

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- July 26, 1983
7:30 pm - 10:00 pm

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

Bill O'Dwyer	Jack Ott
Dick Litle	Jane Quimby
Susan Rinker	

(Commissioner Miland Dunivent was absent)

In attendance, representing the Planning Department were:

Karl Metzner Don Warner Bob Goldin Janet C.-Stephens

Rachelle Daily of Sunshine Computer Services, was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 25 interested citizens present at the beginning of the meeting.

* * * * *

Chairman Transmeier called the meeting to order and explained that the items heard tonight will go on to City Council whether they are approved or disapproved, unless the petitioners ask for them to be removed.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Chairman Transmeier asked the Planning Commission for a discussion on the minutes of the 6/28/83 GJPC Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER QUIMBY) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 28, 1983 GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING BE APPROVED AFTER THE FOLLOWING CORRECTION IS MADE ON PAGE 14:

DELETE THE PHRASE "TO LANDSCAPING" ON LINE SIX OF THE MOTION ON ITEM #33-83."

Commissioner Susan Rinker seconded the motion.

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR VISITORS.

A. MESA COUNTY BUILDING AUTHORITY

Karl Metzner, Planning Staff, presented the Mesa County Building Authority's proposal for an elderly low-cost housing project and made the following comments:

1. Location: Southeast corner of 15th St. and F 1/4 Rd.
2. Density: Highest existing zoning in the area is Planned Residential at 8 units/acre; this proposal is for slightly over 19 units/acre. This increase in density is one of the reasons for requesting public input. (96 units on slightly less than 5 acres)
3. Access: Off of 15th Street.
4. Design: Central common area, recreation facility, open space area.
5. Parking: Although slightly lower than the City standards for multi-family housing, it does fit with other existing parking approved for other elderly housing projects.
6. Future Extension of F 1/4 Road (27 1/2 Road and 15th Street) has been approved by the City and the Right of Way will be dedicated. 15th Street is a Collector Road and all Right of Way will be given at the time of building submittal.
7. Emergency Access: Scheduled for northeast corner, off of the future F 1/4 Road extension.

Karl mentioned that three County Commissioners were present to answer questions and introduced Maxine Albers, George White, and Dick Pond.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Little asked for the timeframe of construction.

Gordon Buford answered that it is scheduled to begin as soon as they can, to be completed by April or May, 1984.

Commissioner Rinker asked when F 1/4 Road is scheduled to go in.

Karl Metzner responded that the timeframe is undetermined at the present time, but he estimates it will be within the next five years.

Commissioner Quimby asked and received confirmation from Karl Metzner that the south parcel of land is owned by one property owner.

Chairman Transmeier asked for the criteria for "low-cost elderly."

Bob Gardner, Secretary for the Mesa County Building Authority, then introduced other members of the Authority who were present in the audience:

Henry Faussone - President
Gordon Buford - Construction Manager for the project

To answer Chairman Transmeier's question, Mr. Gardner provided background information on the project. His statements included:

1. The project is unique in the sense that it is a "non-subsidized" public housing project. The facility will be owned by the community, but during the course of the debt reduction for the bonds that have been sold, it will be managed by the Mesa County Building Authority (on behalf of the community).
2. Entrance requirements are the same found for any public housing project -- 62 years of age or older; low-income; and other criteria established by the State.
3. This is the first time in the U.S. that this sort of project has been done without subsidy from federal, state, or local governments -- the project is paid for by the people who occupy the rented units.
4. The estimated time for repayment of the bonds is less than twenty years.
5. 95 units will be occupied by tenants; 1 unit will be occupied by a manager.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if these bonds were "Industrial Revenue type."

Bob Gardner answered, "No, the bonds have been sold through the Mesa County Building Authority, which is made up of seven private citizens."

Commissioner Quimby asked what the responsibilities are of this Authority and whether they are an appointed or elected board.

Mr. Gardner stated that they were appointed by the County Commissioners and are responsible for managing the project (collecting the money, etc).

Commissioner Quimby asked what the difference is between this board and the Mesa County Housing Authority.

Mr. Gardner said he did not know what the difference was, but that the Mesa County Building Authority is the official title for their non-profit corporation.

