

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing - March 5, 1996
7:05 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:05 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium by Chairman John Elmer.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were: John Elmer (Chairman), Jeff Driscoll, Bob Withers, Tom Whitaker, and Paul Coleman.

In attendance, representing Planning Department staff, were Kathy Portner (Planning Supervisor), Mike Pelletier (Associate Planner), Kristen Ashbeck (Associate Planner), Michael Drollinger (Sr. Planner), Bill Nebeker (Sr. Planner), and Dave Thornton (Sr. Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Asst. City Attorney), Larry Timm (Community Development Director), and Jody Kliska (City Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 33 citizens present.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Consideration of the minutes for February 6 was deferred to the March 12 hearing.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or prescheduled visitors.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

FPP-96-28 AMENDED PRELIMINARY PLAN, FINAL PLAT/PLAN, FILING #3, OPEN SPACE FEE WAIVER--CANYON VIEW SUBDIVISION

Request to: 1) amend the approved Preliminary Plan; 2) approve Filing #3 for 19 single family lots on 8.9 acres of land; and 3) waive parks and open space fees in lieu of dedication of 4.65 acres for use as parks and open space.

Petitioner: John Thomas, Thomas and Sun, Inc.

Location: South Camp Road and Canyon View Drive

Representative: Craig Roberts (Ciavonne and Associates, Inc.)

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker outlined the three elements of the proposal and indicated the site location on the maps provided. While the petitioner had agreed to construct a bicycle/pedestrian path along South Camp Road to the northern property line, Mr. Nebeker noted that a 15-foot strip of land existed from the end of the petitioner's northern property line to Wingate School where the bike bath had not been constructed. If the petitioner agreed to continue the path to Wingate School, a credit will be applied to the TCP for this or a future phase. Due to the existence of a large detention pond in the north side of the park site, Mr. Nebeker recommended staff condition 2. be reworded such that the requirement for construction of the 8-foot-wide pedestrian path from Canyon View Drive to the park site be deleted if deemed unnecessary. He also stated that the ODP for Phases V & VI should not be approved at this time because this area is zoned PR-1 dwelling unit per 35 acres, which is not consistent with the ODP layout.

With no other major issues outstanding, staff recommended approval of the Final Plat for Canyon View Subdivision, Phase III, and Revised Preliminary Plan for Phases III and IV, subject to the following conditions:

Revised Preliminary

1. The revised Preliminary Plan is approved for Phases III and IV only.
2. Phase IV shall include a minimum of a 12-foot-wide pedestrian easement along the Redlands Canal and from the cul-de-sac adjacent to the park, to the park.

Final Plan

1. A bicycle/pedestrian path along South Camp Road shall be constructed to the south property line. If the applicant desires to construct the path to Wingate School, a credit will be applied to the TCP for this or a future phase.
2. Construct an 8-foot-wide concrete path in the 12-foot pedestrian easement between Canyon Court and the new park site (amended).
3. Remove Redcliff Drive from the Final Subdivision Plat.
4. Side setbacks shall include 20 feet on corner lots for garages and an 80-foot center line setback along South Camp Road.
5. A street light is required at the intersection of South Camp Road and South Canyon View Drive.

With the dedication of a 4.67 acre park site adjacent to Wingate Elementary School, staff also recommended that the waiver of open space fees be granted.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked why the pedestrian easement wasn't required for connection to Canyon Court. Mr. Nebeker replied that an easement and path is required between Canyon Court West and South Canyon View Drive but the path construction in Phase II was a condition of Filing 2; although path construction in Filing 2 had not been completed to date, the petitioner has agreed to construct the path as required.

Commissioner Vogel asked for clarification of staff's amending of condition 2.

Commissioner Withers suggested the following wording for condition 2.: "A pedestrian easement and path shall be constructed between Lots 8 and 9, Block 2 or other such location(s) approved by staff." Mr. Nebeker concurred with this wording.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Craig Roberts, representing the petitioner, elaborated briefly on the history of the development and the reason for the requested revision to the Preliminary Plan. He indicated that the petitioner would be willing to add the 15-foot strip of land to Wingate Elementary, provided it was located on their property. He agreed that access to the park site was important, saying that the petitioner intended to provide the path originally required for Filing II and any paths required by staff for Filings III and IV. He wanted to make sure that path locations and alignment made sense, adding that neighborhood input would be encouraged.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Withers asked if the easement located along Lot 6, Block 3 would remain, to which Mr. Roberts said that it would since it served as a utilities easement and drive.

