

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

7:30 p.m. - 10:30 p.m.

*Neva Lockhart* ✓

The Grand Junction Planning Commission Public Hearing was called to order by Chairman Ron Halsey at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium, 520 Rood Avenue.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were Chairman Ron Halsey, Commissioners Jim Anderson, Scott Brown, and Craig Roberts.

Commissioners John Elmer and Sheilah Renberger were absent.

In attendance representing the Community Development Department were Claudia Hazelhurst, Acting Community Development Director, Kathy Portner, Karl Metzner, David Thornton and Kristen Ashbeck. John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney, Don Newton, City Engineer and Gerald Williams, City Development Engineer were also present.

Marcia Petering was present to record the minutes.

There were 31 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** (JIM ANDERSON) "Mr. Chairman I move that the minutes of July 7, 1992 be approved as they stand."

Craig Roberts seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0.

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS**

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

**IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION**

- 1. **Item #34-92 Consideration of a revised final plan for the east parking lot for St. Mary's Hospital in a Planned Business (PB) Zone. Tabled at the July 7th Meeting.**

**PETITIONER: St. Mary's Hospital**

**REPRESENTATIVE: Larry Gebhart, Western Engineers**

**LOCATION: SE Corner of 7th Street & Patterson Road**

**PETITIONERS PRESENTATION**

Mr. James Fridlington, Executive Vice President of St. Mary's Hospital, referred to a packet of information addressing potential problems both pedestrian and vehicular and solutions to them. These solutions were arrived at through the combined efforts of St. Mary's engineers and City Staff. Mr. Fridlington said there are eight (8) proposed resolutions to potential problems identified between 7th and Patterson; 7th Street at Wellington; and on Patterson Road. The overview talks about these resolution opportunities. Mr. Fridlington said they have worked closely with Don Newton, City

## GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 2

Engineer, on these problems and said they felt this plan, brought here tonight, is one which will be in the best interest of employee safety as well as general pedestrian traffic safety. Mr. Fridlington said he believes City staff is ready to recommend adoption of this plan.

Chairman Halsey requested Mr. Fridlington go through the various points of the plan.

Mr. Fridlington reviewed the following eight points; the first 4 pertain to the intersection at 7th Street & Patterson Road.

1. To improve the line of sight at the intersection of 7th & Patterson, two weeks ago ten (10) parking spaces were taken out of service as an experiment. It improved the line of sight so a concrete curb has been installed to permanently block off these spaces.
2. Move the stop bar back for the left turn and through lane; by moving these back the cars that are moving forward in the right turn lane now have line of sight as well as having an advantage on distance on the other cars so they can see what is happening with pedestrian traffic as well as automobile.
3. The walk signal has been lengthened in that intersection to allow additional pedestrians to cross each time there is an opportunity.
4. Add new signage on the traffic light bar which states "no right turn when pedestrians are in the crosswalk area".
5. On 7th Street fencing will be added to the existing fencing to prevent people from jaywalking from the parking lot to the hospital. This will force people to go up to the safe crosswalk and would not allow them to cross the street in other places.
6. It has been determined that a traffic signal at the intersection of Wellington & 7th would not be appropriate; so for traffic coming out of the new parking lot it initially would force people onto Wellington and out to 7th Street. We have agreed to signage directing traffic East on Wellington as there are other opportunities to exit via Bookcliff to 7th where there is a traffic signal or to 12th Street.
7. On Patterson Road originally the proposal was for an exit only, now the proposal is to make this a full entrance/exit to improve the congestion which could be created at the corner of 7th & Wellington if everything was forced to flow out into that intersection.
8. Remove curb cuts on Patterson Road which exist from previous times so flow is limited to the new entrance/exits.

Mr. Fridlington said, additionally, there will be a fairly extensive education program for our employees in terms of preferred ways to get in and out of the lot and the required ways to cross the street in terms of safety for the pedestrian.

### STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner said at the last Planning Commission meeting the only concerns remaining were traffic circulation and congestion both pedestrian and vehicular. Mr. Metzner said the issues have been well explained and Don Newton, City Engineer, has written a memo agreeing with these proposals and that they will mitigate both the pedestrian and vehicular impacts to 7th & Patterson and 7th & Wellington.

Don Newton said the City required St. Mary's consulting engineer prepare a traffic & pedestrian impact

## GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 3

study and as a result of that study he was able to identify some improvements to both the traffic signal and sight distance at the intersection which would improve the crosswalk and allow the volume of pedestrians to cross. The biggest problem was the sight distance to the west for vehicles turning east onto Patterson Road off of 7th Street. By removing the ten parking spaces more than the minimum of 300' of sight distance was provided.

