

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing
Minutes

February 23, 1982
7:30 p.m. - 11:30 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Chairwoman Jane Quimby at 7:30 p.m., in the City Council Chambers.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

Jane Quimby, Chairwoman	Ross Transmeier
Susan Rinker	Jack Ott
Miland Dunivent	Bill O'Dwyer
Dick Little	

In attendance, representing the Planning Staff were:

Alex Candelaria
Karl Metzner
Patti Sitko

In addition, 35-40 interested citizens were in attendance during the course of the evening.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES. Since all members of the Commission had not been provided with copies of the minutes, Chairwoman Quimby deferred approval of the 1/26/82 minutes until the next meeting.

II. AGENDA ITEM #2-- ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR VISITORS
Chairwoman Quimby noted that the petitioners for Item #3-81 and #55-80 had been requested to appear at this meeting since the one-year time limit from the start of their projects had been exceeded.

- A. #3-81, Tamerlane, Ltd. Mr. Fred Lundin, Glenwood Springs, was present, and stated that their intentions haven't changed but that they economically hadn't been able to progress as quickly as planned. He also clarified the rezone request was for 110 condominium units on 27 1/4 Rd and that tonight's request was for a six-month extension.

Chairwoman Quimby noted that the January 1981 motion had been passed to City Council to approve zoning of annexation of PR-11, subject to staff comments.

Commission members questioned Mr. Lundin regarding his intentions and reminded him that everything should be taken care of at Preliminary Plan.

There were no comments from the public.

MOTION: (Commissioner Ross Transmeier) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON #3-81, TAMERLANE, LTD., I MAKE A RECOMMENDATION WE EXTEND THIS TO THE MIDDLE OR LAST MEETING IN AUGUST, 1982 FOR FINAL PLAN TO BE SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Dick Litle seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby reiterated the motion and called for a vote. The motion was passed unanimously.

- B. #55-80, Petitioner: **Duane Scott**, 135 Vista Grande, spoke to the Commissioners indicating original approval had been obtained from the Planning Commission 8/80 and from the City Council 9/80; that the property being discussed was located at 27 Rd. and B 3/4; and that he now was requesting an extension until June, 1982, due to economic reasons.

The Commissioners questioned Mr. Scott on the location of the fire hydrant and he pointed it out on the map, indicating it would be placed in the lower left-hand corner. **Alex** commented this had been approved by the Fire Department.

Chairwoman Quimby indicated the previous motion had been adopted on August 26, 1980 by the Planning Commissioners with a motion to recommend approval to City Council, subject to Staff Review comments being satisfied and with the stipulation they meet with the Fire Department to find an appropriate place for the fire hydrant.

There were no comments from the public.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dick Litle) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE ON #55-80 THAT THE EXTENSION BE GRANTED UNTIL JUNE 1, 1982."

Commissioner Susan Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby called for a vote and the motion carried unanimously.

III. CONSENT ITEMS

Chairwoman Quimby explained the Consent Items Procedure (as per Page 1 of the Agenda for tonight's meeting).

CONSENT ITEM #1 -- #72-80, Final Plan for Approved Conditional Use--Professional Office Building.

Petitioner: Clayton Tipping.
Location: 1449 North 1st St.

A request for a final plan of an approved conditional use on .49 acre in a residential multi-family zone at 64 units per acre.

- a. Consideration of final plan.

Larry Beckner, representing the Petitioner, outlined the request.

The Commissioners questioned Larry on why landscaping had not yet been started on the completed buildings and Alex Candelaria, Staff, indicated they would like to have a detailed landscaping plan and a commitment to.

Mr. Beckner indicated the timing of the construction completion last fall disallowed the landscaping plans to be incorporated because of the onset of winter, but that those plans would be incorporated on the existing buildings as soon as spring arrives.

There were no comments from the public.

CONSENT ITEM #2 -- #16-79, Crown Heights Subdivision Filing #2 -- Final plat and plan.

Petitioner: Lloyd and Leland Unfred
Location: Northeast corner of 27.5 Road and Courtland Ave.

A request for a final plat and plan of 24 units on 8.71 acres in a planned residential zone at 8 units per acre with a design density of 2.76 units per acre.

- a. Consideration of final plat.
- b. Consideration of final plan.

