

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing - April 9, 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 Vogel, Jeff Driscoll, Tom Whitaker, Bob Withers, and Ron Halsey. Paul Coleman was absent.

In attendance, representing Planning Department staff, were Kathy Portner (Planning Supervisor), Mike Pelletier (Associate Planner), Kristen Ashbeck (Associate Planner), Michael Drollinger (Senior Planner), and Jan Koehn (Code Enforcement Supervisor).

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

Patti Cronk was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 27 citizens present.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

There were no minutes available to approve.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

VR-96-49 VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY - MESA STATE COLLEGE AREA

Request to vacate the East-West alley between Elm Ave. and Texas Ave. and 12th Street and College Place.

Petitioner: Ron Gray, Mesa State College

Location: E-W alley between Elm & Texas and 12th Street & College Place

Representative: Matt Lohof, Western Engineers

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck presented an overview of the proposal. She said that the right-of-way in question is completely surrounded by Mesa State College property and currently only accesses college facilities. The College is planning to construct a new dormitory which would encroach on the existing alley. Existing utilities will be relocated and the College will accept maintenance responsibilities for the City sewer line. Staff recommended approval of the vacation.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Ron Gray, Director of Physical Plant for Mesa State College, (3009 Northridge Drive) had no further comments to add.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Withers felt that the proposal was "straight forward." Chairman Elmer felt the only possible issue was the sewer line and that had been satisfactorily resolved. Commissioner Halsey asked that Mesa State College submit a Master Plan to the Board to help in future decision-making.

Ron Gray said that the College's current five-year master plan had just expired and it would develop a new plan after the new president was hired.

Matt Lohof, representative for petitioner, stated that the College would probably request that a City planning staff member participate in the master plan process. He said that the College could provide a copy of the current master plan.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item VR-96-49, a request to vacate an "L-shaped" alley within the Mesa State College Campus, I move that we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval."

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

FP-95-133(2) STREET STANDARD VARIANCE-WILLOW RIDGE SUBDIVISION

Request for a variance to City Street Standards to allow an electronic eye gate at the entrance to the Willow Ridge Subdivision.

Petitioner: Oliver Frascona

Location: West of Highway 340 & Redlands Canal

Representative: Kenneth Schmohe, Design Affiliates

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave an overview of the request. She said that the subdivision had recently received final approval, although the final plat had not yet been recorded. She said that the planned perimeter fence would include an electronic gate which would go across a public street. She said that although it would automatically open for any vehicle, such a gate would give the impression of a private, locked gate. City street standards do not allow for gating of public streets, although City Council did approve the gated community of The Villas at Country Club as a private street, citing a number of conditions for approval. Staff recommended that if the request is approved, the following conditions apply:

1. All previous conditions of approval of the subdivision apply.
2. The final plat shall identify the gated entry feature and identify the streets as private tracts dedicated to the homeowners.
3. The internal private street shall be reserved and identified as a full-width, multi-purpose easement on the final plat.
4. The design of the gate entry shall provide sufficient stacking distance from the Highway 340 ROW

- as required by the Director of Public Works.
5. A sign at the entrance to the site shall identify the street as a gated, private street.
 6. All public service and utility providers shall have 24-hour access, as determined by the Public Works Director, through the gate in order to attend to either routine or emergency needs.
 7. The homeowners association shall establish an annual maintenance fund for the private street. The form and financial mechanisms of this fund shall be submitted by the petitioner for review and approval by the Public Works Department prior to the release of the Development Improvements Agreement and/or recording of the final plat, whichever comes first.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Halsey asked if CDOT would need to review the request; Ms. Portner felt the request should be submitted for CDOT's final approval.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Kenneth Schmohe, representative for petitioner, said he felt that the gate would slow down traffic, but since an electric eye is non-discriminatory, it shouldn't be an issue. He said that pedestrians would have an arched walkway to pass through. He pointed out that petitioner had not fully explored the cost of the gates yet, but would like the option to install such a gate.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer asked what would happen if the eye failed to work properly when the gate was in a closed position. Mr. Schmohe said that he didn't have the engineering details for the mechanism yet.

