

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 28, 2005 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 9:25 p.m.

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Paul Dibble. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Dr. Paul Dibble (Chairman), Patrick Carlow, Lynn Pavelka-Zarkesh, William Putnam, Bill Pitts, Tom Lowrey, and John Redifer. Roland Cole was absent.

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, were Bob Blanchard (Community Development Director), Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Lori Bowers (Senior Planner), Senta Costello (Associate Planner) and Ronnie Edwards (Associate Planner).

Also present were Jamie Kreiling (Assistant City Attorney) and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 26 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the May 24, 2005 City/County Joint Planning Commission public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "I move we accept the minutes from May 24, 2005 as printed."

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0, with Chairman Dibble and Commissioner Redifer abstaining.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Available for consideration were items

- A. ANX-2005-102 (Zone of Annexation--Career Center Annexation)
- B. GPA-2005-125 (Growth Plan Amendment--Pear Park School Annexation)
- C. ANX-2005-108 (Zone of Annexation--Koch/Fischer Annexation)
- D. ANX-2005-112 (Zone of Annexation--Schultz Annexation)
- E. PP-2005-008 (Preliminary Plan--Camelot Gardens II)
- F. VR-2005-052 (Vacation of Right-of-Way, Forrest Run Row Vacation)
- G. GPA-2005-045 (Zone of Annexation--23 Park Plaza Annexation)
- H. PP-2005-219 (Preliminary Plan--The Glens at Canyon View)

Chairman Dibble briefly explained the Consent Agenda and invited the public, planning commissioners, and staff to speak up if they wanted one or more of the items pulled for additional discussion. Staff

requested that item VR-2005-052 be pulled from the Consent Agenda and continued to the July 12, 2005 public hearing. At citizen request, item GPA-2005-045 was also pulled from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Full Hearing Agenda. No objections were received from the audience or planning commissioners on any of the remaining items.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we move item 6 on the Consent Agenda [VR-2005-052], to be continued to the 12th of July."

Commissioner Redifer seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I move we approve the Consent Agenda, with item 6 [VR-2005-052] continued to July 12th, and item 7 [GPA-2005-045] to be removed for full hearing."

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

IV. FULL HEARING

GPA-2005-045 ZONE OF ANNEXATION-23 PARK PLAZA ANNEXATION

A request for approval to zone 30 acres from a County PI (Planned Industrial) to a City I-1 (Light Industrial) zone district or appropriate zone district consistent with the Growth Plan.

Petitioner: Karen Marquette

Location: 789 23 Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

The petitioner was not present in the audience at this point and did not arrive until the public comments portion of the public hearing. As such, the petitioner's presentation is contained in the Public Comments portion of the minutes.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave a PowerPoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo map; 3) Future Land Use Map; and 4) an Existing City and County Zoning Map. She said that the property had retained a Planned Industrial zone in the County since the 1980s. The petitioner's representatives had originally requested a Growth Plan Amendment to change the property's land use designation from Commercial/Industrial to Residential. During the review process, and after discussions with staff, that request had been withdrawn. Ms. Portner noted the site's location and surrounding zoning and uses. Surrounding zonings included County AFT (Agricultural) to the north, I-1 (Light Industrial) to the south, County PC (Planned Commercial) to the east, and County RSF-E (Residential Estate) to the west. Under the terms of the Persigo Agreement, the City was bound to apply a zone to recently annexed property that was either the closest County equivalent or one that was consistent with Growth Plan guidelines. The currently proposed I-1 zone represented the closest County zone equivalent and was also supported by the Growth Plan. Ms. Porter said that other zoning options available, in addition to the I-1 zone, included C-2 (Heavy Commercial) and I-O (Industrial Office); however, the City's Zoning and Development Code prohibited rezoning to C-2 directly adjacent to residential uses, so practically speaking, the only other option available was the I-O zone.

