

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION was called to order in the CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, at 8:00 A.M., December 31, 1975, by Chairman LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: BLAKE CHAMBLISS, VIRGINIA FLAGER, JOHN ABRAMS, JERRY WILDS, JANINE RIDER, FRANK SIMONETTI and JANE QUIMBY.

Also present were: DON WARNER, City Planner; KARL METZNER, City Planning Technician; BONNIE PEHL, Acting Secretary and approximately 15 interested persons.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as mailed.

There was one addition to the agenda under discussion concerning a land division at 17th and Walnut.

1. #35-75: PROPOSED PLAN WITHIN AN H.O. (HIGHWAY ORIENTED) ZONE:

Petitioner: W.A. Weaver and Parker James
Location: 427 Sherman Drive.

Don Warner pointed out the location of the property on the map. He stated that all he had on this plan was a plot plan for the building the petitioners wished to put on the property. The property is directly east of Valley Trash. It is a proposed shop building and Mr. James will explain what they want to do.

Parker James: We have the Placer Gold Mine and we have to repair our equipment. That's basically what we want the shop for.

Levi Lucero: How big an operation is it?

Parker James: We have a few bulldozers, two loaders, one backhoe. It is not a huge operation.

Levi Lucero: Will this be a permanent situation?

Parker James: Yes, it probably will be.

Don Warner: This is a steel building isn't it?

Parker James: Yes, and Dad told me to be sure to tell you that the south wall will be cinder block.

Levi Lucero: As long as it meets code, we have nothing to do with that. Are there any proponents or opponents to this request? Are there any questions for Mr. James?

John Abrams: How far back does this H.O. zone go?

Don Warner: Five or six lots beyond where this proposed project is. There's more H.O. behind it than in front of it.

Don Warner and Parker James explained to the Board what uses are in existence around the proposed site.

Levi Lucero: I think this is a good use of the land.

Don Warner: I went and looked at it and the ground is filled with about two feet of pit run. I was looking at it from the standpoint of "could you grow anything?" I don't know how you would grow anything.

Levi Lucero: There is a note on the soil conditions, there is high alkali content in the soil.

Don Warner: I think with the things located around it, there isn't much we can ask in the way of beautification or anything of that type even though it is an H.O. zone.

Blake Chambliss: I think there are certain things we can ask for. The point for the H.O. zone in that area was to make sure that we don't have the continuation of the alkali flat and to see that the kind of thing that goes on there would not be like build a building and let it go. It seems to me that one of the obligations we accept upon ourselves. We zoned that H.O. so we could watch very carefully the visual impact of that area and so forth. I'm not sure what works, but I'm not ready to say that nothing will.

Don Warner: I think you could use tub type planters.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to see something on this that would make the area look better. I am not about to prescribe what kind of planting or anything else that there, but I am certainly concerned that the site be maintained in some kind of form that is visually acceptable as a major entry to the City of Grand Junction.

Parker James: I don't think we could plant anything there. My father has noted that out of five residences there only one has a lawn at this time. We were going to have 3/4 inch gravel for parking around the building.

Virginia Flager: That area has been a big problem and I don't think we could do anything but require planters. They certainly can't plant trees there.

Blake Chambliss: Normally these are processed through the City Parks Department. Has this been done?

Don Warner: No, it has not. I talked to Mr. Weaver and I told him at the time that I looked at the sketch that this isn't really what we ask for with an H.O. zone and I explained some of the things that would be asked and this is all I got.

Blake Chambliss: What is your time schedule on this project?

Levi Lucero: June of '76.

Parker James: Yes. It will be quite a while.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to refer this to the Parks Department and have them look at what you are doing. Then or the Soil Conservation Service or anybody else that has some kind of suggestion and not deal with this until we have gotten a report on what would be appropriate.

Levi Lucero: This is a very incomplete submission. We don't have a distance from the highway and we don't know how this is going to visually affect the residential area near it.

Don Warner: Directly across the street is H.O. then north of it is Sherman which is some residential. Probably it would be well to ask for some screening on the north of it. I would suggest that we get Mr. James and Ken Idleman together to discuss this.

John Abrams: Is there a dwelling just south of this?

Parker James: Yes, there is a house and a shop on the corner. I believe the man who owns the house also owns the shop.

Levi Lucero: Are there any more questions, if not, we will close the hearing.

Don Warner: We will get a report from the Parks Department.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion to table this until it has been reviewed by the Parks Department.

Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

2. #36-75: PROPOSED REZONING FROM R-1-C TO R-2-A:

Petitioner: Dale L. Martin, et al
Location: Approximately 2867 Elm Avenue

Don Warner: (Pointed out the property on the maps and explained the zoning around the property. The recommendation from the staff would be to allow this.) We have the problem in this area of very narrow deep properties and practically the only thing you could do with that much property and do it right is use a four-plex type arrangement.

Blake Chambliss: Could a bulk development accomodate this property--will it allow four-plexes?

Don Warner: It will allow it under R-2-A which is low density duplex zone.

Levi Lucero: Are there any questions of Mr. Martin?

Dale Martin: The address is 2867 on the agenda but it is really 2865. The house that was on there burned and it was a total loss so I want to take that off there and put something on that will be of use.

Don Warner: We have had no calls or comments on this request.

John Abrams: I am concerned about the lack of off-street parking. There are four units and there doesn't seem to be enough parking.

Don Warner: They're required to have eight off-street parking spaces. When he gets the building permit, he will have to present plans for those eight off-street parking spots.

Levi Lucero: Are there any more questions? If not we will close the hearing. Is there any further discussion from the board members? Does the chair hear a motion?

Jerry Wilds: I will make a motion that we approve the zoning change. Janine Rider second. Motion passed unanimously.

3. #37-75: PROPOSED BULK DEVELOPMENT FOR PARK PLACE APARTMENTS:

Petitioner: Jess Nugent
Location: First Street and Park Avenue

Don Warner: (Pointed out the location of the proposal for the Board.) This is a large lot with two four-plexes on it and they would be attempting to put one between them. There is sufficient room under the zoning to do it. There will be parking all along the back. The reason for bulk development is because this is not subdivided.

Virginia Flager: Are they going to have enough room there for all that parking?

Don Warner: They show more parking than is required.

Frank Simonetti: Are you going to make Park Drive one-way? That's the only way you can get in and out. How much more development will you be making on

that parking? I didn't see that much room.

Jess Nugent: We plan to put a retaining wall 18 inches high along the property line and that would be filled and black topped/bumper blocks. We would have probably 27 or 28 parking spaces. The ones we do have, have ample room to drive by--these would be the same.

~~John Abrams~~: Are you going to eliminate parking directly in front of the building?

J. Nugent: Yes.

Levi Lucero: Will this be in front of all the buildings or just the center one:

J. Nugent: We plan to eliminate all the parking in front and black top the back.

Virginia Flager: What is the dimension of those parking spaces.

Don Warner: Angle parking is 17 feet, 90 degree parking is 20 feet.

Virginia Flager. That's 13 feet for driving--it's going to be a tight squeeze getting a car between the back of the building and into the lot.

Don Warner: With angle parking the driveway has to be 12 feet wide.

Frank Simonetti: How wide is Park Drive supposed to be?

Don Warner: The right of way is 40 feet--the part paved is probably the old county 18 feet. Since this is a bulk development, this Board can require that it be curbed; additional paving to a curb line--whatever you feel you need.

Janine Rider: Can we also request the city to put up No Parking signs on the street?

Don Warner: They can put them up.

Blake Chambliss: There is not enough right of way for Park Drive now.

Don Warner: We need five more feet on each side.

Virginia Flager: By the time that third building is put up, there isn't going to be much living room space around those buildings.

Jess Nugent : Those other two buildings we built were designed with the five foot right of way in mind.

Levi Lucero: Any proponents? Any opponents.?

Don Warner: One of the things the Traffic Department looked at was this exit on to First Street and they felt that this traffic circulation plan was better than having it come out on Park Drive because they are further away from the crest of the hill.

Virginia Flager: I hate to see another apartment jammed in there--there is not enough room.

Janine Rider: Where is the trash pick up?

Janine Rider: It is picked up in the front for the time being.

Levi Lucero: If there is enough land for a four-plex why does it have to go through a bulk development?

Don Warner: Because it is not divided into separate lots.

Virginia Flager: I don't think there is enough land for that and it's a shame to do that to an already crowded area. I think you are compounding it and that parking is going to be a hassle if this is drawn anywhere near to scale.

Blake Chambliss: Is this drawn to scale?

Don Warner: I couldn't figure out any scale.

Levi Lucero: When you get in the full right of way will there be parking on the street?

Don Warner: If you put in a full scale street yes, there will be parking allowed on it.

Karl Metzner: I checked with the Traffic Department on the back parking lot and they did agree that the parking lot would be alright.

