

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION**

Public Hearing

February 22, 1983

7:30 p.m. - 9:45 p.m.

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Ross Transmeier at 7:45 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

Bill O'Dwyer  
Susan Rinker

Jane Quimby  
Miland Dunivent

Dick Litle  
Jack Ott

In attendance, representing the Planning Staff were:

Mary Ann Carlson and Don Warner

Rachelle Daily and Sharon Stavast of Sunshine Business Services were present to record the minutes.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

Chairman Transmeier called the meeting to order and announced that the items voted on at tonight's meeting will be forwarded to City Council for a second public hearing, regardless of whether the items are approved or disapproved.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Transmeier asked for discussion from the Planning Commission on the minutes of the January 24, 1983 meeting.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER QUIMBY) "MR CHAIRMAN, I RECOMMEND THAT THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 24, 1983 GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBIC HEARING BE APPROVED AS SENT TO US."**

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion.

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

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATION, OR VISITORS.** There were none.

### III. FULL HEARING

#### 1. #6-83 RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION

Petitioner: Cedar Terrace Towne Assoc./Mary Anne Hutchins.  
Location: A section of 28.5 Road, North of Picardy Drive, South of Grand Valley Canal. A request to vacate a portion of 28.5 Road.

Consideration of right-of-way vacation.

Chairman Transmeier announced that this item had been pulled from the agenda by the petitioner and would not be heard this evening.

#### 2. #8-83 RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION

Petitioner: Valley Ventures/Richard Schubert/Gary Ulibarri/Larry Mattison.  
Location: Sections East and West of 28 Road from the Grand Valley Canal to approximately 400 feet south of Bookcliff Avenue. A request to vacate a portion of 28 Road.

Consideration of right-of-way vacation.

### PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Katie McIntyre of Paragon Engineering, representing Valley Ventures, provided background information on the vacation petition:

- Mr. Ulibarri (adjacent property owner) has signed the petition.
- When Valley Ventures was first considering purchasing the piece of property (that is now Northstar Subdivision), the Planning Department suggested they consider vacating 28 Road north of Bookcliff, since 28.25 Road was built and improved and 28 Road would never be extended north of the canal. The decision was made to take the east 30' and spread it out along the lots of the Northstar Subdivision in an effort to benefit that subdivision. Since the petitioner decided it wasn't "in anyone's best interest to vacate just half of the right-of-way," they contacted Mr. Ulibarri and received approval to vacate the entire right-of-way.
- No adverse comments have been received from the Review Agencies.
- There has been discussion on the storm sewer (that lies about 5' to the west of the center line). Katie noted that a 20' feet easement will be given for that and the legal descriptions have been submitted for amendment.

## **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Litle asked Katie to explain the location of the canal in relation to the vacated portion. Katie pointed it out on the map.

Commissioner O'Dwyer questioned ownership of the land between the canal right-of-way and the north boundary of the properties. Katie explained that south and north boundaries by using the map as her guide, noting that a "right-by-use" exists rather than a "right-of-way" across the property. Katie further stated that they will be designating what the right-of-way will be.

Katie provided additional history by explaining that a couple of years ago a church had purchased this land and installed an "extremely shallow" drain tile line (about 1' deep). They leveled the area for construction purposes and the dirt was piled up against the canal bank -- they then surcharged the whole canal bank area. The final result was the edge of the canal being moved considerably further south than where it had been. Katie explained that this is the petitioner's reason for setting the edge of the canal right-of-way and the edge of any grading that will occur 10' south of that tile line. She added that it will intercept the seep water.

Katie also noted that she has met with Bob Henderson and Chuck Tilton of the Drainage District and they agreed that was the best way for it to be handled.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Jim Patterson where the drain tile is discharged. Mr. Patterson responded that he wasn't sure. Katie suggested that it drains to Indian Wash.

## **STAFF COMMENTS**

Mary Ann Carlson noted that Planning Staff has not received any objections and that all Review Agency comments have been resolved.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments actually made either in favor or against the proposal. There were several questions raised by citizens as well as the Commissioners:

Jim Patterson responded to Commissioner O'Dwyer's question by stating that it is a storm sewer but he is not sure whether it drains to Indian Wash or not.

Katie commented that there is a sanitary and a storm sewer definitely out there.

Doug Sawtell wondered who would have control of the property so weeds would be taken care of.

Katie commented that everything will be in some sort of ownership, and that the right-of-way belongs to the City.

