



D. & R.G.W. R.R. GUNNISON RIVER

SOUTH

U.S. H/W 50

CANNON ST.

DOLORES ST.

SANTA CLARA ST.

LAVETA ST.

ESCALANTE ST.

GRAND MESA AVE.

ORCHARD ADDITION
COLORADO RIVER

SOUTH BOUND
NORTH BOUND

Added
T.S. R.W.
2945234

SEE
2945234

Neel I. & A.K. Crim
1882 Dolores
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

Glen E. Hertol
1661 Dolores
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

Rocky Lee Bailey Etal
1646 Dolores #90-81
Grand Jct., Co.

Viola M. Wilson
1620 Dolores
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

James A. Lyon
2475 Hwy 6 & 50
Grand Jct., Colo. #90-81

Robt W. & C. V. Holmes
1660 Dolores #90-81
Grand Jct., Co.

Chas. C. & Bessie E. Huck
Box 250
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

Elmer L. Neal
1625 Laveta
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

Ruth Ann Reed
1615 Laveta #90-81
Grand Jct., Co.

D. S. Dykstra
2700 G. Road
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

Theresa B. Robinson
1654 Cannon Ave.
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

Ted. E. Kernt
1642 Cannon Ave. #90-81
Grand Jct., Co.

Harold Mulder
1730 Hall
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

Dale G. Cole
1651 Dolores
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

pet.

V. W. Perino
606 Viewpoint Dr. #90-81
Grand Jct., Co.

H. E. Perino
606 Viewpoint Dr.
Grand Jct., Co. #90-81

REVIEW SHEET SUMMARY

FILE NO. 90-81 DUE DATE 10/15/81
 ACTIVITY Alley Vacation
 PHASE _____ ACRES _____
 LOCATION N. of Lot 48, Bl 4 & South 50' of Lots 1 to 5, Bl 4 Orchard Mesa Hqhts. Sub.
 PETITIONER V.W. Perino
 PETITIONER ADDRESS 606 Viewpoint Dr., Grand Junction, CO 81501
 ENGINEER _____

OVERALL CONSIDERATIONS

- OVERALL COMPATABILITY**
- CONSISTENCY**
- ADJACENT PROPERTY**
- CHANGE IN THE AREA**
- TRAFFIC IMPACT**

HAS BEEN ADDRESSED
 NOT BEEN ADDRESSED

<u>DATE REC.</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
10/8/81	Transportation Engineer	The location of this alley is not very clear to me, but the one I saw that appeared to be the one for vacation seemed to be actively used.
10/13/81	Fire Dept.	This office has no objections to this alley vacation, provided adequate accessibility is provided to proposed building. Building plans must be submitted.
10/15/81	City Engineer	I can't tell the limits of the requested vacation. The map isn't marked. Is any of the north - south alley to be vacated? I see no particular problem with vacating the east end of the east - west alley. Easements should be granted for any existing utilities. I am confused because the statement refers to lots 42 to 48 of Block 4. If the alley behind those lots is vacated, the entire alley system in that block would be useless.
10/15/81	Staff Comments SIC	1) Will the vacation of this R.O.W. landlock access to any parcel? 2) How will the City benefit by vacating this R.O.W. and how will it improve traffic circulation? 3) If all other review agency comments resolved, as well, staff has no further comments.
10/20/81	Mountain Bell	No requests.
10/27/81	Public Service <i>Late</i> <i>Late</i>	Electric: Require 10' easement on West side of alley behind Lots 42 to 48, Inc. block 4 and 10' easement South side of alley behind Lots 1 to 5 Inc. Block 4 Orchard Mesa Heights subdivision. HT 10-13-81. Gas: No objection to alley vacation. Lots 48-42 and 11-17 and 1-5 in block 4 Orchard Mesa Heights. HT 10-20-81.

DATE REC.

AGENCY

COMMENTS

10/27/81

QUIMBY/DUNIVENT PASSED 5-0 A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF #90-81 ALLEY VACATION, ALL SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF.

RESPONSE TO REVIEW SHEET SUMMARY

Location: N. of lot 48 Bl 4 and South of 50' of Lots 1-5 inc.
bl 4 Orchard Mesa Hts. Sub

- Item: Transportation Engineer I have contacted Jim Bragdon, exact location of alley has been found, said he knew of no reason it couldn't be vacated.
- Item: Fire Dept Prior to building, plans will be submitted for all departments approval.
- Item: City Engineer I have spoken with Ron Rish, location of proposed vacation is clear to him, said he sees no problem with this vacation.
- Item: Staff Comments Vacation of this alley WILL NOT landlock access to any parcel.

The city will benefit because this vacation will make possible more housing units which Grand Jct. sorely needs now and probably will need in future years. In addition, this is an area that could deteriorate unless new buildings are erected--and not a commercial type which would depress the values of existing homes. Present plans call for the erection of quality 4-plexes and the eventual razing of the two older homes on the corner of Grand Mesa and Dolores.

Submitted 10/23/81
V. W. Perino

V. W. Perino

RECEIVED MESA COUNTY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

OCT 23 1981

*Verified by ph. conversation
w/ Jim Bragdon
Alex*

