

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
Public Hearing -- November 1, 1983  
7:30 pm - 10:30 pm

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

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission were:

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

In attendance, representing the Planning Department were:

Don Warner Janet C.-Stephens

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

There were approximately 40 interested citizens present at the beginning of the meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chairperson Rinker called the meeting to order and explained that the items heard tonight will go on to City Council whether they are approved or disapproved, unless the petitioners ask for them to be removed.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

Chairperson Rinker asked the Planning Commission for a discussion on the minutes of the 9/27/83 GJPC Public Hearing.

**MOTION: (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 27, 1983 GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED."**

Commissioner Dunivent seconded the motion.

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

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND/OR VISITORS.**

1. Chairperson Rinker noted that Item #49-83 had been pulled from the agenda.

**III. FULL HEARING.**

**2. #51-83 REZONE RMF-16 TO PB AND COLUMBINE CORNERS -  
FINAL PLAT AND PLAN**

Petitioner: C&F Food Stores, Inc.  
Location: Northwest corner of Orchard Avenue and 28 1/2  
Road (2822 Orchard Avenue).

A request to change from residential multi-family uses at 16 units per acre to planned business uses and a final plat and plan on .55 acre.

- a. Consideration of rezone.
- b. Consideration of final plat and plan.

**PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION**

Connie McDonough, Planning Consultant serving C&F Food Stores, Inc., introduced Carl Phelps and Frank Childs (owners of C&F Food Stores) and presented the request. She provided an in-depth explanation of the proposal for the benefit of the audience and Planning Commission by discussing the following points:

1. ZONE CHANGE.  
The owners elected Planned Business as the appropriate zone because this is and has been in the past a residential neighborhood and it is important that any use going into this neighborhood be responsive and compatible and try to address the neighborhood issues in a positive way. The Planned Development Zone allows petitioners and City decision makers to negotiate what is best for the neighborhood in terms of site, design, and use.
2. PROPOSED PLAN.  
To construct a neighborhood convenience business providing convenient shopping for miscellaneous items and gasoline.
3. SITE.  
Owned by C&F Foods, Inc. and consists of two adjoining separate filings located at the northwest corner of 28 1/4 Road and Orchard Avenue. The rental house that exists on the property will be removed.

4. CONSTRUCTION PLANS.  
Plans for a 2800 sq. ft. structure will be configured, the existing structure will be removed, and upon final approval of this application, construction will begin immediately.
5. BUFFERING AND LANDSCAPING.  
Plans provides for buffering and landscaping on the north; existing trees will be pruned and will remain on the west border.
6. COLUMBINE CORNERS.  
A one-lot subdivision is also included within this application.
7. CITY PLANNING STAFF CONFERENCE.  
Connie noted that a conference with City Planning Staff indicated that this request is not in conflict with the City's adopted plans, policies, or regulations. She added that many of the policies that are adopted are supportive of this request, and generally those policies deal with social and economic factors, environmental resources, general land use, residential and commercial land use, transportation, public facilities, etc. She said that the petitioners are pleased that their request conforms with that many City policies.
8. REVIEW OF CRITERIA USED BY PLANNING COMMISSION TO MEASURE THEIR DECISION REGARDING REZONES TO PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION.

a) Question: "Was the existing zone in at the time of adoption?"

Petitioner's response: "No, at the time the existing zoning was adopted on this property, all property north of North Avenue was zoned and developed as residential. Later, this property was annexed and zoned for multi-family development (16 units/acre). Business and commercial development primarily took place between First and Twelfth Street and North and South Avenues and along highway entrances to the City. The growth of the City has caused business development to go beyond those original borders of the original square mile of the City."

b) Question: "Has there been a change in character in the area?"

Petitioner's response: "Yes, growth and development has expanded as far north as the

airport and necessitated the expansion of public facilities, including expanded roadway development. Zone changes to provide for area and neighborhood business and commercial facilities have been made. Use and development transitions from the original residential development to uses and/or structures more compatible to the changing area or to provide for changing needs have taken place in this neighborhood. Residential zones have been changed to provide for such things as increased density such as the complex to the east of this project."

