

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- January 3, 1984
7:30 pm - 9:15 pm

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

Bill O'Dwyer	Jack Ott
Ross Transmeier	Miland Dunivent
Dick Litle	Glen Green

In attendance, representing the Planning Department were:

Don Warner Janet C.-Stephens Karl Metzner

Rachelle Daily of Sunshine Computer Services, was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 15 interested citizens present at the beginning of the meeting.

Chairperson Rinker called the meeting to order and explained that the items heard tonight will go on to City Council if they are approved; if disapproved, the petitioner must request scheduling of the item for the City Council agenda.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Chairperson Rinker asked the Planning Commission for a discussion on the minutes of the 11/1/83 GJPC Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 1, 1983 GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

Chairperson Rinker repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR VISITORS.

Janet Stephens, Planning Staff, announced that the City Attorney has asked the Planning Commission to review and comment on a balcony proposal for the Chamberlain Architecture building at 435 Main Street. The DDA has stated that they have no problems with the balcony overhanging into the right of way. The City Engineer and Transportation Engineer both reviewed it in December and also indicated they have no problems with it. The proposal will be going to City Council tomorrow night and Planning Staff requests the Planning Commission's input tonight.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Transmeier commented that he feels it helps dress up some of the buildings on Main Street and he sees no problem with it.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if all DDA criteria have been met.

Janet Stephens answered that DDA's comment indicated approval.

Chairperson Rinker told Janet that the Planning Commission approves the proposal.

III. FULL HEARING

1. #38-83 CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission.
Location: Within the established boundaries of the City of Grand Junction and the boundaries of the Intergovernmental Agreement dated March 24, 1983 by the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County.

(Copies are available at the City/County Planning Department, 559 White Avenue, Room 60, 244-1628.)

Consideration of the City of Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan.

- a. Human Resource Services - Chapter 16
- b. Population and Demographics - Chapter 6

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION -- CHAPTER 16

Ken Strohson, Comprehensive Plan Project Manager, provided background information on the adoption procedures for the Comprehensive Planning Process.

1. The plan includes adopting each chapter as an element of the Comprehensive Plan so it is usable immediately.
2. To date, the Planning Commission and City Council has adopted 17 Chapters, the Introduction, Table of Contents, and the Adoption/Administrative Procedures Chapter.

Speaking directly to the two chapters under consideration tonight (Chapters 6 and 16), Ken noted that they have both undergone extensive agency and City Council review (through workshops) and that suggested changes have been incorporated into the text. He added that the purpose of the meeting tonight was to gain citizen input. Any additional minor changes or corrections (if needed) will be incorporated prior to submission to City Council. If any major changes are needed, adoption of the chapters can be tabled or the changes can be incorporated later.

Ken discussed the Human Services portion of Chapter 16 and outlined the three most important parts of the chapter -- Issues, Policies and Implementation Tasks.

Ken Flebbe presented the Hospital Institutions and the Long-Term Health Care Institutions sections of Chapter 16. He noted that the major concern of hospital expansion is related to the "pressure development" in residential neighborhoods. Ken added that this will be a continuing concern

as will the location of new regional health facilities nearby the hospitals. New policies will need to be developed in that area with relation to 7th Street and St. Mary's Hospital.

Ken stated that there are no issues with the current Long-term Health Facilities as there are no planned expansions at this point in time and Grand Junction has excellent capacity for long-term health care. In addition, the present health care facilities are starting more "out-patient facilities" which results in less people needing long-term health care facilities. Ken projected that there will not be any land use issues (relating to expansion plans) in the foreseeable future.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Rex Critchfield, Human Services Planner, spoke in support of adopting the Human Services section as he considers it an effective cooperative working effort between the City, County and other agencies. Rex cited a good example of this cooperation made it possible for the Cheese and Butter program to be successful: The City allowed use of their facility for the distribution point.

