

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- May 28, 1985
7:30 p.m. - 9:08 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:

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department were:

Bob Goldin	Mike Sutherland
------------	-----------------

In attendance, representing the City Engineering Department was:

Darrel Lowder-ROW Agent

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 14 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE MINUTES OF THE GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ON APRIL 30, 1985 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

Note: Commissioner Stephens was not present to vote on approval of the minutes, consequently, the vote of 6-0 did not include his approval or denial.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors at this time.

III. FULL HEARING

1. #9-85 REPLAT--JACOBS COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: W.T. Hall et. al.

Location: SE corner of 24 1/2 & F Roads, appx. 400' south of F Road.

Consideration of replat.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jeff Ollinger, representing the petitioner, gave an overview of the proposal. Some of the points outlined were that the intent was to divide three lots into sixteen more marketably sized lots. It was agreed to move the fire hydrants to the west to better accommodate hydrant usage off of 24 1/2 Road. Regarding the request for variance of city street standards, it was felt that the roads adjoining this property maintained the same road sections that was being requested. Since the roads in the neighborhood were felt to be similar and the eventual users of the lots would determine where the curb cuts would be, the petitioner felt the variance was justified. Jeff stated that no on-street parking would be needed. The drainage plan offered to collect the drainage in the southern portion of the northern row of lots. A certain amount of detention was included with this. Left turn and storage lanes were proposed for southbound traffic off of 24 1/2 Road and additional turn capabilities were proposed for Commerce Blvd. on the west side.

QUESTIONS

No questions were asked of the petitioner's representative at this time.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin asked for clarification on whether the road proposed for construction in 1985 was still planned, or if the road was approved subject to meeting city standards, would it be delayed until the development of the individual lots.

Jeff responded that the petitioner still intended to build the road in 1985.

Bob also asked if the situation with Mr. Muhr had been resolved.

Jeff gave a brief history of the situation for benefit of the Planning Commission saying that Mel Muhr owned two of the lots on

the north side of the boundary. Mr. Muhr had been notified with regard to negotiations of access but as yet, nothing definite had been agreed to.

Chairman O'Dwyer commented that problems arose when putting in bridges across canals and preferred pursuing alternative accesses.

Jeff stated that Mr. Muhr had been under the impression that the canal was to be piped at that location as it relates to his property.

Bob reiterated that two of the major concerns addressed in the motion should be the Engineering Department's concern over streets meeting city standards and sidewalks, and to continue to pursue negotiations with Mr. Muhr on obtaining access.

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer noted that in the north corner of the property was located a storm sewer grate and asked where this lead. He pointed out that in looking at this on the map, it couldn't effectively drain to the north.

Jeff replied that it was assumed that the inlet would drain into Ranchman's Ditch, but since the water in the ditch was so high, this point was difficult to confirm. He thought that the inlet may, in fact, be silted in or doesn't connect. At this time, Jeff presented supporting research to indicate the problems being experienced with this point.

A discussion of this issue ensued between the Planning Commissioners and Jeff Ollinger.

Commissioner Stephens asked if the lots in question were 004 and 005, to which he received an affirmative answer.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against this proposal.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Jeff said only that regarding the request for variance of the street section, his client felt that this was based on reasonable justification.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON FILE #9-85 THE JACOBS COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND INCLUDING THE CHANGE TO CITY STANDARDS ON THE STREETS, CURB AND GUTTER WITH THE OMISSION OF SIDEWALKS ON ONE SIDE OF THE STREET; AND HOPEFULLY THE PETITIONER WILL TRY TO CONTINUE TO NEGOTIATE FOR ACCESS TO THOSE LOTS TO THE NORTH."

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

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

2. #10-85 ALLEY VACATION

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Location: West of West avenue between Grand and White Avenues.

Consideration of alleyway vacation.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Darrel Lowder, the City's Right-Of-Way Agent, stated that the alley was completely located on City property and was never actually used as an alley; it was currently being used for a parking area.

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer asked what would happen to the power line.

Darrel responded that this would remain where it was; that an easement be left to accommodate it.

Commissioner Dooley asked if there was an easement there already.

Bob Goldin replied that there wasn't because of its location in a public right-of-way, but that if the alley was vacated, it would be subject to the easement being retained.

Darrel clarified that there were no additional utilities located in this area of question.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-85 ALLEY VACATION, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ONTO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL PROVIDING THAT THE UTILITY EASEMENT FOR THE POWER LINE IS RETAINED."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

3. #54-79 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE--AMENDMENT

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

Consideration of text amendment.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike Sutherland stated that both the 7th and 12th Street Corridor policies were already adopted and they were being amended in order to provide clarity and uniformity in content with other policies.

