

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

October 26, 1977

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 7:35 p.m. in the City Council Chambers by Chairman, VIRGINIA FLAGER, with the following members present: BLAKE CHAMBLISS, JANINE RIDER, DR. MAC BREWER, VERN DENISON, and FRANK SIMONETTI.

Also present were: DEL BEAVER, Senior City Planner, KARL METZNER, Planner I, KATHY LOFINK, Planner I, and DEBRA WILBANKS, Acting Secretary, and approximately 40 interested persons.

Dr. Mack Brewer made the motion to accept the August minutes. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Vern Denison made the motion to approve the September minutes and Blake Chambliss seconded it with the stipulations that the conversation over the problem of community cost be added onto the Whitewater West petition on County Items, and that Blake Chambliss be added to the minutes as being present at the September meeting. The motion was passed unanimously.

1. #27-77: FIRST ADDITION ARBOR VILLAGE (Tabled)

Petitioner: Blaine Ford  
Location: Northwest Corner of Orchard Avenue and 26th Street.

Del Beaver: Just a quick summary as to what has been agreed upon. This portion of Bookcliff has been agreed upon to be fully improved, the necessary easements and right-of-way would be provided. The two major items at that meeting was how the irrigation ditch would impact or what impact would be on the irrigation ditch as well as the treatment for the access of these lots off Pinyon and these lots off Walnut. We asked the engineer or petitioner to come in with some alternatives to indicate how that might better be handled. Regarding the irrigation ditch, we had requested a letter of some sort indicating the impact and perceived problems with the use of the irrigation ditch as the drainage for this proposed development. You have on the bulletin board three alternatives which deal with the cul-de-sac and those lots off Pinyon and Walnut. What we are looking for then is a final plot approval for Arbor Village First Addition that was tabled. Alternative one shows the existing cul-de-sacs, and an extension into the properties that have been only stubbed, to better provide for trash pickup without having to back up as well as better accessibility for the lots.

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

October 26, 1977

Page 2

Del Beaver: I should point out at this point that there is going to have to be substantial reconstruction of the cul-de-sac that is already in there to facilitate positive drainage in this area. Alternative two, as suggested in the engineer working with staff, would be to initiate a vacation of the portion of the initial cul-de-sac as long as it will have to be reworked and extend the cul-de-sac into the lots and vacate these portions back to the abutting property owners for both Pinyon and Walnut. Alternative three represents a further refinement of what was initially presented and that being solving one of the problems that was perceived as kind of a sticky one and that's how to handle trash pickup and still not have garbage cans sitting out in the middle of the cul-de-sac and getting hit and knocked over. It was proposed by the engineer that there would be a small concrete slab and there would be a raised six inch curb around the slab extension that would accommodate the individual garbage cans so the owners of these lots, one, two, three, four, would be responsible for moving the trash containers out to that point.

Dr. Mac Brewer: Do you have any dimensions on that trash island there?

Bob Gerloffs: That island would be adequate to hold eight trash cans. We do not prefer alternate one, we give it to you because we discussed it last time. Staff, I think, still prefers alternate two. We prefer alternate three because it tends to disrupt the neighborhood less.

Del Beaver: Planning Staff and City Engineering urge the utilization of alternative two.

Closed hearing.

Frank Simonetti: Alternate three with those joint driveways, I can see nothing but trouble.

Dr. Mac Brewer: Are you satisfied that the irrigation is alright? Are we going to have enough trash washing in here that it is going to be running over all the time?

Del: Staff doesn't really know if we're going to have trash flow into irrigation ditch if alternate three is selected. Or alternate one or alternate two. There has been indications that there should be no problem. Grand Valley is not all that concerned.

Janine Rider made the motion to approve Arbor Village First Addition with the stipulations that Bookcliff be fully improved, all necessary easements be given and that the second alternate plan be used. Dr. Mac Brewer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. #73-77: ROAD VACATION, BUNTING AVENUE (Proposed 23rd Street Subdivision)

Petitioner: W. H. Buttolph

Location: Bunting Avenue, West of 23rd Street 102.22 feet.

Del Beaver: This is the area that action had been taken on to rezone C-1, but there has to be an action to vacate this portion of the former right-of-way of Bunting that had been designated. I will be glad to give you my approval of recommendation right now.

Closed hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to approve and Frank Simonetti seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. #68-77: ALTERATION OF DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. ZONE (Addition of convenience shopping to service station)

Petitioner: Amoco Oil Company

Location: U.S. 50 and Linden Street (Northwest corner of intersection)

Karl Metzner: This is an existing service station on U.S. 50 and Linden. The review comments we have are from City Engineering, they request this curb cut here be closed and the drive apron be removed feeling that this curb cut is too close to the intersection. You eventually got a three way intersection with B 3/4 Road coming in here and they feel that that extra cut is a traffic hazard. We want this curb extended another 30 feet essentially for the same reason, to prevent an access to the highway, cutting across that corner and dodging in. In relation to that, they made a suggestion that some additional landscaping be provided in this corner area here. They are remodeling the interior of the building turning it into a convenience store and essentially the rest of the site would be left as is. We had an additionally staff comment that went along with City Engineering, some additional landscaping here and some landscaping on this right-of-way here.

Blake Chambliss: Is Linden paved at that point?

Karl Metzner: Yes.

Blake Chambliss: Does it have curb, gutter, and sidewalks?

Karl Metzner: No.

