

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Public Hearing -- April 2, 1991**  
**7:30 p.m. - 11:45 p.m.**

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

|                   |            |               |
|-------------------|------------|---------------|
| Sheilah Renberger | Ron Halsey | Katie Worrall |
| Craig Roberts     | John Elmer |               |

Chairman Steve Love and Commissioner Jim Bittel were absent.

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

John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney; Don Newton, City Engineer; Mike Thompson and Ken Johnson, representing the City Fire Department, were also present.

Bobbie Paulson was present to record the minutes.

There were 36 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 1991 MEETING AS SUBMITTED."**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Worrall.

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

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRE-SCHEDULED VISITORS**

There were no announcements, presentations and/or pre-scheduled visitors.

**III. MEETING ON ITEMS FOR FINAL DECISION**

1. **#19-91 HEIGHT RESTRICTION VARIANCE FOR GUYTON'S FUN JUNCTION**  
A request to increase the height restriction up to 25 percent in a C-1 (Light Commercial) Zone to allow an amusement ride at Guyton's Fun Junction.  
**PETITIONER: Bob Guyton**  
**LOCATION: 2878 North Avenue**

### **PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Bob Guyton, owner of Guyton's Fun Junction Amusement Park, stated that he had purchased the 44 feet 4 inch high roller coaster before realizing that a variance would be required due to the height limitation.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

David Thornton gave a brief overview of the variance request. The reason a variance is needed is because the maximum height in a C-1 Zone, which is the current zoning at Guyton's Fun Junction Amusement Park, is only 40 feet. The Zoning and Development Code allows the Planning Commission to increase the allowable height an additional 25 percent, making the height limit 50 feet. The highest track on the proposed roller coaster is 44 feet 4 inches.

All of the Review Agencies had no objections to this height variance. The roller coaster meets all setback requirements for this zone and will be located in the southeast corner of the lot on North Avenue and 28 3/4 Road. There is access for emergency vehicles to the proposed roller coaster location off of North Avenue.

Staff recommends approval of this request. Currently, there are two rides over the 40 foot height limit that are grandfathered. The roller coaster is a structure by definition of the Code and as a result needs a variance, although not requiring a building permit. However, an electrical permit will be required to ensure the electrical system is in order.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Elmer asked if it was necessary to vary the height limit on all the rides in order to make them legal at the same time?

Mr. Thornton replied that because the other two rides are grandfathered, they did not need a variance; nevertheless, this is up to the Commission's discretion whether to change the height limit for the entire park to 50 feet.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

### **DISCUSSION**

Discussion ensued about legalizing the existing non-conforming rides, the ferris wheel and the rocket ride.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the motion should include future amusement rides in order to avoid the need for a variance each time.

Mr. Shaver stated that so long as the non-conforming rides have continuing use at the park, they are technically grandfathered. It would be up to the discretion of the Commission to create a variance for the entire park.

Commissioner Renberger was concerned that all the rides had safety inspections done.

Mr. Thornton stated that an amusement park in a C-1 zone is a use by right. Amusement park rides require safety inspections to ensure public safety. These are usually done by the State.

Mr. Guyton agreed with Mr. Thornton; the State inspects the rides on an annual basis. The rides undergo fire retardant tests, metal tests, ultra sonic tests, and magna flux tests.

**MOTION:** (Commissioner Elmer) "Mr. Chairman, on item #19-91, a request to increase the height restriction up to 25 percent in a C-1 (Light Commercial) Zone to allow for amusement rides, plural, at Guyton's Fun Junction, I move that we approve this subject to the Review Agency Summary Sheet comments."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

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

2. #21-91 **CONDITIONAL USE FOR THE ST. NICHOLAS CHURCH**  
A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a church in a RSF-4 Zone (Residential Single Family - not to exceed four units per acre).  
**PETITIONER:** St. Nicholas Church, Chris P. Jouflas  
**LOCATION:** 3585 North 12th Street

#### PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Chris Jouflas, president of the St. Nicholas Church Parish Council, stated that the St. Nicholas Church has been in this location for 35 years and consists of a small combination meeting hall and chapel. The proposal is to build a new chapel. The proposed chapel addition will face to the east. Mr. Jouflas stated that he did not expect a great increase in membership. He indicated that the congregation was very small.

He presented a three dimensional model of the church for the Planning Commission to review.

#### STAFF PRESENTATION

David Thornton gave a brief presentation of the proposal. He stated that the Zoning and Development Code requires one parking space for every three seats of designed seating capacity. With the addition, a total of 85 parking spaces would be required. The petitioner is requesting a waiver of the number of required parking spaces. As Mr.

Joufflas mentioned, the congregation is small, approximately 20 to 25 members. At this particular time, 85 spaces would not be needed; therefore, the petitioner is requesting that this site plan be approved with 63 spaces.

The petitioner's property line will change because they will deed an additional 10 feet for the right-of-way needed to widen 12th Street. The building must be setback at least 75 feet from the centerline of the right-of-way. The centerline is 50 feet from property line; therefore, an additional 25 feet is required. The petitioner is also requesting that the setback requirement be waived to allow the addition to the building to be constructed 10 feet from property line.

The petitioner is responsible for the cost of half-street improvements to a collector standard for the portion of their property fronting 12th Street. They are also requesting a waiver of this. The City Engineer is willing to waive this requirement since the church has been there for 35 years prior to being annexed into the city and because they are just expanding, it is not a new use. The petitioner is willing to give up 10 feet of their property for the right-of-way for no monetary gain. The request for the waiver of the half-street improvements will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

The petitioner requests that they be granted six years to pave the parking lot. The Zoning and Development Code requires only a dust-free parking surface; however, pavement is preferred.

George Bennett, of the Fire Department, has stated that one fire hydrant on the southwest corner of the building will be required.

The entrance to the church is a shared access with Horizon Towers. The petitioner is in the process of obtaining an agreement so that they can use that easement as access. They are also in the process of obtaining deeds to give the City 10 feet of right-of-way and a drainage easement that extends across the Horizon Tower's property.

#### QUESTIONS

Vice Chairman Halsey asked if the 25 foot setback was consistent with other buildings in that area?

