

MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

Monday -- June 9, 1958 -- 7:30 A.M.

LaCourt Hotel

The Grand Junction Planning Commission held a special meeting at the LaCourt Hotel at 7:30 A.M. Monday, June 9, 1958, with the following members present: Chairman Al Cornelison, Secretary R. E. Cheever, Mrs. F. A. Brumbaugh, Mr. Howard McMullin, Mr. Robert Van Deusen, Mrs. Cleo Diemer, and Mr. Laird Smith. Absent: Mr. Richard Zollner, and Mr. Claud Smith.

Also present: Regional Planning Director Gene Allen, City Engineer Carl Alstatt, Chief of Police Karl Johnson, Mr. Henry Faussonne, and Mr. William Rump.

Motion was made by Mr. Cheever, seconded by Mrs. Brumbaugh, that minutes of the previous meeting be approved as written; motion carried.

The Chairman called upon Mr. Laird Smith, Annexation Committee Chairman, for his committee's report on the revised plats submitted for the Subdivision and Annexation of Blocks 2 and 3, North Monterey Park.

Mr. Smith stated that it had been reported at the last meeting of the Commission, which he had been unable to attend, that it was impossible to proceed with the original plat which had been presented for this annexation. Mr. Smith further stated that the annexation committee had held a meeting and made an investigation and would recommend to the Planning Commission that they accept the revised plat which had been presented, wherein 10th Street and College Place would be off-set one-half block, with the understanding that pavement on the N-S streets be no less than 32½ ft., plus a 10½ ft. cement flat and that pavement on Walnut Avenue be 38 ft. wide, plus a 10½ ft. cement flat. They also suggested that in future planning of the homes and open ground to the East of this area, between College Place and 12th Street and between Walnut and Bookcliff, that Walnut Avenue should be dead-ended before reaching 12th Street so that it would not be a fast, through street. He spoke favorably concerning off-set streets, stating that they help to cut down fast traffic.

Discussion on this report was as follows.

City Engineer Alstatt said that they were planning on making the pavement on Walnut Avenue about 6 ft. wider than an ordinary width street to help facilitate the off-sets. He also recommended easements instead of alleys in this area, but did ask the Commission to give consideration to an alley along Tope School.

At this point, Mr. McMullin made the motion that this revised plat be approved by the Commission; however, the Chairman stated there was still discussion to be heard on the question.

Mr. Van Deusen remarked that having easements instead of alleys opposite the off-set streets would keep traffic from going through the alleys. Mr. Allen stated that sewers are already in, in this area, and either utility easements or streets should be put in where they are located. The City Engineer said that the sewers are located in the streets.

At this time Mr. Rump stated that one of the residents in this area, Mr. Robert Maffey, was originally in favor of the first plan, with the off-side of the street being developed, but would not work with them in improving the off-side of the street, so had instructed his attorney to remove his name from the original plat. Mr. Faussone stated that the revised plan did not touch Mr. Maffey's property.

Mr. Cheever asked if the original plat for development, all except the east row of houses, could be used, as all of the area around there will be wanting to annex in the near future; and in this way everything would match the existing streets. He pointed out that off-set streets make it much more difficult for the City to render trash and garbage service.

Mr. McMullin stated that it would not be possible to have just a portion of the tract approved for F.H.A. loans -- the entire subdivision must be approved.

Mr. Cheever stated that it causes trouble if front pick-ups and alley pick-ups are all mixed up in the same area; perhaps it is all right in a large enough area, but it does not make for efficient operation and is not agreeable to all people if in adjacent areas too close together.

Mr. Cornelison stated that maintenance and cost of operation are factors that definitely must be considered in planning. He then asked the question if it would be wise to put an alley against a school.

Mr. Allen's reply to this question was that it is better to have an alley adjacent to a school rather than a street with houses facing into the school grounds. He stated that if the school grounds are fenced there should be no traffic problem.

The Chairman then asked Chief Karl Johnson to express his opinion of off-set streets, from the viewpoint of the police. Mr. Johnson stated that it depended very greatly upon the size of the area. If the area is relatively large and residential, off-set streets do tend to keep traffic from moving through the area for long distances; but if a small area, it only adds confusion and makes it difficult to get services into the area. When asked his opinion from a fire protection viewpoint, Mr. Johnson said that his thinking along this line would be that it is of major importance to the fire department that their equipment be able to get into any area from any direction, and off-set streets would complicate their services.

