

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
November 8, 2016 MINUTES
6:00 p.m. to 6:25 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, Ebe Eslami, George Gatseos, Steve Tolle and Bill Wade.

In attendance, representing the City's Administration Department - Community Development, was Greg Moberg, Development Services Manager, and Scott Peterson (Senior Planner).

Also present was Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney).

Lydia Reynolds was present to record the minutes.

There were seventeen citizens in attendance during the hearing.

*****CONSENT CALENDAR*****

1. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Action: Approve the minutes from the October 11, 2016 Meeting.

2. Connor Zone of Annexation
470]

[File# ANX-2016-

Request a Zone of Annexation from County RSF-R (Residential Single Family – Rural) to a City R-5 (Residential – 5 du/ac) on 6.35 acres.

Action: Recommendation to City Council

Applicant: Naomi E. Connor, Owner
Location: 2839 Riverside Parkway
Staff Presentation: Scott Peterson, Sr. Planner

Chairman Reece briefly explained the Consent Agenda and invited the public, Planning Commissioners and staff to speak if they wanted the item pulled for a full hearing. A member of the audience requested that the Connor Zone of Annexation be pulled for a full hearing. Chairman Reece asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda with the modification.

MOTION: (Commissioner Wade) “Madam Chairman, I move to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.”

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

*****INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION*****

2. Connor Zone of Annexation
470]

[File# ANX-2016-

Request a Zone of Annexation from County RSF-R (Residential Single Family – Rural) to a City R-5 (Residential – 5 du/ac) on 6.35 acres.

Action: Recommendation to City Council

Applicant: Naomi E. Connor, Owner
Location: 2839 Riverside Parkway
Staff Presentation: Scott Peterson, Sr. Planner

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Peterson explained that the property owner, Naomi Connor has requested annexation into the City limits. The proposed zoning of R-5 (Residential 5 du/ac) implements the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map, which has designated the property as Residential Medium (Residential 4-8 du/ac).

Mr. Peterson stated that a Neighborhood Meeting was held on August 1, 2016 with eight citizens along with the applicant’s representative and City Project Manager in attendance. No major objections to the proposed annexation were received, however the neighborhood did have concerns regarding the proposed overall density that the area could have when the remaining acreage would be developed at time of future single-family residential subdivision development.

Mr. Peterson displayed a slide of the site location map and noted that the 6.35-acre property is located in Pear Park and is directly across the street the Veterans Memorial Cemetery of Western Colorado. The property owner has requested annexation and zoning into the City limits in order to subdivide the existing property to create a free-standing lot for the existing single-family home and a second lot to market and sell in anticipation of future residential subdivision development. Mr. Peterson explained that under the 1998 Persigo Agreement with Mesa County, residential annexable development within the Persigo Wastewater Treatment Facility boundary (201 service area) triggers land use review and annexation by the City.

The next slide Mr. Peterson showed was an aerial photo of the property and explained that the property contains an existing single-family home and various accessory structures. The existing Summer Glen subdivision is located to the west and is zoned R-8. It contains 63 lots with an overall residential density of 4.92 du/ac. To the east is the Pine Estates subdivision within Mesa County jurisdiction that contains 20 lots (1.07 du/ac) (0.55 acre lots).

Mr. Peterson displayed the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map that identifies the property as Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac) and the proposed zoning of R-5 implements this land use designation. Mr. Peterson stated that the current zoning of County RSF-R (Residential Single-Family – Rural) is not compatible with the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designation of Residential Medium (4-8 du/ac), therefore the rezone request is triggering the annexation request.

Mr. Peterson then showed a slide illustrating the existing zoning in the area. In looking at the review criteria for the zoning designation, Mr. Peterson stated that he feels that the proposed zoning of R-5 provides a transition of density between the adjacent existing RSF-2 and R-8 (Residential 8 du/ac) zone district and would be in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan, therefore, the character and condition of the area has changed and the applicant is requesting a density that lies in the middle of the range allowed by the Residential Medium category. Mr. Peterson noted that adequate public and community services are available to the property. Both Ute Water and City sanitary sewer are presently stubbed to the property.

Mr. Peterson stated that the proposed R-5 (Residential-5 du/ac) zone district would also implement Goals 1, 3 & 5 of the Comprehensive Plan by creating an opportunity for ordered and balanced growth in a manner consistent with adjacent residential development. In addition, the proposed Annexation and zoning also provides for additional housing opportunities and choices to meet the needs of a growing community.

FINDINGS OF FACT/CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Peterson stated that after reviewing the Connor Zone of Annexation application, a request to zone the property R-5 (Residential-5 du/ac), the following findings of fact and conclusions have been determined:

- The requested Zone of Annexation is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, specifically Goals 1, 3 & 5.
- The review criteria in Section 21.02.140 of the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code have been met or addressed.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Commissioner Eslami asked Mr. Peterson if the cul-de-sacs of N. Forest Ct. and S. Forest Ct. would be allowed to access the property from the East. Mr. Peterson explained that the two cul-de-sacs stub directly at the property line and could conceivably connect to the subject property, providing access, in the future.

