

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing -- May 29, 1984
7:30 p.m. - 10:42 p.m.

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

Bill O'Dwyer	Dick Little
Susan Rush	Warren Stephens
Mike Dooley	Miland Dunivent
Ross Transmeier, Chairman	

In attendance, representing the City Planning Department were:

Karl Metzner	Don Warner
Bob Goldin	Mike Sutherland

In attendance, representing the City Engineering Department were:

Ken Reedy	Jim Bragdon
-----------	-------------

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 81 interested citizens present during the course of the meeting.

* * * * *

Chairman Transmeier called the meeting to order.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Transmeier asked if there was any discussion of the minutes for the 4/24/84 GJPC Public Hearing.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 24, 1984 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier called for a vote and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Chairman Transmeier began by welcoming the three new Planning Commission members. They are Susan Rush, Warren Stephens, and Mike Dooley.

On June 5th and June 12th at 7:30 p.m. there are to be City-wide meetings on the Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan in order to respond to those questions which were raised in earlier meetings. These are to be held at the Grey Gourmet Building at 551 Chipeta Avenue.

III. FULL HEARING

1. #10-84 REZONE B-1 TO PB AND COLORAMO CREDIT UNION - FINAL PLAN

Petitioner: Coloramo Credit Union/Marilyn Haller
Location: 910 Main Street

A request to change from a limited business zone to a planned business zone and final plan on approximately .21 acre.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Marilyn Haller made a brief presentation and stated that the main request was centered around obtaining a drive-up window at this 910 Main Street location.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Rush abstained from further participation at this time. Since she is a member of this particular credit union, it was felt that there would be a conflict of interest.

Commissioner O'Dwyer remarked that the alleyway was to be used as an exit after transactions were completed at the Credit Union, and that either left or right hand turns would be made from this alleyway. Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if a left turn only onto Main Street would be any problem.

Marilyn stated that whatever was acceptable to everyone else would be fine with her.

Commissioner Litle asked about the anticipated traffic count.

Marilyn was unsure of a precise figure since a drive-up window had never before been used. It was felt that it would be minimal, however.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked for an estimated traffic count at the main office located in the Department of Energy governmental office.

Marilyn estimated this at approximately 20-30 and continued by saying that there was a lot of mail-in business. She thought there might be a little more traffic downtown because of the more convenient location.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin began the presentation by reiterating that this was in a B-1 zone which did allow for financial institutions. Since the drive-up window was not allowed in the B-1 zone, they did have to apply for a rezone. Bob stated that all other criteria had been met, however, a Power of Attorney was requested to cover any future alley improvements. The City Engineering Department had contended that they would be trying to establish a special improvements district for those alleyways on Main Street and North Avenue (mainly) which were being used for commercial purposes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

There were no comments in favor of this proposal.

IN OPPOSITION:

Bryan Sims, 917 Main Street, voiced his concern over access. He felt that several traffic problems needed to be addressed such as stacking, turning, curb cuts, parking, etc.

Bob Goldin said that a couple of spaces right of the access of Main Street as well as the rear parking were deleted. He stated that given the estimated traffic count, there did not seem to be a problem of stacking. There was an existing curb cut off of Main Street at this time and one in the alley. Given the left turn only, this would help defer any alleyway traffic on the right. No other problems were foreseen.

Commissioner Transmeier: "Can you tell me how much stacking is there..."

Bob Goldin: "They have approximately two before it does access into the driveway...again we do not expect a problem given that it is not a regular financial institution, but more of a credit union. With any facility such as this or the bank buildings downtown, if there is a problem, the City Engineering Department does have the authority to go in and resolve that."

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Little: "Ms. Haller, is the position of the window flexible at this point, could it be moved back?"

Marilyn: "This window is already in existence."

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Marilyn felt that most of the traffic would be making a right hand turn anyway into the drive-up.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion:

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF FILE #10-84 CONSIDERATION OF REZONE FROM B-1 TO PB, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, with Commissioner Rush abstaining.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF FILE #10-84 CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL PLAN, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON THE DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE AT THE ALLEY EXIT, CONTINGENT UPON NON-INTERFERENCE, AND SUBJECT TO FUTURE REVIEW AND SECURING A POWER OF ATTORNEY FOR ALLEY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE FUTURE AND STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion and called for a vote. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0 with Commissioner Rush abstaining.

