

DISCUSSIONS AT THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

at the City Hall

Connie McDonough I would like to read to you the complete review sheet from Jim Patterson of the City Sewer Disposing and he is here now. If the developer constructs the sewage collection system that will carry the sewage to the existing city system, the city can accept for treatment sanitary waste from the initial 700 acre development. However, this sewage, along with the sewage from the newly annexed Orchard Mesa area, will bring the plant load to 77% of capacity. Sanitary sewage from this entire development along with other anticipated growth would bring the plant load up to 96% of capacity.

Virginia Flager Would that include Horizon Drive?

Connie McDonough That's a question for Mr. Patterson, I don't know what he was incorporating in this.

Jim Patterson That does not include anything else just Orchard Mesa and the Redlands is really one of our concerns what is going to happen in the north part of town. We do have a contract to take sewage from Fruitvale, which is in the eastern part of town and all of this area can be developed a lot more than it is now, too. So this is something that we want to look at; do we want to go to the Redlands and take up to 96% of the capacity of our plant. There is something else that we should not completely ignore and that is the possibility of a regional plant for the Redlands area to be operated and maintained by the city, rather than taking it into our existing plant.

Mr. Van Houten I have a question. Who is going to end up paying for that.

Jim Patterson That's a good question.

Blake Chambliss I can't answer your question and I would suggest that no answer does exist, anyway, and I would like to suggest that the magnitude of this is such that we're not going to be able to cover it probably by noon. I would like to suggest that we set up a special meeting and review this one and at least one other meeting devoted to the Redlands as we have direct \_\_\_\_\_ city. And at that meeting we have some people there who are expert; who can deal in some of the areas of the proposal, which they apparently cannot figure at all, and that is the whole problem of financing. With some experts who are not of their choosing. The problem of the suggestion of a home owners association, it seems to me incredibly naive when you are talking about an essentially new town. I think we need somebody that is prepared to talk about the legalities of a quasi municipality or a new municipality or the

attachment of that municipality to the City of Grand Junction. I think we ought to have some people from Ute water; I think we ought to have some people - the city ought to be able to come and talk to us in more detail about what the impact of the sewer are with relation to the other developments that are occurring. I think we need more information on development schedules; we need information from the school in terms of school sites and adequacy in that regard.

They have talked about a mixed single family and multi-family units. I am curious if they are at all concerned about the economic or any other kind of mixes in a basically new community. I am curious about whether they have done any review into the necessary social services -- social services being provided for a basically new town. I am curious about the edges and what is happening there. The second thing; another group that I think ought to be involved in such a study or in such a review, (we've got a tremendous amount of new subdivisions being provided -- the City Manager has been quoted as saying that the City of Grand Junction could be on the order of 100,000 people in the next five years). I think we need some people who are capable of coming and talking to us in realistic terms about what, in fact, is going to be happening to us. I would suggest that some of the people who should be invited to such a discussion certainly ought to be the oil companies who are planning development of new towns and have gone into considerable study into the economic impact facts and see how that relates with what is going to happen here. I just think that there are a fantastic number of questions that we have no way of getting at this point and I think it is inappropriate to even try to address them until we can get them altogether.

Mr. Van Houten It appears to me that this development, if it were to proceed according to the suggested plan here, is going to have a tremendous fiscal impact on the City of Grand Junction; probably beyond its capabilities at present to even absorb it.

Blake Chambliss I am curious that the County Commissioners have any understanding of what the dimensions of it are.

Virginia Flager I doubt it.

Blake Chambliss I don't think that anybody, quite frankly, has any idea what the dimensions of this impact is and I think that before anything happens that we ought to start pulling some of those people together.

Robert Engleke Off the cuff serious comment \_\_\_\_\_

Blake Chambliss I was listening to Connie and these are some comments that we had.

Robert Engleke Just thinking on this, there's a series, you have a copy of the state corrections there, regardless of state statutes there is a pretty logical form for discussing these items scheduled almost monthly, or on a semimonthly basis.

Virginia Flager Are you referring to the Regional Planning Commission?

Robert Engleke The Regional Planning Commission which has a meeting scheduled on the second of April at 8:00. It is also on my notes to mention to you. This might be the time for some of the discussion we talked about.

Blake Chambliss Perhaps some of it Bob. It seems to me that this one specifically and the other one there on top deserve, not an evening meeting, but a full weekend seminar.

Robert Engleke Perhaps. You are talking about setting up a meeting in time for a schedule and this indicates a procedure that normally goes to the Commissioners the 19th \_\_\_\_\_

Connie McDonough It is going to the Commissioners on the 19th.

Virginia Flager This has been before the County Planning Commission. This is for information only. The County Planning Commission has allowed this to get to the Commissioners without these questions being answered.

