

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

November 30, 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, DR. MAC BREWER, BLAKE CHAMBLISS, FRANK SIMONETTI, and JOHN ABRAMS.

Also present were: DEL BEAVER, Senior City Planner, KARL METZNER, Planner I, DON WARNER, Planner Analyst, and DEBRA WILBANKS, Acting Secretary, and approximately 45 interested persons.

AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MEETING, DR. MAC BREWER WAS NOT YET PRESENT.

Vern Denison made corrections to minutes on item #74-77 to change Jim Kepley to Jim Teply and on item #70-77 on page 7 to change curb blocks to curb walks.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to approve the minutes and Janine Rider seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

1. #68-77: REVISION IN H.O. (TABLED ITEM)

Petitioner: Amoco Oil Company
Location: U.S. Hwy. 50 and Linden Street - Northwest corner.

Karl Metzner: Staff comments were to close the driveway closest to Linden, a 30' extension of the curb along Linden, some additional landscaping, and a parking plan. The petitioner has complied with all the staff comments. City Engineering which had most of the comments last time agreed that this plan does meet their needs on providing a little better traffic circulation in the area.

Vern Denison: Does this plan reflect the updated parking requirements which came out in the last meeting also?

Karl Metzner: Yes.

Ken Murray: I have nothing else to add unless there are some specific questions which would be raised that I could answer.

Blake Chambliss: You show landscaping inside the property, but this indicates that you are taking asphalt outside the area; what is to be done with that area between the pavement of the highway and the property line?

Ken Murray: As I understood the City and State Highway Department, we were just to remove the asphalt and

Ken Murray: put it back the way it is now.

Del Beaver: We recommend approval as submitted.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to recommend approval as submitted and Janine Rider seconded the motion. The motion passed with the exception of one "NO" vote made by John Abrams.

2. #27-77: FIRST ADDITION ARBOR VILLAGE (RETURNED FROM CITY COUNCIL)

Petitioner: Blaine Ford

Location: Northeast of Orchard Avenue and 24th.

Del Beaver: I specifically asked that this be referred back to the Planning Commission so that Council would not be considering an item that was different than the Planning Commission consideration. What occurred between the Planning Commission's last meeting and the Council meeting was some door to door interviewing of the residents involved in the area and they expressed a preference, not for the vacated portions of the cul de sac. They felt they would incur undue expense to pull the driveways out to the new curb lines and they didn't want to incur that expense. The other alternative that was acceptable to Planning Staff and City Engineering Staff was what was originally proposed, and that was to have the cul de sac and to have these stub streets enter on to there with a concrete, raised curb spot for the trash containers so the trash trucks could stop here entering either the back or side not having to make any turning movements out and around. This was listed as alternative #2. It was most acceptable to the neighbors.

Virginia Flager: I have one comment Del. I suggest that in the future before a staff recommendation is presented to this Commission in which we act upon your recommendation, that the neighborhood be consulted in the future.

Blake Chambliss: I don't understand the concern of the neighbors, that they were going to get tacked with the cost of additional driveway.

Don Warner: Their driveways come to the edge of that circle and it would require another 12-15 foot of double concrete driveway to come out to the straight curb if the cul de sac were vacated and the curb went straight through. Also, they didn't want that much lawn.

Blaine Ford: I talked to alot of those people out there and it's like Don says, they don't want to change that cul de sac.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to reconsider the action that was taken at the last meeting. Janine Rider seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Frank Simonetti made the motion to recommend alternative #3 and Vern Denison seconded the motion. Blake made mention that reasons should be stated in the motion such as the concern of the neighbors for not disturbing an existing situation, a situation which isn't going to add beyond this four additional housing, it does not seem to be a major traffic consideration, and the indifference to the neighbors concerns about not plowing up their front yard again. Janine Rider made the comment that this was not the best alternative, but they were doing it because it seemed the best thing to do considering the feelings of the neighborhood. Frank Simonetti accepted these comments. The motion was voted upon and passed unanimously.

3. #78-77: CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION

Petitioner: Lee Fetters:
Location: Northeast corner 9th and Hill

Del Beaver: What is being requested here is a Conditional Use to allow this facility to be converted into Day Care or Nursery School facility. City Engineering comments that no parking should be allowed into the alley. Planning Staff recommendations are that all trees and existing landscaping should be maintained if possible and parking would be alright subject to Engineering comments. The petitioner should be advised that the building does not meet with building codes and fire codes and would have to be brought up to such.

Blake Chambliss: What is the Learning Tree Children's Center?

Lee Fetters: It is a nursery school.

Blake Chambliss: How many students do you think you would have under your license in this location?

Lee Fetters: I think there would be about sixty.

Janine Rider: Are you moving or adding on.

Lee Fetters: This would be an addition.

Del Beaver: Staff would recommend no apparent problems with Conditional Use of this nature in that area. With that we would recommend the approval of the Conditional Use concept here.

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

November 30, 1977

Page 4

Janine Rider: How much parking space is there room for back there?

Lee Fetters: It depends upon where the fence would be located. I hope to have parking for three cars in the back.

Karl Metzner: The parking he has shown on the plat could accommodate seven cars with two sets of cars being stacked, front to back.

DR. MAC BREWER JOINED THE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 8:05 p.m.

Jim Devenny: There are some questions that I would like to ask Mr. Fetters and there are some opinions I'd like to state for the neighborhood. I'm sure that Planning Commission and Staff are aware that that is quite a heavy traffic area in that East Junior High School is directly across the street. There has been trouble at times with that building in that kids have used it to do things that maybe they shouldn't be doing and to hid out so an addition like Mr. Fetters would be welcomed at this time. There are people who are concerned as to what exactly is going to take place there and what renovations are going to be made. People would like to know what improvements Mr. Fetters does intend to make, how many children will be going there, what hours will be the peak load hours, and also to express our feelings at this time to Planning Commission, realizing that that piece of property is run down and is probably a burden on the school district, that we would like to keep this a residential area.

Lee Fetters: Could you be more specific?

Jim Devenny: What kind of renovation are you going to put in?

Lee Fetters: The thing needs to be completely rewired, roof needs to be re-done, I don't intend to change the physical appearance of the building, but what I'd like to do is fix it up so that it looks like a well maintained older building. The parking you see is going to be out in back and probably pick-up in the front.

Virginia Flager: Isn't there some restrictions as to the covering of the walls and so forth.

Karl Metzner: It depends on the fire zone. This is in a fire zone three which is the least restricted fire zone.

Virginia Flager: Aren't they required to use a fire retardant material on the outside?

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

November 30, 1977

Page 5

Karl Metzner: I believe in a fire zone three, they can do the inside with a fire retardant.

Virginia Flager: So it's all interior rather than exterior.

Karl Metzner: I believe that is the building requirements, I don't know what the state requirements might be.