2. #12-84 RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION

Petitioner: Mesa College
Location: Elm Avenue from 12th Street to College Place and a section of the north/south alley and east/west alley north of Elm Avenue.

A request to vacate the right-of-way and alley.

John Tomlinson, President of Mesa College, began his presentation by giving an historic background of the College. He stated that the first plan for Mesa College was devised in 1960. He pointed out that what was being requested tonight was basically what had been put together in 1960 (24 years ago).

John continued by saying that Mesa College was an urban campus and that with the continued growth of Grand Junction, growth of the campus was inevitable, and Mesa College should be within the urban complex.

Another point was that of trying to provide a unified campus with regard to access and provide an uninterrupted pedestrian circulation system.

A "Zone and Spine" concept set up five basic zones on the campus and would be used essentially as they were proposed 24 years ago. A focal point to these zones was the separation of vehicle and pedestrian with phased development. John felt that Elm Avenue violated this concept.

John concluded by stating that this expansion was outlined in the 1960 Master Plan and essentially what was being requested was the implementation of another phase of this plan. He pointed out the economic benefits brought into Grand Junction by Mesa College, both directly and indirectly. It was pointed out that in the instance of many public facilities buildings including schools, hospitals, etc. where additional space had been needed for expansion, the community had seen fit to make exception to what had been referred to as the "sacred grid system" when planning streets and accessways, etc.

At this time Conni McDonough, consultant to Mesa College for City processing, began her presentation by outlining the current status of Elm Avenue in the area of interest. Conni indicated that a 100' of this street area was painted a pedestrian crosswalk which is the north/south spine that Mr. Tomlinson referred to. The alleyway was being used, to her knowledge, solely for the service vehicles coming to Mesa College. Utilities were located in the alley right-of-way and the College would provide any easements necessary for the continuing maintenance of those utilities.

Mesa College proposes a long term redevelopment of the vacated Elm Avenue right-of-way to include walkways, bikeways, student relaxation areas, etc. Conni continued that upon the City's approval, a utility easement would be established, drainage would be provided for, and access to the inner campus for emergency vehicles would be coordinated with the various departments.

Since the construction of the Living Resource Center is to begin this summer, it was felt that some changes would be

needed in the Elm Avenue area to accommodate temporary buildings.

Conni stated that benefits would be provided to the City in the form of reduced maintenance of Elm Avenue between 12th Street and College Place, reduced maintenance of the alleyway, reducing the possibility of vehicle/pedestrian accidents in the crossing of Elm Avenue, reduced traffic on Elm Avenue between College Place and 7th Street, and the end result of increased educational and economic benefit.

Carl Walberg, Executive Assistant to the President of Mesa College, began his presentation by stating that many of the professionals brought into the system had been saying since 1960 that "you had better close Elm Avenue to do some of the things that President Tomlinson talked about."

Carl continued saying that once a Master Plan is adopted, that becomes the overall policy which guides future direction. He reaffirmed that the closure of Elm Avenue was in the Master Plan. In terms of capital construction requests, these are prepared each year based on a 5-year advancing schedule. In the 1984-1985 capital construction request, the Elm Avenue closure was listed and funds amounting to approximately \$134,000 would be requested in 1986-1987. Before this request would be seriously reviewed by the Office of State Planning and Budgeting and the State Buildings Division, as well as the various other review agencies, a vacation guarantee of Elm Avenue must be received.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Transmeier: "It is my understanding that win or lose, this item will go on to City Council. Is that your intent?"

Carl Walberg: "Yes."

Chairman Transmeier: "The reason I make that comment is to clarify that, as you say, this has been going on for 24 years in trying to get this closure or some form of action..."

Carl Walberg: "Let me clarify one point. This is the first time we have actually asked for the closure...it's been in the planning documents that long."

Commissioner Little: "If this closure occurs, when would it occur? You say this is a budget item for '86-'87, would it occur at that point?"

Carl Walberg: "Our preference would be to have the closure begin this fall...this would be on a less than completed landscaping basis since funds would not be requested until 1986-1987."

Commissioner Stephens: "What would the landscaping be in this interim period?"

Carl Walberg: "It is my understanding that there would be some movable cement planters, but the safety factor would be of primary importance."

Commissioner O'Dwyer: "Would that be immediately, say next fall?"

Carl Walberg: "Yes, that would be next fall (meaning late summer)."

