

**GRAND JUNCTION, PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- August 7, 1990
7:30 p.m. - 10:15 p.m.**

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

Steve Love, Chairman	Ron Halsey	Jim Bittel
Sheliah Renberger	Katie Worrall	John Elmer
Jim Tyson		

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department, were Kathy Portner and Karl Metzner.

John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney; Don Newton, City Engineer; and David Thornton with the City Planning Department were present.

Sandi Warner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 28 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IT WAS NOTED THAT THE FOLLOWING CHANGE BE MADE IN THE JULY 10, 1990 MINUTES:

PAGE 21, FIRST PARAGRAPH IS TO READ AS FOLLOWS: John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney, had a copy of the ballot. He said it specifically pertained to the rezone. There is no mention made of a special plat or description of the plan in the ballot proposal.

Then a motion was made and seconded. A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

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

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

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **#25-90, A REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR PTARMIGAN RIDGE**
A request for Preliminary Plan for 79 lots or approximately 31 acres in a Residential Single Family (RSF-4) zone.
A request for Ptarmigan Ridge Final Plat for 19 lots on approximately 7.4 acres, Filing #1.
Petitioner: John Siegfried

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

John Siegfried stated that the request is for a preliminary plan for 79 residential lots on property located west of 27 1/2 Road and south of G Road. The first filing of the subdivision is adjacent to existing Bell Ridge subdivision and is similar in design. The overall density of the project is 2.3 units per acre, which is much less than what the current zoning (RSF-4) would allow. Access to the subdivision would be an extension of 15th Street at the south end and access onto 27 1/2 Road at the north end.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked Mr. Siegfried to describe the road design.

Mr. Siegfried replied that the road design meets the proposed standards as developed by the City. Pavement width would allow for parking on both sides. The one exception is that sidewalk will only be provided on one side of the street. The width of sidewalk will be increased to 7' to provide a more useable path for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the construction equipment storage was a part of the subdivision and will the refuse at the north end of the property be removed.

Mr. Siegfried stated that the equipment storage area will be removed and the refuse will be removed or buried.

Commissioner Elmer asked Mr. Siegfried to describe the irrigation and drainage retention or detention proposed.

Mr. Siegfried answered that the final design has not been done. He anticipates the need for a series of irrigation ponds and for one or two retention areas for drainage.

Commissioner Bittel asked if Ptarmigan Ridge Drive should be aligned with Cortland Avenue.

Don Newton explained that Ptarmigan Ridge Drive would align with the existing Cortland Avenue.

Commissioner Renberger asked if all engineering concerns had been addressed.

Kathy Portner replied that all comments have been responded to by the petitioner. The City Engineer will make sure all the concerns are adequately addressed prior to signing the plat.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner clarified that the request was for a preliminary plan for subdivision of 79 single family lots on approximately 31 acres, plus one out lot being created for access to an adjacent parcel. Also a request is being made for a final plat on 19 of the 79 lots. The current zoning is RSF-4 and will remain as such. The proposed density is much less than what would be allowed under the current zoning.

The development is in the Walker Field critical zone. An avigation easement will be required.

The petitioner has responded to all review agency comments. The requested final engineering reports will be reviewed and approved prior to recording.

Final irrigation plans must be approved, in writing, by the Grand Valley Water User's Association prior to recording.

The design fits the existing character of the area and meets the intent of the Zoning and Development Code.

Two motions will be required, one concerning the preliminary plan and one concerning the final plat.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Love asked Don Newton about revised road standards and his concern about Ptarmigan Ridge Road being used for through traffic between 15th and 27 1/2 Road.

Don Newton explained that the revised road standards have been developed. Don felt the design of Ptarmigan Ridge Road would discourage through traffic.

Commissioner Worrall suggested that V-pans across the road for drainage would further discourage through traffic.

Commissioner Halsey asked if handicapped access ramps would be provided at all corners.

Don Newton replied affirmatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Chairman Love acknowledged receipt of a letter from Mr. Ken Etter and asked Mr. Etter if he wanted to present it. Mr. Etter declined. Chairman Love entered the letter into the record.

