

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

November 25, 1980

The first meeting of the month of November was called to order at 7:31 p.m. by Chairman JIM PICKENS. The following members were present: FRANK SIMONETTI, JANINE RIDER, REBECCA FRANK, VIRGINIA FLAGER, FLORENCE GRAHAM and DALE SCHOENBECK.

ALEX CANDELARIA, Planning Staff, DON WARNER, Planning Analyst, and LEILA E. MOSHER, Certified Shorthand Reporter, were also present. There were approximately thirty-five interested citizens in the audience.

JIM PICKENS called to order the Sign Code Board of Appeals and read the request for #83-80, Sign Variance, Woodland Golf and Sports, 497 28.25 Road, for variance in the size of a sign.

DON WARNER outlined the proposal and the need for the variance in the size of the sign.

FLAGER/SCHOENBECK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN VARIANCE REQUEST.

JIM PICKENS adjourned the meeting of the Sign Code Board of Appeals.

FLAGER/SIMONETTI PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO TABLE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 28, 1980 UNTIL THE DECEMBER MEETING TO ALLOW THE COMMISSION TIME TO STUDY THEM.

The Planning Staff advised the Commission that three items had been deleted from the Agenda, being item 3, #67-80, Conditional Use, Drive-up Window; Item 12, #78-80, Alley Vacation, and Item 14, #3-79, Rezone PDB to R3.

#63-80 WELLINGTON BUSINESS PARK, PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: CBW Builders.

Location: Northeast of 11th and Wellington, Southwest of Grand Valley Canal.

Contains 5.4 acres designed for 2 lots in a business zone.

JIM PICKENS read the request and opened the public hearing.

ROBERT GURLOFF, of CBW Builders, appeared for the Petitioner, as well as the Petitioner being present. BOB GURLOFF outlined the proposed Wellington Business Park, Preliminary Plan.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: I would like to know about the access.

ROBERT GURLOFF: When we do the construction drawings for Wellington, we will address that, but the access, as I understand it, is off of 11th Street, at this point.

DON WARNER: In fact, I don't see that it is a problem, whether it comes off of Wellington or 11th, or right out of the corner, really, because there is no traffic going by. It's an "L" intersection there. I don't see the location of that access as any problem.

FRANK SIMONETTI: It looks to me like common sense would be to move the lot line a little, so you could have at least 50 feet of access.

VIRGINIA FLAGER: My curiosity is aroused. This is obviously routed to the City Engineering and Transportation Engineer, and he didn't bother to comment on it. That kind of leaves us up in the air.

DON WARNER: He does not see any problem; if he had seen a problem, he would have commented on it.

RIDER/FRANK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE WELLINGTON BUSINESS PARK, PRELIMINARY PLAN, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, SPECIFICALLY THAT THE TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER COMMENT ON THE ACCESS, BEFORE GOING TO CITY COUNCIL HEARING.

#79-80 . NORTH AVENUE WEST COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION, PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Turtle Enterprises.

Location: East of 25.25 Road, Southwest of Highway 6 and 50.

Contains 7.71 acres designed for 31 lots in a commercial zone.

JIM PICKENS read the request and opened the public hearing.

RON FROMLICH, of Gingery Associates, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the proposal for North Avenue West Commercial Subdivision, Preliminary Plan.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: What about that street design meeting the City standards?

RON FROMLICH: We will meet the City standards with those.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: What about that storm ditch? The Staff seem to have all kinds of adverse comments.

RON FROMLICH: Most of the adverse comments, I think, are from Ron, concerning the problem he has had with 6 & 50 Filings #1 and 2, where they made agreements they agreed to perform before they got building permits. They haven't performed them yet, and they haven't gotten any building permits in Filing #2, either. But we are willing to build the portion on our property, and get it down to where they have to tie into, even though they have agreed to bring it all in, way up along their property.

JANINE RIDER: The question I have has to do with this access: It seems to me like any logical traffic pattern within that subdivision is fully based on getting a frontage road, and if this is temporary, my question is, how temporary? And obviously, you are only going to have one entrance and exit there, and nothing else.

RON FROMLICH: This is temporary until these people come in here. The Final Plan has been approved by the Planning Commission.

JIM PICKENS: How wide is your frontage street going to be?

RON FROMLICH: The Highway Department won't tell us. A normal frontage road is about twenty-four feet.

