

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

August 28, 1979

The first meeting of the month of August was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman FRANK SIMONETTI. The following members were present: DALE SCHOENBECK, FLORENCE GRAHAM, VIRGINIA FLAGER, JIM PICKENS and JANINE RIDER.

KARL METZNER, Design and Development Planner; DIANE SMUCNY, Planner; DON WARNER, Planner Analyst; and KAREN MAHER, Stenographer, were also present. There were approximately 35 interested citizens in the audience.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED MASTER PARKS & RECREATION PLAN

The Mesa County Planning Commission was also present to hear this item. The following members were present: MARY BUSS, NANCY DICKEY, DAVID SKINNER, CHARLIE REICKS, GERRY STUART, JUDY PRAKKEN and GEORGE BEVAN.

Frank Simonetti opened the public hearing.

John Ballagh, from the City/County Development Department, briefly presented the format and covered the content of the Parks Master Plan. Mr. Ballagh pointed out that the Plan is conceptual in nature. The plan is needed because there are funds budgeted for parkland acquisition, and the plan will assist in guiding the expenditure of those public funds. John Ballagh emphasized that no specific sites are identified in this plan.

Judy Prakken asked why bikeways had not been included in the plan. John Ballagh responded that a separate proposal is being drawn up with regard to bikeways in the County. Diane Smucny and Don Warner went on to say that Bob Kettle is presently working on that bikeway plan.

A member of the audience questioned whether a park could be developed in Foresite Park. John Ballagh explained that a park is proposed for the Northwest area of the County, which would include Foresite Park. However, John Ballagh added, the Master Plan makes no attempt to propose any specific park site in the County. John Ballagh went on to say that land in Foresite Park is very expensive because of the major services available, and acquisition of parkland there would not make sense from an economic point of view.

Charlie Reicks asked if the County would resort to condemnation procedures in order to acquire parkland. John Ballagh answered that the site selection committee would use all means available to acquire sites, but did not envision the use of eminent domain becoming necessary. Don Warner added that even if the County used its condemnation powers, the landowner would be paid the fair market value of the land, to be determined by three separate appraisers.

In response to a question by Florence Graham, John Ballagh noted that there are financial and technical supplements to the Master Plan. Virginia Flager pointed out that the plan covers parks only, not recreation areas. It is important to acquire park sites, Virginia Flager said,

because there isn't going to be more land, though there will always be more sports equipment available.

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

In response to questions from Judy Prakken, Ken Idelman of the County Parks & Recreation Department explained that the site selection committee is presently made up of representatives of the Lions Club, a representative of the P.B.A. Board, two representatives from the County, one representative from the Recreation Board, a representative from the School District, as well as himself.

PRAKKEN/BEVAN/PASSED 6-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS THAT THEY EXAMINE CAREFULLY AND ADOPT AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE THE MASTER PARKS AND RECREATION PLAN, IN ORDER TO BEGIN ACQUIRING PARK LAND AS SOON AS POSSIBLE; THE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION FAVORS THE USE OF THE CITY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT, AS WELL AS THE EXISTING SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE; IF A COUNTY BIKEWAY PLAN IS NOT ACCOMPLISHED SEPARATELY, IT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THIS MASTER PARKS PLAN.

RIDER/GRAHAM/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF THE MASTER PARKS AND RECREATION PLAN; THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION ALSO APPROVES OF THE SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE, AND IS CONCERNED ABOUT DEVELOPING A BIKEWAY PLAN.

#58-79 CONDITIONAL USE - DRIVE-IN WINDOW

Petitioner: Lee Miller. Location: 2430 North Avenue. Request for a drive-up window facility for Popeye's Restaurant.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Diane Smucny pointed out that the drive-up window policy statement has been completed, and is in the possession of the Planning Commission. Diane Smucny outlined the location of the subject parcel, and reviewed criticisms of the site plan as brought out in the July hearing.

Sam Haupt, representing the petitioner, stated that the petitioner has agreed to fulfill the suggested requirements.

Florence Graham stated that the eastern entrance on North Avenue will impede traffic at the 25th Street intersection. For that reason, Florence Graham suggested that it should not be permitted, as specified in Paragraph 4 of the policy statement. Virginia Flager expressed her agreement with those comments. Sam Haupt said that identifying that curb cut as an exit would prevent customers from entering at that point. Virginia Flager suggested that the entrance be located on 25th Street, with both exits directionalized onto North Avenue.

