

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

CONFERENCE ROOM - CITY HALL

Wednesday - April 26, 1961 - 8:00 A.M.

Members present: Messrs. Elmer Nelson, Ray Meacham, Art Hadden, Alex Bauer, V. L. Colony, Mrs. Eleanor Diemer, and Mrs. William Hyde.

Others present: City Manager Joe Lacy, Development Director Don Warner, and Regional Planning Director Gene Allen, and a group of interested citizens.

I. MINUTES APPROVED

Motion was made by Mr. Bauer that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 29, 1961 be approved as written. Motion seconded by Mr. Colony, and carried.

III. HEARING ON ZONING CHANGE LOTS 1--11, EXPOSITION ARCADE, TABLED, PENDING MORE INFORMATION

Chairman Nelson announced that since a group of people were present in the interest of the rezoning hearing scheduled for this date (Item III on Agenda) the Commission would consider this item next, before the annexation petition scheduled as Item II on the Agenda.

The members of the Commission had inspected the site of the rezoning request, Lots 1 thru 11, Exposition Arcade (from alley West of 14th Street to 15th Street from Glenwood Avenue 150 ft. South). A change of zoning from R-3 to C-1 is requested for this area.

City Manager Lacy showed slides of the area in question and surrounding areas that would be affected.

This was the first rezoning hearing held under the recently adopted zoning ordinance, and the Chairman explained to those present that according to Section 10(e) of the ordinance it is necessary that each such request be accompanied by an economic justification study showing the need for such change.

Chairman Nelson then called upon Mr. Young who had presented the application for rezoning.

Mr. Young said that he had purchased the Holiday Motel with the idea of expanding it in the future. He desires to extend the motel back to Glenwood Avenue.

Mr. Warner presented the original plans which had been submitted for this motel when it was built. These plans allow for future expansion but state that the added units will be converted to apartment units.

Mr. Johnson, owner of Johnson's House of Flowers, pointed out that the area was a commercial area before it was in the City. He added that his trade area takes in the entire United States. He said that the present zoning restricts the expansion of his business to only 10% per year and feels that this zoning (R-3) is a wrong zoning for the area.

Mr. Warner said that he did not recall any provision of 10% per year expansion. He explained to Mr. Johnson that he was allowed to put the additional buildings there because he had the foundations already in and was not changing the character of the business.

Mr. Lacy pointed out that the present zoning had been considered at the time the new ordinance was written. At that time Mr. Johnson had wished to have C-1 zoning extended to Glenwood, but the R-3 zoning was adopted because with the exception of the Park View Motel and Johnson's House of Flowers the area is used as a residential area. Existing single-family dwellings would be facing directly into a business area if it is rezoned. The relative burden that would be placed on present property owners should be considered, he said.

Mr. Meacham said the Planning Commission must keep in mind the fact that part of this area is actually non-conforming. The entire area is adjacent to this business type of zoning so it would seem that in view of the homes next to this property the logical thing to do would be to square it off so there is some conformity of the zoning through the area.

It was also claimed by the applicants that the proposed zoning would conform more with the rest of North Avenue.

In general discussion following it was brought out that the Commission is trying to stay away from spot zoning; also if granted, would it stop here or would there be further petitions to extend the business zoning still further?

It was pointed out that the Park View Motel which extends to Glenwood does contain apartments. Although the physical appearance of the structure is about the same whether it is a motel or apartments, the usage is quite a bit different. A more permanent type of usage is indicated with the apartment-type of building. Although many apartments are vacant, they are not the desirable ones and since tourist business is seasonal it might prove profitable to have apartment units in connection with a motel.

Mr. Lacy pointed out that the former zoning allowed multiple family use and applied to motels as such. The present zoning does not allow motels, but does allow apartment units whether they are a part of a motel or just by themselves. He said the Commission must consider the applicant's point of view, that this would not make anything worse than it is already but no doubt improve the area; however they must also look at the problem from the other side and try to determine whether it would hurt the entire area in the long run. He said that outside of a few specialty businesses, this area is Grand Junction's tourist strip and these businesses do well here; however, many other types of businesses have not made a success in the area and if the requested zoning is allowed it would permit the type of development which might not succeed in the area and would only cause blight.

Gene Allen said this question involves a basic problem of determining the breaking point between commercial zoning and residential zoning. General speaking, he said, it is a better practice if it can be divided at an alley or in back of property rather than at a street line. Glenwood is a street, not an alley, and if the property owners who have commercial uses in the area can provide their own buffer between their business property and the residential uses it makes for a better situation. Although the businesses may not be able to utilize the back part of their properties quite as well as if it were all commercial, by being able to put in apartments it can be well used and still provide this buffer.

Mr. Nelson felt that it is a bit premature as far as the Commission's making a decision on this matter at this meeting is concerned. He explained that this is the first time the new ordinance has been used on this type of request and he thought the discussion has been very good. However he did not think it should continue until an economic study is presented to the Commission. There is nothing now to assure the Commission what might be put in the area.

Since Mr. Young has progressed as far on his project as he will now for the summer months and the postponement of the decision on this matter would not have any ill effect on it, Mr. Nelson said he felt that the Commission should have the over-all picture for the entire area. The Commission knows what is planned for three or four pieces of property in the area, but the intent for the entire area should be made clear. He read the list of possible businesses that might go into the area if it were zoned C-1, pointing out that once the area is zoned that way the Commission would have no control of what went in there as long as it is allowed in C-1 zoning, and some of these uses would be very undesirable in this area.

Mr. Johnson said, "Business is the life-blood of any community; anything that hamstrings business hamstrings Grand Junction".

