

5

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing — October 3, 1989
7:35 p.m. - 10:50 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Steve Love at 7:35 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

Steve Love, Chairman	Jim Tyson	John Elmer
Sheilah Renberger	Jack Campbell	

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department, were:

Karl Metzner and Kathy Portner

Bobbie Darlington was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 97 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 1989 MEETING AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

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

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

There were no announcements, presentations and/or prescheduled visitors.

III. PUBLIC MEETING

1. **#47-89 REVISED FINAL PLAN FOR RETAIL SALES ON APPROXIMATELY 0.4 ACRES IN A PLANNED BUSINESS (PB) ZONE.**
Petitioner: Lil' Sprout Nursery, Keith Purser
Location: 2464 F Rd

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Purser did not have any comments at this time.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner presented a brief overview of the proposal. Kathy stated the property is currently zoned Planned Business (PB) and was approved for office use. The request for a nursery and inside retail sales is consistent with the Patterson Road Corridor Guidelines. If approved, the petitioner would be required to plat the property in the spring of 1990, and a statement to that effect would be recorded with the site plan. A complete drainage plan shall be required at the time the parking lot is paved, and the petitioner has requested the paving be deferred until 1993. The proposed landscaping and signage must meet Code requirements; in addition, some type of screening will be required along the west property line which the petitioner has agreed to. Any new construction, fencing, or signage would require separate permits. The petitioner has also requested the Parks open space fee payment be deferred until the Fall of 1990, for which the Planning Commission must make a recommendation to City Council. All other technical concerns have been addressed by the petitioner.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Elmer asked if a handicap parking space would be appropriate.

Kathy stated there were not any handicap parking requirements in the Code.

Mr. Purser agreed handicap parking was a good idea, and should be done for courtesy reasons.

To discourage other outdoor sales in this area, Kathy recommended the uses be limited to retail business indoor and the nursery as proposed.

Commissioner Elmer expressed a concern about the deferment of the plat.

Kathy responded, according to the City Attorney it would not be a problem if a statement to this effect was put on the site plan when it was recorded.

When asked who maintains the ditch, Mr. Purser replied there is an agricultural ditch on the west side of their property, and most of the water on the property drains into this ditch, with the exception of a little runoff in the southeast corner. This ditch is sufficient to carry the run off at the present time.

Commissioner Campbell asked why the paved parking area could not be done sooner than 1993.

Mr. Purser explained that is was because of financial limitations, and pointed out that they had graveled the parking area.

Commissioner Campbell asked Mr. Purser if he could elaborate on the bakery he referred to in the narrative.

Mr. Purser explained that approximately a year ago he had been in Illinois where he observed a combination nursery and apple orchard. The owner had an outlet where he sold apple cider and cinnamon apple cake donuts. This was done in order to generate year round customers, since nurseries do most of their business only four to six months out of the year.

There was some discussion concerning the open space fee. Commissioner Campbell expressed his opposition to the deferment of this fee.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #47-89, A REQUEST FOR A FINAL PLAN FOR LI'L SPROUT NURSERY AT 2464 F ROAD, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS AND THAT THE ALLOWED USES BE LIMITED TO INSIDE RETAIL BUSINESS AND THE NURSERY AS PROPOSED WITH THE EXCEPTIONS THAT ONE HANDICAP PARKING SPACE WILL BE PROVIDED; THE PLAT BE DEFERRED UNTIL MAY 1990; AND THE PAVING DEFERRED UNTIL JANUARY 1992."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #47-89, A REQUEST TO DEFER THE OPEN SPACE FEE FOR LI'L SPROUT NURSERY AT 2464 F ROAD, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL."

Commissioner Elmer seconded the motion.

A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 3-2, with Commissioners Renberger and Elmer opposing.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

- #45-89 REZONE AND FINAL PLAN FOR NELLIE BECHTEL**
Petitioner: Mesa County, Alan Hassler
Location: 3032 North 15th Street

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Hassler stated Mesa County had obtained a contract for the sale of this property as of 09/26/89. The buyer is a developer who specializes in elderly housing, and intends to continue the operation as such. Mesa County is requesting the zoning density be changed from Planned Residential (PR) 12.3 to Planned Residential (PR) 21.4 to conform with the current structure.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Renberger had some concerns regarding adequate parking on the property.

Kathy pointed out that in the past fewer parking spaces had been approved for elderly housing than what the Code required for other housing.

