

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

June 26, 1979

The first meeting of the month of June was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman FRANK SIMONETTI. The following members were present: JANINE RIDER, FLORENCE GRAHAM, JIM PICKENS, BILL MIKESELL and VIRGINIA FLAGER.

KARL METZNER, Design & Development Planner; DIANE SMUCNY, Planner; DON WARNER, Planner Analyst; and KAREN MAHER, Stenographer, were also present. There were approximately 25 interested citizens in the audience.

#119-78 CONDITIONAL USE - Drive-up Window - Revised
Petitioner: Arctic Circle, Michael Coyne. Location: South-east corner of North Avenue and 7th Street. Request for drive-up window on existing restaurant in C-1 zone.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner stated that this request had been approved by the Planning Commission and denied by the City Council previously. Karl Metzner pointed out revisions in the site plan, and noted that Arctic Circle has worked with Dairy Queen to eliminate previous problems. Karl Metzner went on to point out specific details on the site plan. Karl Metzner called attention to the Review Sheet comments, and noted that the island at the entrance has been shortened so as not to interfere with parking for Arctic Circle or Dairy Queen.

Jim Pickens asked if there would be any problems for traffic making a left turn and entering the north-south alley after going through the drive-up window. Karl Metzner stated that there should be no problem with that 22-foot alley. Virginia Flager asked if there will be a median at the exit on Seventh Street to prevent traffic from turning south on Seventh at that point. Karl Metzner stated that there will be such a median.

Mike Coyne, the petitioner, stated that he has worked with the owners of Dairy Queen to change the exiting into the alley and shortened the entrance median to help the Dairy Queen's parking problem and alleviate congestion in the alley.

Frank Simonetti: There is no longer any conflict with Dairy Queen?

Mike Coyne: No, we ironed out all our problems. They are here tonight to answer questions.

Virginia Flager: How will the increased Arctic Circle business affect the motorcycle shop?

Mike Coyne: The motorcycle shop doesn't border my property. Dairy Queen owns that property, and the problem is between Dairy Queen and the motorcycle shop.

Karl Metzner clarified that traffic from the drive-up window will exit on to the east-west alley, not on to the north-south alley.

Florence Graham: This takes the problem off North Avenue. It is a better plan all-together.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

MIKESELL/RIDER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

#44-79 ALLEY VACATION

Petitioner: Richard Welch. Location: East of 1730 North Avenue. Request to vacate an alley to improve circulation at North Avenue Burger King.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner noted that this item should be considered separately from the Burger King conditional use, though they are related. Karl Metzner familiarized the Planning Commission with the location of the parcel, and pointed out specific details on the site plan.

Virginia Flager: The City is involved by ownership of that parking lot leased to the Timbers. That parking lot creates a tremendous problem on 18th Street because there is no access on the east side. Who is representing the City's interests?

Karl Metzner: The people from the City feel that this should be looked at as a piece of private property, because it is being used as such.

Karl Metzner called attention to the Review Sheet comments. Virginia Flager elaborated on the traffic problems in the immediate vicinity. Karl Metzner explained that the 35-foot easement through the Burger King parking lot should serve the same function as the alley. Bill Mikesell asked for the purpose of the alley vacation. Karl Metzner stated that it is to improve circulation at the Burger King.

Tom Logue of Paragon Engineering, representing the petitioner, stated that the alley vacation will improve traffic circulation for the parking lot, and will provide additional parking spaces which will be required should the drive-up window facility be granted. Tom Logue noted that the Texaco station has space available to relocate their trash pick-up facilities. In response to a question from Bill Mikesell, Tom Logue stated that the alley is presently used as access for utilities, in particular a sewer line that serves the area, and for trash pick-up. Tom Logue went on to say that one curb cut into the Texaco station could be modified to accomodate only one-way traffic.

Tom Logue, Rich Welch, Don Warner and the Planning Commission members discussed the possibility of providing access through the Timbers parking lot for traffic to exit on to 18th Street.

Virginia Flager: With the addition of additional floor space to the fire station, that City-owned parking lot could become part of the fire station sometime in the future.

Florence Graham: I fail to see how the 35-foot easement will improve traffic circulation unless you open up access to 18th Street. Traffic cannot move once it's in that parking lot.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

RIDER/FLAGGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF AND REVIEW SHEET COMMENTS, AND SUBJECT TO BURGER KING WORKING OUT AN AGREEMENT WITH THE TIMBERS TO HAVE ACCESS FROM THE TIMBERS PARKING LOT TO THE ACCESS EASEMENT FOR CIRCULATION OF TRAFFIC.

