



## CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

§

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
February 27, 1974

### MINUTES

Members Present: Virginia Flager, acting Chairwoman, Jane Quimby, Eugene McEwen, Blake Chambliss. Also present: Robert Engelke, Rick Cisar

1. Meeting was called to order at 8:10 A.M.
2. Approval of minutes of previous meeting:  
Minutes were approved as mailed.
3. #6-74: Consider petition for the establishment of bicycle lanes in the City of Grand Junction.  
Petitioners: Bruce Bauerle and Steve Madsen

Mr. Bauerle: We have passed around a petition for signatures. We have discussed our plan with Rick Cisar and we will talk to interested businessmen so we can come up with a plan to submit to the City Council. We have picked three streets: Elm Street from 7th-23rd, Houston to North then to 10th to Gunnison to 9th, Gunnison. These are all stop streets, not high traffic streets. Lateral streets to North Avenue to provide access to the swimming pool and shopping centers. We have taken a survey but have not had time to consider the results. The survey asked whether people were willing to give up parking on one side of the street, both sides or not at all. Approximate results; 40% parking on one side, 40% parking on both sides, 20% not at all. Problem on Houston for two blocks because it is very narrow with parking on both sides of the street. The petition has over 2,000 names without our really trying: It considers slowing down traffic - especially on Gunnison & Elm to 25 mph, having striped bike lanes down one side of the street and to help support the project to have a \$2.00 bike fee (now \$1.00) to be collected by the police department. The City will count vehicles as well as cars to help us gain concrete information. If the bike lanes prove safe we hope to incorporate 1st, 3rd, and 7th Streets on out to Orchard Mesa.

Ms. Flager: You do not include the Boys Club near Sherwood or Monterrey Park (Senior Citizens).

Mr. Bauerle: There isn't enough traffic yet to bother with Monterrey Park. The Boys Club was left out but it is located in a high traffic area.

Ms. Flager: Seventh Street gives access to the highschool via a R.O.W.

Mr. Chambliss: It was chosen due to the R.O.W. extension to Elm.

Mr. Warner: The R.O.W. alley is used as an access way.

Mr. Chambliss: Auto traffic: collectors and secondary roads. Primary transportation way for bikes. I am concerned to see if cyclists will modify their routes dependent on bike use. See what appears as the most heavily used. It is a trial for the City. Your homework was well done and much needed - I am delighted by the response of the people.

Mr. Bauerle: The people are willing to give up something.

Audience: I did the survey on Elm. The people are mostly retired and don't like the speed of the traffic and therefore are for the bike lanes.

Mr. Chambliss: According to State Law bikes and cars are governed by the same laws. The Small-Cooley Act regards all vehicular traffic.

Ms. Flager: Gunnison is not a good choice due to heavy traffic.

Mr. Chambliss: The City plans to increase traffic on Grand.

Mr. Madsen: Gunnison Street is not really against it. They are for bikeways but they need a place to park. They don't like bikeways on First Street - East Jr. High. Older people are not vehemently against it. Whether the lanes are on the sidewalks or streets is up to the City.

Ms. Flager: What does Mr. Byrom think?

Mr. Cisar: Mr. Byrom's comments were heard at our 2/17/74 meeting.

Ms. Quimby: The City Council specifically asked that these petitions be circulated with no street names.

Mr. Bauerle: These streets were only suggested and not made specific.

Ms. Quimby: We are unhappy at the way the petitions read but your work is commendable. Why not use the sidewalks to encompass a larger area?

Mr. Madsen: Eventually this could be established if sidewalks are 8-10 feet wide. It would create problems in the residential areas because it would cut into yards. Most accidents occur in mid-block because people are careful at intersections. In Palo Alto, California public became educated after the bike lanes were established. It becomes a real hassle if you put bikes and pedestrians on the sidewalks

Ms. Quimby: I see the problem.

Audience: The sidewalks aren't wide enough.

Ms. Quimby: What if we use one side of the street for pedestrians and the other side for bikes?

Mr. Bessler: Bike routes should first be established in a limited area then incorporate the walks, street and low speeds. We still have to pick the routes.

Mr. Bauerle: We could incorporate bike lanes into the North Avenue beautification program.

Mr. Cisar: The proposed plan calls for detached sidewalks.

