

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

January 26, 1977

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 8:10 A.M. in the City Council Chambers by Vice-Chairperson VIRGINIA FLAGER, with the following members present, JANINE RIDER, FRANK SIMONETTI, BLAKE CHAMBLISS, JOHN ABRAMS, and DR. MAC BREWER.

Also present were: DON WARNER, Sr. City Planner, KARL METZNER, Planner, CONNI McDONOUGH, Sr. County Planner, MARGO KINNEY, Acting Secretary and approximately 15 interested persons.

The minutes were approved as corrected by Dr. Mac Brewer.

Blake Chambliss added item number 13 as a nominating report. John Abrams wanted to voice a request after the County Items.

1. #70-76: MINNOW DRIVE - VACATION

Petitioner: Henry G. Green  
Location: Minnow Drive

Don Warner: It has been agreed by the parties involved and by the City Staff that Minnow Drive should be vacated in this one part and having a turn around put in. We had one of the Engineers look at this and they agreed that a turn around could be put in there. I would like an approval from you to Council to vacate part of Minnow Drive contingent to the turn around.

Blake Chambliss: This will be put in at no cost to the City?

Don Warner: Right. The City will have no cost involved.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to approve the vacation subject to the aquisition of the turn around. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. #63-76: NORTHRIDGE ESTATES FILING #1 - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Steve Foster et. al.  
Location: N of Willowbrook and E of 26 Road.

Don Warner: The comments from the reviewing agencies were that Public Service requires additional easements. City Utilities said the Subdivision will be using Ute Water and will have to provide addequate fire protection. Grand Valley Irrigation said that the utilities may not locate in the Grand Valley right-of-way. We have an agreement to use the Independent Ranchers ditch, which is down below, for run off. It will have to be controlled by pipe to prevent damage to the canal bank. The engineers required the temporary access until Horizon Drive is extended on through here. The fire department requires three hydrants.

Tom Logue: We do have the hydrants located now. We are willing to work with the Mountain Bell and Public Service.

The hearing was closed.

Don Warner: This is a subdivision under the R-1-A zoning which is the most restrictive zoning. The developers have developed this on the R-1-A standard.

Virginia Flager: There is only one access and that is the temporary access to First Street right?

Don Warner: There is a right-of-way down here further that we may possibly be able to put an access through. Then there is one on Horizon Drive if it continues on.

Dr. Brewer left at 8:23.

Blake Chambliss: We need to get additional access out of this subdivision. If we don't get it now we never will.

Tom Logue: We have talked to them and there is a possibility of getting another road out of there down below.

Janine Rider: I think that if we approve this we should put a stipulation on it that there be another access.

Dr. Brewer returned at 8:26.

Blake Chambliss: We do not want to approve the next one until there is an access there.

Tom Logue: We did not put the lots on the other part because we wanted to get an overall picture of what could happen. A lot of it depends on what Horizon Drive does.

Don Warner: There is actually two access but the existing one we don't really want them to use.

Tom Logue: The cul-de-sacs are really temporary. The real problem is how fast Horizon Drive is worked out.

John Abrams made a motion to deny the request until it could be brought back with better accesses planned.

Tom Logue: I would like to make a comment that in the preliminary plans when they came before you they were approved by you and the Council with this concept in mind.

Virginia Flager: If this one is approved there will be no more approval until this is resolved.

Frank Simonetti seconded the motion which stated that the request would be denied until they got some right-of-way onto 1st Street.

John Abrams: I think there could be a better plan overall.

Dr. Brewer: I think that if they could get another access this would be a good plan.

John Abrams and Frank Simonetti voted yes, Blake Chambliss, Janine Rider and Dr. Brewer voted Nay.

Janine Rider made a motion to approve the request with the stipulation that there be no more filings come before the Planning Commission until there are some accesses added and full approval of the Planning Commission. Also with the stipulations that the review agencies had. Dr. Brewer ~~seconded~~ the motion. The motion passed with four approving and one nay.

3. #71-76: MOTOR CITY SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: William B. Lowe  
Location: Highway 6 & 50 east of Division of Wildlife

Karl Metzner: Reviewing agencies comments were that Fire Department would like a fire hydrant where marked on the Plan with a 6 inch supply line which fits with their system out there. Engineering had the comment that the Project Engineers are working with the City on detailed planning of sewer and water. There were no objections with any reviewing agencies. The lot lines are right on the zoning lines now.

John Abrams: Do these southern most lot lines abutt the highway right-of-way?

Don Warner: It does abutt the highway but the service is a frontage road.

