

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing June 7, 1994
7:02 p.m. - 9:01 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman John Elmer at 7:02 p.m. in the City County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Chairman John Elmer, Ron Halsey, Bob Withers, Jeff Vogel, Thomas Volkmann, Stephen Laiche, and James Anderson, who excused himself from the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Larry Timm, Director; Dave Thornton, Senior Planner; and Michael Drollinger, Senior Planner.

John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney, and Jody Kliska, City Development Engineer, were also present.

There were 23 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, I move we accept the minutes of the May 3 meeting as prepared."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Withers.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0. Commissioner Anderson was present for this vote.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

Chairman Elmer announced that the Board had received a letter of resignation from Commissioner James Anderson who was moving out of the City. Chairman Elmer thanked Commissioner Anderson for his commitment to the planning commission. Commissioner Anderson responded, "I have never served on a commission with such an amiable and yet challenging group of men, and I appreciate the time that I've spent here. And for the staff of the City, I appreciate all of the help they have given. They have just bent over backwards to help me." Commissioner Anderson then excused himself from the meeting, since there was a quorum.

Chairman Elmer announced that two items had been pulled from the agenda at the request of the petitioners: Item #86-94 PRELIMINARY PLAN/PLAT - SUNDANCE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION; and Item #87-94 PRELIMINARY PLAN/PLAT - MICHAELA'S VILLAGE.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

- 1. #74-94 FINAL PLAT/PLAN - SOUTH RIM, FILING #2**
Request for approval of a Final Plat/Plan for South Rim, Filing #2 for 45 single family lots on 16.9 acres with zoning of PR-2.7 (Planned Residential, 2.7 units per acre).
PETITIONER: Lowe Development Corporation
LOCATION: South Rim Drive
REPRESENTATIVE: Tom Logue
CITY STAFF: Michael Drollinger

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger gave an overview of the request. He said the original ODP was approved by the County prior to the City annexing the property. He said that as part of Phase 2, the applicant would be improving South Rim Drive from 23 Road into the development. Mr. Drollinger said that the applicant had responded satisfactorily to all of staff's comments and that staff recommended approval. He asked that the planning commission motion include approval of a revised ODP since a revised ODP had been submitted to reflect changes which were a condition of the annexation agreement.

Chairman Elmer asked if South Rim Drive would be paved only to the end of Filing 2 or if "the whole loop" would be paved. Mr. Drollinger pointed out the appropriate section on the map.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, 227 S. 9th, representative for the petitioner, said that Filing 1 and the original ODP had been processed through the County. He said that the County had approved Phase 1 with conditions in accordance with the requirements of the City of Grand Junction. He said the first phase, consisting of 22 sites, had been "extremely successful" and that almost all of the lots had been sold and many were already being built upon.

Chairman Elmer asked how sewer would be provided to the lower lots. Mr. Logue said that the plan called for the construction of a lift station along the easterly edge of the property which would be pumped back to the gravity system in South Rim Drive. He said the petitioner would construct the lift station in the next phase and was coordinating with the City in the construction of a regionalized lift station. He said that ideally there would be a single large lift station operated by the City

Chairman Elmer said he was concerned that some of the lots around Promontory Court encroached onto the road. Mr. Logue said that at one time the County had excavated pit run

on the property. He said the edge of the right-of-way was 75' from the vertical bank where gravel had been extracted and would be "ideally suited" for a walk-out designed home.

Chairman Elmer asked if a geotechnical report had been prepared which outlined the hazards, and Mr. Logue said that the subsurface soils investigation recommendations had been incorporated into the covenants, as well as architectural guidelines.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer said that the lots would be purchased for the view and that the site looked down over an industrial area. He wanted it clear for the record that visual easements were not being granted and that home owners "do not have a right over these areas for what they see." Chairman Elmer was concerned that when a business in the industrial area wished to expand, a homeowner in the development would complain.

MOTION: (Commissioner Laiche) "Mr. Chairman, on item #74-94, Request for Final Approval and Plat and Revised ODP, I move the application be approved subject to compliance with all review comments."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Withers.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

- 2. #83-94 MINOR SUBDIVISION - TROLLEY PARK**
Request for approval of a Minor Subdivision of Trolley Park, a commercial development located at 552 25 Road.
PETITIONER: Steve & Bobette McCallum
LOCATION: 552 25 Road
REPRESENTATIVE: Robert Engelke
CITY STAFF: Dave Thornton

STAFF PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton gave an overview of the request. He said the current zoning was commercial and that the site "was built-out." He said the petitioner was requesting that the lot be divided into four lots and three common tracts. One of the common tracts would be a private drive which was approved as part of preliminary approval in 1992. Mr. Thornton said that "the way the site works today will be the same as it will work tomorrow, assuming approval, so nothing's really changing, other than the fact that they're dividing (the parcel) into separate parcels which could be sold to separate owners."

