

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING  
GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday -- May 28, 1958 -- 7:30 AM

LaCourt Hotel

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was held at the LaCourt Hotel at 7:30 A.M. Wednesday, May 28, 1958, with the following members present: Chairman Al Cornelison, Secretary R. E. Cheever, Mrs. F. A. Brumbaugh, Mr. Richard Zollner, Mr. Robert VanDeusen, Mr. Claud Smith, Mrs. Cleo Diemer. Absent: Mr. Laird Smith and Mr. Howard McMullin. Also present: Regional Planning Director Gene Allen, City Engineer Carl Alstatt, and Mr. Henry Faussonne.

The first item on the Agenda - Bookcliff Heights Replat - was discussed briefly. Since this item had been before the Commission once before, on March 12, 1958, the Commission's action taken on the question at that time was reaffirmed. Motions from minutes of March 12, 1958 read as follows:

"After discussion of this subject, motion was made by Mr. McMullin that the Commission approve the Bookcliff Heights Replat, provided full street width according to present City ordinances be granted, and that the Commission further express its preliminary intention to approve the North 7th Street Plat, subject to submission of a formal plat. Motion seconded by Mr. Zollner.

Mr. McMullin then introduced an amendment to his motion, stating: Provided that the petitioners desiring to file the North 7th Street Plat and the owners of the Bookcliff Heights property work out a cooperative effort to obtain the 50 ft. street right-of-way.

This amendment was not seconded, and Mr. McMullin found it necessary to leave the meeting at this point, withdrawing both his motion and the amendment. However, Mr. Zollner who had seconded the motion did not care to withdraw his second, and the Chairman then called for a vote. Motion carried unanimously.

In regard to utility easements in the Bookcliff Heights area, Mr. Cheever made the following motion: Utility easements be deleted except for those deemed necessary by the City Engineer's office. Motion seconded by Laird Smith, and carried".

In connection with the second item on the Agenda, Mr. Henry Faussonne was present to report upon the progress that had been made on this project since he and Mr. Wm. Rump had presented their preliminary plat for Subdivision and Annexation of Blocks 2 and 3, Monterey Park at the Planning Commission meeting on

March 26. Mr. Faussonne stated that it had been impossible to secure the necessary right-of-way in order to develop their preliminary plat as presented; he, therefore, had two alternative plats to present for the Commission's consideration.

After discussion, motion was made by Mrs. Diemer that this be given to the Annexation Committee for study at their earliest convenience, and, if necessary, that a special meeting of the Planning Commission be called to act upon this request. Motion was seconded by Mr. Zollner, and carried.

Not on the Agenda, but next discussed, was a petition to vacate an alley which had been presented to City Engineer Alstatt by S&M Supply Company and Elgin Realty. They requested that the alley which runs north and south separating Lots 6 to 10 and Lots 11 to 19 of Benton Canon's First Subdivision be vacated since they own all of this described property and the said alley running north and south does not now serve the convenience and necessity of the public.

This petition asks only for the vacating of the N-S alley for one-half block, and after some discussion, motion was made by Mr. VanDeusen that an investigation be made into the possibility of closing the entire N-S alley in the entire block and a report made on this at the next meeting of the Planning Commission. Seconded by Mrs. Brumbaugh, and carried. Chairman Cornelison appointed Planning Director Gene Allen, City Manager Cheever, and City Engineer Alstatt to make this investigation and report.

Chairman Cornelison said that he had included item No. III on the agenda in order that the members might keep in mind that we do need a new zoning ordinance and so that they might be thinking of the items that need attention. As an example, he pointed out that our present zoning ordinance does not cover such things as private swimming pools within the city or shopping centers. Mr. Allen said that he hoped to be able to start working on a new city zoning ordinance within the very near future.

Item No. IV - discussion of method of presenting our findings to the City Council, in writing or in person - was next taken up. Mrs. Brumbaugh made the motion, which was seconded and carried, that the Commission go on record as commending Chairman Cornelison for his action at the recent Council meeting, wherein he had asked that the Council accept a reconsideration of a rezoning by the Commission.

During the discussion, the question was brought up, "In rezoning requests, does the Commission consider what the intent at the time is, or what can be put in, in case of rezoning?" Mr. Cornelison stated that until such time as we have a new zoning ordinance, we should consider what the worst possible thing would be, should rezoning be permitted.

Regarding the method of presenting the Commission's opinions to the City Council, motion was made by Mr. Claud Smith that we invite the City Council to meet with the Planning Commission at our next regular meeting so that this may be discussed and some

method agreeable to both groups be adopted. Motion seconded by Mr. Cheever, and carried.

Mr. Zollner then made the motion that the Chairman and one or two other members of the Commission draft a written report on our conclusions and study leading to our recommendation of the zoning question presented on the Jaros tract last meeting, and that it be presented to the City Council prior to the Council meeting next week, not later than Tuesday afternoon, for consideration of this Jaros tract rezoning. Motion seconded by Mrs. Diemer, and carried.

