



MINUTES
City of Glenwood Springs
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
June 23, 2020
Zoom
6:00PM

1. Roll Call

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Marco Dehm, George Shaver, Carolyn Cipperly, Kathryn Grosccup, Sumner Schachter

Absent at roll call were Commissioners: Amber Wissing, Ingrid Wussow, Ben West, Dean Kinkel

Also present were: Jenn Ooton Asst. City Manager, Gretchen Ricehill Asst. Economic/Community Development Director, Terri Parch City Engineer, Trent Hyatt Senior Planner, Anna Itenberg City Attorney, Emery Ellingson Planner I, Jessica Bowser Asst. City Engineer, Matt Langhorst Public Works Director

2. Receipt of Minutes- Receipt of May 26, 2020 minutes.

Commissioner Shaver made the motion to receive the May 26, 2020 minutes. Commissioner Schachter seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously

3. Public Comments

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

4. Continued Items –

- a. 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)*

Applicant: Triumph Development

Owner: Bell Rippy Glenwood, LLC

Location: Adjacent to Palmer Avenue between Blake and 26th

Zone: RH Residential High-Density and RT Residential Transitional

Trent Hyatt provided an update on the progression of the review of the application. Hyatt summarized that the application was first heard on April 28th, 2020 and was continued to the May 5th meeting to allow for more public input. The May 5th meeting was cut short due to an internet outage and was continued to the May 26th meeting. At the May 26th meeting the Commission requested that staff hold a neighborhood meeting to gather more input regarding the project and proposal.

Hyatt stated that a neighborhood meeting was held on Monday, June 8th to discuss options regarding traffic circulation and other concerns. Hyatt indicated that there were approximately 20 individuals in attendance at this meeting. The new site plan that resulted from this meeting included, as summarized by Hyatt, the elimination of a building, expanded footprint of other buildings, changes to Palmer Avenue by creating a non-through street, adding emergency access and pedestrian access to only the upper section of Palmer, and changes to existing parking areas. Hyatt indicated that the proposed changes and input from this meeting were all contained in the staff report and packet of materials, referred to as Option C.

Commissioner Schachter expressed his opinion on the new proposal's improvements to the transportation network. City Engineer Terri Partch addressed Schachter's concerns and stated that staff conducted a site visit to investigate possible improvement options. Partch suggested that Blake could be signed one way southbound until improvements occurred and stated some concerns that traffic coming off Highway 82 could funnel to Palmer.

Commissioner Grosscup also expressed concerns about the status of the Blake gate being open in conjunction with this project. Commissioner Shaver asked for the width of the right-of-way of Blake between 24th and 26th Street. Assistant Engineer Jessica Bowser confirmed that the right-of-way was 50'. Terri Partch confirmed that the asphalt at that part of Blake was approximately 20'. Shaver asked if the right-of-way extended near the houses on that street, which Partch confirmed. Partch mentioned the possibility of a temporary one-way on Blake and explained that if that would be a permanent change, that additional solutions would be considered. Shaver also asked if speed bumps would be considered for Blake. Partch explained that temporary speed bumps which can be installed for a summer and removed during the winter could be an option. Trent Hyatt also explained that there was concern from the neighborhood about possible effects of creating a one-way street in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Cipperly expressed concern about two-way traffic on Blake Avenue and the dangerous environment for pedestrians in that area. Cipperly also asked about any previous City Council direction to make Blake one way.

Commissioner Shaver asked if the one-way on Blake would extend from 24th or 23rd. Terri Partch confirmed that a one-way for this project would likely extend from 24th to 26th rather than from 23rd to 26th.

Commissioner Schachter asked if the local transportation plan had a draft and Partch confirmed there was a draft that would go before City Council at an upcoming meeting. Partch also indicated that any plan regarding turning Blake into a one-way street would likely require more public input, specifically to involve more of the Palmer neighborhood in the discussion.

Commissioner Dehm asked if there were any previous documents that prohibited the removal or alteration of the Blake Gate. Assistant City Engineer Jessica Bowser confirmed that nothing had been documented or recorded during the installation of the Blake Gate to prohibit the removal or alteration of the Blake Gate.

Commissioner Dehm asked if Staff would have issues with the reconfigured plan. Partch explained that Palmer was not on a schedule for improvements and explained the situations that would likely trigger that being added to that schedule such as a rapid increase in property value in the area.

Dehm then invited the applicants to share their comments.

Michael O'Connor from Triumph Development, LLC presented on the changes to the plan based on the results of the previous Planning & Zoning meeting and neighborhood meeting held on June 8th. He provided a summary of the questions and comments from Planning & Zoning and public feedback that would be addressed.

