

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing October 6, 1992
7:30 p.m. - 9:42 p.m.

Neva Lockhart
City Clerk

✓
File

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, John Elmer, Tom Volkmann and Scott Brown.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Larry Timm Director; Kathy Portner, Senior Planner; Karl Metzner, Planner II; and Dave Thornton, Planner.

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 37 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 SEPTEMBER 1, 1992 MEETING."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

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 non-scheduled visitors.

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

1. #53-92 REVISED FINAL PLAN - ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL ADDITION IN PB ZONE

A request for approval of a revised Final Plan for St. Mary's Hospital which includes the construction of a six level Patient Tower and a three story addition on top of the existing structure of the Hospital to house a medical office building in a Planned Business (PB) Zone.

PETITIONER: Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth
(St. Mary's Hospital)

REPRESENTATIVE: Western Engineers, Inc.

LOCATION: 2635 N. Seventh Street

PETITIONERS PRESENTATION

Mr. Daryll Evans Vice President of Finance for St. Mary's Hospital was present to explain the request for approval of a revised Final Plan for St. Mary's Hospital. The proposal is for two specific

additions to the building; the first will be 5 stories above ground that combines three areas that were identified in the long range plan done in 1988. This will consolidate all the entrances to one location and will add 3 new patient floors; the second addition will be used for the medical office building.

Mr. Bill Meyer of HBE, Project Manager for St. Mary's Hospital was present to further explain the request is a final phase for the master plan the Hospital created in 1985. Included in this phase is the construction of a new main lobby for the hospital, also the laboratory will be expanded. The 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors will be new nursing beds, also 35 medical/surgical beds, 35 neurological beds and 35 medical beds.

Upon completion of remodeling in phase 2 the cardiology rehab center, the volunteer center, and a new recovery room will take the place of a central service department which will move to the new addition. The medical staff area and a medical library will also be on the first floor. The second floor will have 32 medical/surgical beds which will be modernized, also a new administrative suite and additional miscellaneous offices. The closed psychiatric unit will be move from the north area and it will be adjacent to the third floor to improve the efficiency for that unit.

The fourth floor will have class room, conference space, physical therapy, miscellaneous offices and 4 guest rooms. The medical office building will include 3 floors which will be located over the existing building which will contain 42,000 square feet of rentable space which should house 25 to 30 physicians. The entire project will be built contiguous to the existing building. Other than a change being in the main entry drive there will be no impact to the area.

Mr. Meyer continued explaining the site coverage will be increased to about 16 percent; if the areas west and east are included which include the new parking areas the building coverage drops to 11 percent.

Construction can begin immediately and will continue for about 24 months. Renovation will be done on the older portion as new construction is completed, some impact from remodeling may occur. The medical office building should begin about December of 1992 and will continue for about 12 months.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department was present to explain the review comments and the master plan. The outstanding comment from the Review Agency Summary Sheet came from the Development Engineer who has concerns about the fact that there has never been a comprehensive look at the drainage generated from the site. St. Mary's Hospital has instructed Western Engineers to proceed on the drainage study, one option is the use of the park owned by St. Mary's as a detention area. St. Mary's has budgeted \$150,000 for any possible drainage improvement which may be made.

The park would only be used as a detention area during large storms.

The parking lot east of 7th Street was approved which includes all employee parking. The parking on the west side of 7th street will be visitor, physician and patient parking. The master plan will be revised over the next 2 years. Staff recommends this be brought before the Planning Commission for review and adoption when the revised plan is done. This project completes the master plan to date, further plans will be included in the next segment of the master plan. There are no other concerns on this request and Staff recommends approval.

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Metzner if this building project is the last construction phase in the existing master plan?

Mr. Metzner replied affirmatively and explained this master plan was originally proposed in the late 1980's and has been scaled down since the original proposal.

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR: There was no public comment for the Petitioner.

