

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**July 12, 2016 MINUTES**  
**6:00 p.m. to 7:25 p.m.**

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Christian Reece. The hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium located at 250 N. 5th Street, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Also in attendance representing the City Planning Commission were Jon Buschhorn, Kathy Deppe, Keith Ehlers, Ebe Eslami, Steve Tolle and Bill Wade.

In attendance, representing the City's Administration Department - Community Development, was Greg Moberg, (Development Services Manager), Rick Dorris (Development Engineer), Lori Bowers, (Senior Planner), Scott Peterson, (Senior Planner) and David Thornton (Principal Planner).

Also present was Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney).

Lydia Reynolds was present to record the minutes.

There were 19 citizens in attendance during the hearing.

**Consent Agenda**

**1. Minutes of Previous Meetings**

*No Minutes Available.*

**2. Amending the ODP and PD Ordinance for Highlands Apartments [File#PLD-2016-326]**

Request approval to amend the Outline Development Plan and Ordinance No. 4652.

*Action: Recommendation to City Council*

Applicant: Grand Junction Housing Authority - Owner  
Location: 805 and 825 Bookcliff Avenue  
Staff Presentation: Lori Bowers, Sr. Planner

Chairman Reece briefly explained the Consent Agenda and invited the public, Planning Commissioners and staff to speak if they wanted an item pulled for a full hearing.

With no amendments to the Consent Agenda, Chairman Reece called for a motion.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Wade)** "Madam Chairman, I propose that we approve the Consent Agenda as presented."

Commissioner Deppe seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

Chairman Reece explained that the public hearing items will be in a different order to allow enough time for the public in attendance to be heard. Therefore, the Redlands Hollow Rezone will move up to be the first item for individual consideration.

**\*\*\*INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION\*\*\***

**3. Redlands Hollow Rezone [File#RZN-2016-253]**

Request approval to Rezone 2.88 acres from an R-2 (Residential – 2 du/ac) to an R-4 (Residential – 4 du/ac) zone district.

*Action: Recommendation to City Council*

Applicant: Barbara Krause – Owner  
Location: 508 22 ¼ Road  
Staff Presentation: Scott Peterson, Sr. Planner

Scott Peterson, (Senior Planner) explained that this is a request to rezone 2.88 acres from R-2 (Residential -2 du/ac) to R-4 (Residential 4 du/ac) zone district. The applicants are Redlands Investment Properties, LLC and Barbara Krause, property owner.

A Neighborhood Meeting regarding the proposed zone change and subdivision application was held on April 19, 2016 with 11 citizens along with the applicant, applicant's representative's and City Project Manager in attendance. Area residents in attendance voiced concerns regarding increased traffic on 22 ¼ Road as a result of the proposed subdivision, increase in the overall density on the property and also some residents would like to keep a rural setting and not become part of a more urban environment.

Mr. Peterson showed a slide of the site location map and noted the property is located south of Broadway (Hwy 340) and west of the Redlands Parkway. The property currently contains a single-family detached home and detached garage on 2.88 +/- acres. The applicant, Redlands Investment Properties, LLC, is in negotiations to purchase the property and is requesting to rezone the property to R-4 in anticipation of developing a residential subdivision.

Mr. Peterson's next slide was of an aerial photo map and noted that there are adequate public and community facilities and services are available to the property and are sufficient to serve the residential land uses allowed in the R-4 zone district. Ute Water and City sanitary sewer are presently located within 22 ¼ Road. Property is also being served by Xcel Energy electric and natural gas. To the northeast, is a neighborhood commercial center that includes an office complex, veterinary clinic, convenience store, car wash and gas islands. Further to the east is another car wash, bank and medical clinic. Within walking distance are Broadway Elementary School, Redlands Middle School and area churches, located north of Broadway (Hwy 340). Less than a mile from the property is Grand Junction Redlands Fire Station No. 5.

