

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION was called to order in the CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, at 7:00 P.M., March 31, 1976 by Chairman LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: FRANK SIMONETTI, JANINE RIDER, JOHN ABRAMS, BLAKE CHAMBLISS, JERRY WILDS and LARRY BROWN, Representing City Council.

Also present were: DON WARNER, City Planner, KARL METZNER, City Planning Technician; BARBARA EINSPIARR, Acting Secretary and approximately 30 interested persons.

Addition to the Agenda was a County Item: ADDITION TO FRUITWOOD SUB-DIVISION - FINAL FILING #6 - Transitional Subdivision. Petitioner: Frank W. and J. Lehman Pond. Location: Southeast of 30 and E Roads.

The minutes of the previous meeting stood approved as mailed.

1. #11-76: REQUEST FOR AN ALLEY VACATION

Petitioner: The Sterling Co.
Location: 300 Block South of South Avenue

Don Warner pointed out the property in question. He stated that this is a ten foot alley in the block South of South Avenue adjacent to a railroad spur. The request to vacate is a section of the alley. Two items of correspondence were read (On file at City/County Development Department). One was from the Rio Grande Railroad in which it stated that they have no particular feeling in this matter. The other letter was from Central Distributing Co. in which their opposition was expressed for the alley vacation.

Randy Smith, representing The Sterling Co., spoke of the purpose of The Sterling Co. and its direction. The Sterling Co. is an investment and development company interested in developing commercial and industrial property

Randy Smith: The company looks at this property on South Street as a very good location for a warehouse facility with access to train traffic. This traffic, as Rio Grande has explained, is not accessible to us to use to unload rail cars from. In lieu of being able to use that track the railroad has required us to install another spur in the event that we were interested in being able to unload from the railroad tracks to the warehouse. This other spur would have to parallel the existing spur. They have done this because there is too much traffic on the existing tracks. To provide us the additional spur we would have to come around Central Distributing, and at the present time, the track comes so close to the Central Distributing building that it would be impossible for access between the building and the existing track. Our proposal is to parallel the existing track in some portion or part of the existing alley way. You can see that if we do not use a portion of the alley way we would then have to cross the alley right-of-way with the railroad track bringing it into our property eight feet from the center line of the railroad to center line of the side of the alley way right-of-way. This would reduce the size of our property sufficiently that it would be uneconomical to provide railroad trackage at all.

I would like to review the letter that we wrote to the Planning Commission because there are some corrections. When the letter was written it was our intention that we would be able to unload from the existing track. This has been changed. The statement that the existing alley right-of-way serves no purpose for pickup of trash or delivery is incorrect. Central Distributing does, on occasion, run their truck down that alley way to provide access to their loading dock in the rear. This letter stated that Mr. John A. and Mr. J. R. Cadez also support this vacation but, in fact, they do not and did not sign.

Some years ago Central Distributing Company requested a vacation of the right-of-way of Third Street. At the time that they requested that vacation, The Sterling Co. did not oppose that. If that right-of-way had not been vacated, there would be access to the alley. Also, at the present time, the Central Distributing Buildings are built in such a way they pretty much parallel the western border of Lot 1 of Block 163. So, in fact, there is a parking lot driveway in approximately lots one and two. That does gain access to that alley way. Because of Central Distributings desire to have access to that alley way we submit that that is access to the alley way.

Because of the above and the fore mentioned considerations the Sterling Co. feels that this vacation is in order and should be granted. If the vacation is not granted, it would preclude us from developing that area as a warehouse facility with trackage. It would not, of course, prevent us from developing that area as a warehouse facility without trackage.

Levi Lucero: Does anyone wish to speak as an opponent?

Clay Hanlon, Attorney, representing Central Distributing Company; speaking against the proposed alley vacation: Mr. Smith's point is that access to the alley could be gained through the parking lot area for trucks to go back and unload at the dock. The only problem is The Sterling Co. or anyone else that might own that property in the future actually makes use of this land up to their property line. This leaves only a 40 foot width which is not sufficient to get the semi trucks through to gain access. If the alley is vacated Central Distributing Company will be denied access to the docking area.

Blake Chambliss: Is it true that there is a piece of remaining alley with no access to it?

