

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 27, 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: JANE QUIMBY, BLAKE CHAMBLISS, VIRGINIA FLAGER, EUGENE MCEWEN, and JOHN ABRAMS.

Also present were: GENE ALLEN, Development Director; DON WARNER, City Planner; IRINA BOVEE, Planning Technician III; PAT HURLEY, Senior County Planner; BONNIE PEHL, Acting Secretary; and approximately ten interested persons.

Chairman Levi Lucero welcomed the new City Planning Commission member, John Abrams, to the Board.

Blake Chambliss made the following correction to the minutes of the October 30, 1974, meeting:

1. Item #44-74: Rezone for Cedar Circle Subdivision, was approved at the October meeting with Blake Chambliss and Jerry Wilds opposed.
2. The stipulations for the approval of the Preliminary Plat of the Spring Valley Subdivision were amended as follows:
 - a. That the flood retention in the park site be noted and evaluated;
 - b. That the flood plain projection be increased to fifty years instead of the ten years now projected.

THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE ABOVE CHANGES, AND CHANGES WERE MADE IN THE OFFICIAL RECORD ON FILE IN THE PLANNING OFFICE.

3. #44-74: REQUEST FOR REZONING - CEDAR CIRCLE SUBDIVISION - FROM R-1-C, SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE, TO R-2-A, TWO FAMILY RESIDENCE - LOW DENSITY.

Petitioner: C.H. and Helen Buttolph
Location: East of 15th Street between Walnut Avenue and Bookcliff Avenue.

Don Warner explained that at the October 30, 1974, meeting the rezoning for the Cedar Circle Subdivision was approved but that Mr. Buttolph did not have the required four acres for a rezone. Since that meeting, two property owners, Mrs. Ellen Lancaster, and J. Perry Olson, submitted letters to the Planning Commission requesting that their property be rezoned with Mr. Buttolph's property. The total of the three properties was more than the required four acres.

Blake Chambliss: My objections are two and one-half times as great. Fifteenth Street is incapable of handling it. I objected to it last meeting, I object today.

Don Warner explained that the right-of-way on 15th Street is 50' up to the vacated road on Mr. Olson's property. Mr. Warner told the Board that he would talk to Mr. Olson and try to get a 30' right-of-way from the vacated road to the Grand Valley Canal which would make 15th Street 50' wide all the way to the Canal.

The doubling of this area would require twice as much parking as first was planned, but no building permit would be issued until the plan shows adequate parking spaces for the building.

Jane Quimby: Mr. Buttolph, do you understand that you would have to provide adequate off-street parking spaces?

Mr. Buttolph: Yes, we will have plenty of parking spaces.

JANE QUIMBY MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR THE REZONING SUBJECT TO GETTING THE RIGHT-OF-WAY FROM MR. OLSON. VIRGINIA FLAGER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED WITH BLAKE CHAMBLISS OPPOSED.

4. #50-74: ETTER ANNEXATION - PROPOSED ZONING HO, HIGHWAY ORIENTED.

Location: Beginning at the NE corner of the NE 1/4 of the NW 1/4 of Sec. 1 of T1S, R1W of the Ute Meridian thence South 230', thence West 230', thence North 230', thence East to the point of beginning.

Don Warner: This zoning was discussed previously. The property was annexed at the request of the owner. Mr. Etter had an HS - Highway Service Zone in the county. We determined that HO - Highway Oriented would be compatible with the property around him. Mr. Etter requested that we zone the land to something comparable to the zone he has in the county and would be happy with the HO zone.

Levi Lucero: Are there any questions? Anyone opposing? Then we will close the hearing.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION THAT THE BOARD RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THAT THE PROPERTY ANNEXED TO THE CITY AND OWNED BY MR. ETTER BE ZONED HO - HIGHWAY ORIENTED. VIRGINIA FLAGER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS APPROVED.

5. #52-74: REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE - OFFICE BUILDING IN R-3 ZONE.

Petitioner: Mary L. Mason
Location: SW corner of 12th and Patterson

Don Warner pointed out the property stating that there is a house on the property now. The proposal includes two buildings. The first building is an allowed use in this zone, Dental Clinic, the second building is a conditional use in this zone, Office Building. The plan includes additional right-of-way and some minor beautification. The

building will not exceed twelve feet in height; the building style will be spanish with brick and stucco; the floor level will be eighteen inches above road level; parking will be blacktopped; and shrubs will be low so visibility is not hindard.

Blake Chambliss: This is presently zoned R-3, right?

Don Warner: Yes, the R-3 zone allows the conditonal use for offices, and the permitted use for the dental clinic.

John Abrams: I have a question concerning the curb cut along 12th Street.

Blake Chambliss: Has this been to the Traffic Department?

Don Warner: They have no objections or comments. We have one comment back from the Sanitation Department asking that we indicate where the trash pickup will be.

~~Blake Chambliss: What kind of controls do you have on the office if it goes in?~~

Don Warner: The zone will not allow retail sales. The Zoning Department will see to it that no retail sales are allowed here.

EUGENE MCEWEN MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL SUBJECT TO THE SUBMISSION OF AN ELEVATION DRAWING. VIRGINIA FLAGER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

6. #53-74: PROPOSED ZONING ON THE ORCHARD AVENUE ANNEXATION.

