

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing August 2, 1994
7:03 p.m. - 11:56 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman John Elmer at 7:03 p.m. in the City County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were John Elmer, Tom Volkmann, Stephen Laiche, Bob Withers, Ron Halsey and Jeff Vogel.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Larry Timm, Director; Kathy Portner, Planning Supervisor; Dave Thornton, Senior Planner; Kristen Ashbeck, Associate Planner; Michael Drollinger, Senior Planner; and Tom Dixon, Senior Planner.

Also present was Jody Kliska, City Development Engineer and John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney.

There were 46 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes as submitted."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laiche.

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

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

Chairman Elmer announced that the following items had been pulled from the agenda: #87-94 Michaela's Village; #114-94 Vacation of Right-of-Way, Glenwood Avenue; #119-94 Whitman Park; and #1-94(K) Text Amendment-Site Plan Review.

Tom Volkmann announced that he would step down for items #20-94 and #121-94 because of prior involvement.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

1. **#20-94 PRELIMINARY PLAN - EAGLE CREST**
Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan for Eagle Crest Subdivision consisting of 12 single family homes on 2.8 acres with a zoning of PR-4, (Planned Residential, 4 units per acre).
PETITIONER: Sidney Gottlieb
LOCATION: Lot 17, Block 9, The Ridges Filing #6

REPRESENTATIVE: Tom Logue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner gave an overview of the request. She said the original Ridges Development Plan approved by the County identified the parcel as a multifamily site with no specific density assigned. The overall density for the Ridges is 4 units per acre. The City is working on a plan for the Ridges which will specify the maximum densities for the remaining multifamily sites. Ms. Portner said development of the parcel was limited by the narrow (26') access and topographical constraints. The developer had originally proposed approximately 36 units for the site, which staff had felt was not appropriate because of the existing constraints of the site. The developer withdrew that plan and resubmitted the current plan for 12 single family lots.

Ms. Portner said that the standard street right-of-way required is 44', while the proposal only has 26' of access, thereby eliminating room for sidewalks, curb and gutter, and not providing an adequate pavement mat width. She said the turning radii was not adequate as well. She said staff would support 4 single family lots accessed by a common drive, built to a standard in conformance with the rest of the Ridges development, although pavement thickness would need to meet City standards.

Ms. Portner said drainage was also a concern since the plan proposed piping the drainage off a steep slope across Ridges open space down to the existing drainage facilities near Ridges Boulevard. Staff was concerned about the visual impact of the pipe if it were not buried and the scarring that would occur to the existing landscape if it were buried.

Ms. Portner said if Eagle Crest Court was to be a public road accessing 12 lots, as proposed, then it must meet City standards, including curb, gutter and sidewalk. Any alternative design would have to address pedestrian access, adequate pavement width, turning radius and drainage. She said a connection to the existing pathway system below the development should be provided with a trail section through Lot 5, which is a location not as steep as other areas. Staff preferred that the drainage facility be combined with the trail system so there was only one area of disturbance through the open space.

Ms. Portner said that the petitioner had discussed the possibility of Eagle Crest Court being allowed as a private drive. Staff felt that a public right-of-way built to a lesser standard was preferable since, in the City's experience, home owners were not willing to maintain the private drive and eventually looked to the City to take them over. Staff was also concerned that lots 5 and 7 did not have building envelopes of adequate depth for construction.

Ms. Portner said the following conditions would need to be met in order for staff to support the proposal:

1. Additional right-of-way must be obtained for the proposed Eagle Crest Court at its intersection with Prospector Point Drive to meet minimum design standards, including curb, gutter and sidewalk or an alternative design must be submitted accommodating adequate roadway width and turning radii at the intersection, drainage and pedestrian access.
2. Specific building plans for lots 5 and 7 must be submitted with the final plan.
3. All building envelopes must maintain a 20' setback from the bluff line and the ROW.

4. Utility easements must be provided to Prospector Point Drive in an alignment acceptable to all utility providers.
5. A pathway must be constructed through lot 5 connecting to the existing trail system at the bottom of the slope.
6. An alternative means of dealing with storm drainage must be proposed and considered rather than a drainage pipe through the open space.

Ms. Portner said staff recommended denial of the request for 12 lots as proposed. If the Planning Commission were to approve the request, staff recommended the 6 conditions listed above be included.

Staff recommended the approval of allowing up to 4 single family lots accessing a public drive with the following conditions:

1. The standards for the public drive will be determined prior to the final plan/plat.
2. An alternative means of dealing with storm drainage be proposed and considered rather than a drainage pipe through the open space.

DISCUSSION/QUESTIONS

Commissioner Withers asked if the Ridges architectural control committee had to approve the plan. Kathy Portner said that staff would ask for their review of the plan but that their approval was not required.

Jody Kliska showed slides of the road situation at the parcel, depicting the narrow access, the steep topography and the native landscaping which would be disturbed by a buried drainage pipe. She said that the reason standards for roadway widths had been developed was to address problems which had occurred in the past.

Chairman Elmer asked if there was a master plan for the Ridges which showed where pedestrian pathways should be located. Kathy Portner said she was not aware of one. Bill Stubbs (speaking from the audience) said that it had been a "haphazard approach" over the years, that there was no requirement for multifamily lots to provide pedestrian/bike paths and he didn't feel that it was "germane".

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, 200 N. 6th Street, representative for petitioner, said that the only real issue was access to the property. He said 26' was the old County standard established over 20 years ago when a 22' paved mat was considered normal. He said petitioner could not obtain more right-of-way in order to meet the access standards. He pointed out that the 26' width was at the very narrowest point and that the road met the 44' standard by the time it reached the corner of proposed lots 1 and 2. Mr. Logue said the plan proposed a 2'6" curb and gutter section along each side of the roadway with paving in between and "no parking" designation along the substandard section. He distributed a handout to the board dealing with the turning radii issue and felt the turn could be made. He said the conflict would occur if a vehicle were exiting the road at the same time a service vehicle were entering, but pointed out that same conflict would occur even

if there were only four lots.