Mr. Peterson then displayed a slide of The Comprehensive Plan-Future Land Use Map and explained that the property was annexed and zoned R-2 in 1999. In 2010 the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County jointly adopted a Comprehensive Plan, replacing the Growth Plan and establishing new land use designations. The Comprehensive Plan includes a Future Land Use Map and a Blended Residential Land Use Categories Map ("Blended Map"). The Blended Map blends compatible residential densities into three categories (Low, Medium and High), allowing overlapping of zones to provide flexibility to accommodate residential market

preferences and trends, streamline the development process and support the Comprehensive Plan's vision. The overlap of zones allows an appropriate mix of density for an area without being limited to a specific land use designation and does not create higher densities than what would be compatible with adjacent development.

The site was annexed into the City in 1999 as part of the Krause Annexation No. 1 and No. 2. The annexed property was zoned R-2 (Residential – 2 du/ac) which was in conformance with the Residential Low designation of the City's Growth Plan.

The residential character within the immediate vicinity of the proposed rezone has not changed since the area developed in the 1980's. Within a larger area several residential developments have occurred since 2004. These developments were annexed and zoned R-4 and include Redlands Valley Subdivision (Swan Lane), Schroeder Subdivision (2 lots adjacent to Reed Mesa Drive), D & K Lucas Subdivision (Lucas Court) and Boulders Subdivision (Milena Way).

Though the character and/or condition of the immediate vicinity of the property has not changed significantly within the last 30 years, the broader area has seen growth since the property was annexed and zoned in 1999.

The next slide was of the Blended Residential Land Use Categories Map. Mr. Peterson explained that in 2010 the City and County adopted the Comprehensive Plan which included the Future Land Use Map and the Blended Residential Land Use Categories Map ("Blended Map"). The new Future Land Use Map continued to designate the area where the property is located as Residential Low. The following zone districts are listed as appropriate zone districts to implement the Residential Low future land use category: RR, R-E, R-1, R-2, R-4 and R-5. The Blended Map as applied to this property allows up to five dwelling units per acre.

Therefore the proposed R-4 zone is compatible with (1) the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map; (2) the Blended Map; (3) the surrounding R-2 (City) and RSF-4 (County) zoning; and (4) the surrounding single family uses.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS**

After reviewing the Redland Hollow Rezone, RZN-2016-253, a request to zone 2.88 acres from R-2 (Residential – 2 du/ac) to R-4 (Residential – 4 du/ac) zone district, the following findings of fact and conclusions have been determined:

1. The requested zone is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan;
2. All review criteria Section 21.02.140 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code, except for criterion 4, have been met.

Mr. Peterson stated that City Staff recommends approval of the rezone as the proposed R-4 zone would implement Goal 3 of the Comprehensive Plan by creating an opportunity for future residential development which will provide additional residential housing opportunities for residents of the community, located within the highly desirable Redlands area and near neighborhood commercial centers, elementary and junior high schools.

Mr. Peterson additionally noted that one of the criterion to approve a rezone is that the amendment is consistent with the Plan.

Mr. Peterson stated that there was an email submitted as well as a petition from the area residents and two letters that were handed out at the beginning of the meeting that were too late to get into the packet.

### **Applicants Presentation**

Cliff Anson stated that he and his wife Teresa Anson, were the Managers of the Redlands Investment Properties. Mr. Anson noted that Ted Ciavonne (Ciavonne, Roberts and Associates) was also present.

Mr. Anson asked if he will have an opportunity to address citizens' concerns regarding the project, after the public comment. Chairman Reese informed Mr. Anson that they can call him up for an applicant rebuttal at that time. With no questions for the applicant at this time, Chairman Reese opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

### **Public Comments**

Aaron Livingston, 517 22 ¼ Road noted that he lives just across the street on the north end of the site. Mr. Livingston stated that the issue that he and his neighbors have is traffic. The traffic is mainly parents traveling with their kids, through the subdivision to get kids to Redlands Middle School. Instead of going to S. Broadway, and turning left through Redlands Mesa, (Redlands Parkway to Broadway), they bypass through their neighborhood to get kids to school.

