



MINUTES
City of Glenwood Springs
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
May 5, 2020
Zoom
6:00PM

1. Roll Call

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

Absent at roll call were Commissioners: None

Also present were: Jenn Ooton, Asst. City Manager, Terri Partch, City Engineer, Gretchen Ricehill, Asst. Economic/Community Development Director, Trent Hyatt, Senior Planner
Anna S. Itenberg, City Attorney's Office
Catherine Fletcher, City Clerk
Jessica Bowser, Asst. City Engineer, Alissa Owsley, IT Director

2. Receipt of Minutes- Receipt of February 25, 2020 minutes.

At previous meeting Commissioner Grosscup had requested a review of the minutes.

Motion: Commissioner Dehm made a motion to receive the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Schachter. Motion passed with Shaver and Schachter abstaining.

3. Public Comments

Comments from citizens appearing for items not on the agenda. No citizens were present.

4. New Items –

- a. *11-20 Consideration of various amendments to Municipal Code Title 070 Sections 070.030, 070.040 and 070.070 regarding Use Regulations; Accessory Uses; Hillside Development; Landscaping, Screening and Fencing; Off-street Parking; Residential Site and Building Design Storage requirements; Signs; and Rules of Construction and Definitions*

Assistant Community Development Director presented on the proposed changes to the municipal code. The following changes to the municipal code were proposed by Ricehill:

- Change to Code 070.030.020(e) Table of Allowed Uses. Proposal to create a new zoning use for “Craft Manufacturing” and propose to add it to all current commercial and industrial zoning categories. This use would include smaller manufacturing uses such as cabinetry, blacksmithing, and other small manufacturing uses.
- Change to Code 070.030.040 Accessory Uses and Structures. Proposal to allow backyard chickens as an allowed accessory use in Planned Unit Developments (PUD) unless specifically identified as a prohibited use in the PUD.
- Change to Code 070.040.050 Landscaping, Screening, Fencing. Proposal to reduce the amount of shrubs and perennials required in development proposals. Proposed to go back to previous code requirements for shrubs and perennials. Also proposed to reduce amount of required landscaping in I2 and I1 districts, as it is currently 20% which is greater than commercial zoning districts.
- Change to Code 070.040.050(f)(2)b Landscaping, Screening, and Fencing: Fence Standards and Fence materials. Proposal to amend code to allow chain link fencing in front and side yards in industrial zone districts if plants are added to base of fence when bordering public right-of-way.
- Change to Code 070.040.080(e) Residential Site and Building Design – Residential Building Design and Character. Proposal to correct formatting and change required storage for multifamily developments from 100 square feet per unit to a requirement of 1 cubic foot of storage per 3 square feet of gross floor area per unit.
- Change to Code 070.040.110 Signs. Proposal to add signs that are not visible from the public way to be added to list of signs not requiring a permit. Proposal to remove electronic message signs from the code per previous Council direction.
- Change to Code 070.040.060(h) Parking and Loading Area Use and Design. Proposal to require same number of trees per parking spaces and allow more flexibility with configuration of landscaping areas to be more flexible with installations of bioswales and rain gardens.

Commissioner Wussow asked how striking electronic messages from the code would affect existing electronic message board signs. Ricehill confirmed that those signs would be considered legal non-conforming signs going forward.

Commissioner Cipperly asked to clarify the required location of the landscaping screening for the chain link fencing in industrial area. Commissioner Dehm asked if landscape screening could be placed in public right of way.

Commissioner Grosscup asked if signs not visible from the public way would require a sign permit, and whether that would have any effect on sign lighting. Commissioner Wissing had questions regarding craft manufacturing and how it would relate to a mixed use or residential zone and home occupation uses and what scale of manufacturing was intended by the definition.

Commissioner Schachter asked to clarify the definition of bioswales. Commissioner Cipperly had a question about the tree islands and if those spaces could be permeable surfaces. The Commission requested clarification of the intent of shading a parking lot.

The Commission asked that 3-d printing be added to the craft manufacturing definition.

Chairman Dehm opened public comment. No public comments.

Commissioner Grosscup moved to approve item 11-20, motion with the noted modifications and clarifications, seconded by Commissioner Wussow. Commissioner Wussow asked if there was a need to modify any of the amendments, if that would be possible to do at a later meeting regarding these amendments.

Motion carried unanimously.

5. Continued Items from April 28, 2020

- a. 07-20 Consideration of a request to Rezone a parcel from RH-Residential High Density to M2-Mixed Use Commercial Central Core zone district. The property is Lot 11B, Glenwood Meadows No. to a Minor Re-subdivision of Glenwood Meadows No 4 Lot Line Adjustment, County of Garfield, State of Colorado (PIN 2185-081-41-004)*

Assistant Director Ricehill indicated that since this issue was discussed at the previous meeting, there had been no submitted public comments.