O'Connor explained how a traffic management plan was created by combining staff and public input, which resulted in the creation of four different options for traffic management. These four options that were created included:

- Existing current entitlements
- Option A: Neighborhood speed calming with speed bumps
- Option B: Coupled one-way streets with striped pedestrian and bike lane on Blake southbound and Palmer northbound
- Option C: Redesign of Palmer Avenue through the site.

At the public meeting held on June 8th, there was substantial support for the current plan with support for adding speed calming on Palmer as well as redesigning Palmer through the site.

Mike Foster, Triumph West Architecture, spoke to explain proposed site plan modifications which include the following changes:

- Elimination of Building F resulting in five apartment buildings with a total of 98 units
- Decrease in size of Building B from 12 units to 10 units
- Enlargement of Buildings A & E
- Addition of a duplex building to replace Building F
- Elimination of north parking lot to be replaced with green space

- Enhanced landscape buffers between the project and existing Oakhurst townhomes
- Reconstruction of Palmer Avenue within the site including 10' bike path
- Location of Community Room and management office

O'Connor also explained that with the change in units and parking configuration that the property now exceeds parking requirements by 11%. O'Connor stated that there will be a property manager on-site that will manage community parking through tools such as lease requirements, assigned parking, and paid parking. O'Connor also provided Commission a summary table of how the proposed plan compares to the previously approved plan. O'Connor continued to explain that since this project is based in an opportunity zone, that the project was under a time constraint due to financing requirements and deadlines. O'Connor concluded by thanking Commission for their time and expressed the opinion that the new proposed plan was superior to previous versions.

Stephanie Copeland, Triumph Development, voiced support for the proposed plan of the applicant.

Commissioner Grosscup asked how peak hour traffic would impact this site and if there would be queuing up at the entrance. Grosscup asked to confirm that the park part of the design would be open to the public and maintained by the applicant. Grosscup also asked about the surface of the proposed bike trail. O'Connor confirmed that the park would be open to the public and maintained by the applicant and that the bike trail surface was still under consideration. Grosscup also asked to confirm the one-way status of Blake Avenue. O'Connor confirmed that the proposal was to have Blake be one-way.

Commissioner Shaver asked the applicant to confirm about a specific area on the site plan that was indicated by cross-hatching. O'Connor explained that area was an additional debris flow area. Shaver also asked about designated snow storage areas. Foster explained that there were existing snow storage areas which would be included in the final plan. Shaver also asked about coordination with other Departments including Fire and Emergency. Hyatt confirmed that final plans would need to receive approval from those Departments and were in support of the general details of the plan.

Community Development Director Jenn Ooton asked for Commission to clarify if the condition to designate a one-way street on Blake would be temporary or permanent.

Commissioner Schachter asked to confirm that the condition of approval would include one-way Blake.

Commissioner Dehm asked for clarification if approval of the proposed project tonight would be the resulting development. Hyatt explained that the vested right of the previous approval expires January 2021 and believed that either the proposed plan or the previously approved plan could be developed by the applicant. City Attorney Anna Itenberg explained that this proposal could not have a condition placed on it that would undo the approval of the previous plan. Michael O'Connor confirmed that the proposed plan was what the applicant would be looking to build. Stephanie Copeland also confirmed that the proposed project, in its most recent version, is what the applicant was looking to build.

Dehm also asked to confirm that this plan would result in the removal of the Blake Gate which was confirmed by Hyatt.

Dehm stated that public comment portion had already been closed and that there would be no additional public comment on the item.

Commissioner Schachter made a motion to approve the site architectural plan with the findings and conditions of the revised suggested motions and staff report from June 23rd with a modification that Condition of Approval #1 include that Blake from 24th to 26th be made one-way south bound until a more permanent solution is devised. Commissioner Cipperly seconded the motion. Commissioner Shaver asked about the finding and conditions listed in the staff report.

Motion was called to a vote. Commissioner Grosscup, Shaver, Cipperly, Schacher, and Dehm voted to approve the motion.

Motion passed 5-0

5. New Items

- a. *14-20 Consideration of a Minor Site/Architectural Plan Review for a 2,838 square foot expansion of an existing commercial building (PIN: 2185-053-41-001 and 002)*

Applicant: Kinetic Design (formerly EI Design)
Owner: Halle Properties, LLC
Location: 51537 Highway 6
Zone: M1 Mixed Use Corridor

Planner I Emery Ellingson briefly explained the proposed project and proposed location.

