

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

September 29, 1976

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 8:10 A.M. in the City Council Chambers, by Chairman LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: VIRGINIA FLAGER, JANINE RIDER, FRANK SIMONETTE, BLAKE CHAMBLISS and JANE QUIMBY.

Also present were: DON WARNER, Sr. City Planner, KARL METZNER, Planning Technician, CONNI McDONOUGH, Sr. County Planner, JIM CLARK, Planning Technician, and MARGO KINNEY, Acting Secretary and approximately twenty interested persons.

The minutes for the August 25 meeting were approved.

1. #45-76: REHEARING FOR A CONDITIONAL USE - SONIC BURGER

Petitioner: Logan Wright
Location: 1051 and 1061 North Avenue

Don Warner: There was a question of the amount of traffic this would cause. The City Council suggested leaving out the walk up window and just having the automobile drive up. The City Council decided not to make a ruling on that change since that proposed change had not been through the Planning Commission.

Janine Rider: Where do the entrances and exits come in?

Don Warner: The entrances and exits are on 11th Street.

Jim Golden: The drive-in facility was designed to serve people setting in their automobiles. The food is prepared to order. Orders will be placed through a speaker phone device. The automobiles will be served by car hops. There are no set down facilities at all. The facility intends to draw off of the traffic of North Ave. The facility itself will not create a lot of traffic. There was concern that this being located across from the college would cause lot of foot traffic across North Ave. This is one major reason why it was turned down in July.

Levi Lucero: One of the factors considered because of the walk up was there is no actual intersection right there.

Bernard Brodak: If I live across the alley, do I have to get into my car, drive around and to the drive-up window and then go back home? Doesn't this cause more traffic?

Levi Lucero: It looks like that is the way it is on the plans. On the other hand there are about 3,000 college kids that would be cause in foot traffic across North Ave. compared to the few people like you.

Jane Quimby: John Abrams voiced his concern about the one in Montrose. When he went to drive in there he had to stack out on the street because the cars pulling out of the stalls did not leave room for cars coming in. Is there going to be this problem in this Sonic Burger?

Don Warner: This was brought up at the meeting before and they said that if this becomes a problem they will eliminate the two front stalls so that it will not cause problems.

Jane Quimby: They will be put in at first though?

Don Warner: Yes. There is sufficient room to get around there now.

Betty Rankin: The word stacked really got to me. The traffic on North Ave. is really stacked already. 11th Street carries so much traffic already. I can't see how cars can turn in here and get out without causing a lot more accidents. 12th Street is the most active corner in our city. Don't think this is feasible to put something like that in there.

Levi Lucero read a letter from Mrs. James Rankin to the City Planning Commission.

Mrs. Delp: I live at 1043 North Ave. My reason for opposing this is because of the late hour activity. The alley is already so busy now and we don't need any more traffic on North Ave.

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

William Nelson: I live on 1001 North Ave. If you walked up to order would they deny you that service?

Virginia Flager: At this point that is exactly what they are proposing.

Janine Rider: What would they do if you walked up and ordered in a stall? Would they have to serve you?

Virginia Flager: I imagine it could be taken to court and force service.

Frank Simonette: I make a motion we table this until we get the inventory of all the homes on North Ave. and potential problem areas.

Levi Lucero: We did get some information.

Frank Simonette: That is only a map this isn't really information;

Levi Lucero: I think we owe an answer to the people who are requesting this change.

Don Warner: I would suggest that the survey of houses on North Ave. will not do you any good. These are all going to be individual conditions because all are in different areas. The traffic situation is different and all are in different use. Each one considered on its merits as it comes along.

Janine Rider: I didn't feel my major concern was the foot traffic across North Ave. My major concern was the traffic generating in that location. I feel that when we have the ability not to let something that will cause more traffic. It is stupid to put one in without a walkup window as it is dangerous to have a walk-up window.

Blake Chambliss: Same kind of problem that we have had with service stations in terms of number and frequency of those along North Ave. I think a motion to table is in order and I second the motion.

Mr. Nelson: There is a bad sewer problem at the Kentucky Fried Chicken. The grease gets in there and stops up the sewer. This also attracts flies and no one is doing anything about it.

Don Warner: I have turned it in but they have not done anything about it.

Virginia Flager: Is this study going to be productive and what proposed time schedule is on the study? When is the information forthcoming? I think we owe these people an explanation.

Blake Chambliss: I make an amendment to the motion that there be a work session this month to go over that. The congestion on North Avenue doesn't happen all at once. This will be adding to the congestion though. The question is, is it an unreasonable amount? At some point it is going to be unreasonable.

Levi Lucero: Frank says to look at the housing and Blake says to look at the Drive ins.

Don Warner: We are going to have to look at every use that has a driveway on North Ave. Not just put the regulations on drive-ins and service stations but put them on everything.

The motion was moved and seconded by Blake Chambliss. There were three in favor and one opposed, Janine Rider.

Levi Lucero introduced the new Planning Commission member, Dr. Mac Brewer to the other members.

2. JIM ARNOLD BULK DEVELOPMENT

Petitioner: Jim Arnold Construction
Location: 2117 North 1st Street

Don Warner: They have done what has been asked, which was changing some gravel areas to lawn and correcting all the dimensions. The setback is corrected from 1st Street.