Mr. Logue said that the curb and gutter could be reduced to 2', which was a Department of Transportation standard, and with careful construction the road could be increased to a width of 24'. He said that the proposal called for the development of an off-site trail system connecting into the existing system as a means to offset the lack of internal sidewalks. Mr. Logue said that another road alternative might be to widen a section along the westerly side of E. Prospector Point, at petitioner's expense, to allow an additional turning area for a left turn, which would be the direction of the traffic flow.

Commissioner Withers asked if any traffic studies had been done as to traffic circulation in the area. Mr. Logue said he had done an initial traffic analysis but did not study the direction of traffic on E. Prospector's Point. He said he had originally recommended designating Prospector's Point as a one-way loop when the proposal was for a higher density.

Commissioner Vogel said that the access to Columbine across the street appeared to have the same size access. Jody Kliska said that Columbine had a pavement width of 26'.

Commissioner Laiche asked about the slope of the road entering the proposal, and Mr. Logue said it was relatively flat.

Regarding drainage, Mr. Logue said the petitioner has three options: 1)bury the pipe following the existing driving area and attempt a two-season reclamation procedure; 2)utilize an open channel with natural stone riprap terraced down the hillside, which was the most preferable option from a maintenance standpoint; and 3)combine the routing of the drainage channel with the pedestrian pathway. He said petitioner preferred to pursue option #3.

Sid Gottlieb, Englewood, New Jersey, petitioner, said that he hadn't "pulled the number of 35 units out of the air." He said he'd purchased the property with certain density expectations in order to make development economically feasible, and that the density had been discussed with staff. He said Mr. Logue had attended a pre-application conference with staff and was told that 12 units/acre would be acceptable if the turning radii and other issues were addressed. He said he had a letter from the City "allowing" him such a density, and stating that they would support a request of 10-12 units. Regarding the access width, Mr. Gottlieb said staff had told him "that's how we annexed the property, and that's what it is, and we can't do anything about it." He said he'd expended thousands of dollars in engineering fees, and that if the City had felt that the access was inadequate regardless of the number of units, they should have advised him of that immediately. Mr. Gottlieb said that the project was not economically feasible with four units, and asked that 6-8 units be approved with the roadway constructed to a lesser standard.

PUBLIC COMMENT

In favor

Willis Stubbs, representing Dynamic Investments, said that he had sold the property to Mr. Gottlieb several months ago. He said that the Ridges annexation had not been well thought out and that the City was aware that the already approved accesses didn't meet City standards. He said that Columbine had the same access width and it was "unfair" to impose "unreasonable" standards on the developer. Mr. Stubbs said he'd "site-

planned" 8-10 units on the property, and that four lots would result in double the lot size existing anywhere in the Ridges.

In opposition

Dennis Stark, 416 Prospector Point, an adjacent property owner, said that Mr. Stubbs had approached him about buying a portion of his property in order to down zone the parcel. He said "that's not a new problem. That's not something Mr. Gottlieb should have walked in unaware of." Mr. Stark was concerned that people would be "tromping" through his property if there were no sidewalks. He said that when Mr. Stubbs was marketing the property, he stated "6-8 luxury homes" would be built on the parcel. He stated that adjacent property owners had not been advised of the public hearing.

Commissioner Laiche asked if Mr. Stark would consider selling a portion of his property to petitioner so that he could meet the necessary standards. Mr. Stark said he would entertain the idea.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Logue, in his rebuttal, said that the plan proposed a fence being installed to prohibit people from walking on private property.

Commissioner Withers questioned the building envelopes on lots 5 and 7. Tom Logue said that he felt there was sufficient room, but that the homes would need to be two story. He said petitioner would hire a geologist/soils engineer to define the bluff line and come to an agreement with staff as to where the bluff line is.

Chairman Elmer questioned the lack of internal sidewalks, and Mr. Logue said that people at the last public hearing had felt that sidewalks were not appropriate because there were no sidewalks elsewhere in the Ridges. He said the design was such that there would be enough room that sidewalks could be installed in the future, beginning at the boundary of lots 1 and 12.

Commissioner Laiche asked when Mr. Gottlieb purchased the property and if it were annexed at that time. Mr. Logue said that petitioner purchased the property in November, 1993, and pointed out that this was one of the first applications for new development in the Ridges, so petitioner was "breaking new ground."

Commissioner Halsey asked what density would allow on-site storm water detention. Mr. Logue said that the drainage flows for the parcel were relatively small and that he could look at some type of detention in order to reduce the amount of piping.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Laiche questioned staff as to petitioner's contention that staff had given him approval for a higher density. Kathy Portner said that a former staff member had done some calculations looking at what might be remaining in Ridges density at the time the original proposal was submitted. She said an "overall letter" had been issued that talked about such a maximum density, but said the letter also stated that site constraints would dictate the maximum number of units. She said staff had also talked to petitioner about what density less than the 35 units would be appropriate, and that petitioner had responded by presenting a plan for 12 units. At that time, staff indicated that such a density was certainly "more acceptable," but that

overall constraints of the site would still need to be looked at. She said staff would "never tell someone that they had approval for a certain number of units."

Commissioner Halsey questioned how staff came up with the figure of 4 units. Kathy Portner said that the matter was discussed with a number of staff members and that 4 units was the number of units allowed to share common private drives. Staff felt that 4 units would create the least complications for traffic and road maintenance. Ms. Portner reminded the board that staff did not have the authority to waive the street standards. She told the board that if the commission wished to approve a lesser density and vary street standards, that would need to be a recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner Laiche asked Mr. Gottlieb if tabling the item for a month in order to allow him time to negotiate with Mr. Stark for additional ground, would "cripple" petitioner. Mr. Gottlieb said it would not, but he would like some indication from Mr. Stark that he would be amenable to discussing the issue. He said he would prefer to "throw myself at the mercy" of the commission, rather than at the mercy of Mr. Stark. Kathy Portner said 12 units would be the maximum number acceptable if petitioner could meet City street standards. Chairman Elmer said the commission should give the petitioner two options: 1) the approval of 12 units meeting City street standards, or 2) a recommendation to City Council that a lesser number of units be approved with a variance of City street standards.

