

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

August 29, 1973

M I N U T E S

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

Others Present: Assistant Planning Director, Rick Cisar, Building Inspector, Fred Fuhrmeister and Acting Secretary, Joan Brown.

Approval of minutes of previous meeting:

Minutes were approved as mailed.

2. #28-73: Consider revised Preliminary Development Plan for the Landing Heights Nursing Home involving approximately 3.67 acres. Tabled at previous meeting.

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.

Mr. Cisar described the property in question. Mr. Pat Dwyer was present to represent the Landings. He stated that access and solutions to density were the motion on the last meeting and reiterated what has happened with the plan and Commission to date. Landscaping has been planned on the back of the nursing home to shield the view of the water tank on the adjoining property.

Mr. Lucero asked for questions, there were none. Virginia Flager asked who owned the property on the east of the Landings' property. Mr. Cisar showed the board a plat of the area which showed adjoining property owners.

Mr. Lucero asked for opponents, there were none. Mr. Chambliss asked for Subdivision Plat. Mr. Cisar said that it would come at a later time. At the next presentation, we will be looking at a final plat and final PUD. Mr. Chambliss expressed his concern with the density and how the rest of the land would be used. With the only access through Mantey Heights, it could be a real traffic problem.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out that if the Landings didn't own the rest of the property the board wouldn't even be talking about it. Since the conception of this project, density has not been defined. Mr. Dwyer feels that they have met all of the recommendations. He also pointed out that the people in a nursing home are usually confined and there would be little egress. Mr. Lucero asked if the replat was in process. Mr. Dwyer said that they have agreed to demolish existing buildings within one year from the completion date. Mr. Van Houten stated that he is of the belief that the original request was for the rezoning of the whole parcel. Virginia Flager said that it is her understanding that anything higher than single family density would have to be brought back before the board, Mr. Cisar said that that

Grand Junction Planning Commission
August 29, 1973
MINUTES

is correct. Mr. Lucero read the minutes of the June meeting regarding this property.

The hearing was closed.

Mr. Chambliss made a motion to expand PD-8 zoning to total area under consideration with maximum density set at R-1-B density for the remaining 16.63+ acres. It was seconded by Jane Quimby and a discussion followed. Mr. Chambliss explained why he felt this type of motion was necessary. We have allowed the PUD to allow a nursing home but we don't want that high of density for the rest of the property. Mr. Dwyer asked if they have to come up with plans for the PUD when they present the final. Mr. Cisar said no, only the conceptual. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

3. #34-73: Consider Revised Preliminary Plat of the Spring Valley Subdivision involving 160 acres with R-1-A and R-1-C (One Family Residential Zoning).

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

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

Mr. Cisar described the property in question. Mr. Gerlofs was present to represent the Peaches. At this point they have no plans for the PUD and the Shopping Center. He would like to leave these areas off of the final plat until the project progresses. Mr. Cisar said that in regards to the two tracts the Board should require that the developer petition for rezoning of these parcels if this is the way they are going to be used. Before filing of the Final Plan, we will need the following: Detail drainage plan, detailed irrigation plan and approval of Grand Valley Water Users Board for ditch relocations. Mr. Gerlofs feels that they are too far from development of the two parcels to request the rezoning now. Mr. Lucero asked Mr. Gerlofs if they would have definite plans for the two parcels by the time they submitted the final plat. Mr. Gerlofs said that this is a slow process and a decision on these two areas may not come up for 5 years. Mr. Peach said that they came with a master plan of the entire area because they thought this is what the board wanted. We could plan just a portion of it at a time. Mrs. Peach stated that they have buyers for and against the PUD and so they really aren't sure what to do at this time. Mr. Gerlofs said that they would appreciate consideration of the First filing because the preliminary has been before the Board for two months now. Rick stated that we can't take action on the First filing but we can on the Preliminary Plat. A discussion followed on the Park Area. Mr. Chambliss asked if the parks become city property and Mr. Gerlofs said yes. Mr. Chambliss made a motion to approve the Preliminary Plat subject to the staff recommendations:

1. Comprehensive drainage and irrigation plan approved by city Engineer.
2. Approval of Grand Valley Water Users Board for Ditch relocation.
3. The developer either petition for rezoning of the two tracts (shopping center and PUD) or subdivide the two tracts before this goes before the City Council.

Mr. Wilds seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Grand Junction Planning Commission
August 29, 1978
MINUTES

#40-73: Consider request for the vacation of an alley. The S1/2 of the NS Alley between 3rd and 4th Avenue running from 7th St. to 8th St.

Petitioner: Castings Inc. and Dwight Poland

Location: South Half of the North-South Alley of Block 20, Milldale Sub.

