

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

September 28, 1977

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 7:35 p.m. in the City Council Chambers by Chairman, VIRGINIA FLAGER, with the following members present: JANINE RIDER, VERN DENISON, FRANK SIMONETTI, AND JOHN ABRAMS.

Also present were: DEL BEAVER, Senior City Planner, DON WARNER, Administrative Analyst, KATHY LOFINK, Planner I, DEBRA WILBANKS, Acting Secretary, and approximately 35 interested persons.

The approval of the minutes was postponed until later in the meeting when more of Commission members were present.

1. #59-77: 23RD STREET SUBDIVISION (TABLED ITEM)

Petitioner: Buttolph Construction Company
Location: 23rd Street

Del Beaver: What we have is a rezoning from R-2 to C-1 and then we have the entire subdivision as well. It is located in part of the Southwest corner of the Southeast quarter of Section 12, Township 1 South, Range 1 West, Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction. This is a R-2 zone with a C-1 zone requested. Comments back from the City Transportation people indicates that a sidewalk should be provided here. There were concerns about access, but the proposed access using a common access will wind up at Bunting, and is now acceptable. Public Utilities commented the ten foot easement abutting the North property line and the 12½ foot for the 145 foot portions of lots one and two should be utility easements. Fire Department commented needing one fire hydrant on site. Staff and Engineering indicated the need for 25 foot alley to be dedicated along the North line of Lot one.

Virginia Flager: What is the zoning across to the west of the cul-de-sac where the traffic will be fed in?

Del Beaver: The zoning immediately across the cul-de-sac is split. This corner is R-1-C and this one is R-2.

John Abrams: How far west does that alley go west of 22nd Street?

Del Beaver: It goes a little between 21st and 22nd Street, then it goes back North to the immediate to the east west street North of that.

Del

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes
September 28, 1977
Page 2

Don Warner: It goes over to the alley between 21st and 22nd street.

Virginia Flager: The reason I'm asking is that there is a dead end street to the North and the traffic has to feed to the east or west.

Del Beaver: There will be no access from this project into the alley.

Virginia Flager: Didn't you say the traffic would feed into that cul-de-sac and go North on 22nd?

Del Beaver: As far as maintenance vehicles and trash trucks, etc. that was the intention, yes.

Janine Rider: We have a question about the frontage, in that we held off on a motion because a 12½ foot frontage wasn't enough.

Del Beaver: As I understand it, Blake had asked for tabling and I assume that his biggest question was how this access was going to be worked out between all parties. Now this will be handled through a common easement.

Bob Gerlofs: Lot one and lot two actually have a fifteen foot each frontage on to 23rd. That was only twenty-five feet last month, and that was a concern so it has been widened to 30 feet. It has a 30 foot curb cut opposite the 25 foot curb cut of the opposite Bunting.

Del Beaver: Staff would recommend approval based on any additional fencing considerations that the Commission would like to stipulate beyond those already stipulated by staff.

Closed public hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to approve the subdivision with the stipulation that the northern perimeter of the property be fenced from the western corner where it is already being fenced to the northeastern corner, and with the stipulation set forth by City Transportation, Public Utilities, Fire Department, and Staff and Engineering. John Abrams seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Janine Rider made the motion to approve the vacation of the right-of-way and Frank Simonetti seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

Janine Rider made the motion to approve the rezoning of R-2 to C-1 and John Abrams seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

2. #27-77: FIRST ADDITION ARBOR VILLAGE

Petitioner: Blaine Ford
Location: Northwest Corner of Orchard Avenue and 26th
Street

Del Beaver: The First Addition of Arbor Village lies in Section 12, the Northeast quarter, Township 1 South, Range 1 West. Comments from the City Public Works Engineer state that the street section that had been provided was not adequate. The City has also not accepted undeveloped streets adjacent because of construction deficiencies. Street lights should be provided off each cul-de-sac (Walnut Court and Pinyon Court). City Utilities indicated the trash pick-up would be a problem and would have to be picked up off the cul-de-sac if the City system is to be used. They also indicated that sewer lines and water lines should be extended into the stub ends of the streets for better access in the lots; that has now been shown in the utility composite and is alright. Grand Valley Irrigation indicated that there was enough right-of-way provided on the west side of the drainage ditch, but they were not satisfied when we got the comments that there was enough right-of-way on the east side of the drainage ditch. They have also indicated that there always been seepwater in the area and they wouldn't assume any responsibility concerning that matter. They also suggest the the purposers clear that problem with the Grand Junction Drainage District. Public Utilities require ten foot easement adjacent east to the property line.