AGAINST:

Mr. V. Harbert of 2512 Mira Vista, Grand Junction, CO. 81501 had concerns about the new construction which is adjacent to his property. Primarily, is the east portion of the new building going to be glass or brick and what is the elevation? Also, what is the landscaping plan for the new construction adjoining Mira Vista?

Mrs. Judy Harbert of 2512 Mira Vista, Grand Junction, CO. 81501 had concerns about the visual impact of the this addition. The hospital to date is not filled to capacity so it seems unreasonable to make such a large addition at this time. Also, there is a lot of concern about the large number of Doctor's offices and the parking impact that will have on the area.

PETITIONERS RESPONSE

Mr. Evans explained the new construction will be glass and hallways will be on the east portion. The distance from the top floor to the adjoining property is approximately 330 feet which is equivalent to the length of a football field, and there has been adequate shrubbery planted.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Anderson asked Mr. Metzner if the \$150,000 would cover the construction costs on the drainage problem?

Mr. Metzner referred the question to Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams the City Development Engineer explained Western Engineers had done a preliminary study showing costs of approximately \$120,000; the City Engineers reviewed this and feel at this time \$150,000 is within a reasonable range for completion

of the drainage problems. There will be a certificate of occupancy required for the addition and if the drainage project costs more to complete it will still have to be completed prior to issuance of the final certificate of occupancy.

Commissioner Anderson asked Mr. Evans if the required fence on Patterson around the new parking lot had been completed?

Mr. Evans replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Brown stated the proposed 25 to 30 physicians, which includes their office staff and patients could require approximately 150 parking spaces. Would this cause a parking problem?

Mr. Evans replied there are 200 parking spaces on that side of the building which currently is employee parking. The employees will be parking on the east side of 7th Street.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Evans if the employees of the physicians are going to park on the east side of 7th Street?

Mr. Evans replied they would be parking in the physician parking lot to the west also. Estimates indicate a need for 140 spaces for the physicians and staff.

Commissioner Brown asked if there will be any changes to the helicopter operations.

Mr. Evans replied the changes would not affect the helicopter operations at all.

Commissioner Elmer asked if supplying physicians office space was a normal procedure for hospitals?

Mr. Evans replied affirmatively, and explained it is much more efficient for the patient, the physician and the hospital.

Commissioner Elmer had concerns about the time frame for the master plan?

Mr. Evans explained this request now completes the master plan as submitted; after this phase is completed a new master plan will be developed and submitted.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #53-92, A REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A REVISED FINAL PLAN FOR ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL WHICH INCLUDES THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SIX LEVEL PATIENT TOWER AND A THREE STORY ADDITION ON TOP OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE OF THE HOSPITAL TO HOUSE A MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING IN A PLANNED BUSINESS (PB) ZONE I MOVE WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

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

V. HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

1. #56-92 REZONE FROM RSF-4 TO PR & ODP - PTARMIGAN RIDGE

A request for a Rezone from a Residential Single Family Zone with 4 units per acre (RSF-4) to a Planned Residential (PR) Zone with no increase in density and an Outline Development Plan (ODP) for Ptarmigan Ridge Subdivision.

