

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday - August 31, 1960 - 8:00 A.M.

CONFERENCE ROOM - CITY HALL

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was held in the Conference Room of the City Hall at 8:00 A.M., Wednesday, August 31, 1960, with the following members present: Messrs Nelson, Colony, Bauer, Tessman, and Mrs. Cleo Diemer.

Members absent: Chairman Glen Hopper.

Others present: Regional Planning Director Gene Allen, City Manager Joe Lacy, City Engineer Carl Alstatt, Development Director Don Warner, Messrs. Amos Raso, Bob Faith, and Alden Spooner.

ACTING CHAIRMAN APPOINTED

In the absence of a Chairman, motion was made by Mr. Nelson that City Manager Joe Lacy act as Chairman for this meeting. Motion was seconded by Mr. Bauer, and carried.

I. MINUTES APPROVED

Motion was made by Mr. Bauer that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 27, 1960 be approved as written. Motion seconded by Mr. Nelson and carried.

II. FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO GRANTING OF VACATION OF A PORTION OF THIRD STREET

Mr. Amos Raso who had submitted a request for the vacating of a portion of Third Street south of South Avenue was present. Mr. Raso explained that this 80 ft. street was not being used and was grown up with weeds on both sides. He stated that he had had several opportunities to put a building in this location if there had been more parking space available. He was therefore requesting the vacation of a portion of the street so that it could be used for parking.

In the discussion following it was felt that the City should have at least a right-of-way through to the alley but that an 80 ft. street was not necessary. It was suggested that 25 ft. be vacated on each side of the street, leaving a 30 ft. right-of-way down the center. Mr. Raso indicated this would be satisfactory with him.

Motion was made by Mr. Nelson that the Planning Commission grant this request, upon receipt of proper petition submitted by Mr. Raso and signed by both Mr. Raso and Mr. Golden (the other property owner involved) for the vacating of 25 ft. on each side of the street with a 30 ft. right-of-way down the center. Motion was seconded by Mrs. Diemer, and carried.

III. VACATION OF BLOCKS 1, 2, 3 and 4, GARFIELD PARK SUB. RECOMMENDED

This area is that portion south of Orchard Avenue which is owned by Mesa College and will be the "Activity Area" in their final campus plan. City Manager Lacy said that the City would work out details with the College for the purchase by the College of that portion of water mains that lie along Hall Avenue and would be in the vacated area.

Motion was made by Mr. Bauer that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that this request be granted and that Blocks 1, 2, 3, and 4 in Garfield Park Subdivision be vacated. Motion was seconded by Mr. Tessman, and carried.

#### IV. TWO ANNEZATIONS RECOMMENDED

City Manager Lacy explained that the "Procedure for Annexations" which has been adopted by the Council has been followed with the annexations under consideration. A survey considering the economic feasibility of each annexation has been made. Since this procedure is very new yet, it is felt that the figures arrived at are more or less of a "rough draft" at this point; however it is a start and as time goes on this procedure will become very valuable in the consideration of annexations.

##### a. 1st & Orchard

Development Director Don Warner reported that the survey of the 1st and Orchard annexation shows that the ratio of revenue vs cost for the first three-year period would be approximately 2 to 3; however, over a ten-year period it would change to about a 4 to 3 ratio due to development and increased population. No major service problems as to water or sewer exist in this area.

Motion was made by Mr. Bauer that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the area at 1st and Orchard is eligible for annexation, with the understanding that the residents of the area file a deed on the rights-of-way that are required for the extension of Orchard Avenue and the widening of First Street. Motion was seconded by Mr. Colony, and carried.

##### b. 28 $\frac{1}{4}$ to 28 $\frac{1}{2}$ Road, North Ave. 1/4 mile south

Development Director Warner reported that this looks like a good annexation because it is a more developed area. He also reported that there are no major service problems regarding water or sewer in this area.

Motion was made by Mr. Bauer that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the area 28 $\frac{1}{4}$  to 28 $\frac{1}{2}$  Road, North Ave. 1/4 mile south is eligible for annexation. Motion was seconded by Mr. Tessman, and carried.

##### c. 28 $\frac{1}{2}$ Road to Indian Wash, Orchard Avenue north 1/4 mile.

This annexation was tabled for further study.

#### V. DATE SET FOR SPECIAL MEETING FOR HEARINGS ON ZONING ORDINANCE

Motion was made by Mrs. Diemer that a meeting of the Planning Commission be held on September 14, 1960 for the hearing on the Zoning Map at 7:30 P.M. and the hearing of the text of the Zoning Ordinance at 9:00 P.M. Motion was seconded by Mr. Tessman, and carried.

VI. APPOINTMENT OF CITIZENS' COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

City Manager Joe Lacy said that Downtown re-development would give the Planning Commission an opportunity to do some real "planning". He said that for some time small groups have been wanting to improve the downtown area of Grand Junction and that there is a definite need for this development. However, all of these different aspects which are needed -- off-street parking, street lighting, improved sanitary sewers, better curbs, smoother traffic flow, general beautification -- will have to be coordinated and centralized in order to be accomplished. He stressed that the saving of downtown is of interest to the taxpayer, although the major financial burden must be carried by downtown interests themselves. The deterioration of the downtown area would be a discredit to the entire community and increase everyone's taxes. He said one of the biggest factors is to figure out a priority system and then stick to it.

Mr. Lacy said that he has met with a number of different businessmen and that several professional city planning consultants have been contacted. Their fees for drawing a downtown plan would range all the way from \$3,900.00 to \$12,000.00. In discussions with the Downtown Improvement Association consultant help had been considered with the possibility of businessmen paying half the cost and the City paying the other half.

Various attempts have been made in the past toward this goal, such as the Barton Study in 1955, and more recently the Downtown Improvement Association. By using and upgrading such information, together with other data gathered by the Regional Planning Office and the City Administration and the use of material and information on the subject which is available from the same sources a professional consultant would use, it would be possible to work out our own basic plan. Perhaps the limited use of a professional consultant might be considered in certain areas.

Mr. Lacy suggested that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that they appoint a Citizens' Committee to work with the Planning Commission on this problem, which would be a part of the Master Plan and a part of community development.

Motion was made by Mr. Colony that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that they appoint a Citizens' Committee to work with the Planning Commission on Downtown Development. Motion was seconded by Mr. Bauer, and carried.

VII. OFFICERS ELECTED FOR NEXT FISCAL YEAR

Annual election of officers was held, with the following officers being elected: Mr. Glen Hopper was re-elected Chairman by unanimous vote; Mr. Elmer Nelson was elected Vice-Chairman by unanimous vote; and Mrs. Cleo Diemer was elected Secretary by unanimous vote.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Motion was made by Mr. Bauer that this meeting be adjourned to meet again on September 14, 1960 for the purpose of continuing the meeting in order to conduct hearings on the Zoning Map at 7:30 P.M. and the text of the Zoning Ordinance at 9:00 P.M. Motion seconded by Mr. Tessman, and carried.