

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**AUGUST 15, 2000 MINUTES**  
**7:03 p.m. to 12:00 a.m.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Joe Grout. The public hearing was held at Two Rivers Convention Center.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were Joe Grout (Vice-Chairman), Dr. Paul Dibble, Terri Binder, James Nall, Jerry Ainsworth, and William Putnam (alternate). John Elmer, Nick Prinster and Vicki Boutilier (alternate) were absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Joe Carter (Associate Planner), Lori Bowers (Associate Planner) and Tricia Parish (Associate Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney), Kent Marsh and Rick Dorris (Development Engineers).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 44 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

**Due to technical difficulties, the motions for approval of the Minutes and the Consent Agenda were unrecorded.**

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Available for consideration were the minutes of the July 11, 2000 Planning Commission public hearing.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes of July 11 as written."**

Commissioner Ainsworth seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS**

There were no announcements, presentations and/or visitors.

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

Offered for placement on the Consent Agenda were items FPP-1998-131 (Final Plat/Plan-Extension of Development Schedule for Hacienda/Hunter's Glen, southeast corner of 24.5 Road and F.25 Road), PP-1999-053 (Revised Preliminary Plan and Extension of Development Schedule for Fruitvale Meadows, northeast corner of D.5 Road and 30.75 Road), MS-2000-124 (McLean Minor Subdivision, 436 Independent Avenue), and FPP-2000-130 (Final Plat/Plan for The Commons, 616 27 ½ Road). Chairman Grout said that letters of objection had been received on item MS-2000-124 from Emma Schaffer (1615 Poplar Drive, Grand Junction), Imogene Cameron (1610 Poplar Drive, Grand Junction) and Martha Love (1605 Poplar Drive, Grand Junction). He asked Mr. Shaver whether their concerns constitute grounds for hearing the item in full? Mr. Shaver said without the presence of those individuals at the public hearing,

it was appropriate to enter the letters into the record and accordingly the Commission could afford the weight to the evidence that it determined. (These residents wondered what type of business would be proposed for the location.) They were also concerned about the resultant traffic impacts.

No further objections were raised and a motion was made.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) “Mr. Chairman, I move that items FPP-1998-131, PP-1999-053, MS-2000-124, and FPP-2000-130 be approved as submitted.”**

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**IV. FULL PUBLIC HEARING**

**CUP-2000-129 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—BANK WITH DRIVE-UP**

**Request for a Conditional Use Permit for a bank with a drive-through facility in a C-1 (Light Commercial) zoning district. Request calls for demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new two-story building.**

**Petitioner: Wayne Fisher  
Location: 2448 Patterson Road  
Representative: Pat Edwards**

**PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

Pat Edwards, representing the petitioner, presented via an overhead transparency an aerial view of the site’s location. He said that the petitioner would try to save as many of the trees and as much of the existing landscaping as possible. A traffic study had been completed which attested to the safe operation of the facility at the proposed location for the next 20 years. Two access options onto F Road had been discussed with City engineering staff. It was felt that the option selected would probably be a shared access with Capps Furniture to the north. Discussions with staff regarding stacking at the drive-up windows were ongoing but Mr. Edwards felt that compliance with City regulations could be achieved.

**STAFF’S PRESENTATION**

Lori Bowers read the CUP criteria into the record and felt that the petitioner could meet Code requirements. Of the two access options recommended to the petitioner, the petitioner preferred trying to work out a shared access agreement with Capps Furniture. She noted that a comprehensive signage plan was usually required with a proposal of this type; however, the petitioner was still unsure how large the banking structure would be. Staff recommended approval of the request subject to the following requirements:

1. The applicant must either use a shared access with the property to the north or demonstrate with a traffic analysis that the separate intersection 75 feet south can safely accommodate traffic according to City standards.
2. Parking, stacking, and signage requirements must also be met.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dibble referenced the F Road access and wondered if turn lanes into the site were proposed for southbound traffic. Ms. Bowers said that any such turning movement would be illegal as the access was striped to indicate that motorists should not make such turns. Ms. Bowers noted that City

staff had also required extension of the existing concrete median further northward to reinforce the restriction.

Commissioner Ainsworth asked if the separate access option to the south had been deemed impractical. Rick Dorris said that while that option may be able to meet some City standards, it would create an overlap in turning movements. If the applicant pursued it, he would be required to prove its feasibility.

Commissioner Dibble asked if the applicant's parking plan met City requirements. Mr. Dorris said that parking requirements would depend on the size of the structure. When asked if the applicant had considered a shared parking arrangement with Capps, Mr. Dorris said that while a possibility, any such agreement would require review and approval by the City.

Commissioner Binder asked if walk-in traffic would also be accommodated, to which Mr. Dorris responded affirmatively. The request proposed two drive-up windows and one ATM machine.

Commissioner Binder suggested that directional signage be installed at the site's entrances to lessen driver confusion. She noted that many drivers crossed the street's double yellow line painted in front of businesses located to the north. Mr. Dorris said that the City would support directional signage but added that any proposal would come from the site's overall sign allowance. John Shaver added that signage was more a Site Plan issue and should be discussed independent of the current request.

Commissioner Dibble noted that 14 stacking positions were anticipated on the southwest side of the property. If the shared access option is implemented, he thought that this might prove awkward. He asked if single-file stacking is acceptable for two drive-up windows and an ATM? Mr. Dorris said that the TEDS manual required six parking spaces per each drive-up lane and four spaces for each ATM machine. The applicant viewed this as restrictive, so the City had suggested he do a local comparison using his traffic engineer to determine whether the requirement was unreasonable. The comparison had only recently been completed and has not yet been received. It compared 6-7 similarly-sized facilities. The applicant's traffic engineer said the study showed an average of 1 ½-2 vehicles stacking allowance per drive-up lane, resulting in the applicant's traffic engineer recommending a measure of three vehicles per lane. Mr. Dorris said that this would allow three vehicles side-by-side at the windows and three more behind them before narrowing. He felt that the alternative would work, with details to be further modified during the site design process.

Commissioner Nall acknowledged that Site Plan details were more appropriately left to staff. Mr. Dorris said that only because there had been traffic concerns had the City required more detail at this stage from the applicant. The applicant, he added, had proven general compatibility.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the request.

