

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Public Hearing - July 2, 1996**  
**7:00 p.m. to 8:50 p.m.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium by Vice-Chairman Jeff Vogel.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were: Jeff Vogel (Vice-Chairman), Jeff Driscoll, Ron Halsey, Tom Whitaker, and Paul Coleman.

In attendance, representing Community Development Department staff, were: Kathy Portner (Acting Community Development Director), and Kristen Ashbeck (Associate Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney) and Jody Kliska (City Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 23 citizens present.

\*\*\*\*\*

**II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**

With regard to the minutes of June 4, 1996, Commissioner Halsey asked that his question to Lou Grasso of School District #51 be included in the minutes on page 4. He'd asked if year-round school scheduling would alleviate some of the present overcrowding, to which Mr. Grasso had responded that it might allow for 25-30 percent more students.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, with that addition, I move that we approve both the June 4 and June 11 minutes."**

Commissioner Driscoll seconded the motion.

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

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS**

Vice-Chairman Vogel indicated that items FP-96-114 and FPP-96-48 had been pulled from the evening's agenda. In addition, the petitioner for item PP-96-132 had requested that this item be continued to the July 9 hearing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Whitaker) "Mr. Chairman, on item PP-96-132, Preliminary Plan for Pheasant Ridge Estates, I move that the item be tabled at this meeting and brought up at the next meeting."**

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

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

#### IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

##### **FPP-96-135 FINAL PLAT/PLAN--HILLVIEW COURT SUBDIVISION**

**Request for Final Plan/Plan approval for 6 duplex buildings (12 units) on approximately 2.26 acres of land with zoning of PR-4 (Planned Residential, 4 units per acre).**

**Petitioner: GNT Development Corp.**  
**Location: Hillview Drive, The Ridges**  
**Representative: Dan Garrison**

##### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Kathy Portner noted the site's location on maps provided and began by saying that the petitioner had reduced the density of the project from 16 to 12 units. A one-way looped road was proposed around a privately owned and maintained landscaped area in the center of the cul-de-sac. The drainage plan had been reconfigured, with drainage directed to the east and north over the street and to the proposed pedestrian easement along the east property line. Ms. Portner recalled the conditions of the Preliminary Plan approval, adding that the petitioner had completed many of the technical requirements. The remaining requirements would be completed prior to platting. She indicated that minor modifications in driveway configurations and landscape design may still take place, and only minor modifications were required on the plat.

Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Revise site plan to show that the 8-foot pedestrian path does not conflict with the electrical transformer.
2. Prior to receiving a building permit, the final design of the driveways must be approved by staff and shown on the site plan.
3. Prior to receiving a building permit, a revised landscape plan shall be submitted that meets or exceeds SSID specifications and Section 5-4-15 (Landscaping Standards) of the *Zoning and Development Code*. Revisions as noted on submitted plans will be required. At least 16 trees (4 existing and 12 new) will be required for the site. No landscape boulders shall be placed within 7.5 feet of either side of the sewer alignment in Tract A.
4. Proposed optional parking in the center of Tract A shall be at least 9 feet wide and 22 feet long per space.
5. "No Parking" signs shall be required along the one way looped road.
6. Other conditions of staff review shall be incorporated into the Final Plat and Plan prior to recordation.

##### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Driscoll asked if there was to be no pedestrian easement located along the southern portion of the property. Ms. Portner referred to the site plan and noted the two sections of easement located along the southern border. She pointed out that obstacles located on the property nearest the southeastern easement prohibited a completed connection to the southwest easement.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Dan Garrison, representing the petitioner, felt that staff recommendations were reasonable, outlined his intent to use natural colors and xeriscaping, and felt that the redesign had gone a long way in mitigating drainage. He indicated that all drainage water would be channeled away from residents in the Clusters development.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**FOR:**

There were no comments for the proposal.

**AGAINST:**

Ron Smith (397 Ridge Circle Drive, Grand Junction), a resident of the Clusters development, expressed opposition and felt that the Commission was unresponsive to their concerns.

**PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Mr. Garrison said that with regard to Mr. Smith's comment, quite the contrary was true. He said that the concerns and comments expressed by residents during the Preliminary Plan phase of approval had resulted in the complete redesigning of the drainage system. He reiterated that all runoff from the project would be handled on site, with no impact to residents of the Clusters development.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Halsey commented that it appeared the City Engineer was satisfied with the new drainage plan, and that the developer had redesigned the project to mitigate former concerns. He felt the developer had done a nice job with the site.

Commissioners Coleman and Whitaker agreed, with Commissioner Whitaker expressing approval for the lowered density.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-96-135, I move that we approve the Final Plan and Plat of the Hillview Court Subdivision with the conditions stated in the staff recommendations."**

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion.

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

**FPP-96-138 FINAL PLAT/PLAN--VALLEY MEADOWS EAST**

**Request for Final Plan/Plat approval for Filing #1 for 14 single family lots on 4.26 acres; Filing #2 for 12 single family lots and a 1.15 acre open space area on 4.51 acres; and an outlot of approximately 4.51 acres, all of which are zoned PR-2.93 (Planned Residential, 2.93 units per acre).**

**Petitioner: GWHC, Inc.**  
**Location: Northeast corner of 25 ½ Road and Grand Valley Canal**  
**Representative: Rolland Engineering**

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Kathy Portner pointed out the site's location on the map and briefly recalled that the Preliminary Plan approval had originally been denied. The petitioner appealed to the City Council and Council approved the plan with some major revisions. These changes included lowering the density to a PR-2.93 for 44 lots, with each of the lots having an area of approximately 10,000 square feet. Approval also included:

1. Accepting the offer of the five foot trail easement on the east side of the property and two lots of open space as being the open space requirement.
2. The remainder of the lot reduction to 44 lots to be divided among the remaining lots as the developer chooses.
3. Acceptance of staff recommendations 1. and 3. which deal with street naming and the location of F 3/4 Road.
4. Amend staff recommendation 2. to accept the developers offer of canal right-of-way to be deeded to the City.

The internal street configuration would be essentially the same; however, one access was eliminated and redesigned to be common open space. Since the primary open space is located in the center of the subdivision and should be inviting to all subdivision residents, staff recommended that privacy fencing not be allowed along the perimeter and accessways (to prevent a “boxed in” look and feel) and that fencing be uniform in design and materials.

Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. A note shall be included on the plat showing the location of the proposed F 3/4 Road to the north.
2. Fencing along the entire perimeter of the common open space area shall be limited to a maximum of 4 feet in height and shall be “open-type” fencing such as split rail or picket fencing. All fencing shall be uniform in type and design, to be approved by the Community Development Department and included in the covenants of the subdivision.
3. The 12-foot and 15-foot access points into the open space area shall include a 6-foot-wide concrete path with the remainder of the width being in gravel or similar ground cover. The two access points shall be clearly signed.
4. The final dedication language on the plats is subject to final approval by the Community Development Department.
5. The final landscaping and signage plan for the entry feature and common open space shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department.
6. The bulk requirements for the zone shall be as follows:

Principal structure:	Front yard setback	20 feet
	Rear yard setback	30 feet
	Side yard setback	15 feet
Accessory structure: (on rear half of property)	Rear yard setback	3 feet
	Side yard setback	3 feet
Max. structure height:	32 feet	

### **QUESTIONS**

With regard to the 5-foot easement dedication along the eastern boundary, Commissioner Halsey asked whether the adjacent property owners to the east had also dedicated 5 feet. Ms. Portner answered that this hadn't been done yet, but that discussions were underway and it looked promising.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if there were projects with similar central open space to this which could be used for comparison. Ms. Portner said that the closest comparison would be that of Niagara Village. She said that the current proposal's design for access to the open space area wasn't ideal because it lacked significant frontage.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if the Code addressed similar situations, to which Ms. Portner said that it didn't specifically.

Commissioner Halsey asked if there had been any Council discussions on signage of the access points. Ms. Portner said that the access points would be clearly signed.

Commissioner Whitaker wondered if additional accesses to the open space area should be added. Ms. Portner said that, during discussions, the developer had indicated that any additional accesses would significantly decrease adjacent lot sizes.

