

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing - October 3, 1995
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, Ron Halsey, Bob Withers, Tom Volkmann, and Paul Coleman. Commissioner Coleman arrived late and was present for consideration of item FPA-95-166.

In attendance, representing Planning Department staff, were: Kathy Portner (Planning Supervisor), Dave Thornton (Sr. Planner), Michael Drollinger (Sr. Planner) and Bill Nebeker (Sr. Planner).

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

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 31 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, I move we accept the minutes of September 12 as presented."

Commissioner Volkmann seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the minutes from September 5 as submitted."

Commissioner Volkmann seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

Chairman Elmer announced that the following items were pulled from the evening's agenda: PP-95-157, SUP-95-136, and ANX-95-129.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION

CUP-95-167 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT--RESIDENCE

Request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a residence in a B-3 zone district located at 842 White Avenue.

Petitioner: Edward Martinez

Location: 842 White Avenue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker presented an overview of the proposal. The proposal would eliminate a non-conforming use and would comply with surrounding uses. Staff recommended approval.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

The petitioner offered nothing further.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey asked staff to look into the downtown area zoning and see if it would be practicable to revert some of the existing but unused business zoning back to residential. He felt that this might assist in revitalizing the downtown area.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on CUP-95-167, I move that we approve this request."

Commissioner Volkmann seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

FPA-95-164 FINAL PLAN AMENDMENT--COUNTRY CLUB TOWNHOMES

Request for approval for an amendment to an approved Final Plan for Country Club Townhomes. Petitioner is requesting the extension of a retaining wall along the north property line.

Petitioner: Sidney Gottlieb

Location: Southeast corner of 27 and G Roads

Representative: Phil Hart, Landesign, LLC

Commissioner Volkmann withdrew from consideration of this item due to a conflict of interest.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger provided an overview of the proposal and indicated that the retaining wall extension request did not fall within the parameters of a Minor Change. The retaining wall would help stabilize the slope and protect trees and vegetation on the north side of the wall. Staff recommended approval.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

The petitioner offered nothing further.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on FPA-95-164, a request for an amended final plan approval for the Villas at Country Club, I move that we approve this application."

Commissioner Withers seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a

vote of 4-0.

FPA-95-166 FINAL PLAN AMENDMENT--ERNST EXPANSION

Request for approval of an amendment to an approved Final Plan for the expansion of the Ernst store. Petitioner is requesting a modification of the fencing/screening requirements for this project.

Petitioner: Bonnie, John, and Olga Clark

Location: 514 - 28 1/4 Road

Representative: Monty Stroup, Landesign, LLC

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger said the petitioners were requesting amendment of two prior conditions of approval regarding screening and buffering. They were requesting reconsideration by the Commission for a 10-foot chain link fence with vinyl slats to surround the entire perimeter of the project. Unlike the Sutherlands Lumber Yard which was not required to install a masonry perimeter fence, the Ernst building directly encroaches into a viable residential neighborhood. Staff felt it important to adequately buffer neighborhood residents from the noise and visual impacts of the commercial use and recommended denial of the amended final plan.

PETITIONERS' PRESENTATION

Monty Stroup, Don Schulties and Jeff Mills, representing the Ernst store, said that they had received estimates for fencing the perimeter as the Commission had directed and that costs were prohibitive (appx. \$65K). They felt that the noise generated came primarily from the refrigerated trucks loading and unloading at the City Market store. Mr. Schulties felt that the wood fiber products which would be stored along the fence line would offer a natural sound barrier and that a masonry wall would not provide that much additional buffering against noise. He continued that a chain link fence would be more durable and require less maintenance. The petitioners requested compromise.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Coleman said that the backup alarms from the Ernst forklifts were very noisy and added that any natural materials along the fence line could and would sometimes be moved, leaving no buffer there at all.

Chairman Elmer still felt that the Ernst hours of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. were long and afforded nearby residents no break in the noise generated from the property.

Mr. Schulties reminded the Commission that they were not trying to get out of the fencing requirement but, rather, to request compromise on the type of fencing material used.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Bob Clark (721 - 25 1/2 Road, Grand Junction) did not want the masonry wall because he felt it would look too much like a prison wall. Additionally, he felt it might encourage graffiti.

AGAINST:

Margaret Lee (518 - 28 1/4 Road, Grand Junction) expressed a preference for the block wall.

