

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 7:30 P.M., April 28, 1976 by Chairman LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: FRANK SIMONETTI, JANINE RIDER, JOHN ABRAMS, VIRGINIA FLAGER and JANE QUIMBY.

Also present were: DON WARNER, City Planner, KARL METZNER, City Planning Technician; BARBARA EINSPIHR, Acting Secretary and approximately 15 interested persons.

Additions to the Agenda were:  
Question of right-of-way at 12th and Ute Avenue and;  
The Colorado Futures Project presentation.

County Item Pear Park Estates - Sketch was taken from the Agenda.

The City Items of the previous meeting were approved as mailed.

1. #25-76: PROPOSED FINAL PLAT ON BEASLEY MINOR SUBDIVISION:

Petitioner: Barton O. Beasley  
Location: SE corner of Texas Avenue and Melody Lane

Karl Metzner: This is a minor subdivision divided into five lots. They are dividing one of the larger lots of Cannon Subdivision. This is an R-1-C Zone and the lots will be approximately 7,000 to 9,000 square foot.

Public Service requests a six foot gas easement on the West side, lots 1, 3, 4 and 5 and an eight foot easement at the bottom of lot 2.

Mountain Bell want a 15 foot easement on the South and East property lines and the South 10 foot of the lot 2 and the North 10 foot of lot 3.

Levi Lucero: Are there any petitioners in the audience wishing to speak on this?

Mr. Barton Beasley: We had in mind to put some modest homes in this minor subdivision. There is a house and garage that sits on lot 2. The 15 foot easement requested by Mountain Bell on the South and East will go thru the garage.

Don Warner: Before this final goes to City Council we will have the location of the house and garage on lot 2 and talk to Mountain Bell about the requested 15 foot easement.

Levi Lucero: Is there any irrigation water or easements for the property?

Mr. Beasley: There is a drainage ditch on the West side that comes from Orchard Avenue. There is water to the property but the property does not include any water.

There were no further questions or opponents. The hearing was closed.

Don Warner: I would suggest that in your approval there be a second check with the City Engineer concerning drainage for the street that dead ends at the present time.

Janine Rider: What is the right-of-way on Melody Lane?

Don Warner: 25 foot has been granted in the plat.

VIRGINIA FLAHER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR PROPOSED FINAL PLAT ON BEASLEY MINOR SUBDIVISION WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE DRAINAGE PROBLEMS AND THE EASEMENT REQUEST FROM MOUNTAIN BELL BE SETTLED SATISFACTORILY PRIOR TO BEING PRESENTED TO CITY COUNCIL. JANINE RIDER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. #26-76: PROPOSED PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR PINYON PARK SUBDIVISION:

Petitioner: Pinyon Builders  
Location: I-70 Business and 19th Street

Don Warner explained that the lots are narrow so that they can be sold in any number. Mountain Bell has requested a 20 foot easement.

Frank Simonetti: Will this subdivision be served by the Frontage Road?

Don Warner: Yes. The road will be made as Frontage Road.

Mr. Warner explained that sewer and water are available. The Fire Department has requested an easement for fire hydrants which will go in the right-of-way as far as east-west dimensions.

Levi Lucero: Is there a demand for small lots?

Don Warner: The petitioner is doing it this way so that if someone desires a small lot then they will not have to divide at a later date.

Terzy Granger, representing Pinyon Builders: We have some land at another location and have had difficulty selling the lots because of the size. I don't anticipate more than two more businesses in Pinyon Park Subdivision.

Levi Lucero: Does the City need any dedicated right-of-way?

Don Warner: No.

John Abrams: Does Frontage Road dead end at lot 1?

Don Warner: Yes.

Jane Quimby: The name Pinyon Park bothers me because of streets with the same name.

Mr. Granger: It is possible that we could name this subdivision Pinyon Industrial Park. Would the telephone easement in any way compromise bringing a rail spur off of the South side of the property?

Don Warner: I don't think so but we will check on this.

There were no opponents. The hearing was closed.

FRANK SIMONETTI MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR PUNYON PARK SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAN. JOHN ABRAMS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. PROPOSED CHANGE IN FENCE PLAN FOR GRAND VALLEY APARTMENTS:

Petitioner: Dennis Granum  
Location: 2260 North 13th Street

Don Warner: The proposed six foot fence is on the back line of the residential property. The request for change is to put the fence directly behind the parking lot. Mr. Granum agrees to pay for the complete paving of the alley. He will also ask that the refuse in the alley be removed.

Levi Lucero: Do you have any problems with the neighbors?

