

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- March 7, 1989
7:35 p.m. - 9:35 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Steve Love at 7:35 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

Ron Halsey	Karen Madsen
Jack Campbell	Jim Tyson
Dutch Afman	John Elmer
Steve Love, Chairman	

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department, were:

Kathy Portner Mike Sutherland

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 77 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

* * * * *

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 7, I RECOMMEND WE APPROVE THEM AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0. (Note: Commissioner Afman was not present to vote on this item.)

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

Chairman Love welcomed John Elmer to the Commission as its newest member. John also serves on the Grand Junction Board of Appeals.

III. PUBLIC MEETING

1. #6-89 HEALD-ELLIOTT MINOR SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Steve Heald
Location: 357 Franklin Avenue

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Steve Heald did not make a formal presentation; however, he said that he would answer any questions the Commissioners may ask.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy said that technical concerns had been resolved. She added that a deed restriction be placed on lot 3 stating that the foundation may be used only for an accessory structure and not a dwelling unit. This would be recorded with the plat. Any new structures placed on the property would require a detailed slope and drainage evaluation plan due to the steep slope on the property to the back. This statement, also, will be required either on the plat or recorded as a separate statement.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mrs. Orbis, 329 Franklin, asked if there was to be more construction planned for the lots.

Mr. Heald responded that the plans called for only the refurbishing of the existing structures.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #6-89, REQUEST FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION OF THREE LOTS ON 1.2 ACRES IN AN RMF-64 ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY COMMENTS AND THAT A DEED RESTRICTION BE PLACED ON LOT 3 STATING THAT THE FOUNDATION MAY NOT BE USED FOR A DWELLING UNIT."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

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

2. #7-89 CONDITIONAL USE - CALVARY BIBLE CHURCH

Petitioner: Calvary Bible Church
Location: 27 1/2 Road and F 1/4 Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Rob Jenkins, an architect representing the Calvary Bible Church, felt that all review agency concerns had been addressed. He provided a brief overview of the project.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked if there were any elevations available for the project.

Mr. Jenkins said that the height limitation for the RSF-4 zone was 32 feet. The building, would only be built to a maximum of 30 feet. Residents located to the north would look over the church building because of a rise in the property where these homes were located. Building materials would consist of stucco, masonry block or brick, with accented wood and glass.

Commissioner Elmer questioned the use of gravel versus the request by Planning staff for a paved surface. Did he plan to keep the parking lot graveled only?

Mr. Jenkins responded that Planning had requested a dust-free surface only. A congregation of approximately 200 persons was expected, making the proposed 100 spaces more than adequate. The entry road would be paved at the time of construction; the parking lot would be paved in two stages. The parking lot would consist of road base with gravel on top of it and would be maintained until paving took place.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy said that all review agency comments had been addressed. The timing for the paving of the parking lot was set at five years by the petitioner; the Commission could amend this schedule if they so chose. A quit claim deed dedicating the utility easements will have to be recorded prior to construction. A letter was received by the Fire Department which amended its earlier request for a 10-inch water line to say that the present 8-inch water line was adequate.

Rob Jenkins clarified that the Fire Department requested that the petitioner tie into and extend the present 8-inch line to another fire plug, thereby providing two fire plugs for the area.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Love asked whether the City had any plans to extend F 1/4 Road.

Kathy said that the City had no plans to extend this road.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Geneva Hyde, 633 27 1/2 Road, wanted the unused portion of the lot chained off so that it could not be used for additional parking (adding to potential dust problems). For the record, she stated that she had a contract with Henry Faussone which called for the paving of 27 1/2 Road past her property. When extension of 27 1/2 Road took place, she wanted to ensure that it extended past her property. She understood that the petitioner would not be responsible for the expense of other than those street improvements in front of the church. In addition, she felt that the speed limit should be reduced to 25 mph in this area.

Mr. Jenkins said that the petitioner would escrow for half street improvements. When asked, he replied that there would be no angle parking in front of the church.

Kirk Guntermann, 3150 27 1/2 Road, felt that 27 1/2 Road was not presently designed to carry the proposed increase in traffic. He had talked to Jim Shanks and Dave Tontoli of the Engineering Department concerning this and the request for a 25 mph speed limit in this area.

Ms. Cowden, 1910 Hawthorne Drive, felt there should be a four-way stop sign at the intersection of Hawthorne and 27 1/2 Road.

John Hebert, 3110 27 1/2 Road, expressed similar traffic concerns as well as a concern for any view impairment.