Don Warner: State requires that it meet the local building code and meet their health standards, but there is no exterior work has to be done in a fire zone three.

Janine Rider: Mr. Devenny what you are telling us is that you do care what happens in the neighborhood and if we do not pass Mr. Fetters request, you will be watching to see what we do.

Jim Devenny: Yes.

Blake Chambliss: On the plan that you have, you don't indicate anything in the way of landscaping and so forth. You indicate a couple of trees that are already there and some bushes there. What kind of a ground service do you see in the area where the kids will play outside?

Lee Fetters: It will be pea gravel. In the front of the building will be trees and grass.

Don Bridgett: I'd like to make an observation. This is a very congested area. People coming to pick their kids up, kids around the area, so if you add 60 more kids it is going to be worse.

Jim Devenny: There is going to be some additional traffic in there, but the people I have talked to would rather see this go in rather than something else.

Don Bridgett: All I wanted to comment on, was an over-loaded area already.

Blake Chambliss: Are you talking about paving the parking area off the alley?

Lee Fetters: No.

Closed public hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend approval to City Council with the stipulation that the landscaping, grass and trees be maintained in a non-fenced area. Dr. Mac Brewer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

5. #79-77: PROPOSED ZONE R-1-A to R-1-B

Petitioner: Spomer Construction Company
Location: West of 27½ and F½ Roads

Karl Metzner: You have seen a preliminary and one filing known as Bell Ridge Subdivision. The request is for rezoning from R-1-A to R-1-B. The request is not to allow more units, but more flexibility of putting the structures on the lots that are platted. There is ten foot setback on each side and the R-1-B requires a minimum of seven foot.

Virginia Flager: What we are talking about then is the difference in side-yard setbacks, not additional units .

Karl Metzner: That is correct if you put that stipulation on it.

John Abrams: What is the zoning immediately South?

Karl Metzner: R-2-County.

Ed Spomer: I don't want to change any of the lot sizes or anything, we would just like to have the yard sideage.

Blake Chambliss: What are the widths of lots that you have?

Ed Spomer: They're about 79' to 89' average.

Virginia Flager: It's going to be a pretty good size house then.

Ed Spomer: Our houses have been anywhere from 70 to 76 feet in length.

Mac Brewer: I want to see if I understand this. We would rezone the whole area. One area is platted and you have preliminary's on the other areas. If we stipulate that they could not change the size of lots even though the change of zone would allow it, that would control this.

Karl Metzner: That's correct. We recommend approval subject to stipulations of no replatting or other preliminary's being accepted.

Closed hearing.

Blake Chambliss made a motion to recommend approval with stipulations recommended by staff. Janine Rider seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

6. #81-77: PROPOSED REZONE R-2 to B-3

Petitioner: Larry Lkauzer
Location: Southwest corner 17th and Main

Del Beaver: The Planning Staff, Parks Department Staff, City Engineering Staff all met and we suggest visual screening, some addressing of how the trash would be picked up, landscaping was suggested on 17th Street and City Engineering indicated that the siting of the building would have to be careful not to move into the site line requirements for traffic moving into the alley or from the alley on 17th Street.

Virginia Flager: This building is to face North on Main Street?

Del Beaver: East on 17th.

Frank Simonetti: How many parking spaces?

Larry Klauzer: We anticipate about 12 on 17th Street and possibly two or three in the alley.

Frank Simonetti: What is the zone across the street?

Del Beaver: This is R-2. To the East and South of this property is C-2 (commercial). North of it is R-2 property.

Closed public hearing.

Dr. Mac Brewer: This looks to me like it might be a pretty good way to buffer.

Janine Rider: I feel that streets are a better buffer.

Blake Chambliss read some of the uses which could be used in this zone such as community facilities, open area (cemetary, park, golf course, etc.), swimming pool, semi-public, community facilities, non-commercial (place of worship, kindergarten, library, etc.) and so forth.

Frank Simonetti: I'll buy Janine's argument, to me a street is a better buffer.

John Abrams made the motion to recommend denial of the change in zoning to the City Council because of the spot zoning and because of too many loop holes in business zoning; loop holes which would be bad neighbors for a residential area. Blake Chambliss seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

7. #51-77: FINAL PLAT - REPIAT OF LOT 3, COLORADO WEST DEVELOPMENT PARK, FILING #1

Petitioner: CBW Builders

Location: West side of 900 block of South 15th Street

Karl Metzner: Comments were City Engineering requested they replace the three foot gutter pan at intersection with five foot. City Utilities requires a 15' easement centered on sewer lines for access and maintainance. Public service and Mountain Bell require some additional easements. Fire Department is happy with the location of fire hydrants. Building permits will be reviewed to insure adequate circulation for police and fire around all structures.

John Abrams: This Second Avenue that is on here, how far South of the South driveway of Wholesome Baker is this?

Karl Metzner: Approximately 250 feet. The distance from Second Avenue to the North property line is approximately 138 feet. Staff recommends approval.

Closed public hearing.

Frank Simonetti made motion to recommend approval to the City Council. Dr. Mac Brewer seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

8. #53-77: FINAL PLAT, NORTHRIDGE ESTATES, FILING #3

Petitioner: Don D. Foster etal

Location: Northeasterly of Northridge Drive

Karl Metzner: The subdivision is zoned R-1-A. We have been working with Mr. Foster very closely to make sure everything has been ironed out. City Engineering had some questions about the drainage to the East. They have placed all fire hydrants as required by City Fire Department. Public Service and Mountain Bell do require some additional easements. Just a reminder, when you approved the preliminary on this you stated at that time that when this filing was built up 75%, that the access to the North must be provided. In subservice soils investigation it was noted that there might be some problems with foundations in certain areas unless they're engineered right and a copy of that soils investigation has been given to the Building Department and they will closely watch all building permits to make sure the correct foundations are put in where required. I don't think you need to include that in your motion, that is information only.

Janine Rider: Did anyone have complaints about the street names?

Karl Metzner: We did have some name changes.

Vern Denison: When we approved Filing #1, there was a question put to City through Staff concerning an additional traffic light on 1st and Patterson, is there any new information back on that.

Karl Metzner: Yes. The City Traffic Engineer has told me that he is working on that problem and he hopes to get the count completed and see if they meet the warrants. If financing allows it, they will put a light in there.

Closed public hearing.

Karl Metzner: Staff would recommend approval subject to the comments made on the preliminary that the access to the North would be provided.

