side of the property.

Chairman Elmer asked if Mrs. Sandifer would have the ability, regardless of any developer agreement, to secure a driveway onto her property from High Pointe Drive, to which Mr. Shaver responded affirmatively, assuming that High Pointe Drive would be dedicated as a public street.

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification on why abandonment of Mrs. Standifer's driveway was integral to the development, which was provided.

Commissioner Binder asked if open space areas would be left in their natural states. Ms. Gerstenberger said that wetlands areas would be left undisturbed. The detention pond had not been designated as open

space. She thought that the irrigation pond area would also be left in a natural state but suggested that additional clarification be sought from the petitioner. Chairman Elmer said that the motion could be conditioned to require a landscaping plan by Final.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-228, Zone of Annexation of PR-2 (Planned Residential with a density not to exceed 2 units per acre), I move that we forward the request to City Council with a recommendation of approval.”

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

A brief discussion ensued over the motion’s crafting.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-1999-228, Preliminary Plan approval, I move that we approve the project subject to the staff conditions with the additions, that a landscape plan for Tract A be included with Final, and that a 6-foot privacy fence between the Standifer property and Lots 19 and 20 be included; staff condition 3 will be revised to allow a 33% maximum allowed lot coverage for lots 0.4 acre or less that the petitioner will delineate at Final; that building height shall be measured according to the City’s definition and left at 32 feet; however, if the petitioner wanted to come back at Final and propose something else, he could.”

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

Mr. Shaver clarified that with regard to the engineering standards mentioned previously, he advised that the petitioner’s responses be to the satisfaction of the City’s Development Engineer.

A brief recess was called at 8:40 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:45 p.m.

RZP-1999-252 REZONE/PRELIMINARY PLAN—GARRETT ESTATES

A request to rezone approximately 12.16 acres from PR-21 (Planned Residential with a density not to exceed 21 units to the acre) to RSF-8 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 8 units to the acre), and approval of a Preliminary Plan for 55 single-family lots.

**Petitioner: Sonshine Construction
Location: Northeast corner of 25 and F ½ Roads
Representative: Pat O’Conner, Banner Associates**

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Francis Blackwelder, representing the petitioner, noted the location of the site and surrounding zoning using an overhead transparency. No open space had been provided since the request proposed a straight zone. The developer agreed to comply with established zoning setbacks.

QUESTIONS

When asked by Chairman Elmer if the petitioner took issue with any of staff’s conditions, Ms. Blackwelder responded negatively.

Commissioner Binder asked if an HOA would be formed. Ms. Blackwelder said that one would be formed to ensure maintenance of the detention area and landscaping along 25 Road and F ½ Rd.

Commissioner Binder asked if any type of RV storage was being provided. Where would people park their boats and RVs? Ms. Blackwelder said that no specific RV storage area had been planned. Mr.

Shaver said that while any licensed motorized vehicle was allowed to park on the street, boats would have to be parked off-street.

Commissioner Fenn suggested that covenants be drafted to address and restrict any on-street parking of RVs.

Commissioner Binder asked how far internal streets would extend. Would there be a G Road extension? She noted the long, straight internal streets which, she felt, would encourage speeding. Mr. Nebeker said that the street wouldn't extend all the way to G Road but close to it. Chairman Elmer said that it was important that the City consider traffic-calming options on longer, straight internal streets. Mr. Shaver said that longer streets usually occurred as a result of interconnectivity between neighborhoods. Absent the interconnectivity element, more cul-de-sacs and shorter streets were possible, but traffic would then be routed to other streets.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker said that the proposed density was compatible with surrounding uses and complied with Growth Plan recommendations. Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Construction of an 8-foot-wide minimum concrete path with weed barrier and gravel on each side is required in the pedestrian tracts for access between 25 Road and Diamond Ridge Subdivision.
2. The applicant shall obtain and submit an executed easement over the property to the west of 25 Road for off-site drainage, with Final Plat submittal. This easement must be obtained prior to submittal for final approval.
3. If an analysis of downstream drainage performed by the applicant shows that there is excess capacity in the drainage system to Leach Creek, the City will consider the allowance for full stormwater discharge rather than detention and release at historic rates.
4. A 6-foot-high solid fence shall be constructed by the developer around the perimeter of this subdivision along 25 Road and F ½ Road behind a five-foot-wide landscaped setback with trees and shrubs provided by the developer in a tract or easement. The tract or easement shall be conveyed to the Homeowners Association for maintenance.

