

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

June 30, 1981

The first meeting of the month of June was called to order at 7:29 p.m. by Chairperson JANE QUIMBY. The following members were present: TOM PRICE, RICHARD LITTLE, SUSAN RINKER, JACK OTT and ROSS TRANSMEIER.

ALEX CANDELARIA, Planning Staff, DON WARNER, Planning Analyst, BOB GOLDIN, Planning Staff, and LEILA E. MOSHER, Certified Shorthand Reporter, were also present. MARK ECKERT, Planning Staff, later joined the meeting. There were approximately twenty-five (25) interested citizens in the audience.

LITTLE/RINKER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 26, 1981 MEETING WITH THE DELETION OF A STATEMENT BY BILL RYDEN ON PAGE 6, AND CORRECTION IN THE SPELLING OF THE NAME OF TED STRAUGHAN.

JANE QUIMBY introduced the members of the Planning Commission to the assemblage, as there were several new members to the Commission.

JANE QUIMBY announced that item five, #48-81, Development in H. O., Super 8 Motel and Right of Way and Easement Vacation, had been pulled from the Agenda.

#23-80 HORIZON TOWERS - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: William Boll.
Location: Southwest corner of Horizon Drive and 12th Street (Gonzo Annex)

Contains 5.28 acres designed for a planned residential zone at a density of 34.9 units/acre. (Tabled for fact finding)

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

JANE QUIMBY: Subsequently we did not go to fact finding because in a more careful research of the background information we found that the density had been established and approved, and that there was not an opportunity for down zoning, so with that, the Planning Commission would -- is there anything the Petitioner would like to add, in addition to this?

DON WARNER: It is fact finding only.

JANE QUIMBY: But we did not go to fact finding.

DON WARNER: But the hearing was closed.

JANE QUIMBY: That's right, we did close the meeting. Do we need some action by the Planning Commission in regard to this item? You have all of the information that was submitted at the time of the public hearing.

RINKER/LITTLE PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION #23-80, FINAL PLAT AND PLAN OF THE HORIZON TOWERS DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF HORIZON DRIVE AND 12TH STREET, AND RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THIS ITEM, SUBJECT TO THE RESOLUTION OF ALL STAFF COMMENTS.

#58-81 CONDITIONAL USE - BEER AND WINE LICENSE

Petitioner: Thomas LaCroix.
Location: Northeast corner of 29th and North Avenue
(Flynn Subdivision)

A request for a beer and wine license on approximately 1.3 acres in a light commercial zone. (Tabled for fact finding)

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

JANE QUIMBY: One of the reasons that it was tabled was for a meeting with the neighborhood to see if there could be a resolution of the dispute. It is my understanding that there has been some additional information gained, and because we have two new Members on the Planning Commission who were not present at the last hearing, I am going to reopen this hearing for the submission of additional information.

THOMAS LaCROIX appeared for the Petitioner and presented a Petition and map to the Commission.

THOMAS LaCROIX: -- they have fourteen operations currently in the State of Colorado, and the entire time the Round-the-Corner has been in business, they have never had a liquor violation in their history, and they have never had a complaint or any actions taken against them, and for the Board's review, we also brought several large photographs of the interior and exterior of the building.

REED GUTHRIE appeared as one of the principals in the Round-the-Corner Restaurant and stated: The beer and wine is all from tap and is meant to be used with the meals. -- and we can't see any way that we would bring any detrimental quality of the residential neighborhood, which is immediately to the north of where the Restaurant is.

SUSAN RINKER: This is not a 3.2 license, right?

REED GUTHRIE: This is not a 3.2 license; beer and wine only.

BOB GOLDIN: Staff has no comments.

WINONA BECKNER appeared on behalf of her Mother, MRS. GEORGE FULTS and presented a petition to the Commission, objecting to the proposed conditional use for the beer and wine license.

JANE QUIMBY: Could you refresh for me what the area was that you covered with your petitions?