Alex Candelaria, Staff, requested the Planning Commission to recommend that all review comments be addressed.

Chairwoman Quimby mentioned that Power of Attorney for Courtland on 27 1/2 should be obtained to which Mr. Unfred agreed to.

No one from the audience indicated they wished the item removed.

**CONSENT ITEM #3 -- #8-82, Conditional Use--Immaculate Heart
of Mary Catholic Church.**

Petitioner: Bishop Arthur N. Tafoya
Location: 2342 North 8th Street.

A request for a conditional use for a church and accessory buildings on 11.22 acres in a residential single family zone at 8 units per acre.

No one was present to speak for the item and no one from the audience voiced objection. **Chairwoman Quimby** indicated everything had been adequately satisfied.

**CONSENT ITEM #4 -- #7-82, Replat Pepperidge Filing #1 and a
Revised Final Plan (the replat is 1 of 2 to be
known as Pepper Tree Filing #1).**

Petitioner: Todd Deutsch
Location: South of Patterson Rd. and 990 ft. West of 29 Rd.

A request for a replat of Pepperidge Filing #1 (to be known as Pepper Tree Filing #1) and a revised final plan of 8 units on 1.413 acres with a design density of 5.66 units per acre in a planned residential zone at 20 units per acre.

- a. Consideration of replat.
- b. Consideration of revised final plan.

Bryan Sims was present and presented a letter from Benchmark Homes, signed by Gary Ferguson, General Manager, which confirmed their intentions to provide the following:

. hammer head turnaround at the South end of Indian Creek Drive and the West end of Cascade Avenue in an effort to utilize the project parking lot at this location as a part of Phase II--with these roadways to remain in use until after the completion of Phase III or the extension of Cascade Ave to adjacent properties.

. a temporary 50' radius gravel surfaced cul-de-sac at the south End of Indian Creek Drive as part of Phase III and IV or until the extension of Indian Creek Drive to a permanent cul-de-sac as shown on the development plan.

Chairwoman Quimby noted that the appraisal for plat needed to be recorded.

No one from the audience indicated they wished this item to be removed.

CONSENT ITEM #5 -- #7-82, Pepper Tree Filing #2--Final Plat and Plan.

Petitioner: Todd Deutsch
Location: South of Patterson Rd and 990 ft. West of 29 Rd.

A request for a final plat and plan of 11 units on 1.343 acres with a design density of 8.2 units per acre in a planned residential zone at 20 units per acre.

- a. Consideration of final plat.
- b. Consideration of final plan.

There was no discussion and no one from the audience spoke up against the item.

MOTION: (Commissioner Bill O'Dwyer) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE ON CONSENT ITEMS #1, 2, 3, 4, AND 5 TO APPROVE AND FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL AND RECOMMEND FOR APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS."

Chairwoman Quimby read the motion and called for a vote, which carried unanimously, 6-0.

* * * * *

IV. FULL HEARING

ITEM #1 -- #55-79, Amendment to the 12th Street Corridor Policy Statements

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission
Location: 12th Street from Horizon Drive to Pitkin Avenue
(Amendment only applies to that part of 12th Street between North Avenue and Patterson Road)

Consideration of amendment to the 12th Street Corridor Policy Statements.

Chairwoman Quimby clarified the error on the agenda item, indicating the amendment applies to that part of 12th Street between NORTH Avenue (not Orchard Avenue) and Patterson Road, and read the policy statement. Changes made apply to Item D of the policy statement.

Two letters were received regarding this agenda item:

- a. Armstrong & Associates (Arnold Hottovy and Jeff Olinger) suggesting a change to the 12th Street Corridor Policy is needed, due to the expansion of the Oseopathic Hospital at 12th & Walnut Avenue. They suggest uses allowed should be "allied with human care services that are tied

to the functional and locational features of the hospital"; and that "planned business and parking should probably be the only type of zoning permitted."

- b. Claudia & David McKinley, 1308 Wellington, suggesting that residential housing should be taken into consideration to the extent that: (1) such uses be limited to planned business with no commercial zoning to be encouraged/allowed; (2) such development be limited to 150-200 feet back from the street; (3) the trees that now exist on this portion of 12th Street be preserved in the planned developments.

Ray Sullivan, 2335 North 12th asked the Commission what they planned to do with Fairmont Hall.