Mr. Nebeker said that the petitioner proposed directing drainage water to the west, to be then directed into open drains which would empty into Leach Creek. This option would require an easement over the western property. The petitioner was hoping to achieve full discharge, with no onsite retention or detention. Staff had not yet received the petitioner's figures on this option. If no easement from the western property could be obtained, the petitioner would then be required to submit a revised Preliminary Plan, with retention and detention sites designated.

QUESTIONS

Mr. Shaver asked if any kind of retention facility would be required with condition 3. Mr. Nebeker said that if further analysis demonstrated sufficient capacity in the system to the west, no onsite retention or detention would be required. Mr. Shaver said that condition 3's verbiage did not obviate any other legal requirements associated with drainage; there could still be some drainage accommodation requirement.

Kent Harbert explained that drainage water was currently routed south via a pipe along 25 Road, crossed Independent Ranchman's Ditch at F Road, continued to a point where it crossed the highway, and tied into the Buthorne Drain in front of Coldwell Banker's building. Just accommodating irrigation tailwater

took up 3/4 of the current pipe, leaving very little room for conveyance of stormwater. That's why onsite retention had been considered. While the Grand Junction Drainage District had given its approval for discharge into its open drain without any onsite detention, given the amount of undeveloped property which lay within that basin, the City required additional analysis of the option. The City did not feel that sufficient line capacity was present to serve both present and future need.

Commissioner Grout thought that the detention area shown on the plat was rather long and narrow. Mr. Nebeker said that the petitioner understood that the detention area, as shown, was insufficient. If deemed necessary, Lot 2 could be utilized for placement of a detention pond.

Mr. Shaver said that final engineering detail could be deferred to Final.

Chairman Elmer noted that retention could also be required. Mr. Harbert provided a brief engineering explanation of how the City's Engineering Department would proceed.

Commissioner Binder asked if any portion of 25 Road would be widened. Mr. Harbert said that half-street improvements would be required.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

No rebuttal testimony was offered.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer agreed that the project's density appeared to be consistent with the surrounding area. The RSF-8 zone designation represented an overall reduction in the previous density allowance of 21 units/acre.

Commissioner Fenn said that there appeared to be a potential solution to the drainage problem available to the petitioner.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZP-1999-252, I move that we approve Garrett Subdivision and forward a recommendation of approval to City Council for the rezoning of this parcel from PR-21 to RSF-8 and to approve the Preliminary Plan subject to staff's recommendation and conditions."

Commissioner Fenn seconded the motion.

Chairman Elmer asked if additional clarification of condition 3 was required. Mr. Shaver clarified that an evaluation of Leach Creek's capacity would be required to determine whether the City would allow discharge as proposed by the petitioner. Engineering and planning staff expressed an understanding of the intent.

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

2020 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office (MPO) is requesting approval of an amendment to the adopted 2015 Regional Transportation Plan to extend the plan to the year 2020. Eligibility for Colorado and federal highway funding requires adoption of the Plan amended by each government entity in Mesa County.

Petitioners: Cliff Davidson and Ken Simms, MPO

PETITIONER=S PRESENTATION

Prior to the onset of the public hearing, Cliff Davidson, co-petitioner, passed out to planning commissioners and staff copies of the proposed 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Colorado, he said, required the Plan to be updated every five years. Mr. Davidson provided an in-depth overview of the proposal, complete with multimedia slide presentation. Slides included the hierarchy of the advisory committee, outline of the statewide planning area, growth and expansion of new housing starts from 1990-1999, 20-year statewide resource allocations, CDOT Region 3 statewide resource allocations, transportation improvements and funding strategies, CDOT/Grand Junction MPO/Mesa County TPR 20-Year Plan, the use of triggers, state and local technical capabilities, and preferred plan improvements. Also shown were slides on high priority local projects, TransCad modeling for the Grand Valley, expansion of the Major Street Plan to include the entire Grand Valley, pedestrian precincts, Urban Trails Master Plan, sidewalk inventory, and 2020 Plan revenue projections.

