

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 3, 1999 MINUTES
6:12 p.m. to 11:08 p.m.**

The specially scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 6:12 p.m. by Chairman John Elmer. The public hearing was held at Two Rivers Convention Center.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were: John Elmer (Chairman), Joe Grout, Mark Fenn, Jeff Driscoll, Terri Binder and Paul Coleman. Nick Prinster was absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were: Scott Harrington (Community Development Director), Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), and Bill Nebeker (Sr. Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Asst. City Attorney), Mark Relph (Public Works Director), Ken Simms (Mesa County MPO), and Jody Kliska (Transportation Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 200 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No minutes were available for consideration.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

The following item was heard in part on May 27, 1999. While originally intended to begin with public comment, the petitioner offered new information, and following a brief discussion with the Planning Commission chairman and the City's legal counsel, the petitioner was allowed to make a brief presentation on the new material.

III. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

RZ-1998-082/SDR-1998-129 GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT/REZONE/SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW-CITY MARKET

A request to: 1) amend the Growth Plan from Residential, Medium (4-7.9 dwelling units/acre) to Commercial on approximately 3 acres, 2) rezone 8.26 acres from RSF-8 (Residential Single Family not to exceed a density of 8 units per acre) and PB (planned Business) to a B-3 (Retail Business) zone district, and 3) approve a site specific development plan for a 60,405 square foot City Market store.

Petitioner: City Market, Inc.

Location: Southeast corner of 12th Street and Patterson Road

Representative: Mike Shunk

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Caldwell referenced the new plan on the alternative access design for Wellington Avenue. While not his first choice, he thought that it might alleviate some of Planning Commission's concerns. He again introduced members of his design team, which was comprised of Tom Rolland, David Hook and Alan Richman.

Tom Rolland, representing the petitioner, presented an overhead transparency of the revised access alternative. He also passed out copies of the petitioners narrative dated June 3, 1999, which detailed changes and impact mitigation (see file). Mr. Rolland read the narrative into the record and outlined proposed plan changes. Essentially, the truck exit (Driveway E) would be eliminated as an access onto Wellington Avenue. Instead, delivery and service vehicles would be routed on-site one-way west around the south end of the store and the employee parking lot south of the store building, then north through the parking lot to the driver's choice of either the Patterson Road Driveway B or the 12th Street Driveway C.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Coleman asked if any consideration had been given to making the Wellington access a right-turn only from the site. He also thought there would be a stacking problem at the 12th and Wellington intersection; a signal light at that location could be warranted.

David Hook, representing the petitioner, did not expect the proposed amendment to change wait times at that intersection. He still predicted average wait times of 16 seconds for motorists wanting to turn either left or right onto 12th Street. Mr. Caldwell added that the volume of traffic traveling from the site to 15th Street was expected to be light.

Commissioner Coleman asked for current traffic counts along Wellington, to which Mr. Caldwell responded 360 ADTs. The access alternative would increase that number to approximately 730 ADTs. The increase was still acceptable for a local residential street. Commissioner Coleman reiterated that less impact to the Wellington Avenue corridor would be realized if a right-turn-only option were pursued and a signal light installed at the intersection. He felt that the estimated 16-second wait time was overly optimistic. He added that the left-turn access lane had been deleted to provide a wide-radius in-turn to accommodate wide turns from delivery trucks. That turn lane could be re-added and the access reconfigured to a right-turn only if required.

Commissioner Driscoll wondered if the turning radius at the southeast corner of the building were wide enough to accommodate a truck turning and bisecting the employee parking area (noted). Mr. Rolland responded affirmatively for smaller delivery trucks.

Commissioner Binder asked for clarification on turning movements for each of the proposed access points, which was provided.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker said that submission of the access amendment did not change staff's position nor the recommendation for denial. He was unable to comment on the amendment specifically because it pertained to engineering and suggested that any questions be directed to the City's engineering staff.

Jody Kliska said that she had not been given sufficient time to thoroughly review the plan amendment, but on a cursory level it appeared to reduce traffic volumes on Wellington.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if redirecting traffic to the 12th and Patterson location would change that street's level of service. Commissioner Grout expounded on the question to ask if the 300 ADTs taken from Wellington along with delivery truck traffic would significantly decrease the 12th and Patterson intersection's level of service. Ms. Kliska said that the percentage of vehicle trips added to the intersection would be very small compared to the overall volume.

