

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

JULY 28, 1976

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 8:35 A.M. in the City Council Chambers, by Chairman, LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: VIRGINIA FLAGER, JANINE RIDER and FRANK SIMONETTI.

Also present were: DON WARNER, Sr. City Planner; KARL METZNER, Planning Technician; BARBARA EINSPAHR, Acting Secretary and approximately 35 interested persons.

The minutes for the June 30, meeting were approved as mailed. Additions to the agenda were under Discussion: (D) Seminar concerning agriculture problems in Mesa County, (E) Discussion of proposed business on North Avenue.

3. #45-76: PROPOSAL FOR A CONDITIONAL USE - SONIC BURGER

Petitioner: Logan Wright  
Location: 1051 and 1061 North Avenue

Don Warner: At the previous hearing, there was objection to the two proposed driveways onto North Avenue. It was suggested to the applicants at that time that a drive would be acceptable on 11th Street. Ron Rish, City Engineer, agrees with one exception. The driveway island infringes upon the alley and the driveway should be moved 20' to the north so the full 20' exit for the alley would exist. There may be a need for two spaces on the end to be taken off in order for flow of traffic.

Levi Lucero: Weren't there another two spaces taken off originally?

Don Warner: Engineering and traffic have both looked at this and they see no problem with this layout. A hedge is shown but no detail is shown as to what material it is on, what the proposed trees are. This would have to be shown before going to City Council and have it cleared with Parks Department.

Levi Lucero: Are there any proponents in the audience wishing to make any comments?

Lee Trudgeon: (Representative for Mr. Wright) I would like to point out that the plan for landscaping has been subject to Park Departments and Recreation.

Levi Lucero: Have you received any comments?

Lee Trudgeon: No, I have had no response whatsoever.

(Mr. Trudgeon showed pictures of the facility at Montrose and read a letter from Logan Wright, which is on file in the Development Department.)

Frank Simonetti: Do the patrons park their car and walk in and get the food?

Lee Trudgeon: No. The mode of operation is to drive-in to a parking bay and use the microphone to place the orders. The patron actually never

July 28, 1976

Page 2

gets out of his car. A facility is provided to deposit tray and paper. There will be one walk-up window but no eating on the premises will be allowed unless they stay in their car.

Levi Lucero: Would it be in order to have a stipulation that there will not be any outside eating accommodations?

Lee Trudgeon: There are not plans for one and I am sure you will have the cooperation of Mr. Wright.

Frank Rose: While in Montrose on business I went to the Sonic Drive-In and it is clean. It appeared that they ran a good operation. Mr. Wright has been very straight forward with his dealings with me and I feel that he would be with you also.

Steve Johnson: My son lives across the street from the Sonic Burger in Montrose. They are delighted with the business and happy to have it there.

Levi Lucero: Are there any opponents. There were no opponents. The hearing was closed.

Jane Quimby: Is it agreeable with the lady that lives in the residence to be separated by the 5' fence? Does she know that there will be a fence between her and the operation?

Lee Trudgeon: Not to the best of my knowledge. I would imagine under the circumstances that she would want a fence there - I suppose she should be advised of our intentions and if she has any objections, we should discuss them.

Levi Lucero: Has anyone had personal contact with this lady?

Don Warner: Frank Rose has had, but I have not. We do generally require fencing between a single family use even is it's in the Business Zone.

Frank Rose: I have discussed with her the fact that sooner or later a business will be going in and it isn't going to be as nice a place to live. A while back I tried to get her to sell but this is her home and she wants to stay. I'm sure they will maintain the fence.

Jane Quimby: My point is that the more informed she is about what is going to happen to her, perhaps it will be easier for her to accept it.

Virginia Flager: I am concerned with the left turn onto North Avenue. During peak hours, blocking of traffic will occur.

Don Warner: There are left turns being made now from 11th Street and, as you know, there is a left turn lane. We do get some hold up in this spot which is less than the hold up going the other way. At busy times, there will be a lot of cars going into Kentucky Fried Chicken and the Sonic Burger and some hold up will occur.

Virginia Flager: Is there also going to be a no left turn coming out of that driveway trying to get back onto 11th Street?

Don Warner: This is up to the Board. I would suggest that a no left

turn would be the way to set that up. The Engineering Department has approved that driveway saying that it is the required distance away from North Avenue.