Mr. Hassler stated that presently there were 1.5 spaces per unit, which was adequate.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner briefly presented an overview of the proposal. The property was rezoned one year ago from a PZ to PR 12.3 to accommodate the proposal at that time. The request now is to rezone to a density which fits the current number of units which is 96 or 21.4 units per acre. If approved, the staff recommends either the use at that density be restricted to elderly housing, or the number of units be reduced to fit the available parking.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gail Duarte, of 2656 G Road, began by stating her concerns were not with the parking, rather her concerns were whether or not the residents would be able to remain there, and if the property would remain elderly housing. She also inquired as to who would have the final decision of the sale, and who would turn over the title. She understood that there was a group involved called the Old Age Housing, and wondered how they could be reached.

Mr. Hassler explained that the buyer has told the County that they intend to continue the operation as is. Also, the buyer has requested the County not terminate any tenancies or rearrange the building, which Mr. Hassler believed was a good indication that the buyer would continue with the current residents. Mr. Hassler continued, the title of the property is held in the name of Mesa County Old Age Pension Fund Trustees, and the Trustees are the Mesa County Commissioners.

Commissioner Elmer asked if the contract with the buyer contained a stipulation that the current residents would be allowed to stay, and if not, could a resolution be made to this effect.

Mr. Hassler replied that the County already had a contract in which this was not included, and suggested that the Planning Commission get legal council if they wanted to include such a resolution.

Commissioner Renberger pointed out that if the buyer decided to change the existing operation, he would be required to come before the Planning Commission to address the parking issue and other concerns at that time.

Ben Sellers, of 124 Vista Grande, asked if there was anticipation of a rate increase in the near future, and was puzzled as to why the County felt they had to sell this property.

Chairman Love responded that this could not be addressed at this meeting, and suggested that Mr. Sellers direct his comments and questions to the new owner.

Mr. Sellers asked Mr. Hassler if the buyer would be willing to meet with the residents to hear their concerns and questions.

Mr. Hassler acknowledged the request, and said he would relay the message to the buyer.

Vena Woodward, of 3032 N 15th Street, felt they had ample parking, and was puzzled why it was such an issue.

Chairman Love explained that this gave the Planning Commission an area of latitude in making their recommendation to the City Council.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #45-89, A REQUEST TO REZONE FROM PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (PR) 12.3 TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (PR) 21.4, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS AND THAT THE USE BE RESTRICTED TO ELDERLY HOUSING."

Commissioner Renberger 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 #45-89, A REQUEST FOR A FINAL PLAN FOR NELLIE BECHTEL AT 3032 NORTH 15TH STREET, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THIS, SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AGENCY SUMMARY SHEET COMMENTS AND THAT THE USE BE RESTRICTED TO ELDERLY HOUSING."

Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

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

2. **#48-89 REZONE & PRELIMINARY PLAN & PLAT FOR NORTHRIDGE FILING #4**
Petitioner: Colson & Colson, Pat Edwards
Location: Northeast corner of 1st Street & Patterson Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Pat Edwards, a local real estate broker involved in the purchase of this property on behalf of Colson & Colson, briefly presented a background on Colson & Colson Construction Co. Colson & Colson Construction Company has two divisions; Holiday Retirement Corp, which is the management entity of this facility, and Colson & Colson Construction which is the construction development arm of the company.

Mr. Edwards described the area's boundary and explained the proposed retirement area is presently zoned PR-4 which would allow the development of 39 single family lots and 73 multifamily units. The multifamily units are in approximately the same area in which Colson & Colson is proposing a change in density.

Mr. Edwards chose to divide the area into three parts and discuss them individually. The first area of discussion was the single family area located south and west of the retirement area. This area would be platted with 39 single family lots, which would be under the same covenants and building restrictions as those in filing 3 of Northridge Subdivision.

Mr. Edwards addressed several items in this area:

- When Northridge Subdivision was built, it was determined there was not an adequate line of site for the North Bluff Drive entrance, therefore the access was changed to Northridge Drive, in addition, the City has requested, and the petitioner will comply with the vacation of North Bluff Drive. A substantial amount of utilities lie within this easement, which will be relocated and reconnected in Northridge Drive or other adequate easements will be left in place along North Bluff Drive. Currently, May Belle Daniel's only access is along North Bluff Drive; a 20' easement will be dedicated to access that lot.

- The north line of Willowbrook Subdivision will be adjusted to extend north to the center line of Independent Ranchman's Ditch. Whomever lives in the north area of Willowbrook will accrue that land that adjoins them.

