

## Grand County Planning Commission Minutes

May 24, 2006

A regular meeting of the Grand County Planning Commission convened on the above date at 6:00 PM in the Council Chambers of the Grand County Courthouse.

**Members Present:** Chairman Marcus LaFrance, D.L. Taylor, Dave Cozzens, Ed Bridges, Jean Binyon and Charley Every. Tom Shellenberger was excused.  
County liaison - Judy Carmichael.

**Others Present:** Mary Hofhine, and other concerned citizens.

**The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM** by the Chair, Marcus LaFrance; the Chair read through the items on the agenda and asked the Commission if there were any conflicts of interest or ex-parte communications between the applicants and the Commission. Charlie Every said he has had business with Jeff Flanders.

**Approval of minutes:** The April 26<sup>th</sup> minutes were accepted as written.

**Jones Minor Subdivision – Bill & Joyce Jones applicants** - This application is submitted by Virginia Joyce Jones, (Applicant). The Applicant is requesting approval of a 2-lot minor subdivision, pursuant to the *Grand County Land Use Code*, Sec. 6.9, Minor Subdivisions. The subject property includes about 2.40 acres and is located at 2611 South Desert Road.

The subject property is zoned LLR, Large Lot Residential, which has a minimum lot area of ½ acre and a minimum lot width of 100 feet – the proposed lots comply with both of those requirements. Minimum side setbacks are 15 feet. Lot 2 is already improved with a single family dwelling.

All utility companies and the Fire Chief have provided letters of service.

Charley Every moved to recommend approval to the County Council with the following conditions:

(1) Addition of the following (drainage) note to the plat:

Note: No building permit(s) shall be issued for a structure(s) on any lot in this subdivision prior to the completion of a site specific drainage study to quantify the potential change in drainage run-off (pre- vs. post-development flows), and a detention basin, drainage swell, dry well, or similar facility on site designed to detain such run-off.

(2) The current and future residence will be serviced by the Grand Valley Water and Sewer Service Agency, as stated in the letter to the applicant from Terry Sykes, GWSSA Supervisor.

(3) A letter from Moab Valley Fire Department addressing fire hydrants placement.

D.L. Taylor seconded. The Chair called for discussion by the Commission – Jean Binyon recommended amending the motion to include;

The final plat show the footprint of the existing building and that the septic system be abandoned

Charley Every amended the motion to include those items and D.L.Taylor seconded. All voted in favor.

**Ivy Acres Minor Subdivision – Ivy Norlander applicant** - This application is submitted by Ivy Norlander, (Applicant). The Applicant is requesting approval of a 2-lot minor subdivision, pursuant to the *Grand County Land Use Code*, Sec. 6.9, Minor Subdivisions. The subject property includes about 1.97 acres and is located at 1402 So. Hwy 191.

The subject property has a split zone of HC, Highway Commercial along the highway and RR, Rural Residential in the back. Proposed Lot 1 is already improved with a single family dwelling, proposed Lot 2 is in the RR, zone district– the proposed lots meet the requirements of a zoning lot in the respective zoned districts.

All utility companies and the Fire Chief have provided letters of service. Since the property's access is off of Highway 191 a UDOT encroachment permit was issued.

Jean Binyon moved to recommend approval to the County Council subject to the following conditions;

(1) Addition of the following (drainage) note to the plat:

Note: No building permit(s) shall be issued for a structure(s) on any lot in this subdivision prior to the completion of a site specific drainage study to quantify the potential change in drainage run-off (pre- vs. post-development flows), and a detention basin, drainage swell, dry well, or similar facility on site designed to detain such run-off.

(2) The approach from the Highway shall meet all the requirements listed on the UDOT letter to Ms. Norlander dated April 27, 2006.

(3) Compliance with recommendations of the County Engineer.

Ed Bridges seconded and all voted in favor.

**Trail End PUD sketch – Jeff Flanders Applicant** - This application is submitted by property owner Jeffrey S. Flanders (Applicant). The subject property is zoned RR, Rural Residential, a mandatory PUD district; and the property includes a total of 6.75 acres, located at the north end of Roberts Road. The Applicant proposed division of the subject property into 6 lots with a minimum of ½ acre, each for single family use, and 35 percent open space. The open space proposed will include a drainage channel and significant power transmission and gas pipeline corridors.

Letters submitted with the application indicate the availability of water and sewer service, gas and electric service, and the adequacy of easements proposed.

