

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- January 9, 1990
7:30 p.m. - 10:30 p.m.

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

All Planning Commission members were present:

Steve Love, Chairman	Jack Campbell	Jim Tyson
Sheilah Renberger	Ron Halsey	John Elmer

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department was Karl Metzner.

Bobbie Darlington was present to record the minutes.

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

* * * * *

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 1989 MEETING AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

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

There were no announcements, presentations and/or pre-scheduled visitors.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

- #55-89 REZONE FROM RSF-4 TO PR-4, FINAL PLAN & PLAT AND A VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR PTARMIGAN ESTATES SUBDIVISION.
Petitioner: John Siegfried
Location: Southeast corner of 27 1/2 and G Roads

Chairman Love excused himself from participating in this item due to a potential conflict of interest. Vice-Chairperson Ron Halsey directed this portion of the meeting.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Siegfried felt that all concerns expressed by the Planning Commission and review agencies had been satisfactorily addressed.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner presented a brief overview of the development request. There was a minor change on the plat in reference to the vacation area; the vacation is only a portion to the west of Piazza. Karl stated that the drainage problems have all been resolved along with all the other technical concerns. The developer requested a waiver of the required improvements to G Road. It is questionable whether G Road will be improved in the future, but the right-of-way will be retained just in case. If improvements are needed in the future, they would be done by the City.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Ken Etter, 697 27 1/2 Road, expressed his support towards the project, but suggested that some provisions be made on the location of the water source, when and if G Road is extended.

Karl explained that there is an easement provided on the plat for water mains. Whenever any utilities, including irrigation, are located in a right-of-way, it is the City's responsibility to relocate or make provisions for these. Karl assured Mr. Etter that the water rights would certainly be provided regardless of the circumstance.

Gordon Harshman, 2312 South Seville Circle, also expressed his approval of the development, but wondered if arrangements could be made to share the maintenance of the median south of the turnaround area at Cortland Avenue. He suggested the possibility of either; returning it to the City, or else having the residents of Crown Heights and Ptarmigan Estates share the maintenance and expenses.

AGAINST:

None

Commissioner Campbell asked Don Newton, City Engineer, if he had any concerns that had not been addressed.

Don responded that all his concerns have been addressed.

John Siegfried had no rebuttal comments.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #55-89, A REQUEST TO REZONE FROM RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY WITH A DENSITY OF APPROXIMATELY 4 UNITS PER ACRE (RSF-4) TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL WITH A DENSITY OF APPROXIMATELY 4 UNITS PER ACRE (PR-4), I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SINCE THIS ZONING DOES NOT CHANGE THE DENSITY OR USES ALLOWED IN THE CURRENT ZONING, BUT WILL PERMIT MORE CREATIVE USE OF THE SITE BY ESTABLISHING GREENBELT EASEMENTS AND SPECIFIC BUILDING ENVELOPES FOR EACH LOT, AND RECOMMEND TO WAIVE THE IMPROVEMENTS OF G ROAD FROM 27 1/2 ROAD TO PUTTER DRIVE."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #55-89, A REQUEST FOR A FINAL PLAN FOR PTARMIGAN ESTATES, LOCATED AT 27 1/2 AND G ROADS, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SINCE; IT MEETS THE INTENTS OF THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ZONE BY PROVIDING OPEN SPACE GREENBELT AREAS, IT IS COMPATIBLE WITH ADJACENT USES, AND UTILIZES THE NATURAL TOPOGRAPHICAL FEATURES OF THE SITE."

Commissioner Elmer seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #55-89, A REQUEST FOR A FINAL PLAT FOR PTARMIGAN ESTATES LOCATED AT 27 1/2 AND G ROADS, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, SUBJECT TO ALL THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS, SINCE PREVIOUS TECHNICAL CONCERNS HAVE BEEN RESOLVED TO THE CITY ENGINEER'S SATISFACTION."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #55-89, A REQUEST TO VACATE A PORTION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY ALONG EAST PIAZZA PLACE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SINCE; THE VACATION WILL NOT LANDLOCK ANY PARCEL OF LAND, OR RESTRICT ACCESS TO ANY PARCEL OF LAND, AND THE RIGHT-OF-WAY SERVES NO PUBLIC PURPOSE."

Commissioner Elmer seconded the motion.