#45-79 CONDITIONAL USE - Drive-up Window

Petitioner: L & R Inc., Richard Welch. Location: 1730 North Avenue. Request for drive-up window at the North Avenue Burger King.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner outlined the location of the parcel, pointed out specific details on the development plan, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments.

Tom Logue of Paragon Engineering, representing the petitioner, explained that the proposal calls for complete on-site internal circulation through the drive-up window facility. The plan depends on the alley vacation, Mr. Logue said. There is provision for one parking stall for every three seats, Tom Logue noted, plus seven employee spaces. With respect to Ron Rish's comments, Tom Logue stated that the petitioner is willing to make adjustments in the parking spaces adjacent to North Avenue to insure that cars backing out of the spaces will not get too close to that road. Addressing Design & Development Planner comments, Tom Logue stated that it is impossible to provide access through the drive-up window facility without passing through, along or beside a certain amount of parking. Mr. Logue added that the call box can be located at a point midway between the window and the drive-up entrance to allow for 10-car stacking. Tom Logue went on to describe access into and circulation through the site, and added that the suggested access through the Timbers parking lot would eliminate a portion of the traffic encountered on the northern alley. Tom Logue concluded by pointing out that the site is already heavily landscaped, and traffic on to the alley is adequately screened and buffered at this time.

Richard Welch, the petitioner, repeated that the relocation of the ordering window would be no problem, and the allowance for 10-car stacking is more than adequate for this site.

Bill Mikesell noted his concern that drive-up window traffic exiting through the parking lot will create a hazard for cars backing out of parking spaces. Tom Logue and Richard Welch stated that the 35-foot easement should mitigate those concerns.

Florence Graham: I think you need a better plan for traffic circulation.

Frank Simonetti asked for audience comments, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

Karl Metzner: On the drive-up, Staff recommends denial of the plan, mainly for traffic circulation reasons on the alley.

Jim Pickens: I have a real problem with cars backing into the drive-up lanes. I also have a problem with traffic criss-crossing in and out of the site.

Virginia Flager: Where were all these concerns when we considered other drive-ups? This is exactly the same traffic problem. There is no way to design these facilities for an existing restaurant. All fast food establishments have the same problem.

Janine Rider: The other ones do not have the same entrance and exit for the drive-up window.

Bill Mikesell: I think we have established some good policies for drive-up windows.

PICKENS/MIKESELL/PASSED 4-1 (FLAGER VOTING AGAINST)/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, BECAUSE OF TRAFFIC CIRCULATION PROBLEMS, AND BECAUSE PARKED CARS MUST BACK INTO TRAFFIC LANES.

Virginia Flager: I think it behooves this board to come up with criteria for judging these requests. We have approved other ones. This is not fair.

Janine Rider: I don't think that should be a measure of our judgment tonight. That is not a fair statement.

#48-79 ALLEY VACATION

Petitioner: Constance Joufflas. Location: North-South alley East of 7th Street, between North Avenue and Glenwood Avenue. Request to vacate alley to improve traffic circulation.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Diane Smucny outlined the location of the parcel, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments.

Tom Logue of Paragon Engineering, representing the petitioner, stated that the alley vacation will improve traffic circulation. Mr. Logue said that the existing alley is only 15 feet wide, which creates problems for City services as far as coming off Glenwood Avenue and making a turn into the east-west alley. The petitioner has provided for an effective driving width of 29 feet instead. Tom Logue stated that necessary access and utilities services can be provided to businesses along North Avenue. There are no manholes for the sewer located under the proposed parking lot, Mr. Logue said. The relocation and reconstruction of the alley will alleviate the existing drainage problems, according to Tom Logue.

After some discussion, the Planning Commission decided to hear #49-79 REZONE: R2 to P (PARKING) at the same time.

Diane Smucny outlined the background of the request, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments.

Diane Smucny: On June 21, a letter was submitted in opposition to the rezone, which contains 25 signatures of residential property owners from 7th through 9th Street on Glenwood Avenue. (See petition in file.)

Bill Mikesell: What are the parking spaces going to be used for?

Tom Logue: Additional parking for Dusty's. There is also a parcel of land to the west that is undeveloped at this time, which may benefit from the additional parking in the future.

Diane Smucny recommended that the petitioner retain the alley, and provide diagonal parking to either side of that alley, and parallel parking along the alley itself. The rezone is fine, however, Diane Smucny added.

