

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
Public Hearing -- August 28, 1984  
7:30 p.m. - 9:27 p.m.

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department were:

Bob Goldin                      Karl Metzner

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 27 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chairman Transmeier called the meeting to order.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING AS PRINTED FOR JULY 31, 1984."**

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

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

Bob Goldin announced that the term of the Chairman was up and nominations for this position should be taken during tonight's meeting. Chairman Transmeier scheduled the election for the end of the meeting.

### III. FULL HEARING

#### 1. #11-84 REZONE RMF-32 TO RSF-8 OR PR-8

Petitioner: Kathy Jordan

Location: Both sides of 7th Street from Grand Avenue to Hill Avenue (7th Street Historic District)

A request to change from residential multi-family uses at 32 units per acre to single-family residential uses at 8 units per acre on approximately 6.91 acres excluding the street right-of-way. A proposal to substitute a PR (Planned Residential) zone in place of the requested RSF-8 may also be considered.

Chairman Transmeier commented that this proposal had been heard on May 29, 1984 and recommendation for approval for the RSF-8 zoning was given by the Planning Commission at that time. Since the item was sent back to the Grand Junction Planning Commission by the City Council, the City Planning Department has made a recommendation of a PR-8 zoning as an alternative to the RSF-8. Chairman Transmeier asked the planning staff to clarify the reason(s) behind this recommendation.

Karl Metzner, Director of Planning, stated that many of the residents at the City Council meeting objected to the RSF-8 zoning since it made many of the structures non-conforming. The City Council sent the proposal back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration and during this interim period, the planning staff had reevaluated the proposal. It was felt that the PR zoning would preserve the character of the area and still keep the present uses conforming.

Karl noted that since the change would be Planned Residential, changes in uses which would be primarily business would not be allowed. This would allow those home occupations, however, where the primary use remains residential.

What was being proposed, Karl continued, would be that requests for major changes of use such as the addition of dwelling units, or conversion of any structure allowed by the RMF or RSF zones, be done through an amended plan submitted to the Planning Commission for approval. This would also include the demolition of principal structures. Minor changes, such as the removal of an accessory structure or additions to the primary structure where there is no increase in density nor change in use would be handled through the City Planning Department.

#### QUESTIONS

Commissioner Rush questioned that if a daycare wanted to convert to a three story structure, would this be considered a Minor Change.

Karl responded that it may have to go through full hearing to determine if the proposed structure change would continue to reflect the character of the area. An instance of this type would be at the discretion of the Planning Department.

Chairman Transmeier asked how the procedure for changing an existing structure in an RSF-8 zone would differ from the same request for change in a PR zone.

Karl answered that the only real difference was that under a PR zone, major changes would be required to go through an amended plan process which would be easier and less expensive. Otherwise, the procedures were similar.

Chairman Transmeier asked if a multi-family structure were to be destroyed, could it be rebuilt.

Karl pointed out that this question was a major concern to many of the residents and owners of these multi-family structures since under the RSF-8 zoning, if such a structure was destroyed over 50%, it could not be rebuilt as a multi-family structure. Under a PR zoning, since the existing uses would be allowed uses, a structure could be rebuilt to its original density or less.

Mike Dooley wanted to know if the residents were made fully aware that if the PR-8 zoning was passed, it would not affect the current property values.

Karl felt that this was the case.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

##### **FOR THE PROPOSAL:**

Homer Moody, 416 Lilac Lane, was for the compromise of a Planned Residential zoning.

Audrey Thompson, 726 North 7th Street, spoke out in favor of the Planned Residential zoning.

##### **AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:**

Fern Cook, 737 Ouray Avenue, did not like the idea of multi-family residences in this area as she felt that owners of such residences did not take pride in their structures and keep them in good condition. She passed around pictures of several of the multi-family residences to Planning Commission members which she thought indicated this point. She was also concerned about the number of vehicles which would be traveling this area and cited a problem she experienced in the exhaust fumes coming into her residence from the parking lot at the First Baptist Church.

Jay Brodell, 712 North 7th Street, was also opposed and wondered how any zoning change would be enforced.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

Karl stated that the Building Department had been checking on the various units and utilities being supplied to those units and any problems found were presently being resolved.

#### **QUESTIONS**

Chairman Transmeier commented that 7th Street is unique in that the residents participate in trying to affect changes in their area for the better, and also because the area is becoming a busier area with more traffic. He said also that any zone change would provide a basic guideline for the area, but that it was up to the individual residents to maintain their property.