Mr. Thornton replied that the Northwood Apartment building is only ten feet from their property line. Staff supports the request to vary the setback because 1) it would not be different from Northwood Apartment building and 2) the church sits on a hill therefore it would not be as much of an impact as if it sat on level ground.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

Commissioner Elmer asked the petitioner for clarification; why is a variance needed for a larger structure, yet a decrease in the required number of parking spaces being requested?

Mr. Jouflas explained that when the church was initially built there were approximately 100 members; membership has since diminished. He reiterated that an increase in membership is not anticipated. The purpose of this request is to build a chapel which should properly face east. Since all light comes from the east, Orthodox churches should face that direction.

Commissioner Elmer asked if it would be possible to shorten the addition 10 feet?

Mr. Jouflas, replied that this would not be feasible.

Trent Wilson, architect for the church, said that half of the proposed addition contains the alter which has no seating. The seating area is behind the alter. There is a curtain separating the addition from the existing building; this curtain can be opened up for overflow seating. The existing building will be turned into a fellowship hall.

Mr. Jouflas added that the addition would only be increasing the floor space. The seating area is simply being relocated to another part of the building.

Commissioner Roberts asked where the overflow parking would go?

Mr. Thornton pointed out that the Code requires one parking space per every three seats. The petitioner is proposing 63 spaces. 63 parking spaces would allow 180 plus seats. The question that needs to be considered, is how often do they have crowds of over 190 people?

Mr. Jouflas responded that the answer is never in the past 35 years.

Commissioner Roberts asked what the proposed width of the 12th Street right-of-way and what the distance between the property line and the curb and sidewalk was? How much street development will be within 10 feet of this building?

Don Newton stated that 12th Street is classified as a major arterial roadway which requires a 100 feet of right-of-way width. The back of the sidewalk will be half a foot from the right-of-way line. Essentially, the entire 100 foot right-of-way will be used for street improvements. This would place the building 25 1/2 feet behind the sidewalk.

Mr. Thornton clarified that in this case, the building would be 10 1/2 feet back of the sidewalk because the petitioner is requesting a 15 foot variance.

Commissioner Roberts asked because of the extreme grade change, would a retaining wall be needed along 12th Street?

Mr. Newton stated that the grading for 12th Street has not been established yet. If there is a grade difference between the sidewalk and the existing adjacent property, a retaining wall or a slope easement would be constructed to make up the difference in elevation.

Mr. Thornton stated that if the setback variance were approved, it would not change the grade difference and whether a retaining wall was needed or not.

Commissioner Roberts asked for clarification of the drainage study. Will the drainage be detained on the property?

Mr. Thornton replied that there is a drainage easement in the northwest corner. The petitioners have been working with staff on the details.

Mr. Wilson explained that the drainage will come off the northwest corner and across onto to Horizon Tower's driveway.

Mr. Newton added that historically all of the drainage has run to the back of the church property and across the property that is now Horizon Towers. He believed that the church addition would not significantly increase the drainage runoff. Our primary concern is that an easement be required for the drainage that runs on private property. Because of the topography of the lot, it is not necessary and also would be very difficult to provide on site detention.

When asked if any landscaping was required, Mr. Thornton responded that because the church is in a residential single family zone, there are no specific requirements for landscaping.

Commissioner Elmer was concerned that if the building sold and another church moved in with a larger congregation, there would not be sufficient parking for the size of building. He suggested restricting the seating capacity to the parking.

Mr. Jouflas asked if the church growth could be restricted to the parking?

Commissioner Elmer pointed out that if there were more cars than available parking, where would they park? It is one or the other.

Mr. Jouflas reiterated that the seating was simply being relocated from the existing building to the new addition. We are not constructing a new building, we are just trying to enhance the existing building.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the seating capacity was based on the square footage?

Mr. Thornton stated it is based on the square footage of the chapel and the overflow area. The Building Department takes in account the line of sight etc. when determining seating capacity.

Commissioner Renberger asked if there was room for additional parking spaces?

Mr. Thornton stated that the lot could be rearranged to make room for possibly one or two more spaces, but he could not foresee having room for 85 spaces.

Discussion ensued regarding the parking situation.

Commissioner Elmer asked Mr. Shaver if there would be a problem putting an occupancy restriction on the church?

Mr. Shaver replied that historically there have been cases where conditions were placed on a use because of inadequate parking. It is appropriate for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation for a use contingent on the available parking in a Conditional Use process. Because this is a request for a variance and a Conditional Use, the other procedure is to deny the variance and allow the petitioner to work with City Staff to possibly redesign the interior seating area. It is up to the Commission's discretion to make a recommendation and engraft any conditions deemed appropriate.

Mr. Joufflas felt that it would be unconstitutional to limit the occupancy of the church.

Mr. Thornton stated that parking for all conditional uses are determined in conjunction with the conditional use process; therefore, allowing the Commission the power to grant a variance to allow only 63 parking spaces.

**MOTION:** (Commissioner Worrall) "Mr. Chairman, on item #21-91, a request for a Conditional Use permit to allow a church in a Residential Single Family Zone - not to exceed four units per acre, I move that we approve this subject to the Review Agency Summary Sheet comments and with the following condition - limit the capacity to 189 people."

Commissioner Elmer seconded the motion.

**AMENDMENT:** (Commissioner Elmer) "Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion to require that the landscaping and the dust free parking lot be finished before occupancy of the addition, the parking will be paved within six years, and that we deny the owner's request for waiver of half-street improvements, and grant the variance for the 10 foot setback."

Commissioner Worrall seconded the amendment.

A vote was called, and the amended motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Roberts opposing.

Mr. Joufflas verbally appealed this item to City Council.

**3. #15-91 HORIZON GLEN OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PRELIMINARY PLAN AND PLAT.**

A request for an Outline Development Plan and a Preliminary Plan and Plat for 33 residential housing units on 14.4 acres.

