

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

February 22, 1978

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 7:33 p.m. in the City Council Chambers by Chairman, JANINE RIDER with the following members present: VIRGINIA FLAGER, FRANK SIMONETTI, JOHN ABRAMS, and VERN DENISON.

Also present were: DEL BEAVER, Senior City Planner, KARL METZNER, Planner I, DON WARNER, Planner Analyst, CONNI McDONOUGH, Development Director, DEBRA WILBANKS, Acting Secretary, and approximately 50 interested persons.

SIMONETTI/DENISON/PASSED TO ACCEPT THE JANUARY MINUTES WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE ELECTION OF JANINE RIDER AS CHAIRPERSON BE ADDED.

1. # 6-78: PRELIMINARY PLAN - MALDONADO SUBDIVISION (TABLED)

Petitioner: Felix Maldonado
Location: 350 West Grand

Karl Metzner: The East/West road has been eliminated. Additional dedication has been put in to make the North/South street a 50 foot right of way. That way the lots can face on a North/South direction. The setbacks will be going East/West. Lots 7, 8, and 9 are fronting off of Crosby Avenue. Review comments are as follows: Fire Department wants 1 fire hydrant on the Northwest corner of West Grand and Crosby, Public Service needs some additional easements, City Utilities doesn't want a 15 foot easement.

Marvin Maldonado made a few comments concerning the five foot easement and the drainage sewer.

Asked for proponents. (NONE)

Asked for opponents. (NONE)

Closed public hearing.

Vern Denison: What is the zoning there?

Karl Metzner: R-3. If they decide to sale those lots, then they will have to provide whatever engineering is necessary to get into those lots.

After some discussion about the fire hydrant it was decided that Karl should check into it and **make sure** it was really needed.

FLAGER/ABRAMS/PASSED WITH THE STIPULATIONS THAT THE FIRE HYDRANT MEET WITH FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS, PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT,

STORM SEWER EASEMENT, AND DEALING WITH THE ACCESS ON CROSBY. WHEN THE REAR LOTS ARE DEVELOPED, THE DEVELOPER SHALL PROVIDE ACCESS.

2. #21-78: CONDITIONAL USE - CHURCH PARKING

Petitioner: Northeast Christian Church
Location: 22nd West of Northeast Christian Church

Del Beaver: This is a city owned parcel. The Northeast Christian Church wants to use this parcel as an extension of their parking lot which exists right now. They have indicated they will upgrade and improve the property so it might be better utilized. City Engineering supports the attempt to reduce on-street parking on 23rd. The lot should be graveled or paved and should be drained. Planning Staff comments are as follows: screen fence to the North, there should be no parking within 15 feet of the stalls off of 22nd Street to honor the setbacks, erect some kind of a barrier if there is to be access on 22nd Street so that people going to 23rd Street Subdivision would not be pulling into this parking area and using it as an extension of the parking facility in 23rd Street Subdivision. Staff feels they should put up a chain so the parking lot can't be used except during church use. The chains should also be maintained.

Vern Denison: Can they provide positive drainage to one of the streets without affecting the adjacent property owners?

Del Beaver: That can be accomplished by draining into 22nd or working something out with 23rd. We talked with Duane Jensen and Ron Rish on the traffic situation and they feel that this would work out well.

Del Beaver read the letter from Northeast Christian Church.

Mr. Davis explained that at first they had intended to use this piece of ground as a recreation area, but after talking with Ken Idleman found out that was not a good idea.

Virginia Flager: This is for church usage on Sunday, is that right?

Mr. Davis: Yes.

Asked for proponents.

Doug Hawke: If we do acquire this, we intend to black top it within a year. We will do anything you want us to do.

Asked for opponents. (NONE)

Del Beaver: We feel the parking lot should be accessible through the two entrances that are proposed to the parking lot. We feel it should be channelized so that it can be cut off during working hours.

John Abrams: I'm concerned about the North/South alley.

Del Beaver: When they put in the necessary channelization things I just referred to, it will probably take care of itself.