Kathy Portner reiterated that while the elevation materials would be submitted later, the petitioner has agreed to limit the height of the structure to 30 feet. When asked, she replied that the church could not expand (e.g. school facilities) without going through the hearing process again.

Bob Stokes, 626 27 1/4 Road, thought the use was excellent and said that traffic impacts would be far less from a church than from a (formerly) proposed single family residential development.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Afman asked staff if they felt the parking situation, as proposed, was adequate.

Kathy replied that it was.

Commissioner Elmer felt that maintenance of the dust-free surface was as important a consideration as just the requiring of one.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER HALSEY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #7-89, REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE FOR CALVARY BIBLE CHURCH ON 7.1 ACRES IN AN RSF-4 ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY COMMENTS, AND THAT THE NON-PAVED PARKING AREA BE MAINTAINED UNTIL SUCH TIME AS IT IS ALSO PAVED, AND FOR TOTAL PAVING TO BE COMPLETED NO LATER THAN FIVE YEARS FROM THE DATE THE BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

Commissioner Madsen asked if these conditions would be a hardship for the petitioner.

Mr. Jenkins said that these points were agreed to in the project narrative; therefore, the conditions as set forth would not be a hardship.

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

3. #8-89 D&RGW RAILROAD SUBDIVISION, FILING #6, FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: The Anschutz Corporation, Steve Hebert
Location: East of 5th Street between South Avenue and the railroad.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representing the petitioner, made a brief presentation of the proposal. He felt that this was the most complex of all the filings to be brought before the Commission since it involved the dedication of street right-of-way. Lot 2 was the only lot still vacant; thus, open space fees would be calculated based on that property only.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Afman asked if the appraisal had been submitted for calculation of the open space fees.

Mike Sutherland replied that it was forthcoming; it should be received next week.

Mr. Logue elaborated that it would probably be forwarded to Don Hobbs of the Parks Department for his approval. Computation of open space fees for Filing #1 were completed, and would come in the form of partial land dedication and cash payment. Open space fees due from Lot 2 would be entirely in cash, with no deferral of payment as in Filing #1.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike felt that most technical concerns had been addressed satisfactorily. Regarding improvements guarantees, improvements will be provided by D&RGW, with participation from the City and potential participation from Public Service and Burkey Lumber. All other concerns will be mitigated prior to recording the final plat. Outstanding open space fees will be resolved and received prior to the recording of the final plat.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #8-89, REQUEST FOR A FINAL PLAT OF THE D&RGW RAILROAD SUBDIVISION, FILING #6, OF SIX LOTS ON APPROXIMATELY 9.29 ACRES IN AN I-1 ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY COMMENTS, THAT THE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE FEES MUST BE RESOLVED PRIOR TO THE RECORDING OF THE PLAT, AND THAT THE EXTENSION OF 6TH STREET MUST BE DEDICATED AS A PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY."

Commissioner Afman seconded the motion.

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

V. PUBLIC HEARING

1. #9-89 WELLINGTON TOWNHOMES-AMENDED FINAL PLAN AND UTILITY EASEMENT VACATION

Petitioner: Robert L. Dorssey
Location: 1305 Wellington Court

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Dorssey stated that there was amendment to the original plan for the installation of a sprinkling system, using city, not irrigation, water. The cost for this would be borne by him initially, to be spread out later among the new units sold.

QUESTIONS

When asked how the new homeowners would be billed, Mr. Dorssey replied that he would reactivate a Homeowners Association. The irrigation of the small portion (indicated on the site plan) would be billed to, and paid by, the Homeowners Association.

Mr. Dorssey said the proposal included converting the portion of open space (indicated on plan) to RV parking with a 6-foot fence separating the parking from the canal bank. Landscape would include grass with a washed rock border.

Commissioner Halsey expressed his concern that the only open space present in this area would be deleted. He asked the petitioner why this was being proposed.

Mr. Dorssey replied that plans had been designed with retirees in mind for a target market. The units had been scaled down, single story, and it was thought that the majority of retirees would have at least one recreational vehicle, so that additional parking for those vehicles would be necessary.

Parking was discussed among Commissioners, staff, and the petitioner. It was determined that ample parking existed for the proposed units, and that part of the open space there now could remain as open space without sacrificing necessary parking. It would still give the petitioner nine added RV spaces.

