

PUBLIC WORKS
& UTILITIES

June 24, 2004

Mr. Cliff Anson
Grand Valley Development, LLC
2185 Quail Ct.
Grand Junction, CO 81503

DE07-04 – Design Exception – Request to Reduce Access Spacing for
424 South Camp Road.

Dear Cliff:

Please find attached the committee's decision to deny the above request. I would encourage you to review the newly adopted Alternate Residential Street Standards and their application to your project. Rick Dorris may be able to provide some additional feedback on these standards and how they may apply.

If you have any questions concerning this decision, please feel free to contact Rick or me at (970)244-1557.

Sincerely,



Tim Moore, Public Works Manager
City of Grand Junction

Xc: Rick Dorris, Development Engineer (256-4034)
Pat Cecil, Development Services Supervisor

PUBLIC WORKS
& UTILITIES

DESIGN EXCEPTION #DE07-04

To: Mark Relph, Director of Public Works & Utilities
Rick Beaty, Fire Chief
Bob Blanchard, Community Development Director

Copy to: Rick Dorris, Development Engineer
Pat Cecil, Development Services Supervisor

From: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

Date: June 23, 2004

RE: Request to Reduce Access Spacing for 424 South Camp Road

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION

The applicant is planning to provide access to the proposed Redlands Grove subdivision via Redlands Ct. onto South Camp Road and is requesting a TEDS Exception for access spacing. As currently proposed, Redlands Ct. will be located approximately 108' from Avenal Lane.

EXCEPTION CONSIDERATIONS

- 1. Will the exception compromise safety?**
The access as proposed will create a left turn conflict with the existing Avenal Lane. The result will be that safety along South Camp Road will be compromised.
- 2. Have other alternatives been considered that would meet the standard?**
This is the second time the TEDS Committee has met to consider this request. The Committee has asked that alternative designs be considered that would create an intersection with Avenal Lane, which the applicant has done.
- 3. Has the proposed design been used in other areas?**
There are other locations where less than the full 150-foot access spacing exists and have been permitted within the developed areas of the City.

4. Will the exception require CDOT or FHWA coordination?

No.

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

In rural areas this situation will probably continue to arise wherever there is a presence of large single-family parcels in proximity to development along major corridors. Staff will continue to monitor the number of similar requests and evaluate this issue each year.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends denial of this request. The applicant has demonstrated that alternatives to this design option exist which would meet the requirements of the TEDS manual.

Recommended by:

Tim Noon

Approved as Recommended: _____

Denied:

Date:

6/23/04

[Signature]

Robert Stachura

[Signature]

June 2, 2004

Please refer to Concept Plan 9 for Redlands Grove. The applicant is requesting a TEDS exemption for the alignment of Redlands CT. such that the separation between Avenal Lane and Redlands CT will be approximately 108ft instead of the required 150ft. The Site Overview shows that this is a severely constrained site. There is a large drainage that must be accommodated on the East and South sides. No access was provided on the North side when the Renaissance was approved. The only access to this site is from South Camp Road.

The applicant submitted an application earlier this year (see Plans A and B and the accompanying letters of submittal) for this same exemption and was told that the access must line up with the ROW for Avenal Lane. The applicant then submitted a Preliminary Sketch Plan for staff review using this alignment.

Staff commented at the preliminary meeting that the drainage easement must be a separate tract and that the private street must be approved by City Council. This news required a redesign of the project, since the requirement of a separate tract for the drainage meant that a lot would be lost. Also the applicant was unwilling to go through the design, engineering and review processes only to risk having the private streets rejected by City Council. The result was Concept 8.

The eighth attempt to plan this site quickly revealed that, even though no TEDS exemption was needed, several code issues arose. For instance, can you have a flag lot on an autocourt? What, exactly, is a flag lot? Does a flag lot really have to be 20% larger than the rest of the lots? Will the Director allow us two flag lots in this project? Can a lot border an autocourt and not access from the autocourt? Since we have two lots with 6 sides and one lot with 9 sides, it becomes an issue as to where are the front, rear and side yard setbacks?

The problem that the applicant faces is that Plan 8 requires no TEDS exemptions but it does require several "favorable" interpretations of the code by the Director. Conversely, Plan 9 requires no "favorable" interpretations. However, it does require one TEDS exemption, which is the 108ft separation from Avenal Lane. We believe that Plan 9 is the better choice.

We respectfully submit that the Panel reconsider its decision and allow the applicant the requested exemption to the TEDS Manual.

RECEIVED

JUN 02 2004

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPT.