Evelyn Thackaberry (521 Compton, Grand Junction) provided some historical background and said that when the Ernst store originally moved in and asked the neighbors to sign a petition of no contest for its storage of materials, the residents had been told that such storage would be seasonal only. She felt that the residents had been lied to, that the area behind the store was always unkempt, and that Ernst had not proven

itself to be a good neighbor.

Ed Pacheco (509 Compton, Grand Junction), owner of property directly behind Ernst to the east, agreed with statements concerning the need for sufficient noise and visual buffering. He urged the Commission to hold its ground and that chain link fencing was no kind of buffer.

PETITIONERS' REBUTTAL

Mr. Schulties asked for latitude in exploring other materials options.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Withers said that cost was not something the Commission could consider. He felt that any research into materials options should have been done by the petitioners prior to the hearing process. He felt that some latitude may be given for fencing materials along 28 1/4 Road only.

There was general discussion over which portions of fencing, if any, should be given latitude on materials choices. Chairman Elmer reiterated previous sentiments that chain link with vinyl slats was unsightly and that any fencing choice should be aesthetically pleasing as well as provide for buffering.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item FPA-95-166, I recommend that we require fencing/screening along the north be a solid wall construction, along the east to be a block wall, along the south to be a chain link and along the west to be a chain link. Construction materials and design to be agreed upon with staff. 'Solid wall' is to be defined as a combination of masonry/wood, concrete, or something that air will not pass through."

Commissioner Halsey seconded the motion.

Chairman Elmer asked the Asst. City Attorney if the motion, as stated, was clear enough as a recommendation of denial for the petitioners' request and that an alternate proposal was suggested. Mr. Shaver replied affirmatively.

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

FPP-95-133 FINAL PLAT/PLAN--WILLOW RIDGE SUBDIVISION

Request for approval of the Final Plat/Plan for Willow Ridge Subdivision for 14 single family residential lots on approximately 4.65 acres with zoning of PR-3.1.

Petitioner: Oliver Frascona

Location: Highway 340 & Redlands Canal

Representative: Kenneth Schmohe, Design Affiliates

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner indicated that the proposal is in compliance with the preliminary conditions of approval. In addition, the petitioner has agreed to the following:

1. A plan for the landscaping and signage for the common tracts will be submitted for approval and the cost of the improvements will be included in the Improvements Agreement.
2. The portion of the bike trail to be reconstructed will meet City standards.
3. All other technical concerns of the review agencies have been addressed on the revised plans and documents.

The applicant is also proposing a 5 to 6-foot stucco finish fence/wall along Highway 340. The proposed location and heights must be reviewed and approved by City staff and the cost of the wall included in the Development Improvements Agreement.

Staff recommended approval subject to the condition that the final plat, plans and documents, including the proposed fence/wall along Highway 340, must receive final approval by City staff prior to recording the plat and/or initiating construction.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Volkmann asked if the issue with Redlands Water and Power had been resolved. Ms. Portner felt that it had but indicated that anything still outstanding could be resolved and finalized with them prior to final review.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

The petitioner offered nothing further.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey commented that he still felt there were too many lots with zero lot line homes for this project.

Chairman Elmer asked if the sewer line easement had been granted. Mr. Shaver responded no; the easement is to provide temporary access and will become void once the Final Plat is recorded.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-95-133, I move we approve the Final Plat and Plan for Willowridge Subdivision as per staff recommendation with the following two amendments: that the word 'plat' be added after the word 'recording' in the third line, and the word 'initiating' be inserted between 'and/or' and 'construction.'"

Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1, with Commissioner Halsey opposing.

FPP-95-156 FINAL PLAT/PLAN--NIAGARA VILLAGE, FILING #1

Request for approval of a Final Plan and Plat for 28 single family residential lots on approximately 5 acres zoned PR-5.8 (Planned Residential with a density not to exceed 5.8 units per acre).

Petitioner: Waterloo Nevada, Ltd.

