

REVISED SHEET SUMMARY

FILE NO. 3-88 TITLE/HEADING Text Amendments for 1988 DUE DATE 12/19/88
ACTIVITY - PETITIONER - LOCATION - PHASE - ACRES Text amendment for Section 12-4-2 to
repeal and reenact that section. City Attorney: Dan Wilson

PETITIONER ADDRESS _____

ENGINEER _____

DATE REC.

AGENCY

COMMENTS

NOTE: WRITTEN RESPONSE BY THE PETITIONER TO THE REVIEW COMMENTS IS REQUIRED
A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE FIRST SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARING.

12/20/88

Planning

This amendment removes the potential of the City being named
in a suit brought by a third party. No objections.

REVIEW SHEET SUMMARY

FILE NO. 3-88 TITLE HEADING Text Amendment-5-1-7K to add par. 3 DUE DATE 6/17/88

ACTIVITY - PETITIONER - LOCATION - PHASE - ACRES Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

PETITIONER ADDRESS 250 North 5th Street Grand Junction, CO 81501

ENGINEER n/a

DATE REC. AGENCY COMMENTS

NOTE: WRITTEN RESPONSE BY THE PETITIONER TO THE REVIEW COMMENTS IS REQUIRED
A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE FIRST SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARING.

06/17/88 Development Dept. This amendment is intended to address a problem unique to corner lots in the downtown area of the city. These corner lots are frequently only 50' wide and were platted the same size as interior lots. Deducting existing setback requirements leaves only 25' available for a structure. Most existing structures are non-conforming in that they cannot meet frontyard setbacks on one of the street frontages. This amendment would allow additions or accessory structures within the normal 20' frontyard requirement on a side street without requiring Board of Adjustment action. This would only be allowable in areas where there is an existing parkway strip to maintain adequate separation from the roadway.

06/24/88 City Engineer O.K. as long as sight distance triangle is maintained at intersections.

LATE

MOTION: (SEWELL/CAMPBELL 5-0) TO APPROVE

development summary



File # 3-88 Name Text Amendment Date 7/6/88

PROJECT LOCATION: n/a

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A text amendment to allow staff to vary the 20' front yard setback on a side street of a corner lot where parkways exist between the sidewalk and the curb. Variances would be for single family uses only and be restricted to a minimum of 5' from property line. This will generally affect only properties in the original square mile of the city.

REVIEW SUMMARY (Major Concerns)

POLICIES COMPLIANCE	YES		NO*		TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	SATISFIED		NOT SATISFIED*	
Complies with adopted policies	X				Streets/Rights Of Way	X			
Complies with adopted criteria	X				Water/Sewer n/a				
Meets guidelines of Comprehensive Plan	X				Irrigation/Drainage n/a				
					Landscaping/Screening n/a				
					Other: _____				

* See explanation below

STATUS & RECOMMENDATIONS: This amendment is intended to provide more flexibility for the small corner lots platted in the older part of the city. Using current setbacks on a standard 50' wide lot allows only 25' of buildable width. With the existence of parkway strips, there is flexibility in reducing setbacks without encroaching into the streetscape.

Planning Commission Action

Recommended approval

development summary



File # 3-88 Name Text Amendments Date 8/3/88

PROJECT LOCATION:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A request to amend various sections of the Code pertaining to Home Occupation, Fee Waiver, and Law Enforcement Rehabilitation Center definition.

REVIEW SUMMARY (Major Concerns)

POLICIES COMPLIANCE	YES NO*		TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	SATISFIED NOT SATISFIED*	
Complies with adopted policies			Streets/Rights Of Way		
Complies with adopted criteria			Water/Sewer		
Meets guidelines of Comprehensive Plan			Irrigation/Drainage		
			Landscaping/Screening		
			Other: _____		

* See explanation below

STATUS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

The proposed amendments are "housekeeping" measures to clarify sections of the Code and include additional procedures currently being followed.

Planning Commission Action

8/2/88 Recommend approval of all three proposed amendments.

*Oic 8/17/88 Approved on Consent agenda. 2nd Reading on Sept. 7th.
2nd reading*

development summary



File # 3-88 Name Text Amendments Date 10/6/88

PROJECT LOCATION: n/a

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- a. A request to amend Chapter 7 of the Grand Jct. Z&DC regarding Planned Development (P.D.) designation on the Official Zoning Map, and that all uses being considered for a P.D. be listed and submitted along with P.D. request.
- b. A request to amend Section 4-2-11D of the Grand Jct. D&DC regarding landscaping requirements for frontyard setbacks less than 5 feet.
- c. A request to add paragraph 6-8-2A.1.t. which requires the names and addresses of all surface owners, mineral owners and lessees of mineral owners.

