

MINUTES
CITY OF GLENWOOD SPRINGS
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
May 27, 2025
Council Chambers, First Floor
101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call

Present: Commissioners: John Houghton, Gregory Cowan, Connie Geiman, Peter Waller, Amy Connerton, Majorie Lear, Patrick Corcoran

Also Present: Community Development Director Hannah Klausman, Senior Planner Emery Ellingson, , City Attorney Karl Hanlon.

Actions: Commissioner Connerton made a motion to seat Alternate Commissioner Lear and Alternate Commissioner Corcoran, motion seconded by Commissioner Cowan. Voice vote taken; motion passed unanimously.

2. Conflicts of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. Receipt of Minutes

April 22, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission minutes

Review of April minutes postponed to June meeting.

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

No public comment was offered.

5. New Items

a. Planning File 10-25 Design Variance, 515 11th Street

Commissioner Geiman recused from the item as their residence is within the 300' public notice distance.

Planner Emery Ellingson presented Planning File 10-25 Design Variance, 515 11th Street with Action Item 1 for approval of a variance for relief from Section 070.040.080(d)(3)(b)(2), Section 070.040.080(d)(3)(b)(3) and *Section 070.040.080(e)(9)(a)* to allow a new garage to access the street and Action Item 2 for approval of a variance from Section 070.040.080(ee)(10)(c)(5)(i) to allow sections of roof with a pitch less than 6:12 within the Downtown Core.

Staff recommended denial of Action Item 1 with findings and conditions in the staff report. Staff recommended approval of Action Item 2 with findings and conditions in staff report.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Commission asked for clarification on the Code definition of a hardship.

Staff response: Provided definition that a hardship, per Code, as a condition by which the property cannot be put to reasonable use under existing regulations. Staff also explained how hardship factored into the criteria for a design variance.

Commission asked if the existing curb cut would be altered if the variance were approved.

Staff response: Staff confirmed that the proposed design would not result in an increase in size of the existing curb cut.

Commission question what possible future improvements could occur in the alley.

Staff response: Staff explained that future improvements in the alley could include hard surfacing of the alley to the full extent of the actual right-of-way.

Commission question what percentage of an addition would trigger meeting Code.

Staff response: Staff explained the threshold for triggering design requirements was 20% of the existing home and that the proposed project was a 260% addition.

Commission question on grade change on the existing lot.

Staff response: Staff referenced photos of the site to illustrate the change in grade between Bennett Avenue and the alley.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant

Mara Shultz, Mark Noel Architects, presented on the proposed variance and project.

Commission asked for clarification on what the driveway grade would be coming from the alley and what is typical.

Applicant response: The applicant explained that bringing a driveway from the alley up to grade of site would result in a driveway with a grade of 13% while typical grades are less than 6%. Staff also explained that variances from Engineering Standards are not reviewed by Planning and Zoning Commission.

Commission asked if alley improvements were scheduled

Applicant response: Applicant deferred to staff who explained that this alley was not scheduled for a specific date in the near future.

Commission asked for the age of the home.

Applicant response: Applicant stated the home was built in 1940.

The Commission asked for what the front setback was and from which side and what was preventing adding the garage from the alley in area of lesser grade.

Applicant response: Applicant described that the front setback was 20' from the 11th Street side which prevented a garage being placed with alley access on a part of the lot with a smaller grade difference.

Justin Windholz, property owner, resident of Glenwood Springs briefly discussed the proposed variance and his rationale for designing a garage off the street as well as plans to build an accessory dwelling unit as part of the remodel.

Commissioners asked staff for confirmation of parking requirements for an ADU.

Staff response: Staff confirmed requirement would be 1 space for the single family dwelling and 1 space for an accessory dwelling unit.

Commissioner Waller opened the item to public comment. No members of the public presented to speak. Commissioner Waller closed the item to public comment.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to approve Action Item 2 with conditions as written in the packet. Commissioner Cowan seconded the motion. Commissioner Waller called the item to question. Motion passed with a vote 6-0.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to approve Action Item 1 with conditions as written in the packet providing findings including exceptional conditions of the site, benefits to the community, and undue hardship related to physical conditions of the site. Commissioner Cowan seconded the motion.

Commissioner discussion after the motion discussed stormwater and drainage requirements for the lot, intent of the Comprehensive Plan in relation to the proposed variance, existing conditions of the site, condition of the alley, and the design variance criteria.

Commissioner Waller called the item to question. Motion passed with a vote of 4-2 with Commissioners Waller, Connerton, Cowan, and Corcoran voting yes and with Commissioners Lear and Houghton voting no.

b. Planning File ##-## Type Plan, Name

Community Development Director Hannah Klausman presented the proposed Code Amendments to Title 070 with staff analysis of the required approval criteria and recommended findings from Staff. The Commission decided to discuss and vote on each code amendment as a separate item for clarity.

Landscaping applicability for Accessory Dwelling Units

Commissioner questions:

The interior makes perfect sense. But the detached exemption, is there a middle ground to achieve some of landscaping requirements especially in light of the City's programs to buy back turf?