Janine Rider: Is there going to be lawn to the Street?

Don Warner: It shows lawn to the property line but I don't know if it goes out to the street.

Levi Lucero closed the hearing.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion that we recommend the council of the approval of the bulk development. Frank Simonette seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

3. #60-76: SUNDANCE BUILDERS BULK DEVELOPMENT

Petitioner: Doug Fossbinder
Location: 15th and Kennedy Avenue

Don Warner: The parking area in back has been enlarged and the lawn in front enlarged also.

Jane Quimby: Are those single family houses?

Doug Fossbinder: Yes.

Jane Quimby: Where is the trash pick-up?

Doug Fossbinder: On the back side.

Frank Simonette: Will the cars be able to drive out and in the alley now?

Doug Fossbinder: Yes.

Blake Chambliss: We are looking at the area not just in terms of landscaping and so forth.

Levi Lucero: There is some landscaping on there. There is a degree of neglect as far as draining and up-keep of the grounds, but maybe something could be done to incorporate the whole area as an attractive total sight.

Blake Chambliss: Are these existing trees?

Levi Lucero: Yes those are good mature trees.

Blake Chambliss: This is an impact on the community whether it is difficult or not. What we are doing is adding more units and adding more problems. Our concern with Development is when we do this we are taking care of these problems, so to suggest that in landscaping all you are doing is putting in a little bit of grass in front of your units is not addressing the problem of bulk development for an entire piece of property. It seems to me what we need to talk about is what we are going to do on an entire piece of property. It is not appropriate that you color in the little piece of green. As far as I'm concerned landscaping plans include the whole development. The open space has to have something done with it for landscaping.

Doug Fossbinder: I strongly feel the people of apartments should have garden spaces.

Virginia Flager: We need to have the total picture before we ok it.

The hearing was closed.

Virginia Flager: I make a motion that this be tabled until we address ourselves with the entire plan with specific details and the landscaping.

Blake Chambliss: I would suggest that we would look into passing it and suggesting that all the open space be grass.

Virginia Flager: We should be more specific in what requirements we want.

Blake made a motion to write in grass and the parking barrier. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

5. #64-76: PROPOSED ROAD EASEMENT VACATION - LA VILLA GRANDE

Petitioner: Louise Forster, et.al.
Location: 26 3/4 Patterson

Don Warner: Engineering says we need a cul-de-sac on this road and this has been solved. Utilities said the 5 ft. easement was too small. It should be 15 ft. for one type of utility and 5 more additional utilities that would go in. There was a fire hydrant that had no access. They have asked that it be moved.

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

Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend easement be granted subject to the conditions stated. Virginia Flager seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

6. #68-76: PROPOSED ALLEY VACATION - TOPLINE SUPPLY

Petitioner: Topline Supply Co.
Location: 10th Street and Second Avenue

Don Warner: 2nd Street was vacated for several companies and Topline owns property here they wish to close in. Their proposal is to vacate this small section of the alley. This is 75 ft. long and 20 ft. wide. They would then deed this lot which is 25 foot wide and 125 foot long. We have had no objection to it. The Utilities Companies said they had no objections to the vacation as long as it is retained as easement for existing utilities. This comment comes from Traffic Engineering and everyone concerned.

Janine Rider: Which means you can't build on it.

Don Warner: They can't build on to of thos utilities. Engineering had a question about turning radius here but when they found it was a 25 foot lot they had no objections. It will be required in the vacation that they gravel and grade this.

Virginia Flager: Is the other part of the alley paved?

Don Warner: No. All alleys on the south end of town are graveled.

KentWebster, representing Topline Supply: I will explain the use that will be made of this property. Topline is a public supply house. They have a requirement outside their store house to store large cast iron pipe and things like that. If the alley is vacated they can enclose the entire lot and prevent pilferage without having to enclose a fence along each side of that alley. Not all alleys down there are graveled.

Levi Lucero: Some have ashes on them.

Don Warner: If we are providing a new alley it will not be packed down so it would be muddy without gravel.

Kent Webster: That would be no problem.

Don Warner: We did notify each of the owners by mail that this would affect and we had no objections.

Blake Chambliss: What kind of trash services is there.

Don Warner: All of it is front end pick-up.

The hearing was closed.

Virginia Flager made a motion to approve the alley vacation with the condition that it be graveled.

Blake Chambliss: We have talked about this area quite a bit in terms of what use the alley's are and whether we shouldn't be trying to aggregate that land in some way. I continue to object to the piecemeal aggregation of the land. I have some concern about L shaped alley's and non connections through an alley.

Frank Simonette seconded the motion. There were four "Ayes" and Blake Chambliss opposed.

7. #62-76: PROPOSED BULK DEVELOPMENT - PONDEROSA APTS.

Petitioner: Noel L. Welch
Location: 1541 White

Karl Metzner: There are two existing 4 plexes. There is a large open lot east of that. They are proposing a six plex to tie the whole thing together in a bulk development. The only comments we have back other than no comment, is the Parks Department. They see no problem with the landscaping on the new part. The only thing they suggested was to take out the globe willows on the old park and put in something like Ponderosa Pines.