Given that the requested I-1 zone met both Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations, staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Jack Wernet (756 Goldenrod Court, Grand Junction), vice-president of the Bookcliff Ranches Subdivision Homeowners Association and homeowner in that subdivision, noted that on February 28, 2005 he'd received notification that the property was being annexed and that a Growth Plan Amendment requesting Residential Low (4 units/acre) zoning had been submitted for consideration. On June 1, there had been a meeting to consider the property's annexation; however, there had been no mention of changing the applied zone district from residential to industrial at that time. Approval of the annexation seemed to acknowledge that the property would be zoned Residential Low. Only after approval of the annexation had there been a letter submitted by the petitioner's representatives to withdraw the Growth Plan Amendment request. While a Planned Industrial zone may have been appropriate in 1982, it was no longer the case. Looking at the Future Land Use Map, he noted that there were no industrial uses located north of Interstate 70; rather, the area north of the interstate consisted primarily of agricultural and residential uses.

Mr. Wernet contended that Code criteria had not been met since the proposed zone was not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and that approval of the zone district would result in significant impacts to the area in terms of industrial truck traffic, screening, and public safety. Elaborating briefly on the issue of traffic impacts, Mr. Werner said that if the existing Plaza Road were made available to the site, it would encourage traffic to travel down the currently under-improved Foxfire Court through their subdivision. Since there would be no community benefit derived from the application of an Industrial zone to the property, he contended that that Code criterion had also not been met.

Mr. Wernet wondered what drastic changes had occurred between February 28 and June 6 to merit the proposed change in zoning. Placing industrial uses directly adjacent to residential uses didn't make sense.

Sean Norris (778 23 Road, Grand Junction) agreed that the initial notification proposed a residential zone and use. Only after further contact at a later date did he discover that the original Growth Plan Amendment (GPA) had been pulled. Upon hearing that the GPA had been pulled, there had been no further notification to area residents to even suggest that an annexation was still under consideration. So he felt that insufficient and inaccurate notification had been given to the public. He reiterated that the entire surrounding area north of the interstate was residential, with the area predominately zoned RSF-E. Already he'd seen truck traffic travel down H Road and turn onto Foxfire Court to get to Plaza Road. While there were barricades placed along Plaza Road to discourage through traffic, it appeared to him that traffic had not been dissuaded. Industrial traffic would pose significant impacts to their neighborhood. Also, he felt that industrial uses, with their associated outdoor storage and security lighting, would also impact adjacent residential uses. He noted that the nearest night lighting was currently situated along the interstate. He also feared for the safety of his children and other pedestrians and cited a recent accident involving a UPS driver and a woman at the 23/H Roads intersection. Mr. Norris urged planning commissioners to consider the lesser impacts of an I-O zone and apply that zone to the property if no other residential zoning choices were available. He felt that the application of an I-O zone would reduce the amount of truck traffic and eliminate the need for outdoor storage and security lighting.

Alex Mirrow (2514 Oleusten Court, Grand Junction), representing the petitioner, offered the petitioner's presentation at this time. He said that the property had been originally designated as an energy plaza in the early 1980s during the oil shale boom. The subject parcel had been platted as such, and he

understood that the northern 40 acres had also been slated for similar platting. Several streets, pan gutters, and fire hydrants had already been installed, and two accesses to the site available. Sewer was available but wasn't as yet connected to the site. While acknowledging the adjacent residential use, he noted the Commercial zoning located to the east of 23 Road. Directly across the street from that was United Rentals. Businesses, he said, were always looking for the easiest accesses. For the subject parcel, that would be via 24 Road, with traffic traveling down the frontage road to the property.

At the time the Bookcliff Ranches Subdivision was platted, the petitioner's parcel had already been platted for industrial uses for more than 20 years. So anyone purchasing a lot in that subdivision should have been aware that at some point the subject parcel would be developed according to its industrial zoning. The biggest problem in developing the property had been in providing sewer access; however, several options were presently available, with one being to extend sewer along the southern border of Bookcliff Ranches Subdivision. That particular option would benefit the subdivision since it was his understanding that septic systems in the subdivision were already beginning to fail. Mr. Mirrow felt that there was a real need for industrially zoned property in the area, especially given the rise in property values and the need for more oil and gas development. The currently requested zoning would permit oil and gas developers to situate their businesses there; however, he'd spoken with representatives of the medical community who had also expressed interest in the site. He was certainly open to addressing neighborhood concerns but reiterated that residential property owners had purchased their properties knowing that they were situated next to industrial property.