Commissioner Quimby asked Mr. Gardner to clarify the elderly requirements, as to whether it is restricted to low-income or low income and moderate income.

Mr. Gardner replied, "Low, moderate, or any kind. There is a requirement that 20% of the occupants will be low-income."

Commissioner Quimby commented that she was glad to see them appear before the Planning Commission tonight, but that she was sorry it took a letter from the Commission to get them here, since this is a development within the City and the Planning Commission knew nothing about it.

Mr. Gardner apologized for not informing the Planning Commission before now. He added that the project has been underway for more than 18 months.

Chairman Transmeier Karl Metzner if this project has gone through a full technical review.

Karl indicated that it had and all concerns have been resolved.

Chairman Transmeier noted that one concern of the Planning Commission was that since this is a public zone, they wanted to give the public an opportunity to be heard. He then asked for comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mark Fleck, 3011 North 15th St., stated he was basically in favor of the project on the condition that they get the street paved since they currently have a real dust problem.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Karl Metzner for the status of 15th St. from Patterson and up.

Karl Metzner answered that the City is trying to put together a Street Improvement District this year to improve 15th St. from Patterson Road to Crestview.

Henry Fausse responded to the paving question, saying it has been difficult to get the property owners that parallel 15th Street to agree on street improvements for this area between Patterson and Crestview Drive. He stated that the City initially determined that the best procedure would be to pave from Hermosa Court to Crestview (where some resemblance of oil exists on 15th St. from Patterson to Hermosa).

Petitions are being circulated now, but the process is slow (some property owners live out of town, etc.). Further discussion with the City (Jim Wysocki and Engineers) has provided the suggestion to extend the paving down to Patterson and consider a relatively full interchange at the intersection of Patterson and 15th St. Mr. Fausone stated he cannot visualize this would be completed before next year. He also noted that since the County owns the property, they will be participating, and it will be coming before the Commission.

Karl Metzner added that the City has applied for monetary assistance for these improvements, but when the money will be available is not known.

Commissioner Quimby asked if the Planning Staff is comfortable and considers the five-year timeframe realistic and desirable.

Karl Metzner responded that the key is the development in the area, and given the present level of development and economic activity, it may be at least five years.

Mary Lynn Phillips, area resident, asked for the date of groundbreaking.

Mr. Buford answered that it would be as soon as they get approval from City Council.

Chairman Transmeier commented that this item doesn't really require the Planning Commission's approval because it is already in an approved zone. The Planning Commission has negotiated for a few changes in the plan which they feel are improvements in the process.

Mr. Buford commented that the County intends to participate in the 15th Street improvements.

Henry Fausone added that the property is 330' wide and feels it represents a large "chunk" of 15th St. between Hermosa and Crestview and thinks it's fair to assume that without this project, the prospects for having it paved would be dimmer.

County Commissioner Maxine Albers addressed the dust problem by saying that it is a requirement during construction for the road to be watered regularly to keep the dust down. She also commented that during other construction projects (on Patterson Road), they have made a good effort to keep the dust down and it seems like the water trucks are running all the time.

Mary Lynn Phillips stated that it was her understanding that the water trucks are required to come by three times a day.

Henry Fausson explained that those arrangements had been made in order to establish the trash collection stops.

Mark Fleck commented that they haven't watered now for three months.

Chairman Transmeier thanked the County Commissioners and members of the Mesa County Building Authority for being present at the meeting, noting that a vote is not required.

=====

B. SURPLUS CITY

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jim Holmes, representing Surplus City, presented his request for the Planning Commission to consider leaving the curb cuts in front of the store as they are now.

COMMENTS

Jim Bragdon presented what he feels are the problems with the current curb-cut situation. He noted that the City Engineer and the City Traffic Engineer have the authority to alter any curb cuts within the city that are considered traffic hazards and that they try to use the authority in a reasonable manner. He stated this particular curb cut situation borders on being "super dangerous." Since this property has recently come in for developmental changes, they have analyzed the curb cuts for safety and other considerations and feel two major problems exist:

1. The curb cut existing next to Spruce Street has been a problem for a long time.
2. The other existing curb cut is 85' long.

