

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Public Hearing, June 29, 1982**  
**Minutes**  
**7:30 p.m. - 10:10 p.m.**

The meeting was called to order by Chairwoman Jane Quimby at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

Dick Litle	Susan Rinker
Miland Dunivent	Bill O'Dwyer
Ross Transmeier	Jane Quimby
Jack Ott	

Bob Goldin was in attendance, representing the Planning Department Staff.

In attendance, recording the minutes, was Rachelle Daily of Sunshine Business Services.

Approximately 20-25 interested citizens attended the Public Hearing during the course of the evening.

\*\*\*\*\*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

**MOTION:** (Commissioner Transmeier) "I MOVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 27, 1982 GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR VISITORS.** There were none.

**III. FULL HEARING**

**1. #27-82 HIGH COUNTRY STORAGE--AMENDED FINAL PLAN**

Petitioner: John Bray  
Location: Southeast corner of Cannon Street and Grand Mesa Avenue.

A request for an amended final plan on approximately .37 acre in a planned business zone.

Consideration of amended final plan.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Katie McIntyre oriented the audience on the location of the proposal. She noted the proposal is for the construction of mini storage units and that the changes that have been made to the previously submitted plan include: internal access will be taken entirely

internally, therefore solving the alley question; the units have been shortened; the drainage situation should not worsen the problem there.

#### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Transmeier asked whether there would be any fencing and what the height of the structure would be. Katie replied there would not be any fencing, that the building itself would serve as a buffer and that the height should be single-story, around 10' with a shed roof.

Commissioner Transmeier also asked what type of construction would be used. Mr. Jack Williams spoke up from the audience indicating it would be either "tilt" or "block" concrete.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked if the drainage would drain to the back out to the alley or onto the lot; Katie indicated it could be directed either way if the shed roof is installed.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Kathy Kerndt, 1642 Cannon, had questions on the landscaping plans and mentioned that there is a drainage problem. She was told that the landscaping plans would be incorporated and that the Planning Commission is aware of the drainage problems.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

Bob Goldin indicated the City Review Agencies have no problem with the design as shown, that the neighbors at the last meeting did have concerns with the alleyway; that the City Engineer requested information regarding improvements to the alleyway and questioned whether these people would be responsible for those. Bob also noted that based on a discussion with the City Attorney, since they won't be utilizing the alley at all, an Improvements District would have to be formed to obtain improvements; other than these comments, Bob indicated all technical aspects have been resolved.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

IN FAVOR: Jack Williams, 2639 Dahlia Drive, stated that the reason for the revision to the plan was basically economics; smaller units with higher density had to be incorporated, and he encouraged passage of the plan.

Commissioner Transmeier asked Mr. Williams if the driving surface would be hard surfaced. Mr. Williams indicated it would be paved.

Chairwoman Quimby asked when construction would be started. Mr. Williams answered "by this fall."

Commissioner Dunivent asked Mr. Williams if he would participate in the Improvement District if one were formed. Mr. Williams indicated he would.

IN OPPOSITION: Rose Mulder, 1630 Cannon, asked why the petitioner decided not to have a fence. Mr. Williams answered that they were told to keep off the alley so the fencing project has been dropped. Commissioner Transmeier noted that the building itself would be a buffer and that the standard roof slope allowing the water to run to the alley would give less building height and not add to the drainage problem.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the public hearing.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "ON FILE #27-82 HIGH COUNTRY STORAGE--AMENDED FINAL PLAN, I RECOMMEND WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL, INCORPORATING ALL CONCERNS OF STAFF AND PLANNING COMMISSION.**

Commissioner Transmeier seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote and the motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

**2. #20-82 EDGEWOOD TOWNHOMES--FINAL PLAT AND PLAN**

Petitioner: John T. Combs  
Location: West of 15th Street, South of the Grand Valley Canal.

A request for a final plat and plan of 10 units on approximately .59 acre in a planned residential zone at 17 units per acre.

Consideration of final plat.  
Consideration of final plan.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Roger Foisy, representing the petitioner, briefly outlined the project and indicated all technical problems have been solved.

