

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

September 29, 1981

The first meeting of the month of September, 1981 was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairperson JANE QUIMBY. The following members were present: MILAND DUNIVENT, ROSS TRANSMEIER, JACK OTT, SUSAN RINKER, and RICHARD LITTLE.

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

LITTLE/DUNIVENT PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 25, 1981 MEETING.

88-81 TEXT AMENDMENT - TEXT CHANGE TO SECTION 5-8-4E FLOODPLAIN MAPS & CHAPTER 13 DEFINITIONS

Petitioner: City/County Development Department.

A proposal to adopt amended and updated floodplain maps and study for portions of the City of Grand Junction, and adding Flood Insurance Rate Maps to the list of definitions, Chapter 13.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

(No public input or no comments from audience.)

BOB GOLDIN: Staff has no concerns. If there is any comments or questions from the audience, we will be happy to answer them here, or in the Department.

DUNIVENT/RINKER PASSED 4-0 (TRANSMEIER ABSTAINING) A MOTION TO SUBMIT #88-81, A REQUEST FOR TEXT AMENDMENT, TEXT CHANGE TO SECTION 5-8-4E, FLOODPLAIN MAPS & CHAPTER 13 DEFINITIONS TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

9-79 FIRST STREET CORRIDOR POLICY AS 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 read the request and opened the public hearing.

JANE QUIMBY: This has a rather long history and some extensive work on the part of the Planning Commission. (No public input or no comments from audience.)
JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

TRANSMEIER/LITTLE PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #9-79, FIRST STREET CORRIDOR POLICY, AS AMENDED, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

#72-81 REZONE RMF-64 TO C1

Petitioner: C. K. and Vivian Whitmire.
Location: West of Peach Street and approximately 150' North of West Ouray.

A request to change from multi-family residential uses at 64 units per acre to light commercial uses on .5 acre.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

CHARLES THOMAS appeared for the Petitioner.

JANE QUIMBY submitted a letter for the record written by Mr. Thomas to the Planning Commission Members.

CHARLES THOMAS outlined again questioned the procedure for protests and opposition to his proposal and stated his understanding of the law governing such procedure.

BOB GOLDIN: The Staff really has no other concerns that haven't been discussed already.

VIOLA BUESCHER appeared and spoke in favor of the proposed rezone RMF to C1, stating she had property within two blocks from the request and she was in agreement with MR. THOMAS.

MARVIN MALDONADO appeared as a property owner, stated he had not been contacted by MR. THOMAS, he has been attempting to improve his property, wants to retain the residential character of the neighborhood and is in opposition to the proposed rezone.

JANE QUIMBY: Mr. Maldonado, you are saying you were not contacted by the property owner?

MARVIN MALDONADO: By the individual proposing this, yes. I don't know for sure, but I am sure there has been some others that weren't contacted, also, I have heard -- I don't know whether it's a rumor, or not, but it seemed like the individual was trying to create friction amongst the owners down there. I don't know what actually had happened.

JANE QUIMBY: If my recollection was correct, it was tabled at the other meeting for a neighborhood meeting, is that not correct?

BOB GOLDIN: That is correct.

JANE QUIMBY: That was one of the reasons, because there seems to be such a diversity of opinion about it, so we had tabled it and requested the Petitioner get together with the neighborhood and see if this could be resolved.

VIRGINIA TRUJILLO appeared as a homeowner in the area and presented a petition as follows:

"We, the undersigned, of Mesa County, that reside in the 'El Poso Area', are against the rezoning of Section #72-81 (Rezone RMF-64 to C1)."

The Petition contained ten signatures of property owners in the area.

VIRGINIA TRUJILLO stated she was in opposition because of the increase in traffic.

JANE QUIMBY: Are the neighbors objecting to any kind of development on that piece of property, or are they objecting to the commercial development?

VIRGINIA TRUJILLO: No. They said if they want to build a house, fine, but we do not want to go commercial, due to the traffic, and dust, and pollution.

JANE QUIMBY: Since the last meeting, have you had any contact with the owner of the property?

VIRGINIA TRUJILLO: No. We have had no contact at all.

JULIA MALDONADO appeared as a property owner in the area and inquired as to why the Petitioners were Whitmire and not Thomas.

