

## ATTACH 1

### GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION December 13, 2016 MINUTES 6:00 p.m. to 8:12 p.m.

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Christian Reece. The hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium located at 250 N. 5th Street, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Also in attendance representing the City Planning Commission were Jon Buschhorn, Kathy Deppe, Ebe Eslami and Bill Wade.

In attendance, representing the City's Administration Department - Community Development, was Kathy Portner, Community Services Manager, Greg Moberg, Development Services Manager, Lori Bowers (Senior Planner), Scott Peterson (Senior Planner) Brian Rusche (Senior Planner), and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

Also present was Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney).

Lydia Reynolds was present to record the minutes.

There were 21 citizens in attendance during the hearing.

#### **Consent Agenda**

##### **1. Minutes of Previous Meetings**

*Action: Approve the minutes from the November 8th, 2016 Meeting.*

##### **2. Balanced Rock Way Vacation of Public Right-of-Way** [File# VAC-2016-407]

Request to vacate public Right-of-Way, known as Balanced Rock Way, located within Sundance Village Subdivision.

*Action: Recommendation to City Council*

Applicant: Rimrock Landing Apartment Investors LLC, c/o Lynn Rindlisbacher  
Hidden Cove LLC, c/o Nathan Coulter  
24.5 Road LLC, c/o LeAnn B. Maisel  
Location: Between Flat Top Lane and F<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Road  
Staff Presentation: Lori Bowers, Sr. Planner

##### **3. McHugh Zone of Annexation** [File#ANX-2016-490]

Request a zone of Annexation from County RSF-4 (Residential Single Family – 4 ac/du) to a City R-4 (Residential – 4 du/ac) on 1.20 +/- acres.

*Action: Recommendation to City Council*

Applicant: Richard and Virginia McHugh, Owners  
Location: 115 Vista Grande Road  
Staff Presentation: Scott Peterson, Sr. Planner

Chairman Reece briefly explained the Consent Agenda and invited the public, Planning Commissioners and staff to speak if they wanted the item pulled for a full hearing. With no requests to pull an item for full hearing, Chairman Reece asked for a motion.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Wade)** “Madam Chairman, I move that the Consent Agenda be approved as presented.”

Commissioner Deppe seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

**\*\*\*INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION\*\*\***

**4. Grand Junction Lodge Outline Development Plan [File#PLD-2016-501]**

Request to rezone from R-4 (Residential 4 du/ac) to PD (Planned Development) and approval of an Outline Development Plan to develop a 45,000 square foot Senior Living Facility on 2.069 acres in a PD (Planned Development) zone district.

*Action: Recommendation to City Council*

Applicant: Joe W. and Carol J. Ott, Trustees, Owners  
Sopris Lodge, LLC, Applicant  
Location: 2656 Patterson Road  
Staff Presentation: Kathy Portner, Community Services Manager

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Kathy Portner, Community Services Manager, stated that this request is to rezone the property at 2656 Patterson Road from R-4 to PD and includes a plan for an assisted living facility, not to exceed 45,000 square feet. The 2.069-acre site is located at the northeast corner of Patterson Road and North 8<sup>th</sup> Court.

Ms. Portner displayed a slide of the area, pointing out that the surrounding land uses include single-family residential to the west and north, as well as across the canal to the east. On the opposite side of Patterson Road are medical complexes associated with St. Mary’s Regional Medical Center. The applicants are proposing an assisted living facility, not to exceed 45,000 square feet, covering two (2) stories with no direct access to Patterson Road.

Ms. Portner explained that the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2010 designated both sides of Patterson Road as a Mixed Use Opportunity Corridor. A “form based” zone of the same name (MXOC) was established in 2014. The proposed ODP will utilize the MXOC zone as the “default zone” and proposes no deviations from its standards.

The impetus for the Planned Development is the fact that the form based zone allows a variety of commercial uses, in addition to group living facilities which is actually what is proposed for the property. By establishing the use of the PD as only an assisted living facility, the future use of the property is known as opposed to a “speculative” rezone.

The next slide Ms. Portner displayed was of the Existing Zoning Map and pointed out that the current zoning of R-4 would permit additional dwelling units, up to 4 per acre, without a rezone. The hospital area is zoned as a Planned Development, reflecting its unique size and function. Two properties within this portion of Patterson Road have been rezoned to Residential Office, which has no maximum residential density. The most prevalent zone is B-1 (Neighborhood Business), which includes offices both east and west of the hospital.