Ken Murray: One of the comments I had was that we were told that we had to provide seven additional parking spaces for this location. I think the way to approach this is to take the

Ken Murray: comments one at a time and I think the major one is where we are talking about closing up this driveway here. My comment to this is that this station was built around 1960, 1961 or 1962, somewhere around in that vicinity, but it is around 17 years old. We're trying to modernize it, we're trying to convert this into a convenience store and into what we call a self serve gas pumper. Staff recommendation to close this driveway hits me pretty hard, and I want to object to this. I don't know the reason for staff recommendation to close up this driveway. Nothing was forwarded to me, this caught me about Monday. One of the other things that was thrown at me that was suppose to be staff recommendation, was that we would have to provide seven additional parking stalls. As I understand the Staff comment, they object to this driveway due to the traffic that would be congregated at this corner. Now you have 100 percent of your traffic here at the corner where if you let these driveways remain, this is an ingress only, people enter here and now you've diverted your traffic away from the corner. As I understood it the staff objected to the traffic at the corner by this approach. I can't see how this approach would ever be an egress. I think if we delete this, all we are doing is antagonizing the traffic pattern that could possibly develop there.

Blake Chambliss: Mr. Murray, you indicated that you only heard this week about some of these criticism. I seem to feel that if you had more time, you could address them more properly. Would you like another month?

Ken Murray: No, sir, I would prefer not to.

Blake Chambliss: I think you need some time to work this out.

Ken Murray: Mr. Chambliss, I think I have addressed this as well as I can.

Del Beaver: At least you are able to push the egressing traffic South of where two or three cars loading on the intersection would be placed. In other words, there would be sufficient room for two or three cars to stack on Linden South bound at that intersection whereas, as it exist right now, there would be no room.

Ken Murray: To bring a curb up here, now a car is 20 feet long, that would put a car here, now here is the end of the curb. Now a car would have to move out and make this exit. I think that is bad.

Blake Chambliss: I can see you saying that from the point of view in dealing with that piece of property, but in terms of dealing with moving people down Highway 50 and

Blake Chambliss: keeping the intersections clean and keeping traffic movements at a reasonable rate, it does seem to me that is a reasonable request.

Ken Murray: Now we have two conflicting lanes of traffic outside our property.

Blake Chambliss: That's what I said. My question was that with your capability and talents, do you think if you were given some time to come up with a traffic pattern on there that we could meet our requirements as well as yours? It seems to me that if you could work with them and come up with some kind of solution that maybe moves one of those one way or other, that would solve your problem and our problem, then we could both agree and move on.

Janine Rider: What I see in front of us looks illogical no matter which way you look at it now. First of all, if that one driveway on the highway is going to be the only driveway on the highway, it certainly wouldn't come in at that angle would it?

Del Beaver: Implicit in the presentation was that there would be ingress and egress from 50, but one entire drive would be closed up as it exists close to the intersection.

Ken Murray: From a previous discussion we were asked to provide seven parking spots. We have done this.

Karl Metzner: There are rarely the same conflict points on site in both of these proposals. We feel that it is better to have the conflict points on site where you are going five miles an hour at the most than to have the conflict points in the highway where you got people narrowing down. Most of the traffic would come to this point on Linden. We submit that is exactly where it should be. Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations: that the driveway closest to Linden Street be closed and the pavement be removed, that the existing curbing on Linden be extended 30 feet, additional landscaping be provided in the Southeast corner of the property and along the East property line and this landscaping to be approved by Parks and Recreation and City Planning Staff and that the parking plan be submitted and that would be checked over by Planning Staff. Also that there would be no problem with changing that apron and that driveway should be egress and ingress.

Ken Murray: I honestly think it is a mistake to close that driveway. All I can do is ask consideration on this and let it go at that.

Closed Public hearing.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to table this until Mr. Murray has had chance to respond to stipulations set forth by Staff. Dr. Mac Brewer seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

4. #69-77: ALTERATION OF DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. ZONE (Addition of car wash facility to service station)

Petitioner: Amoco Oil Company  
Location: I-70 and Horizon Drive (North of interchange, East of Horizon Drive)

Karl Metzner: This is on the Northeast corner of Horizon Drive and I-70. What they are purposing is to add a car wash stall on the southerly part of the building. They will be doing some additional paving at the back to provide circulation around the back. There are no real concerns from anybody except Engineering and they are concerned over the waste water from the car wash stalls and how it would be handled which wasn't specified in the submittal. Specifically they do want sand and grease traps. We do have note that the area has low water pressure in flow. It is serviced by Ute Water and there is no City responsibility to provide water.

Ken Murray: In response to Staff recommendations, mud and sand traps will be provided. In order to obtain a building permit, this has to be done.

Dr. Mac Brewer: Grease and sand.

Ken Murray: It's a code requirement, so there is no problem there.

Virginia Flager: You can handle the problem of water pressure?

Ken Murray: Yes, I went to the Ute Water Company and we have more than adequate water pressure at that particular point for this car wash. The present service line is sufficient.

Karl Metzner: The water pressure in the area is generally low. We talked to the Fire Department and the City Utilities people and it is not felt that this facility will have any great impact on the situation in general.