Commissioner Withers asked for clarification on staff's consideration of the proposal as a Preliminary Plan rather than an ODP, which was given. He also asked about any proposed street lighting for the two new intersections. Mr. Roberts said that street lighting was being discouraged to protect night views. Commissioner Withers felt that at least one light may be needed for the intersection of Redcliff Drive and South Canyon View Drive. John

Thomas, petitioner, interjected and added that if the street becomes a residential collector, additional traffic control and safety measures would have to be considered.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) “Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-96-28, I move that we approve the Canyon View Subdivision Phase III and Revised Preliminary for Phases III and IV, subject to the conditions and staff recommendations, including the revised condition 2.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) “Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-96-28, the second issue, waiver of the open space fees, I move that we recommend approval of waiving the fees and pass this on to the City Council.”

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

FPP-96-20 REZONE, AMENDED PRELIMINARY PLAN, FINAL PLAT/PLAN--COUNTRY CROSSING, FILINGS I and II

Request to: 1) rezone from PR-17 (Planned Residential, 17 units per acre) to PR-3.75 (Planned Residential, 3.75 units per acre); 2) amend the approved Preliminary Plan for Country Crossings Subdivision; and 3) Final Plat approval for Filing I (3 single family residential lots), Filing II (21 single family lots) and various sized outlots.

Petitioner: Denny Granum, Country Crossing LLC
Location: Southeast corner of 25 and G Roads
Representative: Brian Hart, Land Design

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger outlined the proposal, giving both overview and site history. He indicated that the Preliminary Plan was being revised to accommodate changes in phasing. With no major issues outstanding, staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner must provide a copy of the deed which conveys the subject parcel to the applicant.
2. The plat must be modified to provide a multi-use path easement along the Grand Valley Canal which is to be dedicated to the City. The remainder of the area may be retained in private open space. The dedication must be acceptable to the Parks Department.
3. A pavement design report which is acceptable to the Development Engineer must be provided.
4. The petitioner must clarify the future use of proposed Lot E. If the lot is to be used for other than private open space, then access to a public street must be provided.

Mr. Drollinger indicated that the petitioner had already complied with condition 1.; therefore, it could be deleted. He added that while the Parks Department had decided against acquisition of tract D as public open space, they would like a 15- to 20-foot pedestrian path easement, with tract D to remain as private open space. Mr. Drollinger indicated that he was currently working with the Parks Department on a suitable alignment for the path, to be roughly parallel with the canal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Withers and Mr. Drollinger proposed the following revised wording for staff condition 2.: “Lot D must be shown as private open space with a 15- to 20-foot public pedestrian easement, subject to staff approval.”

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Brian Hart of Land Design, representing the petitioner, said that, to avoid a potential landlock situation, the petitioner was working to dispose of Lot E, believing that the lot might be of interest to an adjacent landowner. He felt that the width of the pedestrian easement proposed by staff could be worked out with the Parks Department. A new pavement design report would be submitted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) “Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-96-20, a request for amendment to a Preliminary Plan and Final Plat/Plan approval for Filing I and II, I move that the plans be approved subject to staff conditions in the staff report as amended tonight, to include deleting item 1. and amending item 2.”

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) “Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-96-20, a request for rezone from PR-17 to PR-3.8, I move that we forward this on to City Council with recommendation of approval.”

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

RZF-96-26 REZONE AND FINAL PLAT AND PLAN--PUMPHOUSE SUBDIVISION

Request to: 1) rezone from RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre) to PC (Planned Commercial) for lot 1; 2) Final Plat to subdivide approximately 36.3 acres into three lots; and 3) Final Plan approval for Lot 1.