John Abrams: What kind of an approach are we getting to Independent from Motor Street?

Karl Metzner: The Motor Street has been changed as best it can be to line up. This is not a perfect situation but is better than before.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend approval of Motor City Subdivision subject to the stipulations of the reviewing agencies. John Abrams seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. #1-77: REZONE R-3 TO B-1

Petitioner: Donald H. Hutchison  
Location: 1001 F Road.

Don Warner: There is B-1 zoning on two sides of this property. There is a four plex here which they want to turn into office use.

Blake Chambliss: Haven't we modified R-3 to allow offices?

Don Warner: Yes we have. The man choose to go B-1. The uses allowed in B-1 are restricted to the office use.

Blake Chambliss: It seems that those two streets could some how be lined up. That looks like it could cause some problems.

Don Warner: Engineering has looked at this and said that they can't come across here because of the angle. The only possible way would be to bring the street across the bridge at this angle and come onto Patterson road at an angle.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to ask that Engineering would look at this again and see if it could not get lined up. I do not have any objection to the zoning.

Blake Chambliss made a motion that the request be tabled until there is further study by engineering. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Janine Rider made a motion that in the next meeting someone from Engineering be there to explain some things to the Commission. Blake Chambliss seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

5. #3-77: REZONE R-3 TO PD-B

Petitioner: Bruce G. Jones

Location: NW Corner of 10th and Belford

Don Warner: This is where we have a rezoning for a request to create some offices. The plan shows gravel between the sidewalk and the street and Engineering has recommended against this because generally when there is gravel next to the street it all ends up there and gets thrown up into someone's window.

Bruce G. Jones: My only reason for putting gravel there is because I did not want to take care of the grass.

Janine Rider: I think that the grass is a very important part of this area and I think that it should be kept grass in this area to fit in with the Residential surroundings.

Don Warner: Also if the grass were kept there the City would put Street trees in.

Blake Chambliss: This faces basically on Belford. It seems that the customers would park on the streets. The parking lot in back seems to me to be quite useless. If all the entrances to the building were from the parking lot it would be more useful.

Bruce G. Jones: If you will notice the only way to get to the bottom floor is from the parking lot and there is only one entrance to the top floor from Belford.

Dan Needham representing C.B.W. Builders: The building itself is going to be business use. It is not going to be retail so there will not be that many customers. Primarily the main entrance will be from the parking lot.

Janine Rider: Is there only two ways to get out of this building?

Dan Needham: Right at the moment there are only the two entrances.

Dr. Brewer: I think that this is a hard decision to approve all of this today. Can we get another meeting and look this over more carefully?

Blake Chambliss: I would like to do this also.

Janine Rider made a motion to table the request until it is talked over in a special meeting two weeks from now on February 9. John Abrams seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to ask that when we set it up we ask that the Engineers and the parks Engineer be in this meeting..

The meeting was set up for February 9, 7:00 a.m. for a breakfast meeting.

6. #5-77: REZONE R-1-D TO PD-B

Petitioner: W.R. Hall  
Location: SE 28 Road and Elm Avenue

Blake Chambliss stepped down because of involvement in this item.

Don Warner: This is just a generalized plan of a required use. There is a 65 ft. required right-of-way. I think you have more information with you than I can give you myself.

Janine Rider: I would like to complement the person put this together on the information that we have here. If we had as much information everytime it might make it easier to make a decision on these things.

Don Warner: You are complementing Blake.

Robert Engelke: Basically we are trying to do two things here today. One is get approval of a zoning change. We are also asking you to approve a concept of what we are going to do in that zone. I would make a distinction between what you frequently see in Planned Development projects and projects where you see a lot of beautiful pictures and they don't mean anything whereas in Planned Development what we say on the maps does mean something. When you change a zone I guess we have all heard what is required in the change of zone. There is basically the change in character of the area, error in the original zoning or some reflection on the comprehensive Master plan. I would just like to go through these things very briefly as they relate to this project. The change in character of the area. I think that we are dealing with as we put in our submittal one of the most rapidly changing areas in Grand Junction in terms of activity. Since this area was zoned there has been four shopping centers, Gibsons, Tempo, Woolco and K-Mart. That is a pretty big change. We have also had a bank developed and we are looking at a second bank development. To my way of thinking, this changes the character of the area. I want to discuss just briefly the error in zoning. I sat through this hearing a couple months ago when there were many items on North Avenue and it was mentioned at that time