Robert Engleke At this point this is planned development now.

Connie McDonough This is a zoning question.

Robert Engleke This is a zoning question and a sketch plan fazed.

Virginia Flager This is my question. How can you get to the point that it's going to the Commissioners on the 19th for even a look see.

Connie McDonough The County Planning Commission reviewed it and made the recommendation to the Commissioners and it has been advertised for the commissioners for the 19th.

Robert Engleke I am suggesting that planning get this other review (sentente not completed)

Virginia Flager Are you going to try to get this on the agenda then for the Regional Planning?

Robert Engleke It was on there.

Virginia Flager I mean again, are you going to get that back on?

Robert Engleke That would be one suggestion, you know getting things started-there is no way to stop them now. That's only 5 days off, Tuesday night, so it seems to fit the purpose.

Connie McDonough The other large development out there has gone before the Commission and was tabled and is understandably delayed. The 921 Acres.

Blake Chambliss My concern here is that all the other ones that are in the works, and there are substantial number of others in the works at this point, that have various stages of completion. I think that somebody needs to look very hard at what are the questions, in fact, that we would really be asking, if nothing else. The question it says here. Damn it, we've got to start asking the questions before having to deal with who is paying for it, and so forth.

Van Houten We are not, at this point even qualified to ask the questions.

Robert Engleke This is not a disagreement here.

Unidentified conversation (I think it is not necessary)

Blake Chambliss There a number of people who are qualified to talk about this. They're planning a new town south of Grand Valley and are preparing a good deal of information for this. I have talked to some of their people and they would be glad to come in and give us some advice and start showing us what is going to impart and start helping us to direct proper questions to the proper people at the proper time. My suggestion is, that I think that we need to proceed as quickly as possible to set up leaders and I recognize that Tuesday night we may or may not be able to get them. We may or may not be able to get it to the Regional Planning Commission. If there is not time to get to the Planning Commission it would be fairly appropriate for this committee to initiate setting up of such a thing. So I am suggesting, at this point that this body take the leadership and making sure that such a discussion is held with the County Commissioners, with the City Council and all the others concerned.

Robert Engleke I understand there is a quorum here. .

Blake Chambliss There is a quorum here and we can make the recommendation here.

Robert Engleke You need a quorum of the Regional Planning Commission right here you changed the quorum, remember, it's 6.

Virginia Flager I think that a quorum is three from the county and three from the city just of members of the board, not the . . . . Blake are you making that a form of a motion that we initiate the action of getting these people together and form a weekend seminar?

Blake Chambliss I would make a motion that this be referred to the Regional for immediate action and action be taken whether the Regional does anything or not.

Robert Engleke For those of you who were at the last meeting, this is between the two projects out there, Morris is getting this running out of his ears so there is the possibility that is equivalent to the community of Loveland.

Virginia Flager And this actually on the basis of those two major tracts being built, the houses being built and people living there, that is the equivalent to the city of Loveland.

Robert Engleke In round figures, or, if you want to put it in other terms, 4 Craigs, or 4 Glenwood Springs or 1 6/10 Durango's

Blake Chambliss Or another perspective, Grand Junction about 15 years ago.

Robert Engleke Or less. Or if you want to put it in perspective that gets you close. Or you can take three times Grand Junction 15 years ago.

Unidentified That's what you've got to look at.

Robert Engleke It's hard to say.

Unidentified It's 150,000 and that's too big and too much people.

Robert Engleke To be concerned about this, that in itself, I think is short sighted because we are looking at here a proposal that would hopefully be fazed as such. And we are fazing now and we have this stuff that would include several things. We have 700 units to enact the same night. Which is a quibbling sort of thing, I suppose, except that 2001 is a fazing of sorts with 100 or so units.

Connie McDonough Fruitwood, not 2001.

Robert Engleke

The College Farm is another form of fazing with how many units there.

Connie McDonough 80.

Robert Engleke The point I am making is that for the reviewing and setting up of this kind of a project are pretty big steps. Everytime we approve a subdivision we record the acreage. The opportunity of doing an adequate job with this kind of a proposal is much better taking out a parcel of this size and really looking at it's impact and it's a lot easier to identify the problems here than probably when you are dealing with 8 or 10 smaller ones. So this, I think, is a tremendous advantage when you are dealing with this kind of a parcel rather than the 20 subordinates, those things are very deceptive where this is not deceptive; A community this size. It turns out, at least, that it is bigger than \_\_\_\_\_ . That is something in that \_\_\_\_\_ where it is hard to keep track of small concentrations of a couple of hundred units.

Van Houten About two weeks ago on a development out on the corner of 12th and Patterson over which we had quite a hassle, and still are, over 10 foot of right of way and yet he had no compunction to ask the city to provide 2 million dollars worth of sewer plant to serve his development. (The reference is to Warren E. Gardner)

Virginia Flager Very interesting point. Do you want to do anything this week at all or do you want to try--we do have another thing involved if you wanted to review it.