Commissioner Dehm opened public comments. No public comments.

Commissioner Schachter made a motion to approve the request with the findings and conditions listed on page 8 of the staff report. Commissioner Shaver seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

- b. 04-20 Consideration of a Major Site/Architectural Plan Review, Rezoning from RH Residential High-Density to RT Residential Transitional, and Variance applications for the construction of 100 Multifamily apartment units in 6 buildings on approximately 5.8 acres (PIN 2185-153-04-001, 2185-153-02-008, and 2185-211-00-002)*

Senior Planner Trent Hyatt provided an update as several items had been added to the application packet to address comments from the public and Planning Commission at the previous meeting. One question that was addressed by the applicant was the revision of a site plan showing parking options for electric vehicles. Additional drawings showing elevations between the existing Oakhurst Townhomes and proposed development were also added.

Public comments received between the previous meeting and 5/5/2020 were also added to the application packet. The following public comments were read into the record:

- David Turtle, no address given, expressed concerns over the effect of increased traffic on Blake and Palmer, especially given the current physical condition of the streets. Requested that Planning & Zoning deny the application.
- Lisa Menzano, 23rd & Palmer, expressed concern over scale of project and would prefer the space to remain open. Request Planning & Zoning to deny application
- Christine Smalley, no address given, expressed concerns over the amount of parking provided, increased traffic, and lack of sidewalks. Requested that Planning & Zoning deny the application.
- Janet & Richard O'Connell, 2409 Palmer Avenue, expressed concerns that current roads will not support future development and expressed concerns over parking, traffic, sidewalks. Requested that Planning & Zoning deny the application.
- Joan Troth, 3202 Cooper Court, expressed concerns over the scale of the project and size of the buildings, increased traffic, and decreased home values in the neighborhood. Requested that Planning & Zoning deny the application.
- Sara Simms, representing Mountain Valley Developmental Services, located at 2503 Palmer Avenue. Mountain Valley Developmental Services operates a home at this property for individuals with intellectual and development disabilities. Simms expressed concern that this project would increase traffic density in the neighborhood and expressed concern over the safety of the home's residents. Requested that the applicant extend street improvements through the neighborhood and increase safety measures for pedestrians in the neighborhood.
- Elaine Speck, 2506 Palmer Avenue, expressed concerns regarding density of the project and increased traffic in the neighborhood. Speck also suggested that the project application was tabled until after the COVID-19 crisis.
- Laura Speck, 2506 Palmer Avenue, requested Planning & Zoning Commission deny or postpone the decision on the application citing that many residents have been unable to follow the project or express their concerns adequately due to the online formats. Also expressed concerns over project density and proposed parking lot which would face the Speck residence. In addition, also expressed concern over possible change to their driveway configuration due to changes to Palmer. Speck also suggested that the project remove the north parking lot, reduce the number of units, and install adequate parking signage.
- Public comment received on behalf of multiple residents of the neighboring Oakhurst Townhomes including Laurie Nelson of Oakhurst #34, Dulce Ramirez of Oakhurst #33, Bianca Ramirez of Oakhurst #33, Bradley Rice of Oakhurst #10, Brandy Rice of Oakhurst #10, Unidentified of Oakhurst #10, Drake Timroth of Oakhurst #7, Kristen Levey #7, Unidentified #7, Steve [unknown last name] #28, Erica Crampton #28, Marie Dohm #4, George Dana #1, Shelly Lott #19, Joan Guilianelli #15, Brianna Millspaugh #18, Zachary Apke #18, Daisy Apke #18. This letter expressed concerns over increased traffic,