### **PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Tom Rolland, representing the petitioner, said that Council's requirements created an additional 37,000 feet of open space. He felt that two accesses to the common open space area were sufficient; two more accesses would impact an additional four lots. The open space, he continued, would be developed with grass, trees and appropriate signage. Mr. Rolland agreed to comply with staff requirements but asked for reconsideration of the fencing requirement. He felt that limiting residents to only one type of fencing would be too restrictive and would preclude any privacy. He asked the Commission to allow residents the option of building privacy fencing, if desired, but that the fencing be restricted to no more than 4 feet in height.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Driscoll asked if the petitioner had considered other options for placement of the open space. Mr. Rolland said that they had considered placing the open space in the southeast portion of the property but that it wouldn't have been a safe location for small children. In addition, it would not have facilitated all of the drainage concerns and wouldn't have been developed until Phase 3. The current placement, he continued, had the added benefit of saved street and sewer costs.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

#### **FOR:**

Brian Mahoney (2567 G Road, Grand Junction), a resident living near the development, said that the petitioner had attended neighborhood meetings and was genuinely interested in mitigating concerns. He expressed approval for the final plan and was especially pleased with the inclusion of trails. He felt that the plan would preserve the more rural atmosphere of the area and hoped other developers would follow suit. He said that he and other neighbors were in favor of the more centralized open space, since it afforded parents the opportunity of keeping an eye on their children. He expressed no strong opinions for the type of fencing to be used.

Walid Boumatar (677 - 25 ½ Road, Grand Junction) thought the project was nicely designed but was concerned over the lack of vehicular access to the park in case of emergencies.

Alan and Bernadine Sherman (2570 Young Court, Grand Junction), owners of property to the east of the subject property, wanted to know the timetable for Filing 3. They had been present during the City Council's hearing of this item and understood that a fence had been approved for installation along the east property line. When would this be installed? Mr. Sherman also wondered when the open ditch would be turned over to the City. Ms. Portner, who had a copy of City Council's minutes on the proposal, said that she would review them and respond to Mr. and Mrs. Sherman's concerns before closure of the item.

Margie Blair (2545 Moonridge Drive, Grand Junction) spoke in favor of the plan and acknowledged the petitioner's accommodation of neighborhood concerns.

**AGAINST:**

There were no comments against the proposal.

**PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

(Mr. Rolland submitted his copy of Council minutes to Ms. Portner and highlighted sections referencing discussions over the fence.) Ms. Portner read that a 6-foot high chain link fence had been discussed by Council members but that it had not been made a requirement in the motion. Council referenced installation of the fence in conjunction with Phase 3. Ms. Portner said that since the fence had been a Planning Commission requirement during the Preliminary Plan stage, and since Council had not reverted the condition, the installation of the fence should still be considered a requirement. Mr. Rolland said that he was not opposed to the installation of this fence during Phase 3. He recalled the evolution of the 5-foot trail easement to the east, saying that the neighbors had asked for it, although he was unsure who would be donating the additional 5 feet. With regard to the ditch, he noted the various ditch locations, saying that the particular ditch referred to by Mr. Sherman did not belong to the petitioner; thus, they had no authority over it nor was it their responsibility to maintain it. He indicated that they'd expressed an interest in abandoning the ditches altogether and installing pumps, but that the Grand Valley Canal Company had said that to do so would require approval from all of the property owners.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Whitaker asked where the water would be coming from and how would it be conveyed. Mr. Rolland said that they would be getting water from the irrigation ditch (location noted) which needed repairs, and which they would help maintain. He said that no water for the property would be received via the ditch referred to by Mr. Sherman on the east side of the property.

Vice-Chairman Vogel commented that there should be some uniformity in fencing along the open space perimeter. Mr. Rolland said that he wanted to be able to preserve the privacy of individual homeowners, and he felt that a 4-foot-high privacy fence would do this while addressing staff's requirement for uniformity.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Driscoll asked if there would be removable barriers at the entrances to the open space. Ms. Portner said that they were not proposed, although this could be made a requirement by the Commission.