Frank Simonetti: This is going to be bad during the peak hours. It's only a block from 12th and North Avenue.

Virginia Flager: The rate of accidents that occur within this two block area of 12th and North Avenue and the congestion at peak hours is my objection to the proposal.

Janine Rider: There might be some resentment for patrons to have to go into a residential area in order to get back onto North Avenue.

Virginia Flager: What kind of action can be taken if a large amount of foot traffic is encouraged across North Avenue by college students? Do we have any mechanism to protect the people crossing one of the busiest streets in town?

Don Warner: I don't think so.

Jim Gale: The only way you can get people to cross where they are supposed to is for the Police Department to issue tickets to the violators. It is almost impossible to protect people from themselves.

Don Warner: I could stand to be corrected but I think the Model Traffic Code does not call crossing in the middle of the block illegal unless there is a signal light at each end of the block.

Janine Rider: The only protection that I can see is that a drive-in is a conditional use and a conditional use is not applicable in all areas. I think this is one where it may not be.

Jim Gale: I think that you should remember to that this is not all new traffic. Regardless of how many hamburger facilities that you put in, there are only so many hamburgers that are going to be sold. So, consequently, some of the traffic on the corner of 11th Street is in coming from some of the other areas that are also congested.

Virginia Flager: My main concern is the four to five thousand students immediately to the north that cross the four-lane street. I think there is a better use of this property. We have promises of what is going to be done, but what action can we take if it does not become reality?

Lee Trudgeon: I think that the picture reflected that the facility in Montrose was 100% complete before the doors even opened.

Janine Rider: I think that those of us who have bad feelings about it have no bad feelings whatsoever about the business itself. It sounds like it would be upstanding and have the best intentions. It is just the location for this conditional use that bothers us.

Jim Gale: If you are worried about the student traffic, the only alternative would be to put a crosswalk at 11th Street.

Levi Lucero: Regardless of where you put this facility up and down North

North Avenue or any other facility around the college, there will be students crossing the street.

Jim Gale: Is there anything that you can have control on for landscaping.

Don Warner: Yes, we have full control on the landscaping. I don't think this will be any problem because it will be as agreed with Parks Department. The walk crossing light would be a problem since it is so close to 12th and North Avenue.

Levi Lucero: Would there be any objections to not having the self-service window?

Lee Trudgeon: This has in the past been a part of their business. All I can say is that I would have to speak to Mr. Wright. I know how badly he wants to open a business here. I suppose we would have his cooperation at that also.

Levi Lucero: I would like to recommend to leave the walk-up window open since this is a conditional use and if a problem is created with the students crossing and taking their trash across the street, then have them close the window.

Jane Quimby: Looking at it from the standpoint of the college students, I think it is a tremendous addition.

Janine Rider made the motion to deny the conditional use for Sonic Burger at 1051 and 1061 North Avenue. Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. #46-76: PROPOSED BULK DEVELOPMENT IN R-2-A

Petitioner: Federal Projects, Inc.

Location: NE of 28½ Road and Orchard Avenue

Karl Metzner pointed out the property in question.

Karl Metzner: This is proposed to cross the canal at a future date. I have talked with the City Engineer, Ron Rish, and he has stated that the project is on a list for federal aid projects and is the last one on the list. They are proposing condominium project style units. This is to the west of Cedar Terrace and they are going ahead with the Brittany Drive on their portion as you asked for Cedar Terrace. There are sufficient parking spaces. Since 28½ Road is going over the canal at some time, the City Engineer gave us some preliminary grades for what they would have to bring 28½ Road up to cross the canal. Preliminary grade is four foot above level shown here, six foot above the level at the second entrance and 12 feet above the level shown at the back line of the row of buildings. Ron Rish has suggested that as far as improvements on 28½ Road, we could ask for improvements up to half of the project now. He could give them grades for putting in curb, gutter and sidewalks. He does not have any final grades for the remaining part of development and suggests that if the Board approves this, approve it under the condition that engineering approve all of these grades and all design before anything goes in there and allow them to make a temporary roadway.

Levi Lucero: Will this have to go into any improvement district?

