



MINUTES
City of Glenwood Springs
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
January 28, 2020
Council Chambers, First Floor, City Hall
101 W. 8th Street
6:00PM

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Ingrid Wussow, George Shaver, Sumner Schachter, Marco Dehm, Amber Wissing, and Carolyn Cipperly

Absent: Kathryn Grosscup, Tim Malloy and Dean Kinkel

Also present were: Trent Hyatt, Senior Planner
Hannah Klausman, AICP, Senior Planner
Jenn Ooton, Asst. City Manager, Director
Gretchen Ricehill, Assist. Director
Anna S. Itenberg, City Attorney's Office
Kathleen Michel, Admin. Assistant

Motion to seat Commissioner Cipperly for this meeting was carried by voice vote.

2. Receipt of [minutes](#) from the [October 22, 2019](#) regular meeting. On motion of Commissioner Shaver seconded by Commissioner Schachter the minutes were approved as written. Motion carried by voice vote.

Receipt of [minutes](#) from the [November 26, 2019](#) regular meeting. On motion of Commissioner Wussow, seconded by Commissioner Shaver, the minutes were approved as written. Motion carried by voice vote; Chairman Dehm did not vote.

Receipt of [minutes](#) from the [December 17, 2019](#) regular meeting. On motion of Commissioner Schachter, seconded by Commissioner Wissing, the minutes were approved as written. Motion carried by voice vote.

3. **Public Comments from citizens appearing for items not on the agenda.** No one appeared.

4. Continued Items

A. 20-19-Consideration of a Code Amendment to Section 070.040.020(d)(24) of the Glenwood Springs Municipal Code regarding riparian setbacks. ITEM WILL BE CONTINUED TO FEBRUARY 25, 2020.

Motion to continue: Commissioner Schachter moved to continue Item 20-19 to the February 25, 2020 meeting. Commissioner Wissing seconded the motion. Motion carried by voice vote with Commissioner Shaver recused.

5. New Items

A. 45-19 Minor Site/Arch Plan, Minor Subdivision, Variance, and Condominiumization for Iron Mountain Hot Springs---

Hannah Klausman presented the staff report for this item.

Minor Subdivision

- Minor Subdivision will increase the lot size;
- Shared access drive;
- Utility easements of City will be relocated;

- 9,000 ground floor office space
- Residential units - 19
- Bike and pedestrian pathway
- Variance for plant materials

- Traffic Report includes all development and connections between
- CDOT access permit
- Parking required 63 spaces – 60 spaces shared by office/residential (14 in CDOT lot)

Variance

- Plant requirements difficult to fit on site
- Staff will bring forward a code amendment to address this issue
- Will meet old code standards
- Staff found aesthetically pleasing

Condominiumization

- Consistent with Comp Plan
- Housing opportunities for the community
- Regional center
- Reviewing agencies

Actions

- Approve
- Approve with conditions
- Deny

Recommendations:

- Staff recommends approval of Variance

- Staff recommends approval of Minor Site/Arch Plan
- Staff recommends Condominiumization

Commissioner Schachter verified that bike path meets parkland standard.

Ms. Klausman explained the sidewalk as planned.

Commissioner Shaver asked about the perennial ratio; does not recall density expressed in plants per square foot.

Ms. Ricehill commented that a code amendment regarding plantings is coming in future.

Terri Partch, City Engineer, explained the connection for LOVA trail, crossing the river in two places.

- Private access easement not held to City road standard; Engineering had no problem with it.
- Public access sidewalks meet park land dedication standards.
- ADA requirement standards for onsite; whether the offsite spaces change the count.

Doug Pratte introduced Steve Beckley, 802 N. Traver Trail, who spoke about his development proposal and presented images explaining the use of the property. CDOT considers the 14 offsite parking spaces theirs. He suggested a cost sharing for the river crossings.

- Distance from ADA parking to elevator; possible to flip stairs and elevator location.
- CDOT needs office space; Iron Mtn. needs employee housing.
- Lift station approved locally; waiting for state approval.
- Status of a master plan for this area; anticipated in future with next phase
- Standard for the access drive; curbs will slow traffic
- Owners association will be developed
- Iron Mtn and CDOT will have priority for the deed restricted housing; then general public
- Green building status

Public comment.

Steve Carver, address 1555 County Road 129, Glenwood Springs, and Manager of Condo Association, River District Building. Expressed concerns about vehicle and pedestrian access on Centennial.

6:59 closed public hearing.

Action Item 1 – “Consideration of a minor subdivision to amend the boundaries of a single parcel which does not create any additional parcels”: Commissioner Wussow moved to approve Item 45-19, Action Item 1, with findings and conditions on pages 15 and 16 of the staff report. Commissioner Cipperly seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Action Item 2 – “Consideration of a variance to allow for a reduced amount of shrubs and perennials as required by code”: Commissioner Wussow moved to approve Item 45-19 with suggested findings and conditions on page 15 and 16 of the staff report.