Virginia Flager: Why?

Karl Metzner: They felt Globe willows are rank feeders and must have lots of water, they take a lot of room and they are short lived. They are easily broken and they clog the sewers very easily.

Levi Lucero: The willows are shortlived so eventually they will be replaced by something else.

Karl Metzner: They are quite Beautiful.

Levi Lucero: The whole landscaping is beautiful and it is bad to attack the globe willows in this area.

Janine Rider: My only comment from that area was that in front of the concret fence it is gravel and it would be pretty if this was lawn.

Noel Welch: I would like to comment that the gravel is in the city right of way at the present time. There is at the present time 6 thousand square feet of grass, trees and rose gardens.

Levi Lucero: You are the owner of the total complex?

Noel Welch: Yes.

Levi Lucero closed the hearing. Virginia Flager made a motion to recommend acceptance of the request and it was seconded by Frank Simonetti, it passed unanimously.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. - G.S.A. BUILDING:

Petitioner: Lea Co.
Location: N of Patterson Road S of F 1/2 Road
and East of 26 Road.

Don Warner: I would recommend to vacate all the easement within here. There is no service from the rear. The Park and Recreation Department recommend the elimination of the Cottonwoods.

Janine Rider: Why?

Don Warner: They absorb water and attract bugs.

Karl Metzner: They suggest that they are replaced with Black Ash trees. The sites should be sited to drain toward Horizon Drive. The Fire Department has suggested that there be a fire hydrant placed in each parking lot. Developers work with Ute Water.

Conditions:

Fire Hydrant be put in East parking lot entrance.
Drainage toward Horizon Drive. and Black Ash or something else acceptable be put in in place of the Cottonwoods.

There were no opponents or proponents.

Discussion:

Virginia Flager: What about sidewalks?

Levi Lucero: This is beyond the highly congested area as far as foot traffic is concerned.

Don Warner: Will probably require detached sidewalks.

Virginia Flager made the motion to approve proposed development in H.O. for G.S.A. Building subject to the entering in of interpretation of putting in the sidewalks. Janine Rider seconded the amendment and it passed unanimously.

9. #63-76: PROPOSED NORTHRIDGE ESTATES - PRELIMINARY

Petitioner: Steve Foster, Don Foster, Thomas Folkestad
Location: N of Patterson Rd. South of F 1/2 Rd. and East of 26 Rd.

Don Warner: Public Service has required some additional easements. City Utilities says the subdivision will have to use Ute Water and will have to provide adequate fire protection. This is being worked out between utilities and the developers. The Grand Valley Irrigation Co. said that utilities cannot be located within the Grand Valley right of way. There is nothing planned for that area. As a staff requirement the developers must have a letter from Grand Valley Irrigation agreeing to the use of the canal as the drainage. It has been normal drainage all along. Engineering was concerned about how the drainage would be handled and this is reason we came up with requirement that they get letter from the canal.

Virginia Flager: Isn't it unusual to use a canal for drainage?

Don Warner: No.

Bob Gerlofs: Northacres Road is a dedicated unapproved road. The access to the houses are not by Northacres Road. The City Engineer had a plan that showed a service road.

Janine Rider: Do you own all the land except the piece in the middle?

Bob Gerlofs: No one 5 acre piece is owned by Mrs. Ryan. Mr Jones owns a piece also.

Levi Lucero: Are there several owners on the rest of it?

Bob Gerlofs: There are three. The whole thing is one parcel.

Jim Gale: I am here today in favor of what they are trying to do now. I think subdivision in this type of zoning in this particular location is in bad need in our city.

Virginia Flager: What is your reaction of the subdivision feeding off of Horizon Drive?

Jim Gale: This problem is up th the traffic engineers. I don't have an answer for you on it really. YOur going to have a problem with traffic . All you can do is resolve the problem the best way you know how to. I don't know that I would object to access to Horizon Drive as long as Horizon Drive and the ground around it would stay residential and not turn commercial.

Dwayne Scott: What is proposed? Single family or multi-family?

Bob Gerlofs: Single Family residences.

Dwayne Scott: What size are the lots?

Don Warner: The largest that is required by any zoning in the city which is about a quarter acre. 10,500 sq. Feet.

Dwayne Scott: How many Lots will this make in that area?

Bob Gerlofs: In this particular area there are 45.

Warren Jones: Having lived there sometime I know that getting access off of this old Road is extremely difficult. In the winter I have to break the law in order to get out and stay alive. People can't see you when they come over the hill.

Blake Chambliss: Don Who is consultant on this job?

Don Warner: Centennial

Blake Chambliss: Where are they? Are they having any hearings with people in the area?

Don Warner: They are here working on it now. They are doing the same type of study the State Highway Department requires.

Levi Lucero: Where is their office at?

Karl Metzner: They are going to have their office in this building.

Gene Allen: They have been on the study a year but they have had a problem getting the Federal agency's to process and get it through. The State Highway and local agencies have approved it and last I knew about a week ago the Federal agency.