Virginia Flager: I'm interested in the comment you made about Grand Valley Irrigation assuming no responsibility for the ground water seepage from the canal in this area.

Del Beaver: I should point out that in the proposal that we received from the engineer, they have indicated that it would be concrete lined ditch. So, there shouldn't be any additional seepage from the ditch itself. I should point out that it may or may not accommodate. We do not know at this point whether it would accommodate overflows or not.

Del Beaver: City Engineering and Planning Staff would like to submit a strong recommendation to move these cul-de-sacs into the parcels so that trash trucks might be able to be accommodate and we eliminate a less than good servicing concept for those lots. As it exists, would work, but we feel that moving the cul-de-sacs would work much better.

Bob Gerlofs: Ron Rish feels he should make it known to the Commission and City Council that there are some drainage problems back in Arbor Village Filing 1. The ones that are important to this project are drainage problems in these cul-de-sacs. The petitioner has agreed to rebuild these

Bob Gerlofs: cul-de-sacs. We do have some qualms about re-locating these cul-de-sacs. The way to do it from our stand point is to leave this cul-de-sac and build another.

Virginia Flager: Del, what would be the standard procedure.

Del Beaver: You could end up with the net result of what you wanted in the first place.

John Abrams: What's the width of that stub?

Bob Gerlofs: The right-of-way is fifty feet and it's a conventional street section, 34 or 36 foot of paving. It's a full width City street.

Del Beaver: Another one of the considerations that had been brought up was a request for not full street improvements, but a matt from this point of the improved section of 28 and 26 street to connect up with the portion that would be fully improved from Bookcliff going through the parcel.

Janine Rider: In other words, you want them to put the matt down outside of their subdivision.

Del Beaver: It was a proposed consideration by City Staff because of the probable dust problem that would exist.

Virginia Flager: Where do those cul-de-sacs get their access from?

Bob Gerlofs: Each of these lots have 50 foot frontage here and these lots have 25 foot frontage here. It was approved like this.

Virginia Flager: With no access to the lots onto the cul-de-sac?

Bob Gerlofs: The access is off the stub street.

Frank Simonetti: The main problem I remember we were faced with was the three lots at the South end.

Bob Gerlofs: In the preliminary plat there were three lots here.

Virginia Flager: You changed it into two and got access onto Orchard, right?

Bob Gerlofs: Right.

Janine Rider: In the preliminary plat, I don't remember any comments from the Trash people.

Del Beaver: Yes there was. Trash pick-up in the street extension, suggest a tank provided by developer in parking space in cul-de-sac and have six or eight lots bordering that cul-de-sac.

Blaine Ford: I don't feel it is my obligation to provide paving. I would gravel it.

Vern Denison: The staffs point was not necessarily access, but dust control.

Janine Rider: What's the problem with the street to the east? Is that dedicated right-of-way there?

Virginia Flager: There's a house on the south and north side of that street, and obviously on the west side of it.

Janine Rider: Is that dedicated right-of-way then, to the east there?

Del Beaver: I don't know for sure. I can check on it. I would assume it was, but I don't know for sure. I would like to make a further comment from staff. Aside from some of the basic design questions, I think in view of the design questions and the drainage problem I would suggest that if you are going to act on this, to act on it as it is presently designed, not as the double bubble. I would suggest that if you're not satisfied with it, to refer it to the next meeting if you want them to come in with something different. If you don't like the proposal.

Closed public hearing.

John Abrams made the motion to temporarily table this item in order to look over the minutes which contained the first portion of Arbor Village. Vern Denison seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

3. #58-77: GREENWOOD ESTATES - PD-12

Petitioner: Green Tree, Inc.

