

Date Received: 3-29

Item # 24-73

Request: Preliminary Plat

Location: Bell Ridge Subdivision

Location: SE 1/4 of NW 1/4 of Sec. 1, 400 ft N of F 1/2 Rd. & W of 27 1/2 Road (19th St)

Petitioner: William H. Huber N.H.P.Q.

Address: _____ Phone: _____

Advertised: No. Date: _____

To Planning Comm: Cancelled Per Huber / April 22 1973

Action: _____

Advertised: _____ Date: _____

To City Council: _____

Action: _____

Comments: _____

SCHOOL DISTRICT REPORT

MESA COUNTY VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 51

PRELIMINARY PLAN: BELL RIDGE SUBDIVISION

DATE: April 12, 1973

OWNERS AND/OR SUBDIVIDERS: William G. Huber
650 Round Hill Drive
Grand Junction, Colorado

1. What schools would children residing in the proposed plan or subdivision normally attend?

Tope Elementary School
West Junior High School
Grand Junction High School

2. What is the current enrollment and the projected maximum capacity of each of the respective schools?

Tope Elementary School	406	425
West Junior High School	590	675
Grand Junction High School	1,258	1,450

3. What is the anticipated enrollment of these schools within one year, inclusive of proposed plans and subdivisions already approved within the respective attendance area?

Previous plans and subdivisions have not been submitted for analysis prior to this year. Therefore, the information needed is unknown at this time.

4. What is the projected number of dwellings proposed in the subdivision?

29 building sites with a minimum lot size of 10,500 square feet.

5. What is the projected number of families proposed in the subdivision?

Estimated 29 families

6. What is the projected average number of persons per household?

Tope Area	3.2
West Area	3.0 +
G. J. Area	2.9

Average number of persons per household based upon Reporting Data for Colorado, Mesa County developed from the 1970 census data and produced by Applied Urbanetics, Inc., Washington, D. C.

7. What is the projected number of children who would reside in the subdivision?

$33.61\% \times 29 \text{ sites} \times 3.0 = 29 \text{ children}$

8. What is the projected number of school age (5-17) children who would reside in the subdivision?

$$29 \text{ children} \times 79.39\% = 23$$

9. What is the projected number of pre-school age children (under 5) who would reside in the subdivision?

$$29 \text{ children} \times 20.61\% = 6$$

10. What is the projected number of school age children who would attend each of the respective schools?

Tope Elementary School	=	12
West Junior High School	=	5
Grand Junction High School	=	6

11. When the projected number of school age children for each of the respective schools is added to the current enrollments plus the projected enrollment increases anticipated because of approval of subdivision plans is the resulting sum greater, equal, or less than the estimated capacity of the respective schools?

Tope Elementary School	Less
West Junior High School	Less
Grand Junction High School	Less

12. What means of transportation will be required for pupils attending each of the respective schools?

Pupils will need to be bused at each of the respective schools.

Mesa County Valley School District Transportation Policies provide transportation for elementary (K-6) pupils who reside one mile from school and provide transportation for secondary pupils who reside over two (2) miles from school.

13. Will bus transportation traffic have to pass through or enter the subdivision?

No. Pick-up of pupils can be made at main entrance to subdivision or 27½ Road

14. Is a bus transportation pickup point provided which would enable the bus to leave the main road safely to pick up pupils at a point distant from the main flow of vehicular traffic?

No. Turnout is planned or provided in the proposed plan. Consideration of this requirement should be given because of the necessity to bus all students. Space should be provided in the subdivision at the bus pickup point which will enable pupils to congregate without encroaching upon private property.

15. Are the roadways within the subdivision of adequate construction and width to accommodate school bus traffic?

Yes, but not applicable because students would have to be picked up at the entrance to the subdivision on 27½ Road.

16. Will a bus turn-a-round be required in the subdivision?

No. Bus would not be required to pass through the subdivision for pickup since roadway is dead ended with a temporary Cul-De-Sac.

17. Is there adequate provision for ingress and egress of school bus traffic in the subdivision?

Not applicable.

18. Will crosswalks be required for pedestrian traffic in or near the subdivision?

No.

19. Will signs be required to alert traffic of a heavy concentration of children coming from the subdivision?

Because of the numbers of pupils coming out one exit, warning signs would probably be advisable.

20. Will additional teachers be required to accommodate the additional pupils?

No.

21. Will additional facilities be required immediately to accommodate the additional pupils?

No.

23. What additional costs would the district experience in order to accommodate the additional pupils from the proposed subdivision?

With the present decline in enrollment, it is doubtful whether any additional cost would be anticipated in materials and supplies, however it may require an additional school bus and a bus route. We presently operate one bus which makes two (2) trips on 27½ Road to transport students east of 27½ Road to Fruitvale, Bookcliff and Central.

24. What conditions exist for pupils walking to and from school?

The conditions which exist in this area for pedestrian traffic are similar to all of the conditions existing for schools located outside the city of Grand Junction. Pedestrian paths and walkways are not provided along any county roads. It should be noted that detached sidewalks are also missing within the proposed subdivision.

25. Other recommendations.

It is recommended that the Commissioners of Mesa County assess fees for this subdivision in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations adopted August 31, 1972; and that said fee be set aside in separate funds identified as School Site Funds and Recreational Park Site Funds in accordance with the Colorado Revised Statutes 106-2-34 (as amended 1972).

Further, it is recommended that the County Commissioners provide a monthly statement of the School Site Fund to the Board of Education indicating the monthly beginning balance, the deposits made during the month (indicating fee assessed for the respective approved subdivisions making the deposit), the withdrawals authorized for the purchase of school sites officially approved by the Board of Education, and the ending balance for the month. Further, it is recommended that the School Site Fund be authorized for expenditure only upon the official approval of the Board of Education for the purchase of school sites.