Chairwoman Quimby explained the changes to the Corridor Policy that were proposed and provided him with a copy. In addition, she agreed with Mr. Sullivan's concern that Fairmont Hall should remain in existence.

Discussion followed as to who retained title to Fairmont Hall and it was decided that Alex Candelaria (Staff) would check on that and inform Mr. Sullivan.

Ed Clements, 2528 North 12th, spoke up in favor of the policy changes.

Mrs. Kochevar indicated she would prefer not to see any businesses built on that property.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dick Litle) "I MOVE THAT THE POLICY STATEMENT AMENDMENT, #55-79, BE FORWARDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR ADOPTION AND APPROVAL."

Commissioners Ross Transmeier and Susan Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby reiterated the motion, called for a vote and the motion carried 6-0.

ITEM #2 -- 105-81, Rezone RMF-64 to PB and Outline Development Plan -- Hodges Addition.

Petitioner: Eacel Hodges
Location: 2048 North 12th Street

A request to change from residential multi-family uses at 64 units per acre to planned business uses on 2.69 acres.

- a. Consideration of rezone.
- b. Consideration of outline development plan.
(Tabled from January 5, 1982 GJPC Hearing and pulled by petitioner on January 26, 1982 GJPC Hearing)

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Arnold Hottovy, Armstrong Associates, asked Commission to consider the entire piece of property (rather than only 300' as was just adopted) since ownership is one ownership that can be developed into one nice workable project without disturbing residential area to east through the use of buffering (fences, landscaping, etc.). Traffic would be eliminated to 13th Street by use of emergency access only; pedestrian walkway through the 20' strip.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

In Favor of Proposal: No discussion.

In Opposition to Proposal:

Harlan Jacobs, 2125 No. 13th, indicated he has reservations on the project, including the 13th Street exit and he would like to see the building backed up to north end to allow parking and landscaping.

Les Hodges spoke up saying he would be willing to turn the building and that the 20' would have to be kept for fire access.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Alex Candelaria stated this proposal submitted is still against the 12th Street Corridor Policy; Staff would prefer to see planned business in the front portion and the remaining portion to be left as residential or multi-family use.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Bill O'Dwyer stated he was not in favor of making an exception to the 12th Street Corridor Policy.

Mr. Hodges stated they had asked for variance before the 12th Street Policy had been adopted and that going with a multiple unit dwelling on the back section would create more problems and more traffic for surrounding neighbors and feels their proposed professional office building would enhance the neighborhood, and create less noise and burden on the streets.

Chairwoman Quimby noted that the proposal was in violation of the 12th Street Corridor Policy to begin with.

Commissioner Litle commented his opposition has still not changed as it is still encroachment into that neighborhood.

Commissioner Transmeier added the Commission took this project into consideration when the 12th Street Corridor Policy was revised and that he prefers not to see business development that close to 13th Street; he then asked Mr. Hodges if he would want the front 300' or front 290' for business should it be approved.

Mr. Hodges responded that if it had to be broken up he would rather have the 300' but hopes the entire project would be considered.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the public hearing.

MOTION: (Ross Transmeier) "ON FILE #105-81, HODGES ADDITION, I WOULD MAKE A MOTION THAT THE REZONE FROM RMF 64 TO PB BE APPROVED FROM A DEPTH OF 300' FROM 12TH STREET, BUT THE REMAINING PORTION IN THE BACK PART BE DENIED AND REMAIN RMF 64."

Motion was seconded by **Commissioner Dick Litle**.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion. Vote carried the motion 6-0.

MOTION: (Ross Transmeier) "ON FILE #105-81, HODGES ADDITION ON THE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, BECAUSE OF THE CHANGE IN THE DEPTH OF THE PROJECT AND THE CONFIGURATION WOULD PROBABLY CHANGE, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE DENY THE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN."

Motion was seconded by **Commissioner O'Dwyer**.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, informing the Petitioner the denial was primarily due to the change in the amount of square footage that will be allowed in the rezone area and suggested he may want to redo their outline development plan and resubmit it.

Mr. Hodges asked if the ODP needed to be resubmitted to the Planning Commission. Alex Candelaria indicated it would need to be resubmitted as an ODP at preliminary on the approved zone. Chairwoman Quimby reminded Mr. Hodges that when preliminary plans are submitted all problems should be taken care of at that step so moving to final would mean almost automatic approval.