Ms. Flager: This is extremely dangerous.

Mr. Bauerle: The sidewalks would be 5 yards off the street.

Ms. Flager: That is not enough access, you need another 10 feet but from where?

Mr. Bauerle: Slow the traffic down on Elm and Gunnison.

Mr. Warner: All Collector streets have a 30 mph speed limit.

Ms. Quimby: Have you met with the concerned departments?

Mr. Bauerle: Yes but we are not through.

Ms. Quimby: Can we use alleys?

Mr. Bauerle: It is best to consider the major routes. Alleys and canals were considered but the City would not want to spend the money to fix them up.

Mr. McEwen: How well has this worked in other cities? We should

study their success and failures. What impact will it have on Grand Junction - we possibly can't relate but will have to find our own way.

Audience: We are studying plans from other cities.

Mr. Chambliss: I make a motion that the Planning Commission actively participate in the planning and evaluate specific ways of handling the traffic. Get the staff, traffic director, police and bike committee together then come to this meeting again in one month.

Ms. Quimby: I second the motion.

Mr. Chambliss: We appreciate your homework. Our reaction is gut feelings. We need a positive indication that bikeways are needed.

Mr. Engelke: I move the commission itself participate on this committee plus two members from the planning board.

Ms. Flager: The energy crisis is real. We need to incorporate senior citizens & Boys Club and the 28th and Belford Housing into the plan. It is a good plan but a long way from City Council enactment. East Jr. High School is also a problem to consider.

Ms. Quimby: This is a trial beginning and not the final plan. We need to start small.

Mr. Bauerle: When school is out we need access to Lincoln Park.

Mr. Chambliss: I second Bob's motion.

Mr. Bessler: I wish to emphasize "we" as all the people of Grand Junction.

4. #51-73: Consider rezoning petition and preliminary Planned Unit Development involving 2.26 plus acres from R-1-C (One Family Residential) to PD-12 Planned Development Residential Zoning (referred back to Planning Commission by the City Council on 2-6-74).

Petitioner: M.E. McCallister representing R.W. & W.F. Loebe

Mr. Cisar: Showed transparencies of the surrounding zoning. To the South and West is R-3, high density zoning and to the East and North and Northwest R-1C, single family zoning. Mr. Cisar explained the density in Wellington Gardens as 6.9 units per acre, the area to the South is 4.3 units per acre, and R-3 allows 174 units per acre providing the parking requirements are met.

Mr. McCallister: Our development would enhance the value of the property as it is now in trash and weeds. It is not desirable for single family development due to the ditch, fill, etc.

Mr. Gardner: I have been asked by my client, Mr. McCallister, to explain the nature of the project. Development intends to have a total of 24 units. It is a PUD Development. A unit is a reasonable measure but what is important is the number of bedrooms. Three buildings have one bedroom, three buildings have two bedrooms or a total of 36 bedrooms. This gives us an estimate of the number of people. On the South- East and West the site is closed from the neighbors to create a park-like environment. Parking is in the peripheral area. We have talked with the people it will have the impact on. Rather than continue a deadend alley we use it to gain access to the parking area but not for parking. We can construct a visual and noise barrier. There will be an impact on certain portions of the neighborhood. We screen the units from each other; the two bedroom units have windows all around, the one bedroom has windows on the front and back only. The total neighborhood has been considered and we are consistent with the existing density. We have less density than existing units.

Mr. Gardner (cont.): We have 53 parking spaces and that is more spaces than Wellington Gardens. This project is responsive to PD zoning. I am passing around pictures of the type of units and fencing proposed.

Mr. Cisar: On our review comment sheet there is a need to relocate the trash recepticals for access.

Mr. Gardner: We have done this and moved it to the southeast alley and on the West end we have roll out dumpster units.

Mr. McEwen: You can't back trash trucks in a residential area.

Mr. Gardner: This is not a normal residential area. When the trash truck appears everything stops plus the fence closes off the hazard.

Mr. Chambliss: This is not true. You have closed the North end only but you have gone to the interior for the hazard. Is it not the most dangerous backing in town?

Mr. Gardner: This is an existing condition, we are not responsible for the alley way that stops in the middle. It is a remote position and you can get in and out either direction - we have offered a turn around.