Mr. Newton said the movement of the stop bar on 7th Street will be done by city traffic crews; the signal time has already been lengthened to a 21 second walk time; and the sign for "no right turn on red when pedestrians are present" will be installed on the mast arm by city traffic crews. The additional fencing will direct all pedestrian traffic to the crosswalk and prevent jaywalking. The project originally was designed for an "exit only" onto Patterson Road but after the consultant did a traffic gap study to determine the number of gaps during peak traffic time both on Patterson and Wellington we found that with the proposed access being an exit only there were not enough gaps at 7th & Wellington to allow all the traffic from the lot to go out. By opening up the access on Patterson to full access it allows a redistribution of the traffic and provide sufficient gaps for the total traffic volume.

Mr. Newton said the hospital has agreed to do some education with their employees to get them to go east on Wellington and over to the light at Bookcliff & 7th rather than using the intersection at 7th & Wellington to go left onto 7th Street,

### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no comment either for or against the proposal.

### COMMISSION QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Newton if the options presented by Western Engineers, such as the walkway overpass or tunnel, were discussed. Mr. Newton said the overpass and underpass alternatives were more of a long range alternative if buildings eventually get built on the east side of 7th Street and at this point these types of structures are not necessary to make a safe crossing across the street.

Chairman Halsey said he would think the new 5 story proposed addition he read about in the paper for St. Mary's would have an effect on this issue. Mr. Fridlington said the over and under the street proposals were initially brought up to deal with jaywalkers and the fencing takes care of this problem. He said future development for expansion will all be on the west side adjacent to the existing hospital so the parking lot will still be for employees who will be coming to the main hospital. Chairman Halsey said that was exactly his concern, with the number of pedestrians and the already existing dangers, the only thing which can handle this volume safely is an overpass or underpass and he didn't see where the solutions proposed tonight address all of the concerns brought up last month.

Mr. Fridlington said the amount of fencing talked about, and the terrain, makes it prohibitive for people to jaywalk. Employees were jaywalking for safety rather than convenience and once they know a safe crossing has been provided, and are educated, this problem will be taken care of.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the connecting walks from the end of the single spur parking lot have been eliminated. Mr. Fridlington said yes and the lower one also; the previous entrance into the lot

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 4

will be torn up and fencing will go in.

Chairman Halsey said he was concerned that the entrance/exit on Patterson Road will eliminate one problem for pedestrians but cause another problem with traffic, especially a left hand turn onto the very busy Patterson Road. Mr. Newton said the peak hour traffic volume on Patterson Road occurs from 1:00-1:15 p.m. and during that time period there are 92 gaps in traffic which allow cars to cross and make a left hand turn. The peak hour for employee traffic leaving the parking lot is between 4:15-4:30 p.m. at a rate of 54 vehicles per hour; these peak hours do not coincide so he saw no problem.

Larry Gebhart of Western Engineers said the critical gap time is approximately 5-7 seconds to allow a vehicle to merge into traffic safely and over 1/2 of the gaps counted were 8-10+ seconds. Mr. Newton said there is a continuous left turn lane on Patterson Road, there are no other curb cuts which would interfere with traffic entering and the sight distance is good.

Chairman Halsey said when we saw the initial proposal for the first parking lot, we had concerns regarding pedestrian loads, it was indicated that this parking lot was always in the plans and asked if there are other additional plans for growth or parking lots which will impact this area.

Mr. Fridlington said as parking lot F was originally being developed and rezoned as it ties into the master plan for the hospital, it was designed so this will meet current and future needs. He said they will be submitting plans for expansion of the hospital, which is part of the master plan also.

Commissioner Brown asked how many people will be standing at the corner of Patterson & 7th going back to the parking lot at a shift change waiting for the light to change. Mr. Fridlington said all of the figures are included in the study the city traffic engineer requested. He said the parking lot is going to be designated primarily for day employees whose shifts start anywhere from 6:30-8:30 a.m. as they have staggered shifts for starting times as well as length of shifts.

Commissioner Brown said there is fencing proposed only on the east side of 7th Street, so how will this stop people from jaywalking when they are going off shift from the hospital to the parking lot. Mr. Fridlington said the employees will be looking for the easiest route and it serves no purpose for them to jaywalk as the lot can not be entered from anywhere but at the corner.