Chairperson Rinker closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ADOPT AND FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL FOR ADOPTION, CHAPTER 16, THE HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES CHAPTER, OF THE GRAND JUNCTION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

Chairperson Rinker repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION - CHAPTER 6

Ken Glover, prefaced his presentation by announcing that until today he was Director of the City/County Comprehensive Planning Department, and has now been assigned as the Director of the County Policy and Research office. Ken discussed the Population Section of Chapter 6 by outlining the two basic modes of population Grand Junction has experienced in recent history:

- 1) Slow growth period (1970 - 1980)
- 2) Rapid growth period (1980 - 1983)

Ken projected two possible futures for population growth: Slow to Moderate (as in 1940-50 and 1960-70) or the Boom Growth (as seen in more recent years). Ken noted that because of the highly variable growth possibilities, it was determined by the Planning Commission, Planning Staff and City Council to address a population future via a "Horizon Population" which allows for planning for a particular target population. 40,000 has been chosen as the "Horizon Population."

The chapter identifies these issues:

- 1) The need to monitor and estimate population more frequently than once every ten years.
- 2) Integers of population will be developed and maintained by the City Planning Department.
- 3) Potential annexations will be analyzed with regards to their impact on the City's population characteristics.
- 4) Cost estimates will be obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau for a special census to be conducted. The County, the School District and other governmental agencies will be involved in reviewing this.
- 5) Population estimates will be reviewed annually to determine if revisions need to be made to this chapter of the Plan.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked when the cost estimates will be available.

Ken replied that he didn't know exactly when since the School District has been involved in their election. He added that now would be a good time to follow up on that.

Rex Critchfield complimented the Planning Commissioners and Planning Staff for the excellent public meeting process and the feedback.

Chairperson Rinker closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ADOPT AND FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL RECOMMENDING THEIR ADOPTION, CHAPTER 6 OF THE GRAND JUNCTION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

Chairperson Rinker repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 6-0.

2. #55-83 ORCHARD MESA LANES - AMENDMENT TO FINAL PLAN

Petitioner: C&W Investments.
Location: 295 27 Road.

A request for an increased lounge area by amendment of a final plan in a planned business zone.

Consideration of amendment to final plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Earl Stevenson indicated they need to increase the plan by 235 feet. The existing plan shows it to be 635 feet and they have 925 feet now. It was expanded by the previous owners. They plan to enclose an additional area into the lounge; the entire facility (bowling alley) is serviceable by liquor now, so they are not requesting an additional liquor license.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked if the record currently shows a different size building or a different size lounge.

Earl replied that it shows a different size lounge.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if this lounge is all enclosed within the existing building.

Earl answered that it is.

Commissioner Transmeier stated that he guessed he is confused as to why Mr. Stevenson is here.

Earl replied, "Everybody's got to be somewhere. We want to bring in line what we have, as what you have is not what we have."

STAFF COMMENTS

Janet Stephens noted that the Liquor License Modification Form (which was a concern) was submitted to the City Clerk today. She also said that Planning Staff noticed that some of the existing landscaping is either unhealthy or missing and Staff would like to have the dead plants replaced.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dunivent asked Mr. Stevenson if he is proposing any additional landscaping.

Mr. Stevenson agreed to replace the dead plants.

Commissioner Ott asked Mr. Stevenson if he intended to maintain the new plants.

Mr. Stevenson agreed to maintain the plants.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public, either in favor or against.

Chairperson Rinker closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE ON ITEM #55-83, ORCHARD MESA LANES, AMDENDMENT TO FINAL PLAN, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING NEW LANDSCAPING AND MAINTENANCE."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

Chairperson Rinker repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 6-0.

3. #26-81 CARRIAGE HILLS - FINAL PLAN (2 of 2)

Petitioner: Planners & Developers Ltd.
Location: Southeast corner of Crossroads Blvd. and 12th Street.