Mr. Engelke: It is better than the earlier plan.

Mr. Cisar: Grand Valley Irrigation: An official survey needs to be done to determine the North property line so we can determine where the right-of-way begins. Fire Department: R.T. Matlow. We need access to the site, it is hard to serve the units by the alleyway. Also should move the building North.

Mr. Gardner: The property line is not the fence. We have two alternatives; a fire hydrant on the East end and two, we can use a double sidewalk and curb cut to reach the front three units or we can use a North access. We agree that we can provide the access: sidewalks, hydrants, or North access. We met with Mr. Matlow on February 26, 1974.

Mr. Cisar: The initial request was for R-3. Bookcliff is a residential street. At the September meeting our recommendation was based on the potential traffic problem. Wellington Gardens is R-1-C units (6,000 square feet per unit), single family 4.3 units per acre, R-3 ground with the development potential of 174 units per acre. Wellington Gardens traffic is a problem now. PD-12 would allow 27 units per acre whereas PD-8 would allow 16 units per acre.

Mr. Chambliss: In Wellington Gardens how many units of one, two, and three bedrooms?

Mr. Gardner: We are compatible with the area. There are 52 units in Wellington Gardens, it has eight - one bedroom units, twelve - three bedroom units and the balance is in two bedroom units. We are not considering PD anything. We must accept the project as it is not based on zoning.

Ms. Flager: What about the neighbors?

Mr. Dickenson (Cedar Avenue): We view it as both good and bad. 1. Bad: 13th Street as residents, were never contacted. Until we heard it from the Design Center we didn't know anything about it so we started talking to the neighbors.

Mr. Cisar: It is the developers responsibility to contact the property owners. Before the final hearing all will be contacted.

Mr. Gardner: We used the Galley approach on the alley treatment. The easement in the alley was incorporated into the plan.

Mr. Dickenson: Fencing: the aesthetics don't have a whole lot to offer. I discussed the approach with Mr. Paulson and we propose a

planter adjacent to the alley paving. This would be a reasonable visual and sound barrier plus letting in light. This is a vocal objection to building the fence and them having a place to put their trash can. The fence and parking lot depreciates our property. Need a gate on the South side for access. A proposal such as I have described is not objectionable. Bookcliff is a residential street and has a high volume of traffic. R-3 zoning and only street improved with the exception of 13th Street, not collector streets, and three cross streets. East and West creates generalized traffic on 13th street due to existing high density. Albertson-Skaggs traffic using 13th as a collector creates a traffic problem. The point is this is a traffic problem more than a development one. 13th and Orchard is bad at 8:15 A.M., Bookcliff at 8:30 A.M. is okay if there are no parked cars or bad weather conditions. This is probably as good a plan as they could come up with. We should take a hard look at the screening South of the alley and some statement should be made of the traffic problem in the area.

Ms. Fieger: Any more questions or comments?

Mrs. McCabe, 1409 Cedar: Density is high, quiet residential area and it should be maintained as such. (telephone call to Mr. Cisar)

Mr. Cisar: Public notices on rezoning petition, all names and additional property owners should be informed (35 names - 32 notices were sent). We had no addresses on single family residences South of the property or we could send out an additional 150. Traffic in area South mostly single family projected residential. Arterials are 12th and the next one is Patterson.

Mr. Chambliss: This arrangement has all traffic on the South and East neighbors. 13th Street is the main access South to Orchard. 13th Street is not paved.

Mr. Gardner: We are improving 13th, the developer is putting in drainage and a vertical curb. It should be brought into an improvement district. People take the easiest way out. On site use: The alley is deadend - not using ten feet to Cedar. Impact East creates impact on the West we can't do anything on the canal side. Wellington Gardens parking - created a design not actual parking. Alley parking similar to garages. The fence is a noise and site pollution barrier. Impact: PD-12, Pd-8 not important just so many bedrooms.

Mr. Engelke: Where is the fence on the South?

Mr. Gardner: It is their fence on their property.

Mr. Engelke: Is the curbing treatment on their property?

Mr. Gardner: This arrangement is philanthropic on our part.

Mr. Engelke: What type of arrangement with the property owners?

Mr. Gardner: We buy the fence for the property owner. We need a signed agreement from them.

