### **Table of Contents**

File 1987-0004 Project Name: Sign Code Amendment - Wind Driven Signs - Dwayne Dodd A few items are denoted with an asterisk (\*), which means they are to be scanned for permanent record on the in some instances, not all entries designated to be scanned by the department are present in the file. There are also documents e specific to certain files, not found on the standard list. For this reason, a checklist has been provided. Remaining items, (not selected for scanning), will be marked present on the checklist. This index can serve as a quick e guide for the contents of each file. n t Files denoted with (\*\*) are to be located using the ISYS Query System. Planning Clearance will need to be typed in full, as well as other entries such as Ordinances, Resolutions, Board of Appeals, and etc. X X **Table of Contents** X X **Review Sheet Summary** X Application form X Review Sheets Receipts for fees paid for anything \*Submittal checklist \*General project report Reduced copy of final plans or drawings Reduction of assessor's map Evidence of title, deeds, easements \*Mailing list to adjacent property owners Public notice cards Record of certified mail Legal description Appraisal of raw land Reduction of any maps - final copy \*Final reports for drainage and soils (geotechnical reports) Other bound or non-bound reports Traffic studies Individual review comments from agencies \*Petitioner's response to comments \*Staff Reports \*Planning Commission staff report and exhibits \*City Council staff report and exhibits \*Summary sheet of final conditions \*Letters and correspondence dated after the date of final approval (pertaining to change in conditions or expiration date) **DOCUMENTS SPECIFIC TO THIS DEVELOPMENT FILE:** X X Action Sheet X X Review Sheet Summary Review Sheets Development Application - 12/4/86, 2/3/87 Ordinance No. 2347 X | X | Planning Commission - \*\* - 3/3/87 Letter from Karl Metzner to Dwayne Dodd re: Asking for Development Summary - 2/4/87 X | Review Sheet Summary – 1/21/87 X X Review of proposed sign amendment XX City Sign Code Change Petition Protest letter from Modern Classic Motors - 2/2/87 Appeal letter from Dwayne Dodd to City Council - 3/5/87 Daily Sentinel letters to the editor

# RECEIVED GRAND JUNGTION PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

DEC 08 1986



Thank you, Dwayne Dodd

Grand Junction Planning Department 559 White Avenue, Room 60 Grand Junction, Colorado 81501–2643 (303) 244–1648

December 2, 1986

Mr. Dwayne Dodd Modern Classic Motors 420 North 1st Street Grand Junction, CO 81501

Dear Mr. Dodd:

The City Manager's office has forwarded a petition asking the City to delete paragraph 5-7-2F of the City Zoning and Development Code dealing with wind-driven signs. Before we can begin processing this request, we need to clarify some points about the request.

- 1) Are you the applicant in this request? If so, we need you to fill out the enclosed application with your name as representative and your signature as person completing application. The rest of the spaces will remain blank.
- 2) Many of the signs defined as wind-driven are also defined as portable signs and prohibited by section 5-7-2E. Was it your intent to include this section as well?  $)_{\mathcal{O}}$
- 3) Any signs which are removed from section 5-7-2 as prohibited signs would have to be listed elsewhere as allowed signs. Have you given any thought on where you would like this placed? For example, should they be allowed in residential zones as well as commercial, should they be part of sign allowance, should a permit be required? We have strongly to Commercial signs on Communial property. I would recommend plants

4) Should there be any limit to the number or size of wind- ofherwise. driven or portable signs?

As soon as we receive the completed application form and a response to these questions, we will commence processing this application in accordance with the code requirements.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely

Karl G. Metzmer

Director of Planning

KGM/tt Enclosure

### MODERN CLASSIC MOTORS

Sales & Leasing

(303) 245-7671

124 N. 1ST STREET

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO. 81501

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

FEB 4 1987

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING DEPT. 559 White Ave. Grand Junction CO. 81501-2643

February 2nd , 1987

RE: File # 4-87 Sign Code Amendment

Dear Sirs ,

In response to your review and summary of the proposed change to the city sign code, we the petitioners still contest that our requests are justified. We wish to pursue this change. If necessary, we will prove that without any doubt, it is the desire of the majority of the businesses and citizens of Grand Junction that our requests be enacted.

Of the member of the Advisory Boards comments, we have serious questions about his forty or fifty persons surveyed. We also found his comments to be in "Prejudice of Character" to our industry as a whole. "Even if all the car dealers in the area think this is a good idea, it is apparent to me that it is not ", still leaves the majority to stand.