Closed hearing.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to approve this item and Frank Simonetti seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. #70-77: FINAL PLAN/PLAT - LAMPLITE PARK FILING #1 (PD-8)

Petitioner: Jon Abrahamson et al

Location: East end of Santa Clara Avenue, 900 Block

Del Beaver: As you are probably familiar with this, it is located the South of Colorado River, at the end of Santa Clara Avenue. What is being proposed is a PD-8 on preliminary approval. This is the subsequent submission. As far as Staff comments are concerned, Public Service has indicated that additional easements will be required within the site, Parks and Recreation indicated after review of trees and species and shrub requirements that some species were not suitable and that others were quite suitable. I presume that those that are undesirable would be replaced. Fire Department is requiring fire hydrants (5). City Engineering wanted to extend curb blocks around all the intersection so that ramps would be provided, they were also concerned about drainage on Olson Avenue on the West end and they would like that addressed, they would also request a statement from Paragon Engineering or the geologist addressing the stabilization of all units to be constructed on the edge of the scarf. The utilities composite shows insufficient hydrants; we have already addressed that with the Fire Department recommendations. Prior to recording the plat, revising utility composites must be filed with the Development Department showing hydrants and water line sizes as required by City specifications. City Engineer wants specifications on handling the irrigation system particularly as a cross public right-of-way in street sections. All vertical faced curbs on all the public streets for Lamplite. On Olson Avenue it was desirable to construct a six foot curb block along the northerly side of Olson Avenue and to have this space provided as an undedicated turn around until such time that this road would be build through and turn South to enable better on site circulation for trash trucks and emergency vehicles. At such time that that future extension is created, the site that will be currently used as a turn around will then revert back to being able to be utilized by the Home Owners Association vehicle storage area.

Blake Chambliss: Should there be any indication that that should go to back to any kind of cul-de-sac or anything else?

Del Beaver: There just isn't sufficient space in here.

Blake Chambliss: Offset or partially offset into the cul-de-sac so that there is an extension to the South some point in the future, there still remains access into that or is that a problem?

Del Beaver: I suspect that a cul-de-sac could be squeezed into here to make it fit and work, but it was felt that may

Del Beaver: be unnecessary by City Engineering to require that at this time. If the on site turning movements could be handled without going through the whole cul-de-sac and the dedication and vacation process, they would like to handle it that way.

Blake Chambliss: Olson Avenue is to be a public dedicated street?

Del Beaver: Yes.

Blake Chambliss: Is the City allowing on Olson Avenue west of Lamplite that half improvements on that street?

Del Beaver: What they are requesting there is 19 feet of pavement plus a six foot curb block. Nineteen feet of pavement for egress and ingress to the traffic.

Blake Chambliss: I thought there had been an objection by the City on half streets.

Del Beaver: They made the determination that since it would be serving seven units, that in this case a considered exception and go with nine and a half foot driving lanes with no parking on that street. Because quite logically if the street is to be extended downwards, it's going to have to pick up additional right-of-way from the South.

Blake Chambliss: You don't have any guarantees that that is going to happen?

Del Beaver: No.

Janine Rider: What do they do on the other side now, do they just end it?

Del Beaver: No. When that comes in from the South, I assume this will have to be reset to grade. To address the situation now, we're proposing two nine and a half lanes plus a six foot curb block. Development Department is requesting in lieu of the sidewalk situation, we would prefer to see sidewalks along the street frontages plus instead of two sidewalks along either side of what would actually be the front of the house here, to have one landscaped block going through the green space connecting with the school yard. The final plat requested from the Building Department and the Staff, the final plat would contain a statement that engineered foundations shall be submitted on lots that are required by the Building Department. Dick Hollinger would like that included in the motion to approve if there is one.

Bob Gerloff: This will be paved and used as a park service play area until such time that the county traffic will no longer need it then it will be reverted to recreational storage.



Bob Gerloffs: This recommendation for right-of-way was Planning Commission addition in plat stage.

Blake Chambliss: Bob, you indicate that the side of the house facing the street, the houses are basically turned their backs one them, and your indicating further substantial gravel to parking area, a carport, and then desert landscape on the whole face to that street. Desert landscaping is very popular, but I don't know what it means. On Santa Clara which is a public dedicated street the City has had a policy of providing street trees at no cost to the developer or no cost to the home owner as long as they were set in grass or some other guarantee that they would be provided with water. I think that even though you have desert landscaping that trees and so forth are going a great deal to make that development more liveable. I guess I feel you should make some provision for taking advantage of that offer of the City of Grand Junction.

Del Beaver: I think you can have some textures other than sod and if the Engineer would like to come in and work with us and Parks Department to include both street trees and maybe an alternative to sod, we'd be glad to work those things out with them.

Dr. Mac Brewer: How do you guarantee water to them?

Del Beaver: Yes, water would have to be guaranteed to them, but it doesn't necessarily follow that you would have to have a sodded surface.

Blake Chambliss: I recognize that Engineering think they can get by with a half street on Olson Avenue and I'm just not sure about that approach on those nine lots. I'm curious to the reaction of simply not developing those nine lots at this time.

Bob Gerloffs: Is you concern parking?

Blake Chambliss: Well parking is obviously going to be a problem or they are going to drive into the field unless there is a big fence there.

Bob Gerloffs: If parking is concerned, we could not develop the middle lot and utilize that for eight additional parking spaces.

Del Beaver: Staff would recommend approval subject to any other considerations such as Blake just indicated. They should hold one lot open for parking until such time it is fully developed and that street goes through South and is able to be fully improved plus all the review agency requirements and any other requirements you might have. We would specifically request that you include in the motion that engineering foundations would be required for all those

Del Beaver: indicated as necessary by the City Building Inspection Department.

Closed hearing.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to recommend approval to City Council subject to Staff's recommendations, engineering recommendations, and so forth and with the provision of additional parking on Olson Avenue and provision of water for street trees on every lot (everything on public right-of-way because they will not do that on anything that is not public right-of-way). Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

6. #71-77: PRELIMINARY PLAT - GOLDEN COURT SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Hershl B. Pilcher  
Location: South of Patterson; West, 206 feet from  
12th Street.

