

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

April 27, 1977

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, VIRGINIA FLAGER, with the following members present: BLAKE CHAMBLISS, DICK UMMEL, JANINE RIDER, JOHN ABRAMS, FRNAK SIMONETTI and DR. Mac Brewer.

Also present were: DON WARNER, Sr. City Planner, KARL METZNER, Planner, CONNI MCDONOUGH, Development Director, MARGO KINNEY, Acting Secretary, and approximately fifty interested persons.

The minutes were approved as read.

1. #12-77: OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - FAIRMONT NORTH
(Tabled Item)

Petitioner: Norm Jones
Locaiton: NW Corner of 13th and Hermosa

Don Warner: This is a tabled item from the last meeting and I am going to let the developer explain this and he has the new plan on the board.

Tom Logue: I think that you are all familiar with this project. We decided to come up with another plan reducing the density and with different parking facilities. We reduced the number of units on the site. We originally had 92 units on the ten acre site and we reduced that number to 84. We changed the individual parking lots to four large lots. In the reduction of density we made a feeling of more openness. The units will face on a pedestrian walk way. Each unit will have a small patio. The units are basically the same as last time. All we have done is modified the plan.

Virginia Flager: Do you have any staff comments Don?

Don Warner: We have the same comments as last time. City Utilities said there should be an addressing of trash collection problems they suggest tanks with screening. Fire Department wanted hydrants. One at the Northwest corner of Hermosa and 15th, one at the Southwest corner of F $\frac{1}{4}$ and 15th, and another and the Southeast corner of F $\frac{1}{4}$ and 13th, then another approximately 300' North of Hermosa on 14th Court. Engineering needed $\frac{1}{2}$ Street full concrete improvements and 34' asphalt on all perimiter streets. Storm drainage should run into existing ditch. Pipe irrigation ditches along 13th Street.

Virginia Flager: We have a petition here that pertains to this, are you aware of this petition Tom?

Tom Logue: No.

Don Warner: We just got this petition this morning.

Bob Berry: I am the one that carried the petition around, the people in the community got together and talked about this. The feeling is

that they would like to see Bonita continue through. The other thing was that the people did not want to see a density in there that was higher than what is surrounding it. That is the only thing that really concerned us.

The hearing was closed.

Virginia Flager: We had the feelings of the people of wanting Bonita to go through and in this plan it does not. We also knew how they felt about the increased density in this area and in this plan we have the increased density.

Blake Chambliss: At the last meeting the discussion was that F $\frac{1}{4}$ would probably not be able to go through, and you have a number of units that appear to be facing F $\frac{1}{4}$ Road. Have you all done further study that that might go through? Or is there only going to be access off of the inside?

Tom Logue: The main access is still off of Hermosa. We felt that we needed a loop in there in order to necessitate the trash pick up. This entrance in here is 20 ft. wide.

Dr. Brewer: Is that a one way flow through there?

Tom Logue: No sir, it is not.

Dr. Brewer: Is 20 ft. just a little bit too narrow for two way traffic in there?

Tom Logue: In some cases it is but in a parking lot it is not.

Blake Chambliss: Did the City Engineering see this type of arrangement? The internal circulation?

Don Warner: They have not seen this yet. I think that probably that their suggestion on that would be that if they went with that type of arrangement that it should be private from the internal and there be a recorded agreement that if it were not maintained by the homeowners that the city would go in there and do maintenance and bill it to the homeowners. I don't see it being accepted in that manner as a city street.

Tom Logue: We were not aware of the neighborhood wanting Bonita to go through when we prepared this plan last week. We feel that that would not be so advantageous because of the site distance problem.

Dr. Brewer: Your density is 8.4. Previously it was 9.2. And the people are looking at 7.3.

Tom Logue: The density in a R-1-C is 7.3.

Blake Chambliss: We have one other communication problem in terms of the density we are talking about here. In the Eagleton subdivision those are all separate lots. Those are 6,000 foot lots which means a net density of 7 per acre. What is being proposed here is about 50% denser than what exists in the Eagleton Subdivision. I remained concerned that you have not met the concerns of the neighborhood.