Karl Metzner: Depending upon what you do, but we could get a power of attorney to join the improvement district for this second half. A blanket easement is required for all of the utilities. Fire Department has suggested some hydrants which will be passed onto City Utilities for their part in taking care of this. There is a minor problem with the landscaping in that some of the landscaping shown will not grow in this area and it has been transmitted to the developers. They will have to get with Parks Department to resolve those few issues. There will be 14 one-bedroom units, 72 two bedroom units and 23 three-bedroom units.

Ron Mesec of Federal Projects: I am here to answer any question you might have.

Jane Quimby: What kind of time table are you looking at?

Ron Mesec: It would be six months or so before any potential construction could start.

Virginia Flager: Federal Projects, Inc. indicates a governmental agency.

Ron Mesec: It is a private company. Federal Projects has existed since the early 60's. If this project were to start tomorrow it would be the 89th project. We have been dealing with F.H.A. and H.U.D. for many years and we have a good relationship. The contract rents would be \$210.00 for one bedroom units, \$260.00 for two bedroom units and \$290.00 for three bedroom units.

Levi Lucero: Are there anymore proponents or any opponents? There were none. The hearing was closed.

Don Warner: There is an existing house on the corner that is excluded. This is a 10 acre tract separated by Grand Valley Canal.

Levi Lucero: A copy of the elevations should be taken to the City Council meeting.

Virginia Flager made the motion to recommend approval of Federal Projects, Inc. to City Council subject to working out problem of grades with the City Engineering Department, power of attorney for the north and for improvement district and improvements on the south end and problem of types of trees be worked out with the City Parks Department with the stipulation that if construction is not started within nine months then an extension must be requested from the Planning Commission at that time.

Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

5. #49-76: PROPOSED REZONING FROM R-3 to B-3

Petitioner: M.A. Heller & W.A. Weaver

Location: Between 12th and 13th St., South of Walnut

#48-76: PROPOSED ALLEY VACATION

Petitioner and Location: Same as above

Don Warner: This is a proposal for B-3 zoning in an area that is presently R-3. They are also asking that the portion of the alley that comes from the east and turns south be vacated. This alley is not open yet, but is a deeded alley.

Jane Quimby: If we vacate that portion of the alley running east and west, what would that do to the property owners directly to the north?

Don Warner: This is all one property owner?

Mr. Heller: You ask what is the alley doing there? For a period of three months, I fought with the City back and forth about giving it an easement. I finally had to go this route because they forced me to. So what we want to do is give an easement for the sewer lines and move the alley back.

Levi Lucero: Are there sewer lines in that present alley now?

Mr. Heller: Yes, east and west.

Don Warner: This has been determined by the City Utilities that if this alley is vacated it would remain subject to easements for utilities.

Levi Lucero: We would like to hear from the proponents if you have any comments you would like to make.

Bob Gerlofs (representing the petitioners): The initial request was a proposal to locate an enclosed restaurant on this property and this is the only B zone that will allow this type of restaurant. They feel that a B-3 zone is a less intensive use of the land than an R-3 zone for city services including roadways and will probably return equal amounts in revenue to the city commerce through appraised property values when developed. I think that the relocation of the alley is logical regardless of what your decision might be on the zone change. Right now it physically bisects the property and also reduces the allowed useable area because with the alley there, it does create a sideyard there which we would have to setback from.

Levi Lucero: Are there any opponents in the audience wishing to speak? There were no opponents.

Mr. Weaver: I have a lot of inquiries about that property. Everybody wants a business property, no apartments.

Jane Quimby: If rezoned for business, do you intend to develop that?

Mr. Heller: I really don't know if I will or not. I have a man here who would like to develop it.

Charles Cronas: I intend to develop that parcel if you change it to Business. I intend to put in a high-classed restaurant, fish house and the remaining in stores.

Levi Lucero: Are there any requirements for lot sizes?

Don Warner: No, this zone has no requirement for minimum lot size.

Mr. Heller: What I would like to have on a portion of land would be

Doctors offices. The existing alley has sewer coming across and is not an accessible alley for people to drive through. There is off-street parking behind apartments off of Walnut Avenue. All utilities are in.

Don Warner: Public Service has requested that if this alley is vacated that it be retained as an easement.

Levi Lucero read a letter from Mr. Roy Cottingham, of 1250 Pinyon Avenue requesting denial of the rezoning. (The letter is on file at the Development Department)

Mr. Heller: November 25, 1957, this was registered in the County Books on page 404, book 730, this was zoned as Business when I was in the County and when I came into the city, this zone was taken away. This was zoned business when Mr. Cottingham bought the property.

