

Neva Lockhart
City Clerk

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing July 7, 1992
7:30 p.m. - 10:45 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Ron Halsey at 7:30 p.m. in the City County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Chairman Ron Halsey, Jim Anderson, Sheilah Renberger, John Elmer, and Tom Volkmann.

Commissioners Craig Roberts and Scott Brown were absent.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Claudia Hazelhurst, Acting Community Development Director, Karl Metzner, Senior Planner; and Kristen Ashbeck, Planning Technician II.

John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney; Don Newton, City Engineer; and Gerald Williams, City Development Engineer were also present.

Judy Morehouse, of KLB Secretarial Services, was present to record the minutes.

There were 27 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 1992 MEETING."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRE-SCHEDULED VISITORS

There were no presentations or pre-scheduled visitors.

IV. GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

- 1. #18-92 CONSIDERATION OF REVISED FINAL PLAN IN PR-8 FOR DAYCARE CENTER AND SCHOOL**

A revised final plan for a new building at 2815 F Road to house the Mesa Montessori Children's House, a day care center and school, in a Planned Residential Zone. Tabled at the May 5th and June 2nd meetings.

PETITIONER: Leo Warren
REPRESENTATIVE: Wayne H. Lizer & Associates
LOCATION: 2815 F Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Wayne Lizer explained the request for the revised final plan for a new building at 2815 F Road. The original turn-around in the parking lot has been eliminated. The revised plan includes 8 parking spaces on the east side of the building and 9 spaces in the front of the building. The landscaping plan and the drainage plans have been revised providing storm water retention on site.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department explained the request for consideration of a revised final plan for a new building to house the Mesa Montessori Children's House in a planned residential zone. The Petitioner has revised the plan since the June meeting eliminating the turn-around and replacing it with 8 parking spaces for employee parking, 1 handicap space and 9 additional parking spaces. The landscaping along Patterson has been increased with additional trees and shrubs, and more trees and shrubs are proposed on the east and west side of the site. The playground is on the southwest portion of the site.

The City Development Engineer and City Utilities Engineer have submitted revised comments; a fire hydrant easement has been requested. The Petitioner is working with these departments and signing of the final forms has been agreed to. All other concerns have been addressed and Staff recommends approval subject to the review agency summary sheet comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked what the improvements agreement was addressing?

Mr. Metzner explained this involved the fire hydrant easement and the curb cut improvements.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #18-92, A REVISED FINAL PLAN FOR A NEW BUILDING AT 2815 F ROAD TO HOUSE THE MESA MONTESSORI CHILDREN'S HOUSE IN A PLANNED RESIDENTIAL ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

2. **#23-92 ODP AND FINAL FOR HERITAGE ELDER CARE FACILITY**
A revision of The Falls Outline Development Plan and a request for Final Plan and Plat approval for the Heritage Elder Care Facility, revising the currently zoned planned residential with a density of 9.5 units to 17.1 units to the acre. The designed density of the remaining Falls development will be reduced because of the density to the elder care facility. Tabled at June 2nd meeting.

PETITIONER: Heritage Elder Care
LOCATION: 2835 Patterson Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bill Thrig of 2324 N. Villa Circle, Grand Junction, CO. representing Heritage Elder Care was present to explain the request for the final plan and plat. The drainage problems have been worked out and the clarification of the transfer of density has been presented to Staff.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department explained the request for the final plan and plat revising the planned residential from 9.5 units to 17.1 units per acre. The areas being affected in the density transfer are owned by Mr. Siegfried and by Heritage Elder Care Center. The density approval by the previous plan was 87 units for area C and 7 units for area F; the new revision to the ODP would put area C to 16 units and area F to 10 units. Area H which is Heritage Homes would change from 18 units to 33 units. The overall density is being reduced even with the density transfer; zoning allowance originally was 286, in January 1992 it was approved for 250, after the latest revisions and transfers the allowance will be 190 for the entire Falls Development area. The Heritage Elder Care buildings will be single story units with terracing on the hill providing a 2 story building for one of the structures.

The drainage plan has been revised and the City Development Engineer has accepted the revised plan. The maintenance agreement is outstanding; however, it has been agreed to and will be signed. All other concerns have been addressed and Staff recommends approval subject to the review agency summary sheet comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Anderson asked for clarification of the classification of the project; are fees and appraisals needed?

Mr. Metzner explained the comment referred to parks and open space fees; this is residential and those fees are based on a per unit charge.