Dennis Granum: The problem is with visitors of the tenants; street lights shining in back yards and people backing their cars into fences on the adjoining property lines. As the fence is proposed now, it completely isolates our parking lot from the City's alley. There will be two sections of fence with the entrances off of the alley on each end.

There were no further questions or any opponents. The hearing was closed.

VIRGINIA FLAGER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR PROPOSED CHANGE IN FENCE PLAN FOR GRAND VALLEY APARTMENTS AT 2260 NORTH 13th STREET. JANINE RIDER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. REQUEST FOR REVOCABLE PERMIT TO USE PART OF PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY:

Petitioner: Grand Junction Steel  
Location: SW corner of 12th Street and D Road

Don Warner: Grand Junction Steel has purchased formerly owned railroad property in this area. They are asking to fence in the area on D Road on a revocable permit which consists of 15 feet. The fence would be 10 feet back of the curb. We will request that the fence be brought back on the corner of D Road and 12th Street because of poor visibility.

When the right-of-way was acquired from the railroad it was acquired down to Grand Junction Steel's property. If you see fit to work with this revocable permit, I would like to request that the portion in the Southeast corner be deeded to the City to complete the 100 foot right-of-way.

Virginia Flager: I presume there is a need for this additional right-of-way. Would there be any arguing about moving this fence back to the property line?

Don Warner: We would put this in the revocable permit that if the right-of-way is needed for road extension then the fence would be moved at Grand Junction Steels expense.

James Golden, Representing Grand Junction Steel: The request for a revocable permit also includes the area down to the North end of Block 15. What the company would propose is that they would not put any steel tanks or store anything up against the fence. The storage would be about 15 feet back from the fence line. The company has no objection, as one of the considerations, to deed that additional area so that the right-of-way would be squared off.

There were no further questions or any opponents. The hearing was closed.

VIRGINIA FLAGER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR A REVOCABLE PERMIT FOR GRAND JUNCTION STEEL FOR USE OF PART OF THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE LAND AREA REQUIRED BY THE CITY BE DEEDED TO THE CITY TO BRING THE RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR D ROAD UP TO FULL REQUIREMENTS. IF THE CITY NEEDS THE RIGHT-OF-WAY TO IMPROVE D ROAD, GRAND JUNCTION STEEL WILL BE REQUIRED TO REMOVE THE FENCE AT THEIR EXPENSE. JOHN ABRAMS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. 12TH AND UTE RIGHT-OF-WAY:

Don Warner: This is an H. O. Zone which required a PD. With the PD we had asked for planters. It was not included in your motion with the Planning Commission for the right-of-way needed at 12th Street. When I presented this to City Council a 10 foot request for right-of-way was asked for.

Mr. Coburn: At the time this was brought to my attention I was told that the City regulations required that I deed this property to the City in order to go thru with this development. So I was in no position to object or concur at that time. Since that time I have contacted my lenders and they have agreed to deed this if I want to pay them large sums of money to compensate for the loss of that land. I am requesting that Planning Commission recommend to City Council that this action be deleted.

Don Warner: I would suggest that we not turn down the right-of-way but give Mr. Coburn sufficient time to work out problems with his lenders.

This will be a discussion item for May Planning Commission Meeting.

Discussion:

Virginia Flager mentioned that the new 12th Street Bridge has no guard rails to protect a car from going into the canal.

Mr. Lucero felt that the same problem exists at 28 1/4 and 28 1/4 and Orchard Avenue.

Chairman, Levi Lucero left the meeting at this time and Virginia Flager chaired the remainder of the meeting.

C O U N T Y I T E M S

1. LITTLE TRIO SUBDIVISION FIRST ADDITION - PRELIMINARY:

Petitioner: Richard Watson  
Location: South of F 1/4 Rd. on the East side of 30 Road

Conni McDonough, Senior County Planner, explained that this subdivision is in part a replat of lots 2 and 3 of Little Trio Subdivision. The plans are for future connection with Karen Lee and The Trading Post Subdivision. This development will be improving the existing F 3/10 Road. Proper right-of-way is being gained on 30 Road.

The cul-de-sac is there because of the requirement of a 30 foot frontage on all lots. By doing this 33 foot frontage was gained for lot 6.

Virginia Flager: If the road is not improved, how will there be access for lot 3?

Conni McDonough: If the stub is not improved, then lot 3 will have to take its drive off of the cul-de-sac.