Petitioner: Redlands Water and Power Company
Location: South Camp road and South Broadway
Representative: Rolland Engineering

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner presented an overview of the proposal and indicated the site location on the maps provided. She said that the petitioner was proposing a minor subdivision to accommodate the rezone request. Lot 3 in the proposed minor subdivision would be created due to the separation of the property by South Broadway. Due to the steep topography and limited, if not impossible, development potential of Lot 3, staff suggested that, if approved, the plat include a note putting potential future buyers on notice that the lot might not be developable. Ms. Portner said that since the petitioner’s pumping station was already located on the property and that Redlands Water and Power was viewed as a service provider, rezoning to allow limited commercial use was appropriate. She expressed opposition, however, to any other commercial uses for the site. Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. All technical concerns of the review agencies, specific to the plat, must be addressed prior to recording the plat.
2. The plat shall contain a prominent note stating that lot 3, because of the steep terrain, might be difficult, if not impossible, to develop in a manner acceptable to the City.

Staff recommends approval of the rezone and Final Plan with the following conditions:

1. Final site plan review will be required for lot 1.
2. The approved signage for the site will not exceed a 4 square feet, non-illuminated sign. Such signage can be on the building or a monument-style, freestanding sign.
3. All concerns of the Grand Junction Fire Department, City Development Engineer, and Community Development must be addressed through the site plan review process.
4. The PC (Planned Commercial) zoning shall be specific to Redlands Water and Power's proposed uses and site plan.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer said that the zoning of lot 3 would not necessarily preclude the building of even a single residential structure; thus, he proposed designating the lot as open space to prevent any building on it. He also asked if the storage of materials would be screened on site, to which Ms. Portner replied affirmatively.

Chairman Elmer asked if the County had approved any plans for adjacent properties. Ms. Portner was not aware of any pending proposals.

Chairman Elmer asked about the two mobile homes which currently existed on one of the lots. Ms. Portner indicated that upon approval of the proposal, the mobile homes would be non-conforming and that if moved or destroyed, they could not be replaced.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Ed Carpenter, Chairman of Redlands Water and Power, indicated that the proposal would consolidate operations and save the shareholders money.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification on the storage of materials on site. Mr. Carpenter said that there wouldn't be that much to store.

Chairman Elmer asked for the petitioner's opinion in calling lot 3 "open space." Mr. Carpenter preferred not to do so, but agreed to abide by staff's recommendation to include a plat note.

When asked for legal ramifications of such a plat note, Mr. Shaver said that it was a question of expectation for a potential buyer. He said that even the definition of "open space" was subject to change and interpretation. Chairman Elmer asked if this lot could be zoned Planned Residential. Mr. Shaver said that without a submitted plan, it was not advised.

Mr. Carpenter clarified that the proposed signage was 16 square feet, not the 4 square feet indicated in the staff report. Ms. Portner said that this amendment would still fall within the signage allowance and agreed to amend the recommendation to include a 16-square-foot sign.

Chairman Elmer asked if the petitioner would ever have cause to start up heavy equipment on site at night in the event of emergencies. Mr. Carpenter said that this would be very infrequent, but that it might be necessary on occasion.

Commissioner Vogel felt that any proposed structure should be in keeping with the existing residential character of the neighborhood. Mr. Carpenter said that a pre-fab metal building was far less expensive than one made from wood and the former was his choice for the site.

Commissioner Withers felt that even if a metal building was placed on the site, it could be more architecturally pleasing if it were made out of earth tone-colored metal panels and not galvanized.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Jim Shea (438 Meadows Way, Grand Junction) although in favor of the proposal, he suggested realignment of South Broadway.

AGAINST:

Linda Rattan, owner of property located at 2222 and 2226 South Broadway, opposed all commercial zoning for the site. She felt that outdoor storage would be equivalent to that of Grand Valley Irrigation, which she viewed as not being compatible for a residential neighborhood. She indicated that she'd submitted a letter of protest to staff.

Sam Marutsky (2229 Redlands Parkway, Grand Junction) also expressed opposition to commercial zoning for properties on the Redlands.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Carpenter said that some of the company's materials would be stored on the current power plant site and that he agreed to screen materials stored on the site.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Withers reiterated his preference for colored, rather than galvanized, metal panels.

Ms. Portner suggested adding specific verbiage to the motion to address outdoor storage of materials.

Chairman Elmer asked if a landscaping plan had been approved, to which Ms. Portner replied that the proposal was still preliminary; additional detail would be required for adequate site plan review.

