

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing - January 16, 1996
7:05 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:05 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium by Chairman John Elmer.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were: John Elmer (Chairman), Jeff Vogel, Ron Halsey, Jeff Driscoll, and Paul Coleman. Bob Withers and Thomas Whitaker were absent.

In attendance, representing Planning Department staff, were Kathy Portner (Planning Supervisor), Mike Pelletier (Associate Planner), and Bill Nebeker (Senior Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Asst. City Attorney), Larry Timm (Community Development Director), and Jody Kliska (City Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 19 citizens present.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

No minutes were available for consideration.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

Chairman Elmer indicated that the petitioner had requested tabling item SUP-95-136 until the February Planning Commission hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on SUP-95-136, I move that we table this item until the February 6 meeting."

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

RZ-95-222 REZONE--2507 ORCHARD AVENUE

Request to rezone a parcel of land located at 2507 Orchard from RSF-8 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 8 units per acre) to PR-8.7 (Planned Residential with a density of 8.7 units per acre).

Petitioner: Hasty Trust

Location: 2507 Orchard Avenue

Representative: Alex Mirrow

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner provided a brief outline of the request, elaborating that the present structure had once been a single family structure which had been converted to a four-plex. It was unclear just when the conversion

took place, but the four-plex had fallen into disrepair. The petitioner purchased the property and renovated the structure as a duplex and was now interested in selling the property. A PR8.7 zoning would allow for a buyer to acquire financing. Staff reviewed how the proposal met the rezoning criteria. With no outstanding issues or concerns, staff recommended approval.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Alex Mirrow, representing the petitioner, said that when he'd purchased the property, he was unaware that a zoning problem existed. He detailed the extent of his renovation and indicated he had a buyer for the property. Approval of the rezone was needed before the buyer could acquire financing.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the request.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZ-95-222, a request for a rezone from RSF-8 to PR-8.7 to allow for the duplex, I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of approval."

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

VR-95-210 VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY--WEST PINYON AVENUE, EAST OF 25 ROAD Request to vacate approximately 800 feet of West Pinyon Avenue to the east of 25 Road.

**Petitioner: Ute Water Conservancy District
Location: West Pinyon Avenue, east of 25 Road
Representative: C.E. Stockton**

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker briefly overviewed the proposal. He expressed concern that West Pinyon was the only direct link between 25 and 25 ½ Roads between Patterson and U.S. 6&50. While the street had not been constructed, he felt it may be needed in the future to provide access to the Westgate subdivision and to provide better servicing of this area. Mr. Nebeker felt that the vacation was not critical to Ute Water's operations and that the vacation request could be re-reviewed if it was later determined that the street extension was not needed. Staff recommended denial of the request.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Driscoll asked for clarification of Fire Department comments, which was given.

Jody Kliska responded to Commission's question on the City's timeline for construction of the street. She indicated that 25 Road was scheduled for widening in 2001, at which time, the City would review the connecting streets.

Chairman Elmer asked whether a revocable permit was a viable option. Mr. Nebeker said that the option had not been investigated, adding that he didn't see the need for one.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Charlie Stockton, representing the petitioner, felt that the vacation would help alleviate the difficulty experienced by customers attempting to turn left onto 25 Road from the Ute Water property. He didn't feel that the nearby Westgate or Minerva Subdivisions would need the access.

PUBLIC COMMENTS***FOR:***

Jim Love (137 Santa Fe Drive, Grand Junction), an adjacent property owner, spoke in favor of the proposal.

AGAINST:

Lee Jensen (610 Wagon Trail Drive, Grand Junction), also an adjacent property owner, opposed the proposal. He felt that West Pinyon should be developed immediately and would be needed as access to both the Westgate and Minerva Subdivisions. He felt the extension may also serve to mitigate some of the increasing traffic along 25 Road. Mr. Jensen also expressed concern over drainage problems in the subject area.

Bud Blaney (435 West Mesa, Grand Junction), nearby property owner, agreed with Mr. Jensen's statements. He said that he was currently discussing the sale of some property along West Pinyon to a freight company. The freight company, he maintained, would require the additional access for its fleet.

Merle Rumsey (1935 Broadway, Grand Junction), a nearby property owner, concurred with statements regarding the drainage problems in the area.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Stockton said only that he didn't feel West Pinyon's construction would have any effect on drainage.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Coleman felt there was too much traffic in the subject area to warrant vacation of a potential street extension.

Commissioner Elmer acknowledged the need for east-west corridors and felt the request was premature.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item VR-95-210, I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of denial for the vacation of West Pinyon Avenue between 25 Road and south Westgate Drive."