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Steve Damon, past President of the Mesa College Student Body Association, felt that the benefits to the closure would far outweigh the detriments.

IN OPPOSITION:

Maude Dooling, 1345 College Place, spoke out in opposition to the proposal by saying that she had heard nothing on the vacation of the alleyways. She cited the value of the property which Mesa College wanted closed to be worth over \$100,000. Other points which were brought out were the facts that Mesa College students were only part-time residents and did not care about the homeowners along Elm Avenue and their feelings. She felt that although there were many north/south arteries through the City, there were very few going east/west.

Safety was cited as a real concern. It was felt that services such as fire protection, ambulance, police, etc. would be delayed by the closure of Elm Avenue jeopardizing the residents of this area. Inconvenience was another point which was made. Maude stated, also, that there would be a lowering of property values for the homeowners in this area as well as increased fire insurance rates.

At this time a petition containing over 500 signatures from residents in this area was given to the Planning Commissioners voicing opposition to this proposal.

Chairman Transmeier asked Ms. Dooling if the alley vacation would affect her in any way.

Ms. Dooling replied that she thought that these were located north of her but she wasn't sure of the exact location. She didn't think that it would affect her.

Bob Goldin indicated the location of the alley in question on a map located behind the Commission members. He stated the location as being between Texas and Elm, running east/west, and then a portion hooking it into the "L", the north/south alleyway coming in off of Elm.

Bill Williams, 1342 Texas Avenue, also spoke in opposition to the proposal stating that traffic would be greatly increased on North Avenue and 12th Street, and that vehicles would end up having to wait for the students who jaywalked these streets anyway. He felt that closing Elm Avenue would merely serve to move the problem to a different location.

Donald Whitford, 1227 Texas Avenue, continued the opposition by saying that when Mesa College closed the through street of Texas Avenue, the City of Grand Junction said they would compensate residents through Orchard Avenue. He felt that no closure of Elm Avenue should occur without first widening Orchard in order to handle the overflow.

Regarding the alleyways used by Mesa College, Donald said that he did not know how the fire department would be able to access the dorms if the alley was closed.

Bill Johnson, 1001 Texas Avenue, brought out concerns over the landscaping plans. He felt that Mesa College was not following through with its commitments to landscaping with relation to the Texas Avenue closure and felt that the same thing would happen in the event of the Elm Avenue closure.

Charlene Iverson, 1205 Houston, compared Mesa College to Brigham Young University in Utah, saying that they had similar streets running through its university with no apparent problems. She felt that Mesa College was small by comparison and could not understand why there would be such a need to close off another street.

Thatcher Shaw, 1035 Bunting Avenue, felt that the crosswalk was too wide.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin began the presentation by stating that if this proposal is approved, certain stipulations would have to be made regarding drainage, utilities, and traffic control devices. Bob pointed out that on the Review Sheet Summaries which came back to

the Planning Department, no one was in objection the alleyway vacation. The only concern had been expressed over the closure of Elm Avenue.

Jim Bragdon, Transportation Engineer, said that the closure took place beginning March 20, 1984 and was reopened May 15, 1984. During this period Jim conducted a study to form an impact statement on this closure.

At this time slides were presented to the Commission members and the audience on various aspects of this impact statement. These are as follows:

1. Traffic circulation. Traffic counts were made in various locations in and around the Elm Avenue area. These counts were made at six locations four different times, both during classes and when classes were not being held.

The results were an increase of approximately 1,600 cars/day on North Avenue when classes were held, but decreased when classes were out of session (conjectured that by that time, people had figured out how to avoid North Avenue traffic). On Orchard Avenue west of 12th Street, there was an increase of approximately 857 cars/day when classes were held, increasing to 1,000/cars/day when classes were not in session. On Cannel Avenue an increase of 800 cars/day was recorded when classes were held and increased 600 cars/day when classes were not in session.

College Place decreased by 20% when classes were in session, but increased by 372 cars/day when classes were not in session. Houston Avenue increased approximately 29% in traffic during this time.

Chairman Transmeier asked if the traffic count on Elm Avenue was taken before it had been closed.

Jim replied that yes, it was, but there was some difficulty in falling behind schedule due to ice on the roads during this time.

Commissioner Rush asked about the variability in results from day to day or on any particular group of days.