Chairman Elmer was concerned about protecting aesthetics in a residential area. Ms. Portner said that the Commission could offer a suitable color range for building materials.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item RSF-96-26, I move we forward the request for a rezone for Redlands Water and Power on to City Council with recommendation of approval, subject to staff conditions 1. through 4.; 2., the square footage of the sign should be changed from 4 square feet to 16 square feet; and add 5. 'All buildings must have architectural, earth tone-colored metal panels rather than plain or galvanized steel.' (add) Item 6. 'Any and all stored materials and/or equipment shall be effectively from public view as seen from the adjacent roadway.'"

There was additional discussion concerning the various points noted in Commissioner Withers' motion.

Commissioner Whitaker seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion was defeated by a 3-3 tie vote, with Commissioners Vogel and Coleman and Chairman Elmer opposing.

Mr. Shaver explained the appeal process to the petitioner.

VR-96-22 VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY--SOUTH RIM SUBDIVISION, FILING #1

Request to vacate approximately 596 square feet of a dedicated public pedestrian right-of-way.

Petitioner: David Behrhorst, Lowe Development Corp.

Location: South Rim Drive and Teal Court

Representative: Monty Stroup, Land Design, LLC

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger said that the vacation would allow the petitioner to include a landscape feature with Filing #5 soon to be brought before the Commission. The vacation would not impede the trail system, and staff recommended approval.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

No further comments were received from the petitioner or his representative.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) "Mr. Chairman, on item VR-96-22, vacation of right-of-way, I move that we forward this on to the City Council with recommendation of approval."

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

VR-96-24 VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY--F ROAD AND MANTEY HEIGHTS DRIVE

Request to: 1) vacate a portion of the alley right-of-way just south of F Road and east of Mantey Heights Drive; and 2) replat lots 41, 42, 49, and 50 of Mantey Heights Subdivision.

Petitioner: Tony Taylor

Location: South of F Road, east of Mantey Heights Drive

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker said that the vacation would allow the petitioner to combine all four of his lots into one buildable lot. Adjacent property owners expressed opposition to the entire alley vacation; thus, staff recommended vacation of only the alley within the proposed replat. The petitioner agreed to relocate any utilities in the vacated portion of the alley.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

No further comments were offered by the petitioner.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked for clarification on who would do the replat, which was provided.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item VR-96-24, I move that we forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the Rosehaven Subdivision and vacation of the alley within the subdivision as outlined in the staff recommendations (eliminating reference to retaining an irrigation and utility easement, as amended)."

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

VR-96-25 VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY--EAST OF HIGHWAY 50 TO CANON STREET

Request to vacate the north half of an alley in Block 5, Orchard Mesa Heights, as amended, located between lots 1 and 4 on the north and lot 5 on the south.

Petitioner: Leroy Workman

Location: Highway 50 and Canon Street

Representative: Harold Cope

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck said that the right-of-way had never been developed as an alley and that there were existing encroachments into the right-of-way which would preclude future alley development. The utility companies indicated that no easement was needed to accommodate utilities. Staff recommended approval of the vacation.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

No further comment was offered by the petitioner or his representative.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Coleman) "Mr. Chairman, on item VR-96-25, a request to vacate an east-west alley near the southeast corner of U.S. Hwy 50 and Grand Mesa Avenue, I move we forward the item on to City Council with recommendation of approval."

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

RZ-96-32 REZONE--903 AND 915 GRAND AVENUE

Request to rezone two houses located on four City lots from PZ (Public Zone) to RMF-64 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 64 units per acre).

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Location: 903 and 915 Grand Avenue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck gave a brief history of the site, saying that the public zone had never been reverted to a non-public zone when the property transferred to the present private owner, the Salvation Army. The interim zone of RMF-64 was recommended prior to approval and implementation of the City/County Growth Plan.

The proposed zoning would provide suitable setbacks to allow the Salvation Army to replace its existing garage. Staff recommended approval.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer understood the Growth Plan to call for a lower density residential zone for the subject area. If the site was rezoned, would it still be non-conforming? Ms. Ashbeck said that the Growth Plan called for zoning from between 4 and 8 units per acre and that the use would be non-conforming. If the present use should desire to expand, it would then require a Conditional Use Permit in a residential zone.

John Ballagh, representing the property owner, expounded briefly on the petitioner's desire to replace the garage which had been burned.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Driscoll) "Mr. Chairman, on item RZ-96-32, a rezone request from a public zone to RMF-64, I move that we forward that to the City Council with the recommendation that we approve that."

