

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing, May 25, 1982
Minutes
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:

Dick Litle	Susan Rinker
Miland Dunivent	Bill O'Dwyer
Ross Transmeier	Jane Quimby

In attendance, representing the Planning Department Staff were:

Alex Candelaria
Bob Goldin
Don Warner

In attendance, recording the minutes, was Rachelle Daily, Sunshine Business Services.

Approximately 20-25 interested citizens attended the public hearing during the course of the evening.

* * * * *

Chairwoman Quimby opened the hearing by reminding all present that any requests denied by the Grand Junction Planning Commission will be scheduled for a public hearing before the City Council, unless the petitioner requests that their petition be removed from the City Council agenda.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dunivent) "I MOVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 27, 1982 GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR VISITORS. There were none.

III. FULL HEARING

1. REVIEW AND COMMENT ON AMENDING THE DDA (Downtown Development Authority) PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT.

Petitioner: DDA/Skip Grkovic

A request for review and comment on amending the adopted boundaries of the DDA's Plan of Development.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Skip Grkovic noted the Commission has had time to review the amendments to the plan, and that the Commission and City Council had approved the DDA Plan of Development last December. Since that time a number of property owners have requested that their property be included within the DDA and the DDA Board has accepted their petitions for inclusion and City Council has included those properties by ordinance. The Plan of Development is required, by State Law, to amend the plan of Development to include those properties within the Tax Increment Financing District or the Commercial Innovation District (whichever applies). The amendments basically redefine the boundaries of the DDA and the Tax Increment District with one technical change to include a legal phrase that was originally excluded unintentionally and request County Assessor and City Finance Director to provide additional information to the DDA.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if there was only one time during the year that other properties can come in.

Skip Grkovic answered that other properties can come in at any time they want by submitting a petition to the DDA Board for inclusion; most likely (due to legal process) City Council's action to expand the boundaries and DDA/Planning/ City Council action from within the plan will occur only once a year.

PUBLIC COMMENTS -- There were no comments either in favor or in opposition. Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "I MOVE THAT IN THE CASE OF THE AMENDMENT FOR THE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT THAT WE FORWARD THE AMENDMENT TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion was approved unanimously.

2. #36-82 CONDITIONAL USE -- 3.2 BEER LICENSE

Petitioner: Rob Ramsey/Skippers
Location: Northeast corner of 28.25 Road and North Ave.

A request for a conditional use for a 3.2 beer license on .03 acre in a light commercial zone.

Consideration of conditional use for 3.2 beer license.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin, Planning Staff, oriented the audience on the location and purpose of this request.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Rob Ramsey, Petitioner, outlined their plan and indicated they intend to comply with all Review Agency Comments. Mr. Ramsey also stated their intentions were to provide a "family-style" restaurant and the beer will represent less than 2% of their sales, but want to provide beer as an option to their customers.

QUESTIONS

Chairwoman Quimby asked for a written statement on the verbal agreement between Mr. Ramsey and Woolco regarding a trade-off on parking areas. Mr. Ramsey agreed to do so.

Commissioner Little questioned the source of the 2% of gross sales figure and if it was based on experience by other Skipper operations. Mr. Ramsey confirmed it was.

Commissioner O'Dwyer wondered if policing would be a problem because of the proximity of the Suds N Sounds operation and their tendency to park in this area. Mr. Ramsey didn't feel the neighboring clientele or parking would be a problem and he is personally policing his establishment.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin indicated all issues have been resolved; that the Petitioners have agreed they may lose the first four parking spaces as a result of improvements to 28.25 Road but feel they will be able to acquire additional parking (parking requirement is 1 for 3 so they need 33 plus employee parking); asking for an additional ten spaces. Mr. Ramsey stated they average 12-15 employees per shift, but after training the maximum will be 10-11; most employees walk or ride bicycles.

PUBLIC COMMENTS -- There were no comments either in favor or in opposition. Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION:

(COMMISSIONER RINKER) "ON FILE #36-82, CONDITIONAL USE--3.2 BEER LICENSE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL, CONTINGENT UPON THE LEASE AGREEMENT FOR ADDITIONAL TEN PARKING SPACES (FROM WHOMEVER) WITHIN CLOSE PROXIMITY (TO MEET CITY REQUIREMENTS) BEFORE IT GOES TO CITY COUNCIL."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby called for a vote and the motion carried by a vote of 4-1 (Commissioner O'Dwyer against).

3. #31-82 DEVELOPMENT IN HO--THREE STORY SPECULATIVE OFFICE BUILDING.. (TABLED LAST MONTH)

Petitioner: Horizon Park Company/Stephen Owen
Location: East of Horizon Court and West of the Highline Canal.

A request for a final plan on 2.85 acres in a highway-oriented zone.

