

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Public Hearing October 22, 1991**  
**7:30 p.m. - 9:05 p.m.**

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Ron Halsey at p.m. in the City County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

Ron Halsey, Chairman	Craig Robert
Jim Anderson	Sheilah Renberger
Steve Love	

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Bennett Boeschenstein, Director; and Karl Metzner, Planner.

Bobbie Paulson, Senior Administrative Secretary, was present to record the minutes and Judy Morehouse, KLB Secretarial Services, transcribed the minutes.

Jim Shanks, Public Works Director, and John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney, were also present.

\* \* \* \* \*

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ANDERSON) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 1991 MEETING."**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Love.

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

**III. MEETING ON ITEM FOR FINAL DECISION**

1. # 68-91 INDEPENDENCE CENTER MINOR SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT  
A request for a Final Plat for a minor subdivision which consists of one lot on approximately 24.49 acres in an existing Heavy Commercial Zone (C-2).  
Petitioner: Grand Junction Development Partners I,  
Mark Goldberg  
Location: Northwest of 25 1/2 Road and Independent Ave

## PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Mark Goldberg thanked the Commissioners for having this special hearing to accommodate the Petitioner.

He explained that his main business is retail real estate, ie. building shopping centers throughout the country. The request is to merge three parcels into one subdivision lot. The petitioner would like to begin construction early this fall.

Mr. Goldberg explained that there were Subdivision Improvements Agreements entered into previously for two of the parcels. One was before the subdivision was annexed into the City. The improvements that were to be installed by the previous agreements have not been done. There is a reservation on those properties that no building permits can take place until there has been a satisfaction of those payments. The intent is to enter into a new Subdivision Improvement Agreement that will have in excess of \$300,000 in public improvements (water, sewer, landscaping, roadways) and vacate the earlier ones. Then there will be only one Subdivision Improvement Agreement with the Wal Mart organization standing behind it.

The water will be obtained approximately 200 feet north of this property at the intersection of 25 1/2 Road & Orchard. The sewer is less than 50 feet from the property. Faith Street will be improved on the east side with curb, gutters and sidewalk, and over 50 percent of that street will be paved. Faith Street will become mainly a truck route and could in the future have more development on that street after the improvements are done.

At the onset of the project, Independent and 25 1/2 Road will be improved with accel/decel lanes and a widened street. The issue of traffic from Highway 6 & 50 is rather complex because of proximity of Independent Avenue. Currently there is a traffic signal at the intersection of Highway 6 & 50 and Independent. It is our plan to install another set of signals at Sam's main entrance on Independent.

This development is expected to generate 9,000 visitors a day; and at the peak hour, there will be approximately 400 egress/ingress automobiles. The agreement to install the traffic light has not been finalized with the Colorado Department of Highways because there is a concern regarding the entrance to a automobile dealership which would have to be closed in order to accommodate the changes intended for this development. The petitioner is working out a satisfactory solution with the City and that property owner.

The drainage issue is a problem; there is no room to put the drainage into a concentrated area. One solution is to confine the 100 year rainstorm runoff into a pond and then let it flow into an

existing canal. The problem is the bottom would percolate. The City's solution to this would be to take the drainage out the front of the property to an existing barrow ditch. This solution should work and the engineers are working on this.

#### STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Metzner outlined the area proposed for the Sam's Warehouse on a map. The total site is 24 1/2 acres. It is resubdividing seven subdivided lots and one metes and bounds parcel into one subdivided lot.

All the utilities are available to the site; this development will be hooked to City Water. Regarding the drainage; there are two possible solutions and either solution would work to take care of the 100 year storm event. The City Engineer and the Petitioner's Engineers are working together to decide which solution will work and be most cost effective. The Drainage District is responsible for the Buthorn drain, which runs north of the site.

All of the standard improvements agreements and guarantees for half street improvements on abutting roads as well as all utility improvements apply. The improvements will include half-street improvements on Faith Street. The petitioner will be constructing more than half street improvements on Faith to allow for two lanes of travel, with curb-gutter. The additional improvements would be the responsibility of the property owner on the west side.