JANE QUIMBY: It is my understanding the Whitmires are the owners of the property, and Mr. Thomas is trying to develop the property.

JULIA MALDONADO: We have been objecting all along because we do want to keep the place residential for our homes and for our children.

JANE QUIMBY: You have not had any communication from Mr. Thomas since the previous meeting?

JULIA MALDONADO: No.

MARVIN MALDONADO: I was just going to say I noticed they stated there is sewer. We put down the sewage down there, and it is because of us that it is down there, is because we proposed it so that we could have it for our homes.

JANE QUIMBY: Yes, sir. I recognize that.

The Commission discussed what the property could be used for under the present zoning.

JANE QUIMBY: But the point is, there could be a number of residential units put up on that piece of property, as it is presently zoned, which could create more of an impact, particularly when you are talking about traffic.

RICHARD LITTLE: I think the planned activity is warehouse, primarily.

JANE QUIMBY: There is no sale or anything like that, as I understand it. It was for warehousing only.

BOB GOLDIN: Right. No outdoor storage is allowed.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: A six foot fence all the way around, and access on to Peach.

BOB GOLDIN: Right.

CHARLES THOMAS: I want to suggest at no time did I indicate I contacted everyone. I contacted everyone available, on several occasions, within the proximity, or the distance of three hundred feet, which I am told that's usually the rule you use.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: How many would be working in the building, approximately?

CHARLES THOMAS: Five, for the first three years, would be my guess -- would be about five -- maybe seven, and myself.

JANE QUIMBY: In the letter it says Mr. Thomas plans to extend the improvements on Peach and Vine Streets at the time of construction on this property. That was the letter submitted by the Engineer, Mr. Ryden, to us.

CHARLES THOMAS: He probably wanted more work -- I didn't know he included Vine Street. That didn't come up, here, until the day of the meeting. -- I didn't know he included Peach Street, because we have no purpose for that.

BOB GOLDIN: This letter is dated July 27 and it was an amendment to the letter that Mr. Thomas did submit.

Staff would like to make a recommendation that some motion be made on this for a time frame, and also, that there was concern for a neighborhood meeting at the previous July 28th hearing, which was never held. These questions seem to be neighborhood oriented and were never clarified before, so we would like some action taken either for or against, or tabling, or rediscussion.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I am concerned that we are breaking over a line. We are going from the commercial district to the residential district, and I am concerned about that.

DUNIVENT/RINKER PASSED 4-1 (TRANSMEIER AGAINST) A MOTION TO TABLE #72-81, REZONE RMF-64 TO C1, UNTIL THE RESIDENTS AND ADJACENT LANDOWNERS IN THE AREA HAVE BEEN CONTACTED FOR RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS BETWEEN PETITIONER AND THE RESIDENTS IN THE AREA; THAT THE STAFF BE REQUESTED TO SUPERVISE THE MEETING AND ARRANGEMENTS THEREFOR.

SUSAN RINKER: Could we suggest that Staff help them?

JANE QUIMBY: I think what Susan has in mind is that the Staff be present at the meeting. Maybe you will be the organizers, if you will, and the directors, so that they understand what is happening, and so that both sides are heard on a one on one, face to face basis.

DON WARNER: We would be glad to set up the meeting.

#68-81 REZONE RSF-8 TO PR-23 AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Robert Reece.
Location: Southwest corner of Orchard Avenue and 13th Street.

A request to change from single family residential uses at 8 units per acre to planned residential uses with a design density of 23 units per acre.

#70-81 REZONE RSF-8 TO PB AND OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Robert Reece.
Location: East of 12th Street and North of Mesa Avenue.

A request to change from single family residential uses at 8 units per acre to planned business on 1.13 acres.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and stated the hearing was for informational purposes only.

JANE QUIMBY: -- and it is my information that this item is not ready to be presented, and it is going to be somewhat of an update with no action taken on this tonight, for informational purposes only.

RICHARD LIVINGSTON appeared for the Petitioner, advised the Commission what had transpired since the last public hearing, and stated they had had a group meeting with some of the residents of the area in an attempt to resolve some of the conflicts and they had received input from the residents.

RICHARD LIVINGSTON: -- there are some things of that type that will have to be addressed as part of any planned zone, and in our meeting I assured them under the Planned Zone Ordinance and Regulations, things of that type can be addressed.