Location: East of 28 1/4 Road, south of North Avenue

Representative: Phil Hart, Landesign, LLC

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger outlined the proposal using the site plan provided. He indicated resolution of all major outstanding issues except the following: 1) Fruitvale Sanitation has not had an opportunity to review the revised sewer plans but they would review and comment on them prior to hearing, and 2) the City Development Engineer has not had an opportunity to review the petitioner's revised plans as of the date of this staff report. Comments have since been received from Art Crawford of Fruitvale Sanitation and they are in agreement. Additional comments were received by the Grand Junction Drainage District who

expressed initial concern about drainage water. The petitioner's design regarding piping of drainage water, however, satisfactorily addressed this concern. Staff recommended approval subject to conditions 1 and 2.

QUESTIONS

Commissioners asked for and received minor points of clarification from staff.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Monty Stroup, representing the petitioner, passed out reductions of the petitioner's proposed landscaping plan to Commissioners and added that picnic tables/benches would also be installed in the open space areas.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Halsey commended the petitioner for a nicely designed landscape plan.

MOTION: (Commissioner Coleman) "Mr. Chairman, on item FPP-95-156, a request for final plat and plan, I move for approval of this application subject to conditions 1 and 2 in the staff report dated September 25, 1995."

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

MS-95-160 MINOR SUBDIVISION--KAIN/KEENAN

Request for approval of a two (2) lot Minor Subdivision of approximately 1/2 acre of land located in an RSF-5 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 5 units per acre) zone district.

Petitioner: William Kain and Kevin Keenan

Location: 2715 G Road

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker began his presentation by stating that the redesigned rear lot would have frontage off of G Road. A single entrance would be provided as access to both lots. Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits prior to construction and the final plat shall comply with all applicable codes and regulations
2. Access to G Road for both lots shall be limited to a single driveway with one future curb cut. A notation on the final plat shall state the following: "Lots 1 and 2 are limited to a single driveway access onto G Road." A dimensional ingress/egress easement, minimum of 20-feet wide, shall be shown on the final plat at the location of the proposed driveway entrance. The dedication statement on the plat shall include the following: "All ingress/egress easements to the owners of lots or tracts specifically identified on the plat as perpetual easements for ingress and egress purposes for the use by said lot or tract owners, their guests, and invitees, and also for use by public services, including but not limited to, postal service, trash collection, fire, police, emergency vehicles, and the City of Grand Junction."
3. Remove all references to building setbacks from the primary portion of the subdivision plat. An inset shall be included for information purposes that shows the location of the front, side and rear yard of lot 2. Setbacks are shown on the resubmitted plat. No dimensions or building envelopes shall be shown.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Withers asked if there were to be any covenants required. Mr. Nebeker replied that they

would not be required unless the petitioner wished to provide them.

Commissioner Withers asked for clarification of the sewer fee and open space requirement. Mr. Nebeker and Ms. Portner provided information.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bill Kain and Kevin Keenan, petitioners, said that their intention was to build two nice homes on the lots. They'd received approval to hookup to sewer in the area and agreed to comply with staff conditions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal; however, Don Tyre (694 West Cliff Drive, Grand Junction) requested clarification of the height limitation, which was stated as 32 feet.

MOTION: (Commissioner Vogel) "Mr. Chairman, on item MS-95-160, I move that we approve the Kain/Keenan Minor Subdivision at 2715 G Road with conditions and staff recommendations."

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

PP-95-158 REPLAT--MESA VILLAGE SUBDIVISION

Request for approval of a replat of all 5 lots of the Mesa Village Subdivision, including common space, into 5 lots on 24.72 acres in an HO (Highway Oriented) zone district.

Petitioner: Dillon Real Estate Comp., c/o City Market

Location: Northeast corner of 24 and F Roads

Representative: Western Engineers

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner presented a brief description of the proposal, indicating that no new lots would be created. All technical concerns had been addressed except for the following:

1. It is noted that the dedication of the utility easements is still shown incorrectly on the revised plat and must be corrected prior to recording.
2. As agreed upon by the City and the petitioner, a drainage easement shall be provided on the south half of lot 2A for future stormwater detention for the subdivision.

Staff also put the petitioner on notice that a very limited sign allowance was available for lots 1A and 2A. The petitioner may need to go through the variance process for the reallocation of sign allowance.

Staff recommended approval subject to the following additions:

1. The utility easement dedication be revised as per the City standard.
2. A drainage easement and/or detention easement be provided on the south half of lot 2A.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

John Caldwell, representing the petitioner, expressed a concern over staff's requirement of dedicating one-half of the southern lot for drainage. He felt that an adequate easement had been provided for carrying the water away from the site.