A request for 14 units on 3.655 acres in a planned residential zone - PR-4.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Ken Shrum, part owner, presented the request. They plan to build 7 duplexes which they are calling townhouses. Ken stated that the other owner, Mr. Ed Settle, plans to live in the first one to be built. He outlined the building phases which are anticipated to be started in February or March (1984) and completed by late 1985 or early 1986. Ken referenced a neighborhood meeting that indicated approval of their plan. The neighbors did request one-level buildings.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if there was sufficient room between the buildings.

Ken Shrum replied that 10' is required and he believes that is what the plans shows and if it isn't they will comply.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Ken to discuss the irrigation provisions.

Ken stated that the parcel of land has no water to it and after discussions with the Highline Irrigation Company, they were told they could get waste water. Ken noted that "waste water from agricultural use and waste water from commercial use are not the same words." He said that there are parcels of land to the east that have Highline Water and are using Ute Water to irrigate their landscaping but he cannot get his hands on that waste water. One possibility that exists is to work with a backup system from an irrigation line from Paradise Hills (their water is piped from the canal).

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Ken how their land relates in elevation to Paradise Hills.

Ken stated the water would have to be pumped because of the high elevation of the land.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if that was why Highline excluded them.

Ken replied, "I think the reason it was excluded was because it wasn't irrigatable, but I can't answer that." Ken added that they plan to use a 2" water cap and all the homes will be on that one system which will be maintained by the Homeowner's Association.

Chairperson Rinker asked Ken to explain why they need a replat.

Ken replied that it is a five-lot subdivision with three lots on Crossroads Boulevard which are 1/2 acre lots and two lots along I-70 that are 1-acre lots. They are trying to give the footprints for each parcels; each unit has been put on a lot on Crossroads and the southern two have been placed on a lot of their own. They designed it this way purposely and will be coming back in for replatting for the townhouses.

Commissioner O'Dwyer: "In other words, we'll see this again?"

Ken: "You'll probably see it as many as four or five times."

Chairperson Rinker: "Then it is totally for the townhouses."

Ken agreed.

Commissioner Little: So you won't touch the upper three, just the lower?"

Ken said there will be a total of 14 lots plus a common area.

STAFF COMMENTS

Janet Stephens discussed Planning Staff concerns:

- 1) Access. The original plan shows two accesses off of 12th Street which has been resolved by changing to one access.
- 2) The sewer concern has been resolved.
- 3) Public Service concern is in work.

PUBLIC COMMENTS. There were no comments from the audience either in favor or against.

Chairperson Rinker closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #26-81, CARRIAGE HILLS FINAL PLAN, I MOVE WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

Chairperson Rinker repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried, 6-0.

4. #56-83 ONION HILL - PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Onion Hill Partnership.
Location: Southeast corner of 27 1/2 Road and Cortland Avenue.

A request for 123 units on 28 acres in a planned residential zone - PR-7.2.

Consideration of preliminary plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Chris Gray of Gray, Brenner and Associates, introduced his partner, Chuck Brenner, Noel Welch and Tom Beck who were in attendance. Chris outlined the proposed preliminary plan by discussing the following points:

- 1) Their land plan includes continuing Ridge Drive to align with Bell Ridge.
- 2) They plan to develop 35 secured, single-family units (similar to detached townhouses) on the western section of the property where it adjoins existing single-family units in Spring Valley. The balance of the property will be moderate density, multi-family. The southern portion of the property will be used for recreational vehicle storage.
- 3) Amenities will include a swimming pool, tennis court and walkway.
- 4) The single-family section will be security patrolled with a card-operated gate.
- 5) They have proposed building the single-family units by "pads" (private space maintained by the homeowner's association). The same "pad" concept will be used for the multi-family units. This will give them the flexibility of rearranging units as demand dictates.
- 6) There will be private drives (that "don't go anywhere" -- from the public transportation standpoint) within the single-family unit section. They feel the private

drives will have very little traffic except for owners and visitors.

