

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., January 28, 1976, by Chairman, LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: VIRGINIA FLAGER, BLAKE CHAMBLISS, JERRY WILDS, JOHN ABRAMS, 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 with one correction changing the name of a person answering a question to the person that actually answered the question.

There were no additions to the agenda.

1 #37-75: PROPOSED BULK DEVELOPMENT FOR PARK PLACE APARTMENTS:

Row ID
Petitioner: Jesse Nugent

Location: First Street and Park Avenue

Don Warner presented the location of the property. He stated that the engineering and traffic departments felt there was enough parking as the plan had shown.

Levi Lucero: Mr. Nugent is in the audience, are there any questions you would like to ask him?

Virginia Flager: What about curb, gutters and sidewalks?

Jess Nugent: We have discussed that and I think it was the decision that because there is going to be quite a bit of change of the grade when the street goes through that I would get into an improvement district.

Don Warner: This was the recommendation of the engineering department because they felt that he would just get the sidewalks, curbs and gutters in and they would come through to improve the street and widen it and would have to tear them out so if Mr. Nugent could get into an improvement district that would take care of it at that time.

Levi Lucero: Any further questions? Are there any other proponents? Are there any opponents in the audience?

Virginia Flager: Has the right-of-way been taken care of?

Don Warner: It will be by the time we are through here.

Blake Chambliss: I will make a motion to recommend the approval of the Bulk Development subject to the improvement district and the granting of the right-of-way needed.

John Abrams seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

- January 28, 1976

Page 2

- 2. #35-75: PROPOSED PLAN WITHIN AN H.O. (HIGHWAY ORIENTED) ZONE:
(Tabled Item)

- Don Warner asked that the Chairman ask if anyone representing the petitioners was in the audience. There was nobody in the audience representing the petitioners for this request. Mr. Warner asked that the item be tabled due to lack of information in the absence of the petitioners or their representative.

- Virginia Flager: I make a motion that this be tabled until such time as sufficient information is submitted to the planning staff.

Jerry Wilds seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

- 3. #19-75: PLAN MODIFICATION - TENNIS CLUB

Petitioner: Dennis Granum

- Location: Lot 19 - Horizon Park Plaza (Southeast of Howard Johnson Motel)

- Blake Chambliss excused himself from discussion on this item because he is involved in the planning of this project.

- Don Warner presented the changes in the plan. The petitioner plans to reduce the number of parking spaces, the number of tennis courts and enlarge the shower rooms. Mr. Warner stated that the changes were extensive enough that the planning staff felt the modification should come back to the Planning Commission for approval.

Levi Lucero: Are there any requirements for parking?

- Mr. Stetner (owner of the property): We reduced the parking spaces and we reduced the number of courts. We felt five courts would be enough and even with the reduced parking we still have five to six spaces per court. The building was changed a little, I don't feel we need any significant changes in our general plan. We just cut down on the number of courts.

- Jane Quimby: Are you planning to cover some of these tennis courts?

Mr. Stetner: At this time I have no plans for putting a bubble on it.

- Don Warner: As far as staff review, we see no problem.

- Levi Lucero: My only concern is access to the back portion.

Don Warner : They show access to the rear.

- Levi Lucero: Are there any proponents or opponents? We will close the hearing.

- Jerry Wilds: I make a motion that we accept the modification of the development as presented.

- Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

No mod except
buildings as
shown

4. # 3-75: PLAN MODIFICATION - PATTERSON GARDENS

Petitioner: Chuck Wiman

Location: Southwest corner of 15th and Patterson Road

Don Warner: This change is fairly minor. They have changed the plan so they could put carports in there and they need one slight change for trash pick up at Bill Reeve's request.

Wayne Lizer from Armstrong Engineering introduced himself as a representative for the petitioner.

Levi Lucero: Do you have any questions of Mr. Lizer?

Blake Chambliss: I have a general question on the PUD. Isn't the plan on file?

Don Warner: The plan on a PUD is recorded in the County Clerk's office and any changes made on it have to be recorded. In this modification, two of the units will have to go to a story and one half to allow room for the carports.

Jerry Wilds: Wasn't that one of the problems at first, the height?

Don Warner: They wanted it to not go any higher than RIC allows. I had one call from Mr. Goffredi and after explaining it to him, he said that they had no objections to that.

