

REGULAR MEETING

8

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday - May 31, 1962 - 8:00 A. M.

CONFERENCE ROOM - CITY HALL

Members present: Messrs. Elmer Nelson, Ray Meacham, Art Hadden, Mrs. Robert Russell, Robert Baker, and Mrs. Wm. Hyde.

Others present: Amos Raso, Don Warner, Development Director, J. Lacy, City Manager, J. E. Stockton, Building Inspector, and Jack Loss, Telephone Company President.

I. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING DEFERRED:

Motion was made to defer the approval of the minutes of the May 16, 1962 meeting until the next regular meeting.

II. CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RE-MODELING OF TELEPHONE BUILDING AT 7TH AND ROOD AVENUE.

Amos Raso explained to the Commission the proposed plan of the remodeling of the Telephone Company Building and stated that it would be much more attractive if it could be done as planned. There is a 22 foot concrete side walk now in front of this building. The Northwest corner of the building would be the same as it is now. The Telephone Building is a new building and it would not be practical to remove the entire face at this time. The material requested by the architect was to bring out the shadow effect desired. If other thinner materials were used the effect would be lost. Mrs. Hyde told them they should be considering the types of trees that they were going to plant as some varieties would not grow well planted in concrete surroundings and would have to be planted every 5 or 6 years. Mr. Nelson asked if it would be controlled in some way to match the other side of the street. Don Warner said this consideration should be tied to the extra width of sidewalk, extra wide right-of-way and type of pedestrian traffic in the area. Rulings should be considered on individual basis. Motion was made that the extension be allowed as proposed in plan on file in Building Department and plan on file with the Planning Commission because of the following reasons:

- (1) 100 foot right-of-way on 7th Street.
- (2) Low Pedestrian traffic in this area.
- (3) Extra wide side-walk existing (22'curb to building).

The motion was seconded and carried.

III. CONSIDERATION OF FURTHER CHANGES IN ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT.
(SET-BACKS AND PORCHES).

Don Warner explained the proposed Ammendment to set back regulations. He explained that this would eliminate the extension of porches into the set back area. It would allow the people in the older part of town the same use of land as those in the new part of town.

Mr. Nelson asked for the wishes of the Commission. Mrs. Hyde made a motion that we recommend to the Council the Ammendment of text in the Zoning Ordinance be as follows.

Section 6. SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

i. Set-back and Floor Area in Developed Areas:

In blocks with more than 50% of the buildable lots already developed, new construction shall conform to the average set-back of the existing buildings, and floor area may conform to the average floor area if less than that specified.

TO BE AMMENDED TO READ:

i. Set-back in residential zone districts and floor area in Developed Areas:

In residential zone districts new construction, additions or alterations shall comply with the set-back regulations in Section 2 of this Ordinance or set-back shall be 15' (Fifteen Feet) from the front property line, whichever is the more restrictive.

Floor area may conform to the average floor area in the block if such average is less than that area specified for the zone district in Section 2 of this Ordinance.

The motion was seconded by Arthur Hadden. Motion carried.

To accomplish the intent of the preceeding ammendment the following changes should be made:

Section 6. SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

n. Yard Exceptions:

5. Projection into yards.....

- (b) Porches that are open, unenclosed, or screened in at ground level or below the main floor level, and chimneys and fire escapes may extend into a required yard not more than six feet but in no case closer than three feet to any lot line.

TO BE AMMENDED BY DELETION OF SAID PARAGRAPH (b)

Section 3. ZONE CLASSIFICATIONS

b. Zone Districts:

(7) B-1 Limited Business

E. Set-back

TO BE AMMENDED BY DELETION OF THE FOLLOWING:

- 1) Same as required by any abutting "R" residential District in the same block.

Either of the above standards will be used, whichever requires the greater setback.

(9) B-3 Retail Business

D. Setback

TO BE AMMENDED BY DELETION OF THE FOLLOWING:

- 1) Same as required by any abutting "R" residential district in the same block and fronting on the same street.

Either of the above standards will be used, whichever requires the greater setback.

(10) C-1 Light Commerce

D. Setback

TO BE AMMENDED BY DELETION OF THE FOLLOWING:

- 1) Same as required by any abutting "R" residential district in the same block and fronting on the same street.

Either of the above standards will be used, whichever requires the greater setback.

Motion was made and carried in approving these deletions.

IV. RE-BIRTH OF REGIONAL PLANNING STAFF.

Mr. Lacy discussed the need for reconstituting the Regional Planning Staff. Various examples were cited to show the constant and growing need for both a Regional Staff as well as the existing City Planning function. After further discussion, it was moved by Mrs. Russell and seconded by Robert Baker that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the City participate in the Regional Planning operating budget on a 1/3 City and 2/3 County basis, and a 1/2 and 1/2 basis for all special projects annually, since the detailed planning tasks will primarily concern areas outside of Grand Junction. The motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business to come before the Commission the meeting was adjourned.