Commissioner Transmeier asked if they plan to keep the existing trees and questioned the planned

height. Mr. Foisy answered they plan to keep all the trees they can although five will have to be removed for the parking area. The height is two-story.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

Bob Goldin indicated they have not deviated from their preliminary plan, have resolved all technical issues and complimented the petitioners for handling everything at preliminary.

Commissiner Transmeier asked if the appraisal had been completed. Bob indicated it was received on 6/28/82.

Commissioner Litle asked if the signage had been taken care of. Mr. Foisy wasn't sure of that. Bob Goldin stated that if the petitioner agrees to meet the Sign Code there would not be a problem. Mr. Foisy so agreed.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

IN FAVOR: None.  
IN OPPOSITION: None.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "I MOVE ON FILE #20-82, FINAL PLAT FOR THE EDGEWOOD TOWNHOMES, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.**

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "I MOVE ON FILE #20-82, FINAL PLAN, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.**

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

**3. #38-79 WELLINGTON TOWNHOMES--FINAL PLAT AND PLAN  
(2 OF 2)**

Petitioner: Paul Smith  
Location: 225 feet East of 12th Street between  
Wellington Avenue and the Grand Valley  
Canal.

A request for a final plat and plan of 26 units on  
approximately 1.70 acres in a planned residential zone  
at 16 units per acre.

Consideration of final plat.  
Consideration of final plan.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Roger Foisy, representing the petitioner, indicated all  
technical aspects of this project have been solved.

**QUESTIONS: NONE.**

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Bob Goldin summarized the plan and made note of  
previous neighborhood comments on density and type of  
design, noting that the petitioners have come back  
several times in an attempt to accommodate those con-  
cerns. Bob stated other comments at preliminary have  
been resolved.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Joe Abell, 1212 Wellington, asked for clarification on  
Power of Attorney and what it means to the residents of  
this area.

Bob Goldin responded to Mr. Abell's question and  
explained that the Power of Attorney is submitted to  
the City by the petitioners for half-street improve-  
ments of their frontage; if the City should form an  
Improvements District, this Power of Attorney would be  
activated and they would be responsible for these half-  
street improvements (for their portion of Wellington);  
other people who may or may not have a Power of Attor-  
neys will be either assessed through an Improvements  
District (formed and approved by City Council) or asked  
to improve this piece of Wellington; and, as future  
development occurs, pick up remaining portions of the  
improvement. Power of Attorney would not be activated  
for anyone other than Wellington.

Mr. Abell asked if the City has to be petitioned in  
order to form such a district. Bob Goldin indicated  
that in more cases than not the City might say that is

an area they would like improved and it would be accomplished through an Improvements District or by actually going out and doing it -- the City would give notice if this were to become necessary.

Chairwoman Quimby noted that there have only been a few instances where the City has had to force anyone into an Improvement District and those were cases where the street required improvements and the residents of the area did not wish to. Normally there are more requests for Improvement Districts than the City has the time or the money to agree to do, so they usually prefer to rely upon requests from citizens of the particular area.

Mr. Abell also asked about the location of the trash disposal and if it would still remain at the back far end. Bob Goldin confirmed it would.

PUBLIC COMMENTS IN FAVOR: None  
PUBLIC COMMENTS IN OPPOSITION: None

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, IN CASE OF FILE #38-79, WELLINGTON TOWNHOMES, FINAL PLAT, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."**

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1 (Commissioner Transmeier against).

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, IN CASE OF FILE #38-79, WELLINGTON TOWNHOMES, FINAL PLAN, I MOVE THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."**

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion passed by a vote of 5-1 (Commissioner Transmeier against).

Chairwoman Quimby commented to the public that even though it may appear that the Planning Commission is moving quickly through these items without giving much consideration to details, the reason is that most details have been taken care of at the preliminary plan level and approving final plans is a fairly routine procedure.

4. #43-82, REZONE RMF-32 TO PB AND WESTERN COLORADO CENTER FOR THE ARTS--FINAL PLAN.

Petitioner: Western Colorado Center for the Arts/Allen Dodworth

Location: 1803 North 7th Street (Southwest corner of 7th Street and Orchard Avenue).