### **PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Mr. Edwards referenced the F Road entry and said that the petitioner agreed to accept a right-in, right-out restriction and reiterated his preference for the shared access option. He also agreed to comply with the City's requirement for extending the concrete median as previously mentioned. Discussions with Mr. Capp had resulted in various options for obtaining full cross-easements for ingress/egress and parking. Parking requirements would be dependent upon the size of the bank, which could range from a single-story, 3,600 square-foot structure to a 6,000 square-foot two-story structure.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dibble asked how many would be employed by the bank, to which Mr. Edwards replied 7.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Nall acknowledged that the request met the general requirements of a CUP. The business would fit in well with surrounding land uses.

Vice-Chairman Grout concurred, adding that remaining issues were Site Plan-related.

Commissioner Dibble remarked that the petitioner would be making good use of the property; he felt it to be a good location for a bank. He felt that staff would resolve any outstanding parking/circulation issues.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nall) “Mr. Chairman, on item #CUP-2000-129, a request for a Conditional Use Permit for a drive-through banking facility, I recommend approval with the condition that the traffic analysis demonstrate that the separate intersection 75 feet south can safely accommodate traffic according to City standards or provide a shared access with the property to the north. Adequate parking and stacking aisles must also be provided. These issues are to be resolved to staff’s satisfaction prior to final Site Plan review and issuance of a Planning Clearance.”**

Commissioner Ainsworth seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**CUP-2000-123 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—WASTE TIRE FACILITY**

**Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a waste tire recycling facility in an I-1 (Light Industrial) zone district on an approximately .17 acre parcel.**

**Petitioner: Steven Ordahl  
Location: 126 South 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Representative: Edwin Stephens**

**PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

Edwin Stephens, representing the petitioner, said that the existing building would be sufficient for the proposed use. No outdoor storage of tires was proposed, although one trailer would be stored onsite. He noted the location of the site’s gated entry and employee parking area. Approximately 9,500 tires/month were expected to come through the facility. Benefits included not only preservation of space in the County’s landfill but recycling that would produce new, useful materials. Noise testing had been performed with no adverse impacts noted. No chemicals or heat would be used in the recycling process nor would there be any odor produced. He said that staff concerns had been satisfactorily addressed in the petitioner’s narrative. In meetings with the Fire Department, officials had given them a “change of notice.”

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Nall asked for clarification of the term “change of notice.” Mr. Stephens said that they’d been able to demonstrate how the proposed low speed process would not create undue proliferation of dust; thus, the Fire Department had changed its original position on dust generation and fire hazard concerns.

When Commissioner Dibble asked if noise protection devices would be worn by employees onsite, Mr. Stephens said that staff, management and visitors would all comply with OSHA requirements and any and all recommendations made as a result of the sound survey.

Vice-Chairman Grout wondered how long the machines would be in use each day. Mr. Stephens said that some of the machinery would operate 6 hours/day; the chipper would be in operation approximately two hours/day, from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM. No diesel-run machinery would be operated after 5:00 PM. The chipper would be housed inside the building, exhausting outside to the rear of the building. The cutter would be operated at the back door of the facility, exhausting outside as well.

Commissioner Ainsworth wondered how the chipped material would be packaged and would it be factored into the 500 tire maximum load limit? Mr. Stephens said that chipped material would be bagged, with approximately 1,000 lbs of material per bag. Bags would be stacked inside the building in a designated storage area. Bags would not factor into the tire load limit because once chipped, tires became another product.

When asked if there were any other facilities like the one being proposed, Mr. Stephens replied negatively. This would be the first plant of its type anywhere.

Commissioner Ainsworth asked if the entire tire would be chipped and recycled. Mr. Stephens said that investigations were currently underway to find a market for the tire tread (*i.e.*, steel belts). Until a market could be established, however, this type of material would go to the County's landfill.

#### **STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Joe Carter confirmed that no outdoor storage of tires had been proposed. W-H Interscience of Colorado concluded as part of its sound survey that maximum noise levels would be at 92 dBA in the immediate area of the chipping machine, with noise decibel levels dropping to a level of 72 dBA at 50 feet. Employees exposed to noise levels above 85 dBA for periods exceeding a full day would be included in a Hearing Conservation Program. Proposed hours of operation were 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM, with machinery in operation only from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. As mentioned by Mr. Stephens, diesel-run machinery would be in operation for approximately two hours/day. Fire Department staff were convinced after having watched a video of the process that no undue noise or dust would be generated; thus, no requirement for sprinklers had been made. Of the three citizens calling to inquire about the proposal, two had been opposed but one seemed satisfied when he'd found out that operations would be kept indoors and that there would be no outdoor tire storage.

Having found the request to have met Code criteria, staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Signage shall be limited to that which is approved by the Planning Commission (8 square feet).
2. Noise levels shall not exceed sixty-five decibels (65 dBA) at any point along the property line of this parcel.
3. The operation of the tire chipper will not exceed four hours on any one day, and the operation hours of this machine will be established from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM., Monday through Friday. There will be no weekend operation of this facility.
4. Fuel storage for this facility shall be in compliance with the City of Grand Junction Fire Department standards.

- 5. Further comment from the City of Grand Junction Fire Department until the Department is satisfied with the operation of machinery, fire safety and odor emission from the proposed facility.

Mr. Carter said that condition 5 already seemed to have been satisfied.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Ainsworth asked if the building was insulated. Mr. Stephens said that the entire building was steel on the outside and drywalled on the inside. When asked if the finished product would be kept separate of the tires, Mr. Stephens responded affirmatively.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the request.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Nall commented that since the Fire Department was convinced that there was no fire danger and since CUP criteria had been met, he expressed support for the request.

Commissioner Ainsworth also expressed support, adding that noise concerns seemed also to have been addressed.