Ms. Portner pointed out that areas within a Mixed Use Opportunity corridor currently zoned for residential purposes may be rezoned for more intense use provided that form districts are utilized and the depth of the lot is at least 150 feet. The subject property meets this standard.

The next slide displayed was a schematic of the Outline Development Plan (ODP) which is to be adopted concurrently with the PD zone and will be recorded. This ODP outlines the access locations and building parameters for the future project.

Ms. Portner noted that the long-term community benefits of the proposed project include more effective use of infrastructure, reduced traffic demands when compared with other commercial uses, provision of a needed housing type particularly the memory-care portion, and innovative design through the use of sustainable materials.

A proposed site plan was displayed and it was explained that this constitutes the next step in the process which is a Final Development Plan that is done at a staff level review. Ms. Portner explained that this was included for illustrative purposes.

Similarly, a landscaping plan was displayed and included for illustrative purposes and will be incorporated into the next step in the process, which is the Final Development Plan. Ms. Portner noted that there are six (6) existing trees along the north property line that are to be preserved as part of this plan, along with three (3) on the eastern side of the property. The incorporating of existing landscaping is one of the sustainability and buffering elements proposed as part of this project.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT/CONCLUSIONS**

Ms. Portner stated that as outlined in the staff report, the request meets the standards for approval of the Planned Development and Outline Development Plan.

## **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Terry Claassen, Manager of GJSL LCC, explained he represents the group that has the property under contract. Mr. Claassen thanked the City Staff and his colleagues in the audience that worked on the project for the past year. Mr. Claassen explained that they are proposing the Grand Junction Lodge Senior Living Community which is a 48 unit assisted living and memory care facility.

Mr. Claassen showed slides listing current similar projects his company is developing in the region. Mr. Claassen noted that a demand/feasibility study was done by The Highland Group before initiating the proposal. Mr. Claassen explained that their plan for this project included the following points:

- High-quality environmentally friendly community.

- Directly across the street from St. Mary's Regional Hospital.
- One main residential "lodge" building.
- Offering only assisted living and memory care-minimum neighborhood impact.
- Designed to blend into the residential neighborhood to the north.
- Community concept to provide a myriad of services.
- Assisted living continuum of care which will cater to older, higher acuity adults who prefer to be in close proximity to a top notch Regional Hospital. No variances are being requested.
- Anticipate synergies of care with St. Mary's, Colorado mesa University Nursing Programs and with the neighborhood.

Mr. Claassen stated that as a result of the City Council meeting, three areas of concern were identified; the size of the facility, parking and traffic. As a result, they have reduced the size of the building 20% to 40,000 square feet. The number of parking spaces remain the same, however because the units have been reduced by 20%, there is a higher ratio of parking spaces per unit. Additionally, the proposed greenhouse has been moved closer to the building to provide a better buffer to the neighborhood to the north. Mr. Claassen emphasized that the location and its proximity to St. Mary's and the resources they provide makes this particular location desirable.

The next slide listed the businesses involved with the project which are primarily Colorado and Western Slope based.

Mr. Claassen explained that the Memory Care component of the project involves 10,000 square feet comprising 12 studio units. There are common areas for dining, living, as well as activity spaces. Also included in this section are indoor/outdoor wandering gardens and multi-functional and administrative space. Mr. Claassen went on to explain the family style or "greenhouse" living. Not to be confused with the actual greenhouse on the grounds, greenhouse living is where the residents live, eat and recreate together which has proven to be an effective model.

Mr. Claassen talked about the assisted living portion of the building which is 15,000 square feet. They have reduced the number of units from 48 to 36. There are 26 studio and 10 one bedroom units proposed. This section will have dining, living, fitness and swimming pool, theatre, large central fireplace, spa and other activity spaces. There is a chef on staff and they will provide multiple dining packages and seating options. The residents will also have access to a 800 square foot greenhouse with personal raised beds.

Mr. Claassen indicated they held a neighborhood meeting on August 1<sup>st</sup> on site to make it as convenient as possible to the neighborhood, however no citizens attended. Two of the concerns the neighbors had expressed at the City Council meeting was the parking ratio and overflow parking onto their streets. Mr. Claassen noted that they had addressed the parking ratio by adjusting down the number of units and they are committing to having a shuttle service for special events to an off-site location to prevent overflow on to the neighborhood to the north.

