## June 27, 1973

## MINUTES

1. Members present: Chairman Levi Lucero, Jane Quimby, Robert Van Houten, Virginia Flager, and Blake Chambliss.

Others present: Planning Director, Bob Engelke and Rick Cisar, Assistant Planning Director.

2. <u>Approval of minutes of previous meeting</u>: The minutes were approved as mailed.

3. #28-73: Consider rezoning petition involving approximately 20.3 acres from R-1-B (One family residential) zoning to R-2 (Two family residential) zoning. (Rezoning requested for a Conditional Use, Nursing home. Institutional Use 3.4 in the R-2 zoning district.

Petitioners: Ralph & Lilamarie Landing.

Location: NW1/4 of the NW1/4 of Sec 7, R1E, T1S, UM, South of Patterson Rd. East of Mantey Heights Subdivision and West of the Mantey Heights Water Tank.

Mr. Lucero read the request to the Planning Commission. Mr. Pat Dwyer, of N.H.P.Q., was present to make the presentation for the Landings. Mr. Dwyer stated that there would be a sixty bed nursing home and that all structures would be residential in nature. The plans are preliminary in nature as to what the buildings will look like. Chairman Lucero asked if the entire 20 acres would be used for the nursing home. Mr. Landing stated that only about one acre would be used for the nursing home. There was a discussion on why the entire area should be rezoned R-2 if only one acre was going to be used.

Mr. Lucero asked for opponents to the proposal. Mrs. Edith Kemper, Mr. Herb Backman and Ralph Gurrier were all present to express their opposition to the proposal. Mr. Landing stated that Mr. Backman has two apartments in the area and Mr. Landing does not see why Mr. Backman should be opposed to this proposal.

Virginia Flager asked about the right-of-way for Patterson Road. Mr. Cisar stated that there is a 30 foot from center line right-of-way and a 50 foot from centerline would be needed.

There was a discussion on what the remaining 19 acres would be used for that would be rezoned. It was the feeling of the Board that by rezoning the entire parcel R-2, they would lose all control over the area. It was suggested that a PUD would be better for the area. Through the PUD, the Board would have a review of the plans for the area. It was the suggestion of the Board that the Landings come back with a PUD plan. Grand Junction Planning Commission June 27, 1973 MINUTES

Page 2

Robert Van Houten moved that the request be denied  $\xi$  recommended that the Landings come back in with a PUD request. It was seconded by Blake Chambliss and carried unanimously.

Mr. Dwyer wanted to know if by the vote if Board was favorable toward a PUD. Chairman Lucero stated that the Board would be more favorable toward a PUD development.

4. #29-73: Consider request for a Conditional Use (Mechanical Car Wash) Commercial Use (5.8) in the C-1, Light Commerce zoning district.

Petitioner: Kmoco Oil Co., Keith J. Messinger, Jr.

Location: SW1/4 of the SW1/4 of Sec 7, R1E, T1S, UM, the NE Cor of the intersection of 28 1/2 Road and North Ave.

Chairman Lucero read the request to the Commission. Mr. Cisar showed the Commission where the property is located and what the surrounding property is like.

Mr. Messinger was present and stated that the service was to be primarily for customers of the service station.

There was no opposition to the request.

Mr. Cisar stated that Mr. Messinger has agreed to landscape the site.

Jane Quimby moved the request be approved. Robert Van Houten seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

5. #31-73: Consider request for a Conditional Use (Parochial School) Assembly Use 2.4 in the R-1-A, One Family residention zoning district.

Petitioner: Grand Junction Christian Schools.

Location: SE1/4 of NW1/4 of Sec 1, R1W, T1S, UM, the NW Cor of the intersection of 27 1/2 Rd. and F 1/2 Rd. extended East.

Levi Lucero read the request, Mr. Cisar made the presentation on the location of the request.

Greg Dillon presented the plans of the school.

Mr. Frank Randall, a member of the School's governing Board, made a presentation on what the goals of the school are and why more land was needed. Mr. Randall stated that children from all over the valley were enrolled in the school and that is why this particular location was chosen. Chairman Lucero wanted to know what the capacity of the school would be. Mr. Randall stated that the capacity would be about 150. A discussion followed on how the school operated.

