

M I N U T E S

The special meeting to discuss the Sign Code of the Grand Junction Planning Commission was called to order in the City Council Chambers at 8:00 A.M. on December 3, 1975 by Chairman LEVI LUCERO, with the following members present: FRANK SINONETTI, VIRGINIA FLAGER, JOHN ABRAMS, JERRY WILDS, BLAKE CHAMBLISS and JANINE RIBER.

Also present were: DON WARNER, City Planner, KARL METZNER, City Planning Technician; BARBARA HINSPAHR, Acting Secretary and approximately 25 interested persons.

Discussion was opened to members of the audience with the City Planning Commission.

Richard Clark, representing the North Avenue Businessmen, stated that they support the revised Sign Code with very few exceptions.

Gay Johnson did not agree with the Sign Code. He felt that existing signs should not have to be removed but only that new signs should conform to the Sign Code.

Matt Mattas: "Why was there a committee formed?"

Don Warner: "The first group that met were the North Avenue Beautification Group. Shortly after this committee started they decided they were going to take a look at signs. A smaller group was selected to be a Sign Code Committee. About six months ago the City Council asked that the Sign Code be completed. Within the last five months the Sign Code Committee has met and presented their recommendations to the City Planning Commission."

Dick Bullard questioned whether we need a better Sign Code.

Levi Lucero stated that there is a time limit to make signs conforming. Unfortunately, it will affect some people more than others.

Dick Bullard: "Has anyone taken into consideration what the actual cost to present sign owners will be?"

Bean Dickey: "75% will be affected in some way."

Virginia Flager: "I think there is one thing the sign owners might as well live with and it won't come from this Board, it will come from federal legislation pertaining to the out put of energy for the illumination of signs. As one of the things that will come down as the energy crisis worsens."

Dale Luke felt that there isn't a sign to conform. He stated that he was unhappy with the way the recommendations were accepted.

Levi Lucero stated that recommendations were made to the Board and if someone feels that they are not proper then discuss what the change should be.

Joe Hughes felt that any committee that is appointed is useless.

Don Warner stated that no board has any legislative power. All it has is recommendation power to the City Council.

Glen Cochran who is interested in outdoor signs stated that there are very few areas where outdoor signs can be built because of the zoning. He was unhappy with just being able to put up one sign per location (300 square foot limit).

~~Richard Clark~~ did not feel that the Sign Code Committee time was futile because there would not have been anything to present if a committee had not been formed.

Bruce Bauerle felt that having a Sign Code is a matter of good taste. He felt that Grand Junction is behind and this is the first step in North Avenue beautification and he felt that it would help the business on North Avenue if we make it a nice place to shop.

Judy Prack, representing the housewives, stated that many women she knows avoids shopping on North Avenue because the signs are confusing.

The Sign Code was reviewed page by page and recommendations made to the City Planning Commission Board:

Page 1: Out of the Model Sign Code Ordinance.

Page 2, 3 and 4: Don Warner stated that he had checked with Sign companies concerning definitions.

Page 5 and 6: No comment.

Page 7: Paragraph 4.3: 90 days was felt sufficient.

Page 8: Paragraph 4.6.2: Bob Denning was interested in the statement that beacon lights are not permitted.

It was explained that a beacon light is one that revolves and/or flashes. It is like the search light used by KEXO for promotions.

Mary Hurst felt that 4.6.2 should be eliminated except for beacon lights.

Page 9: 5.2:

Ben Carnes questioned when a sale is complete on a piece of real estate.

It was the feeling that when a contract is signed, then the property is not shown to anyone else. By putting a "sold by" on the advertising sign, then it becomes an off-premise advertising sign.

Page 10 and 11: No comment.

Page 12: Paragraph 6.3.3

The sentence in CAPS was added by the Planning Commission Board and is not in the original Sign Code Committee recommendations.

Richard Clark, representing the North Avenue Businessmen, felt that this sentence cuts the sign allowance down to where many businesses cannot properly identify their businesses.

Mr. Warner gave an example of a 75 foot building and a 100 foot frontage lot under this paragraph you would take the larger of the two. The building would allow 150 square feet. Divide this between building sign and free-standing sign. This would allow 100 feet for a free-standing sign and 50 feet for a sign on the building.

~~Page 13 and 14: No comment.~~

Page 15:

Richard Clark suggested that (1) square foot should be changed to (1.5) square foot for a maximum area of sign per face per front foot of property for 4 or more lanes.

Page 16: Paragraph A:

Glen Cochran objected to the (300) feet and suggested 600 square feet.

Paragraph B:

Dale Lake questioned why the sentence in CAPS was added.

Blake Chambliss stated that it was to prevent proliferation of billboards.

Page 17 and 18: No suggested changes.

The following are recommendations made by the Planning Commission concerning suggestions from interested persons:

Page 8: 4.6.2:

Blake Chambliss made the motion to add "except as specified in 8.5" after brightness or color. Janine Rider seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Page 9: 5.2:

Janine Rider made the motion to leave 5.2 as is except to add the words "or covered by" after "except that such signs may be replaced". Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Blake Chambliss offered a substitute motion to eliminate all of the paragraph after "within 24 hours of sale or lease of the premises." Amendment was not accepted.

Page 12: 6.3.3:

Virginia Flager made the motion to strike the sentence in CAPS from 6.3.3 because of it's impact. John Abrams seconded the motion. Virginia Flager and John Abrams voted for the motion and Blake Chambliss, Frank Simonetti, Janine Rider and Jerry Wilds voted against. Motion failed.

Due to a prior commitment, Mr. Abrams had to leave the meeting at 10:30 A.M.

Page 15:

Virginia Flager made the motion to change 1 square foot for maximum area of sign per face per front foot of property for 4 or more lanes to 1.5 square feet. Janine Rider seconded the motion. Blake Chambliss voted against the motion. Virginia Flager, Frank Simonetti, Jerry Wilds and Janine Rider voted for the motion. Motion was passed.

Some members of the Board felt that since they had left the sentence in CAPS in 6.3.3 in then the larger allowance of 1.5 square feet is good.

Page 16: A-Height and Size Limitations:

There had been a recommendation to change (300) square feet to (600) square feet. It was the concensus of the Board to leave it at (300) square feet.

Page 16: B - Distance:

Virginia Flager made the motion to read: No sign can be erected closer than 600 feet to an existing 300 square foot sign. A MAXIMUM OF ONE OFF-PREMISE SIGN SHALL BE ALLOWED PER PARCEL OF LAND. JANINE RIDER seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Page 18:

Blake Chambliss made the motion to add 6.5.4 to read: "Color changes may be allowed if such changes occur at a maximum of seven changes per minute. Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Blake Chambliss made the motion to recommend to City Council as amended the Sign Code for Grand Junction for their approval. Virginia Flager seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 A.M.