Mr. McEwen: Is there a doubt as to who owns the alley?

Mr. Gardner: Is it an alley? For 21 years nothing was done.

Legal description is meets and bounds.

Mr. McEwen: Parking lot on the East end should face into the property instead of out.

Mr. Gardner: There is a fence. It is acceptable to the people behind the Galley.

Mr. McEwen: You should back out to the fence not in toward the kids.

Mr. Gardner: No difference, 24 feet use is always accessible.

Mr. Chambliss: Access puts maximum impact South and East. Concern

is to take a responsible look at the plan not the density concern both PD-12 too dense, rather we should see an arrangement that protects the neighbors. PD-8 is better for protection.

Mr. Gardner: Small units and the development is modest. Site has certain constraints - canal down six feet to the North, West is GVD District ditch, all area is to the North, and the alley is on the South. Regardless of zoning it is a site consideration. We put the parking where we felt it would be best. Planting along the fence makes a screen. Biggest question is the use of the alley. There is no difference between PD-12, PD-8 still is the same plan. The alley must be parking not 13th Street.

Mr. Chambliss: The alley is used for parking.

Mr. Gardner: We can't get the City to gravel it.

Mr. Dickinson: We have tried. PD-8, PD-12 the impact is on us as a neighborhood. 36 parking spaces will generate more traffic than 13th Street. Going to have to intersect.

Mr. Chambliss: 24 units is a 16 unit difference.

Ms. Flager: We must move along. Any more questions?

Mr. Chambliss: My concern is if PD-12 is necessary? I move that rezoning be granted subject to the owners approval of PD-8 (18) Units zoning.

Ms. Quimby: I second the motion.

Motion approved under the above stipulation.

5. #5-1974, Consider rezoning petition involving .46 acres from  
#10- 1974 R-3 (Multi-family Residential) and C1 (Light Commerce),  
zoning to PDB, Planned Development Business Zoning.  
Consider Preliminary Planned Unit Development for  
the LaCoquille Restaurant involving .46 acres.

Petitioner: James F. and Gertrude Ramsey

Mr. George Graham: Representing the Ramseys. This is a successful operation. We are increasing the seating 80-90 people. We need additional parking. We discussed this with Mr. Cisar to have the parking in the rear. We need to proceed with as much solarity as possible so we can be ready for the summer season.

Ms. Flager: Any objections? Any comments?

Mr. Cisar: I have a response from Mr. Gibson, a property owner. He realized the impact of commercial zoning on Glenwood with the alleyway as access. The alley is gravel. They have tried an improvement district but there was not enough interest. It raises dust. There is an option open to try and setup another improvement district.

Mr. Ramsey: We will pave it.

Mr. Cisar: As far as the plan is concerned: 16' on Glenwood, no curbcuts. 11' of landscaping between the curb and the sidewalk, 5' behind the sidewalk landscaping, he has met the requirements for the request. There are two comments: Mr. Byrom; There is a need to eliminate two parking spaces in front of the building, the side fence is not needed but could be added.

Mr. Ramsey: We would be willing to do something with the alley in conjunction with the City. If we remove the shrubs and put up a fence it would allow two-way traffic (17') and the shrub removal would give us another 3'. We are trying to solve the noise at night, paving would possibly eliminate some of the noise. The curbcut is for dispursement to try to get the traffic through the alley. We plan to enclose the garbage area and to try and stop

the garbage truck from blocking the alley and to do that we would need a curbcut from the city.

Mr. Cisar: We must look at the long range affects of a curbcut. If we have one on Glenwood we could have six and we need to control the access so the impact is not as great.

Mr. Johnson: The alley is not easy to get in and out of now. There would be the same amount of traffic either way, if there is a curbcut please put a gate on it.

Mr. McCallister: (13th and Glenwood) I am in favor of the parking lot if the traffic can be controlled.

Mr. Chambliss: Additional access to Glenwood could turn Glenwood into another commercial strip like North Avenue. The alley was not designed for heavy traffic. Access from North to the parking lot is tough enough and the people would probably not use it to go back to North.

Mr. Engelke: There is a need for more scheduled access to the property on the South.

Mr. Chambliss: Encourage the traffic to go back to North Avenue.

