

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- March 25, 1986
7:30 p.m. - 8:50 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Bill O'Dwyer 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
Miland Dunivent	Ross Transmeier
Bill O'Dwyer, Chairman	

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department were:

Mike Sutherland	Karl Metzner
-----------------	--------------

Don Newton, representing the City Engineering Department, was present.

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There was approximately 19 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

* * * * *

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 25, 1986 BE ACCEPTED AS SUBMITTED.

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

III. FULL HEARING

1. #7-86 REZONE RMF-64 TO PB

Petitioner: Louise Pool
Location: 1035 Grand Avenue

Consideration of rezone and final.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Louise Pool indicated that she was the owner of the All American Insurance Agency. Her intentions were to find a permanent location for her business and felt that this proposed location would best serve her needs.

She pointed out that the building had been used for counseling services and offices for a number of years; therefore, the use planned for the building, she felt, would remain the same. No major remodeling was needed for either the inside or the outside of the building. The driveway would be improved to accommodate one way traffic coming into the parking area located in the rear of the lot, and a one way drive located on the other side of the building would accommodate persons leaving. She stated that the average client visitation was six per day with a few more on Fridays.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Sutherland began by saying that the property in question was located in an area designated by the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) as a Residential Office Conversion Corridor. He noted that the driveway currently located on the west side of the property overlapped the property line of the next door neighbors but that an agreement had been reached between property owners regarding this. The curb cut off of Grand Avenue will be widened, and a six-foot, solid wood fence will be installed in the back of the property as is required of all businesses locating in the Conversion Corridor. This would prohibit the business from using the alley as an access. Mike reiterated that the ingress/egress would form a loop around the property.

All other technical issues have been resolved. One phone call was received questioning the use, but not necessarily objecting to the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer asked if the driveway locations of the proposed business would interfere with those of either of its neighbors.

Mike commented that the neighbor to the east of the property had his own driveway, while the neighbor to the west has historically shared the present access with the property in question.

Commissioner Transmeier asked if the residents at 1025 Grand would be limited in their own access by this proposal.

Mike responded that they should not be affected since these residents would still maintain access through the alley.

Commissioner Stephens inquired as to why the zone change was needed.

Mike replied that although this is not an allowed use, other businesses were approved provided that they did not conflict with the residential character of the area. It was recommended by staff that the zone be changed to Planned Business (PB), and the final plan be submitted to staff for approval.

Commissioner Stephens wondered if this was the only Planned Business zoning in the area.

Mike pointed out some B-1 and B-2 zoned businesses located in the nearby area, but that this proposal would be the only Planned Business zone for this block.

Discussion ensued on the surrounding business uses between staff and the commissioners.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Steve Landman, 820 Hill Avenue, the current owner of the property felt that Grand Avenue is rapidly deteriorating from a residential area into a more business-oriented area. He thought that the use was not only appropriate for the area, but would actually improve the area since he understood there was to be landscaping and improvements made to the property through minor remodeling. Steve indicated that the petitioners would be leasing a portion of the building back to him for continuation of his counseling center.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if the counseling would be done in the evenings.

Steve responded that he does have Wednesday evening counseling for groups of up to 15 persons. On this evening there tends to be some competition with the Nazarene Church for parking in front of the property; however, parking is available along the street up to 11th Street in addition to parking in the rear. During the day, he continued, traffic generated includes approximately one vehicle per hour.

AGAINST:

There were no comments against the proposal.

STAFF REBUTTAL

Mike mentioned that the DDA board meeting, scheduled for April 4th, would be discussing this proposal as well as the viability of continuing the conversion corridors.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Louise Pool stated that although the continuation of the counseling service was discussed, nothing definite had yet been decided.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Rush asked if holding off on the approval of this proposal pending the April 4th meeting by the DDA would create an undue hardship on the petitioner.

Louise replied that the sale of the property was contingent upon the approval of the rezone. The delay would not create any undue hardship for her, although it may present some problems for the current property owner.

Commissioner Dooley asked if the DDA was aware of this situation.

Mike responded that Gary Ferguson of the DDA indicated that he had no problem with it, but felt that the proposal should be brought up at the board meeting so that other members could be made aware of what was taking place.

Commissioner Transmeier clarified that an overall concern of the Commission would be spot zoning of this area; this had the potential for future repercussions.