Closed public hearing.

SIMONETTI/FLAGER/PASSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING: SCREEN FENCE ERECTED TO THE NORTH PERIMETER, PARKING WILL BE SETBACK 15' FROM THE 22ND STREET, GRADED AND GRAVELED AT THIS TIME TO DRAIN TOWARD THE CUL DE SAC WHICH WILL BE PROPER, PAVING AND STRIPING TO BE DONE WHEN THEY ACQUIRE THE PROPERTY, CHAINS WHEN IT IS NOT USED ON 22ND STREET AND ALSO ON THE ALLEY, AND CHANELLIZE THE TRAFFIC.

3. #20-78: FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

Petitioner: William H. Nelson
Location: 7th and Grand

Karl Metzner: This is to give a secondary fire escape to First Baptist Church. It will protrude into the alley seven inches. There were no review comments.

John Abrams: How high off the ground will this be?

Karl Metzner: They will have to meet City standards so that trash trucks can clear it.

Asked for proponents. (NONE)

Asked for opponents. (NONE)

FLAGER/SIMONETTI/PASSED TO APPROVE PETITION FOR FIRE ESCAPE.

4. #18-78: CONDITIONAL USE - NURSERY SCHOOL

Petitioner: Mr. and Mrs. Larry Knight
Location: 2880 Elm

Del Beaver: This is an R-1-C. Fire Department has said that the fire hydrants are alright. Building plans must be submitted to the Building Department and the Fire Department. City Engineering would require power of attorney for full cost of half street improvements. The only comment City Staff has is that this appears to be very compatible with the neighborhood uses.

Asked for proponents. (NONE)

Asked for opponents.

Bob Walters: The thing we are concerned about is the traffic.

Percelia McDurmon: We all have children and we just don't feel that a nursery belongs right there. Nisley School had to stagger their let out times because of the traffic.

Jerry Walter: I'm a daycare mother. I have two children of my own and I know it is awful hard to watch all of the kids all of the time. I do have a backyard, but there are times when they do play in the front.

Jean Ray: I have the Lollipop Tree. I just don't feel we need a nursery in this area.

Larry Knight: The plan is to have a looped drive. The traffic will probably come directly from Elm. There will be very little access on to Texas Avenue. We have checked with all the nursery's in Grand Junction and we feel that there is a need for another nursery.

Mrs. Knight: I feel that I am here to get the land approved for Conditional Uses and not to fight over whether I'm going to interfere with another center. I don't feel that has anything to do with this. There is only one daycare center coming in from Clifton and Palisade. There is also about five or six subdivisions being built on F Road. We felt that people coming from those subdivisions from F Road could come down 29 Road, go down North Avenue and turn down 28 3/4 Road and come down Elm Ave. I have a looped drive way and all they have to do is come in and turn around and go back the way they came. I see no reason why they should have to go down Texas. We are proposing to have this street paved as well as Melody Lane. Before we even proposed to have this site, I went to every person in the neighborhood and got the signatures from each one giving their approval. (Mrs. Knight read the petition that each of the neighbors signed.) The reason I chose this piece land is because it is by the Little League Park and I have no neighbors on either side.

Del Beaver stated that Staff felt that there would be very little traffic added to Texas Avenue.

Sandy Patterson: I am a day care mother. I have just a few comments I would like to make. First the state has a law that all daycare facilities should be fenced so that should take care of the daycare mother's problem. Daycare schools do need to be in neighborhoods.

Closed public hearing.

FLAGER/ABRAMS/PASSED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO COUNCIL WITH THE STIPULATION OF FULL POWER OF ATTORNEY FOR FULL HALF STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

5. #89-77: FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN PD-B - LaCOQUILLE RESTAURANT

Petitioner: J. Ramsey
Location: 1309 Glenwood

Del Beaver: City Engineering would like to pull the building back five feet from the alley and extend the sight lines. We would like a larger drive. We want to make sure that sidewalks on Glenwood are included, and the trees to be changed. The only other comment made by City Engineering is that the trash tanks should be made accessible to a front end loading truck.