WINONA BECKNER: We covered a half mile radius square -- a square half mile radius. We covered 29 Road. We covered Harris Road. We covered Texas Avenue. We went down Elm Avenue. We do have the support of Nisley Elementary teachers, and I realize they are not residents of the neighborhood, but they did want to sign it, just to give their support to those who had signed it, as being a school in that area.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Your objection is not of the Restaurant, per se, but of any new liquor establishment in that area? Do you have a question of the reputation of this Company, or anything like that?

WINONA BECKNER: No, we don't. -- you know, it is not against the Restaurant being there; it's the license itself.

DORIS MCGILL appeared as a property owner twenty feet behind the proposed Restaurant and concurred with the comments of WINONA BECKNER.

THOMAS LaCROIX responded to the comments of the audience and stated the Restaurant does not have a bar in it, with everything behind the counter, and went on to describe the function of the Restaurant.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: What do you think the proposed closing time of the Restaurant would be?

THOMAS LaCROIX: 10:30.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

JANE QUIMBY: We are not approving or disapproving the liquor, the beer and wine license itself. The action that is before the Commission is the conditional use for a beer and wine license. It will be up to the City Council to make the determination as to whether or not a beer and wine license will be issued.

LITTLE/RINKER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION #58-81, CONDITIONAL USE, BEER AND WINE LICENSE, LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 29TH AND NORTH AVENUE, KNOWN AS ROUND-THE-CORNER RESTAURANT, AND HEREBY RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF #58-81, CONDITIONAL USE, BEER AND WINE LICENSE, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: THAT STAFF COMMENTS BE RESOLVED.

#61-81 REZONE R1C TO PR 27 - ATRISCO - OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Atrisco Investment Company, Levi Lucero.
Location: East of 28.5 Road, approximately 500' North of North Avenue.

A request to change from single family residential use at 7 units per acre to planned residential uses with a design density of 27.1 units per acre on 3.61 acres.

- a. Consideration of zone.
- b. Consideration of outline development plan.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

JANE QUIMBY: We have two actions before us tonight: One is consideration of the zone, and the second is the consideration of an outline development plan.

DEL BEAVER, of Paragon Engineering, appeared for the Petitioner, and the Petitioner was present. DEL BEAVER outlined the proposed Rezone R1C to PR 27, Atrisco, and the outline development plan, for the Commission.

BOB GOLDIN outlined the Review Sheet Comments and gave the Staff Recommendations.

DEL BEAVER responded to the Staff Comments, stating: We don't have any problem with attempting to maximize the green space. We would be sizing the business office accordingly. -- As far as landscaping, we will cover that at preliminary stage in detail.

JACK OTT: There is no place here for any open space, though. This is what you are saying, because of the type of people you are going to serve?

DEL BEAVER: No. I didn't say that. I said we would attempt to maximize the open space at preliminary development stage.

SUSAN RINKER: Do you have R V parking, for boats, etcetera?

DEL BEAVER: We will have sufficient parking in here, in accordance with the City --

SUSAN RINKER: That's not what I asked.

DEL BEAVER: Well, we don't have a separate R V storage area, but there will be enough parking stalls created to accommodate R V storage, in accordance with the parking regulations.

DON WARNER: -- I think they have got to refigure the density for the zoning, because the commercial figure can't be included in the overall density -- You don't have enough parking for the commercial building itself.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: What is the square footage of each unit?

LEVI LUCERO: It would be a little over seven hundred square feet.

MERLE NAIR: I have a business at 504 28.5 Road, several hundred feet away from here. I am not against the proposal. I have a couple of questions I would like answered, however. A number of years ago, when Cottonwood Meadows was put in, there was some question about the sewer in that area being large enough to handle Cottonwood Meadows. This sewer has been in over twenty years and probably was not designed for the impact it has had.

Also, from North Avenue to Elm Avenue, the three blocks is now only just a single paved strip -- no sidewalk, no curb, no gutter, and this puts a lot of cars in there, plus Levi's Restaurant, and his apartments next door. I feel that the street is going to have to be improved, but I don't feel that the neighborhood should have to do it.

As far as the density and so forth, I can see no objection to that.