Don Warner, Planning Staff, noted that the edge of the subdivision will go the drain line and everything north of it will go to the canal.

Commissioner O'Dwyer expressed concern about the possibility of someone coming in with a legal action changing the right-of-way which could result in a new access.

Don Warner stated that what Commissioner O'Dwyer means is a "Quiet Title" which is done on a piece of ground that has no apparent ownership. Don explained that the Canal Company would, without any doubt, object to anyone quieting title to land that is on the slope of their canal. He further noted that the Canal Company will be the owner of it and it will stay that way.

Scott Caulkins asked if the land being vacated is owned by the City and if so, do the developers come by it by simply paying the \$400 fee.

Don Warner agreed confirmed that to be true and stated that:

"it is assumed that it was given in the first place (by them) and therefore we can't sell right-of-way; we have to vacate it with a statement that it is not of use to anybody. It doesn't belong to the City, it belongs to the public and it's vacated under the theory that it is of no use to anybody and they don't allow us to sell it."

Commissioner Quimby stated that, essentially, when the land is vacated and returned to the owners, it then goes back onto the property tax rolls as part of their property. So, in one sense they are receiving an additional 30 feet, but it also increases the size of their lot and their tax liability.

Commissioner Quimby then asked Katie if they have any problem with the curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Katie responded they have no problems.

Chairman Transmeier then closed the public hearing.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN CASE OF FILE #8-83, RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION, VALLEY VENTURES, SECTIONS EAST AND WEST OF 28 ROAD AND WALNUT AVENUE, CONSIDERATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY, I MOVE WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE EASEMENT FOR EXISTING STORM DRAIN."**

Commissioner Bill O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 6-0.

Commissioner Quimby pointed out that, even though it was not discussed tonight, everyone should recognize that there is 5' from the east side of 28 Road that is part of this vacation for this subdivision.

**3. #9-83 NORTHSTAR SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAT**

**Petitioner:** Valley Ventures/Richard Schubert/  
Gary Ulibarri/Larry Mattison.  
**Location:** Northeast corner of 28 Road and Walnut Avenue.  
A request for a preliminary plat of 20 units on 2.7 acres in a residential single-family zone at 8 units per acre.

Consideration of preliminary plat.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Katie McIntyre, Paragon Engineering, presented the preliminary plat by making the following points:

- 20 lots on net acreage of 2.7 acres (subtracting the canal right-of-way from 3.5 acres).
- There is an existing house on the property as well as some very large trees.
- The Petitioner would like to extend a street to "loop" Cindy Ann and Walnut into the Bookcliff and 28 Road area.
- They have proposed a 24' pavement width. They also feel that 2-car garages and 2 parking spaces out front will allow adequate off-street parking. Additional street parking will not be allowed and will be signed as such by the Developer.

## QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Katie whether irrigation water will be available for the lots.

Richard Schubert answered that since they are small lots they feel it would be cheaper for the residents to use "water system water" rather than having to pay for an irrigation system (reflected in the price of the house).

Commissioner Ott asked if there was irrigation water available for that property.

Mr. Schubert stated that they are buying it from a church and they don't know at this time if there is irrigation water available.

Commissioner O'Dwyer commented that although he appreciates Mr. Schubert's position, water treatment costs to the City are becoming increasingly costly and it is the general feeling of the Commission that irrigation water should be provided whenever possible.

Mr. Schubert replied that it would cost approximately \$10,000 for an irrigation system.

Commissioner O'Dwyer asked Mr. Schubert if there is a ditch running along the east side of the property.

Mr. John Phillips (adjacent property owner) answered Commissioner O'Dwyer by indicating that there is a ditch right-of-way on the east side from the canal clear to Orchard Avenue. Mr. Phillips further commented that he has one share and that he is the only one using it now and he is concerned about how he will be affected.

Don Warner stated that the Developer will have to recognize his use because they cannot close off any "historic irrigation water."

Chairman Transmeier asked for the breakdown of the costs for putting in the irrigation system.

Katie McIntyre indicated they have computed the cost to about \$600/lot.

Chairman Transmeier commented on the comparison of that cost to what it costs to treat the water over a long period of time, treatment plant expansion, etc.

Mr. Schubert noted that they are working with four 5000 sq. ft. lots with two-car garages and driveways, which leaves about 2000 sq. ft., part of which will be landscaped in a "western decor" (lava rock, etc.) He was

making the point that very small yards will be left over and they didn't feel an irrigation system would be cost effective.