Commissioner Coleman asked if a signal light at 12th and Wellington would be warranted, or would it be located too closely to the 12th and Patterson intersection? Ms. Kliska said that a Wellington signal light would be too close to the Patterson signal light; also, Wellington would not generate sufficient traffic to warrant the light.

Ms. Kliska added that in recent monitoring of the Patterson Road exit it had been discovered there were very few gaps in traffic along Patterson for left-turn vehicles exiting the site. She expected that people could wait the better part of an hour before being able to turn left onto Patterson from that exit point. On 12th Street there had been concerns over City Market traffic conflicting with traffic from the Village Fair Shopping Center.

Commissioner Binder wondered if turning movements into and out of the Village Fair Shopping Center would be affected by City Market's traffic. Ms. Kliska said that traffic queues had been measured and for the present time, the Village Fair driveway would be left as-is, with City Market's access restricted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Fred Aldrich (1750 Bitteren Court, Grand Junction), attorney representing City Market, expressed support for City Market and its management. He felt there was a need for the store at the proposed site and would save cross-town vehicle trips. Having it would be very convenient for him and his family. He also noted that the 12th and Patterson Road improvements would benefit the entire community, especially since the intersection was expected to "fail" within the next three years. City Market had demonstrated a willingness to mitigate concerns. If not approved, he wondered what else would go on the site.

Sally Schaffer (3845 Horizon Glen Court, Grand Junction) said that she typically shopped the bigger stores offering greater selection. Representing Hilltop, she said that a number of elderly and disabled persons residing in the immediate area would benefit from the store's convenient location. She agreed that it could cut down on travel time and the number of vehicle trips.

Bill Wilson (no address given), reading his letter into the record, said that City Market was his favorite store. He felt that the store's benefits would include fewer number of trips and less congestion at the 12th and Patterson intersection. Improvements would extend the intersection's life by 10 years. He felt that the petitioner had met or exceeded staff's requirements.

Brian Mahoney (2567 G Road, Grand Junction) said that City Market had always been a wonderful corporate citizen involved in numerous community events and local charities. He hoped they would receive what he felt was due them and wondered if the Growth Plan had ever been meant to be taken literally.

Terry Toner (549 W. Greenwood Drive, Grand Junction), vendor for City Market, said that the store's management had been good to him and his family. A number of desirable benefits, he said, would be derived from the store's location and he noted the added landscaping, intersection improvements and traffic mitigation measures proposed.

Rick Swank (3305 E 1/4 Road, Grand Junction) felt that the store would benefit the City and that the plan was a good one. He hoped that the facts, not emotion, would guide the City's ruling.

Linda Todd (685 Crestridge Drive, Grand Junction) said that she currently drove across town to do her shopping. Having the store located so much closer to her home would reduce the number of trips she made. She also thought that City Market had met City requirements and that the Growth Plan should be more flexible.

Mark Nersman (no address given) said that the proposal would clean up the property. He felt that intersection improvements were needed and that traffic volumes would only increase. The plan was a good one, and City Market would add jobs to the area.

Tillman Bishop (2697 G Road, Grand Junction) agreed that City Market was an excellent corporate citizen. He felt that the plan was good and that the petitioner had tried hard to mitigate staff concerns.

Dan Prinster (1203 Gunnison Avenue, Grand Junction), speaking on behalf of St. Mary's Hospital, felt that the plan was good and the location appropriate. Offering a map of the area, Mr. Prinster said that the site would not make a good location for a medical facility as suggested because of its distance from nearby hospitals.

Roger Wilcox (641 Panorama Drive, Grand Junction), real estate broker, said that growth in the north Grand Junction area would continue. If the plan were not approved, traffic

would continue to travel further distances for their shopping. He agreed that City Market was a good corporate citizen and that the proposed intersection improvements were needed.

Greg Hoskin (411 Rio Vista, Grand Junction) felt that planning staff missed the "big picture." The Growth Plan was short-sighted in that it only projected out to the year 2010. As such, it failed to consider long-term growth. Submitting a copy of his comments for the record, he added that the Joint Planning Area was experiencing explosive growth. The store would help serve that increased population base. He felt that impacts to the 12th and Patterson intersection would be negligible, given the number of improvements offered by City Market. He submitted a written statement which he wanted to be included in the record.

Sharon Dixon (641 Panorama Drive, Grand Junction) didn't feel that the use was too intense for the site. The majority of the site would be landscaped, and open space was prevalent. Only 20 percent of the site's total acreage, she said, would be taken up by structures. She felt that having the store there would be an asset to the community.

