

Table of Contents

File 1981-0072
Date 3/5/02

Project Name: Carpenter Subdivision – Rezone RMF-64 to C1

P S A few items are denoted with an asterisk (*), which means they are to be scanned for permanent record on the in some
r e instances, not all entries designated to be scanned by the department are present in the file. There are also documents
s e specific to certain files, not found on the standard list. For this reason, a checklist has been provided.
n e Remaining items, (not selected for scanning), will be marked present on the checklist. This index can serve as a quick
d guide for the contents of each file.
Files denoted with (**) are to be located using the ISYS Query System. Planning Clearance will need to be typed in full, as well as other entries such as Ordinances, Resolutions, Board of Appeals, and etc.

X		*Summary Sheet – Table of Contents
X	X	Review Sheet Summary
X		Application form
X		Review Sheets
		Receipts for fees paid for anything
		*Submittal checklist
		*General project report
		Reduced copy of final plans or drawings
X		Reduction of assessor's map
		Evidence of title, deeds
X	X	*Mailing list to adjacent property owners
		Public notice cards
		Record of certified mail
		Legal description
		Appraisal of raw land
		Reduction of any maps – final copy
		*Final reports for drainage and soils (geotechnical reports)
		Other bound or nonbound reports
		Traffic studies
		Individual review comments from agencies
		*Consolidated review comments list
		*Petitioner's response to comments
		*Staff Reports
		*Planning Commission staff report and exhibits
		*City Council staff report and exhibits
		*Summary sheet of final conditions
		*Letters and correspondence dated after the date of final approval (pertaining to change in conditions or expiration date)

DOCUMENTS SPECIFIC TO THIS DEVELOPMENT FILE:

X	X	Action Sheet	X	Deed
X	X	Review Sheet Summary	X	X
X		Review Sheets	X	Handwritten Notes to file – no date
X	X	List of Property Owners within the distance required		
X	X	Petition and letters from those who are opposed to the rezone – 9/29/81		
X		Photographs of Lots 1 & 2		
X		Letter from Alex Candelaria to Mr. & Mrs. John Trujillo re: Letter to inform about item in public hearing – 11/4/81		
X	X	Planning Commission Minutes - ** - 7/28/81, 9/29/81 and 10/27/81		
X		Development Application		
X		Public Notice Posting		
X	X	Letter from William Ryden to Planning Staff re: Thomas plans to extend the improvements on Peach and Vine Streets at the time of construction on this property, eliminating the need for Power of Attorney – 7/2781		
X	X	Impact Statement – 6/30/81		

OVERALL COMPATIBILITY

The property in question has belonged to the same family since before 1900, with no improvements. It remains vacant and unimproved with a minimum tax base. There should be no inconvenience whatsoever to the public in general, or to the environment. The property is adjacent to commercial property on the entire north side, which has had no detrimental effect on anyone.

CONSISTENCY

These particular lots are adjacent to commercial subdivisions 6&50, which is rapidly being developed and has no apparent detrimental impact on the area in question.

ADJACENT-PROPERTY

The surrounding property is commercial to the North, North-East and Northwest. There is one unimproved and vacant house to the south, one vacant lot to the west, one rental house to the southwest and one rental house to the southeast.

CHANGE IN THE AREA

No change in the area will be necessary as applicant will enter and exit from the north on Peach and Vine Street, which will cause no interference to the inhabitants of the area.

TRAFFIC IMPACT

Peach and Vine will be utilized from the alley between West Ouray and West Chipeta to the North. No traffic to the South or to Hiway 340 will be of any advantage to the applicant.


There should be no traffic impact on any of the streets south of the applicants property.

It is the applicant's belief that if financing were available for residential development in the El Poso area there would be 80 to 90 per cent greater impact than there will be for the purpose intended by the applicant.

Also, the applicant believes that this type of property (unimproved) with no production and minimal tax base should be given the utmost consideration. The applicant's plan would have no adverse effect on the neighborhood nor traffic wise, and will indeed improve the vicinity plus added employment.

The applicant has attempted to contact each and every one to explain the contemplated purpose of having the property rezoned to C-1. The majority was not adverse to the zone change.

