

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

August 25, 1981

The first meeting of the month of August, 1981 was called to order at 7:29 p.m. by Chairperson JANE QUIMBY. The following members were present: SUSAN RINKER, RICHARD LITTLE, MILAND DUNIVENT, ROSS TRANSMEIER, JACK OTT and TOM PRICE.

BOB GOLDIN, Planning Staff, MARK ECKERT, Planning Staff, DON WARNER, Planning Analyst, and LEILA E. MOSHER, Certified Shorthand Reporter, were also present. There were approximately forty interested citizens in the audience.

JANE QUIMBY announced that item 4, #72-81, REZONE RMF-64 TO C 1 had been pulled from the Agenda, that item 5, #68-81, REZONE RSF-8 TO PR-23 AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN had been pulled from the Agenda, and that item 6, #70-81, REZONE RSF-8 TO PB AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, had been pulled from the Agenda.

DUNIVENT/LITTLE PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 14, 1981 MEETING.

DUNIVENT/LITTLE PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 28, 1981 MEETING, WITH THE CORRECTION ON PAGE 5 THAT SUSAN RINKER VOTED AGAINST ALL THREE MOTIONS THEREIN.

TEXT AMENDMENT - GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE

Petitioner: Airport Authority.

An amendment to the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code to add an Airport Overlay Zone governing uses within, and establish new compatible land uses around the airport.

BOB GOLDIN outlined the Text Amendment for the Commission.

PAUL BOWERS, Airport Manager for Walker Field, appeared and outlined the proposed Text Amendment, pointed out the areas on the map and outlined the need for the Amendment.

BOB ENGELKE appeared and spoke in opposition to the Text Amendment and questioned the procedure followed in requesting the Text Amendment, as well as the notice to property owners that would be affected by the Airport Overlay Zone.

JOHN BALLAGH appeared and spoke in opposition to the Text Amendment, questioned the procedure that had been followed, and stated he felt an impact statement should be forthcoming before any action could be taken by the Commission on this item.

PAUL BOWERS responded to the comments of BOB ENGELKE and JOHN BALLAGH, stating the County Planning Commission had taken the item to fact finding to attempt to answer some of the questions that had been raised. PAUL BOWERS further stated the Text Amendment had been put together and coordinated with the City - County Attorney Ashby and the legal process was the same as that followed in the past.

MILAND DUNIVENT: I am a little disturbed -- and I am sure that we are going to have an airport -- at least I would hope so -- and I am a little disturbed that it was stated that the Airport is trying to protect itself. It would appear to me that we are looking at this thing to protect the people as well as the Airport, providing that the people are aware of what they are buying, and some way, in some piece of paper, that they are made aware of that.

JANE QUIMBY: I do believe that the Commission and the Council are charged with looking at the health, safety and welfare of the general public, and I think that's where we get the authority, at least to consider something like this.

MARK ECKERT: I would like to make a general comment as a newcomer to the area. I can't address the legal arguments -- I am not a lawyer, and I am not going to attempt to, but it continues to amaze me that the people of Grand Junction want to duplicate the errors of every other metropolitan area in the country. Not adopting something like this will encourage making those same errors.

RICHARD LITTLE: Does the Staff think the procedure we followed in coming up with this document is correct?

BOB GOLDIN: We will abide by Mr. Ashby's decision, which it was. It should be stated, also, this is a text amendment; it is not a consideration of a rezone. On that, the legal advertising and all legal ramifications, as far as we were concerned, was correct.

RICHARD LITTLE: So public notification, to whatever degree it was done, was done and done correctly?

BOB GOLDIN: Right. Individual notification of individual property owners is not required on a text amendment.

CHARLES COE, of Apple Crest Subdivision, appeared and stated they had been notified about the airplanes flying over, but they were supposed to be 88 feet in the air.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

LITTLE/DUNIVENT PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT THE TEXT AMENDMENT - GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, TO ADD AN AIRPORT OVERLAY ZONE, TO THE CITY COUNCIL; THAT THE TEXT AMENDMENT IS RECOMMENDED FOR ADOPTION.