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

A brief recess was called at 7:50 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:55 p.m.

2. **#58-89 ZONE OF ANNEXATION FOR FOX ESTATES #1 AND #2.**
Petitioner: City Property Manager, Tim Woodmansee
Location: 28 Road and F 1/2 Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tim Woodmansee, City Property Manager representing the Fire Department, presented an overview of the proposal. The proposed location of the new fire station is at the corner of 28 Road and F 1/2 Road east of Spring Valley Subdivision and south of Garfield View Subdivision. After several months of careful study, this site was selected as the best location to meet the fire protection needs of the community as it grows north and east. A purchase contract has been secured for this site, and it is preferable to annex this area with the proposed zoning. If the zoning is approved, a special use permit would still have to be obtained to build the fire station.

Tim continued; a meeting was held last Thursday with the Spring Valley residents so they could air their concerns. Tim felt the majority of these concerns had already been addressed. Main concerns were increased noise and speeding emergency vehicles. To alleviate the possibility of a noise problem, a 6 foot tall, double-faced wood fence would be installed on the north, east, and south perimeters of the facility. The west perimeter would be landscaped to buffer any noise. Outdoor speakers will not be used, rather the firemen will carry handheld radios for communication. Emergency vehicles would not be permitted to exceed the posted speed limits along 28 Road driving south to Patterson Road or on 28 Road driving north and west on Cortland to 27 1/2 Road.

Tim stated that there were also concerns regarding the firetrucks being able to negotiate the turn from Cortland Avenue to 27 1/2 Road, adding that the redesign of this intersection in conjunction with the construction of the fire station was being considered; in any event, 27 1/2 Road is scheduled to be rebuilt entirely in 1993. In order to build a facility that is aesthetically compatible with the surrounding area, the sellers and the Spring Valley Architectural Control Committee have been asked to help design the exterior of the fire station facility; preference being that the building should look more like a house than an institutional structure. The height of the structure will not exceed 22 feet measured from the crown line of 28 Road.

Tim continued stating that the seller has requested the zoning as Planned Residential with a density of 12 units per acre for the remaining 58.28 acres. This zoning does not apply to the fire station site. The petition for annexation is contingent on achieving this zone and density. Construction of the fire station is scheduled to begin in the Fall of 1990 with completion in the Spring of 1991.

Commissioner Campbell asked if there was a rough draft plan for the proposed fire station, and if so, was there a hose tower in this plan?

Mr. Ken Johnson, Acting Fire Chief, answered no there was not a plan and assured Commissioner Campbell there would not be a hose tower; the drying of the hose would be done with by an electric dryer.

Chairman Love asked Tim if he would briefly expound on a few of the sites that were considered for the proposed fire station.

Tim replied that the Fire Department had a presentation they would like to share which graphically supported the location that was selected. Specifically, a site at the airport was considered but recanted as this removed them from some of the fire protection coverage area. A couple of sites were looked at on 27 1/2 Road, but the deterrence there was the existing topography of the road, including some blind spots, hills, and vertical curves which limited the sight distance, also the number of private driveways entering directly on to 27 1/2 Road. The site on 28 Road was the most favorable because of the coverage area, the extremely good site distance, and only a couple side streets to contend with.

Commissioner Elmer questioned the fact that the improvements scheduled for 27 1/2 Road would alleviate the problem of sight distance.

Tim replied, they hoped to build and use the fire station by 1991, leaving a two year lapse of a somewhat hazardous situation.

Commissioner Renberger felt that a fire station should be located in commercial areas rather than residential because of safety factors. She also suggested that since the fire trucks would not be using sirens, time would be lost if other vehicles were not yielding to them.

Ken Johnson concurred, the primary concern was the safety of the children. He explained that it has been past practice to locate a fire station in a commercial area, but current trends are to locate them in the middle of residential areas. If the fire station is built at this location, lost time has already been minimized. To locate it somewhere else would only add to the response time.

Rick Smith, of the Fire Department, gave a site selection presentation on a overhead projector. Currently, there are four fire stations that cover the city and rural fire protection district. Rick began by demonstrating the gross overlap in the current protection areas; some areas had double, even triple coverage. A site selection study was done to address this problem. First, 27 1/2 Road was examined as a possible site. Rick reiterated what Tim had pointed out about the sight distance limitations and the private driveways. He added that another deterrence was this location fell within the critical flight zone of one of the runways at the airport, which could possibly be a hazardous situation. Next, Rick demonstrated how the proposed site on 28 Road better covered the protection area without overlapping into the other coverage areas, adding that the sight distance at this location was very good.