Sincerely


A. C. Thomas
2811 Texas
Grand Junction, Colo.
243-7672

Neighborhood Mtg.
Sat. 6:30
Sun. 6:30

Name	Date	Address
John Sines	Oct 19, 1986	323 West Oway
Off Rabona	04 1986	URAF
Frank Jimenez	320 West Grand	Dr. Junter
Charles A. Sinton	412 1/2 West Grand	
Marvin E Maldonado	527 W. Oway Ave.	402
Frank Maldonado	402 West Grand	
Julia Maldonado	402 West Grand	
Virginia S. Dujillo	323 West Oway	

Petitioner didn't show.

September 29, 1981

We the undersigned, of Mesa County, that reside
in the "El Poso Area", are against the rezoning of
section # 72-81 (Rezone RMF -64 to CL).

Witnessed by Virginia J. Trujillo

signed Below Signed by _____

Mrs Bern Miller
310 West Huray, 28. in house,
Frank Maldonado

Julia Maldonado

Oliver Roberts 404 W Huray

Rose Garcia

Roy Blankenhorn 505 W Huray

Charles A. Seyton 412 $\frac{1}{2}$ W Grand

Everett Richardson 412 $\frac{1}{2}$ W Grand

Elie Richardson 412 $\frac{1}{2}$ W Grand

July 28, 1981

I the undersigned do not want
to rezone. we want to keep Residential
Multi-F 64. we are unable to be here.

Signature witnessed by Virginia
S. Brujillo

Mr. + Mrs. Frank Maldonado 243-7309

402 West Grand Ave.

Charles A. Sinton 412 1/2 W. Grand PH. 70245
west 8491

Earl Richardson 412 1/2 Grand

Elsie Richardson 412 1/2 West Grand

Frank Jimenez Jr 390 West Grand Dr. Janet + Col
241-1546



COLORADO WEST
SURVEYING COMPANY

comprehensive land planning
complete surveying service

835 COLORADO AVENUE • 303 245-2767 • GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO 81501

June 30, 1981

City Planning
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

Re: UM 8-57FN-1
Thomas rezone

IMPACT STATEMENT

Due to the original zoning, there is some question as to a mechanical error with the zoning in relation to the existing facilities, mainly derived because of the close proximity of Highway 6 & 50 and the railroad.

In the last three years there has been significant change in the surrounding area. 6 & 50 Highway West Subdivision, lies adjacent to this property on the North. This is a commercial subdivision with many large buildings and warehouses.

A large metal building used as a warehouse is immediately North of this property.

To the North and East is Rainbow Roller Rink.

The streets to the North are all paved with curb and gutter and has good access to Highway 6 & 50 West.

To the South, there are a few scattered residences. One immediately South is situated on Lots 18 and 19, Block 2 of Carpenters Subdivision No. 2.

Directly to the East and West, the land is vacant.

Although the Six and Fifty West Subdivision is only partially built, the future growth of the Grand Valley demands commercial warehouse space close to the core city with access to a major highway.

Neenah Board

25% COTTON CLOVER 5/8/81

EU



COLORADO WEST
SURVEYING COMPANY

comprehensive land planning
complete surveying service

835 COLORADO AVENUE • 303 245-2767 • GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO 81501

July 27, 1981

City Planning Staff
City of Grand Junction
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

Re: File # 72-81
A. C. Thomas
Rezone R3 to C1

Dear Planning Staff:

This letter is an addendum to the letter submitted by Mr. A. C. Thomas.

City Engineer

Mr. Thomas plans to extend the improvements on Peach and Vine Streets at the time of construction on this property, eliminating the need for Power of Attorney or Power of Attorney will be provided if necessary.

Staff Comments

The neighboring land owners were contacted individually, whenever possible. Mr. Thomas was unable to contact some. Out of twelve (12) adjoining land owners, seven (7) had no objection, see attached list.

A screening fence, six (6) foot chainlink with slats will be built. The alley will also be a buffer zone.

Vine and Peach Streets will remain essentially unimproved to the South as access will be from North on improved streets.

Lighting scheme and curb cuts will be provided with building plans at the time of construction.

Power of Attorney can be provided, if necessary, see City Engineer comments.

Yours very truly,

William G. Ryden
William G. Ryden

WGR/lr

72-81

2811 Texas
Grand Junction, Colo.
Sept. 23, .981

City & County Planning Commission

Dear Members:

I am hopeful that you will recall my appearance before the commission last month in reference to a zone change from R-3 to C-I on approximately a half ($\frac{1}{2}$) acre in the Carpenter Subdivision No 2.

I took exception to the manner or method of allowing the desenters to protest. That is: Just simply allowing a show of hands in protest.