Charles A. Kemfer of 675 271/2 Road owned adjoining property and was

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION June 27, 1973 Minutes

Page 3

in favor of the building would be used for the school. Mr. Dillon stated that modular units were going to be used for classrooms. The utilities available for the school were discussed.

There was a discussion on the status of  $27 \ 1/2$  Road. It was stated that before any construction could start the problem with the road would have to be solved. Also, F 1/2 Road presents a problem at the present location. Robert Van Houten made a motion and Jane Quimby seconded that the site plan be approved with the following conditions:

- 6" loop or 8" deadend watermain and fire hydrants per fire department 1. requirements be installed.
- Access for fire trucks to be within 150 feet of all buildings. 2.
- 3. Cover irrigation ditch through property as requested by Mr. Klapwyk, Grand Valley Water Association.
- 4. A 40 foot deeded right-of-way dedication from center line on 27 1/2 Road ammending the Small-Cooley report as adopted by the City of Grand Junction.
- Plantings along 27 1/2 Road should allow for future sidewalks and 5. street trees. Final plan to be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Department.

The motion carried unanimously.

Consider final Plat of the Lamm Subdivision involving 23 lots, 32-73: (approximately 9 acres) with R-1-C, One Family Residential zoning.

Developer: Edwin S. Lamm

SW1/4 of the NE1/4 of the SE1/4 of Sec 7, R1E, T1S, UM, bounded by Mesa Ave. on the North, Elm Ave. on the South, 28 3/4 Rd. on the West and Melody Lane on the East. Location:

Mr. Cisar stated that this item had come up before the board four or five months ago. Mr. Cisar said that there still had to be a settlement on the dedication for 28 3/4 Road and on the problem of drainage for the area.

Virginia Flager moved that the plat be approved with the following conditions:

- A 30 foot from centerline dedication on 28 3/4 Road (collector, 1. page 66, zoning ordinance).
- Full 50 foot rights-of-way on Mesa Ave. and Melody Lane (comments 2. made at last hearing)

3. Storm drainge easement as required by engineering department. Blake Chambliss seconded and it carried unanimously.

6.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION June 27, 1973 Minutes

Page 4

7. #33-73: Request for revocable permit (Parking).

Developer: Valley Federal Savings & Loan

- Location: South side of White between 4th & 5th.

This item was withdrawn so no action was taken.

8. Consideration of Revised Fee Schedule and Proposed Filing and Processing Procedures.

Chairman Lucero stated that the commission had received a letter from Mr. Harvey Rose stating that he felt the fee schedule was exorbinant. Mr. Lucero read the letter from Mr. Rose and stated that some of the members of the Commission had met with Mr. Rose on Tuesday, June 26 to discuss the fees.

Mr. Chambliss had written a letter in reply to Mr. Rose's letter.

Mr. Cisar stated that the payment for a request which is going to benefit the petitioner should be paid for by the petitioner.

Mr. Chambliss stated that if people are benefiting from the services of the Commission then people should be willing to pay for those services. Chairman Lucero stated that other cities are considering changes in their fee schedules.

Cole McMartin, of KREX, wanted to know how long a time period was needed for processing items. Bob Engelke stated that some subdivisions have been in process for six months because of trying to gather information from the reviewing agencies and trying to solve various problems. Mr. Cisar stated that by having deadline dates then most of the problems could be solved before the item goes before the Planning Commission rather than having it tabled at the meeting for lack of information.

Virginia Flager moved that the study be presented to the council along with a copy of Mr. Rose's and Mr. Chambliss' letter. The motion was seconded by Blake Chambliss and carried unanimously. Members of the Planning Commission were asked to be present when the presentation is made to the City Council.

9. General Discussion:

a. Pine Estates Subdivision, b. Paradise Valley Subdivision, c. Lamplight Subdivision.

These items were discussed by the Planning Commission at a luncheon meeting.

Mr. Cisar stated that there are numerous subdivisions which are built miles from town. Thus, forcing people to drive miles for any services which they need. Areas should be planned with a commercial or business zone. Mr. Engelke stated that the developer and the Commission would

L

L

L

\_\_\_\_

L

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION June 27, 1973 Minutes

Page 5

have to work together to set up the development of these areas to make sure they are compatible with the area.

Robert Van Houten stated that some changes should be made in the regulations which allow building on the lot line. There should be a change which deals with structures that sit on the corner. There are several corner lots which have structures built right on the property line thus creating dangerous intersections.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.