Commissioner Elmer asked Mr. Shaver about possible future complaints due to the proximity to the fire station?

Mr. Shaver explained the law recognizes a theory called coming to the nuisance. The fire station does exist and the building is coming to the area knowing of this preexisting situation.

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner if he recognizes this situation and how the law recognizes this type of situation?

Mr. Thrig replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Elmer asked why the median was being moved on Patterson Road.

Mr. Thrig explained the traffic engineer did a study on this particular area and recommended the median be shortened.

Commissioner Elmer felt this would cause a hazard.

Mr. Gerald Williams, City Development Engineer explained the Traffic Engineer did study this and David Tontoli, the Traffic Engineer, did not object to the proposal.

Commissioner Volkmann asked the Petitioner if the Traffic Engineer has suggested this change?

Mr. Thrig explained Heritage Homes had hired a private engineer who suggested the change and the City Traffic Engineer reviewed the proposal and had no objection to the change.

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner why there was no fencing on the north side of the property?

Mr. Thrig explained the residents would go to the park area on the east side of the property and fencing did not seem necessary to the north.

Commissioner Renberger asked what street exit the fire station used?

Mr. Metzner explained the fire trucks exit on 28 1/4 Road.

Commissioner Renberger felt the elimination of the median did not seem appropriate, and asked how much of the median was going to be eliminated?

Mr. Metzner explained the median would be shortened by 20 feet.

Chairman Halsey commented that left hand turns should be discouraged on Patterson Road rather than encouraged, and the elimination of the median encourages dangerous turns.

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner if the building would have an engineered foundation?

Mr. Thrig replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Elmer added his main concerns were the fence on the north of the property and the proposed removal of a portion of the median.

Commissioner Volkmann questioned the need for the fence.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM # 23-92, A REVISION OF THE FALLS ODP AND A REQUEST FOR FINAL PLAN AND PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE HERITAGE ELDER CARE FACILITY, REVISING THE CURRENTLY ZONED PLANNED RESIDENTIAL WITH A DENSITY OF 9.5 UNITS TO 17.1 UNITS TO THE ACRE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

- 3. # 30-92 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY IN B-3 ZONE**
A request for a Conditional Use Permit for a residential four-plex unit in a Business (B-3) Zone.

PETITIONER: Ellen McComas
LOCATION: 941 Main Street

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Norma Watkins representative for the Petitioner requested a conditional use permit for a residential four-plex unit in a B-3 zone. In the event of fire the property could not be replaced and financing cannot be obtained on the property due to the B-3 zone.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department explained the request for a conditional use permit for a residential four-plex in a B-3 zone. This B-3 zone is the general zoning for the downtown area. In the B-3 zone a multi-family use is a conditional use; this property was in existence before the zoning code and is therefore considered a grandfathered nonconforming use. However, if it is damaged more than 50

percent of replacement value, it could not be replaced without coming back through the conditional use approval process. The owners felt it would be more appropriate to go through the process at this time, and have it legalized which would assist in a possible sale of the property.

There are no changes proposed, there is existing landscaping and parking; the purpose of the application is to eliminate the nonconforming use.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked about the City Attorney's comment regarding the need for an easement for the grass on the City property.

Mr. Metzner explained for grass only there was no irrevocable permit required. Larger landscaping items such as planters and shrubs would require a permit.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER VOLKMANN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #30-92, A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A RESIDENTIAL FOUR- PLEX UNIT IN A BUSINESS (B-3) ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

4. #33-92 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND MINOR SUBDIVISION IN H.O. ZONE

A request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a retail toy store (Toys "R" Us) on two existing undeveloped parcels of land near Mesa Mall zoned Highway Oriented (HO). This proposal also includes the necessary minor subdivision of the current parcels to form one buildable site.

**PETITIONER: Toys "R" Us
REPRESENTATIVE: Rick Willinger, The WBDC Group
Daniel R. Owen, General Growth Management, Inc.
LOCATION: 585 24 1/2 Road (Mesa Mall)**

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jim Brendle, representing Toys "R" Us, explained the request for a conditional use permit to construct a retail toy store on two existing

undeveloped parcels of land near Mesa Mall. All review agency summary sheet comments have been addressed.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Ashbeck of the City Community Development Department explained the Petitioner has submitted a final plat for the minor subdivision. The Petitioner has also submitted the site plan, landscape plan, utilities plan and grading plan, and the required detail sheets for the conditional use permit for the proposed Toys "R" Us located on the northwest corner of 24 1/2 Road and Highway 6 & 50. The property is zoned Highway Oriented (H.O.) which requires the Conditional Use Permit review for this type of commercial development. The plat is required so that the site on which Toys "R" Us is situated may be sold as a separate parcel.