Jim Pickens: I agree with that, and it also solves the traffic flow problem through the site.

Janine Rider: It also avoids conflict between walking traffic and driving traffic.

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

FLAGER/PICKENS/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, SUBJECT TO THE ENTRANCE BEING LOCATED AT THE 25TH STREET CURB CUT, AND SUBJECT TO BOTH NORTH AVENUE CURB CUTS BEING DIRECTIONALIZED AS EXITS.

#63-79 REZONE: R1B to R3

Petitioner: Lark Washburn. Location: 580 Bookcliff Avenue. Request to change from single family residential uses at approximately 4.8 units/acre to multi-family residential uses at approximately 60 units/acre. (Request was denied July 31, 1979. Petitioner has requested rehearing to consider new information.)

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing.

Don Warner: At the last meeting, I agreed to research whether this use could be extended 50 feet into that property. I went back into the old records, and discovered that this cannot be extended because the application for the rezoning applied for that exact footage. Therefore, it wasn't arbitrarily set by the City. This is the distance at which they asked for the zoning.

Fred Aldrich, representing the petitioner, stated that the primary purpose for the rehearing was to determine whether that question of the 50 feet was moot. Mr. Aldrich went on to say that the petitioner has four alternatives for his land: Non-use, use as R1B, use for parking as requested here, or use as a park. Non-use and use as a park are out of the question for the petitioner, Mr. Aldrich said. He added that the property is not suitable for single family dwellings. Fred Aldrich presented a map of the property showing the proposed use, and explained that the petitioner would draw up a restrictive covenant which will permit only parking, parking carports and storage on the site. This covenant will prohibit any other use of the property, unless it is already permitted in an R1B zone. Mr. Aldrich added that the covenant provides for planting and buffering at the discretion of the Planning Commission and City Council. Enforcement of the covenant will be granted to the City of Grand Junction and neighboring property owners, allowing them injunctive and other legal remedies. Fred Aldrich also presented an affidavit from William H. Nelson, his law partner, who had been one of the previous owners of the property, which affidavit sets forth the background of the property and its zoning. (See affidavit in file.) Fred Aldrich also pointed out that the petitioner had approached many of the people who had signed the petition opposing the request. Seventy-five percent of the people approached withdrew their names from that petition, Mr. Aldrich said.

Responding to questions from Virginia Flager, Don Warner indicated that Conni McDonough had made the determination to reopen the hearing, because the question of whether or not the 50-foot extension could be allowed might have entered into the decision at the July hearing.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience. Andy Williams, an attorney speaking on behalf of the opponents of the request, briefly outlined the background of the neighborhood. Mr. Williams stated that the land on the west side of the zoning boundary is presently unused, but it is usable. The petitioner has shown no effort to use or market that land as presently zoned, Andy Williams said. Mr. Williams called attention to the fact that the present parkland is only leased to the City until 1988, at which time St. Mary's Hospital may wish to change

that to some other use. Therefore, the existing park is no permanent buffer, Mr. Williams said. Andy Williams went on to note that the residents of the area built their homes relying on the R1B zone. At Andy Williams' request, approximately 15 audience members raised their hands to indicate opposition to the request.

Virginia Flager: In other words, in less than 10 years St. Mary's may deem it economically necessary to discontinue the use of that park and utilize it in some other way?

Andy Williams: That's right.

Janine Rider: In that case, it would automatically revert to R1B.

Don Warner: They would need R3 or B1 zoning for any hospital use.

Virginia Rosso, a resident of the area, stated that parking is already a problem in the subject neighborhood. James Cox, another area resident, remarked that the parking problem is caused more by hospital traffic than apartment residents. Guy Cherp, 448 Bookcliff, indicated that the jog in 6th Street at Bookcliff makes it a very dangerous intersection. Lee Strand, a resident of the area, also stated that parking is a problem in that neighborhood.

Frank Simonetti pointed out that by today's parking standards, the apartments in question are 15 spaces short. However, Mr. Simonetti added, the apartments pre-dated the parking regulation. Virginia Flager noted that the parking question is not relevant to the zoning issue. Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

Virginia Flager made a motion to deny the request, because the petitioner can complete his project by utilizing another zone which will not have as great an impact on the neighborhood. The motion died for lack of a second.