Don Warner: The legalities of vacation are that anyone who has legal use of it can object and Council can't vacate it but they do not have to furnish access if there is a public right-of-way. They can extend their warehouse across the two lots.

Don Warner: The utility companies have commented that they have no objections as long as the easements are obtained.

Jerry Wilds: What sort of problems are they going to get into with utilities?

Don Warner: The Telephone, Sewer and Public Service comments are that they are not opposed as long as the easements are obtained.

Levi Lucero: So a railroad track could not be put over these lines.

Don Warner: We do allow even buildings to be built over a sewer line if the sewer line is taken up and put back in steel or cast iron.

Randy Smith: In regards to the question of sewer line, we would build as close as possible and allow the appropriate easements.

Jim Cadez: Six years ago when we constructed our latest facility on that property of a 22,000 square foot building, the City declined to let us build over that alley. The dock is built at the furthest west end of the property.

Levi Lucero: Have you looked into the possibility of giving some additional access along that side of that building so it would be wider?

Randy Smith: We have not at the present but in the future there is the possibility.

Randy Smith: There is no time process. We would like to request six months to work this out.

JANINE RIDER MADE THE MOTION TO TABLE THE REQUEST FOR AN ALLEY VACATION SO THAT PROBLEMS CAN BE WORKED OUT WITH THE STERLING COMPANY AND CENTRAL DISTRIBUTING AND THAT IT BE BROUGHT UP AGAIN WITHIN THE SIX MONTH PERIOD. BLAKE CHAMBLISS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. #10-76: REQUEST FOR A DEVELOPMENT PLAN IN LAKESIDE SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: T. L. Benson
Location: Lakeside Subdivision

Don Warner explained that the entry to Horizon Drive from Lakeside Drive is at a right angle turn. Mr. Benson will develop the landscaping to screen Horizon Drive with berm and trees on top. The preliminary plan showed three larger buildings and now shows two lower buildings in place of one of the larger ones. Public Service has requested a blanket easement. All request have been met.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A REQUEST FOR A DEVELOPMENT PLAN IN LAKESIDE SUBDIVISION TO CITY COUNCIL. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. #15-76: PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE - RESTAURANT WITH A LIQUOR
LICENSE - EL CHARRO SUPPER CLUB

Petitioner: Michelle Garcia
Location: 227 Rood Avenue

Don Warner stated that the conditional use for a restaurant with a liquor license should be looked at concerning the effects that the license will have on the neighborhood.

Gary Cowan, representing Mrs. Garcia, stated that the building is now vacant. Half of the building will be used for this use.

Mr. Cowan felt that the area would be suitable for the use since there are other types of restaurants with liquor licenses in the area.

This building is adjacent to Western Slope Autos parking lot for their body shop.

Janine Rider: Do you anticipate any problems with the availability of the parking lot after 5:00 P.M.?

Mr. Cowan stated that both parties have agreed and felt that after 5:00 P.M. there will be sufficient parking in the area.

The seating capacity will be for a maximum of 125 persons.

JANINE RIDER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR A CONDITIONAL USE FOR A RESTAURANT WITH A LIQUOR LICENSE AT 227 ROOD AVENUE, EL CHARRO SUPPER CLUB. FRANK SIMONETTI SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. #20-76: SPRING VALLEY SUBDIVISION FILING #4

Petitioner: Warie and Melden Peach
Location: Northeast corner of the intersection 27 1/2 Road
and F Road

Don Warner stated that comments from staff are for the same agreement that was made on previous filings two and three which states that no Certificates of Occupancy will be issued until the improvements are all in. Four foot sidewalks for straight residential interior streets are required. The thru streets are required to have five foot sidewalks. Public Service requires a five foot side lot easement on the east side of Lot 20, Block 7.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR SPRING VALLEY SUBDIVISION FILING #4 SUBJECT TO THE SAME REQUIREMENTS THAT WERE MET ON PREVIOUS FILINGS WITH THE ADDITION FOR A FIVE FIIT SIDE LOT EASEMENT ON THE EAST SIDE OF LOT 20, BLOCK 7. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTIONA ND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. #18-76: PROPOSED BULK DEVELOPMENT - AL'S DUPLEX

Petitioner: Al Goffreidi
Location: 2716 F Road

Don Warner stated that this is a large house that is being converted into a duplex. There is a need for 20 feet to be dedicated for right-of-way on Patterson Road and the plan shows the 20 feet dedicated.