Commissioner Anderson said, unlike a plant, when a shift change occurs there isn't a mass exodus from the facility. Commissioner Brown asked how many people could be at the light at any one time. Mr. Gebhart said they did traffic studies for three days and during the peak hours of pedestrian traffic (7:45-8:00 a.m.) approximately 18 people was the largest group; so when you pro-rate this based on number of vehicles the maximum would be 182 people during the 15 minute peak flow. He said there is a 70 second signal on the stop light with a 21 second time on the crosswalk and in that 21 seconds 30 people can cross at the corner.

Commissioner Roberts said he thought a good job had been done handling the vehicular traffic and pedestrians on the exterior but the interior plan is somewhat lacking for getting pedestrians to the crosswalk as there are no sidewalks or easy routes. He said nothing comes naturally. When we dealt with the first portion of this a year ago we hadn't seen a Master Plan, and still haven't, if we had it could have led to a better design of that parking lot to allow something to get you to that corner

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 6

of sales are from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday. Marriott Food Service will hold the liquor license and will be responsible, along with campus security, for proper ID verification and proper student conduct while in the area. Mr. Boeschstein reviewed Section 4.8 of the Zoning & Development code regarding Conditional Use Permits. Staff recommends approval with review agency comments.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Against**

Dan Wilkerson, 1240 Grand Avenue, made the following points in opposition to the application:

1. This item has been controversial in the past so it would be better addressed by our elected city council rather than an appointed board;
2. Can see not see any positive benefit from a health, safety or educational standpoint.
3. Alcohol is readily available in many places around the campus already and the only beneficiary of this license on campus is Marriott Food Service.

Maureen McLaughlin, 1010 Elm Avenue, lives two blocks from the student center and had the following concerns:

1. With the hours of operation being from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., I have concern with monitoring of the behavior, alcohol being allowed to leave the premises and underage people being served;
2. As a homeowner in the area, we already have problems with underage students going to local parties and this will increase with this liquor license.

No one was present to speak in favor of the petitioner.

**Rebuttal**

Mr. Lanning stated the drinking age will be 21 years old as stated by Colorado law. Security is on campus 24 hours a day and starting this fall there will be a city police officer assigned to the Mesa State College campus. Mr. Lanning said his staff will be going through training with campus security and the liquor enforcement bureau from the Colorado Dept. of Revenue on ID enforcement and liability.

Ms. McLaughlin said there is already a lot of pedestrian traffic in this area and this could increase with this use at night. Mr. Lanning said that is correct, it could increase but about 80% of the students on campus are under 21 so foot traffic shouldn't increase that much.

**COMMISSION QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION**

Chairman Halsey asked how the proposed hours for sale of alcohol coincide with the general hours of the student center. Mr. Lanning said the hours are to cover any special events which might occur. Chairman Halsey asked if the student center is generally open until 11:00 p.m. Mr. Lanning said yes. Commissioner Anderson asked if there will be a way to prevent people from exiting the premises with the beer. Mr. Lanning said there is only one door which allows public access and that will be monitored at all times when beer is being served. Mr. Lanning said beer won't necessarily be sold at all times, if there is nothing going on and there is no need to sell beer say on Monday through Friday until 3:00 p.m. - it won't be sold.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 6

of sales are from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday. Marriott Food Service will hold the liquor license and will be responsible, along with campus security, for proper ID verification and proper student conduct while in the area. Mr. Boeschstein reviewed Section 4.8 of the Zoning & Development code regarding Conditional Use Permits. Staff recommends approval with review agency comments.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Against**

Dan Wilkerson, 1240 Grand Avenue, made the following points in opposition to the application:

1. This item has been controversial in the past so it would be better addressed by our elected city council rather than an appointed board;
2. Can see not see any positive benefit from a health, safety or educational standpoint.
3. Alcohol is readily available in many places around the campus already and the only beneficiary of this license on campus is Marriott Food Service.

Maureen McLaughlin, 1010 Elm Avenue, lives two blocks from the student center and had the following concerns:

1. With the hours of operation being from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., I have concern with monitoring of the behavior, alcohol being allowed to leave the premises and underage people being served;
2. As a homeowner in the area, we already have problems with underage students going to local parties and this will increase with this liquor license.

No one was present to speak in favor of the petitioner.

**Rebuttal**

Mr. Lanning stated the drinking age will be 21 years old as stated by Colorado law. Security is on campus 24 hours a day and starting this fall there will be a city police officer assigned to the Mesa State College campus. Mr. Lanning said his staff will be going through training with campus security and the liquor enforcement bureau from the Colorado Dept. of Revenue on ID enforcement and liability.

Ms. McLaughlin said there is already a lot of pedestrian traffic in this area and this could increase with this use at night. Mr. Lanning said that is correct, it could increase but about 80% of the students on campus are under 21 so foot traffic shouldn't increase that much.