Lynn Moore, 658 Eastcliff Drive, expressed his concern about how the drainage in the proposed subdivision would affect properties in his area. They have had problems with flooding and are all on septic which makes the problem worse.

John Siegfried pointed out where the retention ponds would be located and acknowledged that they may have to be lined.

Louis Morton, 1753 Ridge Drive, asked what size houses were proposed.

Kathy Portner stated that the covenants show a range of minimum sizes of 1400 square feet to 1800 square feet depending on the lot size.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM 25-90, A REQUEST FOR PTARMIGAN RIDGE PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR 79 LOTS ON APPROXIMATELY 31 ACRES IN A RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY (RSF-4) ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS REQUEST SUBJECT TO COMPLYING WITH ALL THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger and a vote was called. The motion was passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM 25-90, A REQUEST FOR PTARMIGAN RIDGE FINAL PLAT FOR 19 LOTS ON APPROXIMATELY 7.4 ACRES, FILING #1, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THESE REQUESTS SUBJECT TO COMPLYING WITH ALL THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger and a vote was called. The motion was passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

2. #30-90. A REQUEST FOR SPECIAL USE FOR MESA COUNTY JAIL
A request for Special Use Permit for a jail site on approximately 12.5 acres in a public zone.
Location: 215 Rice Street
Petitioner: Andy Anderson

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

John Leane stated that the "old jail" became obsolete in 1963 and the County moved to their present jail site which is located between the Sheriff's Office and the Police Department. The present facility became obsolete by a court order which restricts Mesa County from holding 86 prisoners in that location. This constitutes a need for a new jail.

On January 11, 1990, the County Commissioners selected the new jail site.

Andy Anderson, Project Manager, Mesa County gave his presentation. There will be a detention center, sheriff's office and jail built on

this site. A court justice center will be built adjacent to the site that the County is in the process of purchasing.

The building will be a two story structure with approximately 80,000 square feet.

There has been a change in access to the property located off of Rice Street as well as other changes since original design. The additional 2 acre parcel is needed for parking to build needed to build the Mesa County Justice Center.

The County has assembled several parcels and is negotiating for several others for the justice center.

Mesa County has solicited comments from the State Highway Department on access onto Highway 340.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner, City Planning, stated that the property for the new jail site has Highway 340, Rice Street, Main Street and Crosby Avenue frontage.

Karl clarified the plans by pointing out that the main accesses are proposed off of Rice Street. The Sheriff's Office and the Detention Facility will be located in the center of the property with housing nodes around the outside. Part of the proposal is for future nodes.

In viewing the plans, public parking is proposed to be off of Rice Street, employee parking behind that and employee parking adjacent to Highway 340.

Most of the review comments have been satisfactorily addressed by the petitioner.

The County has proposed to close Crosby Avenue during the preliminary phase of construction because of some excavation that is required to remove landfill material. Then a structural base will be put on Crosby Avenue and it will be re-opened.

Planning commented that they concur with petitioner's response that there should not be a solid fence along Broadway to screen the parking. It would not be beneficial due to the elevation of the viaduct.

The State Highway did respond to comments. They said they would require a traffic signal at Highway 340 and Rice and Mulberry. They would also require realignment of Mulberry Street.

There are two major issues that are potentially unresolved at this point. One of them is that the drainage plan that was submitted initially shows the drainage from the site going into a sanitary sewer

system. The City Engineer said he wanted them to go into a storm sewer on Main Street.

The petitioners have said that they would accommodate that, but a revised drainage plan has not been submitted.

The other issue relates to required street improvements to Rice and Crosby with additional right-of-way dedication on Rice.

The County has indicated that they may want to vacate Rice to better function with the Justice Center.

Until such a vacation is approved, we should get an improvements agreement and guarantee for improvements of both Crosby Avenue and Rice Street. If Rice street is vacated then the guarantee can be released.

Crosby Avenue is under discussion as to whether it is a public right-of-way or a County owned property and any approval should include a public dedication for right-of-way on Crosby Avenue.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Bittel commented that if Rice Street is vacated in the future then that will negate the need for a traffic signal on Mulberry.