JANE QUIMBY: And in the forwarding of this recommendation to the City Council we will give them some additional information as to the kind of discussion that we had, and the concerns that were voiced.

REED GUTHRIE appeared before the Commission and outlined the need for an extension of time on an area in PD, approximately 1.7 acres, on Wellington Street, East of 12th Street, stating they had been waiting for economics in the country to improve before commencing development.

JANE QUIMBY: It is my understanding -- correct me if I am wrong -- two years ago, you did have a preliminary plan approved?

REED GUTHRIE: We had a conceptual.

JANE QUIMBY: An ODP?

REED GUTHRIE: Yes.

JANE QUIMBY: Okay. The reason I am asking that is on the Review Sheet it shows as a preliminary.

BOB GOLDIN: It was a preliminary.

JANE QUIMBY: It was a preliminary, so I guess from the standpoint -- at least from my standpoint as a Member of this Commission, I don't know a thing about that plan. That was two years ago. And I don't know whether I want to approve an extension of that when I don't even know what we are talking about.

MILAND DUNIVENT: Mr. Guthrie, how much time were you asking?

REED GUTHRIE: All right. Give us until 1 January to get this in.

BOB GOLDIN: Staff would like some clarification, then, as to why Mr. Wyman requested ninety days, and then turns around and asks for close to six months from the time of the letter, dating July 16th.

TRANSMEIER/PRICE PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO TABLE #38-79 UNTIL THE REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN CAN BE PROVIDED BY THE PETITIONER, ON OR BEFORE JANUARY 1, 1982.

#77-81 CONDITIONAL USE 3.2 LIQUOR LICENSE

Petitioner: Mesa College.
Location: Mesa College Snack Bar.

A request for a 3.2 liquor license.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

JAY JEFFERSON appeared as Director of the College Center and outlined the request for the conditional use 3.2 liquor license on behalf of Mesa College.

RICHARD LITTLE: Jay, just a question: Will this be open to the public, or just to the students of Mesa College?

JAY JEFFERSON: Well, it would be open to the public as such, although we are not soliciting it to be a public pub, no, because it is not a pub to start with. It is just to be served on the line, as you go through to get a hamburger, or whatever, to get a beer, is all.

MILAND DUNIVENT: Would this eliminate or preclude special permits that the College now gets?

JAY JEFFERSON: I don't foresee it eliminating special permits entirely.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I presume this has passed through the College authorities, or Board, or Dean, or whoever?

JAY JEFFERSON: Yes. It was voted on by the students first, and received, of course, overwhelming support, and then it was brought before the Administration of the College, which in turn took it to the Trustees, and of course, that's in kind of a holding pattern at the Trustees at the present time, depending upon the action of the City and the Planning Commission.

JIMMY DEE appeared as President of the Student Body at Mesa College and spoke in favor of the request.

FRED KAUFMAN, 1334 Mesa Avenue, appeared and stated the people in the area had so many problems already with the college students and drinking and they felt this would just add to the problems.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I would like to make a comment. I think I probably ought to vote in favor of this. I think it is probably the wrong place for liquor, but I don't think it is the City's place to say so. I think it is up to the College Administration to govern their own campus, and for that reason I think I would vote in favor of it, but I really am opposed to it actually happening. I don't

think it ought to be taught in the College that it is socially acceptable to do these things. I think people learn it soon enough. Granted, they are going to drink anyway.

LITTLE/RINKER PASSED 5-1 (PRICE AGAINST) A MOTION TO SUBMIT #77-81, CONDITIONAL USE 3.2 LIQUOR LICENSE, MESA COLLEGE, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

#75-81 REZONE RMF-64 TO P

Petitioner: Granum Investments.
Location: Ouray Avenue (north half of block) between 2nd and 3rd Streets/Lots 1-16, Block 76, Grand Junction.

A request to change from multi-family residential uses at 64 units per acre to parking uses on approximately 1.15 acres.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

DENNY GRANUM appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the request for Rezone RMF-64 to P, for the Commission.