Connie stated that this area has become very urbanized with the passing of time. She then discussed her exhibit showing the area between 28 Road from North Avenue to Orchard and Orchard to 28 1/4 Road and 28 1/4 Road to Patterson. She pointed out that the exhibit shows that this corridor actually connects the I-70 bypass to the south with F Road and that shows the alignment of that corridor. She added that in recognition that this type of roadway usually affects the desirability of the original single-family residential uses, the City has approved many rezones along this corridor to uses more compatible and more beneficial to the use of the newly-developed roadway.

c) Question: "Is there an area or community need for the proposed rezone?"

Petitioner's response: "Yes. The City's B-2 Zone Neighborhood Convenience Business states that it is appropriate to approve if located 8/10 of a mile from similar uses. In addition, the existing and potential densities in the neighborhood has been significantly increased. This increases the need for neighborhood conveniences."

d) Question: "Is the proposed rezone compatible with the surrounding area or will there be adverse impacts?"

Petitioner's response: "Yes. The proposed plan has been designed to be compatible with the existing residential and park development in the area. The structure is of brick and wood shingles; the structure has a height compatible to single-family houses and less than the

multi-family structures to the east and northeast." Connie also discussed other "compatibility features" such as landscaping, pedestrian access, screening and buffering (6' wood fence and the existing wash that separates the residential development to the south), etc.

e) Question: "Will there be benefits derived by the community or area by granting the proposed rezone?"

Petitioner's response: "Yes, it will provide convenient shopping within walking distance and convenient gas service for the passing vehicle." She added that no adverse impacts are anticipated.

f) Question: "Is the proposal in conformance with policies and requirements?"

Petitioner's response: "Yes, as previously stated."

g) Question: "Are aggregate facilities available to serve the development of the type and scope suggested by the proposed zone?"

Petitioner's response: "All facilities required to support the requested zone and use in this development are available to the site."

9. OWNER'S COMMITMENT.

The owners personally took a look at the neighborhood and did a survey among the residents in the neighborhood immediately adjacent to the site, 1 1/2 blocks in either direction (west, east and south). The survey yielded petitions in support of the rezone with 78 signatures (67 in favor, 6 against, 3 no comment).

10. LIMITATION OF USES.

Project uses will be limited to providing convenience items and gasoline. Paved parking and circulation area will be provided, as will concrete walkways, bike rack, landscaping, screen fencing, site lighting, business and directional signing.

11. FUNCTION OF THE PROJECT.

Project will be kept free of debris. Convenient business hours (24 hours/day). The south curb cut will be ingress/egress; the east curb cut will be no left turn egress.

12. PARKING.  
The required customer plus one required parking space will be provided.
13. DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE.  
Upon approval of this application, construction documents will be prepared and construction will begin within 60 days, weather permitting.
14. RESPONSE TO REVIEW COMMENTS.
  - a) County Planning's suggested a more appropriate location (1/4 mile north of this proposed site). The Petitioner referenced the July 1982 County Commissioner's Resolution of approval of this site which states "that the application be approved providing all roads within the subdivision or on its perimeter be constructed in accordance with the plan on the subdivision and be completed within 12 months; or the tracts may be rezoned back to RF2 or PR16 after a hearing before the Board of Commissioners." According to the County Planning Staff this item is scheduled for reconsideration by the County and neither the preliminary or final development plans have been submitted for the County's consideration; consequently, no construction has commenced or is committed at this point in time for that site. Other convenience store companies as well as C&F Food Stores have toured this site more than a year ago and determined it to be an unsatisfactory location for a neighborhood convenience outlet. The site being considered in this application has many positive features: 4-way intersection; newly reconstructed raised medians and full signalization for highest level of safety conditions; 4-way pedestrian crosswalks exist; signalization exists at the intersection (F Road has no signalization); substantial residential development for high and medium densities exist to be serviced from this location.
  - b) Fire Department's concern regarding the petitioner's plans for submitting the required fire flow will be complied with. The petitioner will install fire hydrant on Orchard Avenue on their side of the road.
  - c) City Park's request for landscaping will be complied with.

d) City Planning Staff's comments.