Mr. Ramsey: That is why we want to remove the trees for a 20' alley to encourage straight in and out traffic pattern. The North Avenue traffic makes it hard to reenter North during the rush hours and Glenwood is more accessible.

Mr. Engelke: We need to consider the relationship North and South.

Mr. Ramsey: The main entrance to the restaurant would face the alley. 90% of the traffic would be from the parking lot to the main entrance.

Mr. Van Houten: More parking would only compound the problem.

Mr. Ramsey: The new building and the North Avenue curbcut would ease the problem.

Mr. Chambliss: I move the PUD Plan be approved without the curbcut on Glenwood, with restricted parking on the East side of the building, the two parking spaces in front of the building be removed and with staff recommendations.

Ms. Quimby: I second the motion.

Motion carried.

Mr. Ramsey: Do we go ahead or wait for paving?

Mr. Cisar: Contact Gus Byrom as far as your financial responsibility.

Motion on rezoning request: Mr. Chambliss: I move that the rezoning request be approved subject to the developers participation in an improvement district for the alley. Mr. Van Houten seconded the request

All in favor: all ayes

Motion carried.

6. #9-74: Consider petition to vacate a portion of a street right-of-way located adjacent to the East line of the Bookcliff Heights Subdivision 85 feet North of Bookcliff Avenue, and 215 feet West of Center Avenue.

Petitioner: Lark Washburn

Mr. Chambliss voluntarily removed himself from the Board with possible conflict of interest involved.

Mr. Warner: Extend Center up over the hill to Patterson. It is an isolated R.O.W. and the vacation would give this extra consideration. This would revert back to the property as the deed reads to Perry Olson.

Review comment: Bookcliff needs 25' from the centerline, if the

vacation is approved we need another 5' R.O.W. up to 6th.  
Ms. Flager: This sounds like a fair trade. Why do you need the street. R-1 area is for single family dwellings and this property was given to the hospital as a park so why do we need the access?  
Mr. Chambliss: The Perry Olson property would remain a minimum of ten years to allow for the future development of St. Marys. It won't remain a park for long but we could need the R.O.W. at some point in the future.  
Mr. Van Houten: What is the immediate use of the property?  
Ms. Flager: There is no access to the property without the 5' easement.  
Mr. Warner: The South side is only 5', no R.O.W.  
Ms. Flager: The property West of St. Marys down to Bookcliff.  
Mr. Van Houten: How many feet?  
Mr. Cisar: Approximately 100 feet.  
Mr. Van Houten: We may want future access.  
Mr. McEwen: Who wants the vacation?  
Ms. Flager: It is for convenience only.  
Mr. Warner: The buildings are too far East, they are already on the R.O.W. with a carport.  
Mr. Van Houten: The picture is not clear enough for a decision. I move we take no action until the picture is clear and I move we table the item.  
Mr. McEwen: I second the motion.  
The motion was tabled.

7. #1-74: Consider Final Planned Unit Development for the Fountain Park Apartment Complex involving 1.3 acres plus with PDB, Planned Development Business Zoning.  
Petitioner: Henry Blaylock

This has been before the Board three times and is now the Final Development Plan.

Staff Comment: Relocate the parking, trash containers, additional landscaping in open space on Belford. The trash can be placed in one of the parking spaces and this still leaves adequate parking. The plan has met all requirements for a PUD development. The staff recommends approval.

Ms. Quimby: I recommend approval of the Final Planned Unit Development.  
Mr. Chambliss: Second  
Motion approved.

8. #4-74: Consider Final Plat of the Arbor Village Subdivision involving 13.98 acres (36 lots) with R1C single family residential zoning. (Tabled 1-30-74).  
Developers: Blaine D. and Lee B. Ford

This item was tabled at the last meeting because they did not have R.O.W. title. Cont. Grand Valley Canal location 1) Bookcliff, 2) 50' deed on property owned by the Grand Valley Canal. Changed relocation of Bookcliff away from the Canal. Mr. Henderson and the developer have an appraisal being done on the property and it will be purchased from the ditch company.

Mr. Chambliss: With the company making the purchase there will be no problem on the deed. Easement: tree planting, electrical,



surveyor are minor information.

Ms. Flager: Are there any pros or cons? Comments? It appears the conflicts have been resolved.

