

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- March 6, 1990
7:30 p.m. - 9:40 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Steve Love at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

All Planning Commission members were present:

Steve Love, Chairman	Ron Halsey	Jim Tyson
Sheilah Renberger	John Elmer	Jim Bittel

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department were Karl Metzner and David Thornton.

Bobbie Darlington was present to record the minutes.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE FEBRUARY 6, 1990 MINUTES AS PRESENTED."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0, with one abstaining vote by Commissioner Bittel, as he was not present at the February 6, 1990 meeting.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRE-SCHEDULED VISITORS

Chairman Love welcomed Jim Bittel as the newest member of the Planning Commission. Jim gave a brief overview of his qualifications.

DDA'S PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

Joe Skinner, Attorney for the Downtown Development Authority, gave a presentation of two proposals for the DDA Plan of Development which will be presented to the City Council on March 7, 1990. First, an amendment to add property to the boundaries of DDA, and second, a resolution requesting amendments to the Plan of Development to the DDA.

Mr. Skinner gave a brief description of DDA's purpose and history. The DDA's main purpose is to concentrate on the development and redevelopment of the central business district, to plan and study and propose projects to eliminate blight and assist the central business district. The Plan of Development was developed and adopted in 1981 which spelled out certain development strategies. Amendments were made to the Plan of Development in 1982 and 1983.

Mr. Skinner explained that the amendment to the ordinance to add property to boundaries of the DDA was simply adding those properties that have already been included within the boundaries; it is just a house cleaning item. The property owners have petitioned to be included within the boundaries; DDA does not have powers of eminent domain and can not expand without the property owner's permission.

The resolution requesting amendments to the Plan of Development, however is a request to change the current boundaries of the DDA to allow expansion past South Avenue along the corridors because of the potential Riverfront project.

Commissioner Elmer felt there was a concern of the DDA expanding into residential areas and asked if there was a limitation to their future expansion of the boundaries.

Mr. Skinner replied that DDA's basic strategy is to incorporate the area on the north to Ouray Avenue, and as far as North 9th Street on the east. Mr. Skinner reiterated that the DDA must have the property owner's consent to include them within the boundaries.

Mr. Skinner asked the Planning Commission to write a memo to the City Council which states that the DDA has consulted with the Commission in regards to the proposed changes.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. # 9-90 REZONE FROM RSF-5 TO PR-6 AND A FINAL PLAN AND PLAT FOR MISSION VIEJO.
Petitioner: David and Ivan Wood
Location: El Corona Drive and Patterson Road**

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Wayne Lizer, Engineer for the project and representative for the petitioners, addressed various aspects of the development request. The proposed development is located at El Corona Drive and Patterson Road, bounded on the east side by Mantey Heights, on the west by Intermountain Bible School, on the north by Spring Valley, and on the south by the Grand Valley Canal and Arbor Village. There are two existing homes located west of the development. There is an existing gravel road which runs through the center of the subdivision. The proposed improvements are a paved street with curb, gutter and sidewalk, a fire hydrant and street lights. A homeowners association will be formed to take care of the irrigation and landscaping. The structures will be attached two unit dwellings which will yield more open space. Mr. Lizer submitted architectural drawings of the proposed homes which were examined by the Planning Commission. A retention pond for irrigation purposes will be built on the south side of the subdivision next to an existing irrigation lateral.

QUESTIONS

When asked what the size of the water line was and if it was looped or dead ended, Mr Lizer replied that it was an 8" looped line.

Commissioner Tyson asked if the buildings would be for sale; if they were retirement homes; and why the petitioner's were requesting an increase in density from five to six.

Mr. Lizer stated that the homes were for sale, and the developer was aiming for the retirement market, but would not exclude anyone. The RSF-5 zone for this property would allow the construction of approximately 26 homes. The costs of the street, irrigation, and storm retention facilities would be offset by increasing the density to allow 32 units.

Commissioner Renberger asked if the storm retention area would be developed into a landscape park type atmosphere.

Mr. Lizer said according to the development plan, the area around the irrigation pond would be landscaped; he recommended the area around the storm retention pond just be grassed.

Commissioner Renberger asked if it would be required to install a plastic liner in the pond to hold the water in. She added that a pond would encourage habitat for mosquitos.

Mr. Lizer explained that the storm retention pond would not be permanent, the pond would fill up during storms then dry up into a grassed area, therefore it would not need a liner.

Mr. Lizer stated that the irrigation pond would have a timing valve in order to open up at night time to fill up and close during the day; he added that this pond would be lined.

Commissioner Elmer asked what form of market research was done to justify a community need for this type of development.

The petitioner David Wood, 1999 Bison Court, replied that they checked with realtors and a number of real estate firms who indicated that this type of development was needed in the area. Mr. Wood stated that the plans had been designed with retirees in mind as a target market.

Commissioner Elmer questioned how the density was calculated. He asked if the southern most lot (Lot 15) was figured into the total.