In addition, there are two home mechanic shops that currently create heavy traffic as well. Mr. Livingston is concerned about additional traffic that more development will create. Mr. Livingston stated that 4 additional units is ok, however to allow six units is too much.

Noting that the average lot is .68 acres, Mr. Livingston felt this area is not City and is more rural and laid-back. Additional concerns Mr. Livingston expressed was the loss of open space and views that the proposal will impact. The potential for streets, paved sidewalks and city lights are all concerns that he and his neighbors have.

Naomi Rintowl, 515 22 ¼ Road stated that she lives across the street from the proposed development and next door to the Livingstons. Ms. Rintowl noted that the road they live on is more of a rural road with no lines, and also dead-ends. They often have traffic turn around in their driveways. Ms. Rintowl is concerned with how much more traffic they will have with six additional units. Presently the mailman turns around in the lot that they propose to develop. Ms. Rintowl stated that they have a standard of living that is rural with small houses on large lots quality of life.

Ruth Reed, 2221 Broadway, stated she has lived in the area for 76 years and she likes her neighborhood. She expressed concern that if four houses are allowed, soon it will be six or eight in such a small area. She is concerned when she hears people from other areas, such as Denver, state what neighborhoods are like back where they are from. She likes the rural feel to her neighborhood and wants it to stay that way.

### **Applicant Rebuttal**

Mr. Anson stated that as part of the application process, the property was re-surveyed and the area of lot two is 2.98 acres. Mr. Anton explained that at the neighborhood meeting, he said they would like to develop 7 houses on those three acres. Referring to the overhead map of the

area, Mr. Anson mentioned that there are seven properties with houses on the west side of the frontage street and feels it's only fair that seven houses would be allowed on the east side as well.

Mr. Anson stated that he had spent time observing traffic in the area. One morning during rush hour when school was in session, and again in the afternoon and he only observed about ten cars going through there.

Mr. Anson expressed his appreciation for the rural setting and stated that he is working with the City to do a rural street section. His development would only need to use the street to tap into water and sewer. After discussions with the Fire Marshall, since the last lot to the north is within 150 feet of the intersection, there will be no turn-around required at the north end of 22 ¼ road. Mr. Anson pointed out that even though there is a right-of-way depicted on the map running north and south, the street ends at the canal and will not cross the canal.

Mr. Anson pointed out that on the south west side of the property site, there are five lots that are zoned RSF-4. Mr. Anson stated that those five lots are duplex lots, and have 9 units on 2.6 acres (3.5 units/acre). Mr. Anson pointed out that although current neighbors have no interest in developing to that density, future neighbors may want to. He would like Barbara Krause to have those same property rights maintained.

Mr. Anson added that on the east side of 22 ¼ rd., the ditch will be built up to accommodate a storm drain thereby improving the area. In addition, Mr. Anson stated that there are no street lights or sidewalks proposed or required, therefore the rural aspect of the street will remain.

Commissioner Deppe asked for clarification as to whether there are six or seven lots proposed for development. Mr. Anson explained that there will be six additional lots created for a total of seven lots. These lots are approximately 90 feet wide and 151.3 feet deep.

Noting that the proposal is in the rezone stage, Commissioner Deppe asked if Mr. Anson if he envisions ranch or two story homes being build there as the loss of view is a concern expressed by neighbors. Mr. Anson noted that he is a developer and not a builder. He sells lots to builders. Mr. Anson stated that they have covenants on their projects and there are city codes that apply as well. Commissioner Deppe asked what the covenants stated as far as two story houses. Mr. Anson stated that they are not far enough along to have the covenants yet, but he does not foresee covenants that would restrict two story homes.

Commissioner Deppe asked if the covenants would have special requirements such as fencing types and styles etc. Mr. Anson stated that they would like to keep the covenants as minimal as possible to allow people to do what they want with their property. He envisions that families will have room to grow, with possibly adding a shop in the back and chain link fence for the dog. Noting that it's hard to find affordable lots in the Redlands, Mr. Anson stated he wants the lots to be affordable without adding additional requirements.