Mr. Van Houten: I move that with the title clarification and staff comments considered that the final plat be approved.

Ms. Quimby: Second

Motion carried.

9. #11-74: Consider Final Plat of the D. & W. Subdivision involving approximately 8.0 acres with IL, Light Industrial Zoning.  
Developers: George E. & Bruce E. Dixon  
Wheeler

Dedicated 40' from centerline on 28 1/2 Road. A one tract subdivision may be divided up into 3-4 tracts with access. This is now in order after the dedication on 28 1/2 Road and is in accordance with the subdivision regulations.

Mr. Van Houten: West of the building

Mr. Chambliss: No

Mr. Cisar: Property was annexed a couple of months ago.

Mr. Chambliss: How can they subdivide a subdivision?

Mr. Cisar: According to the subdivision regulations it is permissible.

Mr. Engelke: Before they divided for a subdivision, except for agricultural purposes, it is necessary to subdivide within the existing regulations. To get around this the company proposed it industrial back to 25' lots, so people buy the lots according to need. Instead of specific lots they buy as many lots as they need. The alternative is arbitrary lots but they are still able to split, the question is academic.

Mr. Chambliss: I move we approve the Final Plat.

Ms. Quimby: Second

Motion Carried.

10. #14-74: Consider Final Plat of the Peterson-Irwin Subdivision involving 9 lots with C2, Heavy Commerce, and R-3 Multiple Family Residential Zoning.  
Developers: J.C. Irwin and Vern Anderson

Mr. Cisar: Require that they dedicate 50' from the center of Grand off Lot #6 according to the Small-Cooley Plan.

Mr. Van Houten: R.O.W. all the way across?

Mr. Cisar: We are asking for an additional 20'

Mr. Irwin: I put this into dwellings 20 years ago under the Lloyd George survey. I gave the R.O.W., REA later, the City approved the gutter, and later the City accepted this as residential. I divided off the other tract over 20 years ago. Three years ago the sewage R.O.W. was given. There is no way one is joined into the other I shouldn't have to give another 20' - how many times is the City going to want more? 20' more from me then they should go all the way down Grand and make everyone give their ground. I worked with Don Warner to get the off Grand cul-du-sac. I have always given the R.O.W. This is the only first class industrial, rail service, etc. I don't feel they can come in under a new law. I am the only one on Grand having to give the R.O.W. and I can't see why.

Ms. Flager: All the utilities were put in for the benefit of the users not the City.

Mr. Irwin: The City accepted this as residential and the lots that were there. Why a new subdivision ruling, subdivision and industrial, when were they separated?

Ms. Flager: Separate yet locked into the same subdivision. We put them all together under the new regulations.

Mr. Irwin: From City Mgr. Gritz on down I have worked with them; I put in a street across 18th-19th starting this deal. It was laid out to their approval 25 years ago. I have had a workable deal on the industrial but not on the housing.

Mr. Van Houten: This is a complete subdivision.

Ms. Flager: What about the zoning?

Mr. Chambliss: It is the same zoning within the subdivision.

Ms. Flager: This is a unique situation.

Mr. Irwin: It has just come within the law. I have tried to cooperate in every respect but I do not want to give this land to Grand Avenue.

Mr. Engelke: Mr. Irwin owns the whole Southeast end of the town. The Northeast has been zoned a long time.

Mr. Irwin: The lots, the ditch there, nothing has changed.

Mr. Chambliss: We sympathize by we don't agree. It was 60' now we need 100'. Your property has appreciated due to these improvements. Taxes are not a valid point. Our concern is the growth within, R.O.W. or the City chokes within its own success.

Mr. Irwin: You have to acquire all the property along Grand. There should be equal treatment. This is already set up - Planning Commission set it up - everything uniform. I fought to get a good industrial section. The City wanted to skirt the RR all the way in. DNRG requested them to move all the way from 9th to Clifton. They cut me short on the West end then skirted it out to Clifton. Why are they cutting in? People charge us, I am trying to help.

Mr. Van Houten: How much frontage is involved?

Mr. Irwin: 244' frontage on Grand.

Mr. Cisar: According to the accessors records 14- are together. 1-2-4-6- are all one parcel.

Ms. Flager: Are they all on Grand?

Mr. Irwin: The lots are 112' deep - all uniform. I have given my share but I will not bend over backwards after 20 years.

