

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

November 24, 1981

The first meeting of the month of November, 1981 was called to order at 7:33 p.m. by Chairperson JANE QUIMBY. The following members were present: MILAND DUNIVENT, ROSS TRANSMEIER, JACK OTT, SUSAN RINKER, DICK LITTLE and BILL O'DWYER.

ALEX CANDELARIA, Planning Staff, DON WARNER, Planning Analyst, BOURDAI HARGROVE, Assistant City Attorney, and LEILA E. MOSHER, Certified Shorthand Reporter, were also present. There were approximately thirty interested citizens in the audience.

DUNIVENT/RINKER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 27, 1981 PUBLIC HEARING.

JANE QUIMBY announced that there would not be a public hearing meeting in December and that the next scheduled public hearing would be January 5, 1982.

JANE QUIMBY announced that item 4, #97-81, Conditional Use in HO Zone, 748 Horizon Drive, had been pulled from the Agenda, and that the Commission was prepared to hear item 5, #38-79, first and then item 3 would be heard.

The Petitioner on item 5 was not prepared to proceed and the Staff began the presentation.

#38-79 WELLINGTON CONDOMINIUMS - REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Paul Smith.  
Location: 225 feet East of 12th Street, South of Wellington Avenue and North of the Grand Valley Canal.

A request for a revised preliminary plan of 28 units on 1.70 acres in a planned residential zone at 16 units per acre.

a. Consideration of revised preliminary plan.

ALEX CANDELARIA: It is differently revised than what you have seen. Basically what they did was to do some more parking and a different alignment in the parking area on Wellington Court. It doesn't indicate a cul de sac, and that is the question the review agency had as to where the cul de sac is.

ALEX CANDELARIA: -- and the Petitioner did submit a response in writing, but Staff hasn't had adequate time to review

these responses to the Comments, as well as the reviewing agencies. Supposedly there was supposed to be a revised plan submitted. Staff wouldn't have adequate time to review the proposed preliminary, or revised preliminary. -- instead of postponing this meeting, Staff would recommend that at least the Commission hear the concerns of the citizens as to their objections.

JANE QUIMBY: Just to review for you a little bit, this proposal first came to us back in 1979 and nothing happened with the development and then they had to come back in and request an extension and we are now in that process.

We have a preliminary plan tonight -- we have a revised preliminary plan in front of us and because it was inadequate, there was the attitude that perhaps it should be pulled from the Agenda, but when we realized there was neighborhood input and objections and so forth, we decided to proceed with this so that we could make the neighborhood input a part of the record, and so that's where we are at this point, and we are still waiting for a couple of participants, I think, on the Petitioner's side, to arrive.

MILAND DUNIVENT: Alex, is there any indication on what the height of those buildings would be?

ALEX CANDELARIA: The only indications we figured out they were approximately two stories high, the fact they did submit their per unit would be 4,800 square feet, and to all indications that would make it approximately about a two story, but we requested at final that we get an elevation detail drawing on it.

PAUL SMITH: After turning this in to the Planning Department they came back with their comments and Tamra is coming with all the heights and architectural concept of what we are trying to accomplish. They are two stories. We put them up to about less than thirty feet high. No three stories. Nothing raised out of the ground, or any real high -- anything like that.

We have put the cul de sac in the back.

DICK LITTLE: Has the density changed any with the redesign?

PAUL SMITH: No, it hasn't.

BILL O'DWYER: Madam Chairman, even though we don't have all the drawings and things here, couldn't we go ahead and hear the input from the citizens on this and then -- I mean, because the drawings are coming tonight and everything, and the Staff hasn't had time to review them. I don't think we can make an approval anyway.

JANE QUIMBY: No. And that is not the intention of this particular proposal tonight, because we haven't had the information. We will have the input of the citizens.

BILL O'DWYER: Would you have any objection to having the opponents first?

PAUL SMITH: No. It would be fine.

DAVID McKINLEY: I think our concern tonight, since we really don't have a chance to respond to a specific plan, is to maybe highlight for you some of the characteristics of the neighborhood. It is kind of unique in it's own way, and if you are not familiar with it maybe I can inform you of some things we think are of concern.

It is not so much we are anti-development. The density and nature of this development is to our mind not in keeping with the safety and wellbeing of the people in the neighborhood, and we still have a neighborhood, and that is one of our concerns.

DAVID McKINLEY went on to explain the bad road conditions in the area, with no curb, gutter or sidewalk, the hazardous conditions on Patterson Road and the large number of children that walk to school in the area.

