

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

December 28, 1977

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers by Chairman, VIRGINIA FLAGER, with the following members present: JOHN ABRAMS, BLAKE CHAMBLISS, VERN DENISON, DR. MAC BREWER, and FRANK SIMONETTI.

Also present were: DEL BEAVER, Senior City Planner, KARL METZNER, Planner I, DON WARNER, Planner Analyst, and BONNIE CLARK, Acting Secretary, and approximately 40 interested persons.

The following corrections to November 30 minutes were noted: Page 3, Paragraph 2 indifference to in deference; Page 9, Paragraph 8 - 75% occupied to 75% built-up, from Noelridge Lane to Northridge Lane; Page 11, Paragraph 6 - ecstatic to aesthetic; Page 15, Paragraph 4, 3rd sentence, planning to planting; Page 17, Paragraph 12, sentence 1 seven feet to eleven feet; Page 29, Paragraph 1, lawn to one; Page 30, Paragraph 8, D Road to G Road; Page 30, Sentence 14, change recommendation to reaction; Page 30 insert new paragraphs 3 and 4 and insert paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 as follows:

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

Bob Engelke: I am not in a position to ask for PDB, but it would be more attractive.

Blake Chambliss: If you are talking about annexation before this thing goes we have PDB.

Page 30, last paragraph, change D Road to G Road.

SIMONETTI/BREWER/PASSED MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES AS CORRECTED.

4. #91-77: PD-B 12TH AND PATTERSON PLAZA - PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Guthrie/Weaver

Location: Southeast corner of 12th and Patterson

Petitioner of record should be changed to William Milius. This is the same property, same designer, and has been legally advertised.

Petitioner desires to use space to property line to be able to create a more interesting court space between the structures.

Bob VanDeusen, representing petitioner, discussed preliminary plan describing cluster arrangement. To meet setback requirements, petitioner will deed 9,000 sq. ft. to City of the 49,000 sq. ft. purchased. Petitioner is making arrangements with church across from property for employee parking.

Petitioner would also like to move building back from street so it doesn't create traffic hazards. Petitioner will build around trees so as many trees as possible may be saved. Plan shows curb cut 100 feet from intersection for safety.

Mac Brewer questioned meaning of set-back as shown by dashed red line on chart. Del Beaver said the red line reflects right-of-way-this is the 15 foot additional from setback requirement. This is negotiable point in PD-B. Dr. Brewer questioned if red line is approved, would it make property line the red line. Bob VanDeusen said it would.

Review agency comments: Fire Department approved; City Utilities would like additional information on existing and proposed utilities; Parks Department would like additional information on landscaping and ground coverage; Public Service would like 10 foot easement abutting East/South property line; City Engineering would like power of attorney for full improvements on one-half Patterson Road and would like to see park layout without any of the right-of-way on Patterson being used. (Layout was provided at meeting.)

Public hearing opened. No proponents or opponents present.

Additional staff comments: Staff would recommend approval of plan in view of flexibility of regulations for requirements of set-backs, and if other points were taken care of. If City Transportation thinks it would be safer for sight line, approve it as such. Staff would not like to see a more intensified use at that intersection.

Mac Brewer asked how far back traffic stacks up on 12th Street and would it be difficult to exit. Del Beaver said Steve McKee, City Traffic Engineer, said there would be no problem. Mr. Beaver could not give exact figures on traffic stacking up. Mr. Beaver felt a right turn signal would be installed in the future which would reduce traffic stacking up.

Blake Chambliss asked if chart reflects right turn lane and how far back would right turn lane be to function. Mr. Beaver said it did not, but he scaled land which reflected 80 feet. Mr. Chambliss is concerned that when 12th Street is widened there wouldn't be sufficient space. Mr. Chambliss feels that the type of drawing submitted gives a different picture in terms of what sight lines are and other things. He feels Commission would be violating sight lines in terms of set-backs.

Mr. Beaver answered that setbacks are supposed to do several things. They are to provide for public safety in using those thoroughfares.

