

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing March 3 , 1992
7:30 p.m. - 9:42 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Ron Halsey at 7:30 p.m. in the City County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Chairman Ron Halsey, Craig Roberts, Sheilah Renberger, John Elmer, Tom Volkmann and Scott Brown.

Commissioner Jim Anderson was absent.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Bennett Boeschstein, Director; Kathy Portner, Senior Planner; and Dave Thornton, Planner I.

John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney, and Don Newton, City Engineer, were also present.

Judy Morehouse, of KLB Secretarial Services, was present to record the minutes.

There were 17 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

* * * * *

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 1992 MEETING."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

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

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRE-SCHEDULED VISITORS

There were no presentations or pre-scheduled visitors

IV. GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

1. #5-92 CONDITIONAL USE - TACO BELL

A request for Conditional Use Permit to construct a Taco Bell Drive-Thru Restaurant in an HO Zone.

PETITIONER: Moss, Inc (Taco Bell)

REPRESENTATIVE: Michael Saelens

LOCATION: 759 Horizon Drive, Grand Junction, CO.

Commissioner Volkmann excused himself for this item due to conflict of interest.

PETITIONERS PRESENTATION

Mike Saelens representing Moss, Inc. gave an overview of the request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a Taco Bell on Horizon Drive. The parking will be extended beyond the property lines into the State Right-of-Way, which will be leased from the State. Those negotiations are underway and will include a 5 year lease with two 5 year options. The state access road ends at the ditch. The petitioner has been asked by the City to put curb, gutter and sidewalk along this section and to widen the road (which comes off Horizon Drive) to 36 feet so the road is three lanes with improvements and paving. The City Engineer has requested that the existing median in Horizon Drive be rebuilt with a left turn lane north of the access road.

The landscaping will be extensive on this project. The development will be in three phases beginning with the Taco Bell building itself and progressing with the landscaping and improvements. The open ditch with the four foot drain pipe will be improved and covered.

STAFF PRESENTATION

David Thornton, Planner I, explained that the request is for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Drive-Thru Taco Bell. The proposed construction for the site would be in the summer of 1992.

The proposed 7,400 square feet of landscaping meets the Zoning & Development Code requirements for the Highway Oriented (HO) Zone.

The number of parking spaces proposed (52) is sufficient to comply with the Code. The Code requires only 40. Proposed signage consists of two free-standing signs at 228 square feet each and four wall signs at 17 square feet each for a total of 524 square feet. The signage also complies with Code.

The Petitioner has agreed to construct any fire hydrant(s)

necessary for compliance to the Fire Code; which includes extending the 8" Ute Water line from the west side of Horizon Drive to service the hydrants(s).

The Petitioner has also agreed to obtain all necessary permits, agreements and leases from State Highway for construction and use of State Highway right-of-way and to execute an avigation easement with the Walker Airport Authority. They have also agreed to improve the State Access road and rebuild the median in Horizon Drive to allow for a left turn lane which will be an extension of the left turn lane onto Interstate 70 and to contribute their portion up to \$15,000 for the future installation of a traffic signal at the Access Road/Horizon Drive intersection.

All Review Agency Summary Sheet Comments have been satisfied. Staff recommends approval subject to Review Agency Summary Sheet Comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Renberger questioned if this access road would be used for access into the proposed Taco Bell?

Mr. Thornton replied that the access road dead ends at the canal. After Phase II, there will be two access points from the property onto the access road. Eventually a signal on Horizon Drive will be necessary at this location.

Mr. Boeschenstein commented on the Traffic Engineer's and City Engineer's proposals for channeling the turning movements so they will all be separated in the future; a proposed sketch is available for consideration.

Commissioner Roberts expressed his concerns that channeling all the turns did not seem possible.

Mr. Boeschenstein replied the channeling is concerned only with the left turns.

Commissioner Renberger questioned the timing proposed for the signalization?

Mr. Thornton explained it is not immediate; the installation of the signals is contingent upon the State Highway Department.

