

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing - November 7, 1995
7:05 p.m. to 11:55 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled 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, Bob Withers, Tom Whitaker, and Paul Coleman.

In attendance, representing Planning Department staff, were: Kathy Portner (Planning Supervisor), Dave Thornton (Sr. Planner), Michael Drollinger (Sr. Planner), Kristen Ashbeck (Associate Planner), Bill Nebeker (Senior Planner) and Mike Pelletier (Associate Planner).

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 53 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the minutes from October 3 as submitted."

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

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

Chairman Elmer announced that the agenda had been split into two separate hearings. Item PP-95-179 had been pulled and item SUP-95-136 would be heard at the November 14 hearing.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION

CUP-95-185 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT--RESIDENCE IN B-3 ZONE

Request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a residence in a B-3 (Retail Business) Zone District.

Petitioner: David Burt

Location: 811 White Avenue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker said that the single family residential use in a B-3 Zone would be brought into conformance with the Conditional Use Permit. With no issues outstanding, staff recommended approval with no conditions.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

The petitioner declined further comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER HALSEY) "Mr. Chairman, on CUP-95-185, I move that we approve this request."

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

FPA-95-183 FINAL PLAN AMENDMENT--COUNTRY CLUB TOWNHOMES

Request for approval of an amendment to an approved final plan for Country Club Townhomes.

PETITIONER: Sidney Gottlieb

LOCATION: Southeast corner of 27 and G Roads

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger indicated that the only change to the previous development approval was the addition of a retaining wall. Site drainages were also reviewed in conjunction with the retaining wall addition. With no issues outstanding, staff recommended approval.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike Best of Landesign, representing the petitioner, said that the request was made more to protect landscaping and patio additions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on FPA-95-183, a request for an Amended Final Plan approval for the Villas at Country Club located at the southeast corner of 12th Street and G Road, I move that we approve this application."

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

FPP-95-181 FINAL PLAT/PLAN--SOUTH RIM SUBDIVISION, FILING #4

Request for approval of the Final Plat/Plan for South Rim Subdivision, Filing #4, consisting of 15 single family residential lots on approximately 8.6 acres with zoning of PR-3.5 (Planned Residential with a density not to exceed 3.5 units per acre).

PETITIONER: David Behrhorst, Lowe Development Corp.

LOCATION: East end of South Rim Drive

REPRESENTATIVE: Landesign, LLC

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger pointed out the location of the subject property on the map provided. In his overview he indicated that a multi-use path would be constructed as part of this filing which will link Promontory Court with the existing multi-use path adjacent to the north of the project which is part of the river trail network. Staff recommended approval of the proposal.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Phil Hart, president of Landesign, offered no further comment.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked about the stability of the slopes and their relationship to the building envelopes. Mr. Hart said that there's a clearly defined line which could not be transgressed. Building envelopes would be kept on the approved side of that line and away from unstable slopes.

Chairman Elmer asked about bike path signage, which was explained by Mr. Drollinger.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR: Rudy Cook (522 Riverview Drive, Grand Junction) asked if any more grading work was planned. Mr. Hart replied that grading for the project was within approximately 10 percent of being completed. Mr. Cook asked about intended irrigation, to which Mr. Behrhorst replied that irrigation water would come from a pond using a pump, both to be located at the development entrance.

AGAINST: There were no comments against the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if the bike path would be paved. Mr. Hart replied affirmatively, elaborating that it would be constructed to City standards.

MOTION: (Commissioner Coleman) "Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-95-181, a request for final plat/plan approval for Filing #4, I move that the final plat/plan be approved."

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

FPP-95-182 FINAL PLAT/PLAN--VISTA DEL RIO, FILING #3

- 1. Request for approval of the Final Plan/Plat for Vista Del Rio, Filing #3 for 23 single family residential lots on 11.4 acres.**
- 2. Request for approval to amend the approved Preliminary Plan for Vista Del Rio**

PETITIONER: Steve Colony, Alpine C.M., Inc.