BOB REECE: -- I am also developer of this property, and co-owner. We have had two meetings in which we have sent letters to all of the adjacent owners and some additional people did come, but in both cases they were in room 131 at Mesa College. It was well directed, well informed, we thought, and there was a number of people who did attend.

DON WARNER: I am assuming you would be willing to pay for your half of the street improvements on 13th?

BOB REECE: Yes.

JANE QUIMBY: I don't believe we need a motion, or anything. This is for information only.

ALEX CANDELARIA: This is for information only.

JANE QUIMBY: There is going to be no action taken on this item tonight. There will be a neighborhood meeting with the proponents and with the neighborhood to discuss the new plan.

#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 Unawep 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.

JIM LINDELL appeared for the Petitioners and outlined the proposed vacation of right of way and utilities easements, for the Commission.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Did you have a meeting?

JIM LINDELL: Yes. We had a meeting with the homeowners on September 11th, I believe, and we sent a letter to the Planning Commission.

JANE QUIMBY: We have a letter in our file, dated the 11th. The meeting was held on the 30th.

JIM LINDELL: That is correct.

ALEX CANDELARIA advised the Staff had concern about the ingress and egress of the alley and the traffic movement; also, that the park be worked out with Ken Idleman, the Parks and Recreation Director.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Where does the Fire Department think it needs crash gates?

BOB GOLDIN: They are satisfied as long as it meets the break-a-way requirements for break-a-way emergency access gates, which they had agreed to.

RICHARD LITTLE: The adjacent property owners to the alleys, are they aware of this?

JIM LINDELL: They are very much aware of this. We talked about it at length. We told them we would not encourage use of the alleys; they would be there, and they are aware of it.

JIM LINDELL: There is one more comment I would like to make. There is an additional comment from the Orchard Mesa Irrigation Company. -- We have met with the gentleman, Mr. Caraway, at Orchard Mesa Irrigation. He has no problems with it. He did not understand it. We are not involving any of his ditches, moving any of his ditches, and he has no problem at this point.

BOB GOLDIN: Staff would like some kind of recommendation from the Planning Commission on the alleyway, giving parking recommendations. The Traffic Engineer and Staff both have concerns, as does the City Council, using alleyways, other than service oriented.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

LITTLE/TRANSMEIER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #80-81, VACATION OF RIGHT OF WAY AND UTILITIES EASEMENTS, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO PARKING IN THE ALLEYWAYS BEING DISALLOWED AND INCLUSION OF THE PARK DEDICATION.

#54-81 MERIDIAN PARK - FINAL PLAT

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

A request for a final plat 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 request for final plat approval, Meridian Park, for the Commission.

BOB GOLDIN outlined the Review Sheet Comments for the Commission.

MILAND DUNIVENT: Tom, did you say that the drain tile, the 42 inch drain tile, has to be put in anyway?

TOM LOGUE: In order to accomplish the widening for B.5 Road -- that widening would encroach in to the existing drainage channel, and in order to make it function properly it necessitated the installation of reinforced concrete pipe.

BOB GOLDIN: The City Council did approve the 42 inch pipe.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: That is for the entire length of the property?

TOM LOGUE: That's right. It's for about a quarter of a mile.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

BOB GOLDIN: This is final plat; this isn't final plan, what you will see. This is development in H.O., so each individual lot has the potential to come before you for later consideration. This is merely a final plat.

TRANSMEIER/LITTLE PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #54-81, MERIDIAN PARK, FINAL PLAT, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS, INTERNAL ACCESS AS THE PRELIMINARY PLAN SHOWS, AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY ENGINEER FOR IMPROVEMENT ON B.5 ROAD.

#61-81 REZONE RSF-8 TO PB AND ATRISCO - OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: Atrisco Investment Company/Levi Lucero.
Location: 728 feet North of North Avenue, East of 28.5 Road.

A request to change from a residential single family use at 8 units per acre to a planned business use on .34 acres.

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

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

GARY LUCERO appeared for the Petitioner and stated he was present to answer any questions the Commission might have regarding the request.

BOB GOLDIN: We have no problem with the technical issues. We are concerned about the impact on 28.5 Road and about the rezone request in general setting a precedent for encroachment into the residential areas; also, setting a precedent for more business off of North Avenue.