Consideration of development in HO.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Alex Candelaria, Planning Staff, oriented the audience on the location and purpose of this request.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Alan Pasqua, 7555 East Hamden, Denver, CO. Mr. Pasqua summarized their request and indicated the outstanding issues have been resolved; specifically, an access road around the perimeter of the building for emergency fire vehicles--Wes Painter has approved our solution and has contacted the Planning Department so they are aware of his approval. Curb blocks and parking lots and other issues have been resolved.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier wondered about the dead end road and traffic using that road. Mr. Pasqua indicated the road is intended only as a fire lane and will be so designated.

Commissioner Quimby questioned Mr. Pasqua on their timetable for development. Mr. Pasqua answered that, pending approval, construction would begin as soon as the building permit is issued and plan to be completed by the first of 1983.

STAFF COMMENTS

Alex Candelaria noted that all technical issues have been resolved, including the fire access, and more landscaping has been added to the plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS There were no comments either in favor or in opposition. Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "ON FILE #31-82, DEVELOPMENT IN HO--THREE STORY SPECULATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO ALL STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously (5-0).

COMMISSIONER O'DWYER ASKED CHAIRWOMAN QUIMBY FOR PERMISSION TO REMOVE HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE NEXT ITEM. CHAIRWOMAN QUIMBY GRANTED PERMISSION.

4. #35-82 CONDITIONAL USE--TAVERN LIQUOR LICENSE

Petitioner: Lee and Joan Fetters (dba The Haberdashery)
Location: 464 28.5 Road (lots 4 and 5 of Brawley
Subdivision)

A request for a conditional use for a tavern liquor license on approximately .61 acre in a light industrial zone.

Consideration of conditional use for a tavern liquor license.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Alex Candelaria oriented the audience on the location and purpose of this request.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Lee Fetters, 620 No. 7th Street, Grand Junction. Mr. Fetters defined "The Haberdashery" as being a recreation business offering the game of billiards (similar to Freeway Bowling Alley) requiring 50,000 or more in population in order to support the business and a location within a commercial/industrial zone. Construction type will be exposed aggregate. Their plans have been modified to comply with Reveiw Agency suggestions.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked for hours of operation. Mr. Fetters indicated they would be 11:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Commissioner Rinker asked whether they would be serving lunch and dinner. Mr. Fetters answered they will have sandwiches (so request is for Tavern Liquor License) and they will have short menu (about six items) at both lunch and dinner hour and afterwards -- not a full kitchen.

Commissioner Dunivent wondered if the elimination of center parking would create a problem. Alex answered it would and Staff would like to see additional parking picked up. Mr. Fetters indicated he feels they have enough options in the area to solve the parking problem. There was discussion on traffic flow.

STAFF COMMENTS

Alex Candelaria stated Staff's basic concern is with parking requirements and the island in the middle and Staff would

like to see this taken care of prior to forwarding to City Council.

Don Warner mentioned that Mrs. Fetters had submitted a petition signed by 160 persons indicating their support of this request.

PUBLIC COMMENTS There were no comments either in favor or against the proposal. Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSIONER'S DISCUSSION

Commissioner Transmeier expressed concern with increased traffic load between North Ave and 28.5 Road. Staff members (Alex and Don) noted there is a 66' collector, as subdivided, and is completely surrounded by light industrial and heavy commercial, with 3 blocks above of residential (east side) and residential on 2/3 of that distance on the west side.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON CASE OF FILE #35-82, CONDITIONAL USE--TAVERN LIQUOR LICENSE FOR 464 28.5 ROAD, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, CONTINGENT UPON SECURING ADEQUATE PARKING AND RESOLUTION WITH PLANNING STAFF BEFORE GOING TO CITY COUNCIL."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 4-0.

COMMISSIONER O'DWYER RETURNED TO THE COMMISSION.

5. #39-82 CONDITIONAL USE--LIQUOR LICENSE

Petitioner: Roy Dimond
Location: 2790 Crossroads Boulevard (The Rodeway Inn)

A request for a conditional use for a liquor license on 2.93 acres in a highway-oriented zone.

Consideration of conditional use for a liquor license.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Alex Candelaria oriented the audience on the location and purpose of this request.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Roy Dimond, 390 Ridge View Drive, Grand Junction. Mr. Dimond outlined his request for the Rodeway Inn to include 160-room six-story high rise hotel, 142-seat restaurant, 117-seat Cocktail/Lounge, 2400 sq.ft. meeting/banquet space. Full service hotel, access by driveway off of Crossroads Blvd.--no access from Horizon Drive; Fully landscaped

property within next 2-3 weeks; Anticipate opening in early July, 1982.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier questioned the parking facilities. Mr. Dimond responded he believed they were required to have 1 parking space for each room (160 rooms = 80 parking spaces).

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding the parking requirements. Alex indicated they have 220 spaces and are required to have 201. Mr. Dimond indicated they would have a maximum number of 100 employees (24-hour operation).

STAFF COMMENTS

Alex indicated they would be approximately 45 spaces short even though there are some different uses ranging throughout the day; which would not be acceptable to Staff.

