

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing March 9, 1993
7:00 p.m. - 10:05 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Ron Halsey at 7:00 p.m. in the City County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Chairman Ron Halsey, Jim Anderson, John Elmer, Tom Volkmann, Stephen Laiche, Gabe Harbin, and Larry Seese.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner, Karl Metzner, Dave Thornton, and Kristen Ashbeck.

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 42 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

***** I.

CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes of the February 10, 1993 meeting."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Elmer.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

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

Chairman Halsey welcomed three new Planning Commission members: Stephen Laiche, Gabe Harbin, and Larry Seese.

IV. GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION

1. #12-92 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT & MINOR SUBDIVISION - PROSPECTOR MOTEL STORAGE UNIT.

A request for a Conditional Use Permit to build 100 new storage units on vacant land south of the Prospector Motel, in a Highway Oriented (HO) Zone. Also, a request to subdivide the property into two lots. Tabled at April 7th, May 5th and June 2nd 1992 hearings.

PETITIONER: Michael Hert
REPRESENTATIVE: Mark Young
LOCATION: 547 Highway 50

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Young requested approval of a Conditional Use Permit to build 100 new storage units on vacant land south of the Prospector Motel and to subdivide the property into two lots.

The original proposal in February of 1992 was for the motel and storage units with the removal of seven existing motel units and three mobile homes over a four year period. Because of the concerns received from the Review Agencies, the proposal was changed.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner stated that originally the drainage issue was a great concern. Some of the original requirements have been changed due to revisions in text amendments; therefore, a conditional use permit for the storage units and a subdivision of the property into two lots is all that is applicable this evening.

A drainage basin located in the northwest corner will resolve the drainage issues. Access will be from the current motel driveway and off of 26 1/4 Road. The mini storage unit will be graveled to help eliminate excess drainage. Paving is required in the motel area because of the higher traffic. The number of units have been reduced to 49 and will be screened from the adjoining properties. Staff recommends approval of this request.

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR: There were no public comments in favor of this proposal.

AGAINST: Mr. Stewart Snyder of Snyder Memorials and owner of the property to the northwest had concerns about the drainage from this property and asked what the Petitioner planned to do with the drainage.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Young stated that the proposed retention pond was adequately sized to accommodate the 100 year runoff.

Mr. Metzner showed Mr. Snyder the drainage easement on the site plan.

Mr. Snyder questioned the proposed 18 foot traffic width?

Mr. Metzner replied that Staff preferred a 20 foot width, but because of the low traffic volume an 18 foot width would be sufficient.

Mr. Snyder asked if fencing between the properties was proposed?

Mr. Young explained that there will be a six foot high privacy fence around the property.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer felt that the drainage will be an improvement from what currently exists.

Chairman Halsey asked Staff if adequate drainage was being provided?

Mr. Metzner replied affirmatively and added that Gerald Williams, City Development Engineer, approved the drainage proposal adding that there are some minor corrections to be made later.

Mr. Young explained that the minor revisions do not deal with the drainage, but they do involve the paving radius requirements.

Commissioner Anderson asked what volume of water would be expected in the drainage area?

Mr. Young replied it will be 5,800 cubic feet.

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item # 12-92 a request for a Conditional Use Permit to build 49 new storage units on vacant land south of the Prospector Motel in a Highway Oriented (HO) Zone, I move that we approve this subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Volkmann) "Mr. Chairman, on item # 12-92 a request to subdivide the property south of the Prospector Motel into two lots, I move we approve this subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Elmer.

A vote as called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

2. #13-93 FINAL PLAT - SEDONA SUBDIVISION

A request for approval of a Final Plat for Sedona Subdivision (11.6 acres), zoned Planned Residential with a density of 4.2 units per acre.