The infill of commercial development proposed by this project is consistent with the existing and intended uses and zoning along the Highway 6 & 50 corridor. This project will result in a currently vacant lot being improved, developed and landscaped. Circulation includes one entrance off 24 1/2 Road.

The Utilities and Drainage plans have been revised to address review comments with a few outstanding issues. These are primarily corrections to the storm sewer and grading plan and the detail plan as outlined in the comments received July 7, 1992 from the City Development Engineer.

The Toys "R" Us site lies in the floodway of the Horizon Drive Channel per the new Flood Insurance Rate Maps revised July 15, 1992. The site has a base flood elevation of 4551 feet. In order to meet the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program, the Toys "R" Us building must be constructed at least one foot above that elevation. As indicated on the Grading and Drainage and Site Plans, the finished floor elevation of the building will be 4553 feet. Thus, the project meets the flood insurance requirements.

Total number of parking spaces required is 101. Total number of parking spaces provided is 170. According to ADA requirements, 6 barrier free spaces with 5 foot access aisles have been provided.

Landscaping within the parking area meets code requirements. The total amount of landscaping shown is adequate; however, within the front yard setback off 24 1/2 Road, only 43 percent of the setback is landscaped as opposed to the 75 percent required by the zoning code. This shortfall has been mitigated by providing 8 additional shade trees on the site.

An appraisal for the property has been submitted and the open space fee has been calculated to be \$34,000.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Halsey asked if comments from the City Engineer were necessary prior to the Commissioners consideration of this proposal?

Ms. Ashbeck replied the City Development Engineer has indicated that the construction of the building could proceed; however, some considerations need to be met prior to construction of the site improvements.

Mr. Williams confirmed what Ms. Ashbeck had stated; the construction of the building could proceed; however, construction of the site improvements should wait until all items have been addressed.

Commissioner Elmer asked Mr. Williams about the location of the proposed street light?

Mr. Williams explained that a light will be required at the entrance on the corner of 24 1/2 Road.

Mr. Newton explained his request was for a street light at the main access off 24 1/2 Road.

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner if the irrigation water would be an extension of the Mall irrigation system?

Mr. Brendle replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Elmer asked about street improvements and sidewalks on 24 1/2 Road?

Ms. Ashbeck replied there will be a sidewalk on the east side of the site.

Commissioner Volkmann asked Ms. Ashbeck about the 43 percent landscape plan for the setback as opposed to the 75 percent required. Is the mitigated change acceptable?

Ms. Ashbeck explained there will be more trees on site and Code does allow a waiver to the total landscaping if more shade trees are provided. Because of the Mesa Mall requirements on parking the site didn't allow a lot of landscaping space, this waiver worked well for the site.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #33-92, A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A RETAIL TOY STORE (TOYS "R" US) ON TWO EXISTING UNDEVELOPED PARCELS OF LAND NEAR MESA MALL AND ZONED HIGHWAY ORIENTED (HO), I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, AND THE SITE IMPROVEMENTS CANNOT BE INITIATED UNTIL ALL THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS ARE SATISFACTORILY ADDRESSED TO THE CITY STAFF."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #33-92, A REQUEST FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION IN A HIGHWAY ORIENTED (HO) ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

5. #34-92 REVISED FINAL PLAN FOR ST. MARY'S PARKING IN A PLANNED BUSINESS ZONE.

A consideration of a revised final plan for the east parking lot for St. Mary's Hospital in a Planned Business (PB) Zone.

**PETITIONER: St. Mary's Hospital
REPRESENTATIVE: Larry Gebhart, Western Engineers
LOCATION: S.E. Corner of 7th Street & Patterson**

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Larry Gebhart explained the request for a revised final plan for the parking lot east of 7th Street between Wellington & Patterson Road. The additional parking will provide employee parking for St. Mary's Hospital. The proposed project consists of approximately 360 parking spaces. The preliminary earthwork has begun on the project which will entail about three months to finalize.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department explained the request for the revised final plan for St. Mary's parking lot in a Planned Business Zone. The existing lot was approved previously with an access off Wellington. This proposal is to the east of the Wellington Medical Center. A right turn exit only onto Patterson Road is proposed and the access will be controlled.

