

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

PLANNING COMMISSION

December 27, 1973

M I N U T E S

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Levi Lucero at 8:00 A. M., in City Hall Auditorium with the following members present: Jane Quimby, Robert Van Houton, Blake Chambliss, Levi Lucero and Virginia Flager.
2. The minutes were approved as mailed.
3. #61-73. Consider rezoning petition involving approximately 3.3 acres from R-L-D (Single Family Residential) to PDM (Planned Development Mobile Home).

Petitioner: Thomas J. Brimhall

Location: NE1/4 SW1/4 Section 7, T1S, R1E, Ute Meridian.  
South of Mesa Ave., North of Texas Avenue and  
West of 28 1/2 Road.

Mr. Cisar presented the property location and the proposed request.

Mr. Brimhall stated that he had purchased the property to be a part of Cottonwood Meadows #2. The property is already subdivided thus it would not have to be replatted. When Mr. Brimhall had first purchased the property he had planned to use the property to sell for modular homes. But he has realized that there is no market for this type of subdivision thus for economics he finds it necessary to change the zoning on the property. The Sewer, water and all utilities have been stubbed into the lots by the developer. Mr. Brimhall stated that there are numerous people who would like to own lots for their mobile homes but who can not do so because of the county regulations. The lots would accommodate double wide mobile homes. The area has enough access roads.

Mr. Tom Elder: Mr. Brimhall has built an attractive mobile home park compared to some in the area. Mr. Brimhall has followed all of the regulations that have been established by the Fruitvale Sanitation District for the construction of the sewer into the park. This area is better organized than some of the residential areas.

Mr. Lord, Dale Broome: There are many people who wish to have a small lot for their mobile home. Mesa County has eliminated the small lot from being used.

Mr. Larry Dowd, realtor: The lots to this time have not been marketable. Mr. Brimhall has tried to market the lots for modular homes and the people have not been interested.

I have shown the lots and all I have received is a negative result.

There were no opponents to the request.

Ms. Flager: What size will the units be?

Mr. Brimhall: There would be a covenant restricting the size of the units.

Mr. Chambliss: Would there be a replatting of the subdivision?

Mr. Brimhall: There is no need for replatting of the lots. There size of the lots will accommodate the mobile homes. Through this type of subdivision the people will be able to do their own landscaping.

Mr. Cisar: There has been considerable concern over the screening of the present park. The board, under the PUD regulations can review the present facility as well. Mr. Cisar stated in conversations with Mr. Brimhall, he has said he will correct the situation this spring.

Mr. Lucero: Is this correct Mr. Brimhall?

Mr. Brimhall: Agreed.

Chairman Lucero: What were the reviewing agencies requests?

Mr. Cisar: There was no opposition to the request.

Mr. Chambliss: What does Mr. Brimhall plan to do about the fence that is surrounding the present mobile home park. There have been numerous complaints about the present fencing.

Mr. Brimhall: The fence is the one that is located on Orchard and it had been planted as required. The trees that had been planted had died because the people who were to water them did not do so. The trees will be replanted.

Mr. Cisar: Since this is a planned development then the Board will have a review of the site. The only difference between this and any other subdivision is the type of unit that will be placed upon the lots. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Van Houton moved that the request be approved, it was seconded by Virginia Flager. Mr. Chambliss moved that the motion be amended to read that the request be approved subject to total review of the site. Mr. Cisar stated that there would be total site review because of the PUD requirements. The motion died for lack of a seconding. The original motion carried unanimously.

3. #62-73: Consider rezoning petition involving approximately 1.96 acres from R-3 (Multi-family residential), P (Parking) and B-2 (Neighborhood Business) to PDB (Planned Development Business).

Petitioner: CBW Builders, Inc., Ben Carnes

Location: The SE1/4 of Section 2, T1S, R1E, Ute Meridian.  
NW Corner of the intersection of the intersection  
of 12th and Patterson Road.

Mr. Cisar presented the property plan. Item #63-73 is a part of this item.

Mr. Pat Hurley made the presentation of the rezoning request. Mr. Hurley asked if the Board had any questions.

Mr. Cisar stated that the present zoning would not require any review by the Board. What the developer is asking for would be a PDB zone to give the Board a review. Mr. Cisar read some of the reviewing agencies comments. Mr. Cisar stated that he would like to see the building moved in order to have smoother traffic flow and pedestrian circulation. Mr. Cisar stated that there should be a dedication of the right-of-way for both Patterson and 12th Streets. According to the Small-Cooley Plan these two streets are to be 100' right-of-way.

There was discussion over the dedication of the right-of-way.

There was discussion over the building design.

Ms. Flager wanted to know when a stop light would be put up in the area. A stop light would eliminate many of the problems in the area. If the light were put in prior to the completion of the building then there would be no problems.

Chairman Lucero asked for staff comments.

Mr. Cisar stated that the staff would like to see the relocation of the building and the dedication of the streets.

There was no opposition to the request.

Mr. Gardner: Would be opposed to moving the building. The building was placed there in order to screen the parking from the street. Another problem with moving the building is that it would cut down on the parking. The buildings will be set back from the 100' right-of-way thus they see no reason at the present time for the dedication of the full right-of-way.

Mr. Chambliss: Can we request the dedication of the right-of-way?

Mr. Cisar: Through the planned development the right-of-

way dedication can be required.

Mr. Van Houton moved that the rezoning request be approved. It was seconded by Blake Chambliss. The motion carried un-animously.

4. #63-73. Consider preliminary development plan for an office complex and surgi-center.

Developer: CBW Builders, Inc.

Location: The SE1/4 of SE1/4 of Section 2, T1S, R1E, Ute Meridian. The NW Corner of the intersection of 12th and Patterson Road.

Mr. Cisar read the comments that have been made on the proposal.

Mr. Chambliss: What standards will be used? At the present time there are no state standards concerning surgi-centers. Who would be responsible for design and staffing of the center?

Mr. Gardner: There are surgi-center which are being built in other cities and these will be used for examples. The standards which are used in these areas will be used. Even though there are not definite standards established there are state regulations which regulate what is done within the surgi-center.

Ms. Flager: The City must consider getting the right-of-way at this time. The traffic plan is extremely important.

Mr. Gardner: The present zoning would allow the construction of all of the buildings except for the surgi-center.

Ms. Flager: There is a problem with 12th Street which should not continue if the Commission can do anything about it.

Mr. Gardner: If someone would develop the property as it is presently zoned then the Board would have no review. The buildings will be set back from the 100' right-of-way thus the City could buy the right-of-way when they get ready to use it.

Chairman Lucero: Are there any requirements on the right-of-way?

Mr. Cisar: The right-of-way can be required under the approval of the site plan.

Mr. Van Houton: It is the Commissions responsibility to look into the future and to plan for future expansion. When the Commission rezones the property then it is a benefit to the property owners. Can see no reason why this should not be part of the approval of the site plan.

Mr. Gardner: This same question came up at the County meeting. The City has paid for land in numerous other situations. There is no reason why the City should force a property owner to dedicate property in order to have his request approved. There should not be an either or situation.

Mr. Cisar: This type of policy is done in many other cities across the state.

Mr. Chambliss moved that the site plan be approved subject to dedication of the right-of-way. It was seconded by Virginia Flager carried unanimously.

5. #55-73: Consider rezoning petition involving approximately .19 acre from R-1-D (Single Family Residential to C-1 (Light Commerce))

Petitioner: Mr. & Mrs. P. Donovan

Location: Beg at a point 300' North of the SE Corner of the E $\frac{1}{4}$  SW $\frac{1}{4}$  SW $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 7, T1S, R1E of the UN, thence N 61', thence W 165', thence S 61', thence E 165' to the POB; except the west 15 feet thereof. 300 feet north of North Ave. and east of Court Road.

Mr. Cisar presented the property location.

Mr. Van Houton wanted to know what the rezoning would be for. Chairman Lucero stated that the proponent were planning to build apartments.

Mr. Cisar stated that under the present R-1-D zoning that apartments are not permitted. In asking for C-1 there would be a required approval of the plan.

The only comment made was by the Trash Department and they required a concrete trash slab.

Mr. Donovan stated that part of the existing building would be removed and that efficiency type of apartments would be built.

Chairman Lucero wanted to know about the access to the property.

Mr. Donovan stated that there would be access off of Court Road and there would be two roads through the existing motel for the apartments.

There were no opponents to the request.

Mr. Cisar stated that the C-1 request would give the Board some review power. At some future time the zoning along North Avenue might be expanded in order for redevelopment to occur.

Jane Quimby moved that the rezoning be approved. It was seconded by Robert Van Houton and the motion carried unanimously.

6. #46-73: Consider Final Planned Unit Development For Sparkman Building.

Petitioner: Richard L. Sparkman

Location: Lots 21 to 32, Block 3, City of Grand Junction. The NE Corner of the intersection of 9th St. and Belford Ave.

Mr. Cisar presented the final plan. The plan meet all of the requirements. The item has been sent to all the reviewing agencies and there is no objection. The only comment was concerning the placing of the gate across the alley. (The next item.) The Fire Department needs access through the alley. Public Service and Mountain Bell have utilities in the alley which they will need to get to.

Mrs. Kemper stated that she would have no objection if they placed a street light at the Corner of 9th & North Ave. in order to discourage traffic through the alley.

Mr. Cisar stated that the staff saw no problems with the plan and recommended approval.

Mr. Van Houton moved that the plan be approved. It was seconded by Jane Quimby and the motion carried unanimously.

7. #64-73: Consider request for a revocable permit for the installation of a lockable gate across the E-W alley of Block 3, City of Grand Junction, approximately 100 feet west of Tenth Street.