Closed public hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend approval to the City Council subject to the previous conditions that at the time the subdivision is 75% occupied, that the North access will be made available on Noelridge Lane. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

9. #28-77: PRELIMINARY PLAT, PHEASANT RUN AT SPRING VALLEY
FINAL

Petitioner: Paul S. Barru, etal
Location: West of 28 Road, and North of Patterson
Road

Del Beaver: Staff comments are as follows: Mountain Bell is requiring an additional 10' easement around the irrigation pond, Planning Staff is concerned with the security system for the fence in closing the irrigation pond, there is a recommendation from Public Health to stock the irrigation pond with a gambosse fish which feeds on large mosquitos. All the conditions surrounding drainage have been addressed to staff satisfaction. The petitioner has requested that Pheasant Run Street and Pheasant Run Circle to be treated differently than the balance of streets that you see in the proposed plat. What is being requested in lieu of traditional 6' curb walk, 34' mat are 4' detached sidewalks, 6½' area between the sidewalk, vertical face curb, 28' mat which will allow parking on one side and two driving lanes. The 34' mat would obviously provide parking on both sides plus two driving lanes. After City Engineering and Planning Staff met with the petitioner, agreed that the 28' mat would be workable. The houses that would be built would

Del Beaver: have two car garages, driveway mats, and at the time of staff discussion it was indicated that if this were to go to a 28' mat covenants to read that all recreational vehicles would be parked off-street and there shall be four off-street parking spaces per unit constructed. The City Engineer has indicated that there is flexibility on his part and he feels that the 28' mat is warranted. City Planning Staff would also bring to your attention that we have a number of streets in the city of Grand Junction with inside curb to inside curb measurements less than the 31'. This is totally an internal street and is not expected to carry pass through traffic.

Dr. Mac Brewer: Is Pheasant Circle the only one being considered for the 28' mat.

Del Beaver: Pheasant Run Circle is the only one being considered for the 28' mat because of the condition that Pheasant Run Street does run between Hawthorne Avenue and Beechwood which will have 60' rights-of-way with detached sidewalks and 34' mat which will allow parking on either side of the street plus two driving lanes.

Virginia Flager: It would be interesting to know the comments of the future owners of those lots; Those who suddenly have a parking lane on their side of the street and the unfortunate individuals who purchase the property on the other side of the street have no parking. Who polices to see who parks where? Is that the expense of the tax payers?

Del Beaver: Obviously that would be a policing function. The City Staff did go out and check that area and found that there was no substantial on-street parking in Spring Valley as constructed and built out to date.

Paul Barru: I'd like to comment about the street situation. First of all, it was our intention in developing the final plat of this to work through with staff all the problems. It was the City Engineer who felt very, very strongly toward the problems of safety of attached sidewalks. In other words, the six foot curb walk presents some safety problems by the proximity of the sidewalks to the driving lanes and particularly if kids ride bikes down those streets as is apt to happen in a subdivision like Spring Valley. He recommended that we consider at some additional cost to the developer, the possibility of switching from a curb walk attached to the black top to a detached walk. We would like to suggest that to have some attached and some detached sidewalks creates problems at street crossings, and creates problems, where the city is concerned, to provide ramps and access for handicapped people. From our point of view, we'll be glad to go along with whatever your recommendation is, but we think that the original agreement with Planning Staff and City Engineering makes alot more

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

November 30, 1977

Page 11

Paul Barru: sense for the future value of the lot. The one comment that Staff did not make, is that the developer agreed to place lot signs before the occupancy of any home so that people would know before they bought a home, that they were buying on the side of the street that either had no parking or had parking. One final comment, the developer does have trouble with the easement request of Mountain Bell. That ten foot easement is under water. Further than that, I would be glad to answer questions you might have.

Dr. Mac Brewer: Do I understand correctly. Initially you were going to put in attached sidewalks and you were asked to put the other in?

Paul Barru: No. Before we made any decision about the shape and configuration of the streets, we arranged an appointment with Mr. Rish to discuss precisely the profile of the street. Not only for this filing, but for the rest of the subdivision. He invited Del to be present at that and it turned out to be an over all staff conference. It was out of that discussion that these profiles were recommended and we agreed to go along with them.

Blake Chambliss: I'd like to know what the deviation from the preliminary is.

Paul Barru: At preliminary we did not know how we were going to handle the irrigation system. We finally came to the decision that the only way to handle an irrigation system was to put in a holding pond about six to eight acres of water and putting in a fully underground pressurized system. Then the problem came, how do you store that much water? The holding pond is in place of six lots in a cul de sac that were in the original preliminary plat that was submitted to you. It is a fully fenced area. It is a pond slopes gradually from the side starting at about three feet of depth. It is fully lined to the outside perimeter and wrapped on the outside with rock and then covered with a layer of crushed rock on the bottom. There is a fairly deep retaining area in the center. It is designed to be easily serviced and above all to be estatic. It is closed off so that the only people who would have access to it would be the people who own the eighteen lots which back up to it. Total security was our concern, as it was the Staff, and I might add other agencies financing us.

Blake Chambliss: I'm interested that you solved the ecstatic problem, but would you tell us how.

Paul Barru: Well, it was to make it sufficiently deep on the perimeter of the pond so that the normal draw down would still leave a foot of water covering the

Paul Barru: covering the exterior of the pond.

Blake Chambliss: How much dirt do you leave exposed on draw down?

Paul Barru: None. It would only be if there were a prolonged period with no replenishment.

Virginia Flager: What is the fence going to be made of? I haven't ever seen one yet that is kid proof.

Del Beaver: Would there be room to put a four foot planting area (pyracantha or rosebush)? I think an additional safeguard such as that would make me feel more secure.

Paul Barru: Well, let's begin with the basic problem. Let's say you did plant it, who is going to maintain it?

Dr. Mac Brewer: Why are you at such great risk when we have these wide open, fast running, much deeper canals all over the place?

Paul Barru: We are proposing a six foot high split cedar picket fence and I may eat my words because the split cedars are becoming very expensive and hard to get. We even thought of the possibility of a special rail approximately 24 inches down and then fastening a barb wire catch basin at that point and still might do that as a security measure.

Virginia Flager: I would say it is impossible to come up with something to keep a kid out who wants in. A six foot fence would keep a toddler out of it, but you're not going to be able to keep an adolescent out no matter what you do.

Del Beaver: May I make a couple of comments that I neglected before. Mr. Barru would like to have a chance to respond to them before the hearing is closed. As far as Mountain Bell easements, Planning Staff is in accordance with Mr. Barru's comments. The other important factor that I neglected in the outline presentation was that should this be approved, we would like to work with the developer on full improvements on 28 Road. Mr. Rish's comments here were that we would be better off accepting power of attorney for full improvements on 28 Road.

Paul Barru: FHA and VA both have problems with the power of attorney. There are a number of problems with 28 Road.