DAVID McKINLEY: These are all the single family residence owners who own the houses down there -- there is twelve of them and nine of them are here. We are concerned because we don't want to be forced into an improvement district. It is not clear to me at all with twenty-eight units, twenty-eight votes, whether we can be pushed into one, and we are not ready. These people are on fixed income, and we have a street that is tolerable right now. We think with this much density it may become intolerable, and something has to be done.

There are no two story buildings on Wellington at all on this portion of Wellington. The portion of Wellington on the other side of the Canal is medical buildings. The area in which this proposed development is directed is still single family dwellings. and no two stories. Even the apartment houses are single story. We think this is a major change for the neighborhood, and no, we are not saying that will never happen, but until support services can be offered to us -- and we want to try to maintain our neighborhood.

There are some specific concerns that we don't know about, whether that sewer was going under the Canal, or whether that is going to tap into the Wellington sewer. -- I think that is a concern, also, with the water. We have a water pressure problem - always have - some of these other people can attest to that.

ALEX CANDELARIA: For your information on this, they have indicated on this plan they would be tapping into Wellington.

DAVID McKINLEY: That may be a physical problem with the sewer capacity. The City Engineer says not, but it is a fairly new line and not very big.

BILL O'DWYER: Dave, could you give me a guesstimate of how many children -- I guess they all walk to Orchard Avenue Schools?

A number of more than fifty was given as a response by the audience.

MAY BELLE KANAVAL appeared as a property owner in the area.

MAY BELLE KANAVAL: Now, I have to agree with what has been said about the traffic and so on, but I think maybe I am concerned about the water, for one thing, and I do think that some investigation should be made on this water system. Now, that area was at one time under what was known as the Fruit Ridge water system. When the area was annexed to the City, the City took over the system, and I don't know, but I question whether it has ever been upgraded to the point of handling this many more people, or not. Now, that I don't know, but I think it is something to consider.

As far as the sewer is concerned, there is a little difficulty there in the placement of the sewer. It was laid at the regulation depth, up to about the entrance of 1251 Wellington. Then there were problems with the sand and so forth. So the line was raised considerably. Now, that would only affect about half, I would say, of the proposed development, -- the ones on the east side. Well, I think that should be investigated.

Now, about three years ago I said I would not oppose the construction of the condominiums. Evidently this plan, or one similar to this, was presented about three years ago to the Council, or maybe not the Council, but the Commission.

JANE QUIMBY: It went through the Planning Commission and it also went to the Council.

MAY BELLE KANAVAL: Well, I wasn't sure about that, but however, I will have to say I was very much surprised when I learned that the sixteen unit density had been planned for. Now, the plan was probably presented -- that I won't say it wasn't -- I just was very much surprised that that was what was planned for.

Now, I feel as though this particular layout is going to establish a precedent for most of the development from 12th Street to 15th. I think you are all very much aware of the problem in the area of 15th and Wellington. There is a possibility of people saturation in that area. What you will approve, I don't know, but there is a lot of vacant land up there.

CLAUDIA McKINLEY appeared as a property owner in the area and presented a petition to the Commission as follows:

"We the Undersigned are home owners on Wellington Ave from 12th to 15th Street and are opposed to the development of #38-79, WELLINGTON CONDOMINIUMS, for reasons of the safety and welfare of those already living in this crowded area."

CLAUDIA McKINLEY: The signers are not against all development, but we only feel it should be done more safely and with concern for the character of the neighborhood.

CLAUDIA McKINLEY went on to describe the traffic hazards during the rush hours getting on to 12th Street.

FAYE CARPENTER appeared as a property owner at 1340 Wellington, stating:

I am in agreement with the McKinleys. I feel the same as they do about the district and the area.

LEONA KOCHIVAR: There isn't very much more to say that hasn't been said, except since this plan has not been shown to us, we don't really know too much about it except that when this was first presented several years ago, I am sure it was presented as one single story building. I am not sure that it was not to be a two story building, because as it was told to me they would be similar to those up on 12th Street, at Lakeside, which are definitely duplexes, one story.

And we have other concerns, like if these are to be townhouses, we don't -- we want to know whether or not they could be sublet -- we don't like any more rentals up there than we can help, and we don't know what kind of people you are getting.

We also would like to know, when this thing is presented, where the trash receptacles are going to be.

