

GRAND JUNCTION CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

M I N U T E S

The regular meeting of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order in the City Council Chambers at 8:00 A.M. on October 29, 1975 by Chairman LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: BLAKE CHAMBLISS, VIRGINIA FLAGER, JANINE RIBER, JERRY WILDS, JOHN ABRAMS and JANE QUINBY.

Also present were: DON WARNER, City Planner, KARI METZNER, City Planning Technician; BARBARA EINSPIR, Acting Secretary and approximately 20 interested persons.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as mailed.

Correction to the Work Session minutes of 10-8-75 was to add Jane Quinby as present.

1. ~~PROPOSED HIGH DEVELOPMENT~~

Petitioner: Jack Payne
Location: West of 28 1/2 Road - 181 feet North of Orchard Avenue

Don Warner pointed out the area in question. This item was tabled 9-24-75 for further review from the City Engineering and City Traffic Departments for traffic, drainage and general plan of the whole area.

Rodger Young stated that the City has plans for the future in putting 28 1/4 Road thru to Patterson Road to Orchard Avenue. In this area City Engineering feels that they need a thru access to help eliminate entrances onto Orchard Avenue. In order to obtain site distances and have a safe travel road, they feel that the best and most desirable location would be to enter the development even with Brittany Drive and then proceed West to 28 1/4 Road. He also stated that the City residential streets have a 30 MPH speed limit and for safe stopping distance they recommend 300 feet spacing of intersections. Mr. Young felt that an undesirable T intersection was presented for Cedar Terrace.

Virginia Flager questioned if the proposed 28 1/4 roadway would go between Landing Heights and the water tower. Mr. Young stated that it would. This would be in back of the Landing Heights Nursing Home.

Mr. Young stated that it is not feasible to put 28 Road or 28 1/2 Road thru because they would be required to have more bridges and the expense would be too great.

John Abrams questioned the amount of fill that they are anticipating and would be required to have to put 28 1/4 Road thru. Mr. Young stated that it would be 12 feet.

Bob Gardner, Architect for Cedar Terrace, stated that he had met with Rodger Young and that he does not disagree with him and they will provide the city with right-of-way so that tract does not block off access from 28 1/4 to 28 1/2 Road.

By putting Brittany Drive through, this would run traffic through Rothaupt Subdivision. The T intersection would mean a right hand turn. Potentially either direction can be taken but the road to the left does not go anywhere because of the canal blocking it. Mr. Gardner felt that it was the recommendation of the Board that traffic should not go thru Rothaupt Subdivision but rather stop somewhere else. He also felt that this area is not going to develop into single-detached housing but into a higher more intense use.

Mr. Gardner stated that the right-of-way will lay under the grass. This area will be developed as a park until right-of-way is needed. He did not feel that the right-of-way should be on Brittany Drive. He also felt that 28 1/2 Road is a natural exit to Orchard Avenue. They have stated before that they will build 28 1/2 Road with the first phase. He stated that they do not object to the access, but do object to where it's being put.

Mr. Young stated that they have no driveway access on 28 1/2 Road with a street somewhere in that area running East and West. They want to eliminate one street where there are two conflicting movements proposed. He would rather see a continuation of an access.

Mr. Young explained that, under the Subdivision Regulations, when they put the development in, the proposed road would need to be built or the money excrowded. Mr. Gardner stated that they would do this.

Janine Rider questioned the eventual possibility for a required right-of-way for Picardy Drive from this development. Mr. Young stated that the developers would not be required to supply right-of-way for Picardy Drive. City Engineering is concerned with an access and he did not feel that Picardy Drive is a desirable access.

The South portion will be in the first phase. The project is 64 units with 32 units in each court. They are not rentals but are for sale. The units are below \$29,000.00. The people own their own building units. The common open space is owned by the home owners association. They maintain the open space and the courts. This is a condominium ownership of the land.

Jerry Wilds questioned if the park would be developed in the second phase. Virginia Flager stated that if the road goes through, there won't be any land for a park.

Mr. Gardner stated that they would give the right-of-way. He does not want to give it in lining up with Brittany Drive but if they have to, they will. He stated that they would not land lock any other parcels. He felt that the park area will be developed as a park initially.

Blake Chambliss questioned if there are any covenants on the development of open space. Mr. Warner stated that it is up to the Board whether they go along with the plan.