PETITIONER: John Siegfried

LOCATION: North of Ridge Drive and West of 27 1/2 Road

PETITIONERS PRESENTATION

Mr. Siegfried was present to explain the request for a Rezone from a Residential Single Family Zone with 4 units per acre (RSF-4) to a Planned Residential (PR) Zone with no increase in density and an Outline Development Plan (ODP) for Ptarmigan Ridge Subdivision. This differs from the original plan in that it does not have thru traffic from 27 1/2 Road and Cortland intersection to 15th Street. There have been changes in the length of cul-de-sacs, resulting in reduced traffic flow in residential neighborhoods. There is a request for some flexibility in regard to the set backs which are currently somewhat restrictive on the corner lots. There is a density transfer from one area of the ODP to another, but still keeping the overall density at 4 units per acre. This ODP addresses the neighborhood planning and will tie the different phases of Ptarmigan Ridge together. There is no change in the overall density.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Thornton of the City Community Development Department was present to explain the request for a Rezone from a Residential Single Family Zone with 4 units per acre (RSF-4) to a Planned Residential (PR) Zone with no increase in density and an Outline Development Plan (ODP) for Ptarmigan Ridge Subdivision. There have been an additional 10 acres added to the original Ptarmigan Ridge area. To summarize the filings; in 1990 a preliminary plan was approved, since 1990 Filing One was approved and developed; Filing Two was approved and is being developed; Filing Three has been approved; Filing Four in under review this month and will be brought to the Commission in November of 1992. This ODP allows some flexibility as far as housing types and shifts of density. Also, it changes the road configuration so that there will not be a thru street onto 15th Street.

This is a two fold request; first for a rezone and secondly for approval of the ODP. The rezone meets the criteria in that it is compatible with the surrounding area and it is not increasing the density for the site. This proposal will provide different types of housing for the area as some attached types units are proposed. The planned zone will also provide open space and pedestrian

walkways through the development. The utilities are readily available. The Review Agency comments show Ute Water initially had opposition to the ODP due to the fact that there would not be a looped water line in the public ROW. Mr. Matthews of Ute Water has worked out an agreement with the Petitioner since the comment was made and they have agreed on a 30 foot easement being provided by the Petitioner so that the water line can be a looped system. There will be restrictions on the development in that 30 foot easement; no fences, no buildings, and contained drainage.

The Petitioner will be required to come to the Commissioners for Preliminary and Final Plans. The Preliminary Plan will include the entire area while Final Plan could occur in phases. Staff recommends approval subject to Review Agency Summary Sheet Comments with a special note that a pedestrian system be provided to link the new Ptarmigan Ridge neighborhood to the old Ptarmigan Ridge neighborhood. Also, the 30 foot utilities easement must be provided with the following conditions: 1) within that 30 foot wide easement no fences will be built 2) no vehicles and a restriction of vehicle access 3) so that drainage is constructed so that all the run-off is contained within the easement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR: There was no comment for the proposal.

AGAINST:

Dan Miller of 3643 Bellridge Grand Junction, CO. was present to ask questions about the proposed zoning. Filing One had density restrictions and if higher densities are being allowed in this adjoining Filing it would reduce the property values. Would the existing covenants be effective for this filing?

Mr. Jim Davis of 1829 Ridge Drive Grand Junction, CO. opposed not having the road extend to 15th Street. The traffic on Ridge Drive has increased since the first two filings by 60 vehicles, which have to exit onto Ridge Drive or 15th Street. The traffic travels at excessive speeds and there are a number of children in the area with no parks to play in. If the road were extended on to 15th Street as originally planned the traffic would be lightened somewhat for Ridge Road.

Mr. Dave Turner of 1839 Bellridge Court Grand Junction, CO. had concerns because of the traffic on Ridge Drive. His children have to cross in order to go to the bus stop. The traffic at 27 1/2 Road and Ridge Drive is excessive during peak times, many exceed the speed limits and much of the traffic is circumventing the light at Patterson going down 15th Street and onto Ridge Drive in order to get to 27 1/2 Road faster. When the development was being proposed there were promises the roads would extend onto Cortland and onto 27 1/2 Road and a traffic control signal was expected to be installed and the current problems would be alleviated when the final phases were completed.

Mr. Elton Crisman of 1819 Ridge Drive Grand Junction, CO. explained a stop sign was proposed for 15th and Ridge Drive which would slow

the traffic down and put some of it back onto 27 1/2 Road but it has never been installed.

PETITIONERS REBUTTAL

Mr. Siegfried explained the only change anticipated in the neighborhood would be in one area and those lots would be isolated, ~~with~~ localized density and perhaps zero lot line configuration with a correspondingly greater amount of open space. The net effect would be 5 more units in one area, not the entire area. The lots adjacent to the existing subdivision at least mirror those subdivisions in the size of lots, types of units and covenants of any lots in the adjoining subdivision.

