

**GRAND JUNCTION BOARD OF APPEALS
JANUARY 10, 2007 MINUTES
12:15 p.m to 12:50 p.m.**

The regularly scheduled Board of Appeals meeting was called to order at 12:15 p.m. by Chairman Paul Dibble. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the Board of Appeals, were Dr. Paul Dibble (Chairman), Mark Williams, Travis Cox, Patrick Carlow and Ken Sublett.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Kathy Portner (Assistant Community Development Director) and Pat Cecil (Senior Planner).

Jamie Kreiling, Assistant City Attorney, was also present.

The minutes were recorded and transcribed by Nishi Aragon.

There were no citizens present other than the applicant, Jeff Ungerer.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes for consideration at this time.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Both staff and the applicant requested that the following item be pulled from the agenda as the applicant was not prepared to present the request at this time.

III. FULL HEARING

VAR-2006-337 VARIANCE - Riverside Crossing Sign Variance

Request approval for a Variance of the City's Sign Code, requesting two lots be considered as one, pylon signage and allowance of building facade of 420 sq ft to an overall commercial develop on 6.1 acres in a C-2 (General Commercial) zone district.

PETITIONER: Jeff Ungerer - WTN COEX I LLC

LOCATION: 2504, 2502 Highway 6 & 50

STAFF: Pat Cecil

DISCUSSION

The applicant stated that he is in support of the item being pulled, but would like to have some feed back on options. He stated that he would like to be able to allocate signage for the tenants of one lot onto the pylon sign.

Chairman Dibble stated that we understand and support staff who is in favor of recommendation for approval. It appears that there are some changes needed to be made so for that we will require a full hearing, from the applicant and staff.

Kathy (Assistant Community Development Director) After talking to the applicant we are hoping that we might be able to work out an amendment to the code that would allow us to achieve this goal that would allow us to review signage for shopping centers.

Chairman Dibble Planning Commission members would have to agree that the sign code is not the easiest part of the code and does need to be revised. Will the applicant be coming forward before the amendment to the sign code?

Ms. Portner depending on the amendment that is proposed, the amendment process would go through the Planning Commission too, depending on how the amendment is written the applicant may not have to come back through the process.

Jim Walker (Applicant) would like to be able to put signage on the building but would like to be able to resolve the freestanding sign issue within the next 60 days before the second phase of the development.

Ms. Portner should be able to get something in consideration within 45 to 60 days. Would like to be able to find something that won't be controversial.

Chairman Dibble will applicant be able to put a sign up.

Ms. Portner has not reviewed the specifics of the project but applicant will be able to put up signs that meet the current sign code.

Mr. Walker the current phase is the Chipolte and Starbucks which is one building with three tenants which faces Highway 6 & 50, which would allow a 180 sq ft pile on sign.

Travis Cox: was this originally one lot.

Mr. Walker at the time of purchase the lots were already two individual lots, the reason why we did two lots was that would allow us to sell one of the lots off.

Travis Cox could the lots be developed as pad sights, and sold off like that.

Mr. Walker Mesa County requires the lots to be legal lots in order to be sold off.

Ken Sublett concerned with the height of the freestanding sign, traffic on Highway 6 & 50 is extremely high as well as the accidents, is concerned that the height of the sign will only increase the traffic pressure.

MOTION: (Mr. Cox) "Mr. Chairman", on Variance request VAR-2006-337 I move that this item be pulled.

Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion was pulled by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 12:50.