There was no further discussion or opponents. Hearing was closed.

Mr. Chambliss stated that he agreed with Rodger Youngs suggestions for redesign of the development in order to have an adequate right-of-way and the location of Brittany Drive eliminates additional points of conflict along 28 1/2 Road.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO DENY APPROVAL OF CEDAR TERRACE BULK DEVELOPMENT AS IT WAS PRESENTED SUBJECT TO REDESIGN TO ACCOMODATE THE CONCERNS THAT RODGER YOUNG HAD EXPRESSED. VIRGINIA FLAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS CHANGED HIS MOTYON TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CEDAR TERRACE BULK DEVELOPMENT TO CITY COUNCIL WITH CORRECTIONS REQUESTED BY RODGER YOUNG IN TERMS OF EAST-WEST STREET GOING THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT AND THAT THE PLANS COME BACK TO PLANNING COMMISSION FOR FINAL REVIEW. VIRGINIA FLAGER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. PROPOSED REZONING FROM R-1-C TO B-1 (Light Business)

Petitioner: George Schnell
Location: 23rd and Grand Avenue

Mr. Warner read a letter from Art Lund, Assistant Director of Business Services for the School District #51 Office, in which Mr. Lund stated that the change in zoning proposed would cause a significantly increased traffic and parking problem. Mr. Lund felt that any housing development should provide sufficient spaces of off-street parking for the occupants and their guests. (On file at the City/County Development Department).

Mr. Warner stated that Mr. Schnell requested a rezoning to B-1 for apartment use of the land. There is no R-3 zoning adjacent to the land but there is B-1 zoning adjacent.

There were no objections from any of the reviewing agencies.

The Planning Commission Board wanted to be assured that apartments would be built. Mr. Schnell stated that they do intend to build apartments.

Mr. Warner stated that this area was zoned B-1 at one time. Columbia Savings and Loan requested that it be zoned R-1-C because at that time they had intended to put more single-

family dwellings in.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

VIRGINIA FLAHER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE PROPOSED REZONING FROM R-1-C TO B-1 (APARTMENTS) TO CITY COUNCIL. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. PROPOSED REZONING FROM R-1-D TO C-1 (Light Commercial)

Petitioner: Eugene Wimer-Alice E. Wimer
Location: NW Corner of North Ave. & 28 1/4 Rd.
West of Eastgate Shopping Center

Mr. Warner stated that this is a land locked piece of property North of North Avenue. The access is off of North Avenue through a permanent easement in 30 foot width. Rita Place has been open for years but is actually an easement. The property is partially zoned C-1 now. As of now, Valspar Paint can build the building they want without rezoning but they do plan to expand in the future. If, in the future they do expand to the rear of the property, then the right-of-way would have to be increased to 50 feet and made a public street.

Mr. Malcolm Wimer stated that this area requested to be rezoned is behind Colorado West Tire and Valspar Paint Store. On the East side there is a telephone construction site and it borders Mac McCoy Associate Building, Colorado West Tire and a house owned by Mr. Tom DeRita; Valspar Paint and Glass, the Motor Inn and then a line of houses up the West side on Court Street.

Mr. Warner stated that, from the staff viewpoint, 600 from North Avenue is what they are talking about in order to have depth to get a more workable commercial zone.

The telephone construction site that is on the East side is located in an R-1-D zoning. This is a leased building. Mr. Lucero recommended that the owner of this site be approached for rezoning. They had not applied for rezoning so could not be rezoned at this time.

Mr. Wilds stated that the site of the telephone company has access onto 28 1/4 Road whereas the proposed rezoning area only has access onto North Avenue.

Mr. Lucero questioned if there is a canal or drainage ditch easement. Mr. Wimer stated that there is a ditch along the North part of the property but it has not been in use for several years.

There were no opponents and no further comments. Hearing was closed.

JANINE RIDER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REZONING FROM R-1-D TO C-1 (LIGHT COMMERCIAL) TO CITY COUNCIL WITH THE STIPULATION THAT ADJACENT-PROPERTY OWNERS BE CONTACTED IN RELATION TO A ZONING CHANGE ALSO. VIRGINIA FLAGER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

If the adjacent property owners want to rezone, this will have to come before the City Planning Commission again.