DON WARNER: Denny, are you going to put a sprinkler system in there, between the sidewalk and the curb, to keep the grass up there?

DENNY GRANUM: We have done that on the south half of the block, put a sprinkler system out there. I can't answer that question. I think we probably will.

DON WARNER: I think it will be required, because we did require that already. We did require it in the next block up from the Church.

DENNY GRANUM: We don't have any problem with that.

JANE QUIMBY: This parking is needed for the building that you are presently building on the corner of 2nd?

DENNY GRANUM: Right.

JANE QUIMBY: I guess we probably would like a written statement, Denny, to be attached to whatever --

DENNY GRANUM: It will be landscaped and maintained. If you need it in writing, that's fine.

JANE QUIMBY: We do.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

DUNIVENT/RINKER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #75-81, REZONE RMF-64 TO P, FOR GRANUM INVESTMENTS, LOCATED ON OURAY AVENUE, BETWEEN 2ND AND 3RD STREETS, LOTS 1-16, BLOCK 76, GRAND JUNCTION, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

#76-81 NORTHEAST CHRISTIAN CHURCH - FINAL PLAT AND PLAN

Petitioner: Northeast Christian Church.
Location: South of Patterson, East of 27.5 section line.

A request for a final plan and plat on 3.5 acres in a planned business zone.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

ROBERT McCLUNG appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the Final Plat and Plan for the Northeast Christian Church, for the Commission.

BOB GOLDIN: All Staff Comments have been resolved. Staff has no other concerns, except at the time the plat is recorded a Power of Attorney be provided.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

TRANSMEIER/RINKER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #76-81, NORTHEAST CHRISTIAN CHURCH, FINAL PLAT, LOCATED SOUTH OF PATTERSON, EAST OF 27.5 SECTION LINE, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

TRANSMEIER/PRICE PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #76-81, NORTHEAST CHRISTIAN CHURCH, FINAL PLAN, LOCATED SOUTH OF PATTERSON, EAST OF 27.5 SECTION LINE, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

#78-81 ZONING OF THOMPSON ANNEXATION TO PR-8 AND CORTLAND SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Vern Thompson.
Location: North of Cortland Avenue and East of Applecrest Subdivision.

A request to zone Thompson's annexation to planned residential of 8 units per acre on 2.61 acres.

- a. Consideration of zone
- b. Consideration of preliminary plan.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

KENT HARBERT, of Western Engineers, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the zoning of Thompson Annexation to PR-8, and Cortland Subdivision Preliminary Plan, for the Commission.

KENT HARBERT: -- and in this case it was my error, and we would like to revise it to the actual density of a PR-5, or smaller.

JANE QUIMBY: Then we will go with the fact that PR-5 is the maximum density which we are looking to develop.

TOM PRICE: Are you going to provide an agreement on the cul de sac -- a letter of commitment on that?

JANE QUIMBY: I believe what we need, Tom, is a dedication of that, is that not correct?

BOB GOLDIN: Yes.

JANE QUIMBY: Dedicating it to the City.

KENT HARBERT: Right. The adjacent property owner will dedicate it; we don't own it. Mr. Singh has agreed, and the developer has worked that out with him, that that will be dedicated to the City.

BOB GOLDIN: We will need that dedication prior to the final plat being recorded.

JANE QUIMBY: Staff, are there comments?

BOB GOLDIN: Just that it be made clear that it is a change from PR-5 to PR-4.2, at eleven units on the proposed site, and that be made clear in the motion, and the revision of the plat be submitted prior to City Council hearing.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

LITTLE/TRANSMEIER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #78-81, ZONING OF THOMPSON ANNEXATION TO PR-4.2, FOR VERN THOMPSON, LOCATED NORTH OF CORTLAND AVENUE AND EAST OF APPLECREST SUBDIVISION, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

LITTLE/PRICE PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #78-81, CORTLAND SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY PLAN, LOCATED NORTH OF CORTLAND AVENUE AND EAST OF APPLECREST SUBDIVISION, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND RECEIPT OF THE DEDICATION OF THE CUL DE SAC.