In response to questions from Bill Mikesell, Tom Logue explained that the proposed plan will provide 24 parking spaces. Mr. Logue pointed out that there is a single-family residence to the north of the parcel. The proposed V gutters paralleling the alley will serve to delineate that as a through-way rather than a drive between parked cars, and will also help with drainage, Mr. Logue said.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience. Lois Kerr, 730 Glenwood Avenue, stated that the petitioner has trash cans on Glenwood Avenue that are dumped at five o'clock in the morning, which annoys her. Mrs. Kerr added that she is opposed to the parking lot because it will bring North Avenue traffic up to Glenwood Avenue. Blanch Van Zante, 805 Glenwood Avenue, commented that there are many people besides patrons of Dusty's who use the alley and are satisfied with it the way it is at the present time. R.D. Van Zante, 805 Glenwood Avenue, stated that he is opposed to the rezone because it is a piecemeal nibbling at the residential neighborhood. John Kenny, 733 Glenwood Avenue, stated that his bedroom window will overlook the proposed parking lot. If the rezone is granted, Mr. Kenny indicated that he would move elsewhere. John Kenny added that the existing homes are ideal because the residents can walk to North Avenue shopping facilities.

Janine Rider, Don Warner, and Karl Metzner discussed the fact that 20 percent of a neighborhood in opposition to a request can force a 5-2 vote of the City Council. Janine Rider noted that the Planning Commission need not consider that at this time, except as input in the deliberations.

Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

MIKESELL/FLAGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF THE ALLEY VACATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL, BECAUSE IT IS NOT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PUBLIC.

GRAHAM/FLAGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF THE REZONE TO THE CITY COUNCIL, BECAUSE OF STAFF COMMENTS, AND BECAUSE OF OBJECTIONS OF AREA RESIDENTS.

#50-79 ALLEY VACATION

Petitioner: John Cadez. Location: Alley South of South Avenue, between 3rd and 4th Streets. Request to vacate alley to allow for the construction of a railroad loading dock.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Diane Smucny outlined the location of the alley, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments.

Janine Rider: Didn't we see this before?

Karl Metzner: You saw the alley next to it, from 4th to 5th. It is the same alley, one block to the east. You denied that alley vacation, due to the objections from this petitioner that he was using the alley.

Tom Swenson, representing the petitioner, stated that an 18,000 square foot distribution warehouse is proposed for the site. The warehouse requires railroad facilities, and the alley location is necessary for the loading area. In response to a question from Bill Mikesell, Mr. Swenson noted that the land is not owned by the railroad, but the building will be built to railroad specifications.

In response to a question by Florence Graham, John Cadez noted that the previous alley vacation had been denied because it would have allowed no access to the Cadez property at that time. Mr. Cadez indicated that he has since purchased the entire block, and that this particular alley is the only one remaining south of South Avenue which has not been vacated. Tom Swenson presented a telegram from Denver Rio Grande Railroad in favor of the alley vacation. (See letter in file.)

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

MIKESELL/RIDER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF AND REVIEW SHEET COMMENTS.

#46-79 REZONE: County R1B to City PD-8 & 12TH STREET & HORIZON DRIVE
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT - OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Margaret Foster & Sirdus Saghatoleslami.

Location: Northwest corner of 12th Street and Horizon Drive. Request to change from County single family residential use at 2 units/acre to City planned residential use at 8 units/acre on 9.747 acres designed for 83 townhouse units.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner outlined the location of the parcel, pointed out details on the development plan, and noted that there would be no access on Horizon Drive except for the public road to the west. Karl Metzner explained that there is existing single family residential, Round Hill Subdivision, to the west of the subject parcel. Karl Metzner clarified that this is an outline development plan, not a preliminary plan. Mr. Metzner called attention to the Review Sheet comments.

Jim Luke of Armstrong Engineers, representing the petitioner, stated that potential floodplain problems will be addressed on the preliminary plan. The comments on the flag lots will be taken under advisement and addressed by the petitioner at preliminary plan time, Mr. Luke said. Jim Luke commented that by developing this property along with the property to the north, a more workable plan can be provided for this small, triangular piece of ground.

Virginia Flager pointed out that the plan does not provide for a frontage road or accel/decel lanes on Horizon Drive. Karl Metzner noted that this is an outline development plan, and those details can be dealt with later. In response to a question from Bill Mikesell, Mr. Luke explained that these lots will be filled before construction.