DON WARNER: It is highway right of way. The right of way is all there, so they will dedicate the width.

JANINE RIDER: The recommendation of the Staff is the item be tabled until the problems are solved, but he seems to be willing to meet all of the standards. Are there any problems still existing?

ALEX CANDELARIA: Primarily to the frontage; 6&50 has never answered to any request that is requested by Ron Rish, and primarily to drainage, which they will eventually have to tie into the drainage, and there is quite a few memorandums and so forth sent to 6&50 which was never answered to, or -- and that is basically our reason for tabling the matter until it can be worked out.

DON WARNER: I think what Alex is saying is that with the shaky situation on 6&50, probably Ron wants to see an alternative drainage plan in a way that will work. If that Filing 3 isn't developed, they need another drainage plan that will work. Did you look into that?

RON FROMLICH: No. We haven't looked into the alternative yet, but I am sure we can come up with another drainage plan.

DON WARNER: That's what Staff was really thinking of; at the moment there is no answer to drainage.

VIRGINIA FLAGER: The drainage is the only thing you are really concerned about, is the drainage?

REBECCA FRANK: Is there a reason you haven't gotten together with City Engineering?

RON FROMLICH: That's 6&50 he is talking about; not us.

JIM PICKENS closed the public hearing.

VIRGINIA FLAGER: My only comment is that the whole area needs to be developed as soon as possible and brought up to the standards we have been discussing, and if there is any way to get somebody interested in building that area up, I would condone it, and if the Staff could work out the difficulties --

FLAGER/RIDER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #79-80 NORTH AVENUE WEST COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION, PRELIMINARY PLAN, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND STIPULATIONS.

#82-80 REZONE I-1 TO PR 17 AND PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR GRAND RIVER CONDOMINIUMS

Petitioner: SNPH - c/o Steve Heald.

Location: East of Power Road, North of Brach's Market, on Colorado River.

A request to change from industrial use to planned residential use on 23.9 acres with a design density of 252 condominium units.

- a. Consideration of zone.
- b. Consideration of Preliminary Plan.

JIM PICKENS read the request and opened the public hearing.

BOB GURLOFF appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the request for Rezone I-1 to PR 17, and the Preliminary Plan for Grand River Condominiums.

REBECCA FRANK: What happens if the water doesn't seep in, as you say it will? I understand sort of what you are saying, but is there a possibility that the water table wouldn't rise, and you would have these big holes?

BOB GURLOFF: If the water table doesn't rise, we would landscape the holes and leave them as landscaped openings.

DALE SCHOENBECK: On the transportation in here, I note you have made comment -- do you disagree then, about the comment on private drives as maintenance problems and hazards?

BOB GURLOFF: We have some islands in here which we put in for two purposes: One, is to break up the black asphalt a little bit; one is to lessen the visual impact, while you are driving down the street. I don't see any greater traffic hazard than the fountains down in the intersection down by Denver City Hall, or the State Capitol Building. These are things we are not used to in Grand Junction, but I don't view them as major traffic hazards.

DON WARNER: Ron told me to worry about private drives when they don't build them up to City construction standards, and that is basically because when the developer is gone and it's completely owned by individuals, they start thinking they are City streets and ask us to maintain them, and it just is a little problem. As long as they are built to City Standards, they are all right.

JANINE RIDER: There are two things that bother me on this project, and they are reflected in the Staff Comments. First, is setting those places right up next to the River. I can understand the idea of orientation to the River to be a pleasant thing, but I don't think that needs to be setting right up next to the River, with all the talk we have done about the green belt -- to me this just goes against it. -- The second thing that bothers me was those waterways. I certainly don't know enough to know if they will work, but you haven't proven to me that they will, and it makes me very nervous to think about mosquito infested swamp beds in there -- they could be a real problem.

BOB GURLOFF: I don't want to get into all specifics of how they will work, but let me say we will be happy to work with the Health Department or whomever you designate, to bring back a water management plan to control that. I don't even know what a water management plan means, but if we have somebody we can work with, we will be happy to do that. We don't want them to be a mess, either, because we have to sell those things to somebody.

JANINE RIDER: -- I find it hard to make any kind of possibly sensible judgment, based on what we don't know about the flood plain.

