

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

March 13, 1979

The first meeting of the month of March was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman FRANK SIMONETTI. The following members were present: JIM PICKENS, VIRGINIA FLAGER, FLORENCE GRAHAM, BILL MIKESELL, DALE SCHOENBECK and JANINE RIDER.

KARL METZNER, Planner; DON WARNER, Planner Analyst; and KAREN MAHER, Stenographer, were also present. There were approximately 10 interested citizens in the audience.

3. # 16-79 ZONING OF ANNEXATION TO PD-8 & PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Allen Jones. Location: Southeast corner of 27.5 Road and G Road. Development plan and zoning request for annexation to planned residential uses with a maximum of 8 units/acre on 40 acres. County R2 previous to annexation allows single family/duplex residential uses at 3.5 units/acre.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner familiarized the Planning Commission with the location of the parcel, briefly outlined the development plan details, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments.

In response to a question from Janine Rider, Karl Metzner demonstrated on the map where the clear zone would intersect the property.

Virginia Flager pointed out that there had been an extensive workshop several years ago while the airport was working out the areas of influence, and at that time the Highline Canal was designated the boundary for the clear zone.

Lloyd Unfred, representing the petitioner, stated that the petitioner is mainly interested in building single family dwellings, and if those single family dwellings work out well the proposed condominium or townhouse units may be abandoned in favor of all single family units. With respect to the fruit trees on the property, Mr. Unfred stated that many of the trees will remain as landscaping and would be properly maintained and sprayed for pest control. Lloyd Unfred added that the petitioner would develop and build the subdivision himself. The expected minimum house price would be around \$70,000, Mr. Unfred stated.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience. Bea O'Rear, 704 Bunker Drive, asked where the petitioner plans on locating the condominium units, and stated that she would like to see single family houses adjacent to Partee Heights where she lives. In response, Lloyd Unfred stated that the condominium units would be located in the lake area because the topography is better suited to multi-family dwellings. Mr. Unfred added that the proposed PD-8 is a much higher density than will be necessary; that the petitioner will build nothing over two or three stories.

Gloria Gross, 708 Bunker Drive, asked if there would be single family dwellings along G Road, and Mr. Unfred stated that there would be.

Virginia Flager stated she is opposed to using fruit trees for landscaping because, if not properly maintained and sprayed, they will become a nuisance to the residents. Virginia Flager asked what the petitioner will do when the trees mature past the fruit-bearing stage. Lloyd Unfred stated that the older trees would be removed and replaced with shade trees. Virginia Flager stated that a row of mature fruit trees interspersed with small, immature shade trees would be ragged, unattractive landscaping. Concerning the trees in the City right-of-way, Virginia Flager said she doesn't think it proper for the City to be stuck with the maintenance of those trees and the expense of replacing the dying fruit trees. Karl Metzner pointed out that though the trees are in the City right-of-way, the homeowners will be responsible for their maintenance. Virginia Flager also noted her concern that the spraying procedures would adversely affect children and older people with respiratory problems. Lloyd Unfred suggested that the petitioner may use a spray that would kill the blossoms on the trees, which would decrease the number of additional yearly sprayings and eliminate the problem of fruit falling and decaying on the ground.

In response to questions from Bill Mikesell, Lloyd Unfred explained that the homeowners association would control the irrigation system and maintenance of the landscaping and would function with yearly fees paid by the homeowners. Virginia Flager suggested that the lot sizes are too small to merit the \$70,000 price, and Mr. Unfred noted that 11 lots will be eliminated from the plan in order to increase the size of the remaining lots. Mr. Unfred also stated that the petitioner would look into the lake problems addressed in City Parks' comments, and pointed out that the lake serves as a storage area for the irrigation water. Florence Graham expressed concern that the lake would pose a danger for small children in the area, and Lloyd Unfred answered that he felt the danger would be minimal compared to ditches and canals in the area.

Gloria Gross, 708 Bunker Drive, stated she is pleased to see the additional single family units because they will add less traffic than multi-family units would.

In answer to questions from Jim Pickens, Lloyd Unfred said that the homeowners association would be recorded with the final plat and that the petitioners would be members of the association until the entire subdivision is built. Mr. Unfred added that the architectural styles were chosen because they are the most popular selling styles of houses.

With regard to soundproofing, Lloyd Unfred stated that the petitioner is still exploring ways to accomplish that, but will probably use R30 blown-in insulation in the ceilings.

James W. Spelman, Manager of Walker Field Public Airport Authority, pointed out that the extension of the threshold of Runway 4 is an outside possibility only in the very long-term future with no

current plans for doing that. That extension is shown purely to notify potential developers of the area that that possibility does exist, Mr. Spelman added. If the runway remains classified as a visual approach runway, no part of the clear zone would encroach on the subject parcel, even with a 1000-foot extension. However, if the runway is upgraded to a non-precision instrument approach runway, probably 150 feet of the corner of the subject parcel closest to the runway would fall within the clear zone. In the opinion of the Airport Authority, Mr. Spelman said, the idea of the runway extension should not be the deciding factor as to whether this development is a good idea or not. The Airport Authority takes no stand on whether this development shows good land use planning. Mr. Spelman noted that the City and County have the responsibility of setting guidelines for land use planning in key areas, which includes areas around airports.