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

(Since the next two items were interrelated, they were heard concurrently.)

ANX-95-223 ZONE OF ANNEXATION--SUNSET VILLAGE

Request to zone lands currently being annexed to the City to RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre).

Petitioner: Mark Laird

Location: 686 - 25 ½ Road

and

PP-95-214 PRELIMINARY PLAN--SUNSET VILLAGE

Preliminary Plan for 12 single family residential units on approximately 3.4 acres of land currently being annexed to the City.

Petitioner: Marc Laird

Location: 686 - 25 ½ Road

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Nebeker presented a brief outline of both rezone and preliminary plan requests and pointed out the site location on maps provided. The property is zoned AFT and is currently located outside of the City limits.

The petitioner's request for RSF-4 zoning would allow for development of the subdivision once the annexation is completed. Staff felt that the zoning would be compatible with surrounding zoning and recommended approval. With regard to the Preliminary Plan, Mr. Nebeker advised the Commission that a revised plan had been recently submitted by the petitioner which relocated access to the southern property boundary. The access was revised at staff's request and would, in fact, have the additional benefit of allowing the petitioner one extra building lot and allow for the sharing of street improvements by adjacent property owners. Staff recommended approval of the revised preliminary plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Final approval of the proposed subdivision is contingent upon approval of the annexation and zone of annexation for this parcel.
2. The final plat shall include an improved street extension to the east.
3. No access shall be allowed to 25 ½ Road from any of the lots in the subdivision. No access to the east-west entrance road into the subdivision shall be allowed from the lots fronting that street.
4. A six-foot high privacy fence may be allowed in the front yard along 25 ½ Road, outside of the sight triangle at intersections, if desired by the applicant.
5. Half-street improvements will be required on 25 ½ Road.
6. The applicant may submit a final plat showing the entrance road and extension to the east along the southern property line, subject to staff review.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Halsey wanted to know if the southern access option was approved, how long would the internal cul-de-sac be. Mr. Nebeker responded that the total length would be approximately 600 feet.

Commissioners asked for clarification on how much of the southern access road would be improved under the revised option. Mr. Nebeker clarified that the street was designated "residential collector" and would have to be built out to 52 feet. The petitioner would ultimately be responsible for improving 37 feet of the total 52 feet, with the adjacent property owner to the east responsible for improvements made to the remaining 15 feet. Until the eastern property was improved, however, the petitioner would only be required to construct a 24-foot mat with curb and gutter on the north side only. Half-street improvements would still be required for 25 ½ Road.

Commissioner Elmer asked if TCP payments would be credited for improvements, to which Mr. Nebeker replied affirmatively.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Brian Hart of Landesign, representing the petitioner, further clarified road improvements and expressed a preference for the revised site plan design. He wanted to make sure there were no issues with the requested zoning, which would jeopardize the project.

Mr. Nebeker said that even with the increase of the additional lot, the total density would still be compatible with the RSF-4 straight zone.

Chairman Elmer asked the petitioner if he wanted the motion to focus on consideration of the revised plan, to which Mr. Hart replied that that would be preferable.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Stan Seligman (3032 I-70 Business Loop, Grand Junction), nearby property owner, clarified that there were two affected properties directly to the east of the proposed subdivision. He felt that the revised plan was a good one and urged approval.

Jackie Moran (1515 Rado Drive, Grand Junction) asked for clarification on the southern street extension, which was given.

AGAINST:

There were no comments against the proposal.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer asked if the southern road extension would be viewed as an extension of F 3/4 Road, to which the petitioner replied that it would.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-95-223, I move that we forward the zoning of RSF-4 of the Sunset Village Zone of Annexation on to the City Council with our recommendation of approval.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) “Mr. Chairman, on item PP-95-214, I move that we approve the preliminary plan for Sunset Village subject to revised conditions outlined in staff’s recommendations 1. through 6.”

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

ANX-95-195 ZONE OF ANNEXATION--B ½ ROAD ENCLAVE

Request to zone lands currently being annexed to the City consisting of approximately 8.06 acres to the City H.O. (Highway Oriented).

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Location: Northeast corner of B ½ and 27 Roads

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Pelletier presented a brief overview of the proposal, saying that the H.O. zoning was the equivalent City zone for the property. The zoning was consistent with plans outlined in the Orchard Mesa Community Plan. Staff recommended approval of the H.O. zone of annexation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) “Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-95-195, the zone of annexation for the B ½ Road enclave, I move that we forward this on to City Council with recommendation of the H.O. zone.”

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

The hearing was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.