Commissioner Elmer was concerned that the commission would be setting a precedent in the matter, but Mr. Stubbs said that it was safe to assume that this proposal was the only exception like it in the Ridges.

Commissioner Halsey was concerned that the visual impact of the drainage pipe be mitigated. He felt if the density were reduced, then on-site detention would be a possibility. Jody Kliska said that it would be an option but that she hadn't done any calculations yet.

John Shaver reminded the board that Code requirements said the commissioners could approve, deny, or approve with conditions, but cautioned the board against appearing to "make a deal." He said the proposal was a preliminary plan and the board should be careful it didn't approve something not before it.

Commissioner Halsey said he preferred to deny the proposal and give the petitioner direction as to how to resubmit. Commissioner Elmer preferred the petitioner be offered the two options he proposed above. He said he felt the drainage issue could be worked out, and liked the option of combining the drainage with the pedestrian path.

The board discussed the number of units the commission should recommend to City Council. The board felt 8 units was appropriate considering it was so much lower than a multifamily density. Commissioner Withers questioned the matter of the bluff line. Kathy Portner felt its location could be worked out between staff and petitioner. Commissioner Vogel suggested that the location of the pathway not be specified as to a particular lot. Kathy Portner said that would be acceptable.

MOTION: (Commissioner Laiche) "Mr. Chairman, on item #20-94(2) Preliminary Plan - Eagle Crest, I move that we approve it up to 12 single family lots, accessing a public drive, with the amended conditions discussed tonight recommended by staff, with condition

#5 being amended to read: A pathway must be constructed which meets City requirements connecting to the existing trail system at the bottom of the slope."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Halsey.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0, with Commissioner Volkmann not voting.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item #20-94(2) Preliminary Plan - Eagle Crest, I move that we recommend to City Council approval of this filing with a maximum of 8 units, and a recommendation that the street standards be modified to be compatible with the standards existing on Prospector Point, with no curb, gutter or sidewalks, and a pavement width as approved by the City Development Engineer."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Vogel.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 5-0, with Commissioner Volkmann not voting.

**2. #121-94 PRELIMINARY PLAN - COUNTRY CLUB TOWNHOMES
Request for approval of a preliminary plan for Country Club Townhomes consisting of 24 attached units on approximately 5 acres with a zoning of PR-6 (Planned Residential, 6 units per acre).**

PETITIONER: Sidney Gottlieb

LOCATION: SE corner of G Road and 27 Road

REPRESENTATIVE: Tom Logue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Tom Dixon presented an overview of the proposal. He said the proposal was originally reviewed as Country Club Estates, which was for 21 single family lots. He said the new proposal was for 24 units in six separate structures, and that the proposal conformed to the PR-6 zone. Mr. Dixon said the previous review determined some "substantive issues:" 1)access and improvements on Westcliff Drive will not be required, 2)one access will be allowed on 12th Street, and 3)looped, turn around drives will be replaced with standard cul-de-sacs.

Mr. Dixon said staff felt the site layout was "inefficient and somewhat difficult." Mr. Dixon presented a revised plan which shifted the access 150' to the north in order to have less paved area, allow the re-location of the water feature and allow more flexibility to the site. He said staff recommended a height limitation of 32'. Mr. Dixon said staff recommended approval of the preliminary plan contingent on the following site modifications:

1. Access to the site should be moved up 150'.
2. All units shall have two off-street parking spaces.
3. The overflow parking lot has been eliminated.
4. The site should have a continuous shrub screen, at least 4' in height, extending the full length of the south property line to buffer to the site from the commercially-zoned area to the south.

5. A sidewalk connection from the northerly portion of North Club Court shall be made to the 12th Street (27 Road) right-of-way unless the site access is moved northward at least 150 feet.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representative for petitioner, said that the original plan for Country Club Estates was revised after an in-depth marketing and economic evaluation was conducted. He said petitioner felt staff's plan was "workable" but explained the reasons for the design of the submitted plan. Mr. Logue said he didn't feel it was appropriate to have lots backed up to 12th Street because of the traffic. He also wanted to minimize lots backing up to the commercial property to the south in order to mitigate future problems. He said the original plan also utilized the existing sewer line rather than requiring the construction of a new line. Mr. Logue said petitioner did not want a "cook-off" over which was the best plan, and petitioner was willing to accept staff's plan. Mr. Logue said the units would be owned fee simple and said petitioner would like to plat the property as one lot with the dedicated roadways in it, then obtain a building permit and have staff do an administrative replat defining each townhome cluster. He said it was preferable to submit an as-built and survey what was "actually on the ground."

Chairman Elmer questioned Ute Water's comment about the pond. Mr. Logue said the final submittal would address the issue, as well as other comments from utility and service providers. He said petitioner did prefer the plan as submitted, rather than staff's plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either in favor or opposition.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey felt it was important to move the road up to accommodate future development to the south. Commissioner Withers disagreed, stating he felt petitioner should be able to develop the property however he wanted as long as it met the standards and that keeping the road in the proposed location would be better for future traffic flows. He said there was no way to determine what would happen to the land to the south and that it was preferable not to have homes abutting that property. Chairman Elmer also felt the road would act as a buffer to the property to the south, and since that parcel was so large it would have any flexibility it needed in the future.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item #121-94 Preliminary Plan - Country Club Townhomes, I move that we approve this request with conditions #2-5 as stated in staff recommendations, with #4 modified to include 'and/or screened fence,' after the word shrub screen."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laiche.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Halsey opposed and Commissioner Volkmann not voting.

3. **#107-94 RESUBDIVISION - RANA ROAD REPLAT**
Request for approval of the Replat of Lots 41A through 47A and Lot 45 of Block 9 in Ridges

Filing 6, including the relocation of open space access.
PETITIONER: Dynamic Investments, Inc.
LOCATION: Rana Road in the Ridges
REPRESENTATIVE: Ciavonne & Associates

Commissioner Volkmann returned to hear the meeting.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner presented an overview of the proposal. She said the proposal would decrease the number of single family lots from 6 to 4 and increase the size of the resulting lots. She said the proposal would also increase the access point onto Rana Road in order to meet current City standards. The only reason the proposal needed to come before the commission was because increasing the width of a lot necessitated the relocation of the open space access. Ms. Portner said that the City Council would also need to authorize the City Manager to sign the plat since the City was the actual owner of the open space. She said staff had discussed trying to get the two accesses lined up, but there is a large transformer which would end up in the middle of a lot and make the lot unbuildable. She said the current proposal offset the two accesses as much as possible and still met standards. Staff would still like to pursue aligning the accesses, but felt that even offset, it would "definitely make a bad situation better." She said the City Engineer would not be as concerned about the offset accesses if the density on the site were kept fairly low.