Connie McDonough Do we have a quorum?

General discussion about agenda - bike paths.

Blake Chambliss Do we have a motion that this is to be directed to the Regional?

Secretary We have a motion that this be referred to the Regional Committee for immediate action of the Regional.

Van Houten I'll second that.

The vote was held and the motion passed.

Virginia Flager This has been referred to the regional and I think that the further motion was that if the Regional doesn't do anything we will take the initiative in setting up \_\_\_\_\_.

Van Houten That was understood.

City of Grand Junction Planning Commission  
March 27, 1974

Members Present: Jane Quimby, Robert Van Houten, Jerry Wilds,  
Blake Chambliss, Gene McEwen, Virginia Flager  
(acting Chairwoman).

1. Meeting called to order at 8:05 A.M.  
Agenda corrections made.  
Minutes from previous meeting approved by Jerry Wilds, seconded  
by Jane Quimby.
2. Orchard Mesa Annexation. #15-74: Consider zoning for the  
Orchard Mesa Annexation.

Mr. Cisar presented the zoning using the overhead projector and  
briefly explained the meaning of the various zones. Mr. Engelke  
explained the difference in the county zoning and the proposed  
changes.

Ms. Flager called for questions from the floor.

Mr. Thomas Lewis opposed the zoning from Struthers to the Colorado  
River and wanted it to remain industrial as it was zoned in 1966.  
The Fruitvale Planning Commission (now dissolved) granted him the  
Industrial zoning. His property is part in the City and part  
in the County. His industrial zoning had been changed to PD-8.  
Mr. Engelke discussed the question of Watsons Island. The annex-  
ation read to the Colorado River. The question in regard to Mr.  
Lewis' property is is this an overflow from the river or what is it.  
The question is a legal one.

Mr. Lewis said that he requested a meander map from the state and  
that that part of the river is an old waste ditch developed by the  
City and it should remain I-2.

Mr. Chambliss asked where the BLM land was located. Mr. Lewis said  
that the BLM owns 3.8 acres and he pointed out the area on the map,  
but said it was not part of what he was talking about. Mr. Chambliss  
said if the BLM owns the land, and if this piece is proven an island  
then that part of the river is a legitimate part of the Colorado  
river.

Mr. Lewis provided his own map and pointed out the Climax waste ditch.  
Ms. Flager pointed out that this is a legal question and out of the  
Boards hands. Mr. Engelke suggested that the Board ask for comment  
from the City Attorney. Mr. Van Houten moved that the matter of bound-  
ary be turned over to the City Attorney. Mr. Wilds seconded the  
motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Van Houten pointed out that if the BLM claims that the point  
is an island then the whole thing must be an island. Mr. Chambliss  
pointed out that the channel would change.

Ms. Flager asked if there were any more questions. Mr. Snyder who  
lives on UnawEEP just South of the East side of Linden asked if  
small business' were still allowed. Mr. Engelke said that the annex-  
ation would not change the use, if it were legal in the County then  
it would be legal now except that the City allows for non-conforming

uses. Mr. Snyder said the original zoning in the area was spot zoning and he wondered if there would be any provisions made for starting small business'. Mr. Engelke said there would be for businesses in the home but it would not include garages or filling stations. Mr. Snyder pointed out that there was a Shell station on Unawep and wondered why it was allowed in that area when he was refused permission to sell his land across the road for the same purpose. Mr. Engelke said that if he wanted to do something like this he would have to put in for a rezoning application since his land was not zoned for that purpose.

Ms. Flager asked for any more questions and then asked the Board for their comment. Mr. Chambliss said the annexation as a whole was good. Mr. Van Houten said there is nothing that could be done for Mr. Lewis' area by the Board and that he would have to fight it out from another standpoint. Mr. Van Houten moved that the Board accept the zoning as it was legally advertised. Mr. Chambliss seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Engelke said this is a question of the flood plain zone and that it would come under Federal regulations and not out of our own. The River land and its use does not lend itself to the current City zoning possibilities and this area is similar to the County AFT zone. Between this area and the airport the zoning is flexible.

3. #16-74: Consider the Wellington Cove Bulk Development plan involving 1.12 acres with R-1-C, single family residential zoning.  
Developer: ElDorado Construction  
Location: NW 1/4 of Section 12, North of Wellington Street and 550 feet East of 12th Street. Corrected to 175' East of 12th Street.

Mr. Cisar presented the site plan and showed the access is from Wellington by a 45' wide driveway. It is a bulk development and theoretically could have 8.13 units but they are proposing 7 units per acre.