There will be no changes on the outside. Remodeling will be done on the inside which will have to meet Uniform Building Code standards.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED BULK DEVELOPMENT - AL'S DUPLEX AT 2716 F ROAD TO CITY COUNCIL. JOHN ABRAMS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. #16-76: PROPOSED BULK DEVELOPMENT - HARRIS APARTMENTS

Petitioner: Dean and Genevieve Harris
Location: 482 Harris Road

Don Warner showed the area South of North Avenue on Harris Road. The proposal is for a four-plex.

Don Warner: I have told Mr. Harris that we will need 25 foot right-of-way for Harris Road. One comment on the comment sheet was from Public Service asking for a five foot perimeter easement.

Jerry Wilds: Is the area to the South and East going to be graveled?

Dean Harris: The area is quite large there and will probably be gravel. I feel that the grass on the East and West areas will be adequate. There is irrigation water in the back so if someone wanted to have a garden they could.

Blake Chambliss: The reason for our concern, especially on large lots, is that areas are left over and become weed patches.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR THE BULK DEVELOPMENT FOR HARRIS ROAD APARTMENTS SUBJECT TO COMPLETION OF THE GREEN LANDSCAPING ON THE UNDEVELOPED PORTION OF THE LOT; THE PARKING LOT BE DEFINED AND THAT THE TWENTY-FIVE FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY BE GIVEN FOR THE PERIMETER EASEMENT. JANINE RIDER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. #19-76: PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE - TACO TIME

Petitioner: Ralph Cluff, Craig Food Industries
Location: SE Corner of 5th and North Avenue

Don Warner: The property is for a Taco Time Drive-In. The plan, as presented to us, shows the existing driveways. We have requested that the driveway going onto 5th Street be closed, and the petitioners have agreed to that. Any drive-in restaurant is a conditional use. We feel that the driveway close to the signal light should be closed. City Engineering do not see any problems as long as the driveway is not up against the corner.

Levi Lucero: What access will be used for North Avenue?

Don Warner: There is a drive cut there now and they are proposing to widen it.

Jerry Wilds: What is proposed adjacent to this property?

Don Warner: The other property is not included with this request. I have been told that a pizza restaurant is under consideration.

Blake Chambliss: With as much traffic as we have on North Avenue and the problems that we have with multi curb cuts, we are encouraging more access onto North Avenue at this point. I don't see why this should be necessary.

Don Warner: This can go in as an inside restaurant. The conditional use is for a drive-in.

Levi Lucero: There is an east-west alley.

Don Warner: There are three curb cuts between the alley and North avenue now. The proposal would be to close up two.

Larry Brown: I am convinced that someday the City is going to have to go down North Avenue and close curb cuts on existing businesses because the traffic is getting so heavy. In view of that, it makes sense since that when something new is going in, a good look should be taken at the project to see what they are doing because something that you approve today someone may have to go back and close tomorrow.

Frank Simonetti: Is this a combination sit-down and drive-in?

Ralph Cluff: Yes. The seating capacity will be for 28 people with 30 parking stalls available.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed. There were no objections on the comment sheets.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE FOR TACO TIME DRIVE-IN TO CITY COUNCIL SUBJECT TO CLOSING THE THREE CURB CUTS ON 5th STREET AND BOTH CURB CUTS ON NORTH AVENUE; THENCE HAVING ONE CURB CUT ON THE EXTREME EAST END OF PROPERTY FOR ACCESS ONTO NORTH AVENUE. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. #17-76: PROPOSED PD-B - VIDA ALLEGRE APARTMENTS

Petitioner: Levi and Bernice Lucero
Location: 509 - 28 1/2 Road

Levi Lucero was excused from the Planning Commission Board concerning this item because this is a project of his own interest.