The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

ITEM #3 -- #6-82, REZONE RSF-8 TO PB AND FINAL PLAN

Petitioner: Larry Brown
Location: 219 feet south of Patterson Road on the east side of 12th Street.

A request to change from residential single family uses at 8 units per acre to planned business uses and a final plan on .27 acre.

- a. Consideration of rezone
- b. Consideration of final plan

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Bill Kane, Attorney representing Larry Brown, summarized the request indicating that: (1) Mr. Brown's property adjoins a lot previously zoned planned business; (2) there is high traffic on 12th Street; (3) the area is transitional; (4) the professional office use (writing service) proposed would not necessitate much walk-in customer traffic and 90% of the time only two people would occupy the building--in essence, the house will remain a house, changing from tenant use to owner use, with no extensive remodeling or increased traffic being generated. Mr. Kane also submitted a map which showed the result of talking with the neighbors regarding their feelings, concluding that all of the 12th Street frontage shows no opposition with some people specifically in favor of the project. Mr. Kane indicated the City Engineer redrew the parking layout which is acceptable to the petitioner and that the parking area will be gravelled as it is economically difficult for them to pave.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mrs. Kochevar, 1238 Wellington, expressed concern about future businesses and brought up the question of this being a violation of the neighborhood covenants.

The Commissioners and Staff member Alex Candelaria clarified the definition of Planned Business to Mr. Kochevar, explaining that a change in the business would necessitate a request coming before the Commissioners.

Mr. Clements indicated he had an office in his home.

Claudia McKinley commented on her concern that an appropriate buffer zone wouldn't be provided, and that the corridor isn't 300'.

Commissioner Litle explained that the property extends 170' now and that every change of 10% or more must come back to the Commissioners--the Corridor Policy is strictly a guideline; each project is "site specific" so that the 300' is not automatic.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION:

The Commissioners raised questions concerning appropriate signage, paving requirement. Mr. Kane indicated there would be a sign that would conform to the signage code (3 1/2' or less) and that within one year from the time they apply for the permit, paving would be implemented.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Alex Candelaria requested the parking be paved and striped, that the covenants restriction be mitigated prior to scheduling before City Council, and that if the business zone is allowed, appropriate building codes must be met.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the public hearing and reminded the Commissioners of the considerations for this issue.

MOTION: (Commissioner Bill O'Dwyer) **"MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE ITEM #6-82 REZONE RSF-8 TO PLANNED BUSINESS CONTINGENT UPON THE RESOLUTION OF COVENANT (FAIRMONT SUBDIVISION)."**

Chairwoman Quimby added, "Not to go to City Council until the covenant issue is resolved."

Commissioner Dick Litle seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner O'Dwyer) "I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE FINAL PLAN ON ITEM #6-82 WITH THE CHANGES IN THE PARKING LOT DESIGNED BY CITY ENGINEER AND THAT IT WILL BE PAVED WITHIN ONE YEAR OF FINAL APPROVAL."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby called for a vote which passed 6-0.

Chairwoman Quimby adjourned the meeting for a 5-minute break. The meeting resumed at 8:52 p.m.

ITEM #4 -- #9-82, Rezone RMF-64 to PB and Final Plan

Petitioner: Estate of Ollie Lee Evans
Location: 838 Grand Avenue

A request to change from residential multi-family use at 64 units per acre to planned business use and a final plan on .17 acre.

- a. Consideration of rezone.
- b. Consideration of final plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Ken Hunt summarized the request, indicating written responses had been submitted and discussed the following points:

1. Site currently run-down single family resident being used as a Rooming House. Owner is deceased, property is up for sale and we have a contract on it with the intention of converting it to office space.
2. We are proposing a one-way entrance and using the alley as an exit only.
3. We plan to maintain the integrity of the building during this conversion, landscape and provide sprinkler system, leaving trees that are in good health.
4. The proposal is in line with other redesign proposals planned in the area.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION:

The use of the alley was discussed in depth by the Commission members and Mr. Hunt. Mr. Hunt agreed to pursue the possibility of acquiring joint curb cuts from adjoining neighbors on Grand Avenue in an effort to share ingress/egress, thereby eliminating the need to use the exit off the alley. The Commissioners were concerned that allowing use of the alley for ingress/egress to Mr. Hunt and other people would create too much additional traffic.

