



AGENDA  
CITY OF GLENWOOD SPRINGS  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting  
NOVEMBER 18, 2025  
Council Chambers, First Floor  
101 W. 8<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
6:00 PM

1 Attendance Instructions

- A. This meeting is held in person as well as via Zoom.  
Join at: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86380550264>  
Or Dial: 719-359-4580,  
253-215-8782 US (Tacoma) 346 248 7799 US (Houston)  
Webinar ID: 863 8055 0264  
International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86380550264>

2 Roll Call

3 Receipt of the Minutes

- A. August 26, 2025 Meeting Minutes  
B. October 28, 2025 Meeting Minutes

4 Comments from citizens appearing for items not on the agenda

5 New Items

- A. Housing Work Session

6 Commissioner Comments

7 Director Comments

8 Adjournment

**MINUTES**  
**City of Glenwood Springs Planning and Zoning Commission**

**Regular Meeting**

**August 26, 2025**

**Council Chambers, First Floor**

**101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM**

**1. Roll Call**

Present: Commissioners: Carolyn Cipperly, Amy Connerton, Pete Waller, John Houghton, Gregory Cowan, Joy White, and Connie Geiman.

Also Present: Interim Community Development Director Tim Bergman, Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray, Long Range Principal Planner Jim Hardcastle, and City Attorney Karl Hanlon.

**2. Conflicts of Interest**

Commissioner Cowan stated he will recuse himself from consideration of items 6.B Planning File REZONE-000048-2025, Rezoning from Glenwood Springs Mall. There were no other conflicts of interest.

**3. Receipt of Minutes**

**a. July 22, 2025 Meeting Minutes**

By hand vote, all members approved the minutes, with Commissioners Waller and White abstaining.

**4. Comments from citizens for items not appearing on the agenda**

No public comment was offered.

**5. New Items**

**a. Planning File SUP-000062-2025, Special Use Permit Marijuana Dispensary 2922 Glen Avenue**

Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray presented Action Item 1 and recommended approval with findings and conditions outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner questions, comments, and staff responses included the following:

- **Commissioner Connerton:** How is this a legal nonconforming use when it is a new Special Use Permit? **Staff response:** This is a continuation of the same use that was lawfully operating. If the previous business had been required to get a Special Use Permit when it was established, the Permit could have transferred with this property. The mental health facility and school district facility that are now within the buffer area moved there after the establishment of the retail marijuana use.
- **Commissioner Connerton:** Is there a regulation to negate the buffer area that was changed in 2020? **Staff response:** The retail marijuana use was already there when the vocational tech facility started. Similarly, a mental health facility moved in when

the retail marijuana business was operating, then failed, then a new business moved in.

- **Chair Waller:** Does the City need to inform the school district about this new business? **Staff response:** The marijuana business is obvious from Grand Ave., and the school district must know it exists. The Green Dragon has not had any complaints or issues.
- **Commissioner Cowan:** If a different business, not retail marijuana, occupied this space, and then a retail marijuana business came back to the space afterward, how would we deal with it? **Staff response:** That would be different.
- **Commissioner White:** Are all Special Use Permits transferable? **Staff response:** Yes, unless the P&Z makes a condition saying that they are not.
- **Commissioner Geiman:** Who changed the buffer to 1,000 feet in 2020 and why? **Staff response:** **Staff response:** Staff is unsure, but it may match State buffer requirements.
- **Commissioner Geiman:** Is it important to keep mental health patients and students away from marijuana? **Staff response:** The history of marijuana in Colorado is interesting, and may be based more on how people feel rather than data. The buffer in Glenwood Springs used to be 500 feet.
- **Commissioner Connerton:** Why did the Green Dragon fail and is there a compatibility issue with the surrounding businesses? Are we limiting the opportunity of other businesses? **Staff response:** Staff does not have any information indicating that the Green Dragon failed. The landlord has the freedom to select the tenants they want, and so the City is responding to what they are requesting to do.
- **Commissioner Geiman:** Does the fact that the mental health facility does not have a business mean that it is not caring for mental health patients? **Staff response:** The issue is whether it is legally defensible to deny this permit. The other issue is the fact that it moved into the buffer zone when a marijuana business was already operating there.
- **Chair Waller:** Clarified that there is no Special Use Permit currently for the Green Dragon.
- **Commissioner Geiman:** Was the school district notified about this Special Use Permit application? **Staff response:** This application was noticed in accordance with the regulations and the school district was not required to be noticed.