Karl Metzner: This is a request for a subdivision in a B-1 zone. Request were for some additional easements from Mountain Bell and Public Service. City Utilities Department says a six inch dead end water line is not adequate for fire protection and they want an eight inch. City Public Works Engineer says all foundation should be engineered due to the high water table and the soil conditions, require power of attorney for improvements on Patterson Road, that's half street improvements. Glendale Court will require full improvement up to the right-of-way line of Patterson Road. At this point Engineering feels that the existing waste ditch needs improving to handle the additional drainage which would come from this project. Any approval should include a recommendation to the developer to get with the City Engineer and determine what types of improvements need to be made to that ditch, what improvements need to be made for the outlets into the storm sewer, and what easements may be required. That could be handled between now and the final plat stage.

Janine Rider: This is a subdivision for business purposes then?

Karl Metzner: Yes, B-1 would allow office use and it could allow multi-family use.

Janine Rider: Up to what point?

Karl Metzner: There is no density.

Janine Rider: These are small lots for the purpose of subdividing whatever they want like commercial subdivision?

Karl Metzner: That is correct. Now there are no minimum lot sizes in the B-1 zone for office type uses. If they

Karl Metzner: use residential uses, I believe you would have to fall back for the lot sizes in an R-1-3 zone.

Virginia Flager: Is there a fence provided on the South side of this property along the canal?

Karl Metzner: At the present time that canal road goes through 12th and comes out behind that four plex that you rezoned for office use.

Virginia Flager: You did stipulate that this could become a residential situation where there could be numerous children in there?

Karl Metzner: There could.

Harold Quick told the Commission that if they had any questions that he would be glad to answer them.

Karl Metzner: We recommend approval along with stipulations, water lines and fire hydrants as required by Fire Department, engineer foundations on all structures, power of attorney for improvement through to Patterson Road, improvement of existing waste ditch to be coordinated with the City Engineering Department prior to final plat stage.

Closed hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend approval to City Council with the stipulations given by staff and with the further stipulation that the canal be fenced for safety. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

RECESSED at 9:20

RECONVENED at 9:25

7. #72-77: REZONING REQUEST FOR R-1-B TO PD-8 AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - CHERRILYN VILLAS

Petitioner: James R. Cadez and Donald Kanaly  
Location East of the North end of Knollwood Drive

Del Beaver: It is a request for rezoning from R-1-B to PD-8 and the approval of the Outline Development plan. This is a single family residential neighborhood. The ten units are currently being purposed to be put in this area. Eight point seven units would be possible using minimum lots requirements in this zone. Staff comments are as follows: Mountain Bell is requesting a ten foot easement, easements running along the back sides of the structures, Public Service

Del Beaver: is requesting additional easements necessary and they said they would work that out with the developer, Fire Department is requiring one hydrant near lot eight and they also request that the 20 foot road width be extended to 25 feet to insure adequate access within the site, City Utilities indicated a need for space to be provided for trash containers, and City Public Works Engineering indicated that there was a question for the amount of parking spaces indicated in the proposed which average out to 5.5 parking spaces per unit. I should indicate that is has been agreed upon by the developer and his engineer that the turn around in this small circular median would be constructed so as to not interfere with the turning movements of trash trucks or emergency vehicles such as fire trucks.

Tom Logue: We met with Planning Staff this afternoon and went over the review comments and we feel that we can adequately address those. The site is approximately 1.8 acres and is presently zoned R-1-B located at the extreme northerly end of Knollwood Drive. There is approximately one acres of a cherry orchard. These smaller circles indicate the cherry trees that are there. This 8/10 of an acres in here is currently unused and undeveloped. There are several smaller residential tracts that adjoin the property. The development plan calls for ten single family lots. Four units on the ten lots will be attached into duplexes. The remaining six will be single family detached units. The plan also indicates a common open area which includes a pedestrian walkway, some open play areas. The common open area consist of an half acre or about 27.8 percent of the total area. The plan itself revolves mainly around the cherry orchard. Great effort was taken not to remove anymore of the trees than was necessary and the ones we did move were diseased or in poor shape. The trees for the most part will remain in the common open area.

Janine Rider: We received a letter recently, Pest Control District, that pest were becoming a problem in the area because people were having fruit trees in the yards or keeping fruit trees in developments and not taking care of them. Can you address this problem?

Tom Logue: In the set of by-laws will be a clause for proper care and maintenance of the fruit trees that are there. Fortunately, I understand that cherry trees are the least diseased pron. I would like to point out too that at preliminary plan time a complete and detailed landscaping plan will be submitted. The site is also proposed to be screened fence. Each unit will be on an individually owned lot as illustrated in this blow up. The units will be patio homes in nature. We propose the possibility of some jet pools or fountain type areas to be set aside within each unit. We are looking for

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

October 26, 1977

Page 13

Tom Logue: the ultimate privacy which would allow the lot owner to have his own private area that would be maintained and taken care of by him. When he moves in it will be completely landscaped. The common area will be owned and maintained by the Association. Each building will be unique in its own appearance, but will maintain a Spanish style character. Right now our plans call for a living area between 1400 and 1600 square feet. We have provided four off street parking spaces for each site. Two in the double garage and two in the driveway, in addition to those we provided 15 guest parking, overflow parking spaces, in this area here. It brings the total parking to 5.5 spaces per unit. Water and sewer, electricity, gas, phone, and cable TV and utilities necessary for a development this type are there. The developers plan to utilize irrigation water that is with the site now for the maintenance and irrigation of the larger open areas. We have prepared a comparison of zonings between the R-1-B and the PD.

	<u>R-1-B</u>	<u>PD</u>
Minimum lot area	9,000 sq. feet	3,800 square feet
Minimum lot frontage	75 feet	38 feet
Minimum floor area	1100 sq. feet	1400-1600 square feet
Minimum distance between single family detached dwellings	14 feet	25 feet
Maximum units allowed	8.7	10
Minimum parking	2	5.5
Maximum building height	25 feet	Do not expect any of our buildings to exceed that height.
Open Space	No requirement	We are providing for a half acre.

