

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

July 27, 1977

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers by Chairman, VIRGINIA FLAGER, with the following members present: BLAKE CHAMBLISS, VERN DENISON, JANINE RIDER, JOHN ABRAMS, FRANK SIMONETTI, AND DR. MAC BREWER.

Also present were: DON WARNER, Senior Planner, KARL METZNER, Planner I, DEBRA WILBANKS, Acting Secretary, CONNIE MC DONOUGH, Development Director, and approximately 35 interested persons.

Dr. Brewer asked what was meant by structural landscaping, and it was concluded that this was anything beyond flowers, such as trees and shrubs.

Frank Simonetti made the motion that the minutes be approved and Dr. Brewer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1. #55-77: PROPOSED ZONING, DANIELS ANNEX, R-1-A

Petitioner: Staff

Location: Northeast 1st and Fruitridge Drive

Don Warner: The surrounding zoning for this area is all R-1-A within the city and it is also large lot zoning in the county. We recommend R-1-A zoning for this annexation.

Virginia Flager: Is this the Daniels area that is in the Northeast corner of the Northridge Estates?

Don Warner: Yes.

Janine Rider made the motion that they approve the R-1-A zoning, Dr. Mac Brewer seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

2. #46-76: BULK DEVELOPMENT - REVISED PLAN, GRAND MANOR

Petitioner: Federal Projects Inc.

Location: Northeast 28 $\frac{1}{2}$  and Orchard

Karl Metzner: The purposal is for 112 units, the original was for 110 units. There are some changes in the locations of the buildings. There are some major changes from before as far as access roads upon recommendation of the City Engineer Department. The City Engineer Department recommended that the petitioner bring a roadway in to a point that the Engineering felt confident would not change in grade. At that point they will swing a service road off of the right-of-way on to their own property to service this North parking and this North cluster of buildings. At the present time the statis of the

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

July 27, 1977

Page 2

road is vague so they are recommending a 20 foot pavement only on the East side of 28 $\frac{1}{4}$  centerline. They are also asking for Power of Attorney before approvals on 28 $\frac{1}{4}$  Road. At a later date when the rest of the right-of-way is acquired and the road is constructed we will have half of the required pavement and at that time we will be putting in curb gutter sidewalks. The City Utilities wants the traffic location to be accessible to front end loading trucks. The sewer lines are private inside the project, so they won't be required easements. The Traffic Department wanted the parking lot to have a one-way operation. Mountain Bell is requiring a ten foot utility easement. The Fire Department has required fire hydrants. We will be working with Grand Valley Irrigation to provide property easements for their service roads and at the same time we will be getting easements for pedestrian and five foot access roads.

Virginia Flager: In the Southeast corner with the intersection of Orchard and 28 $\frac{1}{4}$  Road what is the existing right-of-way for Orchard Avenue at that point?

Karl Metzner: 30' 1/2 right-of-way.

Virginia Flager: In other words, the total right-of-way is sixty.

Don Warner: We will be getting extra right-of-way from these people because the right-of-way for Orchard Avenue although we have sixty feet, 30 of it is in Indian Wash.

Virginia Flager: In other words we actually have a 30 foot street there.

Karl Metzner: No, that is 30 foot on the North side of the section line and then you got a little bit on the South and then Indian Wash. Most of the South side is in Indian Wash.

Virginia Flager: What's the width of the street in there?

Don Warner: Probably 18 foot County paving. We are getting sixty foot right-of-way off of this project here.

Karl Metzner: As you noticed the last time you requested that Brittany be extended through, and they are complying.

Janine Rider: So the biggest difference is the changing of the road and the addition of two apartments somewhere because of the way the buildings changed.

Karl Metzner: That's correct. Under Bulk Development, this is zoned R-2-A, they could have possible maximum of 145 units. They are requesting 112.

Frank Simonetti: Does that require a number of parking spaces?

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

July 27, 1977

Page 3

Karl Metzner: Yes.

Closed hearing.

John Abrams: Most of the developments that we have been looking at have been asking for ten foot wide parking spaces.

Karl Metzner: They are nine by twenty.

Blake Chambliss: It was indicated that they have signed a Power of Attorney for both the completion of Orchard Avenue and 28 $\frac{1}{2}$  Road.

Karl Metzner: That's correct.

Blake Chambliss: The area North of the Grand Valley Canal which is left blank, that is to remain simply open is that right?

Don Warner: Yes.

Blake Chambliss: Do we have fences for protection of the adjacent properties and called for around this property? I recognize the Bulk Development. It seems to me that we have treated the Bulk Developments in the past as a simplified and faster form of PUD and it seems to me that we can make the same requests for Bulk Development as we do for PUD. Certainly the screening of the adjacent areas would be an important consideration.

Don Warner: This is my opinion of the agreement for Bulk Development.

Blake Chambliss: Has the City Parks Department reviewed the trees, the landscaping, and so forth for adequacy of species size and so forth?

Karl Metzner: They did review it the first time and they made some comments about some species that would grow in this area. On those recommendations we have already transmitted them to the petitioner.

Blake Chambliss: I think that we should make sure that the Parks Department review this.

Janine Rider: Can't we stipulate that the council have a report to go along with this to the Parks Department?

Don Warner: We will get with the Parks Department.

Virginia Flager: Are there any requirements on the limitation of the number of units that can be slipped through a Bulk Development?

Don Warner: The Bulk Development is set up as a over lay on the zone and the density of the underlined zone.

Blake Chambliss: On some other projects of this sort, we have asked for on site storage of recreational vehicles and that sort of thing. I don't think we got that space available. The experience in the past is that that sort of space is necessary. I think we should ask for some of that kind of space to be provided.