4. PROPOSED KENNEDY COVE BULK DEVELOPMENT

Petitioner: Audrey Stephens
Location: 1321 Kennedy Avenue

Mr. Warner showed the area proposed in an R-2 zone. Proposed further development is for court arrangement. parking access would be back in off of the alley which is an area of a 20 foot easement but is open and used as an alley. This would be decided as an alley. Mrs. Stephens owns the whole piece of property which is actually two lots and bounds parcels. There is one building existing now which is a tri-plex.

Mr. Warner spoke of the comments from Ken Idelman in which Mr. Idelman agrees to the landscaping plans as submitted with the exceptions that globe willows should be looked at very closely to keep them away from sanitary sewer lines because of the root problems and that the shrubs should be located so that they are not obstructions to traffic at traffic intersections.

Mr. Rodger Young stated that there are no drainage problems in the alley. He questioned if there is access on each end to the alley. Mr. Warner stated that the alley on the West where traffic would go out is alley instead of easement and is the short distance to Mrs. Stephens property. Going East it is still easement but used as alley.

Mr. Wilds questioned that since the trash containers are in the back, will the sanitation crews be able to get in to pick up trash. Mr. Warner stated that the sanitation department is using the alley now. In this process, it would be necessary to deed as alley.

Blake Chambliss questioned the number of apartments. Mrs. Stephens said that when it is completed there will be ten units. She also stated that the utility room is in the ground level. The existing structure will remain temporarily and eventually will be connected to the new units. This will be for student housing for college students.

Mr. Chambliss questioned if there is a sidewalk along Kennedy Avenue. Mrs. Stephens stated that there is not a sidewalk in this area.

Mr. Warner stated that from the staff viewpoint, this is in within the acceptable area for housing for the students and would serve a need in the immediate area.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF KENNEDY COVE BULK DEVELOPMENT TO CITY COUNCIL SUBJECT TO THE INCLUSION OF KEN IDELMAN'S REVIEW COMMENTS AND WITH THE ADDITION OF SIDEWALK BEING PROVIDED ON KENNEDY AVENUE ALONG WITH THE DEDICATION OF ALLEY ON THE SOUTH. VIRGINIA FLAGER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE FOR DRIVE THRU PHOTO

Petitioner: Lee Markley
Location: Teller Arms Shopping Center

Mr. Warner explained that this is the same type of Drive Thru Photo that is located at 12th and Glenwood Avenue.

Levi Lucero asked whether restrooms are in the design. Mr. Warner stated that they had made arrangements with other businesses in order to use their restrooms. Under the Uniform Building Code, they are not required to build restrooms if these are available at a reasonable distance.

Mr. Markley stated that they had made arrangements with McDonalds to use their restrooms.

Mr. Young spoke of his concern that there could be a conflict with traffic. The new entrance into the parking lot has been widened, also a 75 foot island with 50 feet of curbing coming back into the lot.

Mr. Markley stated that they are approximately 75 feet West of the new West curb.

Virginia Flager stated that she did not like the Drive Thru Photo to be put in the middle of the parking lot. She also stated her concern that no restrooms are provided in the design. Mr. Markley stated that the normal design of a Drive Thru Photo is for it to fit into a shopping center complex and not up against other buildings.

Mr. Warner stated that all drive in facilities are a conditional use.

Mr. Markley stated that the owners in the Teller Arms Shopping Center have been assured that there will be no traffic congestion in the center of the parking lot.

There were no opponents. Hearing was closed.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE DRIVE THRU PHOTO TO CITY COUNCIL SUBJECT TO THE FINAL REVIEW OF THE DETAILED PARKING LAYOUT BY RODGER YOUNG IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE OWNERS TO BE SURE THAT CONGESTION IS NOT CAUSED AROUND THE REVISED ENTRY. JANINE RIDER SECONDED THE MOTION. FIVE MEMBERS VOTED FOR AND VIRGINIA FLAGER VOTED AGAINST. MOTION WAS PASSED.

6. SIGN CODE

The following changes to the Preliminary Sign Code were recommended by the City Planning Commission Board:

Page 7 - GENERAL REGULATIONS: 4.2:

(30) - no parenthesis

Page 9 - 4.7:

After clearly legible - "from the ground" should be taken out

5. TEMPORARY SIGNS: 5.1:

(32) suggested change to (16) Also add "Unless an application for continuance is submitted to the administrator. The Administrator may issue approval to continue the sign for an additional year." Delete words "or replaced" after "summarized"

5.2: Add after "similar sign" "except that such signs may be replaced by a sign containing only the words "Property Sold" and no other word, symbol, design or any form of advertising."