JANE QUIMBY: I would like to ask a question, Mr. Lucero. Have you any idea whether the business use that would be in that building would be oriented to the people who live in the residences behind? Do you have some idea of what kind of use will be in that?

GARY LUCERO: Sure. Initially, the intent here was to do a health spa, or something of that nature in this office building to facilitate the condominium project. -- we would have probably offices upstairs and space downstairs for the spa, and that caused a technical problem in the rezoning request, so we need to have two separate zones versus a single zone, to handle the office space that we would like to put in there as well -- office, the second story and spa, first story, and that concept.

BOB GOLDIN: Under the Planned Development Regulations, unless the business or office is totally oriented toward the residential facility, they do have to come under two separate requests, as this one. Originally, it didn't, but then they came back and did resubmit.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I am concerned about the additional impact of an office building over what I already feel is too dense of a project, and you are just putting one more thing in there.

RICHARD LITTLE: -- about how much of that will be used for the health spa? Half of it?

GARY LUCERO: Probably thirty percent, something like that.

RICHARD LITTLE: Seventy percent potential office use?

GARY LUCERO: Right.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

DUNIVENT/RINKER PASSED 3-2 (OTT AND TRANSMEIER AGAINST)
A MOTION TO SUBMIT #61-81 REZONE RSF-8 TO PB, ATRISCO INVESTMENT COMPANY, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

DUNIVENT/LITTLE PASSED 3-2 (OTT AND TRANSMEIER AGAINST)
A MOTION TO SUBMIT #61-81, OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, ATRISCO, LOCATED 728 FEET NORTH OF NORTH AVENUE, EAST OF 28.5 ROAD, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

#73-81 CREST VIEW II - FINAL PLAT AND PLAN

Petitioner: Crest View Ltd./Henry Fausson.
Location: South of F.5 Section line and West of 27.5 Road.

A request for a final plat and plan on 2.15 acres in a planned residential zone at 1.9 units per acre.

- a. Consideration of plat.
- b. Consideration of final 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 approval of final plat and plan for Crest View II, for the Commission.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments for the Commission.

JANE QUIMBY: I am a little confused about the Power of Attorney, because on the Review Sheet it says find attached Power of Attorney for Improvements.

ALEX CANDELARIA: Right. We were confused.

TOM LOGUE: Those items were requested by the City Engineer, and unfortunately, the Staff hasn't received those copies, and we have submitted an unsigned Power of Attorney, which will be fully executed, if that Power of Attorney is acceptable to the City Council.

JANE QUIMBY: And the Petitioners, what is your reaction or feeling about the land, or the five percent fee?

TOM LOGUE: We are operating under a new Subdivision Regulation, and the Petitioner would more than likely participate in a cash payment.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

TRANSMEIER/RINKER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #73-81 CREST VIEW II, FINAL PLAT, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS BEING RESOLVED BEFORE PRESENTATION TO CITY COUNCIL.

TRANSMEIER/RINKER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #73-81 CREST VIEW II, FINAL PLAN, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS BEING RESOLVED BEFORE PRESENTATION TO CITY COUNCIL.

#66-81 REZONE PR-20 TO PR-30 AND WELL'S ADDITION -
OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Petitioner: William Wells.
Location: 250 feet South of Elm Avenue, West of
28.5 Road.

A request to change from a planned residential use at 20 units per acre to a planned residential use at 30 units per acre, on 1.41 acres.

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

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

FRANK WAGNER, of Armstrong and Associates, appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the request for Rezone PR-20 to PR-30, and the outline development plan for Well's Addition, for the Commission.

RICHARD LITTLE: That's a lot of building and a lot of parking for less than an acre and a half.

BOB GOLDIN outlined the Review Sheet Comments for the Commission.

ALEX CANDELARIA: There is another little comment that the Commission may not have seen -- Fruitvale Sanitation District did comment, as per phone conversation, that the additional use could be handled by the Sanitation District.