Commissioner Binder concurred and commended the petitioner for his ingenuity.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) “Mr. Chairman, On item CUP-2000-123, the Waste Tire Recycling, I move that we find the project consistent with the Growth Plan and Section 2.13 of the Zoning and Development Code and approve the request for a Conditional Use Permit, subject to the conditions of the City Community Development Department and the City of Grand Junction Fire Department, as stated in the staff report dated August 15, 2000, and that these items are addressed and agreed to prior to the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.”**

Commissioner Ainsworth seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**FP-2000-105 FINAL PLAN—TEXACO CAR WASH**

**Request for approval of a 2,800 square-foot retail liquor store and a four bay self-serve car wash in a PD (Planned Development) zone district.**

**Petitioner: Fruitvale Texaco, LLC**

**Location: 2996 D Road**

**Representative: Sidney Squirrell**

**PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

Sid Squirrell briefly reviewed the request, noting that the liquor store had taken the place of the laundromat initially proposed. Requested hours of operation were from 7:00 AM to 11:00 PM.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dibble wondered why the use had been changed from a laundromat to a liquor store. Mr. Squirrell said that laundromats were more highly frequented by apartment dwellers. Given the limited number of apartments in the area, demographics did not support the use.

Commissioner Binder asked if access would be derived from D Road, to which Mr. Squirrell replied affirmatively. The two access points into the site were noted.

Commissioner Nall asked if the property was under one ownership. Mr. Squirrell answered that there were two separately-owned properties utilizing a shared access. He understood that a cross-access easement agreement would be required as a condition of approval.

Commissioner Dibble asked if the Texaco station would be independent of the liquor store-car wash, to which Mr. Squirrell replied affirmatively. Mr. Squirrell said that he intended to purchase the liquor store property from the Texaco station owner.

**STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Joe Carter said that as part of the Preliminary Plan a number of uses had been approved for the property. A liquor store was an allowed use. The five conditions outlined in the Preliminary Plan are applicable to the Final Plan. To satisfy access spacing concerns, the petitioner for the Texaco Station had purchased additional property to the west and had located the access there. Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Community Development Department approval of any change in the landscaping for the site, including the buffer area plantings.
2. A cross-access agreement or easement for both the fuel station and the proposed car wash and liquor store. The cross-access easement agreement or easements will provide access from D road to 30 Road for all potential accesses across the sites.
3. Dimensional parking lot modifications to show parking lot aisle widths at 24 feet as specified in the TEDS manual.
4. Correction of all spelling errors on the Landscape Plan.
5. Signage shall be limited to that which was previously approved for the Fruitvale Texaco and wall signage only for the proposed care wash and liquor store.
6. The applicant will provide the Development Engineer and the Community Development Department with a Site Plan, Detail Sheet and Grading and Drainage Plan with signature blocks.
7. If traffic is disrupted or if dangerous traffic patterns are created by the addition of the car wash and liquor store, the left-turn access to D road shall be restricted by a center median in D Road.
8. A drainage fee will be required before a Planning Clearance is issued.
9. Any further comment or requirements from the Central Grand Valley Sanitation District.

**QUESTIONS**

Vice-Chairman Grout wondered how long condition 7 would run with the property since no timeframe had been mentioned. Mr. Shaver said that as long as the property stayed in its current ownership the condition would remain in effect; if sold, the condition may become null. The City understood that the property's ownership could change and negate the condition, but it was also understood that traffic projections did not warrant immediate implementation of the condition. Any problem arising could occur 5-10 years down the road. The condition was more just to put the petitioner and/or successors on notice.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments either for or against the request.

**PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Mr. Squirrell said that the original petitioner for the Texaco Station's purchase of additional property to the west had not only met City requirements but also eliminated left-hand turning problems. He said that staff had told him that they did not foresee any new problems arising with the proposed change in use.

Mr. Carter added that the petitioner for the Texaco Station had improved D Road along the frontage to the west and widened the area to the extent that a deceleration lane could be created with just additional striping.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Binder wondered if there were any records available on the accident rates at the D Road intersection; she had seen a big accident there at the intersection earlier in the day. Mr. Shaver said that the type of reports available would probably not give the Commissioner the specific information she was looking for.

Commissioner Dibble recognized the need to protect and ensure traffic flows along D Road.

Vice-Chairman Grout said that it sounded as though there was sufficient width for a deceleration lane should one be necessary.

Commissioner Dibble said that the petitioner's narrative mentioned an island to discourage left-hand turns onto D Road and installation of a right-turn-only sign. Mr. Dorris was unaware of any mention of an island in the petitioner's report, but the County did not want to restripe the road and probably wouldn't until and only if turning became a problem. Mr. Shaver suggested that the condition could be imposed by the Planning Commission as a condition. Mr. Squirrell said that the Fire Department had expressed concern over the proposed island during discussions with the County, saying that it would impede emergency vehicle access. The island was ultimately deleted from the Preliminary Plan.

Mr. Dorris said that at the point 29 Road was extended, likely the intersection would be signalized. While traffic increases along D Road could warrant additional improvements, those improvements would not be required as a direct result of impacts from the current development.

Commissioner Nall observed that item 7 provided the City with a "safety net."

Vice-Chairman Grout concurred, adding that what was currently necessary was in place. The petitioner had met Code criteria.

Commissioner Dibble agreed, although expressing some reservation over what appeared to be restricted internal circulation patterns.



Commissioner Binder expressed continued concern over the double yellow striping in place at present. She felt that the striping should be made right or motorists would run the risk of being ticketed for crossing the double yellow line. Mr. Shaver said that restriping may be accomplished through the Public Works Department but he reminded the Commissioner that D Road was still within County jurisdiction. While no promises could be made, he, the Development Engineer and planning staff would pass her comments along to County staff for further consideration.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nall) “Mr. Chairman, on item FP-2000-105, Texaco Car Wash, I move that we find the project consistent with the Growth Plan, the Zoning and Development Code, and the approved Preliminary Plan, and that we approve the request for Final Plan subject to the conditions of the City Development Engineer, the Community Development Department, and the Central Grand Valley Sanitation District as stated in the staff report of August 15, 2000, and that these items are addressed and agreed to prior to issuance of a Planning Clearance, and that the reference to ‘laundromat’ in item 5 be changed to ‘liquor store.’”**

Commissioner Ainsworth seconded the motion.

