

November 14, 2005

Eric Kraai  
Chamberlin Architects  
225 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 1010  
Grand Junction, CO 81501

Re: Design Exception #DE27-05 – Driveway Spacing – 202 N. 7<sup>th</sup> Street

Dear Mr. Kraai:

Please find attached the committee's decision for the above referenced request. This design exception has been approved as requested. You may use this decision to proceed through the development review process for this exception.

If you have any questions concerning this decision, please feel free to contact the Development Engineer in charge of your project or Tim Moore, Public Works Manager at (970) 244-1557.

Sincerely,



Sandi Nimon,  
Sr. Administrative Assistant

Xc: Laura Lamberty, Development Engineer (256-1451)

## DESIGN EXCEPTION #DE 27-05

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

From: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

Copy to: Laura Lamberty, Development Engineer  
Pat Cecil, Development Services Supervisor

Date: November 8, 2005

RE: Driveway Spacing – 202 N 7<sup>th</sup> Street

### DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION

1. The applicant proposes to develop the existing vacant site located at 202 N 7<sup>th</sup> Street at Rood Avenue. The current access to this site is the vacated cross-alley on Rood Avenue with a second access to the alley. This old alleyway forms the proposed centerline of the improved access. TEDS Spacing (Chapter 4.1.1) requires 50' separation of driveways for local commercial streets. The cross-alley, 15' in width, exactly meets TEDS spacing for the driveway located to the east for the Rio Grande Federal Credit Union, approved for construction in 2003.

The proposed access directly opposes an existing cross-alley to the south, and meets TEDS criteria for spacing from the signalized intersection. TEDS 4.2.4 criteria further specify the minimum width of commercial driveways to be 28', 13' wider than the old 15' cross-alley.

### EXCEPTION CONSIDERATIONS

1. **Will the exception compromise safety?**  
The widening of the driveway preserves intersection spacing, alignment with opposing driveway, and proper driveway width. The spacing is nominally compromised and is not anticipated to create safety problems.
2. **Have other alternatives been considered that would meet the standard?**  
The numbers of alternatives available are limited and all the alternatives considered create other TEDS Exceptions. The applicant explored moving the driveway, but has not considered eliminating the access on Rood for an access to the alley.
3. **Has the proposed design been used in other areas?**

This design currently exists in other 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?**

This would be a one-time exception.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff believes this driveway alignment is the best possible solution given the constrictions of the site and recommends approval.

Recommended by: Tom Moe

Approved as Requested:

Denied:

Dated: 11/9/05

[Signature]

Robert E. Blawie

[Signature]

# Proposed TEDS Exception

Page 1 of 3  
November 9, 2005

**Project:** Triumvirate LLC Office Building

**LOCATION:** 202 North 7th Street (Northeast corner of 7<sup>th</sup> and Rood)

**PETITIONER:** Mike Roussin - Triumvirate, LLC

**PETITIONER'S ADDRESS/TELEPHONE:** 225 N 5th Street, Ste 1010  
241-0707

**PETITIONER'S REPRESENTATIVE:** Eric Kraai - Chamberlin Architects  
242-6804

Proposed Exception: We are requesting an exception to the 50' separation requirement between driveways (Section 4.1 Access Locations) we propose increasing the existing south driveway at Rood Avenue 14' in width to the east to comply with TEDS driveway standard of 28'. The current driveway is now 14'+/- wide. The property to the east located their driveway 50' (the minimum required distance) from the existing referenced, non-conforming driveway. Their driveway is approximately 8'-6" to the shared property line (see photo A), thus forcing us to locate the proposed driveway 42' west of the shared property line.

## Alternatives:

The alternatives are limited on this site considering there is not enough frontage to meet the 150' minimum from signalized intersection, 50' minimum from adjacent driveway, and 28' driveway width standards.

1. The first alternative is to shift the driveway to the west (see attached C1.1a). There are three problems with this.
  - a. Triumvirate loses four parking spaces. The parking lot is currently short on spaces and relies on the downtown parking regulation to meet code.
  - b. Widening the driveway to the west will cause the driveway to be misaligned slightly with the alley directly to the south.
  - c. This also reduces the TEDS standard for the minimum distance from a signalized intersection of 150'.
2. The second alternative is to widen the driveway both directions from the centerline (see attached C11b). This will also reduce the required distance between the two driveways and the distance to a signalized intersection to less than TEDS standards, and reduce the number of parking spaces by three.

## Proposed Design:

The proposed design considers the city's parking needs and also the proposed 7<sup>th</sup> street improvements. The building location is optimal by creating a pedestrian friendly entryway with

the building/plaza fronting the street and parking on the back side of the lot. The location of the east neighbor's driveway prevents us from meeting both the distance required between driveways and the distance from a signalized intersection. The proposed design meets the distance from a signalized intersection which we feel is the more critical of the two standards.

**Impacts of change:**

Given the downtown location of the property and the low amount of traffic, the requested change has limited impact on traffic flow. The proposed exception increases the distance from the major intersection at 7<sup>th</sup> and Rood. A good example of the proposed exception is the separation of the two driveways located across Rood which are less than TEDS standards. (see photo B) This separation seems to cause no problems.

**Photo A**



**Photo B**