Mr. Lacy said that business is the life-blood of any community and that both Mr. Johnson and Mr. Young bring in money from outside the community. He assured them that we want to do anything within reason for all property owners, but asked if they thought the value of residential property should be jeopardized just because a business could get a piece of ground to put in a business. He wondered how the three homes would like to have any of the C-1 uses that might go in right across the street.

Mr. Johnson said those three houses were built since the greenhouse was there. Also he said that his son has an expensive house out there and he does not want anything that would hurt his property.

Mr. Warner pointed out that this house faces away from the area, while the other houses actually face into this proposed rezoning. He said the residents in the area are trying to get the street widened so that it will be a full-scale street. These people and what might go in there have to be considered, not just the extension of the businesses located in the area. He also pointed out that the Commission could get a request from the people to the North for an extension of business zoning, and asked "will it be an extension of what is on North Avenue, or other small businesses that could go in there?"

Mr. Young mentioned that the motel on 7th Street is located in a residential area, and Mr. Feller said he thought if Mr. Young extended his motel it would improve the appearance of the property.

Mrs. Hyde asked what would constitute a good buffer zone in this case. Mr. Allen said the way it has been set up is about as good a buffer as we could have. Generally speaking, if you would step from a light commercial into a multiple family area or into a parking zone it is a pretty good step-down or buffer between the commercial and residential. He added that the motels that are there are not as much of a problem as the vacant property that is there, and what might go in there.

Mr. Lacy said we should also consider that in cities of our size and type there is traditionally about 4% of the land zoned and used by business; in Grand Junction there is already 7% of the land so zoned. Does the community need more business zone?

Mr. Johnson said the business zoning may not be where people want it or want to put in businesses. Also, he said if there is 3% more zoned for business than we should have then there should be more available for parking space. He noted that the supermarkets have taken whole blocks of residential area. He asked, "Because we are not a chain are we denied the right to expand our businesses?"

Mrs. Haish asked if, under the regulations, whatever would be allowed on North Avenue could go through to Glenwood. The answer was "yes". She then asked if the area is rezoned what it would do to taxes. Mr. Lacy explained it would not change the taxes until the use changes - a zoning change does not affect taxes.

Mrs. Diemer observed that there is not enough land there to develop into some big business; it would have to be a smaller type of business.

Mr. Meacham asked if B-1 zoning would allow the development of the motel and if it would not be a lot more restrictive than C-1 zoning?

Mr. Warner replied that B-1 zoning would allow the extension they want and would not allow other development; however, this zoning cannot be requested because no other B-1 is adjacent.

Chairman Nelson asked for a vote at this time from the Commission as to whether they wanted to accept or reject the responsibility of going ahead with either accepting or rejecting this matter at this time. He felt it would be wrong to go ahead and complete the matter at this time due to lack of information/<sup>and</sup> would like to have a vote for the record as to the thinking of the Commission before going into the actual rezoning of this area. He felt that the Commission has not been supplied with adequate information as to the future use of all of this property, also, that time is not as important as being right.

Mr. Lacy suggested that the Commission table the matter indefinitely until the application is completed with the survey, as required.

Mr. Young asked what else was needed, saying that they were the property owners and should have some say as to what they can do. Mr. Feller noted that all the property owners were present but Mr. Pray who was out of town; however he is in favor of the rezoning. He asked if each property owner should present a plan.

Mr. Nelson replied that it was necessary to know what all the plans are.

Mr. Allen said that what we want is whatever is good for the neighborhood and good for the community.

Mr. Meacham asked the group if they knew what all could go in there, and warned that if the entire area is rezoned without any plans there is a possibility of many things going in there that might be consistent with the remaining property and might not be. He told them they needed to protect themselves by knowing what can be put in and what might be put into the area.

Chairman Nelson then made the recommendation that the Commission follow the procedure as set forth in the zoning ordinance and asked Development Director Don Warner to see that each property owner does have adequate information to follow through on the survey required. This recommendation was agreeable to all Commission members.

The Chairman then said that this portion of the meeting will be postponed until such time as the required information is provided to the Commission. Mr. Nelson also said that he hoped this discussion gave the property owners a better view of the responsibility and thankless job the Commission has of trying to protect joint residential and business property.

## II. ANNEXATION OF 30-ACRE TRACT AT 28 ROAD & ORCHARD APPROVED (BARCO)

Development Director Don Warner said that this is a 30-acre area, with 20 acres signed up for annexation, (66%). A qualified petition has been presented. The petition circulator states there are no resident land owners. The Barco Development Company will subdivide and develop the area.

The boundaries and economic study have already been approved, and Mr. Warner explained that the action required now is to approve and recommend to the City Council the legality of the petition.

Mr. Colony made the motion that the Planning Commission approve this annexation as to the legality of the petitions presented and recommend it to the City Council. Motion was seconded by Mr. Meacham, and carried.

Mr. Warner stated that the above step (approving the legality of the petitions) is an unnecessary step for the Planning Commission to take after having approved the boundaries of an annexation and then its economic study. He recommended that the Commission request its discontinuance. Motion was made by Mr. Bauer that the Planning Commission request approval of the City Council to eliminate this third step in annexation procedure (that the Planning Commission approve the legality of petitions). Motion was seconded by Mr. Meacham, and carried.

PLANNING OFFICIAL CONFERENCE IN DENVER

City Manager Lacy announced the Planning Conference in Denver next week, mentioning that the sessions on Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning would be of particular interest to Grand Junction. Development Director Warner is planning to attend the entire conference, and Mr. Lacy asked any Commission members who would be interested in attending a part of the meeting to contact him.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Bauer, seconded by Mr. Hadden, and carried.

Respectfully submitted,

  
ELEANOR DIEMER,  
Secretary