Virginia Flager: I have a motion I'd like to have considered. I would like to table this until he comes back with a to scale drawing. To me this is going to be another one of these asphalt jungles being placed around the city. We have some statements that haven't been backed up and looking at that area and the impact on it I would still like to table this until we have a little input on it and they come back with a correct drawing.

Blake Chambliss: I second it.

Levi Lucero: A motion has been made to table this and seconded. Are you ready for the discussion?

Jerry Wilds: You are asking for a to scale drawing, right?

Blake Chambliss: We are asking really to look at some other things too.

Don Warner: One thing I would like to do is take it through Roger and see if curb, gutter and sidewalk could be placed on this project and have that placed on the drawing.

Levi Lucero: We are getting a lot of incomplete information and we can't make any decision on this.

Don Warner: These have been through the other departments but some questions have come up here that weren't anticipated.

Levi Lucero: There is a motion and a second on the floor. Those in favor to table this until we get full scale drawings and recommendation on street designs. Those in favor say Aye- opposed Nay-- The motion carried unanimously.

Jess Nugent : I originally had the permits issued for all three buildings, but they expired before I got financing and now I have the financing arranged but I have to take it immediately. So this means the development will probably ~~not take place~~. I think all the questions have been pretty well answered and I think if you want it you are going to do it and if you don't want it you won't do it. There are two of these buildings there already and it will be much more desirable to have a third one there than to leave it the way it is now and the way it will have to be if you go on this approach. That's all I have to say.

Virginia Flager: It is not us that is stumbling around. I think this is the first time I have seen this application and I feel the drawing is inadequate and I feel we are justified in tabling this until the application is complete. It is not our fault that you did not bring this before and now you say it's our fault that you are going to lose financing - I find that hard to believe. This is the first time we have seen this.

4. #38-75: PROPOSED REZONING FROM B-1 TO PDB FOR PROPOSED GENERAL BUSINESS USE:

Petitioner: Sam T. Haupt

Location: NW corner of 7th Street and Patterson Road.

Don Warner pointed out the location of the property.

Don Warner: This proposal for 7th and Patterson would have additional right-of-way granted. The comments from the Highway Department are that they would like to see paving for deceleration and a large center island that would allow no left turn going out of here and to prevent a left hand turn across 7th St. Sam has some other comments.

Virginia Flager: In other words, the only way to get in would be off Patterson.

Levi Lucero: This property has been posted and you have talked to the adjacent property owners, Sam?

Sam Haupt: Yes. At the present time the property is zoned B-1. We could go in with offices and apartments and possibly put in 40 apartment units and 10 to 12 offices or as many as 60 apartment units under the present zoning. Due to the growth of the hospital and with the medical complexes under construction this would be a good place for a service area for the hospital. As far as the service area is concerned now you have a 7-11 store below the hospital, a Gibson's Pharmacy, Mesa Orthopedic and Mesa Drug. What we are proposing here is a 12,000 to 13,000 square foot building which would be leased to service type people in that area and possibly there would be a restaurant. We would put a restriction on it that only retail type, indoor service and restaurant business would be allowed. The parking required for this area would be about 40 parking spaces. I believe we have 79 parking spaces proposed in there. At the present time, it is zoned B-1 and to get utilization of the property we would have to look at a combination of apartment and office type building.

Mr. Haupt pointed out the zoning of the surrounding property.

Virginia Flager: In using that property, could it be possible to make it so that the access would be off Patterson rather than 7th? The reason I ask is that the intersection

there is a mess and it is going to get worse as the years go on. I think this is a good use for that property. I would like to see a commercial area develop around the hospital but I am concerned about the access on 7th Street. I know the highway is proposed, but I don't think that is going to be the answer.

Bob Gerlofs: We have two accesses off Patterson now. I think we could develop that entrance as a major entrance. Right now they are working on the engineering of 7th Street and it is proposed as a six lane street.

Virginia Flager: I can see an entrance from 7th Street but I can't see generating that traffic onto 7th Street.

Sam Haupt: If we don't have the south bound traffic coming out of here, we are going to create traffic here with a left hand turn.

Don Warner: This is what the Traffic Department said, "The proximity of this property does not lend itself suitable for convenient and safe maneuverings of traffic. The 7th Street vertical alignment is such that northbound traffic turning left into this development and traffic exiting turning left onto 7th Street could be shielded from view of the northbound through vehicles. If this were used as an entrance, and exit, physical barriers should be used to discourage maneuvers being made as previously mentioned. Neither entrance is or could be situated far enough away from the 7th Street and Patterson intersection to provide for storage areas of vehicles making maneuvers across oncoming traffic lanes. With retail trade, vehicle movement into and out of such facilities would be greatly increased which necessitates the need for safer controls be implemented."