- parking, physical condition of neighborhood roads, and project density.
- Annie Hoghuag, 678 Country Road 127, owner of 519 Easy Street. Annie expressed concerns over the amount of parking provided in the project. Requested that the City reconsider parking requirements.
 - Dave Malehorn, 2407 Palmer Avenue, expressed concern over the project density, lack of sidewalks in the neighborhoods, neighborhood road conditions, parking, snow removal plan, and potential overall impact of the development on the neighborhood. This public comment had additional attachments that were unable to be read into record.
 - A public comment from Allison Brett, 2201 Crestwood Drive, was submitted in the form of a Powerpoint. The presentation was shown by sharing a screen over Zoom. The slides were then read by the presentation author. Brett expressed concerns regarding traffic spillover and potential pollution from Highway 82 due to opening the Blake Gate, potential increased traffic, current road conditions, and pedestrian safety
 - Joan Guilainelli, Oakhurst Townhomes, Unit #15 expressed concern over project density, physical proximity to Oakhurst and lack of fence, and decrease of open space in the neighborhood.
 - Lynette Marie Lacerda, 285 Mikala Lane, New Castle, Colorado and former resident of 1814 Ouray Road, Glenwood Springs, Colorado. Lynette expressed concern over parking for the project.
 - Ryan Roberts, 2419 Palmer Avenue, expressed concerns over the public involvement in the project especially concerning the capacity of residents of the neighborhood to communicate with one another and engage with the City given the current health crisis. Roberts suggested that the meeting and decision be postponed to a future date.
 - A. David Cox & Cynthia Green, 2504 Palmer Avenue, submitted concerns regarding the public input process and expressed that the hearing should be delayed until an in person public hearing can be held. Concerns were also expressed regarding project density, parking, and rezoning of property at 2710 Blake as part of the project. Also questioned if these units were needed citing other multi-family developments in Glenwood Springs.
 - Erin and William Lee, 2402 Palmer Avenue expressed concerns over the public input of the project and how COVID-19 limits communication regarding meaningful conversations about this project. Requested to postpone a decision until more personal forms of communication and meetings can occur.
 - George Dana, Oakhurst Townhomes, expressed concerns over project size and density, parking, traffic, flood debris control, water flow, fencing, light pollution, pedestrian safety, snow removal, and open space. Requested Planning and Zoning to deny application.
 - Lynn B Cary, 2405 Palmer expressed concerns regarding traffic, gating Palmer, increased density and inadequate parking.
 - Scott Kramer, 2501 Palmer Avenue, expressed concerns regarding current road conditions, pedestrian safety, traffic overflow from Highway 82, opening of Blake Gate, and concern over public input process and use of Zoom platform during COVID-19.

Commissioner Dehm then opened the public comment to any meeting attendees.

- Frank Martin, 805 Crestwood Drive. Prior to comments Martin disclosed that he is the spouse of City Council member Paula Stepp and that his comments reflect his own

opinions. Expressed concerns over current conditions of Palmer Avenue and possible increase in traffic.

- Jamie Raehal, 2314 Palmer Avenue, expressed concerns that the City of Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission was not involved in these discussions as traffic, parking, and other transportation concerns have been a focal point of public input.
- Shelly Lott, Oakhurst Townhomes #19, expressed concern over the roads in the neighborhood and the access to the development. Suggested making the development a cul-de-sac pushing traffic through the Blake gate rather than connecting to Palmer.
- Elaine Speck, 2506 Palmer, expressed concern over public input process and requested that the decision be postponed.
- Annie Hoghaug, 678 County Road 127 and owner of a property at 519 Easy Street expressed concerns regarding project density, traffic, local road conditions, and possible effect of the development on the neighborhood.
- Dave Malehorn, 2407 Palmer, expressed concern regarding public input process and suggested that any decision with the project be postponed.
- Cody Lyden, 2415 Palmer, expressed that he was in agreement with the general sentiment of the neighborhood such as concerns regarding traffic, project density, and local road conditions.

Commissioner Dehm closed the public comment period.

Michael O'Connor, Triumph Development West, addressed the following questions from the public and Planning & Zoning Commission from the previous meeting.

- Restricted Public Access to Uphill Open Space: O'Connor explained that the uphill open space would be separated from the development by a 420' debris flow fence and multiple retaining walls which would provide physical separation.
- Neighborhood Traffic Impacts: Greg Schroeder, McDowell Engineering spoke on the possible traffic impact on the neighborhood from this project. Stated that they had received a CDOT access permit and that estimated increase in traffic as a direct result of this development would be 4 to 13 vehicles per hour based on studies. Schroeder also stated that the traffic studies were also peer-reviewed by engineers at CDOT. O'Connor stated that traffic calming measures have been considered for Palmer including one-way designation, signage, and speed bumps.
- Parking Counts and Management: O'Connor stated that their parking plan meets City Code and is not requesting a variance for parking. Also explained that leases for the unit will require tenant to specify number of cars and residents to each unit as managed by an onsite manager and that assigned numbered parking will be used.
- Site Sections and Landscape Buffers at Oakhurst Townhomes: Mike Foster, the landscape architect for the project, further described the landscape plan along with elevations showing the development and its spatial relation to the existing Oakhurst Townhomes. Foster also explained that the light poles for this project would be placed as far as possible away from the Oakhurst Townhomes.
- Controlling Trespassing through Neighbor Properties: O'Connor mentioned that the planned landscaping would provide a physical deterrent to cutting through the Oakhurst property.
- Pedestrian Circulation and Palmer Avenue Typical Section: Foster explained that there

would be a continuous sidewalk on both sides of Palmer as part of the site plan. There would also be additional sidewalk added on Blake as part of the project as well. Foster explained more about the Palmer street design showing sidewalks and landscaping.