Mr. Bragdon indicated that he has tried to find out what the future plans are for the area and found them to be uncertain, but that the possibility exists that there will be development to the north of the new Jolly Jug Liquor Store. He, therefore, analyzed the current plan and has suggested that one curb cut be placed in the middle of the property to serve Jolly Jug and any future development to the north of it. Mr. Bragdon added that he doesn't think there is adequate parking now and some of what does exist will have to be eliminated.

Other problems include the fact that Grand Avenue is also Hwy 340 (State property) and in discussing with the State Traffic Engineers it was proposed to reduce the 85' curb cut to 25' or 35'. Mr. Bragdon clarified that the reason for the requests are primarily for safety reasons.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Mr. Bragdon to point out the location of the existing and proposed curb cuts on the map.

Mr. Bragdon so obliged, and further illustrated the location of the angle parking area which will be eliminated when the present curb cut is eliminated.

PLANNING STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin discussed what he understood to be future plans for the site after talking with Jim Holmes; that being to eventually tear down the existing Surplus City building and rebuilding to the north of the new Jolly Jug Liquor Store. The parking situation now is adequate on site; new development will require additional parking, which would be available after the existing Surplus City building is torn down. Bob further explained that Jim Bragdon's suggestion for the change in curb cuts is a result of the City's concern for safety at the site, the State Highway's recommendation, and the speculation for future development by Jim Holmes.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Jim Holmes discussed the past record on car wrecks for the site and indicated that most of them have been farther west towards the Gasamat Station. He noted that the way it exists, cars pulling out onto Grand Avenue reach a speed of about 17 miles per hour before turning into his curb cut, and after testing it himself, has found that a curb cut placed farther west (closer to Jolly Jug) will allow cars to speed up to at least 25 mph before entering. He also attributed this rate of speed to the fact that most people are running the stoplight on Spruce. He interprets the proposed location of the curb cut to interfere with the edge of his Surplus City building.

Commissioner Rinker argued that the location of the proposed curb cut would bring the cars straight north and would not interfere with the building. She also noted that she has driven around that corner many times in the last week and personally thinks it (the existing curb cut) should be removed.

Bob Goldin added that the exact location of the curb cut is more at Surplus City's discretion in regards to the alignment.

Chairman Transmeier then closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DICK LITTLE) "IN THE CASE OF THE SURPLUS CITY REQUEST ON CURB CUTS, I RECOMMEND WE ACCEPT THE CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S RECOMMENDATION TO REPLACE THE EXISTING CURB CUTS PER HIS DESIGN."

Commissioner Quimby seconded the motion.

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

III. FULL HEARING

1. #30-83 REZONE C-1 TO PC AND GENE TAYLORS - FINAL PLAN (2 of 2)

Petitioner: Gene Taylor
Location: Southwest corner of West Gunnison Avenue and Peach Street. A request to change from light commercial uses to planned commercial uses and a final plan on approximately .63 acre.

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

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Chairman Transmeier announced that Gene Taylor was here primarily at the request of the Planning Commission for him to rezone the balance of his property as discussed at the June Public Hearing. Chairman Transmeier asked Mr. Taylor if there have been any changes in his plan.

Gene Taylor replied that he didn't think so and asked Janet Stephens to respond.

PLANNING STAFF

Janet Stephens commented that City Council had questioned the drainage and alleyway access, which resulted in further discussion with the City Engineer, architect and Mr. Taylor. It was determined that it would be better not to have alley

access at all. The access will be off of Peach and Vine. The alley easement will be maintained. She also noted that two parking spaces were deleted at the north section of the plan per a suggestion by the City Transportation Engineer.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked for the status of the underground pumping application, and wanted clarification on Mr. Taylor's plans for sealing off the water.

Mr. Taylor indicated he applied for it five weeks ago. He made a followup telephone call about a week ago and was told that it is a commercial water use which will take a little longer than a domestic water use application. He said he plans to work with all the engineers to completely seal off the top water from the bottom water. He added that he plans to put in a 5 hp pump that will pump around 100-120 gallons/minute. The replacement factor is about 18 gallons, so they will be more than able to pump the water out of the lake and any excess water will be drained to the street through a natural drainage (per City Engineer's specifications).

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion on the Rezone request.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER QUIMBY) "ON ITEM #30-83, REZONE C1 TO PC, I MOVE WE SEND TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion.