The Commissioners were confused as to the calculations of seating spaces and parking spaces required, due in part to the fact Mr. Dimond's calculations were based on square footage.

Bob Goldin further explained the seating capacity situation:

Lounge	117
Restaurant	142
Rooms	<u>160</u>
Total	289 spaces needed

220 spaces were originally provided for (shared parking, people in restaurant would be staying in the rooms, lounge, visa versa). Staff originally questioned whether the bar was incorporated into their overall plan for the 220 spaces or was it an addition after the development in HO process came through. According to Mr. Keating (Petitioner's Denver attorney), the bar and restaurant had been incorporated in, not an expansion of, the hotel/restaurant/lounge. Calculations were submitted based on square footage (not on use), which does show them over the amount; Based on use shows them short by 69 spaces. That was part of the proposal--this is not in addition to what was previously approved and Planning Commission/City Council apparently felt that was sufficient for the restaurant/lounge/hotel. Staff does not know if, at the time it was approved, if the employee parking was considered in that or not. Staff feels shared uses gives less than adequate parking; there are no regulations regarding shared parking; tight parking exists and Staff feels this is an issue; whether additional parking can be acquired has not been raised or explored.

Chairwoman Quimby asked when this had gone through the Planning Commission. Bob Goldin answered May or April of 1981. Alex indicated it was March, 1981.

Chairwoman Quimby expressed additional concern about meeting rooms that could generate additional traffic and the need for additional parking spaces over and above what people staying at the hotel will require.

Mr. Dimond mentioned that 50% of guest rooms will be occupied by people coming in by airline and that the hotel will be providing transportation. Chairwoman Quimby agreed but noted that many of those people will be renting cars. Chairwoman Quimby asked if there was any additional property that can be acquired for parking or if shared parking could be explored, in an effort to rectify the problem of the 70 parking spaces they are short.

Mr. Dimond said he has not explored these questions and expressed amazement there is a problem at this late date with the parking.

It was mentioned, by Commission members and Planning Staff, that more rooms have been added and no capacity had been shown when the plan was first approved.

Bob Goldin noted that Mr. Keating has indicated no additional seating capacity or area has been added to the original conditional use permit (May 1981); Staff will confirm this for verification on what Planning Commission and City Council approved.

Chairwoman Quimby noted that parking regulations should be carefully considered and adequately addressed in the future.

PUBLIC COMMENTS There were no comments either in favor or in opposition.

Chairwoman Quimby asked Mr. Dimond if he would be willing to explore the possibility of acquiring additional parking or share parking arrangement. Mr. Dimond agreed.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I SUGGEST WE TABLE THIS ITEM UNTIL THE PARKING PROBLEM IS RESOLVED. MR. DIMOND HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO INVESTIGATE OTHER ALTERNATIVES; STAFF NEEDS TO CHECK WITH MR. KEATING, ETC."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

Commissioner Transmeier asked Mr. Dimond when their opening date was scheduled. Mr. Dimond responded: 1st week of July.

Commissioner O'Dwyer noted this would put the Petitioner in a problem, but if their request was denied they would have to go through the process again, or appeal to City Council.

Alex Candelaria stated this item could be scheduled for the June hearing and then onto City Council the first Wednesday in July.

Other discussion regarding procedures and time frames ensued.

COMMISSIONER O'DWYER WITHDREW HIS MOTION. Commissioner Little agreed to the withdrawal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE ON ITEM #39-82, CONDITIONAL USE -- LIQUOR LICENSE FOR THE RODEWAY INN, 2790 CROSSROADS BLVD, THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, CONTINGENT UPON THE RESOLUTION OF THE PARKING PROBLEMS EITHER THROUGH SECURING SHARED PARKING OR ACQUIRING ADDITIONAL PARKING TO STAFF REQUIREMENTS, PRIOR TO FORWARDING TO CITY COUNCIL."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby read the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 4-1 (Commissioner O'Dwyer opposed).

Chairwoman Quimby apologized to Mr. Dimond, indicating that the majority of the members of this Planning Commission were not present when this proposal initially came through.

Commissioner Transmeier added that approval was obtained a year ago and the process for obtaining their liquor license could have been started earlier.

6. #37-82 EASEMENT VACATION

Petitioner: Village Fair/Earl Jensen
Location: Southwest corner of 12th Street and Patterson Road.

A request to vacate all utility easements and a sanitary sewer easement as recorded in Plat Book 13, Page 1 on January 7, 1982 in the Office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder for Village Fair Subdivision in a planned business zone.

Consideration of all easement vacations.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin oriented the audience on the location, background and purpose of this request.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Katie McIntyre, Paragon Engineering, representing Earl Jensen, provided the Commissioners with a sketch showing the easements that are being vacated but not rededicated by this action, and explained the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked for verification that these easements will not be used at all. Katie indicated that was true.

Commissioner Transmeier asked if they did have some easements now. Katie answered yes and that some that are being vacated are rededicated on the amended plan.