The Petitioner was questioned on what type of business would be using the property. Mr. Hunt indicated it would be used for professional office space rather than retail or real estate offices which would generate high parking stress.

Chairwoman Quimby requested comments from the public to speak in favor of or against the project and there were none.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Alex Candelaria noted that Grand Avenue is transitional and requested the Petitioner: to pursue the common ingress/egress commitment from adjoining property owners; to close the alley exit off and use it only as service, not traffic; and that lighting and signage be shown in detail.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dunivent) "ON ITEM #9-82, REZONE RMF 64 TO PB, I RECOMMEND APPROVAL."

The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Dick Litle**.

Alex Candelaria indicated Staff would like a commitment letter from the petitioners on the kind of business contemplated.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, adding Staff's comment, and called for a vote. The motion carried 6-0.

The Commissioners then discussed further the following points regarding the final plan: (1) Power of Attorney for alley improvements could be stipulated; (2) the fact that City and Traffic Engineer are opposed to the proposed alley usage, but that they can't stop them from using it, but that the appropriate course of action might be the "shared ingress/egress" suggestion heard earlier.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dunivent) "I MAKE A MOTION ON #9-82, FINAL PLAN, THAT WE RECOMMEND APPROVAL WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF COMMENTS AND THAT SERIOUS EFFORT BE ATTEMPTED BY THE PETITIONER TO WIDEN INGRESS/EGRESS CURB CUTS OFF OF GRAND AVENUE BEFORE GOING BEFORE CITY COUNCIL."

Commissioners O'Dwyer/Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion passed 6-0.

ITEM #5 -- #88-79, College Square - Revised Final Plan

**Petitioner: Doss Simpson
Location: Southeast corner of 12th Street and Elm Avenue**

A request to revise a final plan on .88 acre in a planned business zone.

- a. Consideration of revised final plan

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Sarah Simpson, Van Deusen/Assoc/Architects, provided a model of the plan, background on the proposed final plan and explained each of the items listed on their Response to the Review Sheet Comments submitted 2/23/82.

Chairwoman Quimby informed the petitioner that the Commission needs to see the Review Comments in writing from the Reviewing Agencies.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Art Ingfordson, 1257 Elm, agreed with some of the items proposed, but indicated he hadn't seen an alley proposal for vacation and referenced an agreement between himself and Doss Simpson regarding the erection of a fence which he would like to make sure happens.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Alex Candelaria noted the revised plan hadn't been reviewed and that a Hold Harmless Agreement had been obtained in the past but wasn't sure it still applies.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION:

The petitioner was questioned on the type of uses planned and whether the whole alley would be vacated. Sarah answered yes to the alley question and indicated video games area (640 sq.ft.) and a restaurant with a seating capacity of 30 was planned.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dick Litle) "I MAKE A MOTION THAT ITEM #88-79, CONSIDERATION OF REVISED FINAL PLAN, COLLEGE SQUARE, BE TABLED UNTIL THE MARCH MEETING OF THIS COMMISSION SO THAT THE REVISED PLAN CAN BE REVIEWED BY THE AGENCIES INVOLVED."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 6-0.

Commissioner Transmeier noted he would like to see the alley vacation at that time. **Chairwoman Quimby** asked Sarah to provide those.

ITEM #6 -- #5-82, Plaza 15 Minor Subdivision

Petitioner: Bob Emrich
Location: 140 feet south of Bookcliff Avenue on the east side of 11th Street.

A request for a minor subdivision of 2 lots on .765 acre in a residential multi-family zone at 64 units per acre.

Consideration of minor subdivision.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Tom Logue introduced the proposal.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION:

Chairwoman Quimby questioned Bob Emrich of his intentions regarding getting 11th Street developed through to Bookcliff. Mr. Emrich indicated he was reluctant to commit to paying for all the improvements, (since he is not required to do so and hesitates to commit his partner to that) but would be willing to give some or all of the right of way through it. **Chairwoman Quimby** suggested it would be more economical to do the whole street at once rather than a little at a time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Jim Alvillar, 2150 College Place, spoke on the issues of parking facilities, area in question being an eyesore, and his concern with ingress/egress--will 11th Street go all the way through, who will pay for it, and how many apartments will ultimately be there?