Access to the property is from Roberts Road, which will be built at the local road standard. The cul-de-sac is not dimensioned. Two of the lots will be flag shape lots with the “handle” 20 foot wide and the body of the lot meeting required lot size.

This subdivision requires sidewalks, Sec. 5.4 of the LUC, unless the average lot size is more than ½ acre, which is the case. The applicant has proposed a 158 foot long, 15 foot wide trail at the end of the cul-de-sac to access vacant land to the West.

Fire hydrants will be placed per directions of the Fire Chief as designated on plat, which is signed by the Fire Chief.

A Preliminary Drainage Report recommends construction of a drainage detention pond to accommodate the difference between pre- and post-development flows, along with other measures to protect the structures and minimize impervious surfaces.

D.L. Taylor moved to approve the sketch plan for Trails End without condition, Charley Every seconded. ‘

The Chair called for discussion – the Commission discussed the need for connectivity pursuant to the code. After discussion the Commission found that the connection to the west and north would not be needed due to the terrain and BLM ownership. Although the proposed trail would be needed. The Commission discussed the need for building envelopes on lots 1,6, and 2 due to the terrain and power line easements.

The Chair reread the motion to include the discussion items; the motion on the floor is:

Move to approve the sketch plan for Trail End with the following conditions and findings;

1. The Commission found that due to the unusual circumstance of the land to the west and south there is no need to provide a road connection due to the terrain and BLM ownership of the land; there will be no development in that area.
2. Building envelopes on lots 1, 2, and 6 due to the utility easements in the area.

The Chair called for the vote; all voted in favor.

**Public Hearing – Rim Village III PUD Vistas Preliminary Plat:** Staff read into the record the Land Use Code as amended to date the General Plan as amended to date and staff’s memo of today’s date. This application, submitted by SMA, on behalf of the owner Chuck Henderson (“Applicant”), proposes to subdivide a 21.72 acre parcel into 196 lots. The property is a split zone of RR, Rural Residential and MFR-20, multi-family residential 20. The Council has endorsed the Zoning Administrator’s interpretation to allow mixing densities; the applicant has provided a Master Plan of the project and has mixed the density with 9.25 of the acres in MFR 20 and 12.47 acres in RR. The density mix will allow for 197 units on the total acreage of 21.72 acres; the proposal is for 196 units on 21.72 acres.

The property is adjacent to Rim Village Vistas and the developer has proposed a total of 16 multi family units, common areas consisting of the pool, tennis court and covered pavilion.

Utilities are anticipated to run along the proposed road and in utility rights of ways. Access to the lots will be through an extension of the existing Prickly Pear Circle, a private drive, and all proposed interior roads will also be private. The County Engineer has recommended that all interior roadways be 24 foot wide.

Donzil Worthington made a presentation as the agent for Chuck Henderson and stated that all issues that the County Engineer has will be corrected by the applicant's engineer.

The Chair opened the public hearing to the public – since there were no comment from the public the Chair entertained a motion.

D.L. Taylor moved to recommend approval to the County Council with the condition of the County Engineers recommendations, seconded by Dave Cozzens. Discussion by the Commission was a question of clarification on the width of the private roads, the County Engineer has recommended 24 feet. All voted in favor.

**Site Plan Review for Bryon and Nita Walston for the Commercial storage units:** Bryon and Nita Walston, submitted the attached application ("Applicant"). The subject property consists of approximately 2.7 acres to be developed into a self storage commercial site. The properties to the North and South are HC, Highway Commercial; the properties to the rear are RR, Rural Residential.

The site plan complies with county standards, but the Commission should decide if slats in the chain link meet the requirement of opaque fencing along the protected zone; and if gravel driveways and parking strips are recommended by the Commission. The County Engineer has been sent a second revision of the drainage and his comment had not been received at this date.

Jean Binyon moved to approve subject to the following conditions;

- All recommendations by the County Engineer,
- Compliance with Sec. 4.6 Outdoor lighting.

Seconded by Charley Every.

The Chair opened up the discussion to the Commission and asked for the input requested by staff for the decision on slats in the fence and gravel for the parking. The Commission felt the slats have been approved on other sites; gravel is an acceptable driving surface on self storage uses since there is limited and slower traffic.

The Chair re-read the motion, which included the approval of the slats and graveled parking; and called for the vote. All voted in favor.

**Site Plan Review for Paradox Business Park;** Paradox Business Park, Jim Dressler is the agent, and has submitted the application. The subject property consists of approximately 2.35 acres to be developed into Commercial, Industrial, Communications, transportation automobile uses. The properties to the North and South are Commercial; the properties to the rear are MFR-8. The applicant did not provide an elevation of the building. The property is located at 2302 Resource Boulevard.

