



City of Grand Junction
Public Works Department
250 North 5th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501-2668
Phone: (970) 244-1555
FAX: (970) 256-4022

DESIGN EXCEPTION #DE12-02

To: Mark Relph, Director of Public Works & Utilities

Thru: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

Copy to: Dave Donohue, Development Engineer

From: Mike McDill, City Engineer

Date: April 16, 2002

RE: Design Exception Request to Replace Two Existing Driveways onto 7th Street at Enstrom Candy at 200 S. 7th with One Driveway Only 122 Feet (center to center) from Colorado Avenue

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION

Enstrom Candy is planning to construct a building expansion on the southeast corner of their property at 200 S. 7th Street. After some discussion they are proposing to close one driveway just south of Colorado Avenue in return for permission to expand the southerly drive from 20-feet to 28 feet in width.

The applicant requests exception from Section 4.1.3, Corner Clearance. For the southern driveway to remain exception will also need to be granted from Section 3.2.2, Provision of Access, which states, "The primary access shall be on the lower-order street. Additional access points may be allowed based on traffic safety as determined by a Traffic Impact Study...."

EXCEPTION CONSIDERATIONS

1. Will the exception compromise safety?

7th Street is classified as a minor arterial. Current traffic counts in front of this property are 8,034 vehicles per day (VPD). Projections for 2025 are from 12,500 to 19,500 VPD, depending on other major transportation improvements within the period. The ability to transport these volumes safely through this corridor depends on limiting accesses in all cases and limiting them to only safe locations where they are not avoidable.

As these volumes grow, the safety of drivers on 7th Street and those using Enstrom Candy WILL deteriorate. Applicant needs to understand that approval of this request will eventually lead to future limitations on its use. Eventually this drive will need to be reduced to only “right-in, right-out,” or even “enter-only.”

2. Have other alternatives been considered that would meet the standard?

The applicant presents the attached parking layout in an effort to compromise on this issue. There may be other layouts that could provide required on-site parking without either of these two driveways. However, this proposal does represent a major improvement over the current situation.

3. Has the proposed design been used in other areas?

As the applicant indicates, there are many other existing driveways that do not meet this criterion. Typically, as development and re-development plans are presented anywhere in the city, conformance with these access standards is stressed, especially along the arterial and collector streets.

From a historical perspective, this proposed driveway might be considered a replacement for the vacated alley that accessed 7th Street in the past. Applicant also states that the original alley did not even meet this criterion. However, with a 125-foot deep lot, a 20-foot alley and an 80-foot ROW on Colorado Avenue, the spacing would have been 175 feet.

4. Will the exception require CDOT or FHWA coordination?

No.

5. Is this a one-time exception or a manual revision?

This would be a one-time exception.

Staff Recommendation

In the spirit of compromise, I recommend approval of the proposed plan for a single 28-foot access from 7th Street approximately 122 feet south of the centerline of Colorado Avenue. This recommendation is given with the condition that all parties understand that the use of this driveway WILL be restricted in the future as traffic on 7th Street requires it. Approval of this Design Exception does not establish any property right for the future use of this driveway.

Recommended by: *Michael A. McNeil*

Approved: Denied:

[Signature]
Kathleen Blanchard

Just dit for Rick Beatty, Fire Chief

May 2, 2002

Mike McDill, P.E.
City Engineer
City of Grand Junction
250 North 5th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501

**RE: Design TEDS Exception to Section 4.1.3, Corner Clearance
Enstrom Candies 200 North 7th Street**

Dear Mr. McDill:

On behalf of the developer, En-Sim Partnership, LLP, the following is a formal request for a design TEDS exception to Section 4.1.3 Corner Clearance.

The TEDS exception would allow the developer to keep the southern most access into the Enstrom Candies site. This access is located closer than the minimum required distance to the intersection at Colorado Avenue. Attached are exhibits that show the existing parking configuration, and the new proposed parking layout. Several parking layouts were considered, and the option submitted provides the best traffic flow through the parking lot.

Existing Conditions:

The developer owns the entire block that is within the boundary between 7th Street and 8th Street and between Ute Ave. and Colorado Ave. There are two existing buildings and a paved parking lot. Approximately one-third of this block is an empty, gravel lot. The developer is removing one of the buildings and expanding the other to the east and constructing additional paved parking to the east. This expansion as currently designed will provide adequate parking while upgrading and enhancing this area of downtown. Currently this site has two existing accesses off of 7th Street.

The current building and parking lot were constructed in 1989. At that time the alley located at mid block between Colorado Avenue and Ute Avenue was vacated through a public process that involved hearings with the Grand Junction Planning Commission. The Planning Commission approved the developer to construct the two current accesses to 7th Street. In the public hearing for the alley vacation, it was also stated by the City Planning Department that the primary access to this site would be from 7th Street, (minutes from that meeting are attached). It should be noted that the block length between Ute Avenue and Colorado Avenue is shorter than normal, and even the location

of the previous alley located at the mid block of 7th Street, would not meet the current spacing requirements in Section 4.1.3.