Tom Logue: April 25 is the date of the petition and we didn't have time to see what they wanted after that. We had already submitted this plan to the planning staff.

Mr. Berry: We had not seen this plan either. This has been a communication gap. What we are worried about is the traffic. What are we going to do with it?

Dr. Brewer: I think that we should send this back for further discussion.

Norman Jones: I understand that you can vote on any zoning that is of less density than what was advertised for. I would like to request that it be changed to a conventional R-1-C zoning.

Janine Rider made a motion to approve the R-1-C zoning for this area. Blake Chambliss seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. #24-77: REZONE R-1-B TO R-2

Petitioner: Louise Forster

Location: SE Corner of Park Drive and Patterson Road

Don Warner: This is a proposal to rezone from R-1-B to R-2. City Utilities said that existing water lines in the area are inadequate for high density developments. City Engineering said that Park Drive was a substandard street.

Tom Logue: Mrs. Forster would like to construct 3, 4 plex structures. The access would be off of F Road and 1st Street. We are not sure if Horizon Drive will go through but that might create another access some day. Its present condition is unused. The site is located within a short distance from St. Mary's Hospital, it is fairly close to Walker Field for employment. There are additional employment areas on 7th Street. The School District 51 are at capacity or over a capacity. This area does have all the uses needed for the development.

Bob Denning: You have received many letters against this proposal. We feel that a need for the change in the zoning does not exist. It is presently zoned R-1-B and we urge that it remain the same. We feel that the open space there is important. We feel that a higher density would ruin the character of the area. We also feel that the property value would be damaged.

Keith Mumby: I have a chart here that should be able to show you how the people in the area feel about this. I have colored the proposed zoning in black and the opposers in red. This makes it easy to see how opposed the surrounding property owners are. If this zoning and density goes in here then that will make it easy for the property adjacent to it to get this high of density and we do not want that in there.

Dick Keeler: This is just another effort to produce high density in a residential area. This shouldn't happen in this area of town and I am totally against it.

Mrs. Sam Solinteno: I am in complete agreement with Mr. Denning.

Martin Winger: Park Drive is a congested street. It is very dangerous and narrow.

Harriet Trabor: I am very much in agreement with what Mr. Denning said.

Hearing was closed.

Virginia Flager: What are the reasons for a zone change?

Janine Rider: The zoning was wrong in the first place. There is sufficient need for more of that zoning in the neighborhood. And a character change would make it fitting for the zoning to be changed.

Blake Chambliss: I think that there is another reason for changing the zoning. I had hoped that in the last general election that the state agreed to have a lottery that perhaps that lottery would take the gambling out of real estate. Unfortunately it hasn't. It takes less to get into the game of real estate and the returns are potentially higher. I guess that my feeling are that this is a pretty good example the attempt to double the value of a piece of property. I think that it is totally improper and inappropriate.

Janine Rider: Well the area has not changed. The zoning was wrong in the first place, If there is an argument that there is a need for more R-2 zoning in town, the problems involved in that particular parcel in terms of how it lays, the access, the surroundings that there is no legitimate reason to change it there.

John Abrams: Due to the terrific input that the neighborhood has made I could in no way vote for this zoning.

Dick Ummel: We have been asking for public input and we have got it today and I am really impressed. I think that we ought to listen to the people.

John Abrams made a motion to deny the request for the zone change. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Blake Chambliss: There has been a lot of talk about a person doing what they want to do with their land. The inference and sometimes a direct accusation that the surrounding neighbors could tell a person what they could do with their land is communistic.

Keith Mumby: I think that a person that has owned a tract of land for a long time and someone comes along and says, your going to farm for the rest of your life smacks me much different than a speculator coming into an established neighborhood and buys a piece of property and tries to double their money and inflicts something on the existing neighborhood and the existing situation. It was zoned like this when she bought it and she didn't have to buy it.