The subdivision's previous improvements agreements will be voided upon approval and recording of a new improvement and guarantee for this project.

The Development Department has received the traffic analysis and the proposed improvements to the intersection of Independent Avenue and Highway 6 & 50, but it has not been reviewed to date. Staff will review and comment on these in the site review process.

To clarify for the Commissioners, the question tonight is the one lot subdivision. In terms of any motions the Commission needs to keep that in mind. Any additional comments on the Development Proposal (Site Plan) aside from the subdivision aspect of this need to be kept separate. The site plan comments can be directed to the Staff as to what the Commission would like to see; the subdivision comments being specific elements of the motion.

Mr. Shaver commented that the Traffic Plan & Drainage Plan had been received late this afternoon. Any motions for approval need to be contingent upon Staff's ability to review these plans and ensure they meet adequate commercial standards for drainage, traffic and utilities.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Joanne Payne, 25 1/2 Road and West Orchard Avenue, was concerned about the potential increase of traffic on 25 1/2 Road referring to the estimated 9,000 vehicles traveling to the development. She felt that many cars would be coming from Patterson and down 25 1/2 Road. Currently, 25 1/2 Road is a substandard, very narrow road with no sidewalks with a blind hill at the intersection with West Orchard Avenue. There are several children that walk to school as well as a number of joggers along 25 1/2 Road. She asked that this concern be addressed by the Engineering Department.

Francis McCracken, Attorney representing John Bauman who owns the property at 541 1/2 Faith Street, stated that Mr. Bauman's concerns were in regard to the drainage plan for the subdivision. Historically there have been drainage problems with the parcel in question; it sits significantly higher than the property to the west and as a result the water drains directly onto the Faith Street properties. There are no storm sewers in the area and the barrow ditch is not adequate to drain the property, resulting in standing water for a significant length of time after any rainfall. She stated that she realized that there is an evaluation for the drainage system, however, adequate drainage needs to be guaranteed and that would probably require more than just the barrow ditch or the drainage ditch along the north side of the property. She felt that the property owners along Faith Street should be contacted regarding the resolution of the drainage problems.

## QUESTIONS

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Metzner to comment on the questions brought up regarding the traffic and the drainage.

Mr. Metzner replied that Mr. Shanks would be more qualified to answer those questions.

Jim Shanks, Public Works Director for the City of Grand Junction, spoke first about the drainage problem. The City's requirement is that the water must be limited to the 10 year historic undeveloped flow which has been calculated. The Developer cannot discharge anymore than that calculation. They are required to accommodate the 100 year fully developed storm. This includes quite a bit of water, and they have to design facilities to handle that water and limit the discharge. Staff has been looking at plans; both of which have large retention basins which would retain water on site and release at a slow rate. The basins would be located in the northwest corner of the property and in the southwest corner. Staff realizes that there are some capacity problems for the frontage road and will take these problems into account. Staff will be sure the final plan addresses all these issues. The properties to the west would benefit because Faith Street would act

as a barrier for water flowing to the west. The discharge is limited to the historic discharge of the undeveloped property.

Chairman Halsey asked if when the plan is finalized will there be strong consideration regarding the flow onto Faith Street which has been a historical problem?

Mr. Shanks replied it would be taken into account.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the drainage would be under the pavement or down the road? Mr. Shanks replied it would probably be a combination of both, some may be in pipes, and some will be carried over land to the detention ponds. There are no detailed plans available yet.

Mr. Shanks stated the traffic report shows projections on Independent and 25 1/2 Road. The City requirements are that the developer construct half-street improvements along any streets that front their property. The City will require the developer to make widening improvements along Independent and 25 1/2 Road to accommodate additional traffic. The City will also require the petitioner to escrow funds for the future total reconstruction of those streets. He stated his concerns regarding the sharp curve on Independent and the impact due to speeds and increased volume. He felt that this kind of development would speed up the City's priority on street improvements. The reconstruction of 25 1/2 Road to Independent will have to be considered. In this case the escrow funds from this developer will go towards those improvements.

Commissioner Anderson commented that this is also access for the Fire Department, and with the increased projections there may be problems especially during peak traffic.

