

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing - July 9, 1996
7:07 p.m. to 12:03 a.m.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:07 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium by Chairman John Elmer.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were: John Elmer (Chairman), Jeff Vogel, Jeff Driscoll, Ron Halsey, and Paul Coleman.

In attendance, representing Community Development Department staff, were: Kathy Portner (Acting Community Development Director), Michael Drollinger (Senior Planner), Bill Nebeker (Senior Planner), and Kristen Ashbeck (Associate Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney) and Jody Kliska (City Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 92 citizens present.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

No minutes were available for consideration.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or Prescheduled visitors.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

SPR-96-107 SITE PLAN REVIEW--SAFEWAY COTTONWOOD CENTRE

Appeal of a site plan review approval for an approximately 80,000 square foot retail center located on approximately 11 acres of land with a zoning of PB (Planned Business).

Petitioner: Safeway, Inc.

Location: Southeast corner of F and 29 Roads

Representative: Monty Stroup, LANDESIGN LLC

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger provided a brief history on the item and indicated that the appeal came as a result of public protest over the original administrative approval. With the petitioner having satisfactorily addressed most of the outstanding issues, staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions and procedures outlined in the Administrative Decision letter dated June 14, 1996.

PETITIONER*S PRESENTATION

Howard Gerelick of Safeway (6900 S. Yosemite, Englewood, CO) introduced his team of experts working on various aspects of the Safeway center project and briefly outlined the project. Copies of brochures on the project were passed out to staff and Commissioners. Mr. Gerelick indicated that the

land would be leased long-term and pad sites on the property would also be leased. Conditions of the B-3 zone would be followed, and he understood that any proposals for a drive-thru use would have to come before the Commission for consideration of a Conditional Use Permit. He felt the project met or exceeded landscaping and buffering requirements. Mr. Gerelick presented an enlarged site plan to show proposed traffic circulation. He explained that they expected to have two delivery trucks per day (Safeway store only) and noted the dock area which would include a screen wall to provide additional buffering against noise from delivery vehicles. A 6-foot masonry fence would be constructed along the south and east perimeters of the property, with any graffiti being removed promptly. The owner of the land had granted an additional 25 feet of right-of-way for improvements such as turn and bike lanes. The open ditch presently on the site would be piped underground and lead ultimately to the site's detention pond. At this time, Mr. Gerelick turned the presentation over to Pawan Maini, Safeway's Traffic Engineer.

Pawan Maini (5299 DTC Blvd., Ste. 400, Englewood, CO) provided additional detail from the Traffic Impact Analysis. Various points mentioned included that the left turn lane from Patterson Road could be a problem; this was corrected by providing for a three-quarter access. A right turn and right deceleration lane have been provided at the 29 Road access, located 300 feet south of the intersection. Spacing for the turn lanes has been increased, with an additional lane added the length of the frontage along 29 Road. Studies of the 29 and Patterson Road intersection indicated that plans would work satisfactorily. Mr. Maini noted that the original analysis had been based on an estimated 91,000 square feet of store use. Since the current proposal called for only 80,000 square feet, traffic impacts should be less than originally expected.

Mr. Gerelick again spoke, saying that Safeway would propose a cross-easement agreement regarding cross-parking and access, in order to guarantee cohesiveness for the various uses on site. The site would not allow bars, lounges, or other obnoxious uses, but would allow restaurants which might serve alcoholic beverages. He stated that approximately \$150,000 in off-site improvements were being proposed, to include bike paths, sidewalk and street improvements. He felt that they had attempted to mitigate all outstanding concerns.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Halsey asked if the store had addressed hours of operation for delivery trucks. Mr. Gerelick was unsure what those hours might be, but said that most deliveries would occur in the evenings. When asked if there would be any problem in limiting the hours for deliveries, Mr. Gerelick replied that would be acceptable but asked to be allowed to accept deliveries until midnight, given the distance from Denver, where most of them would be originating.

Commissioner Halsey asked about the screen wall located at the dock. Mr. Gerelick provided additional detail, adding that this screening would be in addition to the masonry wall already proposed.

Commissioner Halsey referred to the sidewalk and exits to Patterson Road and asked if the sidewalk extended through the proposed islands, since pedestrian safety was a concern. Mr. Gerelick noted the locations of the proposed sidewalks on the site plan. Mr. Drollinger clarified, also, that a cut in the island located at the main exit onto Patterson Road was being provided for pedestrian traffic.

Chairman Elmer expressed concern over delivery trucks arriving late onto the site and potential problems over continuous idling. He asked if this could be prohibited and such prohibition be noted in the covenants. Mr. Gerelick said that he would work to mitigate this concern.