Mr. Thornton said staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The existing landscaped area along 25 Road be dedicated as a common tract, to be maintained by all lot owners, not just lot 1.
2. The fire flow issue be resolved with the Fire Department and all required improvements be built prior to recording the plat.
3. All other required changes on the plat be made prior to recording the plat.

Chairman Elmer asked if the water line issue had been resolved, and Mr. Thornton said it "was being worked out," and that the petitioner had stated "they will do whatever is needed to resolve that."

Chairman Elmer questioned "invitees onto the site" as related to ingress and egress. He asked if police/fire personnel would need to be invited onto the property. John Shaver said that "invitee" was "leftover from some of the English common law pertaining to real property," and referred to persons on the property for lawful purposes.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Steve McCallum, petitioner, thanked staff for their help and said he had addressed all of staff's concerns. He said the landscaping area would be a common lot, that the fire flow issue had been resolved with Ken Johnson, Grand Junction Fire Department, and changes on the plat would be made. He said that the road would remain a private drive with access granted to utility and service providers with maintenance to be outlined in the covenants.

Chairman Elmer asked if any parking deficiencies were being created due to the common lot area. Mr. Thornton responded the proposal didn't change anything as far as Code requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

The Planning Commission had no further questions or discussion.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item #83-94 Trolley Park Minor Subdivision, I move we approve this subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Halsey.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

- 3. #85-94 PRELIMINARY PLAN/PLAT - GRAND VIEW SUBDIVISION**
Request for approval of the Preliminary Plan & Plat for Grand View Subdivision located at 28 Road and F-1/4 Road for 200 single family residential lots on a 66.7 acre site for an overall density of approximately 3 units per acre.
PETITIONER: Ben Carnes & Discovery 76 Corp.
LOCATION: 28 Road and F-1/4 Road
REPRESENTATIVE: Tom Logue
CITY STAFF: Michael Drollinger

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger gave an overview of the request. He said that a portion of the property was still in the County, but it was in the process of being annexed. He said the zoning was currently split, with the City part zoned RSF-5 and the County section zoned PR-12.5. He said the annexation and subsequent rezoning would result in the entire parcel being zoned RSF-5. Mr. Drollinger said that the main access for the site would be via Ridge Drive and Hawthorne Road, which are existing streets west of the project, and that a number of stub streets were proposed.

Mr. Drollinger said that the applicant has responded to staff comments and that applicant has agreed to address the five issues staff had outlined in the staff report. Applicant has agreed to the construction of a landscape berm along 28 Road. Applicant was also aware that if the need for additional detention space caused "major modifications" to the plan, then an amended approval would be required before final. Applicant has also agreed to provide pedestrian easements to adjoining properties. Applicant agreed to relocate a private drive from 28 Road to Ridge Drive and provide an island cut. Applicant agreed to pursue obtaining the necessary right-of-way to extend a sidewalk on the north side of Ridge Drive to 28 Road. Mr. Drollinger said that staff recommended approval subject to the conditions contained in the staff report.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Withers asked if a traffic light were being proposed for 28 Road and Patterson. Jody Kliska said that a traffic study would be required for the final submittal and it would look at the matter of a light and address costs.

Chairman Elmer was concerned about a neighborhood park and asked if such a park would be required for either the Matchett property or this development. Mr. Drollinger said the applicant had indicated that the detention area in the southeast corner of the property would be developed with "passive recreation." Commissioner Withers asked if the area would be sufficient for both uses, and Jody Kliska said the matter would be looked at during the final submittal.

Commissioner Withers asked if mosquito abatement had been addressed. Jody Kliska said it hadn't

been discussed.

Chairman Elmer asked if the Parks Master Plan commented on establishing neighborhood parks. Mr. Thornton said that the Master Plan specified the area for a regional park and that a neighborhood park was also needed. He said the City was a review agency for the Matchett property being considered for development within the County.