PETITIONER: Sedona Partnership & T. L. Benson

REPRESENTATIVE: Thomas A. Logue

LOCATION: Southwest of 12th Street & H Road, West of Alpine Meadows Subdivision

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Tom Logue requested approval of a Final Plat for Sedona Subdivision. He stated that previous discussions included:

- 1) the Fire Department required that a water line be constructed on the north boundary of the property. This proposal reflects this requirement.
- 2) A stub street to the west was requested and the final plat reflects this street.
- 3) Improvements on Jordana Road and H Road were requested and are included in this proposal.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Dave Thornton gave an overview of the request for Sedona Subdivision. The requirement of a private drive to the south adequate to accommodate service vehicles has been incorporated into the plan. Most of the review agency's comments have been adequately addressed. The remainder of the comments can be worked out prior to recording. Staff recommends approval of this request subject to the review agency summary sheet comments with the exception that the landscaping along Amber Way should be the responsibility of the lot owners on either side of the right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against the proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Anderson asked about the responsibility for removal of landscaping in the right-of-way if it ever opens up?

Mr. Thornton explained that if the right-of-way were ever needed by the adjacent property owners, the revocable permit would be revoked and the property owners would not be permitted to use that land as part of their yard.

Commissioner Harbin asked if the property owners could build structures such as fences on this

right-of-way?

Mr. Thornton explained that any structures such as fences would have to be approved through the revocable permit process and added that all structures would have to meet setback requirements.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item # 13-93 a request for approval of a final plat for Sedona Subdivision (11.6 Acres), zoned Planned Residential with a density of 4.2 Units per acre, I move that we approve this subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

1. # 12-93 EASEMENT VACATION - 865 NORTH AVENUE

A request to vacate a utility easement for use by American Furniture Company.

PETITIONER: Sherwin Williams Development Corporation

REPRESENTATIVE: Jeffrey K. Williams

LOCATION: 865 North Avenue

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Jeffrey Williams requested approval of a request to vacate a utility easement to be used by American Furniture Company and submitted the preliminary site plan and re-subdivision proposal. The proposal includes subdividing the property into two parcels. A new Sherwin Williams building is proposed on Lot 1 and American Furniture on Lot 2. The proposal is to renovate the old City Market Store and to add on a 2,000 square foot warehouse for American Furniture. The surrounding area consists of commercial properties. With the existing curb cuts, there will be little impact on North Avenue. Sherwin Williams has provided a 25 foot easement between the buildings for ingress/egress. The Petitioner will relocate the utilities.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck stated that this is a proposal for two easement vacations. One easement was specifically dedicated to U.S. West and Public Service, and the other was retained when an alley was vacated previously. Quit claim deeds by U.S. West and Public Service will be provided and then the new plat will be recorded which will convey easement for the relocated utilities. The issues regarding the site plan will be addressed administratively.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against this proposal.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Halsey asked if the re-subdivision was included in this proposal?

Ms. Ashbeck explained that since this proposal is a replat, it can be approved administratively after the approval of the utility vacation.

Commissioner Elmer felt that the sidewalk along Belford Avenue and a two-way access should be required. The parking should be relative to visits not sales. He stated that the owner would be limiting the future resale of the property by infilling most of the area.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #12-93, a request to vacate a utility easement, I move that we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation for approval subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Elmer.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

2. #14-93 REZONE & ODP - NORTHCREST VILLAGE SUBDIVISION

A request to change the zoning of a property from Residential Single Family, two units per acre (RSF-2) to Planned Residential with a density of 2.9 units per acre (PR-2.9) and an Outline Development Plan for Northcrest Village Subdivision consisting of 29 single family dwelling units on 10 acres.

PETITIONER: Kay Scott c/o Gregg Cranston

REPRESENTATIVE: Thomas Logue

LOCATION: Northeast of Hemlock Drive and Seventh Street

Commissioner Volkmann excused himself from hearing this item due to a potential conflict of interest.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Thomas Logue gave an overview of the request for Northcrest Village Subdivision. Detailed technical information will be presented in the Preliminary Plan. Most of the surrounding subdivisions have been built. The lot sizes range from 9,000 square feet up to 15,000 square feet. Access to the property would be from 7th Street which is classified as a Minor Arterial. G Road is

also classified as a Minor Arterial and allows access to the east. This proposal includes 1,400 feet of new public roadway for access onto the lots.