Mr. Chambliss said the fact that driveway comes out in thoroughfare has not been addressed. Commission has the flexibility to look at this and petitioner has the flexibility to modify plan.

Mr. Beaver answered that staff has discussed this with petitioner and so has City Engineering. City Engineering professional comments were that there would be no sight line problems with those two buildings brought out to property line.

Frank Simonetti was concerned with trash pick-up and loading zone.

Public hearing closed.

Dr. Mac Brewer said if Commission is being asked to vary set-back he would like to see plan presented by City Engineering of maximum improvements which could be located at 12th and Patterson. He also feels plans for trash pick-up and loading should be presented.

Janine Rider said Commission is not varying set-back, that in PDB Commission can determine set-back.

BREWER/RIDER/PASSED MOTION TO TABLE THIS ITEM UNTIL NEXT MEETING.

Commission requests petitioner to address problems on maximum street width, trash pick-up, delivery areas, driveway in proportion to right turn lane with City Engineering.

Robert Van Deusen said he has met with City Departments and they would come back in one month with the same comments. Mr. Van Deusen said the diagram presented tonight is the worst possible conditions that could exist. Chairman Flager said tabled decision stands.

5. #87-77: PROPOSED REZONE R-2 TO R-3

Petitioner: Fred Larson

Location: Northeast corner of 11th and White Avenue

Comments from City Engineering: Increased densities can only increase additional problems. City Utilities: Trash access down alleys is going to be necessary at all times. Fire Department approved as far as fire flow and necessary pressure.

A three plex is being proposed which will require 6 off street parking spaces.

Janine Rider asked why petitioner is requesting R-3 zoning as 4 units are allowed in R-2 zoning. Mr. Beaver said the reason is to meet square footage requirements for building. In R-3 you can put 8 units on 6,000 sq. ft.

Public hearing opened. No opponents.

Staff opinion: To further infringe upon R2 neighborhood with R3 zoning which would permit not a very environmentally sound living environment because entire back side would have to accommodate off street parking and because alley encroachment would obviously be verboten, and this would extend R3 zoning across 11th Street, staff recommends denial.

Mr. Dufford, representing petitioner, said three living units are needed to make project economically feasible. Mr. Dufford said property is located in an area that is deteriorating rapidly and these units should help to improve the conditions.

Mr. Dufford: Satisfactory arrangements have been made for off street parking requirements.

Dr. Brewer suggested that petitioner build two better living units and charge more. He said entire area would be downgraded by allowing change.

Mr. Dufford said he could not see where R3 zoning downgrades an area. It's already downgraded on three sides.

Janine Rider feels there is a good chance of not downgrading the area and turning it into "apartmentville" by retaining the R2 zoning, which is relatively a single family living area.

Virginia Flager said she feels nothing wrong with the three family dwelling on that spot, but the fact remains there is not enough footage requirements.

Janine Rider stated that if Commission approved rezone, petitioner is not required to follow plans presented to Commission. Plans could be changed which would allow increased densities.

RIDER/BREWER/PASSED MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL AS AREA IS R2 AREA AND THERE IS NOT ENOUGH SPACE FOR INCREASED DENSITY.

6. #88-77: HAMMER BULK DEVELOPMENT

Petitioner: T. L. Hammer
Location: 203 Epps Drive

Staff comments: City Engineering requires 5 foot storm drainage easement along east property line and 10 foot along south property line. Access is along Epps Drive.

Public hearing opened.

Mr. Angelo Paul, representing petitioner, said easement would be provided. Petitioner would like to convert lower story of house to another dwelling unit, which would convert house to duplex.

No opponents.

Staff has no objection to bulk development being approved.

Public hearing closed.

CHAMBLISS/RIDER/PASSED MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEW ON DRAINAGE AND ONE SINGLE ENTRANCE OFF EPPS DRIVE.