Don Warner: If they do not choose to go along with the suggestions, they can go back to their original of 110 units.

John Abrams: Since the South Parking lot has an in and out only, why don't we use that same thing on the North.

Blake Chambliss made the motion they approve the Bulk Development Revised Plan with the following stipulations:  
(1) That the property be screened to the East, (2) That the landscaping be reviewed by the Parks Department for species and for size, (3) That parking be provided for recreational vehicles in addition to the parking that is already shown, (4) That landscaping be provided screening the parking areas with the minimum of one tree per six parking spaces, (5) That the present development as shown be the maximum development to be allowed on the property (112 units). Janine Rider seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

3. #37-77: PD-8 - LAMP LITE PARK PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Lamp Lite Park Development  
Location: East end of Santa Clara Avenue

Tom Logue: Basically the plan reflects what was submitted in the Outline Development Plat. Two major changes being the dedication of roads and the addition of some over flow parking. We increased it to a total of 68 spaces over the amount that is on the site. We also submitted a cross section with the site looking at it in a cut a way section.

Dr. Mac Brewer: The Cross Hatch green area, is that a open space common to all people?

Tom Logue: That's where we've added our walkways. This is another minor change that we made. We purpose that private roads have a width of 22 feet of asphalt with two foot gutters along each side. We feel this will be more than adequate to serve the needs of residents in this area. The dedicated road is going to have a width of 30 feet of pavement with the two foot gutters on each side.

Janine Rider: So there actually won't be parking allowed in the street.

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

July 27, 1977

Page 5

Tom Logue: That's right.

Blake Chambliss: What is the typical lot width and depth?

Tom Logue: Forty-five by ninety is our minimum. The depth may seem limited, but with the common open spaces at the rear which will be substituted for a rear yard.

Blake Chambliss: Are the double faced lots any deeper?

Tom Logue: Yes, they are. At final platting time we will have all of the dimensions of the lots.

Blake Chambliss: Are these going to be pretty much zero lot line houses?

Tom Logue: Yes, sir.

Don Warner: City Engineering suggest on the dedicated right-of-way a 34' mat if it has on street parking, a 24' mat if there is no parking on the street. The North and South streets would have sidewalks on both sides. The City Utilities and Fire Department have specifications for hydrants and size of water lines. Public Service thinks the open space should be dedicated as easements, and that the private road be dedicated as utility easements for trash, post office, emergency vehicles, and so forth.

Tom Logue: The developers feel that to enhance their project a 30 foot matt works.

Janine Rider: Why is it logical to have sidewalks on the South and not the dedicated street that goes East and West?

Tom Logue: We've provided sidewalks on both sides of this street here.

Closed hearing.

Blake Chambliss: I have a couple of questions about the street within the dedicated right-of-way. I realize that with you providing 30' you are providing more than Ron's 24' minimum, but the advantage of the 24' foot minimum is self placing. The 30' feet would tend to encourage people to think that they could park there and so they would park there. I think that since people will probably park there that it should be provided for them. I'm concerned about the lack of front yard space. It provides little alternative for somebody who might decide in the future that they want to enclose their own carport. Then all of the sudden we have a very major visual block, and they themselves have a problem in being able to use it.

Frank Simonetti: I'm curious about the private road that ends up by the storage.

Karl Metzner: That's a public road. It will be half of the right-of-way.

Janine Rider: I share your concern Blake about the two car garage. I can't imagine putting a two car garage on a little picture that we have here. It looks like it could be a bad situation.

Tom Logue: These streets are laid out in a fashion that when a guy leaves his place to go somewhere, it's quiet type residential and the narrowness of the street also requires that a driver slow down and pay a little more attention to where he's driving.

Blake Chambliss made the motion that they approve the plan subject to comments of the City Engineering and Fire Department with the additional stipulations that: (1) sidewalks be provided to the fronts of all the lots, (2) that Santa Clara be paved to a full 34' width so there is a possibility of on street parking, (3) that the units be designed with adequate space at the front, a minimum of 15' setback from that building line. Vern Denison seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

4. #50-77: DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. - MOTEL 6

Petitioner: Lea and Co.

Location: Northeast of GSA Building

Petitioner asked that this item be dropped from the agenda.

5. #51-77: PRELIMINARY PLAT - REPLAT LOT 3 - COLORADO WEST DEVELOPMENT PARK FILING #1

Petitioner: C.B.W. Builders

Location: Northwest 15th Street and Winters Avenue

Don Warner: This at the present time is all one large lot and will be divided into many smaller lots plus two large lots. City Engineer requires full street improvements.

John Abrams: What is the width of the pavement plan?

Don Warner: Sixty feet is the right-of-way. I don't have a pavement width here. It will be a wide pavement I know because of the commercial type street. It will fit those commercial streets down in that area.

Closed hearing.

Janine Rider: How big is the whole thing from top to bottom?  
Is 897 feet the total? That's about two city blocks, right?

Karl Metzner: Yes.

Janine Rider: Would there be any benefit to making access to  
12th Street?

Don Warner: This property doesn't reach 12th because it is cut  
off by the railroad siding coming out through there.

Janine Rider made the motion they approve with the stipulations  
that: (1) street be put through to 12th, (2) sidewalks be  
provided, (3) hydrants made available as recommended by  
the Fire Department, and (4) easement as required by Mountain  
Bell and Public Service. Vern Denison seconded the motion  
and it passed unanimously.

The meeting was recessed at 9:15 until July 28, 1977 at 7:30 p.m.