Mr. Davidson spent additional time explaining how the new Grand Valley Transit (GVT) system would work, its routes, and its benefits to the community. The system would primarily target disabled, elderly and low-income riders; however, any resident could utilize the system. Bicycles could even be quickly attached to the outside of busses and transported. He expected that the system would be fully operational by February 2000.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if the scheduling of improvements would be based on accident “triggers.” Mr. Davidson said that accident rates represented only one of many triggering mechanisms.

Commissioner Binder wondered if the percentage of people who didn’t drive was high, to which Mr. Davidson replied affirmatively. The number of people living in the Valley who didn’t drive, he added, was actually 30 to 50 percent higher than the state’s average.

Chairman Elmer asked whether the Transportation Plan was in its final form, or was there time for additional “tweaking.” Mr. Davidson said that essentially the Plan was in its final form, but tweaking might make the Plan’s implementation easier.

Chairman Elmer said that since the Plan was modeled after the approved Growth Plan, he wondered if suggested improvements would only serve to maintain current service levels 20 years hence. He observed that from a Growth Plan and planning scenario, the Plan suggested that approval of additional densities in high growth areas would negatively impact the Valley more than was once thought. Mr. Davidson said that the City’s capital improvements planning area was moving west while the County’s was moving further south. This provided a stark contrast to population patterns, which showed population growth occurring in the north and east. Mr. Davidson said that Mr. Simms could give real-life impact projections based on modeling techniques.

Chairman Elmer concurred with the logic behind the Plan’s suggestion to promote commercial centers throughout the Valley instead of just to the west side of Grand Junction. Mr. Davidson agreed and said that additional commercial areas should be proposed for the Clifton area, Horizon Drive, the Redlands and Orchard Mesa.

Chairman Elmer suggested that staff include the MPO as a review agency on all Growth Plan amendment proposals. Mr. Davidson said that they could provide City staff with information on a given development’s impact to the area based on modeling scenarios.

Commissioner Fenn asked if the Riverside Bypass was the only answer to traffic mitigation between 24 and 26 Roads, to which Mr. Davidson responded negatively. While designated as one of the main projects, other options could be considered, given expected growth numbers.

Commissioner Fenn wondered if there had been any discussion with CDOT to fix the frontage roads in the 24 to 26 Road area, or over widening the bypass to six lanes and closing frontage roads. Mr. Simms said that informal discussions had taken place regarding improvement of the Highway 6&50 corridor between 24 and 26 Roads at various intersections. While no firm plans were in place, the Intersection Improvements funding category would help provide the means for some much needed intersection improvements.

There was general consensus among planning commissioners that additional time was needed to review the Plan further. Chairman Elmer suggested that the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan be placed on January's public hearing agenda to allow for further discussion.

IV. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer asked planning and engineering staff to give traffic-calming measures more consideration when reviewing proposed developments. He asked that traffic-calming standards be included in the TEDS manual as well. Mr. Shaver said that the TEDS manual was currently undergoing revision but was unsure if traffic-calming measures had been addressed. He agreed to have staff check and report back to the Planning Commission.

Election of Officers

Commissioner Fenn nominated current Chairman Elmer as Chairman for another term. Commissioner Grout seconded the nomination. Chairman Elmer was elected as Chairman for another term by a unanimous 4-0 vote.

Commissioner Fenn nominated Commissioner Grout to the position of Vice-Chairman. Commissioner Binder seconded the nomination. Commissioner Grout was elected as Vice-Chairman by a unanimous 4-0 vote.

Acting Planning Director Dave Varley said that City Council had recently appointed two new members to the Planning Commission. Both were coming from the City's Board of Appeals. Interviews for an alternate position would be undertaken soon.

With no further business, the hearing was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.