Chairman Transmeier said he hopes Mr. Schubert understands the City's position in that the cost of the water today as well as the cost of a new water treatment plant in the future are the considerations to be dealt with.

Commissioner Quimby added that it might also be beneficial to the people who will be living in the houses to have an irrigation system, particularly since the cost of water will probably keep increasing.

Mr. Schubert said that, from a marketing standpoint, adding \$600 to the price of a house adds an additional hardship to potential buyers.

Commissioner Quimby commented that it doesn't seem like \$600 is very much compared to the overall price of a house.

Commissioner Ott stated that "water is a resource that once you lose cannot reclaim, and I suggest hang on to what you've got."

Doug Sawtell commented that he sure would like to have the ditch water if these people don't want it for his small lot, as it is getting quite expensive to water his trees and bushes.

Commissioner Quimby suggested the residents get together with the Developer to discuss putting in an irrigation system (as a joint venture).

Doug Sawtell answered he would be interested in listening to such a proposal.

John Phillips discussed how he hand-cleans the ditch, and again expressed concern about keeping his irrigation water and getting to the ditch to clean it.

Mr. Sawtell stated that the church had put in a plastic pipe and ran a 2" line to the west part of their property, and perhaps something like this could be arranged at a minimum of expense.

Commissioner O'Dwyer stressed the increasing costs to the City for treating the water (80 cents/1000 gallons -- which doesn't include delivery and dam maintenance).

Commissioner Quimby supported Commissioner O'Dwyer's comments by adding that the water treatment plant is not

too far from full capacity now and adding additional treatment facilities will create considerable expense to the City.

Mr. Patterson agreed and added that they are not collecting tap fees now, so additional funds would have to come from additional service fees.

Commissioner Quimby told Mr. Schubert that the Planning Commission just adopted policy statements which addresses this subject and encourages new developers to consider alternatives to using treated water for irrigation purposes.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

Don Warner noted that Staff would like the Planning Commission to ask that the irrigation water concerns be discussed and looked into prior to final, with input from the City Engineer.

Mary Ann Carlson added that these are single-family units (zoned RMF-8); the petitioner has responded to the Review Agency Comments, and any outstanding concerns will be incorporated prior to the final plat or provided in the restrictive covenants.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Comments in Favor: None.

Comments Against:

Janus Leonardi, 566 28 Road, objected to the high density for this project and that it will affect the harmonious characteristics and the consistency of the existing subdivisions.

Chairman Transmeier indicated that the petitioner is not asking for a change in the zone density; it is already zoned for 8 units to the acre.

Doug Sawtell, 2608 Walnut, questioned whether the width of the proposed new road into the subdivision would provide enough room for public vehicle access if cars are parking on the street.

Chairman Transmeier indicated the 24' width would physically allow enough room.

Don Warner and Mary Ann Carlson agreed that the City can "live with" the 24' width, if "no parking" is posted on both

sides (indicating no parking is permitted on either side) and if this restriction is enforced.

Chairman Transmeier added that the City Engineer has pointed out that this is a short residential street connecting two other important streets and that there are some "pluses and minuses" to the situation.

Katie McIntyre indicated they had measured cars to get a feel for maximum widths and found it to be 7 1/2'.

Doug Sawtell asked the developer for the price range of the proposed homes.

Richard Schubert stated they would be affordable housing in the \$50,000-\$60,000 range; and that they would be providing a combination of 2-3 bedroom homes with a mixture of ranch, bi-level, and tri-level styles. He estimated an average of 3 people to one home.

Mr. Sawtell further commented on the "bad intersection situation" of 28 Road and Bookcliff and voiced his concern that some homeowners may try to "expand" these homes by converting the garage to additional living space.

Chairman Transmeier asked Mr. Schubert if the covenant could contain a clause that "retains 4 off-street parking units per house."

Mr. Schubert agreed to that.

Don Warner said that such a stipulation could be provided at the time of the Plat which would then be on record so that future building permit requests (for requests to modify garages) would not be allowed.

June Hall asked for the planned square footage of the homes, as she is concerned that the value of her neighboring 1800 sq. ft. home might depreciate by the construction of smaller homes.

Richard responded that they are planning to build a 850 - 1500 sq. ft. homes (figure excludes garage space).