Mr. Logue continued; fire protection needs are met, and the sewage, gas and electric lines are all available. An open area of approximately 1/3 acre is being provided to serve as a landscape feature to the property and will be used for storm water detention.

Mr. Cranston commented that a previous Petitioner proposed a 4.2 units per acre density for this property. That plan was rejected. This proposal deals with the reasons that plan was rejected. Those reasons include the following:

- 1) a look that was not compatible with surrounding development;
- 2) the density increase to 4.2 units per acre.

This proposal reduces the density and is similar to the adjoining neighborhoods.

In order to come to an agreement with the surrounding area residents, the plat has been posted and input has been solicited from those neighborhoods and the adjacent properties were mailed a questionnaire. Responses from the questionnaire included one person being concerned with the open area and asked if it was going to be maintained. Mr. Cranston stated that the open area will be maintained by the homeowners association. Other comments on the questionnaire included suggestions that the area be sold to the City for a park. The Petitioner had personally talked to Mark Achen, Dan Wilson, Tim Woodmansee, Ted Novack and Don Hobbs of the City in regards to this property being purchased as a park and until 4:27 p.m. March 9, 1993 no one has showed any interest in this parcel. A facsimile was received this afternoon at 4:27 p.m. from Keith Mumby who is on the steering committee for the Parks Plan and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board indicating via the new master plan they may be interested in small parks in the northeast portion of town.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner gave an overview of the proposal for the Northcrest Village Subdivision. Since this is an Outline Development Plan, it shows the concept of what generally will be done. Review Agency Summary Sheet Comments include a comment from the City Engineer in regards to the minimum City spacing of the two streets. The Petitioner has responded and these details will be worked out prior to submittal of a Preliminary Plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR: Mr. Jeff Williams stated that he lives within 100 yards of the project and felt that it was important to have a project that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

AGAINST: Mr. B.L. Smith who lives at the northeast corner of the property adjacent to the open space, felt the street layout could be changed or put at an angle so that it does not directly face the front of his house. He also asked who will maintain the open space?

Mr. Smith also had concerns with the water retention, and wondered if the open space was going to be fenced?

Chairman Halsey replied that these details would be reviewed at the time the final plan was submitted.

Mr. R. W. McCoe, of 729 Tulip Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81506, felt that this plan would cause too much congestion in the area. The density is too high compared to what exists in the area. The sewer system was improved to enhance the area, not to encourage high density development. The streets are too small for the proposed density. He felt that the best use for this area would be a City park.

Mr. Jeff Little, of 2647 Central Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81506, agreed that this area should be a City park. He added that this is not a full 10 acre lot. If development does occur, it should be with larger lot sizes.

Mr. Ted Street, of 721 Galaxy Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81506, felt the traffic along 7th Street is currently a problem. This subdivision will greatly add to the traffic problem. The proposal for 29 lots as opposed to the current 15 lots that would be allowed is too high a density for the area.

Mr. J.D. Snodgrass, of 704 Galaxy Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81506, had concerns about the proposed density. The area has already been zoned a certain density and has been built up to that density. This proposal increases the density almost 50 percent from the existing neighborhoods. This is an example of spot zoning. It is public knowledge that neighborhood parks are being considered. He had asked Mr. Mumby if the statement by Mr. Cranston in regards to the City not being interested in this area for development of a park was correct. The property owners feel that a City park in this area would enhance their property. He requested that the application be denied.

Mr. Irwin Steward, of 715 Galaxy Drive, Grand Junction, CO. 81506, objected to the proposal due to the increase in density and clarified that the proposed site is on 9.6 acres which comes to 3 lots per acre. He felt that this proposal will lower the adjoining property's values.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Logue felt that this proposal was compatible with the immediate neighborhood. There are a variety of lot sizes with a density of 3.15 per acre.