- 7) There are four entrances to the multi-family section and one entrance to the single-family section.
- 8) The Fire Department has no problem with the circulation system and they are not asking for a crash gate. The Fire Department has asked that they "even" one of their turnarounds in the northwest corner, and that one of the fire lines be looped. The petitioner will comply with both requests.
- 9) There will be two homeowner's associations and the landscaping will be maintained by them. There will be very strict covenants in the single-family section and moderately strict covenants in the multi-family section.
- 10) The multi-family units will have double garages and have approximately 1200 - 1500 sq. ft.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked how visitors will get into the secured area.

Chris replied that there will be a telephone at the gate and the residents will push a buzzer to admit visitors.

Commissioner Litle, referring to the "dead-end loop" the Fire Department is concerned with, asked Chris if they are planning to eliminate the parking altogether.

Chris indicated that they plan to keep the parking. He stated that the settling pond is "probably going out" because they are going to use a level separator instead of the pond to control silt.

Commissioner Dunivent asked if there will be two separate water systems.

Chris replied that the ponds will be a closed system; they will be taking the irrigation water into their system and a "fancy filter" will take out most of the "big stuff" and then it will circulate from two high points down to the pond in the southwest corner where it will be pumped back up and pulled down again, pumped back up, etc. (a loop system). Chris added that as that quantity of water goes down, they will draw from the irrigation line and they will have a drain from that lake south into the wash.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if that will drain to Mr. Fausson's ponds. (Mr. Fausson had submitted a letter expressing concern that uncontrolled polluted run-off water from this project's disposal of surface water would "create serious consequences" on the environment of the two lakes in Crest-

view Subdivision which are used for irrigation of yards and common areas and as a fish and game habitat.)

Noel Welch stated that Mr. Faussone wants to meet to see an overview of the drainage system regarding pollutants. He said the only pollutants he could see that would be added would be mineral salts picked up as a result of the irrigation system, which he feels would be very nominal from a landscaped system.

Chris Gray indicated that the petitioners will be in touch with Mr. Faussone.

Commissioner Little commented on how nice the landscaping plans look and asked when the project would be self-perpetuating (when will the homeowners will be handling the economics of maintaining the landscaping).

Chris replied that Phase 1 will be 20 units on the eastern half of the single-family section (including the swimming pool), that the Homeowner's Association dues will be \$20-35/month, and the petitioners do not anticipate any problem with this fee.

Commissioner Transmeier questioned whether this property falls within the Airport Critical Zone.

Chris stated that probably most of it is in.

Commissioner Transmeier calculated that the balance of the proposal is below 4 units/acre which he thinks is good.

STAFF COMMENTS

Janet Stephens presented the status on three concerns:

- 1) The Fire Department's request for the loop system has been taken care of by the petitioner.
- 2) The Crestview Homeowner's Association wants to discuss the drainage situation.
- 3) The multi-family area and the private streets need to be discussed.

Ken Reedy discussed his objection to the private streets in relation to City Street Standards. He indicated that the private streets do not meet the City's standard development for street standards for several reasons:

- 1) "By calling it a private street, are we simply avoiding the issue of City Street Standards. All the streets proposed in this neighborhood are 24' in width, asphalt mat with attached curb and gutter. The City Street

Standard would require cul-de-sacs on the ends of the streets, a 34' asphalt matte section for adequate on-street parking." Ken feels that some of the things the developer is proposing here technically mitigates some of the questions of the on-street parking, but from the City Engineering standpoint the direct back-up parking onto the streets has negative aspects. City Engineering prefers to avoid direct access back-out parking.

