



AGENDA
for the Planning Commission
of the Town of Palisade, Colorado
341 W. 7th Street (Palisade Civic Center)

July 5, 2022

6:00 pm Regular Meeting

- I. **REGULAR MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 pm**
- II. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- III. **ROLL CALL**
- IV. **AGENDA ADOPTION**
- V. **ANNOUNCEMENTS / PRESENTATIONS**
 - A. **Update on Town projects**
 - B. **PUBLIC COMMENT REMINDER:**

All emails are to be sent to the Community Development Director at brusche@townofpalisade.org. Emails for public comment on a specific agenda item received prior to the day packets are published will be included with the staff report. Emails received after the packets are posted will be forwarded to the Planning Commission. Any member of the public who wishes to have a statement or email read into the Minutes is required to appear in-person at the meeting and make said statements to the Commission directly.
- VI. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - A. **Minutes from May 17, 2022, Regular Planning Commission Meeting**
- VII. **PUBLIC COMMENT – For items not on the Public Hearing agenda**

Please keep comments to 3 minutes or less and state your name and address. Neither the Planning Commissioners nor staff will respond to comments at this time. The Commission may direct staff to look into specific comments to bring back as an Agenda item at a future meeting.
- VIII. **UPDATE ON THE PALISADE GAME PLAN (comprehensive plan update)**

www.PalisadeGamePlan.com
- IX. **ADJOURNMENT**



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PALISADE PLANNING COMMISSION
May 17, 2022**

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission for the Town of Palisade was called to order at 6:00 pm by Chair Riley Parker with Commissioners present: Leora Ruzin, Penny Prinster, Andy Hamilton, David Hull, and Amy Gekas. Commissioner Don Bosch was absent. A quorum was declared. Also in attendance were Community Development Director Brian Rusche, Town Manager Janet Hawkinson and Administrative Assistant Shelley Kopasz.

AGENDA ADOPTION

Motion #1 by Commissioner Prinster, seconded by Commissioner Hull to approve the agenda as presented.

A voice vote was requested
Motion carried unanimously

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion #2 by Commissioner Prinster, seconded by Commissioner Amy Gekas, to approve the Minutes from the April 19, 2022, Regular meeting of the Palisade Planning Commission, as presented.

A voice vote was requested
Motion carried unanimously

PUBLIC COMMENT

None was offered.

PUBLIC HEARING, I

PRO 2022-09, A PRESENTATION OF A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN AT 3734 G 4/10 ROAD (PARCEL # 2937-081-00-111)

Chair Parker opened the public hearing at 6:18 pm.

Community Development Director (CDD) Rusche reviewed his staff report noting that this was only a Concept Plan, the first of three steps toward approval of a subdivision. The direction to the Planning Commission is to review the application and forward comments and feedback to the Board of Trustees and referenced the following sections of the Land Development Code:

**LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (LDC)
Section 4.05.A – Major Subdivision – Concept Plan**

The purpose of the concept plan is to allow the Planning Commission and the Board of Trustees to preview the proposed subdivision and offer an initial evaluation regarding the subdivision layout and

design, public open space, public dedications, and public improvements.

Section 4.03.A – Planned Development Purpose:

The purpose of a Planned Development is to achieve greater flexibility than allowed by the strict application of this LDC while providing greater benefit to the Town.

Section 5.05.B – Planned Development Purpose:

The PD district provides for modification of the otherwise applicable dimensional requirements, in order to accomplish one (1) or more of the following purposes:

1. Promote innovative and creative design of residential and nonresidential areas;
2. Promote flexibility in the placement of structures so as to preserve and take advantage of the site's unique, natural resource or scenic features and to avoid or mitigate any hazardous area;
3. Encourage more efficient use of land and public streets, utilities and governmental services;
4. Preserve open space for the benefit of residents of developments and the community;
5. Achieve a compatible land use relationship with surrounding areas; or
6. Promote a greater variety in the type and design of buildings and thereby improving the character and quality of new development.