Mrs. Diemer mentioned, in connection with curb pick-up, the possibility of having sunken containers where garbage buckets could be placed in order to improve the appearance of places that have this kind of service; however, several members of the Commission said

that they had observed that it took quite a large place to hold all of the trash, etc. that it would need to hold. Mr. Alstatt said that we do have sunken containers in one area, but they are not large enough, and then there is always the problem of keeping them clean.

Mrs. Diemer asked the question, "Is it possible to get right-of-way for Bookcliff to go on as a through street?" and both Mr. Alstatt and Mr. Allen said that it would be possible.

Mr. McMullin said at this time that he wished to include in his motion the wider streets, as presented in the committee's report.

The Chairman then called upon Mr. Alstatt for his opinion on offset streets from a sanitary sewer and water maintenance viewpoint. Mr. Alstatt said that maintenance did not present any serious problem; however, there is one problem and that is house numbering -- one side of the street would have to be numbered a block ahead of the other side. He mentioned that they would just as soon put sewers in streets as in alleys, but do not like to put sewers in easements as that always causes trouble.

At this time Mr. Cornelison read a letter to the Commission which had just been brought in. This letter was written by Mr. Robert F. Maffey, a resident of the area in question, living at 1047 Bookcliff Apartments. Copy of the letter follows:

"June 9, 1958

City Planning Commission

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I was told in no doubtful words by the chairman of this Commission that I was a very ungrateful & bad boy.

It seems the apparent owner of the North Monterey Park subdivision had "tossed a coin" to adjoining property owners-- but they failed to "grab it and start dancing!"

Being unable to appear personally may I take this means to explain our side of the story.

We have asked the subdivision to install a complete street, which naturally includes a curbing on both sides in exchange for our 25 feet by 330 feet right of way grant. This is an area almost equal to the area of the adjoining end lots which I understand are to sell for some \$2,600.00.

While this new street will increase our property value in the future if we sell -- it will actually increase our taxes immediately!

By looking at the air photo of the area it can be seen that an extension of the present portion into the new area as originally proposed is the only allowable move in the interest of the adjoining land owners, future home owners, and the City of Grand Junction.

In addition we are also faced with other problems and expense. On the photo can be seen our established yard and curb. The curb will have to be pulled and the lawn extended down to meet the new street. The irrigation ditch lateral, which runs along our west property line, will have to be moved to our East line in our front or back yard. Mr. Price needs the ditch to reach their lower $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres, or would have to establish a new ditch through his property.

However, I feel that for the good of all, we should all face a fair share of the expense and do some good for Grand Junction. Just look at the mess west of the existing area on the photo which is the result of greed and arguing. No true values and low taxes.

Finally, may I point out that the subdividers are involved in the deal strictly to make money and choose to live many blocks away. However, you are talking about our front yard where we hope to live until we die.

Thank you

Robert F. Maffey"

Mr. Rump then stated that with the old plat, the ditch would have to be moved in front of Mr. Maffey's yard, but he reaffirmed Mr. Faussonne's earlier statement that this revised plat would not touch Mr. Maffey's property, and also stated that it would not raise his taxes.

Chairman Cornelison then stated that there was a motion before the Commission that this revised plat, with wider streets than usually installed, as recommended by the committee be accepted, and called for a second to the motion. Mrs. Diemer seconded the motion.

Mr. Faussonne was then excused (Mr. Rump had gone earlier) and the chairman called for a vote.

Some discussion was had before voting. Mrs. Brumbaugh asked the question how long it would be before the rest of the area would come into the city, and Mr. Cheever replied that this area would no doubt develop very fast on account of health problems involved.

Mr. Cornelison stated that now the streets are all mixed up and, at best, there will still be some confusion; but even so, this plan would be better for the community. He also stated that the first plan was probably the best at that time, but the whole thing had changed because of lack of cooperation.

A vote was then taken, which resulted in a split vote in favor of accepting the revised plat, as recommended by the annexation committee.

Mrs. Diemer asked if the Commission could not set a policy whereby they annexed larger tracts of land which might eliminate some of the problems that arise in annexations. Mr. Cornelison suggested

that a rough draft of the fringe areas of the City might be drawn up, showing all of the buildings and then a preliminary plat made for roads and streets. Mrs. Diemer stated that she felt that the Commission should cooperate very closely with the County within a 5-mile radius of the City and possibly meet with them so that we will be in accord.