Commissioner Dibble wondered if the name “Fruitvale Texaco” should be changed on the Preliminary Plan. Mr. Shaver thought that Fruitvale Texaco was probably the plan file name. As long as it made reference to a file number, it would be legally sufficient. Mr. Carter said that signage on the parcel would most likely reflect Kokepelli Liquors and Gecko Car Wash or something similar. The file reference, however, would remain Fruitvale Texaco.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

A brief recess was called at 8:25. The hearing reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

**PP-2000-127 PRELIMINARY PLAN—DESERT TRAILS CONDOS**

**Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for Desert Trails Condominiums consisting of 7 units in a PD (Planned Development) zone district.**

**Petitioner: Ben Hill/Faith Hill**  
**Location: 373 Ridges Blvd.**  
**Representative: Richard Atkins, dba Atkins & Associates**

**PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

Rob Martindale, representing the petitioner, briefly reviewed the request and availed himself for questions.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dibble asked for clarification on the site’s density. Mr. Martindale said that 7 units would be placed on 1.09 acres. Mr. Martindale, on behalf of the petitioner, expressed agreement with staff’s conditions of approval.

**STAFF’S PRESENTATION**

Tricia Parish said that the project met density recommendations outlined in the Growth Plan and also conformed with both street and urban trails plans. The site had always been designated “multi-family” in the Ridges overall development plan. Access, she said, would be provided via a non-exclusive ingress/egress easement from Ridges Blvd. An emergency access had been requested and a pedestrian connection had been provided to connect with the trail bordering the open space; a landscape plan would

be required at Final. She said that units will be a combination of one- and two-story dwellings. Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall contact the Fire Prevention Office for assistance in locating the “No Parking Fire Lane” signage.
2. The fire flow information shall be provided to the Fire Department. A 1,500 GPM minimum shall be provided at the new fire hydrant location. Documentation stamped by a licensed engineer is required.
3. The emergency access lane required by the Fire Department will require an agreement of the use of the general common element between the Desert Ridge Homeowners Association and Desert Trails Homeowners Association, and provide proof to staff at the Final phase.
4. The ownership, operation and maintenance of any and all general and/or limited common elements shall be outlined in an agreement subject to staff review and approval.

### **QUESTIONS**

Vice-Chairman Grout asked for further clarification on the emergency access requirement. Ms. Parish said that a general common element had been used as part of their emergency access; however, the relationship of that common element between the two projects was unclear. Clarification of that relationship was needed by the City to determine the petitioner’s right to use the common element as its emergency access. If this could not be accomplished, the petitioners would be required to reconfigure the cul-de-sac at the end of the private drive.

Mr. Shaver explained the difference between general and limited common elements. He said that it looked as though someone had presumed existence of a property line between the current and adjacent parcels. The City had been unable to find evidence that a subdivision involving the two parcels had occurred. It was possible that the covenants imposed on the Desert Ridges condominiums applied to the current development as well, with a legal relationship to the common elements already established.

Vice-Chairman Grout wondered if the project’s street design adhered to private street standards. Mr. Dorris said that private street standards had been utilized to accommodate circulation and parking but the project did not require City Council approval. Mr. Shaver added that although constructed to private street standards, the access was regarded more as a parking lot site circulator than a street.

Commissioner Dibble wondered if engineered foundations were a standard or had they been required to accommodate an anticipated problem? Mr. Dorris said that they had been required by the geotechnical report. He said that engineered foundations represented a good standard, especially for homes constructed in the Ridges. It was not anticipated that drainage would impact the integrity of structures.

Commissioner Binder asked if the 25-foot height restriction was part of the Ridges overall plan, to which Ms. Parish responded affirmatively.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**FOR:**

There were no comments for the request.

**AGAINST:**

Charles Knippel (381 ½ West Valley Circle, Grand Junction) said that the same numbers had been generated for each of two drainage scenarios with dirt or asphalt parking area. He questioned the validity of the results. He was unsure whether the drainage swale had enough slope to drain properly and asked that a retaining wall be constructed at the turn to prevent drainage water from flooding his backyard. A cross-section of the swale showed it to be 1 foot deep culminating in the southeast corner as a 10-foot-wide, 1-foot-deep retention area. He thought that at least 1 foot of freeboard was required for all retention/detention areas. While acknowledging the City's work on the culvert along West Ridges Boulevard and West Valley Circle, that area was prone to mud deposits. The development, it seemed, would only channel more water into this area, creating more mud. He asked that tree plantings be included in the landscape plan behind condo units to screen the backs of those structures from their neighbors. He was concerned that condo owners would use their backyards strictly for outdoor storage.

Jack Biddle (378 Soapweed Court, Grand Junction) expressed concerns over the noise, dust, lighting and traffic generated by the development. The development, he contended, was too dense.

Shirley Kalmbach (373 Ridges Boulevard, Grand Junction), representing the Desert Ridge Homeowners Association (HOA), said that the property boundary issue was a big concern for the HOA. The petitioner's use of the common area to accommodate an emergency access would result in the elimination of a large portion of that property and the destruction of an existing hedge. The area was currently being maintained by the Desert Ridge HOA. She also expressed concern that units along the lower half of the driveway would be accessing their homes via the Desert Ridge parking lot. She shared similar drainage concerns as other speakers.

Wendi Blake (379 West Valley Circle, Grand Junction) said that traffic behind her property was of concern since vehicle headlights would shine directly into her bedroom and living room at night. Drainage was also of concern since a 5-foot drop existed between the development and her property. She thought that a retaining wall was perhaps needed at this point as well to keep drainage water onsite. She agreed with previous comments that trees or a hedge were needed to deflect headlights from her home.