Levi Lucero: One of the things we like to know before changing the zoning is the type of use for the property.

Don Warner: An apartment house would be allowed as a conditional use under a B-3 zone. Also, if rezoned, we have to look at two things; was the zoning wrong in the first place or have conditions changed so that it warrants a change of zone.

Levi Lucero: There certainly has been a change in the nature of that area.

Jane Quimby: Under the present zoning, isn't a restaurant a conditional use?

Don Warner: Yes. At the time Albertson's and Skagg's was zoned, it was required that a buffer zone be put around that single family housing. The south end of property was zoned B-3 and the north end zoned "P" for parking. Later on there was a request for a zone change and the parking zone was changed to B-3.

There were no further opponents. The hearing was closed.

Don Warner: Engineering will require the developers to pipe an irrigation ditch that goes down where the new alley would be if rezoned and alley vacated.

Mr. Heller: There is no water running down there. The water comes from the north to the alley. That is a cemented ditch. Two residents water their lawns from this ditch and that is all. There is no run-off.

Levi Lucero: Has the possibility of extending the alley up to Walnut been looked at?

Don Warner: I don't think you want to do that because I think this would add to the problems of the residents.

Jane Quimby: Maybe what this is going to have to come to is that a mixed use in a neighborhood can be compatible.

Frank Simonetti made the motion to recommend approval of rezoning from R-3 to B-3 to City Council. Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it was

passed unanimously.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend to City Council the vacation of the deeded alley and relocation of the new alley with the reservation of easement over the alley. Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

6. #50-76: PROPOSED REZONING FROM R-1-A to R-1-C and R-2

Petitioner: R. A. Raso

Location: North of Patterson Road, South of F 1/2 Road and  
East of 26 Road

Don Warner: This is a request for two sites to be rezoned. There are two separate ownerships within tract. The opposition is sufficient so that if it goes to City Council, a 6-1 vote would be required for approval. The present zoning R-1-A requires 10,500 square foot lot with a minimum frontage of 85 feet and 1,500 square foot minimum for home. R-1-C requires 6,000 square foot lot, 60 foot frontage and 800 square foot minimum for home. R-2 allows a duplex on 6,000 square foot or a four plex on 9,000 square foot. The surrounding zoning is R-2 in the city, R-1-A in the County and R-1-A in the city and R-1-B for Willowbrook Subdivision. The County R-1-A differs from the City R-1-A in that it requires 1 acre. The City growth density for R-1-A is 4 to the acre, R-1-C is 7.23 to an acre, and R-2 on the South end is approximately 28 to the acre.

Levi Lucero: Don, would you update us on the status of Horizon Drive and the right-of-way?

Don Warner: There is going right now, which is financed under Urban Systems, a study for the location of Horizon Drive. Ron Rish's statement is as follows: "We will recommend against this rezoning pending the Environmental Impact Study and analysis of plans for Horizon Drive extension area. This should be conducted in the very near future as soon as contractor approval comes back from FHWA and CBH. This is to be conducted by Centennial Engineering and is scheduled for 160 calendar days including public hearings and community input.

Don Warner: Other comment sheets have no objection to the request.

Levi Lucero: Are there any proponents wishing to speak?

Bob Gerlofs: I would like to start off amplifying on Don Warner's comments regarding the area and surrounding zoning to point out some of the facilities and services which are available in the area. This property is located in the area of Northern Acres which is R-1-A. Across F Road from Willowbrook Subdivision is an R-2 zoned parcel and then we come into the City into R-1-B zoning. The corner that is in the County is zoned R-2. R-2 also allows development of units in the 9,000 square foot with 75 foot lot frontages in the R-2 Transitional zone. F Road is a metro plane major arterial highway. First Street is a major arterial as is Horizon Drive and the expansion of Horizon Drive is planned to be a Master Plan Major Arterial. We have shopping facilities on First Street; hospital and other related business to the East. At 12th and Orchard Avenue shopping is available with new shopping area at the corner of 12th and F Road. The fire station is located approximately 1/2 mile to the West on 25 1/2 Road.