LOCATION: Rio Linda Lane & Redlands Parkway

REPRESENTATIVE: Nichols Associates, Inc.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger indicated the subject property on the map provided and gave a brief overview of the proposal. The petitioner is requesting that TCP credit be given by the City for road improvements made as part of County approval. Also, staff felt that there were physical constraints to construction of the proposed path, located on the west side of the roadway. Thus, the elimination of the path requirement was recommended. Mr. Drollinger said that the petitioner had indicated a desire to build duplexes on the Filing #4 property only. With the majority of other technical issues resolved, staff recommended approval, subject to the following conditions:

1. Elimination of the multi-use path proposal (as required by the County) to be replaced by the following: connections from the existing multi-use path on the east side of the Redlands Parkway to the eastern edge of pavement of Redlands Parkway on both the north and south sides of Rio Linda Lane (aligning with the sidewalks and roadway edge) as further described in the staff report.
2. Modification of the Preliminary Plan for the subdivision to indicate two proposed building lots in Filing #4.

QUESTIONS

Clarification was given by Mr. Drollinger on the location of the culverts. When asked, staff did not express opposition to the building of duplexes in Filing #4. Traffic Impact Fees were being reviewed by the Public Works Director.

Chairman Elmer asked about sight distance problems, to which Eric Marquez, representing the petitioner, responded that they had tried to resolve any specific concerns in Filing #1 by cutting back the slopes and revegetating.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Eric Marquez of Nichols Associates, Inc. offered no further comment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR: There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

Judy Bowman (560 Rio Oso Lane, Grand Junction) was very upset over what she felt were last minute attempts by the petitioner to take away amenities which had been promised, namely the sidewalk/bike path. She wanted the sidewalk requirement to be left intact and expressed vehement opposition to the inclusion of duplexes anywhere on the property.

George Narvez (562 Rio Oso Lane, Grand Junction) asked Commissioners if they intended to deviate from the County's requirements. He complained that construction created an inordinate amount of dust and that weeds were not kept under control on the property. He also expressed opposition to any plans for construction of duplexes on any portion of the property.

Mr. Drollinger explained the safety aspects of staff's recommendation to eliminate the sidewalk. John Shaver added that in matters of dust and weed control, Mr. Narvez should contact Grand Junction's Zoning Enforcement Division.

Randy Shore (2284 Rio Linda Lane) questioned the setback requirements. He felt that the City's setback requirements were less stringent than the County's; he expressed concern over possible inadequate buffering between his property and the developer's property. He was also opposed to the elimination of the sidewalk and the inclusion of duplexes.

Mr. Drollinger read from the County's approved setback requirements and noted that based on the layout of the two properties in question, City setback requirements would either be met or exceeded by the petitioner.

Paul Bowman (560 Rio Oso Lane, Grand Junction) expressed opposition to the elimination of the sidewalk, the inclusion of duplexes and the problems currently experienced with dust and weeds.

Hank Drake (555 Bluff Court, Grand Junction) asked if the zoning would allow duplexes on the property. Mr. Drollinger replied that the density allowance would allow such structures; however, the zoning itself didn't specify whether duplexes would or wouldn't be allowed.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Eric Marquez reminded the Commission and citizens that the current development proposal was much lower in density than what was allowed. He said that with regard to sight distance, nothing would be gained by pulling the slope back, that vertical sight distance considerations should also be given. He said that the "weeds" to which citizens referred was native vegetation which had been approved by the County.

Commissioner Withers asked if earlier proposals included multi-family dwellings. Mr. Marquez replied affirmatively.

Kevin Nourse (580 - 23 Road, Grand Junction), Alpine CM, considered the bike path/sidewalk an off site improvement. He would agree to go ahead with its construction but felt that he should be given DIF credit and the City should assume liability for it. He felt the path may be impractical and unsafe.

Mr. Nourse added that a traffic study had been conducted by RG Consulting Engineers, Inc. (a Denver-based company) and that their determination was that the subdivision would not impact the Redlands Parkway. He said that concessions had already been made and elaborated briefly on specifics. He acknowledged flexibility in his initial request for the inclusion of duplexes, saying that it had been a "first response," and he didn't object to staying with single family structures. He felt that the dust referred to by Mr. Narvez was created as a result of machinery which was there to keep weeds under control. Mr. Nourse said that the County had originally intended to widen the Redlands Parkway; thus, he thought that setback requirements were different along the Parkway.

