

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- April 4, 1989
7:30 p.m. - 8:05 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:

Ron Halsey	John Elmer
Steve Love, Chairman	Karen Madsen

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department, was:

Kathy Portner

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 15 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

* * * * *

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, REGARDING THE MINUTES OF OUR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF MARCH 7, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THESE AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Elmer seconded the motion.

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or prescheduled visitors.

III. PUBLIC MEETING

1. #13-89 SECURITY SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Security Self-Storage, Merritt Dismant
Location: 2490 and 2492 Commerce Blvd.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Dismant felt that all concerns expressed by the Planning Department and review agencies had been satisfactorily addressed. The use, he maintained, would remain the same as that which currently existed.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy said that the proposed subdivision conforms to the zone and the character of the surrounding area. All major technical concerns had been addressed; however, a question still remained as to what to call the Grand Valley Irrigation right-of-way or easement. This issue would have to be resolved between the petitioner and Grand Valley Irrigation prior to recording the plat.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER HALSEY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #13-89, A REQUEST FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION OF TWO LOTS ON APPROXIMATELY .95 ACRES IN A HEAVY COMMERCIAL (C-2) ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, SUBJECT TO REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS AND ALSO THAT THE PETITIONER MAKE WHATEVER ARRANGEMENTS NECESSARY WITH THE GRAND VALLEY."

Commissioner Elmer seconded the motion.

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

1. #12-89 REZONE C-2 TO C-1

Petitioner: Community Mennonite Church, Kenneth Kuhn
Location: 407 Glenwood Avenue

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Herbert Wright, 3740 Beechwood Drive, representing the petitioner, presented a brief overview of the proposal. He felt the lighter use of a church would provide less impact to neighborhood residents than heavier uses.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy said that the proposal was actually split into two sections: 1) the request for the rezone, and 2) the request of a special use permit for the church if the rezone was approved. Kathy pointed out to the Commissioners that the only aspect which could be considered by them was the request for a rezone. The requirements of the special use application would be considered by Planning Department staff. She felt that the rezone would be beneficial to the area by limiting the potential uses near the residential neighborhoods and City park.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked for clarification of the area in question, which was then provided by Kathy.

Commissioner Elmer wanted to know if the petitioner planned for any long-range paving of the parking lot. He expressed concern over the maintenance of the dust-free parking surface if left as gravel.

Mr. Wright thought that the church would eventually pave the lot, but that its first concern was the remodeling of the building's interior. He said that the church would maintain the graveled surface in a dust-free condition until such time as they were able to pave it.

Commissioner Elmer asked if Mr. Wright would be willing to commit to a timeframe for the paving, to which, Mr. Wright said that he, personally, was not in a position to make that type of decision without first approaching the church's board.

Kathy reminded the Commissioners that the parking and other site-specific issues would be addressed by staff during the special use process. While the concerns of the Commission would be taken into consideration, the Commission should not let those concerns affect its decision on the rezone.

Commissioner Elmer pointed out to Mr. Wright that since the area was surrounded by C-2 (Heavy Commercial) zoning, the church may be potentially surrounded by the heavier uses. He asked if the church had thought about this aspect and whether it mattered to them.

Mr. Wright said that they understood this possibility and did not foresee any problems.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #12-89, A REQUEST TO REZONE FROM A HEAVY COMMERCIAL ZONE TO A LIGHT COMMERCIAL ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL BASED ON THE FOLLOWING: 1) THE NEIGHBORHOOD WILL DERIVE A BENEFIT, AND 2) THE REZONE IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

Commissioner Halsey added that staff may want to consider downzoning a larger section of the area to avoid the potential for spot zoning.

Chairman Love concurred, saying that perhaps a different character would be more desirable in this area.

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

Dick Scariano, 529 Tiara Drive, said that the area had formerly been zoned C-1 under old County zoning, and when the City annexed it, it put its own C-1 zoning in place. However, he continued, the County C-1 zoning was different in character than the City's C-1 zoning--the City's being more restrictive. This, he felt, might provide some background and justification for the City to re-look at the area's present zoning.

2. #14-89 REZONE RMF-64 TO PB AND FINAL PLAN AND PLAT

Petitioner: Donald Anderson
Location: 1165 Bookcliff Avenue

Chairman Love felt that he could not participate in the hearing of this item due to a conflict of interest. Since, without his presence there would not be the needed quorum, the meeting was postponed until Tuesday evening, April 11, at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium. By adhering to that scheduling, the petitioner would still be heard at the April 19 City Council hearing, thereby keeping the process and the petitioner on schedule.

V. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no nonscheduled citizens and/or visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.