

Clavonne, Roberts & Associates, Inc.

SITE PLANNING • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
844 GRAND AVE., GRAND JUNCTION, CO
www.clavonne.com 81501
970-241-0745 • FAX 241-0765

December 1, 2006

Eric Hahn, Development Engineer
City of Grand Junction Community Development Department
250 N. 5th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501

RE: Request for a TEDS Exception for On-Site Driveway Vehicle Storage Lengths

Dear Eric,

The applicant, Constructors West, is requesting staff approval of an exception to the Transportation Engineering Design Standards (TEDS) manual for the North 1st Street and Patterson Planned Development. The project is located in the southwestern corner of the First and Patterson Road intersection.

Requested Exception

The applicant is requesting a reduction in the vehicle storage length for the driveway located on the lot line of Lots 1 and 2 in Block 1 (SE corner of Lot 2 and SW corner of Lot 1.) This would require exception to TEDS Section 4.2.5.1 Accesses Serving Off-Street Parking Lots which reads as follows:

"On-site storage is measured from the flowline of the street to the first parking stall or aisle of a parking lot. Vehicle storage equivalent to or greater than the minimum distances shall be provided at accesses serving the site. The recommended distance for accesses with two approach lanes may be adjusted, subject to the TIS finding, roadway geometry, traffic volumes, and site layout."

Alternatives Considered

Multiple alternatives addressing site access have been considered by the applicant. These alternatives have considered principals of traffic engineering, site design and the development potential these two lots.

Alternatives

During the design process for the overall development layout, the applicant determined that there was value in creating shared access points for lots, creating ample distance between on-site intersections and intersections with arterial streets, and providing for a safe distance between driveway cuts and internal street network intersections. These factors coupled with the individual site designs of Lot 1 and Lot 2 and the desire for the primary east/west street to the development to better follow the existing topography resulted in the proposed condition.

The serpentine road alignment of the east/west road and the shared access point intersect at approximately the mid-point between the two proposed lots.

In one alternative, the applicant considered straightening the east/west road alignment. This alternative worked against existing topography on the site by ignoring the existing hill feature in the southeast corner. The applicant was also concerned that straighter roads would lead to higher vehicle speeds.

A second alternative considered eliminating shared access points between the two lots. This design led to additional curb cuts along the east/west road and a reduction in off-street parking counts.

Proposed Design

The proposed design allows for a minimal number of curb cuts along the east/west road while providing for sufficient and safe access to two lots. The design proposes approximately 40 feet between the nearest street flowline and the first parking stall. It is important to note that the first parking stall is to the right of vehicles entering the site. Internal to the lots, left turn movements are not allowed until the driver has gone at least 150 feet into the site. The driveway immediately to the left when entering the site is a one way drive exiting the site. Left turn movements are not allowed.

Impacts of Change

The proposed design should not have an impact on the function of the drive aisle or the east/west road. The standard anticipates left turn delays internal to the site which would stack cars back into the right-of-way of the adjacent street. Because there are multiple access points and because there are no left turns immediately internal to the site, vehicular stacking should not be an issue.

Staff Review

If granted, will the exception compromise safety?

The concept of reducing the stacking distance on this access point does not compromise safety. For the reasons mentioned above under the Impacts of Change section, safety is not anticipated to be compromised.

Have other alternatives been considered that would meet current standard?

Numerous alternatives have been considered as listed above. Since this proposed design did not compromise safety and it is a shared access point, the design should be preferable to staff.

Has the proposed design been used in other areas – locally, state or national?

The applicant is not immediately aware of the proposed design existing in other areas.

Will the exception require CDOT or FHWA coordination?

To the best of our knowledge CDOT or FHWA coordination will not be required.

Is this a one-time exception based upon unique circumstances – location, topography, traffic flow, etc?

This is a one time exception based upon unique circumstances. Topography of the site lead to the serpentine alignment of the streets. The desire to share access between the two lots reinforced the decision to propose this access.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this TEDS exception request to you and we look forward to a positive recommendation from staff so we can proceed with the proposed development.

Sincerely



Joe Carter
Ciavonne, Roberts & Associates, Inc.

February 23, 2007

Joe Carter
Ciavonne, Roberts & Associates, Inc.
844 Grand Avenue
Grand Junction CO 81501

RE: *Design Exception #03-07, 1st & Patterson Planned Development
Driveway Vehicle Storage Length*

Dear Joe,

Please find attached the committee's decision for the above referenced request. This design exception has been denied.

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 and Planning Director at 970.244.1557.

Sincerely,



Sue Mueller
Sr. Administrative Assistant

cc: Eric Hahn, Development Engineer
File

DESIGN EXCEPTION #03-07

To: Mark Relph, Director of Public Works & Utilities
Sheryl Trent, Assistant to the City Manager
Jim Bright, Acting Fire Chief

From: Tim Moore, Public Works Manager

Copy to: Eric Hahn

Date: December 21, 2006

RE: 1st & Patterson Planned Development
- Driveway vehicle storage length

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION

The applicant intends to subdivide approximately 16 acres into a mixed-use development. Proposed access to the subdivision will be from Patterson Road and from 1st Street, with direct access to the individual lots being taken from internal local streets.

Site Description:

TEDS 4.2.5.1 requires minimum onsite vehicle storage lengths of 50' at all accesses serving retail uses, and 25' at all accesses serving office uses. The applicant is requesting allowance for storage lengths of 40' and 25' at two of three shared accesses serving an office building and a retail store. They argue that the multiple accesses and the one-way aisle immediately adjacent to the shortest access, which prohibits onsite left-turns, mitigate the need for additional onsite vehicle storage.

EXCEPTION CONSIDERATIONS

1. Will the exception compromise safety?

Staff does not believe the exception will compromise safety.

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

The applicant has considered alternative lot and street layouts, as well as alternative access locations. All such alternatives produced less acceptable configurations. Staff concurs with the applicant's conclusions, and believes that the current proposed configuration is acceptable, and will not cause traffic problems.

3. **Has the proposed design been used in other areas?**
Yes, staff believes that other exceptions to this TEDS requirement have been allowed.
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 that the requested exception will not cause an unsafe situation, and does not have any specific objections to the proposal.

Recommended by: _____

Approved as Requested: _____

Approved as Modified: _____

Denied X

Dated: _____
[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

DE# ~~03-07~~
03-07