

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 26, 1974

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the City of Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 A.M., in the Civic Hall Auditorium by Chairman Levi Lucero with the following members present: Robert Van Houten, Jane Quimby, Blake Chambliss, Eugene McEwen, Jerry Wilds; and Virginia Flager.

Also present were: Rick Cisar, Assistant Planning Director; Conni McDonough, Subdivision Coordinator; and Bonnie Pehl, Acting Secretary.

Blake Chambliss amended the minutes of the May 29, 1974, meeting by excusing himself from discussion on item number seven of the minutes.

Levi Lucero changed the first item on the supplement to the agenda to the seventh on the agenda, and the seventh item on the agenda to the last item on the agenda.

1. #30-74: Consider rezoning petition involving .25⁺ acres from B1, limited business to C1, light commerce zoning.
Petitioner: Robert L. Orr (Trustee)
Location: SE 1/4 section 14, the NW corner of 12th Street and Ute.

J.D. Snodgrass was representing Mr. Orr. Mr. Snodgrass made a change in the impact study by changing the lots from 21, 22, & 23 to 20, 21, & 22. After discussing the matter with Rick Cisar and learning that he suggested HO zoning, Mr. Snodgrass said they would still like to have the area zoned as C1 but that if the Commission felt the C1 zone was a change they could not make, they could go along with the HO zoning.

Levi Lucero: Is there a definite use for this land?

Mr. Snodgrass: There was an offer from one business when the rezoning began. It was a business to recycle car and truck air filters. Other proposed uses were a car repair shop, water softening business, a service station. There used to be a filling station but the pumps were taken out when it was closed and it would entail considerable cost to put a service station there again. But at this time there is no definite use.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to know the definition for zoning.

Rick Cisar: It is a Highway Oriented type of zoning similar to North Avenue uses but requiring PUB plans.

Levi Lucero: We will close the hearing. Are there any staff recommendations?

Rick Cisar: The filling station would be a by-right use, the repair station would be a by-right use and the recycling business would be a conditional use. Looking at the arterial streets. The HO zoning would allow all these uses but with site review.

Jerry Wilds: The whole street would go HO wouldn't it?

Rick Cisar: Yes.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to have a chance to review the HO zoning. I am very much concerned about what's going to happen in that whole area. I would hesitate to approve even that.

Levi Lucero: I recommend that we table this until next month.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion to table this for now.

Virginia Flager seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously.

2. #29-74: Consider request for a Conditional Use (office) in the R-3, high density residential zoning district.
Petitioner: Federal Land Bank Association
Location: NE 1/4 Section 11, the SW corner of 12th Street and Bookcliff.

Keith Mumby represented the Federal Land Bank. Mr. Mumby expressed the opinion that placing an apartment house in this place would generate more people and traffic than this office would. The city does not have a right-of-way on Bookcliff at this time and we are going to dedicate 30 feet along the entire side of Bookcliff and a total of 50 feet along 12th Street. So realistically, these people have given off about 20% of their lot to the city. All the parking is in the rear of the building.

Eugene McEwen: Will all of this building be built at once?

Keith Mumby: Yes.

Levi Lucero: What is the time schedule?

Keith Mumby: Just as fast as we can go. We decided that rather than go for a zone change this could be allowed as a conditional use in this zone. As it is these people have been delayed several months.

Levi Lucero: Are there any questions, any oppositions?

Jane Quimby: On this plan it says sidewalk by the city. What does that mean?

Rick Cisar: Mr. Cisar explained that the sidewalk would be involved in an improvement district.

Virginia Flager: Wouldn't that be a waste of the taxpayer's money to put in a sidewalk and then have to tear it out when the road is widened through there?

Robert Van Houten: Yes, but that road may not be done for ten or fifteen years.

Keith Mumby: The existing pavement should not be considered right now. The pavement will be extended. There is a 30 foot right-of-way all the way to Horizon Drive. It will then be as wide as it is at the college. It will be within the city limits. This street is designed to be wide, it will be widened anyway and the widening program is going to be done from the end of the city limits.