Mr. Art Custberg made the presentation on behalf of his partner, Bud Rush. He had received the comments from the review departments; one from the fire department and they have changed a fire hydrant and now meet with the Fire Department request. The telephone company also wanted an additional easement because they thought it was a four owner development but since it is under one owner there was not a problem. He said there will be plenty of parking that they had allowed tow spaces per unit and that there would be parking for recreational vehicles along the driveway area. The entire development would be screened with trees and grass. They plan to start construction early this summer and complete it by fall. The buildings would be brick veneer with shake roofs and fireplaces and rent for \$200-250 per month.

Ms. Flager asked if they had contacted the adjacent property owners and Mr. Cisar said this was up to the Petitioner or Developer to submit the names of all the adjacent property owners. Mr. McEwen asked if the lots could be sold separately and Blake Chambliss added that it could turn into condominium type if it was so desired. Mr. Cisar said the person could own the individual unit but the



but the land would be commonly owned.

Mr. Custberg said this would be rental property with six, two bedroom units and two, one bedroom units and the entire property would be under one owner.

Mr. Van Houten said what if the owner in the future might decide to sell as condominiums and Blake said this is a possibility not a probability and that there would be no way you could stop it.

Ms. Quimby asked if all the parking areas were blacktop and Mr. Custberg said all except the gravel area for recreational vehicles.

Mr. Van Houten asked if the density was compatible with the surrounding density. Mr. Cisar said that this lot has an odd configuration and that the development is compatible with the zoning district and that each unit has 6,000 square feet of land area. Ms. Flager asked if there was any comment from the audience.

Mr. Bill Blakesly, an adjacent property owner to the East said that this was multiple housing and he could see no reason this development except for speculative purposes. It would create irrigation problems and it sits in everones backyard. It creates more traffic congestion and the street r.o.w. is only 45' and should be 50'. It will create a stockade effect on the open neighborhood that has always been open. It is a liability rather than an asset as rental property does nothing for a neighborhood. He also did not believe that the revenue would pay for the problems brought in by the development. Poor management would create a slum area. He also did not understand why a duplex had been turned down just to the eastside. Mr. Cisar said he had received a phone call from the Clemens that live at 2528 and 2527 North 12th and Wellington Cove is just behind them. They were concerned about the irriagation water and too many units and that this was not a proper use of the land

Mr. Custberg said that the irrigation rights were dedicated to the development and on the west side the ditch water would be brought on across the property as an amenity. That the development would not interfere with the water flow but that the land did have the right to use the water. The road was wide enough because it was a private driveway and not a city street. Mr. McEwen asked about the width of Wellington and Mr. Cisar said that Wellington is 50' with a ditch on both sides. Mr. Custberg said that the taxes per year on the property would run \$3,000 - \$4,000 per year and that that would be a significant amount for the City. The architecture of the buildings would be attractive and that they would attract good neighbors. Blake said that he understood the concern of the neighbors but he is concerned about the performance of this area in ten years. He said he had two comments. First, that there was limited land around the units and that you lost 1/3 of the land before you built due to the driveway. He felt that the entrance would have the appearance of a used car lot due to the recreational parking. Mr. Custberg said that screening would be provided for this area. Mr. Van Houten said this would create an attractive nuisance. Mr. Chambliss said the boats parked next to Wellington would not be safe and that this area should be reviewed in terms of that kind of thinking. Mr. Custberg pointed out that there was a spacial relationship between the buildings of 57'.

Mr. Chambliss said that the fences were only 13' from the patios and he would like them to rethink the arrangements of the patios, etc. Mr. Custberg said they would consider all the recommendations and would take out the camper and boat parking. Mr. Chambliss said that a bulk development's purpose was to develop difficult pieces of property. The driveway into the development should not be considered as part of the bulk development that it cost space and liveability of the units. Ms. Flager asked if there were any more comments. Mrs. Nora Peterson of 2540 North 12th questioned the eight family units and figuring two cars per family wondered if there was enough parking. She also did not like the recreational parking and wondered about the problems with the water. Mrs. Peterson asked about the ditch on both sides of the property. Mr. Blakesley said that to the west and the south there was 45" of water but that the far corner of the area had problems. People along the ditch would alternate the use as much as possible and that it was served by a six inch pipe and that there was a definite problem. The present owner would have to maintain the ditch. Ms. Flager asked if there were any more questions from the audience and then turned the question over to the Board. Mr. Engelke said that the water question was out of our hands and Ms. Flager said there is no control over irrigation rights or does the Board have the right to take such a stand. Mr. Engelke in response to Mr. Chambliss question as to the number of units that not counting the driveway there would only be a one unit difference. Mr. Chambliss said that under bulk development they were entitled to 8 units and Mr. Engelke said this type of development was to help landlocked types of parcels. Ms. Flager was concerned about the formation of a landlocked island on future development. Mr. Engelke said this parcel was custom made for bulk development and that it could not have to remain a park. Mr. McEwen said he only counted 14 parking spaces and that with the elimination of the boat and camper parking another couple spaces could be added. He felt the elimination of the camper parking would enhance the entry. Mr. Chambliss felt this was a reasonable way to go and that it was not so much a question of density as badly oriented units. There would be a blank wall on the North and South and the windows would only be on the East. This would be easy to change but it doesn't solve the density problem. Mr. Custberg said the property would be entirely screened and surrounded by a split cedar fence. Mr. Chambliss felt it would help if a small copy of the plan would be mailed with the agenda to the adjacent property owners. Mr. Van Houten said that it was a difficult property and in all fairness it wouldn't end up being a park. He would like to see it approved with the elimination of the campers and the reorientation of the units for more use of open space, and with the approach landscaped and the parking spaces increased to 16 using the boat and camper space. Mr. Chambliss seconded the motion adding that Rick be given the authority to work with the developer to solve the problems and that interested neighbors be given the opportunity to make comments and to add to the plan of the development. Mr. Custberg said that Mr. Cisar had recommended that he visit the adjacent owners and he didn't and he could sure see why it would have helped. Mr. Joe Able of 1212 Wellington said he lived adjacent to the entry way and he didn't like the 6' fence all the