Don Warner: So much expression of fears about this road at it's present location. Probably be within reason to request working with Engineering Dept. and see if a temporary road, which they admit is going to be temporary could be located slightly further south in that corner.

Blake Chambliss: May be better the way the contours indicate there, to go a little bit north.

Levi Lucero closed the hearing.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion that we recommend the preliminary plan for approval subject to some pretty heavy decisions that have to be made by the City Engineering, subject to resolution to problems of access to this piece of property by City Engineering Department.

Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

~~10~~ #61-76: PROPOSED CHARLA MINOR SUBDIVISION

~~Petitioner: Walter Kochever, Jr.
Location: 27 Road and Milo Drive~~

Don Warner: Proposed minor subdivision, It has two lots, R-2A zoning on Orchard Mesa. The lot is large enough for a 4 plex. There were no requests from any agency's. Staff has requested the power of attorney of 27 Road.

Tom Logue: I would like a point of clarification. There is an existing house there.

Don Warner: The house sets 10 ft. into the right of way. I think it would be possible to have legal record with the plat as a separate document for dedicating when and if 27 Road is improved. That would tie up the property because it would be recorded but would not affect the existing house. I think the attorney could come up with an agreement of that type.

Tom Logan: That sounds good. They are proposing a 4 plex in this area.

Don Warner: The way this is divided to allow a 4 plex here and if this house was removed it would resolve a future duplex here.

Levi Lucero: closed the hearing.

Blake Chambliss: Sounds to me like it is more than a level kind of a problem.

Don Warner: Would you like to see the agreement?

Blake Chambliss: I find it difficult to project the City into some kind of major problem in the future by this small thing. There may be some alternatives they could look at it in terms of the subdivision.

Don Warner: This street has been designated and 50 ft. right of way and does come through the house.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion to table this until the problem can be worked out.

Frank Simonette seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

11. PROPOSED VACATION OF BOOKCLIFF AVENUE

Petitioner: Staff

Location: 19th Street and Bookcliff Ave.

Blake Chambliss excused himself from the board.

Don Warner: This is a housing authority project. The concern is a piece of right of way 30 ft. wide. It was dedicated in the old subdivision with use of this piece of property and the proposed internal streets. 19th Street is an alley but we are requesting that it be 2 ft. wider than the normal alley. We have notified the adjacent owners and I believe Mr. Brown is in the audience and has no objection to the vacation. No one is now receiving access.

Levi Lucero closed the hearing.

Virginia Flager made a motion to approve the vacation as requested and as needed. Frank Simonette seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

12. PROPOSED ROAD VACATION OF 5th AND NOLAND

Don Warner: Some years ago the State Highway improved the whole area here. They made some changes. They made a straight crossing of Noland on the West and Noland on the East. The old section of Noland at this point still exists. The owners on both sides are requesting vacation for this section of it. They

want to leave it subject to easement for utilites because the sewer lines and water lines are in there. Public Service had something in there. The whole place would be left subject to easement. Engineering would require that these people in vacation of the lot get that piece of land as their own to use and they would be required to continue curb and gutter along Fifth Street.

Frank Simonette: When the street was re-routed like that, was all the land purchased?

Don Warner: I imagine that the Highway Department probably purchased it.

Frank Simonette: Then if we vacate that why don't we sell it?

Don Warner: You can't sell it. You can retain easement rights and curb and gutter.

Dr. Brewer: What about taxations?

Don Warner: It will go back on the tax roles.

Levi Lucero: This is a one owner.

Virginia Flager: What is the total length of it?

Don Warner: About 50 feet by 125 feet.

Levi Lucero closed the hearing. Virginia Flager made a motion that we vacate the road with the provision that the curb and gutter is extended along that area at the expense of the property owners. Blake Chambliss seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

13. PROPOSED FENCE FOR IBC CHURCH SUPPLIES

Petitioner: IBC Church Supplies
Location: Glenwood Ave. and 12th Street

Karl Metzner: The property line is 10 ft. 3 inches back from the edge of the sidewalk and they are having problems with people cutting across the lawn and vandalizing. They would like to put a fence just back of the sidewalk. It would be a 48 inch chain link fence.

Levi Lucero: Would this be in the public right of way?

Karl Metzner: Yes.

Dr. Brewer: Next door there are posts and steel cable at Spanky's.

Don Warner: This was required by city Council at the time when there were some complaints and problems between Spank's and IBC.

Karl Metzner: Only comment that we got was from utilities and they wanted to make sure there was a gate there so they could go in and read the meter.

Blake Chambliss: I really object to fences. I object to Spanky's fence. It is smack dab against that too narrow sidewalk already. The amount of traffic generated by the college there with the 4 ft. sidewalk, if you then further barriered it with that kind of a fence and this fence is a much more real fence than that of Spanky's, which is simply a cable. I don't know who is going to accept the responsibility for the students who are pushed into the street. I recognize that they are on the lawn but that is because there is not enough sidewalk.

Mrs. Heald: No. I disagree.

Virginia Flager: What is the width of that sidewalk?

Karl Metzner: 4 ft. wide.

Blake Chambliss: I understand what you are saying. My concern is not that you have a fence but that you are putting it right next to the sidewalk.

Mrs. Heald: It would be back just a little bit.

