

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- May 7, 1991
7:42 p.m. - 9:39 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Steve Love at 7:42 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

Steve Love, Chairman	Ron Halsey
Sheilah Renberger	Craig Roberts

Commissioners Jim Bittel and John Elmer were absent.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Bennett Boeschenstein, Director; David Thornton, Karl Metzner, Kathy Portner and Bobbie Paulson.

Don Newton, City Engineer, and John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney were also present.

Nancy Martin, of KLB Secretarial Services, was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 17 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RENBERGER) "Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve the minutes of the April 2, 1991 Planning Commission meeting as read."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion carried by a vote of 4-0.

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

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

III. MEETING ON ITEM FOR FINAL DECISION

- 1. #26-91 BLM BUILDING FINAL PLAN: A REQUEST FOR A FINAL PLAN FOR AN OFFICE/WAREHOUSE BUILDING IN A PLANNED COMMERCIAL (PC) ZONE.**

Petitioner: Floyd M. Sack
Location: 2803 Sunstrand Way
Consideration of Final Plan

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Floyd Sack, 950 Wadsworth, Lakewood, Colorado, stated that he bid this project to the BLM to build and then lease back to them 28,000 square feet of office space. At present time he has an option on 3 1/3 acres of land. He felt that what was submitted to the City from Western Engineering and from the Architectural firm will answer most of the questions on this, but added that he would answer questions.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner gave a brief overview of the project. The proposed office/warehouse building will be located at the corner of Sunstrand Way and H Road. The proposal also includes out-door storage for BLM equipment. The petitioner has addressed all the review agency's comments and concerns. Mr. Metzner noted that one of staff's requests was to screen the outdoor storage along Sunstrand Way and H Road with a solid wood fence, later it was discovered that this was against the covenants. The petitioner has agreed to screen the lot with perimeter landscaping. Staff is agreeable to this.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mike Vong, representing Sunstrand at 2800 Sunstrand, requested that the landscaping be sufficient to block the view as much as a six foot cedar fence would have. He explained the exit from their office is adjacent to the warehouse yard.

Mr. Metzner responded that staff would work with the petitioner to achieve some type of vegetative screening that would accomplish the same desired results as a solid wood fence. The minimum requirement for planting size of evergreens is six feet high.

Mr. Vong asked what type of equipment BLM would be storing south of the building?

Mr. Vong replied that it would be fire fighting equipment and trucks.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER HALSEY) "Mr. Chairman on item #26-91, a request for a final plan for an office/warehouse building, I move that we approve this subject to Review Agency summary sheet comments and to replace the fence with berm and/or landscape screening."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. #25-91 EASEMENT VACATION: A REQUEST FOR AN EASEMENT VACATION IN AN RSF-8 ZONE.**
Petitioner: Bradley K. and Marlene J. Loucks
Location: 713 Hopi Drive
Consideration of an easement vacation.

PETITIONER'S REPRESENTATION

Marjorie Heitt, 422 White Avenue, representing the mortgage company that made the loan to Mr. and Mrs. Loucks spoke. The petitioners are requesting that the easement be vacated as indicated on the plat map. The house has been on this property for approximately 40 years and the easement runs through the middle of the house.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner stated that Hopi Drive is located north of Unawep Avenue. The house has been here for quite some time. Evidently, the easement that runs underneath the house was never caught. It is a typical type utility easement that is required on most subdivision plats. There are no utilities in the easement. All review agencies have indicated that they have no problem with vacating this easement and have no plans to use it in the future. Mr. Metzner explained that the reason the easement is located underneath the house is because originally there was a platted road, which was never built, and this was a standard 10 foot easement along the front property line. The road was vacated but no one thought about the easement at that time. The easement runs directly under the existing house that has been there for somewhere between 30 or 40 years.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "Mr. Chairman, on item #25-91, a request for an easement vacation, I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of approval subject to the Review Agency summary sheet comments."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

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

- 2. #27-91 TOWNPARK TOWNHOMES PRELIMINARY PLAN, REZONE AND RIGHT OF WAY VACATION. A request for a Preliminary Plan for 7 residential units on 0.89 acres, a request for a rezone from Residential Single Family eight units per acre to Planned Residential eight units per acre (PR-8), and a request to vacate a portion of Orchard Avenue.**
Petitioner: Blaine D. Ford
Location: Northeast Corner North 25th Street & Orchard Avenue.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

David Hoffman, 925 North 12th Street and a general contractor, stated that the proposal is to rezone Lots 11 & 12, Block 2 of the 1st addition of Arbor Village Subdivision from the current zone of RSF-8 (Residential single family eight units per acre) to planned residential and to construct seven townhomes on the lots. The density would remain at eight units per acre. The lots are located on the corner of 25th Street and Orchard Avenue across from Metrose Park. He felt that the proposed townhomes would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Roberts asked the petitioner if he planned to plat these so that the footprint is basically the lot itself and everything else is common open space.