Ms. Portner said that staff recommended approval of the replat subject to the following conditions:

1. All possible means of aligning the access points to the two multifamily sites on either side of Rana Road be considered, and that the final alignment must satisfy the requirements of the City Development Engineer.
2. The access point to the open space shall be allowed to be moved as long as adequate access is maintained.
3. All access to the open space being replatted must be at least 12' wide to accommodate future trail development, and the specific location and width must be reviewed and approved by the Parks and Recreation Director.
4. The 5' irrigation easement noted on the original plats must be vacated through the City's administrative process prior to recording the plat, or those easements must be shown on the plat.

Ms. Portner said that the easements were not dedicated to the public, but given to the Ridges Metro District, and that the City had developed an administrative process to deal with vacating them without a hearing.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Craig Roberts, 844 Grand Avenue, representative for petitioner, said that the plan tried to maintain a 75' lot width. He said that moving the transformer also required moving a switch box, a process so expensive that Public Service was not even willing to estimate a price. He said because of the configuration of the open space on the lot across the street, there was not much flexibility as to where to move the access however, the plan did address the matter of insufficient access width and created a 44' wide access to the multifamily lots. He said the 5' irrigation easements could only be rescinded by the Metro District, which no longer

existed, so the City now handled such vacations administratively. He said the property had good access to Ridges Boulevard with a 30' mat width on Rana Road.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no public comment either in favor or opposition to the proposal.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer asked if staff had any problems with the proposed density, and Ms. Portner said that staff had not been presented with an actual plan yet and that such a plan would come before the commission in the future.

Chairman Elmer said the proposal appeared "straight forward" and a benefit to the City. He said he would prefer to have the streets lined up but could understand the problem with moving the transformer.

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item #107-94, a replat of Lots 41A through 47A and Lot 45 of Block 9 in Ridges Filing 6, I move we approve the replat subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Withers.

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

4. FINAL PLAN - SLEEP-N-AIRE EXPANSION

Request for approval of site design standards and maximum square footage requirements for a PC (Planned Commercial) Zone at 2484 F Road.

PETITIONER: Don Damron

LOCATION: 2484 F Road

REPRESENTATIVE: Ford Construction Co., Inc.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner presented an overview of the request. She said that Phase 1 had been approved and built in 1989, the property was then annexed by the City and zoned Planned Commercial, accepting the Phase 1 plan. She said that specific design standards for expansion were not specified in the original approval, although the owner had indicated that he had plans for a Phase 2 and 3 expansion of the building. The owner now proposes a 10,000 square foot warehouse expansion. Ms. Portner said that the proposal is for approval of uses and design standards for the planned commercial zone, rather than the specific site plan, and that upon approval of design standards for the site, the specifics of the plan will be reviewed administratively through the site plan review process.

Ms. Portner said that staff recommended approval with the following uses, densities, and design standards for the site:

1. The permitted uses will be limited to retail sales and warehousing and manufacturing related to the

- retail sales on that site, as well as offices.
2. The total square footage of structures on this site shall not exceed 40,000 square feet, which includes Phase 2 and Phase 3 expansion.
 3. Setback requirements shall be:
 - Side yard - 5'
 - Rear yard - 10'
 - Front yard - 20'
 4. The parking regulations of the Zoning and Development Code shall apply.
 5. The existing 4,900 square feet of landscaped area along Patterson Road shall be retained, and 8 trees must be provided on site, and 1,000 square feet of the landscaped area shall be in shrubs.
 6. Interior landscaping of future expansion of the parking lot must meet the standards for the parking lot landscaping in effect at the time of the expansion.
 7. The total square footage, number and type of sign shall not exceed that which is in existence as of July 27, 1994, or the sign code allowance for a commercial zone in this location that is in effect at the time of the sign permit request, whichever is more restrictive.
 8. Future proposals on the site which meet the above criteria will be reviewed administratively through the site plan review process. Proposals which do not meet the above criteria, and/or put the total square footage of the structures on the site over the 40,000 square foot limit, must be reviewed and approved through the planning commission public hearing process.
 9. The transportation capacity payment, drainage requirements, and any other development requirements will be determined through site plan review.
 10. An appraisal will be required for the land involved and any additions to determine the parks and open space fee.

Ms. Portner said that because the conditions are tied to the planned commercial zone, the board's motion should be a recommendation to City Council, rather than a final approval.

Commissioner Withers asked what would happen if the sign code in the future allowed for more signage than currently in place. Ms. Portner said that staff felt the amount of signage currently on the property was adequate and that petitioner would have to come before commission in order to increase the signage.

Chairman Elmer said that in the past the commission saw the final plan and asked why the procedure had been changed. Kathy Portner said that staff felt it was more efficient to deal with the details of the plan at an administrative level. She said if the commission was uncomfortable with the new procedure, they should give staff that direction. Chairman Elmer said that the Code stated the commission would make a recommendation for the final plan and then staff could administratively change up to 10%. He said the new procedure still met the intent of the Code and it was acceptable.

Commissioner Volkmann asked if petitioner could still come before the commission if they were dissatisfied with staff's recommendations. Ms. Portner said that would be possible.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Kelley Ford, 584 25 Road, representative for petitioner, said he had constructed the factory for petitioner in 1990. He said the business was growing and successful and so needed more room. He said petitioner had

always intended to grow as his business grew, and so had purchased a large parcel of land. He said petitioner would begin making his own quilting material and needed a location for that process. He said the 10,000 square foot addition would match the existing building and have architectural features which would break up the large faces visible from F Road. He said that parking was adequate for the needs of Phase 2 and there was room for more parking if Phase 3 required it.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either in favor or opposition to the proposal.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer said that since the commission did not know what Phase 3 would be like, he preferred the necessary additional landscaping be included now so that the asphalt would not need to be disturbed if future expansion occurred. Commissioner Volkmann preferred to "defer to developer as to how they spend their money." He thought it was better to simply caution the developer that "they are ever so close to the trigger point for having to put those types of islands in the parking lot," and leave it up to petitioner's discretion.