Ms. Flager: We are sympathetic but not in agreement.

Mr. Irwin: These were accepted once. Separate and apart from the other stuff. Deeded off little lot not to leave out the cul-du-sac, to leave a road freeway from the residential. No more traffic to the North.

Ms. Flager: This is an interesting phenomena.

Mr. Irwin: 20' off makes the lots too small.

Ms. Flager: Is there an alternative? Can we both sacrifice to make them workable? Possibly a compromise?

Mr. Irwin: No prior need.

Ms. Flager: We have improved too.

Mr. Van Houten: Requirements change over 20 years. There has been an increase in traffic since the industrial development.

Mr. Irwin: People wanted to buy these houses, they wanted to keep this residential.

Mr. Chambliss: Are there any houses on Lot 6?

Mr. Irwin: Lot 6 is vacant. Not industrial but R-3 residential. It has got to be houses, it is not zoned for business.

Ms. Flager: What is the zoning problem?

Mr. Cisar: Set back is 100' so he can't use this lot anyway.

Mr. Chambliss: We have no choice, we can not accept this unless we get the footage from Lot 6. We must subdivide according to the regulations or we can't accept the plat. It has never been divided and we have no choice. I move we accept the Final Subdivision Plat subject to the 50' R.O.W. along Grand.

Mr. Van Houten: Second

Mr. Irwin: This is blackmail.

Mr. Van Houten: You must pick up your share of the tab.

Mr. Irwin: I have paid my part. I put the cul-du-sac in for the school and for the community. Telling me I haven't paid my part - I have paid it. I figured it was my turn.

Ms. Flager: We sympathize but we can't agree.

Mr. Irwin: Then I have to give the 20'. When asked for lots what are we?

Ms. Flager: We are pr perty owners and we do what is best for the community.

Mr. Chambliss: We haven't taken the use away, it is not unuseable. Provisions are set so you can still use it.

Mr. Irwin: Taxes have been raised a good deal, and now I am cut so shy I can't use it.

11. #13-74: Consider repealing and re-enacting Chapter 27 "Subdivisions" of the City of Grand Junction to provide for Subdivision and Development Regulations.

Mr. Cisar: The regulations have been derieved from the City Council and Planning Commission worksessions, and all the reviewing agencies. Bob Gerlofs helped look over the regulations. The purpose is to inform the developer when he walks into the office. The existing eight pages of the subdivision regulations' information was misleading and left many questions unanswered.

Minor changes:

1. Page 10. Item 4: Added (section 4.5) after utility agreement. What a utility agreement is.
2. Page 7. Item 4. Added after worksession eliminating problems like Arbor Village. Attorney to be sure that all is in order (liens, certificate of title insurance [separate document]). The attorney can submit an opinion on the plat.

Summary of the regulations.

1. Pre-final plats that are now in effect are subject to the item we have just gone over. Minor subdivision plats will not require a preliminary plat but can go into the final.
2. Irrigation system explained: three types; open-concrete underground gravity, and underground pressure. All utilities are underground.
3. Types of sidewalks explained:
  - a. Arterial streets - detached, 5' separated by 10' of landscaping (minimum requirement for planting a tree)
  - b. Collector Street: 1/2 mile, roads the same as arterials
  - c. Residential: 1) Detached 2) Hollywood curb and gutter 3) ramp intersection: down to the street according to the city engineers specifications, and drainage.

Mr. Gerlofs: Regarding sidewalks and gutters. Residential parking; it is important to step out onto a hard surface. Arterials are not as important. Ramping intersections: done in consideration of

of wheel chairs and bikes. Ramping would cause more cost and problems. There are two types of ramps you must watch out how they are built regarding drainage and traffic control.

Mr. Van Houten: The type of sidewalks are important.

Mr. Gerlofs: The new regulations are workable and understandable in general.

Ms. Flager: Call for a motion.

Mr. Van Houten: In general this is a good approach. I move we approve as presented.

Ms. Flager: Either way the type of sidewalk is important.

Mr. Chambliss: I move we ammend the above motion to read; that it is at the discretion of the planning staff to decide in which residential areas they are to have 5' sidewalks.

Mr. Engelke: The size of the sidewalk is important.