- A school bus turn around area is proposed, whereby the bus would enter the subdivision at the loading area, make a loop and get back on N 1st Street to continue its route.

- Colson & Colson has an agreement with Mr. Jones, so that he may acquire the two lots adjacent to his property for additional buffering. These lots would be added to his property by a property line adjustment and become one parcel. When Rose Terrace is constructed, Mr. Jones will access his property directly off the cul-de-sac at the end of Rose Terrace. In exchange for this, Mr. Jones will vacate the access easements that he currently uses.

Chairman Love asked if this was part of the submittal?

Mr. Edwards said it was part of the submittal, and that they had a formal agreement with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Edwards continued:

- Upon the City Engineer's suggestion the number of lots that utilize the N 1st Street and Northridge entrance have been reduced to alleviate the traffic problem. The majority of homes will be accessed through the stop light at N 7th Street.

The second area of the proposal, which Mr. Edwards discussed, was what he referred to as the "Neck Area". There are 8 single family lots platted in this area which will also fall under the same covenants as Filing 3.

- Mr. Edwards stated that although Mr. Ruggeri is opposed to the development, if it is approved, he desires to acquire the property east of his property, and Colson & Colson will honor that request.

- Along Mr. Grosse's southeast boundary line is a retaining wall made of railroad ties. A tremor has caused this wall to lean over and encroach on the neighbor's property. There is an agreement with Mr. Grosse to rebuild his retaining wall, but in so doing additional land on the west of lot 2 will be needed. Therefore, the remainder of lot 2 will be landscaped and maintained by the retirement facility.

- The headgate that serves Mr. Jones' property encroaches onto Ruggari's and Gormley's properties. There is an agreement to vacate the irrigation easement and relocate it on a direct line on the northeast corner of the Jones' property to a new headgate in the Grand Valley Canal. Mr. Jones will also vacate the headgate he is currently using and we will then utilize it for irrigation of the six single family lots.

Mr. Edwards summarized that ultimately the ending scenario would be 37 single family lots each approximately 1/4 acre in size.

The third area Mr. Edwards discussed was the retirement area. Only in this 10 acre parcel is a change of density being requested. The main building will consist of 105 retirement suites, along with two 6-unit and two 4-unit garden suites. In addition, there are two single family lots in the southeast corner of the retirement area. The total request is for 127 retirement units on this 10 acre parcel.

- There will be covered parking, extensive landscaping around the perimeter, and a lot of grass area. Approximately 3 acres will be used for building, parking, and streets, and approximately 7 acres will be left for an open landscaped area, which will be maintained by the developer.

- The developer will comply with Mr. Gormley's request for a privacy fence to be constructed along his south boundary. He has also requested that the lighting in the parking area be installed so that it doesn't shine directly on his home; this request will also be complied with.

- Mr. Filener, who just acquired the Larson property, has requested a privacy fence along his boundary and in addition was interested in acquiring more property; Colson & Colson will comply with this.

- The main building design is in an "S" configuration, which provides a buffer to the adjoining neighborhood. The building elevation is two story, except the dining room area which is a daylight basement plus two stories. All the garden units are single level. There is a substantial cone of vision left on the southeast corner of Mr. Grosse's and Mr. Gormley's properties, and Northacres subdivision's elevation is substantially higher than that of the retirement building.

- The parking area north and west of the main building would be cut down 4 feet from the existing grade. There will be additional landscaping to screen this parking area and the parking area north of the main building entrance.

- There will be no direct route from N 7th to N 1st Street.

Commissioner Renberger stated that on page two of the covenants, it stated that there shall be no public gatherings.

Mr. Edwards replied that this was correct.

Commissioner Elmer stated that in the covenants, it states that for any additional improvements a two-thirds vote of the residents in the retirement facility and residents with contiguous properties would be required. He asked if this would include the whole subdivision.

Mr. Edwards replied that they would be willing to change the language to include all the Filings, if it was required.

Mr. Edwards went on to explain that Colson & Colson had two prior agreements that affected this property, with which they would comply. The first is that any development on the 28 acres must provide a second exit from Northridge Subdivision which would be accomplished by the extension of Horizon Place from N 7th Street to Northridge Drive. The other requirement is that any development on this property shall provide an access to the common point of the Cameron (formerly Waller/and Vandover, properties), and that would be accomplished by Horizon Lane.

Chairman Love commented that it was labeled as a future access.

Mr. Edwards replied that it would be built with the first phase. He continued by explaining that according to the Department of Transportation, congregate housing and retirement residences generate substantially less traffic than any other residential use.

