

MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING  
GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday -- October 29, 1958 -- 8:00 A.M.  
CONFERENCE ROOM -- CITY HALL

The Grand Junction Planning Commission held its regular meeting in the Conference Room at the City Hall at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday, October 29, 1958, with the following members present: Chairman M. A. Cornelison, Secretary R. E. Cheever, Mr. Robert Van Deusen, Mr. Claud Smith, Mr. Richard Zollner, Mr. Glen Hopper, Mrs. F. A. Brumbaugh, and Mrs. Cleo Diemer.

Absent: Mr. Howard McMullin.

Also present: Regional Planning Director Gene Allen, City Engineer Carl Alstatt, Chief of Police Karl Johnson, Rev. Dwight S. Wallack, Mr. Lee Ford, Mr. Blain Ford, Mr. Wm. Harwood, Mr. Fred Sperber, Mr. Henry Blaylock, and Mr. H. A. Kuhnhausen.

All members having received copies of the minutes of September 24th and October 15th, the Chairman said if there were no corrections or omissions, the minutes would stand approved as written.

Since Mr. Van Deusen who was to give the report of the Annexation Committee on the Lee Ford Plat (Item No. II on the Agenda) had not yet arrived, the Chairman called for the report on the proposed Seventh Day Adventist Church at 8th and Mesa Avenue, which was Item III on the Agenda.

This item had been discussed briefly at the last Planning Commission meeting and the question was brought up as to whether the parking lot which is next to the School and separated from the Church but serves as both a playground for the school and a parking lot for the church might some day be sold off for building purposes.

Mr. Gene Allen explained that they proposed to build their church on the NW corner of 8th and Mesa Avenue across from the Academy and that they had marked parking on the north and east of the school as "temporary" as they would no doubt expand the school in those directions in the future; also no doubt the church might be expanded at some future time, so the parking along the ~~west~~ south of the proposed building is also marked "temporary". However, there is enough room to allow for expansion and still provide adequate parking, and both Mr. Allen and Rev. Wallack said they would be willing to sign an agreement to the effect that the parking lot would not be sold for building sites, but would be retained as a parking lot for the church. Rev. Wallack explained that the property adjoining the parking lot was all comprised of rear yards of dwellings and would not ever be up for sale.

The Chairman asked if there were any objections to a church being location here, and no objections were registered.

Mr. Cheever then made the motion that the Commission recommend that the Seventh Day Adventist people be granted a permit for their church, with the understanding that the parking area -- outside of their building expansion -- will be retained for parking. Motion was seconded by Mr. Claud Smith, and carried.

10-29-58

G. J. Planning Comm./2

Mr. Van Deusen had arrived at the meeting, so Chairman Cornelison next called upon him for the report of the Annexation Committee on the Lee Ford plat.

Mr. Van Deusen reported that he and Gene Allen and Carl Alstatt had inspected this area and that in their opinion this preliminary plat appeared suitable for the plot of ground; the over-all street layout and lot sizes seem satisfactory for the type of development that will go in this area, with one exception: enough right-of-way (25 ft) should be obtained on the south boundary so that it would make a 50 ft. street. With the additional right-of-way off of the south boundary, the lots would still be suitable for multiple dwellings.

From the Annexation Committee's point of view, Mr. Van Deusen stated, that "we would like, as a committee, to give our approval of the preliminary plat as to the lay-out; zoning and other matters would be questions for other committees to decide".

Chairman Cornelison then asked Mr. Ford for his comments. Mr. Ford stated that they would like to have the area along 1st Street zoned for business.

Mr. Claud Smith was of the opinion that businesses should not be right across the street from homes.

Mr. Cheever pointed out that there are multiple dwellings on the other side of the street, and this area under consideration could be developed into the same type of dwellings. If zoned for business, it would be putting businesses across the street from some very nice homes.

Motion was then made by Mr. Van Deusen that this preliminary plat be approved, subject to the owner of this property dedicating 25 ft. of right-of-way on the south boundary line. Seconded by Mrs. Diemer, and carried.