The petitioner is requesting City Engineering Department and the Planning Department to designate 28 1/4 Road alignment as a minor arterial and the completion of the construction of this roadway from North Avenue north to 28 1/4 Road to the intersection of 28 1/4 and Patterson Road constituted the first major encroachment on this residential area. The petitioner feels that future policies concerning the development of this Corridor as well as Orchard Avenue will recognize the changes to this area.

The petitioner also feels that approval of this application need not set a precedent for zoning decisions on property north along 28 1/4 Road or west along Orchard Avenue.

The petitioner feels that the recent reconstruction of the intersection will provide the safest conditions for vehiculars and pedestrians.

There will be no liquor sales on this outlet. A 3.2 beer license may be requested should this application be approved.

The petitions signed in support of the application would indicate the residents themselves recognize a need. In addition, there have been no closures of neighborhood convenience outlets in this community in the past two years even during a negative economy which indicates the owners of these outlets are successfully anticipating the needs of these neighborhoods. Connie corrected her statement that "there are no existing or committed neighborhood conveniences within 8/10 of a mile of this site," as there is one at 28 1/2 Road and North Avenue on the south side of North Avenue (which is a divided median highway.)

The recommendation by the Transportation Engineer for the 28 1/4 Road curb cut is accepted by the petitioner. The store will service the park but it will not become a destination point. The store owners will not provide video games or things of that nature and they will not permit the store to become a "hangout."

Signage will comply with City Sign Regulations.

Sidewalks do exist on both sides of this site (both sides of 28 1/4 Road north and on the north side of Orchard Avenue running east and on both sides of Orchard Avenue running west)

Hours of operation (24 hours a day) comply with the requirements for a Planned Business zone rather than a B-2 zone. The purpose of the 24-hour service is to provide emergency nighttime services (carbonated drinks, aspirin for high fever).

Lighting is low intensity, directional only and confined to the site.

Parking and circulation area is as safe as any parking and circulation area can be with the number of spaces.

If trash pickup cannot be coordinated with a private carrier, the petitioner will work it out with the City Sanitation Department, and the easements required for service will be dedicated.

15. PETITIONERS IN OPPOSITION.

The petitioners who signed the opposing petition protested "the establishment of the C&F Food Store because it will cause tremendous congestion on Orchard Avenue, it will create hazards to children and residents in the area and we do not need another convenience store in the area as our needs are already well satisfied with the present store." Connie made the following observation regarding this petition: The petition has 120 signatures representing 91 households; 10 of the households have Orchard Avenue addresses; the petitioner's support petition has 51 households with Orchard Avenue addresses; 4 households signed both petitions; 1 signature with an address on 29 1/4 Road, north of F Road and 1 signature from Spring Valley, and 1 signature from Fruita. She further noted that 98.7% of the signatures lie to the west of the requested site; 1 signature located to the east; 1 signature located at 29 1/4 Road.

16. PETITIONER'S OBSERVATION.

Connie noted that even though there is one convenience store outlet within 8/10 of a mile of this proposed site, the design is that this

area may not be serviced by that outlet because it is located on the south side of a major east-west highway (North Avenue) and getting to that site from this neighborhood is not direct. She suggested that this existing facility probably services the east-west travelers going and coming rather than the residential neighborhood to the north.

Connie also made the observation that most of this neighborhood probably moves westerly to their jobs, shopping, schools, etc., and will pick up their convenience items during that tour. The neighborhood east of this facility will be moving westward to the city and are not opposed to this petition. The bulk of the area of those people signing this petition will not use this facility because they will use the one at 12th and Orchard or the one on the south side of North Avenue.

The owners of the C&F Food Stores are local and they care very much about their own community, service, and location and they pay attention in their other facilities to their customers and they feel that approximately 60-75% of their customers are stopping on their way to somewhere else (versus destination customers). Approximately 15-20% of their customers are destination customers; the balance of the percentage are walk-ins. It is the owner's perspective that this facility will not increase traffic volume on Orchard Avenue.