Exception Considerations:

1. Will the exception compromise safety?

The new parking layout as proposed closes the northerly access onto 7th Street, which is the access closest to Colorado Avenue. Removal of this access will improve the safety issues, and eliminate some of the concerns relative to the existing access. With the new design, the southern 7th Street access has been widened to 28 feet to accommodate two-way traffic. The primary access to the site will be from Colorado Ave. This access has been widened to 30 feet to encourage southbound traffic on 7th Street to use the light at Colorado Avenue for left turns into the site. Signage can be placed at the corner of 7th Street and Colorado Avenue to direct traffic to the main entrance on Colorado Avenue.

2. Have other alternatives been considered that will meet the standards?

Several options were considered before deciding on the design as submitted. The only way to meet the TEDS standards completely would be to close both accesses on 7th Street. Closing both access points on 7th Street creates a traffic flow in the parking area that we feel is undesirable. The Enstrom Candies site has regular truck and bus tour traffic. For delivery trucks on westbound Ute Ave., if they miss the 8th Street access to the site, there is still the option of a right turn into the site from 7th Street, allowing the truck a straight direct line through the parking area. If this access is closed, it will force all truck traffic onto Colorado Avenue, which is a narrower 2-lane residential street. This access will also allow an alternative access for emergency vehicles.

3. Has the proposed design been used in other areas?

The design as proposed will meet all City of Grand Junction Development Code Standards, excepting the TEDS standard for distance to the intersection. There are other instances in the City that are similar including the two 7th Street curb cuts on the Conoco station at Main Street.

4. Will the exception require CDOT or FHWA coordination?

No.

5. Is this a one-time exception or a manual revision?

This would be a one time exception.

Other Considerations:

With the proposed layout, the developer has upgraded the site plan to meet current City standards for landscaping and parking layout. There will be net loss in total parking of 6 existing spaces to meet all code and landscaping requirements.

The expansion of the Enstrom Candies facilities is intended to consolidate facilities, and allow for future manufacturing expansion of the business. Currently, Enstrom's uses the Startek facility on South 7th Street for temporary freezer storage for almond toffee. The new expansion will move the freezer facilities to the new building and eliminate truck traffic between the two locations. Mr. Simons, the owner of Enstrom Candies, estimates an average annual growth of about 5% for the company. The existing retail operations produce an annual customer volume of about 10,000 per year. Most of this traffic is generated during the holiday season from the end of October till January 1. The primary increase in business will be in mail order sales, which will not increase the onsite traffic. The expansion as planned will not substantially increase the traffic flow above the existing numbers. We are aware that traffic on 7th Street will increase in the future, and believe the proposal as submitted will not seriously impact future traffic flows.

In conclusion, the proposed exception does not cause any additional compromise to safety, and will improve the existing conditions by the elimination of one access point. The design closing off the northern access, and widening the southern one to accommodate two-way traffic will improve the safety of traffic on the site.



Kevin Knott, EIT
Project Engineer
LANDesign



City of Grand Junction
Public Works Department
250 North 5th Street
Grand Junction CO 81501-2668
FAX: (970) 256-4022

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 7, 2002

To: Bob Blanchard, Community Development
Jim Bright, Fire Department

From: Sandi Nimon, Sr. Administrative Assistant

Subj: *Design Exception DE12-02 for 7th Street at Enstrom Candy at 200 S. 7th with one driveway only 122 feet (center to center) from Colorado Avenue.*

Mark asked me to send the attached Teds Exception for your review. If you want to discuss this exception with Mark, please contact him by the end of the day on Wednesday. A decision needs to be made no later than noon on Friday, so he needs comments ASAP. He did say that you need to meet by Friday if you want to meet.. You can call him at 244-1539 to discuss it, or you can E-mail your comments to him

sn



City of Grand Junction
Public Works Department
250 North 5th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501-2668
Phone: (970) 244-1555
FAX: (970) 256-4022

May 10, 2002

Mr. Kevin Knott, EIT
LANDesign
244 N. 7th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501

RE: TEDS Exception to Maintain One Driveways onto 7th Street at 200 S. 7th Street

Dear Kevin;

Please find attached the committee's decision on the above request. This TEDS Design Exception is for a single 28-foot wide access from 7th Street approximately 122 feet south of the centerline of Colorado Avenue. This approval is given with the understanding of all parties that the use of this driveway will very likely be restricted in the future, as traffic on 7th Street increases.

You may use this decision to proceed through the development review process. If you have any question concerning this decision, please feel free to contact the Development Engineer in charge of your project or me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael G. McDill".

Michael G. McDill, P.E.
City Engineer

C: Dave Donohue, Development Engineer

development summary



File # #2-89 Name Alley Vacation
Enstrom's Candies, Inc Date 2/8/89

PROJECT LOCATION: East/west alley, east of 7th Street, between Ute and Colorado Avenues

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Request to vacate that portion of the east/west alley between 7th Street and the north/south alley. The purpose of the request is to allow construction of a 19,000 sq. ft. commercial building for Enstrom's Candies, Inc.

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	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:

Petitioner has satisfied all review comments regarding relocation of utilities and service access through the remaining alleys.

Planning Commission Action

Recommended approval, subject to review agency comments.