Gary Timm (3603 Ridge Court, Grand Junction) said that because the City had no plans to improve the 12th and Patterson intersection, City Market's decision to improve it would extend the life of the intersection, serving the community as a whole. He did not feel that the development would generate any additional growth.

Tom Bell (2026 Wrangler Way, Grand Junction), City Market Regional Manager, said that very similar concerns had been expressed over development of a City Market store in El Jebel. In that instance, City Market had worked with neighborhood groups to mitigate concerns. The community, he felt, had been pleased with City Market's efforts. He urged continued communication between store representatives and neighbors.

Don Knutson (2928 27 ½ Road, Grand Junction) felt that proposed intersection improvements would benefit the entire community. The store's location would save him drive time.

Janet Ridgeway (2700 G Road, Grand Junction) said that a grocery store so close to her home would be very convenient. The only time she used Patterson was when she needed to go to the store, so the proposed location would reduce her number of vehicle trips.

Tom Swenson (2420 Wintergreen Drive, Grand Junction) said that he currently shopped the 1st and Orchard City Market and would patronize a store at 12th and Patterson if given the option.

AGAINST:

John Tomason (2412 N. 12th Street, Grand Junction) said that there were already five grocery stores within a two-mile radius. Thus, there was no need for another store at 12th and Patterson. He expressed concern over the volume of traffic traveling down Wellington and said that even 50 ADTs down that street would cause significant wait times. He

predicted that the development would dramatically increase traffic and congestion at both the 12th and Patterson and 12th and Wellington intersections. While jobs may be increased by the new store, the store would negatively affect other stores in the area and probably cost jobs.

Steve Austin (1161 Lowell Court, #4, Grand Junction) said that while the store may be convenient, he was afraid of the area becoming another Denver. He felt that another location further north might be more appropriate. The dilapidated condition of the corner, he said, was only because City Market chose not to maintain it. He didn't feel that the development was compatible with the neighborhood.

Ted Cameron (1305 Wellington Avenue, Grand Junction) expressed concern over the volume of traffic generated down Wellington. It would pose a significant impact to the neighborhood.

Bruce Forestry (1321 Wellington Avenue, Grand Junction) said that the area was residential and should remain that way. Twelfth Street was never intended to be a commercial corridor, he said, a premise supported by corridor guidelines and the Growth Plan. He predicted that motorists would travel through residential areas to find the best way out of the area upon leaving the site. With all the street engineering needed just to enter and exit the site, he felt that that alone demonstrated the complexity and intensity of the use. Mr. Cameron felt that City Market was trying to run Safeway and Albertsons out of business.

Millie Walker (1305 Wellington Avenue, Grand Junction) said that 70 residences were located on either side of Wellington Avenue. City Market proposed being open 24 hours a day and she expected that deliveries would occur at all hours. She said that traffic, noise, and on-street parking during construction would also be a nightmare for residents along Wellington. Increased traffic would pose pedestrian and other safety hazards. Reading from a letter received by Marjorie Miller, attorney for Wellington homeowners, Ms. Miller said that the store should be dramatically scaled down to better fit in with the neighborhood. She felt that City Market had clearly demonstrated a lack of concern for residents in the area.

Susie Mizelle (1340 Wellington Avenue, Grand Junction) also expressed concerns over traffic, noise, blowing trash, odors emanating from the site, etc. She said that the site had never been allowed to run down until City Market had taken possession of it.

Gail Berry (1305 Wellington Avenue, #102, Grand Junction) emphasized that the subject area was residential, which was supported by the Growth Plan. Commercial development should be reserved for commercially-zoned areas.

Louise Wade (1620 N. 18th Street, Grand Junction) objected to the volume of traffic the development would add to the already congested intersection. She asked planning commissioners to take into account the human element, and she predicted an increase in

the number of accidents at that intersection. While not opposed to City Market, she felt that the store's size and intensity was out of character with the neighborhood.

Jack Walker (no address given) recounted a similar situation in 1985 with Smith Foods. The community had been overwhelmingly opposed to its locating at 12th and Patterson and had voted it down in referendum. He thought 12th and Horizon Drive would be a more suitable location for the store. Mr. Walker cautioned against City Market's receiving favorable treatment because of its community involvement.