JANE QUIMBY: One thing we don't have any control over is whether people are rental or property owners. That is not something that is the concern of the Planning Commission.

ROGER FOISY: I am Roger Foisy, Colorado West Engineering, and I am a representative for the --

JANE QUIMBY: Are you ready for the petitioners' side now? Do you have everybody here, and what you need?

ROGER FOISY: If you are ready for me, yes.

JANE QUIMBY: We were ready for you a half an hour ago.

JANE QUIMBY: I want you to know that we expect not to make a decision on this tonight, because of inadequacy of information that was submitted to us, and the short time frame. The Planning Commission had wanted to table this item. We heard it only because we knew that there was some neighborhood input that we wanted to have as part of the record, and there will not be a decision made tonight, because we didn't have time to assimilate the information, and it was not timely, and I believe there is still some missing.

JANE QUIMBY: -- I understand we were under a revised preliminary and now we are under a revised, revised preliminary. There are some concerns of the neighborhood, because they have not seen the plan, and I am wondering if it would be appropriate to have a neighborhood meeting, perhaps.

CHERYL NASH presented a letter to the Commission that had been sent to members of the immediate neighborhood.

CHERYL NASH: -- and took in, you know, the immediate individuals that I knew were concerned about the project, and let them know which individuals they could contact for questions concerning the project and so forth, and I got no response back from anyone. So I assumed if they had any questions they would have contacted the two -- either the Planning Department, or Colorado West Engineering.

JANE QUIMBY: If you have additional information to submit, if you will submit that to the Department, so that we can review it and so forth, that will be -- I do not believe it is the intention of the Planning Commission to go through a long detailed presentation this evening.

ALEX CANDELARIA: Our concern was as far as getting the neighborhood here and getting their concerns, and possibly get some input in to you, so you could get some insight as to where they were coming from, but not to see a revised plan at this time.

ROGER FOISY: Okay. We will submit it to you then, Alex, and anticipate coming up before the next Planning Commission.

JANE QUIMBY: Yes. We will not have a meeting until January. There will not be a December hearing.

There is some work that can be done with the Staff in the meantime. I want to be sure you understand the policy the Planning Commission is following at this point is we expect to have everything, and I mean everything, taken care of at preliminary time.

ROGER FOISY: Can I just address one thing, because I was late, I am assuming the problem in the neighborhood has mostly to do with the density. Now, I heard a lady's comment on parking along the street and if she will take a close look, she will see that is addressed. Am I correct in assuming the biggest problem is density?

BILL O'DWYER: Height, and traffic.

DON WARNER: If you have got a figure on height of the buildings, that was the question of one of the people.

JANE QUIMBY: Do you have a height?

ROGER FOISY: It is two story. I have got a copy of the original preliminary plan which shows a two story elevation of the building.

JANE QUIMBY: There was some misunderstanding. I believe some of the people thought it was one story when it was presented several years ago.

ROGER FOISY: Paul, can you give us a figure on the total height?

PAUL SMITH: To ridge line, 23 to 25 feet; the ridge lines are going to vary. Maybe to save you guys some time, would you, as a neighborhood, would you like to get together and go over

this thing and go over the plans?

At this point the audience began to ask questions of PAUL SMITH and ROGER FOISY. JANE QUIMBY ask the assemblage to hold their discussion in another room so that the public hearing could continue.

BILL O'DWYER: Before you all leave, we do have Jim Patterson here and I would like to have him address the sewers, the water and so on, the trash, while you are all here.

JIM PATTERSON: On the water, there was a two inch water line in Wellington, that I assume was put in by the Fruitridge Water System. That since has been abandoned. There is an eight inch water line in Wellington now. It connects on the west to a six inch line in 12th Street and on the east to an eight inch line in 15th Street.

The sewer, there is an eight inch sewer there that goes to the west and connects to an eight inch sewer at 12th Street.

BILL O'DWYER: Somebody mentioned low pressure, Jim.

JIM PATTERSON discussed the pressure problem with members of the audience and stated he would look into the matter to ascertain what the problem might be.

O'DWYER/LYTLER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO TABLE #38-79, WELLINGTON CONDOMINIUMS - REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN, UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE STAFF HAS ALL OF THE INPUT NECESSARY FROM THE DEVELOPER AND HAS HAD TIME TO REVIEW THE REQUEST.

#### DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN AND TAX INCREMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Downtown Development Authority (DDA)  
Location: Within the established DDA boundaries of downtown Grand Junction.