MOTION: (Commissioner Laiche) "Mr. Chairman, on item #124-94, a request for approval of design standards for a PC zone at 2484 F Road, I move that we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation for approval, with the stated staff conditions."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Halsey.

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

V. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

1. **#118-94 REZONE FROM PRVR TO PMH - 24 ROAD AND G ROAD**
Request for recommendation of approval for rezoning a parcel of land located at the northwest corner of 24 Road and G Road from PRVR (Planned Recreational Vehicle Resort) to PMH (Planned Mobile Home) for a 230 unit manufactured housing park.
PETITIONER: Mesa Partners
LOCATION: 24 Road and G Road
REPRESENTATIVE: Stan Conrad

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger said that he understood that petitioner would present new information at the hearing that staff had not had time to review. He suggested that the planning commission not hear the matter and table the item for one month so staff could evaluate the new information and comment on it. He also suggested that if the board did proceed with the hearing, then the new information should not be considered.

John Shaver felt that Mr. Drollinger's suggestions were appropriate. He felt it was "untimely" for petitioner to present new information at the hearing. If the petitioner wished to proceed, he should proceed with the

"known risk" that the planning commission might not consider the new information.

Commissioner Laiche and Volkmann preferred to hear what the petitioner had to present, but Commissioners Halsey and Elmer felt any new information would be "somewhat worthless" to render a decision on. The board decided to let the petitioner decide if he wished to proceed.

Jeff Williams, representative for petitioner, asked that the board proceed since he didn't feel he was introducing any controversial information.

Michael Drollinger gave an overview of the presentation. He said the surrounding property was predominantly vacant agricultural land. There is currently no comprehensive plan for the area, but staff anticipated that the 24 Road corridor would be the "next major gateway to the City," given the location of the mall, the regional park, and the Redlands Parkway. Staff was concerned about the proper development of the corridor, and such issues as appropriate land uses, access control, aesthetics, pedestrian/bicycle circulation, building setbacks and design consideration. Staff was concerned that without proper planning for the corridor, development would occur in a haphazard manner and the City might miss an opportunity to achieve a high quality gateway.

Mr. Drollinger felt that the current zoning of the area was inappropriate due to the changed circumstances in the area. One-third of the corridor is in the City and 2/3 in the County, but the area is in an annexation enclave expected to be annexed by February, 1995. Mr. Drollinger said that the City's land use consultant will begin to prepare a growth plan for the entire City, including the 24 Road corridor, which should be completed within 18 months. The City is also initiating a planning process for the 24 Road corridor which should be completed by mid-1995.

Mr. Drollinger said staff felt that the rezone request was not supported by the rezone criteria given the change in character of the area, and the fact that there is a planning process for the area underway which is expected to be completed in the near future. Staff "strongly" suggested that no zoning changes be done along the 24 Road corridor in advance of completion of a corridor plan, unless the requested zone change is obviously appropriate for the area and would represent an opportunity for setting a desirable tone for future development of the corridor. Staff also felt any rezone to residential use along the corridor was inappropriate, and that it would likely develop to be a "highway-commercial oriented corridor."

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jeff Williams, 734 Main, presented photographs to the board showing the type of manufactured homes proposed. He said the proposal was not "just a haphazard, North Avenue mobile home park." He agreed that 24 Road would likely become a gateway to the City and felt the proposal was an opportunity to develop an appealing entrance to the City. He said the plan was for "upper class" mobile homes and included walkways, off street parking, tennis courts, landscaping, spas, and jogging paths. Mr. Williams said he'd heard before that a plan was forthcoming for the area, and yet it had not become a reality. He felt such a proposal would be a more aesthetic entry into Grand Junction than any commercial zoning, and would set the desired zone for the corridor. He felt staff's recommendation to deny all area zone changes until 1995 was "unreasonable to all area property owners." Mr. Williams said there was already a tremendous amount of vacant property already zoned commercial in the area.

Jeff Taulman, 2 Oak Street, Santa Barbara, CA and Bruce Sanders, 501 Redwood, Ventura, CA, said the majority of the mobile home parks in the area were "trailer parks". They said "affordable manufactured housing is much, much different." The price of the homes would be between \$40,000-\$60,000 with space rental being \$200/month. They presented a plan layout showing 202 spaces and said it was "just a representation of the kinds of layout that can be done." They said the density was 6 units per acre and they were "open to suggestions" as to what the City would like to see. The site would be completely surrounded by a 6' high block wall. They said they were careful to "build things right the first time," and kept the property well maintained. The covenants are part of the rental agreement and require the residents to keep their areas "up to par." They felt there was a heavy demand for this type of housing, and said one local home dealer sold 80% of his homes to out-of-area residents, due to a lack of local space. They said the proposal would be phased and would contain as many accesses as the City required.

PUBLIC COMMENT

In Favor

No one spoke in favor of the proposal.

In Opposition

Warren Jacobson, owner of the adjacent northern parcel, said he was the original owner of the parcel under question. He said that he was surprised to discover that his property had been rezoned to PRVR, as well as the southerly half he'd sold, and that he was now located in the City. He asked how such a thing could happen without his notification. Mr. Jacobson said "I've seen a lot of trailer parks between Denver and Grand Junction and east, and all the plans sound lovely, but I haven't seen one that's lived up to the expectations that these gentlemen project. I'd rather see that they build their trailer park in downtown Santa Barbara."

Michael Drollinger said both areas were rezoned in the 1980's and that he would look into the details of the matter for Mr. Jacobson.

Quentin Jones, 2491 E. Harbor Circle, read a statement from Chris Duffey, 2489 H Road. Ms. Duffey expressed her concern about the effect the proposal would have on Appleton Elementary school. She said the school was old, currently over capacity and already bussing students. She said that the school district had already stated that any growth in the area would be difficult to deal with, therefore a potential massive influx of students such as this development would generate would be unmanageable.