**COMMISSION QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION**

Chairman Halsey asked how the proposed hours for sale of alcohol coincide with the general hours of the student center. Mr. Lanning said the hours are to cover any special events which might occur. Chairman Halsey asked if the student center is generally open until 11:00 p.m. Mr. Lanning said yes. Commissioner Anderson asked if there will be a way to prevent people from exiting the premises with the beer. Mr. Lanning said there is only one door which allows public access and that will be monitored at all times when beer is being served. Mr. Lanning said beer won't necessarily be sold at all times, if there is nothing going on and there is no need to sell beer say on Monday through Friday until 3:00 p.m. - it won't be sold.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 7

Commissioner Brown asked if the City Council was aware of this application when they approved the contract with the college for a police officer on July 15. John Shaver said he didn't know but such comments and questions may be addressed in the liquor license hearing.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "Mr. Chairman on item #32-92, a request for a Conditional Use Permit for a 3.2 beer liquor license in the snack bar of the Mesa State College Student Center located at 12th & Elm Streets, I move that we approve this subject to review agency comments."**

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0.

**FEE SCHEDULE**

Chairman Halsey announced to the audience that the hearing on the Text Amendment on Application Fee Schedules has been pulled from the agenda for this meeting.

- 3. **#39-92 A proposal for a minor subdivision to split an existing half acre lot into two lots of equal size in a Residential Single Family 8 units to the acre (RSF-8) zone.**

**PETITIONER: YO Investments  
REPRESENTATIVE: Bill Wagner  
LOCATION: 1308 Wellington**

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Bill Wagner said this is a proposal to split a 1/2 acre lot into two equal 1/4 acre residential lots. Lot 1 is improved but Lot 2 is not.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Kristen Ashbeck said the YO Minor Subdivision is located at 1308 Wellington Avenue which is the address of the existing house. The property is zoned RSF-8 and the lot size and bulk requirements for the two lots will be well within the requirements. Lot 2 will be a flag lot so access to that lot will also be from Wellington. The proposed size is consistent with the surrounding zoning and land use. Ms. Ashbeck said the primary issue has been the street improvements which are normally required for a new subdivision. The applicant has requested that the escrow of funds for 1/2 street improvements be waived. At the June 9 council workshop this issue was discussed and the decision was made that if the city found a development to be of a character not conducive to have such improvements then that requirement could be waived. Public Works determined that YO Minor Subdivision was such a development. Ms. Ashbeck said that an open space fee of \$450 will be required.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no comment either for or against this proposal.

**COMMISSIONER'S QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Brown said in light of recent Council action on the Habitat subdivision the council waived open space fees on the two lots which were already developed; so why are we charging open space fees for this one. Commissioner Anderson said the rationale on Habitat was because it was directed to low income people. Commissioner Roberts said the fee is a parks and open space impact fee which is supposed to be for additional population and one of the homes is already there.

Commissioner Brown asked if there was any way to protect the vista rights for Lot 2; the property as it is now is not heavily landscaped but if Lot 1 decided to, it could easily block out Lot 2 with landscaping. Mr. Wagner said the driveway for lot 2 will be fenced and the current house on lot 1 sits only 19' from the west property line so that gives it somewhat of a separation.

Chairman Halsey said we need to look at addressing inner city codes for vista and sight protection which are presently not in the code.

Chairman Halsey asked Ms. Ashbeck if in the future sidewalks were to be placed on Wellington if the owners at that time would be assessed a fee. Ms. Ashbeck said the City would probably look at forming an improvement district where everyone would pay including these two properties.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "Mr. Chairman, on item #39-92, a request for a Minor Subdivision in the RSF-8 Zone District at 1308 Wellington, I move that we approve this subject to the review agency summary sheet comments."**

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

John Shaver read the section of the code pertaining to open space fees. Mr. Shaver said based on his understanding of the section that a developer is normally only charged for the new lot, so Mr. Wagner should only have to pay for one lot.