Levi Lucero: Are there any opponents to this request? Are there any proponents? We will close the hearing if there are no further questions.

Jerry Wilds: We are not getting all the information we need on these things. We really need to get copies of these plans for modifications on these developments.

Don Warner: We thought the changes to these were minor enough that you really wouldn't need copies in your packets but from now on, we will see that you receive copies of all of them.

Blake Chambliss: I will make a motion to approve the modification with the understanding that this is necessary for the carports but that it is not a modification of the landscaping or anything else.

Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

5. PROPOSED BULK DEVELOPMENT: *code*

Petitioner: Alvin Ricks

Location: 27½ and G Road - Loc. in SW¼ SW¼ SE¼ Sec. 24, T1S, R1E, Ute Meridian, Mesa County.

Don Warner: This property is a long narrow lot which creates problems as far as use of the property. This is a proposal to allow a duplex. He shows on this plan the placement of a mobile home to attach to the existing house there but the mobile home will be an FB unit which is code built.

We have had two calls from the neighborhood because of the sign and both of the people said they were in favor of it.

Levi Lucero: My concern is the tax loads and the way it affects the roadways.

Don Warner: There is no way you could get a street in behind there.

Virginia Flager: You're setting a precedence by letting a mobile home in here.

Don Warner: This is not a mobile home, it is a code built unit. By allowing this you are just letting these people use their lot.

John Abrams asked about the 800 square foot requirement for buildings placed on land in this zone.

Don Warner: When you go to the duplex, you can use the duplex size which is 600 square feet per unit.

Levi Lucero: How do you think this will fit in the neighborhood?

Don Warner: I think it will look better than most of the places out there now.

Levi Lucero: Is Mr. Ricks in the audience?

Don Warner: Yes.

Levi Lucero: Do you have any questions or comments you would like to make Mr. Ricks?

Mr. Ricks: I would like to say that I would like to put in a factory built home on the property according to the plan. I don't think it will be a detriment to the neighborhood.

Blake Chambliss: Have you talked to the neighbors about this proposal?

Mr. Ricks: Yes. They are all in favor of it and they welcome the idea that we put a factory built home in there.

Blake Chambliss: Where are you getting the factory built unit?

Mr. Ricks: I don't have a specific one in mind but I have several places in mind as to where I can get one. I am not going to put in a piece of junk.

Blake Chambliss: You understand that one of our concerns is that the neighborhood is attractive so we don't have something that is visually offensive?

Mr. Ricks: It is an investment for me and I certainly don't want something that is going to endanger my investment.

Levi Lucero: Was your original intent to put a mobile home in there?

Code
Road

Mr. Ricks: A mobile home but an FB unit which is the code built home.

Don Warner: He will have to get a building permit and it will have to be placed on a foundation and the unit will have to meet the Uniform Building Code.

Levi Lucero: Are there any opponents to this request? Are there any other proponents? If not, we will close the hearing.

Virginia Flager: I will make a motion that this be approved and that the building meet the regulations of the Building Department.

Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and it was passed with John Abrams opposed.

6. PROPOSED BARGER MINOR SUBDIVISION:

Code Book
E.J.W.

Petitioner: Bennett Realty
Location: 28 and Orchard Avenue

Don Warner pointed out the location to the Planning Commission. The zoning is R1D.

Levi Lucero: Bill Bennett is in the audience representing the owner. Are there any questions for Mr. Bennett? Are there any proponents or opponents to this request? If not, we will close the hearing.

Blake Chambliss: On the area east of there, are there any projections for that drainage ditch?

Don Warner: No.

Blake Chambliss: Are the curb, gutters, and sidewalks in.

Bill Bennett: The sidewalk isn't in along the whole side of Hall.

Don Warner: Are the curbs and gutters in on 28 Road?

Bill Bennett: They are not there.

Don Warner: Staff recommendations would be for approval subject to the placement of sidewalks, curbs and gutters along Hall Avenue.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion that the subdivision be recommended for approval subject to the curb, gutter and sidewalks being placed along Hall Avenue.

Jerry Wilds seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

7. FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - PD 12

Petitioner: Grand Junction Housing Authority
Location: NW Corner of 19th and Walnut Avenue

Blake Chambliss and Levi Lucero excused themselves from voting on this matter since they are both on the Housing Authority.