- 2) No sidewalks are proposed and Ken is concerned, not so much with the development occurring as planned, but with the fact that he has seen secured neighborhoods fail in the past and eventually the owners of the dwellings go back to the local municipalities and ask for those improvements to be accepted into the City maintenance system. At that point the City then has "substandard streets being maintained by City equipment that wasn't designed to work in those kinds of neighborhoods."
- 3) Ken's philosophy with the multi-family area is that it isn't really a private street since it isn't part of the secured neighborhood and it accesses private dwellings. As a rule, Ken feels those kinds of neighborhoods should work in the City system with City Standards and "not avoid the issue by going with private streets." Ken also stated that he feels City Standards should apply throughout the City. He also stated that the farthest northeast driveway has no effective turnaround and he is surprised that the Fire Department didn't have any problems with that.
- 4) Ken said that although he has some problems with the design of the circular drives, he feels they are attractively done.
- 5) Ken said limiting the landscaping adjacent to the critical median areas (between curbs and gutters and the one-way areas) had been discussed so that emergency vehicles could go around them without having trees preventing access.
- 6) He also said that he feels public streets are appropriate in multi-family areas.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Green asked Chris if it is the petitioner's intent not to turn the streets over to the City.

Chris agreed that was their intent; they will be partly-owned like "many dozen areas already in town."

Ken Reedy interjected that the problem is the developer doesn't have any control over that because once he sells the property, the neighborhood becomes an entity unto itself and there is no way for the developer or the City to control it in the future.

Chairperson Rinker asked if the City could say "no" if the Homeowner's Association came in and asked for City maintenance of streets.

Ken Reedy: "Technically, the City could say no; politically, it's hard to say if they could or not."

Commissioner O'Dwyer: "If that point came along, the City could get Powers of Attorney and it would be part of the agreement that each property owner would have to pick up their share of the improvements."

Ken Reedy: "Whether or not circulation is provided, whether or not on-street parking is available, and whether or not sidewalks are appropriate in a neighborhood of this type are issues being met by City Street Standards and all those things are provided for through these standards. When we allow private drives to come in that don't meet those standards, we're circumventing the standard process and somewhere along the way it will come back and haunt us. Everytime we make an exception to the standard process, you're building in another loophole, and as far as I'm concerned a private drive is a loophole in the City Standards." Ken also pointed out that the Recreational Vehicle Site is conveniently located to the church parking lot and accesses Ridge Drive at a curve and Transportation Engineers feel that should be accessed off of a side street rather than off of Ridge Drive. Ken also questions whether Ridge Drive meets the Collector Street Standards.

Commissioner Transmeier asked if a public street makes it impossible to have a secured area.

Ken Reedy: "In a secured area, assuming it will be maintained as a secured area, the public street problem is much less and it certainly is not going to be my problem. In the multi-family area there is no security and it basically serves as a public street, and I think in both cases circulation, on-street parking and sidewalks is appropriate. If the private area concept is approved then it is up to the Planning Commission to decide whether they need those things."

Chris Gray: "In my opinion, the purpose of a public street is to get from here to there (leave home, go to work, drive past lots of other businesses and other streets leading into them) which is why Ridge Drive, which serves that purpose, is a public street. And whether I leave my home and drive down a driveway that happens to be 200 or 300' long instead of 20 or 30' long is irrelevant. We make no attempt to make private drives public streets -- they don't go anywhere. They go to a person's front door."

Ken: "Neither does a cul-de-sac in most subdivisions anywhere else in town."

Chris: "We provide turnaround that pleases the Fire Department -- the largest vehicle that will ever be in there. They're happy."

Ken: "The largest vehicle that will ever be in there is a City trash vehicle."

Chris: "They are smaller than a fire truck, I believe."

Ken: "They are smaller in width but they have more restrictions in turning radius."

Chris: "The other point that you made is that you make it sound like this is brand-spanking new and its never been done before. There are all kinds of private drives; one just approved tonight. This is by no means the first private drive system."

Noel Welch: "You cannot control parking on a public street in a development. We've provided for 70 units lesser density on the acreage than what we're allowed. We've provided what we feel is more than adequate parking in the single-family area (4 parking spaces per unit) which exceeds by 100% the current code for parking."

Ken: "Which is related generally to onstreet parking . . ."

