

A. CALL TO ORDER

Five Planning Commissioners were in attendance. (Aaron Hancey, Derek Biddle, Mel Mulder, JP Nisley, and Amy Miller were present.)

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Hancey led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

The election of a new chair was added to Other Business.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER NISLEY MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 5-0

E. WITHDRAWN ITEMS

None

F. CONTINUED ITEMS

None

G. CONSENT ITEMS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 13, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting.

COMMISSIONER MILLER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES

COMMISSIONER MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 4-0 (COMMISSIONER BIDDLE ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE)

H. HEARING ITEMS

Application #: 2022-30
Project Name: Raptor Crossing
Application: Preliminary PUD Plan
Representative: Kaart Planning
Location: 853 Raptor Road
Description: This is a request for approval of a Preliminary PUD Plan for a luxury Motorcoach development on approximately 4.9 acres.

Staff Presentation: Henry Hemphill

Slide 1 – Introduction

Slide 2 – Application Details

Slide 3 Legal Notice

- Post Cards – September 23, 2022
- Sign Posting – September 23, 2022
- Newspaper – September 23, 2022

Slide 4 – Site Posting and Buffer Zone

Slide 5 – PUD Process

Concept Plan (optional step) - 17.19.030 (A)

- This step is optional.
- The Planning Commission and City Council both review the application in a workshop setting.
- Decisions and discussions are non-binding.

Preliminary PUD Plan - 17.19.030 (B)

- This step is required.
- The Planning Commission will make its recommendation to the City Council.
- As part of the Preliminary PUD Plan, the City Council shall enact an ordinance zoning the property to PUD.

Final PUD Plan – 17.19.030 (C)

- This step is required after the Preliminary PUD Plan.
- This application is reviewed administratively in accordance with review agencies and City Councils' decision on the Preliminary PUD Plan.

Slide 6 – Zoning Map and Aerial Photo

Slide 7 – Site Plan

Slide 8 – Review Criteria

- Section 17.19.030 (A)(1) (a-d) and Section 17.21.040 (A) (1-5)
 - Lot sizes: 2,534 – 3,150 square feet.
 - C-2 zone minimum: 5,000 square feet.
 - Private Street is 24 feet of asphalt and a 2 ½ foot shoulder. Total of 29 feet.
 - Private Streets shall be considered on an individual basis and are not maintained by the City.
 - Fencing.

Slide 9 – Review Criteria Cont.

- Compatibility with surrounding land uses, both existing and allowed.

- Review Comments received by Colorado Parks and Wildlife express concerns with how wildlife may interact with the development.
- Proposing a use that may work well for this uniquely shaped lot.
 - 214 feet by 1,300 feet.
- The flexibility and creativity of a PUD zone can allow the property to develop.

Slide 10 – Review Comments & Public Comments

- **REVIEW COMMENTS:**
- All review comments received are included with this Staff Report. All review comments must be adequately resolved with the Final Plat application.
- **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**
- No written public comments have been received by Staff at this time.

Slide 11 – Suggested Motion

- Mr. Chair, I move we (approve/deny) application 2022-30, the Raptor Crossing Preliminary PUD Plan to the City Council with the condition that all review comments and all issues identified in the Staff Report be adequately resolved with the Final Plat application.

Slide 12 – Next Steps

- Following Planning Commission
 - City Council 1st Reading of the Zoning Ordinance – November 8, 2022
 - City Council 2nd Reading of the Zoning Ordinance – December 6, 2022 (public hearing)
 - If approved by City Council.
 - Applicant has 180 days to submit the Final PUD Plan.
 - Final PUD Plan sent out for review to ensure compliance with review comments.
 - Decision is made administratively.

Mr. Hemphill concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Hancey thanked him. He then called the applicants representative to give his presentation.

Ty Johnson from Kaart located at 734 Main Street did the applicant PowerPoint presentation.

Slide 1 – Introduction

Slide 2 – Luxury Class A Motorcoach Community Site Plan

- Not an RV Park and Not a traditional Subdivision
- 39 conveyable lots w/ strict use limitations

Mr. Johnson elaborated that the lot was a challenging property and that it would lend itself to storage units. He said that he felt this was a unique product. He added that the lots were conveyable with strict limitations.

Slide 3 – Class A Motorcoach

- Larger and higher-end (26'-45') (Avg. cost \$250,000)
- More interior living space
- Increased towing capacity
- NOT...trailer, mobile home, park model, or RV
- Additional year restriction on Motorhomes for this development

Mr. Johnson added that there was a 15-year-old age limit to the Class A Motorcoaches.

Slide 4 – Naples, FL

Mr. Johnson explained that these types of neighborhoods existed in places around the United States and he wanted to show them examples of them.

Slide 5 – Poulson, MT

Slide 6 – Moab, UT

Slide 7 – Palm Springs, CA

Slide 8 – Use Restrictions & Code Deviations

- Strict Use Limitations
 - Residential Use of one Class A Motorcoach
 - Parking for one commuter vehicle, one Motorcycle, and one golf cart
 - No Camping or outdoor storage of any kind.
 - Construction of one accessory structure per lot
 - Small space intended to complement the living space of the motorcoach. Examples include a casita, pergola, shade structure, outdoor kitchens and fireplaces.

Slide 9 – Casita

Mr. Johnson showed different examples of what a Casita was.

Slide 10 – Raptor Crossing Typical RV Lot

Mr. Johnson showed a sample of what the typical lot will look like. He added that there would be a paved pad, that there would be utility easements on the lots and that the HOA would take care of the front yard landscape.