Asked for proponents. (NONE)

Asked for opponents. (NONE)

Del Beaver: What we have seen is a remarkable improvement and I think they have really cooperated with us well.

Closed public hearing.

FLAGER/ABRAMS/PASSED TO APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE STIPULATIONS MADE BY STAFF WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SIGHT LINES.

6. #19-78: CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION - BURGER KING

Petitioner: Norbert Lukas
Location: Southwest corner of 1st and White

Karl Metzner: This project should be looked at as a two phase project. The proposal is for a drive-in restaurant. The petitioner has proposed to pave that portion of the alley that will be used as his exit. City Engineering has requested power of attorney for paving half of the rest of the alley. Fire Department says water flow to hydrants in this area are adequate. Landscaping is treated. We would like a more specific plan for the landscaping on First Street, though. They do meet the parking requirements. Trash pick-up will be screened. The area will be lighted.

Del Beaver: I think it is important to request a number of parking stalls be designated for handicapped parking.

Karl Metzner: They are proposing to change three of these spaces to handicapped spaces. Engineering recommends that the driveway on First Street be extended to 35 feet. That would necessitate that the first two parking spaces be removed. They could use that space for landscaping. You should recommend that City Engineering keep close eye on the on-street parking to the South problems come up, to see about eliminating those parking spaces.

John Abrams expressed some concern about the exit out of the alley.

Richard Welch: I feel this is a very workable plan.

Virginia Flager expressed some concern about the traffic on First street.

Asked for proponents.

Ken Harver, engineer for the project, stated that their proposal still did not include parking for the handicapped.

Janine Rider: In other words you're telling us that if we want the handicapped parking, we'll have to stipulate that.

Asked for opponents. (NONE)

Closed public hearing.

Vern Denison: Burger King does a good job with the lighting, but it could be offensive to the neighbor near by.

SIMONETTI/DENISON/PASSED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF TWO "NO" VOTES MADE BY FLAGER AND ABRAMS. MOTION WAS SUBJECT TO WIDENING DRIVEWAY, POWER OF ATTORNEY TO PAVE REST OF THE ALLEY, PARKS AND RECREATION TO ASSIST WITH LANDSCAPING, REMOVE FIRST TWO PARKING SPACES, HAVE PARKING SPACES FOR HANDICAPPED, AND PROTECTION OF LIGHTING FROM THE NEIGHBORS.

RECESSED 9:30 p.m.

RECONVENED 9:37 p.m.

JANINE RIDER EXCUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT ITEM FOR PERSONAL REASONS.

7. #87-77: PROPOSED REZONE R-2 TO R-3

Petitioner: Fred Larson
Location: Northeast corner of White and 11th

Del Beaver: City Engineer said that increased density can only cause problems. You must remember that there is R-3 across the street to the West. Fire Department had no comments and City Utilities indicated that trash pick-up should be accessible to the alley.

Frank Simonetti: Is the whole block R-2?

Del Beaver: Yes.

Jim Robb: The remodeling of the Larson home would include two units on the bottom floor and a third on the top floor. As far as Mr. Larson is concerned, the garage can come out. He has many neighbors and many of them approve of this. (Mr. Robb read statements from some of the neighbors.)

Jack Childers - 1114 White - "I do not object to rezoning at 1104 White for three apartments."

Martha Goettelman - 1109 White - "I understand that the Larsons have requested permission to convert 1104 White to three apartments. I have no objections to this as long as their tenants have ample space on Larson property to park their cars."

Mrs. Mike Utterback - 1103 White - "I have no objections to this."

Mildred Craig - 1105 Grand Avenue - "I, Mildred Craig do hereby approve that Fred Larson be allowed to make three apartments in his house on the corner of 11th and White. I am his next door neighbor at 1105 Grand."

William H. Hall - 1060 White - "I have no objections to a rezone for three apartments at 1104 White."