A request to change from residential multi-family uses at 32 units per acre to planned business uses and a final plan on approximately 1.34 acres.

Consideration of rezone.  
Consideration of final plan.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Ed Chamberlain, Architect for the Colorado Center for the Arts, outlined the location and intent of the rezone/final plan request. He noted there will be 3 building additions: stage storage, ceramics classroom, new lobby space, exhibition space, workroom and storage. Mr. Chamberlain described the proposal to include:

- \* The 12' wall that will go around the building to enclose future permanent galleries and will help reduce the scale of the building;

- \* The proposed sculptured courtyard;

- \* Access (ingress/egress) through two-way alley;

- \* Parking spaces: 37 additional spaces have been negotiated for with the School District and future parking could be acquired since the Center owns an existing house. 98 spaces have been provided vs. the 67 required.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Litle questioned Mr. Chamberlain on the width of the alleyway. Mr. Chamberlain responded it is a 20' alleyway.

Chairwoman Quimby questioned Mr. Chamberlain on the proximity of the 12' wall to the sidewalk and he replied it would be 16 feet.

The Commissioners, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Allen Dodworth (Director of the Center for the Arts) discussed the following concerns:

- The proposed 12' wall designed in front of the new addition to which the Police Department is strongly objecting to (from a security/surveillance standpoint);

The probability of future problems that might arise in resale value, should the Center eventually require more growth and therefore eventual relocation of their facility;

The overall appearance/change of character to existing neighborhood as a result of the proposed addition, the 12' concrete block wall, and the fact that the building will be exposed to the public via the parking area on the corner of 7th & Orchard.

The required number of parking spaces (67) and the petitioner's statement that they have 98. Bob Goldin explained the 98 spaces includes the 37 spaces down the alleyway and that their calculations were based on actual seating capacity based on Fire Department requirements as an alternative to the shared uses. Bob commented Staff is concerned with the parking spaces and wonder if it will be adequate and if not a revision may be needed.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

Bob Goldin cited three concerns by Staff: (1) When additional parking will be provided and asked the petitioner for a time frame as to when they might expect completion--Staff would like to see as much on-site parking as possible to prevent impact on the neighborhood; (2) Should the Police Department want to see an alternative to the proposed 12' wall, would the petitioner agree to a compromise or an alternative; and, (3) Staff would like to see a resolution to the Mt. Bell telephone box problem prior to construction.

#### **PETITIONER'S RESPONSE**

Mr. Chamberlain, in responding to the security concerns, indicated their emphasis would be on an internal security system that is tied directly to the Police Department, and that they don't feel security will be a problem.

Mr. Chamberlain indicated the parking lot may be an improvement over the existing housing at that site.

In responding to Staff concerns on parking, Mr. Chamberlain commented that low occupancy spaces would be built there, that the Center's policy is to never schedule two functions to full capacity at any one time; and, that placing a time schedule would be difficult to do at this time since the house currently used by the caretaker will be retained for quite some time.

Mr. Chamberlain, in response to future plans, indicated it is difficult to predict, but agrees that at some



point in time they may require additional growth that would necessitate acquiring a larger parcel of land, and could not project the probability of resale value.

Regarding Staff's concerns on resolving the telephone closure, Chairwoman Quimby noted that the City has the right to force Mountain Bell to relocate it. Mr. Chamberlain noted they have proposed two alternatives and would cooperate with Jim Bragdon on that concern.

Chairwoman Quimby also asked Mr. Chamberlain for the projected cost of the overall project, and he answered it would be in the \$300,000 range.

Mr. Allen Dodworth (Director of the Center for the Arts) responded to the 12' wall concern by explaining the electronic security system and the solid doors, adding that he is not particularly concerned with a security problem. He also stated that he views the "courtyard" formed by the wall as a "transitional area" (airlock/sound buffer) between the Center and the busy traffic on 7th & Orchard.