BOB GURLOFF: The flood plain is not a problem. You can build in a flood plain, under your current Regulations, if you are out of the flood plain and you do not change the flows so it affects people upstream or downstream. That's why we put storage in there, to absorb that flow, because we are not going to change the bank. We have to accomodate the flow that would normally come on to that site, and we are trying to accomodate that flood. -- You cannot build in a flood way.

FRANK SIMONETTI: How deep will these lakes be?

BOB GURLOFF: Six to eight feet.

FRANK SIMONETTI: I had a question and I guess it's directed to the Staff, and this is about density -- is this the right density for this particular piece of land?

ALEX CANDELARIA: Staff at present recommends that the density presently adjacents an R4 zone, which it is 17 units, and it is Staff's recommendation that the density be granted at the present time, with a stipulation that the Planning Commission could review it at a later date and specifically, that the flood way is not determined as of yet, and until the flood way is determined, and you could possibly lower the density at that time.

FRANK SIMONETTI: I don't really see how we can possibly approve this with the flood way information hanging in the balance. I don't see how we can approve this preliminary plan.

BOB GURLOFF: I would like to address the flood way a little bit deeper. The determination of flood way is a very difficult thing, and it is not a cheap thing. -- It is a very major consideration and it is very costly. All the information we have got is they are not releasing it, because they simply are calling it preliminary, and simply not turning loose of the information.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: How can we be expected to approve a plan with hidden information?

BOB GURLOFF: The information is also down in your Department for your Staff to analyze.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: Alex, how can we say yes or no when we don't know the flood plain?

BOB GURLOFF: Our contention is, and information we have, the flood way is the top of the bank, and unless somebody demonstrates differently, that is where the flood way is, and that's our position on it.

ALEX CANDELARIA: Everything as far as Review Comments has pretty well been covered and discussed with the Petitioners and the Planning Commission, with the exception of the -- as is stated before, that the rezone, we would like to see the area develop in a residential environment, as opposed to an Industrial.

LOUIE BRACH: I would like to say a couple of words. I own the property right adjacent to that, and have been out there over some seventeen years, I guess, and I haven't seen these people's plan, but I am pretty sure the reason why they are building little ponds out there is to get the fill dirt out to build their buildings on. Just by looking at it, it has got to be raised, I would say, about three feet, looking at it, it has got to be raised, and I think that's where they are going to get the gravel to raise their buildings on. I can see no problem with any of it. The water fluctuates, depending on what the height of the river is, from the height of being full, down three feet in August -- it will drop that much, and the lakes will have water in them all year round.

DALE JENSEN appeared and questioned the density on the proposal.

DALE JENSEN: Is that normal for development, and the Staff has recommended that that's satisfactory?

ALEX CANDELARIA: Yes.

JIM PICKENS closed the public hearing.

RIDER/SCHOENBECK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE REZONE I-1 TO PR 17 ON #82-80.

RIDER/SIMONETTI PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO TABLE THE CONSIDERATION OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN, #82-80, **GRAND RIVER CONDOMINIUMS**, UNTIL SOME OF THE PROBLEMS REFLECTED IN THE REVIEW COMMENTS HAVE BEEN RESOLVED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE STAFF AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE ULTIMATE DENSITY IS RE-STUDIED IN RELATION TO THE PLAN.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: I think you need to be more specific in regard to the flood plain, flood way.

JANINE RIDER: Sure. The major concerns that go along with this motion are concerns of the plan design, of flood way considerations, of the feasibility of the ponds and the necessity of a water management plan to prove that they can be maintained properly and will work properly, together with the possibility of providing some open feeling along the River.

BOB GURLOFF: Mr. Pickens, could we ask that the Staff be responsible for organizing that group session, if you will?

ALEX CANDELARIA: We will be glad to set it up.

#81-80 REZONE R1A TO PDB AND PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR CEDAR SQUARE OFFICES

Petitioner: PDC Investments.
Location: 605 26.5 Road.

A request to change from single family residential use to planned business use on .788 acres.

- a. Consideration of zone.
- b. Consideration of Preliminary Plan.

JIM PICKENS read the request and opened the public hearing.

SAM HAUPT appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the request for Rezone R1A to PDB and the Preliminary Plan for Cedar Square Offices.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

REID DAVIS appeared as a property owner in the area in objection to the proposal, stating it would be breaking up a residential neighborhood and isolating one residence on that side of the block; objecting to the commercial type development in the area, with the concerns of trash and snow removal connected with the commercial development.