Jerry Wilds: I think you should also not allow left turns onto Patterson.

Don Warner: The Traffic Department has suggested deceleration lanes.

Frank Simonetti: I think it is the right idea only it's on the wrong corner. If it were the southeast corner, it would be better.

Levi Lucero: Any further questions?

Blake Chambliss: On Patterson and 7th don't we have an 80' or 100' set back? What is the set back on these streets?

Don Warner: The business set back is 65' from the center line of the street which would be 15' inside the property line. In R-3 it is 100' from the center line of the street and the set back in H.O. is the same as the PDB setback.

Frank Simonetti: You say you are putting in a restaurant. We need one out there but I hope you don't put a big restaurant in a small service area.

Bob Gerlofs: We're not talking about a big restaurant in that area.

Sam Haupt: We are looking at retail business as a primary thing and we are looking now at a family type restaurant there.

Levi Lucero: Are there any property owners that would like to comment on this?

Skip Mottran: I think it might be helpful for the Commission to know some of the history of that area. At the time it was subdivided, there was a restriction put on it to allow only single family residences. Then it was modified to allow doctor's offices. The owner came around and asked the residents to drop the deed restrictions so he could get the price he wanted for doctor's offices. I was against lifting the deed

restrictions and zoning it B-1. We don't like the idea of it going in for what we see as a traffic increase. There are children walking to school in that area, the increase in traffic will endanger anyone walking on that road.

Ray Davis 606 26 1/2 Road: I purchased my home two years ago with the idea that the area would not be used for retail outlets and I think the others that were going to be here feel the same way. The traffic is a problem in that area and it is very dangerous. I don't think changing the traffic patterns will solve the problem at all. The other two people that were going to be here are under the same impression as I was. They were Wes Edfast and Fred Dunham, one of them got sick and the other one is out of town.

Virginia Flager: What is the status of the extension of Horizon Drive?

Don Warner explained that some right-of-way had been purchased for the extension of Horizon Drive and that they are still working on getting more right-of-way for the extension. He also said that the possibility of the State taking over Horizon Drive had been discussed.

Virginia Flager: Is it definitely going through? Is it just a matter of time or what?

Don Warner: I am sure it is going through. I think it is a matter of time. It could lower quite a little turning movement. I think the answer to the questions on making turns off of 7th would be to require a full additional lane which would be a deceleration lane.

Jane Quimby: I would like to ask the property owners a question. If development on this corner is inevitable, do you prefer what is being proposed or would you want something else?

Skip Mottran: I looked at the zoning and found amusement parks, business, gas stations and electrical package plants can be in the PDB zone not in B-1. I would like to see something in there that would generate less traffic.

Sam Haupt: We asked that the business be limited to retail and the restaurant businesses.

Frank Simonetti: You say some apartments could be put up there.

Sam Haupt: We could put 60 units there with 800 square feet each. You have to get the highest density if your going to go with B-1.

Don Warner: The only restriction on the number of apartments would be the parking requirements.

Ray Davis: I don't think Horizon Drive is going to remedy the problem especially with little children walking and riding bicycles along there. All the areas adjacent to this is basically residential area. I am not sure Horizon Drive is even going to do that much because the people coming in from Paradise Hills are not going to turn on Horizon Drive when they are coming to work and going home at the peak hours of the day.

Janine Rider: It might get rid of some of the high speed traffic. But as far as the number of cars, I think you are right especially during the peak hours when the people are coming in and going home after work.

Don Warner: The proposal shows a six lane highway but actually it's only a four lane. The two other lanes are a right turn slot and a left turn slot.

Skip Mottran: How large is that lot? Is that a two acre site?

Sam Haupt: 80,000 square feet. When I donate the right-of-way it will reduce it to a little over 50,000 square feet.

Levi Lucero: Does the Board have any more discussion on this?

Jand Quimby: We have seen some proposals come along and the project never gets off the ground; then we have the rezoning and we get requests back for more rezoning. Do you have some firm plans for development and sale of this property?

Sam Haupt: Yes, we do Jane, but if it does not go through, we have plans to sell it as B-1. I think we are more interested in developing it under the present option, at this time. I am very well acquainted with the problem you have had and I think there are circumstances that enter into these things and as you all know one of the biggest ones is financing. Until we have it to a point where we can take it and talk to somebody about financing we can't get it. At the present time we are looking at going ahead and developing it--if not, we will have to go ahead and sell it to someone who is big enough to go in and build apartments in there.