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

Chairman Transmeier asked the Commissioners for a vote on the Final Plan request.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "ON ITEM #30-83, I MOVE WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN."

Commissioner Quimby seconded the motion.

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

Janet Stephens, Planning Staff, thanked Mr. Taylor for responding to the concerns and appearing before the Planning Commission tonight.

Commissioner Quimby also thanked Mr. Taylor for his prompt attention to their request.

[Chairman Transmeier announced that the following two agenda items would be considered simultaneously (#34-83--Rezone/ODP Request and #34-83--Vacation of Utility Easement)]

**2. #34-83 REZONE RSF-4 TO PB AND PATTERSON MEDICAL CENTER -
OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Petitioner: Henry Faussonne, Dennis Granum, Noel B. Norris
Location: Northwest corner of 26.75 and F Roads. A request to change from residential single-family uses at 4 units per acre to planned business uses and an outline development plan on approximately .37 acre.

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

3. #34-83 VACATION OF UTILITY EASEMENT

Petitioner: Henry Faussonne, Dennis Granum, Noel B. Norris
Location: East 25 feet of lot 2, Bennett Subdivision.

A request to vacate a utility easement.

Consideration of utility easement vacation.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Daryl Shrum, Beck/Shrum & Associates, presented the proposal with the following comments:

1. Discussions with the Planning Department indicate that all responses to review agency comments have been adequate.
2. The only major concern has been how to blend this professional office building with the surrounding uses. The use to the south is the canal; across from the canal is essentially a medical-oriented area. Existing east of the project is a large apartment complex. Daryl provided the Planning

Commission with photographs, explaining that the apartment complex "in no manner faces upon the project; it faces south and north." He also pointed out that although two single family homes exist adjacent to this project, they are essentially "totally screened" by natural vegetation.

3. The ODP reflects additional landscaping (a 3' strip along the west property line). In addition, the 4-6' embankment that surrounds the northern and northwest portion of the property is owned by other property owners. Because of this, Daryl feels that no one is really affronted by this new project and feels that this is the right use at the right location.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Litle asked Daryl if their building will be a single-story unit.

Daryl replied the design is for a two-story building (about 30'). He added that they have not prepared their final development plan, but they plan to use the existing terrain and the peak will be about 30'. He pointed out that their property is about 10-14' lower than the surrounding properties.

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin noted that since this area is in transition, there is some question as to whether this rezone is appropriate; since the area wasn't well defined, the petitioners took the option to present an Outline Development Plan in more of a "Sketch" plan. The Planning Commission will have the opportunity to see this again for conceptual and building specification consideration, if approved.

Chairman Transmeier asked Bob Goldin whether the project will have to go through two more steps (Preliminary and Final Plan) if the ODP is approved.

Bob replied that the petitioner has the option of bypassing the Preliminary Plan step if they can accommodate everything in the Final Development Plan step; so there will be at least one additional public hearing scheduled on this item.

Bob discussed the proposal to vacate the utility easement running north and south on 26.75 Road. The City Engineer has no problem with the easement vacation after locating the sewer line (it is located in the Right of Way, rather than

in the Utility Easement). Other technical concerns (drainage, etc.) will be considered at the next phase.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Walter Hatmaker, 2656 Patterson Road, stated that he is in favor of the rezone for this project.

AGAINST:

Dr. Robert Orr, 609 Rico Way, stated that although he is not really in opposition to the rezone, he is concerned with their plan for a two-story building since he feels views will be obstructed. He also commented on the existing traffic problem on Patterson and his concern that this project will generate more traffic. He also asked for more information on the specifications of the plan, particularly with the parking.

Chairman Transmeier reminded Dr. Orr that those kinds of details are not available at this time since it is at the ODP level. He indicated that, as proposed at this time, there will be 24 parking spaces.

Daryl Shrum responded to Dr. Orr's concerns by informing him that the Pufferbelly Office Complex on Pitkin is a good example of the architecture planned; two story; 6000 total sq. ft. to accommodate 4 condominium units for four offices.

Commissioner Quimby commented that the rezone to Planned Business will give the Planning Commission a little more strength in what they can require of the developer. She assured Dr. Orr that the Planning Commission and Planning Staff are both concerned with the details of the plan.

