

4

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- March 26, 1985
7:30 p.m. - 8:15 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:

Warren Stephens	Susan Rush
Ross Transmeier	Mike Dooley
Karen Madsen	Miland Dunivent
Bill O'Dwyer, Chairman	

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department was:

Bob Goldin

Due to the absence of Terri Troutner, Bob Goldin recorded the minutes.

There were three interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

* * * * *

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 6TH AS PRESENTED TO US."

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Commissioner Rush advised the other Commission members and Planning staff that she would not be present for the Special Hearing scheduled for April 2, 1985.

III. FULL HEARING

1. #6-85A INDEPENDENCE PLAZA - MINOR SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Gerald M. Greenberg

Location: Approximately 500' north of Independent Avenue and west of 25 1/2 Road.

Consideration of a Minor Subdivision

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representing the Petitioner, gave an overview of the proposal. Some of the points he brought out were that the surrounding properties were zoned C-2, that it would be subdivided into five lots, each varying in size. Utilities were said to be presently available with two points of access; one along 25 1/2 Road and one off of Independent Avenue.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob indicated that Public Service may request a change in one of the easements at a later date since they did not want the present easement cutting through the lot. A utilities composite should be submitted to the City Engineer to ensure that no discrepancies exist. A fire hydrant is to be included on the property once the site is approved.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dunivent asked for clarification on whether the change in easement would affect the current easement or become a new one.

Tom Logue responded that this would be a new easement.

Bob Goldin said that there was some question as to the escrowing of funds vs. obtaining a Power of Attorney, but that it would be up to City Council to decide.

Commissioner Rush wanted to know if all the drainage considerations had been taken care of.

Commissioner Transmeier questioned the use of independent collection as opposed to local collection.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER STEPHENS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #6-85A INDEPENDENCE PLAZA-MINOR SUBDIVISION, I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THE MOTION WE FORWARD THIS ONTO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

2. #6-85B REZONE C2 TO C1

Petitioner: Gerald M. Greenberg

Location: Approximately 500' north of Independent Avenue and west of 25 1/2 Road.

Consideration of rezone.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representing the Petitioner, once again gave a brief overview of the proposal, stating that at the present time, there was a day care center located on Lot 1 of the property and that a contract to purchase the center had been submitted. He also asked for a differentiation between the two zones.

Bob Goldin replied that a day care facility would be allowed under a C-1 zoning but would not be allowed under the current C-2 zoning.

Tom asked if this use was allowed for a building that was already located on the site.

Bob responded affirmatively, but the church building which was being referred to was a non-conforming use. With a straight zone request, a site plan is not normally submitted with the rezone petition.

Tom projected that Phase I, remodeling of the building, would occur this summer with Phase II, a 3,000 sq. foot addition with site improvements, occurring approximately one year from the completion of Phase I.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dunivent asked if the paving and parking concerns would be addressed during the second phase.

Tom made reference to the existing parking area on a map which was provided. He stated that during construction a parking lot tends to deteriorate; therefore, new parking accommodations would be postponed until future phases. He did point out that at present time, there were 10 available spaces, whereby the state only required 8 or 9.

Chairman O'Dwyer felt that stacking of spaces may become a problem since there would be many cars delivering and picking up children.

Commissioner Madsen questioned the number of children to be taken care of in the facility.

Tom replied that currently there were 15-16 children being cared for but that a maximum of 30 could be accommodated when the new addition was built.

Commissioner Madsen asked if there were plans to expand the playground and fill the pond.

Tom responded that with the construction of Phase II, an agreement would be made with the ditch company to fill the pond, terrace and grade the area, and maintain a 20' easement.

Commissioner Dunivent asked if the rezone request was being made for only Lot 1.

Tom clarified that the Petitioner wanted to expand but that she may need to sell the property; she wanted the flexibility of a C-1 zoning as opposed to Planned Development.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Rush, Tom Logue and Commissioner Stephens on the vehicular access south on 25 1/2 Road.

Bob stated that this proposal went to the City Engineer for review.

Commissioner Stephens asked if this was required.

Bob stated that it was and read the review agency comment.

Chairman O'Dwyer asked if the Commission members wanted to wait until they could check on this point, to which the members declined, but stipulated that the motion be subject to staff reviews.

Commissioner Stephens felt that the drainage calculations should be checked.

Commissioner Rush questioned the use of signage warning motorists of children present.

Bob gave a brief history of the current project and the role the Petitioner has in this business. He felt that verification should be made of the fire hydrant and include "...subject to staff comments" in the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER STEPHENS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #6-85B, REZONE C-2 TO C-1, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ONTO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL FOR THE REZONE OF LOT 1, PROVIDING THAT ALL CONCERNS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED AND SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS"

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

The meeting was recessed at 8:15 p.m. to be continued on April 2, 1985 at 7:30 p.m.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- April 2, 1985
7:35 p.m. - 7:55 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Bill O'Dwyer at 7:35 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium. It was explained that this was a continuance of the March 26th public hearing.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| Karen Madsen | Miland Dunivent |
| Ross Transmeier | Mike Dooley |
| Bill O'Dwyer, Chairman | |

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department was:

Bob Goldin

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

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

* * * * *

(Due to the nature of the hearing, no approval of minutes nor presentation of visitors was made.)

III. FULL HEARING

**1. #7-85 REZONE H.O. TO P.C. AND FINAL PLAN AND PLAT - CH4
COMMERCIAL PARK (FILING #2)**

Petitioner: Bruce Currier
Location: NW of Horizon Drive and south of H Road.