**PETITIONERS' REBUTTAL**

Mr. Martindale said that discussions with the City over the emergency access issue were ongoing and added that the situation would be resolved to the City's satisfaction. With regard to drainage, he said that proposed detention basins were more than adequate to handle stormwater runoff. When eastbound water crossed the open space, it would be picked up by the swale. At the point it made the turn referenced by Mr. Knippel, there shouldn't be much volume coming through the area. The landscaping plan would include a buffer for the adjoining properties so that headlights and nighttime street lighting wouldn't be an issue. Mr. Martindale said that the hedge referenced by Ms. Kalmbach was located on the petitioners' property and belonged to them. The property line, he stated, was defined pretty clearly by deeds recorded in 1985. Only one portion of the common area bordering Desert Ridges still required additional clarification. Homeowners would have ample recreation space by virtue of nearby open space, tennis courts, etc. Thus, small backyards should not pose a problem. Drainage going out into West Valley Circle would be controlled. The emergency access lane would be reworked to include a V-pan with 6-inch curbing to keep water from diverting to the Desert Ridge property. While the project was "tight," it met City criteria. It was felt that any remaining issues could be addressed prior to Final.

**QUESTIONS**

Mr. Shaver asked for additional clarification on the reference to the property's having been deeded. Mr. Martindale said that title work dated February 9, 2000 outlined the legal description, easements and ingress/egress easements over Desert Ridges. While a copy of the title work had been submitted to staff, it was unclear whether a copy of the deed had been submitted concurrently. Mr. Shaver said that further examination of the deed by staff would be required.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Nall wondered if the petitioners would be amenable to planting trees or other visual buffering along the rear property line. He suggested that perhaps a cost-sharing agreement could be reached. Mr. Martindale said that nothing but open space was located behind the units but agreed that there was always room for compromise. He didn't want to see homeowner access into open space areas restricted, however.

Commissioner Binder asked if patios would be included behind condo units. Mr. Martindale was unsure whether first or second floor patios would be incorporated; no final determination had been made.

Commissioner Binder said that with regard to the concern that backyards could be used as outdoor storage, she wondered if fencing could be erected at the end of patio slabs to help shield outdoor storage. Mr. Martindale said that each unit would come with a two-car garage. Another idea being considered included placement of small storage sheds behind each unit.

Commissioner Dibble asked for clarification of the retaining wall proposed for placement along the swale in the northern portion of the property. Mr. Martindale stated that a retaining wall had not been proposed for the area mentioned by Mr. Knippel because expected flows would be minimal. He agreed that there was a substantial drop between the subject property and that of Ms. Blake; he suggested that the location of drainage ponds in that area would collect all stormwater. A 2-foot retaining wall had been proposed for that area to halt excess drainage flows.

Commissioner Dibble wondered if additional berming could be constructed in the area where the swale angled to prevent unwanted diversion of drainage flows onto Mr. Knippel's property. Mr. Martindale agreed that additional berming could be helpful and agreed to include that as part of the drainage mitigation plan. When asked about the grading of the open space near the swale area, Mr. Martindale thought it was somewhere between 3-4 percent.

Commissioner Ainsworth said that the capacity of the drainage pond noted on the Preliminary Plan seemed to suggest that a large volume of water was expected. Mr. Martindale said that the pond's designer designed the pond to handle a 100-year event. Mr. Dorris reminded planning commissioners that at the Preliminary Plan stage, only the concepts of drainage mitigation need be considered; details would be further addressed at Final.

**DISCUSSION**

Vice-Chairman Grout asked if the request fell within new Code parameters, to which Ms. Parish responded affirmatively. The Final Plan would not be brought before the Planning Commission unless requested.

Commissioner Dibble felt that an informed decision on the project could not be made unless the property line and HOA issues were first clarified. He also asked that the Final Plan be brought before the Planning Commission for consideration. Mr. Shaver suggested that a continuance might be appropriate,

giving the petitioner time to clarify the issues mentioned; further review of the deed mentioned was essential.

A brief discussion ensued over continuance to a date certain; a period of 30 days should be sufficient.

Vice-Chairman Grout and both Commissioners Dibble and Putnam supported a continuance.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) “Mr. Chairman, on PP-2000-127, the Desert Trails Condominiums project, I would propose a continuance for the allotted time according to staff demands and have this heard within 30 days.”**

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**VR-2000-083 VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY/PRELIMINARY PLAN—WINDEMERE HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION**

**Request for a vacation of the southerly portion of Flower Street and approval of a Preliminary Plan for Windemere Heights Subdivision consisting of 20 single family lots on 10.09 acres in an RSF-2 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 2 units/acre) zone district.**

**Petitioner: Tierra Ventures, LLC  
Location: East of Flower Street and southeast of Central Avenue  
Representative: H&AJ Alberthsen, co-trustees**

**PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

Rob Katzenson, representing the petitioner, addressed the Preliminary Plan review he separately addressed the right-of-way vacation request.

Preliminary Plan: A visual exhibit of the subject property and an overhead transparency of the Preliminary Plan were presented. The project, he said, complied with Growth Plan density recommendations of 2-4 units/acre. A voluntary neighborhood meeting had been held to solicit input, with the major issue being traffic. Three proposed accesses for the project were noted. A 12-foot-wide pedestrian/bike path (Tract B) would access the City’s future park to the east. A currently open irrigation ditch would be piped and filled to grade within a 40-foot irrigation easement. Also installed within the 40-foot easement several feet below grade would be 6-inch perforated pipe used to convey any rising water table seepage and discharge into a proposed connection manhole, tying into a piped portion of the downstream section of the Grand Valley Water Users Association (GVWUA) drain. This proposal had already received GVWUA approval. A “cluster” of irrigation structures was located in the southeast corner of the property (location noted). An appropriate easement would be dedicated to ensure continued access for maintenance.

Right-of-Way: The current project represented infill, with the subject property being the last unsubdivided property in the area. An overhead transparency of a photo depicting the right-of-way area was shown. It showed a field overgrown with brush and trees; obstructions had been built within its boundaries by adjacent homeowners. Mr. Katzenson said that once vacated, the subject portion of right-of-way would be dedicated back to the Alberthsens. The petitioners were also assisting the adjoining Melody Park property owners in vacating the entire Flower Street right-of-way to the north. Thus, another vacation request would be forthcoming during the development process. Should the entire right-of-way be vacated, a delivery cistern would revert back to Ms. Eden’s property. Ms. Eden had expressed concern over this and wished to be indemnified from its maintenance and repair. This issue had still not been resolved. If a full vacation of Flower Street was not possible, the petitioner for the preliminary plat

preferred “payment in-lieu” of constructing right-of-way improvements. The Alberthsen’s had also agreed to grant a 15-foot easement for part of the irrigation structure coming off the cluster serving the Melody Park Subdivision.