Commissioner Laiche asked Mr. Logue how big the lots were west of 7th Street?

Mr. Logue stated that they are approximately 10,000 to 12,000 square feet or 1/4 acre in size.

Commissioner Laiche asked what the lot sizes were south of this property?

Mr. Logue replied that they are approximately 1/2 acre in size. Mr. Logue noted there were no statements in the Review Agency Comments from Mr. Hobbs regarding this area being considered for a City park. The only statement included which referenced parks was that the Petitioner will be required to pay \$6,525 into the parks and open space fund.

Mr. Logue continued explaining that the concern with the two points of access will be resolved during the continuing process. The common open space will be fully landscaped and the Homeowners Association will be responsible for maintenance. The common open space will be a common detention area. The only time water will be evident will be in the case of a major storm. Average daily traffic counts have been done for this area at G Road and 7th Street, and according to design criteria of the City Development Code, this area is under design capacity.

Mr. Cranston commented that the lots will be sold at \$25,000 to \$30,000, and the houses will be in the \$130,000 range which commensurate with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Laiche asked if all lots will be sold for \$25,000 to \$30,000?

Mr. Cranston replied the exterior lots will be the larger, more expensive lots and the interior lots will be the smaller.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Halsey had concerns with increasing the density in newly annexed areas such as this. He also felt the increase of traffic on 7th Street is a concern.

Commissioner Laiche asked if Mr. Metzner or Mr. Shaver knew of any proposals for a City park in this area?

Mr. Metzner explained that the Parks Master Plan suggests that a park or a neighborhood center would be appropriate in this vicinity and noted that 15 to 25 acres was the size mentioned. There was never any indication from the Parks Department in any of the reviews that this site was considered for a park.

Mr. Shaver stated that there have been numerous discussions for various park sites. He stated that he was unaware of any negotiations for this particular site.

Mr. Shaver also stated that the park issue is not appropriate to the discussion of the rezone which is what is being requested this evening. The rezone must meet the rezone criteria.

Commissioner Elmer noted that the property to the west is zoned RSF-4. This request cannot be delayed based on what the City might do regarding a park. The neighborhood should be lobbying the City Council and attending other hearings if they want a park in their neighborhood. The developer has done a good job to buffer the density changes and has made other compromises. This proposal does not appear to detract from the value of the surrounding properties.

Commissioner Anderson asked about the water retention problem?

Mr. Logue explained that under normal conditions, there will be no water in this area. In a five year event there will be one foot of water for an hour and in a 100 year event there may be 2 1/2 feet of water for three hours.

Chairman Halsey asked the Petitioner about the concerns of the direction of the roadway?

Mr. Logue felt that screening could be included next to the roadway to eliminate the property owners concerns, or the detention area could be moved and a house could be located in this area.

Commissioner Seese asked if the surrounding areas are zoned RSF-4?

Mr. Metzner explained portions of Sunset Terrace, Bella Vista, and everything south of G Road are zoned RSF-4. However, the zoning does not necessarily reflect the lot size.

MOTION: (Commissioner Elmer) "Mr. Chairman, on item #14-93 a request to change the zoning of a property from Residential Single Family, two units per acre (RSF-2) to Planned Residential with a density of 2.9 units per acre (PR-2.9) and an Outline Development Plan for Northcrest Village Subdivision consisting of 29 single family dwelling units on 10 acres, I move that we forward this on to City Council with a recommendation of approval subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson.

A vote was called, and the motion failed by a vote of 3-3 with Chairman Halsey, Commissioner Harbin, and Commissioner Laiche voting against the proposal.

The Petitioner appealed this item to City Council.

Commissioner Volkmann rejoined the Commission for the next item.

**3. #15-93 RE-PLAT, ALLEY & EASEMENT VACATION AND
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT - ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH**

A request for a replat of eighteen (18) city lots into one parcel and for the vacation of alleys and utility easements throughout the site. Also requested is a Conditional Use Permit for a church in the Retail Business (B-3) Zone.