Location: Northwest corner of Walnut Avenue and North 17th

Del Beaver: This is a re-submission, requesting a PD-12. The existing zoning is R-1-C. What's being presented is 52 units on 5.18 acres for a density of 8.9. Internal circulation would be served by a private 35 foot road that would also accommodate parallel parking along one side. The parking works out to about 3.7 to 3.8 parking spaces per unit. Comments are from Fire Department, request hydrants at parcel 23. There are existing hydrants on the other side

Del Beaver: of Walnut and on two sides of 17th. Parks Department said in response to the landscaping plan which had species of trees and shrubs on it, they would recommend no globe willows being planted. All tree placement should be rethought as to species and purpose. They would be willing to sit down with the developer as far as that situation is concerned. City Engineering would like power of attorney for half street improvements. They would like full improvements for Walnut and 17th Street. They would also like a storm sewer going down to 15th Street. Full street improvements on Walnut are recommended with concurrence of the structure of the units. City Public Works Engineer comment that if the two houses on the South of Walnut cannot be obtained, the 50 foot of right-of-way should be made available on the North side of Walnut which would result in jogging the intersection. City Planning and City Engineering Staff would recommend that Walnut Street should not be jogged. The City Engineering (sanitation part) indicate that sanitary sewer might be a problem in this section, running from North Avenue to approximately Elm of the sewer system and running from Orchard up 17th Street to the project area.

Frank Simonetti: How long will it take staff and City Engineering to decide whether that is going to be a problem or not?

Del Beaver: Within the next couple of days.

Wayne Lizer: After the last meeting we did meet with the City and tell them that we would give additional right-of-way at that time. They felt they didn't want it then because they didn't want the jogged intersection. The existing center line of Walnut on the West side still won't line up with the street they're putting in now South of Elderly Housing project. We have agreed with Mr. Jensen that if there is a problem with the sewer to have some allocated to improve from Orchard up. From the previous plan we did have a two way street circulation and now we have put in a one way for the purpose of the protection of the children and better traffic movement.

Del Beaver: Was the access South on Walnut going to be clear access or full access?

Wayne Lizer: At this point we have intended full access.

Janine Rider: When you said you were thinking about a one way street, what was the width of the pavement?

Wayne Lizer: It will be 25 feet wide and a ten foot strip on the east and west which will be gravel which will be the parking area.

Gwen Bush: I want you to take into consideration that 16th does not go through, 18th does not go through, and 19th does not go through. Seventeenth is a dead end at Orchard. We're going to have all the traffic from the elderly people and all the traffic from this on 17th Street so I think we're going to have to leave a right-of-way there on Walnut for them to come out on or we're going to have an awful traffic jam on 17th.

Skip Clifton: This plan has not done anything to change the previous problems that were presented here at your previous meeting. From the last meeting you had quite a few people who spoke of the inadequacy of the sewer line on 17th Street. There is also a problem of an irrigation ditch which flows water across Walnut Street at the Southwest corner of this property. The present zoning out there, R-1-C, will allow 42 houses or 39 houses. I don't think it is proper to include in your zoning densities those areas that have to be dedicated as streets or those areas that have questionable title. I speak specifically of the Northern end of this property.

Galen Koontz: I feel this is too high density for that area. I would rather it remain as it is zoned, as single dwelling houses. I guess we will always have a problem with that intersection because those houses do stick twenty feet out into the right-of-way.

Mrs. Weaver: We have had people who park their cars on both sides of the street and when they do that you can hardly get around the corner.

Mrs. Lindsey: I understand they need this, but as far as I'm concerned it is going to cause some complications.

AT 9:05 BLAKE CHAMBLISS JOINED THE PLANNING COMMISSION
IN MEETING ALREADY IN PROGRESS.

Jill Kinkad: There is apparently a long range project to provide more improvement along 15th. Then there would be more traffic down on Walnut and then down 15th to Orchard.

Gill Weaver: I would like to recommend that this stay R-1-C for all the problems that have been brought up.

Closed public hearing.

Del Beaver: Staff would like to respond with some comments. To remind you again, all drainage as requested by City Engineering would be directed into 15th Street storm sewer.

Del Beaver: I guess that is all I have to say except that City Planning Staff would really like to see the intersection cleaned up at Walnut and 17th in concurrent with and prior to further development in the area.

Virginia Flager: There is a difference in mathematics which I find very interesting. Has this been addressed by the staff pertaining to the acreage? Does it or does it not include the right-of-way for Grand Valley Canal and is it or is it not an R-1-C zoning, does it exist at 42 or 39?