#### Applicant Comment:

The applicant's representative, Sahil Patel, introduced himself and lives in Lakewood, Colorado. They have done everything according to the rules, believes Glenwood Springs is a phenomenal place to operate, and is seeking the Planning & Zoning Commission's approval to do so.

The owners, Alex and Andrew Levine, also introduced themselves online. They noted that they are the same people who were behind the Green Dragon. They apologized for not appearing in person.

Comments from the Public:

No public comment.

Commissioner Cipperly made a motion to approve Action Item 1 with findings and conditions as written in the packet. Commissioner White seconded the motion.

Discussion after the motion included:

- Commissioner Connerton: She hopes that the store will make sure no students are able to enter.
- Commissioner Geiman: She supports small businesses, but thinks the children trump reasons to approve this business.

Commissioner Waller called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 6-1.

Commissioner Cowan left the room for the next item.

**b. Planning File REZONE-000048-2025, Rezoning from Glenwood Springs Mall PUD to M1 - Mixed-Use Corridor, 51027 HWY 6 & 24**

Long Range Principal Planner Jim Hardcastle presented Action Item 2 and recommended approval with findings and conditions in the staff report, striking the need for #2 in the conditions list and the two findings, c and d, as supplemented in the Staff Report: Rezoning Criteria & Findings.

Commissioner questions, comments, and staff responses included the following:

- Is the Urban Development Authority collaborating on this at all? **Legal response:** the UDA is still in existence but is not relevant to this conversation, it is a financing tool.
- Are all parcels owned by the same individual. **Staff response:** No, there are six different entities connected with this application.
- It looks like future projects would need to conform to many standards, though there is ample parking, but is there a use or situation that would cause this to become a problem. **Staff response:** The owners as they redevelop can only put forth any project that can be accommodated by available parking.
- Can you clarify the purpose of the variance process vs. a rezoning to meet use needs? **Staff response:** Staff would utilize other tools such as variances or Special Use Permits to meet the needs of the applicant before considering a rezoning to meet site needs.
- Would this rezoning increase the value of parcels and benefit the applicant? Can we expect the owners to agree to what the parcels will be used for in the future? **Staff**

**response:** The management and adjustment of the value of a parcel when different parameters are applied is not the intended function of the rezoning process of the City and is market driven. The approval criteria of the Rezoning Approval Criteria in this case have been met.

- Is rezoning parcel by parcel more efficient than a blanket rezoning? **Legal response:** The historical PUD zoning was originally established while the parcel was in the County decades ago. The purpose here is to accommodate how the community wants to achieve growth through the influence of the Comprehensive Plan and the Municipal Code based on public input years ago when these and other driving documents and plans were initially approved.
- Does the Rezoning replace the PUD? **Staff response:** Yes the M1 district replaces the PUD zoning as originally established.
- This proposal exceeds the 125% excess of parking allowed, how will this be addressed? **Staff response:** Tall future redevelopment will address parking on a use by use basis to maintain individual parking requirements are met.
- M1 zoning extends throughout the 6 & 244 corridor, where does this end and how does it affect others uses on Mel Rey? **Staff response:** the M1 - Mixed-Use Corridor district physically meets and supports the commercial zoning of the County along Mel Ray, making the mall rezoning fully surrounded by commercially zoned uses.

Representing the GWS Mall Applicant, Jeff Peterson PE presented aspects of the application, sharing how the applicant has met the rezoning criteria as set forth in the Municipal Code, and the Comprehensive Plan.