way around the development. Mr. Custberg said the entry area would be open and landscaped. Mr. Able asked why it was not a single family development and Ms. Flager said she was sorry he was late and that he was welcomed to work with the developer and the planning staff along with the other neighbors. The motion made by Mr. Chambliss carried unanimously.

4. #10-74: Consider Final Planned Unit Development for the LaCoquille Restaurant involving .46 acres.  
Developer: James F. and Gertrude Ramsey  
Location: The SW 1/4 of Section 12, North of North Avenue, South of Glenwood Ave., and approximately 400 feet East of 12th Street.

This item was reviewed last month and they had eliminated the parking spaces as asked and there was better access to the parking lot and the alley improvement district was under way. All the changes had been made and the plan meets with the full staff approval. Ms. Flager asked if there were any questions. Mr. Wilds moved that the plan be approved as presented and Mr. McEwen seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

5. #9-74: Consider petition to vacate a portion of a street r.o.w. located adjacent to the East line of Bookcliff Heights Subdivision, 85 feet North of Bookcliff Avenue, and 215 feet West of Center Ave.  
Petitioner: Lark Washburn  
Blake Chambliss excused himself from the Board during this item.

Mr. Chambliss said that St. Marys takes no position on this matter and has no objections and that they have no intention of extending Center because it is of no value to them.

Mr. Van Houten said there is no need for this vacation and that this street may be needed at a further time. Mr. Van Houten moved that the petition be denied. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

Request denied.

6. #8-74: Consider amending the zoning text to allow for an additional zoning district, the H.O., Highway Orientated Zoning District.

Mr. Cisar presented the amendment. The new zone application use is for the major arterials, state and federal highways. The zone allows multi-family dwellings, parks, lakes, semi-public swimming pools, community facilities, transportation terminals, and fire and police stations. The majority of the uses in this zone involve the PUD concept.

Assembly use 2.5 and uses in groups (4) through (5) inclusive are a part of a unit development plan as defined, processed, and approved according to Section (15) of this ordinance. Terminals are given full PUD review.

Shopping centers are a conditional use (PUD) requirements plus full review by the City Council, Staff and the City Planning Board.

Uses would be required to have landscaping in the form of a year around screen 15' from the residential properties. Mr. Chambliss asked how and when alley access would be provided and Mr. Cisar answered through the planned development. This is a companion with O.M. and should be put in sequence. This was used on North Avenue. Ms. Flager said this type of zoning will prevail in areas like highway 340 and Brocks Market and will become more important in time as we develop.

Mr. Engelke said that the shopping center as used in 5.0 and 4.4 uses as retail business could create a commercial subdivision without portfolio. It should be pulled out as a provisional use. We need five to six months to consider this especially in regard to Horizon Drive.

Mr. Chambliss made a motion to approve the H.O. text amendment and recommend approval to the City Council with the above omission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilds.

The amendment was approved unanimously as corrected.

7. #17-74: Preliminary Plan - Heatheridge Estates Subdivision. Transitional Subdivision.  
Petitioners: Norman Jones, Charles Barone, and Hettie Smith  
Location: Part of the West 1/2 of the Northwest 1/4 of Section 22, T1S, R1W, Ute Meridian, Contains 42 acres with 82 lots.

