

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing, August 31, 1982
Minutes
7:30 pm - 8:30 pm

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ross Transmeier at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commissioner were:

Miland Dunivent	Jack Ott
Bill O'Dwyer	Jane Quimby
Susan Rinker	

(Commissioner Dick Litle was absent)

In attendance, representing the Planning Department Staff were:

Karl Metzner	Bob Goldin	Don Warner
--------------	------------	------------

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

There were no citizens present during the course of the evening other than the petitioners representing the scheduled agenda items.

* * * * *

Chairman Transmeier called the meeting to order, and indicated that any project presented tonight would be forwarded to City Council whether it is approved or disapproved for a second hearing. Chairman Transmeier then introduced himself as the new Chairman of the Planning Commission and thanked Jane Quimby for her past year's performance.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

MOTION: (Commissioner Dunivent) "I MOVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 27, 1982 GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED WITH THE INCORPORATION OF THE FOLLOWING CORRECTION: THE DATE OF "JULY 27, 1982" BE REPLACED WITH "JUNE 29, 1982 IN THE MOTION FOR ITEM I (APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING)."

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

III. FULL HEARING

1. #51-82 THE FALLS SOUTH--FILING #4--REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN.

Petitioner: Valley Housing and Development/Robert Rewinkle.
Location: East of 28.25 Road and approximately 1200 feet
South of Patterson Road.

A request for a revised preliminary plan for 87 units on approximately 5.8 acres in a planned residential zone at 8 units per acre.

Consideration of revised preliminary plan.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin, Planning Staff, explained the location of the plan, noting that filing #4 was to be re-reviewed as part of the stipulation of approving filing #3 last month. Staff's major concerns are with the amenities.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, Paragon Engineering, represented the petitioner and provided background on the resubmission of filing #4 in that the lack of an amenity package made that step necessary. Tom then further outlined the plans for the recreational development (tennis court; multi-purpose court for volleyball, basketball or other hard-surface sports; spa and hot tub facility with clubhouse; storage facility; small lounge (patio area). Tom indicated they have met with the Fire Department and the Utility Department and have satisfied their concerns. Fruitvale Sanitation, according to Tom, still refuses to accept the Falls so the petitioner is planning to use the proposed lift station.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer questioned Tom for further clarification on Fruitvale Sanitation's initial response on acceptance of the sewage.

Tom answered that Fruitvale Sanitation was initially approached in and around 1978 and were asked if their system could be utilized to carry sewage from the Falls to the City Plant; Fruitvale responded negatively. They were questioned again recently on their policies and the answer was the same, so a 12' lift station will be utilized.

Chairman Transmeier asked if the access problem to the lift station has been solved.

Tom indicated that they had and the construction plans will be submitted with the final application.

Commissioner Quimby questioned Tom Logue on several items:

1. Whether one tennis court, one hot tub and one multi-purpose court as proposed would be sufficient to accommodate the population of the development.

Tom agreed there will be approximately 500 people living there, and noted that the Cascade Condominium Development also plans for an indoor facility (exercise room, spa).

2. Why they decided to change the location of the swimming pool.

Tom stated that the developer (who lives on the site) had taken an informal poll with his neighbors and found they felt they would benefit more from the tennis court than the swimming pool on a more frequent basis. Tom stated he felt one tennis court would be adequate.

3. What is the status of the acceptance of the streets in phases I & II.

Tom answered that there are deficiencies in Filing #1 and those have been taken care of by the developer and he has asked the City for reinspection. Filing #2 had a deficiency with the site distance on Grand Falls Drive and that will necessitate removal of about 130' of road which will be accomplished through complete regrading.

4. Has an agreement been reached on connecting the two streets.

Tom responded that has been difficult to resolve due to the grading situation there in that they would have to exceed the minimum City street grading requirement, and this has been pointed out to the Fire Department.

Commissioner Dunivent asked if the utility easements question has been resolved.

Tom answered yes, that the plat for filing #3 has been submitted with inclusion of those easements, and it has been reviewed by Public Service and Utility agencies.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin stated he talked with Jim Patterson (Director of Public Works) yesterday regarding the Fruitvale Sanitation acceptance of the Falls. Mr. Patterson indicated that since Fruitvale had not responded, he interpreted that as a

negative response, so it appears the only alternative is the lift station. Staff feels this is not the best situation and whether it is adequate is questionable and the City "would have to live with it" since Fruitvale won't accept the project. Bob also stated that Staff is concerned with the amenities package in that the original site plan incorporated far more amenities than what is now proposed, and suggested that the homeowners be made aware of this either through a homeowner's agreement or covenant.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Bob for more clarification on the lift station situation and what he meant by his statement that the "City would have to live with it."

Bob answered that although the City is not much in favor of doing so, they will eventually be responsible for maintaining the system since there are no other alternatives.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked why the City would even be involved since it flows to Central Grand Valley.

Tom Logue clarified the question by stating that the Central Grand Valley Sanitation District has a contract with the City of Grand Junction to maintain their lines and lift stations, so the City does receive some financial compensation through the user's monthly service fee, as he understands it. Tom also indicated the cost to the City for maintaining the lift station includes expenses of the mechanical apparatus required, periodic servicing and inspection and possible reinstallation.

Chairman Transmeier asked for further questions and having heard none, closed the public hearing, noting that after a motion is heard he will ask for discussion.

MOTION: (Commissioner Quimby) "I MAKE A MOTION ON ITEM #51-82 THAT WE RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF FILING #4 PRIOR TO ALL CONCERNS AND COMMENTS FROM REVIEWING AGENCIES BEING ADDRESSED AND AN ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION ON THE AMENITIES TO BE PROVIDED IN THE CONVENANTS."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

Commissioner Quimby explained the reason for her motion as a protection to the City from future complaints from residents who might be expecting different amenities than what will be provided.