that there was no guiding light to what to do with North Avenue. I think perhaps three or four years ago we discussed some concepts on North Avenue that seemed to be in general the way to go to help mitigate the problems of that road and at the same time allow things to exist out there that seemed to be an advantage to the area. The biggest problems that you have is the traffic on North Avenue and the other is the relationship of North Avenue to the adjoining and abutting residential areas. These are the two things that you are going to run into constantly in that area. It is my opinion that the commercial residential relationship is a problem and constitutes an error in the zoning. Quite frequently we have discussed buffers and what that really means and believe me between the zoning on North Avenue and the residential area there is not any buffers. I do want to discuss that relationship here. This zone presently on that property is R-1-D. I think to consider that zone correct you have to look at it as a residential zone and that is what it is. You have to consider the range of residential zone also. Is it appropriate to zone this R-1-D, R-1-C or R-1-A. If it is appropriate for R-1-D then it is also appropriate for R-1-A. I think if you put it in that perspective you have problems accepting R-1-D in this commercial setting. We have to come up with something that is compatible with residential and commercial. A lot of times we have put in multi-family. To me this is reversed logical. This just puts more people up against commercial impact. I personally feel that we have an error in zoning here. To further complicate this we not only put commercial against residential, we are backing commercial with residential which can be twice as bad. The proposed use that we have here is offices and does relate to commercial and I think that offices can relate to residential whether it be R-1-A or R-3. This is a very compatible type of relationship. Our problem is to relate this project with offices to commercial on the South and Residential to the North. One more thing is important to bring out and that is the Master plan and how it would affect the city. I will point out that you are asking this property for 65 ft. of right-of-way. I think that the only reason you are doing this is because this is a planned Development zone. The fact that the City planning major roads, 28 Road and 28½ Road on both sides of this proposal is suggesting that something is going to happen in this area. I am going by the Capitol Improvements program and the construction we are talking about is scheduled for 1977-78. I think that we have really covered the three issues for a zone change. I think planning considerations on a project such as this is the most important thing in this proposal and that you have the opportunity to participate in the specific plan of the project through PD-B to insure that it does do the things that you want it to do. For example, Buffer the residential areas to the North and put most of its emphasis to the south. You have the opportunity to participate in every step and as you well know discuss the issue of what goes into the landscaping. I think that an example of this is one that we discussed this morning. Sparky's. I would make a distinction in that proposal and ours in that we are not proposing any access like Sparky's to the South. We are not proposing any access just more open space than in the Sparky's project. The relation was the same in that it was to try to buffer North Avenue and allow it to be functional and expand some and protect the residential to the South. That concept

was good and I think it is a good concept to proceed along North Avenue. I think that the merits of the project are several fold. One of the merits is that it can relate to the residential and commercial. We are proposing to do this in a number of ways. One is to emphasize a lot of open space. We propose 30% open space on this project and that is more than what is required. We proposed to taper the elevation of the buildings going no more than two stories on the North portion and going a maximum of no more than three stories. We think that we have a project that is unique in that it is a substantial office park. We think it is needed to serve a rapidly growing commercial area. We propose at this time to leave the existing building and make some use of it as was indicated in the submittal. It appears to have some substantial usable area in it. We propose as much as possible to retain the trees. We have proposed one more thing that is important to this Planning Commission to consider in terms of planning. We are proposing that the City Planning Commission and the City consider an East West Road that would run along the area of the drainage ditch. I think this would do a couple of things. It would help this property. It connects two roads that are going to be major roads. It parallels North Avenue. It would help take any pressure that this project would provide on the area around in the way of traffic and it would give an alternate route. It would provide much better traffic circulation in this North Avenue area. I think you should understand that in the Planned Development zone we are limited to 20% coverage of buildings. Which by the way is the same as in residential. We have proposed 30% open space.

Virginia Flager: Is there any possibility of getting the property that extends so far south?

Mike Pavlakis: We have talked to these people about this and they said that they were not interested in selling the property at this time. We didn't want to pressure him. I think that he understands a little bit more about it now. We have built offices in Denver and other towns and when you go in and build some offices other people come in and build some right next to you which creates hodge-podge looking neighborhood. We have found in today's criteria you have to have better working conditions. This is really a small office campus. We want to create character in the neighborhood. We feel that this will be a model project for the city. The Character of the old home is good. We would like to keep it on the land. It was an old plantation. We may name the park The Plantation Office Park if it goes in. It characterizes the area. The new buildings will be built with character. We would also like to buffer the cars. After the building gets started we will be putting in the pool and other recreational things.

The hearing was closed.

Frank Simonetti: I think that we need to look at this a little bit more also. If we table this and give you an answer later will this hold you up?