4. **#40-92 A request for a Conditional Use Permit to remodel an existing building to house a Mortuary Service Facility and Columbarium (to store human ashes) in a Highway Oriented (HO) Zone.  
PETITIONER: Denver Auto Auction  
REPRESENTATIVE: Frank Tucker  
LOCATION: 501 Highway 50**

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Frank Tucker said that he is here to request a Conditional Use Permit to add some significant upgrades to an existing building at 501 Highway 50 and provide a Mortuary Service and Columbarium.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

David Thornton said the request is for a Conditional Use Permit for a Columbarium and Mortuary Service at 501 Highway 50 in Orchard Mesa. This site was approved for an automobile sales facility



## GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 9

in 1990. The petitioner is proposing to remodel the existing building of approximately 2400 s.f. and add another approximately 625 s.f. to house the facility. Within the facility will be a chapel which will seat 96 people, designed capacity. The rear yard setback in the HO zone is 15 feet and the petitioner is requesting a variance of 8 feet to continue the building. The building is currently non-conforming as far as the 15 feet. The adjacent property owner has verbally stated he has no objection to this variance.

Mr. Thornton said staff has concern with the minimum parking requirements; according to the code the petitioner would be required to provide 20 parking spaces, which they have done. Due to the fact that there is no on-street parking available in the area there is no additional parking available. The proposed access is from Canon Street with an exit only on Highway 50. The petitioner has indicated they will chain off that exit except when a group is leaving. Staff recommends this exit be totally closed off and landscaped to blend in with the existing landscaping. Mr. Thornton said most of the existing landscaping is dead and one of the requirements would be for the petitioner to redo all landscaping which is now dead.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against the proposal.

### REBUTTAL

Mr. Tucker said most people don't attend funerals by themselves so 1 space for 5 people will be adequate. He said Mr. Snyder has said they may use his property for overflow parking. Mr. Tucker said normally people with a large funeral service are attached to some organization and the service will take place at the affiliation. Mr. Tucker said they will do valet parking for larger services and would not allow a funeral of over 200 people.

### COMMISSIONER'S QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION

Commissioner Roberts said that this plan indicates that 6-7 spaces are actually in the right-of-way. Mr. Thornton said yes, when the van conversion business was there they got a revocable permit for the parking and the landscaping and the entire area is paved. If you drove out there it looks like it is not part of the right-of-way but it is. Commissioner Roberts asked if the revocable permit is still in force. Mr. Thornton said he believed it ran with the land. Mr. Shaver said generally the permit does run with the land but it can be subject to review depending on the circumstances under which it was issued.

Mr. Tucker said his understanding, from talking to the Highway Department, is the permit was issued for parking and they have no objection to its continuing. Ms. Hedler said the Highway Department also had no concern with the current exit onto Highway 50 being used, as long as it is only an exit.

Chairman Halsey said he had a concern with the opening onto the highway; we should try to avoid this wherever possible; he said the concern wasn't so much for this project but for whatever could occur on that corner in the future. Mr. Tucker asked if anyone else wouldn't have to appear before you for their use also. Mr. Thornton said it would depend upon the use. Mr. Tucker asked if this egress could just be granted to this proposal then.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 10

Commissioner Roberts said we can't do that and he also has a problem with this exit as there are designated parking spaces in front of that exit. Mr. Tucker said he doesn't want to see any permanent closure.

Chairman Halsey asked if there is any potential for parking on the streets in the future. Mr. Thornton said he was not aware of any planned widening of Canon Street. Mr. Tucker said the cemetery precludes widening. Mr. Thornton said there is a lot of traffic on this street with the Department of Energy and others and on-street parking would not be desirable.

Commissioner Brown said there are two handicap accessible spaces indicated and you are only required to provide one; these two spaces don't seem to comply with the ADA. Mr. Tucker said his architect was instructed to make sure they did comply.

Commissioner Anderson said he felt this was a good use for the land; it is an ideal location for this business and the aesthetics proposed are fine but the highway access really bothers him. Mr. Tucker said he is not anxious to have ingress/egress on the highway under normal circumstances but would like to have it available for egress in the event of an emergency. Chairman Halsey said he would agree if this was for retail usage or some use where vehicles are coming and going at various times instead of all at once.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "Mr. Chairman, on item #40-92, a request for a Conditional Use Permit for a mortuary and columbarium, in the HO Zone District, located at 501 Highway 50, I move that we approve this subject to the removal of the entrance on Highway 50 and adjustment of the parallel parking spaces and the other review agency sheet comments."**

Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.

5. **#41-92 TROLLEY PARK MINOR SUBDIVISION - A request to subdivide a parcel to create five separate lots so that existing structures may retain individual ownership in a Heavy Commercial (C-2) Zone.**  
**PETITIONER: Stephen and Bobette McCallum**  
**REPRESENTATIVE: Wayne Lizer**  
**LOCATION: 552 25 Road**

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Wayne Lizer said the proposal is to divide the parcel into five lots; there are four existing structures on the land. Mr. Lizer said the petitioner has worked out Public Works problem with the cross section on the street; have done work on the preliminary drainage plan and the final drainage plan will be submitted later with the final submittal; the majority of the landscaping is on 25 Road and it meets the square footage requirements so no additional landscaping is planned within the subdivision.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Bennett Boeschstein said that this is an existing development at 552 25 Road in a C-2 Zone District.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 11

This is a subdivision of an existing developed project into 5 parcels. Since the project is already developed many items have already been dealt with. Mr. Boeschstein reviewed the staff report and comments from review agencies. Staff recommends approval subject to review agency comments.