Larry Mattison (one of the developers) added that their definition of "expandable homes" gives the buyer the option of finishing the lower level of the home they choose. Completion of that construction would then make most of the homes close to 1800 sq. ft. He also stated that the homes would be "compatible, expandable, and affordable," and that they "will be offering a variety of floorplans to allow for a unique neighborhood."

Joe Aaeng stated that although he thinks it is a good

idea, he does feel the density is a "tad heavy" and that the developer could help that by reducing the development by one home. He also expressed concern with the traffic situation and the existing farm house that faces south.

Scott Caulkins agreed with Mr. Aaaeng's density complaint, adding that he, too, objects to that many people. He suggested that the proposal could be turned down based on other factors such as: quality of the environment or access to the streets.

#### **PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Katie McIntyre addressed the comments as follows:

1. The house facing to the south is also a big concern of theirs and the problem was created by the design of the street. She said the problem could be solved by adding another home on the south side and rebuilding the entrance of the existing home to orient 28 Road.
2. Density argument. Katie repeated that this is zoned on a net density of RSF-8 and that this is coming in less than that.
3. Traffic circulation. Katie made the comment that this problem may be alleviated by putting the proposed road through as it will provide an "inter-neighborhood connector and should offset the additional traffic."

#### **QUESTION FROM THE COMMISSIONERS**

Commissioner Dunivent expressed concern with "policing" the 4 spaces per lot parking restrictions. He said that he lives in a similar situation and it isn't working there and he doesn't see how the problem can be eliminated.

Chairman Transmeier closed the public hearing.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER O'DWYER) "MR. CHAIRMAN, IN CONSIDERATION OF #9-83, NORTHSTAR SUBDIVISION, PRELIMINARY PLAT, I MOVE WE FORWARD THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONTINGENCIES:**

1. THE USE OF IRRIGATION WATER VS. TREATED WATER BE REVIEWED WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD (TO FIGURE OUT A WAY TO PROVIDE A PRESSURIZED SYSTEM SO THAT EACH LOT WILL HAVE IRRIGATION WATER AVAILABLE TO THEM);

2. THE DEVELOPERS AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD TAKE A SECOND LOOK AT THE STREET AND PARKING SITUATION;

3. THAT A RECOMMENDATION ON THESE ISSUES BE RECEIVED BEFORE FORWARDING TO CITY COUNCIL; AND,

4. THAT ALL CITY REVIEW AGENCY COMMENTS ARE RESOLVED."

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

#### DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Chairman Transmeier asked for clarification of the motion regarding the street width question and whether Commissioner O'Dwyer meant he doesn't like what is proposed.

Commissioner O'Dwyer stated that he doesn't have any recommendations -- he just doesn't think it is good.

Commissioner Dunivent amended his second to the motion by adding "THAT THE STREET NEEDS TO BE WIDENED."

Commissioner Ott recommended a larger street.

Commissioner Litle stated that he is "confused," since the Fire Department and the City Engineer can live with the 24' street width as long as it is signed and enforceable.

Commissioner Quimby added that the Transportation Engineer indicated he could also "live with it."

Commissioner O'Dwyer stated that the question is with the enforcement.

Commissioner Litle countered that "we may be projecting something we haven't come across yet," and that "if some of us aren't satisfied with the width of the street, then we shouldn't recommend approval and I question whether the motion should stand."

Commissioner O'Dwyer stated: "I'd like to see the motion stand, vote on it, and listen to everyone."

Chairman Transmeier asked Commissioner O'Dwyer if he would like to clarify the motion pertaining to the street width by indicating a footage amount.

Commissioner O'Dwyer said no.

Commissioner Dunivent stated again that he thinks it should be wider.

Don Warner clarified that the design shows a 24' mat and 1' of concrete on each side which equals 26' curb to curb.

Chairman Transmeier stated that his intentions are to clarify the motion and not to argue with the different viewpoints.

Commissioner Dunivent added that he is not too worried about the width of the street -- it is the "no parking" restriction that concerns him since he knows it cannot be enforced.

Chairman Transmeier: "The Fire Department can live with parking on a 26' street."

Commissioner Dunivent: "That's right."

Mary Ann Carlson made the following suggestion: "If the question is the use or function of the street, they (the Planning Commission) might include the function in your motion and have the developer, Planning Staff, and the City Engineer try to work out the numbers, so you don't have to come down to actual feet in the motion."

Commissioner O'Dwyer responded: "That's why I want to take a look at it."