Chairman O'Dwyer continued by outlining the area of the DDA's jurisdiction and said that the Commission has agreed to work with them on decisions for development within this area. He felt that the DDA should be aware of the proposal and have a chance to input before the Commission makes a decision. He agreed that the character of Grand Avenue is changing, but noted that it was still classified as a residential area. Therefore, spot zoning in a residential area was a real concern.

Commissioner Dooley asked that, if approved, would there be ample time for the DDA to look at this proposal before the City Council hearing on April 16th?

Mike responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Stephens did not think there should be spot zoning in this residential area.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #7-86, THE REZONE FROM RMF-64 TO PB, I MAKE A RECOMMENDATION WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL IN LIGHT OF THE DETERIORATION OF THE RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, THE HIGH TRAFFIC VOLUME UP AND DOWN GRAND AVENUE, AND GOING ALONG WITH THE CORRIDOR CONVERSION IDEAS THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSIONS OF TIME GONE PAST HAVE PUT FORTH IN OUR PLANNING CODE, SUBJECT TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF SUCH AS THE DRIVEWAY, THE FENCING, ETC."

Commissioner Dooley seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-2 with Commissioner Stephens and Chairman O'Dwyer opposing.

2. #9-86 CONDITIONAL USE - HOTEL/RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE

Petitioner: Pancho's Villa, Rod and Michelle Smith
Location: 801 North 1st Street

Consideration of a conditional use.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Larry Dowd, 2660 Paradise Drive, representing the petitioner, gave a brief history of the business, stating the convenience store was being phased out in lieu of the restaurant. Further improvements were desired for the restaurant and it was felt that a liquor license was important in order to retain present, and attract new, customers.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dunivent questioned the safety factor in the backing out of cars onto 1st Street.

Larry pointed out that the petitioners did not own the building and could not make a decision regarding the alteration of parking in front of the building. Also, he felt that the 13 parking spaces were ample, and that they had been there for many years. In addition, parking was available in the back of the building.

Commissioner Dunivent said that this still did not answer the concern for safety in backing onto 1st Street; a risk was being taken by the person backing out since, at the current angle of the parking, there was no clear view of traffic on 1st Street.

Larry agreed with this point but did not feel the problem was as serious as was implied. He was not aware of a problem of accidents as a result of this parking.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike gave a brief overview of the proposal. All concerns, with the exception of the parking problem, were addressed. Don Newton, City Engineer, had done some measuring of the parking area and found that, although the best alternative would be to convert this angled parking into parallel parking, the second best alternative would be to increase the angle to 35o.

Don Newton, City Engineer, expressed serious concerns over the parking situation and couldn't understand why the current parking arrangement was approved in the first place. The building to the north, he continued, totally blocked the view of traffic from 1st Street. He pointed out that four accidents had occurred in 1984 as a result of the present situation. The preferred alternative was to modify the angle to 35o - 40o, but this would eliminate approximately four spaces.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Cecelia Chronis, 555 Normandy, who is the property owner, said that a permit was given to put in a new parking lot last September. She couldn't understand why the sudden urgency to change it. Although she wanted to see the liquor license approved, she did not feel that parking spaces should be deleted. This action would affect the other tenants as well and felt that it may jeopardize the occupancy of the building.

AGAINST:

There were no comments against the proposal.

STAFF REBUTTAL

After discussion between the commissioners, staff and the petitioner, it was determined that the permit which was received came from the Engineering Department was probably a type of right-of-way permit. Don Newton agreed that a permit had been issued for the resurfacing work performed in September, but that the parking issue had not been addressed at that time.

Mike told Ms. Chronis that it was the intent of the Commission to try and rectify potential problems.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Larry reiterated that the petitioners do not own the building. Therefore, they do not have any control over the parking situation, and Ms. Chronis has already stated that they are opposed to deleting any of the present spaces.

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer noted that there is not adequate signage indicating additional parking in the rear of the building. He felt that signage should be improved.

Commissioner Stephens asked that if the liquor license was contingent upon a satisfactory parking arrangement, would the petitioners oppose the action (thereby forfeiting the liquor license)?

Larry said that any agreement made by the petitioners would be subject to the final approval of the property owners, and they have already expressed opposition to the idea.

Commissioner Rush empathized with the petitioners' situation, but said that there was still an overriding concern for public safety. She felt that giving up four spaces was not that much to ask to achieve this goal.