The drainage basin from the previously approved parking will handle the drainage from this proposed parking lot. The improvements and maintenance agreement needs to be finalized. The pedestrian impact study is still outstanding.

Mr. Gebhart explained the pedestrian impact study was not requested in the initial pre-application conference. A traffic analysis was later requested by St. Mary's which was begun and is still under way. On June 29, 1992 City Engineer Don Newton also requested a traffic study in his review comments.

To date the traffic analysis is as follows: The vehicular traffic will be impacted at 7th & Wellington; estimates show 14,038 during peak time at this location. Estimates also show 182 vehicles leaving the new parking lot at 4:15 p.m. and 22 percent would exit on the Patterson exit. This would increase the right hand turns to 188 and 126 left turns; which does not change the level of service for 7th & Wellington.

The estimates of pedestrian traffic on 7th & Patterson, which are based on 15 minute intervals, currently are at a level of service of A. With the increased parking area, the number of pedestrians would increase to 182 which is a level of service of B; the surge would decrease from a level of service from A to C. These projections do not consider the mid street pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Gebhart continued by explaining options to help solve the traffic problems would be a pedestrian only segment to the light, a mid intersection pedestrian light, an overhead pedestrian crossing, or a no turn on right onto Patterson Road.

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Newton if these options had been reviewed?

Mr. Newton replied the pedestrian impact study had not been received by his office. These alternatives have not yet been considered and the hospital has not made any specific commitment for an overhead walk.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Halsey expressed his concerns with the increased pedestrian traffic especially at the peak traffic time. Until one of the options has been put to use it does not seem feasible to expand the parking and increase this existing problem.

Mr. Gebhart replied this is also a concern of St. Mary's Hospital and they feel the traffic analysis is the best course to rectify the problem. We would like to pursue the traffic analysis and work with the City on the problem.

Mr. Larry Leaming Vice President for planning and marketing for St. Mary's Hospital explained their main concern is for the safety of the employees crossing the street. The plan is to work out the best solution possible with the City on this problem. One reason the pedestrians are crossing mid street is that its not perceived to be safe at the intersection.

Commissioner Renberger asked Mr. Leaming what the time frame was for St. Mary's to include the overhead cross walk in their financial planning?

Mr. Leaming explained it is one of the options they have considered;

however, it is not currently in the budget.

Commissioner Volkmann asked when the vehicular and pedestrian studies would be completed?

Mr. Gebhart replied within the week.

Commissioner Volkmann felt uncomfortable passing the project with the traffic problem as yet unsolved. What is the time line on a resolution for the selection for one of the options and what is a time frame after the decision is made.

Mr. Newton replied the traffic engineer would be in charge of the project; each option would have to be analyzed. The easiest option would be the no right turn on red, but studies would have to be done to determine the safety factors for the pedestrians. The other options also cause further difficulties with the vehicle traffic and these options need to be looked into.

Commissioner Anderson asked how long the review process would take?

Mr. Newton replied it would take approximately 2 to 3 weeks to review the options.

Commissioner Elmer felt if the parking lot were approved prior to having a decision by the City on the solution to the traffic problem the parking lot would not be safe to use.

Commissioner Anderson asked Mr. Newton if a conditional approval could be made?

Mr. Newton had concerns as to enforcement; if conditions were not met its hard to stop a project once its begun.

Commissioner Volkmann also felt that the pedestrian and vehicle safety is a real concern prior to approval of this project, and a conditional approval would only increase the traffic concerns.

Mr. Leaming felt the traffic study was not fully understood; the 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. pedestrian traffic will not increase from the present use. The proposed parking is for employee parking which have shift changes throughout the day and night.

Chairman Halsey felt it would be advisable to table this item until further traffic studies are completed.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM # 34-92, A CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED FINAL PLAN FOR THE EAST PARKING LOT FOR ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL IN A PLANNED BUSINESS (PB) ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE TABLE THIS ITEM DUE TO THE LACK OF A CITY REVIEW ON THE NECESSARY PEDESTRIAN AND TRAFFIC STUDY."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

V. ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

1. #27-92 REZONE AND FINAL PLAN FOR LIGHT RETAIL (HI-FASHION FABRICS) IN A PLANNED BUSINESS ZONE

A request for a rezone from RSF-4 to PB at the northwest corner of Patterson Road and Meander Drive and a final plan for the building to house Hi-Fashion Fabrics, a retail fabric store.