REVIEW SHEET SUMMARY

FILE NO. 2-89 TITLE/HEADING Alley Vacation DUE DATE 1/20/89

ACTIVITY - PETITIONER - LOCATION - PHASE - ACRES Petitioner: Emil Enstrom

Location: East/west alley, E of 7th Street, between Ute and Colorado Avenues

PETITIONER ADDRESS 720 Golfmore Drive Grand Junction, CO 81506

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.

1/20/89	Planning Dept.	The following criteria, as listed in section 8-3 of the Zoning and Development Code, have already been satisfied or need to be addressed: 8-3-1 The proposal does not landlock any parcels of land. 8-3-2 The proposal does not restrict access to any parcel so that access is unreasonable or economically prohibitive. 8-3-3 The proposal will have no adverse impacts on the health, safety, and/or welfare of the general community. It will not reduce the quality of police or fire protection to any parcel of land. The petitioner must satisfy trash service access and relocate all utilities. 8-3-4 The proposal does not conflict with adopted plans and policies. 8-3-5 The petitioner must show the benefits the proposal provides to the City.
1/20/89	Police Dept.	Is a "T" alley intersection a problem? No other concerns noted.
1/19/89	City Attorney	Applicants need to fully address the benefits to the City, pursuant to Code 8-3-5.
1/19/89	Public Works	Trash service is provided through this alley. Upon vacation, trash trucks will be required to make a 90° turn from the north/south alley to the east/west alley. At present, there is insufficient space for such a maneuver. The petitioner should work with the Sanitation Department on resolving this issue.
1/18/89	DDA	The DDA supports the attached request for the expansion of Enstrom's Candy.
1/11/89	Fire Dept.	Our office doesn't have a problem with this alley vacation. It won't interfere with our providing fire protection to the building and surrounding area.
1/13/89	City Engineer	If the alley is vacated, the existing curb cut and driveway approach should be removed and replaced with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The proposed new curb cuts for the parking lot should be signed appropriately for entrance and exit only on 7th St. A permit must be obtained from this office prior to any concrete removal or construction in the public right-of-way.
1/13/89	Public Service gas:	Presently have 2" steel gas main in alley proposed for vacation. Will require relocation of line around proposed project either around north and west edge or south and west edge of property, subject to reimbursement for costs.
	electric:	Can install underground to north or south around property and remove overhead, subject to reimbursement for costs and utility easements as required.

1/13/89

City Engineer

The vacation of this alley would present considerable inconvenience for the Sanitation Department. The E/W alley would dead end at the west side of the N/S alley, leaving insufficient turning radius for trash trucks to access the affected customers and negotiate the turn. The only alternative to the Sanitation Division would be to drive past the east end of the E/W alley and then back into traffic to access the alley while backing down the alley to serve trash customers. This action would increase the exposure of our crews to backing hazards and backing into moving traffic hazards.

If the turning radius at the E/W and N/S alley junction would accommodate the turning radius of our largest trash truck, this would eliminate the problems. Removal of the power pole at the northeast corner of the alley intersection and design of parking lot to accommodate trash trucks would eliminate the problem.

1/23/89

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- February 7, 1989
7:30 p.m. - 9:05 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Steve Love at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

Steve Love, Chairman	Jack Campbell
Dutch Afman	Jim Tyson

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department, was:

Karl Metzner

The minutes were also recorded by Karl Metzner.

There were approximately 8 citizens present during the course of the hearing.

* * * * *

I. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER AFMAN) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 10, 1989, I MOVE THAT THEY BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN."

Commissioner Tyson seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations, and/or prescheduled visitors.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. #2-89 ALLEY VACATION

Petitioner: Enstrom Candies, Inc., John Newell
Location: The east/west alley east of 7th Street between Colorado Avenue and Ute Avenue.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

The petitioner felt that there were no additional comments needed.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl said that all concerns had been addressed. Potential circulation problems had been successfully mitigated, and the Fire Department had no concern with the plan to relocate the building.

It was noted that review agency comments had not been included with Planning Commission packets; therefore, discussion ensued among Commissioners regarding outside comment.

QUESTIONS

There were questions regarding Enstrom's access, to which, Karl replied that primary access would be from 7th Street. The north/south alley access would be kept open and left as-is. *

Commissioner Afman asked Mr. Newell if he would explain the project in greater detail; Doug Simmons, representing the petitioner, provided this.

Clarification on the status of the overhead power lines was given by Mr. Newell.

Gary Vanderwood, another representative of Enstrom's, provided further detail on Enstrom's plans for expansion, including a discussion of building plans.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no comment either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-89, ALLEY VACATION, THE EAST/WEST ALLEY FROM 7TH STREET TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE NORTH/SOUTH ALLEY, BETWEEN COLORADO AND UTE, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE COMMENTS OF THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET."

Commissioner Afman seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

2. #4-89 REZONE I-2 TO PZ

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction, Karl Metzner

Location: Along the south side of Struthers Avenue in the 600 and 700 Blocks, approximately.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl presented an overview of the request. He clarified that this proposal would address only the zoning; recreational uses which might want to later locate in the area would need to obtain spe-