Consideration of rezone, final plan and final plat.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jeff Ollinger, representing the petitioner, began with an overview of the project. Responding to the review agency comments, he stated that the use would conform to other uses in the area. Also, with regard to the property being located within the airport's zone of influence, an avigation easement would be provided. All codes would be conformed with. Jeff continued that the plan brought before the Commission was somewhat hypothetical and subject to revision; the final revised proposal would be brought back at a later date for approval. Strict covenants outlining design features of the lots would be adhered to.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dunivent questioned the provisions for landscaping.

Jeff replied that landscaping would be covered upon the final detailed plans to be submitted at a later date, but would be in compliance with the attached covenants as well as those requirements made by the City.

Chairman O'Dwyer commented that the proposal indicated that there would be plating of metals, and chemicals used in this process were toxic. The project would be setting above a canal which furnishes a good many residents in the Valley with water. He was concerned that proper steps be taken, upon approval, to guard against the possibility of accidental contamination. As well, shaley soil existed in this area and if those chemicals went under the canal, they would pose a drainage hazard which would eventually lead to the river.

In addition to this concern, it was noted that there was a large amount of open space to the northwest. There was some concern that a fence might be put up to house a large quantity of junk, and that since this proposal is located in an area of entrance into the City, this would be discouraged for aesthetic reasons. Landscaping should surely be accommodated.

Commissioner Transmeier reaffirmed Chairman O'Dwyer's comments, stating that without final details of the project, it was hard to foresee the plans of the petitioner. Therefore, these points were being brought up at this time.

Jeff reiterated the concerns over landscaping would definitely be addressed as a major issue by the petitioner upon presentation of final details. Regarding hazardous waste, disposal of liquid waste would be handled through a cooperative effort by the petitioner and the City's wastewater treatment plant; solid waste would be stored in containers located in pits with a positive monitoring system as a part of regular maintenance. Further details would be provided at a later date.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin requested that, as a stipulation to approval of the final plat, that the covenants be recorded with those lots to ensure compliance of the petitioner and provide a backup to the City. In considering specific details of construction plans of the rezoned and final plan, it was requested that final details be submitted as part of the approval process and reviewed, then approved by the various City review agencies to ensure compliance with all applicable codes. Assessment or waiver of any fees would be determined by the City Council. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, a document would be required stating that all concerns and issues were addressed and approved by the various

review agencies. Bob continued that the proposal would serve as a buffer between the airport property and the commercial uses south of the Highline Canal, and once the issues had been addressed, there were no further problems with the proposal.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Mr. Currier, the petitioner, voiced his approval for the project from the audience.

AGAINST:

There were no comments against the proposal.

Commissioner Dooley reaffirmed that a stipulation be added to the motion whereby prior to the issuance of any building permit, that all issues be addressed and approved by the review agencies.

Commissioner Transmeier added that upon approval of this proposal, if it is not built according to required guidelines, it may be reverted by the Commission after one year. It was therefore encouraged that the petitioner submit further details in a timely manner to avoid this possibility.

A motion was requested in consideration of the rezone.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #7-85 REZONE H.O. TO P.C. AND FINAL PLAN AND PLAT - CH4 COMMERCIAL PARK (FILING #4), I MOVE THAT (IN CONSIDERATION OF THE REZONE) PRIOR TO THE ISSUING OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT, THAT ALL PLANS BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING STAFF AND OTHER REVIEW AGENCIES FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION. IF NOT APPROVED FOR THIS PROJECT WITHIN A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR, THE ZONING WILL STAY AS IS, AND THAT WE FORWARD THIS ONTO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

A motion was requested for consideration of the final plan.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #7-85 REZONE H.O. TO P.C. AND FINAL PLAN AND PLAT - CH4 COMMERCIAL PARK (FILING #4), I MOVE THAT (IN CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL PLAN) PRIOR TO THE ISSUING OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT, THAT ALL PLANS BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING STAFF AND OTHER REVIEW AGENCIES FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION. IF NOT APPROVED FOR THIS PROJECT WITHIN A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR, THE ZONING WILL STAY AS IS. ALSO, THAT CONCERNING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SUFFICIENT PROTECTION FROM SPILLS AND CONTAMINATION BE REQUIRED AND PROPER STORAGE AND RETENTION OF SUCH HAZARDOUS MATERIALS BE MADE WITH REVIEW AGENCIES PAYING SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THIS REQUIREMENT AND THAT WE FORWARD THIS ONTO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

Bob Goldin questioned whether a stipulation should be added to ensure that the covenants of the two lot subdivision were recorded.

Chairman O'Dwyer replied that since the petitioner has already indicated that this would be done, it would be left up to them.

A motion was requested in consideration of the final plat.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #7-85 REZONE H.O. TO P.C. AND FINAL PLAN AND PLAT - CH4 COMMERCIAL PARK (FILING #4), I MOVE THAT (IN CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL PLAT) PRIOR TO THE ISSUING OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT, THAT ALL PLANS BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING STAFF AND OTHER REVIEW AGENCIES FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION. IF NOT APPROVED FOR THIS PROJECT WITHIN A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR, THE ZONING WILL STAY AS IS. ALSO, THAT CONCERNING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SUFFICIENT PROTECTION FROM SPILLS AND CONTAMINATION BE REQUIRED AND PROPER STORAGE AND RETENTION OF SUCH HAZARDOUS MATERIALS BE MADE WITH REVIEW AGENCIES PAYING SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THIS REQUIREMENT AND THAT WE FORWARD THIS ONTO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

Before the meeting was adjourned, Bob Goldin announced that the annual extension/reversion hearing will be held on April 30, 1985.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.