#### Questions of the Applicant:

- Is there something bigger coming? **Applicant Comment:** There is no private master plan, though residential components are not being considered at this time as the lease with the tenant Ross limits this opportunity, and will be in place for quite some time.
- Can you speak to the collaborative nature of the other tracts in the application and their support of this request? **Applicant Comment:** We reached out to the other four entities, only receiving limited feedback, none of it negative.

#### Comments from the Public

- No public comment was offered.

The Public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to approve Action Item 2 with conditions as written in the packet, though striking the need for #2 in the conditions list and the two findings, c and d, as supplemented in the Staff Report: Rezoning Criteria & Findings. Commissioner White seconded the motion.

Discussion after the motion included:

- Commissioner White is encouraged to see this development in commercial hub in Glenwood Springs.
- Commissioner Cipperly agrees with this extension and infill of M1 zoning makes sense.
- Chairperson Waller agrees with this effort to revitalize this important commercial hub.

Commissioner Waller called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

Commissioner Cowan rejoined the Commission for the remainder of the meeting.

**c. Planning File #23-25 Code Amendment: Sidewalks**

Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray presented Action Item 3 and recommended no changes to the Municipal Code, as described in the staff report.

Commissioner questions, comments, and staff responses included the following:

- **Commissioner White:** Explain how this works. If you're putting in an ADU on a street that has no sidewalk, would there be a sidewalk just in front of my house? **Staff response:** Yes, if there were no fee-in-lieu. It would look weird, but there are examples of gaps where the sidewalks now connect.
- **Commissioner White:** Where are the fees collected spent, and how does the fee-in-lieu compare to market rate? **Staff response:** When you exclude site preparation work, the five-foot residential sidewalks are very close to market rate. With eight-foot sidewalks in commercial districts, the fee-in-lieu is under market rate even without excluding site preparation.
- **Commissioner Geiman:** How expensive is the fee-in-lieu for a typical City lot? **Staff response:** If a lot with a 50-foot street frontage were subject to this, it would be \$3,000.
- **Commissioner Cipperly:** There was an ADU project that was a corner lot that incurred a fee of \$8,000. There was also not a place to put a sidewalk. Those streets should be on the exempt list. Recently those streets were paved, but they did not put in sidewalks or curbs. **Staff response:** People sometimes do not know where the right-of-way starts and their property ends, sometimes lawns are in portions of the right-of-way.
- **Commissioner Cowan:** If things stay as they are, is there an opportunity for property owners to appeal? **Staff response:** Yes, the process for that would be a variance.
- **Commissioner Cowan:** What are the floor area opportunities in the pre-approved ADU options that we might adopt in the future? **Staff response:** There are lots of options.

- **Commissioner Cowan:** Has Staff looked at how pre-approved ADUs would work with sidewalk requirements? **Staff response:** Pre-application conferences and education are the best ways to do this. Also, the City's new permitting software, which requires some files for people to submit applications, is a way to make sure requirements are not missed.
- **Commissioner White:** Currently, you're not required to put in a sidewalk if you build an attached ADU? **Staff response:** That's right, except that if you build an attached ADU by building an addition, it could still trigger the sidewalk requirement.
- **Commissioner White:** Was the direction from City Council to only look at sidewalks and ADUs? **Staff response:** Their direction was to look at barriers to building ADUs, and sidewalks can be one of them.
- **Commissioner White:** Could P&Z's recommendation be for the City Engineer to review the exempt list? **Staff response:** Yes, the way to do that would be in a motion.
- **Commissioner Geiman:** Which areas of town need sidewalks? **Staff response:** A lot of west Glenwood and some of south Glenwood.
- **Commissioner Connerton:** How many sidewalk gaps have been filled with the current system? **Staff response:** Some sidewalks have been built, but Staff does not have specific information.
- **Commissioner Connerton:** Could the P&Z consider different requirements for different parts of town? **Staff response:** Staff would not recommend that. The exempt list is based on streets that do not have sufficient right-of-way for sidewalks, but walkability is important everywhere.
- **Commissioner White:** I would like to see a list of "priority areas" where the fee-in-lieu funding is being utilized. It would be good for the City to find ways to allocate funds toward walkability. Is there a list of areas where sidewalks would be put in with the fee-in-lieu money? **Staff response:** Staff would have to check with Public Works, but a current example of this is the Blake Avenue redevelopment.