Del Beaver: I calculated this out with Staff to be correct as presented. That portion of the right-of-way which is to be an easement or dedicated was included in the calculation.

Virginia Flager: Of the total acreage?

Del Beaver: Yes.

Virginia Flager: I don't believe you can give a developer right-of-way for a canal.

Del Beaver: We're not giving the developer the right-of-way.

Conni McDonough: Is the right-of-way presently a dedicated right-of-way

Del Beaver: I assumed that it was not dedicated at this time.

Conni McDonough: The property description includes the right-of-way by use and when that happens gross acreage is our view as basis for calculation.

Virginia Flager: Even if the road has been in existence for 75 years.

Conni McDonough: Yes, because it is still within the deeded ownership of that adjoining property.

Virginia Flager: What would happen if somebody closed it off and put a fence there?

Conni McDonough: That's not possible.

Janine Rider: We asked for a PD-8 and the point was not necessarily to say that there could be eight units per acre, but that that was an absolute limit which would be equivalent to a R-1-C zoning, but would maybe allow the developer some changes over the just block subdivision housing.

Janine Rider made the motion to deny the PD-12 and Frank Simonetti seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

4. #67-77: VACATION OF BOOKCLIFF AVENUE

Petitioner: Green Tree, Inc.
Location: Bookcliff Avenue West of 17th Street

Frank Simonetti made the motion to deny vacation and John Abrams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. #27-77: 1ST ADDITION ARBOR VILLAGE (Re-open)

Del Beaver: I looked through the minutes and I did not see where there was any discussion concerning trash pick-up.

Janine Rider: There was a statement. It just said that it was recommended that trash bins would be necessary.

Del Beaver explained what had been said in discussion that had taken place at earlier time for Blake Chambliss.

Del Beaver: Please make your action on what has been presented and if you don't want what's been presented going to Council, please postpone it a month to allow the engineer to come up with a redesign.

Janine Rider made the motion to table this item for one month and that during this time two problems are tended to as to being solved. The first being the problem of the cul-de-sac and some solution to the trash problem and also the drainage. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

RECESSED 9:32

RECONVENED 9:38

6. #65-77: REVOCABLE PERMIT FOR ACKERMAN'S HOUSE OF INTERIORS

Petitioner: Mickey Ackerman
Location: 224 North 7th

Del Beaver: What is being requested here is a revocable permit for extending the public right-of-way. I checked this out as far as parking is concerned. Parallel parking could be handled in a couple of ways. Either retain that area which is currently not available for parking or suggest that the submitter suspend the awning from rod iron chains or something from above. The other staff comments would be that

Del Beaver: we would really like to see some resolving of the present parking situation running from 7th on White towards 8th adjacent to the building. The angle parking that is utilized in that area occupies not only part of the street, but also intrudes on the sidewalk. It would be Staff and City Transportation suggestion that that be solved by vertical curb line with parellel parking on White.

Mickey Ackerman: As far as the canopy, we have redesigned that so there will be no poles going into the street. As far as the parking, we will do anything to go along with the City.

Janine Rider: One of the main problems with that whole corner is the parking on White Street.

Mickey Ackerman: If it does cause a problem, we will definetely take care of it.

Janine Rider: I think one of the things that would make us very happy is if that could be changed to parellel parking.

Mickey Ackerman: By us eliminating these entrance as far as drive-ways will allow the city to put in three more meters in front. Is that the cities expense or is that the developers?

Virginia Flager: Mickey, if they put in meters, I don't think you have to worry about it.

Don Warner: They are talking about a trade off. You would install curb and gutters on the North side, too in return for Revocable permit for doing this with the right-of-way. You would be responsible for closing up those drives on 7th Street with vertical curb down White.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to recommend approval to Council including the suspension of the front door awning from over head, replacing of the curb with vertical curb on the North side and five foot sidewalk that continues down the street, and the closing of the curb cuts on 7th Street. Vern Denison seconded the motion and the passed unanimously.

7. #66-77: REZONE R-1-C TO R-2-A

Petitioner: James J. and Sharon Brodell
Location: East end of Santa Clara Avenue

Del Beaver: It abutts the Lamplite PD-8 which has gone through preliminary process and approval thus far. There

Del Beaver: exist an R-1-C, single family unit, immediately to the North of the purposed parcel. R-2-A all around adjacent, school caddy-corner across, R-1-C running through here and another PD-8 running down South of the street with R-2-A coming in here. There has been no adverse comments which clarification was understood as what existed here rather than what is shown on the accessor's map.