Paul Barru: One is the flat road, it doesn't drain. It is less than minimum property standards by County zone standards, City zone standards, and by FHA and VA standards for a good road. On the other hand, it has a major drop at two different points coming down from F 3/4 to F Road. Eventually it ought to be redeveloped and it ought to be redeveloped at one time. Our counter suggestion was that we would enter into agreement as part of each subsequent filing that fronted on 28 Road. At any time during the development period we would undertake to develop our portion of that road with the vertical curb and put in the five to six feet of mat that was required as part of an over all development plan or at the end of the development period if the City did not decide to go ahead with the development of it that we would at the end of the development put in that curb and mat as required.

Del Beaver: Mr. Rish in turn agreed that a letter of credit for such an action would be agreeable which I assume would help to address your problem with FHA and VA.

Paul Barru: Right because then we are responsible for the cost and not the home owner.

Del Beaver: Getting back to the loop street, it was agreed with Fire, Police, City Engineering, City Planning, and Parks Department that it would be appropriate for Pheasant Run Circle to have detached sidewalks and parking on one side if it were signed prior to building and if there were covenants indicating that recreational vehicles shall be parked off street and that there would be covenants indicating that there would be four off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit.

Janine Rider: What about Pheasant Run Street?

Del Beaver: City Planning Staff feels we can accept it, we don't have a great deal of problems with it being 28' mat, but City Engineering, Police and Fire had recommended that that be 34' mat because it does run between two collector streets in the subdivision.

Closed public hearing.

Virginia Flager: If it is so necessary to have the detached sidewalks, why have any parking on that street if it's not a problem? Why not just have two lanes of traffic with the four off-street parking?

Del Beaver: Let me make one additional comment. There was one additional covenant that I have in my notes that I didn't indicate. The covenant would state that at such time parking was determined to go on both sides of Pheasant Run Circle, if that were a necessity, the only option would be to make that street one way because there would

Grand Junction Planning Commission Minutes

November 30, 1977

Page 14

Del Beaver: not be reasonable center mat for traffic in both directions.

Virginia Flager: Arcadia Village was a very nice subdivision back in 1953. It is in the Northeast part of the City immediately adjacent to Burger King, Wendy's, etc. They have very narrow streets and 25 years later they are not satisfactory and the only alternative is to quit parking entirely on 18th Street as you leave North Avenue because it is a death trap.

Dr. Mac Brewer: What about your suggestion of no parking on the street. Can we have adequate parking?

Virginia Flager: If we have adequate off-street parking for each individual lot. I don't like this idea of having one side of the street parking.

Blake Chambliss: I've got three things that I'm interested in specifically. The irrigation pond sits empty during the winter and is a mud flat or a gravel plat.

Paul Barru: It's not intended to sit empty during the winter. We will fill it, then plug it.

Blake Chambliss: I didn't understand what was happening on 28 Road. You're typing a letter of credit now instead of a letter of power of attorney for improvements of that road. How long does that letter of credit be extended?

Paul Barru: We can get the letter of credit extended a year past the final development.

Blake Chambliss: So if 28 Road is not completed by that time then there is no protection and there is no way of getting that road done. Is that right?

Dr. Mac Brewer: No, they will do it. They'll do it then.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to recommend approval with the stipulations recommended by staff, but with the request that all streets go with 34' mat with attached sidewalks. Janine Rider seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Del Beaver: I'd like a policy in the future as to the desirability of detached sidewalk on 50' rights-of-way.

Blake Chambliss: The cross section sort of indicated that they don't fit.

Janine Rider: Yet that has never been brought to our attention before, that it is a problem.

Del Beaver: All I am indicating is that City Engineer indicates that it will work. Do you want City Engineering Staff not to consider detached sidewalks in 50' rights-of-way.

Blake Chambliss: That's correct.

Virginia Flager. There is also one thing you missed. It is not necessary to have a detached sidewalk to have street planning. I have then in front of my house, put in by the City and I don't have a detached sidewalk.

RECESSED 10:05

RECONVENED 10:14

Blake Chambliss made the motion to reconsider the motion that had just been passed because there was a need to make a clarification. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Blake Chambliss: On the 60' right-of-way there is room for a five foot detached sidewalk so I would like to remake the motion as it was made, but make the distinction that we should ask for five foot detached sidewalks on 60' rights-of-way which are the major roads through there and where we only have the 50' rights-of-way to use an attached section as discussed.

Virginia Flager: And then not use the one side of the parking?

Del Beaver: Parking can be on both sides, you won't have to worry about it. The only 50' rights-of-way are Pheasant Run Street and Pheasant Run Circle, the rest of the streets indicated have 60' rights-of-way and they would be assumed to have detached sidewalks, is that correct?

Janine Rider: That's right.

Janine Rider seconded the motion made by Blake Chambliss and it was passed unanimously.

10. #85-77: REVISION OF CONDITIONAL USE - BURGER KING

Petitioner: Norbert Lukas
Location: 1730 North Avenue

Del Beaver: What you have here, that was submitted to you, indicated a drive-up window running along the west side of the building between Burger King and Arrow Glass for

Del Beaver: a pick-up window. City Staff and Planning staff indicated that though you legally need a minimum of 30' for curb cuts and we felt that the curb cuts in that area were inappropriate. We prefer that the applicant submit an application which contained a major egress and ingress from the same point which exist right now. If that were to be done, the egress and ingress point would have to be expanded slightly to be able to make that accommodation. What is being proposed now would be to have traffic come around, come past the building as suggested before, but instead of accessing by the driveway next to Arrow Glass, is to swing the traffic back around to use the single egress and ingress. This would be expanded slightly to accommodate the situation. They indicate that tables would be relocated. One of the applicants indicated that between where the pedestrian area would be and the edge of the driveway would be landscaped.

Dr. Mac Brewer: There is no legal way they could go through Arrow Glass?

Del Beaver: There would be too many problems with that kind of an access.

Virginia Flager: Is this the same situation that existed on 12th and North, South of Arby's there in front of the proposed office building?

Don Warner: You're talking about the office building PRA put in there?

Virginia Flager: Yes.

Don Warner: The problem there was that they were going to be angle parking in front of the building and they would be backing out over the sidewalk.

Dr. Mack Brewer: But here we have the sidewalk protected.

Don Warner: That's why we asked them to landscape instead of allowing any parking in front of the building.

Virginia Flager: How wide exactly is the distance between the Burger King building and east side of Arrow Glass?

Norbert Lukas: The big concern was the front. I went to the City Engineer and I first got the curb cut coming straight which you're looking at in front of you and then Planning told me it might be better to come up with this other way.

Del Beaver: Well, let's be perfectly clear. The City Engineer responded on the site that the absolute minimum on curb cuts would be 30', but he still doesn't want

Del Beaver: to see it.

Virginia Flager: What's the dimension of the driveway?

Del Beaver: They show between 11 and 12 feet.

Richard Welch: It's 13 feet 10 inches.

Janine Rider: One of the things we haven't looked at is the overhang of the roof.

Norbert Lukas: We'll have warning signs in the back.