Mrs. Forster: I bought the land because I love the land. It is beautiful. Because you did not allow me to rezone it does not disturb me. I did not buy it thinking that I was going to go in there and make a big profit. I bought it because it is a piece of property I wanted to keep.

3. #19-77: PATTERSON ENCLAVE ANNEX ZONING - R-1-A

Location: NW of 7th and Patterson Road.

Don Warner: This has been advertised here today for R-1-A zoning. We have had two contacts on this. The owner of this one lot requests a B-1 zoning. The other person said that he does not object to this zone.

The hearing was closed.

Janine Rider: Is this going to be an infringement to the person on the west of the lot that wants B-1 in there if it is a B-1?

Don Warner: These are all on a level. This is the last existing lot in the Fairmount Subdivision.

Dr. Brewer: Does Patterson Road have all the right-of-way it would need to be enlarged? What would that do to the lots if that were enlarged?

Don Warner: If it were to go to the major classification, it would require a 20' right-of-way.

Frank Simonetti: I do not like to see the B-1 go in there.

Don Warner: The B-1 is not a retail zone. It is Dr. offices.

Dick Ummel: Mrs. Rasmisson do you object to that B-1 zoning?

Mrs. Rasmisson: No we do not. They came and talked to us about it. We do want to keep the residence zoning with the rest of it.

Virginia Flager: At the time that the Dr. office was in there did it bother you?

Mrs. Rasmisson: No the only thing was that sometimes they would park on the street.

Blake Chambliss: My concern is that I think that we need to have some justification for zoning this B-1 and we do not have that.

Virginia Flager: I think that the Dr. offices belong around the medical facilities not clear across town.

John Abrams made a motion to recommend approval to council of the R-1-A zoning for all of the area. Dr. Brewer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. #16-77: PHIPPS ANNEX ZONING - H.O.

Location: B $\frac{1}{2}$ Road and U.S. 50

Don Warner: We feel that this is the proper and logical zoning for this area.

Don Warner: Since this does fit the proposed uses of the area this is a good zone.

Frank Simonetti: How much access is there out of that.

Don Warner: This property has all kinds of access. There is a highway and a frontage road that goes along it. B $\frac{1}{2}$ Road is full access also.

Conni Lelina: For any sort of heavy traffic use in this area is really a problem. There is good access all across B $\frac{1}{2}$ road if you can jump across a 15' ditch. The other problem is the ramp that does come across. That whole intersection is a problem. There are also single family dwellings all along there. I am sure that they are not going to look out onto a commercial property.

Don Warner: The zoning in the County was a C commercial. Having the H.O. zone in there is a tremendous upgrading. It does get full site plan review. All of the accesses are also reviewed.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend approval of the H.O. zoning to the council. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Dr. Brewer: I think that the citizen involvement in this is great.

5. # 4-77: COLORADO WEST DEVELOPMENT PARK - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Colorado West Improvements Inc.

Location: SE of 12th Street and Winters Avenue

Don Warner: Review comments were: Fire Department wants 5 hydrants. City Utilities said the sewer and water to lot 6 is to be provided by the developer. City Engineering said street dedications should be more clearly marked, 15th Street should be 60' right-of-way, intersection improvement required at 15th Street and Winters. The large ditch on the East must be piped and wide drainage easement given to the South property line, power of attorney for full cost street improvements on 12th Street should be given.

Mr. Dale Hollingsworth: We purchased the property to do about three things. Number one was to rehabilitate the area. The community had turned their back to this area. Secondly we wanted to put the land back into some productive use. Thirdly we wanted to rebuild the area. We feel that we have enhanced the area.

Dr. Brewer left at 9:30.

Blake Chambliss: As I look at the City map, you are on the perimeter of the City are you not?

Mr. Hollingsworth: Yes we are.

Blake Chambliss: I guess one of my concerns is that normally when we have a dead end road we usually have a cul-de-sac or somewhere for the people to turn around in.

Don Warner: This only serves one lot and when it only serves one lot then we do not put one in.

The hearing was closed.

