

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- December 5, 1989
7:35 p.m. - 9:45 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:

Steve Love, Chairman	Jack Campbell	Jim Tyson
Sheilah Renberger	Ron Halsey	

Commissioner John Elmer was absent.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department was Karl Metzner.

Bobbie Darlington was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 12 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 3, 1989 MEETING AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

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

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

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

III. PUBLIC MEETING

1. #54-89 CONDITIONAL USE FOR A LIQUOR LICENSE ON APPROXIMATELY 0.68 ACRES IN A HEAVY COMMERCIAL (C-2) ZONE.
Petitioner: Joan's Restaurant, O.R. and Alice Catt.
Location: 2456 Industrial Blvd

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Catt felt that if he was granted a liquor license, he could serve drinks with a meal which would help support his restaurant business. He added that arrangements had been made to re-stripe the parking lot by the 15th.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner presented a brief overview of the proposal. The existing restaurant previously had a liquor license prior to being annexed into the city. The liquor license lapsed for over a year after the annexation, making it a nonconforming status. A Conditional Use has to be processed to re-initiate the liquor license.

In reference to the review comments, Karl pointed out that the parking lot needed to be re-striped, the directional sign on 25 Road would need some improvements to bring it up to Code Standards and the Fire Department would need to inspect the restaurant to make sure everything is in compliance. Karl added that the petitioner has acknowledged these requests and has a written letter agreeing to re-stripe the parking and to bring the sign up to Code Specifications.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Renberger asked whether a background check was made prior to issuing the license.

Karl replied that a liquor license application entails two procedures, the license application and the conditional use. The conditional use is used to evaluate the facility, the parking, and the impact on adjacent uses. The liquor license application includes a background check by the Police Department, Health Department, and the Fire Department.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RENBERGER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #54-89, A REQUEST FOR A LIQUOR LICENSE ON APPROXIMATELY 0.68 ACRES IN A HEAVY COMMERCIAL (C-2) ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, SUBJECT TO COMPLYING WITH ALL THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS."

Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

1. #55-89 REZONE FROM RSF-4 TO PR-4, FINAL PLAN & PLAT AND A VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR PTARMIGAN ESTATES SUBDIVISION.
Petitioner: John Siegfried
Location: Southeast corner of 27 1/2 and G Roads.

Chairman Love excused himself from participating in this item due to a potential conflict of interest. Vice-Chairman Ron Halsey directed this portion of the meeting.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

John Siegfried presented a brief overview of his proposed plan for Ptarmigan Estates. He stated that even though a rezone is being requested, the density would not change. The requested zoning change from Residential Single Family 4 units per acre (RSF-4) to Planned Residential (PR-4) was solicited by the Planning Department because of some stringent setbacks in the proposed plan. The rezone would alleviate any potential confusion on setback requirements for anyone building a home in this subdivision. The subdivision is covenanted to allow only one single family unit per lot with the exceptions of lots 1 and 9. Lot 1 will be allowed to have up to 4 single family dwellings on the 3.5 acre parcel and lot 9 will allow up to 2 single family dwellings on the 1.67 acres.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Campbell recalled that there were some cul-de-sac type areas on G Road in the preliminary plan, but the final plan did not show these.

Karl explained that there had been a proposal to vacate G Road on the preliminary plan which required turn around areas, but this was not occurring now.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl addressed the zoning issue again, which he felt may be a point of confusion. Currently, the area of the proposal is zoned RSF-4. Mr. Siegfried's proposal calculates to be less than the allowable density. This development does not require a rezone to be approved; however, because of Mr. Siegfried's unique approach to development in regards to the greenbelt area, common ingress/egress easements, building envelopes, and the deep setbacks, the planning staff has requested the rezone in order to identify that this type of development is out of the ordinary and to alleviate confusion, thereby avoiding someone a financial loss if the incorrect information was used.

QUESTIONS

Mr. Siegfried explained his concept of the development was to preserve trees and use less resources by having common ingress/egresses. He noted that anyone wanting a separate driveway would have that option.

Commissioner Renberger was concerned as to whether or not there was sufficient turn around area in the cul-de-sacs for firetrucks.

Karl replied, the cul-de-sacs met the standards for the Fire Department and also the Sanitation Department.

Don Newton, City Engineer, cited several concerns including the grades, street designs, storm drainage, and sanitary sewers. The final drainage report noted that all the drainage from East Piazza and Ptarmigan Piazza would drain to the west from East Piazza through an open channel, then would be stored in a detention basin east of 27 1/2 Road crossing 27 1/2 Road through an existing 16 1/2" culvert. Since the final drainage report was done, the engineer drawing the plan shows all the drainage going south down South Piazza. All the drainage runs on the surface of the street to the storm sewer which may cause problems during a heavy rainstorm. He added that all these problems could be resolved by sitting down with Mr. Siegfried's engineer.

Don reiterated that his main concern was that the original drainage report does not agree with the construction plan, and at this point we do not have all the required information to complete the engineer's review.

Discussion ensued regarding the drainage problem.

Commissioner Renberger felt that these problems and any unanswered questions should be resolved prior to the Planning Commission's approval.