Mr. Allen told the Commission that the suggested Zoning Resolution for use in the Grand Valley Zoning Area of Mesa County was now ready for consideration.

The third item on the Agenda was the petition of Messrs. George and Christopher Joufflas requesting approval to erect a filling station on the Northeast corner of the intersection of Fifth Street and Grand Avenue. After the reading of this petition, there was considerable discussion.

Mr. McMullin pointed out there is a filling station across the street on the SE corner and also that Safeway Stores maintain this as a parking lot.

Mr. Laird Smith expressed the opinion that it would cause a traffic hazard.

The city engineer stated that if granted, we would need to force them to set the curb back.

Karl Johnson, Chief of Police, said it would be necessary to control the lay-out of the station so that traffic would be channeled properly.

Mr. Cheever pointed out that we would not want the same thing to happen on this corner that had happened at 7th and Main -- we soon might have all filling stations on this corner, too.

Mr. Allen stressed the need for a curb cut ordinance, and the Chief of Police stated there had been some discussion regarding this and that something definitely should be done about it.

Mrs. Brumbaugh then made the motion that this filling station petition be denied.

Mr. McMullin made an amendment to the motion - that, instead of being denied, this matter be tabled pending future study by the Commission, including an inspection of the site by all who are not familiar with it, and that the matter be brought up at our next meeting.

Mrs. Brumbaugh accepted this amendment, and Mrs. Diemer seconded both the motion and amendment. Carried.

Mr. Laird Smith then made the motion that the Zoning Sub-Committee meet with Mr. Gene Allen, Mr. Carl Alstatt, Mr. Karl Johnson, and Mr. Cheever in order to formulate a curb-cut ordinance. Motion was seconded by Mr. McMullin, and carried.

6-9-58

- 6 -

A short discussion was held concerning traffic lights. Chief Johnson stated that a study had been made of traffic at 12th and Grand, 12th and Main, and at 5th and Colorado; no decision has been reached, but he would recommend the first installation be at 5th and Colorado, with 12th and Grand being considered next, as soon as it is possible to make these installations.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

R. E. CHEEVER, Secretary

THE R. F. MAFFEY'S
1047 Bookcliff Apartments
Grand Junction, Colo.

June 9, 1958

City Planning Commission:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I was told in no doubtful words by the chairman of this commission that I was a very ungrateful & bad boy.

It seems the apparent owner of the North Monterey Park subdivision had "tossed a coin" to adjoining property owners - but they failed to "grab it and start dancing!"

THE R. F. MAFFEY'S
1047 Bookcliff Apartments
Grand Junction, Colo.

2

Being unable to appear personally may I take this means to explain our side of the story.

We have asked the subdivision to install a complete street, which naturally includes a curbing on both sides in exchange for our 25-foot by 330 foot right of way grant. This is an area almost equal to the area of the adjoining end lots which I understand are to sell for some \$2600⁰⁰.

While this new street will increase our property value in the future if we sell — it will actually increase our taxes immediately.

THE R. F. MAFFEY'S
1047 Bookcliff Apartments
Grand Junction, Colo.

3

By looking at the air photo of the area it can be seen that an extension of the present portion into the new area as originally proposed is the only allowable move in the interest of the adjoining land owners future home owners, and the city of Grand Junction.

In addition we are also faced with other problems and expense. On the photo can be seen our established yard and curb. The curb will have to be pulled and the lawn extended down to meet the new street. The irrigation ditch lateral, which runs along our west property line will have to be moved to our East line,

THE R. F. MAFFEY'S
1047 Bookcliff Apartments
Grand Junction, Colo.

in our front or back yard. Mr Price
needs ⁴ the ditch to reach their
lower 2½ acres, or would have to
establish a new ditch through his
property.

However, I feel that for the
good of all, we should all face
a fair share of the expense and
do some good for Grand Junction.
Just look at the mess west of
the existing area ^{on the photo} which is the
result of greed and arguing. No
true values and low taxes.

Finally, may I point
out that the subdividers are

THE R. F. MAFFEY'S
1047 Bookcliff Apartments
Grand Junction, Colo.

(
5
involved in the deal strictly
to make money and choose to
live many blocks away. However
you are talking about Our front
yard where we hope to live
until we die.

Thank you
Robert F. Maffey