Slide 11 – Trails and Open Space

- 1.2 acres of acres of open space and 740' of trail provided
 - .58 acres of open space & 514' of trails required

- Clubhouse with bathrooms, laundry, and community gathering space

Mr. Johnson concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Hancey thanked him. He then opened the meeting to public testimony.

There was none.

Commissioner Hancey closed the public discussion and opened the meeting to Planning Commission discussion.

Commissioner Biddle had concerns about how the motorcoaches were going to pull in and out of the subdivision. He wondered if there was enough space.

Sam Atkins said that there would be a conflict but that he did not feel there would be enough traffic to worry about it.

Commissioner Biddle asked if the motorcoaches could load and unload elsewhere.

Mr. Johnson said that they would not be able to store a trailer on the lot.

Commissioner Mulder talked about the layout. He wanted to know if the vehicles were facing South and North. He asked if it was the same for both sides and if they would have to back in.

Mr. Johnson stated that they would use the hammerhead to turn around.

Commissioner Mulder asked if the lot owners were able to rent out their lots.

Mr. Johnson said that they would not.

Commissioner Mulder asked how this would be policed.

Mr. Johnson responded that this would happen with the HOA.

Commissioner Mulder wanted confirmation that the motorcoaches could not be more than 15 years old.

Mr. Johnson said that this was correct.

Commissioner Mulder asked if the motorcoach was older than 15 years if they would have to leave.

Mr. Johnson said that they would have to leave. He then added that the motorcoaches can be exchanged and upgraded.

Commissioner Mulder asked if they would have to maintain their license.

Mr. Johnson said that they would.

Commissioner Mulder asked if they could park and then leave.

Mr. Johnson said that they could be snowbirds but that they would have to keep up their license.

Commissioner Mulder said that he liked the project but worried about the Lagoons. He talked about potentially having an 8 foot fence around the property.

Dan Caris mentioned that there could be the possibility of exchanging lots with other people with motorcoaches.

Mr. Johnson said that this was correct. He said that this would be a direct swap and that this would be set up with the CC&Rs.

Commissioner Mulder said he felt that this was a loose end.

Mr. Johnson stated that he was unsure how this would look on paper. That this would not be a rental and it would have to be an exchange.

Commissioner Biddle wondered if there could be a group purchase with an LLC.

Mr. Johnson said yes.

Commissioner Hancey said that this would not be a short term rental and more of an agreement. He spoke about the possibility that this would be part of an association and then they rented these lots out. He wanted more clarity on this.

Mr. Caris added that what he was talking about was like a condo timeshare and that rules and regulations would exist. He added that they could tighten up the language.

Commissioner Nisley said that this could be a loophole and create issues.

Commissioner Hancey reiterated that the CC&Rs could be tightened up.

Mr. Johnson mentioned that there would be an approval process through the HOA.

Mr. Caris said that they would have no idea if there was a timeshare.

Commissioner Hancey talked about the single entrance/exit. He wanted to know about a future exit and how sure they were that this would have this.

Mr. Atkins said that they were committed to that.

Commissioner Hancey said that he liked the project. He felt it was a unique solution. He asked about outbuildings.

Mr. Johnson mentioned that the property owners would not be able to build in the easement and that this would be conveyed to the HOA.

Commissioner Hancey asked what would happen if the project went upside down. Would the project stay a PUD or go to a C2 zone.

Mr. Caris stated that it would stay a PUD.

Commissioner Hancey asked if it could develop differently.

Mr. Caris said it would have to be rezoned or the PUD would have to be amended.

Commissioner Nisley said that he liked the project as a buffer project. He was concerned that some of the lots would be conveyed and then others not. He did feel this was a good project.

Commissioner Miller asked if there was an age restriction for the development.

Mr. Johnson said that there was not.

Commissioner Miller said that she thought this would be a great addition to Fruita's offerings.

Commissioner Mulder asked about clubbers and if there could be two RVs per lot.

Mr. Johnson said that he was not sure about clubs but that there would not be two RVs per lot as they would not fit.

Commissioner Hancey wanted further clarification on rentals.

Mr. Caris said that it would be fair to add this to the motion.

Commissioner Hancey thanked Mr. Johnson.

COMMISSIONER NISLEY MOVED TO APPROVE APPLICATION 2022-30, THE RAPTOR CROSSING PRELIMINARY PUD PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE CONDITION THAT ALL REVIEW COMMENTS AND ALL ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE STAFF REPORT BE ADEQUATELY RESOLVED WITH THE FINAL PLAT APPLICATION AND THAT THE APPLICANT PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION ON LOT SWAPS AND TIMESHARING

COMMISSIONER MULDER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 5-0

I. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Community Development Updates

Mr. Caris invited the Planning Commissioners to a couple of site visits. They would be touring The Farm on November 1 at 6:00 pm and the apartments on November 15 at 6:00 pm.

2. Visitors and Guests

Theresa Wilcox who lives at 651 E. Carolina Avenue made a proposal to increase the domestic pet limit in Fruita to 6 domestic pets.

Mr. Caris told the commission about different processes for this.

She would get with someone in Planning and Development early next week.

3. Other Business

Election of a new Chair was added to the agenda.

COMMISSIONER NISLEY MOVED TO NOMINATE COMMISSIONER BIDDLE AS CHAIR

COMMISSIONER MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 4-0

Adjournment 7:02 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Kelli McLean

Planning Technician, City of Fruita