2. WEDGEWOOD PARK - PRELIMINARY:

Petitioner: John B. and Sybil Curtis  
Location: East of 30 3/8 Road and North of D Road

Ms. McDonough explained that this is a proposed Mobile Home Park. There will be recreation area, fenced storage area, recreation vehicle parking area and a bridge will be provided over the canal. This will be adequate for emergency vehicles. Curbs, paving and sidewalks will be put in. There are 64 lots.

John Abrams: How wide are the streets?

Ms. McDonough: 50 foot right-of-way.

Jane Quimby: What are the comments from the County Planning Commission?

Ms. McDonough: This is a development that was approved in 1974 for the Sketch Plan phase. The owner became ill at that time and asked for an extension on the zoning. For that reason it was granted.

John Abrams: What is the name of the first street North of D Road?

Ms. McDonough: Lancaster Gate. The street names will be commented on when we collect all of the data.

Jane Quimby: What about landscaping?

Mr. Curtis: There will be grass, trees, sod or other suitable land coverage will be provided on all lots and common areas. The trees will be no less than one inch in diameter at the time of planting.

3. WEST PARK ESTATES ADDITION - PRELIMINARY

Petitioner: L. C. Warren c/o Green Tree, Inc.  
Location: South end of 29 3/8 Road South off of F Road

Ms. McDonough explained that they are projecting continuing 29 3/8 Road into a cul-de-sac. It is designed for 6 lots. A public reservation will be provided along the North boundary of the Grand Valley Canal to be used for park or bridge way.

John Abrams: The cul-de-sac that was there before the proposed subdivision, will that be discontinued?

Conni McDonough: That will be vacated if adjacent owners approved.

The cul-de-sac will be approximately 1,450 feet. It is not necessary to have a crossing of canal at this point.

4. SUNRISE RIDGE - SKETCH

Petitioner: Charles Woodward  
Location: South and East corner of 29 Road and Highway 50

Ms. McDonough explained that the petitioner will request a change of zoning at the next Planning Commission meeting. If they are not successful in their request for zoning, it will be the end of the Plan processing.

The entrance way will be 29 Road. One lot faces Highway 50. There is an existing house on this lot now and one in the middle portion of the Northern half. This will be in the Orchard Mesa Sewer District.

2.2 acre is proposed for a park. It was the feeling that the amount of acreage would not be adequate to serve a reasonable size neighborhood.

There are 30 lots on 43 acres.

5. EASTMOOR II SUBDIVISION - SKETCH

Petitioner: Bray and Company Realtors  
Location: Northeast of 30 Road and Orchard Avenue

Ms. McDonough explained that this subdivision is adjacent to Eastmoor Subdivision that is finalized.

There is adequate right-of-way for Orchard Avenue with Bookcliff Avenue coming through at a later time.

If a road had been brought up through the center of parcel the lots would have been deepened. Eyebrow design is being used to break up the straight row of houses. Walnut Avenue is proposed to be put through in the future. This is not a Transitional Subdivision but sidewalks will be placed in this development.

Conni McDonough presented an up-date on County Planning:

At the last County Commissioners meeting the Commissioners asked for a review of our present Waiver Policy concerning the dividing of parcels in an APT Zone. The County Planning Commission will be making a recommendation to the County Commissioners to bring into line what they believe is more supportive of good planning principals for growth of the urban area.

The Commissioners have asked for a proposed landuse plan for the Bear Park area and the department is considering that.

The Redlands Citizen Committee anticipates having their report by June 1, 1976. This will be processed through the department with public hearings. The hold on the Redlands will probably be lifted in August.

We have new Citizens Groups on Orchard Mesa because they have become aware of the requests that have been submitted. They have questions of the requests that have been submitted. They hope to be party to the future and we will be working with them.

The County Planning Commission has looked at the amended Circulation Plan. This will be advertised for public hearing in May. The plan will on the May meeting for City Planning Commission.

Discussion:

Mr. Gordon McWilliams presented The Colorado Futures Project and presented a slide show. (Copy of outline on file at City/County Development Department)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 P.M.

## THE COLORADO FUTURES PROJECT

### AN EXCITING CHALLENGE TO ALL COLORADANS

One of the basic precepts of participatory democracy assumes the active interest and involvement of the citizenry, a situation only imperfectly attained in practice. Rising voter alienation, distrust of traditional institutions, and growing economic distress have combined to drive the average citizen even further from the established seats of policy formation. Under the initial provocation and encouragement of Governor Richard Lamm and his staff, the Colorado Centennial-Bicentennial Commission has authorized and funded the Colorado Futures Project, which is an attempt to involve a large number of Coloradans in planning the future of the state in a thoughtful, rather than an issue-reactive manner.