Bob Goldin added that next month the Planning Commissioners would be provided with a text amendment to include the clarification procedures of the goals, policies and objectives of the City of Grand Junction. This is to clarify and set procedures for the interpretation of the policies.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal, however, Mr. Bernard Coulson, 2510 North 12th Street, spoke up from the audience stating that he did not receive adequate notice of the proposed changes (specifically as it relates to the 12th Street Corridor policy text amendment).

A copy of the proposed amendment was given to him for his perusal and item #4, the text amendment consideration for 12th Street was postponed until later in the hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, REGARDING ITEM #54-79 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, REQUEST TO AMEND 3-19-7 SEVENTH STREET CORRIDOR POLICY, I RECOMMEND WE SEND THAT 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 7-0.

4. #11-85 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE--ADDITION

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

Consideration of text amendment.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike Sutherland stated that the UnawEEP Corridor policy was a new policy and the intent is to keep the business activities in their present locations, thus striving to maintain the residential character of the area. Sidewalks, curbs and gutters are felt to be needed along this corridor and pedestrian safety is viewed as the highest priority.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time, however, Chairman O'Dwyer did point out that UnawEEP did present some concerns since there were two schools, a park, a public pool as well as both residential and business uses along UnawEEP. Pedestrian safety was of primary concern in this area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #11-85 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE--ADDITION IN REGARDS TO UNAWEEP AVENUE, I RECOMMEND WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Dooley seconded the motion.

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

5. #12-85 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE--ADDITION

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

Consideration of text amendment.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin again stated that this was a new text amendment. The Orchard Avenue policy is designed to accommodate both the concerns of the residents and the existing situation.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DOOLEY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #12-85 THE REQUEST TO ADD ORCHARD AVENUE CORRIDOR POLICY AS SECTION 3-19-12 OF THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THIS AND RECOMMEND THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

6. #55-79 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE--AMENDMENT

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

Consideration of text amendment.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin said that the amendment was being proposed to clarify the originally adopted 12th Street Corridor policy. Some concerns had been expressed over the intersections, and what was intended was to take the existing policy and format it around the original concerns that were adopted in the first part of 1982, rather than rewriting the entire policy.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Stephens asked if all of the concerns had been resolved.

Bob stated that it is proposed that the intersections be addressed on a site specific basis, and that he felt the concerns of the Planning Commission had been addressed.

Commissioner Stephens asked if the concerns had been addressed since last week.

Bob replied affirmatively giving example to the west side of 12th Street from Horizon Drive to G Road not being appropriate to non-residential uses.

Commissioner Stephens asked about the east side of 12th Street.

Bob responded that properties were available on the northeast corner of 12th Street and Patterson Road with planned business zoning. Southeast locations proposals would be considered on a site specific basis.

Commissioner Rush asked for clarification of the final wording on the policy from Colorado south to the Colorado River (the change).

Bob responded from the text giving the wording changes.

Commissioner Transmeier noted that the areas being addressed now extended south to the Colorado River. It was hoped that this would encourage beautification of the Colorado River area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dave McKinley, 1308 Wellington, had read the old and new policy and expressed intense concerns over the intersection of 12th Street and Patterson Road. He felt that by approving the corridor policy for 12th Street, it would be naming the policy for F Road and the intersection as well. Dave pointed out that the southeast corner of the intersection was presently the only one left undeveloped and it was the desire of the residents in that area to keep this in a residential character; it was felt that approval of the 12th Street Corridor policy without prior approval of the F Road Corridor policy was premature and the term "...on a site specific basis..." should not be used as it opens up the area near the intersection to anything which may want to locate there.

He also asked why non-residential business uses would be discouraged only to the north of 12th Street; properties to the south have expressed their interest in remaining residential in character also.

Another question with regard to the business uses that would front on 12th Street, he pointed out that the text reads that the alleys would be used as a buffer to protect the residential areas from the encroachment of business; he wanted to know if, by the business dedicating the alley, do they automatically qualify for putting their business in any location along 12th Street.

A further concern was with regard to the intersection, the term "low-volume" businesses as outlined in the formerly approved corridor policy had not yet been defined, and that no traffic study had been done at this intersection. Dave felt that the traffic volume at this intersection was underestimated and with the approval of the amended policy, it would allow any business to locate along 12th Street merely by professing itself to be a "low-volume" business. Again, it was felt that the amended policy was too general, not specific enough as to what types of business uses would be allowed.

Joe Able, 1212 Wellington, felt that people living to the south of 12th Street have been given no consideration in this matter. He wanted to know what would happen to them if this amended corridor policy was approved.