Karl clarified that even if Rice Street is vacated it will likely be a major access to the "jail site" which would constitute a need for a traffic signal. There will be a standard for Rice Street for the required width for the traffic that it will bear. It will not be an actual street standard, since it will not function as a public street, but merely an access to the "jail site".

Commissioner Bittel wondered if any landscaping is planned to screen the vehicles.

Karl said that one of Planning's comments was to consider adding trees.

The County said that they would consider adding some trees in areas that did not affect their security.

In addition, one of the discussions has been to have the impound areas striped similar to a parking lot to give a look of parked cars rather than vehicles arbitrarily scattered around the lot.

Commissioner Renberger asked how many cars are in the impound lot now; although, she was aware that will probably change.

Andy Anderson replied that there are approximately 6 cars in the impound lot at City Shops now.

Commissioner Bittel expressed some concerns about the turnover of the impounded vehicles and how long any one vehicle will have to be viewed from Highway 340.

Andy said that the impound area could not be moved because of the odd shape of the parcel.

Andy said that the core of the building is being built to accommodate up to 192 inmates. It can be expanded to a capacity of 300 and could actually accommodate about 500 with maximum build-out.

Andy commented that a two year analysis (function program) was done for this facility and it was done with staff completely involved in it. Andy said that he is assuming at this point that the "impound" will need 40 spaces and that this phase came out of the study. He realizes that at some point the County is going to have to look at another alternative to the impound lot because they will lose it just by expansion.

Lyle Duchant commented that they are continuing to develop plans further to incorporate other comments that the Commission has already given to finish the plans.

Andy said it is the County's intent that in the "Justice Building," the District and County courts will be housed and they have taken that into consideration in the traffic counts that will be provided.

Andy commented that the sloped roof on the plans has a functional purpose other than aesthetics. All the mechanical equipment is housed in that area so that it is not accessible for an inmate to get into and hide in the case of an escape. It is wrapped with concrete that forms an envelope in which the pipes run through.

Andy said that all security requirements for roofs are being met.

Commissioner Renberger asked what type of roof it was going to be.

Andy said that it is going to be a steel seamed roof.

Commissioner Tyson asked how the building will be heated.

The housing pods have roof mounted cooling and heating units. The rest of the facility will use hot water heating.

He also wanted to comment on some of the signalization. The County does have a preliminary traffic study from their consultant. He commented that they are concerned about the traffic in that area because they have to transport prisoners. Using the guidelines that are to be used to design intersections, their conclusion was that signals will not be required at the intersection of Highway 340 and Rice Street. This report will be submitted to the Colorado Highway Department to review. If they accept the report, then they will

accept the fact that a traffic signal is not needed. The traffic analysis will be submitted to City Council in final form on August 14.

Andy said that the County does agree that the street does need to be realigned.

Andy stated that because they will request that Rice Street be vacated, that this is the reason they have requested not to have to do the improvements now. They feel this would be a waste of the tax payers money because they would just be ripping the street out in a few years. They are not sure what they are going to do after the temporary closure of Crosby Avenue. They do realize that Crosby Avenue has importance to the City. They are looking to routing Crosby Avenue to the south across part of the County's two-acre parcel and tying it back into Colorado in some way.

Another question in the review comments was about drainage. The County has agreed that they will direct their drainage to Main Street.

Karl said that Planning did look at the contours and it appears that the site is fairly flat and there may be some additional work to get that positive drainage.

Andy said the site falls almost 10 feet from one side to another from Rice street to the other side. This site will be raised some. It has to be elevated to get it above the streets to get the drainage. He said that HDR said that they can do this with no problem. They would like to enter this into final drawings because it will fit better in those drawings. Final drawings will be available in mid-September for final review.

Andy remarked that he is trying to answer all comments in a timely manner so that they can meet the court mandated occupancy date.

Commissioner Bittel said that in the comments it was stated that Crosby Avenue is going to be closed during construction, but in the new plan it is stated that it is going to be improved in the future.