In addition, Mr. Claassen stated that although there are only 8-12 employees max per shift, the facility operator (Vivage) has agreed to stagger their employee shifts to off-peak hours. Although the residents don't drive, by lowering the amount of units/residents, the trips generated by staff and guests will be decreased.

A slide illustrating various other assisted living facilities in the area was displayed with the number of rooms, parking spaces and ratio of rooms per parking space which was part of the parking study. In this survey, the average parking spaces/unit was .62 and they are proposing .77 which is a higher ratio.

Skip Hudson, President of Turnkey Consulting, 587 Cascade Way, indicated that he will be discussing the Traffic Impact Study that his firm conducted for the proposed project. Mr. Hudson explained that the focus of the traffic study included confirming the existing traffic conditions in the study area especially the two intersections of 7<sup>th</sup> and Patterson and 8<sup>th</sup> and Patterson. The study included traffic counts and video documentation taken on a Thursday and Friday during peak hours in the morning and after school hours thru 6 pm.

Another component of the study was to calculate future traffic conditions with the project traffic included. The study also sought to determine traffic operation for each intersection as a stand-alone and evaluated the need for a westbound right turn lane on Patterson Rd. at 8<sup>th</sup> Court. The last element of the analysis was to evaluate safety consideration of closely spaced intersections. Mr. Hudson noted that there is approximately 300 feet between the intersections.

Mr. Hudson pointed out that this study used conservative assumptions whenever possible. That being said, the applicant has proposed to stagger staff hours to not impact the intersections during peak hours.

Mr. Hudson displayed a slide with an aerial photo of the intersections with the number of turns in each direction to illustrate the existing conditions of traffic volumes. The next slide was an aerial photo of the intersections with the existing conditions of traffic operations and Mr. Hudson explained what the level-of-service (LOS) times illustrated.

The next slide presented illustrated the existing conditions of the westbound queue. It was noted that the peak hour video documentation was two days, three camera angles and covered two peak periods of traffic on Oct. 16 and 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016. The findings included that 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. is blocked an average of 13 times per hour with an average of 144 seconds. The intersection is blocked by westbound traffic an average of 4% of the time with a maximum of 8% of the time. Mr. Hudson noted that this indicated that there are plenty of gaps for people to turn in and out of 8<sup>th</sup> Court in the current conditions even with traffic backing up from the 7<sup>th</sup> Street intersection. Mr. Hudson displayed a slide of the eastbound traffic wanting to turn onto 8<sup>th</sup> Court and noted that the backups occurred only 1 percent of the time and is not considered a concern.

Mr. Hudson displayed a chart of the anticipated traffic generated by the project and noted that the conclusion of this analysis is that the proposed project would generate less traffic than almost any other land use on this property including commercial or institutional land uses.

The future anticipated traffic volumes in the year 2037 indicated that only two seconds would be added to the level-of-service with regards to turning onto 8<sup>th</sup> Court.

Mr. Hudson explained the need for a future westbound right turn lane was based on criteria in the Grand Junction TEDS manual. This criteria indicates that it would be warranted if more than 22 vph would be making the right turn. The anticipated traffic volume for 2037 predicts only 4 vph, therefore he concludes that a right turn lane at 8<sup>th</sup> Court is not warranted now or in the future.

Mr. Hudson presented a slide with the following traffic evaluation conclusions:

- 1) the two intersections in the study area currently operate in a safe and effective manner,
- 2) the additional small amount of project traffic would not create any traffic operations problems at the two intersections,
- 3) and the intersection of Patterson Rd. and 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. would continue to operate well during the next 20 years.

Mr. Claassen then showed a site plan of the project and pointed out that they have scaled back the east portion of the building and brought the greenhouse south to provide a bigger buffer between the facility and the neighborhood of 8<sup>th</sup> Court to the north. The next slide Mr. Claassen showed was the floor plans and pointed out the paths, rooms and common areas. The following slide shown was the landscaping plan.

To conclude the presentation, Mr. Claassen noted that Vivage is a “market leader” and will be a great neighbor, as they plan to be long term owners who care about the area. Also noted was that the project is not skilled nursing and this use will have the lowest possible impact on the neighborhood and traffic. In addition, the project will have a mutually beneficial relationship with Colorado Mesa University and St. Mary’s. It was also noted that the size was reduced significantly from what was unanimously approve by Planning Commission in July 2016, and the three areas of concern voiced by City Council; size, parking and traffic have all been addressed.