#79-81 ZONING OF GRAF ANNEXATION TO PR-19.4 AND WOODSMOKE PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: John Kilpatrick.
Location: West of 29 Road and North of Grand Valley Canal

A request to zone Graf annexation to planned residential at 19.4 units per acre on 13 acres.

- a. Consideration of zone.
- b. Consideration of preliminary plan.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

TOM LOGUE, of Paragon Engineering, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the request for zoning of Graf Annexation to PR-19.4 and Woodsmoke Preliminary Plan.

JANE QUIMBY: Do you have an equitable solution on the remaining four hundred feet of that road?

TOM LOGUE: I don't know if there is any way -- I hate to put the problem off -- to see if there is some way to tie it into the development of the other side, once that happens. It may not be for one year, ten years or fifty years, but it is inevitable.

RICHARD LITTLE: Yes, but that's the point: the impacts will come with this development and not five years or fifty years down the road.

TOM LOGUE: I get the impression the major question is what assessment should Woodsmoke pay for improvements to 29 Road.

JANE QUIMBY: I think that's right.

MARK ECKERT: That's it in a nutshell.

BOB GOLDIN: We have two other technical aspects: One is we need designation of the 100 year flood plain -- the other one is we need to get in touch with Mr. Graf as to zoning the rest of the annexation.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

RICHARD LITTLE: Madam Chairman, I feel there is so much unresolved about this particular project at this point, I think it should go to fact finding, or be tabled until some equitable agreement is reached regarding either the zone or the preliminary plan.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I think we resolved everything but the money thing, in my mind. They promised to get with them. We don't like to let this slip to final, but I think he has got a pretty well produced plan.

JANE QUIMBY: Would the solution be that this must be resolved before it goes to City Council?

BOB GOLDIN: For preliminary or final?

JANE QUIMBY: For preliminary. The discussion about the improvements of the road.

DUNIVENT/RINKER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #79-81, ZONING OF GRAF ANNEXATION TO PR-19.4 BY PETITIONER JOHN KILPATRICK, LOCATED WEST OF 29 ROAD AND NORTH OF GRAND VALLEY CANAL, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THE ZONE.

DUNIVENT/RINKER PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #79-81, WOODSMOKE PRELIMINARY PLAN, BY PETITIONER JOHN KILPATRICK, LOCATED WEST OF 29 ROAD AND NORTH OF GRAND VALLEY CANAL, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS BEING RESOLVED PRIOR TO FINAL SUBMITTAL, SPECIFICALLY CONCERNING THE IMPROVEMENT OF 29 ROAD.

#33-81 COLONY PARK FILING #1 - FINAL PLAT AND PLAN

Petitioner: Ted L. Straughn.
Location: 660 feet East of 25 Road, South side of F Road.

A request for 75 units on 3.9280 acres in an approved planned residential zone of 11 units per acre.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

TED STRAUGHN appeared as the Petitioner and spoke to the concerns of the Commission in regard to F Road.

RICHARD LITTLE: I am somewhat confused in reading the City Engineer's comments of May 17th, and then the comments made by the City Engineer on August 17th, and Ted's comments here.

BOB GOLDIN: As of August 24th, which is the letter we received this afternoon, Mr. Rish stated five areas of contention -- if Ted is willing to agree to all of this, the City Engineer then goes on to say that he doesn't see any problem with that. We talked a little this afternoon on it, but as far as the actual -- what we would need is either approval per Mr. Rish's recommendations here, in writing, prior to City Council approval, or whatever the Commission deems necessary concerning the issue involved.

TOM PRICE: Well, I am questioning going against the thinking of the City Engineer, who is a professional in his field.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: In my opinion, I think you are probably right. I think two sidewalks down a residential street that doesn't go very far is probably too many. If the purpose of having two sidewalks, from the City Engineer's point of view, is just to allow foot traffic, I think that one would probably be adequate, in my opinion.