Mr. Schmohe said that he hadn't yet reviewed staff recommendations; he was provided with a copy. He said that the conditions sounded reasonable except for the matter of the private street and that he would need to confer with the petitioner before he could agree. He asked that the item be postponed until he had time to speak with the petitioner.

Commissioner Halsey asked what would happen with "stacking of cars" during busy times. Mr. Schmohe said he didn't feel that 14 lots would create enough volume to warrant such a concern.

Commissioner Withers suggested that the gate be of a "break-away" design so it could be opened by hand or vehicle pressure in the event of an electronic failure.

Kathy Portner reminded Mr. Schmohe that a postponement would delay recordation of the plat.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item FP-95-133(2), I move that we table this item until the 1st Tuesday in May."

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

ANX-96-40 ZONE OF ANNEXATION - VALLEY MEADOWS EAST

Request to zone a parcel of land consisting of approximately 16.2 acres (includes 25-1/2 Road right-of-way) which is currently being annexed to the City of Grand Junction to RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre)

Petitioner: Richard Watson, etal

Location: E of 25-1/2 Road; N of Grand Valley Canal

Heard in conjunction with:

PP-96-44 PRELIMINARY PLAN - VALLEY MEADOWS EAST

Request to subdivide approximately 15 acres of land into 52 single family residential lots with proposed zoning of RSF-4 (Residential Single Family, 4 units per acre).

Petitioner: GWHC, Inc.

Location: E of 25-1/2 Road; N of Grand Valley Canal

Representative: Rolland Engineering

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Pelletier outlined the zone of annexation proposal. He said that the owner of the property, which is currently zoned AFT in the County, has petitioned to come into the city. Staff is proposing a zone of RSF4 which staff feels is consistent with neighboring subdivisions. Mr. Pelletier described the zoning of surrounding parcels.

Kathy Portner gave an overview of the preliminary plan for Valley Meadows East. She said the overall density of the plan would be 3.5 units per acre and all lots would meet the requirements of the RSF-4 zone. She said that the applicant proposed a perimeter fence along 25-1/2 Road and that full half-street improvements to 25-1/2 Road would be required. The applicant proposes to discharge stormwater directly into the Grand Valley Canal and is working on a discharge agreement.

Ms. Portner discussed the matter of access for undeveloped parcels to the north. She said that staff didn't feel it was reasonable to require petitioner to incorporate a northern street into their design, but wanted it noted on the plat that some parcels could have double frontage in the future.

Ms. Portner said that the City will determine whether a trail easement is needed on the north side of the canal and that petitioner is concerned that the issue might hold up recording of the plat. Staff felt confident that petitioner would not be "caught in the middle" while the matter was resolved. She said between preliminary and final stages the City Parks Department will determine whether a trail is needed on the north side.

Staff recommended approval of the preliminary plan with the following conditions:

1. Street naming on the final plat shall conform to review agency recommendations.
2. A trail easement acceptable to the City of Grand Junction shall be provided along the Grand Valley Canal if deemed necessary by the City Parks and Recreation Department.
3. A note shall be included on the plat showing the location of the proposed F-3/4 Road to the north.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Rolland, 405 Ridges Blvd., representative for petitioner, said that he calculated density at 3.44 units per acres. He said that minimum lot size would be 8,500 square feet, with an average lot size of 9,675 square feet. Proposed homes would be in the \$130,000 range and the development would proceed in 2-3 phases. He said petitioner felt the proposal was compatible with the surrounding areas and was a "transitional" proposal. Mr. Rolland elaborated on this statement by briefly reviewing other developments in the area.

Regarding irrigation water, Mr. Rolland said he understood there was some concern about the condition of existing ditches. He described the existing ditch locations. He said that petitioner intended to participate in the maintenance of ditches like all users of the ditch should.