When asked why the corner of 27 1/2 Road and Patterson was not considered, Rick explained this was not preferable due to the FPA Standards which recommend staying away from heavily used roads such as arterials and highly congested intersections.

Chairman Love asked if a location further east was considered?

Rick explained that their Fire Protection District ends at 30 Road and this site selection was also done in consideration of long range plans. As the city grows and annexes the area to the east, an ideal location for a 6th fire station would be at approximately the 31 Road area, between Clifton's fire station and this proposed site.

Tom Logue, 861 Rood Avenue, representing the sellers Discovery 76, outlined the request for the zoning of this property. The land has had a zoning of PR with 12.5 units per acre in the county since 1981. Mesa County granted this zoning for the following reasons, and Tom felt that these reasons were still valid today.

1. There are readily available sources of water of sufficient size for fire protection.

2. There are existing sanitary sewer mains at the property.
3. This land is in close proximity to Patterson Road, which at that time was classified as a main arterial.
4. The philosophical policy of the County was to locate high density population closer to urban core areas.
5. There is a similar use and density located at Patterson and 28 Road.
6. Mesa County Planning Commission encouraged the Planned Unit Development concept, in order to permit a development site with additional landscaping, buffering, and flexibility to maintain compatibility with the surrounding area.

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR:

None

AGAINST:

Tedford M. Hendrickson, of 3330 Beechwood Street, read a statement on behalf of himself and F. Gretchen Clemens. This statement was entered as part of the record. In summary, their concerns were as follows:

1. The proposal does not state the purpose of the zoning.
2. The proposed fire station is not supported by development plans available to the public.
3. The firetrucks would "shortcut" through Spring Valley.
4. Access to Horizon Drive involves three turns, two of which, Cortland to 27 1/2 Road and 27 1/2 Road to G Road, are of questionable radius to accommodate a fire truck easily and safely.
5. Aesthetic quality would be reduced by the associated noise, lighting, and traffic from the proposed fire station.
6. The granting of a Public Zoning to this small area would justify additional Public or Commercial Zones.

Brad Higgenbotham, of 3310 Beechwood Street, voiced his opposition to this proposal based on the following observations. Brad debated the argument of avoiding heavily used roads and intersections. If a Planned Residential of 12 units per acre were allowed, this would create ingress/egress for approximately 700 units. For each unit there would be approximately 1.5 cars, therefore approximately 1000 automobiles would be traveling the area of F 1/2 Road and 28 Road. He also expressed concerns regarding the school bus stop at the corner of Ridge Drive and 28 Road where inevitably there will be a fire call when the bus is loading and unloading children. He continued, the proposed zoning is out of line, it is not compatible with the surrounding area, and the property owners in Spring Valley would be negatively impacted by such a development. He pointed out, the fire station could be tolerated, but the density of 12 units per acre was totally unacceptable.

Dean Lindholm, 3325 Beechwood Street, expressed his opposition toward the high density. Dean agreed, there was a need for a fire station in this area, but requested that further studies be made before approving this particular site. He felt that 27 1/2 Road & Cortland Avenue would be a better site and would not change the coverage areas for the most part. This location would provide a much better access to Horizon Drive. Because the proposed site was surrounded by corn fields, he felt the majority of population would not be served if the station was placed on 28 Road. He also expressed concerns for safety, referring to two intersections. The intersection at 28 and Patterson Road has poor visibility due to the condominiums and six foot high fence on the corner. The intersection at 28 and Hawthorne also has poor visibility.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Tim Woodmansee addressed the concerns, assuring the residents that the Fire Department would not short cut through Spring Valley Subdivision. Tim acknowledged the poor visibility of the two intersections, and felt that some type of measure would need to be taken to alleviate these hazards.

Tom Logue, in defense of the request for the PR-12 Zone, explained that the owners of the property were the original developers of Filings 5 and 6 of Spring Valley Subdivision and still retained some interest in the area because of their investments.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Elmer asked if the decibel of noise from a fire truck was more than that of a garbage or similar type truck.