Blake Chambliss: I wouldn't have any objections if the fence was put on the property line but not on sidewalk.

Levi Lucero: I'm not against the fence but I would be in favor of putting it in about 2 feet.

Mrs. Heald: You want it further back than even the one next door?

Levi Lucero: Yes.

Mrs. Heald: The College officials feel we shouldn't try to even keep a yard anymore. The kids up there don't respect anything.

Blake Chambliss: If you did a pedestrian count in that area you would find it is about the same as downtown. Downtown we have a minimum of 9 or 10 ft. of sidewalk.

Don Warner: It is 12 ft.

Blake Chambliss: A 4 ft. sidewalk is very inadequate. As long as there is not enough sidewalk the grass all around it is going to get stepped on and killed. That's not because the students are bad or anything else. It is not designed to handle that kind of traffic.

Mrs. Heald: It wouldn't make any difference how wide the sidewalk was, the kids wouldn't make any effort.

Blake Chambliss: Put the fence back so that there is adequate space for a sidewalk.

Levi Lucero: Make the sidewalk wider.

Dr. Brewer: Do you mean the length of that street or in front of the college?

Levi Lucero: Just in front of the property.

Don Warner: I agree with Blake, if the grass is being worn out then there is a need for more walking space. The only other solution is to gravel that with colored gravel because the grass isn't going to grow there.

Blake Chambliss: I think this is something we might want to go out and look at.

Dr. Brewer: The grass really isn't worn off as much as I can see.

Mrs. Heald: That is because so much of the summer traffic is been off and I really tried to work with it this summer.

Blake Chambliss: There is a need for an 8 ft. sidewalk in that area and a 6 ft. sidewalk on the Glenwood Ave. side.

Virginia Falger made a motion to table this until it is looked into more. Dr. Brewer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Discussion:

Blake Chambliss: On Thursday night, October 7th the Land Use Commission is having one of their hearings in Grand Junction. They have been directed by the governor to review the Land Use Legislation that the state has specifically Senate Bill 35 and House Bill 1041. They are holding two day hearings. They are having 10 hearings across the state. The Land Use Commission is breaking up and going to the different meetings in the area. In order to talk with people on an informal basis about how they feel about what is happening and what isn't happening and what kinds of problems that land use is creating in the state. On the evening of October 7, 1976 there are going to be three of the meetings in the Grand Junction area. Only one of them is in the city limits, Orchard Mesa. There is one on the Redlands and one in Clifton. They are also having meetings in Palisade, Fruita, Delta, Colburn, Paonia and Montrose. The request is that the members of this planning Commission should participate in whichever one you want to participate in.

Orchard Mesa: 8:00 P.M. October 7, Orchard Mesa Junior High Cafeteria. Host: Phillip Willena

Redlands: Broadway School, 7:30 P.M. Hostess: Bonnie Coper

Clifton: Crossroads Methodist Church, 7:30 P.M.
Hostess: Sue Moon

Discussion:

Don Warner: This is only an information item. This is the U.S. Bank. We brought it before you before as an action item but now we just want you to look at it. At that time the proposition was to change the curb line out into 4th street. The new proposal is to leave the curb right in the same place with a slight flattening of a radius just at this corner. Also take up the sidewalk and replace it with a patterned sidewalk, similar to the pattern in the area where the planters are. The comment that we have that staff has already given to Mr. Jenkins is to take a close look at these as to where the doors would open on cars. Also, the point where the east, west sidewalk goes through and at the corner it will be ramped down for the handicapped.

COUNTY ITEMS

1. #C58-76: FRUITWOOD SUBDIVISION FILING #7 - FINAL PLAT
TRANSITIONAL SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Robert P. Gerlofs, Dee. A. Brinegar
Location: Southeast of E Road and Grand Valley Drive

Conni McDonough: Fruitwood Subdivision is a transitional subdivision and requires the approval of both City and County. This was here last month and was approved subject to the continuation of the cul-de-sac to the east. The petitioner would prefer not to do that and therefore could not precede with the platting until it is resolved. Bob Gerlofs is here to talk to you about your requests.

Bob Gerlofs: We want to talk about the total concept in these filings on how we would handle traffic. We worked out one arrangement with you. You wanted us to continue Helen court straight on through there. We convinced you at that time that we did not want to do that because we don't want to provide a ready route for alternate traffic. With the railroad at this location we were afraid we would get people who would want to travel south and start using this as a major artery. We have developed the subdivision to flow to Gunnison and to E. Road. We have extended Gunnison and provided a connector to the South. The County Planning Commission agreed with us on this point.

Virginia Flager: It seems to me like they picked the wrong one to argue about. It should be the second one South. That thing should be in reverse so you don't have to go all the way down and out. There should be two way's in there. From the top to the bottom of that you have absolutely no east west access. How far is it from Gunnison to E Road?

Bob Gerlofs: 1200 ft.

Virginia Flager: You have a subdivision on either side naturally that 10 acres is going to develop into a subdivision whether you do it or someone else and we have no provision for traffic for 1200 ft.?

Bob Gerlofs: I'm not sure it is needed.

Virginia Flager: Of course not, you are the developer.