Chairwoman Quimby answered Jim's question on the number of units proposed to be 43, according to the Subdivision Summary Form. **Mr. Emrich** voiced objection to that number existing on that form. **Tom Logue** explained 64 units/acre allows a maximum of 43; Bob intends to provide only 22-24 units due to physical layout of their site.

Tom Logue further clarified request is for them to adjust property line on the north boundary, and noted that Power of Attorney was not initially granted, which makes Bob more or less responsible for the improvements.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Alex Candelaria requested 12th Street improvements, the appraisal details worked out, and noted that the approved final plan originally made did recommend 11th Street be totally improved--the western portion of the right of way is there; the eastern portion is also there but has never been granted to the city--so Staff should request Quick Claim Deed from the petitioner prior to final approval. Alex also indicated the easement for Public Service needs to be granted.

MOTION: (Commissioner Ross Transmeier) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #5-82, PLAZA 25 M;INOR SUBDIVISION, I MAKE A RECOMMENDATION THIS BE PASSED TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL WITH THE FOLLOWING STIPULATIONS: (1) FULL STREET IMPROVEMENTS ON 11TH STREET FOR WIDTH OF SUBDIVISION IN QUESTION BE INSTALLED AT THE TIME OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPERTY; (2) THAT THE QUICK CLAIM DEED FOR THE EASEMENT FOR THE COMPLETION OF 12TH STREET TO BOOKCLIFF ON THE RIGHT OF WAY BE GRANTED TO THE CITY, AND (3) THAT THE OTHER STAFF COMMENTS BE COMPLIED WITH, SUCH AS THE OPEN SPACE FEE, PUBLIC SERVICE UTILITY EASEMENT."

Commissioner Rinker/Litle seconded the motion.

The motion was repeated by **Chairwoman Quimby**, a vote was taken, and the motion carried 6-0.

ITEM #7 --#85-81, Rusty Sun Subdivision Filing #1, Final Plat and Plan.

Petitioner: Jim Lindell
Location: Northeast corner of Patterson Road and East Indian Creek Drive.

A request for a final plat and plan of 16 units on 2.094 acres in a planned residential zone at 8.4 units per acre.

- a. Consideration of final plat.
- b. Consideration of final plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Tom Logue, introduced the request indicating the reviewing agency comments have been addressed, including the maintenance of park lane owned by the City, indicating improvements to open space planned will include general site and debris clean up and grading is ongoing, building is scheduled to begin as soon as possible after City Council hearing.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Dunivent questioned Tom Logue on logistics of ingress/egress off of Patterson and how left hand turns will be negotiated if an island exists. Tom indicated East Indian Creek Drive would be used as primary access and median cuts will be used to facilitate traffic movement.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if the Petitioner planned to widen Patterson to match up with Indian Village. Tom indicated the County is in design phases of improving large sections of Patterson Road and the assessment on the roadway is \$60/running foot, the cash payment of which we will be making.

Flood Plain permit was discussed and Tom indicated the limits of 100-year flood plain do fall within the limits of the public land and does not affect this site.

PUBLIC COMMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSAL:

Jim Lindell, Petitioner, commented regarding the maintenance of Indian Wash--Ken Idleman was confused in thinking I owned it and after our discussion agreed with my offer to clean it up. It was established that the City owns the Wash since the annexation by the City of Grand Junction.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

Phil Herrera, President of Indian Village Homeowners Association, expressed concern with additional traffic and the safety of their children--lighting also complicates this problem. Overall, no objection to the units--just the entrance to it. **Tom Logue** explained the location of Patterson Road and East Indian Creek Drive and their proposed loop-type roadway to line up with Arapahoe which would facilitate service vehicle movement.

Charlie Plsek, wondered if this preliminary plat was approved before the Overlay Zone was adopted by the City Council, as he was under the impression that the this area should be limited to 4 units per acre density. The Commission and Staff clarified that that applies only to zones designated as Critical Zones.