PETITIONER: Kathleen Dee Tomkins & Arlene Vogel
REPRESENTATIVE: Thomas A. Logue
LOCATION: NW Corner of Patterson Road and Meander Drive

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Jeff Vogel co-owner of Hi-Fashion Fabrics explained the request for a rezone from RSF-4 to Planned Business at the northwest corner of Patterson Road and Meander Drive. This location is close to the present business location and has good visibility from Patterson Road.

The Petitioner and some of the residents on Meander Drive are not in agreement with the requests by Staff for changes on Meander Drive as it would detract from the current neighborhood setting. The proposal is in lieu of 1/2 street improvements. Mr. Vogel said Hi-Fashion Fabrics would like to improve Meander Drive from Patterson Road to the north side of the proposed exit for the new Hi-Fashion Fabrics store. Mr. Vogel said they would propose a right turn lane onto Meander Drive.

The north side of the property would include a landscaping buffer. The proposal provides for a walkway on the north side as an alternative to the standard City sidewalk requirements.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department explained that the request is for a rezone from RSF-4 to PB for the property located at the northwest corner of Patterson Road and Meander Drive, and is a request for a final plan for the building to house Hi-Fashion Fabrics, a retail fabric store. The proposed parking lot will have an exit onto Meander and exit onto Patterson Road.

The proposal for street improvements will be full street improvements (curb, gutter, sidewalk) on both sides of Meander for half the property length; whereas, the normal requirement is full 1/2 street improvements for the entire length.

Mr. Newton explained the City development code requires 1/2 street improvements along the frontage of the property. The north end of Meander is out of the City and the code may not apply in this case.

Mr. Vogel commented there is a canal easement and that this property does not cross the road.

Mr. Shaver explained that if there is a fee simple canal ownership that would be sufficient to make the property non-contiguous to Meander. As to the question of whether or not the improvements would be required on this portion of property, if it is out of the City then the City would not have any jurisdiction over it for purposes of improvements. If there is property separating Mr. Vogel's property from the north access and if this is an issue of concern it would have to be researched further prior to advising the Commission.

Mr. Metzner continued explaining that the review comments have been resolved and that the fire protection and access have been worked out. The utilities and drainage comments have been satisfied. Comments received July 7, 1992 from the City Development Engineer note recommendation of the full street improvement as shown on the plans. There are still concerns with some of the technical site improvements Mr. Williams recommends the final plan be tabled until these site improvements are worked out.

Staff noted the rezoning does meet the recommendation of the adopted Patterson Road corridor guidelines for light business uses in that area. The overall site does seem to work, but if there are technical difficulties those should be worked out.

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR:

Kathleen Tomkins of 605 Meander Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81505 explained she is selling a portion of the property to the Petitioner and will continue to live on the other portion of the property. Mrs. Tomkins felt the road improvements further north on Meander Drive were unnecessary considering the landscape plan proposed for the site.

John & Bonnie Harris of 602 Meander Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81505 are the closest neighbors to the proposed development. They had no objection to the proposal and felt it will be an appropriate business for this area and the site plan proposal is acceptable.

AGAINST:

Darrell Evans of 620 Meander Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81505 objected to the proposal due to the possible increase in traffic generated by a business in a residential area. Meander Drive currently is 1 1/2 car widths wide, there are no curbs or gutters and ends in a cul-de-sac connected to Mr. Evans driveway. With commercial property available to the east and other adequate commercial property available for sale throughout the City, it does not seem necessary to rezone a residential

area for the purposes of establishing another commercial property.

Also, the increase in traffic on a small unimproved road will cause a hardship and is a hazard for the residents. Patterson Road is a four lane road and during peak traffic it is difficult to exit off Meander Drive onto Patterson Road. The proposal does not appear to have encompassed a traffic study or given any solutions to this problem. Since Meander Drive is a dead end street and if this proposal is accepted there should be some consideration given to extend Meander Drive so that residents have another access available.

Mr. Evans continued his statement by suggesting if this development is allowed the sidewalk and curbs should be required all around the property as it is on other City property.

Mr. Corey Beck of 621 Meander Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81505 had concerns of future development in the area if the commercial zoning is allowed in this residential area. Also, the traffic on Meander Drive is already a problem and will increase greatly with a commercial property at the corner of Patterson Road and Meander Drive. The street is very narrow and residents are aware of the problems; however, unfamiliar drivers could very well cause extreme traffic hazards to the area. A traffic study needs to be done to determine the impact of this development and the Gormley property prior to approval.