Fifteen inch sewer line runs through the property with 14", 8" and 6" water lines in the intersection North of Patterson Road. The parcel itself has approximately 60 acres and there is a 5 acre exception and 1 1/2 acre exception with the zone change within the boundaries. In our development plans we have included the 5 acre parcel. It is not necessary or desirable on that piece to change the zoning. We didn't ask for a zone change and then go out and develop a plan. We've spent almost 6 months in various types of analysis of this property to find out what plan we would like to apply to it and then requested the zone change which we felt was appropriate. As a matter of interest to you we started out with a PD-8 and with the highway and open space and other considerations we felt that the PD-8 was inappropriate. We dropped down to a PD-4 and again with the considerations we had taken into account we ended up with PD-4 density apartment complexes on the project, townhouses and again we did not feel that this was in keeping with the neighborhood. Next we looked at something we thought would be in keeping with Spring Valley Subdivision. The developers of the property are not the current owners. Tom Folkstad, contractor, is one of the developers as are Steve and Gail Foster. With Spring Valley thought in mind we laid out the property and laying it out we approached some lots which are around 8,000 square foot. Spring Valley is an R-1-B zone, 9,000 square foot lots. In our sketch plan, we did end up with some lots that are under the 9,000 square foot R-1-B minimum lot size. We do not have any lots that are 6,000 square feet but we cannot guarantee that the property will not be developed to 6,000 square foot. All I can say is that is not the intention of the present developer to go to that lot size. If we can lock into an 8,000 square foot minimum lot size, the developer would be willing to do that. Perhaps the way to accomplish that is to process the subdivision plat concurrently with the zoning. The 5 acre exception lays out quite well with the R-1-A densities. The reason we get into smaller lot sizes is for flexibility of design not necessarily to cram more units on the property. Our minimum lot sizes would project 80 foot lot width for most of them. The R-2 area, the developers felt that there was a potential market for duplexes. The R-2 zone is the only zone we can get into with that duplex construction so we went with an R-2 zone on a map that looks like 20 acres of R-2. But when you realize that Horizon Drive and the City is proposing to take approximately 5 acres of this ground or more reduces the R-2 zone and actually eliminates about 18 of those lots we have in the R-2 zone. Knowing what we know about Horizon Drive, which is very little, we have projected that it will not come in at the bottom of the property but will come in on the upper level, swing down and take out about 100 foot right-of-way.

Levi Lucero: Don, have you seen any designs for Horizon Drive?

Don Warner: All I know is in discussion of this it was proposed to come in a little bit further to the North. The area between Horizon Drive and the canal is proposed to have grass. A 100 foot right-of-way will need to be provided.

I think Bob Gerlofs realizes that his plan may change somewhat if Horizon Drive does go through because I think the access is going to be limited. There may be a need for a collection street that ties his street together.

One correction to the statement that you can only build duplexes in an R-2 zone. You can also build duplexes in an R-2-A zones.

Bob Gerlofs: We can in R-2-A but R-2-A is again a heavier, a more intensive use than an R-2, isn't it?

Don Warner: No. R-2-A zone is a lighter use in which a duplex is allowed on 6,000 square foot but only allows a four plex on 12,000 square foot. R-2 zone allows a duplex on 6,000 square foot and a four plex on 9,000 square foot.

Bob Gerlofs: Knowing the developers wishes we should probably be in an R-2-A zone. Another thing I would like to point out is that the property is relatively isolated from adjacent properties by the fact that it is surrounded by canals and drain ditches. They do border the properties on First Street.

In our firm we work under the philosophy that higher density zoning should take place within the City limits and close to the corridor. I know it is not a very good thought to the neighbors that this farm which has existed previously as a dairy farm and now as alfalfa field and as other agricultural resources for it to be developed. But I think that its going to go into development and I think it should be put to its best use in as much as the services are available and the highway system is there even if the roads may not yet be developed to their full width. As a matter of interest on this plan we have shown 142 R-1-C units, 53 R-2 units, 14 units in the R-1-A. Lot wise it is under 3 units per acre. I would request that action be taken on this without respect to City Engineers, Ron Rish's comments that no action be taken until Horizon Drive is settled. I think the Horizon Drive issue can be addressed with the subdivision plat. 160 days is the work time for the engineer and the engineers contract. It has not even been approved by the Federal Highway Department or the Colorado Highway Department and I think that if he wants to address that question that the subdivision stays in its proper place I'm not sure that the zoning has a great effect on that.