Blake Chambliss made a motion that the Colorado West Development Plan be recommended to Council for approval subject to the review comments. John Abrams seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

6. #25-77: BULK DEVELOPMENT - PARKVIEW WEST

Petitioner: Stan McFarland
Location: West Parkview

Don Warner: This is a request for a bulk development on 4 lots. The zoning is R-1-C and comes under the requirements. City utilities said that there was to be no concrete drives or parking over the sewer easement. Asphalt is O.K. They should have containers with screening. City Engineering, concrete drives and walks should not be constructed in sewer easement.

Dr. Brewer returned 9:35.

Stan McFarland: The only reason for the bulk development is the easements going through the lots. I can't build separate houses.

Virginia Flager: Don would you clarify this petition for me.

Don Warner: The petition is wrong in saying that there is a change in the zoning. There is no change in the zoning. They are just building 2 du-plexes because they cannot build 4 houses.

John Cherry: Duplexes increase the number of residences in the area. We do not want that.

Virginia Flager: It is my understanding that it does not increase the number of people because you have the same amount of living units.

Mr. Cherry: Putting duplexes in the area will decrease the value of the surrounding property.

Janine Rider: I would question that the people who signed the petition really understood what was really going to go in there.

Blake Chambliss: The way you have drawn it, in fact, in terms of lot 7 and 8 you probably could put two houses on it. It looks like you may have problems with that lot 13.

Mrs. Lelina: I am not a resident of this area but I do know many of the residence of the area and it has come up on the past that they do very much resent the duplexes that are already there. R-1-C is a single family zoning. Most of the people that lived there were under the impression that the area was zoned for single family. Generally the places are not kept up.

Mr. Joe Shook: I think that when you have the duplexes you have people moving in and out all of the time. There are duplexes there that have no yards. They are just sore eyes for anyone that drives up and down the street.

Mrs. Lelina: If siting is a problem isn't there a possibility of getting variances?

Blake Chambliss: The Bulk Development is designed specifically for this type of problem. My concern is the fact that I don't have any idea what the requirements would be for a right-of-way across the property but certainly that had to be a consideration because you have lost some value of the land.

Dr. Brewer: We have some architectural control over this. There is no way we can make the people keep up their yards.

The hearing was closed.

Frank Simonetti made a motion to deny the request for a bulk development. Blake Chambliss seconded the motion.

Janine Rider: If it is possible that Mr. McFarland can put in four single family dwellings on there, I hate to see a lot go just to a weed patch I think that that can become as much of a problem as a poorly taken care of property that is built on. If there is no way that you can put the houses on there then it would deserve to be reconsidered for the duplexes.

Janine Rider abstained, and the motion passed 4 to 1.

7. #22-77: CONDITIONAL USE LIQUOR LICENSE - THE LAMPWICK

Petitioner: Robert Self
Location: Main Street Arcade

Don Warner: There were no staff comments on this. Mr. Maxwell Alley is representing the owner.

Mr. Aley: This building was specifically designed to include this restaurant. During the day it will be walk in business. In the evening there will be no parking problem. There is a metered parking lot that will serve.

Mr. Self: This is to be very sophisticated. In the entire bar there will be 14 seats. The bar will be used as a holding area for the restaurant.

The hearing was closed.

Blake Chambliss: You have depended on the existing parking and you have seating for 106 people.

Don Warner: It is not required that he have parking for the restaurant in the down town area.

Frank Simonetti: There is enough parking areas there at night.

Janine Rider made a motion to recommend approval to council for the liquor license for the Lampwick. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

8. #23-77: DEVELOPMENT IN H.O. - NUCLEAR ASSURANCE BUILDING

Petitioner: Lea and Company
Location: Tech Del Sol - NE of GSA Building

Blake Chambliss: We are getting stuck with another access onto Horizon Drive again if we do not protect this access.

Don Warner: City Utilities said the sewer line under the sidewalk was not acceptable. The water line is too close to the sewer line by state law. The trash service was not addressed. Fire Department said that marginal flow was available. System improvements are needed. One additional hydrant is required at the Northeast corner of the proposed building. Public Service needs a 10' easement along the property line. The Building permit will be conditional on Fire Department approval of line flow. City Engineering needs a power of attorney for full cost improvements for Horizon Drive. There was no storm drainage shown.