I was unaware, at the time, that the panel was all new and also serving without pay. I was also unaware the Commission had not been furnished my application in time for a thorough review.

I have done considerable research on zoning laws since this incident and have found little difference in City zoning and State zoning. Both encourage the appropriate use of land and assurance of a logical growth. The boundary limitations are the same in that "the protesters should be immediately joining or immediately adjacent to the front, side or rear thereof extending 100' therefrom or of those directly opposite thereto extending 100' from the street thereto extending 100' from the street frontage of such opposite lots 100' in each direction".

Grand Junction, being a home-rule city, has occasionally allowed a distance of 300' lineal feet in either direction. The applicant has no objection with either distance range as there appears not to be a required percentage of protesters within either distance of the land in question, particularly with any justifiable reason for protest.

My attorney expanded the research and found that the person or persons objecting to a zone change must give their names, addresses and be property owners. They must also substantiate the fact that they will be inconvenienced or their livelihood be jeopardized, more importantly that the health, welfare and safety of the protester or the community will be effected. If unable to do so the protest would be unjustifiable and have an exclusionary effect,

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Planning Commission for tabling my original request and also for their service to the community.

A. G. Shouse

Sincerely

REVIEW SHEET SUMMARY

FILE NO. 72-81 DUE DATE 7/13/81
 ACTIVITY Rezone R3 to C1
 PHASE _____ ACRES _____
 LOCATION Lots 1 & 2, Carpenter Sub 2
 PETITIONER D.K. & Vivian Whitmire
 PETITIONER ADDRESS 1411 Chipeta, Grand Junction, CO 81501
 ENGINEER _____

OVERALL CONSIDERATIONS

- OVERALL COMPATABILITY**
 depending on uses involved, compatibility needs to be addressed more closely.
- CONSISTENCY**
 is in a stage of transitional development
- ADJACENT PROPERTY**
 Primarily RMF-64 - high density multi-family, C-1 to the north
- CHANGE IN THE AREA**
 would affect the scattered single family sites, displacement of these should be addressed
- TRAFFIC IMPACT**
 Peach & Vine will be impacted as will #340.

HAS NOT BEEN ADDRESSED
 HAS BEEN ADDRESSED

<u>DATE REC.</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
7/8/81	City Fire	This office has no objections to this rezone. Fire hydrant spacing must meet City spacing of 300 feet between hydrants on a minimum 8 inch loop line. Since there has been some water line up-grade in the area, the Fire Department does not know at this time what the available fire flow is. A composite utilities plan must be submitted showing water line size and hydrant spacing. Building and site plans must be submitted for Fire Flow survey.
7/8/81	Transportation Eng.	No comments.
7/10/81	City Engineer	Power of attorney for street improvements on Peach Street and the alley is needed.
7/13/81	City Utilities	None.
7/15/81	Staff Comments	1) Has a neighborhood meeting been held. If so, what were the results? 2) Adequate screening, buffering and landscaping needed between residential and C1 use. 3) What about the traffic impact on Vine and Peach Streets? 4) Need lighting scheme. 5) Where will curb cuts go? 6) POA or Improvement Agreement for street improvements.
7/10/81	Public Service	Electric: No objections to rezone. DM 7/7/81 Gas: No objections to rezone.
7/15/81	Mt. Bell LATE	No comments.
7/28/81	PRICE/RINKER PASSED 5-1 (TRANSMIEIR AGAINST) A MOTION TO TABLE #72-81, REZONE RMF-64 TO C1, D.K. AND VIVIAN WHITMIRE, UNTIL THERE IS A MEETING OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD TO TRY TO RESOLVE THE CONTROVERSY INVOLVED.	

9/29/81

DUNIVENT/RINKER PASSED 4-1 (TRANSMEIER AGAINST) A MOTION TO TABLE #72-81, REZONE RMF-64 TO C1, UNTIL THE RESIDENTS AND ADJACENT LANDOWNERS IN THE AREA HAVE BEEN CONTACTED FOR RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS BETWEEN PETITIONER AND THE RESIDENTS IN THE AREA; THAT THE STAFF BE REQUESTED TO SUPERVISE THE MEETING AND ARRANGEMENTS THEREFOR.

10/27/81

QUIMBY/DUNIVENT PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #72-81, REZONE RMF-64 TO C1, PETITIONER C.K. AND VIVIAN WHITMIRE, LOCATED WEST OF PEACH STREET AND APPROXIMATELY 150' NORTH OF WEST OURAY.

