

\$

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Special Hearing: April 11, 1989
7:30 p.m. - 8:15 p.m.

The special hearing of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Acting Chairperson Karen Madsen. Due to a potential conflict of interest, Chairman Steve Love was absent.

Other Commission members attending the hearing included: Jack Campbell, Jim Tyson, Dutch Afman, and John Elmer.

Kathy Portner was present from the Planning Department.

Approximately 8 interested citizens attended the hearing.

Acting Chairperson Madsen clarified to the audience that the special hearing had been called to consider item #14-89, consideration of rezone from RMF-64 to PB at 1165 Bookcliff Avenue and a final plat and plan for an indoor veterinary clinic. The item had been postponed for hearing before a quorum of the Planning Commission.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jill Anderson, representing the petitioner, outlined the request to rezone the property for a veterinary practice. The business, Columbine Veterinary Clinic, is currently located across 12th Street from the proposed site. The request is in compliance with the Corridor Guidelines and the property has been used for a variety of business uses in the past. All services will be indoors, there will not be outdoor kennels.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner provided some background information on the property and the proposal. The proposal fits the following criteria for rezoning as stated in the Zoning and Development Code:

- There has been a change in the character of the area.
- The proposed rezone would be compatible with the surrounding area.
- The proposal is in conformance with the adopted 12th Street Corridor Guidelines.
- There are adequate facilities to serve the development.

All technical concerns of the plat and plan will be addressed prior to recording those documents. Staff recommends that if the rezone is approved, the approved uses should include the proposed indoor veterinary clinic as well as those uses listing in the Use/Zone Matrix of the Zoning and Development Code as "Service Business--Limited, Inside.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Afman asked about parks and open space fees and additional landscaping.

Kathy responded that the open space fees would be paid prior to recording the plat and that the existing landscaping is adequate to meet the Code requirements.

Commissioner Elmer expressed a concern about the access from the parking lot. Pet owners are forced to walk their animals along Bookcliff Avenue to the entrance. Is there a better entrance?

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR:

Darrow Stemple, 1610 Crestview Court, is the current owner of the property in question. He agreed with Commissioner Elmer that walking animals along Bookcliff Avenue may present a hazard. He suggested that there is a back entrance directly off the parking lot that could be used. He added that the property is currently fenced along the south and west property lines.

AGAINST:

Harold Moss, 964 Lakeside Court, spoke against the proposal. He and his wife are the owners of an apartment complex along College Place. They expressed their concern about clients walking their pets on his property and other neighboring properties.

Acting Chairperson Madsen read a letter of opposition from Floy and Earl Young, who own a duplex next to the proposed veterinary clinic.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Jill Anderson passed around a photograph of the back of the property showing the privacy fence. The fence will keep the clients off of neighboring properties. There are no strong odors associated with veterinary clinics. It is a sterile environment. Noise should not be a problem either. The animals that are boarded are kept there because they are ill. Those animals will be kept inside in an area that is well insulated and has no windows. They will post signs to remind clients of the leash law.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Campbell had some general questions which were answered by the petitioner.

Commissioner Elmer asked the petitioner what their feeling was about the access into the building. The petitioner responded that they did not see a problem with the access, but would comply with any such conditions put on them by the Commission.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER AFMAN) "MADAME CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #14-89, CONSIDERATION OF REZONE FROM RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY (RMF-64) TO PLANNED BUSINESS (PB), I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:
-THERE HAS BEEN A CHANGE IN CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD
-THE PROPOSED REZONE IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA
-THE FACILITIES ARE ADEQUATE TO SERVE THE CLINIC
THE APPROVED USES ARE THE PROPOSED VETERINARY CLINIC AND SERVICE BUSINESS--LIMITED, INSIDE."**

Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MADAME CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #14-89, CONSIDERATION OF FINAL PLAT AND PLAN OF ONE LOT ON APPROXIMATELY .2 ACRES, I RECOMMEND WE APPROVE THE REQUEST SUBJECT TO REVIEW AGENCY COMMENTS AND THAT THE APPROVED USES BE LIMITED TO THE PROPOSAL AND SERVICE BUSINESS-LIMITED, INSIDE."

Commissioner Elmer seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued surrounding amending the motion to include provisions that the noise and odor be kept to a minimum.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "AMEND THE MOTION TO INCLUDE PROVISIONS TO MAINTAIN THE MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR NOISE, ODOR AND HEALTH."

Commissioner Elmer seconded the amendment.

A vote was called and the amended motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Afman opposed because he felt the amendment was unenforceable.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.