The hearing was closed.

Janine Rider: Do I understand correctly that we have no control over the Tech-Del-Sol as a whole?

Don Warner: I don't think so but I think that you can tie your discussions to the total. You are considering a single plan.

Dick Ummel: Do you know the total acreage of the site?

Don Warner: There are 7, 20' lots. The remainder is about 25 or 30 acres.

Dick Ummel: I think that there should be one access into this area and then work around that.

Blake Chambliss: I would like to step over this and look at a plat and then come back to it later in the meeting.

Virginia Flager: O.K. lets table this for a moment and go on.

10. #27-77: FIRST ADDITION TO ARBOR VILLAGE - PRELIMINARY PLAT

Petitioner: Blaine Ford
Location: NE Corner of 24th and Orchard.

Don Warner: This is a proposed addition to Arbor Village. This is a land locked piece of property east of Arbor Village. Public Service requires easements. They will be worked out in the utilities composite. City Utilities need access easement, lots 11 and 12 are not big enough for all utilities. Should go to a trash container program. Mountain Bell requires easements. City Engineering said that the City has not

yet accepted the existing Arbor Village streets due to uncorrected construction deficiencies. The City Attorney is handling this. Cul-de-sacs on Walnut and Pinyon do not drain as shown on the Preliminary Plan. Water lays in gutters and does not drain. The city will not maintain the "private Driveway" access shown to lots 11 and 12. This type of sub-standard street should not be accepted. A street light should be provided on each cul-de-sac. This whole site is lower than existing Arbor Village and it is physically impossible to site grade to drain into the cul-de-sacs at Walnut and Pinyon without a lot of site filling. How will the site grading drain. There are no improvements on Boockliff East of the site to 26th Street. Who is responsible for putting a street through this field and when? People will drive through it and it will be a neighborhood "dustbowl" unless it is paved. There are irrigation ditches along both the east and west edges of the site.

Tom Logue: The site is an odd shape. The area is pretty clear cut. One area that is deviating from the procedure is lots 11 and 12. There was a comment on the inadequacy of the drive that goes there.

Dan Jameson: I am here just to get an idea of what their plans are. We were concerned about the irrigation ditch. Who will be required to maintain the ditch?

Don Warner: Whoever uses the irrigation ditch is supposed to take care of it.

Tom Logue: There is an easement for utilities here.

The hearing was closed.

John Abrams: I am concerned with lots 4,5,8 and 9 that they have so little access from the extension from the cul-de-sac.

Don Warner: John on this type lot we require only sufficient amount to have a driveway.

John Abrams: Since the cul-de-sacs do not drain right why don't we just put the cul-de-sacs on east?

Don Warner: They do not have to be rebuilt, they are draining water into the cul-de-sacs. None of the concrete or paving has to be built.

Blake Chambliss: With your 15 ft. ingress and egress there is not room for two cars. You are indicating that you are going to have at least 3 lots facing off of it and it is really inadequate for lots 11,12 and 13. I think there could be some things that could deal with this better.

Dick Ummel made a motion to recommend approval to council with the subject to review comments and the replatting of the three lots off of the private drive into two lots. Blake Chambliss seconded the motion and it passed four to one.

11. Continuation of #23-77: DEVELOPMENT IN H.O.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend approval to council subject to one public access to the rest of the property at 50' and review comments. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

12. #26-77: NORTHRIDGE ESTATES FILING #2 - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Lyla Miracle
Location: NE Corner of First and Patterson

Don Warner: Northridge Estates did not file all of the necessary thing that we have to have to give to the engineering department and it is recommended by staff that this be tabled until that is turned.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to table, Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

13. #28-77: PHEASANT RUN AT SPRING VALLEY

Petitioner: Discovery 76
Location: SW Corner of 28 and F 3/4 Road

Blake Chambliss excused himself from the discussion.