Commissioner Rush made the comment that if this area is to be considered a historical district, it should be treated as such. She felt that more stringent standards should apply. She also felt that public input should always be kept in mind and was in favor of maintaining the prior approval of the RSF-8 zoning.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion which would either "change" or "not change" the prior approval of the RSF-8 zoning.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF FILE #11-84 REZONE FROM RMF-32, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION THAT WE AMEND OUR PREVIOUS PROPOSAL (RECOMMENDING APPROVAL FROM RMF-32 TO RSF-8) TO READ RMF-32 TO PR-8"**

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-2 with Commissioners Rush and Dooley opposing.

#### **2. #22-84 HILLTOP EMPLOYEE PARKING PLAZA-FINAL PLAN**

Petitioner: Hilltop Rehabilitation Hospital/Dennis Stahl  
Location: The northwest corner of Patterson Road and 26 3/4 Road.

A request for a final plan (parking lot) on .4 acre in a planned business zone.

## PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representing the Petitioner, began with a brief overview of the project. A neighborhood meeting was held for residents in the area and one concern expressed was that of safety for children in this area. Another concern was the current traffic situation at F Road and 26 3/4 Road.

To answer these concerns, Tom began by saying that with regards to safety, the Petitioner would like to see the parking lot built and watch to see if there might be any potential problems. If such a problem arises, or if there are further concerns about children cutting across the lot on their way to school, Hilltop has agreed to build a low rail fence along 26 3/4 Road. It was felt that with the improvements to F Road would come walkways which should alleviate this problem. Concerning the intersection at 26 3/4 Road and F Road, it was felt that problems would be eliminated as the widening of F Road was completed. A single access into the parking lot was proposed for 26 3/4 Road.

Tom proposed the project would begin next summer. Final technical issues would not be totally addressed until the vertical/horizontal alignment of F Road is completed.

## QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if the trash, etc. presently on the lot would be cleaned up.

Dennis Stahl, Bill Norris, and Henry Faussone, the Petitioners, stated that this would be taken care of.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented that the area was low and acknowledged the Petitioner's reasoning in waiting for the City Engineer's report on the elevation of the road before designing the parking lot.

Tom said that this, along with various other technical issues such as drainage, are unresolved pending receipt of this report.

Commissioner Litle asked if these were to be assigned parking stalls.

Tom answered that these were assigned to the employees at Hilltop.

Commissioner Litle pointed out two problem parking spaces on the plat and asked if the circulation could be improved.

Tom responded that this was not seen as a problem. He stated that these were designed to exceed the minimum requirements.

## **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Bob Goldin began by saying that no adverse comments were received on the proposal, and he gratefully acknowledged the Petitioners having the neighborhood meeting prior to the Planning Commission hearing. Bob did ask that the Petitioners offer of providing a split rail fence (or low level fencing) be included in the minutes.

## **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dooley asked if putting up the fence was, in fact, the intent of the Petitioner at this time, or was this to be included in the site plan and development of the property only if needed.

Tom stated that this was an alternative if there was a problem but feels that this will not be needed when the sidewalks are put in on F Road.

Bob asked if Tom knew when the sidewalks/pedestrian paths on 26 3/4 Road would be constructed.

Tom responded that this was to be done in conjunction with the owners directly to the east through a special improvement district.

Bob commented that this would not be a part of the F Road improvements.

Tom responded affirmatively.

## **PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Dennis Stahl said that, with regard to the fence, it would be used primarily as a blocking device; if gates are needed for the driveway, the fence would be put up at the same time.

Dennis continued saying that Earl Jensen, developer of Village Fair, had agreed to let Hilltop staff to use the undeveloped portion of Village Fair for parking until such time that it would be developed. Since it was unsure as to how long this would be, alternate parking plans needed to be developed.

The majority of the vehicle usage would be between 8-5 Monday through Friday with parking being minimal on weekends and in the evenings. Circulation was not felt to be a concern since if the problem parking spots could not be used, they would be taken out. Another possibility would be to assign these spaces to those persons driving sports cars or motorcycles.

## QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dooley asked if the addition of this lot would eliminate parking on the south side.

Dennis said that, most likely it would. He stated that if this was requested by the Commissioners, he would do his utmost to enforce the decision.

Commissioner Little asked if Dennis would participate in an improvement district to provide sidewalks, curbs, gutters etc. on 26 3/4 Road.

Dennis responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Dooley expressed a concern over security. He felt that pedestrian traffic would be resolved by some type of low profile retainer.

Dennis stated that stickers were currently being used on staff cars for identification purposes. Maintaining this practice would help to identify any unauthorized vehicles. Notes would then be put on these vehicles.