With no further questions for staff, Chairman Reece opened the public hearing portion of the meeting and asked for those in favor or opposition to proposed annexation/zoning to come forward and sign in to speak.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Nate Richardson, with United Country Reality stated he was there to represent the applicants. Mr. Richardson stated that although the future land use map indicates a recommended zoning of up to R-8 (Residential-8 du/ac), it was felt that the R-5 (Residential-5 du/ac) density would work best with the area.

Commissioner Wade asked if any kind of preliminary development plan had been discussed. Mr. Richardson stated that a preliminary site plan had been discussed with an engineer and the possible connections to the east and west were explored.

Renee Fugere, 382 Evergreen Rd. stated that she has lived in Pine Estates for 24 years. Ms. Fugere pointed out that she is in the neighboring subdivision that is zoned R2 (Residential-2 units/acre) and most of the lots are one half to one acre in size. To the east of her is White Willows which is zoned R4 (Residential-4 units/acre). Ms. Fugere explained that when a neighboring subdivision came in as R8 (Residential-8 du/ac), it highly impacted their area in a negative way. Ms. Fugere asked the Commissioners why the proposed zone couldn't be zoned R4 (Residential-4 du/ac).

Ms. Fugere stated that her biggest concern is the possible connectivity of N. and S. Forest Cul-de-sacs between the two subdivisions. Already, there is a long wait in the mornings with cars stacked trying to get onto Riverside Parkway.

Ms. Fugere asked if it is possible at this point to even consider an R4 (Residential-4 du/ac) zone and pointed out that it was not a consideration at the neighborhood meeting, just an R5 (Residential-5 du/ac) -R8 (Residential-8 du/ac) was presented for consideration.

Brent Whitman, 2839 N. Forest Ct., pointed out that his subdivision does not have curb and gutter or related infrastructure and their sprinkler systems go right out to the streets. Mr. Whitman also expressed concern that he thought he heard in the staff presentation that there was no opposition, when all of the Pine Estates residents that attending the meeting were opposed to it.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Chairman Reece asked Mr. Richardson to address the question of why R4 (Residential-4 du/ac) zoning was not considered. Mr. Richardson replied that they looked at the density of several of the neighboring subdivisions which are R5 (Residential-5 du/ac) and also considered the marketability of selling the lots to developers.

Chairman Reece noted that the difference between an R5 (Residential-5 du/ac) and R4 (Residential-4 du/ac) density in this subdivision would be about 6 lots. Mr. Richardson stated that six lots is about the difference, however they may lose a lot or two based on the need for a detention area if that comes into play down the road.

Commissioner Eslami stated that it is his experience that they may not even get to five additional lots and that 3.5 or 4 additional lots is probably more realistic.

Commissioner Wade asked if the applicant has shared a preliminary development plan with the neighboring residents at this point. Mr. Richardson stated that the plans are too preliminary at this point and discussions are still on-going with their engineers.

Commissioner Wade stated that it has been his experience that the more information the applicant shares with the neighboring subdivisions, the more likely it is to be accepted.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Noting that there has not been a development plan or request to subdivide the property, Commissioner Wade asked if a traffic study of the area has been conducted. Mr. Peterson replied that only the zone of annexation is being considered at this time. Mr. Peterson noted that the applicant has submitted for a simple subdivision application, however that process is done through administrative review and does not require a public hearing. The simple subdivision application is to carve off the existing home and create a lot that can be marketed for future development.

Mr. Peterson stated that there has not been a subdivision layout design and if or when they get to that stage, another neighborhood meeting would be required.

Commissioner Eslami thanked the students that were in the audience for attending. With no further questions from the public or for staff, Chairman Reece closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Eslami noted that since there are no plans to discuss, his comments are limited to the zone of annexation. Commissioner Eslami indicated that he is in support of the proposed zoning and that it is an appropriate density for the area.

Addressing the citizens in attendance that spoke in opposition of the proposal, Commissioner Wade suggested that they stay on top of the process, adding that it is in review of the site plan where their concerns expressed can have the most impact.

Commissioner Gatseos noted that he understands that the citizens opposed wanted an R4 (Residential-4 du/ac) zoning, however the range for Medium Density is R4 (Residential-4 du/ac) to R8 (Residential-8 du/ac).

Commissioner Tolle stated that safety is always a big concern with him and he hopes that the potential traffic will be reviewed carefully if it moves to another phase.

MOTION: (Commissioner Wade) “Madam Chairman, I move that file ANX-2016-470 be approved and moved on to the City Council.”

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

2. Other Business

None

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.