**PETITIONER:** S L Ventures, Inc.

**REPRESENTATIVE:** Armstrong Consultants, Tom Logue

**LOCATION:** Northwest of 12th Street and Horizon Drive

## PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Tom Logue outlined the proposed Horizon Glen Subdivision. His presentation included slides of the vacant parcel proposed for this development and examples of other areas which have design features similar to what is being proposed. The request is for consideration of an Outline Development Plan and a Preliminary Plan and Rezone on the parcel of land located at the northwest corner of 12th Street and Horizon Drive. The total area is 14.4 acres.

Phase II, the future phase, consists of 4.4 acres. At this time, there is not a specific plan for the development of the 4.4 acres. There are several unknowns that need to be resolved which include the potential development of the property immediately to the north. The land use and potential traffic circulation into the north are going to be key elements that effect the future development of Phase II. A multi-family or clustered single family use is likely for this site, should it develop in the future. When the development plan, market study and other development alternatives are examined, a detailed preliminary plan will be submitted.

Another thing that would make the development of Phase II in the near future remote, is that the City of Grand Junction requires that developers of property next to arterial roads deposit a certain amount of funds into an escrow account for half-street improvements. In the case of Phase II, these funds would exceed the value of the property by approximately 25 percent.

Phase I represents 17 dwelling units on 10 acres, which results in a density of 1.7 dwelling units per acre. Each lot is typically a half-acre in size. There is one access from Horizon Drive to 16 lots; the 17th lot in southwest corner of property will be accessed from F 1/2 Road. The key characteristic of this proposed subdivision is the one-way looped street. The plan has been largely designed not only because of topographical constraints but also from input of the surrounding landowners.

The main entrance will be a 50 foot right-of-way. Lot 2 and 3 will be accessed by flag driveways. One of three drainage channels run along the front of Lots 2 and 3, parallels the westerly property line and runs diagonally across the property. The second drainage channel is the Horizon Drive drainage channel which lies on the south side of Horizon Drive. It has been identified as being prone to flooding as water tends to back up on this property. This area has been designated common open space with no building permitted. The two-way entrance opens up into a one-way loop. The road placement was selected so that it would have the least disruption to the wetlands area identified on the property.

Last month, professional wetlands experts did a study on this property. Results of that study identified areas that qualified as wetlands under the Environmental Protection Agency and the Corps of Engineers. Within Phase I, approximately three acres were identified as wetlands. Approximately 25 percent of that three acres lie within property owned by the City of Grand Junction in the Horizon Drive right-of-way. This

proposed development will encroach upon approximately 10,000 square feet of the designated wetlands area.

One of the key characteristics of this proposal is to preserve and maintain as much of the identified wetlands as possible. In order to ensure the perpetuity of the open space, a homeowners association will be established along with covenants and conditions that deal with preservation of the wetlands. The character of the types of dwellings and standards for landscaping will also be included within these covenants.

One of the most difficult parts of this plan was the traffic circulation. This proposal includes a 30 foot wide one-way looped right-of-way. 14 feet will be a paved surface with three foot graveled shoulders along each side. Grassed drainage swales are proposed along the loop to remove the off-site runoff and drainage from the property and discharge it into the wetlands area. The majority of the surrounding property to the north and west is rural in nature. Utilizing drainage swales adds to the rural character. These swales also help deal with storm water management in a natural fashion allowing the water to percolate into the ground. The wetlands expert indicated that the use of swales is encouraged when in close proximity to a wetlands area.

No parking will be allowed along the one-way loop. The two lane entrance consists of 26 feet of pavement with three foot shoulders and swales on both sides. Roads without curbs, gutters, and sidewalks are found in higher density developments i.e. Hillcrest Manor and Mantey Heights.

The proposed one-way loop provides 20 feet of unobstructed width for emergency vehicle access. Although, the Development Code does not prohibit subdivisions with one-way loops or streets that do not have curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, it is a City development standard.

Once the site is totally developed, we expect the traffic volume to be relatively low, less than 160 trips-per day based on the City trip generators.

One of the key elements of the marketing analysis was the demand for property close to or within the city limits with a rural type setting.

Regarding the requirement for a deceleration lane along Horizon Drive, this proposal is to increase the pavement radius' at the intersection of the entrance to the proposed development and to construct a right turn lane into the property in leu of a full blown deceleration lane. If a deceleration lane is constructed off of Horizon Drive, it would extend beyond the potential access point to Phase II. Access in and out of Phase II is still up in the air. If a deceleration lane were put in to access Phase I, it would minimize the traffic circulation potential. There are four other driveways between 7th and 12th Street that do not have deceleration lanes.

The Lakeside development was estimated to generate 895 trips, this is assuming half would use Horizon Drive. The total trips for Lakeside is twice that number. Westwood, which has one way in and out, generates approximately 252 trips per day based on City trip generators. The church, located southwest of this property, generated approximately 75 trips per day. Horizon Towers, assuming half of the total volume will use Horizon Drive, generates approximately 210 trips per day. All these developments generate considerably more than the total traffic volume for this project. Half of the traffic volume going out and half coming back would equate to 40 trips per day for this project. Horizon Drive is classified as a major arterial and is included in the City's ten year improvement plan. It is conceivable that the widening of Horizon Drive will destroy this deceleration lane. Our proposal was to offset this improvement with an escrow payment. City Staff did not feel that this would be appropriate.

#### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Kathy Portner informed the Planning Commission that the petitioners have submitted the required additional information needed for review of this project.

Ms. Portner continued; staff recommends that the request for rezoning not be considered on the property until final plat approval for the 17 lots, and only after annexation of the portion of that property outside the City limits. Also, staff recommends that the rezoning not be considered on Phase II until preliminary plan review since the topography and drainage features of Phase II will necessitate more detailed design work to determine the appropriate density.

Staff recommends denial of the Outline Development Plan (ODP) for Phase II because of conflicts with the designated wetlands area. Until the petitioner can submit a more detailed plan, showing how they are going to avoid the wetlands, staff's recommendation is for denial of the ODP. There are two sections of the Code that deal with this issue and justify its denial. These sections read "To preserve natural vegetation and cover, to promote the natural beauty of the City, and to restrict building in areas poorly suited for building or construction." An additional access onto Horizon Drive for Phase II is not acceptable.

Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plan for Phase I with the following comments and conditions:

1. Fire hydrant placement and a looped supply line that is acceptable to the City Fire Department must be provided at final plan. The Fire Department has approved the placement of hydrants on the preliminary plan but realize that there may be modifications on the final plan so they are reserving the right to modify the placement of fire hydrants.
2. Final design should include landscaping, berming, and buffering to help minimize the adverse traffic effects to residents along Horizon Drive per the Horizon Drive Corridor Guidelines.

3. A shorter one-way loop will be considered at final review to reduce the impacts on wetlands. Staff recommends that the street section around the proposed loop include a 16 foot pavement width, six foot curb, gutter, and sidewalk on the outside edge of pavement, and a two foot wide "V" pan on the inside edge of the pavement on the wetlands side. To accommodate the required 20 foot fire lane, an additional 6.5 foot wide gravel shoulder on the wetlands side of the one-way loop is needed along with no parking on the outside of the loop. Another option is that parking be allowed only on the inside of the loop and that the pavement width be increased an additional two feet to provide 20 feet of unobstructed fire lane. City Staff will work with the developer prior to final submittal on the best option. The developer will be responsible for all necessary signage.
4. The street pavement section from the loop to Horizon Drive can be 26 feet wide if parking is restricted on the west side of the street, provided that no lots front the street on the west side. If the one-way loop is shortened, the street pavement section for the main stem may have to be increased to 32 feet to allow parking on both sides of the street. Curb, gutter and sidewalk will be required on both sides of this section.
5. The developer will be required to pay for half-collector road improvements, as per current policy, to Horizon Drive the length of the property frontage. In addition, the developer must construct a deceleration lane, at least 10 foot wide, and a bus stop along Horizon Drive as deemed necessary by School District 51 and the City of Grand Junction.
6. All development impact fees in effect at the time of final plat approval must be paid at that time. Those fees would include, but are not be limited to; Parks and Open Space fees and perimeter road improvement fees. Improvements Agreements for all subdivision infrastructure improvements must be guaranteed by a bank letter of credit or similar financial guarantee at the time of final plat recording. The petitioner is working with the City Attorney at this time to come up with an acceptable form of guarantee.
7. Maintenance agreements will be required for ingress/egress easements on Lots 2, 3, 7 and 8.
8. Horizon Glen Subdivision will be required to connect to the city water supply system when it becomes available. The City does not waive its right to supply domestic water at a later date to the subdivision.
9. Additional runoff that occurs as a result of development will require some type of retention or detention facility that will prohibit flows exceeding the historic flows from a ten year storm.
10. Concerns about the retention pond north of the development and a potential dam breach must be addressed at final review.

11. All remaining wetland areas should be protected by easements with the covenants addressing the upkeep of those areas.
12. Use of untreated irrigation water is encouraged if the properties are to be landscaped.
13. The Soil Conservation Service identified soils within the boundary of the property as all having severe building limitations except for one small area. The final plat and plan review process will require a detailed subsurface soils and geology report to identify special building considerations. Review of the final report by the State Geological Survey will be required at final review stage.
14. A detailed floodplain and a drainage and grading analysis will be required at final plan and plat.
15. Sensitivity to the existing drainage, wetlands, and mature vegetation should be maintained through the final plan and plat process.
16. Building envelopes may be necessary on the final plan to better deal with the steep topography of many of the lots.
17. A walkway/bikeway should be considered along the Horizon Drive Channel.
18. If approved, a final plan and plat must be submitted within one year unless extended by the Planning Commission or Governing Body.
19. A petition for annexation for the area of the proposed subdivision currently outside the city limits has been prepared and signed by the petitioner. Lots 8, 9, and 10 are currently located outside the city limits. A replat of Lot 2, Foster Subdivision through Mesa County will be necessary prior to review or concurrently with of the final plan and plat for Horizon Glen Subdivision. The City would prefer to have all of Lot 2 of Foster Subdivision annexed so that the replat of Lot 2 and the final plan and plat of Horizon Glen Subdivision could be reviewed through one process.
20. Access for Lot 1 and the property to the south of the F 1/2 Road cul-de-sac is shown on the revised plans for Horizon Glen Subdivision. However, to build this cul-de-sac, a stand of mature trees would need to be removed. As an alternative to that access, staff recommends a hammer-head turnaround rather than the cul-de-sac at the end of F 1/2 Road on the Horizon Glen property providing access for Lots 1, 2, and 3 and the property to the south. This would eliminate the need to cross the wetlands area.
21. The overall traffic circulation plan proposed by the petitioners for the surrounding properties offers some reasonable alternatives without access into Horizon Glen Subdivision. Staff asked the petitioner to prepare a traffic circulation plan for property they do not own. This plan was to show how the surrounding properties could develop and have reasonable access without accessing the

Horizon Glen Subdivision. The plan they have submitted makes sense given the configuration of the surrounding parcels; however, access to Horizon Glen Phase II is shown entering someone else's property ending in a cul-de-sac. The petitioner should consider access off of the entrance to Phase I through Lot 17. Wetlands is a real concern; the petitioner needs to show how they would avoid this area. If this is not addressed in the final plan and plat stage, the petitioners will not have the available right-of-way. The original proposal was for a right-of-way to cut into Horizon Drive; staff prefers that there is not another access onto Horizon Drive.

22. The final plat and plan review process may result in reduced density for the development due to topographic, drainage and soils constraints.

Two letters were received concerning this proposal. Both of these letters are referring to the extension of Cascade Drive which was never built, and Homestead Road which has not been improved. Ms. Portner read the letters aloud.

---

April 2, 1991

To the Planning Commission:

As a homeowner at 694 Cascade Drive and in agreement with all property owners on Cascade Drive and Homestead Road, I express my objection to any plans present or future to a proposed ingress/egress road from the Horizon Glen development to Cascade Drive or Homestead Road.

In fact, seeing Horizon Drive itself as a rare parkway in and for Grand Junction residents, and as a great first impression for visitors; and the hilly area as a wetlands with deer, pheasant and other birds, I consider the whole development to be a mistake.