5.3: (32) suggested change to (16) Also add "All such signs must be removed within 14 days after construction is completed or 14 days after the beginning of the intended use of the structure, improvement or development."

Page 10 - 6.2.2 - TYPES ALLOWED:

A: (25) suggested change to (24)

B: (32) suggested change to (16)

C: Suggested to read "Signs advertising any subdivision or other development in the City of Grand Junction will be governed by the following:

- 1) suggested change (200) to (100)
- 2) suggested change (32) to (16)

Page 11 - 6.2.3:

suggested change (5) to (6)

6.3.5: should read LOCATION AND SIZE

6.3.3: add "The total amount of signs to be allowed on any property shall not exceed the sign allowance as calculated in 6.3.5 or 6.3.7, whichever is greater."

Page 13 - D:

In the last sentence take out "shall" and put in "may".

E: Add "above grade" to last sentence.

Page 14 - 6.3.7 - A:

Add "No more than" one free-standing-----

The suggested change for the chart:

SIZE LIMITATIONS ON 2 LANE ROADS*

<u>SETBACK FROM FRONT PROPERTY LINE</u>	<u>MAXIMUM SIZE ALLOWED</u>	<u>MAXIMUM HEIGHT ALLOWED</u>
0'	30 sq. ft.	10'
10'	60 sq. ft.	15'
20'	90 sq. ft.	20'
40'+	120 sq. ft.	25'

SIZE LIMITATIONS ON 4+ LANE ROADS*

<u>SETBACK FROM FRONT PROPERTY LINE</u>	<u>MAXIMUM SIZE ALLOWED</u>	<u>MAXIMUM HEIGHT ALLOWED</u>
0'	60 sq. ft.	10'
20'	90 sq. ft.	20'
35'	120 sq. ft.	30'
50'+	150 sq. ft.	40'

* Requirements as proposed by Blake Chambliss but not agreed by Commission.

Page 16 - DISTANCE: B:

(1,000) suggested change to (600)

change 500 square feet to "300 square feet"

Add "A maximum of one off-premise sign shall be allowed per parcel of land."

Page 17 - 7.1: delete "within 90 days."

Page 18 - 8.5.3:

every twenty seconds suggested to read "every 60 seconds."

COUNTY ITEMS

1. REVIEW AND UPDATE OF COUNTY ACTIVITIES

Connie McDonough, Senior County Planner, presented a layout of possible access roads on the Redlands.

Ms. McDonough stated that the staff of the Development Department had been taking a close look at the access problems on the Redlands and have developed a proposal that has been presented to the Chamber of Commerce, to the Chamber Directors and the Chamber Highway Committee. This has been informally presented to the Mesa County Planning Commission and the County Commissioners. The proposal will be on the next County Planning Agenda for public review.

For many years there has been consideration for a river crossing which occurs on the East side of Monument Village area coming out at approximately 22 1/2 Road.

The Comprehensive Plan shows this plus the by-pass from Orchard Mesa coming up and connecting to 24 Road. The Development Department is now proposing that priority number one, as a community, would be to support and encourage a 23 Road crossing at the Goat Draw and the Colorado River location.

It is the feeling that this will provide more quickly the relief that is needed to a greater number of people than either of the other two alternatives. They want to continue to support both of these in future planning, but consider the 23 Road crossing as priority number one.

The Department is proposing design within the Goat Draw as much as possible to take advantage of a natural terrain sound buffer. This will assist South Broadway in getting across into the

community without traveling on Highway 340. It will allow 340 traffic West to use this. The connected Lakes Park road that has been proposed and adopted by resolution for engineering studies will facilitate neighborhood traffic to the East to move directly to the arterial way. This will connect immediately with Highway 6 & 50 and will go on and connect with 26 Road where there is already an interchange with I-70.

This would be much more than road right-of-way. It would be utility coordinate.

The 201 Sewer Plan, which calls for three sewage collectors on the Redlands, was proposed for one of the major crossings of the river at this exact location. It also could be used in the future for a major water line for better fire protection and water service on the Redlands. Drainage would continue in the draws. A pedestrian over and under pass with fencing could be provided as part of the design for the Broadway School area.