Commissioner Campbell replied, in most cases a trash truck creates more noise. A fire truck makes no more noise than a typical two ton truck driving down the road.

Commissioner Elmer felt more input was needed from the residents of Spring Valley and asked if the Fire Department would be adverse towards forming a citizens committee to look at some alternative sites. He added that the notice of the meeting the Fire Department distributed to the residents of Spring Valley was confusing; they did not realize that the fire station was the topic of the meeting.

Ken Johnson reiterated that any location short of 27 1/2 Road or 28 Road is unacceptable to the Fire Department. The Fire Department could not provide the proper service unless another station was built northeast of town. The location on 28 Road is the best site in his professional opinion. He agreed that more involvement of the residents would have been the route to take, but that was now hind-sight. He felt that the majority of concerns of the citizens had been addressed. He added that an emergency signal would be installed at the 28 and Patterson Road intersection, plus the drivers sit up off the street approximately 4 to 5 feet giving them increased visibility.

Chairman Love felt that the Fire Department had done an extensive study in order to find the best site for the fire station; therefore, it was probably the best location for coverage of the area. He added, the density of 12 units per acre was too high regardless of what the current zoning is in the county. He did not concur with Tom's analysis of why the zoning was established in 1981 and why it should be retained now. Even though he did not agree with the proposed density, he preferred not to specify a lesser density. Furthermore, the Planning Commission would have the opportunity to evaluate the plan at the time it is submitted and deal with it at that time.

Commissioner Elmer disagreed; he felt the problem should be dealt with now not later. If the zoning was approved, legally if the plan followed all the required stipulations, eventually the Planning Commission would have to approve it.

Discussion ensued for several minutes regarding the possibilities of specifying a lower density zoning.

Commissioner Renberger reiterated again the importance of having public input and support. She suggested that Public Relations be more of a priority or the citizens would continue to balk at these types of proposals.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #58-89, A REQUEST FOR A ZONE OF ANNEXATION TO PUBLIC ZONE (PZ), I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SINCE THERE IS AN AREA OF COMMUNITY NEED FOR THE PROPOSED REZONE; THERE WILL BE BENEFITS DERIVED BY THE COMMUNITY AND AREA BY GRANTING THE REZONE; IT IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH POLICIES, REQUIREMENTS AND INTENTS OF THE CODE; AND ADEQUATE UTILITIES ARE AVAILABLE TO SERVE THE DEVELOPMENT."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 4-2, with Commissioners Renberger and Elmer opposing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #58-89, A REQUEST FOR A ZONE OF ANNEXATION TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (PR) WITH A MAXIMUM DENSITY OF 12 UNITS PER ACRE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THE ANNEXATION, BUT WITH A STIPULATION OF THE ZONING OF RSF-5, FOR THE REASONS THAT THE REDUCED ZONING IS MORE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA AND THE TRENDS OF THE AREA."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Chairman Love requested that the visibility problem regarding the fences be looked into and suggested that it might be a good idea to start forming citizen committees on projects such as the fire station.

Karl explained the fence on 28 and Patterson was approved as part of the development, but agreed to look in to the matter.

Commissioner Elmer felt that it was necessary to inform the City Council of the public's general discontentment of not having enough input and involvement.

NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS AND VISITORS

Gretchen Clemmins, 3430 Beechwood Street, asked what the next step would be.

Karl answered, this would go before the City Council on January 17, 1990 at 7:30 p.m.

Bill Ferguson, 3215 Beechwood Street, a member of the Home Owner's Association and the Spring Valley Architectural Committee, expressed his disappointment, not in the proposal but rather in the process. He justified his displeasure by explaining that someone from the fire department contacted his home to notify him of the meeting one day prior the meeting that was held with the Spring Valley homeowners; he happened to be out of town at the time. He left his business card as part of the record, and suggested that if anyone ever wanted to get hold of him or anyone in the Spring Valley Homeowner's Association that they should call the number on the card, but not on a 12 hour notice.

Karola Lindholm, 3325 Beechwood Street, suggested extending 28 Road all the way through to Horizon Drive to allow for faster access into that area. Adding that she did not have any objections to the proposed sight for the fire station, but had some concerns regarding the school bus stop.

John White, 2915 Applewood Street, also expressed his discontentment with the process.

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