JANE QUIMBY: I am very disturbed -- we went through a rezoning for PR-20. We are not at PR-30 in less time than it takes to blink an eye. I am also somewhat concerned about your comments about pursuing industrial revenue bonds. I don't think that has any particular bearing on whether we rezone it to PR-20 or PR-30, and I think that was a little misleading and disturbing to me, and that's a whole different process you must go through in order to obtain industrial revenue bonds.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: I think we need more housing in Grand Junction -- I think that is definitely true. On the development plan before us, 1200 square feet, two and three bedrooms, and I voted for that project. Now, we are down to 600 square feet and crowding them in there, and I am wondering what we will get in December -- what kind of proposal?

TRANSMEIER/LITTLE PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #66-81, REZONE PR-20 TO PR-30, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL BECAUSE OF THE INCREASED IMPACT ON 28.5 ROAD, THE INCREASE IN DENSITY FOR A SMALL PARCEL, DOES NOT FIT THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA, THE OPEN SPACE IS INADEQUATE, THERE ARE NO AMENITIES FURNISHED FOR THE RESIDENTS, AND IT IS TOO INTENSE A USE FOR THE PARCEL OF LAND.

TRANSMEIER/RINKER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #66-81, OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, WELL'S ADDITION, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL BECAUSE OF THE INCREASED IMPACT ON 28.5 ROAD, THE INCREASE IN DENSITY FOR A SMALL PARCEL, DOES NOT FIT THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA, THE OPEN SPACE IS

INADEQUATE, THERE ARE NO AMENITIES FURNISHED FOR THE RESIDENTS,
AND IT IS TOO INTENSE A USE FOR THE PARCEL OF LAND.

#82-81 ZONE NORTH 12TH STREET ENCLAVE ANNEXATION TO
RSF-4

Petitioner: Grand Junction Planning Commission.
Location: East of 12th Street, Southeasterly of
Horizon Drive, West of 27.5 Road and North
of F.25 Section Line.

A request to zone North 12th Street Enclave Annexation
to Residential Single Family at 4 units to an acre.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public
hearing.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the request for zoning of the
North 12th Street Enclave Annexation to RSF-4, for the Commission.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

RINKER/LITTLE PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #82-81, ZONE
NORTH 12TH STREET ENCLAVE ANNEXATION TO RSF-4, TO THE CITY COUNCIL
FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

#83-81 CONDITIONAL USE - HOTEL AND RESTAURANT LIQUOR
LICENSE

Petitioner: Janet Johnson, Happy Joe's Pizza and
Ice Cream Parlor.
Location: Mesa Mall #232.

A request for a conditional use for a hotel and restaurant
liquor license in a highway oriented zone.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public
hearing.

JANET JOHNSON appeared as the Petitioner and outlined
the request for conditional use, hotel and restaurant liquor
license, for the Commission.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: So you are going to have complete
alcoholic beverages: beer, wine, whiskey, and all?

JANET JOHNSON: Our intent is only to serve 3.2 beer.
We are going for the hotel restaurant license because we plan to
go multiple license in the State for more Happy Joe's Restaurants.

JANE QUIMBY: It was stated in the intent in some of the
papers with the proposal, it would be 3.2 only. I think that is
a little misleading to people because it is a hotel restaurant
license. That certainly is your prerogative, and I would hope that
you would stick with it, but I hope everyone recognizes that you

can state that that is your intent, but you would not be restricted to hold to that, and there would be no way we could hold you to that if you were granted the hotel restaurant license, and as long as you are aware of the restrictions on your customers' age if you have the hotel restaurant license, that's as far as we can go.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Would you have a conflict with your ice cream shop and your family atmosphere and your alcohol? Your drinks?

JANET JOHNSON: I don't quite understand.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: You have got a little clown in your front door there, and helium balloons, and you are serving -- if you have this license, you could serve drinks out there, too.

JANET JOHNSON: Right.

JANE QUIMBY: -- but she could not serve to those under twenty-one. Those eighteen to twenty-one, if she has the hotel restaurant license, if she has other liquor on the premises.

Any other comments from you, Alex?

ALEX CANDELARIA: No. There was no adverse comment, and Staff personally doesn't have any comments.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

LITTLE/RINKER PASSED 4-1 (TRANSMEIER AGAINST) A MOTION TO SUBMIT #83-81, CONDITIONAL USE, HOTEL RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE, JANET JOHNSON, HAPPY JOE'S PIZZA AND ICE CREAM PARLOR, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL.

