

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- June 25, 1985
7:30 p.m. - 8:40 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 |
| Bill O'Dwyer, Chairman | Mike Dooley |

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department were:

| | |
|------------|-----------------|
| Don Warner | Mike Sutherland |
|------------|-----------------|

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 DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE MINUTES OF MAY 28, 1985 BE ACCEPTED AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Chairman O'Dwyer explained that Bob Goldin, representing the Planning Department would not be here for tonight's presentation since he was called upon to assist in the overseeing of cleanup for an emergency oil spill west of town.

1. #17-85 MOUNTAIN BELL HELIPORT

Petitioner: Mountain Bell-Ron Carey
Location: 2524 N. Foresight Avenue

Consideration of a heliport.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Rick Riden, representing Mountain Bell, presented a brief overview of the project saying that this request was being made for financial reasons as well as for convenience aspects.

(Note: Most of the dialog which took place on this presentation was made at the end of the May 28, 1985 meeting under unscheduled visitors.)

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer explained to the audience that discussions between the Commissioners and the petitioner had taken place prior to this evening's presentation, so that would account for the lack of questions from the Commissioners at this time.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Sutherland, representing the Planning Department, stated that for the most part, concerns of the department had been addressed. He stated that, for the benefit of the audience, sound level tests had been performed in the area of greatest influence. Results indicated that the noise made from the helicopters was shown to be less than that from a diesel truck, even though the helicopters were more visible.

He recommended that the permit for the heliport be given on a temporary basis, while information could be gathered from other communities with similar facilities, in order to establish guidelines for facilities such as this in Grand Junction for the future.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR THE PROPOSAL:

There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

Kenneth Hetzel, 2574 F 1/2 Road, asked for clarification of the heliport's location. He felt that the land located across the road from the proposed heliport would be adversely affected. He felt that this would also affect his property since he was located directly east.

Edna Wanzer, 2520 F 1/2 Road, expressed her opposition to the proposal citing noise concerns. She felt the proposed buffering would not be effective.

Two letters were received by the Planning Commission (Herb/Trudy High and Leroy/Esther McKee) in opposition to the proposal and entered into the record.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Stephens wondered how close the heliport would be from the residents.

After some discussion between the Commissioners and the Planning Department, Mike stated that the sound level tests had indicated a location of the observer being 30' south of F 1/2 Road, 100' north of the proposed heliport. Mike said that this would put the location at approximately 130-150' from the nearest residence.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

There was no rebuttal at this time.

STAFF REBUTTAL

Mike clarified to the audience that as it stands now, Mountain Bell has the authority to land and take off from the current site as specified through FAA regulations. What the heliport proposes is limiting those take offs and landings by enabling the helicopters to remain there for extended periods. This was estimated to cut down the number of flights by approximately two per day.

Chairman O'Dwyer stated that since Grand Junction has no prior adopted policies governing facilities such as heliports, there are no guidelines for the Commissioners to go by. He reiterated that even if a temporary permit was granted during this meeting, Mountain Bell would still have to conform to guidelines and policies when they are developed and put into place.

Commissioner Dooley stated that Mountain Bell has also agreed to restrict their altitude to not less than 500' above the ground while outside of their boundaries. The heliport was designed to reduce the nuisance of landings and take offs, however, if more frequent flights are required, they will use the present helipad facility to accommodate them.

Edna Wanzer asked if whether the other businesses in the area would want a heliport facility, i.e Public Service, etc.

Commissioner Dooley stated that many of these businesses have helicopters and that by FAA guidelines, they would be allowed to land and take off; however, a "heliport" would allow the helicopters to remain stationary.

Delbert Wanzer asked if this action would change the zoning in the area.