Mr. Rolland expressed his concern that the trail issue would hold up the proposal. He said that petitioner was not opposed to having a trail, but didn't want it to delay the project. Ms. Portner said that the City had successfully resolved the issue with other developers. She said that a trail on the south side of the canal had not been available to the City since the area was in the County at the time it developed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR: There was no public comment in favor of the proposal.

AGAINST: The following people spoke in opposition to the proposal: Walid Bou-Matar (677 25-1/2 Road); Steve Blair (2545 Moonridge Drive); Mr. and Mrs. Al Sherman (adjacent property owners); Robert Hunt (2572 Young Court); Lou Motts (2575 Young Court); Linda Mahone (2567 G Road); Nancy Hackett (2573 G Road); Mike Payne (670 Uintah Court); George Japlin (2575 G Road); and Marjorie Bayne (660 Pinyon).

They all expressed their concern over the proposed density, feeling it was too high to be compatible with surrounding properties. They were concerned with the lack of open space proposed and pointed out that residents of neighboring subdivisions currently used the amenities provided by Moonridge Falls. They suggested that such amenities would improve the proposal. Adjacent owners were concerned that their property would be used as the proposal's open space. They were also concerned about the increase in traffic on F-1/2 Road and the poor condition of current irrigation ditches.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked about City plans for road improvements in the area. Jody Kliska said that the City Council had waived road improvements for F-1/2 Road for Cimmaron Subdivision and that 25-1/2 Road would be extended in the year 2003. She noted that a proposal would be coming before the board shortly which would extend a portion of 25-1/2 Road.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Tom Rolland said that he felt the density was appropriate and that once the area was annexed, it would infill rapidly. Regarding open space, he said that the City discouraged small community public parks and pointed out that the development was close to the new City park. He felt that even a high fence would not screen the proposal from neighbors to the east since that property was so much higher. He agreed that irrigation ditches were in poor repair, but pointed out that all of the people who had spoken that evening were users of the ditch and were also responsible for its maintenance. He said that the ditch to the east didn't even service the proposal.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey expressed his concern that residents of the proposal would trespass on adjacent properties. Chairman Elmer asked if covenants could address the issue of fencing, but Kathy Portner said that the City could not enforce covenants.

Chairman Elmer said that he felt the density was compatible and was in line with the growth plan which called for even higher densities. He said that the petitioner would pay an open space fee and that the code did not require a proposal of this size to provide open space. He felt that most homeowners would fence their lots. He felt the irrigation issue could be worked out before the final proposal.

Commissioner Withers said he also felt the density was compatible. He asked if current trespass laws would protect the adjacent homeowners. John Shaver said that a fence could be made a condition of approval, but agreed that the City could not enforce covenants. He agreed that trespass laws would be available but would not provide any visible barrier.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-96-40, I move that we forward the zoning of RSF-4 for the Valley Meadows East Zone of Annexation on to City Council with recommendation of approval."

Commissioner Withers seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Whitaker opposed.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item PP-96-44, I move we approve the Preliminary Plan for Valley Meadows East subdivision subject to staff recommendations 1-3, and adding the recommendation for a security fence, such as a chain link fence, along the east perimeter."

Commissioner Vogel seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Whitaker opposed.

ANX-96-41 ZONE OF ANNEXATION - EULER

Request to zone a parcel of land consisting of approximately 4.09 acres (includes 24-3/4 Road right-of-way) that is currently being annexed to the City to RSF-4 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 4 units per acre).

Petitioner: George & Carrie Euler

Location: 720 24-3/4 Road

Heard in conjunction with:

PP-96-46 PRELIMINARY PLAN - PHEASANT MEADOWS SUBDIVISION

Request to subdivide approximately 3.82 acres into 7 single family lots for an overall density of 1.83 units per acre.

