

MINUTES
CITY OF GLENWOOD SPRINGS
Planning and Zoning Commission

Regular Meeting
March 25, 2025
Council Chambers, First Floor
101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call

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

Also Present: Community Development Director Hannah Klausman, City Attorney Karl Hanlon, Senior Planner Emery Ellingson, Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray, Deputy City Clerk Danyelle Rigli, Public Works Director Matthew Langhorst.

2. Conflicts of Interest

None

3. Receipt of Minutes

Cipperly moved to approve February 25, 2025. Connerton seconded. Motion passes with 7-0 vote.

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

No public comment was offered.

5. New Items

a. Planning File 07-25 Variance 401 N River Hotel 1888 Signage

Senior Planner Emery Ellingson presented the variance application with three action items related to signage allowances for quantity, location, and illumination. Staff recommended approval of all three variance action items.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

What is the intent behind allowing neon versus internal illumination.

Staff response: Partly aesthetic and allowing existing historic neon signs to remain.

Confirmation on maximum size of the signs and that proposed is smaller than max allowed.
Staff response: Yes, smaller than allowed.

Applicant came forward and presented images and explanation of the proposed signage.

Commissioner questions to the applicant:

Is a photometric plan required for signs?

Applicant response: Our company does not typically do photometric plans

Staff response: Staff is recommending a photometric plan to assess total impact of existing and proposed to make sure it is in compliance with exterior lighting standards.

Chair Waller opened up the item for public comment.

No public comment received. Public comment closed.

Action item 1. Commissioner Connerton motioned to approved the variance to exceed the number of wall signs. Commissioner Cowan seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

Action item 2. Commissioner Connerton motioned to approve the variance to allow a wall sign that does not meet frontage. Commissioner Cowan seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

Action item 3. Commissioner Connerton motioned to approve the variance for internal illumination in the downtown core. Commissioner Cowan seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioners had concern that the photometric plan is too onerous, suggests finding another way of achieving compliance with lighting after installation with staff.

Commissioner Connerton amends the motion to remove the photometric plan requirement, striking condition 8, and amend for the applicant to work with staff to show compliance with the lighting standards prior to certificate of completion.

Commissioner Cowan seconds amended motion.

Motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

b. Planning Files 01-25 and 05-25; Canyon Vista Major Site/Architectural Plan and 1041 Review, 51993 Highway 6

Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray presented the Major Site/Architectural Plan and 1041 Review applications for an 80-unit affordable housing development.

Action Item 1, Major Site/Architectural Plan:

Fulk-Gray provided site photos, plans, and zoning compliance information about the application. Staff recommends approval with conditions of approval, including special findings for seven areas recommended for the application of site design flexibility. Staff pointed out adding a 13th condition to action item 1 to include the following: Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit and receive approval for a minor subdivision to combine the lots.

Action Item 2, 1041 Review:

Fulk-Gray explained that the project triggers 1041 Review because of its proximity to Highway 6 and presented the 22 recommended findings. He recommended making the conditions of approval the same for 1041 Review as for the Major Site/Architectural Plan.

Commissioner questions to staff:

Does this project trigger housing variety requirements?

Staff response: The project only needs to meet two types, which this project does.

Clarification of the 1041 review and why it is required for this application.

Staff response: Properties adjacent to Highway 6 with traffic impacts are subject to the 1041 process also known as Matters of State Interest.

Is there a level of flexibility requests that is too much? Is this project's request too much?

Staff response: This is more requests numerically than other projects however they are minor in scope and less impactful.

Is there a way to ensure the old greenhouse is moved somewhere?

Staff response: It is not a requirement, but the applicant has been working on options.

Clarification on the affordability levels and how that works.

Staff response: Tax credit program and requirements sunset at 40 years. Therefore, staff suggests having our requirements apply only if the project turns into a market rate project after the LIHTC period.

Clarification on how the local resident preference possibly violates the Federal Fair Housing Act.

Staff response: Preference for tenancy including employment could jeopardize federal funding. Council approved a forgivable loan tied to 20 percent being local workforce tenants.

Question about water for the site. Will it be the City providing the water or other district?

Legal response: The applicant has a Can and Will serve letter from the City of Glenwood Springs.

Question about traffic report and the presence or consideration of turn lanes?

Staff response: There is not a turn lane currently. CDOT does not require any improvements.

Question on the flat solar panel drawing, will they all be flat on the roof.