Chairman Halsey asked the City Engineer to further explain the

background and explain signalization proposals for this item.

Mr. Newton explained that a Traffic Signal Warrant Study was done two years ago on the interchange of Horizon Drive and Interstate 70 and determined a signal was warranted. As a result of that study, the State Highway Department was contacted since it is on State Highway right-of-way and requested they begin a budget process for the signaling. They applied for a hazard elimination grant in 1991, but it was denied. They are still attempting to come up with the funding for signals at the ramps.

Mr. Newton continued; the City feels eventually there is a need for three signals at this location; one at each ramp off Interstate 70, and also one at the intersection Horizon 70 Court and Horizon Drive. The City proposes to have the businesses in that vicinity participate with the City in the cost of that particular signal. When the State comes up with the funding for the ramp, all three would be installed at the same time.

Commissioner Elmer asked if limiting the driveway use on the frontage road until such time as a signal is in place would help the situation?

Mr. Newton replied negatively; there is a direct conflict with left turns into Taco Bell and left turns into Burger King if only one curb cut is utilized. The City has asked the Petitioner to reconstruct the center median on Horizon Drive north of the State Access road allowing Burger King to utilize the lane further to the south for left turns and southbound traffic for Taco Bell would utilize the area between the ramp and the state access road.

This is a short term solution for the problem until the State can get funding for the signals. The three signals would cost around \$150,000 and would operate off the same controller.

Chairman Halsey asked if there were any long range plans for alternate traffic movement in this area?

Mr. Newton replied there is no alternate route to Horizon Drive. He further explained that they have asked Taco Bell to install a sign at the corner of Horizon Drive and the State Access Road that would designate this as the entrance to Taco Bell to avoid the current traffic confusion between the access road and the on-ramp to Interstate 70.

Commissioner Brown questioned what proposals were underway for pedestrian crossings at this location?

Mr. Newton replied that when signals are installed, crosswalks will be designated. The City tries to avoid crosswalks when there is no control to stop traffic.

Commissioner Elmer questioned the lack of concern about Phase II & III, i.e. what are they going to eventually be doing with the rest of the property?

Mr. Thornton explained Phase II is proposed to be an office building, and Phase III is a small retail outlet. These have to stand alone and future review on these developments would be under a Special Use or Conditional Use. At such time the buffering between residential and commercial should be reviewed.

Commissioner Elmer felt the City Planning Commission has set a precedent of having the landowner meet the Code Requirements on their property. Even if the Petitioner has a five year lease from the State, he can meet the parking needs on this site.

Mr. Thornton explained that the Conditional Use can be revoked. If the Petitioner were to lose the State Highway lease it could come back to the Commission for re-review and on-site parking would then have to be provided.

Mr. Saelens commented on the parking issue, explaining there is adequate parking on site even without the State Highway lease.

Commissioner Elmer added that since the Petitioner has the space available then the Commissioners should enforce the code and force them to stay within their boundaries for parking.

Mr. Shaver asked if Mr. Saelens had sufficient parking without the right-of-way?

Mr. Thornton explained that the petitioner was short 17 spaces if the State right-of-way was not used for parking.

Mr. Saelens asked what would be required if the patio was eliminated?

Mr. Thornton replied 31 spaces would be required. He added that according to the Code, parking is allowed within 200 feet if the property is leased; it is well within the Code and it could be re-reviewed if the lease were ever lost.

Mr. Shaver commented on Mr. Thornton's point. It is within the Commissioners prerogative to question whether or not to deem that the lease is appropriate or sufficient and if it meets the intent of the Code.

Commissioner Elmer felt the traffic problem is compounded by allowing this variance for additional parking.

Commissioner Roberts felt by allowing over half the parking on

leased ground without a long-term lease there could be problems in the future if the lease was not continued.

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner about the right-of-way easement from the Motel property; is that an irrevocable agreement?

Mr. Saelens replied the lease is for 20 years with two five-year options.