Don Warner: There are some changes in the tot lots, in the park and in the drainage. The drainage will be on the lot lines.

Paul Barru: There are two ways to approach a piece of land. One way is to let the land speak for itself and try to develop around the natural by the kind of development plan you do and the other is to develop with the idea of imposing subdividing standards on a piece of land. We wanted to eliminate the houses from facing the street.

Don Warner: City Utilities said should set up residential trash containers Public Service require easements. City Engineering requires a drainage easement. Power of attorney for full improvements on 28 Road and F 3/4 Road. Soil report should be submitted with final, street lighting plan submitted with utilities composite. That is all of the comments from review. The tot lots are nice for mothers to have for the kids to play in just next door.

Janine Rider: Are you going to fence this the same all around the subdivision or is everyone going to fence their own?

Paul Barru: We are proposing to fence the perimeter of the subdivision.

Don Warner: One problem is a half mile of fence coming down a side of a subdivision. I think that you will need to have some greenery to break it up. You could break it up with a planting area.

The hearing was closed.

Dick Ummel made a motion to recommend approval to council subject to review comments.

John Abrams: Is Hawthorn Avenue the same as F $\frac{1}{2}$?

Don Warner: Yes it is.

John Abrams: Some of those cul-de-sacs in there are called "places" instead of "courts".

Don Warner: Those have been changed.

Dr. Brewer seconded the motion. There was an amendment to the motion that made it subject to fencing in the subdivision. The motion passed unanimously.

Blake Chambliss returned to the board.

14. #30-77: OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - PD-B

Petitioner: Bill Weaver

Location: SE Corner of 12th and Patterson

Don Warner: This is an outline plan only for a concept.

Bob Van Deusen: What the petitioner would like to do is to develop this corner as a PD-B. They would like to develop small office buildings two story high and 5,000 sq. feet each. We would like to set the office up in groups. The total area of the site is 50,000 sq. feet. We are proposing four buildings that would occupy 20,000 sq. ft. This would require 71 parking spaces. There is R-1 zoning to the South and East of the development. The developer would screen these.

Don Warner: What you are looking at today is an outline development. We are looking at the concept. Do you think that this is a good zone for this area?

Leona Kochevar: We have lived here 37 years. We have lived there because we liked the residential zone. This development will need 71 parking spaces and where is he going to put them? We are very much opposed to having this business in there. We do not want all if that traffic going by our house.

Blake Chambliss: You indicated that your concern was the traffic that would be generated and the lack of protection to your property adjoining. You realize in this zone we can require landscaped buffering within the plan to give you the protection.

Don Warner: One thing that I did not mention is that they would be asked for additional right-of-way on Patterson and 12th Street.

Blake Chambliss: I have to ask you Mrs. Kochevar, that if that was adequately buffered would you find that acceptable?

Mrs. Kochevar: Well if we were assured that there would be no more development along there. But we cannot be.

Al Gofredy: We have looked for the proper use for this property. The traffic that is generated along here does not make it desirable for a residential development.

The Hearing was closed.

Frank Simonetti: There is no traffic decrease with this type of development

John Abrams: Some of the people in the area would like to see it remain residential.

Janine Rider: I agree with John and Frank.

Blake Chambliss: My concerns are the development being diagonal with Centennial Plaza. The R-3 zoning across the street is a gross error in the density. We have more control with the PD-B than we would have with some others that could come in here. I would like to have this in a discussion with the community and have a chance to discuss and look this over more.

Dr. Brewer: I think that this is a logical approach to this corner.

Dick Ummel: I think that the other people by not opposing it are approving it and I like the PD-B in here.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to table the outline development plan until there was further discussion on it. Dr. Brewer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Janine Rider left at 11:55.

15. #32-77: CONDITIONAL USE LIQUOR LICENSE - JUNCTION SQUARE

Petitioner: Junction Square
Location: 119 N 7th Street

Don Warner: The proposal today is for a restaurant with a liquor license. There are internal changes to the building only.

The hearing was closed.