Chris Clark of 615 Meander Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81505 had concerns about the traffic safety due to the traffic and speed of the vehicles on Patterson Road. Also, the width of Meander Drive is a problem and to increase that traffic without road improvements only increases the current problem. Also, the quality of life issue and decrease in land values due to the zoning change does concern many of the neighbors.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Vogel explained five residents on Meander Drive are in favor of the project and have no problem with leaving the road in the condition which now exists, except for adding a dead end street sign. With signs installed the business would actually be decreasing the traffic on Meander Drive; if the road were continued on to 1st Street an increase in traffic on Meander could occur.

Also, the peak hours of Hi-Fashion Fabrics are 10:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., which does not necessarily coincide with the peak hours of Patterson Road.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner about the pathway and picnic area proposed on site, would the picnic area be considered public?

Mr. Vogel replied it would be only for employees.

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner if the pathway was public and was there ingress/egress required?

Mr. Shaver explained if the pathway is in addition to the sidewalk and the Petitioner is aware that it will be available for public access no particular easement is required. It is simply his land use decision relative to placement of the sidewalk. If the public goes onto his property it will be his issue to deal with.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the Petitioner has the right to block off the sidewalk to his neighbors in the future?

Mr. Shaver replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Elmer felt it should be designated specifically as an easement if the intent is for public access at this point.

Mr. Shaver explained it would be within the Commissioners prerogative to require an easement.

Mr. Vogel explained his intent is to provide a public access in lieu of concrete sidewalks and improvements on the north side.

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Metzner if the improvements on Meander Drive would widen it to a full 2 lane road?

Mr. Metzner replied affirmatively, it will be a full road section with curb, gutter and sidewalk from the rear access point to Patterson Road with a separate turn lane on Patterson Road.

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Metzner if the City or County had proposed a continuation of Meander Drive to 1st Street?

Mr. Metzner replied this had not been done to his knowledge.

Commissioner Elmer asked the City Engineer if the driveway should be limited?

Mr. Newton replied the City would prefer having no curb cut on Patterson Road, the best option would be two curb cuts off Meander Drive into the parking lot. Additional access points on a busy arterial tends to congest the flow of traffic and the street is adjacent to the property providing adequate ingress/egress.

Mr. Newton also noted he has discussed the street improvements with the City Development Engineer and the proposal for the full width street improvements along the front of this development would be a better improvement functionally than 1/2 street improvements around the entire property. The remaining portion of Meander Drive could be included in later development of the area.

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Newton about the signage in regards to the

dead end street, could such signage be required for this street?

Mr. Newton replied there should be signage on that street if it does not currently exist.

Mr. Vogel asked Mr. Newton who would be financially responsible for the street improvements on the north side of Meander Drive?

Mr. Newton replied the developer for that particular parcel of ground. If it remains vacant then improvements will not be required.

Mr. Vogel noted there needs to be some ingress/egress available to the remaining portion of the parcel which he is not purchasing.

Mr. Newton explained the City would not deny access to the parcel, if a development came in the access could be changed from Meander Drive to Patterson Road, but the access would not be denied.

Commissioner Renberger felt that a curb cut should be put in on Patterson Road at this time.

Mr. Newton disagreed with the installation of a curb cut on Patterson Road; with 2 curb cuts on Meander Drive there would be adequate traffic circulation and that a curb cut would be too close to the street to keep traffic on Patterson Road flowing.

Chairman Halsey asked Staff if their recommendation was to approve the rezone at this time, and to table the final plan until more of the technical issues were resolved?

Mr. Metzner replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Elmer asked which specific technical issues were unresolved?

Mr. Metzner replied it is the drainage plan and the grading plan which need to be resolved.

Commissioner Elmer felt this does not meet the intent of the 1st Street Corridor Guideline which discuss light business. The point made by the residents that there is plenty of commercial property available is well taken.

Chairman Halsey stated that ideally the property should remain residential; however, with the adjoining Gormley property zoned commercial and the access on Patterson Road it is probably inevitable that the area will continue to change and this is a good transitional type business next to a residential area.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the property did change hands, would a change in use have to come back to the Commission for approval?

Mr. Metzner replied affirmatively.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER VOLKMANN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #27-92, A REQUEST TO REZONE THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF PATTERSON ROAD AND MEANDER DRIVE FROM RSF-4 TO PB, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS REQUEST TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Elmer.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 3-1 with Commissioner Renberger objecting and Commissioner Anderson absent during the vote.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER VOLKMANN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #27-92, A REQUEST FOR A FINAL PLAN FOR LIGHT RETAIL (HI-FASHION FABRICS) IN A PLANNED BUSINESS ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE TABLE THIS ITEM UNTIL THE TECHNICAL DEFICIENCIES ARE ADDRESSED."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Elmer.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0, Commissioner Anderson was absent during the vote.