Commissioner Elmer was concerned about both accesses to the property being on leased ground, and questioned how the City could even allow it at all especially since the landowner has the ability to use his own property. Commissioner Elmer added that he is very much against the proposal for this reason.

Mr. Thornton explained the State Highway has an extremely large right-of-way in this area and there is right-of-way from Horizon Drive.

Mr. Saelens added that the State right-of-way land-locks the property without a lease.

Commissioner Roberts commented that if in the future the east bound on-ramp were changed, then the access from Horizon Drive would be needed. If that did occur, the property owner would have to change their parking layout and their access to the site. It seems they are compounding the

access problem on that side of Interstate 70 and the signalization should be done first.

Mr. Thornton commented that the signalization was warranted two years ago.

Commissioner Elmer quoted the Code: " The parking area shall be provided on the same property as the principal building wherever possible. In business, commercial, and industrial districts the parking may be within 200 feet of the property but within a zone allowing the parking used." It appears in this case it is possible to have parking on the landowners property.

Commissioner Roberts asked about current situations where highway parking is allowed.

Mr. Saelens replied that the "Rose," and "Gator's" restaurant both allow right-of-way parking.

Commissioner Roberts replied that according to what has been allowed in the past two to three years it is not allowed.

Mr. Thornton replied that normally it is not allowed, but in this situation there is a lot of extra land, more than is normally required for a normal arterial therefore this property was looked at somewhat differently by the Development Department Staff. It seems there is room for variance in this case.

Commissioner Roberts added that it could set a precedent for allowing parking on any right-of-way.

Commissioner Elmer reminded the Commissioners of a decision made by the Board of Adjustment regarding a property on 7th Street which requested parking on City right-of-way, the City Staff and Attorney argued strongly against it.

Mr. Saelens clarified details of the lease agreement by stating it is a five-year lease with two five-year options. The only reason for this is the price will change after five years, but there is a guaranteed lease for 15 years.

Commissioner Elmer questioned the Petitioner about the acceptability of possibly losing the lease after so much investment in the property?

Mr. Saelens replied that they had considered that and still feel it is acceptable.

Commissioner Renberger asked if the frontage road could be used for access to eliminate the heavy traffic on Horizon Drive?

Mr. Saelens explained the reason they want two entrances is to avoid a bottleneck.

Commissioner Roberts summarized his concerns: the visual impact is important and more landscaping on Horizon Drive seems appropriate.

Commissioner Elmer suggested if it is approved the Park and Open Space fees could be used towards applying to the signalization.

Commissioner Roberts disagreed in that those fees are necessary for the Park and Open Space improvements and should not be transferred to another problem.

Mr. Saelens explained the signalization plans; two signals will be supplied by the State. Taco Bell has agreed to participate in the financial burden of the third of which the total cost is approximately \$60,000. If the businesses which immediately impacted the signal contributed, Taco Bell's portion would be \$15,000. Taco Bell is not trying to make the situation difficult, they are trying to make it work for everyone. Realistically someone is going to locate on this property and traffic will increase with development. The petitioners are willing to help

with the necessary changes for signalization in the area.

Mr. Saelens commented on the possible traffic problems such as those the North Avenue site has encountered in the past and explained the drive-thru is located on the access road side and it would be very unlikely the vehicles would be backed up onto Horizon Drive.

Mr. Saelens explained the State access road which at present is in great disrepair will be improved by the Petitioner. Curbs, gutters and sidewalks will be installed.

Chairman Halsey commented on his concerns about the traffic flow and the parking situation on leased land.

Commissioner Elmer stated that he is in favor of a Taco Bell on that site but not with this particular Site Plan. Preventing a bigger traffic problem prior to the installation of signals is one of the duties of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Renberger asked Commissioner Elmer his opinion on how they could make this a better site?

Commissioner Elmer replied by first installing the signal and by having the parking on site; it would then meet the intent of the Code.

Mr. Saelens explained the back of the lot has a 15 foot hill which would have to be moved in order to allow parking.