Page 3
Levi Lucero: Are there any other questions?

Rick Cisar: This is a conditional use under R-3. We are in the 30 day advertising period. The amendment will be final on July 10, 1974.

Blake Chambliss: The statement that the traffic may be less than an apartment would generate. I doubt that very seriously because of that site.

Keith Mumby: I don't know that an apartment house would generate light traffic. The bank is open from 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. and it has four employees.

Levi Lucero: How many apartments could be placed there?

Rick Cisar: Fourteen units. It would require about 21 parking spaces. (Mr. Mumby stated earlier that this plan included only fourteen parking spaces.)

Virginia Flager: I make the motion that we approve subject to the approval of the R-3 zoning amendment and compliance with the development regulations.

Jane Quimby seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously. Keith Mumby expressed his opinion about the city taking land for road right-of-ways. He expressed his feelings that all government agencies should proceed with caution when they begin taking land from the land-owners of this country. He suggested that the additional land (such as the additional 10 feet on the Federal Land Bank) be purchased by the government agencies when the price of the land is low.

The Commission recognized Mr. Mumby's point and pointed out, however, that this is the only system we presently have to serve the public, and that by trying to buy the land, either at the present time or at a later date, the land-owner tries to sell the land at an exorbitant rate.

#31-74: Consider request for a Bulk Development (Triplex) in the R1D, low density residential zoning district.

Petitioner: Orville and Grace Wallner (M.C. Schumann representing)

Location: SW 1/4 of Section 7, South of Texas Avenue and 200' feet West of 28 1/2 Road.

Mr. Schumann was not present to represent the Wallner's.

Rick Cisar: This facility will have three kitchen facilities. We could allow three single family houses on this lot. There are presently other triplexes, four-plexes, and duplexes in this area. I would suggest that a suitable location be found for a fire hydrant.

Levi Lucero: Any opponents?

Blake Chambliss: How directly are people notified?

Rick Cisar: We have posted a sign, sent notices to adjacent property owners, and placed and add in the paper.

Blake Chambliss: I make the motion that it be approved.

EUGENE McEwen seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

#32-74: Consider final plat of the Parcel Subdivision Subdivision involving two 2 Lots

density residential zoning.

Developers: Ray and Eleanor M. Finkel

Location: SE 1/4 of Section 10, North of Independent Avenue and 407⁺ feet West of First Street.

Rick Cisar: This is a split of a metes and bounds parcel.

Levi Lucero: Any Comments?

Rick Cisar: I would like a statement that the subdividers agree to enter into an improvement district.

Virginia Flager: I make the motion that we approve it under the stipulations Rick made.

Jerry Wilds seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously.

5. #35-74: Consider a final plat of the Perino Subdivision (Minor Subdivision) involving two (2) lots with R1D, low density residential zoning.
Developer: Harlien G. Perino
Location: SE 1/4, Section 7, North of Elm Avenue and 275⁺ feet West of 28 1/4 Road.

Rick Cisar: This is another metes and bounds split. The Broken Arrow Subdivision is above it. There is an older house presently on the property. I would recommend approval with the condition that they voluntarily agree to enter an improvement district when one is formed for this area.

Jerry Wilds: There is not an area for trash pick-up, isn't that required?

Rick Cisar: None is required in this type of development.

Levi Lucero: Are there any questions? We will close the hearing.

Jerry Wilds: I make a motion that we approve along with the stipulations made by Rick.

Jane Quimby seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

6. C27-74: Preliminary Plan - Park Estates Addition
Petitioner: Jack Payne
Location: North of Orchard Avenue and West of 29 1/2 Road. Contains 7.87 acres with 25 lots.

