

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

June 23, 1976

The special meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 7:35 P.M. in the County Commissioners Room 207A, in the Mesa County Courthouse, by Chairman, LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: VIRGINIA FLAGER, BLAKE CHAMBLISS, JEANINE RIDER AND FRANK SIMONETTI.

Also Present were: KARL METZNER, City Planning Technician; CONNI MCDONOUGH, Sr. County Planner; BONNIE PEHL, Acting Secretary and approximately six interested persons including Councilmen, Larry Kozisek and Larry Brown.

Karl Metzner: John Abrams sent a letter of suggestions he would have on the changes presented here tonight because he could not attend this meeting. The major portion of the meeting is the street and roadway plan. The other change we are requesting is in the number of subdivision prints received in the office, we are running short every month and need more so all of you can receive them in your packets. We will go through each change and then listen to your comments and suggestions.

Karl Metzner read the text change for Secondary/Minor Arterial Streets (See office file for changes) and asked if there were any questions.

Blake Chambliss asked how wide the Secondary/Minor Arterial Streets are.

Karl Metzner stated they are 80' wide and could be two or four lane roadways.

Levi Lucero asked if all the changes brought up in the discussion at the last regular meeting of the Planning Commission were included in the advertised changes. Karl Metzner said they were. Mr. Lucero also asked if some of the Orchard Mesa citizens had been informed about the meeting. Karl Metzner stated that some of them had been sent agendas. Mr. Lucero asked if there was anyone in the audience from Orchard Mesa; one man was.

Karl Metzner: Some of the Orchard Mesa residents came into the office after the last Planning Commission meeting and we talked with them for about 45 minutes. They seemed to be happy with what we had told them.

Karl Metzner read the text changes for Collector Streets and pointed them out on a map. He stated that the right-of-way width for collector streets is 60' and the set back is according to the zone.

Virginia Flager: You still won't buy the idea of extending 24 Road south to the freeway? I am opposed to the stopping of that street when it's just a matter of hooking onto a cul-de-sac on the other side and that would alleviate the bottleneck that is created by people trying to get on the freeway at 5:00. There's just no way that you can make that left turn to get on the eastbound freeway and I can't understand. What the reasoning was, it was my understanding, it was to keep the traffic out of the old subdivision but you've got the traffic there now anyway and the traffic just stops there.

Levi Lucero: We decided not to do it at the last meeting.

Virginia Flager: I just wanted to get my feelings into the record on this street.

Blake Chambliss: I think there are some people here concerned about Elm Avenue, too.

Carl Wahlberg: We thought you might be interested in a study Bill Conklin has done so that you would be completely aware of the amount of vehicular and pedestrian traffic there is on Elm Street by Mesa College.

Bill Conklin: We did a traffic study of vehicular and pedestrian traffic on March 8 and 9 this year between the hours of 6:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M. Between these hours we had 6,281 pedestrians on Monday and 5,038 pedestrians on Tuesday. On Monday we had 1,638 eastbound vehicles and 1,145 westbound vehicles; Tuesday we had 2,783 eastbound vehicles and 1,104 westbound vehicles. Only about half of the vehicles were related to college students. At the peak hour, between 12:00 and 1:00 there were 833 pedestrians on Monday and Tuesday there were 600 at the peak hour.

Carl Wahlberg: Elm does presently split the campus with dorms and physical education on the north and classrooms on the south so all the students have to cross there to get to classes.

Bill Conklin: We have had three students hit in the last two years that I can think of.

Jeanine Rider: We were discussing putting a cross walk over or under the street and keeping the street open.

Levi Lucero: This traffic has got to move from other places and it is just as bad on Orchard and North Avenue, if we were to close Elm all the traffic on Elm would be shuffled to Orchard or North.

Larry Brown: There are two things that are kind of contradictory here, people complain about the loud North Avenue traffic yet suggest closing Elm. I would like to point out that by closing Elm, the North Avenue traffic will get louder and more accidents will occur.

Carl Wahlberg: I don't think the college is in a position to recommend closing Elm, but I think these facts need to be considered in determining the future of Elm.

Blake Chambliss: I have two comments to make. You need to understand that because of my involvement in working with the firm doing the Mesa College Master Plan and sitting on the Planning Commission I will be wearing two hats so to speak. I am working with the architectural and planning firm that is doing the Mesa College Master plan which has recommended the investigation with the city of closing Elm Avenue. There is a direct conflict between pedestrian and vehicular traffic there and it is a serious problem. I think we need to look at something, either a bridge or something to allow the continued expansion of Mesa College.