Commissioner Elmer reminded Mr. Saelens the motel to the south of this property did cut the hill away for parking.

Mr. Saelens asked what they would do with the State access if it were not used for parking?

Commissioner Elmer replied that it would be considered open space and therefore would be landscaped.

Commissioner Roberts commented that if the State uses the right-of-way, the required parking will be lost.

Mr. Saelens asked if this potential problem occurred in the next 15 years, would they have to come back for approval?

Mr. Thornton explained a condition could be stipulated stating at such time a re-review would occur.

Mr. Saelens stated if this did occur, then they could at that time

add parking where the hill currently exists.

Commissioner Roberts explained if this were to occur, the required parking would be to Code but the excess parking would be lost. The possibility exists that the interchange could be reworked to make it more efficient thereby increasing the probability of losing the lease.

Mr. Saelens explained that they are diverting the traffic to this access road with the second entrance which eliminates further congestion on Horizon Drive.

Mr. Saelens concluded by stating Taco Bell knows what kind of parking and access they require to make it a viable venture and if this isn't acceptable they will have to reassess their position on the project.

Mr. Thornton questioned Commissioner Elmer on his parking proposal for this project. Would parking on top of the hill coinciding with Phase II alleviate the problem?

Commissioner Elmer explained that would not be acceptable for this Phase; however, moving the hill to create parking would be within the intent of the Code.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #5-92, A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TACO BELL DRIVE-THRU RESTAURANT IN A HIGHWAY ORIENTED ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE DENY THIS REQUEST FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: IT DOES NOT MEET THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE WITH PARKING LOCATED OFF-SITE WHEN IT IS POSSIBLE TO LOCATE ON-SITE; AND THAT WE ARE ADDING TO A TRAFFIC SAFETY ISSUE ON HORIZON DRIVE BY NOT PLACING THE TRAFFIC LIGHT AT THIS TIME IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Roberts.

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

Commissioner Volkmann rejoined the Commission for the next item.

V. HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

- 1. #2-92 REPLAT OF A PORTION OF THE FALLS, FILING 3 SUBDIVISION, R.O.W. VACATION OF GRAND FALLS COURT AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
A request to replat lots 12 & 14, Block 2, Filing 3, and a request to vacate a portion of Grand Falls Court and a revised Outline Development Plan for**

lots 11,12,14 & 15, Block 2 Filing 3, The Falls.
PETITIONER: John A. Siegfried
LOCATION: Southeast of F Road and 28 1/4 Road

PETITIONERS PRESENTATION

Mr. Siegfried explained the purpose of the replat is to consolidate two lots and to eliminate an illogically placed public right-of-way. The plan would link the two lots giving access to the outside. Future development on this lot would follow previous development plans. The density will be reduced from the original Falls Developments.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal. The Falls development was proposed and approved in the early 1980's. The plan included a combination of single family detached units, townhomes and multi-family complexes. Only a portion of the development has been built. One phase of townhomes was built in both Filings 2 & 3. There is an unreleased Improvements Agreement for Filing 3, which the Planning Commission is considering tonight. All improvements have been completed except for North Grand Falls Court which provides access primarily to Lots 12 and 14 of Filing 3. These are the two lots they are proposing to replat into one lot. The original townhome plan also had access for Lot 15 off of North Grand Falls Court although other access is available.

The original improvements agreement was guaranteed by a building permit hold, which is still in effect. The developers have requested a partial release on the improvements agreement for the improvements that have been completed and accepted in Filing 3; however, the building permit hold guarantee would then have to be replaced with a bank guarantee for the remainder of the improvements to North Grand Falls Court because we no longer accept building permit holds.

The Petitioner is requesting that the portion of North Grand Falls Court north of Villa Way be vacated so that the entire improvements agreement can be released. To do that, Lots 12 and 14 must be replatted into one large lot with access onto the remainder of North Grand Falls Court and Villa Way which are already built. Because this is a Planned Zone, the Petitioner is also requesting a revised Outline Development Plan for the two lots to be combined in Filing 3 as well as the area to the South (the 6.2 acres shown on the map).