Jim Robb: One of the concerns expressed in the December 28, 1977 minutes was one of jumping the block, if you will. We have R-3 on the West and R-2 from 11th to 12th.

Del Beaver showed on the map what zones surrounded this area.

Jim Robb: Mr. Larson wants to do a fine job in the renovation of his families home. I think when the neighbors say "we don't object," I think they are really saying "here's a chance to put a shiny apple in the neighborhood."

John Abrams: When did this renovation begin?

Janine Rider: In October.

John Abrams: What bothers me is that they didn't come before the Commission to ask whether the zoning could be changed before they started the program.

Jim Robb: We're only asking for a little flexibility so this renovation can go on.

Ronald Albright: At the time this project was started Mr. Larson was under the impression that this was zoned triplex. That's what the real estate agent had told him.

Frank Simonetti: What is allowable in R-3 on that size lot?

Del Beaver: Eight units.

Frank Simonetti: What this means is that if this is approved, this lot could be sold and if he could meet the parking, he could build eight units. I just wonder if the people know this.

Del Beaver: Staff feels that renovation should be encouraged, but we are also aware that R-3 zoning is wide open. Staff is proposing to address a proposal that would address mixed land use and the kind of flexibility Mr. Robb is addressing. That flexibility isn't in our zone ordinance. You really can't rezone for contract zoning in a use by right situation.

Jim Robb: We realize that we have to receive more permission than what we have right now. I am encouraged to hear the some other thinking is going on. I would welcome any suggestions the Planning Commission would have for us. Is it possible that we might proceed with the triplex and not use it as such?

Don Warner: You can construct a third unit as long as you don't put a kitchen in it. If there were a rezoning or a way to come up with the third unit later, then you could install the kitchen.

Virginia Flager: The regulations will be rewritten. There will be alot of changing of language. The site is not unreasonable and the proposal is not unreasonable, if you can live with two sinks until this happens then I'd take a chance.

Asked for opponents. (NONE)

Closed public hearing.

ABRAMS/FLAGER/PASSED TO DENY REZONE DUE TO THE DENSITY. PLANNING COMMISSION RECOGNIZES WHAT MR. LARSON IS TRYING TO DO, BUT BECAUSE OF HIGH DENSITY DENIED REZONE.

JANINE RIDER JOINED THE COMMISSION.

8. #24-78: REVISED PD-B PLAN

Petitioner: CBW Builders
Location: 10th and Belford

Karl Metzner: The revised proposed use is still for an office building. the building has been shifted a little, but it is still on the corner. The access will be on Belford and access on the alley as well. City Utilities want the trash angled for their new pick-up trucks. Landscaping is essentially the same.

Virginia Flager: The landscaping to the West there at Sparky's is lawn and this should go along with it.

Asked for proponents.

Asked for oppenents. (NONE)

Vern Denison: What's the reason for turning the building?

Warren Gardner: We are going to build a vault underneath the building and we had to turn it in order to get it underneath the parking lot.

Closed public hearing.

FLAGER/SIMONETTI/PASSED WITH THE STIPULATIONS THAT THERE BE GRASS LANDSCAPING WITH TREES ON THE BELFORD SIDE, PARKING ON THE ALLEY SIDE BE USED FOR EMPLOYEES, AND THAT TRASH PICK-UP BE ANGLED.

COUNTY ITEMS:

A) C 11-78: FRUITVALE BUSINESS PARK

Larry Rasinski: There have 5.3 acres. They are going for a rezone on the back corner which is presently R-2.

Virginia Flager: There is a frontage road in there?

Larry Rasinski: Yes. City Planning recommended vertical curb, gutter and sidewalk. Clifton Water will be furnishing the water here and Clifton Fire Department will be serving it, and they do go with smaller line requirements. There is a three inch water line, but they feel that will be sufficient.

Conni explained something of what is going on with the Fire Dept.

DENISON/SIMONETTI/PASSED SUBJECT TO ADEQUATE SIZING OF WATER LINES AND VERTICAL CURBS.