Bob Emrich (1441 Patterson Road, Grand Junction), a resident of Patterson Gardens, felt that the development would have serious negative impacts on the Patterson Gardens homeowners. Traffic increases as a result of the store's close proximity would make exiting from the subdivision nearly impossible. Access to the site would be too close to the Patterson Gardens property line. He objected to the smell and noise generated by diesel delivery trucks and dumpsters. With a gas station incorporated into the site plan, what would happen in the event of a fuel spill or fire? A view of City Market's back wall was not a view that any of the Patterson Gardens homeowners would appreciate. Mr. Emrich felt that property values would be affected. He remembered the Smith Foods referendum and said that nothing had changed in the area to warrant reconsideration of a large-scale development on the site. He predicted that the development would create many more problems than it would solve.

Dr. Patricia Verstry (1320 Wellington Avenue, Grand Junction) said that her neighborhood was not in need of "urban renewal" as the petitioner had stated. She concurred with previous comments that City Market had allowed the corner to become run down. Hers was a very close-knit community, which the development would destroy if approved. City Market's management had done nothing to foster a sense of trust with the area's residents.

John Markel (1441 Patterson Road, Grand Junction) concurred with previous statements regarding the closeness of City Market's accesses to the Patterson Gardens property line. He also thought that the 12th and Patterson intersection would be dangerous for pedestrians trying to cross the street. Pedestrians would also impede right-turn traffic, which would extend wait times for motorists.

GENERAL:

Jeannie Lalonic (1850 N. 18th Street, Grand Junction) said that the neighborhood would not be able to support two large food stores. Consequently, one of them would surely be driven out of business. What would happen to the site of the departing store? She said that neighbors took pride in their properties; only City Market had allowed its site to deteriorate.

Dick Fulton (1556 Wellington Avenue, Grand Junction) said that he had been instrumental in the defeat of Smith Foods in 1985. He didn't want to be forced into another battle with City Market. People had purchased their homes with the expectation that the area would remain residential. The City had an obligation to protect its residents from such an

unwelcome encroachment. Traffic was of major concern, and he concurred that there were probably other, better locations for the store.

Velva Anton (1161 Lowell Court, Grand Junction) agreed that there was no need for the store given the amount and proximities of other stores in the area. She expressed similar concerns over traffic and noise.

Kathy Dubbling (3249 Lucille, Grand Junction) said that as an employee of the Albertsons store, she knew that City Market's presence in the area would have a negative impact on the Albertsons store and probably force the store to layoff some of its employees. She also objected to the estimated traffic volumes, noise and the unaesthetic design of the building. The store, she said, was not needed nor wanted.

Conda Allford (1505 Wellington Avenue, #116, Grand Junction) felt that the Wellington access should be eliminated altogether. The 16-second wait time estimate, she felt, was inaccurate and grossly underestimated. She expected that the number of accidents at the 12th and Wellington intersection would increase as a result of motorists taking risks in order to access onto 12th Street. Traffic impacts were a major concern, and she felt that the Wellington neighborhood would be significantly impacted by the development.

Terri Troutner read into the record the following letters and comments received by the public not in attendance:

Lenore Styler (1326 Poplar Drive, Grand Junction) asked that the 1st and Orchard City Market be expanded and a park be constructed in the area. She felt that an expansion of the 1st Street City Market was preferable over the construction of a new store at 12th and Patterson.

Frank Bering (284 W. Morrison Court, Grand Junction) spoke in support of the proposal and felt the site to be appropriate for commercial uses. He felt that City Market had worked hard to mitigate concerns. He concurred that City Market was a good corporate neighbor involved in many worthwhile community projects.

James Hamilton (145 N. 4th Street, Grand Junction) felt that the corner of 12th and Patterson would never again support residential development due to increased traffic at that intersection. He commended City Market for its willingness to provide needed improvements to the 12th and Patterson intersection and thought the store would add to the community's quality of life.

Sandi Knudson (876 Covey Road, Grand Junction) supported City Market in its endeavor and said that it had given much to the community. The store would be an asset to the area and she would patronize it if approved. She agreed that it would cut down on the number of trips she routinely drove to shop at other locations.

Knute Knudson (876 Covey Road, Grand Junction) mirrored the sentiments of his wife. He felt that a store was needed at its proposed location; continued growth in the area would

support it. He also commended City Market on its involvement with local community projects and charities. He disagreed with staff's position and statements made by Ken Simms as well.

Judy Matthews (2112 Chipeta Avenue, Grand Junction) expressed strong opposition to the development. Citing the overwhelming defeat of Smith Foods at the same location, she said that the store was not needed there. She felt that traffic impacts to the area would be overwhelming. Attached to her letter were editorials from the Daily Sentinel.