Mr. Alstatt remarked that after the approval of a preliminary plat, an actual survey is made for a final plat.

Item No. IV - report of committee on curb cut ordinance - was next taken up. Mr. Allen said that this committee (composed of Carl Alstatt, Karl Johnson, and himself) had been advised to check into some legal aspects of this question, and that they had been unable to meet with the City Attorney; however, they did have some definite recommendations to make. The committee had come to the conclusion that the best solution would be to have a one-time permit fee for all new driveways, and include in the ordinance that the City would have authority to have driveways not being used or driveways not up to the standards replaced with curb or brought up to the standards.

Mr. Alstatt explained that this would make the property owner pay for replacing curb or driveways not in use or not in compliance with the new ordinance -- the same as now applies to sidewalks. When asked by Mr. Zollner if this would apply to existing non-conforming driveways, Mr. Alstatt replied that it would. He said they had abandoned the idea of having a yearly fee, but would still have a permit fee.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that this fee would not be sufficient to replace curb, but would be similar to the building permit fee.

Mr. Cheever explained that the fee would only pay for inspections and writing permits. After we get a standard set up so that new curbs and driveways would be built correctly, we would gradually get the old ones corrected and it would not cause a hardship on any one. He further stated that he believed an annual fee would be a lot of trouble for the City and a permit fee that is fair to cover expenses would be better.

Chairman Cornelison then called upon the contractors present for their opinions. Messrs. Wm. Harwood, Fred Sperber, and Henry Blaylock were present representing the contractors and they agreed that they thought the Commission was now on the right track in regard to the curb cuts and driveways; they had opposed the annual fee because they thought it would be penalizing someone who would be wanting to furnish off-street parking. They also expressed the opinion that the first cut should be at a high enough figure so that businesses would not be wanting to have a whole half block for driveways.

Mr. Hopper asked if new legislation was required if it is the owner's responsibility to have curbs replaced or installed and Mr. Cheever said that there is no ordinance at present regarding curbs, just sidewalks.

Mr. M. A. Kuhnhausen who represented the realtors expressed his agreement with the idea of a permit fee.

Mr. Cheever stated that sometimes driveways are put in that are not necessary, and this fee would eliminate unnecessary driveways.

Mr. Smith said he thought this should be developed in semi-final form and a copy sent to each member of the Commission.

The contractors thought perhaps some distinction should be made between business curbs and residential curbs, and suggested a fee of \$1.50 or \$2.00 per ft.

Mr. Alstatt suggested a 10 ft. driveway at a certain fee, and a per foot price above that. In that way, the cost would not be so great for residential driveways -- however, he stated that it was his opinion that 12 ft. or 14 ft. are needed for a residential driveway. He also stated that the City usually does have some work to do when a curb cut is made, so it does cost quite a little.

Mr. Cheever said that if a distinction is made between residential and business curb cuts, it would create a problem in the fringe area.

Mr. Hopper thought there should not be a distinction between business and residential driveways. He said we should establish a fee for a certain size driveway and charge for each foot after that. Mr. Zollner and Mr. Alstatt agreed with this.

Mr. Hopper further stated that this would take care of double driveways and business driveways.

10-29-58

G. J. Planning Comm., 4

Mr. Cheever agreed with Mr. Smith - that we should have a preliminary report made and send each member a copy.

Mr. Smith then said that he thought we should give the committee some idea about a fee. He suggested \$5.00 for a 12 ft. driveway, and a charge of \$2.00 for each additional foot .

Mr. Alstatt remarked that at 35¢ per sqr. foot for repairing streets after cuts are made, this would probably balance out as some are made before the street is paved.

Mr. Cheever asked the question, "What about a sub-divider who puts in all curbs and gutters?"

Mr. Alstatt said that permit fees will not apply when driveways are put in as improvement district. Driveways are usually established when the street is put in and assessed to property at that time.

The Chairman then asked the Contractors what they thought about charging a permit fee on new subdivisions, and their opinion was that it should not be charged.