Mr. Mirrow introduced Sam Suplizio (no address given), who also represented the petitioner. Mr. Suplizio spoke on the ever-increasing values of property in the area and agreed that the community needed more industrially zoned properties; there was less demand for I-O zoned properties. Industrial uses, he felt, could be adequately screened to lessen impacts to the adjacent residential subdivision. The businesses that would locate on the subject parcel would benefit the community by providing good paying jobs, jobs that typically paid \$65K-\$100K annually. Mr. Suplizio felt that the Growth Plan seemed to have neglected providing for sufficient industrial properties.

Sean Norris again came forward to offer additional testimony, contending that the petitioner's presentation should have been given prior to the public comments portion of the public hearing. He said that he currently worked in the oil and gas industry. He said that several of his big name clients had tried to lease and rent some of the undeveloped land south of I-70 but none of the area's real estate agents seemed interested in talking with them. Oil and gas developers needed places where they could put their offices; their industrial yards were actually located at the job sites. There were approximately 100 undeveloped acres south of I-70, all zoned I-1. He was "hard pressed" to see how industrial zoning was warranted for the current site or for the northern 40 acre parcel. He thought it likely that the petitioner would try expanding industrial zoning to include the northern 40 acres previously mentioned by Mr. Mirrow. With regard to Mr. Suplizio's claim that jobs would be in the pay ranges mentioned, he could personally attest that he and others in the industry did not make even the lower end of that pay range. Mr. Mirrow mentioned there being two accesses into the site. While he hadn't elaborated, one of those accesses ran directly through the Bookcliff Ranches Subdivision. He felt it unconscionable to run that much industrial traffic through a residential subdivision. With regard to extending sewer to the site, Mr. Norris said that the option to extend it from the west had thusfar been stymied because a large landowner at 22 Road would not allow the extension to cross his property. If it were brought in from the east, it would have to be brought in using a lift station from 23 1/4 Road. The third option would be to bore under I-70 and extend sewer in from the south. All available options for extending sewer to the site seemed to him to be cost prohibitive.

Mr. Norris added that he had received a number of calls from realtors and developers interested in acquiring his land for residential development. That told him that there was a significant need for

residentially zoned land in the area. That need did not exist for industrially zoned land as evidenced by the large quantity of undeveloped industrial property which lay to the south of I-70.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Mirrow agreed that he didn't want to see traffic routed through Bookcliff Ranches Subdivision. If agreeable to the City, he would be happy to close off that access point. The barriers referenced previously consisted of strings of barbed wire that the owner of the property installed to discourage through traffic because it was tearing up the road base. He expected that 24 Road would serve as the primary access into the site; however, another easy access point could be south via 23 Road over the freeway to the business loop. Mr. Mirrow acknowledged that there was no way at this point to know what businesses would locate on the site or what the wages of employees would be. It did seem that there was a lot of money associated with the oil and gas business. He maintained that local realtors would support Mr. Suplezio's position regarding the need for more industrially zoned property in the area. The actual owner of the subject property had owned it for more than 12 years and had been unable to sell it before land in the Grand Valley began to skyrocket. She should be allowed to develop it to its highest and best use and make a profit on her investment.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked staff if there was any correspondence pertaining to the change in request from residential to industrial that planning commissioners had not yet seen, to which Ms. Portner replied negatively. When asked to elaborate briefly on why the request had changed, Ms. Portner said that the original request had been for a GPA to change the site's land use designation from industrial to residential. Following staff's comments to the petitioner, that request had been withdrawn. The site's annexation into the City had been approved solely by City Council. The application of a zone following the property's annexation was within the purview of the Planning Commission; however, a final decision would be rendered by City Council. The GPA request had been withdrawn, she said, prior to the application for a zone of annexation.

Commissioner Putnam asked for additional clarification on the timeline from the point that the GPA was requested to when it had been withdrawn. Ms. Portner said that the original application had been submitted on February 28 and withdrawn approximately three weeks prior to tonight's public hearing.

Commissioner Redifer asked if the site had already been prepared for a residential subdivision. Ms. Porter said that in the early 1980s it had been previously prepared for a commercial/industrial subdivision. Some of the infrastructure had been installed at that time. Following approval of a zone district, the petitioner would then provide staff with construction drawings that would have to demonstrate compliance with the Code's criteria for that particular zone district. That included providing evidence that the previously installed infrastructure was still functional.