### **PUBIC COMMENTS**

Connie McDonough, 415 Mesa Court, questioned Mr. Chamberlain on the following points:

1. Will the existing street trees on the right of way be maintained? Mr. Chamberlain replied that they would;
2. What kind of material will be used for the addition and the wall? Mr. Chamberlain replied "stucco and concrete block."
3. Will the Berming be sod? Mr. Chamberlain confirmed.
4. Is the Setback to the wall less than the setback to the high school building? Mr. Chamberlain indicated it was 3-4' from the property line to the wall.
5. Would any structure or fencing be provided between the parking bays and Orchard? Mr. Chamberlain indicated there is a planter strip.

Connie McDonough then stated she would be in favor of the proposal and suggested if they vacate the facility perhaps the high school might purchase it for their theatre arts program.

There were no public comments against the proposal.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Transmeier commented he feels the construction of the 12' wall would be a mistake.

Bob Goldin noted that if this proposal is approved that the police issue should be mentioned.

Chairwoman Quimby agreed, noting that the Police Department may not have fully understood the intention of the wall. Chairwoman Quimby then closed the public hearing.

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "I MOVE ON FILE #43-82, REZONE RMF-32 TO PB, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote and the motion carried unanimously (6-0).

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "I MOVE ON FILE #43-82, FINAL PLAN, THAT WE FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL CONTINGENT ON RESOLVING THE CONCERNS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BEFORE A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED AND ON RESOLVING THE ISSUE OF REMOVING THE TELEPHONE PEDESTAL."

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

**5. #45-82, RIGHT-OF-WAY AND EASEMENT VACATION.**

Petitioner: Joel and Kathi Prudhomme.  
Location: Northeast corner of Hillcrest Avenue and Walnut Avenue.

A request to vacate part of the right-of-way on Walnut Avenue and a request to vacate a utility easement on the northeast corner of Hillcrest Avenue and Walnut Avenue.

Consideration of right-of-way vacation.  
Consideration of easement vacation.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Joel Prudhomme, 336 Walnut Avenue, outlined the location and purpose of his request.

## QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier asked whether the property owner to the south has agreed. Mr. Prudhomme indicated he has, informally.

Commissioner Dunivent questioned whether the Fire Department objections had been resolved. Mr. Prudhomme said he didn't think vacation of this right-of-way would affect that access, and Bob Goldin, Planning Staff, explained that the technical elements have been resolved but a new legal is needed prior to notice describing the area (excluding the 10' triangle).

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** There were none.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "I MOVE ON FILE #45-82, RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL, PROVIDING THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION IS RECEIVED".

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion, Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote and the motion carried 6-0.

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER DUNIVENT) "I MOVE ON FILE #45-82, EASEMENT VACATION, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner Litle seconded the motion, Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, asked for a vote and the motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

Commissioner Transmeier asked whether any right-of-way exists on the south side of the road. Carl Vostatek spoke up, indicating the City owns it.

6. #44-82, REZONE OF RMF-64 TO PB AND JOYCE ADDITION--FINAL PLAN.

Petitioner: Warren K. Beldon  
Location: 2140 North 12th Street

A request to change from residential multi-family uses at 64 units per acre to planned business uses and a final plan on approximately .67 acre.

Consideration of rezone.  
Consideration of final plan.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Jeff Ollinger, Armstrong & Associates, presented the proposal, which is for low-volume retail, professional offices, human care offices and dance/exercise studio (to operate within the existing sewing center). He discussed the parking in depth, noting that 24 spaces are required (which is what they have) and feels the parking is more than adequate for both proposed and future uses. Mr. Ollinger also mentioned the compatibility of the proposal and their landscaping plans, the drainage situation and their proposed gravel retention pit (an acceptable engineering practice) has been discussed with Ron Rish; and stated they plan to remove the existing garage for better circulation and turnaround capabilities and place a fire hydrant around the corner of the access on 12th street in answer to the Fire Protection concern.

Mr. Ollinger also discussed the concern regarding the Dance Studio and sufficient parking requirements. Mr. Ollinger stated they estimate each person using the dance studio would need approximately 49 sq. ft. of floor area and their ratio of 1 space per 2 people indicates they would need 9 parking spaces and they have provided more than that. He also stated the ladies attending the studio would arrive 2 to a vehicle, as an average. Total parking requirement, according to Mr. Ollinger, would be 24 (14 for Dance Studio, 2 spaces for installation area, 1 space for employee parking, 6 spaces if single-family house is converted to office space).