The Grand Junction Planning Dept's. summary and proposal stating that when businesses are using this form of attraction, the effect will cancel itself out is incorrect. "Good Business Activity Creates More Good Business". When Steve Westphal came to this town with an advertising budget in excess of \$250,000. all dealers profited! He got the public to think about shopping and out in the marketplace where we could benefit, Auto Dealers and other businesses alike. We also do not feel that the Planning Dept. should be concerned with our cost of doing business or our business overhead in general.

### MODERN CLASSIC MOTORS

Sales & Leasing (303) 245-7671

124 N. 1ST STREET

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO. 81501

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING DEPT. File # 4-87 Sign Code Amendment ( Cont'd )

In conclusion, we feel the overall consensus of the "Review Sheet Sumary" file # 4-87 supports our request for change. We thank the Visitors and Convention Bureau, the Appeal and Advisory, the Chamber of Commerce, the DDA and the Planning Dept. for all their input and efforts. In closing we look forward to an amendment that will be beneficial to all concerned.

Sincerely,

Dwayne Dodd

Owner, MODERN CLASSIC MOTORS

City Council, City of Grand Junction 559 White Ave. Grand Junction CO. 81501-2643

March 5, 1987

RE: File # 4-87 Sign Code Amendment

Dear Sirs ,

We the petitioners of the attached petition do hereby request an appeal to the City Council for consideration.

We are prepared to demonstrate to the City Council that this petition represents the wants and desires of the majority of the businesses in Grand Junction, who further represent the lion's share of the tax revenue provided for this community, and therefore in a democratic atmosphere should be given serious consideration.

Sincerely,

Dwayne Dodd

Owner, Modern Classic Motors

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CITY of GRAND JUNCTION
559 White Ave.
Grand Junction, Colo. 81501-2643

Re: CITY SIGN CODE CHANGE PETITION

Gentlemen:

Some of the sign codes in our city are antiquated, and thus suppress the promotion of business. Most particularly, in these times of economic strife, we as business merchants do not need these antiquated restrictions hampering the promotion of our businesses. There are literally hundreds of violations to the code, and they exist among all the various types to businesses in the city. Quite frankly, we cannot blame them for doing what we feel they must do to maintain their existence during these hard times.

#### The Sign Regulation That We Refer to Specifically Is:

5-7-2 F., The prohibition of wind driven signs, meaning—one or more banners, flags, pennants, ribbons, spinners, streamers, captive balloons, or other objects or materials designed or intended to move when subjected to pressure by wind or breeze, and by that movement attract attention and function as a sign.

It is our contention that we need the aforementioned devices of advertising to properly promote and enhance our businesses. In the long ago days of the "Horse and Buggy", we concede that such devices might have scared the horses and endangered public safety. However, in today's modern times, we feel such displays no longer create a hazard.

We also contend that as far as "Eye Distraction" is concerned these devices certainly do not generate any greater distraction than the "Time and Temperature" displays, "signs displaying prices, rates, or specials", "stationary beacons", or "street banners promoting city sponsored or recognized events". These are all

"legal" and in accordance with the current sign regulation.

We further submit that "visual pollution" is not a factor, because a well presented display only adds color and a sense of vitality to our city's appearance.

Therefore, we the following undersigned merchants of Grand Junction, do hereby petition the City Council in their next regularly scheduled meeting, to eliminate the aforementioned "5-7-2 F." from our city's sign regulation.

SIGNATURE \*\*\*\* NAME OF BUSINESS \*\*\* ADDRESS

in en	1. E. C. Clark Clark motor Co. 630 4th litts.
	Last House Manual Water 107 Bellus 99
•	3. All Mauelin Gack x Rugla Hotel . 2496 Neway 6450
-	3. All Mayelin Gack Mayella Hotel . 2496 Hivey 6450 4. Bus Lausen City motion 935 N 15t
j.	5. Ser Jan Callon 2566 14, 6-50
į l	6 Sodlow 1 11 o Sum Decent MI 1-50 MINDOW: 2496 Huy 6 3 50
· · ·	7. Litala & M. Callin Sundance Motors + Marine Hay 6+50
•	
V	9. The hoty Wester Sign My 2264 Huy 6150 49-1.81500
12	10. VI SUMME ATTAINED 2523 CTS /MIL
	11. I hat Defur Steek intofefile. 1595 thy 6450 Gant d-1
	11. A to the Steer that stately a so they ext to more one more one of the state of the sound of the state of
<i>\\</i>	13. San Clark Internountain Auto 2122 N. AV.
/	14. 10 to Mark Month Control Der 1/1 second Detaile
L-	15 Jahrenfart Motorcycle tressories 2060 EMain St 65.
レ	16. Clarence Simpson Simpson auto 1801 Main
.~	17. Same D. Smith. Chile Stout Witnes 1351 Vite
<i>/</i>	18. 1 DON GASKIN TOTA (0 310 50 12 TM ST
V	19 Jun out Did Illo Tanto do be went and Hamiljet