Mr. Hoffman said that each lot would consist of off-street parking along with some landscaping in front of each unit and open space at the rear of each unit. This development will be fenced with a six foot cedar privacy on the east, north and west sides with the exception of the frontage on Orchard Avenue. Some signage, berm and landscaping is proposed along the Orchard Avenue to buffer the units from the right-of-way.

Commissioner Roberts asked the petitioner how the open space would be maintained?

Mr. Hoffman replied that a homeowners association was being considered.

STAFF PRESENTATION

David Thornton gave a brief overview of the proposal. This proposal is not only for a preliminary plan for Townpark Townhomes but also a request for the vacation of 20 feet of Orchard Avenue which is not currently being used.

A ten foot irrigation easement currently exists just north of the south property line. Because a building cannot be constructed on top of an easement, it will have to be vacated during the final plat phase. Nothing exists in the easement at this time; therefore, it is just a matter of providing an irrigation easement further south assuming this vacation is approved. Mr. Hoffman stated that they intend to provide screening around the entire parcel except for the portion along Orchard Avenue. It is a concern to Staff that the properties that are adjacent to this development be protected. In one particular case, a home will be surrounded by three streets; therefore the buffering is very important. The properties that are adjacent to the proposed court on the east side all have established front yard, rear yard, and side yards setbacks for their particular zone. Potentially, the home on the corner of Orchard and North 26th Street could have three front yard building setbacks. Staff recommends that the rear yard and side yard remain the same as they are currently in this zone.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

For:

None.

Against:

David McDonald, 2528 Orchard Avenue, stated that he lives in the house on the corner of 26th and Orchard Avenue. Mr. McDonald was very concerned that his property would be surrounded by three roads if this proposal were approved. He was also concerned that with seven new townhomes that traffic would be even worse than it already is on North 26th Street and Orchard Avenue. He felt that the proposed townhomes would have a negative impact on the neighborhood because they would eventually end up being rentals. He felt that the proposed fence would not buffer his back yard. A 10 or 20 foot greenery would still not make a difference when you are surrounded by roads. He did not feel these were compatible with the single family homes in the neighborhood.

Patsy Phippen, 1910 North 26th Street, was concerned with the increase in traffic and sufficient buffering. She asked the petitioner if the townhomes would be owner occupied or rented and asked what the price of these homes would be. She was concerned that the townhomes would be rental units and would create an adverse impact on the neighborhood increasing crime.

Victor Robertson, 1920 North 26th Street, stated that he purchased his home in 1970. He chose to live there because it was a single family neighborhood and would be opposed to a zone change. He concurred with Mr. McDonald's and Mrs. Phippin's comments.

PETITIONERS REBUTTAL

Mr. Hoffman stated that his proposal was that these units would be owner occupied and priced at \$67,900. The townhomes will be compatible architecturally with the neighborhood. He pointed out that the existing density would not increase. He stated that he was not sure how to address the concerns regarding the adverse impact multifamily dwellings would have on the neighborhood. He stated that he did not feel that this would encourage crime, but just the opposite.

Mr. Hoffman continued; the irrigation water runs down the east side of this property to Orchard Avenue. However, there is no water presently running on the south side of the property. He added that there is no future use for this easement.

Mr. McDonald stated that the irrigation runs along the front of his property from the west to the east then dumps onto the street and runs into the Indian Wash to the east. There are three or four people who have water rights on that ditch.

Al Parker, 2117 North 26th Street, outlined where the easement ran. He added that the church and another property owner have water rights.

Wayne Lizer, Engineer for the project, stated that the irrigation line runs along the west side of the proposed Townpark Development. There is a storm sewer that runs along the north side of Orchard Avenue through the parkway between the back of the curb and the side walk and then goes east. There is a manhole south of the southwest corner of the proposed Townpark Development. There was an irrigation easement platted in the Arbor Village but it is located on the north side of the 20 foot that is being requested for vacation.

