

*Nova
City Clerk*

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- October 7, 1986
7:35 p.m. - 9:20 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Bill O'Dwyer at 7:35 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------|
| Ross Transmeier | Susan Rush |
| Miland Dunivent | Karen Madsen |
| Bill O'Dwyer, Chairman | |

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department, was:

Mike Sutherland

Kathy Portner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 11 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 2ND TO BE ACCEPTED AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

1. **ROBERT N. McMILLAN**

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike explained this was a request for a variance to chapter 5 of the Zoning and Development Code, and, as such, required a recommendation by the Planning Commission to the City Council with no public hearing. Mr. McMillan was asking to vary the height allowance on a front yard fence from 4 feet to 5 feet. A letter had been submitted from Mr. McMillan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. McMillan, 1603 N. 15th St., explained how the character of his neighborhood had changed over the years. Across the street is Paddock's meat packing with 6 to 10 foot fences. The house north-east of his has a 4 foot fence on a 18 inch foundation. There are a lot of kids that hang out in the neighborhood. He's afraid his dog would jump a 4 foot fence if provoked by the kids. So, he feels he needs a 5 foot fence to keep his dog in and the kids out.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked if it would be chain link with slats.

Mr. McMillan responded that it would be an open chain link fence.

Mike clarified that the zoning on Mr. McMillan's property was RSF-8 and that a 6 foot fence would be allowed along Texas Ave. only to the front yard setback.

Commissioner Rush asked if this type of variance had been granted in the past.

Mike knew of none in the last 3 1/2 years.

Commissioner Rush asked what was the intent of the 4 foot height limitation on front yard fences.

Mike speculated it was to keep the fronts of houses visible from the street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman O'Dwyer asked for public comment even though it was not a public hearing.

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

Commissioner Rush commented that the Code is not intended to solve social problems. She recognized that Mr. McMillan's situation may be unique, but also felt the the problem was not permanent. She felt this would be an unwise precedent to set.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE DENY MR. McMILLAN'S REQUEST FOR A FENCE HEIGHT VARIANCE."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Chairman O'Dwyer opposing.

Mike clarified to Mr. McMillan that this was a recommendation by Planning Commission and the item would be scheduled for City Council on October 15th.

III. HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

1. #29-85 HELICOPTER OPERATIONS GUIDELINES

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Department
Consideration of Helicopter Operations Guidelines.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike explained that these are guidelines and should not be construed as regulation. He explained how the guidelines were written and briefly described the contents.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Rush, referencing section 2c, asked why emergency facilities were not just excepted from the requirements.

Mike responded that the intent is to have those facilities meet the guidelines if at all possible.

Commissioner Rush suggested that FAA Circulars referenced should indicate the most recent update.

Mike responded that the updated Circulars kept the same titles.

Commissioner Rush, referencing section 3h, suggested that the reference to the Grand Junction topographic quad be changed to the appropriate quad to allow for areas that may be annexed.

Chairman O'Dwyer felt there was a need to established minimum distances between heliports/pads, and that distance should be included in section 2a.

Mike responded that the Council Growth and Planning Committee had rejected that suggestion but the new committee may not. However, distance requirements could still be addressed through the Conditional Use process.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Mike Fergione, of Mountain Bell, stated that putting a minimum distance restriction between heliport/pads would limit existing industrial areas to 1 facility. He said the noise assessment requirement included in this draft takes the distance into account by measuring cumulative impact.

Chairman O'Dwyer commented that he would like to see any new industrial development restricted to 1 facility.

AGAINST:

Paula Hildebrandt, 2522 F 1/2 Road, felt the safety of people, especially children, should be considered when determining safe distances for heliports/pads.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #29-85 THE HELICOPTER OPERATIONS GUIDELINES, I MOVE WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE ADDITION UNDER SECTION 2A3 OF 'NO HELI-PORT OR HELIPAD SHOULD BE LOCATED CLOSER THAN 2500 FEET TO ANY OTHER HELI-PORT/PAD'."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Rush felt the number of flights, not the distance between facilities, was the critical factor.

Commissioner Transmeier said his intent was to encourage shared facilities.

Commissioner Rush agreed and suggested the motion should reflect that intent.

REVISED MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #29-85 THE HELICOPTER OPERATIONS GUIDELINES, I MOVE WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE ADDITION UNDER SECTION 2A3 OF 'ONE COMMON USE HELI-PORT/PAD PER INDUSTRIAL AREA SHOULD BE ENCOURAGE'."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

2. #6-86 TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE - 1986

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Department

Consideration of Text Amendments.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike went over the proposed changes.

"A request to amend Section 4-3-4 (Use/Zone Matrix) of the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code as follows:

- Under the general category of Retail Business - Unlimited, Outside
 - To allow automobiles/pickup trucks/vans as "S" in H.O.
 - To allow recreational vehicles & equipment as "C" in H.O.
 - To allow mobile homes as "C" in C-1 and H.O.
- Under the general category of Industrial Storage - Outside
 - To allow concrete products storage and pipe storage as "C" in I-1

A request to amend Chapter 13, Definitions of the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code:

- Amending the definition of JUNK YARD as follows:

JUNK YARD

A land area used for the storage, sale or abandonment of junk metals, glass, paper or other waste, including the dismantling, demolition, collection, crushing or bailing of the waste materials AND THE DISMANTLING, DEMOLITION, OR ABANDONMENT OF AUTOMOBILES OR OTHER MACHINERY OR PARTS THEREOF. The term "Junk Yard" shall include "Wrecking Yard" and "Salvage Yard".