LEVI LUCERO: I did speak with Fruitvale Sanitation, as far as the sewer. -- in fact, they called me up and they said that their study had proven that there was enough sewer capacity in their lines to accomodate our units, and so that's the time that we decided to proceed with our project, and we are willing to sign a Power of Attorney for street improvements.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

DON WARNER: Jane, I would like to just add one thing, and that is for their information: You are approving a concept, because it is an ODP, so you would be approving a concept of a commercial building.

RINKER/TRANSMEIER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO MOVE ITEM #61-81, REZONE R1C TO PR27, ATRISCO, OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, TO WORKSHOP FOR FURTHER STUDY.

DEL BEAVER: In your deliberations, can you give us specific things we can respond to?

DEL BEAVER and LEVI LUCERO commented on the motion.

JANE QUIMBY: I think that this Planning Commission also feels that they are very new at this game, and that they want to go through the proper procedure, and that they would like to have everything in place and resolved before they make a decision.

DEL BEAVER: You are anticipating this will be on the July Agenda?

JANE QUIMBY: Yes, sir.

#63-81 ZONING OF PERSIGO ANNEXATION TO PR-17 - OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

TOM LOGUE, of Paragon Engineering, appeared for the Petitioners and outlined the proposed zoning of Persigo Annexation, and the outline development plan, for the Commission.

GARY RAFFERTY, of Paragon Engineering, explained in detail and at length the planning aspects of the outline development plan, and the objectives of the builders of this project.

JACK OTT: What safety features do you have on that canal?

GARY RAFFERTY: Well, that's something we might have to get to. I don't know that anybody has ever addressed that situation.

JACK OTT: Pretty dangerous canal; pretty big.

DON WARNER: That's something that should be done at preliminary stage, rather than at ODP.

TOM PRICE: I understand that the Grand Junction sewage treatment plant is running at maximum right now.

GARY RAFFERTY: Well, I will tell you what: any questions regarding utilities things, I think I might let Tom --

TOM PRICE: I just have one question I can't answer. It is still foggy in my mind. If we are running at maximum right now, what is the impact of something like this going to be on the plant?

TOM LOGUE: The present facility located near the City Shops is operating at or near capacity as of this point. The new sewage treatment facility that is being constructed west of town, near the Port of Entry, or west of the Port of Entry, should be operational this year, will have capacity of sufficient quantity to afford sewer treatment from affluent generated from this site. The City Utility Department has seen the plan and has seen the proposal. I don't believe they have commented to the negative.

DON WARNER: They have a comment in here that it will be handled by the interim treatment plant, and they are saying the interim treatment plant will not be in service before November, 1981.

JANE QUIMBY: Tom, it is very warm in here tonight. Would you please be as brief as possible? I think your preceding people kind of took a little advantage.

TOM LOGUE responded to the Review Sheet Comments in brief.

JANE QUIMBY: Just a comment: I haven't reviewed in detail the Northwest Vicinity Plan, but I believe the assumptions were that is the maximum to which they could be built, but they probably wouldn't be.

TOM LOGUE: The planning would justify that increase in density.

JANE QUIMBY: Are there any comments from Staff?

BOB GOLDIN: Staff feels all technical issues can be resolved prior to preliminary, but again our major concern is with the overall anticipated influence of this area, both in itself and in relation to the surrounding area, and I think Mark is going to expand a little more on exactly what is our concern.

MARK ECKERT: I don't think we are ever going to see a better, more professional and hopefully, more length presentation than we saw tonight. Really, there was never any problem with the plan. The technical aspect of the plan is fine, but Staff, as Bob just said, our concern is due to it's geologic location on the periphery of the City as it is, and in relation to this border area and the projections that are proposed for the area around there, we have concern, not so much that the sewer plant is going to come on line, but there still is a timing problem.

-- Let me go on record as saying I am not satisfied that the current facilities plan will serve this Valley. That's where we are coming from on this.