7. #89-77: PROPOSED REZONE AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PARKING LOT - R-3 TO PD-B

Petitioner: J. Ramsey
Location: 1309 Glenwood

Petitioner had been asked to return and present all of the changes that they would like to make from the original PD-B proposal in the structure, parking, open space, as well as changes desired in un-constructed parking area, as well as exiting of parking lots.

Staff would like to see petitioner treat this as a sketch plan and return next month with the plan drawn in relation to each of the other proposed changes petitioner wanted implemented. Staff would like discussions between petitioner and Planning Commission on access on Glenwood, proper screening thereon, as well as feasibility for removing structure so parking can result. Problems will have to be addressed as far as Glenwood and whether or not alley should be prime access to parking area as Commission and staff are in agreement that there should be no increase in turning movements along North Avenue.

Review comments: City Utilities, no objections. Fire Department: one hydrant to be installed on Glenwood. City Engineering: increased traffic will compound the already existing traffic problem.

Mr. Ramsey was present and Mr. Gary Cowan, representing petitioner, said he was under impression everything was settled with staff. Mr. Ramsey would like to expand his eating and bar facilities. In order to do that he needs additional parking. He purchased all property behind his establishment with the exception of Mr. Gibson, who will be selling to him sometime in the future. Plans are set up showing two curb cuts off Glenwood. The plan presented would be more attractive to the area and would not force Mr. Ramsey's to exit through the alley. Parking in front of building will be eliminated. New building would be 20 feet from Chilton's Sporting Goods.

Mr. Ramsey feels if he is able to disperse traffic in four different directions it will eliminate noise, traffic, etc. Alley is a 15 foot easement and is not meant for two way traffic.

Staff feels establishment is an asset to Grand Junction and would like to work problems out with them. Staff asked petitioner if there would be additional driveways requested for each parcel on Glenwood. If that is not the desire, would petitioner present a master plan for whole area parking/development scheme.

Mr. Ramsey said he is buying up all surrounding property as he feels it will be needed for parking in the future. His needs will be met with approval of the two presently.

Mac Brewer suggested the eastern side be used for exit.

Mr. Gibson, proponent, asked Commission to approve anything that will get traffic out with the least disruption of his life.

Public hearing closed.

Mr. Ramsey: I would like to know if I can get this curb cut, one or two or whatever, so I may go to the architect and have them draw a complete set showing the traffic pattern. I cannot afford to keep spending \$5,000 for an architect everytime.

Public hearing closed.

Mac Brewer said he feels access should be given on Glenwood. The alley is not the way to approach this. However, Commission should be shown how this will be done.

Virginia Flager feels staff should be asked to bring back the minutes of the last parking lot Commission made a decision on. On that request Commission went into quite an extensive conversation pertaining to the protection of the property owners on North Glenwood. The same problems existed, so answer should probably be the same. It was approved without access.

Dr. Brewer disagrees. He feels alley is dangerous and a decision should be made. He agrees on looking at minutes, but decision might not be the same.

Blake Chambliss questioned if it is appropriate to start overloading Glenwood as North Avenue is equipped to handle heavy traffic.

Discussion ensued on various means of directing traffic - whether it should be on North or through alley or curb cut.

Mr. Ramsey said Commission had allowed Chilton to build on property line and directing traffic on North Avenue would be dangerous due to blind spot caused by Chilton's.

RIDER/SIMONETTI/PASSED MOTION TO TABLE PLAN UNTIL PETITIONER COMES BACK WITH FULL PLAN FOR ENTIRE PD-B.

9. #92-77: 6 & 50 WEST SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAN
R-2-A TO PD-B - HIGH COUNTRY STORAGE

Petitioner: Jack L. Payne
Location: Southeast corner of Grand Mesa Avenue and
Cannon Avenue

Review Comments: Parks and Recreation disapproves use of Siberian elm, would suggest alternative; Public Service, no objection; City Engineering requests full half street improvements on Grand Mesa, Cannon and the alley. Tree at NW corner will have to be eliminated because of sight line; Mountain Bell, no objection.