2. #29-92 HABITAT SUBDIVISION/RE-SUBDIVISION OF KELLEY SUBDIVISION IN RSF-8

A request to waive Open Space Fees for Habitat Subdivision which is dividing two existing lots in Kelly Subdivision into four lots at the southwest corner of Cheyenne Drive and Mountain View Street.

**PETITIONER: Habitat for Humanity
REPRESENTATIVE: David Jensen
LOCATION: SW Corner of Cheyenne Dr. and Mountain View**

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Don Gregory of 2951 Pinyon Court, Grand Junction, CO. 81501 explained the request to waive the open space fees for the Habitat Subdivision for 4 building lots. The purpose of the Habitat for Humanity is to build housing for those people who cannot obtain conventional financing and provide them with affordable places to live. The board members all work without compensation, all the land, most of the materials and a good portion of the funds are donated. The Board is asking for the waiver to keep the cost of the buildings down.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Ashbeck of the City Community Development Department explained the request is to waive the open space fee for the Habitat Subdivision. The fee is \$225.00 for each of the 4 lots, for a total of \$900.00. No open space fees have been collected for the 2 existing lots. The Petitioner is simply asking the opportunity to approach City Council with their request for this waiver; the Planning Commission must make a recommendation on this request before the City Council can act on it.

This request is unique and the use zone matrix in the code states no open space fees are required for those facilities which are considered human care facilities. If the Commissioners consider the low cost housing to be in the category of human care facilities, the open space fees could be waived under that type of use.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Halsey strongly endorses the project and felt it is good for the community; however, it is in the category of residential. Setting a precedent of changing the open space fees for non profit organizations and other entities wanting similar variances does not seem acceptable.

Commissioner Anderson felt the fees for this organization would be a burden; however, to waive all fees would set a bad precedent. Perhaps charging 1/2 the normal fee, and charging for the 2 original lots which were never paid and allowing the petitioner to subdivide at no charge would be an equitable solution.

Chairman Halsey asked the Petitioner if the benefactor of the property would pay for the fees?

Mr. Gregory replied he could not answer that question.

Commissioner Renberger asked Staff if open space fees were required for any of the public housing in the past.

Mr. Metzner replied that public housing projects have been required to pay open space fees.

Commissioner Elmer commented that he is in favor of the project, and the code grants the Commissioners the ability to pass on the recommendation of a variance, and this group meets the definition of a hardship using donated land, materials and time.

Chairman Halsey had concerns about the 16 lots which will be developed in the future.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #29-92, A REQUEST TO WAIVE OPEN SPACE FEES FOR HABITAT SUBDIVISION WHICH IS DIVIDING TWO EXISTING LOTS IN KELLY SUBDIVISION INTO FOUR LOTS AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF CHEYENNE DRIVE AND MOUNTAIN VIEW STREET, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS REQUEST TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY FOR LOW COST AFFORDABLE HOUSING, AND THAT IF IT MEETS THE INTENT OF THE CODE FOR A HARDSHIP VARIANCE."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 3-2, with Chairman Halsey and Commissioner Anderson opposing.

3. #57-91 ZONE OF ANNEXATION - ALPINE MEADOWS

A request to zone the land recently annexed to the City also known as the Alpine Meadows Annexation to a Planned Residential (PR) Zone with a maximum density of 4.2 units per acre.

**PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction
REPRESENTATIVE: Karl Metzner
LOCATION: Southwest of 27 & H Roads**

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department explained that the request is to zone the land recently annexed to the City known as the Alpine Meadows annexation, to PR with a maximum density of 4.2 units per acre. This technically is a City zone for this area which is equivalent to the zone in the county.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Volkmann asked Staff if there were any changes on the plans?

Mr. Metzner replied there were none.

Commissioner Anderson asked Staff if the City agrees with the plans?