Connie concluded her presentation by stating that she understands and supports the concerns of the neighborhood and this statement is based on her history of involvement in these issues through her previous experience with the Planning Commission, Engineering Department, City Staff, and from attending Public Hearings for over 12 years. She indicated that most of the opposing petitioners' signatures do not live on Orchard Avenue but they use it and they recognize these problems; however, the petitioner purports that these are "separate issues:" the traffic condition of Orchard Avenue is one issue; the land use changes will occur because of changes in the neighborhood. Connie requested that everyone try to keep those issues separate as the public expresses their concerns.

## QUESTIONS

Commissioner Litle questioned the 24-hour operation, and asked if this is "truly to support the needs of the neighborhood."

Connie replied: The 24-hour operation is provided to serve the emergency needs of the neighborhood (high fever, calls to leave town late at night and needing gasoline, etc.)

Commissioner Litle asked whether the other C&F Food Store operations were located on major arterials (9th & Pitkin, for example, which is in a little different geographical location.

Frank Childs replied: "The best comparison to that would be the one on 32 Road (closest to the Colorado River) and it is very much a neighborhood type of store even though it is located on the highway. It does get a lot of neighborhood traffic in there between the hours of midnight of 6:00 am. It's a much more neighborhood type of store than the one on 9th & Pitkin which does service primarily major traffic and workers in that area."

Connie McDonough respectfully requested a favorable decision on this matter from the Planning Commission.

## PLANNING STAFF PRESENTATION

Janet Stephens, reviewed the following Planning Staff concerns:

1. No corridor policy exists for 28 1/4 Road and this may set a precedent.
2. Encroachment into the neighborhood.
3. Pedestrian and vehicular safety.
4. 3.2 Beer License will probably be requested (since C&F has historically done so for other stores), but this is something the Planning Commission will not review.
5. There was an approval given in 1981 by the County of an ODP which changed an R-2 to a PR-16 and R-2 to Planned Business and a convenience store was designated in this proposal. There were no neighborhood objections on file; there were 6 notices sent out.

6. The 24-hour/day operation is also a concern even though a B-2 zone requires that all business uses cease operation by 11:00 pm.
7. Neighborhood objections -- 120 signatures.

#### QUESTIONS

Commissioner Transmeier: "Janet, you said that the B-2 Zone requires 11:00 (closing time), but they are not requesting a B-2 Zone, they are requesting Planned Development which allows 24-hour/day operation.

Janet Stephens agreed.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

##### IN FAVOR:

Larry Winger, 557 Court Road, stated he is in support of the convenience store and he feels it would be nice to be able to walk to the store. He also stated that he doesn't see a problem with the traffic and doubts that C&F should be responsible for the traffic on 28 Road and Orchard Avenue. He agrees that is a problem, but doesn't feel it is the petitioner's problem.

##### AGAINST:

Paul Hage, 2821 Hall Avenue, presented copies of a three-page letter to the Planning Commission which summarize his concerns. He also provided the Planning Commission with copies of a petition with 50 signatures of neighboring residents (residing along 28 and 28 1/4 Road) who are opposed to the proposal. Mr. Hage discussed the concerns as outlined in his letter:

- (1) Precedent. He does not want Orchard Avenue to become a "commercialized strip."
- (2) Need. He feels the neighborhood is more than adequately serviced by Eastgate Shopping Center (5/10 of a mile away), the Site Station (6/10 of a mile away) which also has a convenience store, and the 24-hour 7-11 Store (within 3/4 of a mile). He feels the proposed rezone fails to meet the guideline of distance from similar uses.
- (3) Safety. Rezoning should be denied in the interest of public safety; specifically the safety of children living across 28 1/4 Road in the Grand Manor development.

- (4) Traffic. Rezoning should be denied to preserve good traffic movement. Mr. Hage doesn't feel the "proposed driveways will meet the requirements of good traffic design theory" any more than the intersection of 28th and Orchard does.
- (5) Existing Zoning. The rezoning proposed should be denied because it duplicates zoning already existing in close proximity (at 28 1/4 Road and F Road).
- (6) Impact on Columbine Park. If a 3.2 beer license were approved in the future for the convenience store, Mr. Hage feels that would increase incidents of over indulgence and litter at the park.