It was the concensus of the Planning Commission that this was the correct location for a connector road.

2. OX-BOW SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAN

Petitioner: Jack Fitzgerald
Location: 660' East of 29 Rd., North of F Rd., 40 acres

Ms. McDonough presented the plans. This is a Transitional Subdivision.

This was tabled September 24, 1975 for City Engineers comments.

Ms. McDonough stated that Rodger Young has recommended that this subdivision have one entry way to F Road and F 1/2 Road as opposed to two as it was designed originally.

The Engineer for Ox-Bow Subdivision presented an alternative design with a main entry on F Road with a four foot median to separate the traffic lanes. The developer is proposing to screen the F Road boundary with a cinder block wall with stucco face.

Rodger Young stated that on an Arterial Street, which F Road is, standards for a 45 MPH stopping distance is 400 feet. They will not have this if they go with two entrances. Basically, they have 660 feet total over all outside dimensions. Mr. Young stated that if, on arterials, if they can get into a position for intersecting streets every 200 feet then the capacity that can be derived out of F Road is going to be a lot less than what is on North Avenue.

Engineering is asking for an additional right-of-way and entrance for putting in a center island for two lanes of traffic in and two lanes of traffic out.

JANINE RIDER MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF OX-BOW SUBDIVISION TO MESA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS AND CITY COUNCIL SUBJECT TO RODGER YOUNG LOOKING INTO THE ACCESS TO THE WEST AND SUBJECT TO THE CHANGE OF DESIGN TO COME OUT ON THE EAST SIDE TO F ROAD. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. EASTMOOR SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAT

Petitioner: Bray Realty Company
Location: NE of the intersection of 30 Rd. &
B 1/2 Rd. (Orchard Avenue)

Ms. McDonough stated that this is a transitional subdivision. It has had full review and all is in order. The Preliminary Plan was approved by the County and City with the City requesting to alter the design for an additional east-west street which would be known as Walnut Avenue.

The County Commissioners approved the Preliminary Plan without requesting Walnut Avenue. Since that time, Ms. McDonough has received letters and evaluations from Gus Byron in which he states that there is no need for Walnut Avenue to be designed within this subdivision. Mr. Young's evaluation called for no additional penetration of the 30 Road arterial, which an additional street would create.

The County Road Department did not ask for any additional roadways. Mr. Young has asked for screening of lots adjacent to the arterial roadways.

Mr. Warner stated that the staff concurs with what the County Commissioners have done and they recommend not to design for Walnut Avenue up to the outside because access is sufficient onto the arterials to the South and at the access on the North.

JERRY WILDS MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND FINAL APPROVAL OF EASTMOOR SUBDIVISION TO CITY COUNCIL AND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. VIRGINIA FLAHER SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:35 P.M.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested

Yes No

Date

October 28, 1975To: (From:) Don Warner From: (To:) Ken Idleman, Assistant Director
City Planner Parks and Recreation

Subject: Landscaping for bulk development of "Kennedy Cove"

I have reviewed the letter sent to the City Planning Department from Audrey Stephens, 247 27 Road, Grand Junction, Colorado, in reference to the landscaping of the bulk development of "Kennedy Cove" and would recommend the following:

1. Grass - I would recommend that Kentucky Blue Grass mixture be utilized for the grass area mentioned in the letter; 1/3 Kentucky Blue Grass, 1/3 Merian and 1/3 Annual Rye.
2. Trees mentioned in the letter I have no objection to with the exception of the Globe Willows; I would recommend that consideration be given to the location because of the problems that the root structure causes to sanitary sewer.
3. The shrubs that are mentioned we have no objection to but would recommend that they be planted at areas where there would be no obstruction to traffic at driveways and intersections. The variety that have been selected are excellent for this part of the country.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact our office.

KI:sc

Ken Idleman

BULK DEVELOPMENT
KENNEDY COVE
OWNER: AUDREY STEPHENS

~~City Planning Department~~
County Courthouse
Grand Junction, Colorado
81501

Re: Landscapping

Dear Sir;

Regarding the landscaping for the proposed bulk development of "Kennedy Cove", please make note of the following;

Grass - to be planted in all areas not taken up by walkways, parking areas, or buildings.