With regard to staff Conditions of Approval, Mr. Katzenson asked for clarification on condition 1. He felt that given the petitioners’ agreement with the first sentence of condition 5, the second sentence seemed redundant; a plat note seemed unnecessary. With regard to condition 7, he asked that language be included to specify applicable sections of the Development Code referencing exact requirements. He also thought that the condition needed to be restated to better reflect the City’s intent.

### **QUESTIONS**

Vice-Chairman Grout said that even if an HOA were proposed with the request, it wouldn’t be a bad idea to include a plat note as required by condition 5. It put the homeowners on notice that unimpeded access to irrigation and drainage facilities was required for maintenance. Mr. Katzenson felt that the CC&Rs were probably a sufficient vehicle for homeowner notification.

Vice-Chairman Grout asked if the piped GVVUA lines would be relocated within the established easements, to which Mr. Katzenson replied affirmatively. The main easement for the GVVUA lines would be 40 feet wide. When asked if the easement’s width would change as it moved to the northwest, Mr. Katzenson responded negatively. Building envelopes would still fit on lots without adverse impact or setback encroachment.

Commissioner Dibble asked if front and rear yards had been designated for lots 1, 2 and 3 along Flower Street. Mr. Katzenson said that if vacation of Flower Street to the north could not be achieved by Final, a plat note designating rear yards may be necessary. Mr. Cecil said that staff condition 7 addressed the double frontage situation.

Commissioner Dibble asked if there were encroachments presently within the Flower Street right-of-way. Mr. Katzenson referenced the photo presented previously and noted the existence of large Russian Olive trees and structures; Mr. Cecil said that a shed had been constructed in the right-of-way.

Commissioner Dibble asked if setbacks from the right-of-way could be established at some future point should Flower Street be constructed. Mr. Cecil said that this was the City’s only opportunity to secure the right-of-way fence and landscaping should vacation not occur. He noted the existence of two parcels along the Flower Street right-of-way which could potentially be developed and derive access from Flower Street.

Mr. Katzenson presented an overhead transparency of the right-of-way and explained how its vacation would occur.

Commissioner Binder wondered why the City would consent to vacating a platted street. Mr. Dorris said that if the two lots mentioned by Mr. Cecil could be replatted and developed so that they did not require Flower Street access, it would be that much less infrastructure for the City to maintain. The street was not necessary for circulation. The City actually preferred a complete vacation given the number of other cross streets in the area; however, until that occurred, the City had to regard Flower Street as a platted street and had conditioned the current request accordingly.

Mr. Shaver asked if building envelopes had been designated. Mr. Katzenson said that while setbacks had been generally noted, specific building envelopes had not been denoted on the Preliminary Plan. Mr.

Shaver said that given the configuration of the 40-foot easement across a number of the lots, that information would be required.

**STAFF’S PRESENTATION**

Pat Cecil said that the request met Growth Plan density recommendations. Drainage mitigation and access to irrigation structures were primary issues. A number of nearby residents objected to the extension of Centauri and Central Drives through the subdivision, preferring instead a series of cul-de-sacs. However, these through streets served a number of useful functions including improved neighborhood interconnectivity and provision of access for emergency service vehicles. No onsite open space was required; however, the petitioners would be providing a pedestrian path to the future park area east of the subdivision. A drainage release agreement from GVWUA was still required. Staff recommended approval of the vacation and approval of the Preliminary Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioners shall provide an indemnification agreement with the City regarding stormwater.
2. A 14-foot multi-purpose easement must be provided on the Final Plat along the entire frontage of Flower Street that is not being vacated.
3. The petitioners shall pay the half-street improvement cost for the portion of Flower Street not being vacated.
4. If detention of stormwater is proposed the petitioner shall submit a fully executed drainage release agreement with the Grand Valley Water Users Association at the time of submittal of the Final Plat for processing.
5. All open irrigation and drainage facilities shall be piped and relocated within easements created for the benefit of the facilities’ users. The easements shall be physically accessible for maintenance of the facilities and a note to this effect shall be placed on the Final Plat.
6. At the time of submittal of the Final Plat for processing, a geotechnical report shall be supplied, to be reviewed and approved by the Colorado Geological Survey.
7. In the even that the rights-of-way for Beta Place and that portion of Flower Street located behind lots 1, 2 and 3 of Block 1 are not vacated prior to submittal of the Final Plat for processing, then a tract shall be designated on the Final Plat adjacent to these rights-of-way a minimum of 5 feet in width containing landscaping, irrigation, and a right-of-way fence. This tract shall be owned and maintained by the homeowners association.

Mr. Cecil also suggested that if planning commissioners so chose, they could add another condition requiring the designation of building envelopes.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Binder noted the existence of a “traffic choker” on the Preliminary Plan located at the north end of the development. She wondered whether this was to mitigate an expected problem? Mr. Cecil was unsure and suggested directing the question to Mr. Katzenson.

Commissioner Nall said citizens' letters referenced a promise allegedly made by the City during annexation that Centauri Drive would not be extended as a through street. Mr. Cecil said that staff could find nothing to that effect in any of the files.

Vice-Chairman Grout said that if Flower Street was neither vacated nor developed, would it continue to be maintained by the City as an unimproved right-of-way? Mr. Cecil referenced previous photos and suggested that the term "maintained" was probably a misnomer. He added that even with homeowner structures built in the right-of-way, without the vacation the City retained legal ownership. Mr. Shaver added that the law of "adverse possession" did not apply to governmental entities.

Commissioner Putnam asked for the City's rationale on its lack of cul-de-sac support. Referencing an overhead transparency of the area's street configurations, Mr. Dorris said that in addition to the reasons given by staff, through streets cut down on the wear and tear of City infrastructure and vehicles and saved fuel because the driver's route was more direct.

Commissioner Nall asked if there were any nearby traffic generators (e.g., shopping centers, etc.), to which Mr. Dorris replied negatively.

Commissioner Binder asked if all the streets in the subdivision were 44 feet wide, to which Mr. Dorris answered affirmatively. He said that the surrounding street connections had 50 feet of right-of-way but only 21 feet of asphalt.