Larry did not agree with this position and said that people were paying close attention to their backing out onto 1st Street.

Commissioner Dooley acknowledged the petitioners' attempt at resolving this problem with the property owners and asked if he could see any other alternative.

Larry felt that there was no other alternative.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #9-86, CONDITIONAL USE, HOTEL/RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE, I RECOMMEND THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO MODIFICATIONS OF THE PARKING TO ALLOW BACKING WITHOUT DIRECTLY ENTERING THE TRAFFIC ON 1ST STREET AS SUGGESTED BY THE CITY ENGINEER."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-2, with Commissioner Dooley and Chairman O'Dwyer opposing.

3. #2-86 ZONE OF ANNEXATION - BELLA VISTA #1

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike presented a brief overview of the proposal, saying that the area had been newly annexed and the proposed zoning requested was the lowest density available and appropriate for uses presently in this area.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked if this area was developed.

Mike replied that it consisted mainly of vacant land, with only one or two structures.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-86, ZONE OF ANNEXATION - BELLA VISTA #1, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

4. #6-86 TEXT AMENDMENT TO DELETE CHAPTER 3 AND READOPT A NEW CHAPTER 3 TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Department

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike said that this proposal would take the present Chapter 3 out of the Zoning and Development Code and, since it contained policies, goals and objectives, would be made a part of the Comprehensive Plan. He felt that this was a more appropriate place for this chapter.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked if by doing this it would make the guidelines more flexible.

Mike felt that it would be based on past experience with the Corridor Guidelines.

Commissioner Rush questioned whether, if approved, the Commission simultaneously approve it for adoption to the Comprehensive Plan?

Mike said that this could not be done, since the Comprehensive Plan must be considered separately.

Karl Metzner from the Planning Department said that in eliminating this chapter from the Code, the Commission would not be eliminating the concept; the policies, goals and objectives would still remain valid as approved by the City, but they would just be located in a more practical area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #6-86, TEXT AMENDMENT TO DELETE CHAPTER 3 AND READOPT A NEW CHAPTER 3, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ONTO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

5. #108-78 NORTH AVENUE CORRIDOR GUIDELINES

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

6. #10-86 25 ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

7. #11-86 24 ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

8. #12-86 HIGHWAY 50 CORRIDOR GUIDELINES

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

9. #3-86 ADOPTION OF 29 ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike gave a brief overview of each of the corridor guidelines and said that all recommended changes had been incorporated into the present versions of the guidelines.

Chairman O'Dwyer opened the hearing of these corridor guidelines to the public for comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

John Gamble, 173 - 29 1/2 Road, asked if the 29 Road Corridor Guideline pertained to the area south of the river, and if so, were there any changes.

Chairman O'Dwyer commented that these guidelines affect only the area within the City's jurisdiction and that the Orchard Mesa area would fall within County jurisdiction.

Mike gave Mr. Gamble a copy of the 29 Road Corridor Guidelines for reference and pointed out a statement within the guidelines which says that if the 29 Road bridge was constructed, annexation of that area into the City would possibly occur. If that happened, a revision of the present guidelines would be necessary.

Commissioner Transmeier also noted that if Mr. Gamble wanted further information, he should watch for the consideration of the County's Transportation Plan which would be coming up soon.

Commissioner Dooley asked where the guidelines would go from here.

Mike replied that they would be considered (without graphics) by the Growth and Planning Committee (April 8th), and then on to the City Council (April 16th).

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #108-78, NORTH AVENUE CORRIDOR GUIDELINE, I MAKE A RECOMMENDATION WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL AS OF THE 3/24/86 REVISED VERSION WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-86, THE 25 CORRIDOR GUIDELINE AS OF THE 3/24/86 REVISED VERSION, I MAKE A MOTION WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #11-86, 24 ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES, I MAKE A MOTION WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS OF THE 3/24/86 REVISED VERSION."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #12-86, THE HIGHWAY 50 CORRIDOR GUIDELINES, I MAKE A MOTION WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS OF THE 3/24/86 REVISED VERSION."

Commissioner Dooley seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #13-86, THE ADOPTION OF THE 29 ROAD CORRIDOR GUIDELINES, I MAKE A MOTION WE SEND THIS TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL ON THE 3/24/86 REVISED VERSION."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

IV. NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.