Petition is for constuction of 1,680 sq. ft. apartment unit with two car garage, remainder for personal storage units. This is caretaker apartment.

Tom Logue, representing petitioner, said they are agreeable to meet review agency requests.

Blake Chambliss asked how much traffic this type of project would generate. Mr. Logue said he has no figures, but since it's personal storage it should not be much.

Blake Chambliss questioned setbacks.

Public hearing opened.

Opponent, Councilman R. W. Holmes, 1660 Dolores Avenue, representing nine property owners residing in the immediate area of the NW corner of the block bordered by Cannon, Grand Mesa, Dolores and Santa Clara Avenues: As spokesman for the nine property owners we would appreciate answers to these questions.

1. Was R2A zoning for this corner and the remainder of the block proper or improper - correct or incorrect initially?
2. If it was proper initially and correct initially - is it your intent to change the zoning for the entire block bordered by Canon, Grand Mesa, Santa Clara and Dolores Avenues from R2A to PDB.
3. If it is not your intent to do so for the entire block, we submit that to do so for this one corner is in effect Spot Zoning - which is highly objected to by myself and those I represent as being the first step in breaking down and destroying the character and integrity of a neighborhood intended to be primarily a residential one.

We do hereby request that the Planning Commission deny this zoning change in order that the original and still desirable residential character of the neighborhood be preserved.

Janine Rider asked Mr. Holmes if nine property owners is 100% of the property owners. Mr. Holmes said he was unable to contact all of the property owners, although five were present with him. He said he does represent more than half of the property owners in that area.

Blake Chambliss questioned nature of neighborhood objection and asked if they had viewed the plan. Mr. Holmes said they had and it is felt if spot zoning is allowed it will downgrade area.

Janine Rider: In answer to your questions, "Was zoning right in the first place?". I can't answer this, but I do feel it is correct. That is one of the criteria also used for a zoning change. Another criteria is whether or not the area is changed enough to merit changing the zoning to make it more appropriate for the neighborhood. I can see where an argument might be given that a single family dwelling might not be appropriate on a corner with commercial on both sides of the street. Consideration in any change is whether it would better separating the residential neighborhood from the commercial.

Mr. Holmes interjected: One consideration that needs to be met or challenged that has to be met by Planning Commission and City Council and others is to recognize that we do represent people. And this is a neighborhood and a neighborhood is people and it is the desire of the percentages that you stated you represent to retain the character and integrity of the neighborhood as it is. When you fail to consider and to be influenced by the combinations of the people, then we no longer have a right or democratic process. There can all kinds of arguments be made to justify the things that are being proposed here. But we come back to the basics, that you are sitting there as a Planning Commission for the people. I submit that you request a denial of this zoning change.

Staff is in a position for recommending approval of this petition for the following reasons: The proximity to the C-1 zone may or may not be conducive to a high quality residential living environment. The use as proposed and with the Planning Commission ability to impose appropriate restrictions, screening, etc. might be able to better protect the neighborhood from the creation of a use which has minimal neighborhood impact as this one appears to have in its design.

Tom Logue wanted record to show that none of the people Mr. Holmes represents are adjoining property owners.

Mr. Payne, petitioner, said he could not understand people not preferring his proposal compared to the way the property looks now.

Public hearing closed.

Mac Brewer said he would object to cement wall if he lived there.

BREWER/ABRAMS MOTION TO DENY.

Blake Chambliss said he understands concerns of neighbors, but cannot conceive that area developing into R2A for the rest of the neighborhood. He feels rather than turning down request, Commission should work with petitioner on some changes.

Janine Rider said every PD is looked at upon its own merits. There are also residential uses allowed in PD. She does not consider a PD spot zoning.

Mac Brewer: Although I made a motion to deny I agree that the PDB is valid here. My problem is with the project they are going to put on it not with the zoning.

Virginia Flager: I'm going to be very blunt. I've sat on this Commission for four years and anytime that the neighbors come in and object to a specific rezoning regardless of the proposal by the developer for the use, the all important thing is the feeling of the neighborhood impacted not whether we think it's a good plan or the developer is going to make good use of the land or whatever. I think the property owners surrounding the development are of utmost importance.

