

REGULAR MEETING

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday - October 25, 1961 - 8:00 A.M.

CONFERENCE ROOM - CITY HALL

Members present: Messrs. Elmer Nelson, Arthur Hadden, Ray Meacham, Robert Baker, V. L. Colony, Mrs. William Hyde, and Mrs. Robert Russell.

Others present: City Manager Joe Lacy and Development Director Don Warner.

I. MINUTES APPROVED.

The Chairman noted that copies of the minutes of the special meeting of October 5, 1961 had been mailed to all members. Hearing no objections or corrections, he declared the minutes of the special meeting on October 5, 1961 approved as written.

II. TABLE DECISION ON SIGN SET-BACK ON NORTH AVE UNTIL NEXT MEETING

Mr. Dean Dickey of Western Neon Sign Company and Mr. Ray Goldston of Colorado Neon Sign Company were present at the meeting requesting that the zoning ordinance be modified allowing the base poles of signs to be erected on the property line instead of the set-back line. They said that the only place in the City that would be affected would be between 1st and 12th on North Avenue, where many signs are already erected in this manner.

Planning Commission members had met Tuesday morning on North Avenue and studied the situation. It was their feeling that this request would block visibility along North Avenue, especially on corners, and would be a traffic hazard.

Mr. Dickey said he felt that a base pole of 10 or 12 inches would not block the vision of motorists and is no larger than utility poles which are allowed. He noted that since there are signs installed in this way it is difficult to refuse to place new ones in the same way; also he said that the expense of setting the signs back at such time as the buildings in the area involved (1st to 12th on North) are lined up would not be excessive.

Chairman Nelson noted that a sorry situation had developed on this portion of North Avenue, and Development Director Warner said that all of the non-conforming signs were going to be moved back as fast as possible -- the most dangerous ones would be taken care of first. "We need a 100 ft. right-of-way on major highways -- an open look", he said.

It was pointed out that the utility poles have to be in the right-of-way, they cannot be put on private property. By adding sign poles too, there would be more poles per block which would further cut down the visibility. It was noted, too, that the cost of moving the signs back from 18th Street to the Freeway was \$5,000.

In discussing the manner of mounting signs, the use of a supporting pole on the property line was suggested. In this way smaller, more inexpensive bases are possible. The smaller supporting poles would not block the vision, but it was pointed out that these would be the poles upon which flyers would be hung; also eventually, since these poles would be allowed, signs would be hung on them.

In discussing the modification of the ordinance it was pointed out that it would not be possible to let down the barriers for only one spot -- it would have to be the same for the entire City and could cause a situation that might get entirely beyond control. The question was asked if the situation between 1st and 12th on North Avenue is so serious as to warrant breaking the ordinance for the entire City.

Mr. Warner pointed out that it could cause serious trouble if the ordinance were modified in this manner, mentioning that right away a situation could develop with Teller Arms since they would be able to put signs out further on North Avenue than anyone else because only a 40 ft. right-of-way exists there.

Mr. Meacham asked if it is important that the problem be resolved immediately, and if not, it might be well to take a little more time and study on the problem. Mr. Nelson said that all members had already given this a lot of thought, but it is something that affects the entire City both now and in the future. However if we table it for a while longer, at least we are not doing an injustice to the ordinance nor to the sign people, if a time limit is put upon it and it is not tabled indefinitely.

Motion was made by Mr. Meacham that this matter be tabled until the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission in order that more study be given to it. Motion was seconded by Mr. Baker, and carried.

III. ECONOMIC STUDY, NW CORNER 7th & PATTERSON, APPROVED

Development Director Warner said that this is an open piece of ground with no expense to the City until it is built up. The water line goes past the property and the water tap will be paid for by the property owner. The person interested in the area would like to build an apartment house there; however, since there are restrictive covenants on all the deeds of the surrounding property he would have to get releases from all of the property owners around.

The way in which the property is used would of course make a difference in the economic study; however, Mr. Warner said the figures presented are an average of whether it is developed as single family units or apartments. For a three-year period, the cost to the City would be approximately \$2,036. with a return of \$1,551. On a ten-year basis, the cost would be approximately \$7,200. with the return being \$7,865. The owner would like to have the area zoned as R-3, or at least R-2; however, it would automatically be annexed as R-1-a at which time an analysis would be made as to what the zoning for the area should be.

Motion was made by Mr. Mcacham that the economic study on the NW corner of 7th and Patterson be approved and the area recommended to the City Council as being eligible for annexation. Motion was seconded by Mr. Colony, and carried.

IV. EXPLANATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

City Manager Lacy explained the use of the capital improvements programming sheets which are filled out by each department head to cover a six-year period, and are up-dated each year. These capital improvements proposals will be combined with proposals from outside groups such as PIAB (Park Improvement Advisory Board) and will be presented to the Planning Commission, starting early in 1962, for their consideration of over-all scheduling of capital improvement projects.

V. LONG-RANGE PLANNING

Development Director Warner presented to the Commission information that had come to his attention that there is a need for something to be done about sewer services in the commercial area at the top of 5th Street hill on Orchard Mesa. There are several approaches to this problem, one of which could be a request for annexation. There is no definite action underway, but the possibility exists, so the Planning Commission should be doing some thinking about this area. In this way they will have a head start if the question should come up for consideration.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion that the meeting adjourn was made by Mr. Colony, seconded by Mr. Baker, and carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Russell

BETTY RUSSELL,
Secretary