QUESTIONS

When asked if there was a difference in the connotation of a bike path versus a sidewalk, Mr. Nourse said that it was the same thing. There was extensive discussion involving Commissioners and Mr. Nourse over the safety aspects of the path and the hazards of crossing the Redlands Parkway. Mr. Shaver and Chairman Elmer both referred to the Dolan-Tigard case, feeling that since the improvement was off-site, there was no way that the City could force the improvement cost and liability onto the petitioner or developer. Mr. Shaver didn't feel that evidence had been presented which demonstrated that this development should be required to bear the cost; enforcement would be questionable from a legal perspective given the lack of evidence.

When asked to clarify requirements for a signal light, Ms. Kliska expounded on several of the criteria used to evaluate the need for a signal.

Chairman Elmer asked why consideration for Filing #4 plans were even being reviewed at this time. Mr. Drollinger said that the petitioner wanted to gauge Commission and staff response to his expressed intentions. This was also designed to meet County condition 5.

Commissioner Withers asked again if multi-family had been originally proposed, to which Mr. Nourse replied affirmatively and stated that the development proposal had gotten all the way to its final recording but it was never recorded.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer acknowledged the safety concerns expressed by citizens and staff, but he didn't feel the proposed sidewalk would address any of those concerns and may, in fact, exacerbate the problems already being experienced. He felt that the petitioner should at least have the option of considering duplexes.

Commissioner Coleman said that the petitioner had already agreed to stay with construction of single family structures.

Discussion ensued over the annexation of the Redlands Parkway and its possible review and consideration for inclusion into the City's capital improvements budget. Ms. Kliska was asked to elaborate on her credentials, experience, and basis for her specific recommendations, which was given. The overall problem of safety along the Redlands Parkway was again acknowledged but it was felt to be a much larger problem than could be adequately mitigated by a single development.

Commissioner Vogel suggested modifying staff condition 2. to read "...two proposed *single family* building..."

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-95-182, Final Plan approval for Filing #3, I move that the plan be approved subject to staff condition 1."

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) “Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-95-182, a request for an Amended Preliminary Plan for Filing #4, I recommend that we approve this subject to staff condition 2. as amended by Mr. Vogel.”

Commissioner Vogel seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Withers opposing.

MS-95-79 MINOR SUBDIVISION--FROST SUBDIVISION

Request for approval of a re-subdivision of two lots of approximately .72 acres (total) into three lots in an RSF-8 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 8 units per acre) zone district.

PETITIONER: Bob Frost

LOCATION: 2565 Orchard Avenue

REPRESENTATIVE: Landesign, Inc.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker presented a brief overview of the proposal. The petitioner had been granted a variance by the Grand Junction Board of Appeals to allow reduction of street frontage for the two rear lots. Staff recommended approval, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits prior to construction, and the Final Plat shall comply with all applicable codes and regulations.
2. Remove outline of homes and garages from plat.
3. Include “*A replat of lots 11 and 12, block 2...*” in dedication statement.
4. Revise dedication statement regarding irrigation easement to read: “All irrigation easements as set forth on this plat, *‘to the owners of the lots and tracts hereby platted’* as perpetual easements for the installation, operation, maintenance and repair of private irrigation systems.”
5. Correct misspellings and typographical errors in the dedication statements.

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

The petitioner offered no additional comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) “Mr. Chairman, on item 95-79, I move that we approve the Frost Subdivision at 2565 Orchard Avenue with the conditions in the staff recommendation.”

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

PDR-95-180 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW--AMENDMENT TO RIDGES PLAN

Request for approval of an amendment to the approved plan for The Ridges to allow a 6 bedroom Bed and Breakfast to be located on a 3.58 acre parcel of land.

PETITIONER: Lee Garrett

LOCATION: Lot 17, Block 13, The Ridges, Filing #5

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner noted the location of the parcel on the map provided. She felt that the proposed use would be appropriate, given the seclusion of the property and lack of impact to surrounding property owners. Ms. Portner expressed some concern over the petitioner's request to be able to hold weddings and receptions at the B&B. The petitioner agreed to comply with five prior City requirements outlined in the staff report. Approval was recommended, subject to the following additional conditions:

1. In addition to the Fire Department requirement for a 20-foot width all weather surface for the driveway, a minimum of a 10-foot width of the driveway shall be paved.
2. Wedding receptions and similar group activities shall be limited to a maximum of 2 per calendar month.
3. A site plan be submitted for staff approval showing how parking can be accommodated on-site for the maximum number of guests to be allowed for the wedding reception use.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked about the signage requirement, to which Ms. Portner replied that it would be the same as for a home occupation: two square feet, with no off-site signage allowed.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Lee Garrett, petitioner, confirmed that the sign allowance would be sufficient. He expounded briefly on what his plans for the property were, adding that the B&B was more in keeping with his long term goals and would create less impact to the neighborhood than the five single family homes which would have been allowed under prior approval. He said that while it would be nice to be able to hold receptions, if that point jeopardized the existence of the B&B, he would drop the request. Mr. Garrett indicated that there was enough parking area available for 100 persons, and he added that he did not intend to hire employees.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR: Toni Wanebo (381 1/2 Hillview, Grand Junction) was generally in favor of the proposal but requested something in writing which would limit the size of receptions. She also thought a curfew for such receptions would be a good idea to eliminate the potential for late night noise problems.

AGAINST:

Cynthia Bentley (2371 1/2 Rana Road, Grand Junction) was opposed to allowing receptions since it could generate a lot of additional traffic.

Tom Bentley (2371 1/2 Rana Road, Grand Junction) complained that he'd received no notification of the proposal. The notification process was explained to him by Chairman Elmer.

Vince Hostetler (382 Hillview Court, Grand Junction) also opposed the allowance of receptions but didn't object to the B&B. He requested clarification of the type fence to be constructed, which was provided.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Garrett reiterated that he was flexible on the issue of wedding receptions. He would go along with whatever the Commission decided.

Ted Munkres (121 Chipeta Avenue, Grand Junction), a member of The Ridges architectural control committee added from the audience that there were no Ridges covenants which would restrict a B&B from being located there.

DISCUSSION

There was general discussion over the reception issue. It was generally felt that receptions should not be allowed.

MOTION: (Commissioner Coleman) “Mr. Chairman, on item PDR-95-180, I move we approve the request for a Bed and Breakfast with staff recommendation 1. and that we deny the wedding receptions and similar group activities, and allow for a sign not to exceed 2 square feet.”

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

A recess was called at 9:45 p.m. The hearing reconvened at 9:55 p.m.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

MS-95-177 MINOR SUBDIVISION--GILMOR MINOR SUBDIVISION

- 1. Request for approval of a two lot minor subdivision of a parcel of land consisting of approximately 2.13 acres located at the southeast corner of 25 Road and Blichmann Avenue in a PI (Planned Industrial) zone district.**
- 2. Request for a recommendation of approval for waiver of Parks and Recreation open space fees.**

PETITIONER: Tom Gilmor

LOCATION: Southeast corner of 25 Road and Blichmann Avenue

REPRESENTATIVE: Harry Mavrakis

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck briefly outlined the proposal. The only major outstanding issue is payment of open space fees, which would be applicable to lot 2 only. The petitioner is requesting waiver on the grounds that he'd already paid approximately \$28K in half-street improvements for 25 Road and another approximately \$3,900 in drainage fees. Staff recommended approval of the Minor Subdivision and denial of the fee waiver subject to staff report recommendations.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked whether the half-street improvements fee had been for lot 1 or 2. Ms. Ashbeck said that the petitioner had been required to pay improvements fees based on the entire length of the 25 Road frontage for both lots.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Harry Mavrakis, representing the petitioner, reminded the Commission that if the project were considered now, the TCP would be only \$3,500 under the provisions of the new ordinance. He felt that given the circumstances and extreme differences in the financial obligations, the petitioner had more than paid his share of impact fees.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer asked staff if there was any evidence to support a previous payment by the petitioner for open space fees. Ms. Ashbeck replied that she could find no evidence of payment. Chairman Elmer felt that if such a waiver were approved, the parks fund would be shortchanged.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) “Mr. Chairman, on item #MS-95-177, I move that we approve the Gilmor Minor Subdivision subject to staff recommendations.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #MS-95-177, I move that we forward the request for waiver of open space fees to City Council with the recommendation of denial."

Commissioner Vogel seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Withers opposing.