PETITIONER: Bishop Arthur Tafoya, St. Joseph's Church

REPRESENTATIVE: David O. Tryba

LOCATION: Third Street & White Avenue

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. David Tryba gave an overview of the proposal for St. Joseph's Church. The existing church will be restored and maintained as a Parish Center. The traffic flow will be consolidated with an alley from White Avenue and a one-way exit on Grand Avenue. The new church building will be constructed on the site of the existing alley utility right-of-way which the Petitioner would like to relocate to the north.

The height of the new church building is based on the proportions of the existing church in trying to maintain the current angles. The intention of the Petitioner is to design the new church with the same proportions with the west side looking directly onto the old church. The new church building will seat 650. The proposed height of the new church is approximately 7 1/2 feet above the maximum height allowance in the Code.

The Church has agreements with neighbors to facilitate the weekend parking. The required weekday parking for the school is 12 spaces on the church property. Parking availability on the church property and on adjacent properties supply 128 spaces. The parking requirement is 217 on Sundays. The church has agreements that will supply 476 parking spaces which does not include on-street parking.

There is a submittal pending for the vacation of a six foot right-of-way adjacent to White Avenue. The reason for this vacation coincides with maintaining the proportions of the old church building and the new building so that they will match. The old building is built six feet into the right-of-way also.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kristen Ashbeck stated that Staff recommends approval of both the revised site plan showing no encroachment into the right-of-way, as well as approval of the original site plan if the portion of the White Avenue right-of-way is approved. The reason for both is that the revised site plan will allow the Petitioner to obtain a building permit.

Mr. Shaver suggested approval of what is being reviewed this evening, then at the time of the

vacation it will be considered relative to an amended site plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against this proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Seese asked if height variances were normally allowed in the downtown area?

Commissioner Elmer commented that the Commissioners have the leeway to grant up to 25 percent more than the Code allows.

Chairman Halsey felt that when granting variances the impact to the neighborhood should be considered.

Commissioner Harbin asked why the sewer line was not being relocated in the easement?

Mr. Tryba explained that the City Development Engineer recommended a straight sewer line for better flow.

Commissioner Elmer asked Staff if there was adequate parking for this size of building? And does the City feel a 5 year lease is sufficient?

Ms. Ashbeck explained that with the private parking which they are providing through a lease agreement, the required parking standards are met.

When asked if the development of a parking lot was included in the commitments, Mr. Tryba replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Elmer asked the Petitioner if the playground and the parking lot were combined?

Mr. Tryba explained that is how it currently exists; however, the playground will be doubled in size with this current design of open space between the buildings.

Commissioner Elmer felt with all the variances requested, it appears the Petitioner is planning too much for the existing site.

Mr. Tryba explained that there is room to move the church farther back on the lot so that the right-of-way vacation would not be needed. However, to maintain the street frontage, construct the walkway and stay within what is considered good urban design, the Petitioner felt that the vacation was necessary.

Commissioner Volkmann asked what the distance will be between the two structures?

Mr. Tryba replied it will be approximately 92 feet.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the old church was designated as an historic landmark?

Mr. Tryba replied it definitely is a historic landmark; however, it is not formally designated as such.

Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Shaver if two separate motions were needed on this item?

Mr. Shaver replied that two motions would not be necessary; however, to approve an item which is not being considered on this agenda is not advised in reference to the other vacation.

Commissioner Volkmann asked if the vacation of the right-of-way would be submitted next month?

Ms. Ashbeck replied that it will be on April's agenda.

MOTION: (Commissioner Aderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #15-93 a request for a replat of eighteen (18) city lots into one parcel, Conditional Use Permit for a church in the Retail Business (B-3) zone and the height variance on the Revised Plan, I move that we approve this subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Laiche.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

MOTION: (Commissioner Anderson) "Mr. Chairman, on item #15-93 a request for a vacation of utility easements throughout the site and the vacation of alleys, I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of approval subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

4. #19-93 REZONE - 640 BELFORD AVENUE

A request to rezone a property from Residential Multi-family with 32 units per acre (RMF-32) to Limited Business (B-1) to accommodate an existing office use.