Trees - type of tree to be planted as follows:

- 1) globe willows
- 2) blue spruce
- 3) ash
- 4) flowering crab

Bushes - type of bush and or shrubs to be planted as follows:

- 1) evergreen shrubs
- 2) barberry
- 3) lilac

Sincerely,

Audrey Stephens

Audrey Stephens
247 27 Road
Grand Junction, Colo
81501

Bard

FRIENDSHIP INN CITY CENTER MOTEL

P. O. BOX 1225

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO. 81501

As one of the people being affected by the new sign code, I would appreciate your allowing me a little time to present my views, which are of a general nature, and address themselves to a very important function and operating method of the planning commission, which should lend itself to striving for overall consistency and continuity of a plan for the betterment of Grand Junction.

Inasmuch as I was not a member of the sign committee, I had no voice in the ascertainment of specific detailed numbers in the code.

This code, when approved and accepted by the City Council, will have a decided affect on the community, and should be a part of an overall plan or scheme, and not merely another piece of isolated legislation. If this code is approved with stringent detailed numbers as to height, size and short time duration, let alone number of signs per business, in my opinion, the business community will be dealt a very low blow.

I realize this hearing is to go over the code for audience impact, as to its overall acceptability, but I wish to stress some major points first. It is my understanding, and please correct me if I am wrong, that the whole sign code revision comes from an outgrowth of a few far sighted persons, who upon reviewing North Avenue, thought improvement could be had in relation to what their eyes beheld.

Project Foresight, in the downtown area occurred prior to my coming here, but because of its attractiveness, and the fact that it occurred as the work of a farsighted community, somewhat influenced me to establish a business in this city.

Now, at this time, just to establish a sign improvement situation does not do

FRIENDSHIP INN CITY CENTER MOTEL

P. O. BOX 1225

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO. 81501

a great deal toward really improving North Avenue, nor 1st street, nor 6/50 highway, nor the 6/24 highway.

— We have at the present time a view of true clutter, if one were to look down a couple of blocks. There exist numerous telephone poles, transformers wires, buildings of various sizes, shapes and colors, as well as set backs. No clear cut geometrical pattern that might be necessary for beauty exists. Can we here visualize a start of a real plan of improvement city wide? I realize this may not be the place, but it is the time to try to implant an idea in conjunction with a formal sign code. I say city wide, because 6/50 highway to the west, 50 highway to the southeast, are both included in the sign code. The recent Highway 24 improvement into Ute shows a start in the right direction.

This sign code affects businessmen only, in a financial way. These are the people who employ the community people, pay real property tax, as well as furnishings or personal property tax, and derive for the community's benefit, the sales tax. The man in business today needs many tools to create a profit, and one of the tools necessary is a good readable, seeable sign.

In case you've never given it a thought, I'd like to discuss an aspect not realized by all. Grand Junction, like many other cities, has some industry, is a financial community, and is located at a travel division point. It is not a terminal or resort community, but a shopping center for surrounding smaller towns and agricultural communities. From this we can divide the businesses into categories. First there are those whose profit is derived from local people, who are familiar with the product or service, Yellow pages newspaper or radio advertising, and a small sign is all that may be necessary. There are others, who depend on transient trade, who must put up a sign large

FRIENDSHIP INN CITY CENTER MOTEL

P. O. BOX 1225

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO. 81501

enough to inform the traveling public they are here. I refer to the gasoline service stations, motels, restaurants, and even automobile dealers.

Because Grand Junction is a diversion city, on a transient route, the forementioned service stations, motels, restaurants, etc., must announce to the non resident public what is available. To the locals who know their way around, and clamor for prettiness, a large sign is unnecessary. To the tourist, some significant attraction, and information is necessary.

Timely as it is, I have just come back from Hawaii, where stringent sign rules are in effect. Being aware of our sign code development, I attempted to study their results. When walking in the resort areas, I found everything I needed without much problem. When I rented a car, or rode the bus, I had a real problem. They have gone too far. There are not the proper identification tools to aid a person not familiar with the area.

What I am trying to present here may be summed up thusly:

Until the horrible looking telephone poles, wires, transformers, the clutter of many colored, shaped sized and set backs of un-uniformity in structures, are all improved and brought within a full blown improvement plan, not much is really going to be gained by only a sign code.