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning: The Falls subdivision is zoned Planned Residential 8 units per acre. To the north of the development a Fire Station will be developed. The City property

is zoned Planned Residential and is undeveloped. The property south of the Falls is zoned Residential Multi-family 16 units per acre. Across 28 1/4 Road is the Bethesda Care Center which is zoned Planned Residential 8 units per acre.

Patterson Road Corridor Guideline: The Patterson Road Corridor Guideline encourages residential development along this portion of Patterson Road not to exceed 10 units per acre.

Ms. Portner stated that the Petitioner has met the criteria for a right-of-way vacation. The Petitioner has resubmitted the Outline Development Plan to clarify the area being revised. The areas affected are Lot 1 of the replat and the 6.2 acre parcel located south of Grand Falls Drive which is a part of Filing 4. The proposed densities would increase the number of units on Lot 1 from 7 to 16 and decrease the number of units in a portion of Filing 4 from 84 to 25 which results in an overall density of 5.5 units per acre. This is well below what the zoning allows. The Petitioner has identified the type of dwellings to be low scale multi-family and single family structures which would fit the existing character of the area. They would have to come back through the hearing process at the time they are ready to develop the property.

Issues: All easements must be dedicated to the City of Grand Junction on behalf of the utilities and public. They are proposing an existing sewer easement be dedicated only to the sewer district, so that it would be easier to vacate in the future. Staff is recommending it be dedicated to the City as all other easements are. In the future if they feel the easement needs to be vacated or moved they can go through the process.

All errors and omissions on the Plat as noted in the review comments must be corrected prior to recording.

The City Engineering Department has agreed to study the drainage from the adjacent Fire Station site and its impact on this property. The petitioner has agreed to provide an easement if needed for the drainage, this would be done before the Plat is recorded.

The Petitioner has agreed to install signs and barricades as required by the Transportation Engineer.

The other review agency comments have been addressed.

Staff recommends approval of the Outline Development Plan, Replat and right-of-way vacation provided all the issues listed above are satisfied prior to recording the Plat.

PUBLIC COMMENT

AGAINST:

Mr. Wayne Bane from Hills View Homeowners Association was present to express his concerns on the width of the streets. He wanted to be sure the easement for the pumping station in the south portion which runs south to the Grand Valley Canal remains intact. On the zoning which was established 10 years ago but was not used, he thought it had reverted back to the original zoning.

Ms. Portner explained the zoning remains as is unless official action is taken by the Planning Commission and the City Council, in this case official action was not taken. This is a Planned Zone, and the plans on the portion that remained unplatted have lapsed. The Petitioner knows they must go back through the hearing process to propose their plan, but the zoning remains.

Chairman Halsey added there would be a public hearing prior to any future construction on this site.

Mr. Dick Rymer also with the Hills View Homeowners Association stated they are not against this development; however, they do have concerns about the water and the width of Villa Way. The concern is with the access and the proposed road width if there is development immediately north of Villa Way. Currently there are no curb cuts on the north side.

Mr. Bob Van Gundy with the Hills View Homeowners Association also commented on the width of the street, currently it is hard for cars to pass; and the homeowners garages's are on Villa Way and backing out is difficult if cars are parked on the street.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Siegfried replied he is aware of the infrastructure for the irrigation system and their easement, and assumes the legal status is in effect. This proposal before the board does not seem to have any impact on Villa Way.

Commissioner Roberts asked Mr. Siegfried if there was an existing easement for the cistern and pump system?

Mr. Siegfried was not sure about the details of the easement; however, he felt it was not really pertinent to this project.

Commissioner Elmer asked what the proposed uses are along Villa Way?

Ms. Portner replied the old proposal was for eight attached units.

Chairman Halsey asked if Villa Way would be considered at the time

the site plan comes up for consideration?