Mr. Cornelison then asked, "What is a minimum curb cut? If 10 ft. is too small, should it be a 12 ft. and allow for a little bit better sloping of sidewalks?"

Mr. Hopper favored leaving this up to the committee to work out; also, the Contractors when asked their opinion of what the minimum width of driveways should be said they would agree to let the City Engineer work this out.

Mr. Cheever said that their next step would be to work with the City Attorney.

Mr. Zollner then made the motion that we refer the proposed curb cut ordinance back to the committee for rewriting, after consulting with the City Attorney as to legal points, and copies of the re-written draft be sent to the members of the Commission for their study and action at the next regular meeting. Motion seconded by Mrs. Brumbaugh, and carried.

Item V on the Agenda was a report of the committee on changes in the by-laws and manner of voting, and since the chairman of the committee, Mr. McMullin, was absent, Mr. Cheever suggested that this matter be tabled until the next meeting. Mr. Zollner remarked that he thought this matter should be considered at more than one meeting. The Chairman appointed Mrs. Diemer a member of the committee, also.

Item No. VI -- The Chairman called upon the Public Relations Committee for their report, and Mr. Hopper made the following report--

October 27, 1958

"Al Cornelison Chairman  
Grand Junction City Planning Commission  
City

Re: Report of Public Relations Committee

Dear Mr. Cornelison:

We submit herewith the following report of the Public Relations Committee which met October 23rd pursuant to your request and the directive of the Planning Commission:

A. Regarding the question of procedure for handling ~~vis-a-vis~~ the public the various matters coming before the Commission, we recommend as follows:

1. As to the development of the master plan and its components, we would recommend that prior to action of the Commission in sending elements of the master plan to the City Council with recommendation certain representative elements of the community be invited to meet with the Commission to discuss the particular work, criticize and exchange ideas. Such a meeting and presentation would be after a preliminary "shaping-up" on a project under study, but before any finalization in the form to be presented to the City Council. The Commission should designate such representatives as it determines, but it would seem apparent that at least a representative of each newspaper and radio station and the Chamber of Commerce be included.

2. With regard to the spot-zoning type matter (or similar matter) before the Commission on the initiative of the property owner and not essentially involving preparation of our master plan, it is your committee's recommendation that existing procedures are entirely adequate.

3. With regard to a "no man's land" type matter the Commission is called upon from time to time to handle, we would recommend as in 1. above. By way of example of such matters we would cite the West Lake Park annexation and the zoning questions there involved, the "Jaros Tract" type matter and other similar matters that would have an important significance in affecting master planning and in which a community interest is clearly apparent.

B. Your committee strongly recommends that a member of the City Council be invited to attend each meeting of the Planning Commission, this to be regular procedure with such attendance to be under invitation only and for the purpose of liason between the Commission and the

10-29-58

G. J. Planning Comm/6

Council. We would further strongly urge that the Council appoint one man to attend for each six month period, rather than a different man attending each meeting. We believe such liason would be beneficial to both the Council and the Commission and the community; and that such designated council member would then be more fully informed and could better inform the council itself. This procedure would resolve certain difficulties of the Commission that have arisen in the past in its relation with the City Council.

Glen Hopper,  
CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC RELATIONS  
COMMITTEE."

Mr. Smith made the motion that the Commission accept this report as their basic thinking and a request be made to the Council as set forth in paragraph "B", effective at once. Seconded by Mr. Zollner, and carried.

Mr. Cornelison suggested that the same basic thinking should be part of the Regional Planning, also, and asked Mr. Hopper as a member of the Regional Committee to call such a meeting with them. Mr. Hopper agreed to do this.

Item VII - Williams Park. Since this item was included on the Agenda at the request of Mrs. Diemer, the Chairman asked her for her comments upon it.

Mrs. Diemer stated that this particular area which had been designated for a park was, in her opinion, a potentially dangerous situation and a hazard since it is used as a playground by children and also, being in back of a grocery store, used as a parking lot by large trucks. She asked if it could be traded for other property which perhaps might be in a more desirable location for a park, or something be done about improving it as a park.