Mesa College is growing very rapidly and is a major part of the community activity. I think the road now is a major conflict in their growth and in our efforts to provide good traffic circulation and I think we should try to solve the conflict in a rational and reasonable way.

Now I'll take off that hat for a minute. Moving that traffic off to North Avenue and Orchard seems to me to be perhaps unreasonable for the city. So I would object to the absolute closing of Elm. Those are my two comments and I hope we can just recognize the conflict that's within all of us. My suggestion would be to take item (n) out and table it until other alternatives can be discussed by the city and Mesa College. I think we ought to table that portion of the proposed amendment.

Levi Lucero: How wide is Elm between 7th and 12th Street?

Karl Metzner: Some portions are less than 50', some are 60'.

Virginia Flager: Do you realize that if you closed Elm there would be no east-west access between 1st and 12th Streets in the City of Grand Junction?

Levi Lucero: I don't think we are talking about closing Elm between 7th and 12th.

Carl Wahlberg: We are not in a position to recommend that Elm be closed. We understand both problems and would just like to ask that the alternatives be considered and try to reach an acceptable solution.

Blake Chambliss removed himself from the planning commission during the discussion because of his conflict of interest.

Jeanine Rider: My idea of these changes was to may the roadway designation more equal to the present use of the roadway. I don't think we should table it. If the road already does what a collector does what's the difference if it's called a collector or something else.

Karl Metzner: This would not change the classification of Elm because it is one that is already classified as a collector anyway.

Virginia Flager: I would hate to see Elm closed off because it does take an over flow of traffic off North Avenue and Orchard. I think this is something the city couldn't live with. I think we should put pedestrian traffic under the roadway and motor traffic above.

Jeanine Rider: Have there been any studies done as to what other communities have done? Surely this isn't the only place this has happened.

Bill Conklin: There was continued pressure to close the streets and the result has been more accidents.

Levi Lucero: Dr. Wahlberg, what alternatives have been considered by the college?

Carl Wahlberg: Certainly the under-over pass was discussed. That poses some problem particularly with handicapped people. The thing about planning ahead is if the college should go to over 8,000 people, if you can imagine the mass humanity, there would be a problem that will trouble us continually. I hope that someone that has more expertise than I can come up with something to accomodate both points of view.

Levi Lucero: Has the city traffic department reviewed any of these?

Karl Metzner: Yes, and he has approve<sup>d</sup> the plan the way it is before you. Maybe he is the first place to start in trying to solve this problem.

Larry Brown: You can talk about a square mile all day long but you have to remember that it is 10% of the city that you are blocking off. It would seem that everything in this ordinances is subject to change somewhere down the road.

Larry Kozisek: I don't go along with tabling. Why not force the problem or the solution? If you force the situation, the studies will be done in a short period of time. If you table it, there will be no rush on the decision. If you include it in the entire proposal, you will have the solutions in no time at all.

Virginia Flager: I think I go along with Mr. Kozisek. Let's keep it in the proposal and force the issue.

Levi Lucero: Let's get with the engineer and the college and see if a viable solution can't be worked out. If we table it, will it be from Cannal to 7th?

Frank Simonetti: If it's tabled, and someone wants to do some building there what happens?

Larry Kozisek: I might say if it's tabled, it would revert to what it's classified now.

Levi Lucero: I would suggest that we definitely get the input from the traffic engineer.

Jeanine Rider: I think we are all in agreement in our feelings that this is a very important consideration and that we can do something with it still being on the books.

Levi Lucero: Are there any other people who wish to speak on this matter either for or against it? No Answer. We will go on.

Karl Metzner read the proposed changes and pointed out the changes for Major/Principal Arterial Streets. He stated that the right-of-way width for these roads is 100'.

Conni McDonough: What is the status of Horizon Drive and First Street? I know the city engineering department has been considering a contract, it is just in a study now, right?

Larry Brown: We have obtained about three percent of the right-of-way now.

Conni McDonough: I would suggest that you designate First Street as a major/principal arterial all the way to Horizon Drive so the building set backs will be proper for the future extension.

Larry Kozisek: How about First Street to the city limits?

Conni McDonough: How are you planning on using "city limits?" Will it mean the designation moves with the city limits or will you have to have a change everytime the city limits move?