Virginia Flager: If those apartments were built this would add school children wouldn't it?

Janine Rider: This is really difficult and it sort of makes me sick because I don't know who's fault it is. I think we are trying to decide between the worst of two evils. I hate the idea that once we said this could be B-1 to allow doctor's offices that all of a sudden we are threatened with 80 apartments which would be allowable. I'm not blaming anyone, but there is something that's not right here which needed to be considered a long time ago just like when three duplexes went in. I don't think we can tell him no now. I think that we should have done something in the beginning. There is something wrong with our foresight. I am bothered by this situation.

Don Warner: Paul Marasco went to all the people and had the restrictive covenants which restricted this area to single family residential. His proposal then was doctor's offices. The Planning Commission then thought that B-1 would be a good service area around the hospital.

Janine Rider: I just don't like these horrible alternatives that are before us for something that was a good idea ten years ago.

Blake Chambliss: May I say that the alternatives before us today are no more horrible than they were ten years ago.

Levi Lucero: We have had enough discussion on this so we will close the hearing. Are there any recommendations or questions?

John Abrams: There is something that has been bothering me. Every time a new development goes in we have utilities that are digging the street up and I think we either need to have enforcement of the regulations or you get some regulations so that the streets are repaired properly. My street had excellent paving and there have been some developments and it is very rough. I think we need to get something in here that says the street will be properly repaired.

Don Warner: The Engineering Department is working with the attorney and they are recommending licensing of any contractor who works in the street so that you can come down on him hard if he doesn't repair the street right.

Frank Simonetti: What could that land be used for that didn't have any cars or people? No matter what is in there, it will generate traffic of some sort.

Blake Chambliss: I don't know why anybody who wants to do anything has to find a piece of land that is not zoned properly. We are taking land that was intended to be offices and I think logically this should be offices. Now we find that apparently the economic feasibility of doctor's offices is not there now and the doctor's offices are moving into residential areas because that's cheaper land and now we've got economic suitability dictating these other things. It seems to me that we react as a Planning Commission to those economic forces and seen unable, maybe unwilling, I'm not sure, to control the economic forces that are making these decisions for us. And in fact, it is the economic forces that are doing the planning for the city and not this planning board or anybody else. I think we all have an inadequate understanding of what that is. I am uncomfortable with this because of the substantial traffic increase at what is probably one of the cities most dangerous intersections. The traffic particularly on Seventh Street on both sides of that hill are terrible. What we will be doing with any development is potentially increasing the traffic at that point. It seems to me to allow the traffic to come out on Seventh Street and on Patterson Road would further complicate that intersection. It seems to me to be difficult and I can't believe that we would do that. I think the area needs to be developed. I have some concerns about the kind of retail things that could go in. Perhaps with the kind of restrictions that Sam is talking about it doesn't appear in the written material but it certainly should be a part of whatever follows. I do feel very strongly the information on the traffic counts the information on the kinds of intersection that we all know Seventh and Patterson to be, that any kind of development that would be allowed there should not be allowed to enter off Seventh street at all. That is a terrible situation. It is a north slope, it's slick and it's always hazardous in terms of visibility. As somebody said, the city is in the process of designing this intersection and I hope any decision we make now would not complicate the design of this intersection until we have had a fairly complete review by them of the design and the layout of these units.

Don Warner: I do have the long comment from Steve McKee, the Traffic Director, and he covers some of the same points that you are talking about there. Although he did go along with an exit southbound, with a protective island. I know something is going to go on that corner and I can't think what you would do that wouldn't create the traffic situation there. The restrictions Sam is talking about are in his letter.

Blake Chambliss: The intent of the PDB is to give flexibility for development. I don't object to PDB if we could solve that traffic intersection problem. I think any further traffic intersection on Seventh Street is going to be disastrous. I don't want to see the problems created 20 years ago repeated here.

Janine Rider: They already have, Virginia.

Levi Lucero: I think what we are trying to say is that we are concerned with the traffic area and that we are not particularly satisfied with the recommendations of the Traffic Department and we would like more detail.

A motion has been made to approve this proposed development with further study of the Traffic Department. (Janine Rider second the motion.)

Blake Chambliss: Sam had made a comment that they would write in that the ~~only uses~~ allowed would be service business-retail, limited inside and restaurant business.

Virginia Flager: The one thing I was going to ask for is the limitation of no outside restaurants.