Janine Rider recommended that tennis courts should face north-south. Janine Rider added that accel/decel lanes on Horizon Drive are a necessity, and might be desirable on 12th Street.

In response to a question from Bill Mikesell, Karl Metzner explained that the Planning Commission cannot grant the rezone because the annexation has not been submitted as of this time. The Planning Commission, however, can pass on the outline development plan, Karl Metzner said.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

RIDER/PLAGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO TABLE THE REZONING REQUEST UNTIL THE ANNEXATION HAS BEEN SUBMITTED FOR THIS SITE.

Bill Foster gave a brief history of this parcel, and suggested that the policy of requesting rights-of-way and improvements such as accel/decel lanes is not fair to the property owner.

RIDER/PICKENS/PASSED 4-1 (MIKESELL VOTING AGAINST)/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF AND REVIEW SHEET COMMENTS, AND SUBJECT TO PROVISION OF ACCEL/DECEL LANES ON HORIZON DRIVE.

#47-79 REZONE: County R2 to City PD-8 & PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR CRESTVIEW TOWNHOMES

Petitioner: Geneva & Louis Hyde & Henry Faussonne & Noel Norris. Location: Northwest corner of F.25 and 27.50 Roads. Request to change from County single family/duplex residential use at 3.5+ units/acre to City planned residential use at 8 units/acre on 7.25 acres designed for 1 single family unit, 20 townhouse units, 66 apartment units, and 10 cottage units.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner outlined the location of the parcel, pointed out specific details on the development plan, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments. Henry Faussonne clarified that the correct total number of units will be 97 on 14 acres.

John Quest, representing the petitioner, noted that he had just received the Review Sheet comments that afternoon, and had not gone over them with the appropriate agencies. Mr. Quest suggested that those questions raised in the comments be resolved at final plan time. John Quest noted that the Hydes, owners of the property to the east and also petitioner in this request, have been involved in the development of this project, and have specifically requested the proposed locations for single family homes and duplexes. John Quest went on to explain that Jerry Ulibarri owns the property to the west, and will be providing an access easement for the proposed development. Mr. Quest added that drainage will also be following that strip of land. John Quest, Henry Faussonne, and the Planning Commission discussed the merits of public versus private streets for the development. Henry Faussonne clarified that there will not be rental units on the site, despite the designation of 66 "apartment" units. A homeowners association will be responsible for the maintenance of the private streets, Mr. Faussonne said.

Janine Rider: There are good reasons for making this a planned

development, but nobody who offers private roads ever makes them as wide as City streets, nor do they put in the sidewalks and other amenities that are important for a development that could hold 300 people. If Mr. Ulibarri's property will be developed, that is an even stronger reason to make that access a big City street with sidewalks.

In response to a question from Florence Graham, John Quest explained that cottage units will be comparable to a large free-standing apartment, one and a half stories tall, and comprised of approximately 1000 square feet.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience. Beverly Skogen, a resident of Spring Valley, stated that she is concerned about the traffic to be generated by this development. Mrs. Skogen added that it is only fair that this development be required to put in curbs, gutters and sidewalks, as Spring Valley was required to do.

Following further discussion about public versus private roads, Henry Faussonne indicated that the developer might be able to build a cul-de-sac at the Ulibarri property, and construct the main access road to City standards. Karl Metzner pointed out that Staff has no qualms about private internal streets, but the main east-west access should be public.

In response to another question from the audience, Henry Faussonne explained that the apartment units will be purchased, not rented.

Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

RIDER/MIKESELL/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE REZONE TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

MIKESELL/FLAGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF AND REVIEW SHEET COMMENTS, AND SUBJECT TO THE EAST-WEST ACCESS EASEMENT BEING DESIGNED AS A PUBLIC STREET.

#51-79 REZONE: R1D to PR-41 & OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR EASTGATE PLAZA

Petitioner: Real Estate Investments of Grand Junction, Inc., Stan Anderson. Location: Southwest corner of Elm Avenue and 28.25 Road. Request to change from single family residential at 7.2 units/acre to planned residential at 41 units/acre on 6.4 acres.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner outlined the location of the parcel, pointed out specific details on the development plan, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments.

Virginia Flager: Where did we get this parking width of 8.5 feet wide?

Karl Metzner: There is a table at the end of the parking requirements. With a planned development, they can go with this minimum width, but you can put conditions on that. With the new PD requirements, you can give them a specific density, or you can give them a design density, where the development design must justify that

density. The proposed 416 parking spaces figures out to 1.7 per unit, which is at the City standards.