Jeanine Rider: If we say the designation ends at the city limits, then I think when the city limits are extended the roadway designation would be extended with them.

Karl Metzner: I think that's the way it would be handled. The designation will move with the city limits.

Jeanine Rider: I think this is an important concern that if we're going to say "City Limits" we need to check that everyone is compatible with the county roads so when the city limits move we don't have to tell people they have to change designations.

Karl Metzner: This plan fits exactly to the county roadway plan. In all cases where the roads connect into the county, they are the same designation.

Jeanine Rider: We still need to deal with First Street to Horizon Drive.

Karl Metzner: We will need a motion on that.

Larry Brown: What will happen if someone wants to build in there?

Conni McDonough: It will cause the county to get with the city. Engineering with county roads and come up with a solution at that time.

Virginia Flager: Horizon Drive was supposed to be a beautiful street from 7th Street to the Airport. What happened? I was driving through there and there was the Pizza Hut which blocked the view of the Country Club, which was kind of pretty. I am wondering if we are going to have this type of thing all up and down Horizon Drive?

Larry Brown: I will invite you to our beautification meeting, we're on roads.

Blake Chambliss: The Country Club sold that land for the Pizza Hut.

Virginia Flager: I would like to point out that it is a great concern of the citizens what is happening to Horizon Drive and I would like to have that in the record. People are beginning to ask what happened to that concept. We are going to have another North Avenue there and the traffic at G Road and Horizon Drive will be terrible. Is there anything we can do tonight to stop it?

Levi Lucero: No.

Larry Brown: Virginia, except for that one little section where the Pizza Hut and American Family are, the balance of Horizon Drive is in the city until you get to the airport.

Karl Metzner: That's all we have on the roadway plan.

Larry Kozisek: Twelfth Street across the river; speaking quite frankly, I don't think I could ever agree from D Road to Highway 50. I notice that you have another section in your plan with 29 Road to Highway 50. I think that is a better alternative. Twelfth being as close to 5th as it is encountering the problems of the mill tailings pile down in there is the extreme problems of the extreme cut on the south side, it would be out of the question as far as being able to finance that. I would much rather see it further east, no less than 28 Road and probably further east than that.

Virginia Flager: Larry, this is a direct contradiction of what we have been told, as a board, to strive for. Are you aware of this?

Larry Kozisek: We have been told that because of the uranium pile we would not be able to put even a blade of grass out there. It would also be a tremendous cost to try to cross the river there.

Levi Lucero: Another thing that has to be considered is the crossing of the railroad.

Larry Brown: Recognizing how much railroad crossing, river crossing and up hill grade there will have to be, where is it best cost wise to place the crossing. Also recognizing that you are forcing people to go through town when they don't want to.

Levi Lucero: One reason for keeping the 12th Street crossing open is that we have nearly all the right-of-way we need to the river. The industrial traffic also needs a way to get to Highway 50 and 12th Street is right in the heart of the industrial area.

Conni McDonough: Two points of interest. There is a nine million dollar study being done concerning mill tailing piles. I don't think we would spend nine million dollars to study them if we were not going to remove them.

Also, the county has taken the position that the industrial zone will be taken up to 28 Road. Since we have taken that position, we have processed four rezonings. There is a paper from the Development Director to the County Commissioners that the area between 28 and possibly 30 Roads be held in a transitional zone for industrial development as that becomes necessary in the future. You are talking about a lot of employees who will need to get to this part of the community. The 28 Road crossing would be more expensive.

Blake Chambliss: As long as we leave this in the distinction, we have the option of crossing at 12th Street or wherever we determine is the best.

J.D. Bradford (an Orchard Mesa resident): I live on 28½ Road. I am just getting involved in this sort of thing and I don't know a lot about

it. I am with the Orchard Mesa Advisory Group and while I was obtaining signatures from some Orchard Mesa residents I asked what they thought about a bridge crossing 29 Road. The people that I spoke with felt that a bridge at 29 Road would be very useful because when they go shopping right now they have to go down through 5th Street to get out to the shopping on North Avenue. I agree that we will need the crossing at 12th Street but I think that 29 Road should be the first.

Virginia Flager: Do the people out there realize that 29 Road doesn't go anywhere? It seems to me that they would want the crossing somewhere that they could get complete north-south access.

Blake Chambliss: I am hearing people saying that they want a crossing at 29 Road before 12th Street. Is there some confusion that because 12th St. is listed in the designation above 29 Rd. that we are setting some kind of priority?