Gilbert Kelly, 2824 Hall Avenue -- closest neighbor to the site, voiced objection to the proposed rezone for the following reasons:

- (1) Safety of jaywalking children.
- (2) Noise factors (early morning deliveries, doors slamming, tires squealing, loud radios, etc.)
- (3) Increased trash.
- (4) "Grand Manor tenants should have no say because they are here today and gone tomorrow."
- (5) Liquor license later - definitely against.
- (6) Danger of robberies.
- (7) Video games will come later.
- (8) Hazards (cars pulling out of the store, etc.).

Robert Cohen, 2884 Orchard Avenue, spoke to Connie McDonough's comment that most of the customers will be heading west. Since a convenience store is located at 27 Road and F Road and one at 29 1/4 Road and F Road, why would residents of the development in that area come all the way down to 28 1/4 Road when they have the other two? Mr. Cohen also stated that the only "good entrance" on the proposal is on the west; the cars traveling west will require them to cut across in front of other vehicles.

Lorraine Boschi, 28th & Orchard, stated she circulated the petition whereby the opposing signatures were obtained. She noted that she was not contacted by the C&F Food Stores when they circulated their petition and obtained 69 signatures from people living on Orchard Avenue. She said that the people who signed her petition are greatly concerned with the Orchard Avenue access problem. She also expressed concern with the 24-hour/day operation schedule and safety for the children in the neighborhood.

Joan Razor, 3343 Northridge Drive, a previous 10-year resident of Orchard Avenue and a member of the "Orchard Avenue Beautification Association." Joan provided background information on Orchard Avenue pertaining to the fact that the neighborhood had been concerned with encroachment of traffic and four-laning of Orchard for over 18 years. She indicated that during this period of time, residents were more concerned with fighting the issue than taking care of their homes. When the problem was solved (the decision was not to four-lane Orchard Avenue), the last thing they (the City) did was to four-lane 28 Road into Orchard Avenue. This decision did not make any sense to the residents, who were also exhausted from fighting the whole street. The residents "couldn't get any answers" as to why this was going to be done -- they just said "we are going to do that," and that was final. And now "we have this horrendous intersection." Joan concluded that she is for preserving residences (single-family dwellings) against the encroachment of traffic, and if one commercial development goes in on Orchard Avenue, that will be the excuse for more to come in. "Orchard Avenue all the traffic it can bear right now. Commercial development on Orchard Avenue must be denied."

Herb Foster, 560 Court Road, expressed his concern for the safety of children and the increase in traffic on Orchard Avenue, particularly in lieu of the fact that most of their customers will be traveling from the east and will have to cross the artery.

Karen Alio, 2828 Walnut, lives east of the proposed building, and commented that in the seven years that she has lived there she has yet to have to go down late at night for any dire, necessary thing. She feels the existing businesses in the area more than satisfy the needs of the neighborhood. (Safeway, Gibsons, McDonalds, Dunkin' Donuts, etc.)

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

Connie McDonough addressed the comments as follows:

- (1) Corridor Policy (Planning Staff concern). Connie stated that she feels confident that a Corridor Policy will be established in time for Orchard Avenue (west of 28 Road) and one for east of 28 1/4 Road.
- (2) Encroachment (Planning Staff concern). Connie maintains that designation of that Corridor was the encroachment. Change will happen -- the demolition of the house as a rental at this time.