PETITIONER: Bray & Company Realty

REPRESENTATIVE: Levi Lucero
LOCATION: 640 Belford Avenue

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Lucero requested approval of a rezone from Residential Multi-family with 32 units per acre (RMF-32) to Limited Business (B-1) to accommodate an existing office use.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner stated that the zoning to the west is Parking and is being used as a parking lot for Bray & Company employees. The zoning to the east and south is Retail Business (B-3) and Light Commercial (C-1) to the north.

This lot was not rezoned in the late 1970's when the parking area was rezoned. Staff does not feel the area is suitable for residential; it merely did not become rezoned at the time the surrounding properties were.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments either for or against this item.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Volkmann asked about the letter in the file from a Mr. Stout regarding the ingress/egress?

Mr. Metzner explained that it does not have any bearing on this item; it is in regards to development on adjacent property.

MOTION: (Commissioner Elmer) "Mr. Chairman, on item # 19-93 a request to rezone a property from Residential Multi-Family with 32 units per acre (RMF-32 to Limited Business (B-1) to accommodate an existing office use, I move that forward this request to City Council with a recommendation for approval subject to staff recommendations."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Volkmann.

A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

VII. GENERAL DISCUSSION

A. Luncheon Workshop

Ms. Portner informed the Commission that a luncheon/workshop would be scheduled for the three new Commissioners to meet informally with the current Commissioners and Staff. Staff would like to schedule the workshop sometime prior to the April 6, 1993 meeting. Potential dates were discussed.

B. Development Review Manual

Ms. Portner explained the new Development Review Manual which will clarify the Code requirements. This manual is being put together by the Public Works and Community Development Departments and should be ready for the Commissioner's review by the April 6, 1993 meeting. Any policy changes will appear before the Commission approximately a month after it is distributed.

C. Orchard Mesa Plan Update

Mr. Thornton updated the Commissioners on the Orchard Mesa Plan. Issues which were brought up at the previous neighborhood meetings are being discussed. A Citizens Review Committee is being formed to discuss the actual planning documents. A City Planning Commissioner is needed as a committee representative. The committee meets on Thursday afternoons from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Commissioner Anderson volunteered. Chairman Halsey officially appointed Commissioner Anderson to the committee.

Mr. Thornton noted that the next neighborhood meeting will be held the week of March 22, 1993. All Commissioners are encouraged to attend.

D. South Downtown Plan Update

Ms. Portner stated that the planning process for the South Downtown area began over a year ago. There were several neighborhood meetings in which goal statements were initiated. The City Council has now appointed a steering committee which first met in February of 1993. This steering committee is comprised of representative from each of the three neighborhoods; one representative from a large business, which is Grand Junction Steel; one representative from a small business, which is the Velvet Hammer; one representative for the citizens at large which is Robert Bray; and one representative from the Economic Development Council, Riverfront Commission and Parks Board. The next meeting will be Thursday March 11, 1993 and issues from the previous year's meetings will be discussed and the tentative goal statements will be discussed to decide if more public input is needed. All Commissioners are welcome to attend the steering committee meetings and will be informed of any public meetings in the future.

E. Appointment of Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Growth Committee Representative

Chairman Halsey appointed Commissioner Volkmann as the Growth Committee representative for the Planning Commission.

Chairman Halsey suggested that the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson election be postponed until the May 1993 meeting.

F. Captain D's

Chairman Halsey reminded the Commissioners that there was a no-right turn requirement when Captain D's Restaurant was approved. However, the City Council approved the extension of Bunting Avenue and did not eliminate this no-right turn sign. Chairman Halsey asked Staff to check into the discrepancy.

VIII. NONSCHEDULED CITIZENS AND/OR VISITORS

There were no nonscheduled citizens and/or visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.