Stan Anderson, the petitioner, pointed out existing uses in the area, and noted that the ground is too expensive for single family dwellings. Mr. Anderson remarked that this development would be an appropriate transition between the single family homes and the business developments in the area. The project will be constructed in four phases, Stan Anderson said. The majority of the traffic generated by this development will be put on to 28.25 Road, at which point North Avenue is only 300 feet away. The high-rise apartment building will be 750 feet high, containing seven floors; the height is comparable to the Mesa United Bank Building. The location is ideal for high density development, Mr. Anderson said, because of the proximity to Eastgate Shopping Center and other services along North Avenue.

In response to a question by Bill Mikesell, Stan Anderson estimated that construction would begin toward the end of 1979, assuming a favorable outcome from the review process.

Florence Graham expressed her concern that the plan leaves no room for open space or landscaping. Stan Anderson pointed out that there is provision for landscaping inside the court of the building, which equals nearly a half acre of open space. The units to the north will have backyards, Mr. Anderson added.

Janine Rider: When the preliminary plan comes in, we will be looking specifically for signs that the area will be relatively green, with a feeling of open space. I would love to see you put in underground parking. That would give you more space for greenery. It would be a tremendous first for our city, and a hint to other developers that that is the way to go. Despite the increased cost per unit, I think it would be very desirable for a tenant.

Florence Graham: In view of the surroundings, it would look like an oasis and make it outstanding.

In response to questions by Virginia Flager, Stan Anderson noted that the units will be rented, and will be served by elevators. Mr. Anderson stated that the petitioner does not plan to have an apartment hotel type of operation. Virginia Flager remarked that there is a need for apartment hotels, especially for senior citizens, and that this area would lend itself to such a facility. Bill Mikesell pointed out that there is a trend to sell apartment units as condominiums for financial reasons. Stan Anderson indicated that he does not anticipate that that will happen with this project.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience. William I. Clark, 514 28.25 Road, stated that he is in favor of the proposal because it is an ideal location, because it will save gasoline, and because it will not take farmland out of production. Loran Dake suggested that the developer add another story to the high rise, and eliminate townhouses next to single family dwellings, thus leaving more open space. Anita Foster, 525 28.25 Road, asked several questions about the development plan. Fred Gulliford, owner of 518 28.25 Road, asked if he could develop his property as single family residential if the rezone were approved. Frank Simonetti explained that the request does not affect the zoning of Mr. Gulliford's property. Marge Smith, a resident of the area, asked if adjacent property owners could develop

duplexes or apartments on their property. Karl Metzner explained that it would require a rezone request. In response to questions from Anita Foster, Stan Anderson pointed out that the petitioner may develop three single family houses facing Elm, rather than what is depicted on the development plan.

Karl Metzner: We had a phone call from Carley Burns, 522 28.25 Road, opposing the project because of increased traffic and the tall structure will obstruct the view.

Martha Gulliford stated that 28.25 Road cannot handle the amount of traffic that it has at the present time, and the proposed project will make the traffic situation much worse. Anita Foster added that there is approximately one accident a year at the corner of 28.25 Road and Elm.

Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

MIKESELL/FLAGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF A REZONE WITH A DESIGN DENSITY OF 41 UNITS/ACRE.

MIKESELL/FLAGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF AND REVIEW SHEET COMMENTS.

#52-79 CONDITIONAL USE

Petitioner: Robert Stack. Location: Northwest corner of I-70 Business Loop and 21st Street. Request for revision to liquor license for Freeway Lanes.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing.

Karl Metzner: This is a conditional use because the liquor which is served in the lounge area of the existing bowling lanes may be carried into the lanes for consumption there. It has been ruled that the liquor license affects the entire property. The petitioner is taking over the Mazda dealership adjacent, and will utilize that property to contribute parking to the site.

Karl Metzner pointed out access into the site, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments. In response to a question by Jim Pickens, Karl Metzner noted that the driveway opening onto Rood on the west side will not line up with 19th Street. In response to questions from Bill Mikesell, Karl Metzner explained that the conditional use gives the Planning Commission site plan approval. Florence Graham stated that the side of the property which fronts on Rood is unsightly, and that sidewalks and landscaping are necessary because of the existing residences in the area.