The exceptions that are being sought with this application are one time requests and do not require an amendment to the TEDS Manual. Nor will these requests cause any difficulties for the City since South Camp Road (the street being accessed) has recently been improved to design standards. This is an infill site with no possibility of access except from South Camp. The requests are being made due to the unique nature of the Property.

The Property is commonly known as 424 South Camp Road. It consists of 1.8 acres of land with one single family residence. Current access for the house is from South Camp Road. The Property is annexed into the City of Grand Junction with an existing zoning of RSF-4. This allows for a total of 7 units in potential development. The Property is bordered on the North and East by the Renaissance Subdivision, on the South by the Trails West Subdivision, and on the West by South Camp Road. No connectivity or access was provided for the Property by either of these subdivisions. Hence, access for development can only be from South Camp Road.

The applicant is proposing two development scenarios.

Plan A would be to create four additional lots, for a total of five units. The four additional lots would access South Camp via a shared driveway. The existing residence would utilize its existing historical access to South Camp. The applicant understands that staff may recommend that the residence also access South Camp via the shared driveway. This would necessitate several other exceptions.

Plan B would be to create six additional lots, for a total of seven units. All of the units would access South Camp via a private street that is twenty (20) feet wide with curb and gutter, no sidewalks, with a "T" or "Y" turn around.

Either of these scenarios will require the following exception:

The Manual requires a 150 foot separation between access points on a collector street. In order to achieve this, the center line of either the shared driveway or the private street would need to go through the existing residence. The southern edge of the right-of-way for either of these proposals needs to setback 25 feet from the existing house. This is required by Code and facilitates off street parking and the future placement of the garage. Each of these proposals will show a separation of 115-118 feet from the center line of Avenal Lane. Avenal Lane is a "Tee" intersection. Traffic only enters South Camp from the West side. The next closest street on the East side of South Camp is Renaissance Blvd., which is approximately 300 feet from the proposed access. Please note that the proposed access will be directly across the road from the existing driveway access to the neighboring house on the West side of South Camp. The Property cannot be developed without this exception being granted. The alternative is to raze the existing house. This is not economically feasible.

Plan A probably will also require the additional exception of allowing five units to use the shared driveway, rather than four units on the shared driveway and one unit on a separate driveway. There are two other minor exceptions that are requested for Plan A. One is to increase the maximum length of a shared driveway from 150 feet to 160 feet. The other is to allow a shared driveway to access from a street that does not allow on street parking. The alternative is to go to Plan B.

Plan B has seven units on a private street that is twenty feet wide, has curb and gutter but no sidewalks, with a "T" or "Y" turnaround. This scenario will require an exception that allows driveway cuts to be within fifty feet of the flow line of a collector street (South Camp). There is no reasonably sane method for accommodating access to the existing house without this exception. The alternative is to once again raze the house or to allow access to South Camp via the existing driveway.

In summary the requested exceptions are dictated by the unique circumstances of this infill site. These are one time exceptions which do not require a modification to the TEDS Manual. It is felt that these requests are modest in their scope and impact, and they will not adversely affect the City.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Clifton Anson

When the applicant first pondered the development of this property, it was thought that it would be best to follow the "KISS" philosophy. As we all know that means "Keep It Simple Stupid". There are two access points on the West side of South Camp that the access for development could line up with. One is Avenal Lane and the other is the access to the property South of Avenal Lane on the West side of South Camp.

The Avenal alignment was considered and rejected. Instead, the proposed access was chosen for the following KISS reasons:

1. It is the historical access to the Property.
2. It is centrally located to the Property, making for a logical lot design and more efficient development.
3. Driver behavior and traffic patterns have already been established to accommodate this access.
4. It aligns with the access for the property directly across the street on the West side of South Camp.

Additionally, the Avenal alignment was not considered for the following reasons:

1. The spacing between the Avenal alignment and the South ingress lane of Renaissance Blvd. is less than 150 feet. It was felt that this would require an exemption by itself.
2. This access dictates an illogical lot layout which makes it more difficult to build on and more expensive to develop.
3. The alignment will create a "stupid space" along the northern border that serves no useful purpose, and which will become a "pain to maintain".
4. It is felt that this alignment will create more difficulties between drivers accelerating out of this development and drivers decelerating to access Renaissance Blvd.

The bottom line is this. Can the Avenal alignment work? Yes. Is it the best solution? Absolutely not. So once again the applicant asks the committee to approve plans A and B. Which plan is followed will be determined after considering the KISS philosophy, engineering expenses, development costs and market conditions.

Thank you,

Clifton Anson