Don Warner pointed out the location of the request and explained the City Council's action on the vacation of 19th Street. The review sheets were read to the Commission. The Fire Department recommended that 6 inch lines and hydrants be placed as they had indicated on the plan to provide adequate coverage and accessibility. Bill Reeves commented that he would like the plan to show the trash pick-up sites. Ken Idleman had some reservations about the berm in the north-northwest area of the plan. By locating this berm in the swale, some drainage problems may arise. The actual landscape schemes cannot be properly evaluated at this scale. He had some questions on the ground treatment under the street trees and how they would be watered. He stated that more evergreen trees of different varieties are needed in place of some shade trees. He asked that the turf areas be more clearly defined and that exterior lighting, street furniture and signage be considered to achieve unity in the complex.

Mr. Warner stated that the questions on fire and trash pick-up had been resolved.

There was one comment from the neighbors that they would like some lighting along the alley without glare on them. The plans do have lighting shown in that area.

Public Service requested that the east 6 feet of the 16 feet to be vacated on 19th Street be designated as a natural gas easement.

The School District says Orchard Avenue School is under capacity, East Junior High is slightly under capacity and Grand Junction High School is also shown to be under capacity.

These comments are for the second phase and they show 21 children for the 20 units of family housing.

Jerry Wilds: This did include sidewalks didn't it?

Don Warner: Yes, along Walnut and 17th.

Virginia Flager: Wasn't there a requirement concerning the screening?

Don Warner: There is a requirement for fencing which is for the second portion.

Levi Lucero: Are there any questions for Blake Chambliss?

Jane Quimby: I think you should explain some of the things the Council needed.

Blake Chambliss: The Council had concerns about the width of 19th Street and asked that the alley be increased to 22 feet. They had concerns about the parking and how it would be serviced and if it would generate any conflict with the neighborhood. They sent Charles Teed out to talk to the neighbors and they did not object; they thought it would help eliminate some of the vandalizing.

There were a number of questions on how to deal with 19th Street and they suggested a cul-de-sac in there.

Jerry Wilds: In the discussion of the parking problem, has the Council suggested elimination of the parking on the east side of the alley or will there be "no parking" signs?

Don Warner: They did discuss that and the people said that quite a few had access to garages and rear yards for parking. I think this is something that we can attack through the Traffic Department if it should become a problem.

Levi Lucero: Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to speak?

Donald Curry, 228 28½ Road: I believe I have some serious reservations about putting retirement units with low income housing. My main objections would be the fact that this is a HUD project. When I see what has been done at 17th and Main, 28 Road and Teller Arms, I am afraid we might see something like that in this area. I wonder how you are going to be able to do this when HUD reduces the funds they give you and say that you have to build this a certain way and you have to because of the lower funds you will receive.

Jane Quimby: I sit on the Planning Commission, the Housing Authority and the City Council. We have spent a great deal of time looking into this project. We realized that we had to do the best kind of job possible. In doing this, we have taken every effort to do this right - we want this to be a good part of the community. As for mixing the elderly with the families with children; the input we get from the people in Monterey Park is that the Immaculate Heart of Mary School is the greatest thing that could have happened to them. They don't want to be shut off in the corner. I don't think that the income of people should have consideration in making places for them to live. We have a management contract worked up for this project. There is going to be a management in this development and as time permits, we will have a full time - possibly more than a full time manager. We will be responsible for how these units are kept and we aren't going to let them become run-down and look badly. We are the ones who have to answer to the public for them.

Donald Curry: I recognize that you would be responsible but I fail to see how this power can make this any different than the other projects in the area. Also, there is a lot of difference between having children going to and from school across the street and having them live next to you. This type of project has not been successful anywhere else in the country.

Levi Lucero: Are you saying that Monterey Park is not successful?

Donald Curry: No sir. I am referring to phase two with the family units.

Levi Lucero: There are a considerable number of children living all around Monterey Park they don't just go by to go to school.

Don Warner: The development behind Teller Arms had no control on it when it was built and the low income housing units on Main Street was a bulk development which had very few controls on it. This project will be closely watched and there will be some definite controls on it.

Levi Lucero: A lot of it has to do with management. They will be subject to management controls and if they don't keep the place up, they will not live there - that is just the way it will be.