Mr. Boeschstein said the main issue is drainage and Gerald Williams could address this issue. Mr. Williams said the preliminary submittal has several items which are not addressed; nothing which would prevent the preliminary from being accepted but which need to be addressed, such as oil in the water and seepage. These can be taken care of in the final submittal.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

**COMMISSIONER'S QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION**

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Lizer if he would like to address any of the comments by staff. Mr. Lizer said the drainage plan is done except for approval by Grand Junction Drainage District. Oil skimmers will be placed in the drainage basin and we will try to address all other comments in the final submittal.

Commissioner Brown said Public Service had a comment on Parcel 5; has this been taken care of? Mr. Lizer said a 6' easement will be placed on the south side as required.

Commissioner Roberts said the existing landscaping is 8,000+ s.f. but it is sparsely planted; the required area is supposed to be 75% covered with shrub material or lawn according to the code. Mr. McCallum said the two sides were developed about two years apart and the recommendations for the landscaping on the north side was for lawn and shrubs but when we did the other side the recommendations were for desert landscaping.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "Mr. Chairman, on item #41-92, a request for a Minor Subdivision in the C-2 Zone District at 552 25 Road, I move that we approve this subject to the review agency summary sheet comments."**

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.

**V. HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL**

- 1. #27-92 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. Final Plan Portion tabled at the July 7 hearing.  
PETITIONER: Kathleen Dee Tomkins & Arlene Vogel  
REPRESENTATIVE: Thomas A. Logue  
LOCATION: NW corner of Patterson Road & Meander Drive**

Karl Metzner clarified that the only action required by the Planning Commission tonight is on the final plan/plat as the rezoning was approved at the July 7 Public Hearing and will be considered by City Council tomorrow night, August 5, 1992.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 12

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Jeff Vogel reviewed the proposal for an 11,250 s.f. building to house Hi-Fashion Fabrics at the NW corner of Patterson Road & Meander Drive. The rezone was approved and the technical questions on the final plan/plat have been resolved.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Karl Metzner said there were some technical concerns mostly involving drainage and soils which needed to be resolved before approval of the final plan/plat. We have received comments from Gerald Williams, Development Engineer, which recommends approval of the project conditioned on compliance with engineering requirements. Mr. Metzner said the street section needed revision to conform with the geotechnical recommendations; the improvements agreement and the detention facility maintenance agreement need to be finalized and executed with the plat. Additionally, any additional development on the site would require additional 1/2 street improvements.

Commissioner Roberts asked how the street improvement issues were resolved. Mr. Metzner said the street will be completely improved, both sides, for a full street section, or slightly more than half the property instead of doing half the street for the full width of the property. One of the other discussions at last months meeting was the curb cut on Patterson Road; that has been revised to put both curb cuts on Meander Drive.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no comments either for or against the project.

**COMMISSIONER'S QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Roberts asked if there was a revised landscape plan. Mr. Logue said yes, basically the landscaping has been increased on Patterson and decreased on Meander; the style and character hasn't changed; it is in keeping with other buildings in the area. Mr. Metzner reviewed the landscape plan for the Commission.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the land will be actively irrigated. Mr. Logue said yes, a pressurized system will be installed and they will water out of the Grand Valley Canal. Commissioner Roberts asked if this was all street trees and grass. Mr. Logue said correct with a couple small flower beds and planters and shrubbery planters.

Mr. Metzner stated that the petitioners have considerably more landscaping than is required both in the total square footage and in the number of trees. Commissioner Roberts said this is fine I would just like to see more diversity in the type of landscaping.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "Mr. Chairman, on item #27-92, a request for Final Plan and Plat approval for Hi-Fashion Fabrics to be located at the NW corner of Patterson Road and Meander Drive, I move that we approve this subject to the new plans as presented and review agency comments that are in force as of this time."**

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 13

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. The motion was passed 4-0.

