

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
Public Hearing -- January 28, 1986  
7:30 p.m. - 8:38 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Acting Chairman, Ross Transmeier at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

|                                  |                 |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Mike Dooley                      | Susan Rush      |
| Karen Madsen                     | Warren Stephens |
| Ross Transmeier, Acting Chairman |                 |

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department was:

Mike Sutherland

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 51 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 1986 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED."**

Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

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

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS**

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

### III. FULL HEARING

#### 1. #1-86 GRAND JUNCTION URBANIZED AREA TRANSPORTATION PLAN LONG RANGE STREET CAPACITY ELEMENT

Petitioner: Charles Trainor, Metropolitan Planning Organization

Consideration of Transportation Plan.

#### PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Charles Trainor began the presentation with an overview of the intent of the Plan which was to compare the capacity of the existing street system with growth level projections, thereby determining future transportation needs. The Metropolitan Planning Organization is a joint City/County attempt at coordinated transportation planning and established as a federal requirement in order to maintain funding.

Two growth rate scenarios, one at .7% annually and the other at 1.5% annually were computed to give the best possible projection of actual growth expected for the study area. With the low growth scenario, there would be no undue strain on the current transportation system. However, with the medium growth scenario, substantial impact would be made to the current transportation system and would require additional improvements over the next 20 years. Charles felt that of the proposed improvements, priority should be given to 29 Road, connecting Orchard Mesa with the City, then improvements to Broadway, 9th Street, 28th Street, and F Road through Clifton.

Alternative measures could also be pursued in the maintenance and modification of existing streets to help handle the increased growth without the construction of new streets. This, he said, would reduce the cost while improving the capacity.

The Plan also calls for adoption of a right-of-way network between the City and County to produce a joint classification. Also included in the Plan is a proposal for noise mitigation, development of financing techniques, etc.

## QUESTIONS

Commissioner Stephens asked who Charles had talked to regarding approval of the Plan.

Charles answered that the Plan had gone before the Public Works Department, Planning Departments (both City and County), Mesa County Engineering Department, and the State Highway Department, including both the local district office and the Denver office. It had also gone before the local transit agencies in Mesa County and before various elected officials such as Gary Lucero (City Councilman), Dick Pond (County Commissioner), Jim Golden (State Highway Commission) and the air quality control representative for the Western Slope area.

Commissioner Stephens asked if these individuals had actually approved the final Plan.

Charles responded that the approval was for the preliminary draft but that little change was made between that and the final document. Concerns expressed by the various entities were addressed and incorporated into the final Plan.

Commissioner Rush noted that in the earlier assumptions, there was no allowance for redevelopment; however, at the end, it was stated that certain changes would have to be made on the basis of redevelopment downtown. Why was this not quantified?

Charles replied that it would be difficult without a specific land use plan. Assumptions were made that included the development of vacant land.

When asked by Commissioner Rush about the annexation of the area around the 5th Street Bridge and how it would affect the report, Charles responded by saying that much of the land to be annexed in this area would actually be vacant; thus, the report should not vary significantly. He added that it was possible that the Plan would encourage growth in certain areas through annexation policies, but that a close monitoring system could be established to watch for this.

Commissioner Rush asked if Charles had received any comments concerning the need for impact statements for projects carrying certain amounts of traffic.

Charles said that a copy of the Plan was sent to the Homebuilders Association but that no comments were received.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Doug Holling, 2688 Cottonwood Drive, spoke in behalf of the Homebuilders Association. He encouraged close scrutiny by the Planning Commission on the Plan. Since the Homebuilders Association had only seen this document last week, they had not had enough time to properly assess the impacts of the Plan.

Tom Logue, 2969 Oxbow Road, concurred with the need for close examination and asked for additional time to review the Plan. He pointed out that there was very little mention in the Plan regarding maintenance of existing roads.

Don Newton, City Engineer, asked for additional time as well for in depth study.

Robert Tenny, 702 Ivanhoe Way, asked Acting Commissioner Transmeier who establishes the priorities as far as what particular project is built first, etc.

Acting Commissioner Transmeier responded that it was the hope of both the City and County that this would be a joint plan of both governmental entities and that decisions of priority would be mutually agreed upon. Therefore, at this time, there was no established priority for proposed projects.

## **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dooley asked how much would the State, County or City agencies rely on this Plan, if adopted, in seeking funds. Would the projections in the Plan be binding to the various entities?

Charles Trainor stated that the MPO was addressing capacity and not maintenance. Therefore, the various entities would not be tied to the figures stated within. The grant money which is presently received from the federal government is received regardless of how it is spent once obtained. He reaffirmed that the 1 1/2% growth scenario was a conservative estimate.

Commissioner Stephens commented that the proposal should be tabled for further review since it covered very in depth, technical issues.