#### Comments from the Public

There was no public comment.

Commissioner White made a motion to recommend amendment of the Municipal Code to increase the threshold to 1,000 square feet, and to strongly recommend the City Engineer revisit the exempt streets list.

There was discussion after the motion. Commissioner White stated that her intention is to exempt all ADUs, but continue requiring sidewalks under the current rules for other types of development.

Commissioner Cipperly seconded the motion.

Commissioner Houghton prefers to see a middle ground to completely exempting some projects from the sidewalk requirements, such as a cap on the fee-in-lieu.

Commissioner Connerton agreed.

Commissioner White said she does not like that projects on some streets would cost more than on others, because of the presence or absence of sidewalks.

Commissioner Connerton asked if all ADUs could be assessed the same fee. Fulk-Gray said yes, but pointed out that it would increase the cost of some ADU projects where there are already sidewalks.

Commissioner Houghton suggested a proportional fee based on the size of the ADU.

Commissioner Cowan asked if the streets tax cover sidewalks? Hanlon said that it does.

Chair Waller proposed some options for changes: a flat fee, a fee based on the size of the project, or a 50% reduction for ADUs in the fee-in-lieu.

Commissioner Cowan said he favors Staff's recommendation, because there is already a way to apply for flexibility on the sidewalk requirement.

Commissioners White, Cipperly, and Connerton voted for a flat fee-in-lieu for sidewalks for ADU projects, regardless of whether a sidewalk is present or not.

Two commissioners voted to set the fee-in-lieu based on the floor area of the project.

Commissioners Cowan and Geiman voted to maintain the current regulations.

All expressed interest in revisiting the exempt streets list.

## **6. Commissioner Comments**

- Chair Waller welcomed Tim Bergman. He said Staff did a good job putting everything together.

## **7. Director Comments**

Acting Community Development Director Tim Bergman said that the new director, Trent Hyatt, will be starting on September 15<sup>th</sup>.

## **8. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 10:09 PM.

MINUTES  
City of Glenwood Springs Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting  
October 28, 2025  
Council Chambers, First Floor  
101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM

**1. Roll Call**

Present: Commissioners: Carolyn Cipperly, Amy Connerton, Joy White, John Haughton, Gregory Cowan, Patrick Corcoran, Connie Geiman

Also Present: Community Development Director Trent Hyatt, Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray, Senior Planner Emery Ellingson, Chief of Public Safety Joseph Deras, and City Attorney Karl Hanlon

**2. Comments from citizens for items not appearing on the agenda**

No public comment was offered.

**3. Conflicts of Interest**

There were no conflicts of interest.

**4. New Items**

**a. Planning File 25-25, Code Amendment Regarding Restaurant Drive-Through Use in the Resort (RE) District**

Senior Planner Emery Ellingson presented Action Item 1: Planning File 25-25.

Staff recommend approval with findings in the staff report.

Commissioner questions, comments, and staff responses included the following:

- Commissioner Geiman: Why were drive-throughs not allowed in the RE district? **Staff response:** Staff explained that the previous code to 2018 did not allow drive throughs in the RE Resort District and that barring any reason for changing it, that existing prohibited use was carried forward. Staff also speculated that it was likely due to the conditions at the time where drive throughs were primarily focused on fast food uses.
- Chair White: Is the recommendation to allow drive-throughs by Special Use or use-by-right? **Staff response:** Staff confirmed that the recommendation was to add the use as a Special Use and not as a use-by-right.