Mr. Edwards reported that the development schedule would be as follows:

1st Phase/1990:

- Construction of the main building in the retirement area.
- Landscaping in the 10 acre area would be completed.
- Horizon Place and Horizon Lane would be completed, to include curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and utility extensions.
- The unimproved portion of Horizon Place in front of the existing Mesa View Retirement Center would be completed.
- The curb and gutter along Northridge Drive and N 1st Street would be completed.
- The school bus turn around would be put in.

2nd Phase/1991:

- The completion of Rose Terrace, Rose Court, and Kings Court.
- The completion of the garden units.

In summary, Mr. Edwards continued, the plan being considered is basically the same plan that was approved by the Planning Commission and City Council and subsequently denied by the City Council due to the expiration of the contract for the property.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner noted that Mr. Edwards had covered the proposal as it was submitted, but added that he would like to cover some of the review summary sheet comments. Karl stated that the open space fee would be \$225 per unit. He added that Grand Valley Irrigation had concerns regarding the canal, seepage, and drain lines, which the petitioner has indicated would be resolved. Grand Valley Irrigation also requested that the petitioner work with them on the landscaping to eliminate any potential problems with the canal.

Commissioner Renberger inquired about the parking spaces.

Karl stated the development plan, which will be recorded, shows 70 spaces; the petitioner thinks only 30 will be needed.

Karl continued, Colson & Colson would take no exceptions to the conditions, requirements, and concerns on the Review Summary sheet and would comply with them at the appropriate times.

Karl indicated there were conflicting statements on the Review Summary Sheet, both Ute Water and City Water say they will be serving this development. Upon advise from the City Attorney, this item should be forwarded on to City Council for their consideration. In either case, there is an adequate water supply available for the development.

QUESTIONS

There were no questions at this time.

A brief recess was called at 9:25 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:40 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

FOR:

Mr. Edwards asked that the letters in the file be read into the record.

Chairman Love read a letter from Harold & La Verne Grosse of 3304 Music Lane and a letter from Pat Edwards acknowledged by John P. Gormley of 361 Music Lane. Also, he acknowledged a previous letter from Warren & Beverly Jones of 2624 F 1/8 Road. All were in favor of this proposal.

AGAINST:

Russ Doran, of 3350 Music Lane, distributed typed copies of the neighborhood's concerns to the Planning Commission and staff. Along with this was a petition containing 116 signatures, representing 87 homes in Willowbrook, Northacres, and Northridge subdivisions, all opposing the proposal.

Mr. Doran read through the handout. In summary the concerns were:

- The retirement structure does not belong between custom built single family homes.
- The structure is not compatible with the existing single family residences.
- Holiday Retirement Corporation is a commercial operation that wants to be located in a residential area.
- There is not a need for the retirement center in this particular location.

- The granting of this application could lead to serious deterioration of the residential character in the neighborhood, and cause decreased property values.
- The acceptance of the petitioned rezone would be completely contrary to these four purposes of appropriate zone establishment: 1) To encourage the most appropriate use of land and ensure logical and orderly growth and development. 2) To prevent scattered, haphazard, suburban growth. 3) To conserve and enhance economic, social, and aesthetic property values. 4) To protect and maintain the integrity and character of established neighborhoods.
- There are doubts the petitioner will finish the single family development after the retirement center is built.

Fred Aldrich, of 340 Music Lane, presented a parallel of the Fact Findings from the Gordon case to the proposed retirement center. He reiterated the importance of these facts as related to this proposal.

Mr. Aldrich explained, in this case Mr. Gordon wanted to conduct an engineering business in his home. The City Council found the existing zone permitting single family homes was not in error at the time of adoption. The Council also noted that there had not been a significant change in this neighborhood in 20 years. The Council also found that the Gordon's proposed rezone would not be compatible with the surrounding area. Mr. Aldrich requested that the Planning Commission acknowledge these facts when making their decision.

Also, Mr. Aldrich felt that the irrigation for the landscaping had not been addressed. He explained the three filings in Northridge had extensive irrigation, and felt the retirement area would not be compatible with the landscaping of the surrounding area.

Ken Radideau, of 3360 Star Court, expressed his opposition for reasons that the developer had not shown a need for this project in this particular location, and because there were over 100 nearby residents who were strongly opposed to it.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Edwards explained that the key difference between the Gordon request and this request was that the Gordon's wanted to change the zoning to Planned Business; our request is simply an increase in density. There would be no change in use, it would continue to be residential.