Dennis made one final comment on a concern which was voiced over possible additional traffic impact to 7th and 12th Streets. He felt that the traffic Hilltop would be putting there is that which is already there. No additional impact should be experienced.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

### IN FAVOR:

Henry Faussone, 3318 Crestview Way, felt that if parking was not available to Hilltop, people would end up parking in residential areas. He was in favor of the proposal.

### IN OPPOSITION:

Bill Bush, 619 Viewpoint Drive, spoke in opposition saying that it would increase traffic flow and jeopardize safety.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #22-84 HILLTOP EMPLOYEE PARKING PLAZA-FINAL PLAN FOR HILLTOP REHABILITATION, I MOVE THAT THIS BE FORWARDED TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL WITH THE SUGGESTION THAT THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPERTY COINCIDE WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF PATTERSON ROAD (F) AND THAT IF NEEDED, SOME LOW PROFILE FENCING OR SOME CONTROL BE PROVIDED."**

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**3. #16-84 (2 of 2) GRAND JUNCTION RETIREMENT RESIDENCE/MESA VIEW-FINAL PLAT AND PLAN**

Petitioner: Alfred B. Carrick

Location: Approximately 1,000 feet north of F Road and west of 7th Street.

A request for a final plat and plan of 101 units on 3.65 acres in a planned residential zone at 28 units per acre.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Tom Logue, representing the Petitioner, began by delivering a brief overview of the proposal. Since the question of the Horizon Drive extension had been resolved, that portion of the right-of-way on the plan which was adjoining the subject property. The latest plan called for extending Horizon Drive across 7th Street to the west and terminating it on the western property line which is common with the Northridge development.

It was pointed out that parking accommodations may seem inadequate but he felt this was proportionate to the number of residents who would actually be driving vehicles.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dunivent asked if the County owned property, located directly off Horizon Drive would be purchased by the developer.

Tom outlined two separate sections of land on the plat which was provided. One section belonged to the City of Grand Junction. Located between that section and the Grand Valley Canal is land owned by Mesa County. The principals are preparing a proposal to the City for a possible trade on their section. The same action would be taken with the County on their section.



Commissioner O'Dwyer asked about the 3-story structures which were shown on the latest plat; would this be a problem with the local residents.

Tom presented a map which indicated the elevation/cross-section of the third story of the proposed building in relation to the property immediately to the north. This particular property was chosen for the cross-section since it had the lowest elevation. Looking eye level from the property, one would barely see the top of the roof. It was thought that only the view of the parcel directly across the ditch would be affected.

Commissioner Little expressed a concern about so few parking spaces. He wondered if the ratio of vehicles to residents/visitors was accurately measured.

Tom explained that the amount of spaces determined was based on a comparison to other similar projects, and that this number had seemed adequate for these other projects. A ratio of one space per four residential units was used as a basis. Actually, 39 parking spaces were being provided on-site.

Alfred Carrick continued by saying that a comparison of three other projects was done. Parking was similar and worked very well.

Commissioner Little asked if the other facilities had on-street parking as well.

Alfred responded negatively.

Tom mentioned that an additional 4-5 spaces could be added if considered necessary.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented that the parking situation needed to be done right in the first place. He also expressed a concern that many of the issues were, as yet, unresolved.

Tom said that should negotiations with the City and County on the land acquisition fall through, revisions of the plat/plan could be performed, circulation could be changed, etc. and resubmitted to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Chairman Transmeier asked about access to the project. Since there was nothing indicated, would the Petitioner be responsible for building Horizon Place.

Tom responded affirmatively saying that it would be built from the end of the curb return to a point midway to the upper property line (basically half). In response to the review comments, in the interim basis during construction, a gravel emergency

access road would be built to the west parking lot. The building of the entire road was preferred but would require negotiations with the Northridge developers.

Commissioner Litle asked about the size of the units.

Tom responded that the one bedroom units were between 500-600 sq. feet and the two bedroom units were a little over 700 sq. feet.

Chairman Transmeier questioned the availability of irrigation for landscaping.

Tom replied that approximately 7 shares of water were owned.

Commissioner Stephens asked about the type of water to be furnished.

Tom said that since the City had served the parcel previously, the City's policy was to continue serving the project.

#### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Bob Goldin stated that what the Retirement Residence was requesting at this time was the use of portions of the City property (area shown on plat) for their parking lot, landscaping, and part of their frontage. Because of this, the City has asked the Petitioner to approach the idea of purchasing the County owned property for a right-of-way (Horizon Place). The City would then dedicate their portion of right-of-way to Horizon Place; the remaining portion would then be utilized for the parking lot. This would then be deeded to the Retirement Residence, going onto their tax rolls.