Commission Deppe asked if there was irrigation to the site. Mr. Anson answered that there is irrigation available, however there is no irrigation water to the site. Mr. Anson explained that there is a deep well on the property to the east that at one time serviced about 20 homes with domestic water. Mr. Anson stated that he has had conversations with the owner to see if they would sell the well so he would have irrigation water. Mr. Anson added that if the negotiations to buy the well didn't work, then he plans to have Redlands Power and Water provide a head-gate at the north end of the property to give them access to the ditchwater.

Chairman Reese noticed there was a latecomer who wished to speak and invited her to sign in and speak.

Sharon Sigrist, 2215 Dixon Ave stated that she has lived there for 23 years. Ms. Sigrist stated that they have embraced new neighbors with open arms and most people who live there plan to stay a long time. Ms. Sigrist expressed concern that if smaller homes are built they may become rental homes with tenants who are more transient. Ms. Sigrist explained that they have block parties and kids ride their bikes down the street and the neighbors all know each other. Ms. Sigrist stated that she would like to see the zoning stay the same.

### **Questions for Staff**

Commissioner Wade asked Rick Dorris (Development Engineer) if he had done a traffic impact study based on the proposed development. Mr. Dorris stated that he has, and displayed an aerial photo of a “traffic basin” that he created. Mr. Dorris stated that the standard average number of trips generated per household is ten. With 39 houses identified in the study basin, Mr. Dorris pointed out that it can be expected that 390 Average Daily Trips (ADT) would be generated. Adding the additional homes proposed, you could expect 450 (ADT). Mr. Dorris did note that the proposal came in after school had let out for the summer, therefore they were not able to assess that impact.

Commissioner Wade asked if 450 ADT was considered too much traffic. Mr. Dorris stated that the normal rule of thumb for residential streets was 1,000 ADT. Noting that these streets are a little narrower than standard subdivision streets, Mr. Dorris stated that he was still comfortable with that level of traffic on the streets as it is half of average capacity.

Commissioner Eslami thought the rezone was only adding 20 ADT because the current zoning would allow four houses (40 ADT). Mr. Dorris agreed that the rezone would impact the area by only 20 more ADTs.

Commissioner Deppe asked Mr. Peterson if the surrounding properties have irrigation now. Mr. Peterson noted that the neighbors present indicated that they did have irrigation.

Commissioner Tolle asked Mr. Dorris about a slide he displayed that noted that the potential lots for R-4 for that site is ten. Mr. Dorris stated that if someone else was to develop the site at R-4, they could potentially get 10 homes. Commissioner Tolle asked if the developer is granted the rezone, could he potentially come back with a different proposal for ten homes. Mr. Dorris stated that they could.

### **Commissioner Discussion**

Commissioner Ehlers stated that the neighbor concerns were clear and understood. Commissioner Ehlers went on to say that this proposal adheres to the Comprehensive Plans and Master Plans and noted that those plans had extensive public input. The Comprehensive Plan shows the density is appropriate from a larger community standpoint. Commissioner Ehlers stated that the plan takes into consideration existing infrastructure and this proposal meets the policies and codes established. Additionally, from a compatibility standpoint, Commissioner Ehlers added that there are six existing homes and the proposed homes will match up on the other side of the street.

Commissioner Buschhorn stated that they take this very seriously and the proposal does fit with the parameters of the plan. Commissioner Buschhorn expressed concern that if they rezone the parcel, it could turn into 11 lots. Commissioner Buschhorn felt six additional homes would be compatible with the neighborhood, but ten additional homes would not. Commissioner Buschhorn summed up by saying he is hesitantly comfortable with the rezone, providing the intent is to build six additional homes as the developer proposes.