Staff response: There will be some on the roof but mostly on the ground

Can this be incentivized to be for sale:

Staff response: No, LIHTC is only for rental projects. Legal explains that the City receives right of first refusal for purchase when and if it sells at the end of LIHTC period.

Question on lighting requirements, do we have one?

Staff response: Staff has included a condition that the photometric plan must comply with code.

Question on screening for parking occurring in the front yard setback?

Staff response: There is a 6 foot wide buffer that provides screening with landscaping so that parking is obscured.

Question on the West Glenwood Sanitation district providing capacity?

Staff response: The Can and will serve letter indicates they have plenty of capacity in their service area.

Applicant Presentation: Nick Emenhiser from Cohen Esrey development group introduced the Land Studio, High Country Engineers and KTG Y architects. Land Studio presented a high level overview of the project and how it meets code standards. Cohen Esrey presented information on the Cohen Esrey group and projects completed in other jurisdictions as well as the financing for the project.

KTGY Architects explained that the presence of some flat roofs is designed to house solar panels as well as condensing units for the project. It is screened by surrounding pitched roofs so that those areas are not visible. The outdoor amenity on the rooftop also serves to reduce the bulk of the building on the west side to mitigate height transitions.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Question asked about the Solar panels and has the applicant confirmed with City utility on acceptance of design.

Applicant response: have worked with staff and continuing to get confirmation on design.

Staff Response: Public Works director Matt Langhorst explained the can and will serve letter and that the City does see this as a benefit for the city and project.

Question whether the solar panels will create any glare for the amenities.

Applicant response: Amenities are a bit lower than the panels. The solar panel designers will handle those issues.

Staff pointed out that solar panel glare concern usually doesn't actually pan out as panels are designed to absorb light and not reflect it.

Will the stairs be limited from public use? Will it be lit?

Applicant response: No limit on who can use the stairs. Does not currently have a lighting component.

Question on the statement that the land could fit 131 units and how that got reduced?

Applicant response: The project was right sized to better fit the site and provide for parking.

Question about the moving the bus stop and how it would be done.

Staff response: The applicant would be allowing it to be located on their property, expenses would be covered by the City. The return bus stop is separate from the project but staff is working on that with CDOT.

Applicant response: this will be in the form of an easement.

Questions on lighting and motion activated and dimmer components.

Applicant response: We certainly will try to incorporate elements like those if the lighting designers can make it work.

Question on rent increases with this project.

Applicant response: HUD releases rent and income limits every April for LIHTC projects. so rent increase are regulated by those numbers and are small in nature compared to market rate.

Question on the grade of the property and height of the buildings if there are any changes.

Applicant response: it is about 6-10% across the whole property. We have an accessibility consultant for this project and are making sure to meet all mobility and accessibility for the site.

Chair Waller opened up the item for public comment.

Three residents provided public comment. Those comments included:

- Questions on the provision of water and sewer services.
- Concern related to Mitchel Cooper Water District which the property is within.
- No objection to the proposed project or the property being built other than water district issues.

Chair Waller closed the public hearing.

Legal counsel responded on limitations on engaging with public regarding an active lawsuit and therefor cannot response to all aspects mentioned. Clarified that the current project is not part of any litigation and not part of Planning and Zoning Commissions review this evening.

Commissioner Comments:

- Excited about the project and the social services being on site.
- Applauds the applicant for tailoring the project to the community of location.

Connerton motions to approve action item 1 to approve the 80 unit multifamily project with the findings and conditions as written in the staff report with the addition of item 13 regarding the minor subdivision occurring prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Commissioner Cipperly seconds the motion.

Discussion:

- PZ is a referring body that makes recommendations to City Council.
- Confidence in staff recommendations and requirements included related to utility requirements.
- 100% for the population that will be served by this project and am excited.
- Some concern over comments raised by public regarding Mitchel Cooper.
Legal response: the litigation is being determined at the 9th Judicial district and not a purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

10 minute recess called by Chair Waller to call the public into order.

Meeting resumes. Chair Waller called the question on action item 1.

Motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0. Commissioner Geiman recorded an abstention which is counted as an affirmative vote.

Commissioner Connerton motions to approve action item 2, 1041 review for Matters of State Interest with staff suggested findings and conditions in the staff report.

Commissioner Cowan seconds the motion.

Chair Waller called the question.

Motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

6. Commissioner Comments

Commissioners want an update on LIHTC projects and how they work.

7. Director Comments

Director Klausman explained that the April meeting would include the Comprehensive Plan Update item that was continued this evening and other updates from staff.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM.