

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

PLANNING COMMISSION

January 30, 1974

MINUTES

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Levi Lucero at 8:00 A.M., in the City Hall auditorium with the following members present: Jane Quimby, Eugene McEwen, Blake Chambliss, Levi Lucero, Robert Van Houten, Jerry Wilds, and Virginia Flager.
2. The motion was made by Robert Van Houten and seconded by Blake Chambliss that the minutes of the December 27, 1973, meeting be accepted as mailed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. #58-73: Consider request to vacate the South-one-half of Main Street from the East line of 1st Street to the centerline of 2nd Street. (Tabled 12-27-73)
Petitioner: City of Grand Junction
4. #59-73: Consider request to vacate the West one-half of 2nd Street from the South line of Main Street to a point 165.0 feet South (Tabled 12-27-73)
Petitioner: City of Grand Junction
5. #2-74: Consider request to vacate the East-West Alley of Block 121 bounded by Main Street on the North, Colorado Avenue on the South, First Street on the West, and Second Street on the East.
Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Mr. Cisar presented the property location and the proposed request on the three aforementioned matters.

Chairman Lucero asked proponents to make comments.

Mr. Van Deusen presented additional transparencies relating to this matter. Mr. Van Deusen stated the major problem as follows:

1. There should be open space in connection with the building for visual ties with the present shopping center and an outdoor lobby.
2. Entire building should be on one level with regard to economy as the installation of elevators or escalators would cost approximately \$80,000.
3. Planning should be considered for more than one building; therefore the City should inquire North of Main Street for the possible purchase of additional lots.
4. Adaptive plans for future expansion.

Mr. Van Deusen presented figures from similar buildings and the City supported the need for a large building.

Mr. Mark Schmidt addressed the Planning Commission stating that he owned three lots on the North side of Main Street and that he was in favor of the expanding development of the multi-purpose building.

Mr. Sam Antonopoulos of the Athens Motel voiced 100% favoritism toward the said project.

Chairman Lucero asked for comments in opposition.

Mr. James Golden stated opposition to the project as he felt the plans were impractical and should be drawn with regard to needs of the public. He also stated that at the time the Resolution was presented with regard to the bond issue, that Mr. Rose stated this would be the only building of this nature that Grand Junction would need and could afford. The people didn't actually know what they were voting on at the time the Resolution was introduced. Mr. Golden also stated that he considered the project poor planning with regard to neighboring property owners and that the facility would not necessarily benefit the community as a similar facility in Denver did not benefit the community in which it was constructed.

Mr. Duane Scott addressed the Planning Commission with a statement that the building will not be of adequate size to accommodate proposed services and that the people were not actually aware of the project they were voting on. He concluded with the statement that the entire project should be reviewed again.

Mr. Larry Finnessey voiced the opinion that a search be made for a larger location; and that he did not recall any alternative to location at the time the people voted on this project. He also suggested that plans be made with regard to the future.

Mr. Charles Willsea stated that the project should be sited nearer the center of Grand Junction. He felt that this project would hinder access to neighboring businesses and drive the people out of downtown Grand Junction.

Mr. Joe Hughes of the Silver Spur Motel addressed the Planning Commission with regard to the conflicting newspaper articles pertaining to this project. He stated he read that the construction site must be within six blocks of downtown Grand Junction and that this fact is all that has been considered in this matter.

Mr. Jim McEvoy, a cab driver, related that his passengers comment frequently on the beauty of Grand Junction's Main Street as it is, and he feels the biggest attraction of the City should not be destroyed.

Mr. Cisar stated that a utility easement in the alley be retained for existing utilities, and that the relocation expenses be paid by the petitioner.

Miss Hurst questioned parking facilities for the project.

Chairman Lucero advised that 125 parking spaces are available and adjacent to the building.

Ms. Hurst stated that the proposed building is not adequate as it is not self-contained.

Chairman Lucero stated that this matter did not relate to the function of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Van Deusen stated that other businesses are considering leaving the downtown area if it is not expanded.

Mr. Richard Sparkman asked if the City was in the process of buying property in the area of the proposed multi-purpose building to supply parking.

Don Warner replied that a parking survey had previously been conducted and the figures therein were made of public notice; but that he could not readily remember them.

Mr. Sparkman related that he is in favor of such a building, but that it should be in a more suitable location with respect to parking and adequacy.

Mr. Dale Hollingsworth of the Chamber of Commerce stated that in the past parking facilities were obtained at which time lots became available, and he felt certain this will happen after the building is completed.

The fact was clarified that the streets will have ten feet lanes and unobstructed nine foot sidewalks.

Chairman Lucero closed the hearing.

The motion was made by Mr. Chambliss that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council the vacation of the South 1/2 of Main Street from First to Second; the West 1/2 of Second Street from Main to a point 165 feet South and the vacation of the East-West alley of Block 121, for the purpose of providing adequate entrance and landscaped setting for the development of the Multi-Purpose Building, subject to resolution of the following concerns: We urge the City Council to consider the re-ordering of building design criteria to:

- a. respect Main Street and the design criteria established in Operation Foresight, i.e. plantings, seating, people amenities provided in the public right-of-way.
- b. review of advisability of the design of the building around a temporary facility (LaCourt Office).
- c. provide adequate loading and standing spaces for buses, cabs, and private autos which will require access to the building.
- d. provide adequate off-street loading and service space for trucks, trailers, and other service vehicles making delivery of food, exhibit materials, etc. to the building.

e. assume responsibility of the provision of adequate additional parking in the immediate vicinity for persons using the facility.

Mr. McEwen seconded the motion.

Planning Commission members commented as follows:

Ms. Flager: Opposed to vacation and building in streets. Project does not have enough design.

Mr. McEwen: Believes this is an acceptable proposal.

Mr. Van Houten: Didn't have a choice of location; but feels that the majority of the public is in favor of this building and he has been outvoted. He also felt that the opponents did not relate their views with regard to the public, but rather as they pertained to their own personal aspects.

Mr. Wilds: Was not in on prior selection of location; but agreed with Mr. Van Houten. Also felt that the majority of citizens were for the project; therefore, it shouldn't be prolonged further.

Ms. Quimby: feels site is proper and recommends to proceed.

Roll call vote was as follows:

Mr. Van Houten	Aye
Mr. Wilds	Aye
Ms. Quimby	Aye
Ms. Flager	Nay
Mr. McEwen	Aye
Mr. Chambliss	Aye
Chairman Lucero	Aye

The motion was made by Mr. Chambliss that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council provide public assurances that further development as contemplated can be accomplished without a major commitment of public funds or resources without advance public knowledge, or that the lack of such additional development will not unnecessarily restrict access to, nor esthetically detract from, Operation Foresight and downtown Grand Junction. And that, in addition, there be a review of the apparent policy of actions of the City in excluding the public from the planning process for public buildings and/or spaces.

Ms. Flager seconded the motion. The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. #61-73: Consider Final development plan for the Cottenwood Meadows Mobile Home Park.

Developer: Thomas J. Brimhall
Location: NE 1/4 SW 1/3 Section 7, T1S, R1E, Ute Meridian,
South of Mesa Avenue, North of Texas Avenue, and
West of 28 1/2 Road.

Mr. Clear presented the property location and the proposed plan including a plot plan for each individual lot.

Mr. Brimhall explained the typical lot plan and stated that the driveway area has drainage into the gutter. The remainder of the area will be lawn as to not obstruct access to move the mobile homes. Individuals will landscape lots as per personal likes and dislikes.

Mr. Chambliss related that PUD required trees.

Mr. Brimhall stated that all damaged or dead trees around the existing park will be replaced. He has submitted a letter to that effect.

The motion was made by Mr. Van Houten that this request be granted subject to Mr. Brimhall replacing dead trees and maintaining landscaping in a suitable condition. Mr. Chambliss seconded the motion.

Mr. Chambliss amended the motion to include major landscaping of two trees per lot on new lots. Mr. Van Houten seconded the motion. The vote in favor was unanimous.

7. #63-73: Consider Final Planned Unit Development for an Office Complex and Surgicenter.

Developer: CBW Builders, Inc.

Location: The SE 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Section 2, T1S, R1E, Ute Meridian. The NW corner of the intersection of 12th and Patterson Road.

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

Mr. Pat Hurley related that traffic controls will be shown on the final plan. Landscape plan and fence details were presented. A wall sign is proposed, but still being contemplated.

Ms. Flager: Do you propose the sidewalk to be two feet below ground level?

Mr. Hurley: Yes. And it will be used as a public sidewalk. It will add to the landscaping and benefit the public as it will be covered.