This is a county subdivision on the Old College Farm Property and is R-2 County Zoning. This is a transitional subdivision and it is up to the option of the developer to put in the highest of the city and county requirements. The reviewers comments are as follows: The utilities need additional easements, Fire Department wants to cooperate with them and coordinate efforts, there are certain geologic constraints and they are now working on them and they need a complete drainage plan especially along the bluff. The staff recommends that the open space be put into private ownership as it is very fragile. Other open space is acceptable along the access road to the development, and the Northern open space is also acceptable.

Ms. Flager asked if there was a walkway along the bank of the canal and should there not be a fence along the canal as it is an exiting hazard. Mr. Engelke said the liability for the hazard is a complex problem. Mr. Chambliss said it is the responsibility of the people who own the land. Ms. Flager said should the fence not be built to protect the buyers and the children. Ms. McDonough said who would be responsible for the fence after the lots are sold. Mr. Van Houten said this is an extreme hazard as there is a sharp slope and the currents are strong due to the siphon. He asked if we had jurisdiction over the matter. Mr. Engelke said we can make a recommendation but can we require it. Mr. Cisar said he knew of a similar case and the planning board recommended such action be taken to the City Council and that the FHA required it immediately. Mr. Van Houten said it should be a chain link fence with barb wire on the top, that it would be low in cost but necessary. Mr. Chambliss

asked about a dedicated open space in a high hazard area. The priority should be a public open space where the private property owner is protected. Mr. Van Houten said that the access was made for them. Mr. Wilds said the last lots to be developed would be dangerous. Mr. Engelke said the fencing of the open space could be provisionally contingent on the approval of the fencing. A discussion ensued on the open space and the danger of the canal.

Ms. McDonough said there were double frontage lots due to the elevation changes. That Lots 8 and 17 had a leg to the cul-du-sac for that reason and that it also eliminated a double frontage road. Mr. McEwen asked why they were doing a geologic survey and Ms. McDonough said it was exploratory. Mr. McEwen asked if it could change the subdivision and Ms. McDonough said that they would know the building area limitations prior to the sale.

Mr. Cisar recommended that any county subdivision requiring treatment from the City Sewage Plant be forced to comply to the street and gutter requirements so when they are taken into the City they are ready. Mr. Engelke said the sewer and street requirement was already necessary for annexation that it was part of the hardware.

Mr. Chambliss moved that the preliminary plan be approved subject to a fence, extension of the cul-du-sacs, the reviewers comments and the staff recommendations. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion. Mr. Chambliss suggested that full planning commission review so that new subdivisions meet with the minimum city requirements and have full City control. Mr. Chambliss made a motion to review over future of the City on developments that use City facilities. Mr. McEwen seconded the motion.

Both motions passed unanimously.

8. #18-74: Preliminary Plan - Fruitwood Subdivision. Transitional Subdivision.

Petitioner: 2001 Development

Presentation by Ms. McDonough. The staff needs to review the street names. There are 10' pedestrian walkways through the long blocks. The stub streets are 50' and provide public r.o.w. to the landlocked parcels to the South. The County escrow fund will receive 5% of the appraised land value. There needs to be a more detailed drainage plan.

Ms. Flager asked what is a transitional subdivision and questioned where the water from the irrigation system would be dumped. Ms. McDonough said if the irrigation system was put in it would be totally piped and controlled. Mr. Chambliss asked for the School Districts comments. There would be according to projected figures 69 elementary children, 37 junior high students, and 34 high school students. That would have 69 children bused to Clifton. Cross walks would also be necessary at the intersection of 6 & 24 and 30 Road. Ms. Flager said there were already lights there. Mr. Engelke said it was an intersection of state and county roads, and they would have to get together and work out the problem.

Mr. Chambliss asked how many units would be allowed. Mr. Engelke said three per acre single family - same as duplex approach in The County R-2 zone. Do not look at the area as to busing but to the new school site. Mr. Chambliss said there is never enough concentration in an area like this to justify a new school. Mr. Engelke said the new schools are a question since the existing schools are already filled to capacity. Mr. Chambliss said it is a City, County, and Regional problem plus it is ours and everybody's problem and we must come to grips with it.

Mr. Engelke said it is a question of validity of the intensive zoning already created. This development is more logical to City zoning than most since it is not a scattered urban development. Mr. Chambliss asked when do you zero in on these problems. Mr. Van Houten said that the 5% cost is just a pittance towards the actual development. Mr. Engelke said that there is a sites and parks meeting tonight and that everyone is welcomed to attend. Mr. Chambliss said we should not be satisfied with 5% that we need parks and space. Mr. Engelke said that the 5% is arbitrary. Some are more and some are less. The appropriateness is questioned, no ideas are presented until the last minute therefore the determination of cash or land is made by the County Commission. Mr. Chambliss said the City has the same responsibility as the County. Mr. Wilds said that with no parks, the schools are hurting. Mr. Cisar said the park site and school site takes about 8 1/2 to 10 acres.

