

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

July 25, 1973

M I N U T E S

Members Present: Chairman Lucero, Gene McEwen, Virginia Flager, Blake Chambliss, Jane Quimby and Jerry Wilds.

1. Approval of minutes of previous meeting:

Minutes were approved as mailed.

2. #28-73: Request for rezoning involving approximately 3.67 acres from R-1-B (One family residential) zoning to PD-8.

Petitioner: 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.

Chairman Lucero read the request. Mr. Cisar described the property in question. Mr. Pat Dwyer of N.H.P.Q. was present and explained what was planned. A new nursing home would be built and new retirement housing would replace the existing buildings. We are looking at 10 years for completion of the entire plan.

Jane Quimby stated that she would hate to see the new buildings built and the existing buildings remain. She feels it is presently an eyesore. Virginia Flager mentioned that there is presently a trailer on the property and that it is in violation of the regulations. She is delighted to see another nursing home proposed as it is badly needed.

Mr. Dwyer said that they propose to replat the area because of limited access (land-locked parcels). Mr. Chambliss said that it was asked at the last meeting that they plan the area so that there wouldn't be any land-locked parcels. He would like to see the entire area PD rather than a portion of it. Mr. Dwyer said that the owners don't want to commit themselves on the entire property at this time.

Mr. Lucero asked for questions, there were none.

Mr. Cisar discussed comments from the reviewing departments. The Engineering department commented that sewage would have to be pumped up to the existing main. He has reservations about the plans taking 10 years to complete. Mr. Cisar recommends that the developer take one year to tear down existing buildings after completion of the new 60 bed building and is concerned with their timetable. Mr. Lucero closed the hearing.

Mr. McEwen made a motion that we accept the plan as presented, Jane Quimby seconded. A discussion followed.

Blake Chambliss stated that the density of the area was the objection of the adjoining property owners at the last meeting. Would feel a lot better if more of the land had been put into this plan. Mr. Engelke stated that there is nothing in the regulations concerning the effect of a nursing home to surrounding area. The whole thing hinged on a reasonable plan. Mr. Dwyer stated that regarding density, the proposed apartments are not the typical housing units. People are really benefiting by the close proximity to the nursing home. The normal ground rules don't apply here. Mr. Chambliss then expressed his concern for the building being 10 feet from the property line and the view of the water tank from the windows of the rooms. Feels this is not the kind of planning that is best for the people who will be living at the home.

A discussion followed on amending the motion.

Blake Chambliss made a suggestion that we amend the motion to cover the problem of density and access to the rest of the property. They should work with the staff to resolve these two problems.

Mr. Gerlofs said that unless the developers had some guidelines, this could go on indefinitely. What does Mr. Chambliss have in mind? Mr. Engelke asked what the lot coverage was. Mr. Dwyer answered 20%. Mr. Chambliss again expressed his concern for closing off the rest of the land and doesn't feel this problem has been taken care of.

Mr. Lucero noted that the petitioners have done what the Board requested they do at the last meeting. Mr. Chambliss answered by saying that it was not adequate. Mr. Lucero suggested that Rick Cisar review access and come back with a recommendation, also, a recommendation on density. Mr. Engelke stated that there are no provisions on the density of nursing homes. All we can look at is impact of density on the immediate area. Blake Chambliss made a motion to table the last motion, Virginia Flager seconded. No vote was taken at this time.

Mr. Dwyer stated that they were required to get their plans in three weeks ago for review and they are complying with the board's recommendations and doesn't see why a decision can't be made. There was a vote taken on the motion and it didn't pass.

Virginia Flager made a motion to change the zoning to build the nursing home and recommended the developer come up with a plan acceptable to the planning staff, Gene McEwen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Chambliss excused himself from the meeting as he had another appointment.

3. #14-73: Request for the following:

- A) A variance of maximum building height in the R-3 (multi-family zone) district from 35' to 65' for the purpose of a highrise apartment building.
- B) A variance of the parking regulations in the R-3 (Multi-family zone) district from one (1) parking space to one half (1/2) parking space per unit.

Petitioner: Several, Louise Forster, representing.

Location: NE1/4 of Sec 11, T1S, R1W, UM, South of Patterson Rd.,
North of Wellington St. and West of the Little Bookcliff
Railroad ROW.