Jim recognized this problem and stated that Tuesdays/Wednesdays or Wednesdays/Thursdays were used to avoid the possible problem in "spikes."

2. Accident Study (from the Police Department). No record of a vehicle/pedestrian accident could be found since 1981.

Lt. Martin Curry stated that a 57 day prior traffic count was taken with relation to vehicle/pedestrian accidents and is now in the process of taking a post 57 day traffic count in order to measure any differences in the traffic. Prior to closing there were six accidents, and 10 accidents were recorded during the closure.

Chairman Transmeier asked if Lt. Curry knew of any pedestrian crossing accidents which have occurred on this section of Elm near the College.

Lt. Curry replied that he did not know of any.

3. Impact on emergency services as well as delivery and trash services.

Lt. Curry explained that no major problem was perceived by the Police Department due to the closure.

Norm Noble from the Grand Junction Fire Department expressed that under normal conditions the closure could cause a delay of between 2-3 minutes, and could cause a problem regarding access to hydrants in that area.

Commissioner Litle asked if there would be any problems of access with regard to the alleyways.

Norm replied that there were already problems with this and did not feel that closure of the alleyways would add to this problem.

Jim cited that there were certain problems to be dealt with and he felt that there were some possible alternatives and/or resolutions to these problems. These are as follows:

1. Pedestrian problem.
2. Problem of obtaining a unified campus. (This was not to be addressed by the Traffic Engineer.)
3. Access for the service vehicles.

Some suggestions for alternatives and resolutions were mentioned, but emphasis was placed on the idea of bringing the curb out and cut down the size of the crosswalk. As well, put shrubs, planters, etc. along this to limit pedestrians traversing outside of this area.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Conni McDonough clarified that the College did not request a trial closing--they had originally submitted a petition for vacation and had received an interim action of a trial closure. She reaffirmed development of Elm upon closure beginning with the immediate landscaping in the fall.

Carl Walberg stated that he was aware of the inconvenience brought about by the College but felt that the benefits of economic growth outweighed the detriments.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Litle asked if the proposed reduction of pedestrian access and reduced traffic lane would handle the amount of pedestrian movements daily.

Jim Bragdon replied that he thought that it would, and maybe combine this with improved street lighting.

Commissioner Litle asked about the speed limit in the area.

Jim responded that this was 25 m.p.h.

Commissioner Dunivent asked about the response of the College on any alternatives.

Jim stated that there really had not been any opportunity to discuss this with College officials.

Commissioner Stephens asked about the primary reason for the closure.

Carl Walberg stated that the aesthetics and environment of the College were of primary concern with relation to the Master Plan, however, safety was also a main concern.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion:

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #12-84 RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL FOR THE VACATION OF THE NORTH/SOUTH AND EAST/WEST ALLEYS."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT IN CONSIDERATION OF THE VACATION OF ELM BETWEEN COLLEGE PLACE AND 12TH STREET, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL, BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STAFF, THE CITY, SURVEYS OF TRAFFIC AND FIRE RESPONSE TIMES, CONCERNS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, PETITIONS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, AND OTHER THINGS."

Commissioner Dooley seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion was passed by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

The meeting was recessed at 9:30 p.m. and resumed at 9:40 p.m.

3. #11-84 REZONE RMF-32 TO RSF-8

Petitioner: Kathy Jordan (Representative)
Location: Both sides of 7th Street from Grand Avenue to Hill Avenue (7th Street Historic District).

A request to change from residential multi-family uses at 32 units per acre to single-family residential uses at 8 units per acre on approximately 6.91 acres excluding the street right-of-way.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION"

Kathy gave a brief background of the street outlining its historical value because of the older preserved houses located in this area. She stated that last summer this area had been admitted by the National Register of Historic Streets.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Kathy what her reasons were for doing this.

Kathy stated that there were very few places in Grand Junction like this area on 7th Street and she wanted to see it preserved as a single-family residential area.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if she was trying to strengthen the area.

Kathy replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Stephens asked about the support needed to be accepted by the National Register.

Kathy stated that 51% of the residents had to approve this.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner began by saying that no adverse comments had been received on this proposal and that it was supported by the Seventh Street Corridor Policy. He did note that five structures already in existence in this area would be made non-conforming, and that the Learning Tree Daycare would go from a special use to a conditional use status.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Jack Berry, 417 North 7th Street, voiced approval saying that downzoning should increase property values as well as making the area more desirable.