Mr. Cheever stated that this had been dedicated to the City for a park and could be changed only by vote of the People. He also stated that because of the traffic and use of the area it was impossible to put it in grass, and that the City had no funds at the present time to improve it. He suggested that the best thing to do would be to fence it in so it would be a safer playground for the children, but again stated that there are no funds immediately available for this. He suggested that perhaps some civic organization might be interested in taking this on for a project.

Mr. Smith made the motion that the Park Department be requested to draw up plans for Williams Park and an effort be made to interest some civic organization in developing the area along these plans. Motion seconded by Mrs. Diemer. Carried.

10-29-58  
G. J. Planning Comm/7

The Chairman then called upon Mr. Van Deusen for the following Resolution:

"October 29, 1958

MEMORANDUM

That our planning director, Mr. Gene Allen, be officially commended by this group for his conduct during the recent meetings regarding the Interstate Highway location.

Without reference to the tactical issues involved we feel that Mr. Allen presented his professional viewpoint with dignity and courage against strong opposition. In so doing, he reflected credit on the integrity of his office and the work of this commission.

R. A. Van Deusen"

Mr. Smith made the motion that the Resolution as written by Mr. Van Deusen and set up in permanent form be adopted. Seconded by Mrs. Brumbaugh, and carried.

Upon motion, the meeting was adjourned.

R. E. CHEEVER, Secretary

October 27, 1958

Al Cornelison, Chairman  
Grand Junction City Planning Commission  
City

Re: Report of Public Relations Committee

Dear Mr. Cornelison:

We submit herewith the following report of the Public Relations Committee which met October 23rd pursuant to your request and the directive of the Planning Commission:

A. Regarding the question of procedure for handling vis-a-vis the public the various matters coming before the Commission, we recommend as follows:

1. As to the development of the master plan and its components, we would recommend that prior to action of the Commission in sending elements of the master plan to the City Council with recommendation certain representative elements of the community be invited to meet with the Commission to discuss the particular work, criticize and exchange ideas. Such a meeting and presentation would be <sup>AFTER</sup> a preliminary "shaping-up" on a project under study, but before any finalization in the form to be presented to the City Council. The Commission should designate such representatives as it determines, but it would seem apparent that at least a representative of each newspaper and radio station and the Chamber of Commerce be included.
2. With regard to the spot-zoning type matter (or similar matter) before the Commission on the initiative of the property owner and not essentially involving preparation of our master plan, it is your committee's recommendation that existing procedures are entirely adequate.
3. With regard to a "no man's land" type matter the Commission is called upon from time to time to handle, we would recommend as in 1. above. By way of example of such matters we would cite the West Lake Park annexation and the zoning questions there involved, the "Jaros Tract" type matter and other similar matters that would have an important significance in affecting master planning and in which a community interest is clearly apparent.

B. Your committee strongly recommends that a member of the City Council be invited to attend each meeting of the Planning Commission, this to be regular procedure with such attendance to be under invita-



tion only and for the purpose of liason between the Commission and the Council. We would further strongly urge that the Council appoint one man to attend for each six month period, rather than a different man attending each meeting. We believe such liason would be beneficial to both the Council and the Commission and the community; and that such designated council member would then be more fully informed and could better inform the council itself. This procedure would resolve certain difficulties of the Commission that have arisen in the past in its relation with the City Council.

Glen Hopper

CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

October 29, 1958

MEMORANDUM

I should like to propose the following resolution for adoption by the Grand Junction City Planning Commission:

That our planning director, Mr. Gene Allen, be officially commended by this group for his conduct during the recent meetings regarding the Interstate Highway location.

Without reference to the tactical issues involved we feel that Mr. Allen presented his professional viewpoint with dignity and courage against strong opposition. In so doing, he reflected credit on the integrity of his office and the work of this commission.



---

R. A. Van Deusen