Dale Schoenbeck asked if Andy Williams thought the subject parcel could be used as R1B. Mr. Williams replied that the land may be suitable for a residence, but he cannot be sure because no one has tried to sell it. In response to another question from Dale Schoenbeck, Fred Aldrich explained that the petitioner did not choose to request a PD because it would be more time-consuming, and because the petitioner does not have a site plan to present. In response to a comment by Fred Aldrich, Andy Williams indicated that R1B is the only acceptable zoning for the subject parcel, in the opinion of the opponents.

Responding to a question from Dale Schoenbeck, Karl Metzner remarked that the petitioner could place one residence on the lot and still market it, though it may not bring as high a price as some of the other R1B lots in the area. Virginia Flager pointed out that the petitioner could use the lot as proposed by requesting a PD. Fred Aldrich added there is some doubt whether a PD is permissible without having a residence on it. Andy Williams questioned whether "contract zoning," such as the restrictive covenant submitted by the petitioner, is legal. Don Warner responded that Gerry Ashby, the City Attorney, is of the opinion that there is nothing inherently illegal about contract zoning.

E.E. Lewis, a member of the audience, asked what would happen if the developer breaks his agreement with the City. Fred Aldrich responded that if the agreement is in the form of a covenant, as proposed in this request, the City has recourse through the courts to force the developer

to comply.

Dale Schoenbeck: I can't see this parcel being used as R1B at this time. The covenant presented here will insure a good buffer. This would be a good use, and will increase parking which is a big problem for the area.

Jim Pickens: I hate to see ground unused in a situation like this. I am somewhat familiar with restrictive covenants, but the City does have a means by which this could become developable land, through a PD. I am concerned that if we approve this request, then anyone who doesn't want to go with a PD in a similar situation will come in with restrictive covenants.

RIDER/PICKENS/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, BECAUSE THERE ARE OTHER MEANS BY WHICH TO CHANGE THE ZONING AND SERVE THE DESIRED PURPOSES OF THE PETITIONER.

#72-79 REZONE: R2 to PB & FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR MOUNTAIN WEST OFFICE PRODUCTS

Petitioner: Larry Klauzer. Location: Southwest corner of 17th & Main Streets. Request to change from single family/duplex residential uses at approximately 27 units/acre to planned business uses on .25 acres.

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.

Del Beaver of Paragon Engineering, representing the petitioner, stated that this is an appropriate location for the use because of its proximity to similar facilities in the area, recognizing existing residences in the area also. Del Beaver indicated that the petitioner has no problem with any of the Review Sheet comments. Del Beaver called attention to details on the development plan, and added that this plan has been presented to the City Engineer, who found it acceptable.

Florence Graham and Del Beaver discussed landscaping details. Florence Graham remarked that the proposed grape stake fence will not be durable. Del Beaver responded that the petitioner will be happy to stipulate a more durable screened fence.

Frank Simonetti questioned whether the proposed parking will be sufficient for the use. Del Beaver responded that the number of spaces shown should be adequate, given the type of business and the amount of traffic generated at this location. However, Del Beaver added, another space could be fitted on to the site. Florence Graham stated that the subject parcel is not suitable for R2, and that the proposed office is an acceptable alternative. Frank Simonetti pointed out that there is available commercial land one-half block to the east. Del Beaver responded that offices are permissible in a commercial zone, but it is not the ideal place for them. Mr. Beaver went on to say that the proposed office will serve as an excellent buffer between the residences to the west and the commercial area.

Virginia Flager: I agree with this plan. It's a good location for the office, but it is precedent-setting. How far are we willing to extend these uses to the west?

Frank Simonetti asked for comments from the audience. Larry Klauzer, the petitioner, indicated that Mrs. Jonas, an adjacent property owner, would prefer to have an office on this site, rather than a fourplex which is allowed under the present zoning.

Karl Metzner: If your only concern is precedent setting, you can avoid that by stipulating in your motion that you think it is appropriate only because it provides a buffer for the heavy commercial use.

In response to a question from Virginia Flager, Karl Metzner pointed out that the Planning Commission can stipulate hours of operation. Frank Simonetti noted that that would be a hard stipulation to police.

Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

GRAHAM/RIDER/PASSED 4-1 (FLAGER VOTING AGAINST)/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE REZONE TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

GRAHAM/SCHOENBECK/PASSED 4-0 (FLAGER ABSTAINING)/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, SUBJECT TO A CEDAR FENCE BEING SUBSTITUTED FOR THE PROPOSED GRAPE STAKE FENCE, SUBJECT TO THE PETITIONER ADDING A TENTH PARKING SPACE TO THE SITE, AND STIPULATING THAT THE USE IS TO SERVE AS A BUFFER BETWEEN THE RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL AREAS AND IS NOT MEANT TO SET A PRECEDENT.

#51-79 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT - PRELIMINARY PLAN: EASTGATE PLAZA
Petitioner: Stan Anderson. Location: Southwest corner of Elm Avenue and 28.25 Road. Contains 6.42 acres designed for 235 units at an approximate density of 36.6 units/acre.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner outlined the location of the parcel, pointed out revisions in the site plan, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments.

Stan Anderson, the petitioner, expressed surprise at the 33-foot right-of-way requirement for Elm Avenue. Karl Metzner explained that that requirement complies with the new street standards, which have been in effect for a year. Stan Anderson went on to say that the site plan has been revised to accomodate Planning Commission suggestions from the previous hearing.

Virginia Flager suggested that the petitioner request a traffic light with a left-hand-turn signal for the corner of 28.25 Road and North Avenue. Stan Anderson replied that that will probably be accomplished when it is warranted by increased traffic. In response to Planning Commission questions, Stan Anderson indicated that the required number of parking spaces will not be necessary for this project, due to the type of tenants expected and due to the large variety of services available within walking distance. Mr. Anderson added that facilities such as a barber shop and laundry will be located on the first floor of the apartment complex, geared mainly but not exclusively to the needs of the tenants in the building.

Janine Rider also expressed her concern that the proposed parking would not be adequate. Stan Anderson indicated that the project would be very similar to Lakeside, where there is an over-supply of parking. Virginia Flager questioned whether single family residences and a high-

rise apartment building could exist side-by-side harmoniously. Virginia Flager added that the potential parking problem could adversely affect the marketability of an otherwise excellent project. Stan Anderson and the Planning Commission members went on to discuss proposed parking for the site.

Virginia Flager: If the plan can conform, it should. We are buying trouble if we start relaxing parking standards. Otherwise, I wholeheartedly support this project.

Stan Anderson pointed out that the parking figures represent underground parking also. Soils conditions prevent the petitioner from going deeper for more parking levels, Mr. Anderson said.

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

Karl Metzner: If you choose to require the full number of parking spaces, I ask that you request a trip generation model at the final plan stage. It may be helpful in your determination.

Janine Rider: I want more parking, but I am willing to compromise. I think 56 spaces short is too short.

Jim Pickens: I agree.

Dale Schoenbeck: I agree.

Del Beaver: You can request that the petitioner either convince you beyond a doubt that the parking provided will be sufficient, or to increase the parking to the point where you are satisfied that it is adequate.

Virginia Flager: If we say we can be convinced, we are setting a precedent of violating previous parking requirements. If they want to remove RV parking to off-site, that is fine.

RIDER/FLAGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, SUBJECT TO A TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS BEING SUBMITTED AT FINAL PLAN, AND WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE FINAL PLAN SHOW MORE PARKING SPACES THAN ARE PRESENTLY SHOWN.

#70-79 CONDITIONAL USE - OFFICE IN R3 ZONE

Petitioner: Jack Pennell. Location: North of Ouray Avenue, 60' West of 5th Street. Request for office uses on .18 acres in a multi-family residential zone.

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 Twin Arrow Oil Company offices is the only use proposed for the building. It is not a retail operation in any sense, Mr. Logue said. The hours of operation will be from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, with only occasional exceptions. Tom Logue added that five to seven employees are anticipated for the site. The building will remain essentially as it is, Mr. Logue explained, with only minor maintenance,

such as painting, to be performed.

Karl Metzner pointed out that if the site is ever to be used for other than an office, it will have to come back before the Planning Commission for another conditional use. Virginia Flager questioned whether the parking arrangement is workable. Jack Pennell, the petitioner, explained that only he and three other employees will be working in the office initially, and that the cars will seldom be moved except to arrive in the morning and to leave at night.

In response to a question from Dale Schoenbeck, Jack Pennell noted that there is virtually no walk-in traffic to the office. Mr. Pennell added that there is not even a proposal to have a business sign located on the outside of the building. Tom Logue added that all the neighbors had been approached, and had expressed support for the project.