Fern Cook, 737 Ouray Avenue, also expressed her approval for this proposal saying that this would encourage upkeep of these historically significant houses; that if it were kept multi-family, there would be a greater chance that these properties would be neglected.

A letter from Mrs. Violet Green was also received in favor of the proposal.

IN OPPOSITION:

A letter from the Learning Tree was received expressing opposition to this proposal.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion:

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF FILE #11-84 REZONE RMF-32 TO RSF-8 INVOLVING NORTH 7TH STREET, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

4. #13-84 REZONE RSF-4 TO PB AND KEXO RADIO STATION-FINAL PLAN

Petitioner: Western Broadcasting Company/Lance Spurlock
Location: North of F Road, approximately 220 feet East of 25.5 Road.

A request to change from a residential single-family zone at 4 unit per acre to a planned business zone and a final plan on approximately 4.86 acres.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Lance Spurlock began by saying that the Don Rey Media Group, aka Western Broadcasting Company had intentions of expanding and was in need of attractive adequate housing to support the KEXO broadcast facilities.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Rush asked if they would be responsible for the necessary building permit guarantees.

Lance answered affirmatively.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin stated that there were no adverse comments and the only request made would be that a building permit guarantee relating to improvements on F 1/4 Road would be received or replaced by a bank guarantee.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Sam Haupt, representing Foresight Building, asked the current status of the lower 25' strip of property--was this to be used to provide access.

Lance indicated that access would be from F 1/4 Road.

(A conversation ensued on this 25' strip vacation between Sam Haupt and Lance Spurlock. Sam thought this vacation was agreed to and Lance had not received any word from Western Broadcasting on this. There was apparently no dispute, but only wanted to know the status of this strip.)

IN OPPOSITION:

There were no comments in opposition to this proposal.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Stephens pointed out the 25' access and utility easement on the KEXO plans and wanted to know if this could be verified.

Lance said that he thought that some prior arrangement had been made by management but that he was not in a position to address it at this time.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked when this proposal would go to City Council.

Bob Goldin answered July 5, 1984.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented that this question should be resolved by the time this proposal goes to City Council and should be stated as such in the motion.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested two separate motions on this proposal:

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #13-84 REZONE RSF-4 TO PB AT THE KEXO STATION RADIO SITE, FINAL FOR CONSIDERATION OF A REZONE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL SUBJECT TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STAFF."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #13-84 REZONE AND CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL PLAN, KEXO RADIO STATION SITE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON RECEIVING THE BUILDING PERMIT GUARANTEES PRIOR TO GOING TO CITY COUNCIL AND SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

5. #7-84 SUN CREST VILLAS - PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: F Road Development Corp., Professional Investors
of Grand Junction and Paul and Francis Kern.

Location: North of F Road, approximately 650 feet West of
25 Road.

A request for a preliminary plan of 354 units in a planned residential zone at 17 units per acre and a preliminary plan on .68 acre in a planned business zone.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Daryl Shrum, representative of F Road Development Corp., began his presentation by saying that perhaps the only outstanding issue he could foresee would be the desire to dead-end two of the streets in this development.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Stephens asked if the hydrology report would be submitted with the preliminary plan or the final plan.

Daryl responded that the hydrology report would be inclusive of the entire 28 acres and submitted with the final plan.

Commissioner Rush asked if there would be an alternative use for this project if it did not materialize as a retirement community. Could he provide guarantees that this would be for retirement aged persons.

Daryl answered that because it was a "what if" question, he could not give an accurate answer at this time. Covenants were to be developed for the project stipulating age requirements, but he could not further guarantee this aspect.

Commissioner Stephens questioned the number of shares available from Grand Valley Irrigation--would there be enough water?

Daryl said that they did make sure of this point--they owned more shares than they actually needed.

Commissioner Stephens asked about the City Engineer's thoughts on the design of the streets.

Daryl responded that he felt that changes had been made to reflect their desires.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin stated that most items were in compliance and no adverse comments were received from the nearby residents.

Ken Reedy added to this presentation that alternatives had been discussed to allow the Petitioner flexibility in this plan. With regard to the two dead-end streets, it was felt that an adequate turnaround or through access to F 1/4 was still needed. Fencing in the right-of-way was also brought up but Ken said that this had not yet been discussed with Daryl. As well, there were two miscellaneous parking spaces that Ken had planned to ask Daryl about. Besides those items, most of the conflicts had been resolved.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dooley asked about the minimum size specified in the City standards concerning cul-de-sacs.

