



## REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Tuesday, June 30, 2015

*Chair Helen Rogers* called the Regular Planning Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

### MEMBERS PRESENT AT ROLL CALL:

**ROLL CALL: Rogers, Pettinger, Caldwell, Wood, Strode, and Barnett**

*Commissioner Caldwell moved to EXCUSE Commissioner Marantino and Commissioner Fuller from the meeting. Commissioner Pettinger seconded the motion. The motion CARRIED with the following vote:*

**ROLL CALL: Yes- Rogers, Barnett, Pettinger, Caldwell, Wood, and Strode**

*Commissioner Strode will be a voting member*

*Commissioner Marantino later arrived*

### OTHERS PRESENT:

Planning Director Nathan Lindquist, Planner Hannah Klausman, City Attorney Jim Neu, City Television Station Michael Churchill, Lynn Moore, David Land, Dustin Dodson, William Hutton, Jay Buchanan, Launa Buchanan

### APPROVAL OF April 28, 2015 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

*Commissioner Strode moved to APPROVE, April 28, 2015 Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Commissioner Wood seconded the motion. The motion CARRIED with the following vote:*

**ROLL CALL: Yes- Rogers, Pettinger, Caldwell, Wood, Barnett, and Strode**

### ANNEXATION 2015-3 Grand River Hospital Hill Road

*The Chair* called applicant Dustin Dodson

*The Chair* verified public notice requirements had been met.

**Purpose:** the applicant requests approval of Annexation and Zoning of approximately 12 acres north of Hwy 6 off County Road 194

**Applicant:** *Grand River Hospital representatives explained the annexation of the property currently owned by UMETCO. Grand River intends to buy the property and have it annexed after purchase. The property has had initial assessments completed including radiation hazards, soils reports and there are no concerns.*

**Staff Report:** Staff recommends Planning Commission recommend City Council APPROVE ANNEX 2015-1 with the following conditions:

1. A right-of-way of a minimum of 60 feet shall be dedicated to the City for Hospital Hill Road (County Road 194).
2. Applicant will submit a recently completed Radiation Hazard report, per annexation requirements for a complete application. (Staff noted that this was submitted on the meeting date)

### **Public Comments:**

*Jay and Launa Buchanan:* Residents located next to the proposed annex area on Ash Avenue. They desire to discuss the possibility of access to the back of their property which abuts the annexing land in question. Staff indicated that it was a private matter to be discussed at the will of the two owners. They also mentioned their sewer line runs in the alley behind their property and wanted to make Grand River aware of its existence.

*William Hutton:* Concerned that part of his property at 49 Ash Avenue is proposed for this annexation. He referred to a map.

*Staff:* Explained to the property owner that his property was not part of this annexation and that his property could not be annexed without his consent.

**Commissioners Questions and Comments:**

*Commissioner Pettinger:* Why is the radiation hazard report a concern?

*Staff:* The radiation hazard report is part of a complete annexation application. The applicant had not turned it in by the time of the staff report so staff made it a condition of approval. The applicant did hand in the radiation report today and there is no concern on the property.

*Commissioner Marantino:* What is the plans for the area?

*Applicant :* We are planning on developing on 4 acres of the 12 acres parcel and expanding our hospital services and senior living there.

*Commissioner Strode:* What is the reasoning for the Developing Resource zoning?

*Staff:* The developing resource zone is a holding pattern until Grand River has a more defined development plan. The applicant will come for a rezoning at time of development.

*Commissioner Strode:* What are the water system impacts at development? Who will pay the cost?

*Staff:* The cost will be to the developer at time of development depending on the intensity that comes in. The applicant is aware of that possibility and knows of the possible costs for infrastructure improvements.

**Motion Made:**

*Commissioner Caldwell* moved to **APPROVE** ANNEX 2015-3 with staff recommendations for Grand River Hospital Hill with all Staffs Comments. *Commissioner Pettinger* seconded the motion. The motion **CARRIED** with the following vote:

**ROLL CALL: Yes- Rogers, Barnett, Pettinger, Caldwell, Marantino, Wood, and Strode**

**TEXT AMENDMENT 2015-1 Sign Code**

*The Chair* verified public notice requirements had been met.

**Purpose:** Staff requests approval of an amendment to the Rifle Municipal Code, Chapter 16, Article 8, Sign Code.

**Staff Report:** Staff explained the changes to the Sign Code. Staff recommended Planning Commission TEXT AMENDMENT 2015-1.

**Public Comments:** No Comments

**Commissioners Questions and Comments:**

*Commissioner Caldwell :* Is there a square foot limitation for window signage as the Fuel Canopy signs will be classified?

*Staff:* Window signage is limited to approximately 30% of the window, in this case the entire area under the fuel canopy would be considered window space. Staff would interpret large signage into the total property square footage limitation if these types of signs were attempting to attract more than just the customers using the gas pumps, meaning large signs for passing motorists.

*Commissioner Strode:* Is there a time limit for A frame signs?

*Staff:* No, it is considered like any other sign and is permitted for the duration of the sign being maintained.

*Commissioner Wood:* I don't believe Electronic message signs fits in with the aesthetic with the City and I think it presents a safety issue.

*Commissioner Strode :* I feel like this will be detrimental to the City of Rifle. I think keeping the code the way it is prohibiting these signs is the better choice.

*Commissioner Caldwell:* I agree with the other Commissioners that this does not fit with Rifle, and perhaps we could reconsider this further in the future, but not now.

*Commissioner Marantino:* Have there been requests for this type of electronic signage? Is this what the business community as a whole wants? I agree this is a character issue for the town. My concern is in approving this it would create a huge spike in these signs and businesses competing to have similar signs. I also believe that the new way finding sign package that the City of Rifle is rolling out has a completely different feel and would not match with electronic signs.

*Staff:* We have received two requests from businesses, so staff wanted to put this discussion before the Commission.

**Motion Made:**

*Commissioner Wood* moved to recommend **APPROVAL** of TEXT AMENDMENT 2015-1 Sign Code to City Council with the following conditions:

- a. Add language to the stake sign prohibition to clarify that nonprofit "noncommercial" messages are still allowed.
- b. Remove language allowing Electronic Reader Board signs and maintain the current prohibition on such signs.

*Commissioner Strode* seconded the motion. The motion **CARRIED** with the following vote:

**ROLL CALL: Yes- Rogers, Pettinger, Caldwell, Marantino, Wood, and Strode**

**MEMBER COMMENT AND ADJOURNMENT**

*Chair Rogers adjourned* the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Helen Rogers, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNED COPY ON FILE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Charlotte Squires, Planning Technician

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date