Mr. Lizer said that the area of Lot 15 was used in the calculation, but El Corona Drive was not, because it was already an existing dedicated street.

STAFF PRESENTATION

David Thornton presented a brief overview of the proposal. The petitioners are requesting a rezone to Planned Residential six units per acre. Currently, the subdivision is platted with 11 lots. Because El Corona Drive and Mount View Drive are so close, there may be difficulties meeting the required setbacks with the RSF-5 zone; therefore the planned residential zone may be the best alternative to allow flexibility. David stated that all the review sheet comments and issues have been addressed.

Commissioner Bittel asked if there were any concerns regarding the soils report for this area.

Karl replied that engineered foundations would be required.

PUBLIC COMMENT

For:

None

Against:

Ralph Mulford, 134 El Corona Drive, believed that he owned a piece of the property at the south end of the proposed development.

Mr. Wood stated that Lot 15 is included in the El Corona Subdivision and absolved the confusion by describing the parameters of the Mission Viejo development to Mr. Mulford.

Mr. Mulford continued, stating his concern of a cement wall, 10 to 12 feet high, located approximately 150 feet west of the intersection of Patterson Road and El Corona Drive which creates a visibility problem. He requested that the Planning Commission take this into consideration before approving the higher density.

Carl Burley, 126 Mount View Drive, stated that he opposed the request for the increase in density, because he made an investment into this neighborhood relying on the existing zoning.

Gloria Peloquin, 124 Mount View Drive, was concerned that the ponds would create a mosquitos problem, and was also opposed to the increase in density. She concurred with Mr. Burley, stating that she also made an investment into a single family area and feels that multifamily homes are not compatible.

Charles Sours, 2551 Santa Fe Drive, asked what the size and the price of the homes would be.

David Wood said most of the two unit attached homes are approximately 1,500 square feet. There will also be two single family homes, each approximately 1,700 square feet. The cost of the attached unit homes will range from about \$90,000 to \$100,000 per unit. The other two single family detached homes will be in the \$130,000 range.

Mr. Sours was concerned that this neighborhood was being inundated with multifamily structures. He pointed out that there were approximately 25 multifamily units west of this proposed development, approximately 25 units at the Falls, and approximately 17 units in Spring Valley. He stated that he was not in great opposition to this particular development, but he was opposed to the request for an increase in density.

Jody Ahrens, 110 Mount View Drive, asked what the developer plans were if these plans do not go through.

David Olson, 364 Ridge Circle Drive, opposed the increased density. He felt the density calculation was inaccurate because Lot 15 was being added into the total acreage. He also was concerned that the back yards of this proposed development would be facing the front yards of homes on Mount View Street. He asked if there were any guarantees that these homes would be built according to the architectural design.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Lizer answered questions concerning the development. He stated that the irrigation pond would be fenced if required. There is an existing merge lane for traffic entering into the east bound lane and the median can be used to merge with the west bound traffic. The petitioners propose to begin construction on the south end of the subdivision and build north. Screened fencing along the outside of the development will be installed as the homes are built. The setback from the back property line is 7'. The fencing will be completed within two years from the start of the development. The street, curb, and gutter will be put in at the start of the development.

Chairman Love asked Mr. Lizer to show what percentage of a lot a 1,500 square foot home would cover.

Mr. Lizer replied that a 1,500 square foot home would approximately fill the larger envelopes on the site plan. He added that the homes would range from approximately 1,200 to 1,500 square feet.

Mr. Mulford asked if it could be possible to redesign the plat so that Mount View Drive and El Corona Drive could be connected at the cul-de-sac area, providing a second egress. Because there is only one ingress/egress street for all the proposed units, he felt that the increase in traffic onto Patterson Road would create a problem.

Commissioner Elmer stated that there is not much that can be done at this point because both streets were already platted, but ideally the access points should have been limited.

Commissioner Renberger expressed a concern over the number of parking stalls.

Karl said that there are 72 parking stalls.

Commissioner Elmer stated that the City Engineer estimated seven trips per unit or 224 trips per day for the proposed development.

Karl added that this was an average including visitors, delivery vehicles, etc.

Chairman Love asked Mr. Lizer to re-explain the process in calculating the density.

Mr. Lizer replied that the total area including Lot 15, less El Corona Drive calculated to approximately five acres. The developer has requested to build 32 units. 32 units on five acres calculates to approximately 6 units per acre. Lot 15 will not be developed; it will be left as private open space.

Commissioner Halsey asked what was the area of Lot 15.

Commissioner Elmer replied that it is approximately one acre. El Corona Drive is approximately .8 or .9 acres. Normally the street area would be used in calculating the density, so it would have been a close equivalence.

Mr Olson felt the ponds took up additional area which even further condensed the homes.

Chairman Love asked Mr. Wood if he would explain the methodology that was used for the proposed plan.

David Wood responded that they observed a similar type development at Wellington and 12th Street which sold out before the units were built. He felt there was a need for a larger single level upscale type unit with a two car garage with low maintenance yards. These units were designed with the retirees in mind for a target market. The development is close to shopping and the hospital. The petitioner's felt this type of development would fit the area better than just a subdivision with 26 houses.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the City applied the most appropriate zone when the land was annexed.