Janine Rider: How does this relate to the problems of access to Lamplite?

Del Beaver: Lamplite will be taking care of in the improvements to Santa Clara through here. There will also be pedestrian access maintained through the South of this property. So this is essentially an island cut off by access to Lamplite.

Virginia Flager: Does Santa Clara go East beyond this petition?

Del Beaver: To the East it would go into Lamplite. A 60 foot right-of-way is being provided and that is what is required for a street that size and it would line up with what exist as a center line here because I understand it lies to the North side of this right-of-way line. It doesn't exist in the center of Santa Clara right-of-way, it's shifted somewhat to the North so it would be lining up exactly on this center line. The only comments we had were that the Fire Department indicated that one fire hydrant would be needed in the Northeast corner of the plot.

James Brodell: There are two lots there. One of them, the one to the west, my wife and I own. The other one, to the east, is owned by another gentleman.

Virginia Flager: In other words this is a two lot zoning change and you can only speak for one of them.

James Brodell: Well, I can speak for him to the extent as long as it doesn't cost him anything.

Don Warner: If it goes into a paving district, you and the other man will have to pay for it anyway. This has been proposed for that street in the Lamplite which is the public street drawn through Lamplite that would be a paving district. If it goes that way, you would be assessed for it whether you get rezoned or not.

Del Beaver: What about the fire hydrant?

Don Warner: Did they ask for a fire hydrant?

Virginia Flager: Yes, they slapped it in there.

Don Warner: I would suggest that a fire hydrant is going to be requested of Lamplite rather than a rezoning of a small piece of property.

Mr. Andrews: If a fire plug was required, that property that he has acquired is on City water and it's served by a small line which I'm on, too. We recently moved that small line 1300 feet towards the property where we're coming off of a 24 inch main. To put a fire plug up there would require enlarging the service to that area. To put a fire main up to that property would be very expensive, I think. There will be, undoubtedly, a large line go in to serve Lamplite.

Virginia Flager: I think your point is well taken and I can't see us sticking a two lot deal like this with a fire hydrant when it obviously should be the responsibility of the developer to the East. They're the ones creating a problem.

Don Warner: They're going to put one in.

Virginia Flager: Then we can ignore that request.

Don Warner: I think so, yes.

Virginia Flager: Now we have the question of the paving which you will get stuck for either way. The other property owner will also.

Frank Simonetti made the motion to approve the rezoning with the stipulation of power of attorney for improvements on that street. Janine Rider seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Janine Rider made the motion to approve the July minutes and the motion was seconded by Frank Simonetti. The motion passed unanimously.

Janine Rider made the motion not to accept the August minutes until certain questions had been resolved and Frank Simonetti seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

COUNTY ITEMS:

A. C121-77: PRELIMINARY PLAT - EASTBROOK SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Bray and Company
Location: Northwest of E½ and 31

Larry Rasinski: This is zoned R-2 and is surrounded by R-2 on the West, East, North, and South. There is an AFT catty-corner off to the Southeast area. This also calls for 68 lots on 23.8 acres which would be about 2.6 units per acre. They are going through Central Grand Valley Sanitation, Clifton Water District, and this will be going to the County Commission in October. City Planning suggested that Eastbrook Drive be classified as a collector to stand up to F Road. Presently the right-of-way on the property is just an existing right-of-way and no road there.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to approve this item with the recommendation that there be stubs East and West on Bookcliff and that there be deeper lots South of Pinyon (between Orchard and Pinyon). The motion was seconded by Janine Rider. The motion was passed with the exception of one member, Frank Simonetti.

B. C119-77: PRELIMINARY PLAT - FRUITWOOD FILING #8

Petitioner: J & J Investment
Location: Northeast of 30 and D 3/4

Larry Rasinski: This one is zoned R-2 Transitional and it is R-2 to the North and the East which would be the previous homes there. To the South and West are AFT. This one was approved by the County Commissioners on September 20 subject to working out the street design with City Engineering. They are working with 5 acres there with 16 lots which would come out to 3.2 lots per acre.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to table this item until Staff has had the chance to look at parcelization and the motion was seconded by Vern Denison. The motion passed unanimously.