- 2a. **#6-92 A request to amend Section 4-9 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development code to allow single family residential the right to rebuild if destroyed greater than 50% in the Highway Oriented (HO) Zone.**

**PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction**

**REPRESENTATIVE: Dave Thornton**

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Mr. Thornton said this is a text amendment request which basically changes some things in Section 4-9, the non-conforming use section of the Code. Besides some language changes to make things clearer there are three things that are being added:

1. Change the code to allow existing residential in the HO Zone District to rebuild if destroyed by more than 50% but can not be expanded in scope or area.
2. If a mobile home pad is abandoned for more than one (1) year it will be considered an abandonment of the mobile home or manufactured home and that the site then must comply with the provisions of this Code. This has been departmental policy but is not really presently clear in the Code.
3. Add to paragraph E in Section 4-9: A non-conforming residential use which has been unoccupied for a period of one year or more shall not be considered discontinued unless the structure has been changed to a non-residential use. No such non-conforming residential use shall be allowed to increase the number of dwelling units without compliance with provisions of this code.

Commissioner Roberts asked how a non-conforming residential use can comply with the code. Mr. Thornton said, for example, in the B-3 Zone District single family and multi-family are allowed with a conditional use permit, therefore, if you had a non-conforming single family residential unit in a B-3 Zone it would have to go through a conditional use in order to increase the density.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment either for or against the proposal.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "Mr. Chairman, on item #6-92, a request to amend Section 4-9 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of approval."**

Commissioner Brown seconded. The motion passed 4-0.

- 2b. **A request to amend Section 4-2-1 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code to create an RSF-1 (Residential Single Family not to exceed one unit per acre) Zone and to change Section 4-2-2 from RSF-R to RSF-2 (Residential Single Family not to exceed two units per acre).**

**PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction**

**REPRESENTATIVE: Karl Metzner**

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Karl Metzner said this came about as a result of some of the annexations which have been happening and will be happening in the near future; Community Development felt that we needed a 1 acre zoning designation since some of the residential neighborhoods in the north area are 1 acre parcels and part of the commitment on the part of the City Council is that we will come as close as possible to the zoning they have in the County; to go with this we would like to change the RSF-R to RSF-2 to be consistent with our terminology.

Mr. Metzner reviewed the proposed setbacks for RSF-1: minimum lot area 1 acre; minimum street frontage 50 feet; maximum height of structure 32'; 100' lot width; 15' side yard setbacks; 50' rear yard setback; street setback would be 25'; maximum lot coverage by structures would be 25%. As far as uses we would be going with similar uses to the current RSF-R Zone District. For consistency sake we would like to change our animal regulations allowing 1 large animal per 1/4 acre, whereas in other zone districts it is per 1/2 acre.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment either for or against the proposal.

**COMMISSIONER'S QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION**

Chairman Halsey asked if any multiple acreage annexed to the City would then be zoned RSF-1. Mr. Metzner said not necessarily, we look at a number of things when we are determining zones of annexation, such as adopted plans or policies for an area, the existing County zoning and the character of an area so, therefore, you could have multiple acreage come in under just about any type of zoning.

Commissioner Roberts asked if areas with 2 acre lots would come in under planned residential or be covered by covenants. Mr. Metzner said the County doesn't have a 2 acre designation either and those which are done that way are covered either by the covenants of the subdivision or are planned residential zones.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "Mr. Chairman, on item #6-92, a request to amend Section 4-2-1 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code to create an RSF-1 (Residential Single Family not to exceed one unit per acre) zone, and to change Section 4-2-2 from RSF-R to RSF-2 (Residential Single Family not to exceed two units per acre), I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation for approval.**

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. The motion was passed 4-0.

3. **#43-92 A request to zone the land recently annexed to the City known as the Ridges Majority annexation to Planned Residential (PR) and Residential Single Family, four units to the acre (RSF-4).  
PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction  
REPRESENTATIVE: Karl Metzner  
LOCATION: Redlands south of Broadway Road**

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Karl Metzner pointed out the area of zoning on the map; the areas which have designated areas of business and commercial uses are allowed for in the planned zone. We are essentially matching the zoning the properties had in the County.

Commissioner Roberts asked if he had a conflict of interest on this as he worked in a planning capacity for the developers on the proposed golf course. John Shaver suggested Commissioner Roberts excuse himself from this portion of the meeting.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER BROWN) "Mr. Chairman, on item #43-92, a request to zone the land recently annexed to the City, also known as the Ridges Majority Annexation, to Planned Residential (PR), and Residential Single Family, four units to the acre (RSF-4), I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation for approval."**

Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0.

**VI. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

**SOUTH DOWNTOWN RIVERFRONT MASTER PLAN**

Bennett Boeschstein informed the Commission that the Community Development Department is proceeding with the South Downtown Plan and is presently writing the narrative sections of it. We hope to have something next month for you to review and will continue with the neighborhood workshops starting in September.