James Spelman went on to urge the City to have a hearing in order to set guidelines and establish land use planning for the area around the airport before approving developments of this density. Mr. Spelman pointed out that a large portion of this property is under the approach zone to the airport for an existing runway and that the airport cannot and will not abandon that runway. The airport has an avigation easement over property at the end of that runway, and Mr. Spelman strongly suggested such an easement be put into the chain of title to lots in this development. Mr. Spelman explained that an avigation easement allows aircraft to use the air space above a certain height and gives them the right to make noise in doing so.

In response to questions from Planning Commission members, James Spelman defined the various areas of influence and demonstrated where the various zone boundaries would fall with respect to the subject property.

Bill Mikesell asked what the probabilities are for Runway 4 being extended 1000 feet, and Mr. Spelman answered that, from a safety standpoint, the Airport Authority would like to see the runway extended, but that that would still not affect the subject property unless the runway is reclassified, and that the 10-20 year prediction is reasonable. In answer to a question from Lloyd Unfred, Mr. Spelman noted that the 7000-foot "area of influence" would include the north part of the City of Grand Junction.

Dale Schoenbeck asked if the petitioner has any objection to including the avigation easement in the chain of title, and Lloyd Unfred stated that that would be no problem and would, in fact, serve to protect the petitioner as well.

Janine Rider asked what the Airport Authority's recommendation would be with respect to developing in that area, and James Spelman replied that, from the point of view of caution, he would like to see nothing built in the noise area until the Federal regulatory agencies set final guidelines for noise control. With regard to soundproofing, Mr. Spelman added that there are presently no criteria or standards for noiseproofing and that the petitioner may spend a great deal of money now to soundproof these homes and then some years in

the future may be required to spend even more money to correct or upgrade that soundproofing.

Janine Rider asked if there would be any benefit in protecting the 150-foot corner of the subject property, and James Spelman suggested that there would not; that if and when the runway is extended and reclassified, that the Airport Authority will buy that corner to secure the aviation rights to it.

Gloria Gross, 708 Bunker Drive, stressed the importance of improving the traffic situation in and around the G Road-Horizon Drive intersection. Virginia Flager suggested that this might be a good time to initiate correction of that intersection through the City Engineering Department, since further development in that area is inevitable.

Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

FLAGER/PICKENS/PASSED 6-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ZONING TO PD-8 TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

FLAGER/MIKESELL/PASSED 6-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND USES TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO ALL STAFF AND REVIEW SHEET COMMENTS, AND SPECIFICALLY RECOMMENDING KILLING THE BLOSSOMS ON THE FRUIT TREES ON THE PROPERTY TO AID PEST CONTROL; THAT THE ENGINEERING AND SEWER DETAILS BE WORKED OUT; THAT THE IRRIGATION PIPELINE THAT AFFECTS ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS BE RECOGNIZED; THAT THE PETITIONER WORK WITH THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY TO INSURE THAT THE AVIGATION EASEMENTS ARE INCLUDED IN THE CHAIN OF TITLE; AND THAT THE PETITIONER ADDRESS POSSIBLE PROBLEMS WITH THE LAKE.

RIDER/GRAHAM/PASSED 6-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL LOOK INTO CORRECTION OR IMPROVEMENT OF THE G ROAD-HORIZON DRIVE INTERSECTION.

4. # 19-79 TEXT CHANGE

Petitioner: Development Department Staff. Proposed change to Zoning Ordinance deleting the use category 5.6 specifying used goods businesses.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing.

Karl Metzner: This change is recommended because the impacts of a used retail sales business aren't any different than new retail sales.

Frank Simonetti: I have a problem with the appearance. The used goods establishments I have seen leave a lot to be desired.

Don Warner: We can take care of that with trash ordinances as far as external appearances.

Frank Simonetti asked for audience comments, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

RIDER/SCHOENBECK/PASSED 6-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND DELETION OF CATEGORY 5.6 FROM THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

5. # 21-79 AMENDMENT TO SMALL COOLEY COMPREHENSIVE ROADWAY PLAN
Petitioner: Planning Commission. Reclassification of 1st Street, Grand Avenue to North Avenue, from Arterial (100' right-of-way) to Collector (80' right-of-way and 45' setback).

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner explained the background of the request to the Planning Commission.

Frank Simonetti asked for audience comments, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

FLAGER/PICKENS/PASSED 6-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND RECLASSIFICATION OF FIRST STREET, GRAND AVENUE TO NORTH AVENUE, FROM AN ARTERIAL TO A COLLECTOR STREET.

The first meeting of the month of March was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.