REVIEW SUMMARY (Major Concerns)

POLICIES COMPLIANCE	YES NO*		TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	SATISFIED	NOT SATISFIED*
	YES	NO*			
Complies with adopted policies	X		Streets/Rights Of Way n/a		
Complies with adopted criteria	X		Water/Sewer n/a		
Meets guidelines of Comprehensive Plan		n/a	Irrigation/Drainage n/a		
			Landscaping/Screening n/a		
			Other: _____		

* See explanation below

- a. This amendment would change the way P.D. zones are designated on the zoning map. The map would show the type of P.D. (PR, PB, PC, PI) and the file number (PR36-88, PB16-86). The specific file for any P.D. is unique for that piece of ground. This amendment also requires that all uses being considered for a P.D. zone must be listed and approved.
- b. This amendment would require that 75% of the first 5 feet along the front of a property zoned C-1 be landscaped. It would insure that some landscaping would be required on a property that had no frontyard setback. This conforms to what is required in the C-2 zone.
- c. This amendment requires all plats to include the names and addresses of all surface owners, mineral owners and lessees of mineral owners as required by CRS 31-23-215.

STATUS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Commission Action

10/4/88 Planning Commission recommended approval of all proposed text amendments.

10/19/88 Approved on Consent agenda per P.C. recommendations

REVIEW SHEET SUMMARY

FILE NO. 3-88 TITLE/HEADING Text Amendments for 1988 DUE DATE 11-28-88

ACTIVITY - PETITIONER - LOCATION - PHASE - ACRES City Planning

PETITIONER ADDRESS _____

ENGINEER _____

DATE REC. AGENCY COMMENTS

NOTE: WRITTEN RESPONSE BY THE PETITIONER TO THE REVIEW COMMENTS IS REQUIRED
A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE FIRST SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARING.

11-28-88	Planning Department	Several current provisions of Chapter 5, General Regulations, and the non-conforming use provision are not appealable to any appointed board. In order to provide due process, all provisions of the Zoning and Development Code should be referable to a citizen board. This Text Amendment expands the responsibility of the Board of Adjustment to hear requests for variances from code requirements.
----------	---------------------	---

development summary



File # 3-88 Name Text Amendment Date 12/7/88

PROJECT LOCATION: N/A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A request to amend Section 4-9-3, amend introductory sentence of Chapter 5 and amend Section 10-1-1A., thus granting the Board of Adjustments additional responsibilities in hearing and deciding appeals for variance.

REVIEW SUMMARY (Major Concerns)

POLICIES COMPLIANCE		YES	NO*	TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS		
				SATISFIED	NOT SATISFIED	*
Complies with adopted policies	N/A			Streets/Rights Of Way	N/A	
Complies with adopted criteria	N/A			Water/Sewer	N/A	
Meets guidelines of Comprehensive Plan	N/A			Irrigation/Drainage	N/A	
	N/A			Landscaping/Screening	N/A	
				Other: _____		

* See explanation below

STATUS & RECOMMENDATIONS: Several current provisions of Chapter 5, General Regulations, and the non-conforming use provision are not appealable to any appointed board. In order to provide due process, all provisions of the Zoning and Development Code should be referable to a citizen board. This Text Amendment expands the responsibility of the Board of Adjustment to hear requests for variances from code requirements.

Planning Commission Action

12/6/88--Recommended approval.

development summary



File # 3-88 Name Text Amendment Date 1/13/89

PROJECT LOCATION: n/a

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:-

Amending 12-4-2 Civil Penalties to set a maximum fine of \$5,000 and to remove the City as a party to lawsuits. Amendment was proposed by the City Attorney.

REVIEW SUMMARY (Major Concerns)

POLICIES COMPLIANCE	YES NO *		TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	SATISFIED NOT SATISFIED *	
	YES	NO		SATISFIED	NOT SATISFIED
Complies with adopted policies	X		Streets/Rights Of Way		
Complies with adopted criteria	X		Water/Sewer		
Meets guidelines of Comprehensive Plan	X		Irrigation/Drainage		
			Landscaping/Screening		
			Other: _____		

* See explanation below

STATUS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Commission Action
Recommended approval.