Commissioner Anderson asked when the South Downtown plan will be ready. Kathy Portner said Mr. Boeschstein has been working on the plan. The next public meeting, will be in September, to discuss the alternatives for land use in that area. Ms. Portner said land use changes will be the final major issue to be considered and once that public meeting is held we should be able to refine the alternatives and include everything in one document.

Commissioner Anderson asked if we are still looking at next year for a final draft. Ms. Portner said by the end of this year. Mr. Boeschstein said when the plan is complete we will also make specific zoning change recommendations.

**TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Bennett Boeschstein said the Transportation Development Plan was finalized and City Council did review this five year plan. This plan is a five year plan which keeps Mesability going but also includes a valley wide transit system for the future. Mr. Boeschstein told the Commission we would get them copies of the plan.

### MAJOR ROAD NEEDS STUDY

Dave Thornton said there was another public workshop on July 27 and the consultants, CRSS, presented to us the preliminary suggestions as far as what the computer model is showing for congested roadways in the MPO area, not just the city limits. Some of the items suggested for 1995 are: North Avenue to have right turn lanes; 1st Street from Grand south to Ute and Pitkin to become 6 lanes; Pitkin and Ute would be 3 lanes each; 25 Road from Hwy 6 & 50 to Patterson be upgraded including a left hand turn lane. For the year 2000 there are additional improvements needed: another way around Downtown is needed which supports the Riverside neighborhood minor arterial; River Road needs to be changed from 2 lanes to 3 lanes from Redlands Parkway to Broadway; and the 29 Road bridge and overpass over the railroad need to be constructed.

Mr. Thornton said the study will be completed by the end of September and the consultant will be back in town September 14 to present their final draft.

### ORCHARD MESA MASTER PLAN

Dave Thornton invited the Planning Commission to attend a County/City meeting to look at an Orchard Mesa Master Plan. The first public meeting will be Thursday, August 13, from 6:30-8:30 p.m. at Intermountain Veteran's Memorial Park in Building C. Chairman Halsey asked if the building was handicapped accessible. Mr. Thornton said he would check.

### PARKS MASTER PLAN

Bennett Boeschstein said we just got a rough draft back from the consultants on the Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space and Kris Ashbeck and I are reviewing it.

### WORK SESSIONS

Bennett Boeschstein suggested the Commission schedule work sessions with both St. Mary's and Mesa State College as both entities have recently completed Master Plans and no one has seen them.

### APPLICATION FORM

Commissioner Roberts requested the Project Name be added to the Development Application.

### APPLICATION FEE SCHEDULE

Kathy Portner said the fees have not been updated since 1983 and at the urging of Public Works we have tried to go through each of the different types of development and come up with an average number of hours that the Community Development Department spends on review; the same process was gone through by Public Works and the Fire Department. We have tried to come up with an average and make up the difference on larger projects with acreage fees. On certain items we came up with a basic base fee and then a menu of items which could apply to that development and their fee would go up depending on what was needed for the submittal. We would like an additional month to send this out for review to interested parties such as the Board of Realtors, Homebuilders



GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 4, 1992

page 17

Association and County Planning so that before we bring it to you and City Council everyone that would be interested will have seen the proposal and had a chance to comment on it.

Chairman Halsey said he it looked like you were quite lenient towards the developer. Ms. Portner said we were very conservative in our estimates.

Commissioner Roberts questioned whether, in the case of additional fees, if the basis should be acreage or per unit fees. Ms. Portner said we discussed this at length as far as the amount of time involved in a review and overall we felt acreage was a bigger factor.

Commissioner Brown said his concern was that this won't increase efficiency in your workload; there should be some way that if it is done right the first time they pay very little and when they come back the second and the third time the fees keep going up. Ms. Portner said this was also discussed and we will just have to try and reject any incomplete submittals and not even waste our time, past one hour, looking through it. Commissioner Brown said when the first mistake is found, you should stop and give it back to them, rather than go through the whole thing and find the errors and do their work for them.

Don Newton said that is what we are getting away from; if an application is incomplete we are just going to reject it as an incomplete submittal.

Commissioner Anderson asked if there is an outline which they follow for application submittal. Ms. Portner said yes.

Commissioner Roberts suggested we consider charging a \$50 flat fee just for review of a development submittal to make sure it is complete; this would be in addition to the regular fee. Commissioner Anderson agreed.

**VII. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS**

There were no nonscheduled citizens and/or visitors.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.