Mr. Jones said he, too, was concerned about the school impact, and that he felt that the 24 Road corridor should take into account the visual impact of any development. He felt the proposed development would be an intrusion that would jeopardize the future character of the area. He was also concerned about the impact the proposal would have on traffic. He felt the project was "clearly not in the best or highest interest of the City, both visually and in terms of safety."

Cal Clark, 2115 Grand Avenue, spoke on behalf of School District 51. He said the district had "deep and serious concerns of the impact this development could possibly have on district 51 and its facilities." He said Appleton Elementary, West Middle School, and Fruita Monument High School would all be effected.

FMHS is already going to a year around plan in order to handle the existing growth due to the district's lack of funds to handle capital expansion. He said a "development of this magnitude in this area will certainly have an adverse impact."

Commissioner Laiche asked if the school district was objecting to the type of development or just to "the numbers." Mr. Clark said that a development of the type planned would have a higher than average ratio of school age residents, but that the school district was more concerned with the number of units, rather than the type of units.

Commissioner Volkmann asked if school boundary realignment could alleviate some of the problem, and Mr. Clark said that the issue had been addressed by a task force and that it was "not one of the more attractive options."

Craig Roberts, 844 Grand Avenue said he had been involved in developing the Northwest area plan, and that plan recommended planned commercial zoning for 1/4 mile east of 24 Road, with relatively high density residential beyond that, and then densities toward 1st Street becoming less. He said west of 24 Road was recommended as planned commercial.

Patti Cronk, 1129 24 Road, objected to the proposal due to the present overcrowded status of Appleton Elementary. She felt that petitioner had a right to develop his property, but she objected to the timing, since the developer could develop his property at any time, while school children had only "one shot" at their elementary school education. She felt that schools should be included as part of the infrastructure that the commission considered in approving proposals. She said the current zoning would have no impact on the school system, while the proposed rezone would have a great impact.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Jeff Williams said that 70% of these type of developments were for retirees, although he wasn't sure if a subdivision could be strictly a retirement center. He said the school problem was valley wide, but people still needed somewhere to live.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Michael Drollinger clarified that although staff felt the present commercial zoning in the corridor was inappropriate, staff did not consider the zoning in and of itself as inappropriate. He said staff felt the corridor would probably end up commercial.

Commissioner Laiche asked how many RV spaces could be placed on the lot, and Mr. Drollinger said he didn't have that figure. Commissioner Laiche asked how the City could be assured that the proposal would be like the photographs shown, and Chairman Elmer said that the final plan stage would include all of that detail.

Commissioner Halsey said he supported the Northwest Plan and felt that the proposal was not appropriate for that plan. Chairman Elmer felt that the area had changed with the purchase of the regional park site, and he felt the future density of the area should be addressed through a growth management plan. He said the school issue was his primary concern, and that schools were an infrastructure that needed to be

reviewed since the rezone went from an RV park with "zero" impact to a zone with a "potentially large impact." Chairman Elmer said "if it were a full sewer line, we wouldn't be allowing this; if it's a full school, to me, we shouldn't be allowing it either, just based on that."

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item #118-94 a rezone from PRVR to PMH, I recommend we deny the rezone request due to not meeting the criteria for a rezone."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Vogel.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1-1, with Commissioner Laiche opposed, and Commissioner Withers abstaining.

Mr. Williams appealed the decision and asked to be heard at City Council.

2. **#120-94 REZONE/FINAL PLAN - 2891 NORTH AVENUE**
Request for recommendation of approval to rezone a parcel of land located at 2892 North Avenue from RSF-8 (Residential Single Family, 8 units per acre) and C-1 (Light Commercial) to PC (Planned Commercial); and approval of site design standards and maximum square footage requirements for a proposed 11,700 square foot expansion of existing warehouse and 121 new mini-storage units.
PETITIONER: Emory Cantrell/Mike Davis
LOCATION: 2892 North Ave.
REPRESENTATIVE: Tom Logue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger presented an overview of the request. He said that petitioner's original request was to rezone only the north half of the property. He said there was currently no public access which abutted the northern portion, and so the only way the property could develop as residential would be to purchase additional land or to access through the development on the front. Any non-residential use of the northern half of the property would have to be designed to minimize impact on the surrounding residential uses, and staff felt a Planned Commercial zoning for the entire piece was the appropriate avenue to pursue.

Mr. Drollinger said staff recommended that the specific plan submitted not be approved, but that Planned Commercial zoning for the entire property be approved, with the permitted density, uses, setbacks, screening and buffering, parking and additional restrictions as outlined in the staff report. He said the permitted uses would be warehousing, retail showrooms, and mini-storage with certain restrictions to prohibit any "nuisance uses." He said the density would provide petitioner with an additional 29,400 square feet of development. There would be a minimum of 8' planted screen and fence adjacent to any residential zone or use. Mr. Drollinger said the applicant would still have to go through the site plan review process which would be an administrative process. Petitioner also agreed to incorporate some of staff's original review comments.

Chairman Elmer asked if staff had any "real" problems with the layout. Mr. Drollinger said there were

problems, but felt the PC zone would ensure flexibility and a better development, and allow the petitioner to develop in phases.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue, representative for petitioner, said that petitioner understood staff's report and took no exception to it. He said the site plan was intended to give an idea of the overall direction of the proposal and that the phases would occur over a 3-4 year period. The first phase would be expansion of the current warehouse on the site. He felt that the plan could be modified as necessary to meet technical issues and the mini-storage units would serve as a good buffer between the residential area.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Charles Williams, 133 Epps Drive, asked about the required setbacks from his property line and Mr. Drollinger explained that any buildings would have to be a minimum of 10' from the property line. Mr. Williams was concerned about the lighting of the storage units since the nearby Little League park was very bright. Chairman Elmer said that there would be a fence and landscaping as buffer between the units and Mr. Williams' home, and assured him that the lighting would be "subdued."