Ms. Quimby: I second the motion.

Motion carried.

12. #12-74: Consider Zoning Text Amendments for the R-3 Multi-Family Zoning District adding as conditional uses:
1. Business Use (4.6) Restaurant business limited
  2. Business Use (4.1) Service business, limited, inside.

This would allow offices indoor residences as a conditional use in a R-3 Zone. It would require that they submit plans.

Mr. Van Houten: How about indoor garages?

Mr. Cisar: No, auto maintenance is covered elsewhere. No retail sales. Offices in the R-3 zone would be like doctors offices. This is the highest density use that would be compatible with the use.

Mr. Chambliss: How about the amount of open space? You could have wall to wall cars. R-3 is not out of residential use. Landscaping, etc. should be required as some percentage of the total lot. It should be taken in reference to the whole zone.

Mr. Cisar: Regarding the set back, etc., change the requirements.

Mr. Chambliss: There should not be any heavy business and the light business should use grass and trees.

Mr. Cisar: Conditional use can be controlled through the setback.

Mr. Chambliss: 173 units per acre is the theoretical use. Put this in at the same time.

Mr. Cisar: A package deal.

Mr. Chambliss: I move we table this amendment.

Ms. Quimby: I second

Tabled.

13. Discussion

A. Beauty Shops in a private home.

B. Zoning text on Orchard Mesa

Mr. Stout: My wife is the Vice President of the board of cosmetology We live at 1337 Orchard behind Albertsons. There is already traffic due to the shopping center. We want a small beauty shop in our garage; one or two chairs. It would be an 8-5 business. Off street parking is provided.

Ms. Flager: Is this building detached?

Mr. Stout: No, it is attached to the house but there is no rear entrance or an entrance into the house. The entrance is on 13th.

They would park on our property.

Mr. Chambliss: This would create a high frequency of traffic.

Mr. Stout: No more than 10-12 people per day.

Mr. Engelke: This provision is not uncommon. Non-occupants could work there. The concern is that just the resident work there not outside workers.

Ms. Flager: The house value of the neighboring property owners might decrease. The neighboring property owners would not like to be next door to a business.

Mr. Stout: I knew it would be tough, but is two or three cars that much?

Ms. Flager: It opens the door to other business'

Mr. Chambliss: Access from 13th would not be a paved access plus being a poor access.

Mr. Stout: The commercial areas in town are pretty ratty. I have looked everywhere.

Mr. Chambliss: How about Main and 7th Street East?

Mr. Stout: We don't want to go into other areas, why are you so conservative regarding this decision. It is economically necessary that we both work. As long as the business is contained and it doesn't create the disturbance of a nursery school.

Mr. Chambliss: It is not that you shouldn't ask but I am suggesting that you will go through a month and a half of trauma to be faced with a no.

Ms. Flager: It creates problems and a devaluation of property. This area is subjected to enough with Albertsons and Skaggs.

Mr. Van Houten: Where do you set the precedent.

Ms. Flager: For 25 years I have been going to a neighborhood beauty shop and it belongs in a commercial area. I have in depth knowledge.

Mr. Stout: You can't find a good three to four bedroom house in a commercial area. My wife has an established clientel.

Mr. Van Houten: You can go ahead and pursue it against adversity.

Mr. Stout: Okay I am willing to do whatever is necessary.

Mr. Cisar: There are two ways: 1. Allow as a conditional use 2. Process a text amendment to allow as a home occupation.

Mr. Stout: How do you go about an amendment for a home occupancy.

Mr. Engelke: We need to talk at length, we can discuss it between now and the work sessions regarding home occupations and conditional use variances.

Ms. Flager: There is no quorum so we can't make any motions.

Mr. Engelke: To make a change in the zoning book text it takes 90-120 days and then for a hearing it will take another 45 days.

Mr. Chambliss: That is almost a six month wait.

Mr. Engelke: I will bring it up as staff.

Mr. Stout: This home occupancy ruling is degrading to hairdressers.

Mr. Engelke: We have had this debate before and it is a unique situation that it excludes hairdressers from home occupations.

Discussion on Orchard Mesa Zoning. Presented by Mr. Engelke. Board's consensus that the zoning be accepted and to advertise it as it was presented.

14. Meeting adjourned.