Mr. Parker said there will be irrigation water in the ditch as soon as it is cleaned.

Chairman Love pointed out that the Mr. Parker and Mr. Lizer were discussing two separate easements.

Mr. Parker asked how wide the proposed street would be?

Chairman Love answered that the proposed street will be 26 feet wide which will meet the City Standards for a court.

Mr. Thornton said vacating the easement for this irrigation ditch will not occur until they come back through with a final plat. The easement will be checked to make sure there is nothing underground.

Don Newton, City Engineer, suggested that the roadway into the proposed townhomes be relocated to the west side of the property. This would eliminate the concerns of the homes on the east side being surrounded by roadways.

Mr. Hoffman replied that he tried to do just that, but he could not meet the off-street parking requirements and still have room to build seven units. It will not work financially with six units. He added that either this proposal flies as it is or it doesn't happen.

Chairman Love asked how large the units would be?

Mr. Hoffman replied that the units will be approximately 1,200 square feet of living space in addition to a single car garage.

Commissioner Renberger inquired; how many single family homes will fit on these lots?

Mr. Thornton replied that it would depend on the set backs and without working it out on paper he did not have an answer. If these lots were developed as they are currently platted, two single family homes could be constructed which would have long driveways going back to them.

Commissioner Roberts asked what the density was of the surrounding neighborhood?

Mr. Thornton replied that it would be approximately five to six units per acre.

When asked if the review agency comments had been addressed, Mr. Thornton replied that they had been addressed adequately.

Commissioner Renberger asked if it was allowed to build a permanent structure over an easement? (She was referring to the proposed wood patios at the rear of the townhomes.)

Mr. Thornton said that the petitioner's have stated that these patios are not permanent rather they are portable and can be disassembled. It is also allowable to build a driveway over an easement.

Mr. Hoffman said that the patio would sit approximately 16 inches off the ground. It would be cheaper to put in a concrete pad but the impact would be a lot greater in the event that repair was necessary.

Mr. Thornton explained that on the north side of the property there is currently a utility easement. The reason there was a 10 foot easement platted was to allow for public service or whoever to put lines in to service lots 11 and 12.

Mr. Boeschstein stated that before the plat is finalized, it will be checked by the Utilities Coordinating Committee (UCC). They are the ones to approve or deny the proposal to build patios over the easements. Sometimes UCC does not allow structures on the easement. It depends on what type of lines are there, whether it is a gas, water, or cable TV line.

Commissioner Roberts was concerned that the two lots were platted for two single family homes even though the zone allows a density of up to eight units per acre. Now instead of two single family homes, there are seven townhomes proposed. The existing density would allow eight units per acre but it would also require a subdivision of the two lots into eight lots.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RENBERGER) "Mr. Chairman, on item #27-91, a request for a rezone from residential single family not to exceed eight units per acre (RSF-8) to Planned Residential not to exceed eight units per acre (PR-8), I move that we forward this on to the City Council with the recommendation of denial for the following reason: it would create an adverse impact on the neighborhood."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Halsey.

Commissioner Roberts reiterated his concern that the two lots were not designed for eight single family homes even though it is zoned at that density.

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

3. 30-91 STREET DESIGN CRITERIA: A request to adopt Street Design Criteria in the City of Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Consideration of Street Design Criteria

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Don Newton, City Engineer, gave an overview of the proposal to adopt the revised street design and improvement standards. The standards include street sections and right-of-way widths that have been modified to be more functional and to meet bicyclist and pedestrian needs. The following are some of the more significant changes that are being proposed:

- 1) A four foot wide concrete bicycle lane on both sides of all minor arterial and collector streets and would be an integral part of the concrete curb and gutter.
- 2) Requirements for tree planting easement and a utilities easement on both sides of city streets, the tree planting easement would be for the City tree planting program where the Parks and Recreation Department would plant and maintain the trees.
- 3) Provisions for a rural road standard for developments of one unit per two acres or less which includes a 24 foot pavement width, six foot gravel shoulders and drainage swales.
- 4) Existing standards have sidewalks detached from the curb on local residential streets. The proposed standards would have sidewalks attached to the curb except on principal arterial streets.