Levi Lucero: Are there any other proponents wishing to speak?

Jackie Moland: I want to speak not as an opponent but just out of curiosity I would like to know how many people would be houses in this area exactly?

Levi Lucero: Approximately 620 people.

Mr. Brown: I own an acre to the West side of development in the County. It seems to me that the R-1-A zone is adequate for development and would be more compatible to surrounding area. I think they are programming that for a very high density and more increased traffic and its just not compatible with the residential areas surrounding it.

Mark Garman - 622 - 26 Road: It occurs to me that the development should wait on Horizon Drive. There is not sufficient access for high density zoning. There is only one road into that piece of ground. I don't think that it is compatible with our present zoning.

Dick Maynard - 607 - 26 Road: I don't think we find it objectionable because we're giving up our dairy farm. I object to the density of people that you are putting in there. I don't think anybody says, "keep the dairy farm". We realize that it has to be developed.

Dorothy Coakly - Willowbrook Drive: With the high density there it certainly will bring our property value down.

Warren Jones: What I object to is once we contacted the Planning Commission before we bought the property and we were assured that the zoning would stay that way. This is a money making proposition for a lot of people in a single area. I can understand their point of view but from the neighbors point of view we don't accept it. Also, the idea that it doesn't affect the people on the side of the canals is erroneous because these people live on hills and look right down in this area.

Steve Johnson - near the corner of Patterson and 27 1/2 Road: When we built out there the area was limited to houses on one acre. We've seen the building of this whole area crowding in and as it is now zoned, it looks to me like it is a liberal area to be developed along this line. We came out there where we would have elbow room and if we have homes built on postage stamp lots we are going to have a ghetto there. If we allow this development to go in, the next one is going to have smaller lots and the lot sizes of 6,000 square foot is a pretty small lot. We have had our area reduced in size every since there have been any changes its been for the worst.

Mary Sterling: When we moved out here in approximately 1947 it was County. Thena along came a man and talked us all into rezoning one house to a neighbor which was fine but now your crowding and making a high density area. Everybody moved out there because they wanted to get out of a high density places. I feel that it is an imposition on the rest of us to say the least.

Maxwell Aley - 613 - 26 Road: I am opposed to this proposed rezoning and high density development. I think it is going to completely change the existing character and make traffic problems. It complicates and confounds existing traffic problems we already have at Patterson Road and First Street. I don't know whether Paul Alexander has submitted to the commission the petition that he had circulated.

Don Warner: We have the petition with 61 names on it. This petition states that they are opposed to the development.

Mary Lee Fowler: We talked the other night about the traffic problem on Patterson and First Street. 200 more families which means approximately 400 more cars would certainly complicate the traffic problem. Schools are already over crowded. We've been told Spring Valley intends 500 homes. Do we really need 200 more homes just a few miles away? If Horizon Drive is intended to go thru there, certainly you wouldn't want to rezone the property to a higher cost zoning and have to turn around and buy it at an even higher cost.

Jim Gale: We live on Willowbrook and sometime ago all the folks that live on Willowbrook got together and we ask for an upzoning of property. We asked for R-1-A in keeping with the rest of the area. We compromised to the zoning of R-1-B to facilitate an owner of four or five blocks there. The point I am trying to make is that we would be in the same zone class had we not compromised to get the higher zoning than we were before. We wre zoned at the lesser than we were before.

Steve Foster - speaking for the development: I get the impression that most everyone in this meeting doesn't understand the size of the lots. We're not talking about postage stamp lots. A minimum of 6,000 square foot is a small lot but we don't intend to develop the area in that way. Horizon Drive, obviously, is going thru there and that is going to eradicate a majority of the multiple zoning there. Our intentions for duplexes and possible four plexes would be a buffer zone along Horizon Drive.

Jane Quimby: I know how you feel about higher density but you also must realize that looking at it from a standpoint of a City taxpayer, if you are a city taxpayer, and many of you who are opposing us are County taxpayers. You must realize that from the standpoint of the city the cost of servicing a single family residence is a great deal more than the cost to service a multi family dwelling unit. So, this is one of the things that the City people have to be concerned about in looking at these kind of developments. It is the cost its going to come to for the taxpayers of th city and you all know that at this point the services which are required do not pay their own way. They are subsidized from other funds. So, this is just a point in economics. Most of the land that is available for development a person cannot afford to develop it nor can a person afford to buy it.