Vice-Chairman Grout asked if the positioning of the traffic choker was appropriate or "just there." Mr. Dorris said that the City requested one be placed in its current general location. Further refinement of this detail could be necessary.

Commissioner Ainsworth asked if a driveway off of G 3/8 Road would serve lot 4 in the northwest corner, to which Mr. Dorris replied affirmatively.

Mr. Cecil added that Centauri Drive as a through street would allow other residents in the area to access the City's future park.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

### **FOR:**

There were no comments for the request.

### **AGAINST:**

Patti Taylor (703 Centauri Drive, Grand Junction) read into the record a letter by her husband Michael Sutherland, past City planner, City Council member, Asst. Airport Manager and current interim Planning Director for the town of Parker, CO. The letter, copies of which were distributed to staff and planning commissioners, claimed a number of design deficiencies in the plan and highlighted specific safety concerns. Photos of the existing Centauri Drive were attached to the letter which showed a distinct jog in the road, inadequate pavement and a lack of curb, gutter and sidewalk. The letter also proposed a number of solutions to the problems outlined and included an alternate design plan, which incorporated the use of two cul-de-sacs. The alternate design plan proposed a knock-down barrier to the north for emergency vehicle access and additional pedestrian path connections. Interconnectivity was not evident in surrounding subdivisions, and Mr. Sutherland contended that it should not be forced on this neighborhood. Mr. Sutherland expressed support for the infill project but strongly urged its redesign.



Peter Black (710 Centauri Drive, Grand Junction) said that the jog referenced previously represented a significant safety hazard. The mat width of the road in front of his house, he said, was only 21 feet, and no drainage facilities existed in the area. While not opposed to infill development, he urged consideration of Mr. Sutherland's design alternative and said that it was much more acceptable to residents in the area. Extension of Centauri Drive, he said, would funnel a huge volume of traffic through their subdivision and further jeopardize the safety of children and pedestrians. He understood from the TEDS manual that a traffic study was required if safety concerns existed. Why then had a study not been required? After further review of the manual, he could find no mention of interconnectivity requirements and wondered if this was an arbitrary condition imposed by the City. Mr. Black noted the lack of on-street parking area and said that when vehicles did park on the street, it effectively reduced the street to a single-lane width.

J.D. Snodgrass (704 Galaxy Drive, Grand Junction) said that the TEDS manual also did not preclude the use of cul-de-sacs as an appropriate planning tool. He mirrored the same concerns as had previously been mentioned and urged consideration of Mr. Sutherland's design alternative.

Dennis Wagner (740 Centauri Drive, Grand Junction) said that a number of promises had been made by City staff during the annexation process, one of which was that Centauri would never be extended as a through street. He expressed strong support for Mr. Sutherland's design alternative.

Rod Christ (2677 Continental Drive, Grand Junction) suggested keeping lot 6 next to Continental Drive open and constructing a pedestrian path to the north.

Carla Eden (2660 Central Drive, Grand Junction) concurred with previous neighbor commentary and expressed opposition to what she viewed as "forced interconnectivity." She sought indemnification for maintenance/repair of the delivery cistern mentioned by Mr. Katzenson and felt that the open boxes posed safety hazards. She thought that perhaps the petitioners were underestimating the drainage problems on the property. She'd had to install a French drain to divert groundwater runoff away from her home. She also suggested requiring at least two additional traffic chokers. With all the references made to park accessibility, she said that having lived for years with the promises of a park, she doubted that its development would ever come to fruition.

Earl Reynolds (745 Centauri Drive, Grand Junction) said that there was a lot of pedestrian traffic along Centauri. His research indicated that extension of Centauri would represent the first inter-neighborhood through street anywhere in the area.

#### **PETITIONERS' REBUTTAL**

Mr. Katzenson said that to address Ms. Eden's concern regarding the cistern, if vacation of the southern portion of Flower Street was successful, Mr. Alberthsen would relocate the headgate on his side of the property. A 15-foot irrigation easement would be dedicated concurrent with the vacation. Mr. Katzenson said that he'd engaged in extensive meetings with the City. The project met all requirements and deserved approval.

#### **QUESTIONS**

Vice-Chairman Grout wondered why the cistern was even there. Mr. Katzenson said that it was a distribution box for the irrigation system.

Commissioner Binder asked for the rationale behind placement of the traffic choker in its present location. Mr. Katzenson was unsure, but Mr. Dorris had expressed approval for its general location.

Commissioner Nall observed that the choker's location might provide a satisfactory transition from one street width to another. He asked Mr. Katzenson if he'd been given a chance to review Mr. Sutherland's design proposal. Would he have any objection to considering a cul-de-sac design? Mr. Katzenson said that he hadn't previously seen the referenced design alternative and so wasn't in a position to make a decision without first consulting with his clients.

Commissioner Dibble remarked that the new proposal could prove to be viable. It not only seemed to have merit but appeared to be supported by surrounding residents. He asked if the petitioners would be willing to consider the possibility of another alternative? Had he or the petitioners considered the differences in street quality that would exist between the older neighborhood and the new development? Mr. Katzenson reemphasized his continued participation in discussions with City planning and engineering staff to come up with a design to meet City requirements. The current submittal, he said, met those conditions and had been recommended for approval by staff. Commissioner Dibble expressed reservation in approving a plan which garnered so much objection by residents when another, perhaps more appropriate design alternative was available that could meet City requirements and satisfy resident concerns. To that end, Commissioner Dibble said that the alternative seemed worthy of consideration.

When asked for his input, Mr. Cecil said that speaking strictly from a planning perspective, it made sense to provide the interconnectivity that the current design proposed. There were many valid reasons both for and against, he said.

Vice-Chairman Grout cautioned planning commissioners to direct their attention toward consideration of the current proposal as submitted. A brief discussion ensued over the option for continuance but this was discouraged by Mr. Shaver because the issues in this application are not factual but policy; unlike the last item, this proposal was complete. Also, if major changes were proposed to the current plan, it effectively became a new plan and subject to renotices. Also, he said, that the policy issues with the current request called for a balancing of a competing set of values.