B) C161-77: ^DREWING SUBDIVISION

Larry Rasinski: This is an R-2 Transitional. There will be a cul de sac required. ~~Ron Rish recommends five foot curb, gutter and sidewalk combination, to be flattened at the cul de sac area, to serve as a cul de sac turn around.~~

Virginia Flager: How are they going to accommodate the drainage?

Larry Rasinski: There is a ditch that would accommodate the drainage.

John Abrams: Do they have any provisions for East/West roads in there?

Larry Rasinski: Yes, according to an overall plan we use.

FLAGER/ABRAMS/PASSED WITH THE STIPULATIONS THAT THERE BE A CUL DE SAC AND A STUB.

C) C172-77: FOUR CORNER SUBDIVISION

Larry Rasinski: They have five acres there. Designed for 11 lots.

Virginia Flager: There is something funny with that right of way for 29 Road.

Larry Rasinski: 29 Road is designated as a major arterial there.

THERE WAS A CONSENSUS APPROVAL AS LONG AS THE RIGHT OF WAY WAS GIVEN AND THE DOG LEG IMPROVED.

D) C 59-77: INDIAN VILLAGE FILING #2

Larry Rasinski: This is R-2 Transitional. There are 13.26 acres with 65 lots. All the review comments have been met on this with the exception of some of Ron Rish's concerns. He said he discussed non-standard curb and matt widths. They are proposing Hollywood curbs, but the City wants vertical curbs. Ron has stated that they aren't sure what they want to do with Patterson in the future.

Virginia Flager: What about the driveways, are they going to come out on Patterson or are they going to go out on Arapahoe.

Larry Rasinski: Arapahoe.

John Abrams: It appears there are two entrances. Do we have wide enough streets for adequate protection to people who are living in there?

Del Beaver: There is 50 foot right of way, 34 foot matt.

Larry Rasinski: Ron said he would go along with Hollywood curbs, but he wants a letter from them stating their reason.

SIMONETTI/DENISON/PASSED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE COMMENTS MADE BY STAFF.

E) C119-77: FRUITWOOD FILING #8

Larry Rasinski: On the previous filing they didn't show any stubs. Also, on the previous filing they didn't go with full city standards.

SIMONETTI/DENISON/PASSED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL.

F) C 19-78: REZONE R-2 TO SC

Larry Rasinski: They are proposing a Shopping Center rezone.

John Abrams: How many acres?

Larry Rasinski: 9.1.

Conni McDonough: The closest shopping from this intersection are South-North Avenue, East-30 $\frac{1}{4}$ Road, North-nothing.

Virginia Flager: Will right of ways be addressed for F Road and 29 Road?

Conni McDonough: Yes. They are going to get one driveway curb cut on either side all the way easterly and southerly.

THERE WAS A CONCENSUS OF THE COMMISSION THAT THERE BE PLENTY OF LANDSCAPING, ADDRESS THEMSELVES TO ACCELERATION AND DECELERATION, AND THAT THEY ADDRESS RIGHT TURNING LANES AND LEFT TURNING LANES.

G) C 26-78: REZONE R-1-B TO PD-8 - C. A. WALT

Larry Rasinski: He is going with single family. He is going with an open space dedication.

Del Beaver: It might should be requested that this tie in with the Nelson development to the East.

Janine Rider: How many acres?

Larry Rasinski: There are 13½ acres and with R-1-B zone there would be 27 units maximum and 108 with PD-8.

Janine Rider: How many is he proposing?

Larry Rasinski: Around 108.

Virginia Flager: Are you going to recommend a stop light at 12th and Horizon Drive?

Del Beaver: Yes.

Conni McDonough: This is similar to Vintage 70'.

Del Beaver: I think what we should ask is if the petitioner can make the units liveable and pleasing to the rest of the community. I think if they can satisfy those then they may be entitled to some flexibility on density.