TOM PRICE: What was his comment to you when you were talking with him on this?

TED STRAUGHN: His comment was that's what he wants; that's what he is going to continue to want, and that if -- correct me if I'm wrong, Bob, because Bob was at the meeting with me -- he said if the Planning Commission and the Council dictate otherwise, he will live with it, and it was my understanding, coming away from that meeting, that this was a forum to decide that disagreement.

BOB ENGELKE commented on the location of sidewalks in the development, stating they had as many sidewalks as conveniently could be developed, but they weren't all adjacent to the street.

BOB GOLDIN: Are you anticipating the first filing to be followed rapidly by the second, third and fourth?

TED STRAUGHN: If the economy allows.

BOB GOLDIN: What I am concerned about, you are going to build the first filing with almost no sidewalks or bike paths in it.

TOM PRICE: Madam Chairman, I would like to make just one comment, that is on the Engineering Department. I feel strongly that this should be gone over with the Engineering Department, and I don't feel that I am an expert in his particular field, and I, for one, am willing to go along with his recommendation.

JANE QUIMBY: I am somewhat concerned about the question that was raised as to whether or not he was aware of the additional sidewalks. If this has been done since the conversation, perhaps he was not aware of it.

BOB ENGELKE discussed the revision that had been sent to the Engineering Department for review.

JANE QUIMBY: I guess I want to see it, Bob. I don't want you to tell me what that is. I want to see it in black and white. -- then I guess the solution is you better get back with the Engineer and make him aware of this, and get the comments from the Engineer back to us.

We want to know which plan you are dealing with, so we can be sure everybody is talking about the same thing. Obviously, there is a plan there, there's one there, and there's one there. We don't know which one we are dealing with. At least, I don't.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: They are saying they have one point of view, and the City Engineer has another.

MARK ECKERT: Could the Staff act as intermediaries on this high powered problem, so that we can get it resolved to everyone's benefit? -- if it can't be resolved, for whatever reason, Staff has the option to not even place it on the Agenda.

BOB GOLDIN: If the sidewalk issue cannot be resolved prior to City Council, then we will pull it back for hearing to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission can make a motion for recommendation to either overturn the City Engineer, or to abide by his expertise, if that's agreeable.

TED STRAUGHN: I will agree with that, because I want to continue with this process.

RINKER/TRANSMEIER PASSED 5-0 (LITTLE ABSTAINING) A MOTION TO SUBMIT TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION #33-81, COLONY PARK FILING #1, FINAL PLAT, FOR PETITIONER TED L. STRAUGHN, LOCATED 660 FEET EAST OF 25 ROAD, SOUTH SIDE OF F ROAD, AND WOULD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAT, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS BEING RESOLVED PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO CITY COUNCIL; IF STAFF COMMENTS CANNOT BE RESOLVED AS TO THE SIDEWALK ISSUE THE MATTER WILL BE RETURNED BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THE NEXT AGENDA.

RINKER/TRANSMEIER PASSED 5-0 (LITTLE ABSTAINING) A MOTION TO SUBMIT TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION #33-81, COLONY PARK FILING #1, FINAL PLAN, FOR PETITIONER TED L. STRAUGHN, LOCATED 660 FEET EAST OF 25 ROAD, SOUTH SIDE OF F ROAD, AND WOULD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS BEING RESOLVED.

#80-81 VACATION OF RIGHT OF WAYS AND UTILITIES EASEMENTS

Petitioner: Joe Willoughby and Edward Elinwood.
Location: East and West of Laveta Street and North of Unawweep Avenue.

A request to vacate one road right of way, two alley right of ways, one utility easement, and one irrigation easement.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

CONNIE McDONOUGH, of Chambliss and Associates, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the request for vacation of rights of way East and West of Laveta Street and North of Unawweep Avenue.

TOM LYNCH appeared as a property owner along the alleyway in the area and objected to the proposal, stating he would not like to have the access to the apartments along the alley.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: If the developer put up those gates, as they were talking about, and had access to five parking spaces off that alley, would that be too much traffic for your residence?