Don Warner: This is the fifty acre annexation on Orchard Avenue. These are five - ten acre parcels. The zone to the West is R-1-C, to the East is R-1-B and South is R-1-D which is similar to R-1-C in density. The people have been contacted by letter. I have had only one reply and her only comment was a question on what her tax basis would be. Of course, the zone does not change the tax assessment. We determined at the last meeting that the closest zone to what they have now would be R-2-A which allows one living unit for every 3,000 square feet. This is only a meeting for you to direct me as to what zone I should advertise it for. The hearing on the zoning will be at the next meeting.

Virginia Flager: Be sure all the property owners get their letter. What is the staff recommendation?

Don Warner: R-2-A would be a good zone in light of what we have. There is a park across the road; a trailer court on the other side.

Blake Chambliss: I think we have to look what the impact will be. I think that it would be a very big mistake not to take this to the schools and other reviewing agencies.

Don Warner: I think Blake's point is well taken.

Blake Chambliss: We are getting a lot of land the county has messed up. We have a lot of pressure on us to raise the density, however, I am concerned about where we encourage density to grow. I am not sure that is the place for residential areas. What we have been doing is allowing it someplace where somebody says they want it rather than where the community wants it.

Virginia Flager: It would seem to me that allowing that bad area to develop makes more sense than putting it out five miles from the city.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION THAT THE BOARD RECOMMEND THE R-2-A ZONE FOR ADVERTISING AND THAT THE DESCRIPTION OF THIS ZONE BE SENT TO THE REVIEWING AGENCIES FOR THEIR COMMENTS FOR THE HEARING TO BE HELD AT THE NEXT MEETING.

7. TEXT AMENDMENT ON LOT DESCRIPTION.

~~Don Warner presented the change proposed to the City Zoning Regulations on the definition of a lot.~~

The Board felt they needed more time to study the proposed change and asked that a representative from the Building Department be present to discuss the change with them.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE DECISION ON THE AMENDMENT UNTIL THE BOARD HAS MORE TIME TO REVIEW THE CHANGE. VIRGINIA FLAGER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

~~Don Warner pointed out that the last Wednesday in December was Christmas~~ so the Board changed the meeting date to Wednesday, December 18, 1974.

Jane Quimby left the meeting at approximately 10:00 A.M.

8. C55-74: REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN - CROSSROADS COLORADO WEST.

Petitioner: Haupt Co.

Location: W. of the intersection of Horizon Drive and Highline Canal.

Sam Haupt presented the property to the Board stating that there was access to the North and West of the development. The utility department wanted places where they could stub out to other properties around the development.

Blake Chambliss: Has the State Highway Department been contacted about all the traffic dumping out into that one intersection?

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS APPROVAL OF THE REVISED CROSSROADS COLORADO WEST PLAN WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FRONTAGE ROAD AND SUGGEST THE SUBMISSION OF A PLAN OF THE FRONTAGE ROAD INTERSECTION AT THE INTERSTATE INTERCHANGE TO THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT FOR THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS. EUGENE MCEWEN SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

9. C29-74: PRELIMINARY PLAN - PARADISE HILLS FILING NO. 4

Petitioner: Bray Realty Company
Location: Northeasterly of the intersection of 26 1/2 Road
and H Road. Contains 42 acres with 77 lots.

Levi Lucero excused himself from any discussion on this plan.

Conni McDonough presented the preliminary plan to the Board stating that there is a problem with the drainage in the development. The water may drain onto the property owned by a Mr. Jones. The N.H.P.Q. engineers are working on a solution and it will be presented to Mr. Jones before the final plat is presented. The existing package plant will either be enlarged to take care of the sewage or the sewage will be sent to the city.

Virginia Flager asked if there were any recommendations.

Don Warner: Only that all problems of sewage be worked out before the final plat is submitted.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN OF PARADISE HILLS FILING NO. 4 TO THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SUBJECT TO THE RECOMMENDATION MADE BY DON WARNER. EUGENE MCEWEN SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

10. C87-74: SKETCH PLAN - MONUMENT INDUSTRIAL PARK

Petitioner: Monument Construction, Inc.
Location: SW of the intersection of Patterson Road and
25 Road. Contains 1.7 acres with 3 lots.

This development is only three lots. The owner is going the full subdivision route. They have gotten permission to use septic tanks, and they are going to change the name to Monument Commercial Park since the zone is commercial and not industrial. They will be dedicating more right-of-way on Patterson and 25 Road.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SKETCH PLAN OF MONUMENT INDUSTRIAL PARK. EUGENE MCEWEN SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

11. C88-74: SKETCH PLAN - MONUMENT MESAS SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Jack H. Perlmutter & Associates
Location: Southerly of the intersection of South Broadway
and Easter Hill Drive. Contains 198 acres with
190 lots.

Conni McDonough presented the sketch plan stating that the land is not suitable for agriculture. The natural scenery will not be destroyed by this development, there will only be a few places where landscaping would be put in because the natural landscape is very attractive. There

is a sewage pond in the development presently but N.H.P.Q. and the people in that area are working on a solution to the sewage problem there. The pond, however, would be kept clean enough to keep edible fish in. The tops of the hills will be left open for everyone and a trail system would be developed so you could go from one hill to another without going through someone's back yard. Every site will have to be graded and controlled so no water will drain to the natural sites.

THERE WAS NO RECOMMENDATION MADE BY THE BOARD ON THIS SUBDIVISION.

12. FIELD TRIP TO ORCHARD MESA.

Don Warner set up a field trip to Orchard Mesa for Friday, November 29, 1974. The Board is taking this trip to look at some zoning that was done when Orchard Mesa was annexed to the city.

13. The Board requested that Don Warner get copies of the State Statutes that state specifically what jurisdiction the Planning Commission has and what its territorial obligations are.

14. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:20 A.M. --