Katherine Coulson, 2510 North 12th Street, voiced her concerns over the intersection of 12th and Patterson. She also felt the traffic at this intersection was underestimated, and would only become worse with the start-up of Sundstrand. She was opposed to any high traffic volume business being located in this area, and expressed her wish for clarity of the business use statement.

Commissioner Transmeier answered one of Dave McKinley's concerns saying that the Hodges property at 12th Street and Walnut was the first to bring about the need for a definition on the alley buffering question. The 300' depth figure was felt to be an arbitrary number.

Dave interjected that this was not the question, but whether a business could have the location if they dedicate the alley.

Commissioner Transmeier responded that this was a logical conclusion, but it would be up to the City to accept or reject the offer of the alley dedication.

Commissioner Dooley reiterated that this was not the intent of the policy.

Bob Goldin stated that this point can be reworded to clarify the intent.

Commissioner Transmeier continued saying that with regard to Dave's earlier question of consideration of properties located south of 12th Street, the difference was that the street improvements were already in next to those properties, so it was perceived that this area was a higher traffic volume area.

Dave felt that not having an F Road policy was still a critical issue, and that this should be approved before the approval of the intersecting policies.

Commissioner Transmeier agreed with the point made on the absence of specificity regarding the "site-specific" term in the policy. He felt that this should be reworded and addressed as being more specific in the wording.

Commissioner Stephens clarified to the audience that what was being considered was not a zoning issue but a policy issue.

Maryanne Lafferty, 1404 Wellington, requested clarification on what the exact changes were that were being proposed as well as a reason to why this was being done.

Commissioner Transmeier answered by saying that this was primarily for consistency, and that efforts have been made to try to incorporate those concerns expressed by the neighborhood residents.

Bob Goldin explained that an effort was being made to ensure that all the policies throughout the City were consistent and as clear as possible in both intent and format.

Commissioner Rush also stated that the area south of Colorado Avenue was being addressed which had not been addressed in the formerly adopted policy.

Bob Goldin clarified that the F Road policy did go before the City Council for approval, and they tabled any action. It was decided that the F Road policy would be held back, making sure it complied with the intersecting policies. It was not the intent of the Planning Commission to bring all of the policies to the City Council at once, but those policies of F Road, 1st Street, 7th Street, and 12th Street approved at one time with the remaining corridor policies being brought up for consideration at another time. Display ads announcing these items would be forthcoming when they are to be scheduled for the City Council agenda.

Mike Sutherland made the comment that by leaving the area open to the definition of "site-specific," it would mean that anything being proposed would have to come before the Planning Commission for consideration, therefore, it would give the residents in the area much more control on what goes in.

Dave reiterated that the main issue, he felt, was that no one has effectively estimated the volume of traffic to be experienced at the intersection of 12th and Patterson, and that there was no specific use designation for this area based upon this traffic volume.

Mike Sutherland again expressed encouragement of future low-volume businesses in this area.

Bernard Coulson requested a definition of the term low-volume, but at this time, none could be given.

Commissioner Transmeier proposed wording the policy to read that higher traffic volume businesses be allowed at these intersections (this received much dissention from the audience).

A discussion of this proposal ensued and the following motion was made.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER STEPHENS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE THE MOTION THAT WE TABLE THIS PROPOSAL UNTIL FURTHER DEFINITION OF THE POLICY CAN BE MADE."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

IV. NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS AND VISITORS

At this time Mike Fergione, pilot and representative of Mtn. Bell, made himself available to answer questions presented to him by the Planning Department on the Mtn. Bell request for a heliport located at 2524 N. Foresight Avenue.

Mike brought a topographical map for inspection by the Planning Commission and Bob Goldin aided in the location of the proposed heliport on the map. He stated that approximately 90% of the time he would be approaching from the east and departing from the west, and therefore, would not conflict with any proposed developments lying to the north. The aircraft would be at 300' prior to descent. He felt that this heliport would be in a prime location because of its location in a large open area.

Chairman O'Dwyer asked if there was any problem experienced with the antennas in the area.

Mike replied that the only large antenna within the area was that located in Foresight Park (241' elev.) and that the helicopters would be well above that when passing to the north. No operations were intended to the south, and the only other antenna nearby would be located near St. Mary's hospital and would not pose any problem.

Chairman O'Dwyer further asked if there would be any interference to the antennas created by the helicopters.

Mike felt that the only possible interference may be between KJCT and Lands End where there was a microwave system in effect.

Commissioner Transmeier asked if there would be problems with the power lines.

Mike replied that they were closer than what would have been considered ideal, but even when grounded, the helicopters would be approximately 300' from the lines.

Commissioner Stephens requested clarification of Mtn. Bell's request.