JANE QUIMBY: It would seem that we have, for too long, been looking at one project here, one project here, and one over here, and not looking at the cumulative effect of all of the projects that are on line, or about to come on line, and there has to come a day of reckoning someplace, when you take 229 subdivisions that are in the process someplace along the line. What the effect is going to be of all of those projects and from the City's standpoint, it is even more crucial, because a number of those are in the County at this point and they will probably someday be in the City, and at this point there is not that much discussion by the City and County about the impact of those developments.

MARK ECKERT: Let me be more specific -- there is virtually no discussion between the City and County.

TOM LOGUE responded to the Review Sheet and Staff Comments.

JANE QUIMBY: Well, I would like to reiterate what the Staff Comment is, in that the technical aspects in the plan seem to be very well thought out, and if it were the only plan in the area to be considered at this point, I don't think it would have been a problem at all.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I think because of the size of this, that probably we need more time to study some of these things.

SAM HAUPT appeared, representing the developers, and appealed for some action on this item.

TOM PRICE: I think that we have some real big issues involved. I think we can all appreciate the money market and the way things are today, but I think, too, that you have to look at what we have to work with, such as road conditions, impacts, sewer conditions, and those types of things. And I think you will be the first to admit that we need to look at those. If we don't look at them, we are shirking our jobs.

TRANSMEIER/PRICE PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO TABLE #63-81, ZONING OF PERSIGO ANNEXATION, OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, FOR WORKSHOP STUDY, AND ATTEMPT TO RETURN THE ITEM TO THE AGENDA FOR THE JULY PUBLIC HEARING.

#60-81 REZONE R1C TO C2

Petitioner: Karl and Elizabeth Metzner
Location: Northeast corner of 28.5 Road and Gunnison Avenue.

A request to change from single family residential uses at approximately 7 units per acre to heavy commercial uses on .627 acres.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

KARL H. METZNER appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the requested Rezone R1C to C2, for the Commission.

JANE QUIMBY: Staff, do you have any comments?

BOB GOLDIN: No. All comments have been resolved at this time.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

JACK OTT: Is this zoning compatible with the surrounding area?

BOB GOLDIN: Yes, it is presently zoned part industrial, part commercial and part residential, so we feel the zoning is compatible.

PRICE/LITTLE PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #60-81, REZONE R1C to C2, KARL AND ELIZABETH METZNER, LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 28.5 ROAD AND GUNNISON AVENUE, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION; THAT WE HEREBY RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL BECAUSE THE PROPOSED REZONING DOES COMPLY WITH THE ADOPTED POLICIES AND OTHER FINDINGS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS BEING RESOLVED.

#64-81 REZONE R1C TO P

Petitioner: Dallas and Jack Payne.
Location: South of Belford Avenue and approximately 160' West of 7th Street.

A request to change from single family residential uses at approximately 7 units per acre to parking use on .11 acres.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

JANE QUIMBY: It is my understanding that there were no written comments that were received by the Department tonight, and it is a policy stated at the last meeting that if the comments were not submitted in writing prior to the hearing, the Planning Commission would not hear it.

PETITIONER: No problem. Thank you.

MARK HERMUNDSTAD, of Williams, Turner and Holmes, appeared and presented a petition on behalf of EDNA DOUGLAS, a property owner adjacent to the proposed rezone. MR. HERMUNDSTAD outlined the procedure used in obtaining the signatures on the petition.

MARK HERMUNDSTAD: One thing I would like to mention on behalf of Mrs. Douglas, that if this rezoning does go through, she has been told by the Planning Commission there would be a six foot high wood fence. She does not want a wood fence. She would prefer a chain link fence, or something, because the fence would be in very close proximity to her house, and she would feel boxed in by something like that, and so I would just like to get that in the record as one concern of her's, should it come to that.

I might add our concerns, in addition to any of the concerns the Staff has.

JANE QUIMBY: Mrs. Douglas, we will not take any action on this tonight, because we need some additional information from the Petitioner, but the information that has been presented will be included in the record and then it will be considered at the next meeting, when we make the decision on this rezoning.

JANE QUIMBY: We will table this item until the July public hearing.