Commissioner Schachter seconded. Discussion of the need to agree with all required findings. Motion carried unanimously.

Action Item 3 – “Consideration of a site architectural plan review allowing for the construction of a three floor mixed use building with the first floor commercial and nineteen residential units which are proposed to be deed restricted”: Commissioner Schachter moved to approve with findings and conditions on pages 15, 16 and 17 of the staff report. Commissioner Shaver seconded. Discussion touched on a cost sharing request; recommended to cap the amount. Considerable discussion regarding trail consideration and who will build it as well as pay and maintain it. Commissioner Schachter amended motion related to Issue E: in addition, the owner commits to funding 50% of trail construction up to \$300,000 with engineering costs included in the \$300,000. Commissioner Shaver agreed to amendment. **Carried unanimously.**

Action Item 4 – “Consideration of an application to condominiumization of two units: Commissioner Wussow moved to approve office space/residential units. Commissioner Schachter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

B. 16-18 Major Development Amendment Iron Mountain Hot Springs

Ms. Klausman presented the staff report including conditions for this item.

- Extend the impervious surface for parking to December 31, 2020.
- Extend deadline for previously approved plan
- Staff recommends approval

Actions:

- Approve
- approve with conditions;
- deny or
- continue hearing

Steve Beckley, the applicant, stated that as they developed, they were reconfiguring a lot of the area including installing a lift station and sewer lines. Milled asphalt is used on the parking area currently and applicant feels that is adequate until they are able to pave it.

Motion Action Item 1: To extend the paving requirement to June 2021. Commissioner Schachter moved to approve with findings and conditions. Commissioner Shaver seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

C. 48-19 Major Site/Architectural Plan Review, Special Use Permit, Variance, and License to Encroach for an 89-unit multi-family apartment building (Lofts Phase III)

Trent Hyatt presented the staff report for this item.

- Planning & Zoning is recommending body;
- City Council is decision-making body for the major site plan review and license to encroach.
- Current applicant proposed first phase of development in 2015, second phase in 2017.
- Three story building with underground parking with footprint of approximately 21,000 square feet.

- Code calls for 15 percent of site shall be open space; previous agreements with the City address open space requirements. 687 square feet of proposed project is open space, which totals 3%.
- Per parking requirements, this project would require a total of 152 total spaces.
- Parking spaces proposed: 101 spaces. Applicant has requested a reduction per code.
- 60 in garage, 28 on street, 13 excess in Phase II that were allocated but not required. Applicant is requesting to make a payment in lieu of creating the final 6 parking spaces that would be still required by code even after reductions from transit proximity and bicycle parking.
- Applicant is also requesting a variance on the building length for the project. Code allows for a maximum of 125 feet for a multifamily building, applicant is proposing a 337 feet for their project.
- Additional request is to build 51.5 feet height for four-story/north side which requires a Special Use Permit to exceed height requirement set in code of 40 feet.
- Noted neighbor concerns about street lighting
- Approval criteria outlined
- Staff approves Action Items 1 and 2. Staff also recommends approval of Action Item 3 with conditions to City Council.

Questions for staff regarding project:

Commission Schachter asked about the building length requirement and how it related to City Code and Glenwood Meadows Development Agreement. The restriction on building length is from the Development Agreement and not from City Code. Commissioner Wussow asked about neighboring building heights and how they compare to proposed project. Commissioner Dehm also had questions about the elevation as there was underground parking. Additional questions were raised regarding snow removal adjacent to areas near to the building.

Actions

- Approve
- Approve with conditions
- Deny
- Continue

Bob Moore, 5105 Summit Brook Drive, Colleyville, Texas, representing the applicant and Haley Karmer attorney presented the project. Dan Solberg and Jack Daniels were also present as general contractor and construction site superintendent.

- Phases 1 and 2 are considered a success.
- Phase 1 achieved 100% occupancy shortly after opening.
- Was determined that there was significant demand for smaller studio and one-bedroom units which is what will be included in Phase III.

Commissioner Schachter asked about what requirements there would be regarding prohibiting storage of bicycle on balconies. Commissioner Dehm asked for exact measurements for the building heights of Phase I and II. Applicant representatives estimated that those buildings were about 40 feet tall. Dehm also asked why the building was not broken up into smaller structures and the applicant explained the single building design resulted from the need to use a deep pile structure in designing the building. Dehm also asked if the applicant had considered designating any of the units as deed restricted units. Applicant replied that there was not interest on their part in the deed restricted units for Phase III. Dehm asked for an estimate of rents and applicant estimated \$2.46 per square foot which would be approximately

\$2400 a month for a 1,000 square foot studio. Applicant also mentioned that snow removal services would likely be contracted.