TOM LYNCH: They would have to make a pretty good grade down off of there, because it's six feet off of there. Then, there is a waste ditch that cuts across right there on Lot No. 7. It comes along the side of it and then goes along the alleyway and down into the big ditch down below, too, and it would have to be taken care of.

JASPER WILSON appeared as a property owner in the area of the proposal and stated he was concerned with the west ditch since it was the only place they had to get rid of waste water from the whole block above and on the east side.

LOREN LUSTER appeared as a property owner in the area and stated there were twelve families he knew about that were in opposition to the proposal because of the traffic that would be travelling the alleyway.

TONY KOVACIC appeared as a property owner in the area and concurred with the statements of LOREN LUSTER.

JANE QUIMBY: I guess I am wondering, since the hour is so late, but it seems as though we have a goodly number of people here tonight who are interested in this, and I am wondering if maybe the procedure needs to be if maybe a neighborhood meeting would help to resolve some of the concerns that some of the people have.

CONNIE McDONOUGH responded to some of the concerns of the neighborhood in general, discussing the traffic in the alleyway and the waste ditch.

CONNIE McDONOUGH: And again let me say we would be very happy to meet with the neighborhood people. I will personally send them an invitation to come to a meeting before we go to Council, so that we can specifically address all their concerns about irrigation water, and we will be out there working with them in the meantime.

JOE WILLOUGHBY addressed the Commission as one of the owners of the property to be developed.

JANE QUIMBY: I think that we need to either table this until the neighbors can have a discussion at a more reasonable hour of the night, and I really regret that perhaps I should have used the Chairman's prerogative -- I'm sorry we kept you here until so late -- but I am wondering if we will be able to resolve this to everyone's satisfaction this evening.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I just have one comment that really bothers me, and that is the unresolved portion of the park. If we approve the vacation, then that's it, and the City still has no assurance it will be a park, extended, or anything will happen, but the street is lost to us.

PRICE/LITTLE PASSED 5-1 (TRANSMEIER AGAINST) A MOTION TO TABLE #80-81, VACATION OF RIGHT OF WAYS AND UTILITIES EASEMENTS, PETITIONER JOE WILLOUGHBY AND EDWARD ELINWOOD, LOCATED EAST AND WEST OF LAVETA STREET AND NORTH OF UNAWEEP AVENUE, UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE NEIGHBORHOOD CAN GET TOGETHER WITH THE PETITIONER AND RESOLVE SOME OF THE ISSUES.

#54-81 MERIDIAN PARK - FINAL PLAT AND PLAN.

Petitioner: Ray Phipps.
Location: Northeast corner of 27.75 Road and
Highway 50.

A request for a final plat and plan for a business park on 25.74 acres in a highway oriented zone.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

TOM LOGUE, of Paragon Engineering, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the Final Plat and Plan for Meridian Park, for the Commission.

JANE QUIMBY: I have some real difficulty with looking at all that on B.5 Road and knowing that there are going to be all those turning movements -- even if you cut them down to three.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I sure like your first plan better than your second one.

MILAND DUNIVENT: Personally, I like the internal access.

BOB GOLDIN: There needs to be the input from the State Highway, and also the resolution of internal access versus B.5 Road access.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I would like the record to show there is no-one else present to speak for or against.

RINKER/DUNIVENT PASSED 6-0 A MOTION TO TABLE #54-81, MERIDIAN PARK, FINAL PLAT AND PLAN, PETITIONER RAY PHIPPS, LOCATED ON THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 27.75 ROAD AND HIGHWAY 50, UNTIL THE SEPTEMBER HEARING, TO GIVE THE PETITIONER TIME TO GET WITH THE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT AND RESOLVE THE PROBLEMS WITH THE STAFF REGARDING THE INTERNAL ACCESS CIRCULATION AND HAVE THE INPUT FROM THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT ON B.5 ROAD.

The first meeting of the month of August, 1981, was adjourned at 12:07 a.m.

** ** *