Chairman Elmer asked how the development would change the level of service at the 29 and Patterson Road intersection. Mr. Maini responded that the level of service would change from a B^* to a C^* service level, recognizing a 12 to 17.5 second delay, or 1 to 2 seconds per vehicle.

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR:

Sid Squirrell (4339 Racquet Court, Grand Junction), Realtor, felt that the project would be an asset to the area, and that there was a need for additional retail space. He reiterated that the petitioner had reduced the scale of the project to lessen impacts, would direct some traffic away from North Avenue shopping, and provide less driving miles to persons intent on doing their shopping.

Mary Huber (580 Melrose Court, Grand Junction) said that while she favored the proposal, she recalled Safeway's history for closing its stores and wondered what would become of the building if they should close this one.

Gerald Sparks (591 - 29 3/8 Road, Grand Junction) felt that Safeway should be given the benefit of the doubt.

Jim Weimer (588 - 28 Road, Grand Junction) spoke in favor of the project.

Robert Elliott (3206 Nolene Court, Clifton), union representative for food and commercial employees, felt that the store would provide additional jobs and boost the local economy.

AGAINST:

David Scanga (612 Cris Mar, Grand Junction), attorney representing the Cris Mar homeowners and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Isom, said that in reviewing the petitioner's Traffic Study, significant discrepancies and safety issues became apparent. He pointed out the magnitude of the traffic generated by the store and other businesses. He felt that the 1,800 trips/day alleged by the petitioner for the supermarket was an unrealistic number and pointed out that there would be an estimated 4,803 trips/day generated for other businesses on the site. (When asked by Mr. Scanga for corroboration on weekend numbers, Ms. Kliska responded that Saturdays and Sundays would generate approximately 11,000 trips/day.) Mr. Scanga said that if weekday trips were even half that figure (approximately 5,000 trips/day), there would be a total of 82,000 trips generated per week to the site (58,000 if 30 percent of this estimate was considered passing by traffic).

Mr. Scanga said that the suicide lane dividing Patterson near the subject area was needed by Cris Mar and other residents in the area to access their respective driveways and neighborhoods. The proposal would eliminate a portion of this lane. With the Traffic Study calling for 506 feet of deceleration prior to turning into Safeway and given current vehicle speeds along Patterson, he maintained that there would be constant conflict in the suicide lane between shoppers and those people turning in to their driveways and neighborhoods. The proposed deceleration lane would only serve to further congest traffic, not alleviate it, and would achieve a level D^* of service. Mr. Scanga said that level D^* is unstable.

Mr. Scanga added that the peak hours of store operation coincided with peak travel into and out of area subdivisions. In addition, he felt that the two concrete dividers at the north entrances of Patterson Road needed to be reengineered to prevent left-hand turns out of the development.

Mr. Scanga also pointed out that Mr. and Mrs. Isom's driveway was located directly adjacent to the proposed delivery truck exit (photos were passed out to Commissioners). He felt that the delivery trucks would prevent the Isoms from accessing or exiting their property and would adversely affect their

business. He pointed out that the quantity and type of delivery vehicles for other site businesses were not addresses at all in the Traffic Study. The masonry wall proposed by Safeway would affect sight distance for the Isoms as well.

Mr. Scanga felt that the sidewalk proposed for 29 Road should extend all the way from the 29 and Patterson Road intersection to Orchard Avenue and that there should be a pedestrian bridge crossing the canal. A full pedestrian phase should be installed at the 29 and Patterson Road intersection. The Traffic Study, he asserted, did not address pedestrian traffic and safety issues.

Mr. Scanga argued that the Traffic Study*s basis for traffic calculations was flawed, using figures which were 10 percent less than the 2.2 percent annual traffic increases cited by the City*s Engineering Department; this was also, he said, inconsistent with the projected traffic increases of 3 percent for Patterson Road alone. He felt that there should be a deceleration lane constructed on Patterson Road heading south on 29 Road.

Mr. Scanga summarized by saying that he felt there to be a lack of adequate study and analysis of traffic and safety issues, that no consideration had been given to the Isoms, and that while he would favor the project if done properly, he maintained that the following conditions should be attached to any approval:

1. No left turns from Patterson Road onto the site.
2. The concrete dividers should be configured so that they prohibit left-hand turns in and out of the development.
3. The pedestrian light at the intersection of 29 and Patterson Roads should have a pedestrian only cycle on it.
4. Installation of a sidewalk from the site to Orchard Avenue, including a pedestrian bridge over the canal, should be required.

Commissioner Driscoll said that the Planning Commission was given specific criteria by which to render a decision. He asked if Mr. Scanga could correlate his concerns with the criteria. Mr. Scanga replied that he felt the traffic and safety issues had not been adequately studied and addressed by the petitioner*s Traffic Study; thus, the Commission would be basing its decisions on faulty information.