Chairman Dibble asked if Plaza Road would be utilized as an access to the site. Ms. Portner said that it was currently platted as a right-of-way. Staff would be reviewing options for connections. With regard to screening and buffering, she said that if zoned I-1, the petitioner would be required to construct a 6-foot-tall masonry wall in addition to providing a 25-foot landscape strip. If zoned I-O, the masonry wall would still be required, but the petitioner would only be obligated to provide an 8-foot landscape strip, to occur as each individual lot developed.

Commissioner Lowrey asked when the Growth Plan had been adopted, to which Ms. Portner answered 1996. She reiterated that the parcel had been zoned Planned Industrial since the early 1980s, a zone that had been acknowledged by the Growth Plan. When asked when had the Bookcliff Ranches Subdivision been constructed, Ms. Portner replied that it had built out approximately three years ago. The Growth Plan recognized the area as being appropriate for Residential Estate zoning (2-5 acres/unit), and the

Bookcliff Ranches property had been rezoned to RSF-E prior to its development. With regard to the northern 40 acre parcel, Ms. Portner said that while that parcel had also been zoned Planned Industrial in the County, the Growth Plan did not support that land use and instead recommended Residential Estate.

Commissioner Carlow asked for the major differences between the I-1 and I-O zone districts. Ms. Portner said that the type of uses which could locate there were very similar; however, in the I-O zone, many of those uses would require a Conditional Use Permit.

When Commissioner Putnam asked if planning commissioners only had the options of either approving a zone closest to its County equivalent or one in accordance with the Growth Plan, Ms. Portner responded affirmatively. Ms. Kreiling added that it was the Persigo Agreement that brought the property into the City via the annexation process. The Bookcliff Ranches Subdivision was not located within the 201 boundary and consequently had not had to be annexed prior to its development.

Commissioner Pitts wondered if sewer service to the site would be provided by the Appleton Sewer District. Ms. Kreiling thought that sewer service would be provided by the Appleton Sewer District but asked that the question be deferred to engineering staff.

Mr. Dorris said that the most viable alternative for bringing sewer to the site was to bore under I-70 since sewer existed at Logos Court across the interstate. If the property at Logos Court developed first, the developer would be required to provide an easement to accommodate sewerline extension across I-70. If they didn't develop first, it would be the sole responsibility of the petitioner to obtain sewer by whatever means possible and at the sole expense of the petitioner. He reminded planning commissioners that the only question before them was the application of a zone. If after that approval no sewer connection could be obtained, the petitioner would have no viable project. Review of potential options would be undertaken during the site plan review stage. Water lines were in place but it was unclear if water delivery was pressurized. And while other infrastructure was seemingly in place, it appeared to have greatly deteriorated. Thus, there were a number of engineering challenges present.

Chairman Dibble asked if the entire Plaza Road right-of-way was within city limits, to which Mr. Dorris replied affirmatively. The parcel's plat would have dedicated the road as right-of-way. He remarked that it was not often that the City considered an industrial use so close to a residential area. In terms of interconnectivity, it made sense to connect Plaza Road to the adjacent subdivision; however, he conjectured that the road would not likely be built to handle truck traffic, and signs could be installed at various points to slow ingress/egress. Another way to discourage truck traffic would be to construct a mini roundabout with a center landscape feature at the intersection point between the two parcels on Plaza Road. Truck traffic typically found roundabouts difficult to navigate.

Commissioner Lowrey thought that using signage to prevent and/or to direct larger truck traffic might also prove effective.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Pitts said that he was very familiar with the area. With regard to rezone criterion 3 regarding compatibility with the surrounding area, he determined that an I-1 zone would not be compatible. While roads may have been constructed on the site in 1982, they had since deteriorated significantly to the point that weeds were growing through the pavement. At the time the energy plaza was planned, Grand Junction was facing an oil shale boom. Those circumstances had since changed and the area had since developed with more residential uses. There were large lots throughout the area. If it came down to a decision of whether to apply an I-1 or I-O zone, he would be in favor of the I-O zone.

Ms. Pavelka-Zarkesh noted that there would be greater buffering requirements inherent to the I-1 zone.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2005-045, the request to rezone 23 Park Plaza to I-O, I move that we forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council."

Commissioner Carlow seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 3-4, with Chairman Dibble and Commissioners Putnam, Pavelka-Zarkesh, and Lowrey opposing.