Henry Faussonne indicated that they took this course of action in a cooperative effort to maintain the compatibility of the area. They don't feel that a multi-family use would be the most appropriate. They are agreeable to work closely to accommodate the architectural requests (they are open to considering a garden-level rather than a two-story building, for example).

Dr. Orr reiterated that he would be very much in favor of a "nicely done building there." He does feel, however, that 6000 sq. ft. with 26 parking spaces is a "little bit too much in too small of a space."

Charlotte Wren, 602 Rico Way, wanted to go on record saying that if it is done, she hopes it is accomplished with the minimum amount of impact to the traffic on Patterson. She is concerned for the children playing in the area.

Mr. John Schumacher, 608 Viewpoint Drive, commented on the fact that years ago he and Tom Young approached the Planning Commission in regard to a 40-unit/acre development that adjoined their properties. At that time they were informed that a "protective zone" would be maintained between the high density and the existing homes. He still feels that should be done for this project too, as he is concerned with business encroaching on private residences. He also feels strongly that Grand Junction is already overbuilt with office space and doesn't understand why the "creeping development" is allowed which, in his opinion, "damages a good developed area." He is also concerned for the safety of the children in the area. He suggested an overall plan be developed to help control this type of "creeping development." He concluded by asking the Planning Commission if they police the regulations they pass (to insure that builders do what they say they are going to do).

Chairman Transmeier explained to Mr. Schumacher that there is a difference between the City and the County Planning Commissions, and that the City Planning Commission is responsible for policing anything this Board or the City Council approves. He further explained that when land is annexed into the City, there are new criteria to be considered. However, an effort is made to have projects that are on the "border line" (of annexation) to be built per City specifications, and those specifications are checked after projects are built.

Commissioner Quimby asked Mr. Schumacher if she was understanding him to say that he would prefer not to see any development on this piece of property.

Mr. Schumacher replied that he thinks it would only stand one unit (home).

Commissioner Quimby asked him if he would like to live there in a home on Patterson road with the traffic situation the way it is and with Patterson Road being widened.

Mr. Schumacher said, "Maybe not, but I'm not sure I want to live there with an office building backed up to my back door, which will happen if this keeps on going."

Commissioner Quimby replied that the point is that there is probably no use for the piece of property for a residential home because no one would want to live there, and that the Planning Commission has to consider the use for the piece of property and whether it will be an improvement or not. She

continued by making the assumption that Mr. Schumacher would accept some kind of development and explained that they could presently put four units there since it is zoned RSF-4. She asked Mr. Schumacher if he would want a home there or an office building.

Mr. Schumacher's response was that he thinks they should put a park in there for the kids. He added that the sign posted for this meeting on the property had the incorrect time for the meeting (7:00 with no a.m. or p.m. indicated) and that he did not receive a notice about the meeting.

Chairman Transmeier told Mr. Schumacher that the Planning Commission appreciated his comments and indicated that they are in the progress of adopting policies via a Comprehensive Plan, parts of which are on the agenda for tonight's public hearing.

Chairman Transmeier also asked Planning Staff to check on the Public Hearing Signs in regards to Mr. Schumacher's comment on the incorrect time being posted.

Mr. Bill Bush, 619 Viewpoint, commented that he would prefer to see apartments built there instead of an office complex.

Mr. Jim Hogue, 606 Rico Way, stated that he is not against building anything there that fits in with the environment, but he is concerned with adding traffic problems to the one currently existing. He added that he has three children and he is concerned for their safety; the traffic is already a problem and people run the stop sign at 26.75 Road and Northern Way.

Charlotte Wren substantiated Mr. Hogue's statement about people running the stop sign and the concern for the children in the area.

Steve Weimer, owner of the property directly north of this project, opposes the proposal due to the traffic problem and the two-story design. He plans to install a solar design to his home and is worried that the two-story building will interfere with his plans. He sees no problem with a single family dwelling with appropriate berming.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Litle asked Planning Staff for the width of the road at 26.75 Road and Patterson.

Don Warner indicated it was about 18 to 22'.

Dr. Orr further commented on the history of the original subdivision and that this lot was not allowed to be included

in the subdivision since he (the developer) was doing subdivisions for larger homes. He said that when he bought his home in this area (in 1966), he did so because of the nice area and the value of the homes there. He feels that various rezoning over the years and the addition of condominiums, townhomes and now businesses to the area has negatively affected what he once considered to be "the best subdivision in Grand Junction."