### SIGNATURE \*\*\* NAME OF BUSINESS \*\*\* ADDRESS

20. Clarilia M.	in Munica	autos	123 U	te the
21. Male Mil	L GIS FAM.	LY FUTE	124 N/	ST.
22. Owayne Dod		MHOIS 4	10 N./5 f.	Spt.
23.		۶1۰		24576
24.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	·
25.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
26.				
27.				•
28.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
29.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			• • •
30.		•		<del>-</del>
31.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		• •
32.			•	
33.		•		
34.				
35.				
36.				
37.				•
38.				•
39.				
40.				• ·
41.				
42.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
43.			•.	• *
44.				• .
45			•	

## GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING DEPARTMENT Review of Proposed Sign Code Amendment, Item #4-87

#### I. Proposal Summary

A petition has been submitted to amend the Sign Code to allow wind-driven signs. Wind-driven signs are defined as banners, flags, pennants, ribbons, spinners, streamers, captive balloons, or other objects or materials designed or intended to move in the wind. The proposal would place no limits on the size, number, or placement of wind-driven signs and require no permits.

#### II. Review

Wind-driven signs have been prohibited in the City since the adoption of the current Sign Code in 1976. With the exception of banners, the wind-driven signs listed above differ from other signs in that they carry no written message, but are designed strictly to attract attention by their color, movement, and/or configuration. Attention-getting devices are effective only if some businesses have them while others do not. For example, if one car lot has pennants while one down the road does not, then the one with pennants may attract more customers than the one without. However, if both car lots have pennants, the the effects will cancel Allowing these types of devices will, in effect, increase the cost of doing business, since the purchase of pennants, etc. will be "required" in order to stay competitive, while the intended effect of attracting more customers will be lost.

Also of concern in the proposed amendment is the lack of control on the number and size of wind-driven signs. Controls on permanent signs are intended to keep signage in a reasonable relationship to the size of the business and make those signs that are allowed more effective. Without controls, sign "wars" have occurred where each business tries to outdo the other in the size, height, or number of its signs. This becomes expensive to the business, destructive to the appearance of the community, and ultimately defeats the purpose of signage.

The uncontrolled use of wind-driven signs lends itself even more to the potential of a sign war, since they are cheaper than permanent signs and can be installed or changed more easily.

A final concern about the unrestricted use of wind-driven signs is their effect on the community. The impact of wind-driven signs is especially noticeable along commercial strips such as North Avenue and Hwy 6 and 50. Such a strip lined with pennants, streamers, etc. creates a feeling of clutter and confusion in the eye of the traveler, as well as reducing the effectiveness of permanent signage.

#### III. Alternatives

There are a number of compromise positions between the allor-nothing alternatives. We have had some unofficial requests to consider allowing the controlled use of banners to be used in conjunction with special promotions, sales, or other business events. Items to be considered are: 1) what types of signs should be permitted, 2) what quantities and sizes are acceptable, 3) what frequency of use of these signs is acceptable, and 4) how can these controls be most effectively managed.

By permitting the use of some types of wind-driven signs on a limited and controlled basis, the intent of the proposed amendment could be achieved without its negative consequences.

A very appropriate quotation comes from the California Roadside Council regarding the clutter of signs: "When noone shouts, everyone will be heard."