Bob Gerlofs: In the whole development there are 32 lots.

Virginia Flager: You need a east, west access so it will not develop into a problem area in the future. You would be doing the people in that area a dis-service by not giving them an east, west access. It won't cost any more wherever it goes.

Blake Chambliss: Look at the City of Grand Junction. The original square miles that are there and I think everybody says the great pattern is efficient contributed parking land to circulation right of way, it is a very efficient way of doing things. Yet in the City in that original square mile we have more flexibility to provide changes in the uses that are going on. Part of that is because we have a hundred ft. right of way and 80 ft.

right of way. We have three cross streets that go east, west connected between Gunnison and North Ave. We have the kind of flexibility to deal with urban problems in the original square mile, that, I am afraid we are not going to have in these kinds of things, We have reduced the size of lots from 80 ft. and 100 ft. to 50 ft. We are now suggesting that if we don't put as many cross east, west connections within it you can get 2 or 3 more lots out of it. The concern, then, it seems to me is what we really do is we loose our flexibility of this to try to deal with some changes that that area is going to have to deal with in the future. I am much concerned with the quarter of mile between the streets.

Bob Gerlofs: I do not think the demand for movement in this type of a subdivision is the same as you are talking about in the original square block.

Blake Chambliss: I think that is true but I do not think it is 1/4 of the amount that we have in the original square mile, and I do know that the ability to take care of these conditions in the future has probably reduced by 75%. We know that it is committed to that kind of use forever. I do not see any where else in the community that indicates that we can make that assumption without some trepidation.

Frank Simonetti: We seem to be committed to a North, South movement and not an East, West one.

Bob Gerlofs: The major traffic movers in the city are 1st Street, 7th Street and 12th Street. If you take people from those interior streets and move them out to those major traffic movers you are going to have trouble.

Blake Chambliss: If you didn't have those interior streets the condition at 12th Street and North Avenue would be totally unmanageable. One of the reasons that this is a tough one is because we do not have any east, west access. That is exactly the situation you are creating from scratch here. That is a major traffic mover but there is no alternative. One of the principals of traffic management is traffic dispersal. It is not the concentration of it. It seems to me that this is really predicated on the concept that we are, in fact, concentrating on those things. I am not sure that there is an adequate understanding understanding from the indications of that concentration of it.

Virginia Flager: We need the development in here but we also need the east, west circulation.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to make a motion that we recommend the approval of Fruitwood Subdivision Filing #7 subject to the provision that east, west circulation be at approximately the middle of the block.

Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. #C94-76: BLUFFS WEST - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Bluffs West Inc.
Location: Northeast of 23 and E Roads.

Conni McDonough: They submitted their preliminary plan showing existing roadways. This roadway is designated and dedicated to be Greenbelt Dr.

It will travel from 23 Road to the Bluffs West project. They have also proposed to tie into what would be the Redlands Parkway. It will connect with the Redlands Village Neighborhood North Broadway School. We are pleased with the accomplishment of parallel routes and inter-neighborhood circulation. This is taking place without crossing Broadway. All the units will be built by the developer.

Levi Lucero: You mean that they will be built by him and sold as complete units?--How many lots are there all together?

Conni McDonough: Fourteen.

Dr. Brewer: What kind of a sewer is there?

Conni McDonough: Bluffs West is building a sewage treatment plant in the Goat Draw area. They are also providing construction for additional taps for the neighborhood. There is one existing plant that is not up to standard. It will be abandoned and taken to the new plant. There are three new developments in the area who also are anxious to get taps. Our only problem right now is that the plant is too small already.

Dr. Brewer: You are saying that the sewer plant is too small, when is this new one at 22 Road going to be built?

Conni McDonough: The one at 22 Road is projected at this time somewhere between 3 1/2 to 5 years from now. The old one will provide a normal level of development of the Redlands. It is possible that it may need to be enlarged once. Land is being set aside for the project.

Don Warner: The plant is too small for the interest.

Conni McDonough: Yes the interests are greater than what could possibly be built at this time. The developers have approached the City of Grand Junction. They are in the process of developing an agreement for operation and maintenance by the City.

Don Warner: They have already required that the operators be certified by the City of Grand Junction.

Blake Chambliss: Is there an agreement at this point? It seems to me like there was some discussion of agreement when the City takes that over. They will also receive some kind of power of attorney for annexation of those properties.

Conni McDonough: May I ask to delay answering you until I have shown you the next part of the Bluffs?

3. #C102-76: BLUFFS WEST ESTATES - PUD OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT

Petitioner: Joe Willoughby, Robert Engelke
Location: Northeast of E Road and 23 Road

Conni McDonough: The zoning is in process. The Planning Commission has recommended the change of zoning from R-2 to Planned Development 2. This area is the ownership that they are proposing for that Development. Their proposal sets aside 80 ft. on the east side of Goat Draw, 80ft. is set aside in reserve to allow development of the Redlands Parkway. The 80 ft. which they have suggested is to insure that the development of these lots still gives plenty of flexibility.

Bob Engleke: There is a possible fire station sight down here. We are a little shy on space. We have people who want to hook to the sewer line that would make it almost double what it is now. We really do not need the double capacity. There are approximately 600 taps desired by others and we have the capacity for 300.