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

MS-96-30 REZONE AND FINAL PLAT--SHERWOOD PARK

Request to subdivide approximately 15.5 acres into two lots: 1) existing developed Sherwood Park site; and 2) a 1.2 acre site on 1st Street which is separated from the main park by South Sherwood Drive. Also to rezone the second lot from PZ (Public Zone) to B-3 (Retail Business).

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Location: Southeast corner of 1st Street and South Sherwood Drive

Representative: Tim Woodmansee and Steve Pace

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker provided a brief history of the subject parcels. The City wanted to sell the 1.2 acre parcel, with proceeds of the sale going to procure additional City park sites. South Sherwood Drive, which bisects the two parcels, would be dedicated, with the City constructing curb and gutter on the park site of the street. The Condition regarding no access on 1st Street should be deleted because there is an existing driveway there. Staff recommended approval with no conditions.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Withers asked if the City intended the repair or otherwise build up the low gutter from 2nd Street to South Sherwood Drive. Mr. Nebeker said that he had not received any response on that issue.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item MS-96-30, I move we forward this on to City Council with recommendation of approval of the Sherwood Park Minor Subdivision and rezone."

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

A brief recess was called at 8:55 p.m. The hearing reconvened at 9:00 p.m.

ANX-94-196 ANNEXATION--EASTERN COMMERCIAL/FRUITWOOD SUBDIVISION

Request to zone lands recently annexed to the City to one of the following: PAD (Planned Airport Development), PMH (Planned Mobile Home Park), RSF-8 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 8 units per acre), C-1 (Light Commercial), C-2 (Heavy Commercial), RSF-5 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 5 units per acre), I-1 (Light Industrial), HO (Highway Oriented Commercial), PC (Planned Commercial) and B-1 (Light Business).

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction, Dave Thornton

Location: Airport lands east of the present City limits, then goes east and includes a portion of I-70 from 30 Road to I-70 Business Loop; then south along I-70 Business Loop and includes the Mesa Point Shopping Center, Peachtree Shopping Center, Bray Plaza, Coronado Plaza Shopping Center, and other commercial and some non-commercial properties along the 32 Road to 32 1/2 Road and I-70 Business Loop corridor; then west along I-70 Business Loop to the present City limits and includes commercial and some non-commercial properties in the 30 Road to I-70B corridor and along both sides of North Avenue between 29 Road and 30 Road; and also includes the Fruitwood Subdivision, Filings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and Parsons Park Subdivision.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton presented a detailed synopsis of zoning for specific parcels located on maps provided.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked if industrial zoning near the railroad yard was compatible with former County zoning. Mr. Thornton said that the property owner chose to stay with the industrial zoning because building height was a consideration. The I-1 (Light Industrial) zone seemed to be the most compatible City zone.

PUBLIC COMMENTS**FOR:**

There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

John Baughman, owner of T&J Storage located at 2985 North Avenue, Grand Junction, expressed concern over the zoning of his property. He said that with the City's proposed HO zoning for his property, he could not expand his business without first obtaining a conditional use permit. He requested that a more appropriate zone would be either a C-1 or C-2.

Discussion ensued over this recommendation and both staff and the Commission agreed that a C-1 zone was more suitable for Mr. Baughman's property and it would have the additional benefit of eliminating a non-conforming situation for the adjacent American Radiator Shop.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-94-196, the zone of annexation for the eastern commercial/Fruitwood annexation, I move that we forward this on to City Council with recommendation of approval of the zoning as shown on the proposed zoning maps 1 through 5, with the exception of the map indicating area 2, the specific parcel on the south side of U.S. 6 and 24, starting with parcel just west of the Guest Closet through and including the vacant lot just east of Gators Restaurant, we recommend that said parcels should have a zoning of C-1 (as amended)."

Discussion ensued over the parcels to be included in the C-1 zone. Said parcels were included, as amended, in the motion.

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

V. NON-SCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

Jim Rose (3112 Hwy 6 & 24, Grand Junction) asked the Commission what part it played in the annexation process. Chairman Elmer indicated that the Planning Commission addressed only planning and zoning related issues.

The hearing was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.