It was decided not to discuss item No. V on the Agenda at this time. This item called for a discussion regarding revising our By-Laws, and it was decided to take this matter up at a later date.

In reviewing the minutes of the meeting of April 30, 1958, motion was made by Mrs. Diemer that the last paragraph on page 4, "It was stated....were to be installed", be deleted, as it was felt this paragraph did not contain the true opinion of the Commission. Motion seconded by Mr. Zollner, and carried.

Upon motion by Mr. VanDeusen, the meeting was adjourned.

R. E. CHEEVER, Secretary

to: Harold Shults, President, and  
Members of the City Council of Grand Junction

Dear Sirs:

The Grand Junction City Planning Commission hereby presents its recommendation relative to the requested rezoning of Lot 16, Grandview Subdivision (the Jaros tract). This is submitted in a written form showing the major points of consideration. Representatives of the Planning Commission will be present if the Council wishes to direct questions to them.

1. After much additional work and many hours of analysis and discussion of this work, and based on a year's further development and progress in the City's comprehensive plan, the Commission has voted to deny the request for change in the zoning.
2. There exists an adequately developed business strip and area of a service nature within one-half mile of the property and which serves it. - 9/10
3. North 12th is an existing major traffic circulation route. It is anticipated the volume of traffic will increase and not diminish as the expected and indicated residential character of this area grows. While this may appear an immediate advantage to the proposed private investment in the property, the Commission cannot be primarily concerned with such private investment. The proposed development of the property would create considerable difficulty in the existing traffic problem, the expected increased traffic volume, and hazards in the residential area. We point out the proximity of the 12th and North Avenue area traffic problem. *good if we make for good and abundant development. If business is practical area must become feasible. NO we are not making the development if our community*
4. Whatever may be the convincing conclusions reached by any group interested in private investment, based on thorough analysis and study by their own experts, such conclusions, though they may appear attractive to progress in the community, are not necessarily in the best interest of community planning needs and good planning. We believe good planning is also in the interest of community progress.
5. Under provisions of the "Business A" section of the Grand Junction zoning ordinance, any stated uses, setbacks, yards or designs for development of the area in question cannot be guaranteed other than as provided in said Business "A" district. This has recently been brought to the attention of all of us.

Respectfully submitted by the Grand Junction City Planning Commission

Al Cornelison, Chairman

NOTE: It should be emphasized that this report of the recommendation of the Commission does not purport to include the many pros and cons of this question as pertains to the so called "Jaros Tract". Likewise, it must be remembered that not every member of the Commission concurred in all points made or necessarily in all points here presented. Nevertheless, the Commission did vote, by a majority or greater vote, to deny the request for this change.

THINGS TO BE CONSIDERED WHEN REZONING FOR SHOPPING CENTERS  
FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

The following information entitled "Neighborhood Shopping Centers" is from our LOCAL PLANNING ADMINISTRATION book and is compiled by some of the foremost planners and by city managers with many years of experience, and I quote:

"SPACING AND LOCATION

Since the primary advantage of local shopping centers is their easy accessibility from the homes of the people they serve, those that specialize in convenience goods should be spaced from one-half mile to one mile apart, so that no person will have to travel more than one-half mile to a center. The size of any one of the centers will of course depend upon the number of people living within the area it serves.

GROUP ARRANGEMENTS

The opportunities of securing an attractive and inviting center through the harmonious architectural design of the entire group, the arrangement of buildings about suitably landscaped open squares, and the provision of tree-lined sidewalks of ample width are, of course, much greater in a group development.

ZONING LOCAL BUSINESS DISTRICTS

Practically every city contains a number of small neighborhood shopping centers, located usually at the intersection of major streets or transit lines. They serve a relatively small neighborhood (normally within a radius of one-half mile) with food, drugs, entertainment, and personal services -- convenience goods and services."

I believe the above statements should be considered for the good of the community and the convenience of its citizens whenever shopping center zoning is being considered.

Sincerely,

R. E. Cheever,  
City Manager

BUSINESS ECONOMICS

Good investment makes for good and permanent development. If business is forced into areas not economically feasible, it is retarding the development of the community as, regardless of location, bankrupt businesses do not create a healthy economic condition or improve any community.

To: Harold Shults, President, and  
Honorable Members of the City Council

In regard to the request for rezoning of the property at 12th and Orchard, after hearing the pros and cons we are of the opinion that some of the opposition is arising from a misunderstanding of what is planned for the development of this area.

Therefore, we would like to request that the City Council table any action on this rezoning until such time as we can complete the detailed plans, such as floor plans, building heights, parking area, etc. in order that all parties concerned may have a complete knowledge of what the area will be used for. We feel that this is only fair to all parties concerned.

We are willing to reimburse the City for the expense of re-advertising for another hearing as soon as these plans are completed and can be presented to all parties concerned.