Height Variance: Rick Cisar described the property in question. Dr. Reeder was present and gave an outline of the retirement idea and the need in our area. This complex is planned for the over age 62. This medical complex is designed to take care of a phase of living. The apartments are designed for shelter care and the nursing home is designed for light medical care. The shelter care complex is designed to cut costs, provide better nutrition, emergency care and better living conditions in later years. The location is ideal as everything that is needed is within walking distance. The developers feel that with this type of complex, better and more efficient health care can be provided. It is also more economical. They want to go with a highrise rather than use up all of the land. Mr. Schumann stated that people who are interested in this complex usually prefer to be on the 5th or 6th floor. Mr. Lucero asked if the interest shown was by local people. Dr. Reeger stated that interest was shown from all over. The apartments will be leased on a one year basis. There are 140 apartments and a 60 bed nursing home planned for the immediate future. Dr. Reeder also explained the long-range plan of an additional nursing home and another apartment complex.

Parking Spaces: A discussion followed on the parking requirements. Dr. Reeder stated that research shows that older people do not have as many cars as younger people. Mr. Schumann pointed out that the complex plans to provide transportation for the occupants. Mr. McEwen asked who will the apartments be rented to if they can't be filled by the elderly. Dr. Reeger said that before we build, we plan to have at least 50% of the apartments leased. Louise Forster stated that one of the requirements of obtaining a loan is that the occupants have to be 62 years or older. There is no chance of needing more parking.

Dr. Reeger explained the costs of the apartments. A studio would rent for \$125-135, a one bedroom for \$180-195 and a two bedroom for \$235-250 a month. Services are in addition to this cost.

Rick Cisar went over the comments from the reviewing departments. Noted that there is a height difference of 17 feet between St. Mary's Hospital and this complex. Jerry Wilds asked if there were any problems with flight patterns, Rick said no. Mr. Cisar pointed out that this is the first time he had seen the entire plan for the complex and has not reviewed the entire proposal. There is a lot more to it than was originally presented to the staff and he would like full review of the total proposal by all departments. He also pointed out that Eighth St. is the only access to the property. Rights-of-Way will be required and he read the staff memo. A discussion followed on the access. Virginia Flager made a motion to recommend to council approval of the height variance subject to the staff memo, Jerry Wilds seconded and it passed unanimously. It was pointed out to the developers that only the height was approved and not the entire proposed complex.

Virginia Flager made a motion to recommend to council approval of the seventy (70) parking spaces with the condition that if it was found, upon completion of the project, that more parking was needed, then the developers would have to use land to the north for additional parking. Jerry Wilds seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

4. #34-73: Consider Preliminary Plat of the Spring Valley Subdivision involving 160 acres (319 Lots) with R-1-A, One Family Residential zoning.
-

Developer: Mr. & Mrs. W. L. Peach

Location: Part of Sec 1, T1S, R1W, UM South of F 3/4 Rd., North of F Rd., West of 28 Road and East of 27 1/2 Road.

Rick Cisar Outlined the property in question. Mr. Bob Gerlofs of NHPQ was present to present the proposal. He stated that after a meeting with all department heads, they tried to work out all the problems. He then explained the layout of the subdivision, proposed parks, shopping center and PUD. A discussion followed on drainage of the area and 25 year storms. Rick Cisar explained how the location of the parks and shopping was determined. Mr. Engelke stated that in regards to the PUD, it would have to be taken up at a later time, but we should decide at this time if this is what you will do. If you don't, people may come back later and oppose the PUD, but if they know right from the beginning, then there should be no problems. Mr. Peach said that although the PUD was not definite at this time, we brought the entire layout before the board because they thought it would be the best way to present it. Gene McEwen made a motion to approve the revised Preliminary Plat with the staff recommendations Jane Quimby seconded and it passed unanimously.

5. #37-73 Proposed change in the zoning text:
Section 11, DEFINITIONS AND LIMITATIONS. Lot

Rick Cisar explained that the change was to clarify the definition. A Discussion followed. Jane Quimbly made a motion to recommend to Council approval of the change, Gene McDwen seconded and it passed unanimously. (See Public Notice for complete definition change)

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Rick Cisar explained two proposed changes in the zoning text. A discussion followed and Mr. Cisar pointed out that these two items would be brought up at a later time.

It was decided that there would be a meeting on July 31 at noon to discuss the flood plain.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.