Chairman Transmeier asked if there was any further discussion. Since there was none, Chairman Transmeier then called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

2. #54-82, EASEMENT VACATION

Petitioner: Anne H. Gould
Location: Lot 1, Block 1, Lakeside Subdivision.

A request to vacate a utility and drainage easement on Lot 1, lock 1, of Lakeside Subdivision.

Consideration of easement vacation.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin, Planning Staff, presented the proposal by showing the location and indicating the intentions of the petitioner.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Anne Gould, 2420 No 1st, opened her presentation by making a correction to her site plan which showed the requested vacation extending over into the corner of the north-south drainage easement. This vacation, she explained, would not affect the easement running north and south. She further answered planning staff comments thusly:

1. The existing water main has been dedicated with the appropriate easements -- a 20' easement is now dedicated. (This was substantiated by Don Warner, Planning Staff).
2. In answer to the drainage question, Anne said the exit to the lake was moved even farther north so nothing is going across this land now, nor is anything proposed.

Don Warner added that he checked on the easement and there is nothing under it.

Chairman Transmeier asked for further questions or comments. There were none. Chairman Transmeier then closed the public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner O'Dwyer) "ON ITEM #54-82, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THIS EASEMENT."

Commissioners Rinker and Quimby seconded the motion simultaneously.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

3. #53-82 CONDITIONAL USE - AMENDED DRIVE-UP WINDOW

Petitioner: Carl Gaumer.
Location: 503 North Avenue.

A request to amend an existing conditional use (drive-up window) on approximately .5 acre in a light commercial zone.

Consideration of conditional use.

Chairman Transmeier questioned Staff on the Conditional Use.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin explained that any drive-up within the City is considered Conditional Use, noting that the restaurant is an allowable use with this zone, and commented that the petitioner's intends to add on to the existing structure and change the location of the existing drive-up.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Carl Gaumer, 853 White, introduced his proposal by giving the dimensions of the existing Taco Time building and the proposed additions, to include:

- . Relocation and expansion of the drive-up window to the south;
- . Moving the front doors from the north side of the building to the east side.
- . Adding moss rock to the outside, cleaning up and providing landscaping.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if Mr. Gaumer planned to change the access either off of 5th Street or North Avenue.

Carl stated the alley is currently being used, doesn't know why a curb cut off of 5th Street was never installed, and indicated he would be willing to do that if so required. Mr. Gaumer also noted that there has never been any accidents there as a result of customers using the alley as an access point.

Commissioner O'Dwyer noted that alleys are not supposed to be used as access points by the public; rather, they are intended to be used by service vehicles.

Commissioner Ott commented that the public should be using North Avenue instead of 5th Street for access.

Commissioner Quimby added that using 5th Street is a dangerous situation.

Carl Gaumer explained the landscaping intentions will include possibly a small fence, rock, planters, trees, colored rock, boulders, or something. He stated he has not met with Parks and Recreation yet, but he does intend to landscape.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin stated that Staff has no problems with the drive-up window, but they are concerned with the internal circulation and would like to see a determination made on this and requested this be incorporated as part of the motion. Bob also noted that the alley should not be used for access to this business, per Transportation Department's review comments.

Chairman Transmeier asked for questions of the Staff and asked that the record show there were no audience members present.

Commissioner Dunivent asked about the possibility of alley improvements being incorporated.

Carl Gaumer agreed that would definitely improve the site and indicated he would do his part if the neighbors would agree to take care of their part.

Commissioner O'Dwyer suggested using an Improvement District for alley improvements.

Commissioner Quimby expressed concern with the procedure and timing of this project, in that the Planning Commission prefers having these types of concerns resolved prior to presentation, and that Planning Staff should not be expected to practically design the project. She added that landscaping would definitely improve the site.

MOTION: (Commissioner Quimby) "I MOVE ON ITEM #53-82 THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THIS PROJECT BASED ON ALL TECHNICAL CONCERNS BEING SATISFIED, PARTICULARLY RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNAL CIRCULATION AND CURB CUT QUESTION, DISCUSSION OF POSSIBILITY OF IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT TO PAVE THE ALLEY, AND THAT ATTRACTIVE LANDSCAPING BE PROVIDED, BEFORE THIS IS FORWARDED TO CITY COUNCIL."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

4. #56-82 REZONE PZ TO C2

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction.
Location: Northeast corner of 6th and Ute.

A request to change from Public Zone to Heavy Commercial on approximately .82 acre.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner, Planning Staff, introduced the proposal, noting the change is being requested because the City is trading the property to a private party which means it can no longer be zoned as PZ. Karl further noted that if it is acquired by the State at some future point, it will have to go back to PZ.

Commissioner Quimby suggested the Commission request a site plan review on this property when it is completed.

There were no further Staff comments or comments from the public (no one was present), so Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Rinker) "I MAKE A MOTION ON ITEM #56-82, REZONE PZ TO C2 THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, WITH THE CONSIDERATION THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE A SITE PLAN ON THE PROJECT WHEN IT IS COMPLETED."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion, called for a vote and the motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

Commissioner Quimby entered a comment on the attractiveness of the development at 12th and Elm (ice cream parlour), and suggested sending a letter complimenting the developers. Bob Goldin made note and indicated Staff would handle that. Commissioner Dunivent also complimented the developers of the Gladstone Restaurant for their facility.

Chairman Transmeier adjourned the public hearing at 8:30 p.m.

###