When asked if the petitioner had responded to the Review Comments and questions, Mr. Siegfried replied, yes and stated that he had no problems complying with the requests being made.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Bill Trainor, of 2297 South Seville Circle, requested clarification of the Residential Single Family, RSF-4 zone, and the Planned Residential, PR-4 zone. He expressed concerns that the PR-4 would not be as restrictive as the RSF-4.

Karl explained that the PR-4 zone would be much more restrictive than the present zoning of RSF-4 and added this would only allow single family dwellings to be built.

Mr. Trainor continued, Crown Height's homeowners maintain a drainage ditch near the southwest corner of Cortland and 27 1/2 Road which currently is barely sufficient to carry the drainage runoff; any additional water would flood the ditch area.

Bill Price, of 703 Brassie Drive, asked what the current plans were for G Road.

Karl responded, there are no changes or improvements planned for G Road at this time. In the preliminary stages there was some discussion on vacating G Road, but because of objection from a few of the property owners on 27 1/2 Road these plans were discarded.

John Crawford, of 3943 South Piazza, asked how the proposed greenbelt area would be maintained, and what, if any, type of improvements were planned such as a bike and/or walking path. John felt this proposed subdivision was poorly designed because it consisted primarily of flag type lots, contained common driveways, narrow streets, and few sidewalks and curbs. He suggested that the developer consider redesigning the entrance into the subdivision into a divided parkway which would be more compatible with the other surrounding subdivisions.

Mr. Siegfried stated, a 5 foot easement exists along the canal bank along the eastern boundary, which could be utilized for a bike and/or walking path area. The greenbelt area will be maintained by the individual land owners. John contended, the reason this development was designed with the narrow streets, etc. was because he wanted the area to have a rural, more farm-like character. The entrance would be heavily bounded by orchard, giving the area an ambiance atmosphere. He added that it was also a wise use of resources.

Commissioner Renberger reiterated the importance of resolving these problems prior to approval of a development.

Commissioner Campbell had concerns about possible infestation problems with the apple trees and wondered if there was anything written in the covenants that would cover any potential problems.

In response, Mr. Siegfried said, this was a consideration and the individual homeowners would be responsible to care for the apple trees.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RENBERGER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION TO TABLE THIS ITEM UNTIL THE JANUARY MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION."

Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 3 to 1, with Commissioner Tyson opposing.

A brief recess was called at 9:10 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:15 p.m.

2. #1-89 A REQUEST TO AMEND SECTION 5-7-7B.5 AND SECTION 4-2-17 OF THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE.
Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl explained, the proposed amendments to the sign code (5-7-7B.5) would allow some flexibility in transferring a percentage of the existing front sign allowances for a building to the side. This would not increase the total allowable signage, but would allow a business with poor frontage visibility the opportunity to put signage on the side of the building.

Karl continued, the second amendment (4-2-17 Public Zone), is related with problems of public agencies buying and selling land, and rezoning. He recommended changing the mandatory requirement for public lands to be zoned PZ (Public Zone) to be optional, adding that any extraordinary type uses, such as jails, would only be allowed under the Public Zone.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TYSON) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #1-89, A REQUEST TO AMEND SECTION 5-7-7B.5, AND SECTION 4-2-17 OF THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SINCE;

1. THE SIGN CODE AMENDMENT WILL ALLOW MORE FLEXIBLE AND EFFECTIVE USE OF EXISTING SIGN ALLOWANCES;
2. AND AMENDING THE PUBLIC ZONE (PZ) WILL REDUCE UNNECESSARY PROCEDURES IN THE PUBLIC ACQUISITION OR DISPOSAL OF LAND."

Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

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

3. #57-89 AMENDMENTS TO THE 1ST STREET AND PATTERSON ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES.
Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl briefly outlined the contents of the Guidelines and the changes which were being recommended. Because of the traffic volume on both 1st Street and Patterson, topography of the area north of Patterson, and the small parcel sizes, it is felt that the area on the south side of Patterson between 25 1/2 to 26 Road is suitable for low volume type businesses, offices, etc. On the other hand, the area south of Patterson has a different character, the parcels are larger and the topography is more suitable for residential. The recommended amendment to the First Street and Patterson Road Corridor Guidelines is to replace the statement "Residential only" with "Light business and mixed use development is appropriate". Karl added, it would be stressed that any proposed business use should respect the surrounding area in terms of site and structure design.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Renberger expressed her concerns that this proposed amendment may encourage strip zoning.

Commissioner Halsey added his concerns that this proposal could potentially have a damaging effect on the existing homes on the south side of Patterson Road.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #57-89, A REQUEST TO AMEND THE 1ST STREET AND PATTERSON ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SINCE THE SIZE, TOPOGRAPHY AND ORIENTATION OF PROPERTIES FRONTING THE NORTH SIDE OF PATTERSON ROAD FROM 25 1/2 TO 26 ROAD IS NOT APPROPRIATE FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 3 to 2, with Commissioners Renberger and Halsey opposing.

V. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no nonscheduled citizens and/or visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.