

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order in the City Council Chambers at 8:00 A.M. ON September 24, 1975 by Chairman LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: JANENE RIDER, JERRY WILDS, VIRGINIA FLAHER, JANE QUINBY and BLAKE CHAMBLISS.

Also present were: DON WARNER, City Planner, KARL METENER, City Planning Technician; BARBARA BENSBAHR, Acting Secretary and approximately 35 interested persons.

The minutes were approved as mailed.

1. LANDSCAPING PLAN AND DRAINAGE PLAN - PATTERSON GARDENS

Petitioner: Chuck Wiman

Location: Southwest corner of 15th and Patterson Road

At the August Planning Commission meeting it was stated that Patterson Gardens could go to the City Council for approval but Certificate of Occupancies and development would be held up until a satisfactory drainage program and landscaping pattern was presented to the Commission.

Don Warner showed and explained the Landscaping and Drainage Plan. This Drainage Plan shows drainage to the South and West. It had previously been stated that the drainage would go Northwest.

Mr. Ed Armstrong, representative of Green Tree, Inc., stated that there is an 18" pipe existing on Wallington Avenue now and they would be using it. This has been huddling the drainage from that side of the street. Mr. Armstrong said the reason they will not be able to go Northwest with drainage is because of the natural topography of the ground.

JANE QUINBY MADE THE MOTION THAT NO ACTION BE TAKEN ON THE LANDSCAPING AND DRAINAGE PLAN UNTIL IT IS REVIEWED BY THE CITY PARKS DEPARTMENT AND CITY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT. VIRGINIA FLAHER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chuck Wiman requested the Planning Commission to amend the motion to say if the Engineering Department and Parks and Recreation Department approves this as presented that this would be acceptable to the Planning Commission.

Because of the change of drainage to the Southwest and no review by the proper authorities, request was denied.

JANE QUINBY AMENDED THE MOTION THAT THE COMMENTS FROM THE REVIEWING DEPARTMENTS BE BROUGHT BACK TO PLANNING COMMISSION IN TWO WEEKS. VIRGINIA FLAHER SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS AMENDED THE MOTION TO ADD THAT ADEQUATE ATTENTION BE GIVEN TO ON-SITE CIRCULATION AND TO ACCESS ACROSS THE FRONT

OF THE SITE SUCH AS A DETACHED SIDEWALK BE PROVIDED ALONG PATTERSON ROAD. VIRGINIA FLAHER SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. LANDSCAPING PLAN FOR USE IN H.O. ZONE

Petitioner: Dennis Grenua
Location: Lot 19-Merison Park Plaza

Blake Chambliss was excused because of company involvement.

Gregg Dillon, Architect, showed and explained plan. He said that the first anticipated construction would be a parking lot off the cul-de-sac and a possibility of seven tennis courts against the canal. Because of the nature of the tennis courts there will be a lot of paving and dry landscaping around the courts. There will be drainage swells around the courts and all the drainage would come off the courts down to a natural drainage area. This drainage area has been covered in certain locations and as these properties develop there would probably be a continuation of these coverages.

Mr. Dillon stated the courts would be in use in March, 1976 with the clubhouse being completed by September, 1976.

Janine Rider questioned if this would be private or pay-as-you-go? Mr. Stettner, developer of the land, stated that it would be a private club along with making arrangements with the motels for transit trade and groups who wish to play tennis would have rights to the courts. They would have to pay individually.

Levi Lucero stated the concern for access as to the remaining land since it is an H.O. Zone. Mr. Dillon stated that there is a dedicated road that parallels I-70.

Virginia Flager questioned if there will be any restrooms facilities before the clubhouse is built? Mr. Stettner replied that they are in agreement with the motel people and they are more than willing to comply with needs.

There were no further proponents or opponents. Hearings was closed.

VIRGINIA FLAHER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE LANDSCAPING PLAN FOR USE IN H.O. ZONE TO CITY COUNCIL. JERRY WELDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. SIGN CODE

The Planning Commission Board was presented the Final Draft of the Sign Code, drawn up by the Sign Code Committee, for their review and comments. A film was shown, "The Noisy Landscape" and slides that were taken of the free-standing signs in the Grand Junction area. Slides that Bruce Bauerle, a member of the Sign Code Committee, were also shown.

Mr. Warner stated that the section beginning on page 17 would have to be worked out with the City Attorney since it deals with legalities.

There is a work session October 8, 1975 at 8:00 A.M., City Council Chambers, in order that the Planning Commission Board and Sign Code Committee can go over the Sign Code Draft.

There was no further discussion. Hearing was closed.

Petitioner: Jack Payne
Location: West of 23 1/2 Road - 181 feet North of Orchard Avenue

This is a proposed bulk development in an R-2-A zoning. It is proposed to be condominium housing with total land ownership and building ownership in one name.