These are mathematical, theoretical calculated value. In order to have a basis to work from, we used that for the ground work. You never know how many feet you're going to use in a dedicated road and in our case we don't have any dedicated roads.

Blake Chambliss: You say you got 38 foot width lots, if you had drawn those properly, there is not 25 feet between those dwellings.

Janine Rider: Tom, should all that property to the North decide to develop, is there a possibility of being any access from Knollwood through at a later date.

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

October 26, 1977

Page 14

Tom Logue: We met with some of the adjoining property owners several weeks ago and one of the major items of the neighborhood concerns was that Knollwood Drive ends right where it is at. There is a dedicated right-of-way and depending upon what develops there theoretically could go through. To F Road or into another project. The developers indicated to the home owners that they agree with them and if there is anyway they could vacate a portion of that cul-de-sac in conjunction with the other adjoining owners, they would be more than willing to cooperate with them in this manner.

Dr. Mac Brewer: How many units would you have to drop out to fall in with what is currently allowed there?

Del Beaver: If they proposed Bulk Development, they would have to drop two units.

Blake Chambliss: And if you wanted to subdivide in R-1-B, you would probably drop five.

John Biocic: I live at 2323 North 1st. I like to have my privacy, too. It seems like there is going to be a high wall somewhere around in that area, that far end over there where the cherry trees are at. Talking about some of those cherry trees being alive and diseased now, I'd say about 95 percent of them are diseased. That property has never been taken care of and I've been a resident there in the past since 1954. I came back here and retired, and I want peace and quiet.

Suzanne Bradfield: I live at 2335 North 1st Street. I guess the thing that concerns me is the misleading information that I got through the sale of this house. I had asked repeatedly what the plans for the orchard was in the future and I was told by the Kanaly's that they had plans of building a single dwelling home down about an acre and a half from my property line. I feel like I have taken alot of my hard earned money and for the resale of my house which I have to consider in the future, the charm of the house as far as I'm concerned with duplexes and so forth right on my property line and a wall built around there like that would certainly detract from it.

Blake Chambliss: You own property adjacent to this, is that what you're saying.

Suzanne Bradfield: Yes, that's right.

Del Beaver: I was wondering if these residents would prefer a natural screening to the wall type screening as purposed?

Virginia Flager: I don't think that is revelent at this point until we have discussed the entire thing.

Bud Smock: I have some concerns about what is developing here, both in terms of the comment that they are talking about whether they're going to run an access there through the North. My property is adjoining to the South. I don't want any access through my property now or in the future. That's why I bought the property. I think what bothers me more than anything else is that we were not informed in anyway of these hearings tonight. Nor were we informed of the meeting that was held a week or ten days ago.

Del Beaver: I can only respond to one of those comments and that is the City Staff attempted to contact a number of residents in the area and obviously were not able to contact everybody. There were some people without telephones or unlisted telephone numbers as well as some people not home.

Virginia Flager: Could I interject something?

Dr. Mary Moore: May I ask my neighborhoods just who was contacted?

Virginia Flager: May I ask, where the meeting was and I do not know of the meeting you are referring to?

Bud Smock: You may ask the question of Dr. Moore because I do not know either.

Virginia Flager: What meeting are we referring to because we were not involved nor was City Department Staff?

John Biocic: About four weeks ago my son and I, Dr. Moore also were invited, looking at those plans there, and we voted no at that time.

Virginia Flager: Where was the meeting held sir?

John Biocic: At Mr. Kanaly's.

Virginia Flager: In other words, it was an informal neighborhood meeting. It was not an official meeting. O.K., that's fine, that's what I wanted to clarify.

Dr. Mary Moore: May I have the names of the people that you called?

Del Beaver: Mary Lindquist was notified, Edward Lippoth called, Elizabeth Wygant was notified, Rose Graham was called, Earl Yound came into the department, Suzanne Bradfield was aware of the meeting; there were enough people notified that we knew they knew.

Rose Graham: I was called yesterday morning from someone from Planning Staff and that was the first time I knew about it in any phase or form.

Mrs. Edward Lippoth: I live at 2246 Knollwood Lane. We were notified about the meeting and that is not my concern. This appears to be a very quality development and I think the property owners are concerned about what is going to happen in that area, Mr. Cadez particularly because he lives right there. We have a concern about a density that is being proposed in an area that is primarily rather expensive houses, we all live there with the idea that there would be single family dwellings. I understand the constraints of land sizes these days and so forth, but the big problem I think is access on to Knollwood and the traffic it would create at that point. The question was also raised regarding the extension of Knollwood. We are very concerned that Knollwood Lane not be extended on through to Patterson Road. There's a steep hill there and in my opinion a condition that would be very dangerous. There is a solution in my opinion to the problem of letting these gentlemen develop their property which I think they have the right to have some consideration in that matter. If the Knollwood Lane ending point could be redesigned in some manner so that Mr. Cadez or Mr. Kanaly have access on it. I can see where single family dwellings could be placed upon that property in character with the neighborhood. I for one, I can only speak for my husband and myself, that that would fit with the way we thought it was going to be. We do not have the streets going on to a major artery there.

Virginia Flager: Knollwood Drive is effectively stopped by Pat Gormley's property, is it not?

Mrs. Edward Lippoth: Both Dr. Moore and Mrs. Gormley have property on North.

Del Beaver: I would just like a clarification back to what I indicated before, I am curious as to if there would be a preference, if this project was approved, if there would be a preference for either a combination of vegetation and screening or maybe just vegetation or maybe the preference would be for a wall. I would like to get some feed back from the abutting property owners.