Once gone - forever gone. And as Thoreau wrote:  
In Wilderness is the preservation of the World.

Richard Roth

---

March 26, 1991

RE: Horizon Glen Subdivision

Dear Commission Members,

We are owners of property on Cascade Drive, planning on building a house soon. Our decision to buy this land was based largely on its location and relative privacy. We are opposed to the development of any roads that would connect into Cascade or Homestead. The neighborhood is unique and would be adversely effected by increased traffic, which any

extensions into Cascade or Homestead would create. Hopefully the Commission will consider the input from the local landowners and decide to leave Cascade and Homestead alone.

Sincerely,  
Tom and Susan Meason

---

#### QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked if the road standards restricted the length of cul-de-sacs?

Ms. Portner replied affirmatively.

Mr. Newton explained that the reason the length of cul-de-sacs are limited is because there is only one way in and out. He was not sure that the one-way loop was comparable to a cul-de-sac type street.

Ms. Portner added that on the one-way loop, emergency vehicles could go the wrong way to gain access if needed. So there would be really two ways in.

Commissioner Elmer asked if this proposal included a rezone or would that occur later?

Ms. Portner replied; the petitioners have requested that this property be rezoned at the final plat and plan stage.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the pond to the north is the source of water that currently sustains the wetlands?

Bill Foster replied affirmatively; the overflow from the pond runs through the wetlands. At this point, the irrigation water will not come from the pond.

Commissioner Renberger asked if the new wetlands act was being enforced?

Ms. Portner replied that the City Zoning and Development Code does not include regulations for wetland areas. The Corps of Engineers have been sent a copy of this proposal for their review. The Corp's preliminary review indicates that there are wetlands within this proposed development. Ms. Portner added that an amendment to the Code regarding specific regulations on wetland areas is in the works. The Corps of Engineers will have a chance to fully review this area prior to the final plat and plan stage.

Mr. Foster pointed out that their proposal is a result of the Corps of Engineer's input. Ken Jacobson, of the Corps, has indicated that the proposed site plan was okay. He will be taking some core sampling from the property before he gives us a final approval.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the swales would be used for detention?

Mr. Logue replied that the swales will discharge into the center drainage swale near the confluence of the two one-way loops and then into the wetlands area.

Ron Rish, of Armstrong Engineering and representing the petitioners, said a drainage plan was submitted. Detention was not provided since this property is right next to the Horizon Drive channel. As the drainage report demonstrates, the drainage running through the development is much more significant than the drainage that would be generated on the site. This development is at the lowest end of the drainage basin. The water that runs through these wetlands is initiated about a quarter mile north of G Road. City Staff's comments indicates the need for some detention.

Commissioner Elmer asked the petitioner to address the issues regarding the bus stop, city water, irrigation water, and bikeway.

Mr. Logue replied that like all other developers, we are caught in the middle of the battle between Ute Water and the City.

Mr. Foster stated that their preference was to utilize city water. Both Ute Water and the City have water lines in this area. He said that they would like to do the exact same thing that Ptarmigan Ridge is doing, which is buy the taps and escrow the difference then go with City water and get their money back. Dan Wilson does not feel that this is appropriate in our situation.

Mr. Logue stated that they discussed options for the location of the bus stop with the School District. Our proposal includes construction of a right turn lane of sufficient length to accommodate a school bus and one car. With only 17 single family dwellings, a school bus would not be parked there very long.

Mr. Logue continued; a detailed geo-technical report will be done and will be part of the final plan process.

This property is under the U.S. Government Highline Canal jurisdiction for any shares of irrigation water. We considered utilizing the surplus water in the pond for irrigation, but it is a major contributor to the wetlands area. We were not totally convinced we would be able to preserve the wetlands if we chose this option. Another option is to obtain water rights and utilize a drainage channel that flows pretty much year round. However, our proposal at this time is to utilize domestic sources of water for irrigation along with a homeowners document that suggests landscaping methods that do not require abundant supplies of water.

A bikeway/walkway is anticipated, but we do not know what side of Horizon it will be constructed on. Should we construct a 400 foot trail section that does not go anywhere or do we give the City more money?

Mr. Logue stated that the Round Hill residents have indicated their concern about creating an additional access through their subdivision. Our preference is to look at the alternative, such as the hammerhead or

a wide turnaround for Lot 1 and the property to the south. In lieu of paying \$225 per site for open space fees, land can be dedicated. Horizon Drive policy encourages greenbelts along the corridor.

Vice Chairman Halsey asked Mr. Logue to address the issue regarding sidewalks.

Mr. Logue stated that sidewalks were not proposed because of the low traffic volume this development will generate. Pedestrians can utilize the graveled shoulders such as they do along Horizon Drive and 12th Street. Other options will be considered while doing the final plan.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the access to Horizon from Lot 1 has been eliminated?

Mr. Logue stated that their preference is to eliminate this access, but the easement belongs to someone else.

Commissioner Elmer stated his support of closing this access off, but added that it could be used for emergency access. He asked the representatives from the Fire Department what their preference was?

Ken Johnson, representing the City Fire Department, stated that this option was not necessarily preferable but would be acceptable.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

David Darden, 698 Round Hill, stated that he was in favor of the single family development rather than a higher density development. He stated his opposition of changing F 1/2 Road into a cul-de-sac because it would eliminate some mature landscaping, i.e. 8 to 10 cedar trees that screen him from his neighbors across the street.

Jeff Williams, Realtor with Bray & Company at 1015 North 7th Street, stated that he was in support of the proposed Horizon Glen Subdivision. He felt that because the proposal did not include curbs, gutters and sidewalks, it was compatible with the surrounding rural area.

Dennis Kirkland, 2675 Homestead Road, stated that he was in favor of the proposed density. He felt that the current zone was too dense. He felt that the proposed roadway was compatible with the kinds of roadways within the immediate area. He added that he opposes any connection being made to Homestead Road and this development.