Ms. Portner said that the detention area would be used for actually holding the drainage from the

development on site. She added that the requirement could be modified at the time actual future development was defined.

Mr. Caldwell said that an apportionment agreement was currently being negotiated with the other property owners for an increased signage allotment.

QUESTIONS

There was general discussion over the drainage requirement. Commissioner Withers suggested the following wording: "A drainage easement and/or detention easement acceptable to City staff shall be provided prior to filing of the Final Plat and Plan."

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item RP-95-158, I move that we approve the replat of Mesa Village Subdivision as per the staff recommendations with the revision stated by Commissioner Withers before."

Commissioner Withers seconded the motion. 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

VE-95-154 VACATION OF EASEMENT--PTARMIGAN RIDGE NORTH

Request for a recommendation of approval to vacate a ten (10) foot utility easement along the west edge of Lot 4, Block 3, Ptarmigan Ridge North Subdivision.

Petitioner: Robert Sumrall, Sumrall Corporation

Location: 1715 Ptarmigan Ridge Circle

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bill Nebeker indicated that the easement had been placed on the plat by mistake. The proposal would serve as a housekeeping measure to eliminate that mistake. Staff recommended approval.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bob Sumrall, petitioner, offered nothing further.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Halsey) "Mr. Chairman, on item VE-95-154, I move that we forward this with a recommendation of approval to the City Council for vacation of a 10-foot utility easement on Lot 4, Block 3 of Ptarmigan Ridge Subdivision."

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

PDR-95-159 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AND REZONE--ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER

Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and rezoning of St. Mary's Hospital and Medical Center

Petitioner: Keith Estridge, St. Mary's Hospital and Medical Center

Location: 2635 North 7th Street

Representative: Bertis Rasco, AIA

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger indicated that St. Mary's had submitted for review a Master Site Plan which projected expansion into the next ten years. Outstanding issues included:

1. Additional right-of-way may be required along Patterson Road to straighten the offset in Patterson Road at the 7th Street intersection.
2. Based on accepted engineering standards, Public Works will require that the clearance for a pedestrian bridge over a City right-of-way at 7th Street offer a minimum of 16 feet of underside clearance.

Staff recommends that the development standards in Chapter 4 of the *Master Site Plan* document be the adopted standards for the complex. Variation from height and FAR (Floor Area Ratio) standards of up to 10 percent (as amended) should be permitted without requiring an amendment to the preliminary plan. Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission require that the plan be valid for five (5) years, after which, it must be readopted (with or without changes) through a new public hearing process. The Planning Commission also needs to consider whether St. Mary's should be permitted to have final plans for each phase (assuming they are consistent with the preliminary plan) approved administratively or if final plans shall require a Planning Commission hearing.

Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of the above issues with the Public Works Department.
2. Adoption of Chapter 4 of the document entitled *Master Site Plan* as the required development standards and permitting up to a 10 percent variation in the standards without requiring an amendment to the preliminary plan.
3. The adopted preliminary plan shall be valid for five (5) years from date of adoption, after which, the plan must be reconsidered at a Planning Commission hearing for readoption, with or without modifications.
4. The Planning Commission shall review and approval the final plans.
5. The Wellington lot is not approved for parking.

The Planning Commission should also include a condition regarding approval of final plans.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Volkmann noted that final plans have been approved administratively in past instances. Mr. Shaver and Ms. Portner concurred with this statement.

Commissioner Halsey asked if the 16-foot height restriction was primarily to allow for I-70 corridor-type trucks to access 7th Street. He could not visualize 7th Street becoming a major access point into the City because of the nearby school, the presence of the 7th Street Historical District, etc. Ms. Kliska felt it important for the City to keep its options open, adding that current traffic counts indicated approximately 21,000 cars per day traveled near the hospital intersection.

There was general discussion over the 5 percent requirement for minor changes; it was felt that 10 percent would be more reasonable.

Additional discussion ensued over the proposed pedestrian/bike path lanes from F Road to 6th Street. The potential route was outlined on the Master Plan provided.