Donald Curry: I am sure you are aware of placing your building around HUD. Do you have the budget all lined out?

Levi Lucero: We have everything but the financing for phase two lined up. We are expecting the financing for phase two to come through within the next 30 days. We appreciate your concerns and we wish others would come up and express themselves as you have done.

Virginia Flager: I have been concerned about this project also. I live in an area fairly adjacent to that and I would like to see people like yourself to see that this is maintained like it should be by watching what is going on in that area and see that it is maintained the way it should be.

Jane Quimby: We do have an opening coming up on the Housing Authority. Would you like to apply, Mr. Curry? Since you have a little more interest than the other people I would like to suggest that you submit your name for the position.

Donald Curry: Yes, I would be interested in that. I have one more question. Are there any projections for widening 17th Street?

Don Warner: Yes, but it is down the road a way.

Virginia Flager: I will make a motion that we recommend approval for this final plan subject to all the conditions.

John Abrams seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Jane Quimby: Mr. Curry, do you live in the city limits?

Donald Curry: I was just about to ask about that, no, I don't. My mother lives in the area of this project and that's why I came to speak to you.

Jane Quimby: I'm sorry, that is the one requirement we have for serving on any city board, you must live in the city limits.

8. REQUESTED EASEMENT VACATION:

Petitioner: Phipps Construction

Location: First and Patterson Road - Vacation of the 10' easement along the East side of Lot 2 and the South 15' of the 10' easement along the East side of Lot 5 of Block 1 of the Olympic Acres Subdivision.

Don Warner showed the location and explained that the vacation had been cleared with Public Service, Mountain Bell and the City Utility Department.

Dwight Scott: I am here to answer any questions. The reason for this was the street set back on Patterson Road and the easement doesn't need to be this big.

Don Warner: We have discussed it quite thoroughly with the engineering department and all the utilities have agreed so staff recommends approval.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion that we recommend approval of the vacation of the part of the easement that is not necessary.

Jerry Wilds seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

9. CONSIDERATION OF A USE IN H.O. ZONE

Location: 12th & ~~Pittin~~ Avenue

The location was corrected to read 12th and Ute Avenue.

Blake Chambliss excused himself from this discussion as he had a personal interest in the project.

Don Warner explained that this had come before the Commission and had been approved once before but that the property had been sold since then and the new owner wanted to do the same thing. The new owner had contacted Chambliss

Dillon and Associates and asked if he could use the same plan that had been drawn up before and was told he could. Consequently, this is the same plan, same property but with new owners. This required an approval action by the Planning Commission because there was a new applicant.

Levi Lucero: Are there any proponents or opponents?

Jerry Wilds: I would like to make a motion that we recommend approval of this plan for the new applicant.

Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

10. PROPOSED COLORADO WEST DEVELOPMENT PARK FILING #2:

Petitioner: Chamber of Commerce

Location: SE Corner of Winters Avenue and 12th Street.

Don Warner: This is a proposed addition of lots to the Colorado West Development Park. Dale Hollingsworth is here from the Chamber of Commerce to talk to you about it.

Dale Hollingsworth: When we filed the original plan, we filed on the entire 65 acres. We are here to file an additional plat for the land south of Winters Avenue. When we filed the first plat, 12th Street south of Winters was vacated and the Chamber tried to trade land for right-of-way with AMAX. Right now they have to cross our land without any right-of-way to get to their building. When AMAX sold their land, we contacted the man who bought it and told him the situation. We don't feel they should be able to use our land for access and that maybe the new owner should buy some right-of-way from us.

Don Warner: I have discussed this with the City Attorney and if the Planning Commission thinks this is a viable road for crossing the river, he says we should leave that possibility open.

Levi Lucero: Are you concerned about losing the land or that the right-of-way goes on across the river?

Dale Hollingsworth: The right-of-way here is of no value to us.

ROW
revised
Date
Imp 1st
May 1st start
July 1st completion

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

January 28, 1976

Page 10

Don Warner: I think we need to make an indication of whether or not we are going to make a 12th Street crossing. We could make a covenant to the City and it would have to say we will deed right-of-way when needed - it is a guarantee.

Virginia Flager: What's the difference between the covenant and the right-of-way?

Levi Lucero: They still pay taxes on it if it is under a covenant.