PP-95-178 PRELIMINARY PLAN--COBBLESTONE RIDGES

- 1. Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for Cobblestone Ridges for 113 residential units (65 single family and 48 multi-family) on approximately 32 acres with zoning of PR-4 (Planned Residential with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre).**
- 2. Request for a recommendation of approval accepting land in lieu of Parks and Open Space Fees.**
- 3. Request for a recommendation of approval to modify the required road standards to allow sidewalk on only one side of the street.**

PETITIONER: Steven Craven, Cobblestone Communities, Inc.

LOCATION: Undeveloped land in the Ridges, Filing #6

REPRESENTATIVE: Mike Thompson, Thompson/Langford

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave an overview of the proposal, citing the benefits which would be derived from the development. The traffic report indicated a need to extend the westbound left-turn lane on Broadway at the intersection of Broadway and Ridges Blvd. to accommodate the entire Ridges development. The geologic report recommended leaving steeper slopes as open space. Ms. Portner noted the other areas of open space on the map provided. She felt that private open space areas should not be credited towards open space fees.

Lots 9 and 10 on Saddle Way need to be reconfigured to provide street frontage for both lots with a shared ingress/egress. Staff concurred, however, with the petitioner's request to waive the sidewalk requirement for that portion of Rana Road adjacent to lots 47 through 53 where the privacy berm is proposed. The Ridges Architectural Control Committee (ACC) expressed concern over the sidewalk requirement and requested a pathway system be put into place instead. With regard to the sidewalk issue, staff proposed three alternatives:

1. City standard street section as proposed which would require Council approval to delete the sidewalk on the north side of Rana Road adjacent to lots 47 through 53.
2. A detached asphalt pathway, 8 feet wide, along the northwest side of Rana Road with no other sidewalks in the development.
3. City standard street section as proposed except along the northwest side of Rana Road which would have a detached pathway, 8 feet wide, asphalt or concrete, with area between pathway and street to be landscaped.

The City supported options 1 and 3 with a concrete trail section. With option 3 the developer would request credits to TCP and Parks and Open Space fees to offset increased improvements costs. With any of the options, the City proposes to have the developer build a trail linkage either along Rana Road or through the open space and have the cost of those improvements credited to the TCP for the development.

Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. All requirements of the Fire Department must be met with the final submittal.
2. All streets shall be built to the urban residential street standard. Sidewalk will not be required adjacent

to lots 47 through 53 where a privacy berm is proposed and sidewalk will not be required on the inside loop of Saddleback Court adjacent to the open space island. A detached 8-foot-wide concrete pathway will be considered along the northwest side of Rana Road. Staff recommends that the additional cost associated with the detached pathway be considered for a credit to the TCP and/or Parks and Open Space fees.

3. Alternative pedestrian/bicycle ways may be considered with final plan/plat review in lieu of standard sidewalk if such pathways provide access to all lots.
4. The open space additions and deletions as proposed are acceptable with the modification that the access between lots 34 and 35 be increased in width to a minimum of 25 feet.
5. Lots 9 and 10 on Saddle Way shall be reconfigured so that both lots have street frontage and a shared ingress/egress easement.
6. A trail linkage from this development to the existing trail system south of Prospector Point shall be put in by the developer with the cost being a credit to the TCP.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Steve Craven, petitioner, acknowledged the differing positions of the ACC and the City on the sidewalk issue. He examined each of the three options proposed by staff, saying that he would pay for sidewalk construction but felt that credits to TCP and OS fees should be given for the additional cost of a trail system.

With regard to traffic, a study had been conducted which showed that traffic from the development as proposed (113 units) would be far less than that generated by the 155 units used in the study. He clarified that the original plan proposal had called for over 200 units and that the zoning allowed 143 units. He reiterated his request for the deletion of the portion of sidewalk north along Rana Road, adjacent to lots 47 through 53.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR: There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

Connie Badini (422 Prospector Point, Grand Junction) commented on many of the problems being experienced with the Columbine Village development. She wanted some assurances that the open space areas would be irrigated and maintained. She also wanted to see more than a 5-foot side yard setback.

Bill Boll (383 Hill View Drive, Grand Junction) requested clarification on the number of multi-family units being proposed.