Levi Lucero: Any more discussion? All in favor say Aye--opposed Nay. Motion passed unanimously.

Don Warner: Would you like the recommendations on the plat before it goes to council? (The Planning Commission said they definitely would.)

Levi Lucero: At what point will we definitely know what is being put in there?

Don Warner: He will have to give you some definite answers before final plan.

Blake Chambliss: There is a requirement in PD that requires 25% of common functional space to be open. You don't have that and I don't know what that means in terms of a PDB but I think somebody needs to look into that.

Levi Lucero: We will have a short recess now.

(The Board recessed at 9:45 A.M. During the recess Jane Quimby made a request that she receive all the materials the Planning Commission members received.)

5. #38-75 PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE OF CITY ORDINANCE:
Amendment to make restaurants with liquor or beer licenses conditional uses.

This is an amendment recommended by the city attorney. Council has had problems with issuance of liquor licenses on getting public input. So this is an attempt to put in one more public forum on liquor licenses. We would put in a new category, 4.9 conditional use for on premises consum alcoholic beverages. It would be a conditional use and would have one more public hearing which would be before this board. And would be a further airing of the fact that there's going to be a liquor license requested. This board could give some input on what they feel the impact on the neighborhood is going to be.

Jane Quimby: We have had some really sticky things lately and the council felt that this would help them arrive at a decision.

Levi Lucero: What happened to bring this up.

Don Warner: One thing that came up was the Funny Pages application on North Avenue. The people came to the liquor license hearing with some objections which were really not typical of liquor licenses because they were objecting to

a situation that had nothing to do with liquor. They felt there was insufficient parking because people were parking in front of their homes for that business complex. This could be brought out in a conditional use hearing, but not really at a hearing for a liquor license. This way council could take a look at all of these things and see what kind of affect this would have on the neighborhood.

Levi Lucero: What kind of action do you want?

Don Warner: A motion to recommend a text change adding this to the ordinance. (Don Warner showed the Board a copy of the legal ad to show them what the addition to the zoning book would be.

Conni McDonough: I think this Board should be fully aware of the difficult questions you will be faced with. It will not be an easy matter.

Virginia Flager: What is going to be the reaction of the public knowing that another Board will be involved in the granting of a liquor license? To me this is adding bureaucracy to bureaucracy and yet I can see that this could be a good idea.

Blake Chambliss: Would they have to come back when the license is to be renewed because the conditional use is not renewable?

Don Warner: No a conditional use, once granted, becomes a use by right. If there were any additions or changes to it this would have different neighborhood effects and I think it would have to come back to you. Of course, you don't have that many, this was a very unusual year for liquor licenses.

Levi Lucero: Any more discussion? We need a motion.

Virginia Flager: I move to approve this. Janine Rider second.

Levi Lucero: A motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion?

Blake Chambliss: I would like to make a general objection and that is I'd like to have a chance to read it and look it over before I approve it. I'm not sure i have any objections but I am going to vote against it because I have not had a chance to look it over.

Levi Lucero: Are you ready for the question: Those in favor vote Aye, opposed Nay.

(The motion was passed with Blake Chambliss voting Nay.)

6. PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE TO CITY ORDINANCE:

Change classification of Main Street from First to Seventh Sts.

Don Warner: Main St. is classified as a secondary from First to the Freeway. It is definitely not a secondary type street from 1st to 7th St. A secondary street is a traffic carrier and Main St. was desinged specifically not to be a carrier. One of the problems it gives us is that it requires an extra 5 foot set back. It would mean that all the buildings there now are 5 feet too close.

Jane Quimby: Why don't we close it?

Don Warner: This has been one of the suggestions. It would be classified as an "other" street from 1st to 7th. The only affect it has is on the setbacks.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion to recommend that change.

Jerry Wilds seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

7. PROPOSED H.O. ZONING - CROSSROADS COLORADO WEST ANNEXATION

Don Warner: This is in line with what we are doing in that area.

Levi Lucero: This has been discussed before, Are there any questions?

Virginia Flager: I make a motion to approve this zoning.

The motion was seconded by Janine Rider and it passed unanimously.

8. REQUESTED VACATION OF 16' OF 19th STREET:

Petitioner: Grand Junction Housing Authority
Location: 19th Street and Walnut Avenue

Blake Chambliss excused himself from discussion on this matter.

Levi Lucero: I will have to disqualify myself.

Jane Quimby: I would like to say something about that. I think we are nit picking about disqualifying ourselves. I think it is getting pretty ridiculous. I really think we get carried away with this. I can appreciate Blake's position a little bit more because he is the consultant but I think we really need to look at what constitutes a conflict of interest.