J.D. Bradford: I was told that the 12th Street crossing was not being considered.

Virginia Flager: Someone gave you some wrong information.

Frank Simonetti: The Orchard Mesa Advisory Group said they did not want 29 Road to have this designation, yet they are saying they want the bridge at 29 Road.

Jeanine Rider: I think we can ask him to take something back to his group; and that is that while the Orchard Mesa people do not want the street designated as a larger street, they do want the bridge at 29 Road. If they do want the bridge, they are going to need the wider street or the traffic problems are going to be worse than they could ever hope for.

Levi Lucero: We are not here to set priorities so I am going to close the hearing. Is there any discussion on any specific item?

Blake Chambliss: I will make a motion that we recommend to council the amendment to the ordinance as submitted by staff.

Frank Simonetti seconded the motion.

Jeanine Rider: I make a motion that we amend the previous motion to read that we recommend to council the approval of the amendment as stated with one exception; that we designate First Street all the way to the extension of Horizon Drive as a major arterial instead of stopping at Patterson Road.

Blake Chambliss: I will second it.

The amendment was passed unanimously.

The original motion as amended was passed unanimously.

Karl Metzner read the proposed text changes which would change the number of prints required for subdivisions, etc., from 15 copies to 18 copies. The text change also included changing the terminology in the zoning regulations which states that the review comments would be directed to the Development Director; it would be changed to read that the review comments would be directed to the Sr. City Planner.

Blake Chambliss: Does that mean that instead of the comments being directed to Gene Allen they would be directed to Don Warner?

Karl Metzner: They have been coming to Don anyway, and from what I understand, some years ago the city planner was called the development director which is no longer true and we just want to get the terminology updated.

Blake Chambliss: Why the increase in the number of prints?

Karl Metzner: We have more people we mail the prints to for review and we send the Planning Commission members copies of the requests in their packets. We have been running short of prints lately, even this month some of you will have some things missing in your packets.

Conni McDonough suggested that the city planning staff might look into the use of smaller prints for mailing to the Planning Commission instead of asking for more prints from the developer.

Blake Chambliss asked if there was a way to get the review agency comments back earlier so the developer would have time to respond to their comments prior to coming to the Planning Commission meeting. Karl Metzner pointed out that it would require asking for the submittals earlier in order to do this. The Planning Commission members then suggested that the City Council direct the city review agencies to get their review comments in earlier as there had been some difficulty in the past in getting all the comments in for the Planning Commission meeting.

Conni McDonough stated that the county had reductions of their prints made for the members of the County Planning Commission. Karl Metzner pointed out that the cost would be about the same for the developer to print three extra copies as it would if the Planning Department made reductions and did the extra copies.

Blake Chambliss: I would make a motion to table the text changes.

Virginia Flager: I am sick and tired of the developers riding on my tax dollars. I don't see why they can't make a few extra copies of plats instead of expecting us to use our tax dollars to provide the extra copies necessary. They are making money off their developments and using our tax dollars to do it.

Blake Chambliss: I think the staff can bring us back the alternatives to extra copies so we can see what will be the best.

Levi Lucero closed the hearing.

Jeanine Rider seconded Blake Chambliss' motion and it was passed with Virginia Flager opposed.



DISCUSSION

Jim Spellman, airport manager, introduced Greg Isbill who has done the airport master plan. Mr. Spellman told the Commission that the City Council felt that it would be appropriate to make a presentation of the master plan to the Planning Commission.

Greg Isbill explained the airport master plan to the commission. He indicated that the large runway at the airport was for heavy aircraft while the smaller aircraft could use the smaller runway. The smaller runway is used as an auxiliary runway and will be kept operable for as long as possible. He also stated that in the past 10 years the number of persons using the airport has increased from about 33,000 to 100,000 per year. He also continued to explain the area of influence of the airport and future plans for the airport.

Blake Chambliss: One of the questions I have concerns the 1041 House Bill hearing, establishment of the airport's area of influence; about where it was and I recognize that there was a designation of an area of influence which pushed it pretty far off the runway. You have and propose in your study a different area of influence and the two are somewhat in common. There are some very real complications, however, in the differences of the two areas of influence. We have a large part of the city beginning to push against the airport and beginning to enter, fairly rapidly, that area of influence and I would like to have your respond to that. I will have to read your answer in the transcript of this meeting because I have to leave for another meeting right now.