Petitioner: George & Carrie Euler

Location: 720 24-3/4 Road

Representative: Mike Best, LANDesign, LLC

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Pelletier said that existing zoning for the parcel is PR-12. Staff feels that the RSF-4 zone would be in character with the neighborhood and is a reasonable density.

Michael Drollinger gave an overview of the preliminary plan for Pheasant Meadows Subdivision. He said that the proposal calls for 7 single family lots with a cul-de-sac and half-street-improvements along the east side of 24-3/4 Road. He said that all major issues and technical details have been resolved, and staff recommended approval of the plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike Best (259 Grand Avenue), representative for petitioner, said that the area was currently surrounded by the City and the proposal was for an "infill" subdivision. He felt the request was "straight forward" and had no other comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey agreed that the proposal was straight forward. There was no further discussion.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-96-41, I move that we forward the zoning of RSF-4 for the Euler Zone of Annexation 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.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item PP-96-047, a request for preliminary plan approval for Pheasant Meadows Subdivision, I move that we approve the preliminary plan."

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

MSC-96-61 MISCELLANEOUS - EXPANSION OF D.D.A. BOUNDARY

Request to expand the boundaries of the Downtown Development Authority to include parcels in the South Downtown Area.

Petitioner: Downtown Development Authority

Location: Downtown & South Downtown Area

STAFF PRESENTATION

Barbara Creasman, director of the DDA, said the DDA wished to amend the DDA Plan to expand current boundaries to include additional properties so that all properties within the DDA were also within the tax increment financing district.

Chairman Elmer noted that a City parcel was included and asked if it would also be taxed. Ms. Creasman said that including that parcel allowed the DDA to take in the proposed botanical gardens area. She said taxing was determined by use of the property.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we recommend to the City Council approval of the DDA expansion."

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

TAC-96-1.2 TEXT AMENDMENT - CODE - ANIMAL REGULATIONS

Request to amend Section 5-10 of the City of Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code to restructure and clarify the sections relating to agricultural animals and household pets including redefining the term "agricultural animals" and deleting the requirement to obtain a Conditional Use Permit for the keeping of goats.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

STAFF PRESENTATION

Jan Koehn said that most of the proposals were "general housekeeping." She said that one proposed change was to delete the word "residential" from sections 5-10-3A.3, B.3 and 5-10-4C so that animal impacts did not affect commercial areas. Another change was to add a definition of "Adult Agricultural Animals" to allow the keeping of animals which have not been weaned. Additionally, she said staff felt goats should not be differentiated from any other livestock animal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Withers felt that the current definition for large adult animals might preclude the keeping of unweaned offspring and felt the definition of adult agricultural animal should be defined to include unweaned offspring. He also felt that the listing of specific animals in Item 5-10-4B was not in keeping with other changes.

Chairman Elmer asked if there was a "default" definition for an animal that "falls in between" large and small. Ms. Koehn said that the administrator would make the final decision on such matters.

Ms. Koehn made the following changes to the request:

1. Reword Item 5-10-4B - The requirements of A. above shall not apply to those small animals kept within a residence, e.g. fish, small birds, rodents, and reptiles.
2. Under Chapter 12-Definitions: Delete the definition "Adult Agricultural Animal."
3. Redefine Agricultural Animal-Large: Animals such as horses, cattle, sheep, goats, llamas, ostriches and similar livestock or as otherwise determined by the Administrator. Large agricultural animals which are greater than one year or have been weaned, whichever is less, are considered adult agricultural animals.

4. Redefine Agricultural Animal-Small: Animals such as poultry, pigeons, rabbits and chinchillas or similar animals or as otherwise determined by the Administrator. Small agricultural animals which are greater than one year or have been weaned, whichever is less, are considered adult agricultural animals.

Commissioner Withers still questioned if unweaned offspring were adequately included in other sections. John Shaver said that it was a matter of drafting style whether to be inclusive or exclusive and that it was legally sufficient as stated.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on Item TAC-96-1.2, Text Amendment, Sections 5-10-3, 5-10-4 and Chapter 12, I move we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval as rewritten or amended tonight."