Commissioner Dooley added that no negative comments were apparently received on the Plan itself. It did appear, though, that more time was needed to more thoroughly examine the Plan.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER STEPHENS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE TABLE THIS FOR ONE MONTH AND SCHEDULE A WORKSHOP WITH THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, CITY ENGINEER'S OFFICE, HOMEBUILDERS ASSOCIATION AND THOSE INTERESTED IN ATTENDING, TWO WEEKS FROM NOW."**

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1 with Commissioner Dooley opposing.

**2. #2-86 ZONE OF ANNEXATION - SUNSET TERRACE REPLAT**

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

Consideration of Zone of Annexation.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Mike Sutherland, representing the Planning Department, stated the request was for an area recently annexed into the City. The zone requested was the lowest City zone currently available for residential. Prior to annexation into the City, it had been given the lowest County zone possible of R-1.

**QUESTIONS**

There were no questions at this time.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-86 ZONE OF ANNEXATION FOR THE SUNSET TERRACE REPLAT, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."**

Commissioner Dooley seconded the motion.

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

**3. #18-85 REZONE PREC TO PRVR - NEIGHBORS RV PARK**

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

Consideration of rezone.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Mike Sutherland presented an overview of the intent to rezone and stated that the RV Park was originally allowed under the Planned Recreational Zoning but that later, the Zoning and Development Code was amended to include Recreational Vehicle Resorts. The rezone would more effectively address the concerns of the RV Resort and was, indeed, made a condition of the project application.

**QUESTIONS**

There were no questions at this time.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Robert Tenny spoke up from the audience wanting to know if 24 Road could handle the additional traffic from the RV Resort.

Acting Commissioner Transmeier commented that the Plan had already been approved, but that one of the conditions was that improvements be made to 24 Road to help alleviate any problems which may be experienced by the increase in traffic.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DOOLEY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #18-85 REZONE PREC TO PRVR - NEIGHBORS RV PARK, I MOVE WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."**

Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

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

#### 4. #26-84 PATTERSON (F) ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

Consideration of amending the Patterson (F) Road Corridor Guidelines.

#### PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike Sutherland stated that previously the guidelines had been known as "policy" but that it was felt this term was too strong. Instead, the guidelines are intended to serve as a "guide" only by which future development is considered. The contents of the guideline, he continued, was by no means "cast in concrete" and allowances and variations could be made to the guideline depending on the development proposal. In this way, a prospective developer could look at these guidelines and get an idea of what might be approved for the area. Also included were more of the "whys" and "how" development should occur in this area.

#### QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

The main concern expressed by all persons commenting regarded the fact that F Road was a main arterial for the City. As such, they could not understand why the City would want to enforce the residential zoning and exclude commercial activity from locating there. It was reiterated several times that the guidelines were flexible and were subject to variation or change, depending on the preference of the neighborhood and/or development proposal.

The intent was to protect the existing residences of F Road while allowing those commercial developments which would not deter from this original intent. This action was taken originally because residents expressed this preference at various meetings which were held in the area. The Planning Commission did not want to see another North Avenue-type situation along F Road. The question of F Road assessments came up but Acting Chairman Transmeier quickly responded that this was not an issue that could be decided by the Planning Commission; that decision was reserved for the City Council only. These answers were given to those who expressed concern over the policy-guideline issue.

Doralyn Brodack Genova spoke for her father who resides at 2741 Patterson Road. Her question regarded intent.

Dale Ely, 2736 F Road, commented on the intent.

Shirley Kelly, 2737 F Road, referred to the area meetings and stated that her neighbors had requested commercial development on the south side of F Road. These comments, she noted, were not included in the responses from the City.

Commissioner Stephens asked if the Mantey Heights area asked for commercial development.

Shirley responded affirmatively.

Acting Chairman Transmeier added that he had attended these area meetings but the predominant feeling of the residents in this area was the desire to maintain the residential character.

Shirley also stated that F Road was viewed as a freeway. She also commented on the intent with emphasis on the desire for commercial development.

Douglas Price, 138 Santa Fe, was at the area meeting in question and also expressed interest in seeing light commercial and medical facilities along F Road to act as a buffer for the residential communities.

Leona Sisac, 2742 Patterson Road, felt that the Planning Commission was trying to anticipate the movements of the residents and again felt the assessments were unfair to the residents on F Road.

Commissioner Stephens reminded Mrs. Sisac that anticipation of movement was an essential part of effective planning.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #26-84 PATTERSON ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES, I MAKE A MOTION WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."**

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

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

#### **5. #3-86 I-70 BUSINESS LOOP CORRIDOR GUIDELINES**

This item was pulled from this evening's agenda.

#### **IV. NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS**

There were no non-scheduled citizens and/or visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.