Andy said that the County contends that they own Crosby Avenue; that it is a parcel that was deeded to the County, not a right-of-way.

Commissioner Bittel asked if the County would be willing to have an improvements agreement that they will make improvements.

Andy commented that at this moment, the answer is no, that is for legal council to answer.

Lyle Duchant said that he and Dan Wilson still plan to discuss how these improvements work and how the City calculates these improvements, what the amounts would be, how it is calculated across the rest of the City, and how it fits in with the Colorado case law requirements. So, the City and County are actively in discussion on this.

John Shaver stated that the City's position is that it is a dedicated right-of-way.

Andy stated that in the City Review Comments that they did concur with an acceptable format to an improvements guarantee for an appropriate share in costs for improvements on Rice and Crosby Avenue and for appropriate share of cost for a traffic signal on State Highway 340 if warranted. Andy emphasized it had to be acceptable to both the City and the County.

Commissioner Bittel was concerned that maybe this should be worked out prior to a decision on this.

John Shaver stated that the "City" has gone around and around on this. Karl was in a meeting this afternoon with Dan Wilson and the City Manager. John was not there; however, the comments that were relayed to John is that the City will expect dedication of Crosby Avenue and we will expect a drainage plan. Essentially, this proposal has not been put in complete form for submission tonight. The City is making accommodations based on the representation of the County that they will take care of the issues and the technical questions that are being raised. The comments of the County attorney and John's comments as to Crosby Avenue will have to be sorted out.

Andy commented that the County wishes to be heard by City Council next week.

Karl stated that it was left in the meeting that afternoon that the issue of ownership of Crosby Avenue is a legal question that needs to be worked out between City Council and the County and the issue of improvements is perhaps best left to Council as well. In the meeting that afternoon it was decided that the request could be approved subject to review comments, allowing these particular issues to be worked out at the Council level.

Chairman Love asked if all have been able to agree that the striping looks appropriate for the impound area.

Andy stated that they have no problems with striping the impound area.

Chairman Love asked if they have any problems with the grading plan.

Andy said that the grading plan will be submitted and it will comply with the requirement to grade it to Main Street.

Karl said that the transportation plan shows Crosby ultimately being extended to Highway 6&50 where the frontage road ends just past 25 1/2 Road, providing a bypass link around 1st and Grand.

Commissioner Bittel expressed his concern of the possibility that Crosby could be closed for construction, never to reopen because of some negotiations that the Commission has no control over.

Andy Anderson stated that the County is willing to talk about these issues.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No public comments.

QUESTIONS:

Chairman Love asked John Shaver to clarify Planning Commission's role in this decision.

John stated that this is simply a recommendation process and if it is recommended by the Commission by way of the motion that Crosby Avenue be dedicated or an improvements agreement be established including Crosby Avenue or the possibility of rerouting, then those are conditions of approval and subject to Council's consideration.

Chairman Love asked about the questionable ownership of Crosby Avenue.

John stated that it dates back for many years. The question was raised by the County. The City went to the County road books to find out if there had ever been a dedication of that roadway as a public thoroughfare or as a public right-of-way and the City's research has indicated that, in fact, it was dedicated and it was accepted by the Commissioners many years ago. It is the City's contention since it was dedicated and accepted that any previous deeds are superceded by that dedication and the fact that it has been used continuously for public right-of-way.

Lyle Duchant stated that the County's contention is that the land was transacted to the County on a fee simple basis. The County contends that what was in the road books was an indication of the potential roadway to Fruita, nothing more. The deed was taken by the Commissioners in fee. There is no dedication the title companies could find. There is no adverse possession in Colorado. You cannot adverse against the government. The key questions are whether or not Crosby is viable as a collector road and who is going to pay for improvements, if warranted.

Jim Bittel wanted to know why the County would not want to have Crosby Avenue open.

Andy said that the major concern is who pays for all the improvement. The County does not feel that it is their responsibility. If there is an improvement, it should be like the review comments said "an agreed upon improvement".

Andy said that he could not give a good reason, at this point, why Crosby Avenue should be closed permanently.