Chairman Elmer questioned the matter of the Cortland Avenue right-of-way. Mr. Thornton said that he wasn't aware of a proposal to have Cortland Avenue go through since it would require a house to be removed. He said staff felt F-1/2 Road would be a better corridor to 29 Road.

Commissioner Vogel said that the Parks and Recreation Department had suggested five acres for a park, but Mr. Drollinger said that it was not a requirement of the zone to set aside that amount of open space. Mr. Thornton said that there would be a neighborhood park in the vicinity if the Matchett proposal was approved. Commissioner Vogel suggested that there be access and pedestrian paths between the proposal and any such park.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representative for the petitioner, said that the development would contain four to five phases. He said the need for a signal would be analyzed on a phase-by-phase basis. He said the proposal included some widening along the 28 Road frontage which would be deducted from the transportation impact fee. Mr. Logue said such a deduction would still "leave a balance owing" which the petitioner hoped could be contributed to such a signal if it were needed. He said the traffic analysis would be submitted with the first phase, and the open space would be included in the first phase. Mr. Logue said he had discussed the matter of a park with Mr. Hobbs; it had been suggested that a portion of the park be from the Grand View subdivision and a portion from the Matchett property. The final proposal was for the park to be entirely on the Matchett property.

Mr. Logue said the proposed open space was located so as to provide a buffer between the proposal and the multi-family housing proposed for the adjacent portion of the Matchett property. He said the irrigation water stored in the pond would be "flow through" so mosquito abatement would not be a problem.

Regarding Cortland Avenue, Mr. Logue said the street might eventually be realigned further to the north. He said the north area of the property would be the last phase developed and so plans could be modified in response to any changes in conditions.

Commissioner Halsey asked the size of the proposed pond/open space. Mr. Logue said the proposal called for approximately 3.1 acres of open space, although that figure included the

buffer space along 28 Road. He said the buffer strip would also act as a detention area since the

property was required to detain 100% of its flows and would not be permitted to pay a drainage impact fee.

Commissioner Vogel asked about the existing wash along 28 Road. Mr. Logue said the wash adjoined the parcel's south property line. He said the wash would remain open and unlined, with the homeowner's association being responsible for the stormwater system. He said that a maintenance road would remain for the Grand Valley Water Users Association and that a barrier curb would prevent a car from going into the wash.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following area residents spoke in opposition to the proposal:

Paul Burkes, 2956 Pheasant Run Circle; and Dan Lacey, 3310 Beechwood.

They expressed their concern about traffic impacts, future road plans, impact on area schools, and whether the proposal was compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.

Michael Drollinger said that a detailed traffic report required for final approval would address many of the audience members' traffic concerns. Dave Thornton said that this development did not propose to tie Ridge Drive to 27-1/2 Road, but such a situation might occur when the adjacent vacant land developed. He said that potentially F-1/2 Road could go from 27 Road to 32 Road. Chairman Elmer said that the school district commented that the middle school and high school were not at capacity, but that Orchard Avenue elementary was over capacity by 50 students and the proposal would add another 50 students. Commissioner Halsey said that Spring Valley had a density of 5 units/acre and so this proposal was compatible. Michael Drollinger explained that there would be a landscaped berm and another roadway between the front of proposed residences and 28 Road.

Tom Logue, in his rebuttal, said that the proposed average home price would be approximately \$150,000. He said that the school district was aware of the proposal and that since the project was being phased, all 50 students would most likely not be going to the elementary school during the first year, which would give the school district time to respond appropriately.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer said that Spring Valley had lot sizes of 10,000-13,000 square feet, while this proposal had lots of 8,000-12,000 square feet, so he felt it was compatible. He felt that the school issue had to be addressed at "a different level" but pointed out that the development proposed half the number of units as the parcel was originally zoned for, so it was to the school district's benefit to lessen the impact. He said he was concerned that the area needed a neighborhood park and felt that if such a park did not end up being located on the Matchett property, then the pond area should be "looked at." He asked that staff look at the Parks Master Plan to see if such a site would be in conformance.

Commissioner Volkmann asked if the parks issue could be "revisited" at final if a park on the Matchett property did not develop as envisioned. Dave Thornton said that preliminary approval suggested a "yes vote" to the developer. Chairman Elmer felt that three lots for a park wouldn't change the overall plan significantly.