Ken responded that this was either 40-45' radius.

Commissioner Litle asked about the two miscellaneous parking places which had been mentioned and their location.

Ken replied that these were off of Emerson (location shown on the wall map).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

IN FAVOR:

Sam Haupt expressed some concern as to four accesses off of F 1/4 Road. He wanted some flexibility with regard to these accesses.

IN OPPOSITION:

There were no comments in opposition to this proposal.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Daryl again stated that he was very close to what the City Engineer had requested and agreed to meet with Ken Reedy and Jim Bragdon concerning any final discrepancies.

Commissioner Stephens asked what the reasons were for not putting in a cul-de-sacs where specified.

Daryl responded by saying that by doing so, it would prohibit the building of approximately 6-8 additional units.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN CASE OF FILE #7-84 SUNCREST VILLAS PRELIMINARY PLAN IN A PLANNED RESIDENTIAL ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON THE PETITIONER AND CITY ENGINEER GETTING TOGETHER TO RESOLVE THE QUESTION OF THE VEHICLE TURN-AROUND AREAS AT THE F 1/4 ROAD POINT AND OTHER STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF FILE #7-84 SUNCREST VILLAS PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR PLANNED BUSINESS ZONE, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON THE CITY ENGINEER AND TRAFFIC ENGINEER RESOLVING THE QUESTION OF THE TWO PARKING SPACES ON EMERSON STREET AND ANY OTHER STAFF COMMENTS."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

6. #9-84 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING & DEVELOPMENT CODE - BANNERS.

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Department
Location: 559 White Avenue, Grand Junction, CO

A request to amend Section 5-7-6B2, 5-3-1A, and 5-7-6D of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code. This text amendment is regarding street banners.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Karl Metzner gave a brief presentation saying that this request pertained to banners which would be used for public events to be installed by the City and containing no advertising other than that which would be classified as an official name, i.e. Coors Bicycle Classic.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dunivent questioned the maintenance of these banners.

Karl answered that the City would be responsible for this and then charge it out.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if this charge would be made to the sponsor of the event.

Karl responded affirmatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against this proposal.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #9-84 I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENTS."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

7. ZONE OF ANNEXATION #2-84

Petitioner: City of Grand Junction

A request to zone the following annexations:

State Highway vacated adjacent to R.E.A. Office and Sperber.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin stated that both are currently in compliance with the zoning presently around them.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-84A ZONE OF ANNEXATION OF STATE HWY. VACATED PROPERTY ADJACENT TO R.E.A. OFFICE ZONE C-2 HEAVY COMMERCIAL, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Dooley seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #2-84B SPERBER ZONED RSF-4, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

8. #70-81 ORCHARD GROVE - OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Robert Reese

Location: Southeast corner of 12th Street and Orchard Avenue.

A request for a one year extension of their development schedule.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Richard Livingston gave a brief presentation stating that the main reason for the extension request was economic.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin reminded the Commission members that this would be a one year extension from the original April 1984 meeting, thus granting this until April 1, 1985.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against this proposal.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF FILE #70-81 ORCHARD GROVE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT THE REQUEST OF A ONE YEAR EXTENSION, HOWEVER, IT SHOULD BE GRANTED FROM THE ORIGINAL EXPIRATION WHICH WOULD BE APRIL 1, 1984 EXTENDED TO APRIL 1, 1985."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

9. #49-81 CROSSROADS MOTOR INN - DEVELOPMENT IN HO

Petitioner: Grand Junction Motor Hotel Ltd.

Location: East of 27 3/4 Road Section Line, Northwest of Horizon Drive

A request for a one year extension of their development schedule.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Bob Goldin stated that the Petitioner was here earlier but had to leave due to a previous engagement. A one year extension request was made by Bob for Ward Scott, the Petitioner.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments either for or against this proposal.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT ON THE SUBJECT OF EXPIRATION OF THE SITE PLAN FOR GRAND JUNCTION MOTOR HOTEL LTD. ON HORIZON DRIVE, THAT WE EXTEND THIS FOR ONE YEAR TO APRIL 1, 1985."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

A vote was called and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 p.m.