### **QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT**

Commissioner Wade asked Mr. Hudson for his opinion of the left turn lane on Patterson and 7<sup>th</sup> St. that shares the same space as the left turn lane off Patterson onto 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. Mr. Hudson noted that there are unique situations all up and down Patterson and if he was designing from scratch, one of the alternative might be an access managed roadway with medians and driveways being right in, right out. Mr. Hudson pointed out that there would need to be a system wide improvement to take the next step in addressing the issues along Patterson that would be costly.

Commissioner Wade then asked if they had looked at any accident statistics in the study area. Mr. Hudson stated that they did not look at accident statistics, and noted that after watching five hours of videos, they were surprised to see people doing maneuvers such as U-turns around Patterson and 8<sup>th</sup> Ct., therefore, they must have felt comfortable with the traffic levels to do the U-turns.

### **QUESTIONS FOR STAFF**

Commissioner Wade asked Mr. Dorris if there was crash data available for those two intersections. Mr. Dorris stated that he did look at crash data and there were a few crashes, however, none were attributed to 8<sup>th</sup> Court. Mr. Dorris explained that most of the crashes were rear-end crashes at 7<sup>th</sup> street.

With no further questions for staff, Chairman Reese opened the meeting up to public comment.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Troy Gorman, 2712 North 8<sup>th</sup> Ct., noted that he has seen three different quotes on the size of the facility including 45,000, 48,000 and approximately 40,000 square feet. Mr. Gorman stated that the card that was sent to the neighbors stated 45,000 square feet but the original plan was 50,000 square feet. Originally he was told there would be 60 units, and now there are 36 proposed. Mr. Gorman questioned how they go from 60 to 36 units and only take out 5,000 square feet.

Mr. Gorman also asked why a second traffic study was conducted if the first study passed. It was Mr. Gorman's understanding the traffic numbers were larger in the second study and questioned how the numbers could have increased with the smaller facility.

Regarding the neighborhood meeting conducted on August 1, 2016, Mr. Gorman stated that there was no one in attendance because not of the neighbors received notification.

Mr. Gorman indicated that there is not a lot of traffic presently to 8<sup>th</sup> Ct., however he anticipates that there will be a lot of traffic generated by the facility. Mr. Gorman noted that the only indication he observed that the traffic study was conducted was a hose running across the street.

Mr. Gorman stated that the applicants had exceeded the amount of parking as compared to other facilities in the area, but asked if they actually asked the people running the facilities if their parking was adequate for their needs. Mr. Gorman questioned the assumption that the residents will not have their own cars.

Concerning the trees noted in the landscaping plan along the north border, Mr. Gorman stated that half of the trees are dead

Mr. Gorman questioned how the corridor can be called mixed use when it is all commercial from 12<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> along Patterson with the exception of three houses.

Chairman Reece stated that the need for the second traffic study came from comments from the City Council in their review of the proposal. Chairman Reece asked the applicant to speak to the other questions Mr. Gorman brought up.

Regarding the size of the facility, Mr. Claassen clarified that the facility went from 60 units to 48 total units. They reduced the number of assisted living units from 48 to 36, but the number of memory care units has stayed consistently twelve.

Mr. Claassen stated that they are looking at a 40,000 square foot facility, but when they filled out the application, they put down 45,000 to error on the high side if necessary. He noted that the actual construction drawings have not been done and when they go for permitting they anticipate the facility to be around 40,000 square feet. Mr. Claassen explained that they have reduced the number of units by 12 and each unit is about 350 to 400 square feet, therefore the reduction is roughly 5,000 square feet.

Chairman Reece asked the applicant if they had consulted with other facilities regarding their parking needs. Mr. Claassen replied that they had looked at all of the facilities on their list and noted that all but a half of dozen days per year their parking lots are empty other than employee parking. Mr. Claassen went on to explain that the nature of assisted living is that the residents need assistance with daily tasks such as bathing, eating, etc. and are not going to be driving.

Commissioner Wade asked if a resident could have a car if they wanted to. Mr. Claassen stated that the majority of the residents do not even have a driver's license. Commissioner Wade asked if they actually spoke with the other facilities operators. Mr. Claassen stated that Vivage called each facility and asked about the parking, but he is not sure if they specifically asked if they felt like it was enough parking.

Chairman Reece noted that there was some concern about the trees that were shown on the landscaping plan were dead. Mr. Claassen stated that they would certainly check the condition of the trees and make sure they were viable or replaced. Commissioner Eslami noted that the City would not allow for them to have the dead trees on the property anyway, so the point was moot.