Mr. Metzner replied it is already built, the details would be somewhat different if built after annexation.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #57-91, A REQUEST TO ZONE THE LAND RECENTLY ANNEXED TO THE CITY ALSO KNOWN AS THE ALPINE MEADOWS ANNEXATION TO A PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (PR) ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS REQUEST TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

4. # 58-91 ZONE OF ANNEXATION - WILSON RANCH

A request to zone the land recently annexed to the City also known as Wilson Ranch Annexation to Planned Residential (PR) Zone with a maximum density of 4.4 units per acre and Residential Single Family - Rural (RSF-R) Zone; for large parcels, consistent with rural densities and uses.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction
REPRESENTATIVE: Karl Metzner
LOCATION: North of G Road at 25 1/2 Road

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department explained the request is to zone the land recently annexed to the City known as the Wilson Ranch Annexation to a PR zone. This was approved in the county and was under construction at the time of annexation. The agreement was made to zone it equivalent to the county zoning. The LDS church on the corner of G Road & 25 1/2 Road and an 8 acre parcel are also included in this zoning.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Anderson asked Staff if this was in a residential area?

Mr. Metzner replied affirmatively and explained this in the northwest plan which was adopted recently by the Planning Commission.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER VOLKMANN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #58-91, A REQUEST TO ZONE THE LAND RECENTLY ANNEXED TO THE CITY ALSO KNOWN AS WILSON RANCH ANNEXATION TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (PR) ZONE WITH A MAXIMUM DENSITY OF 4.4 UNITS PER ACRE AND RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY-RURAL (RSF-R) ZONE; FOR LARGE PARCELS, CONSISTENT WITH RURAL DENSITIES AND USES, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS REQUEST TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

VI. GENERAL DISCUSSION

1. UPDATES - MASTER PLANS

B. MASTER PLAN OF PARKS, RECREATIONS AND OPEN SPACE

Mr. Ted Novack, Director of Grand Junction Parks & Recreation Department provided an update of the Master Plan of Parks. In the past year the City has contracted for feasibility studies relating to park and recreation needs, and the proposed recreation center. The steering committee will meet on July 15, 1992 and will review the proposals and studies.

Results of the survey conducted show additional trails are a great concern to the public. Neighborhood parks and large parks are also under study and public input shows a need for more parks. As expansion occurs the neighborhood parks become an important issue, for example the previous item for the Habitat for Humanity will eventually show a need for a neighborhood park and the Parks Department would like to work with the Commissioner's on the development of these areas.

The Recreation Center, and the Senior Facility have been under study and also show there is great concern for the addition of both facilities by the public. The probability is there will be more than one center planned for the Grand Junction area based on the studies, the population and the projected growth. One option mentioned would be a large recreation center with access and indoor facilities that can open up certain hours for the different special interest groups such as teens, or seniors.

Other options mentioned in the studies suggest remodeling existing buildings to house certain segments such as the senior citizen needs. The problem of renovation continues to be financial, however, the consultants are considering this option.

Swimming pools are also being looked into and it depends on the direction of annexation where new pools would be built. The most likely

option for pools will be smaller seasonal neighborhood swimming pools. If a large pool goes into the recreation center it may or may not be a seasonal pool.

To highlight the study, the two biggest deficiencies in the current parks system is the need for an indoor facility and a large regional metropolitan park.

Input from the Planning Commission on the study and future needs of the area are welcome.

Chairman Halsey asked if the Parks and Recreation Department was going to need a resolution of endorsement by the Commission?

Mr. Novack explained the Planning Commission is a part of the selection committee and there will be a need for endorsement in the future. Many financial decisions will have to be made, possibly revenue bonds will be involved or a general obligation bond may be necessary which will require a referendum vote of the citizens.

The intent is to have an overall plan with some targeted priorities and an action plan within a reasonable time.

Commissioner Volkmann asked what size similar population areas had for a large recreation center.

Mr. Novack replied they have studied Loveland, Lafayette, Louisville and Broomfield which have between 50,000 to 60,000 square foot centers. Even Delta has a 50,000 square foot facility.

B. GRAND MESA SLOPES - COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Chairman Halsey asked Staff to check into the status of the Grand Mesa Slopes Cooperative Management Plan.

2. UPDATES- OTHER PROJECTS

A. MAJOR ROAD NEEDS STUDY

Commissioner Elmer asked Staff if the City Council had passed the new street standards.

Mr. Metzner replied affirmatively, and explained there was a deletion of the landscape guidelines.

B. ZONES OF ANNEXATION

Mr. Metzner explained the Ridges zoning will be on the August 4, 1992

agenda. There will be a total of 4 more zones of annexation.

VII. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND / OR VISITORS

There were no nonscheduled citizens or visitors.

Chairman Halsey commented that parking has been a major issue in the City, perhaps major employers need to take responsibility on the parking issue and begin enforcing car pooling etc. to cut down on the requirement of the additional parking.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.