**Section 7.01.A – Residential Use Standards – Single-Family Detached
Single-family detached shall meet the following standards:**

1. The siding shall be wood, brick, stucco or stone or material which looks like wood, brick, block, stucco or stone;
2. Be attached to an excavated and backfilled, continuous concrete or concrete block perimeter foundation that complies with the Building Code;
3. Have a gable or hip type roof construction with at least Class C shingle or metal roofing material; and the roof slope must have a vertical rise of four (4) inches for every twelve (12) inches of horizontal run with a minimum eave projection and roof overhang of one (1) foot, which may include guttering. Roofs may be flat if the architecture is such that it reflects Santa Fe or Territorial style architecture;
4. Have a minimum of eight hundred (800) square feet of enclosed and heated living area per dwelling unit

NOTE: The proposed unit size is not considered a tiny home as Section 14.02 of the LDC defines tiny home as a single family detached dwelling less than four hundred (400) square feet in size.

Ted Ciavonne of Kaart Planning presented a presentation of a residential development concept plan on approximately 9.78 acres at 3734 G 4/10 Road (Parcel # 2937-081-00-111). The presentation is attached to the meeting notes.

Public Comment

Chair Parker opened the hearing to Commissioner comment.

Commissioner Gekas asked about the property storage. Mr. Ciavonne answered that the storage will be at the units. The additional bedroom can be used as additional storage. Commissioner Gekas inquired if it will be a gated community. Town Manager Janet Hawkinson responded that it is not allowed.

Commissioner Prinster asked if one may make money back by leasing the units. Mr. Ciavonne clarified that it is possible to be compared to a mobile home park as far as the financing.

Commissioner Hull asked about gravel roads and meeting Mesa County Road and Bridge standards. He inquired if the roads would revert to the Town after completion of the project or will the subdivision remain control of the roads. He was concerned about the fact that there would be no sidewalks or paving. He asked about the drainage and the system and that the retainage ponds are steep and a concern for children and pets regarding the safety. Mr. Ciavonne replied that the architects would ensure a 4:1 slope and explained that this is preliminary. Commissioner Hull also addressed the concept for parking of possible guests and feels that parking needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Hamilton inquired about the density and why choose a high density instead of low impact. He also asked if this development would be like the Palisade Legends development. Mr. Ciavonne addressed the affordability factor.

Commissioner Ruzin expressed concerns with the two-story model home style with elderly residents. Mr. Ciavonne said that they will discuss a possible one-story design for older residents. She also was concerned with the financing aspect of the project.

Chair Parker opened the meeting up to public comment.

Brittany Lebreznz, 594 Rosa Street stated that she is a neighbor of the Herman's. She likes the idea of affordability factor and the concept, but it is thinks it is quite dense. She wants to make sure that the town can accommodate for the utility aspect. How many cars per property? HOA Rules? More specifics of the maintenance of the quality. Likes the look of the homes rather than condos or apartments.

Patrick Kelley, 569 Cicero Drive stated that he is a neighbor of Herman's and that they are good neighbors and enjoys them. He stated he would like to see this project more cohesive with what is surrounding it such as less dense in nature and being more commensurate with the surrounding neighborhoods. He commented that when exiting Cicero Drive, he feels they have to wait and concerned about how the impact of 60 houses with two cars each would affect the traffic situation.

John Barbier, 820 Cabernet Court informed the commission that he had visited the village located in Silt and he doesn't feel that is what we want in the town as he feels it represents a refined trailer park. He likes the concept idea but not for this proposed location. Park be placed somewhere else in the town. He feels it would be conducive to 20-25 houses rather than the current proposed sixty units.

Shirette of 3560 G Road doesn't feel that it is affordable and lacks garage and storage. She suggests we look at the subdivision located on 25 and G road called Copper Creek. She feels that for first-time home buyers they will not be able to afford these homes.

Brant Harrison, 860 Raid Creek Road stated his family owns Kokopelli Farms and farms the property to the west. He quoted the Federal laws regarding spraying of orchards and feels that if the proposed project will be greatly affected if it is approved.