#### BACKGROUND:

The concept of massive, statewide citizen participation in goal-setting and policy planning is not unprecedented and untested. Projects of this nature have been completed in Vermont, Maine, Iowa, Oregon and Washington within the last four year. Idaho and North Dakota are about to embark on similar endeavors.

The Colorado Futures Project can profit from the experiences---both positive and negative---of those other states in any number of areas: methods of maximizing involvement, securing of enthusiastic media support, use of information feedback mechanisms, etc. We can be "smarter" than our predecessors, just as future projects in other states should benefit from our experience.

The most compelling reason for the timeliness of such a project, however, lies in the unique opportunity afforded by the Centennial observance for the citizens of Colorado to plan their future in light of the lessons of the past. The Centennial can thus provide more than an orgy of nostalgia; it can represent a remarkable springboard for citizen involvement in directing the future of Colorado.

#### OBJECTIVES OF THE COLORADO FUTURES PROJECT:

To utilize the opportunity afforded by the Colorado Centennial-Bicentennial celebration to:

1. Establish community visions, goals and priorities for the next ten years.
2. Relate these visions to the present day status of the community enabling participants to formulate the means by which these goals can be reached.

3. Employ whatever insights are gained in (1) and (2) while participating in priority setting for the community for the next ten years, (to the year 1986).

4. Relate visions, goals and priorities which are identified at the community level to priority and policy making at the regional and state level.

5. Identify the means by which the end-products of such a process (e.g., the experience itself, opinion-polls, the organizational structure, reports) can be utilized in implementing future state policy making.

6. Establish the mechanism by which such thoughtful citizen participation can re-occur and grow in subsequent years.

#### MAJOR PARTICIPATORY ELEMENTS IN THE FUTURES PROJECT:

There are two major avenues through which face-to-face involvement in planning the future of Colorado is anticipated:

1. COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS (June 1 - August 31, 1976)

One-day workshops in communities throughout the state will be held June through August, 1976. The day-long workshops will engage 50 to 150 individuals per community (or neighborhood, if so designated), in:

(1) constructing their "ideal" community and state in the year 1986 in terms of public education facilities, transportation, life styles, recreation, employment, etc.

(2) working backwards from that date to the present to confront the realistic problems and likely solutions needed to attain the "Colorado ideal."

2. STATE FUTURES CONVENTION (November 19 - 21, 1976)

A. Regional Focus

The first day of the State Convention will consist of a series of regionally-oriented meetings to be held in various Denver locations. These regional conferences will be structured so that the information which is obtained can be used to supplement the planning data already being utilized by the Regional Councils of Government. Delegates will be chosen from the local workshops to represent the major state issues which have been identified as also pertinent to the local communities. Prior to the conferences, delegates will be provided with technical materials in their chosen issue area (e.g., land use, energy development, economics, education, transportation).

## B. Issues Focus

The final element in the direct involvement portion of the Futures process will consist of a state-oriented convention in Denver, attended by participants from both the earlier community workshops and the regional conferences held the day before. The sessions will be issue-oriented, thus uniting residents of all regions of the state who have similar concerns. Both the regional and state meetings will be more highly structured than the earlier workshops and the emphasis will be on identifying realistic solutions to problems which impede the path to realizing the type of state deemed most desirable in 1986.

In addition to the two face-to-face processes noted above, citizen participation will also be sought through interspersed newspaper polls, intermediate reports on the findings of the community workshops, public service television programs, etc. The results will be distributed to the key decision-making bodies throughout the state; e.g., the legislature, federal, state and city government, planning agencies, business, and special interest organizations.

### PROJECT ADMINISTRATION:

The Futures Project represents a major effort of the Colorado Centennial-Bicentennial Commission with assistance being sought from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The project will be managed by Colorado Futures, Inc., a non-profit organization.

Project Director is Jock Bickert, and Peter McLaughlin is directing the media efforts. Patsy Garlid is the Project Coordinator and Janet Beardsley serves as Communications Coordinator. Katie Conover is handling the logistics of the Futures Convention. The field organization of the individual communities is being coordinated by Eric Sondermann. The Futures Steering Committee is composed of:

Micki Barnes	Peggy Hart
Karen Cobb	Joe Lacy
Vine DeLoria, Jr.	John Lay
Joe Dolan	Alexis McKinney

Further information concerning the project can be obtained from:

The Colorado Futures Project  
1430 Larimer Street  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: 629-1740