#44-81 FARREL ROPER INVESTMENTS - FINAL PLAT AND PLAN

Petitioner: Farrel Roper.
Location: Northwest corner of 15th and Cedar Streets.

Contains .90 acres designed for 20 units in a planned residential zone of 22 units per acre.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

FARREL ROPER appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the final plat and plan, for the Commission.

Discussion was heard by Staff, the Petitioner and the Commission concerning the proposed parking area.

HARLAN DAVIS appeared and advised the Commission that the survey made in the area is not correct and that his fenceline is in the proper place and should be kept that way.

DON WARNER: This fence that Mr. Davis is mentioning has been there for years.

BILL RYDEN: -- we did our boundary survey in accordance with Mr. Roper's Deeds, and I have also done extensive work in that block. -- if he would like to come in to my office, I would be glad to go through the Deeds with him and try to find out where that six feet went.

JANE QUIMBY: We appreciate that very much. Thank you. Mr. Davis, do you understand? He said that he has a lot of surveys and so forth and he would be very happy to work with you to see if we can find out what happened to that six feet. Okay?

HARLAN DAVIS: Okay. Thank you.

JANE QUIMBY: We will have the Staff help him in that work, also.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

BOB GOLDIN: As long as we see the curb cuts as proposed, prior to City Council; also, that we resolve any parking issues prior to that time, as well.

DON WARNER: We would like to do that at Staff level.

RINKER/TRANSMEIER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #44-81, FARREL ROPER INVESTMENTS, FINAL PLAT AND PLAN, AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 15TH AND CEDAR STREETS, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION: THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ITEM, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS BEING RESOLVED BEFORE SUBMISSION TO CITY COUNCIL.

#41-81 HARRY M'S EXPANSION OF LIQUOR LICENSE IN H.O. ZONE

Petitioner: Harry Mahlaras.
Location: 715 Horizon Drive.

A request for an expansion of liquor license in a highway oriented zone.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

HARRY MAHLARAS appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the proposed expansion of liquor license in an H. O. Zone, for Harry M's Restaurant.

JANE QUIMBY: Staff, any comments?

BOB GOLDIN: No comments on this.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

LITTLE/TRANSMEIERS PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #41-81, HARRY M'S EXPANSION OF LIQUOR LICENSE IN AN H. O. ZONE, AT 715 HORIZON DRIVE, TO THE CITY COUNCIL; THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THIS ITEM TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

#9-79 FIRST STREET CORRIDOR POLICY, AMENDED.

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission.
Location: North of Kennedy Avenue to F.25 Road.

A request to amend the First Street Corridor Policy.

JANE QUIMBY opened the public hearing on the First Street Corridor Policy, Amended, and the policy statements.

JANE QUIMBY: Staff probably doesn't have any more comments?

BOB GOLDIN: No. We are done.

ALEX CANDELARIA: This First Street Policy has been reviewed by three Planning Commission and fined and tuned to what obviously there hasn't been that much of a change; it has just gotten stronger and stronger language as far as negating residential business.

I would like to go on record as in favor of this First Street Policy for some insured protection to the residential area being the fact that there is -- this is one Policy that would insure some sort of protection to the residential area, which would not allow any type of businesses there in this vicinity.

WALTER THOMS appeared as a landowner on First Street and objected to the Amended First Street Policy, and presented an aerial photograph to the Commission, outlining the various uses on First Street at the present time.

JANE QUIMBY: First of all, we did not develop this Policy. It was developed back in 1979 by another Planning Commission, and was adopted by the City Council, and as petitions or proposals have come along the Planning Commission, I believe, has held somewhat fast in ideals to this Policy. We are the planning and advisory body to the City Council; what the City Council does with what we recommend to them is their own business.

WALTER THOMS: Maybe that's where I am upset, because I am a relatively new property owner in there; nobody comes to me and asks my input, my ideas.

JANE QUIMBY: -- I don't think we have to invite you; that is a responsibility for you. There is public notice and so forth about it. We have been talking about the First Street Policy for the last three months.