Until an overall planned program with significant input from the merchants themselves, related to beautification and improvement, including building update, floral plantings, artform lighting, etc., takes place, this sign code will have little affect on the overall betterment of our community. I repeat, little affect on the betterment of our community.

If the code is too stringent, great bitterness will be displayed by the business community. It is my opinion this will be a set back because of the resentment which will be felt by many affected businesses.

FRIENDSHIP INN CITY CENTER MOTEL

P. O. BOX 1225

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO. 81501

In addition, the feeling of having to rush a sign code thru is a lot of baloney. Good judgement dictates that a little more time should be taken to analyze the overall impact.

1. Big signs will be with us for a number of years.
2. A clutter of multiplicity of signs will be here the same length of time.
3. A few turning, spinning, or flashing carnival type signs will cease shortly.
4. The rest of the clutter will remain.
5. To my knowledge, no overall improvement plan is being instituted.

I reccommend that brakes be applied, rather than rushing into this sign code. Take another look. Let other interested persons get into the act. Consider revising the section relating to implementation of the code, as to immediate removal of multiplicity of signs and painted signs on walls which seem to be in poor taste, as I do not remember this indicated in the code.

Because a sign is big, and mounted on a tall pole, does not really make it obnoxious to the majority of the people. Of what use is a small discreet sign, in amongst the clutter of poles and buildings?

Grand Junction is a city, not a resort town, or a country community. Let us come up with a really meaningful program for total beautification of the community, not a hit and miss one piece plan.

Paul S. Shilling

WORK SESSION

10-8-75

Members present from the Sign Code Committee were: Joe Hughes, Dean Dickey, Glen Cochran, Bruce Bauerle, Dale Hollingsworth, and Mary Hurst.

Members present from the City Planning Commission were: Frank Simonetti, Blake Chambliss and Virginia Flager.

Also present were: Don Warner, City Planner; Karl Metzner, City Planning Technician; and Acting Secretary, Barbara Einspahr.

The Sign Code Draft was discussed between the Sign Code Committee and the City Planning Commission members. Because of lack of quorum, the Planning Commission Board were unable to vote on any changes for the Sign Code Draft.

Patterson Gardens--Landscaping and Drainage Plan

Petitioner: Chuck Wiman

Location: Southwest corner of 15th and Patterson Road.

Jerry Wilds was present for this discussion in order to have a quorum.

The Landscaping and Drainage Plan was discussed with Mr. Ed Armstrong and Mr. Chuck Wiman.

Mr. Warner mentioned that the memo from the Parks Department stated that they had no objections to the landscaping but the Parks Department did point out to the petitioners what the problems might be.

A memo from Rodger Young, City Engineer, was read. (On file at the City/County Development Department).

Blake Chambliss was concerned that there was no provision for a sidewalk along Patterson Road.

Mr. Wiman stated that they would put in a sidewalk if it was the desire of the Planning Commission Board and City Council. He stated that they had signed an agreement with the City to put the sidewalks in when 15th Street and Patterson Road are completed. He also stated that they would be the only ones in that area that have sidewalks.

It was stated that Spring Valley Subdivision was required to put in sidewalks.

Jerry Wilds commented that if developments are made during construction, then the improvements will be made prior to the improvement district going in.

Mr. Wiman questioned that if they put the sidewalk in now, will they be assessed a proportionate share for prior improvements to the improvement district. Mr. Warner replied that any improvements made before the improvement district goes in the developer gets credit for.

Mr. Chambliss was concerned with the drainage on the Southwest corner because it will drain onto the pavement and shoulders of the road. He felt ~~that there is no on-site circulation.~~

Mr. Armstrong stated that on-site detention is not necessary and that a 50 or 100 year frequency storm would not change this substantially. It would change the size of the ditch and pipe for adequate drainage.

BLAKE CHAMBLISS MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE LANDSCAPING AND DRAINAGE PLAN FOR PATTERSON GARDENS SUBJECT TO PROVISION OF A FIVE FOOT DETACHED SIDEWALK ALONG PATTERSON ROAD; RODGER YOUNG REVIEW AND LOOK AT 50 OR 100 YEAR STORM PLAN REQUIRED BY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULATIONS; AND PUT CONCRETE EDGE AROUND ROADS TO CONTAIN EDGE OF PAVEMENT TO RODGER YOUNG'S, CITY ENGINEER, SATISFACTION. JERRY WILDS SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.