Chairman Elmer said that Spring Valley residents would object to additional traffic going through their subdivision, and Jody Kliska said that traffic would tend to stay on 28 Road rather than go through a subdivision. She said staff proposed lining up the roads to prevent left turn conflicts.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #85-94, a request for preliminary approval of the plat, I move that the application be approved subject to the conditions of the staff report."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laiche.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

1. #82-94 REZONE FROM RMF-32 TO C-2 - NORTH SIDE OF HILL AVENUE & EAST OF 1ST STREET

Request for a recommendation of approval for rezone from RMF-32 (Residential Multi-family, 32 units per acre) to C-2 (Heavy Commercial) for 4 lots located on the north side of Hill Avenue between 1st and 2nd Streets.

PETITIONER: James & Earl Fuoco

LOCATION: Lots 15-18, Block 33, City of Grand Junction

REPRESENTATIVE: Jim Fuoco

CITY STAFF: Michael Drollinger

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger gave an overview of the request. He said that each of the four lots was 25'x150' for a total square footage of 15,000. He said the property was currently being used for vehicle storage which was a non-conforming use. He said that to the north and east of the subject parcel were residential uses while to the south and west were commercial uses. The petitioner proposed that the current use as a storage lot continue but that the area to be rezoned also be available for building expansion. Mr. Drollinger said there was no comprehensive plan for the area, but the Downtown Residential Neighborhood Guidelines discouraged encroachment of non-residential uses into existing residential areas. Mr. Drollinger said that staff recommended denial since the request was not supported by the rezoning criteria. He said staff felt the uses allowed in a commercial zone would conflict with the existing residential neighborhood.

Mr. Drollinger said that if the commission did support a rezone, staff recommended a partial rezone of the property for only that portion needed for the building expansion, conditioned that any kind of building expansion or storage area be screened from adjacent residential property

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey said he was concerned about allowing a nonconforming use to continue. Michael Drollinger said there were "limited things you could do" if it were a continuing non-conforming use that was not proposed to be changed.

Chairman Elmer asked how such requirements could be placed in a straight zone, rather than a planned zone. John Shaver said that it was appropriate to make them conditions of approval of a rezone.

The Planning Commission questioned the location of commercial uses along 1st Street, and Mr. Drollinger said that generally they extended to mid-block between 1st Street and 2nd Street.

Commissioner Laiche questioned how much area staff recommended for a partial rezone. Mr. Drollinger said it would need to be defined based on the proposed expansion. He said the current request was for 2,000 square feet which could perhaps be contained on one lot.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

James Fuoco, petitioner, said his family bought the property 65 years ago. He said he was "under the gun from the PUC to have a fenced lot" to store cars awaiting repairs. He said he'd just spent \$100,000 on a new paint booth and fire suppression equipment. He said dust control was critical for car painting so he couldn't "pick this operation up and go someplace else." He said he wanted to fence the entire property with a chain link fence with security fencing along the top. Mr. Fuoco said that the surrounding area was predominantly commercial. He said he was a "good neighbor."

Mr. Fuoco said that he wanted to build a new office for estimating repairs on the southwest corner of 1st Street and Hill Avenue, which was presently a parking lot. He said on the east side of the property he wanted to build a containment building for the new car painting equipment he had purchased.

Commissioner Laiche asked how much space the petitioner would need for a partial rezone. Mr. Fuoco said he didn't feel it "would work" since he needed 50' for the building, as well as storage and vehicular movement around the parcel.

Commissioner Laiche asked if the neighbor to the east had expressed any objection to the proposal. Mr. Drollinger said he was not contacted by any property owner.

Commissioner Laiche asked how high the fence would need to be, and Mr. Fuoco said it would need to be 5'-6'. Commissioner Withers felt the petitioner's fence would be "an improvement to what she (the neighbor) has up there now." Commissioner Halsey asked if the fence could be put up without the property being rezoned. Dave Thornton said it could be put up as long as it met the requirements of the RMF-32 zone.

Chairman Elmer told the petitioner that the Planning Commission's concern was that if the petitioner were to move from the property the zoning would remain, and a new owner could use the property for a use incompatible with a residential neighborhood without a public hearing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either in favor or opposition.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Laiche asked if only two lots were rezoned, would the cars and fence be a conforming use. Dave Thornton said the fence would be allowed, but the question was "what use is the fence trying to hide." Commissioner Laiche asked if a rider could be placed on the approval tying it to the petitioner owning the property. Chairman Elmer said that such a stipulation would require a planned zone.