# REVIEW SHEET SUMMARY

FILE NO. #4-87 TITLE HEADING Sign Code Amendment DUE DATE 1-21-87

<u>\</u>	ind Driven Signs Dwayne	voda, petitioner
<del></del>		
**		
PETITIONER	R ADDRESS 420 North 1st	
ENGINEER_	·	
DATE REC.	AGENCY	COMMENTS
09-87	Visitors & Convention Bureau	Wind driven signs are a very effective marketing tool- they add attention and bring an atmosphere of excitement to a special sale, event or grand opening! Their con- stant use can cause a very cluttered look when the signs become old, worn out or wind blown.
		I do not have any objection if they are used on special occassions; and believe they should be allowed to be used more often - permanent use tends not to be monitored by user and they become an "eye sore".
		I notice this petition involves car dealers and I believe this group to be quite responsible in their business' appearance. Banner flags have been used quite effectivel in this industry and do not deter from the overall appear ance of the area or the city.
		My strongest feeling is that they be restricted to a time frame and for special uses such as sales and special events. This unfortunately is very hard to negulate and monitor.
14-87	Appeals Advisory	Even if all of the car dealerships in the area think this is a good idea, it is apparent to me that it is not. Of the forty or fifty citizens that I have asked, I have not found one who supports this amendment. Their comments ranged from "those plastic flags will bleach-out in the sun in just a few weeks and look shabby from then on. to "I wouldn't trust buying a used car from anyone who made their place of business look like a (sic) circus."
		Our marketing professor at Mesa College (a business man himself) stated that such visual pollution would be detrimental both to nearby businesses and to the company itself, keeping potential customers from even stopping to compare prices.
		This proposal is not in the interest of Mesa County citizens, and should not be granted.
-15-87	Chamber of Commerce	We recommend that pennants be allowed, four strings 50 feet each for a maximum of 200 feet of pennants. Also that banners secured either directly to a building or by ropes between poles or structures not over three feet in height and 15 feet in length be allowed. They can be of any color.
		We would suggest that these items should only be allowed for special promotions, no one merchant allowed to displ them more than twice during a calendar year.
•		Duration of displays should be for 72 hours maximum.
2 2		That a permit be required and obtained at least four wor ing days prior to the special permit; said permit cost \$5.00 outlining the event and naming the address

### **REVIEW SHEET SUMMARY**

				•		
			····			
PETITIONER	ADDRESS					
ENGINEER			-			· .
DATE REC.	AGENCY	COMMENTS				,
	cont'd	displayed. A sevent encourage the periout of sight in 7	mitee to h	ave the	pennants	down and
20-87	DDA	encourage the peri	fulfilled esthetics of the corpose who exceptions llow car detection in the city) in the "str	ave the Strict  a valu of this lesale re may and sp ealers to hol restric inged b	able and community abandonmen be and period ever (and by each of the control of t	important y. Hence, Mont of some of rhaps shoud bents. It may extension, even the relaxed ons." as well
20-87		encourage the periout of sight in 7 encouraged.  The Sign Code has function to the acis difficult to prious features. How room for special code desirable to all other business in times a year at whit would allow for	fulfilled esthetics of copose who exceptions llow car dithe city) nich sign the "str dy done si and speci	ave the Strict  a valuof this lesale re may and spealers to hol restricinged pgns. (	able and community abandonmen be and per (and by ex dispectations wou ennant signous define event per	important y. Hence, nt of some of nts. It may xtension, even l events 2-4 ld be relaxed gns", as well e tasteful.) mits are fine

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING FEBRUARY 3, 1987

MOTION:

(COMMISSIONER MADSEN) "MADAM CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM #4-87 SIGN CODE AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND JUNCTION ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, I RECOMMEND THAT IT BE

DENIED."

passed unanimously 5-0.

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING MARCH 3, 1987

MOTION: (COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL) " I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION WE DENY THIS

REQUEST FOR DELETION OF SECTION 5-7-2F FROM THE CODE."

Commissioner Madsen seconded, vote called, passed unanimously 6-0.

# development summary



		the state of the s	
File	# 4-87	Name Sign Regulation	_ Date <u>2-4-87</u>
	,, <u></u>	Name Sign Regulation Text Amendment	_ 0 4 0

PROJECT LOCATION: N/A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Proposes deleting the prohibition on wind driven signs in Section 5-7-2F of the Zoning & Development Code.

REVIEW SUM	MAI	RY	(Major Concerns)			,
POLICIES COMPLIANCE	YES	№ *	TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	SATISFIED	NO1 SATISFI	ED*
Complies with adopted policies	N/A		Streets/Rights Of Way	N/	Α	
Complies with adopted criteria		x	Water/Sewer	N/	Α	
Meets guidelines of Comprehensive Plan	N/A		Irrigation/Drainage	N/	'A	
			Landscaping/Screening	N/	Ά	L
			Other:			

<sup>\*</sup> See explanation below

Criteria for evaluating Text Amendments include consistency with other portions of the Code. This proposal does not appear consistant with other portions of the sign regulation specifically sections 5-7-1 (Purpose & Scope), 5-7-2D (Flashing/Moving Signs), 5-7-2E (Portable Signs), 5-7-5 (Nonconforming Signs), 5-7-6A (Permits Required) and 5-7-6D (Permanent Signs).

#### **STATUS & RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Reviewing agencies recommend some system of permitting certain types of wind-driven or temporary signs on a limited basis. Limitations could include the number of times per year such signs could be used, length of time displayed and size or number of signs used.

#### Planning Commission Action

Recommend denial. Requested staff schedule a workshop for discussion of alternative proposals as recommended by review agencies.