Interior conversion ADU's being exempt from landscaping requirements.

Commissioner Connerton motioned to accessory dwelling unit exemptions from landscaping requirements. Seconded by Commissioner Cowan.

Discussion:

Comments that conserving water is an important goal for the City, and perhaps there is a certain percentage of the landscaping should come up to code. Currently it requires 100% of landscaping to come to code and the proposal is to reduce that to 0%, so maybe there is a lower percentage that is above 0%.

Comments that the cost added to build a small ADU for irrigation or established landscaping is cost prohibitive.

Question on interior conversions and whether there are efficiency requirements for fixtures.

Answer: There are limitation for water flow on appliances.

Updating irrigation to code would possibly provide cost savings in the long run.

Comment that any disturbed landscaping does need to come up to code which provides at least no additional non-conforming landscape.

Motion passes with a vote of 6-1, with Commissioner Geiman voting against.

Stucco as a primary building material

Questions from Commissioners:

Have architects for commercial developments pushed back on not being allowed Stucco?

Staff response: Stucco is an allowed material for commercial buildings. It is only a prohibited for residential builds.

Comment that if it is okay for commercial buildings, which receive more abuse, then prohibiting it from primary building entrances on residential development seems unnecessary.

Suggestion that Include Stucco AND EIFS as primary material.

Strike number 2 that prohibits EIFS in high traffic primary building entrances.

Is currently existing STUCCO in the downtown core allowed to keep their Stucco.

Yes, it can be maintained as Stucco, however if a new addition was added, it would not be allowed to be primarily stucco.

Comments that Stucco is likely a more affordable building option and preventing it from being used is a challenge to

Commissioner Cowan motioned to approve the addition of Stucco and EIFS as a primary building material and striking a.2 prohibiting EIFS being used in high traffic areas. Seconded by Commissioner Houghton.

Motion passes unanimously, 7-0.

Paint Color

No Commissioner questions.

Commissioner Connerton motioned to approve the allowance of white and off-white as paint colors in the downtown core. Seconded by Commissioner Cowan.

Motion passes unanimously, 7-0.

Hotel Definition

Staff explains the difference between vacation rentals and hotel uses and that current definitions do not provide adequate direction for staff.

Commissioner questions:

Commissioner Houghton pointed out an error in the staff report for clarification, that currently an on-site lobby is NOT a requirement.

Commissioners went over definitions for Bed and Breakfast, and other lodging uses.

Commissioner Connerton motioned to approve the amended language for hotel definitions. Seconded by Commissioner Cowan.

Motion passes unanimously, 7-0.

Errata Changes

Commissioner Connerton motioned to approve the amended language for hotel definitions. Seconded by Commissioner Cowan.

Motion passes unanimously, 7-0.

Discussion on sidewalks and ADU's

Director Klausman explained that an additional topic up for discussion is the applicability of requiring sidewalks when ADU's are developed. Currently Accessory Dwelling Units that are over 500 square feet trigger the requirement to put in sidewalks. Applicants have the ability to pay a fee in-lieu at the cost of \$60 a linear foot. There are also a list of substandard width streets that Engineering has determined are not appropriate for sidewalks.

Staff explained the challenge between the goals of completing important sidewalk infrastructure to serve the community versus affordability of an ADU project.

Questions and Comments from Commissioners:

Question on what the threshold for interior remodels is that requires sidewalks?

Staff explained it is additions that are over 500 square feet, or changes in elevations consisting of more than 50% of the elevation.

How long does the sidewalk need to be?

Staff response: The entire length of a property that abuts a street. Additionally, corner lots sometimes have two street fronts to provide a sidewalk for. Staff further explained that the Engineering Department has a list of substandard ROW width streets that are not subject to providing sidewalks.

Comment that Single Family remodels or tear downs probably don't occur that often. If there is a street that has no sidewalk and it is single family residential, seems a bit different than if a commercial development comes in.

Question on why the current threshold of 500 square feet was set as it was and whether the threshold needs updating. Perhaps there is another threshold that is more logical to use such as contiguity.

Staff mentioned that there are other requirements in Code related to proximity that could possibly make sense for sidewalks.

Questions on whether the City will initiate building sidewalks in some of these areas.

Staff response: Public Works has a list of identified capital projects that include sidewalks. One example is the Blake Avenue project that included sidewalks, and the sidewalk placed between the Rec Center and the Meadows.

Question on who maintains the sidewalk once it is built.

Staff response: Developers are required to construct the sidewalk then accepted by the City as a public improvement and the City maintains it and owns it going forward.

Comment that perhaps there is a dollar amount spent on a remodel or ADU addition that could be the threshold.

6. Commissioner Comments

- Commissioner Cowan asked for an update on the West Glenwood Springs Mall
- Chair Waller thanked staff for their presentations.
- Commissioner Houghton reported that he has heard good things about the new permitting software.

7. Director Comments

Director Klausman gave an update on the Urban Renewal Authority and an updated plan for the Glenwood Mall. Mrs. Klausman also update the Commission on the old safeway property moving forward with building permits for new tenants and explained that the permits do not trigger any reviews by the Commission.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:09 PM.