Mr. Payne interjected: My neighbors to the immediate east of me say please do something with the property.

Ms. Flager said the neighbors were not at meeting.

Vote on motion ensued. Denison, Simonetti, Abrams voted to deny; Brewer, Rider, Chambliss voted to approve; Chairman Flager voted to deny causing approval of denial.

9. #92-77: 6 & 50 WEST SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAT

Petitioner: Horizons West Development Corporation
Location: Northwest of Grand Avenue and 1st Street

Review Agency comments: Fire Department, not less than 8" loop water mains, move hydrant to SE corner of lot 6; City Utilities, City wishes to participate in oversizing of water lines; Public Service, 10 foot easement on North and West property lines; City Engineering, 31 foot mat with standard vertical face curb and gutter with sidewalk and storm drainage outlet indicated; Colorado Highway Department desires petitioner provide frontage road along property to Mulberry constructed to gravel standards, which they will blacktop.

Public hearing opened.

No opponents or proponents.

Loran Dake, representing petitioner, agreed to review agency comments.

Del Beaver said street is easier to service with vertical face curbs.

Staff recommends approval based on review agency comments.

Public hearing closed.

CHAMBLISS/BREWER/PASSED MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND CUL-DE-SAC OF ROAD GOING WEST.

10. #94-77: PROPOSED REZONE AND PRELIMINARY PLAN - R-1-B TO PD-8 - APPLE CREST

Petitioner: Chris Gray
Location: 27-3/4 North of F-3/4

Proposal is for a mixture of single family and high quality condominiums. A private road is proposed around project to serve for parking and services to the condominium complex. As a result of plan check, entrance will be switched to come off public street. (Fire Department felt they could get in better off public road)

Staff comments: Fire Department wants more information on fire hydrants; City Utilities will not pick up out of recessed cans (Chris Gray will work with City on this); Public Service and Mountain Bell need additional easements which will be shown on utilities composite Fire Department recommends a true looped 8" water system.

Public hearing opened.

Petitioner will work on large irrigation canal along SE property line. He did not realize that it would be a problem. He must make sure his project does not interfere with farmer's water.

On 22 foot private street section it might be better to provide gutter for drainage.

Del Beaver said petitioner will line up North/South road so it will line up with other streets.

Public hearing closed.

Blake Chambliss feels landscaping is light.

SIMONETTI/BREWER/PASSED MOTION TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY PLAN SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND AIRPORT AREA.

11. McCOY SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Cecil and Irene McCoy
Location: 295 Cherry Lane

Petitioner is giving additional 12.5 feet so there will be 25 foot total on their side of road.

Staff comments: Fire Department (comment to City Engineering) a fire hydrant would be nice at Cherry Lane and Unawep; Public Service wants 10 foot easement abutting north property line of lot 1; City Engineering said there is not adequate right-of-way on Cherry Lane, wants power of attorney for full half street improvements and dedication of additional 12.5 feet (which they are complying with).

Bill Ryden, Colorado West Surveying, representing petitioner was present.

No opponents or proponents.

RIDER/SIMONETTI/PASSED MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

12. #61-77: FAIRMONT NORTH SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: B & S Company
Location: Northeast corner of 13th and Hermosa

Staff comments: City Utilities, water lines behind fire hydrants should be 6" in diameter or more. Looped 6" would be best although not strictly required, 4 hydrants required - 8" where dead-end exists; Public Service, requires additional easement (will be taken care of on utility composite); City Engineering wants 14th Street to standard vertical curb and walk (developer will provide city a written guarantee of this, but will wait until driveways are put in), concerns with drainage (10" pipe along 13th Street will take care of this); Engineering wants power of attorney for 13th Street, Hermosa and 15th Street.

If full improvements were put in 15th Street now you would end up with a jog in right-of-way. Tom Logue, Engineer for petitioner, has worked with City Engineering on this.

