

Minutes of City of Grand Junction Planning Commission
April 24, 1974

Members Present: Levi Lucero, Jane Quimby, Robert Van Houten,
Eugene McEwen, Blake Chambliss

1. The meeting was called to order at 8:00 A.M.
2. The Minutes were approved with a correction on the name Erlof on Page 8.
3. #51-73: Consider the Final Planned Unit Development for the Grand Valley Apartments involving 2.26 acres with PD-8, planned development residential zoning.

Mr. Cisar presented the location on the overhead projector. The development is in compliance with PD-8 density. Review comments: The Grand Valley canal needs a 16' easement, the landscaping has a species that is not permitted by the Parks and Recreation, 13th Street and Bookcliff needs to participate in an improvement district (pave, curb and gutter and sidewalk). There will be a fence on the adjacent property owners North line. Mrs. Priest called the Planning Department and was concerned about the height of the buildings, she did not want the buildings 35 feet high in this area. Mr. Cisar said that the buildings would be 15 feet (approximately). Mr. Chambliss asked if that was a binding agreement with Grand Valley Irrigation about the 16' easement. Mr. Cisar said the 16' is asked for now for an access road. Mr. Van Houten asked how did they get in there before. Mr. Chambliss asked if the total was 16' or was the 16' in addition to the easement. Mr. Cisar said no that this was from the waterline. Mr. Gardner said he would like to see it approved. Mr. Engelke said do we have an agreement on the fence and Mr. Cisar said not at this time but that it would be necessary prior to the Council's approval. Mr. Lucero asked if there were any more pro or con comments from the audience or the Board.

Mr. McEwen made a motion to approve the Final Planned Unit Development for the Grand Valley Apartments subject to staff comments. Virginia Flager seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1. #19-74: Consider Final Plat of the Wagner Subdivision involving .27 acres with RIC single family residential zoning.

This is a two lot subdivision with Elm on the North side. Levi asked if Mr. and Mrs. Wagner were in the audience or if there were any questions.

Mr. Chambliss moved that the subdivision be approved and Jane Quimby seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1. #52-74: Consider Final Plat of the 1st Fruitridge Subdivision, 1st addition, involving .6 acres with PIB, single family resident

zoning.

This is a metes and bounds parcel and they want to divide it into three lots using Wellington Lane for the access. There is a 24' R. O. W. along Wellington and the access from the South is from Margie Street. Mr. Chambliss asked how the City was going to pave 24'. Mr. Engelke said it would treat it like any alley. There is a 50' minimum right-of-way.

Mountain Bell requested a 10' easement along the front of the lots. Mr. Engelke said this is a bad situation and we should be able to improve it to within 1 foot of the standard so lets not argue about the 1 foot at this time. Mr. Chambliss asked if this would take an improvement district and Mr. Van Houten said in order for one to be formed it would take a 50% participation of the area. Ms. Flager asked about the access to the two existing houses and Mr. Cisar said the access was from 1st Street. Mr. Chambliss asked if any decision by the Board would only serve to confuse the issue and would it not be a better idea to discuss this with the City Engineers and the neighborhood regarding the development of the area. Mr. Lucero said there should be a lengthy discussion with the people regarding the cul-du-sac in relation to the area development. Mr. Tom Elder speaking in behalf of the neighborhood in question agreed with Mr. Chambliss and said they would meet with the engineers. The concept at this time is unacceptable for the Potts to give 1/2 of Wellington. The Board is asking the people to donate 20-25' today and then the City will turn around and buy this access tomorrow. The Potts are willing to give 20' off the South on Margie but nothing off Wellington. They would object to any change on Wellington Lane as this involves five property owners and none of them is in favor of giving the R.O.W.

Mr. Brock who owns the house on first said there is ample room on Margie and he doesn't want any changes and his land is not for sale. Ms. Flager said there is no way Margie can be extended. The feelings of the people in the tract to the South is that the lady who owns the land wants nothing to develop. Mr. Lucero asked about the property to the North of Wellington as far as taking more frontage there. Mr. Cisar said additional R.O.W. North of Wellington is not available. Mr. Chambliss said there should be a meeting set up in the area involving all the parcels and property involved. Mrs. Potts said they would like one house to face on Ella and two houses to face Wellington. We will give our 5' then you will have to take it from the rest. On the North side there is no way to get any more footage. You need access only and there is no reason for a R.O.W. Ms. Flager said she would like to make a motion to table this item until there can be a meeting between the engineers, the developer and the neighborhood from the West side of Ella Court to the Canal. Mr. Lucero said that there would be no way to decrease the traffic in response to a question from Mr. Brock. Mr. Chambliss seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. It was suggested that a meeting be arranged as soon as possible.

Preliminary Plan - Fruitwood Subdivision

Mr. Cisar said that this is actually 15' added to the setback. Mr. Chambliss asked the difference between the open space and the landscaped area and asked that the wording be changed to read landscaped area only. Mr. Cisar said he would make that change.

Mr. Chambliss made a motion that the R-3 amendments be approved and that the setback be approved as submitted by the staff subject to the stipulation that no front yard be less than 15' from the front property line. Ms. Flager seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Quimby made a motion that the open space required in the R-3 zone be 25% in landscaped area (omitting the phrase open space from the advertised amendment). Mr. Wilds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Parkland Report Discussion

This report was prepared by Mr. Wysocki and the Planning Department. Mr. Cisar explained the report to the Board. Ms. Flager asked if something could not be oriented to the senior citizens. Mr. Chambliss said that the senior citizens are less mobile than the younger families. Mr. Engelke said that the recommended fees for the acquisition of parkland look high and that at first glance the parkland situation doesn't look too bad. But when you consider that the first three items on today's agenda eliminated area used for park space this is a problem. You could call this fee a tap fee. Growth alone is not going to support itself and it will not sustain the added services. If you look at this as a city service then it can be called a tap fee. The City Council thought nothing of increasing the existing sewer tap fee.

Mr. Wysocki said that this fee would be for the development of the street-tree area (2" caliper tree). The city portion of the money would go into nursery stock. There is a larger margin of loss with the smaller trees. A 75' lot would have two trees. The current source is 1 1/4" and we would be able to use our own source in about 4 years. We could use the land near the sewer plant for a nursery. If we plant 1,000 trees that would let us use 250 trees per year.

Mr. Chambliss said this puts the burden on the residential areas. How do you tap the people outside of the city? All of this adds to the price of the housing - at what point do we realize that we have lower income workers coming in. We must look deeper than the individual for a basis. Are we going to actually plan and tie this into the city-county development. Ms. Quimby said we must do what we have to do. Mr. Gerlofs said the burden of the parks are on the City homeowner. Watch the housing cost, the total burden should not be on the property owner it should also be on the commercial developer. Those who create the load would help carry the burden.

Mr. Chambliss said I received a \$245/unit as the fee that should be established even if we that would still have our parkland

should not be on the residences but we can supplement it with additional funds. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Sketch Plan:

Ms. McDonough presented a sketch plan for an 18 lot development. The State Highway department questioned the urban boundaries and the guidelines had not been met.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 A.M.

11. Mr. Van Houten made a motion that the City Planning meet the last Wednesday of the month at 7:30 P.M. in the City Hall Auditorium. Ms. Flager seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously. The next meeting would be May 29th, 1974 at 7:30 P.M. in the City Hall Auditorium.

12. There was a short discussion about the newly to be formed steering committee to replace the regional planning. Mr. Chambliss made a motion that the City Planning Commission have an additional member on the committee selected by the City Planning Board. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.