Charles and Elvera Howard (845 Kennedy Avenue, Grand Junction) who expressed concern over traffic and safety hazards associated with the site's entrances. Traffic impacts to Wellington Avenue would also be significant. Another store was not needed at the proposed location and they felt the area's needs were already being met by other nearby shopping centers.

A brief recess was called at 8:20 p.m. The hearing reconvened at 8:38 p.m.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Alan Richman, representing the petitioner, said that the Growth Plan amendment's 7 criteria were considerations only and not requirements. He presented an overhead transparency of the amendment's language and noted especially the use of the word "consideration." The amendment process had been recognized as necessary to address conflicts between the Growth Plan and Future Land Use Map. He felt that Growth Plan policies had been sufficiently met. He said that other locations had been investigated but no other suitable options were available. Supermarkets needed, he said, to be integrated with existing neighborhoods, and the current proposal represented good infill development.

Mr. Richman also presented an overhead transparency of the Urban/Core Outlying Growth Centers map contained in the Growth Plan. He felt that the store qualified as a "neighborhood center." Citing the recently approved Brach's Market rezone proposal, he said that the site had been similar in that a portion of it had also been zoned residential. Because of increases in traffic and the existence of other nearby and adjacent commercial enterprises, the site was suitable for commercial development. He also felt that the store would serve the needs of the neighborhood and community as a whole. Concerns, he said, had been mitigated and improvements to the 12th and Patterson intersection would provide a valuable benefit to the community.

David Hook, representing the petitioner, referenced regional Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and said that most people traveling along 12th and Patterson were en route to other shopping locations. The proposed development would reduce total VMT. If nothing was done to mitigate congestion at the 12th and Patterson intersection, motorists could eventually redirect VMT and extend drive times to circumvent the intersection altogether. That might mean motorists would be redirected into residential areas and away from arterials. He explained that most of the over 8,000 ADTs predicted would not be comprised of new trips. Even staff had agreed with City Market's traffic study.

Mr. Caldwell presented a transparency of the site plan and said that multi-vehicle stacking areas had been built into the plan. He asked Mark Relph to provide additional information from the TEDS manual with regard to stacking areas. Mr. Relph said that City Market had satisfied City Engineering.

Mr. Relph said that the standard stacking area was 120 feet. Mr. Nebeker added that the petitioner only provided 95 feet of stacking room at the Patterson Road entrance. Mr. Relph was unsure what impacts a less than 120-foot stacking area might pose.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer said that while 120 feet might be a minimum stacking distance for a store less than 50,000 square feet in size, the standard for a store over 50,000 square feet was 200 feet. Thus, stacking room was deficient by about 105 feet. Mr. Relph agreed that City Market had not met established stacking room standards.

Chairman Elmer said that the existence of an on-site gas station would require additional stacking room because people typically waited for pump availability. Mr. Relph expressed similar concerns and said that the plan did not reflect exactly what engineering staff had wanted.

Commissioner Grout asked for the stacking depth at the left-turn lane off of Patterson Road. Mr. Relph was unsure. Chairman Elmer said that because there was a left-turn lane at that entrance, it would affect not only the acceleration lane but also those vehicles attempting to make left turns. Mr. Relph said that it was a judgment call. Mr. Caldwell said that two lanes were available in the narrow part of the "throat" along with a left-hand turn lane. The intent was that the vehicles turning left would be out of the way of vehicles wanting to go through.

Commissioner Coleman wondered why engineering staff hadn't insisted on getting what was required in terms of stacking area, especially around the gas station area. Mr. Relph felt that what was offered had been reasonable and acceptable with regard to impacts to 12th and Patterson.

Mr. Caldwell felt that staff's intent had been to see either the drive-through pharmacy or the gas station but not both. City Market viewed the pharmacy as a low-volume activity without the conflicts normally associated with other types of drive-through businesses.

Commissioner Coleman asked for affirmation that no traffic conflicts were expected between the two drive-through activities, which was given. Mr. Caldwell said that the drive lane for the pharmacy had been separated from that of the gas lane by a curb.

Commissioner Coleman said that stacking problems could occur at pumps. Mr. Caldwell agreed that there could probably be some stacking there, 8 car lengths had been provided for the 4 pumps.