Commissioner Deppe stated that although she understands her fellow Commissioners viewpoints, she is not in favor of the change. Given that these lots will be 13,500 square feet, there will be a lot of ground to water and there is presently no irrigation water. Commissioner Deppe acknowledged that the developer has indicated that he is working on getting water to the site, but at this time she is not comfortable with the idea that there may not be landscaping established like there is in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Eslami noted that as a developer, he does not think 10 lots is practical. Regarding the availability of irrigation water, Commissioner Eslami explained that if there is no irrigation water, it really doesn't matter if there are 4 lots or 6 lots. Additionally, if there were more homes, the ability to use domestic water for landscaping smaller lots would be more affordable.

Commissioner Wade suggested that the current neighborhood has the opportunity to retain the character of the neighborhood with what the developer is proposing. Commissioner Wade noted that this is a rezone, and there will be future review of site plans done. The developer has indicated that he is seeking a rural street standard that would not have curb and gutter and lights. Commissioner Wade stated that he feels this proposal is supported by the Comprehensive Plan and does not feel the incremental amount of traffic or the irrigation issue is going to keep him from supporting the rezone.

Commissioner Ehlers clarified that it's not that there is no irrigation available, it's just that it's not there now. There are some irrigation districts where the irrigation goes with the land, and other districts where the shares can be purchased. Commissioner Ehlers noted that it is his understanding the in this particular irrigation district, the shares can be purchased.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Wade)** "Madam Chairman, on the Rezone request RZN-2016-253, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval for the Redlands Hollow Rezone from an R-2 (Residential 2 du/ac) to an R-4 (Residential – 4 du/ac) zone district with the findings of fact and conclusions listed in the staff report."

Commissioner Eslami seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-2.

The Planning Commission took a brief break at this time.

#### **4. Amending Title 25 – 24 Road Corridor Design Standards [File#ZCA-2016-111]**

Request to amend the Grand Junction Municipal Code, Title 25, 24 Road Corridor Design Standards.

*Action: Recommendation to City Council*

Applicant: City of Grand Junction

Location: 24 Road Corridor Sub-area  
Staff Presentation: David Thornton, Principal Planner

David Thornton, Principal Planner, stated that 24 Road Corridor Plan was created in 1999 and adopted in 2000 and is about 65 pages long. This plan has been codified and is Title 25 in the Municipal Code. Mr. Thornton explained that staff took a fresh look at the Subarea Plan and Zoning Overlay and although it seems to be working somewhat well, it was decided that it can be improved upon.

Mr. Thornton showed a slide that illustrated why staff proposes amending the Design Standards as follows:

- **Reduce** redundancy, include only standards and eliminate guidelines that are only advisory in nature as written and often redundant with the standards,
- **Eliminate** sections that are better stated and regulated through other sections found in the Zoning and Development Code; and
- **Clarify** code language overall, simplifying and clarifying what the standards are the City is requiring to achieve the vision of the corridor

Mr. Thornton noted that the proposed changes will take the existing section of the code from 65 pages, to about 22 pages thereby streamlining the code and making it more user friendly.

Mr. Thornton noted that the 24 Road Corridor Design Standards were adopted by the City at the same time the 24 Road Corridor Sub-area Plan was adopted in 2000. The Design Standards implement the Sub-area Plan. The vision of the 24 Road Corridor Sub-area Plan contains the following key points:

- (a) Achieve high-quality development in the corridor
- (b) Provide market uses that complement existing and desired uses
- (c) Take advantage of and expand upon existing public facilities such as Canyon View Park and the Leach Creek Corridor.
- (d) Achieve a distinctive “parkway” character along the roadway that can serve as a gateway to the Grand Junction community.
- (e) Encourage development that is consistent with the Grand Junction Growth Plan, now the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Thornton explained the Subarea plan concept was to provide a land use and transportation framework for future development in the 24 Road Corridor that:

- Allows for flexibility in land uses (type, intensity, and density) while recognizing inherent differences between development on small parcels compared with larger parcels.
- Establishes a transportation network that interconnects to create a logical urban pattern.
- Establishes a high-quality image through zoning, design standards, and public improvements.