Connie McDonough: This is a standard subdivision in the V-2 zone. The developer is providing access to the North. All road-ways are required to be improved. Fire protection will be installed. There will be no irrigation system, and I have asked for control of drainage. The problem is a high water table, but it is suitable for housing. There will be a need for extra engineering. The County Planning Commission is asking for the City's recommendations because of its jurisdiction over this particular land.

Levi Lucero: Are there any recommendations? You have our

Levi Lucero: Are there any recommendations? You have our

Levi Lucero: Are there any recommendations? You have our

Levi Lucero: Are there any recommendations? You have our

Levi Lucero: Are there any recommendations? You have our

Levi Lucero: Are there any recommendations? You have our

Sam Haupt presented the sketch plan of Crossroads Colorado West. He reported that there would be office buildings, motels, restaurants, a club house, and a nine acre open space for recreational purposes.

Eugene McEwen: What will you do if one road out is not enough?

Sam Haupt: There may be a chance that another road may be created.

Virginia Flager: Has the state highway given any indication when that will become a full diamond out there?

Unknown: It is already a diamond they need a clover-leaf out there.

Conni McDonough: We will go to the state highway department for review. The road will depend on the transportation study coming out in December.

8. C58-74: Sketch Plan - Horizon Drive Plaza
Petitioner: Joe Restle, Monument Realty, & Karl Larson
Location: E of the intersection of Horizon Drive
and the Easterly right-of-way of Interstate 70.
Contains 21 acres with 25 lots.

Conni McDonough presented the plan. Horizon Drive Plaza would be across the street from Crossroads Colorado West, behind the Howard Johnson Motel. There is only one entrance at this time but it may be possible to run it from the entrance all the way around to make a circle entrance and exit.

Virginia Flager: Horizon is going to become one of our biggest headaches if we don't do something about it.

Levi Lucero: I would like to see the Board make a recommendation. It is not going to be a county road forever.

Rick Cisar: The City wants to annex the airport by the end of the year. As of now all the annexations have been south of Horizon Drive.

Levi Lucero: Is it possible to get a meeting going with the Highway Department?

Conni McDonough: They haven't reviewed this yet.

Levi Lucero: When is this going before the county?

Conni McDonough: It has been to the county and the commissioners asked for the specific recommendations of the city.

Levi Lucero: When will the preliminary plan be in?

Conni McDonough: In the month of August.

Levi Lucero: Could we ask for a special meeting with the County in the State Highway Department? When would be a good date to have it?

VIRGINIA FLAGER: One more question, Levi, there is in a land area where the Federal Land Bank that we should include. There are two islands that are under the jurisdiction of the county that are going to create some problems. We need to get to the state highway department.

Blake Chambilss: I would like to suggest that we have a meeting the last week in July or the first week in August.

A meeting between the County Planning Commission, City Planning Commission, County Road Department, State Highway Department, City Engineering, and interested property owners was tentatively scheduled for the evening of Tuesday, August 6, 1974.

9. C31-74: Preliminary Plan - Fairway Park Subdivision
Petitioner: Charles Woodard, William Foster, Warren Gardner, and John Sebsen.
Location: Northeasterly intersection of 27 Road and Chipper Drive. Contains 10 acres with 18 lots.

Conni McDonough presented the preliminary plan for the Fairway Park Subdivision and explained that the petitioners had not planned for 50 feet from the center line for 12th Street to be dedicated as a roadway at this time. This would be a deviation from the master plan. The county commissioners have not accepted any deviations from the master plan.

Jane Quimby: I don't think we should either. I recommend that we stay with the master plan.

Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously and it was decided that if and when the master plan is changed, then it may revert back.

10. C48-74: Consider a request to change the Mesa County Consolidated zoning map from R-4 and AFT (Residential and Agricultural) to PD-M (Planned Development-Mobile Homes). Contains 61.2 acres. Consider Outline Development Plan.
Petitioner: W.J. Brimhall-Junction Mobile Home Estates
Location: Southeasterly of the intersection of 27 1/2 Road and Orchard Avenue.