Petitioner: Richard L. Sparkman & Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence C. McCluir.

Mr. McCluir: It was his understanding that the alley was to be used as parking. The gate is needed to cut down on the amount of traffic that goes through the alley.

Chairman Lucero stated that perhaps through the plan the problem with the traffic through the alley would be solved.

Mr. Van Houton the people are using the alley to get through to the stop light on 10th Street. The use of the gate might be a good idea in that it would be for a limit period of time which would help to discourage people from using the alley.

Mr. James Golden: Some property owners were in objection to the gate.

Chairman Lucero stated that the problem might be eliminated with the change in the building site.

Mr. McCluir stated that he would be opposed to the idea of a one way alley.

Mr. Van Houton moved that the request be denied with the understanding that if a problem is not solved then the Board would take some action to correct the problem. It was seconded by Virginia Flager and carried unanimously.

8. #22-73: Consider a request for a conditional use for a Drive-in Banking facility for Mesa Federal Savings.

Petitioner: Mesa Federal Savings

Location: The SW corner of Sixth and Rood.

Mr. Cisar presented the request. There would be one-third of the existing parking lot. The reviewing agencies were concerned with the passing of traffic through the alley. If problems would arise then they would discourage left hand turns off of Rood.

Mr. Van Houton stated that the last parking space that is on 6th before the exit should be removed in order to eliminate any exit problems.

Mr. Cisar stated that the amount of traffic through this drive-up would not be as great as through the bank drive-ups.

There was discussion over the traffic flow through the parking lot and on to the Streets.

There was no opposition to the request.

Virginia Flager moved that the request be approved. It was seconded by Robert Van Houton and carried unanimously. Mr. Van Houton stated that the parking space on 6th should be eliminated.

9. #58-73: Consider request to vacate the South Half of Main St. between First and Second St.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction  
#59-73:

10. Consider request to vacate the West half of Second Ave. from Main St. to the alley south of Main St.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction.

Mr. Cisar presented the vacation requests.

Mr. Jim Wysocki explained why the city felt the need for the vacation of the two streets. The building that is located to the west of the vacate lot will not be removed for five years.

Mr. James Golden wanted to know how many square feet would be gained by the vacation. Mr. Wysocki gave the figure.

There was discussion on the access from the building on to the Street.

The vacation would eliminate 37 parking spaces but the construction of the multi-purpose center would create 125.

Mr. James Golden was opposed to the vacation of the streets. He stated that the City had told the tax payers that this lot would be enough for the construction of the multi-purpose building. Mr. Golden stated that Mr. Rose had said that there might be a problem with parking. The taxpayers had been lead to believe onething when the City had not made any substantial study on the project. The cost were rising. Mr. Golden saw no reason why the Planning Commission should correct the error in judgement by the City on the amount of property that would be needed for the project.

Mr. Schilling, owner City Center Motel: Would like to see the item deferred until further study can be done on the project. The people have been miss led at numerous times concerning the construction of the multi-purpose building.

Mr. Joe Prinster: Not in opposition to the building of the multi-purpose building but has to agree with Mr. Golden. The item should have been studied fully before any decision was made on the location.

Ms. Quimby stated that when the Committee started looking at buildings they were ones which were not suitable for the area. She did not see where the vacations would have any effect on the surrounding property. Agreed that there is not enough publication on the building.

Mr. Wysocki stated that there had been several meetings held which were not well attended by the public.

Margaret Golden, Mrs. Pat Mays & Ms. Buceanan were all present and opposed to the vacation.

Mr. Golden stated that access to property is important and that at the present time that access on Main and Second is difficult enough without providing further problems.

Chairman Lucero recommended that the request be tabled until further study can be done on the item. It was so moved by Virginia Flager and seconded by Jane Quimby. All ayes.

The item was tabled.

11. #60-73: Consider amendment to the PDB (Planned Development Business) zoning district specifying the density requirement for multi-family developments.

Mr. Cisar presented the amendment. The Board would have full control over the amount of density in the area.

Mr. Engelke stated how the regulations would be effected.

There was discussion on the amount of density.

It was moved by Jane Quimby and seconded by Blake Chambliss that the amendment be approved. It carried unanimously.



12. #57-73: Consider amendment to the Zoning Ordinance changing size and readable distance for Public Notices (signs) posted on properties prior to public hearing.

The signs that would be used would be smaller in size. There would be a reduction in the cost because only a small part of the sign would have to be changed each time.

Robert Van Houton moved that the request be approved. It was seconded by Virginia Flager and carried unanimously.

13. Discussion

There was discussion over the amendments to the R-3 (Multi-family) zoning districts. The Department is still working with the revisions.

Mr. Engelke stated that the Planning Department should consider doing some planning for the newly annexed area of Orchard Mesa. This could perhaps be done in conjunction with the new plan for North Avenue.

14. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.