Don Warner: I think I agree with Jane. This is a non-profit thing and none of you have anything to gain from it. Blake does though because he can benefit from the decision since he is the consultant.

Virginia Flager: I'm glad you brought that up. For some reason or another, the City Planning Commission has been forced to operate differently than the County Planning Commission on the advice of the same attorney. Consequently, the only time we get together is in front of the public. A discussion period for things such as what has happened here this morning would have been invaluable and would have helped clear up some of these things without making the public set through it.

Blake Chambliss: The American Society of Planning Officials has a code of ethics which talks about these things specifically. It might be well for the members of this Board to have one. Maybe Karl could write them for some.

Virginia Flager: But my question still hasn't been answered.

Don Warner: I am going to refer you to the city attorney for that answer. I feel that the public doesn't get the benefit of knowing that you have thought it through and really discussed it if you discuss it at another time.

Levi Lucero: We are steering off the matters on the agenda.

Don Warner presented the location and explained that the 16' vacation would bring the alley down to the 20' alley size. This will never be a street as far as we can see because if it were it would make double frontage lots in this residential area which is not advisable. Our recommendation would be to allow this to be reduced to the regular alley width.

Levi Lucero: Any questions? Anyone in the audience have any comments?

Janine Rider: I'll make a motion to recommend this vacation.

Jerry Wilds seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

9. DISCUSSION OF SIZE REQUIREMENT FOR REAL ESTATE SIGN IN COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL ZONES.

A discussion was held concerning the size requirement of real estate signs that should be allowed in commercial/industrial zones. Don Warner pointed out that some of the real estate people felt that they need to put more information on a sign in the commercial/industrial areas. When asked what size would be reasonable, Mr. Warner said that a request for 32 square feet had been made and that he would recommend a 16 square foot real estate sign as a good size in the commercial/industrial areas.

It was asked what kind of information is placed on the signs to require more space.

~~Mr. Warner~~ explained that sometimes the zoning and possible uses for the land are listed on signs in those areas.

Virginia Flager made a motion to allow 16 square foot signs to be used by real estate people in the commercial/industrial areas. John Abrams seconded the motion.

Blake Chambliss and Jerry Wilds felt that the extra size was not needed. They felt that all the sign needed to have on it was "For Sale" and the address and phone number of the person to be contacted.

The motion was passed with Blake Chambliss and Jerry Wilds opposed.

DISCUSSION

10. CITY MARKET FIRST AND ORCHARD AVENUE.

Don Warner explained that the City Market at First Street and Orchard Avenue was planning to make an addition and would be asking for a variance on the set backs. He told the Board that the variance would go before the City Board of Adjustment but that he wanted them to be aware of what was happening there. The City Market building is 38 feet from the center line of the road and they are proposing an extension of the building and they want the building to follow the same line. The extension would be approximately 50 feet. The Board felt that this would be favorable.

11. LAND DIVISION 17th AND WALNUT AVENUE.

Don Warner explained the location to the Board and explained that there was a long lot that had a house on it and a four-plex. These were placed on the same lot under the old county R-4 zoning. What would be asked for would be a minor subdivision. It would be a non-conforming use under those conditions but it is already non-conforming. The people just want to divide off the house and make the two buildings into two ownerships. Mr. Warner explained that curb and gutter would be required if the subdivision were allowed.

Levi Lucero asked if action was needed and Mr. Warner said he just needed to know if they would consider a minor subdivision plat for the division. The Board indicated that they would consider it.

Don Warner brought two matters to the attention of the Planning Commission. One was the conditional use in R-3 for office buildings and restaurants becoming a problem. The City attorney had expressed concern for this situation and suggests that some rewriting of the regulations be done in order to change the conditional use to what he believes was intended when it was added to the R-3 zone which would allow an office or restaurant only if it is incorporated in an apartment complex type arrangement.

The other thing brought to the Board's attention was the acreage requirement in the zones. Mr. Warner felt that this should be deleted so some flexibility in the mixing of densities could occur. He stated that as long as the neighborhood could stand it

there should be no reason why if someone wanted to take a few lots and build a "Ma and Pa" type grocery store in the area that they couldn't. These were some things Mr. Warner asked the Planning Commission to think about and stated that they would be brought up again at a later date.