On the traffic questions raised, this proposal should alleviate much of the congestion, by not connecting the road to 15th Street traffic should not be increased on Ridge Drive.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Thornton to explain the ODP and what the future development will involve.

Mr. Thornton explained that the ODP is set up to designate certain numbers of units within the ODP; for example the Petitioner would be limited to 5 units within a 2 acre area and they would be single family detached houses. The adjoining area would allow 21 units of detached houses on 7 acres, on the 3 acre lot would allow 19 units with either single family attached or single family detached. On the 6 acre area there would be 16 units of single family detached, on the 5 acre area there would be approximately 30 units with either single family detached or attached units. The proposal is for 91 units on the entire 23 acres which is under 4 units per acre.

Mr. Siegfried commented on the traffic questions stating he would work with the City Traffic Engineer to install a stop sign on Cortland.

Chairman Halsey commented that the City Engineer might look into the situation and see what needs to be done to improve the traffic patterns.

Commissioner Volkmann asked the City Engineer if the City had addressed the impact of the traffic flow in this neighborhood.

Mr. Newton explained the department has looked at the traffic volume generated by the development. There are some conflicts which need to be considered.

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner if they were not allowed to exceed the 4 units per acre because of the avigation easement? Does the density of 6 units per acre violate that provision?

Mr. Thornton stated under the planned zone it does not violate the provision.

Mr. Shaver explained the specific avigation easement is designated as a specific density that must be adhered to. Mr. Siegfried should not propose a density that is greater than what is allowed.

Commissioner Volkmann asked if the airport authority should be contacted to find out their interpretation.

Mr. Thornton explained this can be done on the subsequent submittals and the Commissioners will have an opportunity to review this when details of the site plans are closer to final.

Commissioner Anderson noted there was a variance in the setback requirement for corner lots and asked how Staff felt about the minimum requirement for this subdivision?

Mr. Thornton stated it is difficult in the ODP stage to assess the setback issue.

Commissioner Volkmann asked how Ute Water came to change their stand on the water line easement?

Mr. Thornton explained they changed their statement with the provision of having a 30 foot wide easement. The loop system was a requirement for this location.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the entire development had been submitted for preliminary review?

Mr. Thornton explained the Code requires development under a certain amount of acres to submit the entire development at the Preliminary, they cannot break it up. The larger developments such as 100 acres can do an ODP for all the development and include only 50 acres for the Preliminary Plan. The Ptarmigan Ridge Subdivision is a smaller development so they will have to come through the Preliminary Plan in its entirety.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Thornton when the pedestrian paths are going to be required to be installed?

Mr. Thornton replied this would be a requirement at the Final Plan stage, but be reviewed at the preliminary plan.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the neighborhood park was still a plan that would be included in the Preliminary?

Mr. Siegfried stated there will not be a major park in the area, the Parks and Recreation Department tends to want money for their funds rather than more parks. The tentative plans will include a 5 foot wide sidewalk in the retention basin area which can be creatively done.

Commissioner Elmer asked Mr. Williams if the cul-de-sacs meet the new road standards as far as length?

Mr. Williams stated he did not personally check on this. There has

been discussion on the length with the developer. The traffic is not a problem because of the number of cul-de-sacs in the area.

Mr. Newton explained the new street standards do not have a maximum length for a dead end road or a street with a cul-de-sac on it. The standard is leaning toward 1,000 to 1,200 feet for the maximum length, these streets fall within that limit. The street design criteria will be reviewed early in 1993 and dead end streets will be considered at that time.

Commissioner Volkmann asked Mr. Thornton about the main issue raised by the citizens which was the traffic problem; will this be reviewed at the Preliminary or by adopting the cul-de-sac and road configuration in the ODP does this become final?