Mr. Chambliss moved that the Fruitwood Subdivision be approved subject to the concerns of staff and provided that a 5% park and school site is provided in land and that the site be approved by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilds.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. #12-74: Consider the following text amendments:

- A. Deleting beauty shops etc., as prohibited home occupations.
- B. Allowing beauty shops etc., as conditional uses in certain residential zones.

Under text amendment A beauty shops would be allowed as a home occupation. Under amendment B the question would involve the surrounding property owners and would be open to review. Lawyer Jerry Erlof was the acting representative for Mr. and Mrs. Stout and other interested parties. He said that historically prominent attorneys and doctors probably were responsible for the existing home occupation zoning. He appreciated the purpose behind the current zoning but felt that it was discriminatory. He also understood the additional traffic a home occupation would generate. He said the traffic flow would probably be there anyway. He supported the first text amendment. He asked that the Commission look at this from the discriminatory side and that these types of business fulfill the needs of the families and the community at large and there is no reason for this discrimination. Mr. Cisar clarified the point that a home business was not allowed to employ outside personnel. Ms. Flager said that a beauty shop was a

commercial establishment and should be treated as such. She also mentioned the problem policing the outside help problem. Mr. Chambliss said he could recognize that under certain circumstance neighborhoods would accept this type of business but that in some areas this would act as a detriment. He recognized the feelings of Mrs. Stout but felt that he should speak in response for the rest of the neighborhood. Ms. Flager said that the City would have problems in policing this type of business and that it would also generate more business than Mrs. Stout had mentioned, and that there would be at least three people in there at all times. Mr. Erloff said this would be a one chair operation and that Mrs. Stout would have to submit her plans to the commission and to the neighbors. And that the zoning regulation needed to be amended. Mr. Engelke said that the doctors and lawyers were a problem too. And that there was no way to distinguish between home occupations. Ms. Flager said she did not know of very many doctors or lawyers engaged in home occupations too like the man who manufactured components to rifles in his home. He said that it is discriminatory and that this same request could come up two or three times a month. He said that it was difficult to start a small business and zoning would act as a safety valve and would cover specific uses. The policing would primarily be done by the adjacent property owners.

Irene Stout said that she couldn't put in a salon without a statement from the City plus a floor plan and that she could not expand without the City and the State Cosmetology approval. She would be unable to set up more chairs. She said her property was close to a commercial area and not in the middle of the block. She had provided off-street parking due to her corner lot. She had talked to her neighbors and they were delighted. She was willing to go along with the rules and regulations. She also said she knew of other home jobs that did not provide off-street parking and that if you weren't allowed to start small you could never grow big and that she needed to be at home.

Mr. Engelke recommended that an amendment to the zoning text be passed. Mr. Chambliss recommended that the council change the zoning text to allow all home occupations as conditional uses (and to delete section 9 from the home occupation text). Ms. Quimby seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

- C. Amending the setback requirements in the R-3, B-1, B-2, B-3, C-1, C-2, I-1, and I-2 Zoning.  
It was suggested that the setback in R-3 which is currently 100' from centerline be amended to 70' from center line (20' front yard). Mr. Chambliss made a motion that this item be tabled until next month when there is time to discuss density, etc. Mr. Van Houten seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Amending the advertising requirements prior to public hearings. Currently this is a twenty day process; seven days prior to planning and the City Council. Mr. Van Houten said that this serves

no particular interest. Mr. McEwen said this cuts short anyone who is out of town. Mr. Chambliss made a motion that the amendment be altered to make the advance notice be seven days. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- E. Amending the R-3 zoning district to allow business uses (4.1) and (4.6) as conditional uses. Mr. Chambliss moved that this item be tabled and to come back before the commission with item C for full discussion. Mr. Van Houten seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

10. Discussion.

A. Consider a request to change the Mesa County Consolidated Zoning Map from R-2 to PD-4, Consider Outline Development Plan, "The Ridges".

Petitioner: C.B.W. Builders, Inc.

Location: More commonly located in the area East of South Camp Road between State Highway 340 and North Thoroughfare Canyon Road. Contains 1188 acres.

This item went before the County Commissioners last month. Mr. Chambliss asked what the economic base for the project was. Ms. McDonough said that this is not in that second stage of development yet. She read a narrative describing the development. It has not gone before the review agencies yet at this stage.