Mr. Caldwell said that with regard to noise levels in dock areas, he said that vehicles would be approximately 95 feet from the nearest adjacent building. A noise analysis had been undertaken and copies of findings had been submitted to staff and planning commissioners for review. Findings were outlined. Sound attenuating panels and quiet refrigeration units would also help lessen noise levels in and around the dock area.

Mr. Caldwell said that with regards to comments made about the store's threat to other shopping centers, he noted the existence of a City Market store across from Max's Foods out on 32 Road. Competition was expected in the food industry and it ultimately created choices for the consumer. He noted that the City's engineering department didn't concur with the findings of MPO representative Ken Simms. Neighborhood impact mitigatory measures would be expensive but they would work, he predicted. He reiterated that traffic along Wellington would still not exceed that of a local residential street. The life of the 12th and Patterson Road intersection would be extended; the store would satisfy a community need; landscaping standards had been met or exceeded; and the development would add to the community's overall quality of life.

Commissioner Coleman asked Mr. Caldwell if he felt the economic climate of the area had changed since the Smith Foods proposal in 1985. Mr. Caldwell felt that there had been a significant change. A lot more growth had occurred in the area. Smith Foods had only proposed to utilize a portion of the property, with less buffering provided for adjacent residents. City Market had purchased additional property so that greater buffering would be afforded to residents. He addressed staff and said that stacking distance at the Patterson Road entrance had been measured at 105 feet, not 95 feet.

Commissioner Fenn said that although the amendment had been submitted in response to his comments for Wellington Avenue mitigation, his intent had been to see the access eliminated altogether. Had that been a consideration? Mr. Caldwell said that if the intersection were eliminated entirely, on-site traffic would only be re-routed to other entrance/exit points. Also, motorists wanting to travel south would probably drive down Patterson Road and turn right on 15th, adding to traffic volumes along 15th Street. They may also backtrack along other residential streets to get back to 12th Street.

Commissioner Coleman asked if the petitioner would be amenable to including the right-turn only access onto Wellington, to which Mr. Caldwell responded affirmatively. A left-hand turn lane from Wellington at 12th Street would also be added. A brief discussion ensued over why the left-hand turn lane had originally been deleted. Double left-hand turn lanes would be provided at both the 12th and Patterson entrances.

Commissioner Binder asked if acceleration lanes would be provided with right-turns out of Driveways A, B, and C. Mr. Caldwell said that with two of the three right turns (noted) no acceleration lane would be provided. Mr. Hook expected that in those instances, motorists would wait for a signal gap to enter traffic lanes. Commissioner Binder felt that this would be a big problem because at that intersection traffic was always moving. Very little gap, if any, would be available and she anticipated that people would quickly tire of waiting and

just jump out into traffic if no acceleration lane were provided. Mr. Rolland said that the City discouraged the incorporation of right-turn acceleration lanes on arterial streets.

Commissioner Binder wondered how long City Market had owned the property. Mr. Caldwell pointed out one portion of the property in the store's possession for the last 10 years. He said that houses on that property had been rented up until about 2 years ago. City Market had tried donating the structures but had been told that there wasn't enough residual value in them to warrant their donation.

Commissioner Driscoll said that in instances of bad weather or delays where deliveries were made after 10 p.m., he wondered if trucks would have to wait in the dock areas to be off-loaded. Mr. Caldwell said that crews were employed so that no truck should have to wait for off-loading.

Chairman Elmer wondered why a 40,000 square-foot store wouldn't work just as well. Mr. Caldwell said that people demanded selection. A larger store catered to more varied tastes.

Commissioner Grout again asked about the stacking depth of the westbound turn lane onto Patterson Road. Mr. Rolland estimated it to be approximately 180 feet (9 car lengths). When asked to compare that stacking depth with the store on 1st and Rood, Mr. Rolland estimated that the 1st and Rood store had perhaps half that amount.

Commissioner Binder asked if there was enough room coming out Driveway C to get across the turn lane. Mr. Caldwell said that the engineering department determined sufficient room was available.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Driscoll asked legal counsel for an opinion on the weight of amendment criteria. Mr. Shaver said that statements made by the petitioner's representative were essentially correct in that amendment criteria were, in fact, "considerations." However, the weighting of that criteria and the petitioner's response to the criteria was up to planning commissioners.

Commissioner Driscoll said that if the site were developed as residential with a possibility of 24 units, he wondered how traffic impacts would compare. Ms. Kliska said that in that scenario, only a maximum of 240 ADTs would be generated.