Addressing Mr. Gorman's observation that the traffic numbers were higher in the second study (with a smaller facility), Mr. Hudson explained that the first study factored in a vacancy rate for trip generation purposes. Mr. Hudson stated that for the second study, he assumed 100 percent bed occupancy so that the most conservative factor is used and reflects maximum trip generation. Mr. Hudson also noted that the national average for a single family home is ten trips generated per day.

Mr. Hudson pointed out that they did not use tubes for data collection of the intersections. Cameras were mounted on poles and signs at the intersection and video detection is the state-of-the-art way data collection is done today.

Commissioner Deppe asked the applicant how the neighbors were notified of the neighborhood meeting. Mr. Claassen stated that they had sent out meeting notifications ten business days ahead of the meeting and only one card was returned undeliverable out of over 50 cards sent.

Wade Johnson, 2881 B ½ Rd., stated that he has traveled from his home to Horizon Dr. and back for the past 30 years. Mr. Johnson stated that he uses 7<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Street and making a left turn onto 7<sup>th</sup> off of Patterson is difficult and backed up at the noon hour and after 4 pm. Mr. Johnson has a concern about the safety and the costs that may be involved to improve the situation.

Pauline Gorman, 2712 North 8<sup>th</sup> Ct., stated that she and her neighbors have met multiple times over the year regarding the property. Ms. Gorman stated that none of them have an issue with the building itself, but object to it being shoe-horned onto this property. Ms. Gorman noted that she and her husband are aware of someone expressing interest in purchasing the property to build two to four homes on the property.

One of the concerns she has is that there are four residential senior living facilities being built within a one-mile radius of this property. Ms. Gorman understands the desirability for them to be located in close proximity of St. Mary's hospital, however she does not understand why the Planning Commissioners are not doing more to have these facilities located around Community Hospital where there are more spacious properties available with the same nearby amenities.

Ms. Gorman stated that when "The House" was located on their street, they were told it was for unfortunate teenagers from the area who are by themselves and homeless. Ms. Gorman stated that this was not true and the residents are actually for the most part, 19-21 year olds from out-of-state. She noted that the residents are doing lewd things on the street and parking in front of their homes and scaring their children and their grandparents in their cars. Ms. Gorman stated that she is not bringing it up for the Commission to do anything about that situation, but to



realize it was presented as a good thing for the community, but has brought a “derelict personality” to their street. Ms. Gorman predicted that whatever is done with the proposed property, they will have delinquents running through the property. Ms. Gorman added that “The House” has room to park 4 cars in the driveway, but speculated that the residents are told not to park in the driveway so they park on the street.

Ms. Gorman stated that she and her neighbors feel that as a result of the proposed facility, they will need to ask people to move their parked cars, they will have to listen to food delivery trucks, trash trucks every other day or however often as well as ambulances.

Ms. Gorman stated that there is a lot of traffic and many accidents along Patterson Rd. between 7<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>. Another concern Ms. Gorman expressed is the environmental impact of the development, and noted that they have Peregrine falcons that nest, deer and quail that are present in the neighborhood.

Richard Troester, 2714 N 8<sup>th</sup> Court stated that he observed at the previous Planning Commission hearing the Commissioners questioned validity of the number of parking spaces and the number of rooms and he feels the Commissioners were given “bogus” numbers. He stated that his opinion was that none of the Commissioners believed the project which is why they questioned it. Mr. Troester stated that he was in mortgage business for over 25 years. Mr. Troester implied that developers manipulate the numbers to make the project look good and the Commissioners are to “read through” that and make sense of it. Mr. Troester questioned why the Commissioners are there reviewing the project if the numbers meet the code. He felt that their (Commissioners) job was to read through the number which could be fraudulent but they chose to pass it onto City Council.

Mr. Troester stated that there is a big traffic problem along Patterson between 7<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> and doesn't understand why the Planning Commission would approve a project that would add to the problem. Mr. Troester said it was a nice project, but it is being shoe-horned into a property and asked the Planning Commission to put it somewhere else. Mr. Troester felt the traffic study misrepresents the scenario because of the nature of overflow parking in this area will heavily impact their cul-de-sac compared to other facilities that it was compared to.