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

RIDER/GRAHAM/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, SUBJECT TO THE HOUSE AND LANDSCAPING BEING MAINTAINED IN ITS PRESENT CHARACTER AND CONDITION, AND REQUESTING THAT SAID CONDITION BE MONITORED BY STAFF.

#71-79 DANWILL (MINOR) SUBDIVISION: FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Williams. Location: East of Cedar Street and 294' North of Unawep Avenue. Contains .7 acres designed for four lots in a single family residential zone at approximately 5.7 units/acre.

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, indicated that the Review Sheet comments can be complied with.

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

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

#15-79 GUNNISON AVENUE SOUTH SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Jerome Fossenier. Location: Northwest corner of I-70 Business Loop and Melody Lane. Contains 2.91 acres designed for 2 lots in a light industrial zone.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner outlined the location of the parcel, and called attention to the Review Sheet comments. Karl Metzner noted that City Fire has been sent updated information, which they are now reviewing and will respond to in the near future.

Karl Metzner: Staff recommends approval, subject to the petitioner working out the right-of-way, power of attorney and the treatment of the frontage road with the City Engineer.

Tom Logue of Paragon Engineering, representing the petitioner, stated that he has discussed those items with the City Engineer, and they will be resolved before the City Council hearing. City Fire's concerns have been satisfied by a new water line being installed in the vicinity, Mr. Logue added.

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

FLAGER/SCHOENBECK/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, AND SUBJECT TO THE POWER OF ATTORNEY, RIGHT-OF-WAY, AND TREATMENT OF THE FRONTAGE ROAD BEING WORKED OUT.

#69-79 ROAD VACATION - NOLAND AVENUE

Petitioner: E.E. Lewis Co. Location: Noland Avenue West of 7th Street. Request to vacate an unnecessary public right-of-way.

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

Karl Metzner: There is presently a revokable permit issued on this right-of-way for the petitioners to use. There was a misunderstanding that the City Engineer's review comment was a recommendation for denial. We talked to Ron Rish, and he emphatically stated that he sees no problem with the vacation. Staff would recommend approval, subject to the utility easement being provided.

E.E. Lewis, the petitioner, circulated photos of the road.

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

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

#55-79 12TH STREET CORRIDOR POLICY STATEMENTS

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission. Location: 12th Street from Horizon Drive to Pitkin Avenue.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner read the amendment to No. 7 in the policy statement. (See amendment in file.)

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

PICKENS/FLAGER/PASSED 5-0/A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION OF THE 12TH STREET CORRIDOR POLICY STATEMENTS AS AMENDED.

#74-79 ZONING OF PORTIONS OF CRESTVIEW ANNEX

Petitioner: Development Department Staff. Location: From F.25 to F.50 Roads, and from 27.25 to 27.50 Roads. Zoning of that portion of Crestview Annex not included in Crestview Subdivision or Crestview Townhomes to single family residential uses at approximately 4 units/acre.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner outlined the location of the parcel, and gave a brief background of the request.

Frank Simonetti: Are the residents in the area aware of this rezone?

Karl Metzner: Yes.

Frank Simonetti asked for comments. M.E. McAllister, a resident of the area, stated that he was not notified of the proposed annexation, and requested an explanation of what is allowed in the new zone, specifically with respect to animals. Karl Metzner explained the R1A zone to Mr. McAllister.

Frank Simonetti closed the public hearing.

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

#75-79 ZONING OF POMONA ANNEX

Petitioner: Development Department Staff. Location: Northeast corner of 25.50 and Patterson Roads. Zoning of portions of Pomona Annex to City single family residential uses at approximately 4 units/acre, and single family residential uses at approximately 5.6 units/acre, and multi-family residential uses at approximately 60 units/acre on a total of 20 acres.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner gave a brief history of the request. Karl Metzner indicated that Mr. Dewey (of Dewey Subdivision) has no objection to the rezone, and will come in with a PD request when his development plans are finalized.

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 TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

#76-79 ZONING OF FORESITE ANNEX - PLANNED INDUSTRIAL

Petitioner: Development Department Staff. Location: Northeast corner of 24.50 and F Roads. Zoning of Foresite Annex from County Planned Industrial uses to City Planned Industrial uses.

Frank Simonetti read the request and opened the public hearing. Karl Metzner gave a brief background of the request.

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

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

The first meeting of the month of August was adjourned at 10:55 p.m.