Commissioner Driscoll noted that Mr. Scanga*s letter of appeal referred to *Code* section 4-14-4, B, and E. He asked Mr. Scanga about his professional expertise on which to make such claims and assertions. Mr. Scanga said that his expertise was solely that of legal counsel for the Cris Mar homeowners and Mr. and Mrs. Isom (no traffic engineering background).

Commissioner Driscoll asked for confirmation that Mr. Scanga had a left-hand turn prohibitor located in the front of his office, to which he replied that he did, acknowledging that it was largely ineffective.

Chairman Elmer stated that the Traffic Study submitted by the petitioner had been signed and stamped by licensed engineers. Without similar credentials, he didn*t feel that Mr. Scanga could adequately refute the study*s data. Mr. Scanga replied that it was the study*s data he used as the basis for his arguments.

Virginia Watson (340 S. Redlands Road, Grand Junction), employee of City Market, felt that Mr. Scanga*s arguments were being influenced by his representation of City Market. Mr. Scanga denied these assertions.

Earl Isom (2917 Patterson Road, Grand Junction) expressed concern over the lack of visibility afforded him by the proposed masonry wall along the eastern property boundary. He felt his family would be

competing for access to and from Patterson Road with delivery trucks and other vehicles, which would create a hazardous situation for his family and customers. He didn't want to see his driveway parallel with that of Safeway and said that delivery trucks would end up using a portion of his driveway to navigate the turn onto the site. He felt that the far eastern proposed access, next to his property, should be deleted. He also expressed concern over the noise generated by the store's delivery trucks late at night and didn't feel that there was adequate noise buffering being provided. Mr. Isom opposed any drive-thru uses and felt his property's value would be adversely affected by the development.

Bob Maffey (594 Redwing, Grand Junction) agreed with Mr. Scanga's arguments and reiterated how traffic and access impacts caused by the development would affect surrounding neighbors.

Tom Parish (617 Wagon Way, Grand Junction) recommended that the City stick with the original uses and zone approved for the site in 1979 and that a list of those approved uses be a part of any Commission approval.

Lisa Ondo (2910 Patterson Road, Grand Junction) was concerned over the development's effects on the quality of life of its neighbors. She didn't feel Safeway's statements concerning only two delivery trucks per week was accurate, since they would also have trucks delivering bread, soft drinks, etc. and that these other delivery trucks would be visiting the other businesses located on the site as well. She concurred that additional studies were needed and expressed concern for the safety of her daughter who may be walking in the area.

Mary Carr (603 Cris Mar, Grand Junction) noted that Safeway stores have pulled out of two previous sites, leaving vacant, unattended buildings. She wondered who would be responsible when or if this store closed. She also echoed concerns over delivery trucks at night, safety issues, and increases in traffic.

Sharon Olsen (633 Melody Lane, Grand Junction) reiterated safety concerns for children and pedestrians.

Gerald Sparks (591 - 29 3/8 Road, Grand Junction) again thought that Safeway should be given the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Drollinger said that a letter had been received from Mr. Robert Kline (2908 Bonita Avenue, Grand Junction) who expressed many of the same concerns as mentioned previously. In addition, Mr. Kline felt that building heights for all businesses be limited to a single story and that no liquor licenses be granted for businesses locating on the site.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Howard Gerelick did not feel that any of the arguments presented by the residents warranted denial of the project and he reminded Commissioners that all City requirements had been or were being met. He suggested cutting back the masonry wall near Mr. Isom's property to increase sight distance and felt that the masonry wall would provide Mr. Isom with adequate sound buffering. He also offered to install a gate at Mr. Isom's driveway to prevent unwarranted access onto his property. Mr. Gerelick said that no technical data had been presented by Mr. Scanga to refute the findings of their traffic study, adding that he felt the traffic circulation plan would be effective. The density, he continued, was less than what could have been proposed.

Pawan Maini added that all acknowledged drafting and engineering principles had been used in the formulation of the traffic study; he acknowledged that the development would have an impact on the area, its streets and intersection. He clarified that the number of trips/day were expected to be 6,600 for Safeway (1,018 trips/hour) and 4,803 trips/day for other business uses, with 70 percent of the total trips

being for Safeway*s customers. He said that the development would increase traffic along Patterson Road by 11-12 percent, but the traffic analysis had indicated that both 29 Road and Patterson Road could handle the expected increases. In analyzing future growth scenarios for other communities, Mr. Maini said that an average growth rate is 1.8 to 2 percent, with 2 percent considered sustainable. Concerning the pedestrian light, he said that this mechanism is typically reserved for downtown areas where pedestrian traffic is highest.

