GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- December 2, 1986
7:30 p.m. - 7:50 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairwoman Susan Rush at 7:30 p.m. in the City/County Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were:

Miland Dunivent	Karen Madsen
Susan Rush, Chairwoman	Ross Transmeier

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department, was:

Mike Sutherland

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There was one interested citizen present during the course of the meeting.

* *

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 13, 1986 AS PUBLISHED."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

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

Commissioner Dunivent also expressed appreciation to Terri Troutner for a letter she wrote to the editor of the Daily Sentinel on behalf of the Planning Commissioners.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Mike indicated to members of the Planning Commission that there would be a joint City Council/Planning Commission workshop held on December 10th. Further information would be forthcoming.

III. FULL HEARING

1. #6-86 TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE - 1986

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Department

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike presented a brief outline of the request, and stated that it was a provision to allow 6' fences in the front yards of properties along four-lane principal arterials. He pointed out that if this request were approved, it should be approved only as a special or conditional use. Mike cited 12th Street and the 7th Street historic district as reasons for this restriction.

QUESTIONS

Chairwoman Rush questioned the last portion of the text amendment. She felt that, as written, it would imply that an unimproved parcel could have a fence no higher than 30" in a front yard setback, yet if an improved property met the required 2/3 ratio of open space, they would not be bound by this restriction. Examples of 7th and 12th Street were once again cited as being areas of concern.

After further examination of this amendment, Mike concurred with this interpretation.

Chairwoman Rush questioned whether the term "principal arterial" was the same as "major arterial."

Mike responded that the two terms meant the same thing.

There was further discussion of this point, since Commissioner Transmeier requested clarification.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #6-86 TEXT AMENDMENT, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE CHANGE THE WORD 'PRINCIPAL' TO 'MAJOR' AND FURTHER THAT WE DENY THE PROPOSAL."

Commissioner Madsen seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by 4-0.

2. #36-86 REZONE PZ TO C-2

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Department

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike stated the request was due to the recent move of the Grand Junction Drainage District. Since the governmental entity was no longer at this location, a different zone designation was necessary.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked if the C-2 zoning was presently located in this area.

Mike responded affirmatively.

A steep bluff was pointed out on the map; Commissioner Dunivent asked if this bluff followed the property lines.

Mike answered that it didn't in every case, but that the zoning perimeters did follow the bluff.

Chairwoman Rush asked if this change in zoning would alter landscaping requirements.

Mike said that it would not since the right-of-way extends into the front yard setback.

Mike added that no comments were received either for or against the proposal. Calls received were only those of inquiry.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against the proposal.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #36-86 REZONE PZ TO C-2, REQUEST TO CHANGE FROM PUBLIC ZONE TO HEAVY COMMERCIAL ON APPROXIMATELY 1.9 ACRES, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.