Conni McDonough: Del, perhaps that is something that can be dealt with at preliminary time in the event this approved.

Mr. Edward Lippoth: If this property should happen to be rezoned for this development, what happens if development doesn't begin in a reasonable amount of time? Does it revert back to the original zone?

Virginia Flager: There are two reasons for changing a zoning: (1) zoning is wrong in the first place, (2) change of the neighborhood or a need for the specific kind of zoning.



Janine Rider: When somebody comes in with a Planned Development we okay a specific plan down to every single tree on the property. They file they're schedule with us and have to follow it and then they can do nothing different from the particular maps that we see. If the proposal is dropped, it reverts back to the zoning that was there before.

Mrs. Edward Lippoth: If the streets and landscaping are neglected by the Home Owner's Association, what protection does the neighborhood have?

Del Beaver: In my perspective, the Home Owner's Association operates as any other cooperation would and it would be subject to law suit.

Mr. Bud Smock: First of all I oppose the zoning change, I don't appreciate the possibility of a change. I would like to know what this zoning change has on the remaining part of my property. I own two acres in this area that has some definite covenants that I must live up to.

Frank Simonetti: This is the zoning ordinance: In case of a protest against any changes in the ordinance or maps signed by owners of 20 percent or more of the area included in such proposed change or those immediately adjacent to the front, side, and rear thereof extending a 100 feet there from or those directly opposite thereto extending 100 feet from the street frontage of such opposite lots such amendment shall not become effective except by the favorable vote of six members of the City Council.

James Cadez: Does that include the City and County zones?

Virginia Flager: The City.

Don Warner: The county resident has as much pressure as the city resident as long as they are abutting the property.

James Cadez: We came before the Commission about a year and a half ago to propose the same thing that Mrs. Lippoth has suggested. Hers was a perfect idea, Don Kanaly and mine was a perfect idea. You would of had six family residents there and it would have worked perfect. In essence, if you deny this tonight, you are denying me access to my property.

Earl Yound: I live at 2303 North 1st. My property joins his property on the South. As a neighbor, I like to feel that I have a neighborly conscience. I appreciate these neighbors and I do feel they should have a right to develop their property. I also feel there are some other circumstances there that we have discussed before. One of them is adequate

Earl Yound: and suitable access. The whole subdivision in there does not have suitable access. To continue to put more residents in this area only compounds the problem, it does not help solve the problem.

Dr. Mary Moore: I live at 2403 North 1st. I own five acres. I'm concerned, we have an irrigation ditch running just South of my property which has an three or four foot easement on this piece of land we are talking about. That ditch has to be maintained. I said many times, "Thank God that ditch is there between this property and my fence." That's the only thing that is going to save my fence.

Lois Boffman: I live at 2181 F Road. One of the important parts of my home is the kind of neighborhood that we do have. Two or three houses sounds feasible but that many is totally foreign to any of the neighborhood.

Del Beaver: We realize that there are some real problems here that if worked out could be better all the way around. I don't there is any question that access is a problem. It is Staff's feeling that there is going to be access problem here regardless of what is built. I think that what has been proposed to be done in a Planned Development manner would ward consideration of approval for a couple of reasons. Granted you are talking about additional density, but granted you are talking about having some very, very strict controls over the developers process. I guess that additional steps rather than just reliance on property owners to the North, that any steps that could be taken should be taken to prevent through traffic to Patterson. This comment was made by City Public Works Engineer as well. In view of what is being proposed, in view of the character of the existing neighborhood, I don't think it would be that far out of line as far as the single family residential character of the neighborhood. A well done planned unit development might be more pleasing and much more compatible as far as livability then a conventional stick built house that would be in your regular subdivision. Planning Staff would recommend approval with the various stipulations that have already been made as far as City Staff comments.

Virginia Flager: In other words, you don't feel that the surrounding property owners comments or their concerns are valid in relationship to the recommendation of the staff.

Del Beaver: I am not saying that at all. From a development stand point and the type of development that is being proposed, staff feels that it would not fit adversely here. Now it is up to the Commission to weigh all the various input plus the public sentiment.

Dr. Mac Brewer: From the thing that Frank read awhile ago, it sounds like if I understood that right, from the sentiments that have been submitted here no matter what we do, these people can go to council with a list of their names and it is going to be awfully hard to get anything passed. So I think we have to weigh this on merits of how it looks to us. The Council really has to make the decision as to what the land owners think.

Closed hearing.

Blake Chambliss: I would like that we look at this in two motions, one is the change of zoning and the other is discussion on the development plan if, assuming that that change in zoning is approved.

Dr. Mac Brewer: Blake, are you saying that because of the traffic patterns and that sort of thing. Would you think maybe that planned unit development would have feasibility but maybe the way it is being done, you don't like.

Blake Chambliss: I think there are some improvements that could be made and should be asked for such as the kind of thing Del was asking about in terms of landscaping, screening and that sort of thing. They don't mean much if we aren't going to recommend the zoning.

Dr. Mac Brewer: The concentration is built into the zoning?

Blake Chambliss: Basically, as I understand it, if we approve the zoning, we approve ten lots.

Karl Metzner: Blake, you could still approve a PD-8, but approve it for less units.

Blake Chambliss made the motion that the request for rezoning from R-1-B to PD-8 be denied. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and the motion was passed. There was one "NO" vote which was made by Dr. Mac Brewer.

8. #74-77: CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION - FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH (Building addition and waiver of additional parking requirements)

Petitioner: First Christian Church  
Location: 1326 North First Street

BLAKE CHAMBLISS EXCUSED HIMSELF FROM THIS ITEM.