Regarding the irrigation, Mr. Edwards added, there are adequate Grand Valley Water shares on the market, and Colson & Colson plans to acquire water shares in order to have adequate irrigation for this proposal.

The City Council's fact findings concluded this specific development would not infringe or cause deterioration of the existing single family neighborhood. If this were true, it would have taken place with the building of Mesa View 1. Mr. Edwards went on to say that another important issue to realize is this property is currently zoned for 39 single family lots and 73 multi-family units, it is not just single family. Furthermore, Colson & Colson Construction is 63rd on the national building list which would make them adequately qualified to build a single family dwelling.

The opposition has expressed concern on whether or not the single family homes will be developed, Mr. Edwards continued, those lots are of adequate size, comparable to those in Northridge subdivision, would be under the same covenants and building restrictions, and would be very marketable to the pre-retirement age group.

Chairman Love read a letter of opposition from Mike Larson who lives at 340 Northridge Drive.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Love asked if there were any assurances that Colson & Colson would complete the project, and if there was anything to prevent Colson & Colson from selling the remaining property after the retirement center was built.

Mr. Edwards replied that there was nothing to prevent the sale of any portion of the retirement area, but the covenants and building restrictions would still be in force for whomever buys it.

Chairman Love asked what type of assurance there was that the construction would be completed as scheduled.

Mr. Edwards answered, there are two options, either a Bank Letter of Credit or a Building Permit Guarantee; with the latter being more preferable.

Commissioner Elmer stated, the existing three filings have an Architectural Control Committee and wondered if the proposed single family homes would also be under the jurisdiction of this same committee.

Mr. Edwards replied, there would be a separate Architectural Control Committee. There had been discussions regarding a common Homeowner's Association for this development and Northridge, but no interest has been expressed by the Northridge people to do this. He added that if there was a desire, the developer would comply. Their intentions are not to build incompatible homes in this area.

Commissioner Renberger asked why this wasn't done under a Planned Unit Development.

Commissioner Elmer clarified that it was the same thing as Planned Residential but different terminology.

Commissioner Campbell asked if there was a contract on the property contingent upon the rezoning.

Mr. Edwards responded that there is a contract with United Bank, and it is subject to the rezoning.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl clarified that currently the area is zoned for planned residential PR-4. When the zoning was established there was an adopted plan which included a mixture of single family and multifamily. This was an outlined development plan which has lapsed; subsequently, making this a Planned Residential zone without a plan. It is not approved for single family or multifamily; it is a PR-4 with no approved plan.

COMMENTS

Commissioner Elmer commended Mr. Edwards and Colson & Colson for a job well done with the existing Mesa View Retirement home; however, he stated there was not sufficient reason to change the density, and felt strongly about protecting the integrity of the existing residential neighborhood.

Chairman Love, and Commissioners Renberger, Campbell, and Tyson concurred, stating their support that the area remain single family homes.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER ELMER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #48-89, A REQUEST TO REZONE FROM PLANNED RESIDENTIAL, DENSITY OF APPROXIMATELY 4 UNITS PER ACRE (PR-4) TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL, DENSITY OF APPROXIMATELY 12.7 UNITS PER ACRE (PR 12.7) ON APPROXIMATELY 10 ACRES FOR MESA VIEW RETIREMENT CENTER, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS; THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH THE EXISTING ZONE; THE BUILDING AND THE INCREASE IN DENSITY IS NOT COMPATIBLE WITH THE EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOMES IN THE AREA; THERE IS NO CHANGE IN CHARACTER TO JUSTIFY THE REZONE; THE COMMUNITY NEED FOR A RETIREMENT CENTER IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA HAS NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

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

3. **#49-89 REZONE PZ TO C-2 FOR CITY MARKET**
Petitioner: City Planning Department, Karl Metzner
Location: 111 Rood Ave

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl briefly presented an overview of the proposal. He stated, the parking lot was completely surround by C-2 zones, therefore recommended the zoning be changed from a Public Zone to Heavy Commercial.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER RENBERGER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #49-89, A REQUEST TO REZONE FROM A PUBLIC ZONE (PZ) TO HEAVY COMMERCIAL (C-2), I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS ON TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SINCE IT MEETS ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR THE PUBLIC ZONE AND IS COMPATIBLE WITH SURROUNDING C-2 ZONING."

Commissioner Renberger seconded the motion.

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

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Chairman Love stated that he did not attend the Planning Commissioner's Conference at Copper Mountain, therefore had no report.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.