Rick Cisar noted that there was a mistake on the Agenda and described the property in question. Mr. John Wood of the Seventh Day Adventist Church was present and expressed concern for access to the rear of the church. He was told that the agenda was incorrect and that the vacation did not affect the church property. Once he understood the error, he had no objection to the vacation. Mr. Tom Harshman was present to represent the petitioners and stated that the alley wasn't used for years and the petitioners had no objection to granting the easement. Mr. Chambliss expressed his personal concern for the number of alleys that are being closed on a piecemeal basis. Would like to see some kind of plan developed for vacation of unused alleys. Mr. Van Houten stated that he is opposed to the vacation of alleys in general. Mr. Wilds asked if the utility companies had any need of this alley. Mr. Cisar said that only Public Service requested that an easement be retained for existing facilities. A discussion followed by the board. Mr. Lucero said that he would like the planning staff to look into the planned development of these alleys. Mr. Chambliss felt that maybe the staff could work with IDI on this. Mr. Harshman explained that the alley was needed for storage and that this alley hasn't been used for years. Mr. McEwen made a motion to vacate the alley, for lack of a second, the motion died. Virginia Flager made a motion that the request be denied, Bob Van Houten seconded and a discussion followed. Motion was withdrawn. Mr. Van Houten made a motion that Castings, Inc. lease the alley from the city at a minimal fee until a master plan can be developed regarding the vacation of alleys in the city. Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

A discussion followed regarding whether or not this could be done legally and Mr. Harshman was told that he could appeal the decision of the Board to City Council. Mr. Chambliss then made a motion to initiate a study of alleys in the industrial area and perhaps then we would know which alleys would not be needed at a future date. Virginia Flager seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

5. #41-73: Consider Final Plat of Rothhaupt Subdivision, Second Addition involving 20 acres + (35) lots with R-1-B (One Family Residential) zoning.

Petitioner: John P. Rothhaupt

Location: NE of Brittany Drive and E of 28 1/2 Rd. The SW1/4 NE1/2 of Sec 7, T1S, R1E of the UM.

Mr. Rothhaupt was present and explained what was planned. Rick explained the easement requirements and recommended an additional 5 foot ROW on 28 1/2 Road. Mr. Rothhaupt agreed. Mr. Lucero asked for opponants, there were none. Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the request subject to the staff recommendations, Blake Chambliss seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
August 29, 1973
MINUTES

6. #44-73: Consider request to vacate the South 3 feet of a 15 foot utility easement.

Petitioner: Mr. & Mrs. B. E. Robinson

Location: Along the North lot line of Lot 5, Walker Heights Subdivision.

Mr. Fred Fuhrmeister described the property in question. A discussion by the board followed. Mr. Lucero asked for proponents, there were none. Jerry Wilds made a motion to approve the request, Gene McEwen seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

7. #45-73: Consideration of Flood Plain Regulations and Flood Plain Map.

Rick Cisar described the property in the flood plain and asked for questions. A discussion followed on the location of the flood plain. Mr. Fuhrmeister said that basically, we are talking about the Riverside Area and some of Industrial Park. He then explained the building requirements in the flood plain. A discussion followed and Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend to Council adoption of the Flood Plain Regulations and Flood Plain Map, Mr. McEwen seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

8. #42-73: Consider proposed change in City Zoning Ordinance. Section 5, Parking and Loading.

Mr. Cisar read the proposed change to the Board. A discussion followed. Mr. Wilds suggested that we change the wording to make it clear that four and more units require 1 1/2 parking spaces per unit. Mr. Van Houten made a motion to approve the change, Jane Quimby seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

9. #43-73: Consider Proposed change in City Zoning Ordinance. Section 3, Zone Classifications.

Mr. Cisar explained the change requires all junk yard proposals be approved by the board. At present they are a "by-right" use and no review is required. He explained the problem with the present regulations. Virginia Flager made a motion to approve the proposed change in the zoning text, Mr. Van Houten seconded and the motion carried.

10. #39-73: Consider proposed change in City Zoning Ordinance. Section 9, (a) Board of Adjustment and Appeals.

Mr. Fuhrmeister explained that this change was proposed because the staff felt men in the building and construction trade would better understand the problems that came before this board. Mr. Chambliss suggested that we change the wording to read: an architect (or engineer). and made a motion to approve the change, Jane Quimby seconded and it passed unanimously.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

The Capitol Improvement Plan was discussed. The board expressed a desire to discuss it further after they had more time to review it.

Grand Junction Planning Commission

August 29, 1973

MINUTES

Mr. Cisar explained to the Board what was being done on the North Avenue Project.

Jane Quimby asked that a work session be scheduled to review the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Lucero discussed the IDI meeting, which he attended prior to this meeting, regarding a Housing Authority.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.