Commissioner Dehm opened the discussion to the applicant for questions. Steve Appel, 1260 Corona Point Court, Corona, CA, representing Kinetic Design explained the extension of the building was to create more space for tire storage. This extension would result in moving the current transformer and trash enclosure. Appel also noted that this addition would result in the removal of some storage containers currently used for tire storage, which is a zoning code violation.

Commissioner Dehm asked if the proposed addition would match the existing building's design, which was confirmed by the applicant.

Commissioner Grosscup asked staff regarding the procedure of Planning & Zoning Commission in reviewing this application since the existing building was less than 10,000 square feet. Emery Ellingson explained that because the addition created a building that was over 10,000 square feet that would require it to go before Planning & Zoning Commission. Grosscup stated that in the future, it might be a good idea to reconsider this requirement in code revisions as this project was a basic build out addition.

Commissioner Cipperly asked for confirmation about changes to the building design had been addressed. Emery Ellingson explained that under code, since this addition was less than 50% of the original footprint, the applicant is not required as condition of approval to meet all design requirements.

Gretchen Ricehill commented that changing the language on square foot threshold for additions that push a building over 10,000 square feet would be a future code amendment.

Commissioner Schachter had a question regarding the landscape plan about the number of trees

indicated in the landscape plan as indicated in the staff report. Emery Ellingson confirmed that there were 36 proposed trees in the landscape plan and 30 trees were required by code.

Commissioner Dehm opened the discussion for public comment.

Anne Leuter, 51579 Highway 6, asked about the development of the back lot on the property as they had received public notice regarding this application.

Bryce Christensen, 1600 Kerns Road, Snowmass, CO representing Kimley-Horn explained that the back lot on the property was not for sale or part of the property.

Commissioner Dehm closed the public comment portion.

Commissioner Grosscup made a motion to approve the item. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Schachter.

Motion was called to a vote. Commissioner Grosscup, Shaver, Cipperly, Schacher, and Dehm voted to approve the motion.

Motion passed 5-0

At approximately 7:45 PM, Commissioner Dehm called for a five-minute recess.

- b. 30-20 Consideration of a Location & Extent Review application for construction of an 1,800 sf covered storage building, a 5-bay 2,250 s.f. garage storage building, a 3,200 s.f. temporary canvas covered buildings, and temporary mobile and storage units. The application includes moving and extending an existing chain link fencing on the north property line and constructing a concrete pad for street sweeper use.*

Applicant: City of Glenwood Springs, Public Works Department

Owner: City of Glenwood Springs

Location: 811 Airport Road and is legally described as a 61.735 acre tract in Section 22 & 27, twp 6, Range 89, Garfield County, Colorado

Zone: IL- Light Industrial

Assistant Director Ricehill explained that this application is a location and extent review that this is an opportunity for Planning & Zoning Commission to review projects by public entities. Ricehill described the status and use of the area, colloquially known as “The Boneyard”. Ricehill explained the City proposal to add buildings as described in the application for use by City departments.

The current use of the property is office, sign shop, and outdoor storage. The application calls for the following improvements:

- Covered storage
- 5-bay garage/storage
- Canvas-covered temporary storage
- 20 x 20 concrete pad
- Extension of existing fence

Ricehill stated that the proposed use does conform to the future land use map shown in the Comprehensive Plan and that the proposed project complied with zoning district standards. Ricehill also explained that the proposal does not meet the nonresidential design standards, fencing standards, or landscaping. Ricehill proposed approval with suggested conditions as listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Cipperly asked to confirm which buildings on the site plan were existing compared to a photograph from the staff report. Ricehill confirmed which buildings were in the photos compared to the site plan.

Commissioner Schachter asked if this project was related to existing excavation on south end of the airport. Matt Langhorst, Public Works explained that some of the vegetation on the site had been removed and there was some reworking of the northeast corner of the site as preliminary site preparation. Commissioner Schachter also asked if these improvements were intended to be temporary or permanent in the face of possible future development and improvements associated with the airport and South Bridge. Matt Langhorst explained that regardless of surrounding development that the functions of these buildings would be to supply storage that will be lost with the elimination of the MOC. Commissioner Schachter also asked if this application were approved if it could be criticized as an example of the City not following its own standards.

Commissioner Grosscup asked how many staff would be based at the site. Matt Langhorst explained that there would be 12 staff members based on site as well as additional employees visiting the site to utilize the storage. Langhorst also explained that if and when the South Bridge improvements were completed, the road to access this site would not be a part of that project and that the gate to the access to the site would allow for a semi-trailer to be able to enter and exit the facility.