Mr. Shanks commented that their study is considering the impact of traffic during peak hours for emergency vehicles and the ball park traffic.

Chairman Halsey asked what the sidewalk requirements were on 25 1/2 Road as well as Independent?

Mr. Shanks said that improvements would include widening the roads along with curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. The west portion of 25 1/2 Road had not specifically been considered yet, but it can be looked into and provisions made for sidewalks there. There is a new project for walking routes even on major streets.

Chairman Halsey asked if there were timetable when these improvements would be made.

Mr. Shanks replied this project will have to compete with other needs throughout the City. Every year the priorities are

reevaluated, this will certainly move up on the priority list as traffic increases.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the City would be able to evaluate the priority of 25 1/2 Road better by the time the Developer comes back for final approval?

Mr. Shanks stated he would not be able to because the prioritization is a long standing process that involves the public, and the City Council. It probably would not be evaluated until after the first of the year.

Chairman Halsey pointed out that the Commissioners would not be re-reviewing this project again after tonight.

Mr. Shanks commented on Highway 6 & 50 access and the signaling system explaining that traffic coming from the parking lot will clear before the light turns. The Developer has \$120,000 in the improvements agreement for the traffic signal cost.

Commissioner Roberts had concerns about traffic coming from the east on Highway 6 & 50 especially during the Christmas rush. Commissioner Roberts added that a lot of traffic will avoid this congestion and use the Independent Avenue (residential neighborhood) route.

Mr. Shanks commented that the study involves just this type of peak traffic for the intersection. Mr. Shanks admitted that the study cannot second guess things like that.

Mr. Boeschenstein commented that the property was in what is considered a subdivision and a heavy commercial zone. The Planning Commission can impose conditions normal to a subdivision at this stage. There will be another stage of review which is a Site Plan Review Stage in which all the City Departments, and all the Utility Companies participate. At the Site Plan Review Stage, it is proper to talk about the specifics on road improvements, traffic impacts, drainage. The plat cannot be recorded until requirements are met according to the decisions made by the various agencies, and the building permit cannot be issued until the site plan has been satisfied. The request tonight is for the approval of a one lot subdivision.

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Goldberg if he would like to comment on any of the issues which had been discussed.

Mr. Goldberg explained that finding suitable property was an important aspect of his job. The Department of Highways had told them that areas on the east side of town had full capacity on the roadways and expansion would be difficult. He stated that he also looked for property that was correctly zoned for the proposed project.

Regarding the drainage problem, Faith Street does not drain to date, it is in a basin. However, there are technical Civil Engineering solutions to this drainage issue. But no matter what the solution, the discharge will not exceed the historic rate.

In regards to the increase in traffic, we believe the increase is isolated to Highway 6 & 50. We have been requested to put in left turn arrows, and we are dedicated to solving the issues. At this point, we have put \$300,000 in with the City for these improvements. As far as the sidewalks, it would be more feasible to install them once and not have to tear them out and replace them at a later date. We have no problem with putting them in after the road is completed.

Chairman Halsey had concerns about the landscaping.

Mr. Goldberg replied that he expected to talk about the details after the basic planning issue was passed; however, his basic philosophy is to have a high degree of landscaping to enhance the marketability of the projects. There is 23,000 square feet of required landscaping by the Municipal Code. He assured the Commission that whatever the petitioner did would be in excess of the Municipal Code requirements.

Commissioner Roberts asked about tract B, if it was a proposed detention area?

Mr. Goldberg explained the retention pond would be on the north end of the property which would be in the area where Tract B. The final location depends on the final decision on the drainage for the property.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the City was ready to handle this size of project? Independent, 1st Street, 25 1/2 Road will all be used as access by people coming from the north.

Mr. Metzner explained that the property is zoned commercial. The impacts would have to be determined by the City Council; through their direction things rise up on the priority list such as traffic increases. It is the responsibility of the Staff to look at those issues and report them to the Council so they can change the priorities. Since the zoning is there, theoretically you could assume the potential traffic problems were addressed prior to that zoning.

Mr. Shanks explained that as traffic plans change the City can adjust the plans. City Council makes the final decision on where the money goes.