Developers in audience agreed to comply with staff comments.

Public hearing opened.

No opponents or proponents. Public hearing closed.

CHAMBLISS/RIDER/ PASSED MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL SUBJECT TO POWER OF ATTORNEY ON F-1/4 Road.

13. #59-77: 23RD STREET SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Buttolph Construction Company
Location: 23rd Street and Bunting Avenue

Correction of location of alley and property line have been corrected. Screening required along North and part of Eastern property line to protect from residences has been ordered and will be installed as soon as it arrives.

Staff comments: Fire Department, on-site fire hydrants required. City Utilities, 6" sewer line not adequate, minimum 8"; Public Service, more electrical easements needed; City Engineering asked if petitioner should be required to gravel alley (Don Warner said upon discussing this point with City Attorney, Mr. Ashby felt City should gravel alley since City needs access for trash pick-up.).

Public hearing opened.

Petitioner was present.

Blake Chambliss is not comfortable with 30 foot access through center. He questioned problems arising in future with access not being maintained.

Karl Metzner feels there would be no problems since there is just two deeds involved and it would be recorded in title.

Public hearing closed.

SIMONETTI/DENISON/PASSED MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS. BLAKE CHAMBLISS OPPOSED.

14. #75-77: PD-B POWELL APARTMENTS AND BUSINESS CENTER - FINAL PLAT/PLAN

Petitioner: John A. Nelson
Location: Northeast corner of 28-1/2 Road and Belford Avenue

Landscaping plan and development plan were presented. Staff received a letter from engineer that there would be no problem in providing planting that Parks Department wanted.

Staff comments: City Utilities said sewer problems have been taken care of. One additional hydrant may be required - this has to be worked out between Developer and Engineering and Fire Department as to the number of hydrants. Staff would like additional detail on lighting of parking lot. Screening has been moved so as not to screen the parking places away from the residences. Public Service and Mountain Bell would like additional easements. City Engineering, dimensions as shown for sidewalks are incorrect. Need power of attorney for curb, gutter and sidewalks on Belford. Reiterated statement on 40' right-of-way, should street develop at some future time, parking would not be allowed in front of apartments. (Developer agrees with parking as most parking is located in rear of project.)

Public hearing opened.

Tom Logue, representing petitioner, is wondering about question of fire hydrants. Feels that sizes are more than adequate.

Blake Chambliss is concerned about access into business offices.

No opponents or proponents.

Public hearing closed.

SIMONETTI/CHAMBLISS/PASSED A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

15. #93-77: PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE - 3.2 BEER LICENSE

Petitioner: Weber Deli
Location: 1144 North 12th

This request is for a conditional use permit to serve 3.2 beer only. There will be no changes in the structure. There are six parking spaces in front of building as shown on posted chart. There were no objections from review agencies. Commission expressed concern on smallness of building, approximately three tables inside. They are also concerned that in granting this request, other surrounding businesses would make same request.

Don Warner gave a recap on survey of area regarding liquor license. Of 600 surveys distributed to Mesa College, 252 were returned, 205 in favor, 45 against, 2 no opinion. Of 40 surveys distributed to Intermountain Bible College, 29 were returned all against license. 509 surrounding neighbors were approached and 287 were in favor, 145 were against, the remainder had no opinion.

The petitioner was not present.

Public hearing closed.

BREWER/ABRAMS/PASSED MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO DENY THIS REQUEST DUE TO LACK OF PARKING AND INCREASING PRESENT TRAFFIC HAZARD. DENISON VOTED TO APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE.

16. #83-77: TEXT CHANGE - SECTION 5, PARKING AND LOADING (TABLED)

Petitioner: Staff

Retabled to discuss at workshop in January.