Chair White opened the item to public comments. No members of the public were present for comment. Chair White closed the item to public comment.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to approve Action Item 1 with findings and conditions as written in the packet. Commissioner Cowan seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

**b. Planning File 50-25, Code Amendment Regarding Fire and Emergency Services and Police Impact Fees**

Director Trent Hyatt, Chief of Public Safety Joseph Deras, and the City's consultant, Dr. Michael Verdone, presented Action Item 1: Planning File 50-25.

Staff recommend approval with the findings outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner questions, comments, and staff responses included the following:

- Commissioner Houghton: Asked questions related to the future location of the fees in the Development Code, how the draft fees were calculated, tourist related impacts/costs. **Staff response:** Staff explained the fees will be added to section of Code where existing dedications and impact fees are located, Section 070.040.030(g). Dr. Verdone explained that the fees are calculated based expected impacts of various uses and that tourism associated with the development of various businesses.
- Commissioner Cipperly: Asked which development types (such as accessory dwelling units) would be subject to the fees and when they are paid. **Staff response:** Staff explained the fees are applicable to new development or redevelopment and are assessed at the time of building permit submittal, one half being due prior to issuance and the other due prior to a certificate of occupancy.
- Commissioner Connerton: Asked for clarification on how fees increase efficiency and how our fees relate to other communities. **Staff response:** Dr. Verdone explained that fees are intended to maintain existing services and to pass the responsibility of new impacts on to development. He explained that the proposed fees are similar to other rural resort communities in Colorado but that each is different.
- Commissioner Cowan: Asked about the distinction in types and forms of development. **Staff response:** Dr. Verdone confirmed that the fees are applicable and specific to all types of new development.
- Commissioner White: Asked specifics related to how fee calculated and our Police Department is currently funded. She also asked what the exact change in the fire and emergency services fee being proposed is. Commissioner White when the last time the fees were adjusted. **Staff response:** City Attorney explained that the department is mostly funded by the general fund and that he is not sure whether the fire and emergency fee has ever been adjusted. Mr. Hyatt explained that the fee is proposed to move from \$1,600 to \$3,267 for a single-family home equivalent rate upon adoption.
- Commissioner Geiman: Inquired about the fee applicable to multi-family residential and whether fees are reassessed if growth trends change. **Staff response:** Dr. Verdone explained that the proposed fee is \$2,793 per multi-family unit and that fees are collected for actual new development and should address the impact or revenue to the fund on an as needed basis.
- Commissioner Cipperly: Asked whether the fees would limit impacts of the Police Department on the general fund and how fees are managed. **Staff response:** Mr. Hanlon explained that it would have material impact because impact fees are not allowed for use for operations and are kept separate from the general fund. Commissioner White opened the item to public comments. No members of the public were present for comment. Commissioner White closed the item to public comment.

Commissioner Cowan made a motion to approve Action Item 1 with findings as written in the packet. Commissioner Connerton seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 6-1.

### c. Housing Update

Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray presented the yearly Housing Update.

Commissioner questions, comments, and staff responses included the following:

- **Commissioner Houghton:** Where does the City stand on its Prop 123 commitments. **Staff response:** We are on target, though the current number is in flux because of the nature of the L3 project.
- **Commissioner Houghton:** Do affordable units have to have their certificates of occupancy to count toward Prop 123? **Staff response:** We will have to verify whether it's CO or just when they are entitled.
- **Chair White:** Will more supply help reduce rental rates, which are plateauing right now? **Staff response:** More supply should help, and should help reduce sharp increases that were seen in 2021 and 2022.
- **Commissioner Cowan:** How well is the City working with Garfield County, and could housing development in the County help Glenwood? **Staff response:** On a person level we know and get along with their planners, but the growth environment in the County is unknown. Annexations are unlikely, given Ballot Measure A's passage. The most likely places to see development in the County nearby is south Glenwood and up Four Mile Road, but the limiting factor is access. If South Bridge is not built, more development is unlikely. The City does provide can and will serve letters for new development and charges the same monthly rates for water and sewer.
- **Commissioner Cowan:** Is the County financially supporting South Bridge? **Staff response:** There was the intent to contribute previously, but that is now uncertain and they are in a difficult financial position.
- **Commissioner Connerton:** Can the City sell City-owned land to a developer for building affordable housing? **Staff response:** Not without an election.
- **Commissioner Cipperly:** Is there a preservation program for new homes? **Staff response:** Not currently, it was one of the recommendations nested within the Preservation strategy.
- **Chair White:** Are there any plans to look at land use rules and incentivizing condominiumizations? **Staff response:** There are not many regulatory barriers toward condominiumizing a building. The challenges would likely come from particular buildings themselves.