Staff recommendations included that the developer would need to dedicate a fifty foot right-of-way on Patterson Road and 12th Street; comply with on site fire hydrant; one cut on Patterson.

Mr. Van Houten related that a second curb cut on Patterson may be beneficial to allow two entries.

Controversial discussion followed regarding the matter of the number of curb cuts on Patterson Road.

Warren Gardner stated that he had met with the Traffic Department and the present criterion is for an eighty foot right-of-way. In view of this, he felt it unnecessary to dedicate an additional ten foot right-of-way at this time, but that the additional ten feet is available whenever needed.

The motion was made by Mr. Van Houten that the Planned Unit Development be approved subject to staff recommendations, and that the request be granted allowing for one curb cut with an alternative flexibility if one cut proves unsatisfactory. Mr. Chambliss seconded the motion. The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. #4-74: Consider Final Plat of the Arbor Village Subdivision involving 13.98 acres (36 lots) with R1C single family residential zoning.

Developer: Blain D. & Lee B. Ford

Location: NE 1/4 of Section 12 T1S, R1W, North of Orchard Avenue, South of the Grand Valley Canal & 200 feet East of Linja Lane.

Mr. Cisar presented the property location and the proposed request. He also related that the petitioners were in the process of resolving a deed for fifty foot right-of-way. In view of this, Mr. Van Houten made the motion that this item be tabled until the deed was in fact resolved. Mr. Chambliss seconded it. The motion carried unanimously.

9. #3-74: Consider Revised Preliminary Planned Unit Development for the Landing-Heights Nursing Home involving 20.3 acres with PD8 (Planned Residential) zoning.

Developers: Continental Western Development Company

Location: South of Patterson Road, West of the Mantey Heights Water Tank, and East of the Mantey Heights Subdivision.

Mr. Cisar presented the property location and revised site plan.

Mr. Pat Berry, representing the developers related that they had changed the size of the proposed Nursing Home.

Mr. Cisar stated that water and sewage facilities need to be pumped up to Patterson Road; facility would require a minimum of four (4.0) acres of area to meet requirements; additional landscaping and screening (burning) along Patterson Road to reduce visible impact of parking lot; provide screening (landscaping and/or fencing) along property to protect adjacent single family subdivision; area would require a subdivision plat upon submission of final PUD. Also, some lots South of site have no legal access and therefore should be included in plat to protect present property owners. As previously mentioned, the final County Certificate of Occupancy will be withheld for one (1) year after construction of the New Nursing Home during which time the existing nursing home facility must be removed. The final PUD must meet all requirements as specified in PUD Ordinance. Staff further suggested that the density for the remainder of this property be set at P1-B.

The motion was made by Mr. Chambliss and seconded by Mr. Van Houten that the project be approved subject to staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chambliss asked what changes were made with the functional open space beneath the building.

Mr. Cisar stated that no provisions have been made to retain any functional open space on the revised plan. He compared the approved plan and proposed plan with the Board.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Chambliss made a motion that as much of the functional open space be retained in the area as possible. Mr. Van Houten seconded it. The vote in favor was unanimous.

10. #1-74: Consider Preliminary Planned Unit Development for an Apartment Complex in the PDB, Planned Business Zoning District.

Developer: Henry Blaylock

Location: Lots 21 through 32 in Block 10, City of Grand Junction. The NE corner of the intersection of Second Street and Belford Avenue.

Mr. Cisar presented the property location and the preliminary plan.

Mr. Blaylock related that he proposed to take out the existing curb cuts on Belford Avenue and install a more efficient curb and gutter system.

Staff recommended to relocate the trash facilities, change the direction of parking in lot, provide ramps, and additional landscaping in open areas.

The motion was made by Mr. Chambliss and seconded by Ms. Flager that this item be approved subject to aforementioned comments. The motion carried unanimously.

11. General discussion

Ms. McDonough presented the transitional plan for the College Farm Subdivision. She stated that this item had been sent to the reviewers with the County Road Department proposing to eliminate double frontage lots. The preliminary plan will be presented for vote in the future.

Mr. McDonough presented the sketch plan for the Fruitwood Subdivision involving 49.4 acres and 160 lots in R2 Zoning. This sketch plan meets the requirements for a Transitional Subdivision and has been through the review process.

At the close of the meeting, the meeting was declared adjourned.