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

TAC-96-1.3 TEXT AMENDMENT - CODE - CHINCHILLA RANCHES

Request to amend Section 5-10-3 of the City of Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code to allow chinchilla ranches in an RSF-R (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 1 unit per 5 acres) Zone District with development standards.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Pelletier said that Mr. Ron Rucker requested that chinchilla ranches be an allowed use in the RSF-R zone. Currently such a ranch requires a Conditional Use Permit. He said that Mr. Rucker wished to avoid possible conflicts with animal rights groups which might occur at a public hearing required by a CUP. Mr. Pelletier said that a chinchilla ranch is completely enclosed and, upon his site visit, there was no smell, noise or dust. He said that it was in the best interest of the rancher to have a sanitary operation and that nuisance ordinances could cover future problems.

Staff recommended approval of the text amendment with the condition that the density does not exceed 8 cubic feet per chinchilla. The language should be added as a new paragraph (D) in Section 5-10-3 as below:

The keeping, breeding, and raising of chinchillas in any number is an "allowed use" in the RSF-R zone if each chinchilla has at least 8 cubic feet of building space which is fully enclosed by solid materials. When enclosed building space is less than 8 cubic feet per chinchilla, a Conditional Use Permit is required in accordance with Section 5-10-3-C. For 15 or less chinchillas, Section 5-10-3B.1 and 5-10-3B.2 shall apply and required enclosed building space for each chinchilla is not required.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Whitaker asked if other Colorado communities had similar statutes. Mr. Pelletier said he couldn't find any information but that often such ranches existed without cities being aware of them.

Chairman Elmer asked if the statute should be "widened" to include other species. Mr. Pelletier felt every

species had a different impact and should be looked at individually. He felt it should be up to the applicant to prove that his species should fall under the statute. Chairman Elmer also noted that any expansion of the ranch would have to go through the site plan review process.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR: Ron Rucker, 770-26 Road, said that he was aware of a farm two blocks from Colfax in Denver, which showed how compatible such a farm was with residential uses. He was concerned that any future expansion of his ranch could lead to a public hearing. The political climate could change in the future and he could be subject to "animal rights" activities such as lawsuits, harassment and vandalism.

AGAINST: None

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item TAC-96-1.3, Text Amendment to Section 5-10-3 to make chinchilla ranches an allowed use in an RSF-R zone, I move this to City Council with a recommendation of approval, with the wording in item D of the staff report."

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

TAC-96-1.4 TEXT AMENDMENT - CODE- TEMPORARY USE PERMITS

Request to amend Section 4-13 of the City of Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code regarding Temporary Uses and Structures, including revisions to the Temporary Use criteria and an amendment to the definition of Temporary Use to exempt uses set up for less than 48 hours.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

STAFF PRESENTATION

Jan Koehn said that after using the new regulations for one year, staff had decided that some uses required less review than others. The proposed text amendment deletes some specific temporary uses. She said that the overall current criteria was found to work well enough for all temporary uses. She also said that staff wished to exempt uses set up for less than 48 hours, since they often happened on weekends when City officials weren't available to enforce the Code.

Commissioner Withers suggested the following change:

4-13A. An allowed use in all non-residential zone districts or....

Commissioner Withers also questioned Section 4-13-4 and asked what allowed neighbors to appeal an approval. He felt that any decision should be allowed to be appealed, not only a denial.

The Board discussed the matter with John Shaver, and it was decided that any decision could be appealed to the Board of Appeals without the language specifically stating so. Jan Koehn said that staff had never had an appeal of a temporary use decision. Chairman Elmer questioned on what grounds the public would appeal. John Shaver felt that it was a rather "innocuous" issue and probably didn't need quite so much public input.

Commissioner Whitaker noted that if a permit was open to appeal, then a time period would need to be established and a petitioner would need to be apprised of the fact that the permit could be revoked. John Shaver said that language currently in the Code allowed for appeal of an administrative decision and

suggested that such language might be sufficient.