Commissioner Halsey expressed agreement with staff's recommendation on fencing, but Commissioner Whitaker felt it important for people to be given the choice.

Commissioner Coleman noted a similar situation in the Lamplite Subdivision where 6-foot privacy fences had been built. The result was the "boxed in" look and feel referred to by staff and the lack of any residents using the open space.

Commissioner Halsey said that whatever requirement was approved should be included in the covenants.

Commissioner Driscoll felt that the “open-type” fencing was good and felt that buffering could be added via additional landscaping. He also thought there should be a removable access barrier.

General discussion ensued over the practicality of the access barrier. Commissioner Halsey noted that when approved for other projects, they had been designed more for public rather than neighborhood access.

Commissioner Coleman suggested including bollards at each entrance. Mr. Rolland agreed to add a bollard at each access point.

Commissioner Driscoll suggested adding the removable barrier as an amendment to staff condition 3.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) “Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-96-138, I move that we approve the Final Plan and Plat for Filings #1 and #2, subject to staff conditions 1. through 5. and 6., as modified this evening.”**

The motion died for lack of a second.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) “Mr. Chairman, I’d move for approval of FPP-96-138, with conditions 1. through 6., with the modification of bulk requirement for principal structures as noted by staff, and with the amendment of condition 3., that some sort of removable barrier be placed at both access points into the open space.”**

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Whitaker opposing.

**MS-96-131 MINOR SUBDIVISION--RICHARDSON**

**Request for a two lot minor subdivision of 1831 and 1835 David Street in an RMF-16 (Residential Multi-Family with a density not to exceed 16 units per acre) zone district.**

**Petitioner: Lynette Richardson  
Location: 1831 and 1835 David Street  
Representative: Cecil Caster**

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Kristen Ashbeck presented a brief overview of the proposal. The subject parcel currently has two duplex units on it. The proposal did not include any additional structures. To meet side yard setbacks, the petitioner would have to relocate or remove the attached storage sheds, prior to recording the plat, which she has agreed to do. With no other outstanding issues, staff recommended approval.

**PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

The petitioner offered no further comment.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Halsey felt the item to be straightforward, with no outstanding issues.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) “Mr. Chairman, on item MS-96-131, I move that we approve the Richardson Minor Subdivision.”**

Commissioner Whitaker seconded the motion.

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

**PDR-96-139 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW--1305 GLENWOOD AVENUE  
Request for approval of an amendment to an approved Planned Business zone to allow construction of a parking lot at 1305 Glenwood Avenue**

**Petitioner: King Enterprises  
Location: 1305 Glenwood Avenue  
Representative: Wilco Construction**

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Kathy Portner passed out copies of a revised staff review to commissioners. She noted the site plan and briefly outlined the history of the site and previous approvals. The proposal called for parking in both the front and rear portions of the property; however, staff was concerned that by allowing parking in the front, it would significantly diminish the residential character of the property. In addition, some of the maneuvering of vehicles in the proposed front parking lot would be in the right-of-way which was not generally allowed for new projects. Staff recommended no more than four spaces be allowed in the front, but suggested that the Commission discuss this issue and determine the appropriateness of allowing front yard parking.

Staff recommended approval subject to the following recommendations:

1. The wood fence along the east property line shall be no higher than 2.5 feet in the front 15 feet of the lots. The remainder of the fence shall be at least 4 feet high.
2. A maximum of four parking spaces shall be provided in front of the building. The spaces and aisle dimensions shall be in conformance with *Code* requirements and shall be paved and striped.
3. All portions of the front yard area, between the building and the street, shall be landscaped, including the right-of-way behind the curb.
4. The two mature trees on site shall be preserved. Two additional trees shall be provided in the front area.
5. A maximum of 10 parking spaces shall be provided to the rear of the building. In addition to the area around the building proposed for landscaping, the southeast corner of the lot, equal to the size of a parking stall, shall be landscaped and include one tree and the required 40 percent shrub coverage.
6. All landscaped areas must comply with Section 5-4-14 (Landscaping Standards) of the *Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code*. All landscaped areas shall be served by an underground, pressurized irrigation system.
7. All landscaping shall be protected with bumper guards or a 6-inch curb.