Clarification of which properties were requesting rezone was given along with a brief elaboration of the landscaping plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Keith Estridge, Ken Tomlon, and Bertis Rasco stood before the Commission. Mr. Rasco elaborated on which parcels would be effected, plans for parking Lot E (to perhaps build a second deck), the detention areas to consist of the corner of Wellington and 7th Street and the corner of Center Street and 7th Street. The nearby park would be retained as open space, its only change would be in zoning. With regard to the pedestrian walkway height, Mr. Rasco said that the State of Colorado maintained a 14-foot 6-inch height limit with the average truck height at 13-feet 6-inches and the average truck with trailer length to be at 105 feet.

He felt that if trucks were oversized, they would need a permit and may be required to access downtown from alternate entrances. He said that refining of the bike path was needed and suggested requiring bikers to stop at a gate and dismounting at the parking lot point to ensure added safety.

Mr. Rasco requested allowance for some of the parking aisles in the main parking lot if Patterson Road was to be narrowed through realignment. If the allowance was not given, St. Mary's would lose valuable parking spaces.

Chairman Elmer suggested that the first row could be designated for compact car parking. He wanted to know how the pedestrian bridge height would impact the building design. Mr. Rasco explained that all bridge elevations should be kept consistent with the first level of the main building for ease in access. The goal was to make the building more easily accessible to those in wheelchairs and persons with disabilities.

Commissioner Halsey agreed with this rationale, adding that minimizing the incline *was* an important consideration.

Discussion ensued over whether final plans should be reviewed administratively. The consensus was to allow the Commission to review final plans but to increase the minor change percentage to 10 percent.

Chairman Elmer asked if the parking lot planned for Wellington was temporary. He saw this as a safety concern and did not think it would serve to alleviate the Hilltop parking situation.

Commissioner Halsey requested investigation by staff into the partial removal of the wall separating Hilltop with the Centennial complex to address perceived traffic safety issues. He applauded the work done by St. Mary's staff on the proposed Master Plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the proposal.

AGAINST:

Charlotte Wren (602 Rico Way, Grand Junction), property manager for the Village Fair Shopping Center, expressed concern about the proposal to expand the 7th Street/Patterson Road intersection. She did not feel it appropriate to bring large truck traffic off of I-70 onto the 7th Street. She agreed with comments made by Commissioner Halsey and Chairman Elmer on traffic safety and pedestrian issues. She also questioned

whether St. Mary's planned to expand its helipad and said that St. Mary's did not have avigation easements. She thought it would be more appropriate and impact residents less if St. Mary's would move its helipad to atop one of the buildings rather than allowing take-off from ground level. She perceived the 7th Street/Patterson Road corridor to be a long-term growth issue.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

No further comments were made.

DISCUSSION

Additional discussion ensued over the long-term plans for 7th Street. Ms. Kliska was unsure as to whether plans to widen 7th Street would materialize.

When asked about Ms. Wren's comments concerning St. Mary's lack of avigation easements, Mr. Shaver elaborated that the helipad proposal had gone through the public hearing process in 1985 or 1986 and that public comments were requested at that time. Since then, it had been a continued use. He was unsure without additional title work what easements were held by St. Mary's.

Chairman Elmer recommended that the Wellington Street parking lot not be allowed. He suggested leaving the pedestrian bridge height as-is. Future discussions could be held later.

MOTION: (Commissioner Withers) "Mr. Chairman, on item PDR-95-159, a request for rezone and preliminary plan approval, I move that we approve the preliminary plan with conditions 1. through 5. as in the staff report, modified hereafter as in the staff report dated September 27, 1995: item 2 in the conditions of approval, change 5 percent to 10 percent; add item 4. The Planning Commission shall review and approval the final plans; item 5. the Wellington lot is not approved for parking, and that we forward the rezone to City Council with the recommendation of approval."

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

ANX-95-150 ANNEXATION--ROUND HILL ENCLAVE

Request for a recommendation of approval zoning lands currently being annexed to the City to RSF-1 (Residential Single Family with a density not to exceed 1 unit per acre).

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

Location: 651 Horizon Drive

STAFF PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton indicated that the proposed City zoning of RSF-1 was closest to the former County zoning. The landowner had expressed an interest in a higher zoning but no development proposal was pending, so staff recommended rezoning to the RSF-1 zone.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item ANX-95-150, a zone of annexation for Round Hill Enclave, I move that we forward this on to City Council with recommendation that the zoning be set at RSF-1."

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

VI. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Dave Thornton passed out copies of the City's newly adopted Orchard Mesa Neighborhood Plan to Commissioners.

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