Commissioner Lowrey asked for additional clarification on the differences between the I-O and I-1 zone districts, both in terms of uses, buffering, and any other major distinctions. Ms. Portner responded in greater detail. Discussions included a further elaboration on the Conditional Use Permit review process and the use of setbacks to meet buffering and landscape requirements. Commissioner Lowrey asked if he could make a motion to reconsider the previous motion, which legal counsel said would be perfectly acceptable.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) "I make a motion to reconsider, then [to reconsider the I-O zone]."

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-2, with Chairman Dibble and Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh opposing.

A brief recess was called at 8:28. The public hearing reconvened at 8:34 p.m.

Following the recess, discussions ensued over the previous motions and whether legal criteria had been met. Ms. Portner asked legal counsel if, since there was no express motion on the I-1, whether a super majority vote by City Council would be required to approve the requested I-1 zoning. Ms. Kreiling said that a motion addressing the I-1 zone should be made as well as the actual motion to consider the I-O zone.

MOTION: (Commissioner Lowrey) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2005-045, a request to zone the 23 Park Plaza Annexation I-1, I move we forward a recommendation of approval."

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 3-4, with Commissioners Pitts, Redifer, Lowrey and Carlow opposing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2005-045, I move we recommend approval for [zone of] annexation of I-O be forwarded to City Council."

Commissioner Lowrey seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-3 with all but Chairman Dibble and Commissioners Putnam and Pavelka-Zarkesh opposing.

PLN-2005-136 DISTRICT MAP--F 1/2 ROAD AMENDMENT TO GRAND VALLEY CIRCULATION PLAN

A request for approval of a district map for the F 1/2 Road corridor alignment.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Location: F 1/2 Road between 25 Road and Highway 6 & 50

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Rick Dorris gave a PowerPoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) purpose of the F 1/2 Road parkway; 2) aerial photo map; 3) proposed F 1/2 Road parkway cross-section; 4) Existing City and County Zoning Map; 5) Future Land Use Map; and 6) findings and conclusions. Mr. Dorris said that a number of open house meetings had been held to solicit public input on various proposals presented by

staff on the F 1/2 Road street alignment. Referencing the aerial photo map denoting the alignment choice that had received the most support, he said that the alignment was conceptual and not literal. The proposed alignment would assist in guiding staff and developers in development of several large parcels along the corridor. It would also provide for improved area connectivity and circulation for existing as well as future developments. Having determined that the request met both Code criteria and Growth Plan recommendations, staff recommended approval.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Lowrey asked if the south bypass or beltway would exit on the north or south side of the railroad. Would it have a connection to 25 Road? Mr. Dorris said that the parkway was located on both the south side of the business loop and the south side of the railroad tracks. 25 Road would be raised to go over the railroad tracks. When asked if the parkway would also connect to 24 Road, Mr. Dorris replied affirmatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Paul Johnson (1691 Snow Eagle Court, Loma), represented Blue Star Industries, a residential development company that currently owned 72 acres along the proposed F 1/2 Road parkway at the 25 and F 1/2 Roads intersection. He recalled voting for the proposed plan although it wasn't his preferred plan. While it had been the best option of those presented by the City, he wondered why consideration hadn't been given to just installing a stoplight at the intersection of 25/F 1/2 Roads, which would negate the need for the curvature proposed at that intersection. Eliminating that curvature would then no longer impact his property and no longer require a relocation of power lines. The proposed alignment, he said, would greatly and negatively affect the development of 7 1/4 acres of Blue Star property and would greatly impact adjacent properties, most of which were already developed. Another alternative might be to construct a roundabout at that intersection. The City was requesting donation of Blue Star property to accommodate the alignment; he was asking that TCP credit be given in exchange. That discussion would be directed to City Council. He also asked why such a wide road was necessary; it would be wider than F Road. He also wondered why the parkway hadn't been proposed for G Road. In conclusion, he asked that his proposed alternatives be considered and that additional consideration be given to reducing the overall width of the parkway.

John Slothower (617 Cottage Meadows Court, Grand Junction) said that he'd attended the open houses referenced by staff, and he agreed that of the proposals presented to the public, this had been the best one. In addition to supporting the statements made by Mr. Johnson, he noted the presence of electrical transmission lines in the area. He'd been unable to reach Excel representatives to find out their preferences for relocation so he wondered if the City's plan was to relocate transmission lines to the proposed median in that area.