Richard Welch: Clearance signs.

Del Beaver: They indicated on the previous submittal to you that there would be warning signs in back so that a vehicle would be allowed to turn out if the vehicle did not meet the clearance.

Janine Rider: What will not be able to go through there?

Norbert Lukas: Campers.

Dr. Mac Brewer: How tall is that?

Norbert Lukas: Our overhang is a little over seven feet and our sign reads nothing over eight feet.

Dr. Mac Brewer: Do you think everyone such as the pizza parlors will be wanting one of these now.

Norbert Lukas: I think your sandwich type places.

Richard Welch: You're carry out mainly.

Frank Simonetti: I don't think you can come out across the front straight enough to get into the exit.

Richard Welch: Sure you can.

Janine Rider: There is something nice about that patio which does do something nice for that area and I hate to see it become just another piece of asphalt.

Norbert Lukas: That's why I liked the idea of coming straight out better. Earlier we talked about George White's curb cut. George and I agreed upon this about a year ago. We were going to knock off about ten feet of our planter box and put some kind of a raised curb to keep the car in this area to come out. We're not going to generate that much more business now. We're probably going to take 25% of the customers we do have in their cars.

Richard Welch: If we do go along with coming in front of the building, there was a concern about a car being able to turn into the exit. From this planter from the exist there is between 15 to 18 feet to make the exit turn. In making that turn, there is plenty of room. Between the front of the building and this cut there has got to be around 25 feet. Arby's you've got to almost stop and go to get around their building, but with this curb cut there is going to be at least 15 feet in this area to drive out of.

Del Beaver: The only comments that staff would have is that if this were to be approved that staff would concur with City Engineering and go with the single egress and ingress.

Richard Welch: In talking to Mr. Rish, say we do make the turn where we come across the front of the building, it is hard to get into with the 25 foot inlet that we do have now. With the 35 foot curb cut, it would make it alot much easier for the egress and ingres. I think it would look much better on North Avenue.

Del Beaver: The extended curb cut is an absolute necessity.

Blake Chambliss: What are the radius's there?

Del Beaver: Ron was more concerned with access on to North Avenue rather than internal circulation.

Norbert Lukas: Ron and Steve were out there for about three hours a month ago and one of the alternatives, when we left our discussion, was to shoot it straight out and then he insisted on the 30 feet. Then we came back with this second proposal which is not commonly used in our planning in the future, but is one that is being adapted quite abit to remodel, where the window is added on.

Blake Chambliss: There is a minimum 25 foot radius for a car to get around comfortably and you haven't got quite that. So you're assuming that people are coming around an eight foot radius or something of that sort.

Richard Welch: It's more than eight feet. I'd say it is close to 18 to 20 foot radius.

Closed public hearing.

Dr. Mac Brewer: We've had two presentations here and we're not a hundred percent sure of the second and I really wonder if there's not much rush. Could we look at this so we'd know exactly what we are talking about before we try to make a decision?

Virginia Flager: We have been very restrictive along North Avenue in relationship to what someone could or couldn't do. We have a pretty nice front looking building here with a few trees and a place for people to go out and come in in the summer time and sit there and eat. They do make use to it believe me. I live very close to that and I know it's a very high traffic area. Now if this is allowed, and I am saying if, you have a very tight shot situation for a car to get through, come in and make a left hand curb and then make a tight right hand curb to get back on to North Avenue. In the meantime the people in the front of that building are going to have to be crossing that lane of traffic, they've got to come from the parking lot to get into the front of the building, and then immediately between them and North Avenue, they've got another lane of traffic. I realize the need for this type of thing, but all the drive-ins have the right to this additional service.

Blake Chambliss: Mac are you suggesting that this be tabled.

Dr. Mac Brewer: I'm saying, this is something we're thinking about doing and we really don't know if this feasible and it's really our responsibility to look at on-site planning. I don't think we can make a decision on what we see here. I really wonder that with a little more time if they can address themselves to the patio area.

Virginia Flager: The pattern from a drive-up window and I've sat there and I can vouch for this. A hot rodder gets his food in his car, he then guns his four wheel drive vehicle and make a hell of a bee line dash for North Avenue and this guy has to make two turns. He's got to make a left turn and then a sharp right turn. That gives him two more chances to get a pedestrian.

Dr. Mac Brewer: I'm just saying they might want to move their patio and put it to the west-east of the building. I'm just wondering if they want to reconsider a little bit.

Janine Rider: I see your point and I don't mind doing that if it is necessary. I don't find either one of these appropriate to me.

Norbert Lukas: We feel there is enough room to move the tables back closer to the building. Right now they're pretty well spread out in that area.

Virginia Flager: Would you prefer a decision rather than to have it tabled?

Norbert Lukas: Yes.

Dr. Mac Brewer: My feeling is, although this is a Conditional Use, they have the right to it. Everybody else has one.

Virginia Flager: Not yet.

Dr. Mac Brewer: This meet traffic problems, we still are seeing some green in front so we're not just seeing asphalt, and if these tables are that popular I think should be extended upwards, but I think I could live with this.

Virginia Flager: You take a holiday week-end and somebody is going to get killed. When you put pedestrians between two lanes of traffic and there's not justifiable condition for this.

Dr. Mac Brewer: North Avenue is a dangerous place and I think it is just as bad going to ball games over at the park.

Virginia Flager: Then you are justifying you position by saying it's a bad place so let's go ahead and make it worse.

Dr. Mac Brewer: I don't think it's a bad place.

Norbert Lukas: Holidays are very slow for us. Most people take their lunches and go up to the mountains. Labor day and Memorial day are very slow week-ends.

Virginia Flager: All I'm saying is that it's one hell of a volume through there on busy days.

Norbert Lukas: You said holiday week-ends.

Frank Simonetti made the motion to deny the petition and Janine Rider seconded the motion. The motion passed with the exception of one "NO" vote made by Dr. Mac Brewer.

11. #77-77: PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE - SECTION 27.22 PARAGRAPH A.

Petitioner: Staff

Del Beaver: The three major text changes are that Senior City Planner may exercise discretion on submittals after the first working day of the month if they are not complex in nature or if they do not need outside agency review, otherwise all submittals shall be in by the first working day of the month. Those submittals that we can exercise some discretion in cannot come in any later than the tenth day of the month. The third point is the Senior City Planner shall withdraw from the agenda prior to legal advertising any submission which is incomplete and has not had appropriate review. As we've indicated, if there

Del Beaver: are some problems that come up after the date of posting that creates an incomplete submission, we will suggest that Planning Commission take no action and refer it to the following meeting. In addition and aside from this, we have entered into an operation with the rest of Department staffs where we are endeavoring in December and all subsequent months to meet on the second Monday of every month for complete review of all the submissions so that we can get back to the petitioners as early as possible so if there are things they have to provide for more complete submission then they will have an ample opportunity to provide those.