Chairman Elmer wondered why the cost of upgrading Wellington Avenue to a residential collector couldn't be borne by the petitioner, given that the development would generate the bulk of the impact. Mr. Relph explained how only half-street improvements would be required the length of the development. Most of the upgrading costs, he said, would be borne by the City.

Commissioner Binder wondered why the City's Code Enforcement department hadn't cited City Market for the condition of the property. Mr. Shaver said that appearance of property

other than for weeds or junk was not an enforceable item. If the structures were deemed to be unsafe, the Building Department would handle any violations.

Commissioner Binder added that if a property owner created blight, then any proposal would seem to be a good one. She did not want to see the area become another North Avenue. She asked if there had been a conscious effort to retain the Patterson Road corridor as residential, to which Mr. Harrington replied affirmatively. He added that a residential character along Patterson had been reaffirmed by Corridor Guidelines, the Growth Plan and Future Land Use Map.

Commissioner Binder asked how the Safeway Store had been approved for 29 and Patterson Roads. Mr. Nebeker said that it had been zoned Commercial in the County.

Commissioner Binder asked engineering staff if the amount of traffic expected from the development would trigger 4-laning 12th Street, to which Mr. Relph responded negatively.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if there were any increases in the number of accidents or in congestion at the Safeway store intersection, to which Ms. Kliska replied negatively.

Commissioner Grout asked Ms. Kliska to explain problems associated with turn lanes in front of Partee Drive at the Safeway store, which was provided. Mr. Relph said that the lesson received by that experience was the importance of raised medians.

Commissioner Driscoll asked Ken Simms if his concerns revolved around the store itself or the "domino effect" it might have for the area. Mr. Simms answered that both were concerns. He clarified that his comments represented the comments of the MPO, not his personal opinion or that of the City. He added that when an intersection failed, people would start looking for alternative routes. He reiterated the importance of protecting capacities along 12th Street and Patterson Road. He didn't object to commercial uses on the corner as long as they generated low-impact trips.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if modeling had been done on just the commercial aspect of the property or using a combination of less intense commercial and build-out of the residential. Mr. Simms explained that his modeling had been based on the Growth Plan. No modeling had been done of this particular development; rather, the traffic study had achieved those results.

Commissioner Driscoll asked if a comparison between the two scenarios could be formulated. Mr. Simms said that only another traffic study using the two scenarios would provide those figures. Mr. Harrington said that a projection on the number of trips had been included in the staff report. However, turning movements had not been included in that analysis. Mr. Simms said that supermarket trips could be either destination trips or pass-by trips, with the biggest impact seen at intersections and with turning movements.

Mr. Relph referred planning commissioners to Table 10 of the traffic study. Levels of service anticipated with the development would be the same as what the Growth Plan predicted.

Chairman Elmer said that if there were no City Market on the subject corner, the 12th and Patterson intersection would continue to operate at acceptable levels for a longer period of time. Mr. Relph agreed that the community could live with the existing network over a longer period of time. He predicted that even without the store's improvements, something would have to be done to improve the intersection within the next 10 years.

Commissioner Fenn acknowledged the complexity of the issue. He agreed that there was a need for a supermarket in the north part of town and this appeared to be the most suitable site for one. Five acres of the subject site had already been designated commercial. He believed that most of the trips to the site would be pass-by, people stopping in on their way home in the evenings. If located somewhere else, the number of pass-by trips would diminish and the number of new trips would increase. The best solution, he felt, would be to include a right-turn only access onto Wellington with a left-hand turn lane onto 12th Street. The proposal, he felt, met most of the amendment criteria and he could not see any better alternatives for the site. When he'd lived 100 feet from the Coronado City Market, he said that it had been very convenient. He'd not experienced any problems with noise, odors or diminished property values. He found himself traveling to the bigger stores for greater selection even though the 1st and Orchard City Market was closer to his home. Further distances meant increases in the number of cross-town trips. He expressed support for the project.

Chairman Elmer asked if H.O. zoning would allow for this type of development, to which Mr. Harrington replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Coleman wondered if a plan for the 12th and Horizon commercial site had been submitted. Mr. Harrington believed that there were some plans already in place for the property.

Chairman Elmer felt that there were alternative locations available for the store; it was not the only northern parcel available with commercial zoning. It was important to look at amendment criteria to ensure consistency with the Growth Plan. He didn't feel that a Growth Plan error had been made. On the contrary, the residential designation had been purposefully left on the site as a buffer to commercial on the corner. The character of the area had remained constant, and he agreed that the existence of so many other stores in the nearby area meant that community need had not been substantiated. Chairman Elmer said that he didn't define community need as providing additional convenience to a few people.