Karl Metzner pointed out that there is a street improvement district set up for the east side of 21st Street and the frontage road to the east of the subject parcel. The City Engineer has, therefore, requested curb, gutter, sidewalk and full street improvements for this project to match what is going on in that improvement district. Karl Metzner suggested that additional landscaping could be accommodated in the right-of-way for Rood outside of the fence, which would not impact the parking.

Robert Stack stated that Freeway Lanes is being expanded from 22 lanes to 48 lanes. In response to questions from Virginia Flager, Mr. Stack expressed no objection to removal of four parking spaces to make a turn-around, and landscaping along the right-of-way on Road. However, Robert Stack said, installing curb, gutter and sidewalk on all sides of the project would create a financial burden for the petitioner, in view of their limited budget.

Virginia Flager: There is no residential along the south boundary of the property, or to the east. Sidewalks would not serve any useful purpose at those locations. I would rather see it developed with curb, gutter and landscaping.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience. Art Butts, general contractor for the project, stated that there is not enough money in the Freeway Lanes budget to develop curb, gutter and sidewalk around the entire parcel.

Art Butts, Robert Stack, Don Warner and the Planning Commission discussed access into the property, and whether or not more curb cuts would be permitted along the frontage road.

Robert Stack: Would we be permitted some time to accomplish these improvements?

Janine Rider: We should recommend what we think is proper.

Karl Metzner: You could indicate whether you would accept phasing.

Virginia Flager: I think a phasing process is fair and equitable.

Florence Graham: The first phase should be along the road facing the residential area.

Del Beaver made suggestions with respect to landscaping.

Bill Mikesell: Do you think a year's time is reasonable for constructing your improvements?

Robert Stack: I don't know the exact costs, but I think a year would be sufficient.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

RIDER/PICKENS/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF AND REVIEW SHEET COMMENTS, SUBJECT TO LANDSCAPING OUTSIDE THE FENCE ALONG ROAD, SUBJECT TO CURB AND GUTTER BEING INSTALLED ON ALL SIDES OF THE PROJECT, SUBJECT TO THE PETITIONER WORKING WITH THE CITY ENGINEER TO DETERMINE WHETHER SIDEWALKS SHOULD BE CONSTRUCTED ALONG ROAD, AND SUBJECT TO THE PETITIONER WORKING WITH STAFF TO COME UP WITH A PHASING TIMETABLE FOR THOSE IMPROVEMENTS BEFORE PROCEEDING TO CITY COUNCIL.

#53-79 REZONE: County PI to City PI - ANNEXATION TO CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
Petitioner: Development Department Staff. Location: Northwest corner of F Road and 25.50 Road.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner explained the request.

Frank Simonetti asked for audience comments, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

FLAGER/MIKESELL/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

#55-79 12TH STREET POLICY STATEMENTS.

Petitioner: Development Department Staff. Location: 12th Street from Horizon Drive to Pitkin Avenue.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing.

Del Beaver read a suggested amendment to the 12th Street policy statement. (See amendment in file.)

Del Beaver: It will be very difficult to get 12th Street to four-lane status if you rely on the City Council and County Commissioners to do that job. You need commitments from developers developing projects in the vicinity, so the City Council can set improvement districts to get the work done.

Don Warner, Del Beaver and the Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendment.

Frank Simonetti: I don't think this amendment is any problem.

Don Warner: I think that is a very good change.

Frank Simonetti asked for audience comments, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

FLAGER/RIDER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE 12TH STREET POLICY STATEMENT TO THE CITY COUNCIL, INCLUDING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

#56-79 EASEMENT VACATION

Petitioner: David Cross. Location: 1405 Motor Street. Request to vacate easement because utilities are located in the front portion of the property and the petitioner wishes to construct a building on the property line.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner outlined the location of the parcel.

Karl Metzner: We have letters from all utilities and the City. There are no utilities in this easement, and no plans to put anything in there.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience, and there were none. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

FLAGER/RIDER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

DISCUSSION

Karl Metzner: You have a request for a revokable permit for Andy's Liquors on 4th Street and North Avenue to put a flagpole in the right-of-way right between the two driveways.

Virginia Flager: I think it is terrible when people put up flags, never take them down at night, and allow them to become worn and ragged.

Don Warner: Unless you intend to illuminate it, you can't leave it up all night.

Virginia Flager: I think it's a dumb place to put a flag.

Janine Rider: If he wants to put a flag there, it's fine with me.

Karl Metzner: It will be a break-away pole.

The first meeting of the month of June was adjourned at 11:40 p.m.