Don Warner, Planning Staff, indicated a need to add wording to the ordinance to show they are not vacating anything recorded in the books only -- to prevent anything from being vacated that is needed.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin stated that the City Engineer originally did not receive a copy of this, but has since, and has given a verbal approval (today); Staff will receive his approval in writing, before this goes to City Council.

PUBLIC COMMENTS There were no comments either in favor or against the proposal. Chairwoman Quimby then closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON CASE #37-82, EASEMENT VACATION FOR VILLAGE FAIR, I MAKE A MOTION WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 5-0.

7. #38-82 ROW VACATION--LAMPLITE PARK SUBDIVISION FILING #1

Petitioner: Mike Messina
Location: All of Santa Clara Avenue lying east of Olson Avenue.

A request to vacate all of Santa Clara Avenue lying east of Olson Avenue within Lamplite Park Subdivision Filing #1 (as amended).

Consideration of right of way vacation.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Don Warner, Planning Staff, pointed out an error on the agenda ("Wast" should read "East").

Bob Goldin oriented the audience on the location and purpose of this request, noting the reason for the vacation request is that OM Irrigation drives their equipment across there and cannot negotiate the 90-degree turn unless they drive

across Lot 41 -- Mr. Messina wishes to build on a lot in that area and wishes to vacate in order to accommodate Orchard Mesa. Bob also noted they have a letter from their attorney giving an overview of what is going on. As far as Staff is aware, nothing has been resolved between Orchard Mesa and Mr. Messina regarding the outcome (OM may win by use by right; may be compromise through litigation; may not be a need to vacate).

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Katie McIntyre, representing Mike Messina, presented the proposal and explained the relationship between the Orchard Mesa canal and Santa Clara Avenue. Orchard Mesa Irrigation wants to drive on Santa Clara to the canal; Petitioner is proposing to "flip flop" Lot 41 and the existing stub end of Santa Clara and shift the future access 50' north of its present location; the roadway vacation is the first step in replatting the area so the irrigation company can get to their ditch; the problem brought up by the City Engineer, Utilities and Transportation Department is the awkward intersection that would be the result -- wide radiuses in the turns could help alleviate the problem.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked if there has been discussion with the people to the east. Katie replied she has not but the attorney has and the people basically had no comments.

Katie indicated they would be getting a slightly pie-shaped lot and Mr. Messina feels he can design a home or building that can sit on the lot and meet setback requirements and other requirements of the plan, and be able to use what would be the new Lot 41.

Commissioner Little asked for and received clarification on the 50' question.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented on the lot situation and future developments to the east affecting Santa Clara.

Katie noted that Santa Clara will definitely be a major road allowing unimpeded traffic flow and stated again that the intersection problem looks like it can be resolved and would meet all criteria.

Commissioner Transmeier expressed concern about the intersection between River Road and East Santa Clara. Katie agreed that would be a concern of theirs also.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin stated Staff/Review Agency concerns are not so much with vacation as with the rededication and how that will align; Mr. Rish indicated a good 90-degree, four-way intersection exists now; The area to the north has the potential of coming in as filing #2 (development could occur further toward the river), thus increasing traffic coming off of River Road onto Olson and Santa Clara; Staff doesn't know what is going to happen to the east -- Santa Clara is bound to go through. Traffic Engineer wondered if there was a chance that this right of way vacation could wait until they could see what does develop to the east -- timing may not be appropriate at this time; and he is opposed to it as it stands now because it offsets the intersection. Also, depending on the outcome of the court case regarding Orchard Mesa's access (should they lose their access), there would be no need for the road vacation to go through. Lot 42 is being built on now and Staff doesn't know if they have accommodated for the increased intersection.

PUBLIC COMMENTS There were no comments in favor of this proposal.

Frank Green, 1151 Santa Clara Avenue, spoke against the proposal as he feels adding another jog in Santa Clara would be a bad decision.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Katie, speaking for the Petitioner, requested a yes or a no tonight to the project.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF FILE #3882, RIGHT OF WAY VACATION, LANPLITE PARK SUBDIVISION FILING #1, I MOVE WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL DUE TO DESIGN QUESTIONS, UNKNOWN FUTURE RAMIFICATIONS OF DEVELOPMENTS TO THE EAST AND NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairwoman Quimby reminded Katie that this action by the Planning Commission may be appealed to City Council.

Chairwoman Quimby recessed the Public Hearing for a 5minute break. The Public Hearing reconvened at 9:05 p.m.

8. #66-81 VILLA SAN MARCOS (FORMERLY WELLS APARTMENTS)-FINAL PLAN

Petitioner: Wells Enterprises/William Wells
Location: 250 feet south of Elm Avenue, west of 28.5 Road.

A request for a final plan of 28 units on 1.4 acres in a planned residential zone at 20 units per acre.