Virginia Flager: Are there any additional comments you want to make before we close the hearing?

Del Beaver: Well, we just recommend approval. We're already using this, but we would just like it legalized.

Closed public hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to accept the text change as proposed. John Abrams seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

12. #83-77: PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE - SECTION 5 PARKING AND LOADING

Petitioner: Staff

Del Beaver: This will be a new Parking and Loading section to replace the existing section. It was brought to my attention today that in our deliberation we may have made some decisions that were in some instances premature. Some of the areas we might want to nail down before we pass this ordinance as follows: We've indicated that the minimum standards would be maintained or applied except for those areas otherwise provided in an organized parking district. As such to date, there is not parking district, there is a parking authority. A district is pending and probably will be formed prior to business of 1980 when the super block is suppose to go into effect. To alleviate some of the potential problems that were outlined to me, I would only make this suggestion for your discussion topic and that is as an interim district for exemption you might consider the current boundaries for the DDA. A couple of the other items that was brought to my attention would be the possibility you might consider expanding the 400' maximum requirement from parking to facility in order that employee parking might be more fully addressed in off-street parking lots that may be

Del Beaver: beyond 400' to the business or whatever. One other item that I felt might be appropriate that we don't have in here and probably should be in here would be to have a waiver procedure to waive some of the parking requirements if it were proved to be warranted. An example would be like in the event you have something like a Goodwill industry where you have many people working there that are not necessarily able to drive themselves to and from work, that that may or may not necessitate or justify a reduction in the parking requirements. A waiver might be considered for instances such as that. If you can't arrive at an agreeable conclusion on these items, I would strongly suggest referral for action to the December meeting.

Ward Scott: One of the things that I'd like to deal for is some additional time for us to consider this and study it. There's a lot of specifics here. For example there is one instance where I know the parking requirements are being increased by 300 percent. I would not offer to you that the cost of parking is the only material issue and I would hope that you would not offer to me that the cost of parking is immaterial. When you talk in changes of that magnitude, I think we would like to think that whole thing through. We really need time to look at these proposed requirements.

Stan Anderson: I'd like to refer to two situations that I brought attention to. One if the requirement that parking has to be within 400 feet, that's a handy situation and a nice thing to have, but there are some properties, especially in the downtown area, where there are no sites available for parking within 400 feet. In cases like that I think it should be necessary to have provision so that parking could be provided somewhere beyond four hundred feet, especially for employees. In the event that something were to happen to one of the buildings or several of the buildings on Main Street, it would absolutely make that useless at the standpoint of providing parking.

Dr. Mac Brewer: What do you mean if something happened to the building?

Stan Anderson: If there were a fire and the building were destroyed or 50 percent destroyed. There would be no way to use that property.

Del Beaver: In a sense you'd be throwing it into a non-conforming use situation because it wouldn't be able to meet the parking requirements at that point.

Dr. Mac Brewer: I still don't understand.

Stan Anderson: Let's say the building at Fifth and Main were destroyed, 50 percent or more, in a fire. Because of the parking requirements there would be no way to use

Stan Anderson: the site for a building site.

Janine Rider: When we worked on these parking regulations, we worked partially from knowing that at sometime in the near future the downtown would be in a district and would somewhat be separate from our regulations. In doing these regulations, we therefore were not as concerned as specific downtown things as we were with the entire rest of Grand Junction. So in using example of what troubles you, I would hope that you would try to relate it to not just downtown, where it doesn't quite fit, but the rest of Grand Junction which is equally important in trying to move and park cars and whatever else.

Stan Anderson: The other thing is that I hope the ability to pay for parking off-site would be included in these regulations. Again there are a number of small sites, especially in the downtown area which could not be developed to their highest and best use unless it were possible for that owner to buy parking spaces from downtown parking authority or district whenever it is formed. I would hope that that could also be incorporated into the regulations.

Virginia Flager: Stan, would you prefer this proposed parking requirements be tabled until such time that it could be more thoroughly studied?

Stan Anderson: It does need some additional study. I would also like for you to look at the parking requirements where you are increasing the parking requirement by 300 percent.

Janine Rider: If the Board of Realtors discussed this, would it possible to receive a letter from you before time of public hearing so we could know what your feelings were in time to consider them.

Del Beaver: May I make a suggestion that we have that letter before the second workshop of December so we might put the final touches on something like that and incorporate that.

Virginia Flager: Do you think that would give you enough time to get that input back to us?

Ward Scott: I think so.

Virginia Flager: In other words, this could be on the agenda for the December meeting if we could get through our workshops and get your input. Would this work with Staff?

Del Beaver: No problem.

Closed public hearing.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to table the item for further discussion at the workshop. The motion was seconded by Dr. Mac Brewer and the motion passed unanimously.

Virginia Flager asked that the workshop be advertised with a paid advertisement in the local newspaper.

13. #84-77: PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE - SECTION 6c (7) SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS - SITE PLAN REVIEW

Petitioner: Staff

Del Beaver: I would appreciate an amendment to what is submitted here to make it clear to the Council what is understood here that the site plan requirements would apply to all zones except R-1-A, R-1-B, R-1-C, and R-1-D. Just to briefly go over this, for the general public, I see something on the second page under item six we were requesting you to make a determination for that. We want it to go over for all the parking areas as far as screening or would that be left to staff where it would be appropriate. I'd like you to address that point as well. The general intent of this is to provide some additional site plan review by staff to insure better planned situation in the protection of the existing neighborhoods as well as potential occupants of the site in the manners described here. If you have any questions as to what is going to be required, come by the planning office and we'll be happy to give you a copy of the document. Those two points I want you to consider as far as the applicable zones and also how large a parking area you want us to consider for screening.

Janine Rider: Maybe we should put item 9 in all caps.

Virginia Flager: Yes, please.

Del Beaver: If you want item 9 in all caps, we'll put it in all caps.

Janine Rider: Well, I think that's what makes the difference between difficult or not.

Frank Simonetti: I'd say just leave the parking area to the staff's discretion.

Del Beaver: My suggestion would be for that to read, parking areas at staff discretion.

Virginia Flager: As long as they follow the other regulations.

Del Beaver: Exactly. The previous sentence reads, the

Del Beaver: following shall be screened wherever possible and feasible. Then we can say parking areas to be determined by staff discretion.

Closed public hearing.

Janine Rider made the motion to recommend approval to City Council of the proposed amendments with the mentioned stipulations. Frank Simonetti seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

14. #82-77: PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE - SECTION 3a, PARAGRAPH 1.8,
BULK DEVELOPMENT

Petitioner: Staff

Del Beaver: The major changes here, although the document is quite lengthy, indicates that Bulk Development will be limited two acres and no more and the entire Bulk Development proposal shall be the responsibility of a single developer or firm. Now those are probably the most significant changes from the existing. Those changes were in turn supported by request for site requirements as you see in the copy. Again, if there is someone who is particularly interested in this, we urge them to come down to the Planning Department and get a copy of this prior to the City Council meeting.