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Daryl Shrum noted that the major trend of the objections he has heard are dealing with "what the apartments are or aren't," and doesn't feel there has been much "serious criticism about the building itself." He pointed out that the 20' utility easement running through the property doesn't leave much alternative for where the building can be located. Plans for a single-family home would experience the same "footprint situation" problems they have faced. Addressing the specification concerns, Daryl stated that those details will be submitted at the Final Development Plan phase. He further commented on the developers reputation for building "fine projects" and that he does not anticipate this one being any different from previous ones. Regarding the concerns he heard for the children in the area, Daryl noted that they are already there and this project won't be adding any new children and the development will have safe ingress and egress for turning movements. He also noted that his clients cannot afford to use this property for a playground.

Commissioner Rinker asked how many rental units could be built there.

Daryl Shrum answered, "one single family house since there is only 1/3 of an acre."

Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of a single-family development.

Commissioner Dick Litle told Mr. Shrum that he realized his question on the two-story design was not appropriate at an ODP phase, but he feels that since this is a change in zoning for an office building, he wanted a little better idea of their plans.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and reminded the Commissioners that three motions were required.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented that he can appreciate the concerns of the residents in the area and considers their

objections legitimate, but in lieu of the fact that Patterson Road has been in a transitional state for the last 15 years, it appears that the use as a single-family residence would not be appropriate. With that background, Commissioner O'Dwyer made the following motion:

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "ON ITEM #34-83, I MOVE WE FORWARD THE REQUEST FOR THE REZONE FROM RSF-4 TO PB TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, PER STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Quimby seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion, called for a vote and the motion carried by a vote of 4-1. (Commissioner Litle voting against)

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "ON ITEM #34-83, I MOVE WE FORWARD THE REQUEST FOR THE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, PER STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Quimby seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION:

Bob Goldin made the recommendation that, prior to submittal of the next phase, the petitioners get together with the neighbors (prior to Public Hearing) in order to clarify what exactly is going to be the situation there.

Commissioner O'Dwyer agreed to that being added as a stipulation to the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion to include Bob Goldin's stipulation:

== AMENDED MOTION ON ODP REQUEST ==

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "ON ITEM #34-83, I MOVE WE FORWARD THE REQUEST FOR THE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, CONTINGENT UPON THE PETITIONER HAVING A MEETING WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD PRIOR TO SUBMITTAL OF THE NEXT PHASE AND THE NEXT PUBLIC HEARING."

Chairman Transmeier then asked for a vote on the motion as amended.

The motion carried, 4-1. (Commissioner Litle against)

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER QUIMBY) "ON ITEM #34-83, I MOVE WE FORWARD THE REQUEST FOR THE VACATION OF THE UTILITY EASEMENT TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, PER STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 4-1. (Commissioner Litle voting against)

Chairman Transmeier commented that the petitioner did request this as a Planned Business rather than a C-1 or Business Zone, which gives the Planning Commission some latitude as to what they can request in terms of landscaping, architectural design, building size, traffic patterns, etc. The Planning Commission hopes the neighbors do get together with the petitioners to discuss the design as they propose during their next phase.

=====

Chairman Transmeier then recessed the meeting for a 10-minute break. The meeting was called back to order at 9:08 p.m.

=====

4. #35-83 DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. - KAR MART

Petitioner: Mesa Mini Mall Properties/Robert Hirons
Location: Lot 5 Fisher Subdivision (north of F Road, west of 24.5 Road)

A request for the development of a car wash, mini-market and self-service gas station in a highway-oriented zone on approximately .51 acre.

Consideration of development in H.O.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

John Cavness introduced the project as primarily a Gas Center with a 20-item Grocery Store as a sideline. Their main marketing target is the service station, not the grocery store operation. He addressed Planning Staff's concern with traffic circulation, noting that they have cross easements across the entire property and it has been recorded in their easements. One of the bays has been changed; it will be redrawn and placed at the north end. He also said that they have added additional landscaping around the convenience mart, per Planning Staff's request.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Rinker asked if there would be enough room for vehicles to move around (after exiting the car wash).