WES SEDBEST appeared as a property owner in the area and objected to the development due to problems with the present Cedar Square area, and increased crime in the area.

FRED DUNHAM appeared as a property owner in the area, objected to the proposed development and concurred with the remarks of the other neighbors in the area.

JIM GALE appeared and stated he felt that the Planning Commission should not make a hasty decision on the rezone. JIM GALE also stated the total zoning of the area should be looked at, as well as the Horizon Drive area, before making a decision on this request.

SKIP MOTTRAM appeared as a property owner in the area and objected to the proposed rezone and commercial development, stating they had decided to live in their home and don't want to leave it, and do not want the area rezoned as commercial.

RAY DAVIS appeared as a property owner in the area and concurred with the comments of Skip Mottram and objected to the possible deterioration of the view from the homes in the neighborhood.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: Will this be a commercial development, or is it to be Doctor's Offices?

SAM HAUPT: It's to be offices. It is stated to be offices, yes.

REBECCA FRANK: Any kind of offices?

JANINE RIDER: It is planned business, so we can specify.

JIM PICKENS closed the public hearing.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: Jim, I am going to remove myself from the discussion.

VIRGINIA FLAGER: I have a question. I notice one of the large property owners in the area is remaining silent, and I think one of the aesthetic values of that property is the view of that nice green alfalfa field down in there. Millie, what are you going to do with that?

MILDRED VANDOVER: Darned if I know what I'm going to do with it.

VIRGINIA FLAGER: I think the point is, one of the things that makes it so desirable is your alfalfa field to look at -- if you decide to do something with yours, the whole area wouldn't have something so pleasant to look at.

MILDRED VANDOVER: Let me put it this way: I had lived there for years, years and years. I have enjoyed the alfalfa, the green fields, but who would want to live on a Freeway? I moved for this reason. I don't want to live on Horizon Drive. I am close enough to it as it is, but it does pose a problem, because I don't know at this time which way I am going to go, because nobody seems to

have decided, but it is my land; I have paid for it, and I would like to have an option as to whether -- I can't imagine anybody building fancy residences there and wanting to live on Horizon Drive. This doesn't appeal to me, and I can't believe it would to anybody else. I would like to have some options as to which way you could go with that land, since I don't plan to live there myself. I would like to have some options. I can understand these peoples' feelings. I had the same feelings, and I moved. Presumably they don't want to, and I can understand that, too.

What else can I say? I don't have any definite plans, but I would like to have some options as to what I can do with that acreage.

DALE SCHOENBECK: I was just thinking in terms of the whole area. What Mr. Gale says, I agree with him one hundred percent. I think we need to have direction. We talked about this in our workshop, also. Even though this area might be removed by topography and level of the land, I still think there is a due consideration that we need to look at the entire area in reference to Horizon and access to Cedar Square and everything else, before we determine exactly what direction it's going to go in.

FRANK SIMONETTI: I think we have a policy statement on Horizon that says there will be no commercial or business development on Horizon Drive.

JANINE RIDER: But if we allow it to creep up almost to Horizon, then we're stuck, aren't we?

JANINE RIDER: I think the time that a policy statement is most likely to be ignored or changed, or whatever you want to call it, is when you have a large part of something in question, so it is not one guy trying to go against everybody else around him, but a large space that would change a larger nature of something, but would not be hurting other people along the way.

I don't know if it is proper, or not, but it seems to me that one of the ways to go -- and my thought was to be against this, mainly because of the access, but it seems that maybe it wouldn't be a bad idea for ourselves to have a workshop and invite these people who own these properties, perhaps talk about the possible future of what is going to be a triangle between Horizon Drive and Patterson Road here, and see if we can come out of that with anything that would be beneficial to everybody involved.

FLAGGER/SIMONETTI PASSED 5-0 (GRAHAM ABSTAINING) A MOTION TO TABLE THIS ITEM UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE PROPERTY OWNERS DIRECTLY AFFECTED BY THIS REQUEST ARE ABLE TO ATTEND A PUBLIC WORKSHOP TYPE MEETING, IN AN ATTEMPT TO REACH AN AGREEMENT AS TO WHAT THE ZONING AND CHARACTER OF THIS AREA SHOULD BE.

JIM PICKENS: I think probably about the first workshop we are going to be able to look at it is going to be the 13th of January.