This application shows a master plan of the lot, the applicant has submitted a site plan for only phase one. The plan does not have plantings only a note stating that they will comply with standards.

The site plan complies with the standards of the code with the following exceptions;

1. Approval of the drainage plan by the County Engineer prior to the issuance of building permits;
2. Provide information regarding adjacent uses and zoning sufficient to determine Code requirements relative to land use compatibility.
3. Submission of landscaping consistent with Code requirements.
4. Payment of the extra expenses of engineering review, if needed.

D.L. Taylor moved to approve, Dave Cozzens seconded. Chair asked for discussion – Jean Binyon asked if the motion should include the conditions recommended by staff and D.L. amended the motion to include the following conditions;

1. Approval of the drainage plan by the County Engineer prior to the issuance of building permits;
2. Provide information regarding adjacent uses and zoning sufficient to determine Code requirements relative to land use compatibility.
3. Submission of landscaping consistent with Code requirements.
4. Payment of the extra expenses of engineering review, if needed.

Marcus LaFrance questioned the developer as to when they would install the pavement since they are planning on one building as Phase I and it's in the far corner. The applicant stated that they will do hard surfacing once the drainage system is put in, but they do plan on installing the road way to the building from Resource Blvd.

The Chair re-read the motion with the conditions and called for the vote. All voted in favor.

**Public Hearing – Tierra del sol PUD amendment:** The Tierra del Sol PUD Preliminary Plat was approved by the County Council on March 7, 2006. This application seeks to amend the Preliminary Plat to change the front set-backs to 20 feet and is submitted by Dan Pyatt.

The amendment seeks to change the front setback requirements to 20 feet. The underlying zone district is SLR2, requires a minimum 25 feet setback for principle structures. To accomplish the change to the PUD the Council can approve an ordinance adopting the change to the exiting PUD, with the Commissions recommendation.

The Chair opened the hearing to the public; with no public comment the chair closed the public hearing and called for a motion.

Charley Every moved to recommend approval of Tierra del sol PUD Amendment to allow for 20 foot front set backs and makes the following findings:

- A. Is consistent with the Grand County General Plan,
- B. Is consistent with the character of existing land uses in the surrounding area, and
- C. Does not adversely affect the future development of the surrounding area.

D.L. Taylor seconded.

Discussion – Jean Binyon recommended that the motion be amended to state that only the living spaces be allowed the 20 foot set-back and the garages and accessory uses set-back stay at 25 feet back.

Charley amended his motion to include the recommendation by Jean and D.L. seconded.

The Chair re-read the motion with the amendment and called for the vote. All voted in favor.

**Worksession** – Bonus density in Dude Ranch Destination Resorts and Bed & Breakfast uses – the Chair stated that this will be a discussion at a later date.

Connectivity Standards – The Commission discussed how much discretion is allowed and when it is used. Staff read from the code Sec. 5.3.3., which states that it is required except under unusual circumstances. Connecting development is not new happens all over the country.

Rural developments do not need the connections as much city developments. Once we start subdividing the rural character becomes incidental.

Connectivity does not necessarily mean roads, but the flow of people, as pedestrians, strollers, or bicycles from one area to another without going onto the major highways.

Relief of multiple accesses on to the highway would be to install a frontage road, but that's still not going to provide the movement of people through the developments safely.

Property owners (developers) sharing the costs of needed roads, including turn lanes and frontage roads.

Trails that are paved and somewhat wider (8 feet) to allow the movement of people but could also be used for emergency vehicle use.

The Land Use Code only requires connectivity for vehicles; maybe we should modify the code to require for pedestrian connectivity.

**Highway Commercial development and uses** – Discussion regarding the use residences in the Highway commercial district. Charley read the purpose statement for Commercial and stated that as soon as you allow residence it eliminates the intent of the commercial district. The following are other items discussed.

- The original intent was to allow businesses on the ground floor and residence on the upper floor or a guard residence now residential uses in the HC zone districts has become the primary use rather than a secondary use.
- The daunting aspect of residences in the HC zone is the density allowance.
- Making residential uses in the HC zone a conditional use.

- Park model housing in the HC zone as residential housing for sale.
- The current HC district is the only district that allows for mixed uses (commercial and residential uses combined).
- Dimensional standards that allow residential at a much lower density.

The commission concluded that these issues will be discussed as we review and codify the Land Use Code in that next few months.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

---

Marcus LaFrance, Chairman