Richard Davis (647 25 Road, Grand Junction) noted the location of his property and said that the current proposal would abut the rear of his property. He agreed with the sentiments of previous speakers although he too had voted for the current proposal. With regard to relocating existing transmission lines, he said that since people normally didn't want to live next to them, locating them in a median probably made the most sense and would lessen impacts to the Blue Star property. If the current proposal were approved, it was likely that zoning in the area would change. As an area property owner, he hoped that the zoning could be changed in conjunction with this approval process so that he didn't have to go through the rezoning process at a later date. He also wondered how the right-of-way acquisition process would work with regard to his property and the properties of others in the area.

Leo Grap (645 25 Road, Grand Junction) agreed with Mr. Davis's comments and also hoped that his property could be rezoned in conjunction with the current request.

Mark Austin (336 Main Street, Grand Junction), wondered what the width of the F 1/2 Road right-of-way would be. The street section showed 10-foot-wide shoulders on both sides of the road. Why did the shoulders need to be so wide? It seemed excessive, and the overall street width would likely encourage traffic to travel faster. He agreed with Mr. Johnson's comments and felt that the City's acquisition of 7 1/4 acres of Blue Star property just to accommodate extra street width seemed excessive.

John Sink (597 Ravenwood Lane, Grand Junction) wondered if the parkway would eventually continue across Highway 6 & 50, to connect to the Redlands Parkway. Would a stoplight or signage be installed at the intersection of Highway 6 & 50 and the parkway?

QUESTIONS

Chairman Dibble asked staff why a "T" intersection hadn't been proposed for the 25/F 1/2 Road intersection. Mr. Dorris explained that the main purpose for the parkway was to draw traffic from F Road; however, to make it an attractive option, the parkway had to be user friendly. One way to do that was to minimize the number of stops and turns along the way. Another was to increase the overall street width. However, the actual street width was not set in stone; a final decision would have to come from City Council. Accesses onto the F 1/2 Road corridor would be strictly controlled, even more so than they were currently along F Road. The parkway would be constructed using City funds as development in the area occurred. Thus, the parkway would likely be constructed in phases, with the street's width tied to the type and scope of the developments proposed. He elaborated that a G Road alignment was just too far north to be a practical alternative. Electrical transmission lines would be situated within medians as much as possible. Excel had agreed to turn some of its property over to the City as needed for right-of-way.

Chairman Dibble asked if electrical lines could be buried, to which Mr. Dorris responded negatively.

When asked by Chairman Dibble if zoning changes could be considered in conjunction with the current request, Mr. Blanchard replied negatively. Rezoning was not part of the current request and could not be considered by planning commissioners. If, during a City Council hearing, City Council members wanted to direct staff to look at rezoning the area, that was within their purview.

Mr. Dorris said that with regard to acquisition of right-of-way, the City would be undertaking processes to acquire the necessary right-of-way. The City would be responsible for purchasing the right-of-way wherever and whenever needed or requiring dedication as development occurs. In response to Mr. Sink's comments, he thought that it might be conceivable that an at-grade intersection would one day be constructed at the juncture of Highway 6 & 50 and the F 1/2 Road parkway; however, since there were no attractants that far west to warrant immediate consideration, that possibility would likely be many years down the road.

Commissioner Pitts asked why a roundabout couldn't be put at the 25/F 1/2 Road intersection. Or, in broader terms, why was the current configuration preferred over a T intersection, even if a roundabout were installed in lieu of a stop sign? Mr. Dorris reiterated that the reason for the configuration was to divert traffic away from F Road. That required making the parkway as user friendly as possible, and the best way to do that was to eliminate as many stops and turns as possible.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Dibble felt that the parkway's overall concept was good. Anything that could be done to alleviate the current congestion along F Road was a good thing.

Commissioners Pitts and Lowrey concurred and expressed support for the request.

Commissioner Putnam agreed, adding that it was not within the Planning Commission's purview to decide the intricacies of engineering-related details. He also expressed support for the request.

MOTION: (Commissioner Putnam) "Mr. Chairman, on item PLN-2005-136, I move that we recommend to City Council to approve the proposed F 1/2 Road District Map and amend the Grand Valley Circulation Plan to include the changes shown on the Map as a text amendment to the Code."

Commissioner Pavelka-Zarkesh seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

With no further business to discuss, the public hearing was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.