Mr. Thornton gave the example of Canyon View Park which establishes a “civic” character for the area, as well as providing valuable open-space and recreational facilities. This character should be continued through the development of the 24 Road “parkway” and linear parks



systems, including regional trails connecting the park and the Colorado River.

Mr. Thornton displayed and explained a slide that illustrated examples of how the plan has already impacted the area in a positive way. The next couple slides in the presentation identified key element that will be preserved in the plan as follows:

- A trail system connecting Canyon View Park with the Colorado River trail system utilizing Leach Creek including the development of trails connecting to the trail system; and public amenities along trails and in open space areas.
- Building orientation standards including treating 24 Road as primary with quality building design; pad buildings located at site corners and entries; and location of drive thru lanes setback away from street frontages.
- The Community Framework Plan which identifies the Leach Creek Open Space corridor, gateway/entry treatment areas and the 24 Road Parkway concepts.
- Pedestrian and Bicycle standards including 8 ft. sidewalks in front of buildings, defined pedestrian and bike circulation and safe routes, with sidewalk connections to the street.
- Architectural requirements for building form and scale; screening mechanical equipment; high quality building materials; and 360 degree architecture/design for all buildings sizes.

Mr. Thornton stated that in the Introduction, staff recommends reducing the language in this section to simply state the background and intent of the Zoning Overlay for the 24 Road Subarea and define “purpose” and “standards” as used in the Overlay.

The Purpose of the 24 Road Corridor Design Standards is to provide guidance and criteria for the planning, design and implementation of public and private improvements in the 24 Road subarea.

The Standards are found in six sections, four of them recommended to remain including: Site Development, Architectural Design Site Lighting and Signs. It is recommended that the two chapters “Community Framework” and “Landscape Development” be eliminated with a few exceptions.

Regarding the Community Framework section, Mr. Thornton recommends eliminating the entire section with a couple of exceptions. These includes eliminating:

- The “Roadway System” which is already part of the Grand Valley Circulation Plan;
- The “Streetscape” requirements which are covered in other sections of the 24 Road overlay and the Zoning Code;
- Identify and create 24 Road as a “Key Gateway” now a part of the Comprehensive Plan; and
- View sheds, a requirement that has not been enforced and therefore proposed to be removed.
- However, KEEPING the requirement to develop existing riparian areas and drainages, such as Leach Creek and its tributaries, as natural open space corridors for surface drainage and pedestrian trails; and updating/moving the Community Framework Plan. These would move to 25.12 Site Development.

Mr. Thornton noted in the next section, Site Development, the recommendation is to remove

redundancies in the requirements also found in other codes and ordinances of the City. Mr. Thornton displayed a slide that identified these to include:

- Removing Block and Lot dimensional standards;
- Eliminating transitions and interconnections section regulating neighboring building scale. This section has not been enforced to date.
- Eliminating most of the standards found under “Site grading and drainage”;
- Building and parking setbacks”; and “Parking, access, and circulation” sections due to redundancy; and eliminating Multi-family residential parking areas section.  
AND
- Removing all guidelines except requiring windows, doors, plazas or other amenities required on frontages to open space.
- Supporting language (includes one standard and figure) found in the “Community Framework” Section would be added to this Section.

Mr. Thornton recommended keeping the following standards in the Site Development section: Onsite open space, Organizing features, Site Grading and Drainage, Building and Parking Setbacks; Building Location and Orientation; Parking, Access and Circulation; Auto-oriented Uses; Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation; and Sidewalks.

Mr. Thornton stated that the proposal is to eliminate the entire Landscape Development section due to redundancy and the fact that the existing Zoning Code already requires equal to or greater landscaping and buffering requirements for all new development including property frontages, parking lots and other site landscaping.

Mr. Thornton’s next slide addressed the Architectural Design section of the plan and noted that the vision is to create buildings designed with a 360 degree appeal. Mr. Thornton stated that the recommendation is to replace current language regarding “architectural details” and “building materials” with Big Box standard language from Zoning and Development Code to be applied to all building sizes in this Subarea

Mr. Thornton suggested removing all guidelines, except;

- Moving chain link fencing “Guideline” to Standards under the Fencing and Walls section.
- Identifying and clarifying which sections affect Nonresidential Structures and/or Multifamily structures.