Commissioner Wussow questioned about the impact to nearby areas due the construction methods and boring described in project description. Wussow asked about the timeframe of the work as well as the impact on the soils. Applicant explained there would be noise and that the work should be completed within 40 days with minimal physical vibrations from the process. Applicant also noted that it was in their interest to limit effects to neighboring buildings as they do not want to inconvenience their own tenants. Question was asked if anything in code mentioned decibel levels, and there is no specified decibel limit per code but code does make allowances for construction work outside of times for such noise stipulated in code. Applicant stated that most construction work would be conducted during the time specified in code.

Commissioner Cipperly had questions if 2 ADA spaces was sufficient compared to the number of units in the building. Applicant indicated that they had the required amount of spaces and would look to place those spaces in the underground parking. Commissioner Cipperly also asked if there were any allowances for composting or recycling and how the trash would be removed. Applicant indicated that they would be using roll out dumpster similar in style used by neighboring buildings where a garbage truck picks up the trash. There was also discussion of long-term parking restriction at Glenwood Meadows in relation to the retail parking area. Applicant mentioned that there will be a detailed description of tenant parking areas in the lease.

Commissioner Dehm asked how deep the excavation for Phase I and II went. Dan Solberg, 341 Church Street, Layton, Utah, addressed Dehm's question. Solberg described that the excavation exceeded 5 feet around the building. Dehm also asked for the width of the proposed building, which is 68 feet.

8:34 p.m. The Chair called for public comment. No one wished to speak. Closed public portion.

Action Item 1 – “Special Use Permit to allow the construction of a 51.5 ft building in the M-2 Zoning District”: Commissioner Schachter moved to approve the special use permit for the building height, findings on page 12. Commissioner Wussow seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Action Item 2: “Variance from Glenwood Meadows Development Plan to allow maximum building length of 337 feet” Commissioner Schachter moved to approve variance of 337 feet length. Commissioner Shaver seconded. Commissioner Wussow wanted to see shorter length and questioned the scale of deviation from code. Chairman Dehm agreed that length was too long and other construction measures could be employed.

Ayes: Commissioners Schachter, Cipperly, and Shaver

Nays: Commissioners Dehm, Wussow, and Wissing

The motion failed due to the tie vote.

New motion:

Commissioner Wussow recommended denial as building was not compatible, does not meet design criteria. Seconded by Commissioner Wissing. Discussion followed.

Commissioner Sumner uncomfortable with the length. Commissioner Dehm was unwilling to approve the building without an engineer's report or any documentation supporting the need for

a building at this scale. Commissioner Schachter also mentioned feeling uncomfortable with the length but argued that it was not that incompatible with surrounding area and that there was a tremendous need for more housing units. Commissioner Shaver commented that the Wulfsohn side was not as imposing; there are a lot of positives for this.

Commissioners Wussow and Wissing withdrew their motion to deny and second. Discussion with Attorney and Director regarding how to move forward.

A new motion was proposed. Commissioner Wissing moved to approve Action Item 2 and accept building length of 337 feet based on conditions listed on page 12.

Commissioner Shaver seconded.

Ayes: Commissioners Schachter, Cipperly, Shaver, and Wissing

Nays: Commissioners Dehm and Wussow

The motion to approve the building length variance carried.

Action Item 3 – “Major Site & Architectural Plan Review”: Commissioner Schachter moved to accept following conditions on page 13 and add condition 7 that pylon operating hours be limited to Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Commissioner Cipperly seconded. Discussion: Commissioner Shaver thought that condition 7 is heading in the right direction as forty days is a long period of time and also mentioned the possibility of adding sound barrier requirements. Chairman Dehm expressed discontent that there were no deed restricted units in the building. **Motion carried unanimously.**

6. Director Comments

Jenn Ooton reminded commissioners that a meeting was coming up to talk about housing. Date to be chosen soon.

7. Commission Comments

Commissioner Schachter thought the new code was difficult to work with especially regarding variance criteria and deserves a second look. It is imperative to have a meeting with the housing commission.

Commissioner Cipperly questioned why we are asking for impervious parking lots when we are concerned with local water quality. Also mentioned needs for more green policies in code such as recycling and composting.

Commissioner Wussow wants to have an actual date for this meeting. She was concerned about the moving sign at Frida's.

Commissioner Shaver agreed with Commissioner Cipperly about impervious parking lots.

Chairman Dehm was concerned about the variance criteria; housing deed restriction program.

Director Ooton reminded him that variance criteria are intended to be restrictive.

8. Adjournment 9:37 p.m.