Mr. Maini felt that the left-hand turn prohibitors were the best deterrents against left-hand turns onto Patterson Road and he recommended the two-way left-turn islands be retained, as recommended by *AASHTO Green Book*, the accepted authority on roadway design standards. He said that the present design would accommodate any future expansion of 29 Road, as suggested by the *29 Road Corridor Study*. He said that all data submitted had been reviewed by the City*s Engineering Department. Commissioner Driscoll asked whether different design standards could be used to mitigate any deficiencies in the divider design to further discourage left-hand turns to and from Patterson Road. Mr. Maini suggested using a different radius angle. When asked what radius angle was being currently proposed, Mr. Maini replied that 48 feet was used for the island at the delivery truck exit and 71 feet was used for the Patterson Road entrance island.

Commissioner Vogel asked Ms. Kliska what the City*s standards were for distances between driveways, to which she replied that this was 75 feet from property line and 25 feet between single family structures.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner asked staff to clarify the classification status of 29 Road, which was provided.

Commissioner Driscoll asked about the restrictions imposed on the Albertson*s store at 12th and Orchard regarding delivery trucks and hours of operations. Mr. Drollinger was unsure of the specifics without referring to the file.

Chairman Elmer expressed continued concern over the idling of delivery trucks.

Commissioner Vogel was concerned over the delivery truck flow. He felt that the truck exit was located too close to Mr. Isom*s property and was in favor of closing the exit altogether. Also, he felt that the left-hand turning from Patterson Road onto the site would create traffic problems. He suggested that the left-turn prohibitors be more elongated.

Chairman Elmer asked Ms. Kliska why she didn*t require a single entrance onto the site, to which she responded that the proposed design would serve to disburse traffic more efficiently. Chairman Elmer asked about the potential impacts of closing the eastern delivery truck exit, to which she replied that to do so would probably have little impact, but added that it was a good idea in terms of separating delivery traffic from general traffic flow.

Commissioner Halsey agreed that it would be nice to have the sidewalk extended all the way to Orchard Avenue and a pedestrian bridge constructed, but he saw this as being more a City/County responsibility. He suggested citizens lobby their government officials to this end. He suggested that such improvements could be included in the north-south corridor improvements plan. When asked if the north-south corridor study was designed to mitigate these types of deficiencies, Ms. Kliska replied negatively. She added that it was acknowledged that the 29 Road and Orchard Avenue intersection needed improvements but that they had not yet been budgeted for.

Chairman Elmer clarified that the Commission*s consideration of an administrative appeal used a different set of criteria than that of a rezone. He acknowledged citizen concerns but said that none of the arguments presented substantiated any claims of non-compliance by the petitioner with City requirements.

Commissioner Halsey concurred, adding that the Planning Commission was responsible for ensuring compliance to City policies and standards. He agreed with Chairman Elmer*s comments concerning the limitation of truck delivery hours.

Commissioner Vogel asked Mr. Shaver to clarify the options available to the Commission for a motion, which was provided.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) §Mr. Chairman, on item SPR-96-107, a site plan review for the Safeway at Cottonwood Centre, I move that we approve the application subject to the following criteria: 1) on the far eastern exit onto Patterson be made into a right turn in, right turn out only; 2) that the island on the other entrance onto Patterson Road be engineered as recommended by Mr. Vogel so that it becomes even more of a deterrent for any left-hand turns; 3) that (18-wheeled refrigerated trucks) do not arrive after 11 p.m. in the evenings and not before 7 a.m. and restricted to loading and unloading (applicable to all businesses on the site); 4) to allow the petitioner and the property owner directly to the east the latitude in coming up with an agreement to either place a gate along the edge for additional access onto their property or remove a portion of the wall on the furthest north end if that will meet the requirements of the neighbor to the east, to the satisfaction of both parties, (and that if no mutual agreement could be reached by the two parties on the driveway access, the condition would be void); and 5) subject to other staff conditions and procedures (as amended).

Mr. Drollinger clarified on condition 1) that the island design was presently configured as a right turn in, right turn out. Ms. Kliska said that the island design came from nationally recognized publications and was recommended by the City*s Engineering Department. Commissioner Halsey chose to leave the condition as part of the motion.

Chairman Elmer suggested that, on condition 3), a morning delivery commencement time be included. After some discussion, it was determined that no deliveries should commence before 7 a.m. Commissioner Coleman asked if condition 3) would apply to trucks delivering to other businesses on the site as well, to which Commissioner Halsey said that this would include the entire site and all businesses on the site.

Mr. Shaver suggested clarifying the type of delivery trucks which would fall under this restriction 3), since it was his recollection that the Albertson*s approval specified 18-wheeled refrigerated trucks. He also asked that with regard to condition 4), what would happen if no agreement on access mitigation could be reached between the two referenced parties. After a brief discussion, Commissioner Halsey agreed to specify 18-wheeled refrigerated trucks in his motion. He also clarified that if no mutual agreement could be reached by two parties on the driveway access, the condition would be void.