Bill Bishop, 2892 Kiowa Ct., expressed opposition because egress out of East Indian Creek makes it difficult to make turns, there are only two points of ingress/egress to this property and that nothing was ever posted regarding the annexation of this property to the City. The Commissioners stated there were public hearings and advertising on two different occasions on the annexation and rezone.

Jack Rounds, 2890 Kiowa Ct., is concerned with the vast number of houses going into a small area and not enough play area available for children.

Joann Moon, 620 Arapahoe Way, listed her concerns primarily with Patterson Road carrying capacity, Indian Creek Drive already having 300 children, how left-hand turns will be made onto Patterson Road since only one exit is proposed, the lack of pedestrian walkways, where overflow visiting parking will be taken care of, and whether this multi-family development will make it more appealing for commercial developers.

PETITIONER'S RESPONSE:

Jim Lindell addressed some of these comments indicating he tried to meet with everyone and will be available tonight to discuss questions from neighbors. Lindell also stated there is a dedicated pedestrian walkway on the north property line coming from Indian Creek to the open space and that there are sidewalks now on Indian Creek and he plans to put more in through Indian Wash.

The Commissioners questioned Mr. Lindell further on parking and Mr. Lindell indicated all requirements have been met and he's tried to provide three units per space.

COMMISSIONERS' QUESTIONS:

Commissioner Litle asked Staff where the County Commissioners plan is at this point in upgrading Patterson. **Chairwoman Quimby** answered that this is part of the Oil Shale Trust Fund unless its been rearranged, and Patterson Road from 7th East, was going to be developed as money was available after other priorities were taken care of. **Karl Metzner** indicated they are trying to get the right of way acquisition done on Patterson by the end of this month, and thinks it is on the the list of the top three priority items.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Alex Candelaria requested the guest parking area be resolved, the flood plain permit be done prior to any construction, and improvements on F Road finished prior to any construction, and that the park issue be resolved with City Council.

MOTION: (Commissioner Litle) "IN REGARD TO FILE #85-81, RUSTY SUN SUBDIVISION FILING #1, FINAL PLAT, I RECOMMEND THE FILE BE FORWARDED TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO CONSIDERATIONS OF STAFF."

The motion was seconded by **Commissioner O'Dwyer**.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion and called for a vote. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-1. (Commissioner Rinker opposed)

MOTION: (Commissioner Litle) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF FILE #85-81, RUSTY SUN SUBDIVISION FILING #1, CONSIDERATION OF FINAL PLAN, I RECOMMEND THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL WITH CONSIDERATION OF STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion and called for a vote which carried 5-1. (Commissioner Rinker was opposed)

ITEM #8 -- #4-82, REZONE PR-4 to PR-12 and Crossroads Court,
Outline Development Plan.

Petitioner: Jerry Fossenier
Location: Lot 1, Block 5 of Colorado Crossroads West.

A request to change from planned residential uses at 4 units per acre to planned residential uses at 12 units per acre and an outline development plan for 44 units on 3.657 acres.

- a. Consideration of rezone.
- b. Consideration of outline development plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Steve Meyer, CBW Builders, provided the Commission with background information on the request on the rezone including the fact that Crossroads Colorado West Subdivision contains PR4 and Highway oriented zones and they feel a PR12 zone would act as a transitional and buffer zone to the HO zone and the I-70 traffic.

Chairwoman Quimby stated that, based on some of their comments on their review sheets, the Commission isn't sure what they plan to do.

Steve Meyer clarified their intentions are to break up the ODP more and that the on-site developer is present and would address that.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION:

Chairwoman Quimby asked what the density of the residential area is now. It was established the density is 20/acre.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked about building height and it was determined they would be 1 1/2 stories high.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Jay Peterson, 2711 Skyline Drive, asked about future plans of the 7 acres east of their proposed plan. Mr. Meyer indicated he could not answer that question since they are going to market the area, not develop it. Mr. Peterson asked who put the sign up indicating it was an ideal location for multi-family dwellings on that area to the east; Mr. Meyer indicated they did as part of their marketing plans.

Mary Flannery, 758 27 Road, asked if this plan hadn't been brought before the Commission previously and turned down. **Chairwoman Quimby** indicated that it had been recommended in

March of 1981 for multi-family (PR16) and there had been neighborhood objection, and the plan was dropped. The density has been reduced to a PR12 in this proposal.

