GRAND JUNCTION BOARD OF APPEALS

Public Hearing June 8, 1994 8:03 a.m. - 8:07 a.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman John Elmer at 8:03 a.m. in the City Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the Board of Appeals, were Lewis Hoffman, Vice-Chairman William Putnam and Jeff Driscoll.

In attendance, representing the City Community Development Department, was Kathy Portner Planning Supervisor. John Shaver, Assistant City Attorney, was also present. Bobbie Paulson, Senior Administrative Secretary, was present to record the minutes.

There were no citizens present during the course of the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 9, 1994 MEETING

MOTION: (Lewis Hoffman) "Mr. Chairman, I move to approve the minutes of the March 9, 1994 meeting."

William Putnam seconded the motion. A vote was called, and the motion passed by a vote of 2-0, with Jeff Driscoll and William Putnam abstaining since they were not present at the March 9th meeting.

III. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD

1. #92-94 Request for a variance from Section 5-5-1 of the Zoning & Development Code for off-street parking requirements for multi-family residential; required parking is two spaces per residential unit; petitioner proposes to provide a total of 12 off-street parking spaces for 8 units; requirement is to provide 16 parking spaces therefore the variance request is for four parking spaces.

PETITIONER: Bray & Company REPRESENTATIVE: Jack Crimmings LOCATION: 831/837 Belford Avenue

STAFF: Kathy Portner

John Elmer stated that staff received a request from the Petitioner to table this item until the July 13, 1994 meeting.

MOTION: (Jeff Driscoll) "I move to table item #92-94."

Lewis Hoffman seconded the motion. A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

William Putnam stated that although he would be out of town during the July, 1994 Board of Appeals meeting, he wanted to disclose his social relationship with Mr. Jack Bray.

William Putnam asked staff what, if any, progress had been made on the sign code.

Ms. Portner reported that a few minor modifications have been made to the sign code; one specifically dealing with roof signs. She explained that staff proposed deleting most of the design requirements for roof signs rather than trying to consistently interpret what an architectural blade was. The only design guidelines that will still be enforced are that no visible guywires or braces are allowed. Also, the roof sign has to be within the roof sign <u>and</u> the total overall sign allowance. City Council approved the text amendment allowing roof signs.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 a.m.