Frank Simonetti: Is that all one school boundary and within walking distance?

Bob Engleke: If the developer is required to sign a Power of Attorney to annex, I feel that they should also have assurance that the City will annex the area if the developer makes such a request.

Virginia Flager: My attitude has always been annex wherever possible.

Blake Chambliss: If we recognize that with it comes a lot of responsibility we are going to have to assume sometime in the near future. It may very well be that the City will look at them and maybe we will look at them more seriously than just a piece of stray information. I think it certainly does emphasize the responsibility which we all recognize.

Don Warner: I think Bob was probably wise in working both ends of this agreement because even from council to council the policies change. We have a council at the present time that has asked me to pursue an aggressive growth council and the services might be needed by these people and I think that there is a city responsibility for urbanizing areas.

4. #C101-76: LOMA RIO SUBDIVISION - SKETCH PLAN

Petitioner: Loma Linda Land and Development Company
Location: Northeast of 22 3/4 Road and Tiffany drive.

Conni McDonough: This is still in the sketch plan stage. on the original submittal they showed one access which is out on Tiffany Dr. which is a residential street. I felt that this was not adequate and asked for a second access. They came in with one moving straight east going into 23 Road. The other one was to come straight south into Bluffs West.

Levi Lucer: Conni was this the other party that wanted to join in with the Bluffs West?

Conni McDonough: Yes. The red on here is what I have proposed for an additional access and that is the only way they can have a tie in.

Dr. Brewer: What is the time schedule on this?

Conni McDonough: I do not know.

Blake Chambliss: This project has looked very carefully at the circulation pattern; neighborhood. They have tried to deal with it to develop it. They have tried to make some sense out of it. They have also tried to maximize the number of lots you can get out of a piece of property. It is frustrating to sit here and give the same kind of approval to this kind of a subdivision that caused somebody 5 or 6 times as much. I would like to express my appreciation for a more complete and very detailed and very community-conscience type of effort that has gone into this material as opposed to the kind of stuff we normally get. The dealing or putting together the sewer plans and some other things I think are things they should be commended for and it makes our job a lot easier. I would make a recommendation that the City enter into a reciprocal agreement in terms of annexation and I just wish that there was some way to encourage more people to do a job like this. I make a motion that all of this be pursued.

Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

5. #C98-76: CLIFTON VILLAGE SUBDIVISION - SKETCH PLAN

Petitioner: Barru Homes Inc.
Location: North West of Highway 50 and 32 Road

Conni McDonough: This property was requested by Paul Barru for rezoning in this location for a combination of residential and commercial zoning development of a neighborhood shopping facility to serve the community. This also is a classic example of a Development that wants to do what is the best for the community and is willing to cooperate.

Levi Lucero: The only recommendation I can make is to have two east, west accesses.

Conni McDonough: Mr. Barru has approached the County and asked them to really get serious about what we are requiring concerning lot sizes, road right of way widths. Next week we are having a workshop to address these items.

Blake Chambliss: I make a motion that they recommend having two additional east, west accesses.

Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Virginia Flager made a motion to put the rest of the agenda on the workshop.

Discussion:

The following discussion was on the Regional Shopping Center.

Virginia Flager: I've not has any reason to change my feeling. The plan is logical, it can only be delayed. It can be built and will be built. We can only discuss what safeguards will put into it. Really, what can we tell them but to try to protect it in the design stage?

Don Warner: I think you are correct. I think you would have to have some interesting and as yet unapparent, and to me strong reasons, saying we don't want this. There is a tremendous difference of uses that can go in.

Levi Lucero: It does tie in with the highway. More than likely the commercial rezoning of it would not be a mistake. It would not be good as a subdivision. It most likely would be better to have commercial come in there.

Conni McDonough: Residential areas are all around F Road. We all know that F Road is going to become a main carrier and all concerned with the fact that we can successfully have a compatible code of distance between residential and commercial areas. We feel also that it is possible at this point. Within a thousand acres there would be a tremendous amount of job potential there. We feel that we are moving into a time when we have to concern ourselves with energy and the use of it. We are actively considering that this area will develop residentially to give support system in terms, residence to people who hold jobs in these areas if they wish to do so. We don't feel that it is absolutely necessary for a for gone conclusion that commercial zoning has to be fronting on F Road at this point, and also fronting 24 Road.

Virginia Flager: If you are comfortable with a housing division looking directly into an industrial site such as Western States Machinery and their resulting lot there is several other little industries along there, and I have heard you as the leading proponent of inflation of residential in relationship to industrial type usage. And I think the concept of residential verses industrial doesn't make any sense at all. This is based on your arguments of the past.

Conni McDonough: Well it can be accomplished depending on what you require to screen and protect.

Virginia Flager: Why is it better to have houses on this land than it is to have industry and commercial type situations? What kind of reason do you have.

Don Warner: I think Conni gave you a reason.

Virginia Flager: I can't justify it.

Don Warner: She gave you the reason that with this much commercial acreage we are going to need some support were there are homes somewhere in the area.