Chairman Transmeier: "I'd just feel a lot better if we'd come up with a decision on what we're really trying to say so City Council understands the point we're trying to make."

Chairman Transmeier then repeated the motion, included Commissioner Dunivent's amendment to the second, and called for a vote. The motion carried 6-0.

**4. #10-83 TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE.**

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission and Development Authority.

A request to amend portions of section 4, 5, 7, and 9 of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code. (Copies available at the City/County Development Department, 559 White Avenue, Room #60. 244-1628).

It was decided to take each section at a time for discussion.

SECTION 1. No changes.

SECTION 2. No changes.

SECTION 3. Discussion as follows:

Keith Mumby, representing the North Avenue Merchants Association and Mesa United Bank, commented that he had

not learned of this until 4:45 p.m. tonight and questioned why the "blanket reduction of heights should affect all the areas in town since this plan is primarily a PDD plan for downtown." Mr. Mumby specifically referred to sections B1, B2, B3, C1, and C2 of SECTION 3 (changing structure heights).

Chairman Transmeier answered that the "height by use by right is 105'" (over a 10-story building), which basically means it wouldn't have to go through a planning stage at all if it met the criteria. He added that they are not saying you can't build a unit taller than 36'. They are saying they want to look at it to be sure there is adequate parking, appropriate amenities, etc.

Keith Mumby: "Why are you coattailing a building on 28th and North Avenue on, presumably, a Downtown development ordinance?"

Skip Grkovic, Downtown Development Authority, responded to Mr. Mumby's question with the following comments:

1. It was the initial intent to deal exclusively with the downtown. It was determined later that minor modifications were needed in the Zoning and Development Code to "clean up and clarify a few things." The Planning Commission determined that a citywide reduction in overall height requirements would be advantageous for their review and approval process for major development projects that would impact the city as a whole.
2. The Planning Commission requested this height reduction be included in this proposed ordinance, which is why there is a "joint petitioner" (Planning Commission and the DDA).

Keith then stated: "We don't want to obstruct the Downtown proposal, but we don't like to have the height restriction on North Avenue coattailed onto the Downtown proposal, and on that basis, I would object. I'm not prepared to argue it but I want my objection registered."

Chairman Transmeier agreed with Mr. Mumby in that it "probably is a coattail," and stated that the Planning Commission decided it was a good time to get rid of some of the height regulations that they don't like. He also said that they are not trying to hurt North Avenue; that all the regulations "won't build the building and won't stop anyone from building."

Keith argued that it will stop a building that is currently planned to go higher, as it makes it a nonconforming use.

Don Warner and Planning Commission members explained that "a step is being added that requires a second hearing for expansion purposes."

Keith replied: "We request a chance for a workshop opportunity for the North Avenue Association to be heard. You can pass the whole thing and leave off the height restrictions and we'd have no objections."

Commissioner Quimby commented that Keith's concern is with just "one building" and the Planning Commission is saying that it isn't really going to do anything other than add another step in the process at some point in time.

Keith still objected because the North Avenue Association hasn't been heard and that they (the Association) let the whole thing go by with the understanding that it was a "downtown ordinance," but suddenly it affects all of North Avenue.

Commissioner Quimby stated: "We're really not doing anything to you."

Commissioner O'Dwyer said: "They want a chance to study it."

Keith added: "We want a chance to be heard, but we don't want to obstruct Downtown."

Don Warner then stated: "Keith's suggestion is good; why don't we pull this section and let the North Avenue and other merchants comment on it." Don further suggested they remove SECTION 5-1-6 (#10, 11, and 12) for further study.

Skip Grkovic suggested they delete and set aside SECTION 2-12.

The Planning Commission and Staff members agreed.

SECTION 13. No changes.

SECTION 14.

Commissioner Dunivent asked for further clarification as to how the parking will be provided.

Skip Grkovic provided a lengthy discussion to include the following points:

1. The fact that the Parking Authority Policy provides public off-street parking for main street shopping is on justification for the reduced requirement. In

addition, the 1981 Tax Increment financing district created for downtown will provide for the contribution of property tax revenues to the tax increment program from new developments generating new assessed values.

2. Skip also explained that the Development Authority, the Downtown Association, and City Staff have been investigating ways to include a special assessment or general improvement district downtown to provide additional revenues for parking.