Del Beaver: They are coming in for a reissuance of a Conditional Use because they are going to be requesting this addition to the structure and requesting also waiver

Del Beaver: of any additional parking spaces. The only comments from City Staff is that these two parking stalls be eliminated entirely because of sideline problems when cars are parked out into the right-of-way which has been the case and permitting them to do thus far. The Fire Department has indicated no problems, the City Utilities has okayed it.

Jim Kipley: This is a Conditional Use application we have here. It again concerns two things. One is the parking and also a setback condition as addition will protrude into a setback 21 feet.

Virginia Flager: Why are you asking for a waiver of additional parking?

Del Beaver: Yes, there would be required additional parking because of the additional of square footage.

Jim Kipley: We presently have 102 parking spaces, but only 59 are really legal parking spaces because of the projection into the City right-of-way. Part of the Conditional Use application asks that these present parking be accepted and a waiver of additional parking required for addition to the structure. The addition is approximately 890 square feet. The present square footage of the building is 11,700. So we are only adding a small addition to an already present structure. The present building which was built in 1957 before the setback was on this property projects 18 feet six inches into the right-of-way. The addition would only add two feet six inches which would make the projection 21 feet into the right-of-way.

Virginia Flager: In other words, your existing building is already in the right-of-way and you are only asking for two feet six inches more?

Jim Kipley: That is correct. I would like to bring up the point that the Boys Club also projects into the setback by 25 feet two inches.

Del Beaver: Staff is under the opinion that the additional parking requirements should be waived in view of the type of use and the hours and the intensity of this. Staff wasn't having any problems with the additional structure as it exist. Staff would submitt that the two parking stalls should be removed and bumper curbs be installed for all those parking stalls extending into the public right-of-way.

Virginia Flager: I have one question. Looking 25 years into the future, I want to be very clear on this, this is Conditional Use and say it would become necessary with the exisiting traffic problem that this building would be taken down with no hassel.

Don Warner: It's not a Revocable Permit, it's a Conditional Use. Under our Building Permit issuance, it says that for any building to be built or an addition, that the required right-of-way must be dedicated to that side of the street.

Harold Moss: I was here last time and we went over the parking items pretty thoroughly. We would be thoroughly agreeable as to those items as indicated can be eliminated. The two parking spots plus those stumbling block, I call them, for the parking area. I would like to state that we have had very adequate parking all these years and it was built in 1958 and we're not encroaching on any of the neighbors.

Closed hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to accept the addition of the building and the waiver of the parking with the stipulations of the two parking stalls being removed and that the parking spaces extending into the right-of-way be given curb bumpers, and that ten feet of right-of-way be given at this time. Vern Denison seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS REJOINED THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

9. #75-77: PD-B PRELIMINARY PLAN - POWELL APARTMENTS AND BUSINESS CENTER

Petitioner: John A. Nelson  
Location: 28½ Road and Belford Avenue (Northeast corner)

Karl Metzner: The proposed is for business offices on the corner of 28½ and Belford and then three four plex structures on individual lots. Staff recommendations: Parks and Recreation did object to some street trees used. City Utilities want some specifics on the trash collection points. Fire department require fire hydrants as required by City specifications. City Engineer require improvement of Belford, a 22 foot mat to be centered in the roadway. Developer is to provide for power of attorney for curb, gutter, and sidewalk on his side. There are some more requirements from Public Service and Mountain Bell and that will be taken care of on the utilities composite.

Tom Logue: The site is approximately eighty-two hundredths of an acre. It is located northeast of Belford and 28. The project is bordered by commercial development on the north and the west. All the utilities are located in 28½ and Belford Avenue. A couple of months ago they submitted a sketch plan which included four four plexes and a restaurant. Your concerns were that a restaurant would not be a good idea in a residential use. Looking at other possibilities in a PD, we decided upon a business center with access to the front and access to the rear. Parking for the four plexes will

Tom Logue: be at the rear at the northerly portion of the four plexes providing two parking places per unit. Access to the parking areas in the back will be gained through a private ingress, egress drive. Access to the business offices will also be through a common egress, ingress drive. Documents will be submitted to the Planning Staff for review of the adequacy and the legality of the proposed ingresses and egresses. We will be working with Ron Rish, Duane Jensen, and the Parks and Recreation Department to comply with the questions that they had. We anticipate that the development would occur over a 12 or 18 month period and will begin immediately upon approval of the final development plan. The floor plan, the buildings would have a living space of about 300 square feet per unit.

Dr. Mac Brewer: Do you have any idea what the business offices will look like?

Tom Logue: Yes, they will be compatible to the four plexes.

Karl Metzner: We would recommend approval in compliance to Parks and Recreation recommendations, fire hydrants as required by Fire Department, power of attorney for improvements on 28½ Road, the improvements on Belford, and then screening to the north to provide protection for the four plexes. In conversations with the City Engineer, they feel that providing screening from the parking areas might be a better way of doing it. So not only would the four plexes be screened from North Avenue and the business development there, but they would also be screened from their own parking area.

Virginia Flager: I have only one question on that. Security for the person driving into the parking lot. I don't know how others feel, but I know that as our city grows you have second thoughts about parking areas away from the dwellings. Especially screened parking, so that stuff going on in the parking area is not seen. If they are moving the parking area away from the apartments, I think they parking area should be well lighted.

Bill Buttolph: The screening around the parking lot would actually be more unsafe. That parking lot will be adequately lite.

Closed public hearing.