Consideration of final plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Brad Chamberlain, (Wells Enterprises/Chamberlains) San Marcos Associates, 2510 Hwy 6&50, Grand Junction. Mr. Chamberlain outlined the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Mr. Chamberlain was questioned by Commission members on various points, including:

How the irrigation ditch in front will be handled. (Mr. Chamberlain indicated they will have to widen the road and provide a covered culvert the full length of the property.)

Whether every unit has a single-car garage. (Mr. Chamberlain indicated that was true and that the units were all two-story units.)

Whether the units were for adults only or family. (Mr. Chamberlain indicated they could not confine it to adults only and each unit will have their own patio.)

If a written agreement exists with property owners regarding the drainage. (Mr. Chamberlain indicated it is a verbal agreement.)

Access to rear of the building. (Mr. Chamberlain said Mr. Painter gave written consent on new type of plan; most of the changes have been incorporated into this site plan -- distance has been increased between the major building structures and eliminated obstructing landscaping.)

Construction Timetable: Mr. Chamberlain indicated six months, beginning July 1st (pending approval) and completing by January 1, 1983.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin noted this proposal was originally for PR-20 and was approved; a later proposal for PR-30 was denied by Planning Commission. Technical concerns include:

(1) Turnaround in the area (Fire Dept. has agreed to plan, Trash Pickup not sure they can maneuver there; requirement is normally 80' diameter -- they are proposing 50' diameter (25' radius) which is less than we usually ask for. (2) Open space is tight. (3) Staff requests written agreement from adjacent property owners on drainage. (4) Improvements on 28.5 Road -- City Engineer has requested improvements to be in place at time of development; City Council has given general policy not to accept Powers of Attorney.

PETITIONER'S RESPONSE

Brad noted they met with the Sanitation Department this morning and was told there would be adequate area for their trucks to use a straight-in approach; a courtyard effect is being created which helps contribute to the open space of the entire complex.

Chairwoman Quimby asked Mr. Chamberlain if there has been any discussion regarding road improvements.

Mr. Chamberlain replied they had discussed with Planning Department the possibility of acquiring Letter of Credit or Power of Attorney, and the City Engineer (who felt they wanted the road improvements and nothing else), and in order to proceed with the project on those terms they would have to put the road improvements in and be responsible for matching to the existing grade levels (running to a curb and gutter, possible detached sidewalk system to the edges of our property). Petitioner objects to this, somewhat, due to the possibility of obstructing the flow of traffic.

PUBLIC COMMENTS There were no comments either in favor or against the proposal. Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "I MOVE IN THE MATTER OF FILE #66-81, VILLA SAN MARCOS FINAL PLAN, THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL PENDING THE IMPROVEMENTS ON 28.5 ROAD IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CITY ENGINEER'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND A LETTER ON FILE ON THE DRAINAGE OF THE ENTIRE PROJECT, THESE BEING RESOLVED PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO CITY COUNCIL."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously (5-0).

9. #46-80 DEVELOPMENT IN HO--REVISED FINAL PLAN (2 of 2)

Petitioner: Louise Forster
Location: 723 and 733 Horizon Drive (Airport Dollar Inn)

A request for a restaurant, a 40-room addition to the hotel, and a convenience store on 3.32 acres in a highway-oriented zone.

Consideration of development in HO--revised final plan.

Larry Moore, representing Louise Forster & the Airport Quality Inn, introduced the proposal and indicated they are in joint submittal with Feather Petroleum (Larry Feather) on a Convenience Store Stop N Save, located south of their building. Mr. Moore indicated the restaurant would be open from 6:00 a.m.-10:30 p.m. and they are not requesting a liquor license at this time; the addition to the hotel will be added onto the west wing going south across behind the Stop N Save building; Petitioner has worked with the Planning Department for several months in an effort to work out the traffic problem and they have acquired more property and feel parking regulations have been addressed (in terms of rooms, seating capacity and employee parking).

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer questioned Mr. Moore on their customers leaving the hotel and having to access Horizon Drive to get to the gas station, thus causing increased traffic problems. Commissioner O'Dwyer also commented on the cluster of signs and wondered how this could be resolved.

Larry Moore responded that they will be providing directional arrows and signs; they are not proposing a drive-through but rather a hotel customer will have access (two-way traffic) around an island between the hotel and the gas station.

Commissioner Rinker asked where the restaurant will be constructed. Mr. Moore pointed out on the map the location would be off of the lobby.

The Commissioners noted that it exists now. Mr. Moore replied the building exists now and the restaurant will be put into the existing building.

Chairwoman Quimby referred to their letter which indicates the restaurant will be constructed immediately and commented on the inconsistency of this statement since it already exists.

Mr. Moore commented that that part of the building is bare on the inside -- that the inside has not been completed.

Commissioner Litle asked if that was on the original plan that way. Mr. Moore indicated it was not; that the building was added on during construction, admitting it was done without approval.

Chairwoman Quimby commented on the irony of Planning Commission's purpose being defeated by Petitioners who come in after the fact to ask for approval of projects they have already completed, and asked Mr. Moore how this happened.