8. A drainage fee will be required.
9. A Power of Attorney for future alley improvements will be required.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Driscoll understood that people were generally discouraged from installing improvements in a right-of-way and wondered why staff was requiring them in condition 3. Ms. Portner answered that *Code* required that unused right-of-way be landscaped. A revocable permit would be issued putting the owners on notice that if the right-of-way were needed in the future, the landscaping would be removed; thus, staff recommended against the installation of extensive landscaping.

Commissioner Halsey asked about the continuation of sidewalk along that side of the street. Ms. Portner said that it was “spotty” and did not extend the entire length of the street.

Commissioner Whitaker asked if installation of the sidewalk had been a requirement for the original approval, to which Ms. Portner replied affirmatively.

### **PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

Tom Logue, representing the petitioner, provided a brief history of the business. He said that the front parking area would be for salesmen and tenants, while the rear parking area would be used primarily for staff. He pointed out that when Mesa State College was in session, on-street parking was virtually non-existent. The petitioner agreed to comply with staff conditions but asked that the Commission allow the front yard parking.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Halsey asked how many employees there were for the business, to which Mr. Logue replied there were four. Commissioner Halsey asked if the business had any signage on the property, to which Mr. Logue responded that there wasn’t any presently on site.

Commissioner Whitaker asked if the number of rear parking spaces could adequately accommodate both staff and visitors, to which Mr. Logue said that they could.

Commissioner Coleman wanted to see the sidewalk along Glenwood constructed. Mr. Logue said that if constructed in front of the subject property, it would not connect with any other adjacent sidewalk. He proposed paving to the rear curb line and striping, which would provide a hard pedestrian surface.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the proposal; however, Kathy Portner said that a phone call had been received by staff from Danna Schelhaas (1240 Glenwood Avenue, Grand Junction), who really wanted parking to be limited in the front yard to allow for landscaping in character with the surrounding residential area.

### **DISCUSSION**

Kathy Portner felt that paving and striping would be an unacceptable alternative to the sidewalk, but asked for the City Development Engineer’s input. Jody Kliska concurred with Community Development’s assessment. Ms. Portner said that the sidewalk was a part of the original approval and she found no evidence that the requirement had been later rescinded.

Vice-Chairman Vogel acknowledged that angled parking was contrary to the residential character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Halsey asked if a sign, similar in size to that of a home occupation, might be allowed, to give visitors an additional visual indication that a business was located there. Ms. Portner said that this could be made a condition of any approval, adding that a home occupation sign was limited to 2 square feet in size.

Commissioner Whitaker expressed concern that allowing the front yard parking could set an unwelcome precedent for future requests. He felt the front parking should be eliminated entirely but wanted to see the sidewalk installed.

Commissioner Halsey agreed, adding that the 10 rear spaces seemed more than adequate to handle both staff and visitors. He was concerned that past site activities had not been monitored nor former conditions enforced. He felt that there should be an allowance made for a 2 square foot sign.

Vice-Chairman Vogel also acknowledged the lack of maneuvering room for vehicles wanting to park in the front and agreed that the front parking area should be eliminated.

Commissioner Coleman wondered if a horseshoe-designed driveway would be more appropriate, since it would ensure access/parking but on a more residential scale. General discussion ensued over allowing a more “residentially-designed” driveway to exit from an existing curb cut. Ms. Portner said that for business uses, the *Code* did not allow for backing into the right-of-way.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) “Mr. Chairman, on item PDR-96-139, I move that we approve the amended plan subject to the conditions and staff recommendations 1. and 3. through 9., but changing 2. to be, ‘Parking shall be a concrete pad not to exceed 12 feet wide in the northeast corner where the existing curb cut exists.’, and adding a condition 10., ‘Allow a 2 square foot, non-illuminating sign.’ and add a condition 11., ‘The sidewalk shall be constructed to the appropriate City standards.’”**

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion.

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

## **V. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Kathy Portner asked for commissioners to apprise her of any conflicting meeting times in July and August.

The hearing was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.