Don Warner: The area in question is now zoned R-1-D and the area zoned C-1 is not in question. This is above North Avenue and West of 28 1/2 Road. The PD-B does allow residential development. It will allow the density of 32 dwelling units per acre. The total number of acres in this development is 1.44 with 24 dwelling units. This area under a PD-B, at its fullest extent, would allow for close to 50 dwelling units.

One of the comments in the application was that it would give housing close to a shopping area.

Levi Lucero: We have been working on this project 9-10 months. Actually, it is only about 16.6 units per acre. There is an old pear orchard and quite a bit of natural landscaping with irrigation water flowing through it and an existing farm house on the property. I want to utilize as much of this as possible. There are 16 one bedroom and 8 two bedroom apartments. This is located approximately 1/4 mile from the school. As far as impact on the school, this should not create any problems. We plan to rent to adults and families with older children.

Jerry Wilds: Is the property along the east side of Wooco a street? Will this be landlocked?

Levi Lucero: No, the property owner has access onto North Avenue.

Blake Chambliss: Are there any opponents to the project?

Question from the audience was if it required a zoning change.

Blake Chambliss: The present zoning is R-1-D which would not allow this many units per acre. R-1-D allows 7.23 units per acre so the density is increased.

Levi Lucero: This development will tie in with Bunting Avenue. It will not be a thru street.

There was a question concerning plans for more units in the future.

Blake Chambliss: PD-B approved on this basis, they could not have more units added at a later date without coming back thru the same hearing process.

Levi Lucero: At a later date, if there should be a demand for four more units, that would be the only time I would approach the Planning Board for another hearing. I don't anticipate any additional units now. With the present plan there are about three more parking spaces than required.

Larry Brown: Does the South end of this abutt North Avenue?

Levi Lucero: No.

There were no further questions from the audience. Hearing was closed.

Don Warner: Public Service does require a blanket easement on the property.

John Abrams: I am concerned about the street width in that area.

Don Warner: Karl Metzner, in his research, found that we have the required width which is 30 foot right-of-way at the point of the apartments.

Jerry Wilds: What about sidewalks?

Levi Lucero: If we need to put widewalks in, we will put them in. There has been some talk about going into an improvement district later on.

Don Warner: Since 28 1/2 Road is a collector street, separated sidewalks would probably be the best possibility.

JANINE RIDER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR THE PD-B WITH THE PRELIMINARY PLAN ALONG WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HAVE SOME INDICATION OF SOME STUDY OF SIDEWALKS WHETHER TO BE ATTACHED OR DETACHED AND THAT ACCURATE LANDSCAPING BE INCLUDED IN THE FINAL PLAN. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. #12-76: APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION PLAT - PD-B

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

Karl Metzner: This is a one-lot subdivision exactly as the Board approved the development plan. The petitioners did not have the subdivision plat ready for approval at that time so it is brought at this time for approval. They do have all the necessary right-of-way.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR THE SUBDIVISION PLAT. FRANK SIMONETTI SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. #23-76: DEVELOPMENT IN AN H.O. ZONE

Petitioners: Zeiler and Gray, Inc.
#22-76: Alco Building Company
#24-76: Lea Company
Location: Tech dol Sol Subdivision

These three were all discussed at the same time because the bids are all for the same proposed building.

Don Warner: The request of the Planning Commission Board is that you look at the general concept and not approve only one plan. This building is for GSA, Bureau of Reclamation and FAA will use part of it. There will be 3,500 square feet for office use and 80,000 square feet outside with a fenced storage yard and parking at the South end of Tech dol Sol Subdivision.

Janine Rider: Does staff see any problems?

Don Warner: No. The area fits and staff recommends use. The utilities and sewer are available. There have been no adverse comments. Landscaping will be along Horizon Drive for beautification and the storage will be kept to the rear end of property.

JERRY WILDS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE PRELIMINARY CONCEPT SUBJECT TO SCREENING ON HORIZON DRIVE AS FAR AS LANDSCAPING. STORAGE AREA SHOULD BE IN BACK OF DEVELOPMENT AND ACCESSES ON HORIZON DRIVE SHOULD BE LOOKED AT WITH ONLY ONE ACCESS ON HORIZON DRIVE. THE PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLAN SHOULD BE SUBMITTED BY THE SUCCESSFUL BIDDER. JANINE RIDER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.