#84-81 EXPANSION OF CONDITIONAL USE - TOTAL FAMILY MINISTRIES BUILDING

Petitioner: Bookcliff Baptist Church.
Location: 2702 Patterson Road.

A request for an expansion of a conditional use for Bookcliff Baptist Church in a residential single family zone at 8 units per acre.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

BILL McMENAMY appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the Expansion of conditional use for the Commission.

BOB GOLDIN: The owner of the property on the east side is another church, is that correct?

BILL McMENAMY: Yes.

BILL McMENAMY: Another thing I might point out, we are doing only phase one of this plan.

BOB GOLDIN: Two other issues Staff would like resolved: one, per telephone conversation I believe power of attorneys would be granted for street improvements -- that that be executed prior to City Council final motion. The other is, we have a small area of contention in that this is for total family usage and no bike racks have been shown to be provided. We would like to see some type of bike racks somewhere.

RICHARD LITTLE: You mentioned one of the uses of the building would be for educational purposes, but not for a school, per se?

BILL McMENAMY: Bible studies and Wednesday nights when we have bible studies, and such as that.

OTIS TESTERMAN advised the Commission the building was being built in accordance with Fire Department and different regulatory agencies so that a preschool could be contemplated in the future.

JANE QUIMBY: Any additional comments from Staff?

BOB GOLDIN: No. If those particular issues can be resolved, we have no additional comments. All technical issues have been met.

DON WARNER: -- if you approve this, you are also approving the location for a sign, because there is one shown on the plan.

JANE QUIMBY: It seems to me with all the parking up there around the one building, it would be nice to have some kind of screening available.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Particularly that north end is all up against residential homes or lots.

RICHARD LITTLE: So is the east, isn't it?

DON WARNER: -- If they are going to use this for parking -- I think you should recommend they pave the alley. That's putting too many cars in the alley and raising too much dust for the neighbors.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: Can you contact these owners and get some sort of written agreement you will pay for the screening on their property, if they want it?

BILL McMENAMY: There are four houses that have it, and three that don't.

DON WARNER: I think you can work out with the people what they need.

LITTLE/TRANSMEIER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #84-81, EXPANSION OF CONDITIONAL USE - TOTAL FAMILY MINISTRIES BUILDING, LOCATED AT 2702 PATTERSON ROAD, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS AND PARTICULARLY SCREENING AND FENCING OF ADJACENT PROPERTIES, BIKE RACKS, AND PAVING OF THE ALLEY TO CITY STANDARDS.

#85-81 ZONING OF RUSTY SUNN ANNEXATION TO PR-8.4 AND RUSTY SUNN SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Sego Services/Jim Lindell.
Location: Northwest corner of 29 and F Roads.

A request to zone annexation to planned residential at 8.4 units per acre on 7.43 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 Rusty Sunn Annexation to PR-8.4, and the preliminary plan for Rusty Sunn Subdivision, for the Commission.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: You said that Indian Wash was dedicated to the City as a park?

TOM LOGUE: Prior to the annexation of the City of Grand Junction, when it was in the County, it was designated as a public site, dedicated to Mesa County.

DON WARNER: It was shown as open space and park on the Indian Village Plat.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: And you did say you would be willing to construct a pedestrian bikeway through that area?

TOM LOGUE: Our proposal shows one basically following the Wash. As we prepare our final construction drawings, we will work with Mr. Idleman, of the Parks Department.

DON ROMEK appeared as President of Sego Services and outlined the background of the proposed project.

JIM PATTON appeared as a property owner in the area, objected to the density, the lack of facilities for storm water detention, and the burden that would be placed on the intersection of F and 29 Roads.

SHIRLEY SCHMALZ appeared and presented a Petition as follows:

"We, the undersigned, are opposed to the planned proposal of the September 29, 1981 Grand Junction Planning Commission Agenda Item #85-81, 'Zoning of Rusty Sunn Annexation to PR 8.4 and Rusty Sunn Subdivision Preliminary Plan. Petitioner: Sego Services/ Jim Lindell. Location: Northwest corner of 29 and F Roads. A request to zone annexation to planned residential at 8.4 units per acre on 7.43 acres.'"

SHIRLEY SCHMALZ stated she had approximately eighty-five signatures on the Petition, and she concurred with the remarks of JIM PATTON in opposition to the proposal.