Mr. Troester asked if any of the Planning Commissioner read the City Councils response. He does not feel the proposed facility is a good fit for the property. Mr. Troester said the City Council does not want to change the zoning and asked that the Planning Commissioners to not make changes that will impact Patterson between 7<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> St. Mr. Troester then spoke to the improbability that a shuttle during holidays would be a feasible solution to potential traffic overflow.

Commissioner Deppe asked Mr. Troester what he would propose to be put on that corner. Mr. Troester stated that at one time the residents had talked about buying the property and putting two or three homes on it. Now, he thinks a house for St. Mary's like the McDonalds House model. Commissioner Deppe stated that there would still be parking and traffic issues associated with that. Commissioner Deppe also added that the average trips per day for a single family home is ten, therefore four homes would generate 40 trips a day.

Commissioner Wade indicated that he would like to address a statement that Mr. Troester had made. Noting that Mr. Troester said that he had wished the Planning Commissioners studied the proposal before the last meeting, as well as read the City Council minutes, Commissioner Wade stated that that statement was completely erroneous. Commissioner Wade stated that

each one of them had studied the project in detail. He went on to explain that the Planning Commission, as an advisory board, has to review for code issues. Commissioner Wade stated that they can't look at a project and say they don't like it, their job is to see if it complies with the code.

Mr. Troester responded by saying that the Planning Commissioners passed it the first time based on the developer's opinions and that it complied with the code, however that doesn't make it a good fit for the area.

Commissioner Eslami stated that the City Council is bound by their constituents, however the Planning Commission's job is to review the project for compliance with the code. Mr. Troester stated that he agrees with that but the Commissioner 'should not believe the numbers they are being told and they should ask for details and follow-up. Commissioner Eslami stated he is confident of the numbers they were given because he has been in the business for 50 years. Commissioner Eslami added that theoretically, as a developer he could put up to 8 houses on that property. He added that eight houses would create far more traffic, noise and problems for the neighborhood than the proposed project would.

George Jachim, 2715 N 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. noted that he did see Mr. Claassen in the neighborhood in August, but he didn't realize there was a meeting. Mr. Jachim stated that he would like to go on record that he is against the project. Mr. Jachim agreed with the study that there is a small amount of traffic going into and out of N 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. Mr. Jachim stated that he may need more clarification on the study, as it looks like the project could triple or quadruple the amount of traffic going into and out of N 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. Mr. Jachim stated that he would like to see one or two single family residences on the property.

Vicki Bledsoe, 2719 N 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. stated that she has lived in her home for 18 years. Ms. Bledsoe stated that her husband needs to go to the Doctors often. Last week they left their house 35 minutes before the appointment. When they got to the intersection of N. 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. and Patterson, they sat there thru three red lights and subsequently got to their appointment (further down Patterson) ten minutes ahead of the appointment. She stated that the traffic has slowly become unbelievable.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that their neighborhood is unique in that they have deer, raccoon, skunks, squirrels and quail. She expressed concern that if this project is allowed, there will be more commercial development. Ms. Bledsoe said many people don't even know the cul-de-sac is there and she has had people visit who have lived here 30 years and didn't know it existed. She noted that she appreciates its uniqueness and would like it to stay that way.

With no further comments, Chairman Reece closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

### **QUESTIONS FOR STAFF**

Commissioner Wade asked Mr. Dorris if during the course of discussions with the applicant and his studies of the traffic, was the limited amount of parking along N 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. ever taken into account. Mr. Dorris noted that Mr. Rusche (Senior Planner) probably dealt with that issue more, however he pointed out that it is legal to park on that street as it is public right-of-way. Mr. Dorris stated that they did a parking analysis of other facilities and there is more parking proposed than there is available at other assisted living facilities.

Ms. Portner stated that as they review any project, there are minimum parking requirements that must be met on site. Whether there is available parking on street or not, the code's requirement is that the required parking must be available on site of the development with no assumption that additional parking is needed. Ms. Portner noted that the proposed project's parking exceeds the requirement.

### **APPLICANT REBUTTAL**

Mr. Claassen, Grand Junction Senior Living LLC, was asked to address a citizens concern that the traffic on N 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. will be tripled or quadrupled. Mr. Claassen referred the question to Mr. Hudson who stated that traffic gap waits will go from two or three seconds to no more than ten seconds for each movement. The base numbers are so low, that a percentage number may seem high, but they are still looking at less than ten trips in the peak hour for any of these movements.