Commissioner Laiche asked if staff had received any complaints, and Mr. Drollinger said he had received phone calls inquiring about the application, however he had not received any written comments.

Chairman Elmer said he was initially concerned about encroaching on residential areas, but he said "we essentially have this buffer problem all the way up along 1st Street, residential against commercial. I don't think we're creating anything unique." He said he didn't consider it a "spot zone." He felt the problem of potential new uses was common to all property on 1st Street. He said landscaping should be limited since "trees are not compatible with new paint jobs."

Commissioner Withers felt that the commercial property in the area was in better condition than the residential properties.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item #82-94, a request to rezone to C-2, I move that we approve the petitioner's request and forward it on to City Council subject to #2 and #3 of staff comments."

Staff Comments (File #82-94):

2. The building expansion and vehicle storage area should be screened from adjacent residential property with both a privacy fence and landscaping.
3. If approved, the applicant will need to obtain site plan approval prior to the construction of a building addition.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laiche.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Halsey opposed.

2. **#84-94 REZONE FROM C-2 TO B-3 - ST. REGIS HOTEL**
Request for a recommendation of approval for rezoning of the St. Regis Hotel from C-2 (Heavy Commercial) to B-3 (Retail Business).
PETITIONER: Harley Nelson
LOCATION: 359 Colorado Avenue
REPRESENTATIVE: Harley Nelson
CITY STAFF: Michael Drollinger

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger presented an overview of the request. He said that the petitioner wished to convert the upper floors of the existing building to residential use which was not an allowed use in the C-2 zone. He said a recent text amendment, to become effective July 1, would revise the Use Zone Matrix to allow residential uses in the B-3 zone on upper floors. Hence, the petitioner wished to rezone his property from C-2 to B-3. He said the petitioner had returned an executed copy of the permit and so all of staff's concerns had been met. Mr. Drollinger said staff recommended approval.

Commissioner Withers asked if the text amendment would include life safety issues. John Shaver said he didn't recall specific language, but it would be subject to Uniform Building Code and Fire Code requirements.

Chairman Elmer questioned if the proposal would use public parking and Mr. Drollinger said that it would.

Commissioner Withers asked if it were appropriate to consider the proposal before the text amendment had become effective. John Shaver said that the amendment had already gone through the public hearing process and was just waiting for the statutory time to elapse.

Commissioner Vogel asked if the text amendment specified how many floors above the main level could be used for residences. Larry Timm said the amendment was for existing structures only and that additional levels could not be added on.

Chairman Elmer said he was concerned about the safety of residents' cars parked in public lots overnight. Mr. Shaver said the determination was made that the zone would be subject to downtown parking requirements. Larry Timm said that parking availability would not be a problem, but the safety issue had not been addressed. He said he felt it was a "marketing" problem for the owner.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Harley Nelson, petitioner, said that he planned to have 8 office units, his own private unit, and 4 residential uses in the upper level. He said 24 parking spaces had been designated for the upper floors. He said he hadn't designed uses for the east wing yet. He said there were 2 floors in the west wing of the building, and 3 floors on the Colorado Avenue side.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either in favor or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer asked if the plan was in compliance with the Downtown Plan. Mr. Drollinger said it was. Chairman Elmer felt the proposal was "in line with the historic use" and was a "good idea."

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item #84-94, a request to rezone property located at 359 Colorado Avenue from Heavy Commercial C-2 to Retail Business B-3, I move that we forward this item to City Council with a recommendation for approval."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Withers.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

3. **#77-94 ZONE OF ANNEXATION - DISCOVERY 76**
 - 1) **Request for approval for zoning of PR-10 Maximum (Planned Residential with a maximum density of 10 units per acre and neighborhood commercial development subject to certain restrictions to be established by the Planning Commission and City Council and on no more than 2.75 acres) for a 38.23 acre parcel of land currently**

being annexed by the City located East of 28 Road and North of Patterson Road, a part of the Discovery 76 annexation;

2) A request for approval of zoning of RSF-5 (Residential Single Family not to exceed five units per acre) for an approximately 57.5 acre parcel of land currently being annexed by the City located East of 28 Road and North of Patterson Road, a part of the Discovery 76 Annexation.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

LOCATION: E of 28 Road, N of Patterson Road

REPRESENTATIVE: Dave Thornton

STAFF PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton said that item 1 of the proposal had been pulled and that only item 2 would be considered. Mr. Thornton showed the affected parcels on a map. He said the City was suggesting a zoning of RSF-5 which was the same as the zoning of Spring Valley and adjoining areas already within the City limits.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either in favor or opposition.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey said it was "clear cut" and the same as adjoining properties. Chairman Elmer agreed it was a "good idea."