### 5. Commissioner Comments

- There were no commissioner comments.

### 6. Director Comments

Community Development Director Hyatt informed the group of the upcoming work session and asked the group for discussion topics. He also stated that the onboarding of the new building permit technician, Joel Asplund, is going well and that efforts to hire a new housing development manager were ongoing. He also mentioned that the department is developing a new survey for online portal customer and working on general improvements for customer service.

## **7. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 PM.

DRAFT



## Planning and Zoning Commission Memo

<b>Date</b>	November 18, 2025
<b>Planning File Number</b>	Not applicable
<b>RE:</b>	Housing Incentives Work Session Discussion
<b>Staff</b>	Watkins Fulk-Gray, AICP, Senior Planner

### **BACKGROUND/PURPOSE**

At the November 6, 2025 joint work session between the Planning & Zoning Commission (P&Z) and City Council, members of both bodies expressed interest in exploring new incentives for housing. Staff considers this request an early-stage, open discussion and is pleased to offer the following list of topics for discussion. No rigorous evaluation has been performed for most of these topics, and Staff does not recommend all of the following changes. Based on the P&Z's discussion, Staff can prepare more information and schedule future work sessions or public hearings with the P&Z as desired.

Housing incentive ideas are grouped by the following categories: zoning changes, programmatic activities, fee changes, building code changes, and mobile home parks.

### **Zoning Changes**

Possible zoning changes to incentivize housing could include the following issues:

- Density bonuses. These could include:
  - Incentives for providing deed restricted units not required by inclusionary zoning standards, including variable incentives depending on level of affordability provided in deed restriction
  - Incentives for projects within 500 feet of a transit stop
  - Incentives for for-sale housing
- Allowing duplexes as a use-by-right in more zone districts
- Reducing parking requirements for small ADUs
- Waiving parking requirements for ADUs that are deed restricted
- Additional incentives for hotel conversions to long-term housing or Extended-Stay Hotels
- Incentives for commercial-to-residential conversions

### **Programmatic Activities**

- Expansion or addition of Workforce Housing Fund programs. Current programs include:
  - Downpayment assistance
  - Employer-based rental assistance
  - Funding for West Mountain Regional Housing Coalition
- Pre-approved designs
- Greater assistance from City Staff (e.g., infrastructure planning)
- Short-term rental to long-term rental conversions
- “Housing navigator” roles
- Development on City-owned land such as The Confluence and Vogelaar Park
- Additional housing open houses, including Spanish-language open house
- Tenants’ rights education

### **Fee Changes**

- Reducing the fee-in-lieu for parking for ADUs (currently \$5,000 per space)
- Increasing the short-term rental fees (currently \$613.62 for new licenses, \$409.08 for renewals) and accessory tourist rental fees (\$368.17 for new licenses, \$184.09 for renewals)

### **Building Code Changes**

- Point access blocks exceptions
- Commercial-to-residential conversions

### **Mobile Home Parks**

- Support for conversion to resident-owned communities (ROCs)
- Zoning overlays that prohibit redevelopment

### **Conclusions**

These topics should be considered preliminary ideas and not recommendations from Community Development. If there are topics in this memo that P&Z Commissioners would like specific information about at the meeting, please email the Director before the meeting. Additional work sessions to discuss housing incentives will be scheduled when meeting time permits. Staff looks forward to the P&Z’s feedback and questions.