Commissioner Withers reiterated that he felt "any decision" rather than "any denial" would look better to the public. Commissioner Halsey felt that since there hadn't been large numbers of complaints, he didn't feel the need for specific language to address who could appeal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on TAC-96-1.4, I move that we recommend to City Council that Section 4-13 and Chapter 12 be amended as staff recommended with the addition of the word "in" under Section A."

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

TAC-96-1.5 TEXT AMENDMENT - CODE - USE/ZONE MATRIX CHART

Request to amend the Use/Zone Matrix Chart for Non-Residential Zone District, Section 4-3-4 of the Zoning & Development Code to make colleges an allowed use in the Highway Oriented Zone District.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner said that Colorado Christian University wished to expand their current location at 715 Horizon Drive, but was not currently an approved use in the H.O. zone. Staff felt such a use was appropriate in an H.O. zone and that both small and large colleges would be attractive entrances to a community.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Withers asked about trade schools; Ms. Portner said that they were allowed with a special use permit since there was the possibility of auto repair or other undesirable uses.

Chairman Elmer was concerned that dormitories might not be appropriate in an H.O. zone. Commissioner Whitaker and Withers felt that many colleges were located on main highways and looked very appropriate, and in fact, could help upgrade an area. Kathy Portner felt that a college was "no more inappropriate" than other uses allowed in an H.O. zone. Commissioner Withers felt it was a good idea to have the traffic generated by a college near a highway versus a residential area.

Commissioner Halsey asked if a dormitory could be placed without the associated college. Ms. Portner felt that the primary use would need to be located in the area, as well, although a CUP could be obtained to allow dormitories because multi-family uses were currently allowed in an H.O. zone with a Conditional Use Permit.

Chairman Elmer questioned the definition of a "college"; John Shaver read the definition from the Code default dictionary, noting that no dormitory or accessory use was listed in the definition. Kathy Portner said that currently all colleges required a conditional use permit in the multi-family, B-3 and PZ zones and Chairman Elmer felt that was still appropriate. Ms. Portner said such a blanket requirement would be easiest to administer.

Chairman Elmer pointed out that he didn't feel City Council would require this school to go through the CUP process for an interior remodel. Commissioner Withers suggested that perhaps a square footage requirement could be added, but John Shaver said such restrictions often weren't practical. Kathy Portner suggested a special use permit might be a compromise since it required notification of neighbors and could be forwarded to public hearing if necessary. The Board discussed the matter and agreed that requiring an SUP would be appropriate.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item TAC-96-1.5, I move that we forward a recommendation of approval of a text amendment to make colleges and universities a "specially allowed use" in the H.O. zone.

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

TAC-96-1.6 TEXT AMENDMENT - CODE- SIGN CODE

Request to amend Section 5-7-7.B.5 of the City of Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, to revise the method of calculating flush wall sign allowance.

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Kathy Portner explained that the current sign allowance for flush wall signs could dictate building orientation, which staff didn't feel was appropriate. She showed diagrams of how the new calculations could affect sign dimensions. Staff recommended approval of the text amendment to allow for the flush wall sign allowance to be calculated on the longer building facade for buildings that are perpendicular to the street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Elmer questioned whether the definition of interior lots was clear enough, and Kathy Portner said staff felt it was. She said that corner lots have two special allowances and suggested that the parenthetical phrase "not corner lot" could be added.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on TAC-96-1.6, I move that we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval, with the clarification of excluding corner lots.

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

VI. GENERAL DISCUSSION

The Board discussed who would volunteer for the Open Space Fee Committee. Kathy Portner said she would find out the time and duration of the meetings and contact Commissioner Halsey and Whitaker with the information to see if it would meet their schedules. John Shaver felt that staff could monitor the meetings for the Board.

VII. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no nonscheduled citizens and/or visitors.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

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