Mr. Warner spoke of the comment from Rodger Young, City Engineer, The 23 1/2 Road development appears to be somewhat in the future. He is worried about the traffic from this area using the thru way into Rothaupt Subdivision. He also questioned if a street could be oriented ~~and if~~ and if an access is needed for this general R-2A area. Whether the drainage and trash pickup has been taken care of was also a concern. Mr. Young had asked if this development could be tabled until these items are taken care of.

Virginia Plager questioned if there is a right-of-way or proposed street on the West side of property. Mr. Warner replied that with this development there is not.

Public Service will need a blanket easement for all of the land not occupied by buildings. This was satisfactory to the developers.

Jack Payne, Petitioner, stated that he is not adverse to putting streets in. There is one problem in this case. They do not own the narrow strip of land of 160 feet which borders Orchard Avenue and now has houses on it. They do intend to bring 23 1/2 Road in off of Orchard Avenue to the right-of-way that does exist but there are no other right-of-way's to the West. With Phase I they intend to bring it up into a temporary cul-de-sac and with Phase II bring it up into a permanent cul-de-sac.

They cannot drain into an irrigation ditch so there will have to be pipe drainage into Indian Wash.

Mr. Young had also commented that redesign is necessary because it is only a 65 foot cul-de-sac and they require 100 feet as a normal cul-de-sac at the end of a street.

Mr. Young needs to look at this as a total part of the R-2-A development and look at a total picture of fifty acres as to how they are going to tie it together.

Mr. Payne suggested that it be Master Planned so that Planning Commission would request from him whatever right-of-way's that might be required and he would concur with the requests.

Mr. Payne stated that these will not be rentals but privately owned dwellings. The individual owners will collectively own the pieces of land that is under the condominium structure. The average size will be around 1248 square feet. These will be three bedroom townhouse type complexes with the living area on the first floor and bedroom area above. There will be a total of 64 units in entire complex. 32 units are included in Phase I.

North of the canal is not included and would not compliment this development by trying to incorporate it into this project.

There were no further proponents or opponents. Hearing was closed.

VIRGINIA FLASER MADE THE MOTION TO TABLE CEDAR TERRACE BULK DEVELOPMENT IN ORDER TO SUBMIT FOR REVIEW TO CITY TRAFFIC AND CITY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENTS FOR TRAFFIC, DRAINAGE AND GENERAL PLAN OF WHOLE AREA. JANINE RIDER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. HEARING ON PROPOSED REZONING FROM R-1-B to B-1
(LIGHT BUSINESS)

Petitioners: Dr. Wilford D. Moses, Dr. Andrew H. Christensen
Dr. David G. Summers and Dr. Samuel W. Kelly
Location: Northeast corner of 1st and Walnut Avenue

Don Warner showed and explained the area. This would be constructed on two lots and a portion of another in Hillcrest Subdivision.

The staff reviewed these lots and felt that the two lots are very poor lots for single family dwellings as they look into the back of the cinder block buildings in the business area to the South.

A letter from Floyd Anderson was read. (On file at City/County Development Department). It was the feeling of the Board that the lots mentioned in the letter should not be included in the rezoning, because Mr. Anderson has not submitted an application for rezoning and had included properties that are not his.

Levi Lucero questioned if the petitioners own lot 28 since the lot lines will be going into four lots. Dr. Summers replied that these are all owned by the same individual so these would have to be deeded or whatever is necessary to get the adequate parking

and site back off of the street.

Dr. Summers feels that this property is unsuitable for single family and would be well suited for a nice looking, well landscaped, dental office. With adequate parking they feel that they can have almost 50 parking spaces. There is over two-thirds of an acre of total ground.

The staff feels that access should be as far East as possible away from First Street. Dr. Summers stated that they would go along with what Planning Commission wants for entrance.

Mr. Warner explained that B-1 is a transitional zone between residential and business and allows no retail sale. Any office handling paper work without the sale of a product. It does allow residential uses such as apartments.

DR. Christensen stated that they would like to start construction in March of 1976 if the rezoning is approved. He spoke of the traffic light at First and Orchard Avenues stating that this does control the traffic as far as left turns are concerned.

Dr. Christensen stated that they are willing to be restricted even until the building goes into construction to assure the residents that it will be a medical-dental facility.

Mr. Walter Carnett, 240 Walnut Avenue, stated that he is definitely against what Mr. Anderson had proposed in his letter. He also felt that the lots in Dr. Summers request are worthless for residential dwellings. He feels that these offices would be an asset to this corner and would like to be assured that nothing would be backed up against the street to make it more of an alley. Mr. Warner stated that there is a 60 foot right-of-way on Walnut Avenue in order that the road can be widened.