Mr. Jim Patterson of the City Sewer facility was present to comment and answer questions. If the sewer takes on the Redlands it will take it up to 96% capacity. Mr. Van Houten asked who would finance this. Mr. Patterson said that is a good question. Mr. Chambliss said that no answer exists. With a development of such magnitude it would be impossible to cover it by noon. That there should be a special meeting to cover this and the other Redlands developments and have people present who are experts on finance that the home owners concept is naive. Many things need to be considered at this point: people, Ute water, the impact on the City and on the sewer of Grand Junction, school sites, mixture of single family, multifamily and any other mixture to be considered, social services, etc. There also needs to be a study to develop new subdivision provisions and a city manager type set up as there will be over 100,000 people here within the next five years and we need to talk in realistic terms and use the advice of experts such as representatives from the oil companies. (Economic and people impacts). We can't deal with this without an expert opinion. Mr. Van Houten said even if this proceeds according to the plans the physical impact will be tremendous. Mr. Chambliss said that to diminish the impact we should pull all these people together. Mr. Engelke said that the logical form for this discussion to take would be the Regional Planning Meeting April 2, 1974 in the Court House Annex. This is the time for part of this discussion to take place. Mr. Chambliss said this deserves not a meeting but a full weekend



seminar. Ms. McDonough said that this went before the County Planning Commission on 2/19/74. Ms. Flager asked how it had gotten this far without any of these questions being answered. Ms. McDonough said that the County had recommended that the City take a look at it. Mr. Engelke said that this item is on the Regional Agenda and that this is a good starting place, and that Fletchers Subdivision had been tabled. Mr. Chambliss said that his concern is to look at all the questions before we start dealing with who is going to pay for it. Mr. Van Houten said that we are not even qualified to ask questions. Mr. Chambliss made a motion that this item be referred to the Regional Planning Commission and if the Regional does not take action then the City Planning Commission should initiate the action. Mr. Engelke said that the concern is not this immediate because this is a phased development and that the reviewing is set in a series of steps. The problems will be easier to identify in this large a development as opposed to the smaller units. Mr. Van Houten said that Warren Gardner fought a 10' r.o.w. at 12th and Patterson and yet he expects the City to pay \$2 million for sewage. Mr. McEwen seconded Blake's motion. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Bikeways and bike routes.

This item was tabled and Ms. Flager and Mr. Chambliss met with those interested in bikeways. The recommendations of the group are as follows: 1. that the bikeways be used exclusively for bike riders, 2. that the routes be shared. The designated bike routes are Elm, Gunnison and 9th to Gunnison. 10th Street North to Houston on Elm. Those streets have 80% of their residents willing to give up part of their on street parking if the traffic is slowed down.

What is proposed is that they remove parking on one side of the street and take the parking space and create a narrow bike lane on both sides of the street. To eliminate bikes off North Avenue. If these bike lanes are successful it will remove bikes from more city streets. The bike routes don't go everywhere and we are requesting further study by the City traffic Department.

The real criticism of this plan is that it doesn't get people downtown and there is no satisfactory solution at this time. The City Engineering and Traffic Department will watch and see where the people go and then we will have a total re-evaluation at the end of the summer and find the prime destination points. 6th Street has been recommended but how do you get across North and if you take 5th to Belford you can't get to 6th.

We need to start an educational program to insert into the educational program and let them know where the lanes are. It would be a good idea to get these lanes on the summer recreation maps put out by the Park Department. It was the committees recommendation to go ahead with this plan and the above routes and reduce the speeds to 20-25 mph. Ms. Quimby asked if there

were any comments from the street department regarding the marking. Ms. Flager said that the police chief did not show up at the meeting. Mr. Chambliss said there is further work to be done but that the bike group had gone as far as it could go. Mr. Chambliss made a motion that the bike program be implemented this summer. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Veterinarian Clinic: This is a vet clinic with no overnight care. No representative was present, the matter was not discussed.

D. Minor Subdivision: one parcel divided into two lots then the charge should be \$75 per lot up to the \$290 figure. Mr. McEwen asked if you divided one lot into two if the cost would be \$150 and Mr. Cisar recommended the fee for a minor subdivision be established at \$75/lot because less time has been required to review this type of subdivision during the past months. Mr. Wilds moved to approve. Mr. McEwen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Storm Drainage: We need a work session to go through this proposal. Mr. Engelke said that the existing areas are more of a problem than the proposed areas. The new subdivisions are surveyed by the SCS - 100 year washes. Ms. Flager said the Bureau of Land Reclamation built the dams in the Bookcliffs and they were in good shape three years ago but how about now. Mr. Engelke said these are more of a threat than the Colorado River. The subdivision regulations need to cover these 100 year washes, etc. Ms. Flager asked when to set up the meeting and Mr. Cisar asked that the City Council be orientated first. Ms. Quimby said that contingency funds months ago were provided the Commission by the Council and asked that everyone come to the meeting on Monday.

Mr. Chambliss recommended that the council not refer this back to the Planning Commission for a final proposal. It needs to have action taken. Ms. Quimby moved that the Council take action to release the funds for the study. Mr. Chambliss seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 12:30.