Mr. Moore answered that the developer and part-owner of the hotel is used to building with fee inspectors in the Nevada area where on-site building inspectors are utilized and "they do it as they go."

Commissioner Litle jokingly asked if he had also put a casino in there. (Mr. Moore said he had not.)

Mr. Moore pointed out the location of the new addition in response to a question from Commissioner Dunivent.

Commissioner Transmeier asked if they have received their certificate of occupancy for the motel yet. Mr. Moore answered they would receive it once the improvements on the site had met with the Planning Department approvals (access, widths, parking spaces, etc.).

Chairwoman Quimby asked about Power of Attorneys for improvements to roads on this project. Don Warner indicated Power of Attorney is appropriate for this project.

Chairwoman Quimby questioned Mr. Moore on his previous comment on a liquor license and whether they will be back for one later. Mr. Moore indicated he didn't think they would.

Mr. Winston Goodpasture, 3084 F Road, Grand Junction, commented on the intentions of the restaurant to serve natural, wholesome foods, freshly squeezed fruit and vegetable juices, no alcohol, and plan to keep it that way.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin pointed out Staff's concerns to include:

- (1) Internal circulation: Staff would like to see traffic kept off of Horizon Drive and limit the number of curb cuts. The City has the option to request shared curb cuts.
- (2) The convenience store has concern about the motel traffic using their curb cuts.
- (3) Staff and Reviewing Agencies recommend they close the curb cut in front of the office which will open up the traffic flow and give them better circulation between the gas station and the hotel.
- (4) Certificate of Occupancy: would designate what would go on ground regarding changes from the original plan; if approved this way they could accommodate for those changes and then get the Certificate.

- (5) Parking spaces designated are adequate.

DISCUSSION

Chairwoman Quimby asked Mr. Moore if there was employee-designated parking. Mr. Moore answered there were and they are located under the existing building (total of 17). Chairwoman Quimby suggested that location would be more convenient for customers to park and the location south of the Stop N Save would be more appropriate for employee parking.

Mr. Moore commented on the curb cut, in that the 25' access to the north of them is off of their property and the only curb cut they have on their property is the one that has been suggested to be eliminated. Because of the lease situation, the legal ramification of giving a permanent access across that property line would be difficult in the event the business was sold or lease runs out.

Bob Goldin noted that if they would lose their lease (and therefore shared curb cuts), an additional curb cut could be renegotiated.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented the problem with that is something would have to be substituted to keep them from using it and then future expense would have to be incurred by the developer and feels this should be resolved initially.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR: Larry Feather, 534 Kingston Court, clarified Feather Petroleum's position being that they have an agreement to lease the 21 parking spaces; that they have leased the property for 5 years and effective June 1, 1982 will execute a new lease for 20 years with two 5-year options with option to purchase within the first 10 years which they intend to exercise -- the parking spaces will go with that purchase. They feel the design and layout they have is the best one to use their existing curb cuts and a common curb cut will reduce the value of their property in the event they intend to sell.

AGAINST: No comments.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSIONER'S DISCUSSION

Commissioner Transmeier commented that the City Engineers have requested three curb cuts and that is not what they want to do. Traffic flow is passable, but not terrific.

Commissioner Rinker commented that there are too many problems to do much.

MOTION:

(COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "ON FILE #46-80, DEVELOPMENT IN HO--REVISED FINAL PLAN, AIRPORT DOLLAR INN, I MAKE A MOTION WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR DENIAL ON THE BASIS OF NONAGREEMENT ON THE THREE ACCESS POINTS (CURB CUTS), INTERNAL CIRCULATION PROBLEMS, AND MARGINAL PARKING."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote and the motion carried 5-0.

10. #106-81 REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN--GREEN VALLEY TOWNHOMES

Petitioner: Mary Ellen Binkley
Location: West of 27.5 Road and approximately 330 feet
North of Patterson Road.

A request to revise a preliminary plan of 50 units in a planned residential zone with an approved density of 10.2 units per acre on 4.9 acres.

Consideration of revised preliminary plan.

Chairwoman Quimby noted that this proposal had been previously denied by the Planning Commission and was appealed to the City Council and in turn referred back to us by City Council.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Katie McIntyre, representing Mrs. Binkley, presented the proposal and provided background on the proposal stating the rezone has been approved and the plan was recommended for denial by the Planning Commission for reasons to include: (1) Geometrics on Lowell Lane; (2) Neighborhood concerns; (3) Drainage problems; (4) Intersection of Spring Valley Court and Lowell Lane not lining up. Tonight's plan has addressed these issues to within City standards. Katie indicated the City Engineer feels this plan is better even though the streets still don't align.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin stated that all technical issues have been met; the alignment with Spring Valley is still in question and if it is approved this way, development to the north will have to respect Lowell Lane as approved. Another issue is the continuation of Lowell Lane and whether or not it is appropriate now vs. later; additional right of way through there could be accommodated for. Zoning was granted by City Council for 10.2 units/acre, so the remaining concern is the design and alignment of the roadway and the continuation of Lowell Lane, as well as the fact there is only one access for 50 units.