Rich Krohn, an attorney representing Walter and Gertrude Dalby, spoke in regards to the proposed traffic circulation, referring to item #21 of the Staff's comments. The Dalby's are the owners of the backwards "L" shaped parcel east of Phase I and directly north of Phase II. The additional access City Staff has suggested for Phase II is unacceptable. He believed that every property owner from the Homestead Road and Cascade Drive area would be in favor of not improving the south end of and the ultimate vacation of the south portion of Cascade Drive. The Dalby's concern is that presently, their only access to the western portion of their property is over the non-improved but dedicated Cascade

Road right-of-way. The approximate length of their property is 870 feet from the east to west; therefore, it would be too long to propose a cul-de-sac. The logical access for both Phase II and the Dalby's property is from Horizon Drive. This would avoid the need for an access from the multi-family development proposed for Phase II through Phase I. Cascade Drive would be difficult to construct due to the topography and the wetlands. It is extremely important to preserve an access west of the Dalby's property to provide for circulation. He stated his opposition to a lengthy deceleration lane for Phase I off of Horizon Drive to the extent that it would preclude the second access coming out of Phase II.

Mr. Krohn added that the highest portion of the property proposed for development is adjacent to the Dalby's best building sites; he therefore, suggested a height limitation for any building constructed there.

Jeff McConnell, owner of property at the corner of G Road and Cascade Drive, stated his opposition to the construction of Cascade Drive south of where it now ends.

Pat Kiernan, 696 Cascade Drive, was in favor of the additional access off of Phase II of Horizon Glen and a shorter deceleration lane into Phase I so that the Phase II can be accessed.

### DISCUSSION

Commissioner Roberts asked what the distance between the access proposed for Phase I and Phase II was?

Mr. Newton stated that it was roughly 300 to 400 feet.

Ms. Portner stated that the vacation of Cascade Drive would take place in the County since it is not within the city limits. This is an issue that should be resolved at the time of the final plan. The replat of Lot 2 would be processed with the County with whom this issue will be discussed.

Mr. Foster stated his apprehension in vacating Cascade Drive. The Dalby's said they would agree to the vacation of Cascade if we provide them an access through Phase II.

Commissioner Elmer asked for clarification; the Dalby's already have access so why would they hold you hostage for the vacation?

Mr. Krohn stated that there is an 870 foot cul-de-sac going to the end of the Dalby's property, but there is a proposal that the this cul-de-sac be extended through the multi-family development proposed in Phase II. This would be a heavily used 1,000 foot cul-de-sac which seems to be a fairly unworkable situation. It would solve both our problems if Phase II could access off of Horizon Drive.

Ms. Portner clarified Staff's recommendation; that the access to Phase II be provided through the stem of Phase I through Lot 17. She added that there are wetland concerns that would have to be dealt with but this proposal would also provide an access to the property to the north.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the City was being consistent in requiring the petitioner to put in a deceleration lane when other more dense developments such as Horizon Towers do not have one.

Ms. Portner replied that she was unaware of what happened in past, but the Engineering Department has determined that the deceleration lane was warranted by this development.

Commissioner Elmer asked if a proposed design for the widening of Horizon Drive has been completed to see whether it would incorporate this deceleration lane.

Mr. Newton believed that the deceleration lane would not be incorporated into the future reconstruction of Horizon Drive. The justification of the requirement for a deceleration lane is based on the State Highway Access Code, the traffic generation data from the ITE Generation Handbook, and the demography tables from the State Highway Access Code.

Commissioner Elmer felt that sidewalks were needed so that there is room for children and families to walk along the roadway. Graveled shoulders are not suitable for such a narrow road.

Mr. Foster stated that they do not want cars parked along the street and feels that this is unattractive. The Fire Department is requiring at least 20 feet of unobstructed access.

Ken Johnson stated that the Fire Department's only requirement is for 20 feet of unobstructed width for emergency access.

Ms. Portner stated that allowing no parking on the street is being unrealistic. Staff proposes parking be allowed on one side of the one-way loop which will effect the 20 feet of unobstructed fire lane.

Mr. Logue pointed out that in the Mantey Height's Subdivision, cars are not parked along the subdivision's streets because the streets are not wide enough.

Discussion ensued regarding the no parking on the one-way loop.

Commissioner Renberger was concerned with allowing streets without curbs, gutters, etc. These standards were adopted for safety reasons.

Mr. Ron Rish explained the concept of this proposal was different than what is normally proposed. The lots in Horizon Glen will be 1/2 acre in size unlike Spring Valley and Northridge which is much more dense.

Horizon Glen has a much more rural character and the petitioner is trying to market that. There is obviously a demand for this. There are already three people who want to build homes here. He added that he

believes the street standards are important, but this is a unique type of development with the existing topography and the wetlands.

Vice Chairman Halsey expressed his concern with having an easement off of Phase II and Lot 17 because of the problem with varying soils. Proper vegetation and dust control must be ensured. He also expressed concerns with the ingress/egress on Horizon Drive and felt a speed limit should be considered along that area.

Commissioner Roberts stated that if the second access is built for Phase II, the acceleration/deceleration lane for Phase I would become ineffective and traffic control difficult. He expressed his concern with accessing Phase II through Lot 17 and how it would effect the wetland areas. He added that the Horizon Drive corridor policies indicate the need for berming, buffering, and landscaping between Horizon Drive and the adjacent residential development.

Commissioner Worrall stated she worked with Representative Foster but felt that it did not create a conflict of interest with this proposal.

#### **PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Mr. Foster stated that a wetlands expert advised him to "sneak it right off the corner" (referring to the access directly onto Horizon Drive). If a road is built through Lot 17, it will destroy a building site. City Staff has requested that a road be built through Lot 17 because it would reduce the impact on the wetland area; this is not correct. There would be less of an impact on the wetland area if there was an access directly onto Horizon Drive. The Army Corps of Engineers, due to a law suit, is in the process of revising their standard for wetlands. That is why we have not gone any further. When these standards are revised, we will figure out how to develop Phase II. At that point, we will consider using our proposed road designation as a splitting line on our property and use that area to comply with the corridor issue in lieu of development fees. We do not control the existing easement access onto Horizon Drive. Our request is to get rid of one access and put one in for this subdivision; there is no net gain. There are two there now. We have been working since day one to get rid of the one that is a 100 feet away from our existing access.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "Mr. Chairman, on item #15-91, a request for a Preliminary Plan and Plat for the Horizon Glen Subdivision, I move that we approve this subject to the Review Agency Summary Sheet Comments which includes staff's recommendations."**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Roberts.