Berry Patton, an adjacent property owner, said that all that was on the site now was a "trash pile." He said trucks turning on the property made a lot of dust, and questioned when petitioner would be required to pave and fence the area, and how it would be enforced. He said petitioner had made "promises" before that hadn't been complied with. Mr. Drollinger said that petitioner would be required to screen whatever he put in at the time he put it in, and that development would occur on the west side first. He said that mechanisms were in place to enforce the requirements and that he would look into any old requirements that had not been complied with.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Tom Logue, in his rebuttal, said that the lighting would be surface mounted, low level intensity lighting, on the face of the building. He said that all access areas and turning areas for trucks will be paved and that the entire site would be fenced immediately upon receiving a building permit. He said landscaping the 8' strip would be done on a "case-by-case" basis to avoid tearing it up during future construction.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer felt the item was "pretty straight forward" and that staff's provisions were adequate to buffer the residential property around it.

Mr. Patton asked if there would be any access between the rear of the storage units and his property. Mr. Drollinger said that such an access was not currently planned, and that it would not be a very efficient site design to have such an access.

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item #120-94, I move that we forward this request for a rezone from RSF-8 and C-1 to PC on to City Council recommending approval subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Withers.

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

3. **#122-94 VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY/FINAL PLAT-REPLAT OF NORTHACRES**
Request for recommendation of approval of a Right-of-way vacation of Northacres Road and a portion of Sage Court Road and approval of a final plat for a replat of a portion of Northacres Subdivision consisting of 8 single family lots on 3.5 acres with a zoning of RSF-4 (Residential Single Family, 4 units per acre).
PETITIONER: WDM Corporation
LOCATION: 26-1/2 Road and Northacres Road
REPRESENTATIVE: Ciavonne & Associates

STAFF PRESENTATION

Tom Dixon presented an overview of the request. He said that when the item was heard earlier in the year as a 9 lot subdivision, the preference was that Northacres Drive be realigned. He said this proposal eliminated Northacres Road and renamed a road to Northridge Drive. He said there was also a reconfiguration of the connection with Sage Court being proposed which would happen by means of land trades/dedications. He said the replat was for 8 lots, as opposed to 9 lots. Sage Court had been improved with recycled asphalt so there would be an improved connection between the two developments.

Mr. Dixon said that sidewalks were required on all of Northridge Drive and staff recommended that sidewalks be extended to the open space area. Regarding the possibility that a bridge might be built sometime in the future between the proposal and the property to the west, petitioner wanted to install a temporary cul-de-sac bulb. Staff reached an agreement with petitioner that permanent improvements to the cul-de-sac could be delayed up to 5 years to see if a bridge would, in fact, be built. He said the cul-de-sac improvements could be made "without being up to City standards." Staff also required that access to Lot 1 be restricted to Northridge Drive so that there was no access onto 7th Street.

Mr. Dixon said that staff recommended a review of the design plans for the pedestrian amenities, because staff had some concern about what kind of use the public might have of property actually owned by the home owners association.

Mr. Dixon said that staff recommended approval of the replat, as proposed, with the conditions staff recommended.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Craig Roberts, Ciavonne & Associates, said he preferred that plans for the open space not be required to be submitted to staff, and that it be left up to the developer to do whatever would help sell the property. He said he felt it would be difficult to restrict public use of the amenities, but he didn't feel the planning department should be the review agency for their design. Mr. Roberts agreed with staff's recommendation regarding the cul-de-sac but was concerned about the setbacks being permanently measured from the temporary cul-de-sac easement. He preferred a variance of the setback to 20', but Mr. Shaver said that the commission could not vary the bulk zone requirements. Mr. Dixon said that the cul-de-sac setbacks were 20' in an RSF-4 zone.

Regarding the connection between Northridge Drive and the Sage Court right-of-way, Mr. Roberts said that there was only 8' of property in question. Mr. Shaver said that "the last we've heard" the agreement was acceptable to the parties but has not been signed.

Regarding the open space issue, Mr. Dixon said that staff didn't necessarily want design review, but wanted to be able to answer questions of potential buyers who were concerned about "what they are buying into," especially if the open space was to be maintained by a homeowners association. He said he requested the right to review the plan, not review and approve. Mr. Shaver said that it was important to clarify the maintenance issue as well as the use issue. Mr. Roberts felt that marketing the property was his job, not staff's, and "if a plant dies, then staff has the right to tell me to put the plant back in. I don't want to have to come back in and change the plan."

PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Curley, the property owner to the northwest, was concerned that he would be forced to make improvements to the road and bridge sometime in the future. The board discussed the issue of local improvements districts, but decided since Mr. Curley was located in the County, any improvement district would not effect him. Chairman Elmer suggested that he negotiate the matter in a pre-annexation agreement if he were ever annexed.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Roberts said that only those parcels adjacent to the improvement would be included in the local improvement district, so the eight lots would not be effected.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Regarding the open space, Chairman Elmer felt that it should be "kept off the public record" since it was a straight zone, and that it should be between the buyer and the developer.

The board discussed ways to ensure that lot buyers were aware that the cul-de-sac was temporary and might eventually go through. Mr. Roberts said "that's why we named it Northridge Drive," and that the cul-de-sac is designated "temporary" on the plat.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item #122-94 right-of-way of Northacres Road and a portion of Sage Court Road, I move that we forward this to City Council with a recommendation of approval as defined by staff and shown on the plan."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

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

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item #122-94, I move we approve the final replat/plan for Northacres Subdivision subject to staff recommendations #1, 2, 3

and 5."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laiche.

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

**4. ADOPTION OF SWMM - STORM WATER MANAGEMENT MANUAL
Request for recommendation of approval of the adoption of the Storm Water Management Manual (SWMM).**

PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

CITY STAFF: Don Newton

STAFF PRESENTATION

Don Newton, City Engineer, presented the staff review of the Storm Water Management Manual. He said an interim manual was developed in 1989 to establish minimum criteria for estimating storm runoff from new developments and for designing drainage. The interim manual was used for 2 years, and, over that time, the City gained "a lot of valuable information" from the development community. In January, 1994, the City hired Williams Engineering to write the new SWMM manual. The new manual is very comprehensive and incorporates hydrology, hydraulics, criteria, general provisions, storm water law, maintenance, drainage fee, detention/retention, storm water quality and grading. Mr. Newton said the new manual was made available to the public on July 6, 1994 and he had received no public comment on the manual. He presented the board with some revisions he would like to have incorporated in the manual.