Jack Hogan, who owns lot 30, stated that he is in favor of zoning change and had he know enough in advance he would have applied for a zoning change along with the Doctors. He feels that because of the way the land lays, it is appropriate that his lot be zoned the same as the proposed rezoning. If this rezoning is approved, he would like to apply later for rezoning. His main concern was if the building was built over towards the East, then there would be a parking lot on his property line on one side and a hill on the other side. His lot would be contained between a hill and a parking lot.

Blake Chambliss suggested that this be changed to a PDE instead of a B-1 zoning. The Doctors and Mr. Hogan are in compliance with this.

Mr. Warner stated that any development under a PDE would have to be completely reviewed. Under a B-1 a development would not have to be reviewed except for a Site Plan. Any of the uses under B-1 could go in.

Mr. Carnett asked that zoning not be changed any further than the vacant lots.

There were no further proponents or opponents. Hearing was closed.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO TURN DOWN B-1 REZONING AND SUGGEST THAT APPLICATION COME BACK AS PDB UNDER SAME FEE. JANINE RIDER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dr. Christensen was concerned that they would spend the money on architect costs before rezoning and when they came back to Planning Commission they might be turned down.

Levi Lucero stated that by suggesting a PDB rezoning, the Board is assuring themselves that the petitioners will do what they propose.

6. PAYNE ZONE CHANGE - FROM R-2A to C-1

Petitioner: Jack L. Payne

Location: Southeast corner of Grand Mesa Aven. and Cannon St.

Don Warner explained surrounding zoned areas. There are five lots proposed for rezoning. The four-acre requirement does not enter into this because they are adjacent to C-1 zoning.

Bob Gerlofs, representing Mr. Payne, who owns the property, stated that there are about 12 residential rental units on the property housed in eleven structures. These houses are in poor condition and are a problem for upkeep. Mr. Payne would like to eliminate this problem and change the use to commercial and remove the structures.

Jane Quimby stated that she feels that what is presently on the property needs something done with, but she did not agree with the commercial zoning because in that block there are some nice homes. She asked what the intention was for a C-1 zone that could not be done under the R-2A zone.

Mr. Gerlofs stated that when annexed areas looked at, the existing land use is taken into consideration to avoid a lot of problems, for which the land is zoned at this time.

Mr. Payne feels that that corner fits in quite well with the area and access has been provided to that location. There is a service road on the highway. The area does have sewer and water with the main truck line from the City.

Mr. Payne bought this property when it was in the County and it was annexed soon after. He stated that there is a natural barrier on the South, an alley going through which divides his property from the property to the South. He stated that the buildings that are on his property are beyond repair.

Blake Chambliss felt that because of what is allowed in a C-1 zone and with the traffic intersection being where it is, on the hill with limited visibility and a possible increase of the traffic, a real traffic hazard could be created in that area. The protection of the adjoining property owners is also at stake. Mr. Chambliss recognized that the buildings are run down but did not feel that in itself is justification for changing the zoning.

Mr. Gerlofs spoke of the economics that Mr. Payne would have to consider in tearing down the houses and building according to R-2A zone. If not rezoned, his probable solution would be to leave the structures as they are now.

Jane Quimby stated that at this point as undesirable as the structures are, they are providing for a need that we have at this time.

Blake Chambliss stated that the Planning Commission Board does not have any control over the cost of construction or any other constraints in doing this.

Mr. Gerlofs felt that one of the tools that the Planning Commission has is to use zoning to create changes in our Urban environment and the lack of the change of zoning tends to retard those changes in upgrading the neighborhoods.

Janine Rider felt that it would not necessarily be an upgrade because in a C-1 zone it allows many different things which Mr. Payne or a subsequent property owner could put in that would do anything but upgrade the neighborhood.

PDB zoning was suggested as an alternative.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

VIRGINIA FLAHER MADE THE MOTION THAT ZONING NOT BE GRANTED AT THIS TIME. BLAKE CHAMBLISS SECONDED THE MOTION. BLAKE CHAMBLISS AMENDED THE MOTION TO SAY THAT THEY DO NOT SEE THE ORIGINAL ZONING AS A MISTAKE NOR DO PLANNING COMMISSION SEE ANY SPECIFIC CHANGES THAT WOULD WARRANT, AT THIS POINT, A CHANGE IN ZONING. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. SPRING VALLEY SUBDIVISION - FINAL ON FILING #3

Petitioner: Warie and Malden Peach
Location: Northeast corner of the intersection of 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ and F Road.

Certificate of Title of the land and utility agreement were missing but are not required until submission to the City Council.

The comment from the Fire Department was that they need fire hydrants to meet City specs. This is in agreement with the total

Subdivision with the Ute Water District.