Charlie Plsek indicated he didn't have any objections until talking with the County Commissioners regarding the Overlay rules and regulations with respect to density factor of four single-family units in the Overlay Zone. **Chairwoman Quimby** noted that the County hasn't yet adopted the Overlay Zone and this is City property which falls under City regulations. Mr. Plsek expressed concern that the City Commissioners have the right to approve or disapprove any zoning changes for their property. **Chairwoman Quimby** stated they couldn't do that until it was annexed to the City. The Commissioners explained to Mr. Plsek that this proposal is for review by the Planning Commissioners.

Mr. Uwe Fohlneister, 2709 SKYline Drive, commented on the buffer zone, stating he would like to see the zone remain single-family residential.

Steve Meyer answered some of the questions; specifically, the buffer, saying proposals could come in to put office buildings right up to the canal bank, but their buffering would separate the office buildings from multi-family and single-family units.

Chairwoman Quimby suggested the petitioner and the neighbors get together at a Neighborhood Meeting to work out their differences.

Bob Blair, the on-site developer from Colorado Springs, attempted to explain to the neighbors what their intentions were. **Commissioner Litle** interrupted and requested Mr. Blair to leave the hearing as previously requested by the Chairwoman.

MOTION: (Commissioner O'Dwyer) "I MAKE A MOTION TO TABLE ITEM #4-82 UNTIL SOME RESOLUTION IS MADE BETWEEN THE DEVELOPER AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion. **Chairwoman Quimby** called for a vote and the motion carried 6-0.

ITEM #9 -- #11-82, Zone of Walker Field Airport Annexation to PZ

Petitioner: Walker Field Airport Authority
Location: Northwest corner of H Road and Horizon Drive.

A request to zone Walker Field Airport parcel #B to a public zone.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Paul Bowers, noted that the rezone will be a temporary one because the Airport Rezone Request will be submitted in the future.

MOTION: (Commissioner Susan Rinker) "I MOVE ON ITEM #11-82 WE RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THAT ZONE."

Commissioners O'Dwyer/Transmeier seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion and called for a vote, which passed 6-0.

ITEM #10 -- #12-81, Conditional Use, Hotel

Petitioner: Paul Penner/Norm Frantz
Location: Northwest corner of H Road and Horizon Drive.

A request for a conditional use for a hotel on 8 acres in a public zone.

Consideration of conditional use.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Paul Penner, responded to review comments by submitting a letter to the Planning Department 2/23/82, which he summarized.

COMMISSIONER'S DISCUSSION:

The Commissioners expressed concern with many items, including:

- . How the overall traffic situation will be affected, specifically the question of entry into the airport complex was initially agreed upon for one-way streets;
- . The service route for delivery trucks (semi-trucks) appears to be nonworkable;
- . Sidewalk perimeters have not been allowed for;
- . Shortness of time frame and lack of information from reviewing agencies;

- . Use appears fine, but many exterior items have not been answered to conform with City codes (discussion ensued regarding airport area recently incorporated into City limits). Concern is with setting precedent on this project with respect to conformity for future projects coming into the area. The Commission wants to see this project as an impressive "premier" job.

PETITIONER'S RESPONSE:

Paul Penner addressed some of these concerns:

- . Traffic plans are in accordance with a re-route discussed with City Traffic Engineer and a Denver Traffic Consultant; the two-way strip follows City Traffic Engineer recommendations;
- . They are trying to cooperate on all City Code issues; that they are designing an upgraded model of a hotel for the traveling businessman;
- . He will check with his designers on the service vehicle question;
- . Perimeter sidewalks weren't anticipated but they will negotiate on that; and,
- . All other comments or questions will be satisfied.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Alex requested: (1) avigation easement; (2) better design on internal circulation, trash pickup and landscaping; (3) Petitioner to respond to additional comments he hasn't had time to respond to.

MOTION: (Commissioner Litle) "I MOVE ITEM #12-81 BE FORWARDED TO CITY COUNCIL WITH APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE WITH STIPULATION OF STAFF CONCERNS AND PETITIONER'S AGREEMENT TO RESOLVE ALL OTHER ITEMS."

The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Miland Dunivent**.

Chairwoman Quimby called for a vote and the motion carried 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned by **Chairwoman Quimby** at 11:35 p.m.