Noel: "We're trying to control no on-street parking by providing ample off-street parking and restrictive covenants against on-street parking as part of our philosophy. The reduction of the density has increased the per unit cost of the land so it's a philosophical approach, not an economical approach. We're trying to control the value of both the single-family and multi-family units. We're trying to insure we don't have cars parked on the street."

Ken: "I commend your philosophy but my question is whether or not it actually serves the neighborhood requirements. The statment made that you have provided twice as much parking as required is somewhat less true from my perspective, because treating it per unit there is a requirement that assumes there is additional parking on the street."

Chuck Brenner: "We're disturbed at the term 'substandard' because we don't feel it is substandard -- that's a misnomer -- the matte that will go down is comparable to what would be going down in any development. The thing that is not standard is the width and that is all that's not standard. What we have done is taken out the parking lane that would

normally be on the street and 90-degreed parked it, which then creates the back-onto-the-street situation but that exists wherever we have a unit as well. We're really not doing anything that isn't normally done. We're not much different than if we provided a residential community with a parking lot instead of a street. In this case, the street is serving as that corridor by which parking is on one or both sides and is, in effect, a parking lot. The one thing we feel we are accomplishing by this is being able to bring our landscape closer to the road to bring more green area into it and thus make it a more attractive area. We don't feel the 90-degree parking is a hindrance because the street is not one that anyone will take as a shortcut to get from Ridge Drive to Cortland. It's easier to drive right to Cortland and make that turn. So we feel the term "substandard" is a misnomer. We also would need to provide a sidewalk if we went with the public street route which broadens things out and we would rather look out over landscaping instead of asphalt. We may put sidewalks in at some point but if we do, one of the things we'd like to do (as in the single-family area) is put in paths that meander around the property through the residences that gets them away from the on-street walking."

Ken: "Again, I understand your philosophy and I agree that it has aesthetic value, but most people travel down a street to get to some place in particular and frequently instead of going down a path behind a house they will walk the street which is potentially more dangerous. Without having anything proposed to show any alternatives we have no way of ascertaining whether they will be developed."

Chris: "This is a preliminary, and a planned development."

Chairperson Rinker: "I would like to ask how this would be different from the way Lakeside is set up? Does Lakeside have a public street going through it and then into the parking areas? And is this what you're trying to do?"

Chris: "Lakeside used to for years. And there is a grouping of 10-12 fourplexes in southeast Lakeside . . ."

Don Warner: "They have sidewalks."

Chairperson Rinker: "The sidewalks aren't attached to the streets."

Don: "The sidewalks are adjacent to the parking areas."

Chris: "The majority of sidewalks are running in front of carports serving you to walk on the sidewalk to your house and we don't have that situation anywhere."

Don: "But they do lead from one to another."

The discussion continued regarding the differences in philosophys between the developers and Ken Reedy. Chuck Brenner commented that they want to make sure that the people living in the units are served by the appropriate utilities and even though they are altering the course from the "norm" they feel the alterations will enhance rather than hinder the development. Chris Gray added that they don't want the "asphalt jungle" -- they want a more aesthetically attractive development.

Chairperson Rinker interrupted the discussion to comment that Ken Reedy's position is that he has standards he has to go by and the Commission has discussed street standards before and it appears what needs to be done at this point is decide whether the Planning Commission likes the basic plan or idea. The Planning Commission has to come to the point where if the streets are private, they can approve them as such, or if they decide they want them to be public streets, the developer will have to comply with that.

Commissioner Green stated that he wouldn't have any problems with the plan as long as it was tied down with some future date in anticipation of it coming back to the City for maintenance. At that time the collective group of people living there will have to be willing to comply with what is being asked for.

Chairperson Rinker: "Can you put that in the covenants?"

Noel: "I think it can be made a condition of ever accepting the street as a public street. At that point in time, if there was a reversionary philosophy of the owners somewhere down the line that they wanted it to be accepted into the public streets, I think it could be a condition of the City to accept it if it is brought up to width standards."