Mike responded that it was their request to maintain this as a heliport instead of a helipad and stated that by doing this, it would cut down on the number of landings and departures by 50%.

Commissioner Transmeier wanted to know how many helicopters would be located at this location.

Mike answered, two, with the maximum, on occasion, of three.

Chairman O'Dwyer questioned whether Mtn. Bell would be willing to share the use of this heliport with other businesses.

Mike responded that it was Mtn. Bell's wish that this be retained as a private facility, due to conflicts in insurance requirements and not being familiar with the pilot's flying abilities of other businesses; he felt that there would be a safety concern and pose too great a risk. He stated that there may be another helicopter flying in occasionally from Denver that would be using the facility.

Chairman O'Dwyer asked if this would be the type used for construction purposes--if there would be any sling loads.

Mike replied that the largest to be used would be a 206L3 which is the same type St. Mary's had been using in the past, carrying up to 6 passengers. No slings loads would be allowed as the FAA bars this type of activity over populated areas.

Commissioner Stephens asked if larger aircraft could land there.

Mike stated that FAA regulations limits the size of the aircraft to a maximum weight of 3,500 lbs. and would be limited to observation type aircraft.

Commissioner Madsen wanted to know if the amount of landings and departures would be cut in half.

Mike answered that in their letter to the FAA, they specified a figure of 60 landings per month and it was felt that this figure may have been estimated high.

Bob Goldin asked for clarification concerning what would happen to the heliport if those high density residential developments to the north are developed out, and that several of these proposals are or could be very near to the point of being constructed.

Mike felt that the biggest complaints would probably be noise and that measures have been and would be taken to see that this is kept to a minimum.

Bob stated that a letter had been received by the Planning Department from a resident located directly across F 1/2 Road expressing noise concerns. What would happen if additional complaints were received.

Mike said that at this time, this location was the only one acceptable for the proposal; that the only alternative was to keep the helicopters at the airport.

Commissioner Transmeier wanted to know what type of capital investment would be involved in this proposal; that what may be an acceptable use today may not be acceptable tomorrow with the proposed developments, and if the heliport had to be moved, what kind of hardship would this cause and did Mtn. Bell consider that this might happen.

Mike said that with regard to noise complaints, certain measures can be taken to reduce the amount of noise. He asked if complaints had been received regarding the St. Mary's helicopters.

Many of the Commissioners replied affirmatively and Commissioner Madsen, who lives in this area, stated that it has been a real concern of hers as a resident located near St. Mary's. Commissioner Rush commented that even with this response, most people tended to be a little more tolerant of helicopters that were on a life saving mission as opposed to those owned by a private business.

Mike stated that if noise complaints were received, they could modify entrance to the field by incorporating a 500' rectangular flight pattern within the field boundaries in a steep approach; however, the figure of 300' would mean that there would be less blade slap upon descent.

Bob asked if Mtn. Bell would consider a temporary heliport until development to the north began.

Dave McKinley spoke out saying that a conditional use permit subject to yearly review would be one alternative. He felt that by allowing a heliport to come in without a conditional use would set a precedent for other companies, i.e. energy related companies, to create their own heliports for their own uses and at their own discretion.

Chairman O'Dwyer concurred with this point.

Bob pointed out that Foresight Park is zoned industrial and even though the helipad was reviewed and approved in-house, it was felt that the heliport decision should be one made by the Commission since it involved more than one helicopter and involved a heliport.

Commissioner Stephens felt that putting in a heliport may discourage future development in that area.

Sam Haupt, developer for the Trolley Gate proposal, presented an update to the Commissioners on his project which would be one located to the north (the area subject to the most controversy). He stated that he was in the process of acquiring additional land in that area for a 9-hole golf course and that he was not opposed to the heliport, subject to a conditional use permit being issued, and if it were to go in within the next year. However, he further stated that his project was aimed at the retirement market and that down the road, removal of the heliport may be required.

Mike reaffirmed that a petition had been signed by the other businesses in the industrial park area with no adverse comments being received.

Dave thought that this should be an item to be considered before the Commission after public notification was made. The discussion ensuing tonight was taking place without the benefit of any public input on the proposal.

Bob thought that the various options to Mtn. Bell should be investigated.

Commissioner Transmeier felt that if a heliport is approved, it should be available for all the businesses in that area to use.

Mike reiterated that the request for a heliport was made because it would cut down on the number of flights in and out of the industrial park area.

Chairman O'Dwyer thanked the representatives of Mtn. Bell for attending tonight's meeting and said that the Commissioners would be addressing this issue further.

Bob reaffirmed to the two representatives that, for the time being, they are still approved for the helipad facility.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08p.m.