- Green Building Elements: Foster explained that they would be pursuing National Green Building Certification as a component of HUD Loan process.
- EV Charging Parking Spaces: Plan will include infrastructure for future EV parking spaces.
- Material Samples and Colors: Foster provided visual examples to demonstrate the colors and materials that would be used for the project.
- Palmer Avenue Construction: O'Connor also addressed the reconstruction of the driveway on the Speck property showing pictures of the current site. The reconstruction of Palmer Avenue to meet City standards would require to create a new driveway on the property with an easement.
- Compliance with Zoning: O'Connor provided further clarification and information as to how the project complies with the current zoning requirements. O'Connor also explained specifically what the variances are for this project.

O'Connor explained that applicant would be willing to include the following items to the plan as condition of approval: privacy fencing on west side of parking area, traffic calming techniques along Palmer Avenue, and working with adjacent landowner on construction of a new driveway.

O'Connor concluded comments and discussion moved to questions from the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Commissioner Dehm proposed a brief recess before continuing the meeting.

Commissioner Dehm reconvened the meeting for questions for the applicant and staff.

Commissioner Shaver asked the applicant about the ratio of compact to standard size parking. Applicant explained that according to the plan that there were 20 compact parking spaces. Shaver also asked staff how any variances previously approved on the property would apply to the current project. Trent Hyatt explained that variances are granted in connection with a specific site plan and since this development has a different site plan that the previous project variances do not apply to this project.

Commissioner Schachter asked applicant regarding the summary of traffic volumes as compiled by McDowell Engineering. Schachter asked how traffic would move if there was only one access route to the site from the south and not connect Palmer through the site. Greg Schroeder, McDowell Engineering, explained that typical best practice road design encourages more access points for traffic flow and emergency response. Schachter expressed concern about the traffic flow in the area with the project. Schachter also had questions about open space requirements, especially the active space requirement. Mike Foster explained that the community room for the site, including outdoor space helped meet that requirement as well as space between Buildings D & E.

Schachter also about the potential for debris flow damages to Palmer or surrounding neighborhoods. Jessica Bower, Assistant City Engineer, explained that there will be a maintenance agreement between the development and the City which includes debris flow inspections and standards to be met. Bower also explained that the proposed design of the project mitigates risk by installing a debris flow fence.

Commissioner Grosscup asked the applicant regarding the number of spaces in the north parking lot that face the Oakhurst Townhomes. Mike Foster explained that there were 24 total spaces in the north parking lot with 14 spaces facing west. Grosscup also asked how development would manage tenants parking additional vehicles in the neighborhood after exceeding their allotted spaces. Grosscup had questions for staff regarding traffic speed, which Terri Partch confirmed would be 25 MPH. Grosscup also asked if any street improvements are planned in the neighborhood. Terri Partch explained that improvements to Blake between 23rd and 26th has been planned for the near future.

At approximately 9:45 PM, there was a disruption as many meeting participants lost access to the Zoom meeting space. There was an internet outage which caused many participants lost access to the Zoom meeting space.

City Attorney Anna Itenberg clarified that without a quorum of commissioners, that the meeting could not legally proceed and advised to wait to see if any other members of the commission could join.

Commissioner Wussow asked if it would be possible to use e-mail to decide to continue the meeting. Anna Itenberg clarified that e-mail was not mentioned in Code.

A quorum of Commissioners returned to the Zoom meeting.

Commissioner Schachter, Dehm, Wussow, and Cipperly were able to rejoin the Zoom meeting. Anna Copeland, Triumph Development West, asked if public comment would be reopened if the meeting was set to continue at a future date. Dehm confirmed that public comment portion had already been closed.

Commissioner Schachter made a motion to continue item 04-20 to the next Planning & Zoning Commission meeting on Tuesday, May 26th. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cipperly.

Motion passed by Schachter, Dehm, Wussow, and Cipperly. Commissioners Shaver, Grosscup, and Wissing were not present to vote due to internet outage.

Commissioner Schachter made a motion to continue item 06-20 to the next Planning & Zoning Commission meeting on Tuesday, May 26th. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wussow.

Motion passed by Schachter, Dehm, Wussow, and Cipperly. Commissioners Shaver, Grosscup, and Wissing were not present to vote due to internet outage.

6. Director Comments

Director was not available for comments as was not able to connect to the meeting.

7. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 10:13 PM.