COUNTY ITEMS

12. CENTENNIAL '76 MOBILE HOME SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: T.J. Brimhall

Location: Southwest of Orchard Avenue and 30 Road

Jim Patty representing Tom Brimhall: The property is located west of 30 Road and north of North Avenue. It is right next to Memorial Gardens Cemetery. I think the county is talking about vacating this strip to eliminate double frontage. This would give access onto Orchard Avenue. Tom Brimhall is in the process of making the same type of development to the west. Conni asked me to point out that either the county or the city is going to have to provide a bridge over Orchard Avenue. Texas Avenue will come through and go over to 29 1/2 Road and I am not sure if it will be close to Orchard or North Avenue. There are 118 lots. We will have curb, gutter and sidewalks in the subdivision.

Tom Brimhall: This is zoned R-1-D which would accommodate stick built houses or mobile homes but I doubt if there will be any stick built homes there in the near future. We are planning to develop the land to the west of this and we will see how the housing industry is going then. Maybe in our own way we can do our part to alleviate the housing shortage.

Don Warner: This is a transitional subdivision and we will need a motion to approve this as a concept.

Virginia Flager: Looking at that I don't feel we are going to have adequate access. I would like to see Orchard go through there and connect to 30 Road.

Blake Chambliss: We ought to try to connect Elm Avenue because it is a pretty major east-west roadway.

Tom Brimhall: When we develop the acreage west of this as it reaches 29 1/2 Road there are some houses. Texas could go through but Elm couldn't because of the houses.

Blake Chambliss: I guess I recognize the problem we've got, but it seems to me that we need to make some kind of a connection through. My concern is that we are asking them to figure out how we are going to get through there. The City has the authority to pre-plan some streets and it seems to me one of them should be Elm or some east-west traffic street. Maybe we can't do it on Elm but I would like to see the City Traffic Department figure out where we can do it and do something so that additional subdivisions don't close it off completely in the future.

Don Warner: I think one of your best supporters on this is Gus Byrom because he feels that we shouldn't allow these large blocks without getting some cross traffic through.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to see some discussion and some resolution and I think we are in a position now to get something done, and I think Tom would like some direction too.

Tom Brimhall: We had this drawn up a little differently and after discussing it with Gus Byrom and Gene Allen we came up with this. This is now set up with their know-

ledge and direction in the redrawing and replatting of it. This makes three times in the past four months that this has been redrawn.

Virginia Flager: I think I will go along with Blake's stipulation. I think somebody should take some long range looks at the east-west access. We can't depend solely on North Avenue, Orchard and Patterson.

Blake Chambliss: What does the school district say about this? Have you got some comments from them.

Don Warner: There are several comment sheets here but there is not one from the school district.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to know what they have to say before any action is taken on this.

Levi Lucero: Do you want to table it then?

Don Warner: They are probably going to say what they have said on every other development lately and that is that the schools are overcrowded. Your recommendations are to the County Commissioners but they have to have your recommendations before they can approve it.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion to table this until the comments from the school district come in.

Levi Lucero: They need our recommendations before we send it back to the county. We really have a good idea what the school district's comments are going to be.

Blake Chambliss: If we knew what their comments were going to be we wouldn't have to ask for them.

Levi Lucero: We have a motion on the floor is there a second? None. The motion dies for lack of a second.

Don Warner: This is just the preliminary we can ask that the final come back to this Board with Blake's questions answered.

Blake Chambliss: I would make a motion to approve the preliminary plan subject to whatever specific comments the school district might have.

Jerry Wilds seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Conni McDonough came into the meeting at this time. She stated that this subdivision was not a transitional subdivision and that the transitional subdivision was purely voluntary on the part of the developer. She stated that this was being presented for the information of the City Planning Commission and that the developer would be putting in curbs, gutters and sidewalks as the city development regulations require. The only difference would be that city would not have full review and the sidewalk would be nine inches less than city requires. Ms. McDonough also stated that the county had created two new zones, R-1-C and R-1-D which would allow more lots than is allowed by going transitional lots in the city.

Don Warner suggested that the city requirements be placed in the two new zones.

Conni McDonough: I feel it is important that any development within one mile of the City limits be required to have sidewalks.

Levi Lucero: From now on maybe we shouldn't act on anything from the county unless a representative is here.

Conni McDonough: Twice a year this conflict arises when I have to be at the Commissioners meeting at the same time this meeting is being held.

The matter of notifying the public was discussed. The fact that the sign and legal ad were not sufficient to get the public in the area involved was brought up and a request was made that the planning department send agendas to the surrounding property owners so they could not claim that they had not been notified of the proposals being made in their area. Don Warner said that this would be done.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 A.M.