Blake Chambliss left the meeting at this point.

Jim Spellman: There are two separate sets of criteria for area of influence. House Bill 1041 designated a set of criteria which included some of the criteria which is included in the master plan and so far as that criteria is concerned, they are parallel. This is called the FAR (Federal Air Regulations) Part 77 and it deals with approach areas and clear zones to the airport. The approach areas are hypothetical sloping areas which are, in a sense, building restrictions that you can't build an aerial antenna, say, into the area that is on the approach to a runway. It also deals with air traffic control areas. It is not dealing with the surface of the ground or the use of the surface, it is dealing with, as you get into the air, a sloping area from the end of the runway. Now, it is my understanding, that the House Bill 1041 designations which were adopted by the county included sufficient of this material concerning the FAR parallel to the master plan to satisfy the FAA. The other thing which deals with surface rights that the FAA is asking for protection of the runways which is the surface itself is to be clear. So far as the criteria for general aviation, the runway at its present length we have, since at least 1965, shown on our master plan our clear zone which extends out across where the interstate is now. We have not changed that at all, it's been there since 1965 and the FAA is not requiring the 1041 people to do anything else. We had, in the original 20 year master plan, projected an extension, 20 years hence, of the threshold 29, this is an air carrier runway and, in fact, it would bring the area which would need to have the surface protected slightly into the Clifton area. We have not done anything about that. Now, the

"area of influence" is strictly a 1041 term and the state commission had designated certain criteria, which had been developed in Isbill's office, but they do not necessarily relate to the master plan. For some reason the planners or 1041 people just elected to stop everything at the Highline Canal and make no area of influence designation beyond that. Now, in that regard, it doesn't deal with the same criteria that is included in the master plan.

Larry Brown: When the 1041 people were having public hearings, through public pressure, they just decided to make the boundary for the area of influence the Highline Canal. I haven't seen too many canals that will stop airplanes.

Jeanine Rider: Could you tell me where the major differences in the areas of influence are?

Greg Isbill: I won't express it probably like Jim did but let me talk a little bit about how this influence area evolved. For years, the land use has been predicated only on noise; the primary noise, of course, was on the main runway. But one of the other areas of concern is, in addition to the back and forth pattern of the large planes, there is a circular pattern for the smaller air craft which has a pattern which is approximately one mile off the end of the runway and a mile on each side. We are saying that a mile off the end of the runway you still have activity which influences what's there and through that, we try to take some physical barrier which you can speak to whether it's a section line or a road or whatever it might be. I believe 1041 stopped at the canal but we took it the full mile beyond the runway. Basically we are saying the influence is a mile beyond the canal. I don't see that there is any way that you can deny that you are influencing this area. If you say that, you are hiding your head in the sand. Anytime you let something develop in there you can anticipate a conflict. If you allow development, you should have a covenant that says they will provide a navigation easement and a hazard easement in those areas.

Discussion followed in which it was pointed out that Walker Field is self supporting right now and does not use any tax dollars. Also a parallel runway was mentioned and Mr. Isbill stated that it would probably cost about 10 million dollars to put one in, but that if you have the money it is ideal because when one is shut down for repair work the other one will be open. The parking of rental cars in the Walker Field area was discussed and Jim Spellman explained that they receive several thousand dollars a year by allowing the car rental agencies operate this way.

The memorandum that Larry Brown had written to the Planning Commission was discussed briefly. The memorandum concerned the offices that have been allowed in the residential areas in the past. The commission discussed with Mr. Brown and Mr. Kozisek the situation; the two councilmen suggested that a periodic review of the zones in the city might be appropriate. It was pointed out that the Older American Center was placed close to downtown and near residential areas so the senior citizens could be close to shopping and the center but now a lot of the residential areas where the senior citizens live are being used for offices.

Conni McDonough passed out copies of the two policy statements the County Planning Commission had recently adopted and sent to the County Commissioners for their review and possible adoption. One policy statement dealt with agricultural land preservation and the other dealt with growth and density. She went on to explain that the County Planning Commission members felt that in order to prevent urban sprawl and save agricultural land, then land must be used to house larger numbers of people closer to the core of the city. The Grand Junction Planning Commission members agreed with the policies and stated that they felt they should have a workshop to discuss possible policies for their own use and in support of the county policies.

A workshop meeting was scheduled for July 14, at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Chambers.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 P.M.