Further discussion ensued and brought up such points as: 1) not all retirees had recreational vehicles, 2) what about families would might move into the homes--where would the children play, 3) the expense of maintenance of the open space might be prohibitive to the new homeowners, 4) none of the present homeowners expressed a preference of leaving the open space versus adding more parking.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike's presentation brought up more of the concerns involved with the easement vacation request of 2 feet of the 14-foot utility easement. The request was acceptable to Public Service. The vacation, if approved, would amend the setbacks, but Planning staff had no problem with that aspect of the proposal. Mike stated that a letter had been received from a Florida man whose daughter lived in one of the existing units. The resident objected to the elimination of the open space area, thinking it might detract from potential property values.

The petitioner agreed to provide covenants prior to issuance of a building permit. While there were questions received from residents, staff had not received any adverse comments to the proposal.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Greg Cranston, representing Monument Realty at 759 Horizon Drive, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Joe Abell, 1212 Wellington, expressed concern over the increased traffic as providing a hazard to the children who did live in the neighborhood. He wanted assurance that the units would remain single story; he was against any off-street parking; and questioned how trash would be picked up.

Ms. Reeves, 1225 Wellington, wanted a fence placed on the western property line separating her property from the parking area.

Mike Sutherland said that the City would pick up the trash on a curbside basis versus having a dumpster placed in a central location.

Mr. Dorssey added that trash could also be picked up in the cul-de-sac if it was preferable.

Mike continued that the fence request on the west could be made a contingency prior to construction of the units if the Commission included it as such in the motion.

Mr. Dorssey said that the fence would be no problem. He felt that the traffic would not increase significantly, and said that he had cut the initial proposal of 19 units to almost half, or 10 units.

Commissioner Elmer asked the petitioner if he had any figures which would compare the costs of maintaining the open space versus the cost of adding new parking spaces.

Mr. Dorssey did not have this information.

Betty Willhite, representing Monument Realty at 759 Horizon Drive, submitted a petition from the residents of this neighborhood who were in favor of the proposed changes as it related to the elimination of the open space, the formation of a Homeowners Association, and the irrigation plans..

Many of the Commissioners expressed a desire to keep the open space rather than have it torn up for additional parking which may not be necessary.

Greg Cranston reminded the Commissioners that the new units were intended for adult living, specifically tailored to retirees.

Further discussion ensued on the pros and cons of water use options and parking/open space options.

Commissioner Elmer said that if the open space were left, but it was determined later that additional parking was needed, the petitioner could come back with a request for more parking at that time.

Mike elaborated on this point, saying that this would constitute a minor change process and the decision would be in-house; no hearing process would be necessary. He provided the details of such a request.

MOTION (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #9-89, REQUEST FOR AN AMENDED FINAL PLAN OF THE WELLINGTON TOWNHOMES SUBDIVISION ON APPROXIMATELY 1.67 ACRES, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY COMMENTS, SUBJECT ALSO TO THE FOUR PARKING SPACES ON THE PLANNED RV AREA BE INSTEAD PLANNED AS A LANDSCAPED OPEN SPACE FOR COMMUNITY USE, AND ALSO THAT THE FENCE ON THE WEST PROPERTY LINE BE BUILT BEFORE THE ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT, AND THAT THE TIMING OF THE OPEN SPACE AREA BE IN CONJUNCTION WITH PHASE THREE, ALSO, THAT THE MINOR CHANGE PROCESS FOR THE OPEN SPACE AREA BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR THE PETITIONER."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

Chairman Love commended the petitioner for being so cooperative and he appreciated the request to downzone.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-1, with Chairman Love opposing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER AFMAN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #9-89, REQUEST TO VACATE TWO FEET OF A 14-FOOT UTILITY EASEMENT, AS DESCRIBED IN THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

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

2. #5-89 ALLEY VACATION

Petitioner: 200 Grand Properties, Kirk Rider
Location: Alley north of Grand, between 2nd and 3rd Streets

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Kirk Rider summarized his proposal and said that he would like one of two options considered by the Commission: 1) partial vacation of the alley now, with a request to vacate the rest of the alley at a later date, or 2) full alley vacation now. Mr. Rider felt that all review agency concerns had been adequately addressed.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike saw no problem with the alley vacation, and said that consideration for the full alley vacation was preferable. In that way, he continued, the proposal would be advertised in its entirety, but Council could actually approve less than the full vacation.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer endorsed the consideration for the entire alley vacation. He asked Mr. Rider if the utilities would then be undergrounded.

Mr. Rider answered that the petitioner's half of the utilities would be undergrounded by December, per an agreement with Colorado National Bank.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #5-89, REQUEST TO VACATE THE ALLEY NORTH OF GRAND AVENUE, BETWEEN 2ND AND 3RD STREETS, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY COMMENTS."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.