Those citizens primarily expressing concerns over traffic and/or the inclusion of sidewalks included: Chuck Wanebo (381 1/2 Hillview Court, Grand Junction); Patti Stubler (2374 Rana Road, Grand Junction); Tom Bentley (2371 1/2 Rana Road, Grand Junction); Rob Cartilge (430 1/2 Prospector Point, Grand Junction); Bill Odell (406 Prospector Point, Grand Junction); Leslie Shaffer (430 1/2 Prospector Point); Gary Stuble (2371 Rana Road, Grand Junction); Roxanne Lewis (383 Hidden Valley Court) and Patrick Still (430 Prospector Point, Grand Junction).

Ted Munkres (121 Chipeta Avenue, Grand Junction) and Lee Garrett (2397 Mariposa, Grand Junction), both members of the ACC, spoke out against the City-proposed sidewalks. They argued that sidewalks went against the Ridges covenants, would probably buckle under the Ridges' shifting soils, and would not be of any useful or aesthetic value if limited to only a single portion of the Ridges overall community development.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Craven reiterated that while he understood citizen concerns, his development proposal was still a lower density development generating less traffic than what had already been approved for the site.

DISCUSSION

Extensive discussion ensued over the traffic and sidewalk issues. Commissioners acknowledged the lower density of the proposal and agreed that there was a concern over traffic in this area. Ms. Portner commented that a future road extension to Monument Road may occur.

When asked if a fully looped trail system was practical, Ms. Portner replied that she'd not had time to fully review that alternative.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #PP-95-178, I move we recommend approval of the request to amend the street standards to allow for a detached 8-foot-wide concrete pathway along the northwest side of Rana Road with City street standards applying everywhere else, with the additional cost of the pathway system being a credit to the TCP and Parks and Open Space fees and that sidewalk not be required on the inside loop on Saddleback Court."

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-2, with Commissioners Vogel and Whitaker opposing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #PP-95-178, I move we approve the ODP and Preliminary Plan subject to conditions 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 as listed by staff."

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-2, with Commissioners Vogel and Whitaker opposing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #PP-95-178, I move we recommend approval of the request for credit to open space fees for the value of the public open space dedicated."

Commissioner Withers seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 2-4, with Commissioners Halsey, Whitaker, Vogel and Coleman opposing.

ANX-95-129 ZONE OF ANNEXATION--LOMA RIO

Request for a recommendation of approval zoning lands currently being annexed to the City to PR-1.86 (Planned Residential, 1.86 units per acre), PR-3.7 (Planned Residential, 3.7 units per acre), and RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre).

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

LOCATION: Northwest corner Redlands Parkway and Hwy 340

STAFF PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton presented a brief overview of the proposal, outlining the area to be annexed on the map provided. Proposed City zoning most closely aligned with former County zoning. Staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-95-129, Zone of Annexation for Loma Rio, I move we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of approval as proposed by staff and as shown on the Loma Rio proposed zone map."

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

ANX-95-168 ZONE OF ANNEXATION--WAYMEYER/SCHULTZ

Request for a recommendation of approval zoning lands currently being annexed to the City to RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre) and PB (Planned Business).

PETITIONER: Walter Waymeyer and Thomas Schultz

LOCATION: 589 - 29 Road and property to the east across 29 Road

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Pelletier presented a brief overview of the proposal, outlining the area to be annexed on the map provided. Proposed City zoning most closely aligned with former County zoning. Staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-95-168, the Zone of Annexation for the Waymeyer/Schultz property, I move we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of RSF-4 for the Schultz property and PB for the Waymeyer property with the conditions outlined in staff report dated October 31, 1995."

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

ANX-95-169 ZONE OF ANNEXATION--PATTERSON/SHOLES ENCLAVE

Request for a recommendation of approval zoning lands currently being annexed to the City to RSF-1 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 1 unit per acre).

PETITIONER: Bill Patterson and John Sholes

LOCATION: 2580 and 2586 Galley Lane

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Pelletier presented a brief overview of the proposal, outlining the area to be annexed on the map provided. Proposed City zoning most closely aligned with former County zoning. Staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Coleman) "Mr. Chairman, on item #ANX-95-169, the Zone of Annexation for Patterson/Sholes, I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of RSF-1 zone."

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

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Coleman volunteered to participate in the County's upcoming steering committee meeting.

Chairman Elmer volunteered to act as monthly liaison to City Council. Mr. Shaver briefly outlined upcoming meetings.

The hearing was adjourned at 11:55 p.m.