Mike Pavlakis: This would hold us up because we are having to put deposits down on the land.

Janine Rider: My concern is not with the Plans they are beautiful but my concern is about the zoning.

Dr. Brewer: I feel very comfortable with this zone in here.

There was a five minute break at 10:10 a.m.

Don Warner read a letter from the United Bank of Grand Junction to the City of Grand Junction Planning Commission giving their approval of the proposal.

Dr. Brewer made a motion to accept the current plan as stated. The motion died with the lack of a second. Frank Simonetti made a motion to deny the request. John Abrams seconded the motion. The motion was tied two to two.

Janine Rider: I would still like to look at the plan. I do not really disapprove of the plan but still I do not approve completely of it.

Virginia Flager cast her vote to deny the request breaking the tie. Janine Rider made a motion to get together at the earliest possible time to discuss this. Dr. Brewer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission will give Mr. Pavlakis his answer by February 9, 1977.

7. #6-77: REZONE B-1 TO PD-B

Petitioner: Fitzgerald-Weaver  
Location: NW Corner 12th and Belford

Blake Chambliss returned to the board.

Don Warner: City Engineering would like some kind of barrier to separate the sidewalk from the driveway so that people will not park up on the sidewalk. They suggested that one of the two driveways could be widened so that you could exit and enter there.

Bill Weaver: There is going to be extensive landscaping. It is in character with the things around it.

Blake Chambliss: How come there is so much black top and not so much landscaping?

Bill Weaver: We have not outlined the landscaping along 12th Street.

Janine Rider: I think that it would be better and look better if there was no parking along 12th Street.

The hearing was closed.

Janine Rider made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning with the following stipulations, The west entrance to the parking lot on Belford be widened for two lanes, the parking be changed to two way No parking in front of the building and for landscaping



Dr. Brewer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

8. #88-76: BOOKCLIFF COURT SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: John Giancanelli, M.E. Williams  
Location: E of 15th and S of the Grand Valley Canal

Don Warner: The access is only to be off of Bookcliff Court. Council reviewed the preliminary plan. They suggested not to get the escrow on the paving of the street yet. It might be sufficient for now but not later. We need a Power of Attorney for N 15th Street and for Bookcliff Court. Bookcliff Court is willing to enter into full without City subsidy.

Blake Chambliss: What is the time on this bridge across 15th Street?

Representing Colorado West Engineers: We are not sure about the time on this.

Don Warner: This is in the Planning stages. This is the reason for holding up on this.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend approval of Bookcliff Court with the stipulations of Engineering. John Abrams Seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

9. #4-77: CONDITIONAL USE FOR LIQUOR LICENSE

Petitioner: Pizza Hut #3  
Location: 601 N 1st Street

Don Warner: They will provide curb and gutter. There are detached sidewalks. Drainage will be in an existing ditch. Fire department comments are that they have to meet fire standards. The existing Valley Drainage is to be changed to curb and gutter. Need deed on right-of-way on 1st Street side.

Karl Metzner: This property is lower than the other. They need to put a concrete curb in to the South or have a V slope in the parking lot for the run off.

Blake Chambliss: Is there any fence around here?

Keith Mumby: There is an existing fence but it does not go all the way around.

Janine Rider: If there is going to be a detached sidewalk what is going to be between the sidewalk and the pavement?

Keith Mumby: I really do not know what is to be put in there.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend approval of Pizza Hut #3 subject to the stipulations of the review agencies, also that the property be fenced. The motion was seconded by Frank Simonetti and it passed unanimously.

Blake Chambliss: The nominating committee met and the nominations are as follows:

For Chairperson - Virginia Flager

- : to chair and preside at planning/zoning hearings  
and to serve on city-county steering committee

For Vice Chairperson - Frank Simonetti

- : to act in absence of chairperson at hearings, planning meetings or on city-county steering committee

For Long Range Planning Chairperson - Janine Rider

- : to chair and preside at long range planning meetings  
and to serve on city-county steering committee

For Secretary - Mac Brewer

- : to record/review official requests of commission and to oversee the preparation of minutes of all official meetings of planning and zoning commission

Blake Chambliss made a motion that the report of the nominating committee be accepted. Dr. Brewer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

#### COUNTY ITEMS

Conni McDonough: I would like to make a few changes to the agenda. Please reverse the order of the items on the agenda and make Mesa Business Park first and put Little Trio next. There are some additions to the agenda. Rincon Subdivision, Southland Subdivision and Northview subdivision.