Mr. Newton continued; the four foot bicycle lane will consist of concrete pavement that would be adjacent to the curb and the driving lane. The proposal does not include any raised pavement markers. He believes that the City of Westminster has a similar standard and it seemed to be working quite well. The sidewalks will be attached to the curb and a tree planting easement will be on the outside of the sidewalk on private property. The tree planting easement will be part of utilities easement. It will be approximately 14 feet wide. There will be water meters, fire hydrants, public service lines and the tree planting strip within that easement. The only streets that will have detached sidewalks is the principal arterial sections.

Commissioner Renberger asked if the attached sidewalks would be wider than the present sidewalks.

Mr. Newton replied that the proposed sidewalk widths are 7 feet wide on major streets, 6 feet wide on principal arterial with a detached sidewalk, 5 1/2 feet wide on commercial and industrial streets, and 4 feet wide on local residential streets.

Commissioner Renberger asked if there were different standards for rural type settings?

Mr. Newton replied affirmatively; the proposal includes a standard that the lots must be at least 2 acres in size for each residential unit. Anything with a higher density would be required to meet the urban standards. The widths of the streets are not arbitrarily picked, they are based on what several other communities use and what is recommend by other institutes and agencies that have manuals with recommendations for street widths, i.e. the American Society of Civil Engineers, the Institute of Traffic Engineers, and the American Home Builders Association. The minimum residential street width for a Lane, Place or Court will be 26 feet. A residential collector street would have a total roadway width of 40 feet as well as bicycle lanes.

Commissioner Renberger wondered if these bicycle lanes would be used.

Mr. Newton stated that he has received several requests for bicycle lanes.

Commissioner Roberts felt that the off-street bicycle paths should be 10 feet wide; an 8 foot wide path would not be sufficient for passing comfortably with bikes, and all the different uses it would have.

Mr. Newton stated that he would not have any objections to a 10 foot wide section for this.

Mr. Boeschenstein pointed out that the problem with increasing it to 10 feet is the additional cost to the developers.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against this proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER HALSEY) "Mr. Chairman, on item #30-91, a request to adopt the street design criteria in the City of Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, I move that we forward this to the City Council with the recommendation of approval."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Roberts.

AMENDMENT: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "I would like to amend the motion to include a 10 foot off-street bicycle path section as opposed to an 8 foot."

The amendment was seconded by Commissioner Halsey.

A vote was called for on the amendment, and passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

A vote was called, and the amended motion passed by a vote of 3-1, with Commissioner Renberger opposing.

4. #5-91 TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR 1991: A request to amend Sections of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, regarding signs, parking and miscellaneous administrative procedures.

**Petitioner: City of Grand Junction
Consideration of Text Amendments.**

Karl Metzner requested the text amendment in Section 5-7-7.B.8. regarding off-premise signs, be tabled until the June 4, 1991 Planning Commission hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER HALSEY) "Mr. Chairman, on item #5-91, a request to amend Section 5-7-7.B.8. of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code regarding off-premise signs, I move that we table this item until the June 4, 1991 Planning Commission meeting."

Seconded by Commissioner Roberts.

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

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Boeschstein stated that most of the proposed text amendments were general house keeping administrative items including a provision for an annual meeting, changing the name from Planning Department to Community Development Department, and replacing Governing Body with City Council. Other proposed amendments include a requirement for front yard landscaping, downtown parking requirements, and allowing changeable electronic signs. The changeable electronic sign was precipitated by the Fuoco Motors request for an electronic sign and the City Council. The sign could not change more than once every half hour. It is operable by a panel inside the office of the establishment. The problem with these type of signs is safety, especially if they flash periodically or are strip signs. This is not new technology. It is not very aesthetically pleasing.

Chairman Love asked for clarification; are these signs similar to the ones at basketball games?

Mr. Boeschenstein replied affirmatively; these type of signs are capable of doing cartoons, etc. It is also a major enforcement problem to ensure they are not changing more than every half hour.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against this proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER HALSEY) "Mr. Chairman on item #5-91, regarding parking and miscellaneous administrative procedures, I move that we forward this to the City Council with a recommendation of approval subject to the Review Agency summary sheet comments."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed 4-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "Mr. Chairman, on item #5-91, a request to amend Section 5-7-2.F.3. of the City of Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code regarding changeable copy signs, I move that we recommend denial for the following reasons: trouble enforcing the number of times this said sign changes and for safety issues."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 4-0.

Commissioner Halsey commented that to allow these types of signs is a step backwards. There was much discussion a couple years ago regarding the sign code and this was the concern then.

There were no non-scheduled citizens and/or visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:39 p.m.