The revisions limited the maximum slopes on detention basins to 4:1, provided maximum depth requirements, allowed maximum street grades of 8% instead of 6%, and required that basins be reseeded with an approved ground cover.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Elmer said that the manual appeared well written, comprehensive, and was a "good job."

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one in favor or opposition to the item.

MOTION: (Commissioner Laiche) "Mr. Chairman, on item #127-94 Storm Water Management Manual, I move we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval of adoption, including the 6 amendments presented by Mr. Don Newton via his memo dated August 2, 1994."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

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

5. #1-94(J) TEXT AMENDMENT - HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

A request for recommendation of approval of a new Section titled Historic Preservation to be added to the Zoning and Development Code. The primary purpose of the section is to protect and preserve the City's architectural, historic and cultural heritage by establishing a City Register for locally designated historic structures, sites and districts.

PETITIONER: Downtown Development Authority

REPRESENTATIVE: Barbara Creasman

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck presented an overview of the text amendment. She said the City was currently undertaking the first phase of an Historic Resources Inventory. The City had planned to complete the second phase next year, create a public information program, and then propose adoption of an ordinance. Ms. Ashbeck said the DDA was currently working on a number of projects that could immediately benefit from local designation as historic resources, therefore, the DDA was proposing the ordinance now so the City could make local designations and those projects could be eligible for grant monies.

Ms. Ashbeck said that the ordinance established a city register of historic sites, structures and districts. It established a historic preservation board appointed by City Council; it required approval by the property owner for a historic designation unless the property is within a district, which requires that only 60% of the property owners approve of the designation; it sets forth criteria by which the board and Council review and approve the designation; it sets forth criteria by which the board will review proposed alterations to the structures.

Ms. Ashbeck said that staff had removed the section on alterations which required review by the Board. Board review of alterations will no longer be required before a building permit is issued. Staff felt that it was a process "that really didn't mean much" because the property owner could ignore the recommendations. The revised ordinance requests the property owner consult the board before making any alterations. The only penalty for not complying with the board's comments is to have the historic designation revoked.

Ms. Ashbeck said that other communities had stronger historic preservation ordinances which favor a "more regulatory" approach. Staff felt such a regulatory approach was probably necessary, however staff was told by DDA that this community would react better to a more voluntary approach and was "a good place to start from." She said the ordinance could evolve to a more regulatory approach as the community desired.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Barbara Creasman said that the Avalon, Museum of Western Colorado, the Arts Commission, and the DDA board all worked on the ordinance, and it was their consensus that a voluntary approach was "more desirable at this time." She said waiting until a more regulatory approach was developed would penalize property owners who wanted to begin preserving important sites. She said that certain historic sites needed to be able to take advantage of grant funds available in order to preserve the history of the area.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment regarding the text amendment.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey felt the ordinance was "long overdue."

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item #1-94(J) Historic Preservation Ordinance, I move we forward it to City Council with a recommendation for approval."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Halsey.

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

- 6. #53-93(2) AMENDMENTS TO THE SSID MANUAL**
Request for recommendation of approval of various amendments to the SSID Manual, including requiring all plat and as-built information be provided on a computer disk and allowing future amendments by Council resolution.
PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner said the amendment added the requirement that all plats and as-built information be provided to the City on computer disk. When originally proposed, there were a "couple of consultants who didn't have those capabilities," but now the engineering and drafting department felt that "probably everyone" has the capabilities. She said the county recently passed a similar requirement. Ms. Portner said that future amendments to the SSID manual would occur by Council resolution rather than ordinance approval.

Commissioner Volkmann asked if someone just starting out who didn't have the capabilities could obtain the service somewhere. Ms. Portner said that "we could work something out with them."

Chairman Elmer asked how the City would deal with the liability issue of making future changes to the disks. Ms. Portner said that the City would still require a stamped set of blue line drawings which would be the official as-built.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment on the amendment.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Vogel asked if there was a "basic, standard AutoCAD out there." Ms. Portner said that the requirement stated a 3.5" disk suitable for use with a personal computer and format compatible with .dxf or .dwg files.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item #53-93(2) Amendments to the SSID Manual, I move that we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laiche.

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

The board agreed to combine hearing Item #1-94(L) and #1-94(M).

7. **#1-94(L) TEXT AMENDMENT - BUSINESS RESIDENCE**
Request for recommendation of approval of a text amendment to Section 4-3-4 Use/Zone Matrix, and Section 5-1-10B of the Zoning & Development Code to allow business residences in the I-1 (Light Industrial) zone.
PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger said presently business residences are allowed in the B1, B3, C1 and C2 districts. Staff didn't feel business residences were an "intensive use" and felt they would have little adverse impact. Mr. Drollinger said it "made sense" to allow them in the I-1 zone, especially in the older, downtown areas. He said the City had very specific criteria which had to be met in order to get a permit for a business residence. Staff recommended approval.

8. **#1-94(M) TEXT AMENDMENT - DUST FREE SURFACES**
Request for recommendation of approval of a text amendment to Section 5-1-4 and Section 12 of the Zoning & Development Code defining requirements for pavement of vehicular traffic areas.
PETITIONER: City of Grand Junction

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger said that the City had previously allowed gravel as a "dust free" surfacing material. The experience of the City has been that gravel is not a dust free surface and there have been a number of problems related to that. The proposed text amendment would require concrete or bituminous pavement on all required parking and vehicular travel areas, although the City Engineer could still permit the use of gravel in overflow areas or similar areas. Mr. Drollinger said that the Mesa County Health Department was "very happy" with the text amendment since particulate from road dust constitutes a large part of the air particulate problem. Staff recommended approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment on either item.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

There was no board discussion on either item.

MOTION: (Commissioner Laiche) "Mr. Chairman, on items #1-94(L) and #1-94(M), I move we forward these to City Council with recommendations of approval."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 11:56 p.m.