Commissioner Love asked Mr. Shanks about the engineering problems of getting all the cars into the area. Mr. Shanks explained there are 20 year projections for this type of project which they work

with. Also, the different possible routes to the site are being looked into and projected traffic for each. He explained that the traffic projections are for the peak traffic for that area.

Chairman Halsey stated that since the Commission needs to make a decision on the Final Plat, and asked if there were further questions?

Commissioner Love questioned the subdivision issue; irrespective of the intended use, is the Commission only considering the subdivision?

Mr. Metzner replied affirmatively, the decision tonight is strictly the subdivision plat.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LOVE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #68-91, A REQUEST FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION WHICH CONSISTS OF ONE LOT ON APPROXIMATELY 24.49 ACRES IN AN EXISTING HEAVY COMMERCIAL ZONE (C-2), I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS AND SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A COMPLETE TRAFFIC GENERATION AND DRAINAGE PLAN AND ANALYSIS AS PART OF THE SITE PLAN APPROVAL PROCESS. IN ADDITION TO THE MOTION, PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT WERE ENTERED TONIGHT REGARDING PUBLIC SAFETY, DIFFICULTY THE COMMISSION PERCEIVES IN THE TRAFFIC ANALYSIS AND DRAINAGE PROBLEMS."**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

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

Following the motion there was general discussion about the proposed site plan.

Mr. Goldberg outlined the proposed site plan which included the 130,000 square foot Sam's building with an option to expand an additional 30,000 square feet on the east side. Along with the Sam's development, there will be an outlot. At this time they are unsure of what that outlot will be. In the case of the traffic study, the worst case scenario will be used to calculate the impacts and that is a full service restaurant.

Mr. Goldberg presented a proposed landscaping plan (drawn by Arceiri) which the Commission reviewed. He outlined the areas that will be landscaped. The landscaping along the streetways will be sod. The lighter colors to the north and east (shown on the plan) depict the existing conditions of the land. There are some wetlands along the north side of the site. The petitioner stated that they would not infringe upon those wetlands. There are existing Cottonwood and Russian Olives trees on the east side of the lot and other landscaping on the southeast corner which is



Independent Plaza. The Code requires that this development have 23,000 square feet in landscaped area. This plan has 71,000 square feet. There is an area north of Independence Plaza that shows heavy landscaping, but we would like to back off that a bit because we do not believe that 25 1/2 Road will be a major access point for Sam's. The Code also requires 51 trees at a caliper of 1 1/2 inch for deciduous trees and 6 to 10 feet for evergreens and 214 shrubs. This plan includes 59 trees and 206 shrubs. The plan shows more trees and slightly less shrubs, but certainly a larger plant area. Mr. Goldberg stated that they have tried to be cognizant of the typical comments regarding a sea of asphalt. Wal Mart likes to break up the sea of asphalt in their projects and that is the reason we have installed landscaping at the end islands. Mr. Goldberg stated that Sam's landscape architect has informed him that these islands need to be slightly larger than is shown on the map; consequently, the islands will be increased.

Mr. Goldberg added that the plan includes a free-standing identification sign located in the southwest corner of the property.

Commissioner Roberts asked if there was a landscape plan for the out-tract until it is sold?

Mr. Goldberg replied no and asked Commissioner Roberts what he would like to see?

Commissioner Roberts referred to other developments, ie. mall which have several undeveloped out-tracts which are saturated with weeds. Because the developers of the mall installed the surrounding infrastructure when it was built, the price of the surrounding lots are extremely expensive. Other developments continue to build out-tracts and these out-tracts remain undeveloped and overrun with weeds. Commissioner Roberts stated that he would like to see an entire development landscaped so that it is complete.

Commissioner Roberts added that he felt that the zoning on this lot was not appropriate because of the vicinity to the North Avenue on-ramp to Highway 6 & 50 and the inadequate road conditions on Independent Avenue and 25 1/2 Road.

Discussion ensued regarding the proper zoning for this lot proposed for the Sam's Warehouse, traffic problems, etc.

The meeting was adjourned 9:05 p.m.