THERE WAS A CONCENSUS OF APPROVAL IF THE PROJECT WAS DONE WELL. (EXAMPLE, VINTAGE 70').

Adjourned 11:40 p.m.

FINAL DRAFT

(DRAFT 6 - 2/23/78)

PROPOSED PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Section 5. PARKING AND LOADING

- a. Unless otherwise provided, as in an organized parking district, purchased or leased, off-site parking, or otherwise acceptably arranged, the minimum standards for off-street on-site parking requirements shall be mandatory for all new construction and expansions of existing uses unless a hardship can be clearly demonstrated.
- b. In unusual circumstances, such as those cases listed below where the parking requirements create an extreme hardship, a reasonable reduction may be requested. In such cases where the petitioner and the Planning Staff do not agree, the City Planning Commission shall hear the request, act upon it and send it to the City Council for final action. Examples of hardships which may be considered are as follows:
 - (1) Uses, where many employees or tenants do not own or drive vehicles due to age or other reasons.
 - (2) Uses, where the multiple use parking requirements may be inappropriate due to differing peaks of demand.
 - (3) Uses, where the multiple use parking requirements may be inappropriate due to the related nature of the uses needing the off-street parking.
 - (4) Uses, which operate on shifts where the actual demand at any one time would be less than a demand calculated on the total number of employees.
 - (5) Uses, which if more than substantially damaged cannot reasonably provide the additional parking required by this ordinance if the use would be reconstructed.
- c. Employee parking shall be addressed and accommodated off-street for all categories, except where employee parking is specifically addressed and required in the minimum standards. The amount of employee parking and the distance it may be located from the proposed use shall be determined from information obtained through a statement of impact. The statement of impact shall address such things as:

- (1) Type of use
 - (2) Number of employees (perceived)
 - (3) Square feet of Sales Area, Service Area, etc. (as requested)
 - (4) Parking spaces proposed on-site
 - (5) Parking spaces proposed off-site
 - (6) Hours of operation
 - (7) Administration (enforcement and maintenance)
- d. All petitioners should be advised that in unusual or extreme circumstances, a petitioner may be asked to provide more than the minimum number of required parking stalls.
- e. The following are minimum standards for parking spaces to be maintained in connection with the buildings and uses indicated. In those instances where there are clearly identified multiple uses within a structure, the minimum standards shall apply to each use, resulting in a total parking requirement when summed.

<u>USE</u>	<u>PROPOSED PARKING REQUIREMENTS</u>
a) Theaters	one space per each four seats (designed seating capacity)
b) Bowling Alleys	four spaces per lane
c) Elementary and Junior High Schools	two spaces per each classroom
d) High Schools	one space per each four persons (designed capacity)
e) Day Care and Nursery Schools	one and one-half spaces per employee
f) Hospitals	one space per each two bed + two spaces per each three employees per employee shift
g) Nursing Homes	one space per each four beds one space per each three employees per employee shift
h) Hotels	one space per unit
i) Motels	one space per unit
j) Boarding Houses	one space per unit + one space per owner/manager
k) Clubs/Lodges	one space per each three persons (designed capacity)

USEPROPOSED PARKING REQUIREMENTS

l) Dormitories/Fraternities/ Sororities	one space per each two beds
m) Offices, Banks, Medical-Dental Clinics, and Government Offices	one space per each 300 square feet of floor area
n) Restaurants	one per three seats (designed seating capacity)
o) Bars/Nightclubs	one space per each two persons (designed capacity)
p) Mortuaries	one space per each five persons (designed capacity)
q) Retail Sales	one space per each 200 square feet sales area (includes employee parking)
r) Service Business (consists of beauty/barber shops, animal hospitals, frozen food lockers, laundries, and similar uses)	one space per each 300 square feet gross floor area (include employee parking)
s) Vehicles Sales (such as auto- mobile dealerships, used car sales, recreational vehicle sales, etc.)	an area = to 10% of the display area
t) Wholesale Business	employee parking plus 10% of total employee stalls for visitor parking
u) Warehousing	employee parking only
v) Industrial/Manufacturing	employee parking plus 10% of total for visitor parking
w) Residential	two spaces per dwelling unit
All Condition Uses (drive-in, auditoriums, trade schools, colleges, churches, etc.)	to be determined in conjunction with conditional use process.