Commissioner Shaver commented that there seemed to be a double standard in terms of this project not adhering to code design requirements. Shaver also asked if there were concerns over the capacity of the road to accommodate heavy vehicle traffic. City Engineer Terri Partch explained that the road is currently maintained by Public Works and that this proposed project would not cause a large impact on the road. Partch also mentioned that there will be future road improvements in the area as part of the South Bridge project. Shaver also asked how permanent some of these improvements would be given the possibility of future development.

Commissioner Dehm opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Greg Rippy, 213 Creekside Court, Glenwood Springs, and owner 61 116 Road, a property across the road from this development. Rippy expressed general support for the project and had questions about the existence of temporary storage containers in use on a City site. Rippy had questions why the Airport and other private entities had not been able to use similar temporary storage containers.

Commissioner Dehm closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Cipperly asked to confirm the location of project in comparison to the proposed road of the South Bridge project. Cipperly had concerns about how close this site would be to the new road, which would be an entrance to Glenwood Springs and stated some concerns about the visuals of the site.

Commissioner Schachter stated, in response to the public comment, that he did not recall the current Planning & Zoning Commission considering any temporary storage containers at the Airport.

Jenn Ooton mentioned that there was a planned joint session with City Council and the Airport Commission which would discuss hanger space and other storage space. Ooton explained that was scheduled for the month of August.

Commissioner Dehm asked for an update on the status of the South Bridge project. Terri Partch explained that the project was starting preliminary design processes in cooperation with CDOT and anticipated that plans would be complete sometime in 2021. Dehm also asked if the reason why most of these buildings were temporary was due to budget restraints, which was confirmed by Matt Langhorst. Langhorst also explained that the temporary storage containers would be painted and be made to look more like buildings rather than a plain storage container on the site.

Commissioner Schachter asked if there would be any difficulty to approve with a condition to recognize that approval would be conditional on the applicant to return to review for compliance with code. Jenn Ooton explained that it could be a condition to revisit this application again within a specific timeframe. Schachter explained that the condition would not necessarily require the project to meet code, but at least an additional review within a five year period since this application has been submitted under emergency circumstances given City finances and the physical condition of the MOC building.

Commissioner Grosscup explained that this project, in comparison to the previous location and extent review at Devereux, was different due to its location and that Grosscup did not find as much of an issue with the compliance issues in terms of design. Grosscup stated that this location is out of the way and it is likely that if this were a private applicant, that some concessions on design could be made. Langhorst commented that budget was a severe constraint with the project which is why the proposal does not fully meet all design requirements.

Commissioner Shaver asked if the location and extent review was required for the temporary buildings already on site. Langhorst explained that those structures were placed in response to the short timeline of having to relocate from the MOC. Langhorst explained that they did not go through location and extent but did have a permit to install.

Commissioner Shaver made a motion to approve the item with all findings and conditions listed in the staff report with the additional condition that the application be required for another review within five years. Commissioner Schachter seconded the motion.

Grosscup asked to confirm about the additional condition and Schachter explained that the condition would require a re-application. City Attorney Anna Itenberg also asked about the specifics of the condition as well.

Commissioner Cipperly asked if the north and west fences should be required to have wind slats for additional screening as they face the road. Commissioner Shaver expressed support for the additional condition to require applicant to come back within five years. Commissioner Dehm expressed support for the application given the current state of the MOC and budget constraints.

Motion was called to a vote. Commissioner Grosscup, Shaver, Cipperly, Schachter, and Dehm voted to approve the motion.

Motion passed 5-0

6. Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Cipperly commented that it will be interesting to see within five years how the development around the area will progress. Cipperly also expressed thanks to all involved with the Bell-Rippy project. Commissioner Schachter stated support for another future joint workshop with Planning & Zoning Commission with the Housing Commission. Schachter also asked about future development in West Glenwood. Commissioner Grosscup stated that part of the reason behind the Bell-Rippy development was due to their location within an opportunity zone and was glad to see additional housing coming to the community. Commissioner Shaver stated appreciation to the applicant of the Bell-Rippy development for making such an effort to gather public input and incorporate it with their application. Commissioner Dehm also expressed appreciation of all parties involved with the Bell-Rippy application for their patience and willingness to adapt the application. Commissioner Dehm also expressed support for a future joint workshop on housing. Dehm also expressed a desire to have a discussion on the existing variance criteria.

Jenn Ooton expressed appreciation for everyone involved with the Bell-Rippy application. Jenn Ooton also invited commission members to join the City listening session on COVID-19.

7. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:03 PM.