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dunivent pointed out that the term "mobile home" was to be changed to "manufactured housing".

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #6-86 TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE - 1986, A REQUEST TO AMEND SECTION 4-3-4 AND CHAPTER 13, I MOVE WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO CHANGING THE TERM MOBILE HOME TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING."

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

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

3. #2-86 ZONE OF ANNEXATION 1986

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction
Location: West along Highway 6 & 50 from North Ave. projected to Mesa Mall and along 25 Road from Independent Ave. to Patterson Road.

Consideration of Zone of Annexation.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-86 ZONE OF ANNEXATION 1986, I MOVE WE TABLE IT."

Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Raymond Cole, 3376 C Road, asked if the area had already been annexed.

Mike answered that it had.

Don Starks, Carbondale, owns property at 2512 E 1/4 Road. He felt the proposed H.O. zoning was not appropriate for his property because it is not directly on the highway. He expressed concern over being able to sell his property when any change of use must go to public hearing. He would prefer the C2 zone. Because his building has been empty for the last year, there is not a previous use to be "grandfathered" in.

Mike clarified the "grandfather" clause and suggested Mr. Starks may have a good argument against the H.O. zoning since his property was not on the highway.

Commissioner Transmeier agreed with Mr. Starks that C-2 zoning would be more appropriate.

Jean Starks, Carbondale, showed photographs of their property. She pointed out they have a very nice building and the property is kept up well.

IV. HEARING ON ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

1. #17-85 REVISED FINAL PLAN FOR MOUNTAIN BELL HELIPORT

Petitioner: Mt. Bell, Mike Fergione
Location: 2524 Blichmann Ave. (formerly known as Foresight Ave.)

Consideration of a Revised Final Plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike Fergione, Mountain Bell, had nothing to add to the application.

STAFF PRESENTATION

This item was presented on June 25, 1985 to the Planning Commission. Mt. Bell was given temporary approval until the City could develop some helicopter guidelines. Mt. Bell agreed to the stipulation that any guidelines that were developed would be retroactive to their proposal.

Mt. Bell's heliport does not meet the minimum distance guideline of 750 feet from any residence, but the calculated noise levels are well within the limits set forth in the guidelines.

Mt. Bell has agreed to do extensive landscaping and buffering to mitigate noise and dust problems. They have also closed the access onto F 1/2 Road.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked if Mountain Bell had been operating the helicopter facility since June of 1985.

Mike Fergione responded that they had been landing helicopters since June of 1985 and operating the heliport since Sept. of 1985.

Commissioner Rush asked if the estimated number of flights, 25 per aircraft per month, was accurate.

Mr. Fergione said the average number of flights had been kept at that number or fewer. He added that Mountain Bell had had two helicopters operating for a while.

Commissioner Rush asked if that number indicated the number of landings and takeoffs at the heliport only or included those at the helipad also.

Mr. Fergione clarified that number indicated use at the heliport only. He estimated the total number of landings and takeoffs for the whole facility to be about 35 per aircraft per month.

Chairman O'Dwyer asked what the total number of landings was for the whole facility.

Mr. Fergione responded that there are not always two aircraft stationed at the facility. He estimated there are a total of 40 landings per month at their facility at Foresight Park.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

AGAINST

Edna Wanzer, 2520 F 1/2 Road, said she feels the same way she did 1 1/2 years ago about the proposed facility. She felt it is not an appropriate area for a heliport since the surrounding area is proposed for high density residential uses. She explained that the noise and the odor was a problem. Mrs. Wanzer did indicate that Mountain Bell had been very cooperative with the neighbors.

Paula Hildebrandt, 2522 F 1/2 Road, again stated her concern with the safety of people, especially children, in the neighborhood.

Herb and Trudy High, 2524 F 1/2 Road, had submitted a letter of concern over the proposed heliport. The High's felt this was not an appropriate area for that type of use. They suggested Mountain Bell should use the airport for their helicopter facility.

QUESTIONS

Mike asked Mountain Bell about their landscaping plans.

Mike Fergione said they are proposing a 6 foot high earth berm with evergreen trees on top to extend the length of their property on F 1/2 Road. This will substantially lower the noise levels. The noise assessments were done not taking into account the earth berm. The resulting noise levels were less than 1/2 the levels allowed by the EPA.

Commissioner Rush asked if they could require a site plan from Mountain Bell before final approval or the issuance of building permits.

Bob Henderson of Mountain Bell said they did have a site plan drawn up and would provide that to the Planning Department.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #17-85 REVISED FINAL PLAN FOR MOUNTAIN BELL HELIPORT, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE PROPOSAL CONTINGENT ON THE LANDSCAPING AND SITE PLAN BEING SUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT FOR APPROVAL, WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF A DUST-FREE SURFACE AND THAT THE FACILITY FALLS UNDER THE HELICOPTER GUIDELINES."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

V. NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

NOMINATION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I NOMINATE COMMISSIONER RUSH AS OUR NEW CHAIRPERSON."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the nomination.

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

NOMINATION: (CHAIRMAN O'DWYER) I NOMINATE COMMISSIONER MADSEN AS OUR NEW VICE CHAIRPERSON."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the nomination.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.