Chairman Reece inquired about the citizens concern about food and trash trucks visiting the facility. Mr. Claassen stated that trash trucks would not be coming more frequently than they do for the neighborhood, probably once every week on average but possible more frequent during peak times such as holidays. Regarding delivery trucks, Mr. Claassen stated that they could work with the neighbors to have the delivery trucks come at hours when it is least disruptive the neighborhood.

Commissioner Wade noted that linen service can have a big impact and asked if they will be doing laundry on-site. Mr. Claassen stated that they will have commercial laundry services on-site.

Commissioner Wade asked Mr. Claassen if any of the other facilities they have worked on have this same situation where there is a major corridor on one side and a small residential neighborhood on the other side. Mr. Claassen stated that he does not know of any facility they have where there is on-street parking utilized when they have provided a parking facility on site.

### **COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION**

Noting that the City Council's concerns regarding the project were size, parking and traffic, Commissioner Deppe stated that after attending the workshop and hearing the applicant tonight, she feels they have addressed the issues adequately. She understands the neighbor's concerns and feels there is a level of distrust due to the building size changes and several of the neighbors stated they had not been notified of the neighborhood meeting.

Commissioner Eslami stated that he has visited several of these types of facilities and has not found parking to ever be a problem even on holidays. Acknowledging that there is a traffic problem along the Patterson corridor, Commissioner Eslami noted that this facility potentially will have minimal impact compared to having four or five houses on the property. He also feels the applicant has made concessions to appease the neighborhood and the facility looks nice in the area.

Commissioner Buschhorn agreed with Commissioner Eslami that the traffic along the Patterson corridor is an issue, but that whether this facility goes in or not, Patterson will still grow at the same rate. Commission Buschhorn stated that the applicant has done an admirable job in changing the size of the building and retaining the same amount of parking as well as changing the scheduling of shift changes to off peak times. Recognizing the neighbors desire to have the

property become single family home(s), Commission Buschhorn does not feel one large home is marketable at that location and several single family homes, even if marketable for the cost of the land, would not lower traffic impact.

Commissioner Wade asked Mr. Dorris if the City could prohibit left turns on Patterson at the location whether there is a median built or not. Mr. Dorris stated that even if they sign it, people will do it anyway. The City has the right to place medians along Patterson and prohibit left in, left out turns, however that will be very costly and if implemented, it would most likely been done after a public process and in sections at a time.

Commissioner Wade talked about the Commissioner's role in the process and reiterated that when a project comes before them and it is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and meets current code, it is very difficult not to pass it on the City Council. City Council has more leeway and is able to base approval on whether they think it is a good project for the site. Commissioner Wade stated that he has reservations about the project and understands the neighbor's concerns, but acknowledges that it does meet the code.

Chairman Reece agreed with all of the comments that the other Commissioners had just made. Regarding a comment from the public that the Planning Commission should force development around Community Hospital, Chairman Reece clarified that development is a private market driven process. The Planning Commission's role is to approve or disapprove projects based on whether they comply with the code. Chairman Reece stated that the Commission does not have the power to tell a developer where to develop, nor should they.

Referring to a comment from the public questioning whether the Commissioners even read the project information, Chairman Reece explained that the Commissioners are volunteers, appointed by City Council, and they spend a great deal of time reading hundreds of pages of reports as well as attend pre-hearing workshops and the Planning Commission meetings.

Chairman Reece stated that this project as well as all the projects that come before the Commission are very well vetted and the Commission works hard to act on behalf of the citizens of the City of Grand Junction.

Chairman Reece commented that in her opinion, this project and its developers have bent over backwards to accommodate the neighbors on N 8<sup>th</sup> Ct. Chairman Reece said she applauds the developer for taking into consideration the neighbors' concerns and modifying the project to address the issues.

**MOTION:** (Commissioner Eslami) "Madam Chairman, on item PLD-2016-501, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council on the requested Outline Development Plan as a Planned Development Ordinance for Grand Junction Lodge, with the findings of fact, conclusions, and conditions identified within the staff report."

Commissioner Buschhorn seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

The Planning Commission took a five-minute break at this time.

## **5. 2017 Master Plan for St. Mary's Hospital**

[File#FMP-2016-486]

Request approval of an Institutional and Civic Master Plan for St. Mary's Hospital for properties on a total of 51 +/- acres.