Commissioner Bittel stated that he just wanted to make sure that if the Commission did include Crosby Avenue as a condition of approval that the County could still move ahead.

Andy Anderson commented that he was concerned about being set back in many aspects. They are on a tight schedule. They are over two months over the court mandated deadline for occupancy. If there is something that they object to, they wish the option to be heard by the City Council.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM 30-90, SPECIAL USE FOR MESA COUNTY JAIL, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW SHEETS SUMMARY COMMENTS AND THAT THE IMPOUNDMENT AREA BE STRIPED LIKE A REGULAR PARKING LOT AND THAT THE REVISED SITE PLAN BE RECORDED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE BUILDING PERMIT.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger and a vote was called.

A vote was called and the motion was passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING/MEETING AGENDA



Date: July 10, 1990

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Place: City Auditorium, 520 Rood Avenue

I. Call to Order

II. Consideration of Minutes

III. Announcements, Presentations, and/or Prescheduled Visitors

IV. Hearing on Items for Recommendation to City Council

On the following items the Planning Commission action will consist of a recommendation to City Council. Following this public hearing, the Planning Department will schedule these items for a second public hearing before City Council. If you have an interest in an item in this section, please call the Planning Department (244-1430) approximately 5 days after this hearing to inquire about City Council scheduling. AN ITEM RECOMMENDED FOR DENIAL WILL NOT BE SCHEDULED FOR CITY COUNCIL UNLESS THE PETITIONER REQUESTS, IN WRITING, OR AT THIS HEARING, THAT AN ITEM BE SCHEDULED.

1. #27-90 Rezone and Final Plan for Taco Bell
Petitioner: Moss Inc., Michael Saelens
Location: 848 North Avenue and 845-865 Glenwood Avenue
A request to change from Light Commercial (C-1) to Planned Business (PB) at 848 North Avenue and from Residential Single Family with a density of approximately 8 units per acre (RSF-8) to Planned Business (PB) at 845-865 Glenwood Avenue and a final plan.
Consideration of Rezones.
Consideration of Final Plan.
2. #28-90 Rezone and a Revised Final Plan for Coloramo Federal Credit Union
Petitioner: Coloramo Federal Credit Union, Marilyn Haller, President
Location: 144 North 9th Street & 910 Main Street
A request to change 144 North 9th Street from Residential Multifamily with a density of approximately 64 units per acre (RMF-64) to Planned Business (PB) for the purpose of a parking lot and a Revised Final Plan for an addition to the Coloramo

Federal Credit Union located at 910 Main Street.
Consideration of Rezone.
Consideration of Revised Final Plan.

3. #20-90 Replat and Right-of-Way Vacation for Grace Commercial Subdivision
Petitioner: C. R. & John Bauman
Location: Independent Avenue & U.S. Hwy 6 & 50
A request to replat lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 in Grace Commercial Subdivision into two lots in a Heavy Commercial (C-2) Zone on approximately 9.29 acres and a request to vacate Faith Street.
Consideration of Replat.
Consideration of Vacation.
4. #30-90 Special Use for Jail Site
Petitioner: Mesa County, Andy Anderson
Location: 215 Rice Street
A request for a Special Use Permit for a jail on approximately 12.5 acres in a Public Zone (PZ).
Consideration of Special Use.
5. #26-90 Final Plat and Plan for Northridge Filing #4 (also known as Mesa View II) and Vacation of Right-of-Ways and Easement.
Petitioner: Colson & Colson Construction Co, Pat Edwards
Location: Northeast corner of 1st Street and Patterson Road
A request to vacate North Bluff Drive, a portion of Horizon Place, and those unused utility easements along the south boundary of the Grosse, Gormley, and Filner properties and a request for a final plat and plan for Northridge Estates Filing #4 on approximately 28.12 acres for a retirement center and 36 single family-homes in a Planned Residential (PR-12.7) Zone.
Consideration of Right-of-Way Vacations.
Consideration of Easement Vacation.
Consideration of Final Plat and Plan.

V. General Discussion

VI. Nonscheduled Citizens and/or Visitors

VII. Adjournment