

MINUTES
CITY OF GLENWOOD SPRINGS
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
July 22, 2025
Council Chambers, First Floor
101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call

Present: Commissioners: Carolyn Cipperly, Amy Connerton, John Houghton, Gregory Cowan, Marjorie Lear, Patrick Corcoran, Connie Geiman

Also Present: Community Development Director Hannah Klausman, Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray, Senior Planner Emery Ellingson, City Attorney Karl Hanlon

Actions: Commissioner Cipperly made a motion to seat Alternate Commissioners Marjorie Lear and Patrick Corcoran, motion seconded by Commissioner Geiman. Voice vote taken; motion passed unanimously.

2. Conflicts of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. Receipt of Minutes

April 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes

May 27, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes

Commissioner Cipperly made a motion to approve the April minutes, seconded by Commissioner Cowan. Voice vote taken, passed unanimously.

Commissioner Cowan made a motion to approve the May minutes, seconded by Commissioner Houghton. Motion passed unanimously.

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

No public comment was offered.

5. New Items

a. Planning File SIGN 041-2025, Off-Premises Sign Permit, Glenwood Vet Clinic

Planner Emery Ellingson presented Item 1: Planning File SIGN 041-2025, an Off-Premises Sign Permit for the Glenwood Vet Clinic.

Staff recommend approval with findings and conditions in the staff report.

No Commissioner questions for staff.

- Clarification about the location of the proposed sign and of where the old sign was. **Staff confirmed the location of the proposed sign was north of the access drive and that the previous sign was south of the drive.**

Applicant Comment: Applicant Sam Johnson, Glenwood Vet Clinic provided the Commission with a brief description of the proposed sign and reasoning behind the application.

Commissioner questions, comments, and applicant’s response.

- Clarification about the location of the proposed sign and of where the old sign was. **Applicant confirmed the location of the proposed sign was north of the access drive and that the previous sign was south of the drive. Applicant also explained that the construction of apartment building at 2512 S Grand was cause for the loss of the original sign and that the owners of 2512 S Grand were okay with installation of a sign on their property.**

Discussion before the motion included:

Comment by Commissioner Cipperly that the concept of an off-premises sign for the Vet Clinic was discussed during approvals for 2512 S Grand apartment building.

Commissioner Cowan made a motion to approve Item 1 with conditions as written in the packet. Commissioner Geiman seconded the motion.

Commissioner Connerton called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

b. Planning File VAR-021-2025, Sign Variance for EuroItalian Underground Signage

Planner Emery Ellingson presented Planning File VAR-021-2025, a Sign Variance for EuroItalian Underground.

Staff recommend denial with findings and conditions in the staff report.

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

- How did this get brought to the City’s attention? **Staff response: Staff confirmed that this was brought to the attention with a code compliance complaint.**
- Have there been any changes to the dimensions or design? **Staff response: Staff confirmed that the replacement sign was identical to the previous unpermitted sign with no changes in dimension or design.**
- Are there other similar violations that have been found? **Staff response: At this time there are no other pending violations for signage for any newly installed signs. Staff also explained that when there is a sign code violation, there are multiple avenues for compliance, including applying for a variance.**
- How is this different from sign variance requests from Walmart? **Staff response: Staff explained that this sign variance is different than Wal-Mart because the original sign was never a permitted location.**

- If they removed the back wall sign, would they be allowed to do a mural? **Staff response: Staff confirmed that a mural would be allowed on the back wall as long as it could not be considered signage per the Sign Code.**
- Are there any other businesses at Bethel Plaza that have signage away from their entry door? **Staff response: Staff confirmed that none of the other businesses on this block of Grand has signage on this frontage. Staff mentioned Ross Bail Bonds has a legal non-conforming sign on the west side of their buildings.**
- Is the City considering any wayfinding to help people find businesses at Bethel Plaza? **Staff response: Staff explained there are wayfinding signs in the downtown but not for specific businesses.**
- Do the restaurants list their addresses as Bethel Plaza? **Staff response: Staff was not able to confirm exactly how all the restaurants advertise but surmised that most do not advertise as being on Bethel Plaza.**
- What is the purpose for these requirements? **Staff response: Staff explained that the purpose of sign code is to balance the needs for wayfinding with the possible negative effects of visual clutter associated with too much signage.**
- How many tenants are in this building? **Staff response: Staff deferred to the applicant for an exact number.**
- Clarification about existing signage. **Staff response: Staff provided summary of the existing signage and how it compared with the Sign Code.**
- Clarification about signage regulations. **Staff response: Staff clarified the differences in sign code between sign types and building types and how that applies to this building.**
- For the applicant to be able to have the sign, do both action items have to be approved? **Staff response: Staff confirmed that both items would have to be approved to allow the sign on the alley side of the building.**

The applicant, Angie Stanford, provided the Commission a description of the signage variance and reasons for why the variance was requested.