Stan Anderson, who had been waiting to discuss this item and representing the Parking Authority, said he has made suggestions to the planning staff. He said if Commission approved this change, it would heavily impact the Grand Junction area. The economic cost would be greater than would be anticipated. If passed, it would encourage urban sprawl, because added requirements placed upon owners/developers for the parking adds a great deal of cost. The Parking Authority asked Mr. Anderson to request an exemption of the area outlined by the Downtown Development Authority in the regulations, with the provision that the Parking Authority in six months would provide to the Planning Commission a program to provide for parking in the Downtown Development Department exempted area.

Don Warner checked with Gerry Ashby, City Attorney, before the meeting and Mr. Ashby asked that no action be taken on the exemption before he has a chance to check all legal implications.

Frank Simonetti said he doesn't think parking regulations by themselves have driven any businesses out of the downtown area. It is more the lack of parking.

Negotiations are going on with the developer of the "super block" and the Parking Authority would rather not have anything disrupting those negotiations at this time.

Blake Chambliss asked staff to have as much detail as possible for the workshop in January so Commission will be able to answer questions raised at meeting.

RIDER/BREWEP/PASSED MOTION TO RETABLE TO FEBRUARY MEETING SO IN-DEPTH STUDY CAN BE MADE AT SECOND WORKSHOP IN JANUARY.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- a) Discussion of Housing for the elderly in the Eastgate area - Stan Anderson

Property was purchased with the understanding that it be used for senior citizen housing. Area residents have told Mr. Anderson it's impossible to change to R-3 zoning in that area. Property is within two blocks of shopping facilities and grocery stores, which is a requirement of F.H.A. This project would be subsidized by H.U.D. On site open space would be 64,000 sq. ft. A variance in parking requirements and height requirements can be granted by the Planning Commission due to type of project.

Virginia Flager said she is in favor of senior citizen housing as there is a shortage in Grand Junction.

Blake Chambliss feels 100 people on two acres is unfair to the people. He feels Mr. Anderson can come up with a better plan and he is not in favor of making exceptions to requirements on this project.

After discussion, Mr. Anderson said he thought he would bring the item back to Commission with a PD request rather than an R-3.

b) Added Discussion item - Harry Williams, 7th and Glenwood

Bob Gardner, representing Mr. Williams: What is Planning Commission interest on property at 7th and Glenwood? Mr. Williams would like to bring in request for PD-B zoning for office space.

Virginia Flager would prefer offices in that area compared to additional dwelling units. She feels offices adjacent to a school are preferred rather than a nesting growth for all sorts of interesting characters to make their little nest.

Mac Brewer would consider business office and residential.

Blake Chambliss is concerned about access. There is a one-way alley on one side and jammed up corner at Glenwood and 7th. There is no way to handle problems caused by increasing density.

Janine Rider said she might consider residential and business offices.

COUNTY ITEMS:

a) Proposed rezone from AFT to PD-2 on 40 acres located at the Southwest corner of the intersection of 26-1/2 and H Roads.

Petitioner: Northwest Quarter, Inc.

Withdrawn.

b) Preliminary Plan Resubmittal for Phase II of Village Nine Subdivision, 40 acres located Northwest of B-1/2 Road and 28-1/2 Road.

Petitioner: Village Nine Ltd.

County Planning Commission has approved 31 acres preliminary plan subject to agreement between developer and staff on which lands will be credited to the open space.

Bob Gardner, representing petitioner, said the major portion of open space and park land is in 3rd phase of project. Developer is willing to make guarantee of giving ground to the School District.

Blake Chambliss thinks B-3/4 Road should be continued to school to 28 Road. He feels the more paths you can provide the better you are.

Blake Chambliss asked if schools in that area are overloaded.

Conni McDonough: All District 51 schools are overloaded. This project is located between two existing schools and project will produce enough students to fill an entire elementary school.

Bob Gardner: We think we are allowing for every possible happening in the future. There is a building separation, streets are safe, there is parking where there should be parking, and we have planted \$50,000 worth of trees.

RIDER/SIMONETTI/PASSED MOTION TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY PLAN SUBJECT TO B-3/4 ROAD BEING CONTINUED.

Meeting adjourned 12:35 a.m.