Discussion ensued between the Commissioners and the Petitioner regarding the layout of the development, the alignment problem with Lowell Lane and the overall design of the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR

Mary Ellen Binkley, 2957 North Avenue, spoke in favor of the project, commenting she feels the plan is attractive.

Commissioner O'Dwyer expressed the Commission's concern with this plan insofar as future problems.

Mrs. Binkley asked what would happen when development goes in to the north of this project and the Commissioners explained how the decision on this project would directly affect future developments in relation to the hazard of this type of intersection causing staggered streets up and down 27.5 Road.

AGAINST

Dick Williams, 607 1/2 Broken Spoke, who also owns a home at 1541 Lowell Lane, stated he is not in favor of the project going in without Lowell Lane being improved as he feels this will be used as a shortcut by the new residents.

Greg Longhorn, 1531 Lowell Lane, spoke against the proposal as he does not want to pay for the paving of Lowell Lane so someone can build apartments; and checked with Planning Staff as to whether his petition had been received. (Bob Goldin confirmed that it had.)

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION:

(COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD ITEM #106-81, REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN -- GREEN VALLEY TOWNHOMES -- TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL BASED ON NEIGHBORHOOD OPPOSITION, NONALIGNMENT OF LOWELL LANE WITH SPRING VALLEY CIRCLE AND OTHER CONCERNS REGARDING ACCESS, TRAFFIC CIRCULATION, ETC."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rinker. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously (5-0).

11. #26-82 FIRST SECURITY SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION--REVISED FINAL PLAN

Petitioner: First Western Development Corporation/Donald D. Cook

Location: 2692 Hwy 50 (Lot 2 of Mesa Plaza Subdivision)

A request for adding a drive-up window to a final plan on 2.35 acres in a planned business zone.

Consideration of revised final plan.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin introduced the proposal and oriented the audience on the location and purpose of this request.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Daryl Shrum, Beck & Associates, noted that all technical aspects have been addressed both verbally and in writing.

Chairwoman Quimby asked Daryl why a Savings and Loan Association would be constructed without a driveup window.

Mr. Shrum responded that the building was leased from another property. Mr. Shrum continued, asking for a modification on the length of the barrier so they can provide a splitrail fence.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin explained the City Transportation Engineer's purpose for wanting to see the "planter" extended was for traffic safety reasons, for designation of drive-up area, and for future parking access.

PUBLIC COMMENTS There were none.

DISCUSSION

There was discussion regarding the drainage from the parking lot conflicting with the location of proposed drive. Mr. Shrum indicated a segment would be cut out to allow for proper drainage.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "ON FILE #2682, FIRST SECURITY SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION REVISED FINAL PLAN, I RECOMMEND WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL PENDING COMPLETION OF STAFF COMMENTS, SUCH AS CLOSING THE CURB CUT PRIOR TO OPENING THE DRIVEUP WINDOW, EXTENSION OF FULL BARRIER AS SHOWN ON THE PLAN INSTALLED."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

12. #21-82 TEXT AMENDMENT--GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE.

Petitioner: City/County Development Department

A request for a text amendment adding Section 7-2-5 Planned Airport Development (PAD) to the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code. Copies are on file at the City/County Development Department, 559 White Avenue, Room 60, Grand Junction, CO 81501.

Consideration of text amendment.

Chairwoman Quimby noted that the County had previously approved a PAD for the Airport (May, 1981); since then the Airport property has become a part of the City of Grand Junction which is the reason for this amendment which will also apply to any airport.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin explained the proposed Text Amendment, indicating that given the PAD tonight, Staff will rezone the hotel and the remainder of Walker Field. Bob noted that the PAD would take into consideration all uses (motels, car rental, and airport related facilities); other uses would come in under conditional use process. The City/County Development Department has requested it be written in accordance with the existing Planned Development regulations; Mr. Paul Bowers has requested different wording to allow more flexibility.

Paul Bowers, Walker Field Airport Authority, presented his proposed text amendment indicating his plan would eliminate subsequent presentations to the Planning Commission for review, therefore expediting the process. Essentially, Mr. Bower's proposal differs from City/County Development Department's proposal in that 7-2-5-B delineates "uses under A.1" (business and commercial areas relating directly to the airport such as car rental agencies, services for aircraft, flight services/operations and similar uses) rather than "uses under A.1 through A.6."

DISCUSSION

Discussion ensued regarding the differences between the two proposals and whether it would be appropriate to add a definition of "Airport Authority." It was decided that would not be necessary as an Airport Authority could only be one thing.

After discussion, Chairwoman Quimby made the following suggestions:

7-2-5-B be modified to read:

"Uses under A.1 above may be finally approved by the Airport Authority if said uses are shown on an overall Airport Plan, and said site specific uses receive favorable recommendation/signoff, as applicable, by City Utilities Department, Grand Junction Fire Department and City/County Development Department.