Lisa Wangsnes, 577 Rosa Street stated that she lives within 300 feet of the proposed project. She is concerned with the density in a high traffic area. She stated that having 2 cars per unit will be an impact on the traffic and feels that it is too much for the area. She wants to see more stop lights or more traffic control.

Kat Green, 862 Iowa Avenue commented that she is a first-time home buyer and states that it is impossible to find any affordable housing. She said that these homes are not for first-time home buyers.

Garn le Baron, 365 W. Fifth Street said he moved to Palisade in August of 2019 and grew up in Orem Utah until 1983. He claims that it was an orchard town until later development destroyed the orchards. He warns of being careful planning because what we have here is very special.

Adam Doherty, 603 W. First Street informed us that he lives across from the proposed “parking lot” and stated that he is 110% against this. He feels that it is glorified trailer park, low-income housing, and subdivision proposal. He went on to add that it is high density and that it will change the population directly. It is an inappropriate use of lands that define our Town and stated that the home values will deteriorate. He continued to say Palisade will become overpopulated and suggests that crime will increase, and Palisade will become a suburb of Grand Junction. He added that the property had been zoned R-3 or HDR in 1989. He suggests to the Town to purchase the property to offset monetary interest.

Debra Revis, 144 Majestic Court. Her opinion is that it is bad for Palisade because the occupants would not own that land and only the structure. She asked if affordable housing meant low-income housing. She commented on the tourism and the fact that tourists do not come here to look at housing. She feels that safety is an issue with 60 homes resulting in too much due to the traffic. She concluded in saying that she doesn't want Palisade to become Clifton.

Debra Ramirez, 308 37 3/8 Road, Grand Junction, CO Stated that she grew up picking peaches at the property. She is concerned about the 60 fire pits at every unit burning all at once and the gravel roads with the possibility of dust. She feels that it is not an affordable solution.

Gail Evans, 126 Majestic Court said she understands what it is like to not have a home to afford and to qualify for a house in Palisade. She feels that infrastructure is the main point, including water. She wants to see a cap on development.

Tyler Loy, 3745 G Road stated his top concerns are that since they will be owned by a trustee and the cost would be at \$300,000.00, it will be \$14,500,000.00 and would like to know what the orchard is currently worth. He also inquired if it were to be sold to a person that wants to keep it an orchard?

Mally Strong, 471 W. Fourth Street says she appreciates the remarks regarding open space and added. that we have spent so much work in preserving the open countryside here. She suggests we all start to begin thinking of going upwards as far as growth is concerned. She suggests a better use of the land.

Gary Glodowski, 123 Davis Circle reminded us of Mr. Davis, former farmer, and Mr. Driscoll of Driscoll Berries always wanting to land for agriculture and wants to Keep Palisade the way it is.

Jennifer Freed, 239 W Fifth Street says that she is concerned with infrastructure specifically childcare and schools. She feels that this proposed development would become a party place and not suitable for small families.

Priscilla Walker, 3718 G4.10 Road feels that this is not the highest best use for this property. She believes there are two conflicting surveys for this property. She states that there are no survey markers, if a recent survey was done the diagram in the packet does not show here three rows of trees located to the west of the project. It also shows medium and not high density.

Theo Otte, 453 W. Fourth Street asked where the water is going to go and who is responsible for the Right of Way. He feels that the gravel roads are a problem.

Michelle Heppenstall, 129 Elberta is frustrated with the Town and not happy already with the current proposal.

Tracy Johnson, 743 Nectarine Street stated that she has a long family history in this town and asked where we go from here.

Chair Parker closed the public hearing.

NEW BUSINESS

CDD Brian Rusche gave a brief update on Conditional Use Permits that were approved recently by the Board of Trustees, who received the same update at their meeting. He also informed the Commission of the schedule of upcoming meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion #7 to adjourn by Chair Parker at 7:56 p.m.

X

Riley Parker
Planning Commission Chairman

X

Shelley Kopasz
Administrative Assistant