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Vogel opposing, based on access.

A brief recess was called at 9:45 p.m. The hearing reconvened at 9:50 p.m.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION UNLESS APPEALED

PP-96-111 PRELIMINARY PLAN--THE KNOLLS

Request for Preliminary Plan approval for 81 single family lots and 1 church site on approximately 33.9 acres (for an overall density of 2.4 units per acre) with zoning of PR-7.2 (Planned Residential, 7.2 units per acre).



Petitioner: Robert Knapple

Location: Southeast corner of 27  Road and Cortland Avenue

Representative: Tom Logue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker outlined the proposal and noted the site*s location on maps provided. He indicated that the southern portion of the site was zoned RSF-4, while the majority of the site fell within the PR-7.2 zone approved in 1980. With most of the property falling within the Airport Critical Zone, no density higher than 4 units per acre would be allowed. If the Preliminary Plan is approved, the petitioner*s intent was to submit a revised plan proposing a gated community; however the latter was not a part of the pending proposal.

Outstanding issues included the Ridge Drive connection, the stub street to the property south of the subject parcel, and the design and function of proposed open space. The Ridge Drive connection was being sought to provide access directly to the future park and school to be located on the recently purchased Matchett property. While Ridge Drive was not intended to serve as a major east-west corridor, it would provide a valuable inter-neighborhood connection and one long planned for by the City. Staff recommended the installation of *traffic calming* devices, to be further described by Jody Kliska. With regard to the stub street proposed to connect to the western property, staff felt it more important for the street to connect to the southernmost property since, without the connection, future development of the southern parcel would be forced to access 27  Road only. Staff suggested that a private drive from the Knolls to the westernmost property would be preferred over providing a stub street. The proposal did not provide for any active recreational areas as mandated by the planned zone criteria. The proposed passive open space would serve only to preserve existing natural features.

Mr. Nebeker touched briefly on the petitioner*s stated intention to provide a church on the property but added that no plans for construction of the church were being considered presently.

Staff recommended denial of the plan because it failed to provide needed roadway linkages for Ridge Drive and to the 25-acre vacant parcel to the south of the Knolls, however, if recommended for approval, staff recommended attaching the following conditions:

1. A revised Preliminary Plan (with a revised phasing plan) be submitted for the entire project except for the lots fronting the existing section of Ridge Drive connecting to Spring Valley Subdivisions (Phase I as originally proposed by the applicant).
2. The lots within Phase I be rezoned to PR-4 or RSF-4 at the time of Final Plat approval. A Special Use permit will be required at Final Plan for those lots located within the Airport Critical Zone.
3. A pedestrian link a minimum of 12 feet wide and with a 10 foot concrete path, open to the public, be provided between Ridge Drive in Phase I to the remainder of this subdivision.

4. Roadway cross-sections shall be provided on the Preliminary Plan for: a) local streets; b) Ridge Drive, which shall include detached 4.5 foot sidewalks with vertical curbs; and c) Cortland Avenue, which shall be designed to meet the City*s collector street standard.
5. The Preliminary Plan shall be revised to indicate the location of the irrigation ditch along Cortland Avenue.
6. A phasing plan with proposed development schedule shall be provided.
7. The Preliminary Plan shall be revised to correctly identify the Airport Critical Zone boundary.

Jody Kliska, City Development Engineer, made a presentation, including handouts to Commissioners and a visual presentation. Data depicted current street linkages and the one proposed for Ridge Drive through the subject property. Ms. Kliska said that the City considered the linkage important in that it provided an inter-neighborhood connection and the last possible connection between 12th Street and the park and school proposed for the newly acquired Matchett property. Ridge Drive was designed as a residential collector and the extension would be constructed to this standard as well. She noted that it was referenced in the 1980 *Roadway Plan*, the 1994 *Roadway Plan* and the 2015 *Planned Goals and Objectives*.

She felt that the Ridge Drive connection may relieve Patterson Road of some of the inter-neighborhood traffic now forced to use the principal arterial. Ms. Kliska elaborated on the proposed ☺traffic calming* devices referred to previously by Mr. Nebeker. A diagram depicting an island of greenspace and plantings in the middle of a given intersection was proffered as an illustration.

Commissioner Driscoll asked Mr. Nebeker to point out the lots which were included in Phase I, which he did.

PETITIONER*S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representing the petitioner, began by saying that this was an infill parcel. The 2.4 units/acre currently proposed was well under the 4 units/acre allowed. He said that the stub street was designed to avoid geologic obstacles and that the street could be extended to the south at the point where it met the westernmost property boundary. He said that a wetlands study would be conducted and that the proposed open space area would be cleaned up but left primarily in its natural state. A walkway would be constructed to access the open space area.