Warren Jones: Your looking at apartments. They do cost less to service, but you have a high density of people in a small area which increases vandalism, additional police protection and everything else which your not considering.

Bernie Buescher: There are other ways of looking at the total tax cost. I am concerned with the fact that we know Horizon Drive will go thru that property. Doesn't that mean that that property has to be condemned at some point and time? By allowing this rezoning, aren't we allowing a higher condemnation costs?

Bob Gerlofs: Everybody is talking of high density zoning. We're talking in the neighborhood of between 3 and 4 units per acre. The Old Downtown area has a density of 12 units per acre. Another thing is what you may realize by allowing a zone change and this development to go thru, you may acquire Horizon Drive at no cost. Our plans for this project, which include Horizon Drive, are setback from the ditch with an access road which is a service road. The developers don't like to think of this but it is very probable that if that development takes place before Horizon Drive, they will be required to give the right-of-way.

Mary Lee Fowler: We have no mechanism to guarantee 3 units per acre.

Bob Gerlofs: The developer intends to develop with 3 units per acres. Under the zoning there is no way to guarantee how many units will go in.

Don Warner: There is one way, I think, but I would have to check with the City Attorney. The owners of the land could enter into a covenant making the City party to the covenant that there would be only such size lots. It would have to be 100% covenant meaning that everybody would have to sign to remove that covenant.

Bob Gerlofs: If we could guarantee that to the city and the people in the neighborhood then I think it would take away a lot of opposition that exists. The developers do not want to go to the 6,000 square foot lots. There happens to be no zone between the 6,000 square and 9,000 square foot lots.

Warren Jones: If this is denied are you going to go ahead with the R-1-A?

Bob Gerlofs: I don't have any idea.

Warren Jones: It is my understanding that the proposed developers have not yet bought the property...So if we go ahead and change the zoning these plans that you are proposing to us may not even occur.

Bob Gerlofs: No. The developers are committed by the property and have put a substantial amount of money in it.

Levi Lucero read a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Russell Cutter (2605 F 1/2 Road - on file at City/County Development Department)

There were no further proponents or opponents. The hearing was closed.

Janine Rider: I'm not sure that I would go with any changes until I know what is going to occur with the plan for Horizon Drive.

Virginia Flager: The one thing that does concern me more than the number of units is the continuation of the commercialization of Horizon Drive. I do not want to see it go from 7th Street to First Street like its gone from 12th Street out.

Virginia Flager made the motion to recommend approval of rezoning from R-1-C to R-1-A and R-2 to City Council contingent upon giving of the required right-of-way for Horizon Drive and the commercialization of Horizon Drive be stopped in anyway that is necessary so that it does not continue from 7th Street to First Street. There was no second to the motion.

Janine Rider made the motion to deny the rezoning from R-1-C to R-1-A and R-2. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion. Frank Simonetti, Virginia Flager and Janine Rider opposed the rezoning. Motion passed unanimously.

7. #51-76: TRAYNOR MINOR SUBDIVISION - FINAL

Petitioner: R. L. AND M. H. Traynor  
Location: 290 Cedar Street

Karl Metzner: This is a monor subdivision less than one acre. The property in question is approximately 450' off of UnawEEP Avenue. They want to split it into two lots. One of them being 70' frontage and the other 140' frontage. The only comment that we have is that the petitioner should get a Power of Attorney for going into the improvement district. There is no curb, gutters or sidewalks on the stret.

Mrs. Traynor: There is a 140' sidewalk down the property line.

There were no opponents. The hearing was closed.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend approval to City Council with the stipulation that the owner gets Power of Attorney to join the Improvement District. Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

8. #52-76: BENNETT MINOR SUBDIVISION - FINAL

Petitioner: Claude Bennett  
Location: N. W. corner of Patterson Road and 26 3/4 Road

Karl Metzner: This is a Minor Subdivision splitting into two lots. We have a request from the Fire Department for hydrants. A Power of Attorney is needed to joint the Improvement District when it is formed. Utility easements are adequate as shown. We have right-of-way for Patterson Road and 26 3/4 Road.

Don Warner: When they get ready to build they will have to get setbacks and location for high pressure gas line.

There were no opponents. The hearing was closed.