A request for the Grand Junction Planning Commission to review the DDA's Downtown Master Plan and Tax Increment Funding Plan and make recommendations to the City Council.

a. Consideration of DDA's Downtown Master Plan.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

SKIP GRKOVIC appeared for the Downtown Development Authority and presented the request to the Commission.

SKIP GRKOVIC: We would like to modify our request this evening because of some legal reviews that are going on in Denver. We would like to postpone any consideration of the Plan

of Development, the Downtown Plan of Development, which would provide for tax increment financing, and a commercial renovation district. This is a new concept. We have only had the law that would allow us to do this since July of this year, and so we want to be very, very careful that all of the legal procedures are followed very exactly, so that we don't run into any problems in the future.

We would, however, like you to consider the Downtown Development Strategy, which has been distributed to you, as the Downtown element of the City Master Plan.

SKIP GRKOVIC went on to outline the procedure that had taken place to arrive at this point in the consideration of the Downtown Development Strategy.

JOE SKINNER, Counsel for the Downtown Development Authority, presented the legal aspects of the consideration of the Downtown Development Strategy Plan, and the necessary steps for approval of the same by the City Council.

JOE SKINNER: We would ask that you follow that procedure, that you endorse the Plan, that you submit it to the City Council for inclusion in the Master Plan, and that it then becomes part of the Master Plan, or an Element, and does not become the whole for the City of Grand Junction.

A couple of questions have been raised: One, does this control outside of the downtown area? I guess my response to that is, no, it does not. It is just a statement; it is just a plan.

SKIP GRKOVIC outlined the content of the Downtown Development Strategy Plan for the Commission.

RICHARD LYTLE: Skip, just to reinforce in my own mind, go to the last chart, and you can at a future time include within the DDA boundary an area outside of the present boundary?

SKIP GRKOVIC: That is correct. -- So we could annex by just touching at one point and include the property.

JOE SKINNER: If I might add to that, I would like to point out that any future inclusions are based upon the consent of the property owner and request of the property owner.

PAT GORMLEY appeared as Chairman of the Downtown Development Authority, outlining what he felt the Authority was attempting to accomplish with the Downtown Development Strategy Plan.

The Commission discussed what was being considered by them at this point.

JOE SKINNER: Tonight you are looking at this only as an element of the Master Plan for the City of Grand Junction.



ROSS TRANSMEIER: Without regard to the taxes.

JOE SKINNER: Right. The taxes are only commenced, or put into play by the Downtown Development Authority's Plan of Development. All this is, is a plan, a statement of the existence of a plan, and the reason that we are requesting this is again, so that there is some type of unified approach to Downtown, if at all possible.

BILL O'DWYER: Madam Chairman, may I ask one question of Bourdai -- is the City Attorney's Office comfortable with all of this, or do you have some concerns?

BOURDAI HARGROVE: I haven't had a chance to look at this. This is the first time I have seen it. I am supposed to be here to observe tonight, but I certainly can take any questions to Mr. Ashby, and give you some answers as soon as we have had a chance to do some research on it.

DON WARNER: There are only three items in here I went over with the City Attorney -- three items I had a question about, and I did go over them thoroughly with the City Attorney.

JANE QUIMBY: We did look at these shortly before we came over here tonight, and I think, at least in number 49, from the discussion, that there was no problem from the Commission, except there was certainly no problem with the review, and we did want participation with the reviewing possibilities from the Authority, but our concern was, as Don had mentioned, the "and approval", because we can't do that, nor can you do that, and with that, I don't think that unless you find there is some additional legal concern on the part of the Staff, I don't think there is any problem with that, and the part of the other two are somewhat of a clarification, but it would be subject again to probably being sure that it cleared through the legal avenues that we depend upon.

DON WARNER: That paragraph 49 is fine, with the word "approved" left out.

JOE SKINNER: No problem.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: If we are going to adopt this in verbatim first -- and I have had this maybe a week or six or eight or nine days -- I don't know if I have had enough time to go over it word for word and be sure every line is acceptable. The general concept, I think, is acceptable.

RICHARD LYTLE: This is strictly a guideline. It is no different from our own corridor policies. It is strictly a recommendation or a guideline to be used. I think that's the intent here.

LYTLE/O'DWYER/DUNIVENT PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO ENDORSE THE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY PLAN AND RECOMMEND IT AS A GUIDELINE FOR EVENTUAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AND ADOPTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

The first meeting of the month of November, 1981,  
was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

\* \* \*