Conni McDonough presented the sketch plan of the Junction Mobile Home Estates. She stated that in the county Mobile Home Subdivisions had not been allowed for the past several years, there will be a hearing to allow them. When site plan is approved, it will be sold to individuals. They will be located on Orchard Avenue. The plan meets the requirements for as the lot is concerned, but the plan is not approved until the staff has completed their report. The plan is approved at that point in the hearing process.

Blake Chambliss: What is the potential population?

Conni McDonough: I don't have those figures, but it represents 684 units. There are four developments very close together in that area.

The discussion broadened to include the next item on the agenda which was the Eastwood Park Estates-Mobile Home Subdivision sketch plan which is to the North of Junction Mobile Home Estates.

11. CS1-74: Consider a request to change the Mesa County Consolidated zoning map from R-2 (Residential) to PD-M (Planned Development-Mobile Homes). Contains 25 acres. Consider Outline Development Plan.
Petitioner: Jack Payne - Eastwood Park Estates-Mobile Home Subdivision
Location: North of the Grand Valley Canal and East of 29 1/2 Road.

The developer of this Subdivision has given 35% open space but he intends to alter that down to the required 25%. The lots will be sold to individuals. The people in Fruitvale and Clifton are very aware of the mobile home plans in this area. Many of the people in this area do not like mobile homes and they don't want any more. They are concerned about the concentration of mobile homes in that neighborhood. They are planning to bring a number of people to the hearing Friday morning. Ike Albers is chairman of this group. They plan to put 250 people in this auditorium Friday morning. We are working with the Fruitvale Sanitation District which would be handling the work for these subdividers. There is a serious need for Mobile Home spaces at this time, and these will not be the last requests we see in this neighborhood. It may well be on the way to becoming Mobile City.

Virginia Flager: If we can't stop the inevitable, I think that Mr. Brinkhall should look into making Texas Avenue and 29 1/2 Road meet by going straight through the development

... We should recommend that proper access from ... Road through the South end of ... should be ...

... The access from ...

...

Conni McDonough: In the Eastwood Park Estates Subdivision there are three stubs that will be left as Tract A stubs. Jerry Wilds: What happens to these? Will they become weed patches?

Conni McDonough: He will be required to do the landscaping. It will be treated as open space. They can be dedicated but not approved at this time.

Unknown: If the open space is dedicated to the public and other things are placed on the open space, the county would have to take care of the park. If there is a Home Owner's Association how would it be taken care of?

Blake Chambliss recommended that an overall look at the area of these subdivisions be undertaken, and that overall planning should be the first order of priority of the planning commission.

Virginia Flager seconded the recommendation and it was passed.

Virginia Flager recommended that a park be investigated at this time because there is a critical need to look into it now. The two developers are the ones who should see about doing something about a park. These subdivisions are the ones that are creating the problem. The developers have an obligation to help solve the problems they are creating.

Eugene McEwen seconded the recommendation and it was passed.

The following recommendations were sent to the County by the City Planning Commission:

Jack Payne's Eastwood Park Estates Mobile Home Subdivision:

1. That the stubs to be used in the future for roadways be dedicated as such at this time.
2. That the PUD requirements set forth in the county be followed specifically.

W. J. Brimball's Junction Mobile Home Estates:

1. That the proposed subdivision follow the PUD requirements set forth in the county.
2. That Orchard Avenue be planned to extend across the canal at a future time.
3. That Texas Avenue and 24th Road run through to 2nd 1st Road and Orchard Avenue.
4. Access to park in this sketch plan and in PUD requirements to be at street level.

City Planning Commission

City Planning Commission

2. That the need for parks in that area is of immediate concern and a study should be initiated at the earliest possible time by the planning staff and other related agencies, and recommendations be prepared for the Mesa County Planning Commission and the City Council.

Rick Cisar reviewed and reported on the progress of some previous items that had been brought to the commission at earlier times.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 A.M.