Bob Gerloffs: I have a question on the major changes. You said it would be the responsibility of one developer or owner.

Del Beaver: Or firm.

Bob Gerloffs: Does that imply that if the site is developed, you're not going to allow sales within the bulk development?

Virginia Flager: I think the first statement was the identifying factor Bob. Read that over.

Del Beaver: The entire bulk development proposal shall be the responsibility of single developer or firm. I interpret this to mean that the entire parcel shall be the responsibility (the development of the parcel) of a single developer. After what happens to that development after it is in the ground and in place, as far as the operation on going maintenance, further lot splits and/or neighborhood associations to take care of certain situations has to be worked out at that time.

Virginia Flager: That would be my interpretation of it.

Karl Metzner: I think what Bob means, can you still sell off a town house or condominium?

Janine Rider: What you can't do is call it a bulk development and then sell off the lots and have three different builders build the buildings on it.

Bob Gerloffs: What if I put in the landscaping, roads, and everything and sold the lot?

Virginia Flager: Well, it's the same situation as going out here into a subdivision and buying a lot isn't it? There's no restrictions there.

Del Beaver: Might I offer an amendment then to clarify. Instead of saying the entire bulk development proposal, how about either the implementation of or the construction of or the development of the entire bulk development proposal shall be developed by one developer or firm and at the time it is completed developed, then the option can be exercised. If there is one firm or person responsible then any number of construction firms can be employed by that firm so long as it is in conformance with the original bulk development proposal and is under the jurisdiction of one firm or individual rather than three or four firms going their separate routes. What I have down here on paper is the entire implementation of bulk development shall be the responsibility of a single developer or firm.

Frank Simonetti: Could you say the entire bulk development to completion shall be the responsibility of one developer or firm?

Dr. Mac Brewer: Well, what does responsibility mean?

Del Beaver: Well, his responsibility will be dictated by your conditions.

Janine Rider: Just leave it as it is and put completion at the end.

Closed public hearing.

Frank Simonetti made the motion to approve with the addition concerning completion. Blake Chambliss seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

15. DISCUSSION

a) PD-B 12th and PATTERSON

The main points brought up by Robert Van Deusen in his presentation was that as many of the large trees existing

on the development site would be preserved as possible, the buildings would be developed in a cluster, suggested two of the buildings be allowed to be constructed at 50' right-of-way and the one on the corner of 12th and Patterson be pulled back to 65', there would be a center court yard between the four buildings, between complexes and Main Street there would be landscaping, a minimum of 64 parking slots would be required separated into two nodes, and that there would be a six foot fence separating the development from the people to the East and South.

Virginia Flager: You are proposing to ignore the 15' setback on the west building.

Bob Van Deusen. Yes.

Virginia Flager: You knew how much space you had there and you knew what the setbacks were when you proposed this originally and it would seem to me that that would go to the Board of Adjustments rather than the Planning Commission. You'd need a variance for the setbacks, wouldn't they Don?

Don Warner: It's a PD.

Virginia Flager: It's ours on a PD?

Don Warner: Yes.

Robert Van Deusen: It's a PD so it would come to you.

Virginia Flager: You are over looking something that will obviously take place in the future and that's the widening of Patterson.

Del Beaver: We talked that over with Ron and Ron indicated that he will be able to do everything he wants to do well within the right-of-way requirement. We worked with McKee on the site line requirements and as Van has submitted here, the site line requirements would be satisfied if building one would be setback to the 65'.

Virginia Flager: I want to make a remark here and I want you to think of the worse example of ignoring proper setbacks; that's North Avenue City Market. That's one of the worse examples I can think of.

Robert Van Deusen: It's also in a corner Virginia.

Virginia Flager: I wouldn't be as concerned on building four as I would on building two.

Del Beaver: I was personally more concerned with building four than building two.

Virginia Flager: Yes, but 12th Street has already been widened. Somewhere in the not too distant future, you're going to have to address Patterson. Patterson is like a time bomb.

Frank Simonett: My question is, what do you do with the development east on Patterson and south on 12th?

Virginia Flager: With the college going in there to the east and the additional development of Spring Valley, Bell Ridge, the proposed Epstein-Etter thing there on 27½ Road and G Road and all along there. Van, if it were my property, I wouldn't risk it.

Janine Rider: When you have a major arterial, which both of these are, and you develop it to the fullest, what is the complete width of the improvements from curb to curb or sidewalk to sidewalk?

Del Beaver: Ron says that he can get detached sidewalks, two turning lanes, two through lanes of traffic plus a median in a 100 feet.

Janine Rider: Does that mean then that when Van puts those two buildings where he is going to put them, that they are immediately next to the detached sidewalk? It does doesn't it?

Del Beaver: No. Ron is saying he can do that within a 100 feet, not using all of the 100 feet.

Janine Rider: But those improvements do take up the 100 feet. This is not going to make sense to me unless I can figure where the sidewalk and street are going to be.

Del Beaver: We can have that information for you when they come in with the proposal. Ron has got a proposed plan that nobody is suppose to know about.

Robert Van Deusen: I don't think he is ready to publish it.

Del Beaver: The original intent of setbacks is to be able to provide for (a) amenities, (b) site line requirements, and (c) possibly some better access from the street. As this is submitted, it appears that most of his access is going to be internal from the parking area. I'm curious, as Janine is curious, to how much width is going to be between five foot sidewalk and the building wall. I want to find that out, too. As far as the site line requirements, I think that is self explanatory if that one is setback so that it does meet what is generally required in the B-1 zone as 65' setback to insure sight line for proper traffic.

Frank Simonetti: If you have one building on 12th sitting at the variance and a lawn on Patterson, what do you do with the people as the developments come in south of that on 12th and east on Patterson? What if they say, we want the variance?

Del Beaver: I think you have to look into each one of them as they stand. As a submittal this is a planned development. You either like it or you don't like it. If something comes in south of it, it may necessitate because of their driveway requirements or whatever 65' setbacks.

Vern Denison: I think there is a clarification that needs to be made here. We're asking questions about variance, but really there is no variance required in a PD. What Van was addressing is that if this was a B-1 zone you would have a setback requirement and he was pointing out that in setting that one building back, it meets the requirements in a B-1 zone. In a PD those setbacks are not required, you can build to zero lot line if it meets all the other criteria and requirements.

Del Beaver: Mr. Van Deusen has been working with City Planning Staff and City Engineering as per request and everything is mutually satisfactory so far.