*Action: Recommendation to City Council*

Applicant: Dan Prinster, St. Mary's Vice-President of Business Development  
Location: 2635 N. 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Staff Presentation: Scott Peterson, Sr. Planner

## **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Scott Peterson, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the project starting with a slide of the map that highlights all properties that St. Mary's owns which total over 51 acres. Mr. Peterson noted that the St. Mary's campus is zoned Planned Development.

Mr. Peterson explained that St. Mary's Hospital prepared its first Master Plan in 1995 in an effort to avoid approving hospital expansions in a piecemeal fashion and at the direction of the Grand Junction Planning Commission. The purpose of the Plan is to set forth the vision for upgrades, improvements and expansions to St. Mary's facilities and campus area over a 5-year period and to allow the City an opportunity to consider the proposed improvements in a comprehensive manner. Since 1995, St. Mary's has updated and received approval by the City of their Master Plan every five years.

Mr. Peterson then showed a slide that illustrated the Master Plan 2017 that proposes the following construction projects over the upcoming 5-years:

1. Continue with the interior remodeling of several departments in the older areas of the hospital, including electrical infrastructure.
2. Demolish the Farrell Building (2320 N. 7<sup>th</sup> Street) and also the building at 2323 N. 7<sup>th</sup> Street and replace with landscaping improvements.
3. Renovation and new construction of an additional 40,000 sq. ft. (2-floors) for the Cardiac Center of Excellence.
4. New construction of an additional 14,000 sq. ft. for the Hybrid Operating Room.
5. Study the idea of constructing an additional 51,000 sq. ft. (2-floors) for the Laboratory and Pharmacy expansions. The construction is anticipated within 5-years, but an actual date is not yet determined, so this expansion might be delayed until Master Plan 2022.

In looking at the review criteria for a Master Plan, City Staff feels that the Plan complies with the Grand Valley Circulation Plan and Transportation Engineering Design Standards (TEDS).

Mr. Peterson indicated that proper access was previously established by St. Mary's with the design and approval of the patient tower project in 2006 and there are no additional plans to provide for a new traffic study or change current access points to the hospital.

Mr. Peterson stated that St. Mary's has an excess of required parking spaces for all their properties by over 500 spaces.

Also, existing detention facilities can handle the new increase in proposed building expansions, therefore, adequate off-street parking and stormwater/drainage improvements have been addressed.

Mr. Peterson explained that St. Mary's officials have also met with the residential neighborhood to the west to help address their concerns regarding existing and proposed developments for the hospital campus. Master Plan 2017 will also provide numerous community benefits in the continued advancement of health care for the region as St. Mary's continues to add, remodel and update their existing facilities in the coming 5 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Peterson stated that the review criteria of the Zoning and Development Code have all been met or addressed.

## **APPLICANTS PRESENTATION**

Dan Prinster, Vice-President of Planning and Business Development, St. Mary's Hospital, stated that he has been with St. Mary's for 20 years. Mr. Prinster explained that when he first started, one of the project he worked on was the 1999 Master Site Plan that was to be adopted in 2000. Mr. Prinster explained that they wanted to develop their campus and meet their future needs by working collaboratively with the City to create the best outcome for both. Mr. Prinster stated that he feels they have done that and expressed appreciation for the City staff in that area.

Mr. Prinster talked about the market forces in play that changes the nature of healthcare. The Master Plan reflects the changes that they need to make to accommodate modern technology and costs savings where possible. Mr. Prinster noted that the Master Plan is more scaled down than previous plans and prepares the campus for more outpatient services.

Eric Tschertter, Chamberlain Architecture, talked about some of the items proposed in the Master Plan and noted that there are no proposed changes to parking or access.

Chairman Reece opened the public hearing portion of the meeting and asked anyone in favor or opposed to the project to please come forward. Hearing none, Chairman Reece closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Wade thanked the applicant for providing the Planning Commission with the opportunity to review their Master Plan.

**MOTION:** (Commissioner Wade) "Madam Chairman, on the Institutional and Civic Facility Master Plan 2017 for St. Mary's Hospital, FMP-2016-486, I move that the Planning Commission forward to the City Council a recommendation of approval with the findings of facts and conclusions listed in the staff report."

Commissioner Deppe seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

## **6. Other Business**

Greg Moberg, Development Services Manager reminded the Commissioners that there will not be a second workshop or meeting in December.

Chairman Reece thanked Mr. Moberg and Brian Rusche (who was not present at the time) for their service to the City of Grand Junction. Mr. Moberg stated that it was a pleasure to have worked with the Planning Commissioners of the City of Grand Junction.

## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 pm