The School Department mentioned a possible need for a bus loading area and warning signs or warning lights. They also requested walkways along 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ Road which are a part of the plan.

Jim Patten, from NHPD, stated that a possible bus loading zone could be the park at the southwest corner as a gathering zone. The gathering zone could possibly be moved to the center of the subdivision at a later time when they get into the areas of the next park or use two separate gathering zones.

Blake Chambliss questioned if there is an agreement for paving on the west side. Don Warner replied that this signed agreement has to be in or it will not go to the City Council. It will be in the same format and same requirements Planning Commission made and City Council made on the other filing.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

JANINE RIDER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SPRING VALLEY SUBDIVISION FILING NUMBER THREE TO CITY COUNCIL. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. HEARING ON PROPOSED ZONING TO H.O. (HIGHWAY ORIENTED)
TECH DEL SOL

Don Warner explained annexation and zoning area.

Staff recommendation is for continuance of H. O. Zoning which is the planned business for a highway in this area with the understanding that this will also be recommended for the second annexation of Tech Del Sol.

VIRGINIA FLAHER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL ZONING CHANGE TO H.O. JANE QUIMBY SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. DISCUSSION:

A. DISCUSS REQUIRED SETBACK

Don Warner stated that one reason why it was brought up is because of the area at First and Patterson Road. The setback from the center line of the road and a residential area is 100 feet. In this area, this more or less cuts out the use of a lot.

Mr. Warner wanted to bring up what the purpose and amount of setback is. Are they for open and clear vision down a road or are they for protection from noise and so forth for a house?

Dwayne Scott showed a drawing of this area and showed existing

properties.

Connie McDonough, Senior County Planner, stated that staff can come up with recommendations but they need an indication of philosophy from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Warner asked that the City Planning Commission Board submit written comments to staff concerning this matter.

B. SKETCH PLAN OF ALVIN RICKS' MINOR SUBDIVISION

The area in question faces C Road on Orchard Mesa and is 59½ feet wide and 230 feet deep.

Mr. Warner asked for recommendations from the Planning Commission if any more money should be spent on project since side lot requirements would take up needed space.

Blake Chambliss suggested making a duplex out of the present single as a bulk development.

COUNTY ITEMS

1. HEATHERIDGE SUBDIVISION

Ms. McDonough stated that this is a transitional subdivision and requires City action.

It has been a year and a half since Planning Commission has reviewed these plans. Ms. McDonough gave a recap of the significant concerns on this property.

~~The drainage on the steep slopes on the east, into Redlands Power Canal are a concern to prevent erosion conditions.~~

This was approved at the Preliminary stage subject to fencing along the Redlands Power Canal. This has had full review. Rodger Young, City Engineer, had many comments and these are being worked out, however, there has not been enough time to meet with the developer.

Ms. McDonough suggested that the City Planning Commission consider approving this request subject to the complete agreement between the City Engineer and the owner. In the event an agreement is not reached, the request will return for consideration.

JANINE RIDER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF HEATHERIDGE SUBDIVISION TO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT OF CITY ENGINEER AND PETITIONER. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. OX-BOW SUBDIVISION

Ms. McDonough stated that she wanted to discuss the plans but would ask for a tabling since the review was not complete by Rodger Young.

Since there is an adjacent park that has been donated to the City, Ms. McDonough will recommend that petitioner offer cash for 50 requirement in lieu of ground.

This subdivision is on 40 acres with 137 lots. The density is 3.4 lots per acre.

Ms. McDonough has asked for a provision for the future F 1/2 with completion of sidewalks and curbs at this time so they can have finished lots and a commitment to an improvement district for future paving.

JERRY WILDS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE TABLING OF OX-BOW SUBDIVISION TO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION SO IT CAN BE REVIEWED BY RODGER YOUNG, CITY ENGINEER. JANE QUIMBY SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 P.M.



Grand Junction, Colorado

October 7, 1975

To: Planning Commission
From: Rodger O. Young, City Engineer
Subject: Patterson Gardens Drainage

I will approve of the drainage plans submitted for Patterson Gardens with the following conditions:

1. A drainage way consisting of either a concrete lined ditch or storm sewer pipe running south in the 12 foot strip of property to the existing pipe under Wellington Avenue.
2. The size of ditch or pipe should be able to accommodate a 10-year frequency storm or if the line under Wellington will not accommodate the 10-year frequency storm, then the size of ditch will be sized accordingly and on site detention provided.
3. If on site detention has to be provided, then the allowable discharge will be that of the capacity of the line under Wellington Avenue.

These conditions will require additional engineering work by the developer. I will insist that when this work is finished and prior to construction that a report by their engineer be submitted to me.