I. J. NICHOLSON appeared in opposition to the request, stating the high density was not in keeping with most of the area and the streets were not capable of handling the increase in traffic.

RANDY PRICE appeared in opposition to the request, stating he felt the proposal was inconsistent with the other dwellings located on three sides of the proposal, the schools were overcrowded in the area and on split sessions, and that the children in the proposed area would not have a play area of their own and would be tempted by the ditch with water in it.

ED GIBHART appeared as a property owner in the area and objected to the proposal because of the density proposed.

MARIAN PRICE appeared as a property owner in the area and stated as a mother, she was concerned with 62 units in the area with that many children close to their area because of all of the water in the area, in the ditches and canals.

JANE QUIMBY: Is it my understanding from the people who are in opposition that you have no difficulty with a development in there -- you just didn't want it of the density it is. Is that correct, generally speaking?

MARIAN PRICE: Yes. Right.

JANE QUIMBY: It looks as though it might require another meeting with the neighborhood and the Petitioner, or maybe more.

TOM LOGUE responded to some of the comments of the neighborhood, stating the residents would be basically from the same type of life style as those people objecting to the proposal.

TOM LOGUE: There will be a set of covenants and restrictions that will be operated by the Homeowners' Association. These will insure the ongoing maintenance of the exterior of the buildings, the apartment areas, and the private landscaped areas around the site.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

ALEX CANDELARIA outlined the Review Sheet Comments and the concerns of the Staff, for the Commission.

TRANSMEIER/DUNIVENT PASSED 3-2 (RINKER AND LITTLE AGAINST) A MOTION TO SUBMIT #85-81 PRELIMINARY PLAN, RUSTY SUNN SUBDIVISION, BY SEGO SERVICES/JIM LINDELL, LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 29 AND F ROADS, TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

TRANSMEIER/DUNIVENT PASSED 3-2 (RINKER AND LITTLE AGAINST) A MOTION TO SUBMIT #85-81, ZONING OF RUSTY SUNN ANNEXATION TO PR 8-4 TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

#86-81 DEVELOPMENT IN H. O. - THE YEAGER BUILDING

Petitioner: Peter and Marie Yeager.

Location: Approximately 400 feet North of B.5 Road - Lots 15 and 16 on Sherman Drive.

A request for a business use in a highway oriented zone on approximately .45 acres.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

BILL RYDEN appeared for the Petitioner and outlined the request for development in H. O., the Yeager Building, for the Commission.

ROSS TRANSMEIER: You have changed this a little -- taken out some parking and put in more landscaping?

BILL RYDEN: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Upon the comments and upon the review comments, we made a revision on the drawing.

ALEX CANDELARIA gave the Staff Comments.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

DUNIVENT/TRANSMEIER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #86-81, DEVELOPMENT IN H. O., THE YEAGER BUILDING, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

#87-81 FRUITRIDGE MINOR SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Walter K. Waymeyer.

Location: 800 feet East of 1st Street, South of Patterson Road.

A request for a final plat of 4 lots on 2.7 acres in a residential single family zone at approximately 5 units per acre.

JANE QUIMBY read the request and opened the public hearing.

TOM LOGUE, of Paragon Engineering, outlined the request for approval of Final Plat, Fruitridge Minor Subdivision, for the Commission.

ALEX CANDELARIA: The only question the Staff had, is the Petitioner willing to put five percent of the open land, or monies, or how do they intend to handle it?

TOM LOGUE: It will be a cash payment would be our preference.

ALEX CANDELARIA: That is the only comment Staff had.

KATE DENNING appeared as a property owner in the area and inquired as to the size of lot 4, and stated she did not feel she should be burdened with additional cost for the improvement of Lost Lane, should Lot 4 be sold and developed.

JANE QUIMBY: I couldn't promise that. The alternative would be to sell it to whoever wants to develop Lot 4 and let them pave all of it.

DON WARNER: If they tore those things there down now, all they could put back up would be one single family house.

JANE QUIMBY closed the public hearing.

LITTLE/RINKER PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO SUBMIT #87-81, FRUITRIDGE MINOR SUBDIVISION, FINAL PLAT, TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION, WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS.

The first regular meeting of the month of September, 1981, was adjourned at 11:33 p.m.

** ** *