The City would pick up the improvements along the City/County owned frontage for 7th Street and the Retirement Residence would be responsible for their own frontage assessments.

The City Council had requested alignment of Horizon Place with the presently existing Horizon Drive. Horizon Place was so named to avoid confusion in motorists trying to find the airport.

Because of the unique nature of the project, the Petitioner was asked to put together data on the parking situation. Since Tom has said parking is generally one space per four units, and given that there are 101 units, it may present a problem. It was not known, however, what the "ideal" number would be. There will be possible parking allowances along Horizon Place since it is a local 55' street classification which allows parking on either side and two 11' driving lanes.

If the County does not agree with present negotiations the Petitioner would have to resubmit the plan with alternatives (which were unclear). It is also dependent on gaining access to

the westerly side of their property that Northridge tie into this, providing access as part of the stipulation for approval to Bud Walley's and Mildred Vandover's property.

#### **QUESTIONS**

Chairman Transmeier asked if this was done at City Council's direction.

Bob replied affirmatively saying that staff had suggested the alternative just north of Ranchman's Ditch offsetting the intersection to deter any traffic through there, but City Council decided against a malaligned intersection. Consequently, change orders have gone in for signalization and 7th Street improvements.

Commissioner Litle asked if Bob knew the parking guidelines for a similar project located on the east side of Mesa Mall.

Bob answered that because of the combination of single family and multi-family residences, this project was made to comply with the straight City regulations. Because this current Retirement Residence proposal deals with the housing of mainly ambulatory residents, it fell under a different category than the one east of Mesa Mall.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

##### **IN FAVOR:**

There were no comments in favor of the proposal.

##### **IN OPPOSITION:**

Robert Orr, 2700 G Road #12-A, felt concern over the appearance of so many unanswered questions. He also wondered why the City would take a scenic area and put in a higher density use when there were so many other high density areas around town where a project of this type could situate.

Paul Reddin, 3010 Cloverdale Court, came as a representative of the Northridge Homeowner's Association and expressed a dislike for the alignment of Horizon Drive to Horizon Place.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

Before the motion was made, however, the following comments were made.

Commissioner Litle felt that Mr. Orr's comments were valid; there were alot of "loose ends" still to be taken care of for the apparently large size of the project.

Chairman Transmeier clarified that these units are leased on a month to month basis and are not to be sold as condominiums. If the parking was not thought adequate by the residents, they would be more apt to move.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented that persons of this age group would not like to move and would put up with many inconveniences to avoid moving.

(A motion was made to table the project until the loose ends could be resolved, however, a discussion ensued on the definition of "loose ends." The following is the motion in final form.)

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT FILE #16-84 (2 OF 2) GRAND JUNCTION RETIREMENT RESIDENCE/MESA VIEW-FINAL PLAT & PLAN BE TABLED UNTIL MORE INFORMATION IS OBTAINED AND FINALIZATION OF DECISIONS IS MADE ON THE CITY/COUNTY RIGHT-OF-WAY ON HORIZON PLACE, NORTHRIDGE'S PARTICIPATION OR NON-PARTICIPATION IN THAT EXTENSION, AND SOME ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE PARKING SITUATION IS RECEIVED."**

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-2 with Commissioners Dunivent and Litle opposing.

#### **IV. NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS & VISITORS**

The election of a Planning Commission Chairman and Vice-Chairman was held.

Commissioner Litle nominated Commissioner O'Dwyer for the position of Planning Commission Chairman. No other nominations were received for this position. Commissioner O'Dwyer accepted the nomination.

**MOTION: (COMMISSION DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE NOMINATIONS CEASE AND A UNANIMOUS BALLOT BE CAST FOR MR. O'DWYER."**

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

Commissioner Rush nominated Commissioner Stephens for the position of Planning Commission Vice-Chairman. Commissioner Stephens accepted the nomination.

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the nomination passed by a vote of 6-0.

Chairman Transmeier commented that, in the past, it was determined a Chairman could not vote unless in the event of a tie. He felt that since the Chairman is also responsible for researching a project, the same voting privilege should be extended to him.

Commissioner Litle indicated a change in the by-laws would be necessary to effect a change in procedure. This would need to be done by motion.

**MOTION: (CHAIRMAN TRANSMEIER) "I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION TO AMEND THE BY-LAWS TO READ THAT THE CHAIRMAN WOULD HAVE A VOTE IN ALL ITEMS."**

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.