Mr. Ollinger outlined the plans to include a facility for the installation of stereo equipment into automobiles -- the automobiles are driven from Visual Sound Sensations, by employees to the back, sound equipment is installed, and the autos are returned to Visual Sound Sensations.

## QUESTIONS

Considerable discussion on the proposed "gravel retention pond" ensued between the Commissioners and Mr. Ollinger. Mr. Ollinger described the gravel retention area as being about 2' of gravel, the exterior would appear as decorative rock surrounded by split-rail fence, that would act as a natural retention area, initiate very little off-site drainage. Mr. Ollinger clarified that it would not be a "pond," per se, as it will not retain water; the water will drain below the gravel level and some would be absorbed by the proposed berm.

Another area of concern that created lengthy discussion was the parking facilities. Mr. Ollinger stated 4-6 stereo installations per day were anticipated, approximately 10 clients per class (based on detailed records) would be enrolled in the Dance Studio. Mr. Ollinger also stated the owner of the Dance Studio (Deborah Beeson) intends to use the Studio during the evenings when other business will not be operating.

## STAFF COMMENTS

Bob Goldin indicated Staff was concerned in the event they try to sell off part of the property they would have to come back for a replat. Staff is also concerned with phasing and parking requirements, particularly if they develop to the maximum. There is no provision for overflow parking, but Bob noted they might be able to acquire some shared parking.

Chairwoman Quimby asked Bob to explain the Planning Staff "Note" on the Review Sheet Summary which states, "A final plan has resolved all issues prior to public hearing. A preliminary may be in order for the Joyce Addition."

Bob Goldin explained that at the time of submittal the petitioner was given their option of the phase to come in and since this is a matter of changing uses, they felt a final plan would be more in order. The overall site plan had some problems (such as circulation), but removal of the garage and opening of the parking spaces helped resolve some of the concerns. Their revised plan did accommodate a lot of the technical aspects of this project.

## PUBIC COMMENTS

Deborah Beeson, 2004 North 12th, was questioned by the Commissioners on the number of clients visiting her Dance Studio in an effort to determine the seriousness of the parking situation. Deborah indicated she allowed ten people per class, eight classes spread

throughout the day. She also noted that there are 43 businesses at this location and only 53 spaces to park.

Commissioner Transmeier asked for a repeat on the number of classes and Deborah indicated 10 people in each class and 10 classes. Each class lasts 30-45 minutes, beginning at 8:30 a.m. through 6:30 p.m. She indicated classes are about 1/2 hour apart and that the classes are getting crowded at the Pinyon Center and this facility would serve as an overflow location.

Chairwoman Quimby closed the Public Hearing.

## DISCUSSION

Commissioner Rinker commented she considered 80 cars per day not low traffic.

Commissioner Transmeier argued that it is low traffic and doesn't see any problem with it.

Commissioner Dunivent stated his concern on a seepage problem and would like to see a Perc Test performed.

Commissioner Transmeier said he assumed the drainage pit would be put in per some engineer's approval.

Chairwoman Quimby commented on neighborhood input in that there weren't concerns or questions.

Chairwoman Quimby then indicated to Staff that she would prefer to not see another final plan come before the Commissioners with so many comments.

Commissioner Rinker asked if the Review Agencies have seen the comments. Bob Goldin indicated they have and they are dated incorrectly -- they were actually received last week. Bob further explained that the original final submittal had included the garage area which originally led to the majority of the comments made and that the removal of that has cleared up most of them.

Mr. Ollinger noted that he realizes there were a lot of comments but feels the important thing is that they have been resolved.

Chairwoman Quimby agreed with Mr. Ollinger's statement but still would prefer to see fewer comments needing resolution in the first place. Chairwoman Quimby further stated that very few people in Grand Junction carpool and you can't speculate or guarantee that people will.

Commissioner O'Dwyer stated there is no on-street parking in that area which causes problems, particularly if everyone drives their own car.