16. COUNTY ITEMS:

a) C180-77: ARROW INDUSTRIAL PARK

Larry Rasinski: The first item we have is Arrow Industrial Park and it's a minor subdivision. It's located west of the 24 3/4 line between D&RG&W railroad and Highway 6 & 50. It's zoned Industrial to the northwest and southeast and then it's Industrial down to the river. Then it is zoned Commercial to the northeast. The plan calls for five lots on 4.7 acres and there are two existing buildings on the site there. The area they are proposing for the restaurant is presently unimproved. Ute Water requires an extension to meet the fire flow. I think they have about a four inch line in the area.

After a brief discussion Dr. Mac Brewer made the motion to approve and Frank Simonetti seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b) C102-75: WESCO COMMERCIAL PARK (DROPPED)

c) C176-77: HORIZON DRIVE (C140-77 was not discussed)

Bob Engleke: We haven't gone anything different or gone any farther with this thing. Everybody in this room except Bob Gerloffs has been through this thing. I do have a complete file here that would mention anything you might want to ask about or where we're at. I can tell you about the 15" sewer line or the 15" water line or whatever

Bob Engleke: you want to know. You really have seen where we're at basically. One of the issues that comes up here is annexation or our relationship to the City and that is why we are here. We are very close to the City and obviously could be part of it in the not to distant future. We would at least like to get the power of attorney to get going so we want to be in your good graces as we proceed. We think we are under commitment to receive some kind of review from you and you are committed, by state laws, to review us and we would like to accomplish that. I would like to accomplish tonight a recommendation for us to either keep going or pack our bags. When we go to the County board the fifteenth of next month, we would like to go with a recommendation from you which they would normally send back to you. We're in the plan process which includes subdivision, zoning, and things like this. In the subdivision process there is a clearer review channel. In the zoning there may or may not be, I don't remember right now. So what I'd like here tonight, if possible, to report back to client that we've been here and either we have a serious problem or we don't.

John Abrams: I would like to have a look at the traffic flow.

Blake Chambliss: Robert, are you asking at this point for approval of a PD-8?

Bob Engleke: Yes.

Janine Rider: When you talk about PD-8, what are the numbers and how many acres?

Bob Engleke: There is approximately 20 acres in a PD-8 which results in approximately 160 units.

Blake Chambliss: We don't get stuck if we talk about PD-8 committing to the full eight?

Bob Engleke: Numbers are established, in this kind of a situation, at preliminary. The only thing I can tell you about the traffic situation is that basically we're on 27 Road which is a major arterial sitting on open and used right-of-way now, Horizon Drive which is sitting on 100' right-of-way at this point, G Road which is normally 60' right-of-way at this point. All three are scheduled as arterials in the County plan. All three of these roads are projected as being under utilized in the traffic study that has been going on for the last year and a half. The access we are looking at to our business zoning is 12th Street or 27 Road and one access to the entire parcel on Horizon Drive and we're contemplating two accesses on D Road. Also, one more to the residential area. I don't see any need for anymore.

Bob Engleke: We have no major utility concerns. We're surrounded by the biggest lines in the valley. In the long run we would rather have this come in as a PD-B.

Frank Simonetti: What type of businesses would you put in?

Bob Engleke: We are looking for a neighborhood shopping center.

Janine Rider: I have no trouble in giving my blessing because I think it's a much needed service out there and a reasonable use for that land.

Vern Denison: How much of the strip along the frontage on Horizon is actually highway oriented now?

Bob Engleke: Nineteen acres.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to approve and Janine Rider seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

d) C184-77: PALACE ESTATES

Larry Rasinski: This is a sketch plan. It's located 400' north of North Avenue. There is a drainer through the middle of the property which is about 15' deep and 25' wide. They are going with 42 lots on 26 acres. The petitioner has a road going from 29¼ to 29½ which is called Bunting Avenue. This is a situation where the water line would require an extension from a larger line to meet the fire flow requirements and there is also concern with City Planning for possible study to the south to provide access. There is presently three parcels between 29¼ and 29½ Roads so whether or not they subdivide in the future is hard to say with Commercial zoning there.

Janine Rider: On the western cul de sacs, they jog. The one going up north is much further west than the one going down south and that seems like a bad situation.

Larry Rasinski: The regulations call for a hundred feet between the two jogs.

Janine Rider: What's the width of the parcel, from east to west?

Larry Rasinski: A quarter mile.

After some further discussion John Abrams made the motion not to approve this item because he felt there were too many problems involved that needed to be taken care of. Janine Rider seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

e) C185-77: SROUFE SUBDIVISION

Larry Rasinski: This is located at 29½ and F Roads and they're going with an R-2 Transitional. They are proposing 15 lots on 5.6 acres. City Planning staff has recommended 34' pavement on this and also full improvements on the stubs. They have a public site down on Grand Valley Canal and presently there is no access provided to it.

DR. BREWER LEFT ROOM FOR A MOMENT.

John Abrams made the motion to recommend approval to County with the stipulation that they try get some access through. Blake Chambliss seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

DR. BREWER RETURNED.

f) C167-77: BANNER INDUSTRIAL PARK

Larry Rasinski: This is west of 30 Road and north of B½. They are proposing 15 lots on 15 acres. The area in there is zoned Industrial and they have one existing building on the property. There is an R-2 area to the northeast and across the street to the east would be AFT. City Planning had a recommendation for a name change from Banner Drive to Gunnison and they also had some comments on design considerations.

Bob Gerloffs: On the south side you have a major drainage which is about 15' deep and 25' wide. There is a small drainage which joins the large one where it turns and goes south. At sketch plan it was recommended to put a street on the south and County Road said we should handle it with only one access extending out to the west.

Frank Simonetti made the motion to approve and Dr. Mac Brewer seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

g) C182-77: REZONE R-2 TO PD-8 AND THE FALLS SUBDIVISION

Larry Rasinski: This is located southwest of 28½ and F Roads.

Bob Gerloffs: What we're doing is taking those adobe hills and under going massive earth moving operation. We're asking for a PD-8, we have a density of 6½ units per acre. The thing was designed with the idea that we would try to restructure the ground and put the building sites on the cut areas. These are what we call

Bob Gerloffs: clustered. There are five groups with six in each. I think there are 36 townhouses and there are 33 patio homes. Twenty-eight and a half road is dedicated across the canal. If this commission feels it is appropriate to continue 28½ Road, I'd like to know that. We can accomodate it.

Janine Rider: Can you guess?

Bob Gerloffs: Yes, you want 28½ Road. There are no parking on the streets, but there are two off-street parking spaces for every unit.

Frank Simonetti: What was the total of units?

Bob Gerloffs: 222.

Janine Rider: How many acres?

Bob Gerloffs: 34 acres.

DR. MAC BREWER EXCUSED HIMSELF FROM THE MEETING AT 1:17 a.m.

Janine Rider made the motion to approve and Vern Denison seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 1:20 a.m.