Commissioner Fenn disagreed and said that the biggest community benefit would be in the reduction of cross-town trips and reduction in the usage of other intersections.

Chairman Elmer said that this plan would draw people to Patterson Road instead of the north-south corridors.

Commissioner Coleman asked if there had been any commercially-zoned property eliminated as a result of the Growth Plan's adoption. Mr. Nebeker said that 80 acres along the 24 Road corridor had been downzoned from commercial to residential. Commissioner Coleman said that just because a parcel was zoned Commercial didn't mean it made sense to put commercial there.

Chairman Elmer said that in looking at the Growth Plan's policies, the proposal didn't meet amendment criteria, corridor guidelines, or Major Street Plan guidelines. It was important, he said, that the City look at long-term solutions to its traffic problems.

Commissioner Fenn said that intersection improvements would be an overall community benefit.

Commissioner Grout said that over a longer period of time, the development would create more problems at that intersection than it would solve.

Chairman Elmer said that City Market's marketing interests and service benefits should not guide land use decisions.

Commissioner Binder expressed support for the plan but not in the proposed location. She believed that the development would ultimately cut down on the number of vehicle miles traveled in the north area and that appreciable benefits could be derived. She supported the concept of mixed uses on the site, but also recognized the impacts that would be felt by other nearby stores. Intersection improvements would buy the City some time, but carrying capacities along 12th and Patterson could be compromised. Patterson Road, she said, was the only good east-west corridor the City had in that area and that the preservation of east-west traffic flows should supersede all other considerations. She agreed that long-term solutions needed to be pursued. She expressed continued concern over the dilapidated condition of the site but didn't believe that any character change had taken place in the area to warrant a zoning change. Community need had not been demonstrated since other stores were located nearby. Circulation plans would be very confusing, especially to seniors. And she agreed that people purchased their properties with a reasonable expectation of what to expect in their neighborhoods.

Commissioner Driscoll said that from a conceptual perspective, the Planning Commission had made a conscious effort to limit commercial development along the Patterson Road corridor. He could see no reason to change the site's original zoning. The plan didn't address amendment criteria nor did it provide sufficient protection for Wellington Avenue residents.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZ-1998-082, I move that we forward a recommendation of denial to the City Council for the Growth Plan

amendment for the City Market store at the southeast corner of 12th and Patterson subject to staff recommendations."

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Fenn opposing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZ-1998-082, I move that we forward a recommendation of denial to the City Council for the rezone of the City Market store at the southeast corner of 12th and Patterson subject to staff recommendations."

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion.

Chairman Elmer clarified that the reason for denial was based on the development's inconsistency with the Growth Plan.

Mr. Harrington wondered if Planning Commission's findings included considerations other than incompatibility with the Growth Plan? Chairman Elmer suggested adding the following verbiage at the end of the word "staff," "...findings and from the discussion heard by the Planning Commission." Commissioner Grout agreed to add that verbiage to his motion, and Commissioner Coleman seconded the amendment. The revised motion is as follows:

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZ-1998-082, I move that we forward a recommendation of denial to the City Council for the rezone of the City Market store at the southeast corner of 12th and Patterson subject to staff findings and from the discussion heard by the Planning Commission (as amended)."

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Fenn opposing.

Chairman Elmer said that with regard to the site plan, his biggest concerns involved the existence of the gas pumps, the lack of sufficient landscaping, and out-of-character signage.

Commissioner Fenn suggested that proposed signage be reduced in size and be designed so that they were more compatible with Patterson Road corridor guidelines. He also suggested eliminating the Wellington access completely to more closely match the Growth Plan's intent.

Chairman Elmer expressed concern that if the access were eliminated altogether, it could direct traffic from Patterson to 15th. Commissioner Fenn concurred and admitted that further review was warranted.

MOTION: (Commissioner Grout) "Mr. Chairman, on item SDR-1998-129, I move that we forward a recommendation of denial to City Council for a site-specific development plan for the City Market store at the southeast corner of 12th and Patterson subject to staff's recommendations along with the recommendations made in our discussion to this point, which include: 1) elimination of the gas pump use, 2) working on upgrading the landscaping for the entire property, 3) possibly monument-style signage, and 4) also eliminating or deleting the Wellington Road access as recommendations should this development be approved."

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Fenn opposed.

With no further business, the hearing was adjourned at 11:08 p.m.