Commissioner Litle commented that using Clubs and Lodges as the basis for determining their parking requirements is illogical. The Commissioners and Staff agreed some corrections need made to the Parking Regulations.

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "I MOVE ON ITEM #44-82, REZONE RMF-64 TO PB, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried by a vote of 5-1 (Commissioner Dunivent opposed).

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "I MOVE ON ITEM #44-82, FINAL PLAN, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL FOR SPECIFIC USES OF THE DANCE STUDIO, SOUND EQUIPMENT INSTALLATION AND REPAIR AND OFFICE SPACE USES ONLY -- ANY CHANGE OF USES WOULD GO THROUGH THE NORMAL PLANNED BUSINESS PROCEDURE."

A second to the motion was not heard.

Chairwoman Quimby asked for a second, which was not received. Chairwoman Quimby then noted that the motion dies for lack of second, and asked for another motion.

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER RINKER) "I MOVE ON FILE #44-82, FINAL PLAN, THAT WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL BASED ON DRAINAGE, PARKING, TRAFFIC FLOW ONTO 12TH STREET PROBLEMS, AND THAT THIS APPEARS TO BE A HIGH TRAFFIC GENERATING USE."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion. Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried by a vote of 5-1 (Commissioner Transmeier voting against).

Commissioner Quimby reminded Mr. Ollinger that he can appeal the decision to the City Council if he wishes.

7. #40-82, TEXT AMENDMENTS TO GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, 1981 ANNUAL UPDATE.

Petitioner: City/County Development Department.

A request to make the following amendments. Copies are available at the City/County Planning Department, 559 White Avenue, Room #60, Grand Junction, CO 81501.

- #9 - Amending Section 7-5-6A of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code regarding minor changes. This amendment is proposed to clarify what minor changes may be authorized by the administrator.
- #10 - Amending Section 5-7-6 H.1 regarding sign measurements. This amendment is proposed to clarify the measurement of different shaped signs.
- #11 - Amendment to Figure 4-3-4 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code to add "(public, church or private)" after "schools" under the general category "community facilities."
- #12 - Amendment to Section 5-7-7B.7b of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code to add the phrase "above grade" after "Maximum Height, 25 Feet," and after "Maximum Height, 40 Feet."

and

Amendment to Section 5-7-7B.8a revising the first sentence of "a" to read as follows:

- a. Height Limitations  
No off-premise sign shall be erected higher than forty feet above grade.

The second sentence of "a." will remain unchanged.

- #13 - Amendment to Section 5-5-2 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code adding paragraph "C" reading as follows:
  - C. Commercial Vehicles parked on street, in residentially zoned areas, shall not exceed 1 1/2 tons carrying capacity.
- #14 - Amending Chapter 13 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code to add a definition of equipment and heavy equipment. This amendment is proposed to clarify the meanings of equipment and heavy equipment.



#15 - Amending Section 2-2-2G. Application Fee Schedule to add item number 12 reading as follows:

12. Recording Fees required by the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder shall be paid by a petitioner at the time or recording. Procedures for this payment shall be established jointly by the department and the Clerk and Recorder.

#2 - Amending Chapter 13 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code to add the definition of density. This amendment is proposed to clarify the appropriate methods of density calculations required.

#16 - This text amendment is to help clarify and standardize requirements for adjacent property owner notification.

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

Bob Goldin noted that copies of the actual amendments are on file.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Connie McDonough cited numerous problems with the proposed text amendments. Most of her comments were concerned with semantics and interpretation problems she felt existed with the amendments as worded. She questioned the motive and necessity on several items and presented suggestions for changes on some of them.

There was lengthy discussion on the items.

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER LITLE) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #40-82, I MAKE A MOTION THAT THESE ITEMS BE TABLED AND A WORKSHOP SCHEDULED TO INDIVIDUALLY LOOK AT EACH ITEM IN JULY."

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion, Chairwoman Quimby repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried with a vote of 6-0.

Commissioner O'Dwyer moved for Adjournment; Commissioner Litle seconded the motion; all Commissioners were in favor, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.