Commissioner Dooley stated that it would not.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DOOLEY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #17-85, MOUNTAIN BELL PETITIONING TO REQUEST A HELIPORT IN THEIR FACILITY AT FORESIGHT PARK, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THEIR REQUEST AND THAT WE PROCEED WITH THE ISSUANCE OF A TEMPORARY PERMIT FOR SUCH HELIPORT AND THAT THAT PERMIT BE SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS AND THE CONDITIONS PUT FORTH BY THE CITY PLANNING IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE FAA. MOUNTAIN BELL WILL ALSO REALIZE THAT WHEN THIS PERMIT AND THE CONDITIONS OF THIS PERMIT ARE FINALIZED, THAT THEY WILL BE MADE A PART OF THAT PERMIT."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

Mike Sutherland requested that the permit be retroactive pending any policies that would be developed.

Commissioner Rush requested amending the motion to stipulate a six month time limitation, at which time, it would be brought up for review and examine any adverse impacts it may have imposed on the neighborhood as well as other aspects of concern.

Commissioner Dooley added that if, at the time, of review, no adverse impacts are found, then the permit would be extended for a year.

Discussion ensued and thus, the amendment was to read that the permit would be reviewed at the end of six months.

Commissioner Stephens seconded the amendment.

A vote was called and the request for the amendment ended in a tie vote of 3-3. A roll call vote was then cast.

Commissioners Dooley, Madsen and Rush voted in favor of the amendment, while Commissioners Stephens, Dunivent, and Chairman O'Dwyer opposed the amendment; thus it did not carry.

A vote was then called for on the original motion. The motion passed by a vote of 4-2 with Commissioners Rush and Stephens opposed.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER STEPHENS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE THE MOTION THAT WE REVIEW THIS IN SIX MONTH'S TIME WITH A PUBLIC HEARING."

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed with a vote of 5-1 with Commissioner Dunivent opposing.

Chairman O'Dwyer clarified to the petitioner that the permit would be up for review during December's Planning Commission meeting.

2. #13-85 CONDITIONAL USE--DRIVE UP WINDOW

Petitioner: Kentucky Fried Chicken-Ric Belden
Location: 1111 North Avenue

Consideration of conditional use.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Ric Belden gave a brief overview of the project citing convenience for the customers as his primary objective. He felt that with the current plan, no sacrifice should be necessary regarding parking. The employee parking will be located on the east side only, parallel to traffic.

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer asked if the farthest curb cut to the east would be used for exit only.

Ric answered affirmatively and that it would be marked with signs indicating an exit.

Commissioner Rush asked about the trash enclosure around the south-east corner. Shouldn't there be a curb separating this from the drive through traffic.

Ric answered that on the south side of the trash enclosure there will be a 6" curb back (location indicated on map by Mike Sutherland). The trash truck will have no trouble entering this area and trash

pickups are in the early morning before the business opens. The truck itself does not pickup through the alley, so there should be no clearance problems.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Sutherland indicated the area to the east to be used for employee parking on the available map, saying that no conflicts are expected between customer and employee traffic or parking. All other concerns were resolved. Handicapped parking would be provided for.

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer asked if a handicapped ramp would also be provided. Ric stated that there would be no problem adding this.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #13-85 CONDITIONAL USE-DRIVE UP WINDOW, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL PROVIDING THAT STAFF COMMENTS BE ADDRESSED."

Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

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

3. #16-85 CONDITIONAL USE-DRIVE UP WINDOW

Petitioner: Hardee's-Jim Cannon
Location: 505 and 515 North Avenue

Consideration of conditional use.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jim Cannon, representing Sunrise Ventures, Inc., outlined the project as being similar to McDonalds, etc. A photograph of the business (the one built in Delta, CO) was included with the Commissioner's packets. Hardee's expected to spend approximately \$900,000 and employ close to 50-55 local people.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time of the petitioner.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Sutherland stated that staff concerns had been met and addressed. The Planning Department did recommend Hardee's narrow the aisle on the southwest to 25' instead of 35' to allow for landscaping but Hardee's has been agreeable to this. A raised curb was requested along the alley (to a point designated on the alley). Mike did ask the petitioner if he intended to improve the alley both the length of 50' as indicated before as well as the entire width of the alley.

Jim said that the 50' would take them back to the ingress/egress area and the full width would be improved.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Rush wondered if traffic considerations had been addressed concerning those persons turning in from 5th Street at the red light.