Ms. Portner replied the right-of-way exists with a certain width and this has been discussed with the City Engineer.

Mr. Newton added the width meets the requirements for a residential street as it is.

Commissioner Volkmann asked if the decrease in density was related to the Hillsvew owner's concerns?

Mr. Siegfried replied that there cistern and pump ares an obvious area of infrastructure which cannot be built in. The easement is such that their infrastructure could possibly be moved; that is not realistic but a possibility.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked how the individual lots are planned and why this isn't considered a rezone?

Ms. Portner explained that the request before them was a final plat and Outline Development Plan; either way it must come up before the hearing process. The zoning is planned residential at a certain density. When they reach the final stage the density would be locked in.

Commissioner Elmer also asked about the access to the original lot?

Ms. Portner replied originally it was off 28 1/4 Road. She added that essentially what they are trying to do is vacate a plat and this is the process which must be followed.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-92, A REQUEST TO REPLAT A PORTION OF THE FALLS, FILING 3 SUBDIVISION, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS, AS REVISED FEBRUARY 28, 1992."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-92, A REQUEST FOR AN OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SHEET COMMENTS, AS REVISED FEBRUARY 28, 1992."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ROBERTS) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-92, A REQUEST TO VACATE A PORTION OF GRAND FALLS COURT, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS, AS REVISED FEBRUARY 28, 1992."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

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

VII. GENERAL DISCUSSION

1. UPDATES - MASTER PLANS

A. SOUTH DOWNTOWN RIVERFRONT MASTER PLAN

Ms. Portner thanked the Commissioners for their representation at the public meeting. Goal statements will be developed from the issues, then a series of meetings will be set with special emphasis on neighborhood meetings. The big problem at the moment is to involve the businesses and industries. Suggestions on how to reach them are welcome. One process that will be looked into are new regulations for existing salvage yards so that they comply with the codes.

Commissioner Volkmann asked when the new salvage yard regulations will be considered?

Ms. Portner explained it will be taken to a Council Committee next month.

Commissioner Roberts asked why the salvage yard issue was tabled two years ago?

Ms. Portner replied at that time they were trying to solve the problem through land negotiations and other methods other than having a new ordinance passed. These negotiations did work to some extent; the City purchased and eliminated some salvage yards.

Mr. Boeschstein commented that Mr. VanGundy attended the South Downtown workshop. Tailings are to be removed from his property.

Chairman Halsey asked about the timing for the smaller community meetings.

Ms. Portner stated they should be started within two weeks. There has already been a subsequent meeting with some South Downtown residents discussing their concerns, issues and some possible solutions for the area.

B. MASTER PLAN OF PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE

Mr. Boeschstein of the City Community Development Department informed the Commissioners that the Watson Island Trail Grand Opening is scheduled the same day as the State Trails Conference. The Jarvis property should be cleaned up soon and the mill tailings removal will begin. The Climax site has 50 percent of the tailings removed at this time.

The consultants for the Master Plan have been in town to collect data. Next week they will be interviewing people, specifically possible users for the Recreation Center. Drafts of this plan will be out within the month.

C. NORTHWEST PLAN

Mr. Boeschstein thanked Commissioner Anderson for attending the Growth and Annexation Committee Meeting. The City Council wants further discussion with two realtors (Harry Mavrakis and Lois Lashbrook), they would like staff to look at making all of the zones in the Northwest Plan straight zones rather than planned zones. Staff will look into it, first by showing all the straight zones in the City and what the requirements are and also showing some of the requirements in the proposed Northwest zone thereby correlating and perhaps making some changes in all the straight zones instead of doing planned zones. The Planning Commission will also see this again. The problem appears to be that the development and real estate community do not like planned zones. They do not like the hearings and might be willing to live with more conditions if the only requirement is to obtain a building permit.

The Council Committee seems to be about ready to pass the Northwest plan. The zone may take longer for a decision.