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

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "Mr. Chairman, on item #15-91, a request for an Outline Development Plan for the Horizon Glen Subdivision, I move that we deny this for the following reasons, that access and the wetland issues for Phase II are still not resolved."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Roberts.

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

A break in the meeting was called at 10:30 p.m.; the meeting reconvened at 10:42 p.m.

#### **IV. HEARING ON ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL**

1. **#20-91 REZONE AND A FINAL PLAN FOR ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL**  
A request to rezone from RSF-8 (Residential Single Family - not to exceed eight units per acre) to PB (Planned Business) and a final plan on approximately eight acres.  
**PETITIONER:** Sisters of Charity  
**LOCATION:** Southeast corner of 7th Street and Patterson Road

#### **PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Larry Gebhart, of Western Engineers and representing the petitioners, gave a brief overview of the request for a rezone and a final plan for a parking lot. Because of the current expansion of St. Mary's Hospital, it has left a shortage of parking. The proposal is to construct an employee's parking lot south of Patterson Road and east of 7th Street. This lot will be strictly regulated for St. Mary's employees use. The lot is currently zoned Single Family Residential eight units per acre. The petitioner is requesting that it be rezoned to Planned Business. The surrounding neighborhood is zoned commercial. The hospital's fiscal year begins June 1st and this project has been slated for budgeting at that time. The project should be complete 90 days after it has been initiated.

#### **STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Bennett Boeschenstein stated that he was filling in for Karl Metzner as this was originally his project, but Karl was unable to make it to this meeting. He asked Mr. Gebhart why one of the maps was labeled "minor subdivision"?

Mr. Gebhart replied that there are presently six parcels within this proposal that overlap. The City suggested that we request a one lot minor subdivision to eliminate any legal difficulties.

Mr. Boeschenstein continued; basically this project consists of a series of driveways and parking lots in back of some single family homes located across from St. Mary's Hospital. There is a private driveway that comes out diagonally at the intersection of Wellington Avenue and 7th Street. Because this is a very dangerous and busy intersection, we

recommend that this driveway be closed and the house be accessed from the south entrance to the parking lot.

Mr. Boeschenstein recommended an additional access onto Patterson Road with a right turn only to improve the circulation through the lots.

Other recommendations were: 1) pedestrian walks should be added around the parking lots, 2) a low wall, at least to the height of the hood of a car, should be installed along Patterson Road to hide visual intrusion of headlights, and 3) a back up notch should be added to the north parking lot.

Mr. Boeschenstein felt that some landscaping should be added along the frontage of the parking lot of the existing St. Mary's building. This should have been required when the City widened Patterson Road. The parking lot is a continuous sea of asphalt and concrete all the way from Patterson to the hospital. Since tonight's proposal is related to the hospital, we feel it is justifiable to request that they landscape the existing lot as well.

### QUESTIONS

Vice Chairperson Halsey asked if an ingress/egress would be appropriate onto to Patterson Road from the parking lot?

Mr. Newton replied that there is a significant grade difference between the proposed parking lot and Patterson Road. He was not sure if it would be appropriate to put an access at that point.

Mr. Gebhart pointed out that there was access onto Patterson Road but it was closed off by St. Mary's due to traffic problems and visual constraints caused by the steepness of the grade.

Mr. Newton reiterated that sight distance will have to be looked at closely to determine adequacy. Also, since there is no median in Patterson Road, it may be difficult to prevent left turns.

Commissioner Renberger asked if the parking lot would have any lighting?

Mr. Gebhart stated that there is lighting on the lot now. St. Mary's has a lighting plan which they will implement as needed.

Rick Mason, of Western Engineers and representing the petitioner, stated that the purpose of this proposal is to provide parking primarily for the day shift employees.

Commissioner Renberger asked where the employees park during the night shift?

Mr. Gebhart replied that since there are no visitors at the hospital at night, the employees park in the lot next to the hospital. Mr. Gebhart felt that any landscaping along the front of the hospital would create sight distance problems. He added that St. Mary's requests there be a

no right turn on the red light to alleviate the pedestrian problem with cars pulling up in the crosswalk to make a right turn.

Mr. Mason presented an aerial photo of the St. Mary's Hospital for the Planning Commission to review.

Mr. Boeschstein asked what the long term plans are for the existing houses on the lot?

Mr. Gebhart replied that the three houses closest to the corner will be removed, assuming housing can be provided for the people who live there.

Mr. Boeschstein asked for clarification; what will happen to the existing facilities, i.e. the hospice house, senior center, etc.

Mr. Gebhart believed that those would not be removed.

Keith Esteridge, representative for St. Mary's Hospital, stated that one of the three houses Mr. Gebhart is referring to is the facility for Home Health. At this time, we are negotiating for other sites to move them. As soon as they move, the houses will be removed.

Mr. Boeschstein asked if the entire site would be made into a parking lot?

Mr. Esteridge stated that the current site plan is pretty much complete. If the current houses are removed, landscaping will be installed in their place. He added that the sight distance would be improved when these houses are removed.

Discussion ensued regarding the landscaping of the existing St. Mary's parking lot.

Mr. Newton stated that when Patterson Road was widened along St. Mary's property, the City completely redesigned and re-stripped their parking lot. There is not room for landscaping without removing some of the existing parking spaces.

Mr. Shaver advised the Commission that it would not be appropriate to engraft conditions on a separate parcel of land even though it was under the same ownership.

Commissioner Elmer expressed his concern that 75 percent of the parcel did not have a plan.

Mr. Mason stated that the vacant area has been used in the past just for runoff. The runoff flows into a depression (pond) in the vacant area.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the depression (pond) would be used for retention or detention of the runoff?

Mr. Gebhart answered that it was for detention.

Commissioner Elmer expressed his concern with the pedestrian traffic crossing 7th Street.