Conni McDonough: If you look at the square footage of area that presently zoned for commercial and industrial development, we have plenty to take care of in this community for the next twenty years. The county doesn't feel that we need to go out and actively zone more. The County Commission feels we need more residential zoning instead of commercial.

Levi Lucero: From my observations as far as agricultural land is concerned, that is the land that already has water. Are we trying to say we should not develop this land and go try to develop where there is no water?

Conni McDonough: Let me remind you the sewer line goes right by there now. I am encouraging the city to comment in accordance to the long view of what you think is appropriate for development in that area.

Don Warner: The things that Blake has brought up many times in our meetings are that there is a need for neighborhoods and being able to serve the neighborhoods. You need commercial areas to serve the residential and residential to serve the commercial. If you get tremendous area all in one zoning you're just creating transportation problems.

Levi Lucero: You say the staff, County Commissioners and County Planning have already designated that we are not concerned about converting that good agricultural land into residential areas.

Conni McDonough: The conditional points to consider are: Has there been a change of area, neighborhood or character? Is there a need for this type of zoning in this area? And was the AFT zoning in error when it was placed?

Blake Chambliss: With a shopping center there you have to be dreaming to think you will not get residence around that area.

Virginia Flater: In the first place if you price the land around that area you will find land on the market at a very high price.

Don Warner: You're going to change the market value of the land whether you sell it commercially or not.

Levi Lucero: I personally don't think that the location of the Regional Shopping Center is the circulation point of the valley. I tend to believe it is going to upset the transportation patterns.

Conni McDonough: The County Planning Commission asked for your input. They were asking you the question on your opinion of whether this would be the best thing for Grand Junction if it is approved.

Levi Lucero: The impact is going to create need for more residential zoning. It is going to create a transportation problem and it is not a central point.

Virginia Flager: In relationship to the south it is not a central point but to the traffic pattern from the west it is a central point.

Levi Lucero: Our biggest amount of customers are regional, Delta, Montrose Rifle, Glenwood Springs and Rangely.

Blake Chambliss: What is the timing on our input to the county?

Levi Lucero: Something prior to the 12th which is a Board Meeting.

Dr. Brewer: Where else could it be put? Whitewater or Orchard Mesa?
It looks to me like that area out there certainly has very few facilities and is an area that is going to grow. If you are talking about serving Glenwood Springs and other with a regional shopping center, I don't think we can do that.

Levi Lucero: The approach these people had was not necessarily made to serve the local community but to serve the regional people.

Frank Simonetti: That is just a sales pitch to call it a regional shopping center because Teller Arms is regional.

Levi Lucero: This is going to be upsetting to the local merchants. The small merchants will be moving from Main street to the shopping center and some North avenue merchants will be moving also.

Frank Simonetti: This is going to shift everything northwest. Once they put this in you won't be able to keep up with the subdivisions. There is a school out there too.

Virginia Flager: There are also gas, water and sewer lines in that area.

Blake Chambliss: This is going to have a real impact on things. That impact is going to create disruption of a lot of things. In our last meeting we asked for a study. We asked for some expert kind of impact, the ability to get somebody who could help us measure what some of those impacts are. We don't have that. We are not going to get it. It seems to me the kinds of things we have may be valuable in terms of reactions. I don't think the responsible reactions to a very serious planning problem that exists for us. I think we recognize that we can't make that kind of response based on the lack of information and lack of communication from anybody to get us the information necessary to make that kind of a response. I think we ought to react to it. But there is no way that we can, we haven't had anyone come in and talk to us about measuring those impacts

or even how to go about measuring some of those impacts. There are a bunch of things I think we all feel are liable to happen here. It is a lot more comfortable not to have to measure them to make those decisions and that is where we are.

Frank Simonetti: I would put the shopping center around Clifton where Delta and Montrose people could come right down 32 Road and people could come in from Fruita and Grand Junction also.

Virginia Flager: At this point you have no access from the interstate.

Frank Simonetti: There will be an access shortly when they build it.

Levi Lucero: We can't elude the situation, we need an impartial party in here with a study.

Don Warner: You did ask for a study didn't you?

Levi Lucero: Yes.

Don Warner: Nobody has been willing to come up with any money to pay anybody to do a study.

Blake Chambliss: I feel very strongly that we need to say that everybody has given lip service to planning input to the process but nobody has been willing to in fact do what is necessary to get it. That is a matter of real concern to me on this issue as I have protested on other issues before. I would like to go on record personally as protesting the fact that we seem unable to get the resources necessary to in fact give meaningful input in terms of the planning decisions that are effecting the lives of all the people in the community. I this would be one big effect.

Frank Simonetti: I would bet that a lot of these subdivisions being built would die at some point of completion and everybody will switch their activity west.

Don Warner: There hasn't been the resources for them to cover.

Don Warner: I suggest that several of you get together and write something up and circulate it amongst the others so you have a consensus.

This does have to be put in before we have another meeting. Get a total consensus on the letter before Levi signs it and then present the letter to the County Planning Commission.

Levi Lucero: Could we get the staff to write up a letter and send one out to each member?

Don Warner: I would like to have Blake assist us in wording a letter and then have all of you read it to see that you all agree with it. This letter should be approved by everyone.