Blake Chambliss: I guess one of the problems is that, like the other one it does not have parking.

Don Warner: Within the parking authority area we cannot make any legal requirements for parking.

Blake Chambliss: I think that they are just serving drinks through the restaurant.

Dr. Brewer: I find no problems with this.

Dr. Brewer left at 12:00

Frank Simonetti made a motion to recommend approval. Dick Ummel seconded the motion.

Blake Chambliss: I think that the directors of the parking authority should be alerted that they should be looking at more parking for the city.

The motion passed unanimously.

16. #29-77: SIGN CODE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Don Warner: This is an amendment because we have been approached by the service clubs saying that they would like to have signs to the entrances to the cities tell people the time and place of their meetings.

Dick Ummel: How many signs are we going to put up?

Don Warner: At each major entrance to the city.

Blake Chambliss: Why don't we make it a state highway designation?

Blake Chambliss made a motion to table the item until more study. Dick Ummel seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

17. #42-76: PROPOSED AMENDMANT - SETBACK ON CORNER LOT

Don Warner read the proposed amendment.

Dick Ummel made a motion to recommend approval to council of the proposed amendment of setback on corner lots, Blake Chambliss seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Discussion items:

1. NORTHRIDGE #2

The Work session was set up for Tuesday, May 3, 1977 at 7:30 in the Planning Department Office.

2. Corps of Engineers request for review - dumping of trash in the Colorado River.

Don Warner: All I need is permission to write the Corps of Engineers suggesting that we are undeniably opposed to the dumping of trash that has been going into the river off of the Tom Lewis property. The Building Department has already contacted them by letter and I asked them to put a paragraph in saying that there would be a further letter coming from the Planning Department. All I need from you people is permission to write this letter.

John Abrams: Can we make that to cover any portion of the flood plain?

Don Warner: They are working on this particular tract right now so I have to write the letter just pertaining to this. I think that we could add a paragraph that our feeling is the same for any of the areas of the city along the Colorado River.

Blake Chambliss: I think that we should say more than that we are just opposed to this. We should also say that it is in violation to the zoning ordinances. I would appreciate it if you would also send a copy of the letter you send to the Corps of Engineers to the BLM. It might give them some backbone to clean up around there also.

3. Review of access to U.S. 50 - South of Shellabarger Chevrolet Property.

Don Warner: The developers would like to get renewed access to highway 6 and 50. There is only in and out on one side of the road.

Frank Simonetti: I think that we need the New Jersey concrete barrier in there.

Karl Vostoteck: This is really an eye sore in this point in time. We would like to do a well thought out complex. A place that would look nice for an entrance to our city. The developers would like to request a PD-B for this. This is only one concept to how the development this. We do not feel that an egress to the North through the Shellabarger property would be beneficial to the property at this point.

Don Warner: Your only action at this time would be a motion to either encourage or discourage this plan.

Virginia Flager: Any development that would clean up that area, I am in favor of.

Blake Chambliss: What you are doing is forcing everyone that comes through this park through the worst intersection in the City of Grand Junction. Five way traffic. This is bad.

Don Warner: I was going to recommend that since that is a right-of-way coming down through here that we could tie that in here. It is 30 feet. Require that it be widened to 50'.

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes
Page 16

Blake Chambliss made a motion to approve the PD-B subject to Mr. Procense finding an ingress, egress and alternate accesses into the area.

~~finding an ingress, egress and alternate accesses into the area.~~
Dick Ummel seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. **land being done as a Planned Development.**

County Items:

1. LINCOLN ORCHARD MESA - PRELIMINARY

Conni McDonough: Thistle Avenue has to come in straight and we have to decide if 30 foot right-of-way is alright. There are two existing structures.

Don Warner: City recommendation for B $\frac{1}{2}$ is 100 foot.

Blake Chambliss: We need some one on the staff that can look at the creativity of some of the projects.

Conni McDonough: We have the resumue, just give me the money.

Virginia Flager: When will the public Relations person be here?

Conni McDonough: I am going through the applications now.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10.