1. Space dimensions...(See table)
2. Applicability...In the case of a use not specifically mentioned, the off-street parking standards for a similar use shall apply.
3. Mixed uses...In the case of mixed uses, the total area shall be the sum of the standards for the various unrelated uses.
4. Location...The parking area should be provided on the same property as the principal building wherever possible. In business, commercial, and industrial districts the parking may be within 400 feet of the property, but within a zone district permitting such parking use. Such separate parking lots shall be maintained as long as the principal buildings or uses are maintained. Parking spaces in residential districts shall not be in a front yard setback as required by setback regulations.
5. Use of off-street parking by another building...No part of an off-street parking space identified for any building or use shall be included as a part of an off-street area for another building or use, unless it is demonstrated such uses do not conflict with each other.

Joint parking facilities...The off-street parking requirements for churches, auditoriums, clubs or lodges may be supplied with other off-street facilities, provided other uses such as business offices, retail stores, manufacturing, or wholesale buildings, whose operations are not normally conducted during the same hours, subject to:

- (a) Off-street parking designated for joint use shall not be more than 400 feet from the property or use it is intended to serve, except that employee parking may be further if it can be reasonably used.
- (b) A business may purchase or long term lease off-street parking from a parking entity (public or private) to satisfy required parking minimums. Purchased or leased parking will be considered appropriate if it is within 400 feet of the property and can be demonstrated not to have an adverse affect on the existing parking supply.
- (c) Sufficient evidence shall be presented to demonstrate that there will be no substantial conflict in any joint parking arrangement.
- (d) Evidence in the form of a written agreement between the owners (or other parties of interest) of the structures or uses for which joint parking arrangements are proposed shall be presented with the application for a building permit and a copy of said agreement shall be maintained in the files of the Building Official.

6. Existing Parking Areas...Off-street parking space being maintained in any zone in connection with any existing building or use on the effective date of this ordinance shall be thereafter maintained unless there is an addition to an existing use which would subject the use to the adopted parking requirements.
7. Plan of Parking Areas...For any parking area, plans should be submitted to the Building Inspector, Traffic Engineer, and City Planner for investigation and recommendation.
8. When an area provides parking spaces for more than 15 cars, at least 5% of the total area shall be used for landscaping and/or aesthetic treatment requiring staff approval.
9. For each boundary line of a business parking area abutting directly on a residential use, there shall be a wall, fence or screen planting of a year-round nature, of six feet high except where setback requirements would limit it.
10. Multiple Family, Business, Commercial, and Industrial Uses shall be constructed and operated so as not to increase curb parking in residential areas.

PARKING ANGLE & STALL WIDTH	(A) STALL WIDTH PARALLEL TO AISLE	(B) STALL DEPTH	(C) AISLE WIDTH
<u>0°</u>			
9 - ft. stall	23	9	12
9.5- ft. stall	23	9.5	12
10 - ft. stall	23	10.0	12
<u>30°</u>			
9 - ft. stall	18	17.3	11
9.5- ft. stall	18.5	17.8	11
10 - ft. stall	19	18.2	11
<u>45°</u>			
8.5- ft. stall	12.0	17.5	13
9.0- ft. stall	12.7		12
9.5- ft. stall	13.4		11
<u>60°</u>			
8.5- ft. stall	9.8	19.0	18
9.0- ft. stall	10.4		16
9.5- ft. stall	11.0		15
<u>75°</u>			
8.5- ft. stall	8.3	19.5	25
9.0- ft. stall	9.3		23
9.5- ft. stall	9.8		22
<u>90°</u>			
8.5- ft. stall	8.5	18.5	28
9.0- ft. stall	9.0		25
9.5- ft. stall	9.5		24