Frank Simonetti made the motion to approve with the stipulations as presented by staff and that screening be placed for security, parking be lighted, a walkway between the cars and the commercial buildings. Janine Rider seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

10. #62-77: CONDITIONAL USE FOR MBI DRIVE-IN

Petitioner: MBI c/o Jerry Mischel  
Location : 19th and Main Street (North and East of  
intersection)

Del Beaver: The review comments are as follows: Public Service Company wants a ten foot easement within the site, City Engineer comments that this is an improved submission over the last one and would require curbs, gutters, and sidewalks as per City standards, City Utility comments that they would like to see a relocation of the traffic to facilitate trucks coming in and also would recommend utilization of the stationary compactor.

Tom Logue: I did meet with Del this afternoon and there aren't any problems with the review comments. Did meet with Steve McGee, the traffic engineer, informally about a month ago and showed him where the driveway was and he felt that our plan reflected that location.

Virginia Flager: You did stipulate that the trash compactor as well as the trash container would be located in the same area and they will be screened, is that correct?

Tom Logue: As I understand it, they want the trash collection area relocated and they strongly recommend that a trash compactor be a part of the collection.

Del Beaver: Staff would recommend approval based on the previous stipulations and one other and that is connecting this short sidewalk with the existing sidewalk on Road. I would urge the petitioner to run the question about the plum trees past the Parks and Recreation Department again.

Blake Chambliss: At the north end, the existing curb and gutters and walk stop at the west end of the property and then nothing happens across the whole north end.

Del Beaver: Exactly.

Closed public hearing.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to approve this item to City Council with the stipulations made by staff and improvement of landscaping and finishing up along Road Avenue. The motion was seconded by Vern Denison and the motion passed with the exception of one "NO" vote made by Janine Rider.

11. #76-77: PETITION FOR H.O. ZONING - ORCHARD MESA BANK ANNEX

Petitioner: Staff  
Location: Southwest of 27 Road and Hwy. 50

Karl Metzner: Staff recommends approval of the H.O. zoning for the Orchard Mesa Bank with the following reasons: (1) it complies to the Planning Commission policy of H.O. zoning on the major entrances to the City of Grand Junction, (2) previous county zoning was a B (business type) zoning (3) adjacent zoning to the east and west is Business and Commercial type zoning along the highway, (4) existing county R-2 zoning to the south can receive protection from adverse influences through the processing requirements of the H.O. zone, and (5) the H.O. zone will allow multi-family, business type mixed uses if the Planning Commission thought those were feasible.

Virginia Flager: Can you explain to me why you would ask for and obtain an annexation for the west side of a street and leave the other triangle there with a natural boundary outside the city with the type of businesses that exist there?

Don Warner: You cannot annex property unless people are willing to annex property and nobody was willing to petition on the other side of the street.

Closed public hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to approve and Frank Simonetti seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### COUNTY ITEMS

A) C140-77: HS TO R4 and R-1-B to B  
DISCUSSION

Petitioner: Epstein and Etter

Bob Kettle: We have before the county two rezonings. They are very close to the City limits and together have given us cause to study the whole vicinity. Boundaries are 26½ on the west, 29 on the east, F Road to the South clear to the airport. We are suppose to deal with one of these rezonings on November 15 and the second one doesn't come up till December. If we don't get far enough to satisfy you, you could request that county put off decision on either or both until you see this again. This blue line is the city limits and everything else you see is in the county. In general their zoning petition includes two changes, there is a draw which comes down central through the Highway Service zone and to the east they would like to create R-4 multi-family county zoning, and this area here is presently R-1-B or R-1-A, they would like to change that to Business zone. The other petition which is not before the county until December involves land in this area. There is obviously Highway Service zoning. The petition seeks to create PD-8 zoning where there is presently single family zoning. Also,



Bob Kettle: Business zoning rather than the Highway Service zoning. Highway Service is more restaurants, motels, it includes some offices, but it's not for retail stores.

Virginia Flager: You don't seem to have a clear map of the property in question.

Bob Kettle: I don't have either petitioner before you.

Virginia Flager: What do we have before us?

Bob Kettle: I'd like to bring the study before you. This petition here was just submitted today, and we don't even have the working maps on it. It seeks to create a B zone and it seeks to create multi-family dwelling in this area and this area. Our knowledge of those petitions coming in caused us to ask several questions. First of all, can multi-family be justified in this vicinity? Is it necessary? Is there a demand for it? Is there a role for multi-family dwellings in this neighborhood? If so, where particularly should they be located? There is about 60,000 square feet of office space within the study area now. There is another 150,000 square feet in the planning stages. You are aware, I would imagine, with the existing Highway Service development (motel, restaurants, etc.), there's also several more in the planning stages. Three restaurants in particular, three motels, possible hotel (Sheraton Hotel), give or take one motel or one restaurant in planning stages. There are many people looking at that area. If you decide that multi-family could be used in the area, we located some spots which could be compatible which are now single family. The second aspect of study is whether or not Commercial or Business (shopping, retail store) could be justified because each of the rezones include a business aspect. Given the existing and foreseeable population within the study area, is there a demand? Can this be justified? What is the size of a market neighborhood here discrete and separate from Grand Junction as a whole? Given the densities that are now mapped, which are now allowed within the city and the county within the planning area, they will all be built out. There will be 6,543 dwelling units (3.0 people per home). In addition, we located some areas where multi-family such as Lakeside and Vintage 70 or something in between them could be located, total acreage for those. Does that justify neighborhood shopping facility? Does it justify anything at all? I think that whatever the population foreseeable, existing, projected, whether or not to allow commercial shopping facilities is still a policy decision. You don't have to do anything.

Janine Rider: Does Safeway or City Market have figures that say with this many people we could build a store and have it be a success?

Del Beaver: Yes, there is.

After much discussion Janine Rider made the motion to postpone this item from the County agency for a month so that City Planning Commission could discuss this item further. Dr. Mac Brewer seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 a.m.