Mr. Esteridge felt that it was safer to cross between the crosswalk and the temporary parking lot than it was to cross at the actual crosswalk. St. Mary's employees feel that if the walk sign was timed longer and if cars did not continually roll through the crosswalk on red lights, they would use the crosswalk. The design of this proposed parking lot encourages the use of the crosswalk.

Mr. Newton stated he would look into lengthening the crosswalk signal and restricting right turns on red onto 7th Street. His concern was that it could back up traffic.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the petitioner intended to leave the existing, mature trees that border along the parking lot?

Mr. Gebhart replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Elmer asked if a condition could be made that if any further development were to take place, the petitioner would have to submit another plan for review?

Ms. Portner stated that the petitioner would be required to submit a revised final plan, and they would have to come before the Planning Commission again.

Mr. Boeschstein pointed out that the current zoning on this proposal is B-1 (Limited Business) not RSF-8 (Residential Single Family).

Mr. Gebhart stated he was told that the zoning map was wrong; it is RSF-8.

Mr. Boeschstein said that this needed to be clarified.

Commissioner Elmer asked Mr. Boeschstein to summarize his concerns.

Mr. Boeschstein restated his comments 1) the private driveway at 7th and Wellington should be closed, 2) a notch should be provided on the north parking lot for backing, 3) a pedestrian walk system should be provided for all the parking lots, 4) landscape the parking lot at St. Mary's current location, and 5) install a retaining wall along Patterson Road, and 6) the outlet onto Patterson Road is still under debate.

Mr. Newton felt that the cars in the parking lot would be well hidden below the street grade.

Mr. Boeschstein asked if the grade was consistent all along the proposed lot?

Mr. Gebhart replied that the first 150 feet along Patterson would need to be landscaped and screened but anything past that drops below 4 to 5 feet.

Mr. Boeschstein added that Mr. Metzner has also requested a landscape plan.

Mr. Esteridge stated that part of St. Mary's master plan includes consideration of a parking structure on St. Mary's property south of the hospital. The intention is to have all of St. Mary's facilities on one side of the street. Sometime in the distant future, this proposed parking lot may be for sale or trade.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "Mr. Chairman, on item #20-91, a request to rezone from RSF-8 (Residential Single Family - not to exceed eight units per acre) to PB (Planned Business), I move that we forward this on to City Council with the recommendation of approval subject to the Review Agency Summary Sheet comments."

Commissioner Worrall seconded the motion.

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

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "Mr. Chairman, on item #20-91, a request for a Final Plan on approximately eight acres, I move that we approve this subject to the Review Agency Summary Sheet comments and the following conditions: that an access not be provided between the two lots, that a perimeter walkway system and a landscaping plan be submitted and approved by staff, that if the houses owned by St. Mary's in the future are ever removed that they are replaced by landscaping and any future plans for this property be reviewed by the Planning Commission."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

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

2. Planning commission recommendation to authorize a contract to (1) annex, (2) plan, (3) zone, and (4) subdivide a parcel of land for a fire station, roadway, road access and related uses on the Matchett property in conformance with Sections 6-2 and 6-3 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code.  
**REPRESENTATIVE:** City of Grand Junction, Fire Department

Commissioner Roberts excused himself from participating in the hearing of this item due to a potential conflict of interest.

## REPRESENTATIVE'S PRESENTATION

Mike Thompson, City Fire Chief, gave a brief overview of the proposal for the Matchett property. The City is currently negotiating with the Matchetts to purchase their property for the relocation of Fire Station #2. The City is proposing a contract with the Matchetts and is requesting Planning Commission's approval to authorize a contract to (1) annex, (2) plan, (3) zone, and (4) subdivide a parcel of land for a fire station, roadway, road access and related uses on the Matchett property in conformance with Sections 6-2 and 6-3 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code. City representatives will be meeting with the Matchetts and their representatives tomorrow. If approved, this item will be forwarded to the City Council meeting tomorrow night for Council's consideration.

## STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Boeschstein explained that the City Attorney's office requested this be added to tonight's agenda as an emergency item. It has not been advertised. There is a section in the Code that allows the Governing Body to vary certain parts of the Code.

This piece of land is extremely important to the future of Grand Junction. Since the City is the developer, correct procedures will be followed. Mr. Boeschstein referred to his memo which outlines these procedures. The first step is to annex the property. Currently it is located in Mesa County and cannot legally come through the City process until it is actually in the city limits. The second step is to zone the parcel, and the third step is to develop a plan. Presently this parcel is zoned with a planned zone in the County; therefore, it will require an Outline Development Plan and a Preliminary and Final Plat for the 1st Filing. This is the standard procedure which has also been written into this contract, but apparently there is some urgency to get this going.

The City Fire Department has hired Ciavonne & Associates to prepare three alternative Outline Development Plans for this property.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the surrounding neighborhood would have some input?

Chief Thompson replied; they will be requesting input in conjunction with this plan. After we have the plans from Ciavonne & Associates, we will have something that shows the people what we anticipate doing. We have worked with a group of people that assisted in the site selection.

Mr. Shaver stated that the negotiations were initiated but have been stalled. The emergency nature, as Mr. Boeschstein has eluded to, is simply the fact that negotiations are back on track giving us an opportunity to begin thinking about actually constructing a fire station. Incidental to Chief Thompson's and Mr. Boeschstein's comments, at this time we are not asking for a land split of any portion of the property. The request is simply for the Planning Commission's consent to allow the negotiations to proceed for the annexation, zoning,

and planning of this parcel. Subsequently, once the development scheme has been determined, it will be presented to the Planning Commission for full consideration.

Mr. Shaver explained that the reason Mr. Roberts excused himself from consideration of this item, is because he is employed by Ciavonne & Associates, and it was felt that there was a possible conflict of interest.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER WORRALL) "Mr. Chairman, a request to authorize a contract to (1) annex, (2) plan, (3) zone, and (4) subdivide a parcel of land for a fire station, roadway, road access and related uses on the Matchett Property in conformance with Sections 6-2 and 6-3 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code, I move that we forward this on to the City Council with the recommendation of approval."**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Renberger.

A vote was called, and the motion passes unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m..