Commissioner Connerton opened the item to public comment. No members of the public offered comment. Commissioner Connerton closed the public comment.

Commissioner questions to the staff and applicant included the following:

- How else do you advertise? **Applicant response: Applicant confirmed they advertise online as well as additional signage on the building.**
- Do you do walk-ins or reservations only? **Applicant response: Applicant stated that they do not take reservations.**
- Is there a wayfinding plan to help locations like this? **Staff response: Staff explained that most wayfinding plans are for general locations and are not business specific and that staff could provide recommendations from Planning and Zoning Commission to the DDA.**
- If there were a door on the west side, could there be a sign on it? **Staff response: Staff confirmed that if there were a public entrance on the west side, there could be one small additional sign but only one total regardless of number of tenants.**

- Is the red door part of the restaurant? **Applicant response: Applicant confirmed the red door was part of the restaurant and accesses the kitchen.**
- If you were to not have signage that is in existence, how much would you have to spend on advertising? **Applicant response: Applicant explained that it would be very difficult to direct customers to this location without the sign.**
- Clarification about what directional signs means. **Staff response: Staff provided Code definition for directional signs.**
- What do the other tenants think about this sign? **Applicant response: Applicant stated no other tenants objected to the signs nor the building owner.**
- Is there signage on the other adjacent building? **Staff response: Staff confirmed that there are not other signage on the adjacent building along the alley.**
- Was there a sign code in 2003? Would this sign have required a permit in 2003? **Staff response: Staff confirmed there was a sign code in 2003 and could not confirm if this sign would have conformed to code in 2003.**

Commissioner Cipperly made a motion to deny Action Item 1 with findings and conditions in the staff report. Commissioner Geiman seconded the motion. Commissioner Connerton called the item to question. The motion passed 5-2 with Commissioners Connerton, Cipperly, Geiman, Lear, and Houghton for approval of the motion and Commissioners Cowan and Corcoran for denial of the motion.

Commissioner Cipperly made a motion to deny Action Item 2 with findings and conditions in the staff report. Commissioner Geiman seconded the motion.

Commissioner Connerton called the item to question. Motion passed 5-2 with Commissioners Connerton, Cipperly, Geiman, Lear, and Houghton for approval of the motion and Commissioners Cowan and Corcoran for denial of the motion.

c. Planning File SUP 042-2025, Special Use Permit, Tesla EV Charging Station

Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray presented Item 3: Planning File SUP 042-2025, a Special Use Permit for a Tesla EV Charging Station.

Staff recommend approval with findings and conditions in the staff report.

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

- Is there mechanical equipment in the cabinets? **Applicant response:** There are many different electrical components, including a rectifier and a fan.
- Do the cabinets need to be screened? **Staff response:** No, they are not required to be screened.
- Will these chargers only charge Teslas? **Applicant response:** They will charge other types of EVs also. Some may require adapters.
- Are they free to use and open to the public? **Applicant response:** They are not free to use, but they are open to the public.
- How do pedestrians get to and from the site? **Staff response:** There are internal sidewalks in the site that bring you to the hotel parcel, where people will need to walk through the hotel's parking lot and to the City's sidewalk network.

- Will there be signage toward the charging station? **Staff response:** That can be accommodated through the City’s processes but is not contemplated in this application. **Applicant response:** Tesla is not planning for any signage. People typically use their phones to find the charging station.

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

Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

6. Commissioner Comments

- The Commission congratulated Director of Community Development Hannah Klausman on her new position with RFTA.

7. Director Comments

Community Development Director Hannah Klausman thanked the Commission for their well wishes and complimented the Commission on all their hard work over the years. Klausman also provided the following updates:

- The departure of Community Development Technician Halie Paris. Klausman described that position was open and had been posted.
- Update on August Planning and Zoning Commission meeting items to include a code change regarding sidewalks and ADUs, Special Use Permit for marijuana, and a rezoning application for the mall.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:38 PM.