Item 13 on the Agenda, #80-80, was discussed at this time as to whether it would be included in the last above motion.

RICHARD LIVINGSTON, appearing for the Petitioner in Item 13: Mr. Chairman, I am Richard Livingston, Attorney for the Petitioners on Item 13, and I would indicate at this time we would consent to participate in such a workshop, and you can remove the item from the Agenda.

#75-80 REZONE HO TO PB AND PRELIMINARY PLAN, MESA PLAZA SUBDIVISION.

Petitioner: Safeway Stores, Inc.
Location: North of U. S. Highway 50 and West of 27 Road.

A request to change from highway oriented zoning to planned business zoning on 5.157 acres.

- a. Consideration of zone.
- b. Consideration of Preliminary Plan.

JIM PICKENS read the request and opened the public hearing.

BORRIS VUKOVICH, President of Peyton Engineering, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the proposed Rezone HO to PB and Preliminary Plan, Mesa Plaza Subdivision.

REBECCA FRANK: Would it be possible to somewhere incorporate a decent bike rack?

BORRIS VUKOVICH: Yes, Ma'am, there will be a decent bike rack.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

ROBERT ANDERSON appeared as Division Property Manager for the Rocky Mountain Region and addressed the appearance and landscaping for the proposed store.

BORRIS VUKOVICH: Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure of the procedure, but may I request the Planning Commission to permit us to go with the Final directly to the City Council, without coming back to the Commission, if you feel that our present submittal is adequate? We are fighting for time to begin construction as soon as possible.

DON WARNER: Bob told the gentleman this afternoon that if you felt satisfied with this, that that procedure is allowed under the Regulations; that they can take the preliminary to the Council and then they can take the final to Council, without coming back with the final here, and as far as Staff is concerned, this is no problem to us. We would review it to see that they have taken care of all of the items that have been asked of them, and then just go directly to Council on the final.

FLAGER/GRAHAM PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE REZONE HO TO PB, #75-80, SAFEWAY STORES, INC.

FLAGER/GRAHAM PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN, MESA PLAZA SUBDIVISION, SAFEWAY STORES, INC., SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS BEING INCORPORATED INTO THIS PLAN BEFORE PRESENTING IT TO COUNCIL.

FLAGER/SCHOENBECK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION ON #75-80, PRELIMINARY PLAN, MESA PLAZA SUBDIVISION, SAFEWAY STORES, INC., TO WAIVE PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW, SUBJECT TO MEETING ALL CONDITIONS REQUESTED BY THE STAFF AND PLANNING COMMISSION BEFORE GOING TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE FINAL PLAN, AND THAT THE FINAL PLAN WILL THEN GO DIRECTLY TO CITY COUNCIL.

#62-80 REZONE RIC TO PR 31.2 AND GLENWOOD APARTMENTS, REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: William Pantuso.
Location: 845-865-875 Glenwood.

A request to change from single family residential use to planned residential use with 18 units on .58 acres.

- a. Consideration of zone.
- b. Consideration of Revised Preliminary Plan.

JIM PICKENS read the request and opened the public hearing.

JIM BURKE appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the proposed Rezone RIC to PR 31.2 and Glenwood Apartments, Revised Preliminary Plan.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

R. D. VANZANT appeared as a property owner in the area and stated the changes made in the plan were only cosmetic in nature and he still objected to the rezone and proposal, because of increased density and traffic in the area.

JOHN KANALY appeared as a property owner in the area and continued his objection to the rezone and the proposal.

RUSSELL PERRY appeared as an adjacent property owner and objected to the proposal, stating he was concerned about the prospect of student housing in the area.

LOWELL LAYCOCK appeared as a property owner in the area and objected to the rezone and the proposal because of traffic and parking generated by the rezone and the proposal.

ALTHEA CLARKE appeared as a property owner in the area and objected to the student housing proposed.

BILL RUPERT appeared as a property owner across the street from the proposed rezone and objected to the rezone and preliminary plan because of increased on-street parking in the area of his home.

JIM PICKENS closed the public hearing.

VIRGINIA FLAGER: I think that we are constantly bombarded with what the college wants, what the college does not want, and I think that we must recognize the needs of the college, but we also have to recognize that these neighborhoods must be protected, and I think there is going to have to be a happy zone, and I think the lady touched on it, and it is the first time it has ever really been put down, but I think a key to this is supervision of the college students, and until we can come up with something of that nature, I would share Florence's concern, and I certainly would back her motion.