Commissioner Little: "At that point it's on the ground; how are you going to take and expand a 24' street?"

Noel: "The setbacks are a fair example to go ahead and bend."

Don: "Won't you lose your parking?"

Noel: "You'll be picking up parking on the street."

Commissioner Green: "Chris, is this technique cheaper than following the City Standards as far as your developmental costs?"

Chris: "By the time we've landscaped it, no."

Ken: "But as far as public amenities are concerned, certainly."

Chris: "All we care about is the bottom line."

Noel: "As far as public amenities?"

Ken: "As far as improvements (34' wide streets, sidewalk, curb and gutter) the cost would be less than for a 24' street without the sidewalks than it would be for a 34' street with sidewalks."

Chris: "We've also provided additional parking. . ." I believe his question was development costs, and I'm totalling everything; public improvements are only a very small portion even if we put in public roads."

Commissioner Transmeier: "Could you do an overlay of your project to show full City improvements (leave the area clear for a 34' street with sidewalks, etc.)"

Noel: "For that hypothetical point in time?"

Chris: "I don't know that we could do that everywhere.."

Commisioner O'Dwyer: "It occurs to me that we're considering whether we like this overall plan or we don't."

Chairperson Rinker: "Either we approve the plan or we don't."

Commissioner O'Dwyer: "It's a matter that this is what these developers have decided to bring before us (private streets) and it's up to us to decide whether it's a good plan or it isn't a good plan."

Chairperson Rinker: "And it's not the first time it has been done."

PUBLIC COMMENTS. No one was present in the audience to provide comments either in favor or against.

Chairperson Rinker closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #56-83, UNION HILL PRELIMINARY PLAN, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN AS OUTLINED."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Green: "I've got one concern. We might be loading all taxpayers down ten years from now; can we add something to the motion regarding the burden?"

Commissioner O'Dwyer: "Yes, we could do that. I withdraw my first motion."

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #56-83, UNION HILL PRELIMINARY PLAN, I MOVE WE FORWARD THIS ITEM TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO:

(1) STAFF COMMENTS EXCEPT THOSE PERTAINING TO THE PRIVATE VS PUBLIC STREET ISSUE;

(2) THE COVENANTS OF THE HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION CONTAINING A STATEMENT THAT INDICATES THE OWNERS OF THE PRIVATE STREETS WILL BE FINANCIALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR BRINGING THE PRIVATE STREETS UP TO CITY STREET STANDARDS IN THE EVENT THE HOMEOWNERS DECIDE THEY WANT PUBLIC STREETS RATHER THAN PRIVATE STREETS.

(3) AND THAT POWERS OF ATTORNEYS WILL BE OBTAINED ON CORTLAND AND 27 1/2 ROAD.

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

Chairperson Rinker repeated the motion, called for a vote and the motion carried 5-1 (Commissioner Litle opposing).

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION AND VOTE

Commissioner Transmeier commented that he hoped the petitioners would also address the question of access to the Recreational Vehicle parking.

Ken Reedy added that the City Council has directed Engineering Staff to begin review of the existing street standards and direct this to communicate with the Planning Commission, Home Builders Association and Planning Staff,

and this will process will be started in the immediate future. He also stated that their problem is a philosophical one rather than an adversary position with the developer. They have a standard that they either apply or they don't.

5. #47-83 1983 ANNUAL UPDATE OF THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING & DEVELOPMENT CODE

Amends various sections of the Code. Copies of specific changes may be obtained at the Grand Junction Planning Department, 559 White, Room 60, 244-1628.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner, Grand Junction Planning Staff, presented the Annual Update, noting that there haven't been any changes or additions since the previous workshop other than they have implemented a fee for minor changes done in-house.

There were no participants in the audience for questions or comments.

Chairperson Rinker closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE ON ITEM #47-83, 1983 ANNUAL UPDATE OF THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion.

Chairperson Rinker repeated the motion and called for a vote. The motion carried 6-0.

== The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. ==