Mr. Logue distributed handouts to Commissioners containing data on collector streets, single family residential access standards, and minimum sight distance requirements. He said that to require the Ridge Drive extension went against *Code* criteria which he said stated that ☺Streets will be laid out to discourage outside traffic from traveling and traversing minor streets.* In addition, he said that page 26 of the *Transportation Engineering Design Standards* stated that ☺Excessively long, straight residential streets conducive to high speed traffic are prohibited.* He felt that the Functional Classification Map must be in error since its specifying Ridge Drive as a collector street didn*t appear to be consistent with the aforementioned *Code* and *Design Standards* statements. He felt that the posted speed limits for existing collector streets (25 mph) were also inconsistent with the ☺collector* classification. He noted that two of the Spring Valley approaches failed to meet the tangent requirement of 100 feet. Forty-four existing driveways backed out onto Ridge Drive, he said, and while this was acceptable for a local street, he said they did not conform to collector street standards. He said that, with regard to the open space area, the petitioner proposed to construct a small sitting area with gazebos.

Chairman Elmer asked that if the street were to be required through the subdivision, could it be appropriately designed, to which Mr. Logue replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Driscoll asked why the stub street was attached to the westernmost property instead of the southernmost property. Mr. Logue replied that this had been granted to satisfy a promise made by the petitioner to the owners of the western property to provide an alternative access to their property. Mr. Logue asked for latitude to allow further discussions on this issue.

Robert Knapple, petitioner, added that he planned to live in the new subdivision and that homes and lots could be designed using quality standards. He said that he'd met with area residents and tried to mitigate outstanding concerns. He presented a petition containing 100 signatures from homeowners who opposed the Ridge Drive extension. He commented that if the extension was intended to provide an inter-neighborhood connection and the neighbors didn't want it, why should it be forced on them. Mr. Knapple said that he would comply with all of staff's conditions if the project was recommended for approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Robert Blom (3426 Ridge Drive, Grand Junction) expressed approval for the subdivision proposal but recommended elimination of the Ridge Drive extension. He felt it would bring unwanted traffic into 5 quiet, established neighborhoods and adversely impact property values.

Chip Newton (2520 Pheasant Run Circle, Grand Junction) mirrored Mr. Blom's comments, adding that she wanted to see the integrity of existing neighborhoods maintained.

Those expressing additional approval for the proposed subdivision but opposition to the Ridge Drive extension included Virginia Rennels (2428 Pheasant Run Circle, Grand Junction), Jim Frasier (3530 Ponderosa Way, Grand Junction), Betty Perry (2954 Beechwood Drive, Grand Junction), and Elton Krisman (1819 Ridge Drive, Grand Junction).

Claude Early (3745 Elderberry Circle, Grand Junction) asked for general information on the size/compatibility of proposed homes, wetlands study provisions, additional details on the gated community proposal, and wondered why a church would want to locate in an Airport Critical Zone.

AGAINST:

There were no comments against the proposal.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Knapple added only that the sizes and configurations of homes would be dependent upon styles and lots sizes but would be generally between 1,800 and 2,000 square feet.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Driscoll asked if the traffic calming devices would be installed only in this development. Ms. Kliska responded that additional devices were planned for other intersections along the Ridge Drive corridor.

Chairman Elmer asked if the corridor was designed to route traffic from Patterson Road onto Ridge Drive. Ms. Kliska replied that it was not intended as a major corridor, but would serve only to connect

what already existed. She reiterated that the street would be designed to residential, not urban, collector standards.

Commissioner Driscoll asked for clarification of the portion of wetlands area located at 15th Street, which was provided by Ms. Kliska.

Mr. Halsey said that he'd attended a traffic teleconference at Mesa State College. Traffic calming devices had been well received in other communities. They were both aesthetic and worked well to slow traffic and he felt they would be effective in mitigating traffic impacts along Ridge Drive.

Commissioner Driscoll asked Ms. Kliska if the City had any timetable on the installation of other devices outside the proposed development. Ms. Kliska said that if the devices were made a requirement, the City would push to install them as quickly as possible but she was unsure when that would take place.

Chairman Elmer noted that active recreational areas were a function of a planned zone, but if rezoned to a straight zone, this would not be a requirement.

Commissioner Halsey asked that if recommended for a straight zone, would it go before the City Council, to which Mr. Shaver indicated that it would.

Chairman Elmer, a resident of Spring Valley, commented that the extension had always been intended and that it was consistent with approved plans and designs.

Commissioner Halsey agreed, adding that the stub street should connect to the southern property.

Commissioner Driscoll said that he lived in cities where traffic calming devices had been used. He was concerned that the City had no timetable for constructing the additionally proposed devices.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) Mr. Chairman, on item PP-96-111, I move that we deny the Knolls Preliminary Plan based on the findings in that it fails to provide needed transportation links for Ridge Drive and the 25-acre vacant parcel to the south.