Mr. Thornton explained the actual layout of the cul-de-sacs isn't final in the ODP; what is final will be the issue of whether the road goes on through to 15th Street or not.

Commissioner Volkmann asked if the traffic flow could be addressed more accurately at the Preliminary Plan stage?

Mr. Thornton replied affirmatively; as far as the cul-de-sacs themselves, they will be addressed more accurately in the Preliminary Plan. However, the external trips will not be considered.

Commissioner Elmer had concerns about the cul-de-sacs being included in two neighborhoods, whereas the Petitioner mentioned the neighborhoods were supposed to be developed as separate entities.

Mr. Siegfried explained there is no difference in density or configuration of the two areas.

Commissioner Elmer felt there was a higher density proposed close to 27 1/2 Road which will put the largest traffic generated from the subdivision closer to 27 1/2 Road which is beneficial.

Mr. Newton explained the City has a 10 year capital improvements plan for 27 1/2 Road which will include a left turn lane, curb, gutter, and sidewalks on both sides by 1995 or 1996. The details of design for this project will begin in 1993. The traffic signal at 15th Street and F Road is also on the 10 year plan and is scheduled to be installed within 3 or 4 years. When the property between 15th Street and 12th Street is developed Ridge Drive will then be extended on to 12th Street.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #56-92 A REQUEST FOR A REZONE FROM A RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY ZONE WITH 4 UNITS PER ACRE (RSF-4) TO A PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (PR) ZONE WITH NO INCREASE IN DENSITY, WITH THE ADDENDA OF A WALKWAY BEING PROVIDED BETWEEN THE NEIGHBORHOODS, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ITEM ON 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 by, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #56-92 A REQUEST FOR AN OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ODP) FOR PTARMIGAN RIDGE SUBDIVISION LOCATED NORTH OF RIDGE DRIVE AND WEST OF 27 1/2 ROAD, I MOVE WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

AMENDED MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #56-92 A REQUEST FOR AN OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ODP) FOR PTARMIGAN RIDGE SUBDIVISION LOCATED NORTH OF RIDGE DRIVE AND WEST OF 27 1/2 ROAD, WITH A 30 FOOT UTILITY EASEMENT AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS WHICH UTE WATER HAS PREVIOUSLY AGREED TO: A LOOP WATER LINE WILL BE INSTALLED, NO PARKING WILL BE PERMITTED ON THE EASEMENT, RESTRICTION OF DRAINAGE ON THE EASEMENT, AND THE EASEMENT MUST NOT ENCROACH UPON ADJACENT PRIVATE PROPERTY, 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 by, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

2. #57-92 UTILITY EASEMENT VACATION - GARFIELD SUBDIVISION IN RSF-8

A request for a vacation of a utility easement in a residential single family zone (8 units per acre).

PETITIONER: Elijah Hitchcock

LOCATION: 652 28 Road

PETITIONERS PRESENTATION

Mr. Elijah Hitchcock of 652 28 Road was present to explain his request for a vacation of a utility easement in a residential single family zone. The reason for the request is that the utilities department does not use this easement. There is no opposition by the Utilities Company on the vacation of the unused easements. There is no one objecting to this as the area is totally within the single family lot.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner of the City Community Development Department was present to explain the request for a vacation of a utility easement in a residential single family zone (8 units per acre). Originally the 20 foot utilities easement was 10 feet on each side of the lot lines, approximately 8 years ago there was a lot line adjustment which shifted the lot line 20 foot north of the plated location

which leaves the 20 easement 10 feet within the Petitioners property line. The utilities companies have reviewed this, there are no utilities within the easements, no plans to put utilities within the easements, and no objection to the vacation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

-There was no public comment either for or against this request.