FRANK SIMONETTI: We have the additional problem that twenty percent of the neighborhood people within one hundred feet -- that ties our hands. -- And we can't change the zone, and the Council can't, unless they have a six vote.

GRAHAM/FRANK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #62-80, REZONE RIC TO PR 31.2 AND GLENWOOD APARTMENTS, REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN, BECAUSE THE RESIDENTS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD DO NOT WANT SUCH AN ENORMOUSLY INCREASED DENSITY AT THIS TIME.

JIM PICKENS: Mr. Burke, of course, as I am sure you are well aware, you are permitted to take this to Council the third week in December.

#77-80 DEVELOPMENT IN H. O. - FINAL PLAT, ENERGY PLAZA I

Petitioner: Energy Center Partnership, Ltd.
Location: Lot 9, Block 2, Replat Crossroads Colorado West, 2759 Crossroads Blvd.

A request for office and storage use on 1.39 acres in a highway oriented zone.

JIM PICKENS read the request and opened the public hearing.

RIDER/SCHOENBECK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO TABLE #77-80, DEVELOPMENT IN H. O., FINAL PLAT, ENERGY PLAZA I, BECAUSE THE PETITIONER DID NOT APPEAR.

#76-80 CONDITIONAL USE, ELDERLY HOUSING

Petitioner: Grand Junction Housing Authority.
Location: South of Main Street between 8th and 9th Street.

A request for an elderly housing project on 1.14 acres.

JIM PICKENS read the request and opened the public hearing.

JIM PEARCE, Architect, appeared on behalf of the Petitioner, together with PAUL MALINOWSKI, and they outlined the Conditional Use for Elderly Housing proposed by the Grand Junction Housing Authority.

The parking situation was discussed by the Commission and the representatives of the Petitioner.

DALE SCHOENBECK: Do you feel, since you did the survey and you are much more aware than we are, you feel fairly comfortable, though, with the idea that half the spaces would be adequate, at even a peak time?

PAUL ROANOWSKI: Yes, and in fact, given the fact this project is down town, there is even going to be fewer people requiring cars.

DON WARNER: You will see very light parking, as far as business is concerned there, too. -- The retail business -- because the square footage would be comparable to L. Cook and Outwest Bootery, if they were put together would total the same square footage as they are talking about, and it's not much square footage of retail.

JIM PICKENS: I just want to make two general comments: Number one, I am totally in favor of elderly housing being downtown, rather than up in Monterey Park; number two, I wholeheartedly support the idea of having businesses with housing over the top. It's a great way to go, in my opinion.

VIRGINIA FLAGER: One of the prime things that the elderly need are easy access to medical facilities; Monterey Park is adjacent to medical facilities.

FLORENCE GRAHAM: I personally feel that the elderly like to be in the center of things. They like to be downtown, and another thing is that their next step from this type of complex is a nursing home, and I think that's where you have the waiting lists -- actually, there are many people who are living in nursing homes, if this type of facility were available, they could move out.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

JIM PEARCE responded to the Staff Comments, describing the trash pickup areas, the location of hydrants and discussions with the City Engineer in regard to the alley.

RIDER/SCHOENBECK PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #76-80 CONDITIONAL USE FOR ELDERLY HOUSING BY THE GRAND JUNCTION HOUSING AUTHORITY, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

#80-80 REZONE R1A TO PDB AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN,
FAIRMONT HEIGHTS MEDICAL CENTER.

Petitioner: Richard Livingston.

Location: 1200 feet West of 7th and North of Patterson.

A request to change from single family residential use to
planned business use on 2.3 acres.

- a. Consideration of zone.
- b. Consideration of Outline Development Plan.

RICHARD LIVINGSTON appeared at an earlier item on the Agenda
and requested continuance of this item to enable the Planning
Commission to hear it at a workshop session.

RIDER/FLAGER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO TABLE #80-80 REZONE
R1A TO PDB AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, FAIRMONT HEIGHTS MEDICAL
CENTER, UNTIL AFTER THE WORKSHOP, AT THE REQUEST OF THE PETITIONER.

The first meeting of the month of November was adjourned at
11:15 p.m.

** ** * * *