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Driscoll opposing.

**PP-96-132 PRELIMINARY PLAN--PHEASANT RIDGE ESTATES
Request for Preliminary Plan approval of 24 single family detached units and 12 duplex units on approximately 6.35 acres of land with PD-8 (Planned Development, 8 units per acre) zoning.
Petitioner: Just Companies
Location: West of northwest corner of 28 and Patterson Roads
Representative: Edison Lenhart**

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck briefly outlined the proposal and noted the site location on maps provided. She noted that since the property had not been developed into the Pheasant Run condominiums as originally planned, the public right-of-way for Springside Court would be vacated at the final phase of this development. She discussed proposed accesses and said that due to the close spacing of driveways on the public cul-de-sacs, and the Fire Department*s requirement that no parking be allowed on the private drives, staff recommended that the developer provide additional off-street parking spaces. The petitioner had responded that each of the detached units would have 4 parking spaces available on site (2 in the garage and 2 on the driveway). Each of the attached units would have 2 parking spaces (1 in the garage

and 1 on the driveway). Since this option didn't meet the intent of the *Code* which required 2 on-site spaces for each unit, staff recommended the developer be required to provide 8 additional off-street parking spaces.

Drainage from the development would be directed to a detention pond located in the northwest corner of the site. An easement will be needed from the City for the discharge facilities. The Grand Valley Water Users Association (GVWUA) requested that the developer submit an application to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). Approval of the application would allow for additional discharge from the Spring Valley pond into Drain D of the Grand Valley Project, which is under the jurisdiction of the two aforementioned entities. Since this request reflected a change in recent policy, the City has engaged in discussions with the GVWUA to ascertain how this requirement should be applied. Thus, staff was not requiring that approval by Grand Valley Water Users Association be made a condition of approval.

Landscaped islands were proposed for the centers of each of the public cul-de-sacs, a landscaped common area for an entry feature, and a mini park within the drainage facility area must all be dedicated as private open space on the Final Plat, and a Homeowners Association must be formed to maintain these open spaces.

A pedestrian pathway between the end of the Springside Court cul-de-sac and Spring Valley Park was being proposed. This would be dedicated to the public and the developer would be responsible for constructing an 8-foot concrete walkway within the easement.

Ms. Ashbeck stated that any other outstanding review agency comments could be addressed at the Final Plat stage. Staff recommended approval subject to provision of off-street parking spaces.

PETITIONER*S PRESENTATION

Marc Maurer, representing the petitioner, said that the only outstanding issue remaining concerned the provision for off-street parking. He felt the driveways and garages to be sufficient and said that area constraints limited the petitioner from providing for additional parking areas. Mr. Maurer pointed out the various other amenities being provided in the project and suggested that this might be just compensation for the additional parking spaces. The project would provide for an architectural site development guideline which would ensure quality design standards (which were expounded upon briefly).

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked Mr. Maurer to point out the locations of the private drives, which he did. Chairman Elmer asked if there could be any parking in the cul-de-sacs. Mr. Maurer said that there was the potential for additional parking in the cul-de-sacs, adding that such parking would be limited.

Chairman Elmer asked if the petitioner would be jeopardizing the open space triangle (noted) if an additional parking area was provided. Mr. Maurer replied affirmatively, adding that the referenced open space area would also be used for signage and to meet other project requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

Virginia Rennels (2428 Pheasant Run Circle, Grand Junction) expressed concern over the additional traffic and suggested the City install a light at the intersection of 28 and Patterson Roads. She also wanted to know the sizes of proposed structures.

Dale Rennels (2428 Pheasant Run Circle, Grand Junction) felt that without adequate parking, people would end up parking along the private drives, which may necessitate backing vehicles the entire street length in order to leave the subdivision. He took issue with the provision of only one access, felt that the density was too high, and suggested that there would be problems for Spring Valley residents over the proposed stormwater detention area.

Chip Newton (2520 Pheasant Run Circle, Grand Junction) concurred with statements made by Mr. Rennels over the stormwater detention area. He said that the Spring Valley area had a high water table and several of the homes along Pheasant Run have had to incorporate cisterns and pumps to divert water away from basements. He suggested the City closely scrutinize drainage designs to ensure that this problem was not perpetuated. With regard to off-street parking, he felt that this should be required.

Betty Perry (2954 Beechwood Drive, Grand Junction), president of the Spring Valley Homeowners Association, said that although not against the project per se, she wanted the developer to meet with their association prior to construction since the proposed pedestrian pathway would be constructed over Spring Valley irrigation lines.

Mary Clawson (2315 Pheasant Run Circle, Grand Junction) felt that any two-story development would affect homes directly abutting the project. She said that rear gates opening up to the proposed pedestrian walkway would compromise privacy and created the potential for trespass. She wanted to know how trash pick-up and utilities would be addressed, what type of additional (if any) fencing was proposed, and whether the petitioner would be required to participate in a wetlands study.