QUESTIONS

There were no comments or questions by the Commissioners

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM # 57-92 A REQUEST FOR A VACATION OF A UTILITY EASEMENT AT 652 28 ROAD IN A RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY ZONE (8 UNITS PER ACRE) I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ITEM ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

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

3. #61-92 ROAD NEEDS STUDY - ADOPTION AS ELEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A request to adopt the Metropolitan Planning Organization Road Needs Study as an appendage to the transportation element of the comprehensive plan, to be used as an advisory document for the city in making future decisions regarding transportation and capital improvements projects.

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

REPRESENTATIVE: Dave Thornton

PETITIONERS PRESENTATION

Mr. Thornton of the City Community Development Department was present to explain the request to adopt the Metropolitan Planning Organization Road Needs Study as an appendage to the transportation element of the comprehensive plan, to be used as an advisory document for the city in making future decisions regarding transportation and capital improvements projects. The study included updating the computer transportation model. The last update was done in the mid 1980's and much of the information had changed. The 1990 census was included in updating the model. Also, the Road Needs Study did recommendations pertaining to the years 1995 and 2000 within the metropolitan planning area, which goes from the Colorado National Monument to 34 Road, and H Road down to A Road.

The following is a list of improvements that are being recommended:
For 1995:

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

October 6, 1992

page 12

1) Recommendations include right turn lanes along North Avenue at major signalized cross-street intersections, the area included is North Avenue, I-70 Business loop on the West and I-70 Business loop on the East.

2) Recommendations for the 1st Street/Ute Avenue/Pitkin Avenue, Colorado Avenue to 2nd Street include an extra lane from Grand to about 9th Street.

3) Recommendations for 9th Street include a 4 lane road and improvements at the railroad crossing from D Road to Pitkin Avenue.

4) Recommendation for the 25 Road, I-70 Business loop to Patterson Road will be the addition of left-turn lanes.

The total estimated costs, not including any ROW acquisition, is \$3,700,000. Much of the area is within the State Highway system ROW and therefore funding would be petitioned from the state.

For 2000:

1) Recommendations for 1st Street, from Orchard Avenue to Patterson Road include addition of left-turn lanes.

2) Recommendations for Riverside Neighborhood, Broadway/ River Road to 5th Street/ 4th Avenue include alternate travel routes to replace the 5th Street bridge traffic patterns. The Riverside Neighborhood minor arterial with a left turn lane is proposed to bring traffic from Broadway to the 5th Street Corridor.

3) Recommendations for River Road, Redlands Parkway to Broadway include left-turn lane additions.

4) Recommendations for 24 1/2 Road or 25 Road, River Road to I-70 Business loop include construction of a two lane minor arterial with left-turn lanes. This would allow traffic to exit I-70, travel to River Road and continue around the Riverside collector.

5) Recommendation for the 29 Road, US 50 to I-70 include

a) addition of another bridge across the Colorado River between Orchard Mesa and the main part of the valley. By the year 2000 the computer shows possible congestion along the existing road networks, and the 29 Road bridge will be required.

b) a four lane viaduct over the railroad tracks on D Road to North Avenue.

c) widening US 50 to D Road and including left-turn lanes and constructing a two lane bridge over the Colorado River.

d) constructing an interchange with I-70 and widening North Avenue to I-70 to four lanes with left-turn lanes.

The total cost for the recommendations for the year 2000 estimated in 1992 dollars is \$29,000,000. The scenario used was approximately a 1 1/2 percent growth rate.

Staff requests the City Planning Commission approves this as an appendage to the comprehensive plan as a guiding document and a

guiding tool for the City and the County to use in studying the transportation needs of the future.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Anderson asked Mr. Thornton about the right turn lanes proposed for North Avenue, is there going to be an elimination of one lane of traffic to accommodate this new right turn lane or will the property be bought?

Mr. Thornton explained the City recommends adding an additional right turn lane similar to those at 12th and North Avenue.

Commissioner Anderson asked Mr. Thornton if the figures were an adequate estimate of the cost because of purchases required to do this?

Mr. Thornton replied in some cases there would be additional costs incurred.

Commissioner Anderson asked where the City is going to get this kind of money?