When asked about the number and content of neighborhood meetings, Mr. Katzenson said that two had been held. The objections raised this evening by residents were the same ones raised during those meetings.

## **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Putnam asked if a traffic study requirement had merit. Mr. Dorris said that the project did not qualify for the requirement.

Commissioner Nall asked if a knock-down barrier merited further consideration. Mr. Dorris said that barriers of this type were generally associated with more restrictive sites with fewer access opportunities. Again, this project did not qualify.

Commissioner Binder wondered how far away the nearest fire station was located. Mr. Shaver thought that the one located in the Pomona School area off of 25 ½ Road was probably the closest.

Mr. Shaver reminded the planning commissioners that they could decide which evidence carried the greatest weight. He framed the issue saying that there were many good arguments for the current design and perhaps just as many arguments against. He added that the term "interconnectivity" was specifically mentioned in the new Code, the Growth Plan and in the new version of the TEDS manual but presently is not well defined.

Commissioner Dibble expressed concern that such a narrow street was being proposed as a through connection, especially when the streets on either end appeared deficient. If Centauri and Central Drives were to be approved as through streets, improvement to the other sections of connecting streets should be improved. Mr. Dorris agreed that safety problems may continue to exist with the jog in Centauri Drive. He thought that interconnectivity could be achieved in ways other than by extending Centauri. Other options were available, but he did not concur with Mr. Sutherland's proposal to cul-de-sac Centauri. If denied, he suggested planning commissioners give specific direction to the petitioners.

Commissioner Binder said that where she'd lived before, a home near hers had burned to the ground because an emergency vehicle could not find its way into the subdivision and to the house in time. She felt that the narrower streets to the south would effectively slow traffic traveling through the subdivision. Interconnectivity was an important consideration, and she used the downtown street grid as an example. She also felt that public access to the future park area was also important. While she was generally not in favor of long, straight stretches of street running through neighborhoods, she acknowledged that there were traffic calming measures which could be employed to mitigate any problems (*e.g.*, speed bumps, additional traffic chokers, stop signs, etc.).

Commissioner Putnam remarked that several residents had stated in written and verbal testimony that the City had promised them that there would be no extension of Centauri. With no reason to doubt their testimony, he felt that the City should at least consider this argument. He expressed opposition to the plan as presented.

Commissioner Nall expressed his divided sentiment over the proposal. On the one hand the petitioners had complied with staff requirements and had satisfied technical elements; however, he thought there were certainly other, better ways of achieving interconnectivity without creating safety hazards for neighborhood residents. He felt reluctantly inclined to support the request.

Vice-Chairman Grout acknowledged the petitioners' compliance with City requirements from a technical standpoint. From a design standpoint, however, other options were available which could satisfy City requirements and resident concerns. He felt that those options needed further investigation. Being familiar with the area and given the deficiencies of the connecting streets, he felt he could not support the project as proposed.

Commissioner Putnam said that if choosing between penalizing the developer and penalizing the residents living there, he chose to risk erring on the side of the residents.

Commissioner Dibble said that the Planning Commission was charged with acting in the best interests of the entire community. There were, in his mind, definite safety issues inherent to the current design plan.

Commissioner Binder wondered why through streets had been supported for other projects but not for this one. Vice-Chairman Grout answered that connecting streets off of Centauri and Central Drives were both narrow and deficient in their design; they could not support increased traffic volumes without further improvement.

Commissioner Binder said that she could support better alternatives for interconnectivity, but that didn't include placing cul-de-sacs at the ends of each street. Vice-Chairman Grout agreed. A number of other, more preferable alternatives were available.

Mr. Shaver asked that any motion made include the Planning Commission's rationale.

Commissioner Ainsworth felt it important to be sensitive to the needs of residents already living in the area. He agreed that neighborhood interconnectivity hadn't generally been an issue.

Mr. Katzenson added that Parks representative Shawn Cooper supported greater accessibility to the City's future park area. Mr. Katzenson offered to install a 3-way stop sign at the intersection of Centauri and Central Drives.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Ainsworth) "Mr. Chairman, on the vacation of the southerly portion of the Flower Street right-of-way, I move that we recommend approval of the right-of-way vacation to the City Council, finding that the proposed vacation is consistent with the Growth Plan and Section 2.11 of the Zoning and Development Code, with a condition that requires that a 15-foot irrigation easement be created on the easterly boundary of the vacation area in favor of the Grand Valley Water Users Association prior to the completion of the vacation process."**

Commissioner Nall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Putnam) "Mr. Chairman, on the Preliminary Plan for the Windemere Heights Subdivision, I move that we deny approval because of safety concerns, particularly on the southern portion of Centauri Drive, and the other concerns that the public has expressed in the record, those concerns being the interconnectivity of Centauri Drive in particular when there are many alternatives that could be looked at that maybe haven't been pursued in relation to the length of Centauri Drive."**

Commissioner Ainsworth seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-2, with Commissioners Nall and Binder opposing.

Vice-Chairman Grout acknowledged the efforts of the petitioners and their representative. He urged neighbors to take a more proactive stance and work more closely with the developer to come up with a workable design alternative that would still meet City requirements. He said that residents needed to realize that increased traffic was inherent with any development.

Commissioner Dibble concurred, adding that it was in the neighborhood's best interest to be involved in the design process. Residents needed to realize, however, that they may not end up with their ideal of cul-de-sacs at the end of each street.

## **V. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Mr. Shaver provided a brief update on the Village Park project. The petitioners, he said, would possibly be submitting an amended Preliminary Plan request and filing for a Final on the commercial portion of the subdivision. If planning commissioners recalled specific discussions on the amended condition, or if a direction other than requiring an amended Preliminary Plan was preferred, he asked that those recollections and/or suggestions be brought forward. Mr. Cecil briefly reviewed the situation as well.

The next Planning Commission hearing on the 24 Road Corridor would be held sometime in September. A joint City/County Planning Commission meeting had been scheduled for August 31 in the County's auditorium. Mr. Cecil said that a special meeting would likely be called in September for the appeal of the Mesa Village Marketplace.

With no further business, the hearing was adjourned at midnight.