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked John how much stacking space is available.

Commissioner Litle also expressed concern with the turning radius for cars exiting the car wash and moving out of the area.

Commissioner Quimby questioned the design as to where customers go to dry off their cars after they exit the car wash.

In response to these questions, John stated that there is enough room for one "waiting car" in each bay. As far as the design for the traffic flow, John indicated the design used for this project is similar to other existing car washes. Cars are to use the car wash first, then drive to the vacuum stalls which are behind the car wash.

Commissioner Litle asked if that this is the only time they'll see this. Commissioner Quimby confirmed that was the case.

STAFF COMMENTS

Janet Stephens indicated that all technical concerns have been met. She also said that they recently discussed the change to the location of the open bay to improve circulation. Circulation is the main concern of Planning Staff, particularly considering semi-truck ingress and egress.

Chairman Transmeier asked if the open parking lot was all pavement between this project and Oil Express.

John Cavness indicated there will be continuous asphalt around the different shopping areas and people will be able to travel across the various properties.

Chairman Transmeier commented that he hoped they were "big on striping and painting" so they can keep some traffic flow around the site.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Jerry Fossenier commented on previous proposals for this parcel of land (strip shopping center, etc.) and how they have worked extensively with the Planning Department (particularly Bob Goldin) in an effort to develop a concept with limited access (from F Road and 24.5 Road) where they could use isolated developments with access, parking, and landscaping programs in common.

Karl Metzner substantiated Mr. Fossenier's comments regarding the history and told the Planning Commission that the project does meet the common curb cut, landscaping, and internal common circulation standards. Moving the bay appears to improve the circulation situation and Planning Staff wants to have that change reviewed by the Transportation Engineer prior to sending it to City Council.

John Cavness noted that another request involves placing another fire hydrant to the rear.

Karl Metzner said that he thought that was because of the gas station use.

COMMENTS AGAINST THE PROPOSAL: None.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner Litle commented that the design appears to be "awful busy," and asked Janet about the change to the open bay.

Janet Stephens said that the Traffic Engineer didn't have a chance to look at the proposed change this afternoon.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER QUIMBY) "ON ITEM #35-83, DEVELOPMENT IN HO - KAR MART, I RECOMMEND SENDING THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH OUR RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, CONTINGENT UPON THE REVIEW OF THE RELOCATION PROPOSAL FOR THE OPEN BAY BY THE TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER, AND OTHER STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Commissioner Litle commented that he is still concerned with the ingress and egress for large vehicles and the overall traffic flow.

Chairman Transmeier summarized that mainly the Planning Commission is concerned with the traffic flow, but not the plan itself.

Commissioner Litle agreed, adding that he thinks it is a great idea and the plan looks good.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion and called for a vote. The motion carried 4-1 (Commissioner O'Dwyer voting against).

5. #37-83 DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. - OFFICE BUILDING

Petitioner: Planners and Developers Ltd./Jerome Fossenier
Location: Lots 9 and 10 Block 3, Crossroads Colorado West
Subdivision (north of I-70 at the 27.25 Road
line).

A request for the development of office buildings on approximately 2.58 acres in a highway-oriented zone.

Consideration of development in H.O

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jerry Fossenier, representing the petitioners, presented the proposal and outlined their plans.

1. 2/3 of the development is in an HO zone which is essentially an office park. They are planning to construct three condominium office buildings, each building consisting of 13,500 sq. ft.
2. The offices will be owned rather than leased.
3. The petitioners intend to work with Grand Valley Water Users to solve their concerns regarding landscaping. Other landscaping concerns related to the ingress/egress will be worked out with the Transportation Engineer, as will the location of the bicycle racks.
4. All other areas of concern are also subject to negotiation (trash pickup, safety, location of parking stalls, etc.).
5. Marketing plans, subject to approval of this project, will be based on the sales of the condominiums;

- they plan to build one and sell it before starting the second building.
6. Timeframe of construction - Three phase-construction to begin within six months following City Council approval; First phase to be completed within three months; Second phase to begin as soon as first one is sold. All exterior work will be completed one building at a time (landscaping, etc.)

STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin indicated that Planning Staff has no problems with the technical issues. Bob did make the comment that the area to the west is zoned PR-4 and the smaller office complexes could help mitigate the effects of a residential versus a large-scale construction that could be out there.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITLE) "ON ITEM #37-83, DEVELOPMENT IN HO - OFFICE BUILDINGS, I MOVE WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion.

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

Commissioners Quimby and O'Dwyer both commented on Jerry's optimistic attitude.

Chairman Transmeier reminded Mr. Fossenier of the one-year building requirement. Mr. Fossenier acknowledged that he is aware of those requirements, noting that they don't expect to complete all three phases within that timeframe and realize they will have to request an extension.

6. #36-83 DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. - TRI-COLOR PHOTO, INC.

Petitioner: Wellcraft Marine Corp./David Skidmore
Location: 501 Hwy 50 South.

A request for the development of a photo finishing, sales and photo studio on approximately .54 acre in a highway-oriented zone.

Consideration of development in H.O.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

David Skidmore presented his proposal for a photo finishing plant, sales and photo studio. He discussed the reasons for his site selection (good traffic flow, Orchard Mesa location, good security and floor drains within the building). He is agreeable to removing the 36' curb cut and will complete the landscaping within 8 weeks of date of approval by City Council. Regarding the concern with the parking area, Mr. Skidmore has agreed that after a period of 18 months, he will pave the area, based on the written stipulation that this agreement is limited to his ownership or his lease; he cannot transfer this on to subsequent property owners -- any new tenants prior to the 18-month period would have to negotiate their own agreement.

Chairman Transmeier questioned Mr. Skidmore on the nature of his business.

Mr. Skidmore plans include an amateur/professional type business for film processing; a small professionally oriented portrait shop; retail sales of small amateur cameras.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented that he understands Mr. Skidmore's problem with the blacktop.

Chairman Transmeier stated that the only problem they would have with such an agreement would be that if another photo shop came in right after him they could do so without the Planning Commission seeing it. Therefore, should the Planning Commission approve the 18-month request, it would be on the condition that an additional stipulation be added to the agreement which states that if Tri-Color Photo, Inc. isn't there, then the zone isn't there either.

Mr. Skidmore agreed to that suggestion.

STAFF COMMENTS

Janet noted that Mr. Skidmore had originally asked for a 52-week timeframe for landscaping and he has now agreed for an 8-week timeframe.

David Skidmore added that he also intends to put up siding to give the building a better appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR: None

AGAINST: None

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "ON ITEM #36-83, DEVELOPMENT IN HO - TRI-COLOR PHOTO, INC., I MOVE WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, CONTINGENT ON: (1) LANDSCAPING BEING COMPLETED WITHIN 8 WEEKS AFTER CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL; (2) PAVING IS COMPLETED WITHIN 18 MONTHS AFTER CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL (PER THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN TRI-COLOR PHOTO, INC. AND THE CITY WHICH SPECIFIES THAT TRI-COLOR PHOTO, INC. WILL RELINQUISH USE OF THAT ZONE IN THE EVENT THE PAVING ISN'T COMPLETED WITHIN THAT TIMEFRAME OR IN THE EVENT TRI-COLOR PHOTO, INC. NO LONGER OCCUPIES THIS SITE; AND (3) ALL OTHER STAFF AND REVIEW AGENCY COMMENTS."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

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

7. #38-83 CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission
Location: Within the established boundaries of the City of Grand Junction and the boundaries of the Intergovernmental agreement dated March 24, 1983 by the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County.

Consideration of the City of Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan, Adoption/Administrative Procedures/Amendments, Table of Contents and the Introduction.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Ken Strohson noted that tonight they are reviewing the Adoption/Admendment and Administrative Procedures, Table of Contents and the Introduction of the Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan and that there will be an 18-month period to go over this entire process.

DISCUSSION

Members of the Planning Commission pointed out typographical errors and minor wording changes throughout the document. There were no problems with the content of the manuscript.

Ken agreed to have those changes implemented.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one was present in the audience for questions or comments.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RINKER) "ON ITEM #38-83, CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, I MOVE WE FORWARD THE ADOPTION/ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES/AMENDMENTS, TABLE OF CONTENTS, AND THE INTRODUCTION TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, AS CORRECTED."

Commissioner Litle seconded the vote.

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

Chairman Transmeier adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.