Mr. Thornton explained if the City and the County both adopt this plan there is more leverage when funds are petitioned for through the MPO and by obtaining funds from the State by getting on their 5 year highway plan. It is true the City could not by itself pay for these types of projects.

Commissioner Anderson asked about the construction of the overpass over the River and the Railroad, which could take two years to complete; this would mean 5th Street would be extremely congested by the time the project is completed, is this scenario reasonable? Also, if population continues the bridge would become obsolete, shouldn't a 3rd or 4th lane be planned into the construction at this time so that the project is not obsolete by the time its completed?

Mr. Thornton agreed with updating the planning prior to actual construction in case a two lane bridge is not adequate by the year 2000.

Chairman Halsey added that with the adoption of this plan the City Council and County Commissioners should have foresight with the high cost items and perhaps begin obtaining the land prior to actual development in order to save acquisition money.

Mr. Thornton added as development on 29 Road occurs it should be mandatory that the ROW is granted at the time of development.

Commissioner Elmer asked how the city is going to prioritize these projects; will accident rates be a criteria in their decisions?

Mr. Newton stated they will be prioritized prior to inclusion in the 10 year plan.

Mr. Shaver added there is a district hearing every year or two done by the Colorado Department of Highways in which recommendations are made for projects, allowing for a more common voice in the decisions. The hearing this year is October 30, 1992 where recommendations are made to the Department of Highways fund allocations.

Commissioner Anderson asked Mr. Shaver if time was of the essence to get this study on the state agenda?

Mr. Shaver replied affirmatively. The state uses a rolling five year plan and any particular years priority may not stay on the plan as number one the next successive year.

Commissioner Anderson asked if actual estimates will be done?

Mr. Shaver explained there will have to be a more detailed engineering and planning analysis.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER VOLKMANN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #61-92, A REQUEST TO ADOPT THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION ROAD NEEDS STUDY AS A APPENDAGE TO THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, TO BE USED AS AN ADVISORY DOCUMENT FOR THE CITY IN MAKING FUTURE DECISIONS REGARDING TRANSPORTATION AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ITEM ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

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

VII. GENERAL DISCUSSION

1. UPDATES - MASTER PLANS

A. South Downtown Riverfront Master Plan

Ms. Portner of the City Community Development Department was present to explain the latest updates on the South Downtown Riverfront Master Plan. The land use alternatives are being looked into and two scenarios have been drawn up.

B. Orchard Mesa Plan

Mr. Thornton of the City Community Development Department was present to explain the Orchard Mesa Plan updates. There were 4 meetings in September with the residents of Orchard Mesa and the meetings were broken up into 3 geographic areas. The 1st meeting had approximately 70 people attending; the 2nd meeting had

approximately 50 people attending; the 3rd meeting had approximately 35-40 people attending. Many issues were discussed, with a lot of input from the public. There will be a meeting at Dos Hombres at 7:30 p.m. and the Commissioners are asked to attend along with the County Commissioners to help generate some goals for the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood.

VIII. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

Commissioner Brown brought up the fact that the next scheduled meeting for the City Planning Commission was scheduled for election
GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
October 6, 1992
page 18

day. A suggestion would be to change the meeting to the second Tuesday of November because of this.

Chairman Halsey replied having the meeting on election day has been a problem in the past. Is there anything on the agenda which would be affected by postponing the meeting a week?

Ms. Portner explained if the items have to go onto City Council, Staff has less time for preparation on those items.

Mr. Shaver brought up the problem of the availability of the auditorium on November 10th.

Commissioner Anderson suggested also trying to obtain the auditorium the week of November 2nd, just not on Tuesday.

Mr. Shaver agreed to check with the City Auditorium schedule and reschedule the meeting.

Mr. Larry Timm Director of the City Community Development Department handed out information regarding which Staff person is in charge of different types of projects to the Commissioners, so that it is clearer who is in charge of the different types of activities.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 p.m.