DON WARNER: This is what was adopted at the behest of the people out there.

WALTER THOMS: But even the changes that are being made, I think they are drastic, and there should be some input from the neighborhood.

DON WARNER: What changes are you referring to?

WALTER THOMS: You are stating there will be no business on First Street.

DON WARNER: It already said that.

SUSAN RINKER: Did you hear a comment about what we have been shown to be put on First Avenue? Have you seen any of the drawings?

WALTER THOMS: No. I haven't, I don't think.

VICTOR DANIEL appeared as an owner of property in the area and objected to the proposed First Street Corridor Policy as Amended. VICTOR DANIEL went into a specific proposal that had been presented to the Planning Commission and was before the City Council.

DON WARNER: I understand what he is saying, but I think I can paraphrase it in just a few words. He is saying any development on First Street should respect the residential nature of the Street.

VICTOR DANIEL: You said it beautifully.

BOB INGELKE appeared, objected to the First Street Corridor Policy, as Amended, and outlined the history of the Policy and the First Street area.

BOB INGELKE: Is it part of the Comprehensive Plan? Is it part of your Master Plan on Comprehensive Planning? Is this a part of it, or is this just a document? You have got some old ex-planners running around here, some ex-Staff people, who are very frustrated, because we try to play by the Rules. Is this a Rule? What is this thing?

RICHARD LITTLE: It is a guideline.

DON WARNER: Bob, let me interrupt for half a second: The planners like you asked for this as an indication of what this group would consider along certain Corridors.

BOB INGELKE: Because we want to know what Rules we are playing by, and that's the name of the game, so there are rules about how you all make rules.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

WALTER THOMS and VICTOR DANIEL discussed the petitions that had been presented and were in the respective files for items they had previously presented to the Commission.

JANE QUIMBY: Part of the problem was that there were several requests came before the Council, Vic, and it seems there was some difficulty with the decisions and there obviously was some difficulty with the Policy, and the Council sent it back to the Planning Commission to review it, to amend or revise, or whatever, and this is the result of that effort.

RICHARD LITTLE: Jane, specifically, the changes that were made in here that started with us, and not with City Council, though. Is that right?

JANE QUIMBY: That's correct. We made the changes. The Council had requested that the Planning Commission look at the First Street Policy again and see if they felt there were any changes which needed to be made in there, and then to resubmit it to the Council, and so that's --

RICHARD LITTLE: That's what we are doing.

JANE QUIMBY: That's what we are doing.

TOM PRICE: Madam Chairman, I think I have to say something. I am not comfortable with this no further business. I just feel bad about it. I think there is an alternative to that. -- I don't think we have ever shut the door and said no, and that's kind of what that is saying.

Staff and the Commission and the audience discussed the corner of First Street and Patterson Road at length, in regard to the extension of Horizon Drive and the business potential for that particular corner.

Discussion was had in regard to an appeal before the City Council by WALTER THOMS.

DON WARNER: Could I make one statement and ask one question? First, I would like to say -- God knows I hate to agree with him, more than anything else. I would have to say that I agree with him somewhat on the problem of being specific in the Policy. Second is a question: Would you be willing to drop your appeal from tomorrow night's Council Meeting, if there was an indication from this Commission that they might soften their deal and look at your project at a work session, and maybe come back with a recommendation first?

I have not asked them anything here. I am just making a statement and asking a question.

VICTOR DANIEL: That would postpone us another month, then.

WALTER THOMS: I just wish this could have come about sooner.

DON WARNER: I think we have learned a lot of things here tonight.

WALTER THOMS: We have, too.

PRICE/RINKER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO WITHDRAW THE FIRST STREET CORRIDOR POLICY, AS AMENDED, FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION.

JANE QUIMBY: I still didn't get an answer from our question. I still didn't get an answer from you. You have until eight o'clock tomorrow night.

BOB GOLDIN: 7:30, really.

WALTER THOMS: We will give you a call tomorrow, one way or the other.

The first meeting of the month of June, 1981, was adjourned at 11:32 p.m.

** ** *