#### 1. C145-76: MESA BUSINESS PARK

Petitioner: Emanuel Pavlakis, Gus and Chris Halandras, & Andy Peroulis  
Location: F $\frac{1}{2}$  and 23 $\frac{1}{2}$  Roads and North of Highway 6 & 50

Conni McDonough: There are 204 acres of proposed commercial subdivision and it will be developed into a business type park.

Harry Mavrakis: The major concern over a period of time was our layout of streets, some bad intersections. I do have a revised plan. You will notice here that there are a lot more streets, there are cul-de-sacs. We have agreed to straighten out some of the streets rather than leave them so wavy. We are going to have a lot of green area. It will have some covenants over it. It will be a phase development over a large period of time. We want to call this business instead of commercial the buildings will have covenants on them so that we will have a real attractive development.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend approval with the investigation of the two changes, the one on G Road the directing line with 23½ and the extension to F¼ Road. John Abrams seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. #C134-76: LITTLE TRIO SUBDIVISION - SECOND ADDITION

Petitioner: David Christenson, Richard Watson, & Don Hasse  
Location: Northwest of F¼ and 30 Roads.

Conni McDonough: We have two tempory cul-de-sac situations coming off of that street. They have continued the North South roads in Trading Post on into Little Trio Subdivision. Sewer is being provided in the whole area. Adequate right-of-way has been provided on 30 Road.

John Abrams: On the North side of the second addition the streets go continually away from 30 Road. What is the distance between those roads?

Conni McDonough: These were already subdivided. We did not have any North/South street ability. It was already constructed.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to approve the Subdivision with the stipulation that they provide a stub from Oxbow Subdivision. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Janine Rider left at 11:30.

3. #C8-77: RINCON SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Roper Construction  
Location: NE Connection between 27 and E Road

Conni McDonough: Rincon and Southlands connect. They are showing some lots that will not be subdivided. Some people have a lot that they want to keep some horses on. There are two other parcels that will be kept out also.

4. #C9-77: SOUTHLAND SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Marchbanks  
Location: East of 27 Road and South of B¼ Road.

Conni McDonough: There is a large canal there. The Orchard Mesa Canal right-of-way borders both properties on the North. There is an existing property there that will be just like a lot.

John Abrams: Will these lots in Southland continue to face 27 Road here?

Conni McDonough: No. There will be no access off of 27 Road.

5. #C 10-77: NORTHVIEW SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Steinkirkner  
Location: 26¼ Road on the North side of Paradise Way.

January 26, 1977

Page 12

Conni McDonough: This is a four lot subdivision that would yeild three new homes within Paradise Hills.

John Abrams: What is adjoining Mr. Steinkirkner's land on the North?

Conni McDonough: More open land within the ownership of Bray and Co. and Paradise Hills.

Conni McDonough discussed the Planning Jobs that are opening in the Department, the re-writing of the Planned Development Regulations, the consideration of the UBC, UPC, UMC and the Electrical Code to be considered for county wide. The Metropolitan District.

Conni McDonough: We have to determine what Citizens participation is and try to work harder to help it along.

Blake Chambliss: We have got to start before that, we have to find out what planning is. We keep not wanting to look at the State law and to look at the responsibility of the Planning Commission. By State Statutes the Planning Commission should be sole preparers and makers of plans. The City and County elected officials have the right to review and accept those plans. They do not have the right to change them or to reject them. One of the problems is that it appears not to be convenient for the elected officials to talk in those kind of terms. So we ask people to participate, then we shut them down and their participation didn't mean much. I think that the Planing Commission's should get together and decide what they want to do, whether they want to insist on living under the State law or suggest to the Council and Commissioners that they modify those and change it so that it is clear. But as long as we keep playing three pence games and nobody knows what game they are in, participation is pretty meaningless. We need to get to the root of the problem.

Virginia Flager: I think that contrary to the past you are going to find this commission much more committed to doing some jobs in specific areas and I think that you are going to find that there are not going to be just a certain few doing all of the work. Everyone is going to get involved.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15.

Nominating Committee Report  
January 26, 1977  
D. Blake Chambliss, Chairman

For Chairperson - Virginia Flager

- : to chair and preside at planning/zoning hearings  
and to serve on city-county steering committee

For Vice Chairperson - Frank Simmonetti

- : to act in absence of chairperson at hearings, planning  
meetings or on city-county steering committee

For Long Range Planning Chairperson - Janine Rider

- : to chair and preside at long range planning meetings  
and to serve on city-county steering committee

For Secretary - Mac Brewer

- : to record/review official requests of commission and  
to oversee the preparation of minutes of all official  
meetings of planning and zoning commission