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item #77-94 a request for approval of zoning of RSF-5 for an approximately 57.5 acre parcel, I move we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Halsey.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

4. #1-94(H) TEXT AMENDMENT - PARKING AREA LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING

Request for approval of a text amendment to add a new Section 5-5.1.G of the Zoning and Development Code pertaining to standards for the landscaping and lighting of non-residential parking areas.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

REPRESENTATIVE: Michael Drollinger

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger presented an overview of the request. He said the amendment was to add

standards for lighting and landscaping for parking lots for developments with 50 or more parking spaces. He said the adverse visual impact of large parking lots was caused by the fact that there was little landscaping, and presently the requirements were minimal. He said the amendment would improve visual impact, and improve pedestrian safety as well as vehicular circulation. He said staff felt 50 spaces was "a good break point" because smaller lots didn't have the same design considerations as lots with over 50 spaces.

Mr. Drollinger said the standards defined frontage, perimeter and interior landscaping and set forth standards for all three. He said there was a minimum number of trees and percentage of shrubs required, and encouragement to use native species and xeriscaping. He said planting islands with minimum dimensional standards would be required, and surface pavers would be required to better define pedestrian spaces. The standards would define height and intensity requirements for lighting.

Mr. Drollinger asked the commission to consider whether right-of-way landscaping would count toward the required general landscaping. He also asked the commission to consider whether street trees for each 40' of frontage should be required. He said overall landscaping requirements would be addressed as part of the comprehensive Code revisions to be done at a later time, but staff felt the issue was pressing since there would likely be a number of large developments in the near future. Staff recommended approval of the text amendment.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Withers asked if standards had been proposed for surface pavers to ensure they wouldn't "pop out." Mr. Drollinger said a design manual would be developed which would set forth standards for such things, as well as a prescribed list of plantings, height and width of curbs, etc. Chairman Elmer said it would be helpful to define "xeriscape" and also the word "extensive" in the phrase, "Extensive use of rocks is not permitted."

Commissioner Halsey felt it was important to include the staff comment that this landscaping would be in addition to the general landscaping regulations. Mr. Drollinger said there was still an outstanding issue if an applicant could get credit for proposing landscaping in a right-of-way, since there was the potential that the landscaping could be removed depending on street improvements. He said landscaping would not be prohibited in the right-of-way, but perhaps a revokable permit could be issued.

Chairman Elmer pointed out that if a business such as Wal-Mart or Teller Arms wished to expand, it would be very expensive to meet this requirement. Mr. Drollinger said that if it were only a partial expansion, then only a percentage of the parcel must be upgraded. Commissioner Withers asked if there would be some right of appeal. John Shaver said that the right of appeal was provided in the Code; a request for variance would probably be more appropriate, although it would be "fact specific depending on exactly what is being appealed." Mr. Drollinger said that if the

landscaping standard limited the function of the parking lot, there

was a statement in the regulations that allowed the administrator to permit a portion of the landscaping to be located near the perimeter or moved as appropriate.

Chairman Elmer asked if staff had received comments from landscapers. Mr. Drollinger said the draft would be circulated to landscape architects and ask them for suggestions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item #1-94H, I move we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of approval, and include the two additional items listed as "a" and "b" in the staff comments."

Staff Comments (File #1-94H):

- a. The following item could also be added to the ordinance: "Landscaping in the ROW does not count toward the required landscaping. The property owner is required to landscape the ROW in addition to the standards contained herein."
- b. Amend the general landscaping requirements to include the following: "One (1) street tree shall be provided for every forty (40) feet of street frontage where none presently exist. Wherever practical, street trees shall be located between the sidewalk and street and shall be irrigated by a pressurized, underground irrigation system."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Withers.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Chairman Elmer announced that a public hearing on the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan would be held June 30, 1994 at 7:00 p.m. at Intermountain Veterans Memorial Park.

Chairman Elmer asked if Commissioner Anderson would be replaced, and Larry Timm said that an ad would be placed and asked board members to let staff know if they wished to recommend anyone.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:01 p.m.