7-2-5-C should read:

"All other uses mentioned above shall have separate plan approval, appropriate to the scale of the development, as specified in Section 7-5."

7-2-5-D should read:

"Uses in a PAD Zone shall also meet the requirements of 7-3 and 7-4-7."

7-2-5-E should read:

"For all development requests in a PAD zone the owner of the airport will be a review agency."

7-2-5-A-1.6 accepted as read on Airport Authority's submittal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "I MOVE WE FORWARD THE TEXT AMENDMENT PROPOSAL TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THE 'AMENDED' PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT FOR THE PLANNED AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairwoman Quimby discussed the Commission's desire to tour the airport terminal and plans were formulated for that visit.

13. #23-82 REZONE PZ TO PAD

Petitioner: Walker Field Airport Authority.
Location: Parcel B of Walker Field property.

A request to rezone from public zone to planned airport development on approximately 8 acres.

Consideration of rezone.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin presented the request.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON FILE #23-82, REZONE OF PUBLIC ZONE TO PAD, I MAKE A MOTION WE PASS THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion and requested a vote from the Commissioners. The motion carried unanimously.

14. #22-82 ZONING OF WALKER FIELD ANNEXATION

Petitioner: Walker Field Airport Authority.
Location: Walker Field Airport.

A request to zone Walker Field Annexation to Planned Airport Development (PAD) on approximately 1344 acres.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "ON FILE #22-82, THE ZONING OF WALKER FIELD ANNEXATION, I MOVE WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion; Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously.

Paul Bower noted that the Airport Authority will be back with a request for a liquor license for the restaurant.

15. TEXT AMENDMENTS

#40-82 ANNUAL UPDATE TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE.

Petitioner: City/County Development Department. As follows:

1. Amending sections 4-2-11 B, 4-2-13 B to add a "10 feet" to the phrase in quotes to read: "(if adjacent to a residential zone or existing residential use 10 feet)."

This amendment is proposed to correct a typographical error in the adopted text.

2. Amending Chapter 13 to add the definition of Density to read as follows:

"Density -- a number representing number of dwelling units per acre in any given development or geographic area. Densities in RSF zones and Residential Planned Development (PR) zones are figured as gross densities of the parcel prior to deducting the area of required roads, open space, etc. Densities in the RMF zones are figured as net densities relating only to the specific parcel on which a multifamily unit is located."

This amendment is proposed to clarify the appropriate methods of density calculation required by the code.

3. Amending section 5-8-4 D1 to change the reference to 8-4E to read 5-8-4E.

This amendment is proposed to correct a typographical error in the adopted text.

4. Amending section 4-3-4, Use/Zone matrix, to change all uses presently listed under the HO zone as "A" or "S" to read "C."

This amendment is proposed to clarify that all uses in the HO zone must receive development approval by the Planning Commission and City Council.

5. Amending section 2-2-2B.9 to change "Governing Body" to read "Mesa County Board of Commissioners."

This amendment is proposed because the intent was to provide for county review and "Governing Body" is defined as the Grand Junction City Council.

6. A request to delete the zero lot line concept from the side yard setback requirements in the residential single family zone at 8 units per acre (RSF-8).

7. Amending section 4-2-10 to add paragraph 4-2-10 F.4 reading as follows:

4. Residential uses in the B-1 zone shall be limited to 16 units per acre if the parcel is adjacent to any RSF zone. If the parcel is not adjacent to a RSF zone, a maximum density of 32 units per acre shall be permitted.

8. Amending section 4-2-12 to add paragraph 4-2-12F.1 reading as follows:

1. Residential uses approved through the conditional use process shall not exceed a maximum density of 64 units per acre.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Transmeier questioned the difference in Item #2 in figuring RSF vs. RMF for density; Bob Goldin explained that what they have now is density for the overall plan which needs clarification on whether it includes roadways, etc. or not. Also discussed were: Item #1 (typographical error of -10), and Item #7 (changed to read: "Amending section 4-2-10 to add paragraph 4-2-10 F.4 reading as follows: 4. Residential uses in the B-1 zone shall be limited to 16 units per acre." -- Remainder deleted.)

MOTION:

(COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "ON FILE #40-82, THE ANNUAL UPDATE OF THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, I MAKE A MOTION WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: ITEM #1 BE CORRECTED TO READ 10' (NOT -10'); ITEM #2 BE DELETED AND TABLED FOR FUTURE CLARIFICATION; APPROVE ITEMS #3, #4, #5, AND #6 AS WRITTEN; AMEND ITEM #7 TO READ "RESIDENTIAL USES IN THE B-1 ZONE SHALL BE LIMITED TO 16 UNITS PER ACRE; ITEM #8 APPROVED AS WRITTEN."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion, Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion and called for a vote. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairwoman reminded the Commission members to plan to attend the Mesa County Planning Commission Thursday at 8:00 p.m.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.