Mr. Thornton stated that the recommendation is to keep the following standards: Building Form and Scale; Building Materials; Multi-family Development Standards; Fencing and Walls; and Service and Storage Areas.

The next slide Mr. Thornton showed regarded Site Lighting. In another effort to remove redundancies in the plan, the following requirements would be removed:

- Standards for streetlights in the public right-of-way;
- Standards for pedestrian lights.
- Standards for parking area lighting.
- Standards for accent and security lighting.
- Removing all guidelines.

Additionally Mr. Thornton explained that the following standards should be kept in the plan and clarified:

- Clarified and reinforced the requirement that new development shall provide pedestrian lighting along public streets and pedestrian/bicycle trails.
- Inserted new pictures of local examples of pedestrian and accent lighting.
- Clarified accent lighting for landscape and pedestrian areas.

Mr. Thornton showed an example of signage and explained that due to a recent Supreme Court decision, content of a sign cannot be regulated. Therefore, it is possible for a business to advertise a business at another location. Mr. Thornton discussed the following points regarding signage in the 24 Road Corridor Plan:

- Define which sign types are allowed.
- Keep maximum size at 100 sq. ft. for all signs.
- Keep maximum height at 12 ft. for freestanding signs
- Remove restrictions on sign content.
- Eliminate requirement for a sign package.
- Continue ban of off-premise signs (billboards).

The plan will still identify which sign types will be allowed as follow:

- Freestanding
- Flush Wall
- Exempt
- Temporary

### **Findings of Fact/Conclusions and Conditions**

After reviewing the proposed text amendments for the 24 Road Sub-area Zoning Overlay standards, ZCA-2016-111, Mr. Thornton stated that the following findings of fact, conclusions and conditions have been determined:

The Proposed Text Amendment will

- Clarify existing requirements for development within the Sub-area Plan area;
- Eliminate redundancies; and
- Provide a more user friendly text to help development achieve the vision of the 24 Road Corridor Sub-area Plan.

With no questions staff at this time, Chairman Reese opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

### **Public Comments**

Bill Merkel, 2136 Banff Ct. stated that he and his wife have owned the property at the southwest G Rd. and 24 Road for a long time. Mr. Merkel explained that they have turned down offers in the past because they wanted to see a flagship development there. Mr. Merkel stated that he was in favor of the revisions, but asked what was the singular trigger was that brought these revisions forward.

Chairman Reece responded that City Council has given direction that they would like to see the

Zoning and Development Code more easily understood by the general public, builders and others.

Mr. Thornton agreed and added that there are other revisions to be made, this was just one of the first.

Mr. Merkel stated that he was originally against Mixed Use zoning, but after research and visiting 3 New Urbanism developments, he is in favor of the concept of living near where you work and other elements. Mr. Merkel explained that he has 13 acres there and is concerned about the City “shaving off” some of the acreage on both G Rd. and 24 Road (obtaining Right-of-Way) as that may limit what development can go there and effect the value of his land.

### **Commissioner Discussion**

Commissioner Wade stated that he is in favor of any simplification of the codes as the redundancy is often confusing.

Commissioner Deppe stated that she agreed with Commissioner Wade.

Commissioner Tolle expressed thanks to the staff for a good job with the recommendations.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Wade)** “Madam Chairman, on the request to forward a recommendation to City Council to amend the Grand Junction Municipal Code, Title 25, 24 Road Corridor Design Standards. ZCA-2016-111, I move that the Planning Commission approve it as presented in the Staff Report.”

Commissioner Deppe seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

### **5. Other Business**

Mr. Moberg reminded the Commission that there will not be a second public hearing meeting in July. There will be a joint workshop with City Council on July 21<sup>st</sup>.

### **6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.