Karl said that before this land was annexed, the County zoning was R-2, which is a single family/duplex zone. There was no zone in the City that was equivalent to the R-2. The density of the RSF-5 zone is close to what the County had. The lots of the subdivision were sized for duplex units because it was platted in the County. The existing RSF-5 zone allows 26 single family units. The lots can be rearranged and lot splits and lot line adjustments can be done to fit the existing zoning.

Chairman Love asked Karl to elaborate on what improvements were guaranteed, such as the fence and site improvements.

Karl replied that the planned zone is one of the most controlled and restrictive zones the City has. Whatever plan is approved, has to be adhered to. Subsequently, any proposed changes would have to be approved, this includes fencing, architectural design, and covenants. The petitioner has to submit guarantees that all of the improvements as proposed and as approved will be built within certain time frames. Unlike the planned zone, the RSF-5 zone allows any type and style of home to be built, subject to meeting the required setbacks and there is no required landscaping or fencing for the straight zones.

Jody Ahrens restated her question, what are the petitioner's plans if this is not approved?

David Wood said they would go back to the 5 units per acre and build 26 houses, with no restrictions or covenants.

Discussion ensued, relating to points brought out from the audience among the Planning Commission members.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #9-90, A REQUEST FOR REZONE FOR MISSION VIEJO, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: IT'S NOT COMPATIBLE WITH THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD; THE NEIGHBORHOOD HAS NOT CHANGED IN CHARACTER; THE COMMUNITY NEED IS QUESTIONABLE; ANY INCREASE ON TO PATTERSON ROAD FROM AN UNCONTROLLED INTERSECTION IS NOT DESIRABLE."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

A vote was called, the motion died (3-3). For the motion were Commissioners Renberger, Elmer, and Tyson. Against the motion were Chairman Love, Commissioners Bittel and Halsey.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER BITTEL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #9-90, A REQUEST FOR REZONE FOR MISSION VIEJO, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

The motion died for lack of second.

Karl stated in absence of a recommendation, the rezone is in essence recommended for denial.

- 2. # 10-90 HEATHERIDGE ESTATES ZONE OF ANNEXATION**
Petitioner: City of Grand Junction
Location: East of Redlands Road & South of Monument Road.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl gave a brief overview of the proposed zones of annexation. City Council annexed Heatheridge Estates; consequently, by state law the City has 90 days to put city zoning on the land. Based on existing uses and the existing county zoning, the staff recommends the closest possible equivalent to county zoning. The bulk of Heatheridge Estates is single family at approximately 4 units per acre, therefore the Residential Single Family 4 units per acre (RSF-4) has been recommended. There is one multifamily lot on Lot 1 Block 1 that has an existing four-plex that is being recommended to be zoned Residential Multifamily 16 units per acre (RMF-16). There is a dedicated county public site, largely a hillside, for which a change is being recommended to Public Zone (PZ). There are approximately three or four vacant lots on the south end which would be included under the RSF-4 zoning.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the Public Zone was owned by the City.

Karl said that it was dedicated to the County as a public site.

Commissioner Elmer asked if 16 units could be constructed on the lot recommended for the RMF-16 zone.

Karl stated that the lot was approximately one quarter acre, consequently making it close to 16 units per acre now.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bert and Virginia Lionberger, 111 Glade Park Road, (adjacent to Heatheridge Estates) thought their property was included within the annexation boundary because a notice of the public hearing was mailed to them.

Karl stated that their lot was not included in the annexation or rezone, adding that notices were sent to everyone within 200 feet of the project.

Keith Rademacher, 2506 1/2 Mount Sopris Drive, asked for clarification of the public zoning definition. He added that he did oppose the annexation, but he had no objections to the proposed zonings.

Karl responded to his concern and explained the purpose of the Public Zone. It is a public site, but currently there are no specific plans. If any type of development were to happen, the people in surrounding area would be notified and would be able to make comments at that time.

Discussion ensued on whether or not a building could be constructed on the public site. The consensus among the Planning Commission members and the staff was that it was highly unlikely.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-90, A REQUEST TO ZONE HEATHERIDGE ESTATES LOT 1 BLOCK 1 TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIFAMILY 16 UNITS PER ACRE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-90, A REQUEST TO ZONE THE PUBLIC SITE IN HEATHERIDGE ESTATES TO PUBLIC ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-90, I MAKE A RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE PUBLIC ZONE BE RESTRICTED TO OPEN SPACE USAGE."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-90, A REQUEST TO ZONE THE REMAINING 93 LOTS TO RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY 4 UNITS PER ACRE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

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

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Planning Commission discussed items relating to lot size restrictions and densities. Commissioner Elmer stated even though the density may be close, the lot sizes may not be compatible because of the open space allowed in planned zones.

NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no non-scheduled citizens and/or visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.