Commissioner Roberts commented if this were all put into straight zoning, it would revert back to what exists now. The only difference will be some property will go from commercial to industrial.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the County Planning Commission needed

to be involved for adoption of this plan.

Mr. Boeschstein replied affirmatively and they are considering adoption. Under the City's extraterritorial powers and municipal plan of annexation powers plans can be adopted for two miles outside the City limits.

Chairman Halsey asked if the Planning Commission could accomplish anything prior to the review process?

Mr. Boeschstein felt that good attendance by the Planning Commission members at the Growth & Annexation Committee meetings does help and attending public hearings would also be helpful.

D. GRAND MESA SLOPES - COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Mr. Boeschstein explained this group formed after the City purchased the Sommerville Ranch which was purchased for water rights. The City would like to recoup some of the investment by selling a portion of the land. The BLM, the Forest Service, and the Town of Palisade are interested in a cooperative planning effort for the slopes of the Grand Mesa. The Community Development Department has been working on a proposed Memorandum of Understanding. The next step is to develop alternative management plans for this 50 square mile area.

The City Planning Commission, the City Council, the County Planning Commission and the County Commissioners will all consider the proposed Memorandum of Understanding. It basically states these entities will agree to cooperatively manage this area. The BLM feels if all the governmental entities sign the Memorandum of Understanding then major Federal money from the Land and Water Conservation Fund could be available. One threatened area is Horse Mountain in the east Orchard Mesa vicinity. Basically there are no specific plans for the areas yet a number of possibilities exist including ranching, grazing, wildlife, hunting, water resources, timbering, ranchettes, oil wells, and mining. The idea is to work out this overall management strategy at this time.

2. UPDATES - OTHER PROJECTS

A. MAJOR ROAD NEEDS STUDY

Mr. Thornton representing the City Community Development Department explained the Major Road Needs Study has begun. This is a MPO funded study which includes the area from 34 Road to 18 Road and H Road to A Road. Recommendations will be given as to which roads need to be upgraded and improved. There is a public forum meeting scheduled for April 13, 1992 at 4:00 p.m. Notice will be given and it is hoped members of the City Planning Commission will attend this meeting.

B. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. Thornton explained this study is being done by Leigh, Scott and Cleary, transportation consultants through Mesability. The City is involved in that they are the technical committee for this Mesability project.

The consultants have visited with Staff and are in the process of finalizing a survey form which will go out on March 16, 1992 which will hit about 5,000 homes in the area. The survey is set up to try and get a grasp of transit needs by residents and also to find funding support and to determine the scope of service needed in the future. This will be done on July 30, 1992.

The CRSS Study will be done by Sept. 30, 1992.

Chairman Halsey asked if they will be looking into public transportation for residents?

Mr. Thornton explained this is just one aspect that will be looked at to see if the majority wants public transportation.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the Road Study is the one which will address the Gunnison Street right-of-way vacation?

Mr. Thornton replied affirmatively.

C. STREET DESIGN CRITERIA

Mr. Boeschstein explained the City Public Works will be submitting designs for adoption next month by the City Planning Commission, the City Council, the Mesa County Planning Commission and the County Commissioners.

Landscaping standards are also proposed in conjunction with the street standards.

Discussion on the Taco Bell continued:

Commissioner Renberger wondered how the Commission could help make this project work.

Mr. Boeschstein explained the traffic and road problems; in 1982 when Horizon Drive was widened a conscious decision was made by City Council not to put in a raised median; even though the City Engineering Staff recommended it. When that decision was passed it was inevitable future problems would arise in a heavy traffic area such as Horizon Drive, with no raised median. The solution continues to be installation of a raised median.

Mr. Shaver reminded the City Planning Commission they are an advisory body not professional planners such as the Development Department Staff and that negotiation is not the Commission's function.

Chairman Halsey advised the Commissioners to attend the City Council meetings if there are issues of real concern, and give testimony to help clarify some of the issues of disagreement.

VIII. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no nonscheduled citizens and/or visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 p.m.