Don Warner: If you feel there is a chance that the bridge might go through, a covenant should be placed on this whole piece of land.

Dale Hollingsworth: We are giving up additional land for a road to which we are opposed and we are giving up our land to people who were told previously that there was not any access.

Virginia Flager: I think the option of crossing the river there must be kept open.

Don Warner: On the promise that they would subdivide, I have allowed them to get a building permit.

Levi Lucero: Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to speak on this matter?

Alicia Cadez: I am with the State Home and Training School and I would like to point out that our only access is on 9th Street for crossing the railroad tracks. It has come to our attention that there may be a possibility of an underpass being put in and we would like to support it. If there were ever an emergency at the State Home we would not be able to get emergency vehicles there very fast especially since the crossing at 9th Street is very often blocked by a train and traffic is backed up for two blocks. Any other way out would take much longer and could make a big difference. So we would like to say that we do support the crossing of the railroad at 12th Street.

Levi Lucero: The Board would like to support you on this.

Dale Hollingsworth: We favor the railroad crossing but not the river crossing.

Levi Lucero: Does anyone else wish to speak? Then we will close the hearing.

Virginia Flager: Being as we have a meeting coming up on Saturday, I move that we table this if it won't delay any progress on the land.

Levi Lucero asked that other owners in the area be contacted with the hope that the Planning Commission could get some input from them.

Jerry Wilds seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

11. REQUEST FOR A REZONING FROM R-1-C to R-2:

Petitioner: Gilbert Rentals
Location: 16th Street and Texas Avenue

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

January 28, 1976

Page 11

Don Warner: This is a request for rezoning of two lots under the R-2. This area would allow a four plex. The zoning around these lots is R-1-C and across the street from these lots it is zoned R-2.

Bill Prakken (representing the Gilberts): The plans are now being drawn up. The owners plan to put four - two bedroom apartments of about 1,000 square feet, moderate rentals on these lots. I think sometimes that the Commission might want to consider what is existing on the lots now. There are two unsightly homes, the rezoning would allow the removal of the two homes and be replaced with more appealing buildings. The change in zoning would permit the construction of the fourplex which would increase the tax value of the property. Mr. Newton, the man who will build the four plex is present to answer any questions you may have about it.

Levi Lucero: How did they put a triplex in the R1C zoning?

Don Warner: The triplex is in the R-2 zone and it was an approved bulk development.

Bill Prakken: There is a terrific need for this and there is a need for more high density housing particularly in the part of the community close to the shopping and I don't think this would scar the neighborhood.

Levi Lucero: Are there any other proponents? If not, are there any opponents?

Leonard Huff: I brought a list of names of neighbors that are against this rezoning. I think the neighborhood has more or less let you know what they think of this idea. There are several multi-family units facing Texas and the street is only approximately 36 feet wide. I don't know how many cars Texas can stand, but it looks like it has about all it can stand now.

If you put in four more units, it will equal about 20 cars being parked on the street there.

Bill Prakken: That parcel is already occupied by two families and this would add only two more cars and there is a requirement for two parking spaces per unit. If a four plex is constructed there would be ample off-street parking. If these are the only major objections, they will be taken care of.

Leonard Huff: They are against a zone change. It's like a cancer - once it starts it begins to spread and everybody says you did it for them why don't you do it for me. I moved up there to get away from congestion and now you want to add it. You have plenty of off-street parking but it doesn't reduce the amount of traffic.

Carl Asher: My objection is that the Gilberts railroad things down the neighborhood's throat. They moved those houses in there without asking anybody and now they want to do this. Until I can see some plans showing what they want to do and what is going in there, I will be opposed to it. For all we know they might want to move something else in there and if they get this rezoning who knows what they will do. I want to see some plans that they are going to stick to.

Mr. Newton: The proposed four plex on this land would be a garden level.

There are 12,671 square feet of land owned by the Gilberts. The building would take 4,000 square feet; that would leave an excess of 8,000 square feet for landscaping, sidewalks and parking.

Mr. Newton showed the Planning Commission the houses as they are and what will be done if the rezoning is granted. He told the Commission that he built the triplex across the street from this request and that the reason the cars were being parked in the street was because they had not been able to blacktop the parking area due to the frozen ground.