C. C142-77: PRELIMINARY PLAT - GREEN MEADOWS ESTATES

Petitioner: Malinda Berry Fisher
Location: Southeast of 26½ and G½

Larry Rasinski: Green Meadows Estates is zoned R-1-B. The zoning surrounding it there is AFT to the North and to the East. It is R-1-B to the South and also to the West. This contains 18.287 acres with 32 lots which will contain approximately 1.75 lots per acres. The requirement is 19,600 square feet per lot. There are a few lots there that would be pretty critical on size.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to accept the Subdivision if they could straighten G½ Road and extend Green Meadows Road through so it could extend and continue the pattern of access. John Abrams seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

D. C151-77: OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - WHITEWATER WEST

Petitioner: Sidney Ostrager
Location: Between A. 25 and A. 25 South - Between
28 and 29½ Road

Bob Kettle: This is for your information and review. This is a PD and they are planning to development approximately 360 units. It's a combination of townhouses, patio homes, and single family homes.

Planning Commission made comments of concern as to the Orchard Mesa Dump being a problem in smell, not enough accesses, the cost of busing would be high, and the high cost of water to the home owners.

E. C127-77: PRELIMINARY PLAT - LODGEPOLE SUBDIVISION

Petitioner: Warren Homes, Company
Location: North of F Road - West of 30 3/4 line

Larry Rasinski: It is zoned R-2 and the zoning is R-2 to the West, East, and the South, and AFT to the North above the Grand Valley Canal. They have six acres with the purposed 18 lots for three lots per acre.

The only comments made were for a stub street for traffic half way up the parcel. Continued on to next item.

F. C126-77: PRELIMINARY PLAT - TAMARAK MEADOWS

Petitioner: Bill Bennett
Location: Southeast of E½ and Grand Valley Drive

Larry Rasinski: This is East of 30 Road. Their present access is a frontage road situation and one of the questions would be what they are doing for upgrading there. That's a R-1-C Subdivision and is surrounded by an R-2 except for a strip of Business about 400 feet wide between the existing right-of-way at E½ and 6 and 50. Their purposal is to vacate the E½ right-of-way that runs across the parcel. They have 25 acres with the purposed 101 lots for four lots per acre.

AT 11:45 FRANK SIMONETTI EXCUSED HIMSELF FROM THE MEETING.

Larry Rasinski: The County Roads only comment was to the existing right-of-way there. We haven't received a response from the State Highway Department.

Blake Chambliss made the statement that they should express concern over the access from the South, specifically the problem of access from the West into the unit from the South, and the access into the subdivision from the South and West.

(Continuation of Blake Chambliss statement) The North-South continuation of the road pattern does not seem to make sense the way it is. Moved on to next item on agenda.

G. C153-77: REZONE R-2 TO R-1-C

Petitioner: Rex Phelps, Jr. and Doris Thatcher
Location: Southeast of F and 29½ line

Bob Kettle: The minimum lot size in an R-2 zone on a sewer is 9900 square feet whereas the minimum lot size in R-1-C is 6500 square feet. The area in general is all R-2. The area below the canal is R-4 and the area above is R-2. There have been cases in which spots of R-1-C have been granted. My feeling is that if R-1-C is a good idea that it should be uniformly extended throughout that area. If it's not a good idea, it shouldn't be granted.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to deny this item and Janine Rider seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

H. C140-77: REZONE HS TO R-4 and R-1-B to B

Petitioner: Emanuel Epstein and K. L. Etter
Location: Between Horizon Drive and 27½, South of G Road

The decision was made to postpone this item until the October meeting.

I. C137-77: AFT TO R-2-A

Petitioner: Harry and Anabel Bonnichsen
Location: Southwest of C½ Road and 28½ Road

Bob Kettle: It's a 19 acre parcel and reaches down to the river and reaches up to C½ Road. Six and a half acres of this parcel Mr. Bonnichsen would like to rezone to R-2-A, just two acre lot sizes. Flood plain line is shown as a portion of each two acre lot which would be outside the flood plain line.

John Abrams made the motion to recommend denial to the County Commissioners. The motion was seconded by Blake Chambliss and the motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNED 12:10