Frank Simonetti made the motion to recommend approval to City Council with the stipulation the owner gets Power of Attorney to join the Improvement District. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

9. #54-76: REQUEST FOR REVOCABLE PERMIT

Petitioner: Corn Construction Company  
Location: Gunnison Avenue from Harris Road to the West side of Lot 22

Don Warner: We do have the right-of-way for Gunnison Avenue but will need five feet right-of-way off of South end of lots. Gunnison Avenue is not opened and used and the people drive across Corn Construction's private property. There is piped irrigation.

There were no opponents. The hearing was closed.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend approve to City Council with the stipulation that the five feet be given off of the South end of lots for right-of-way. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

10. #53-76: PATTERSON GARDENS BULK DEVELOPMENT - REPLAT

Petitioner: Armstrong Engineers  
Location: Blocks 4 and 5 of Patterson Gardens - 1441 Patterson Road

Don Warner: They need a variance for two buildings on the South where the concrete has been poured. The proposal of the proponents is to move the ditch and put the fence on the North side of ditch.

A representative of Armstrong Engineers stated that the concrete pad is 6½ - 7' from property line and 8' to building. Building would be 15' from property line.

Don Warner: Public Service has no objection for gas line to go under the patio.

An agreement form has been drawn up concerning the replat which must be signed by property owners.

The screen fence is on property line and utilities were in agreement. The gas line will be able to be run without going under patio slab.

There were no opponents. The hearing was closed.

Virginia Flager made the motion to recommend approval to City Council for the replat of Patterson Gardens Bulk Development contingent upon agreement being signed by property owners. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

11. PROPOSED STREET NAME CHANGE - F $\frac{1}{4}$  to Hawthorne Avenue

Petitioner: Planning Staff  
Location: F $\frac{1}{4}$  Road from 27 $\frac{1}{2}$  to 28 Road

Mr. Warner stated that the problem exists in Spring Valley Subdivision where city numbers are used. There are two F $\frac{1}{4}$  Roads with same numbers.

There were no opponents. The Hearing was closed.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend approval to City Council for F $\frac{1}{4}$  Road to be changed to Hawthorne Avenue. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

12. TEXT CHANGE TO SECTION 3b(5) PARAGRAPH E OF THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS:

Mr. Warner requested that this be tabled in order that the Planning Staff could advertise for a text change.

Virginia Flager made the motion to table the request in order that it may be advertised again. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

Doug Fossbinder requested that the Planning Commission act on a portion of the zoning regulations where 600 square foot is minimum for a one bedroom apartment. He felt that this is too big for a one bedroom and too small for a two bedroom apartment.

Don Warner stated that the proposal under the zoning now requires 600 square foot. Proposal is for larger buildings to allow units to go smaller square footage in order to vary size of bedrooms.

The hearing was closed.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend approval to City Council for the requested text change as requested. Frank Simonetti, Janine Rider voted for and Virginia Flager voted against. Motion was passed.

Item A from Discussion was void at this time.

B. Discussion of Fence Requirement:

Mr. Warner stated that the present regulations require that a fence on a corner lot cannot be over 30" or 48" high. The request is for five foot on the side setback.

The Planning Commission Board gave their approval for advertisement.

C. Discussion of County Planning Commission Request for input:

Don Warner: It was requested by the State Board, the Developers and seconded by Gerry Ashby that this be an informal input type meeting. A separate time should be set to meet. At that time we should invite the developers and or their attorneys and invite the people who object. The petitioners will make a full presentation of their proposal.

D. Seminar - Agricultural Policies in County:

Levi Lucero stated that he had talked with Ted Albers and the Planning Commission had been asked to be a co-sponsor of the Agricultural Policies in the County for their input. October 6 and 7, 1976 is set for meeting.

Janine Rider and Frank Simonetti were in agreement with the meeting and Virginia Flager opposed.

E. Discussion of proposed business on North Avenue:

Mr. Warner stated that a proposed Arby's Drive-In Restaurant is under consideration at the SW Corner of 12th and North Avenue. Mr. and Mrs. Gould own the property now and would prefer to see this drive-in rather than a gas station on this corner.

Arby's do have a drive-up window for pick up and this would have to come before Planning Commission as a Conditional Use. It has been suggested that the corner driveways be taken out.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 P.M.