Mike said that the Traffic Engineer had no problems with this, but if it did become a problem, it may be handled by putting a raised median in at that location.

Jim felt that there would be no traffic problem experienced.

Commissioner Stephens questioned the east-west width of the lot.

Jim said that this was 200'.

Commissioner Stephens felt that normally, the alley improvements would include the petitioner paying for half of the alley width; since the alley was not that wide (appx. 25'), would the petitioner agree to paying for improvements for 100' of the length instead of the 50'.

Jim stated that this would not benefit him at all.

Mike said that this particular alley had been designated by the City for alley improvements at such time that funds are available. City Engineering was viewing this 50' of improvements for the full width would certainly help in the overall improvement efforts.

Jim reaffirmed that it was their intentions to make the restaurant a nice place and would try to do everything possible to make it such.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #16-85 CONDITIONAL USE FOR HARDEE'S, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD 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 6-0.

4. #15-85 PARENTS WITHOUT PARTNERS BUILDING-FINAL PLAN

Petitioner: Parents Without Partners-Bob Brattis
Location: Southeast corner of Unawep and Bacon Streets

Consideration of a Final Plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bob Brattis stated that Parents Without Partners had been looking for a location suitable for their chapter house for the last eight years and feel that this location would be best suited for them to move a house onto.

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer asked if there would be counseling services available.

Bob responded that this house would be used solely for the PWP activities and meetings and would not involve counseling.

Commissioner Dunivent asked if there were any objections to moving the building towards Unawep.

Bob replied that this would be acceptable and was most agreeable to the recommendation of City Engineering that direct access from Unawep be gained through Lot 5 of this proposal. If this is to be the case, however, he felt it best to locate the house in the south part of the lot. If coming in from the alley, the building was thought to be best located in the north end of the lot. If coming in from the alley, perhaps the City would help with improvements.

Commissioner Stephens asked if they would still go ahead with the project coming in from the alley if they did not receive assistance from the City; and would they comply with City standards.

Bob responded that he would comply.

Mike clarified to the petitioner that what the City Engineer had meant by his comments was that IF the petitioner chose to access Unawep, it was recommended that they locate the driveway on lot 5. The City Engineer's preferred recommendation was that access be gained from Bacon Street. Public Works Department has stated that the alley is also being maintained as a sewer easement and that since PWP would be the only ones to use this, gravel would be acceptable in this instance. If upgrading should occur in the future, notification of possible improvement requirements would be made to all of the adjacent landowners.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike stated that department concerns have been met and addressed. He referred to a dirt walking path running north along C Road and it was requested that they retain, and possibly improve, this path. Mike asked if water rights were designated with this property to PWP.

Bob answered that there were some rights and agreed to furnish the Planning Department with a copy of documents stipulating such.

Mike said that if the proposal was approved, a more specific site plan would be needed by the Planning Department detailing landscaping, etc.

QUESTIONS

Chairman O'Dwyer asked if a Power of Attorney had been received by PWP for any future improvements along Unawep Avenue.

Mike replied that this had already been received as part of the original planned development proposal.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, REGARDING ITEM #15-85 PARENTS WITHOUT PARTNERS BUILDING, I MOVE WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE QUIT CLAIM DEED BEING RECEIVED AND OTHER STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Rush seconded the motion.

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

**5. #5-85 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT
CODED-AMENDMENT**

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission

Consideration of a Text Amendment.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike outlined the text proposal as allowing for minor changes in corridor policies.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER STEPHENS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE THE MOTION ON
#5-85 TO SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF
ADOPTION."**

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

6. #1-85 ZONE OF ANNEXATIONS IN 1985 TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Consideration of Zone of Annexations.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Don Warner, representing the Planning Department, gave a brief outline of the annexation zoning. He reaffirmed to the Commissioners that no concerns were received by the residents in the area and that the request was merely to bring this area into compliance.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RUSH) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #1-85 ZONE OF ANNEXATIONS IN 1985 TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, FAIRWAY PARK ANNEXATION #3, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

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

IV. NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS AND VISITORS

There were no non-scheduled citizens and visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.