Virginia Flager: I don't think the issue is the proposal. I think the rezoning is the issue. I would like to see the discussion closed on it. I agree that once rezoning starts in a neighborhood, it's like a cancer and spreads throughout the neighborhood. On this basis, I would like to make a motion that we deny this rezoning request.

John Abrams seconded the motion.

Blake Chambliss: It seems to me that there are three basic reasons to rezone property. One is that there was a mistake in the original zoning; I don't think there was here. The second is if there was a substantial change in the neighborhood; this isn't the case here. The third is a question of need and I think there is a need for housing but we have a substantial amount of R-2 zoning in the area that is not being used; therefore, I think the motion to deny the change is justified.

Jerry Wilds: I think Blake has pretty well covered the groundwork we should be working with.

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

The Board had a discussion on the procedure to be followed on the joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting to be held Saturday, January 31, 1976. The Planning Commission requested that Don Warner and Gene Allen attend the meeting during the morning to bring the groups up to date on what is being done in the Development Department and what projects are taking place.

COUNTY ITEMS:

A. CENTENNIAL '76 MOBILE HOME SUBDIVISION FILING #2

Paul Arpke presented filing #2 of the Centennial '76 development and pointed out that included in the second filing there is a three acre park.

Paul Arpke: This is a mobile home subdivision under the R1D zoning. The zoning requires 6,500 square foot lots and you are allowed to place a mobile home on the lot and at a future date you can request a conditional use to build a single family conventional house.

Levi Lucero: The type of individual that you are seeking will be mobile home dwellers, right Tom?

Tom Brimhall: Yes, it will be directed toward mobile homes.

Levi Lucero: Are there any questions?

Jim Patty: At a later date there is going to be a need for a bridge - since Mr. Brimhall is opening up Orchard Avenue. We have two accesses on to 29½ Road and he will be putting in curb, gutters and sidewalks.

Levi Lucero: Is this just informational, Don?

Don Warner: Any recommendations you have should be made now.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to make a motion. I think that working through and trying to make Texas a through street and would like to recommend that they look very closely at the extension of Texas or the access through. The developer is going out of his way to do that and I would like to see them say that it might go through.

B. WESLO COMMERCIAL - SKETCH PLAN

Paul Arpke presented the location and stated that it is presently zoned commercial. In general, this subdivision is totally dependent on what happens with the sewer system. The radius of the cul-de-sac will be 55 feet.

Virginia Flager: It is contingent on the trunk line?

Paul Arpke: It is contingent on a sewer system.

Jim Patty: At the southeast corner there is a subdivision that is in about the same predicament. As far as the sewer goes, the client has indicated that he might go in with a force main up Patterson to the school property but it is still up in the air with which way they are going with the master sewer plan.

Jerry Wilds: Who names those streets? Doesn't it correspond to another street in the city?

Paul Arpke: I don't know just exactly what street it would correspond with in the city.

Don Warner pointed out that the addressing could become confusing if the street connected in the city to a street with similar addresses.

C. TRADING POST SUBDIVISION - SKETCH PLAN

Paul Arpke presented the location of the development. The subdivision has a total of 48 lots.

Blake Chambliss: All that land will be wiped out of agricultural use?

Paul Arpke: When you have water, sewer and everything there, how can you say "no"?

Don Warner: I think what you have to do is to in and back zone.

Virginia Flager: How many acres are being platted in this development?

Paul Arpke: 17.2 acres.

D. EASTWOOD, REPLAT TRACT C FILING #1

Paul Arpke located the property and told the Commission what was around the development. This is coming in under the new PD-M regulations which require less open space. Under the PD-M they will be required to have 13% open space plus 5% in parks.

Blake Chambliss: How many mobile homes can be placed in that development?

Paul Arpke: 71 units.

Jerry Wilds: What size are those lots?

Don Warner: They are 50 feet wide by 100 feet deep.

Jane Quimby: I am getting to the point where I would rather see a mobile home on a piece of land here and there rather than in something like this.

Don Warner: I think you are going to have to define what people think is wrong with mobile homes before we can do that.

Jane Quimby: I am not objecting to mobile homes but I am opposed to the concentration in one area.

DISCUSSION:

A discussion was held concerning the February workshop and a meeting was set up for February 17, 1976, at 7:30 P.M. to discuss the designation of future and present roadways in the community.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 A.M.