Mary Hampton (2313 Pheasant Run Circle, Grand Junction) expressed concern over the size of the lots and the proposed density. She was also concerned over her potential loss of view.

Ron McDonald (2427 Pheasant Run Circle, Grand Junction) felt that the development would adversely affect property values, and felt that the apartments would invite uncontrolled parties and noise from trash trucks early in the morning.

PETITIONER*S REBUTTAL

Mr. Maurer said that the proposed homes would be between 1,200 and 1,800 square feet with mainly two car garages. The homes would begin at \$110,000. The private drives would be paved, landscaped, and include a 3-foot concrete pan. He said that the adjacent property to the east was under investigation for development and he had been contacted by those wanting to match street configurations. Mr. Maurer said that the plant types installed in the detention area would be suitable for a park site when the area was not in use for drainage detention; however, those same plantings would be safe should the site be under water. He reminded the Commission that runoff would only be at historic rates, with no additional runoff allowed. He had no problem conferring with the Spring Valley Homeowners Association over the irrigation lines. He thought that their valves were located on the petitioner*s property so he was unsure what legal implications might be involved.

Mr. Maurer said that staff required only 8 off-street parking spaces. He felt that this was accommodated in the driveways and didn*t think overflow would be a problem. Fire trucks could, if necessary, access the site via the private drives; however, hydrants were positioned in such a way that the 150-foot hose length should reach all units without the need for fire truck access. He presented a site plan diagram dating back to 1984 which depicted a build-out of the property which included multi-story units at a much higher density than what was being proposed. Units would be pushed back 25 feet from the north boundary which, he felt, would help to preserve the view line, and he said that plan called for primarily ranch-styled homes. Trash collection would be provided curbside by the City of Grand Junction.

Mr. Maurer reiterated that these would be single family detached homes, the difference being only the shared party wall. He said that the avigation easement had already been applied for. The site had been reviewed by a City Fire Department and no wetlands were located on the property. With regard to the fences adjacent to the property, he said that any fencing constructed would be limited to 6 feet in height, be comprised of a decorative material, that any chain link be screened from public view and that fencing would be subject to the scrutiny of the Homeowners Association and Architectural Control Committee.

Jim Langford, the petitioner*s engineer, said that the project design accommodated the high ground water by building up the low end of the site approximately 2 feet. Along the far western edge, the wet and boggy area was created as a result of the irrigation water overflow. This would dry up when the irrigation lines to the site were hooked up. Stormwater drainage was mitigated to meet City standards and added that any further requirements would also be met. Mr. Langford said that an alternate proposal for stormwater conveyance included draining the historic flow directly into the pond originally intended to hold it instead of via the GVWUA/BOR line.

Chairman Elmer wondered if the petitioner would need to detain the water on site if the City built its detention facility off of 28 Road as planned. Mr. Langford was unsure of this because the project would be located downstream from the detention facility, but he felt this would certainly be a preferred alternative, if workable.

Commissioner Halsey asked staff for clarification on trash collection for the development, since it was his understanding the City did not provide for collection along private streets. Ms. Ashbeck said that the petitioner had been put on notice that there would be no street collection and recommended that a common area be provided. Mr. Langford responded that the City*s Sanitation Department had suggested trash be brought out to the curb for pick up.

Ed Lenhart, developer, reiterated some of the points mentioned by Mr. Langford and Mr. Maurer.

Chairman Elmer wondered if the center street would have to be extended all the way through, to which Mr. Lenhart said that it would because it would provide access to the mail boxes.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey felt that the additional parking spaces required by staff were important, and that the petitioner should have to demonstrate that parking in the cul-de-sacs was both viable and could meet the staff*s requirement for additional parking.

Commissioner Coleman agreed, but Chairman Elmer disagreed, adding that he viewed the private drives more as accesses to the individual lots which would incur little traffic impact. Chairman Elmer felt that there was enough public street right-of-way available for additional off-street parking. If demonstrated by the petitioner that the additional parking requirement could be satisfied by the public street right-of-way, he felt this to be sufficient. Commissioner Halsey expressed that he would be receptive to this suggestion.

Chairman Elmer felt that the proposal was consistent with the Planned Residential zoning, would have less impact than the original design and met the intent of the *Code*. Commissioner Halsey agreed with these statements.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) Mr. Chairman, on item PP-96-132, a Preliminary Plan for the Pheasant Ridge Estates, I move that we approve the Preliminary Plan subject to the staff's recommendation for the 8 additional parking spots, either requiring them or demonstrating that there is sufficient parking existing on the public streets.

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

The hearing was adjourned at 12:03 a.m.