- (3) Safety concerning Children (Planning Staff concern). Connie shares the concern for children, but noted that there are children in similar situations in the city that have had to learn new rules. She doesn't feel that this decision will add to those concerns, since it is already one now.
- (4) Ingress/Egress (Planning Staff concern). This property will have an ingress and egress and it has been designed as safe as possible.
- (5) 3.2 Liquor License (Planning Staff concern). The City determined that there was no need for the Planning Commission to review 3.2 liquor licenses.
- (6) 24-Hour Operation (Planning Staff concern). Many people work irregular hours and they need to be served.
- (7) Neighborhood Petition (Planning Staff concern). The basic concern is traffic on Orchard Avenue and we still maintain that our facility will not increase traffic. This comment is based on experience with 7 existing stores and customer surveys.
- (8) Clean Site (Public Comment). The owners are not "here today and gone tomorrow." They have been here for many years, they take care of their facilities and they take pride in them and are personally involved.
- (9) Customer Travel (Public Comments). The people closest to the facilities this gentleman described will not come to us; the people living south of F Road, north of North Avenue who are either west or eastbound between 1st Street and Clifton will use our facility.
- (10) Traffic Volumes (Public Comments). The volumes concerning the neighborhood are there now and there will be more. This is a very urbanized area. The traffic currently lined up at 28 Road are going home; those are the customers going by in the morning.
- (11) History of Orchard Avenue (Public Comment). The City has not made the determination yet on what they are going to do with it.
- (12) Land Use Changes (Public Comment). The coming land use changes will be significant.
- (12) Mr. Hage's letter. In response to Mr. Hage's letter, Connie addressed the items as follows: Precedent factor: The City has always been very consistent with their decisions (unlike the County) and recognize that planned development has its appropriate place and does not necessarily constitute a precedent. Zone Request: The zone requested is consistent with all other C&F Food Stores. Children Attraction (from Grand Manor): Children are attracted by a lot of things, not just gum and candy (stray dog, etc.) and she doesn't believe that the store would necessarily increase that possibility. Right-Turn yielding to 28 1/4 Road to Orchard: All intersections in Grand Junction have a right-turn and most of the highly-developed center lines intersections have a yield lane and it is the

driver's responsibility to consider pedestrian traffic. C&F Food Store Owners are not developers; they are not interested in developing the site at F Road and 28 Road; they have already testified that they, along with other convenience store outlets in this City, have determined that to be an unsuitable site for a convenience outlet. It may well be a neighborhood service center, but that service center will not have a convenience outlet. There is no neighborhood development at this time at F Road and 28 Road and until that neighborhood builds up there probably will not see development of that zone. Petitions Signed: The residents who live closest to this facility are our primary concern as they probably have the most valid opinions.

Connie concluded that the petitioners feel their petition is a needed, appropriate and compatible use and that it will not generate the concerns expressed here this evening, although we do not deny that those concerns do exist, but they are generated and caused by matters other than land-use on the north side of Orchard Avenue. Connie respectfully requested approval of the application.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

Mr. Kelly apologized for not being an eloquent speaker, and expressed his hope that the Planning Commission heard what he had to say.

Chairperson Rinker closed the public hearing and requested a motion.

**MOTION:** (COMMISSIONER TRANSMEIER) "ON ITEM #51-83, REZONE RMF-16 TO PLANNED BUSINESS AT COLUMBINE CORNERS, I RECOMMEND WE SEND THIS TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL, BASED ON THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. SETTING A PRECEDENT ON ORCHARD AVENUE;
2. THE NEED OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS IN QUESTION BECAUSE OF EXISTING STORES ON NORTH AVENUE AND PATTERSON AVENUE;
3. EXISTING ZONING IS THERE FOR A PURPOSE AND I THINK A BETTER USE FOR THE PROPERTY WOULD BE A HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AREA;
4. ADVERSE IMPACT ON COLUMBINE PARK RELATING TO A FUTURE LIQUOR LICENSE REQUEST BEING GRANTED;
5. 24-HOUR USE OF THE STORE BEING AN IMPROPER IMPACT ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD, SINCE ORCHARD AVENUE IS NOT A MAJOR ARTERIAL (MAJOR TRAFFIC PATTERN)

Commissioner O'Dwyer seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS ON THE MOTION:**

Commissioner Litle: "The City has been faced with a problem with traffic on Orchard; however the City is very much involved with upgrading and four-laning F Road, which we feel in time will pull some of that traffic off of Orchard, so we haven't forgotten the traffic problem there -- the City/County is very much involved in Orchard's traffic problems.

Commissioner Dunivent: "I wanted to make a similar comment regarding the traffic. I don't think C&F Food Stores is going to change the traffic pattern on one car, one way or the other either on 28 1/4 Road or Orchard. And, as far as the 3.2 beer license, I don't think C&F is going to change the amount of beer used in Columbine Park; you can go out there anytime and find all the beer you want. So, I don't think those were legitimate arguments."

Chairperson Rinker repeated the motion, called for a vote, and the motion carried 5-1. (Commissioner Dunivent voting against)