3. He summarized that "in theory there will be a partnership between the private sector and the public sector to provide adequate parking for all of the downtown area." He indicated they will be working with the City Administration to develop a process whereby the parking requirements that remain (for anybody -- whether a use by right or development project going through the PDD process) will be available for "buy off" purposes. (Anybody can buy the spaces from the City and the City will then invest that money in public off-street parking.)

There was additional discussion on the parking space requirements and regulations. Don Warner suggested that they be worked out.

SECTION 15. No discussion.

SECTION 16. 7-1-2: Change "Planned development" to "Planned developments"

SECTION 17. 7-2-6: C.1) Change "D&RW" "D&RG"

7-2-6: C.2) Change "D&WRW RR DEPOT" to "D&RG RAILROAD DEPOT"

SECTION 18.

Keith Mumby asked for a chance to review this section and was specifically concerned with the wording of "ALL PD'S..."

Don Warner also questioned why the last sentence was eliminated.

It was decided to remove this for further consideration at a study session.

SECTION 19. No changes.

- SECTION 20. 7-3-7: Change "density in IN" to "density IN"  
Change "WHICH WILL CONTAIN" to "WHICH CONTAINS"
- SECTION 21. 7-3-8: Change "DEVELOPMENT ZONE AND THAT THERE-  
FORE" to "DEVELOPMENT ZONE, THEREFORE"
- 7-3-9: Change "SHALL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING  
COMPLIANCE" to read "SHALL INCLUDE THE  
FOLLOWING AS SET FORTH IN 7-3-9A THROUGH  
7-3-9E."
- 7-3-9B: Change "THE SUBACREAS" to "THE SUBAREAS"  
and "CAHAPTER 3" to "CHAPTER 3"
- 7-3-9C-4: Change "POLICIES IN CAHPTER III" to  
"POLICIES IN CHAPTER III"
- 7-3-9D: Change "HEIGHT LIMITATION OF 40 FEET" to  
"HEIGHT LIMITATION AS SET BY THE BULK  
REQUIREMENTS"
- 7-3-9E-1: Change "WINDOWS ACROSS THE ENTIRE  
FACADE" to "WINDOWS ACROSS THE FACADE"
- 7-3-9E-5: Change "COMPATIBILE" to "COMPATIBLE"
- SECTION 22. No changes.
- SECTION 23. No changes.
- SECTION 24. No changes.
- SECTION 25. No changes.
- SECTION 26. No changes.

Chairman Transmeier then summarized that a request has been received to pull Sections 2 through 12 and Section 18. He then asked for a motion on Sections 1, Sections 13 through 17, and Sections 19 through 26.

Keith Mumby stated: "If it restricts the desire and wishes of Downtown by the deletion of these Sections and makes the ordinances incoherent, it would be satisfactory to us if they would pass the ordinances in total and restrict their application to the Downtown district. We don't want to delay them."

Chairman Transmeier said that he hopes a meeting for all interested people can be put together as soon as possible. He also noted that it would have been nice if everyone could have

been present for the public hearing, but realizes there wasn't an awful lot of advertisement done.

Skip commented that it would be acceptable to the DDA to process all the proposed text amendments onto City Council, with the exception of the Sections mentioned; or, they would also be willing to wait and process them all together. He also mentioned that the DDA does support a reduction in heights citywide in the interest of good planning and added that they have had several public hearings which have been advertised with display ads.

Commissioner Quimby suggested having the meeting as soon as possible and doing everything at once, unless trying to get everyone together ends up taking 2-3 months.

Don Warner offered to run a display ad and call representatives of different areas to inform them of the scheduled meeting or workshop.

Chairman Transmeier stated that the areas having the most discussion in previous sessions have been pretty "clear cut" except for Section 18, and that the rest of it relates to height restrictions and he considers those separate issues.

Don Warner said he thought a meeting could be put together just as soon as the Planning Commission could schedule one.

Discussion ensued regarding possible meeting dates. (No actual date was established at this time.)

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-83, TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, I MOVE THAT FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL AND RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF SECTION 1, SECTIONS 13 THROUGH 17, AND SECTIONS 19 THROUGH 26 AS CORRECTED AND AMENDED."**

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 6-0.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER LITTLE) "MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #10-83, TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, I MOVE THAT SECTIONS 2 THROUGH 12 AND SECTION 18 BE TABLED FOR 30 DAYS UNTIL THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARING, FOR FURTHER REVIEW."**

Commissioner Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairman Transmeier repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 6-0.

5. **ADJOURNMENT.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.