

**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF GLENWOOD SPRINGS**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**

Regular Meeting  
December 17, 2024  
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, Connie Geiman

Also Present: Community Development Director Hannah Klausman, Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray, Senior Planner Emery Ellingson, City Attorney Richard Peterson-Cremer

**2. Conflicts of Interest**

None

**3. Receipt of Minutes**

No minutes were received.

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

No public comment was offered.

**5. New Items**

**a. Planning File 36-24 Residential Minor Site and Architectural Plan and Planning File #34-24 Preliminary Plat 619 Overlin Drive**

Planner Emery Ellingson presented Action Item 1: Planning File 36-24 Residential Minor Site and Architectural Plan and Action Item 1: Planning File #34-24 Preliminary Plat 614 Overlin Drive.

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

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

- How will the neighboring property's driveway and access be affected? **Staff response:** Staff provided explained that there would be approximately 12' remaining for the access

of the neighboring property which was sufficient for a driveway. Staff also indicated that applicant was open to working with neighbor on what final access would look like.

- Question regarding removal of live vegetation. **Staff response:** Staff provided explained that removal of any living tree with caliper of greater than 14" would require approval by Community Development Director and Parks and Recreation Director.
- Question regarding building height. **Staff response:** Staff confirmed proposed heights of buildings were 25' and 32', both of which are within height limits of the RH Residential High Density Zoning District.
- Question regarding height transition requirements. **Staff response:** Staff explained the four methods for meeting height requirements and indicated that meeting this requirement was a condition of approval and that the applicant was actively working with staff to provide a design solution.
- Question regarding screening of transformer from public right of way. **Staff response:** Staff confirmed that if the transformer were to remain in the proposed location then the transformer would need to be screened with landscaping.
- How long has the area had been zoned as high-density residential zoning? **Staff response:** Staff explained that area had been zoned as high-density since at least 1998 and that existing multi-family buildings constructed in the 1970s seem to indicate the area has been zoned as high density residential for some time.
- Question regarding sidewalk fee-in-lieu option and sidewalk requirements. **Staff response:** Staff explained that Engineering preferred the sidewalk fee-in-lieu option because planning is underway for pedestrian improvements in the area.
- Question on clarification on when height transition is required and if distance from neighboring property had affect on requirement. **Staff response:** Staff explained that requirement is for adjacent properties and that distance from a smaller structure was not a factor in applying the design requirement.
- Question on how many existing multi-family developments currently exist in the neighborhood. **Staff response:** Staff did not have specific number of multi-family properties and provided broad description of neighborhood. Staff also pointed out the neighborhood was a mix of densities.
- Question on sound transmission assembly requirements for the project. **Staff response:** Staff clarified that sound transmission requirements of the International Residential Code would not apply to this project as the City has not adopted Appendix AK of the International Residential Code.
- Question on traffic study and how the numbers were calculated and if Engineering had reviewed and approved the findings **Staff response:** Staff confirmed that Engineering had reviewed and approved the findings of the traffic study and that the proposed volumes did not trigger any improvements per the City's current Engineering Standards.
- Questions on parking lot illumination. **Staff response:** Staff confirmed that the proposed lighting plan did not meet minimum requirements of Lighting District 2 and that a condition of approval was to revise the lighting plan to meeting the minimum parking lot illumination standards.

- Will the units be modular units? **Staff response:** Staff explained that applicant had indicated the homes were to be modular and that the applicant could confirm whether homes to be modular or stick built.

### **Applicant Comment:**

Applicants Ben West, Glenwood Springs and Roger Giard, Carbondale made a short presentation on the proposed development.

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

- Questions on common open space requirement and the areas indicated on the plan and what amenities would be offered in the common open space. **Applicant response:** Applicant explained that the common open spaces would have added amenities that would meet the requirements, most likely benches or garden areas that would provide passive recreation opportunities as opposed to active recreation such as playground equipment. Applicant explained that the square footage would be provided with exact details included later. Applicant also indicated that they had been working on some design revisions specific to this requirement.
- Questions on if eleven units were needed to make the project profitable and if applicant had considered removing a unit to obtain full amount of common open space without a fee-in-lieu. **Applicant response:** Applicant discussed trade off in eliminating a unit and benefits of an additional housing unit versus the amount of open space. Applicant also confirmed that they believed they could achieve the open space with the proposed site plan.
- Questions how parking would be managed and how it would meet parking demands of the development. **Applicant response:** Applicant confirmed they were meeting minimum parking requirements for development per standards of the Code. They also discussed that parking management could be addressed with the HOA. Applicant acknowledged that parking is a concern in the neighborhood and that there could be assigned parking within the property for the units.
- Questions if the development would be modular or stick built. **Applicant response:** Applicant explained that initial idea was to utilize modular housing but that after further review, applicant has decided to stick build the proposed buildings.
- Questions if applicant had made considerations for sound transmission between the units to minimize noise from railroad and neighboring units. **Applicant response:** Applicant explained that they have considered sound transmission and that the constructed units would have some form of sound protection in the construction.
- Questions on common open space requirements and if it needed to be passive or active. **Applicant response:** Staff confirmed that the area could be open to passive recreation and/or active.

- Questions on public noticing and notes from pre-neighborhood application meeting. Specifically, asking why the minutes from the pre-application meeting read that there were 26 parking spaces. Additional question on placement of public notice sign. **Applicant response:** Applicant explained that this was a typo in the minutes and that the proposed site plan which was shared with the neighborhood showed 20 parking spaces as required by Code. Applicant also explained that public noticing items which were done as required.

Commissioner Waller opened the item to public comment. Following members of the public provided comment:

Laurie Chase, Glenwood Springs provided comment on the following:

- Public notices not reaching the entire neighborhood
- Concerns for overflow parking and the City's current parking requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit not being sufficient.
- Concerns for increase in traffic to 8th Street, adding traffic to connection to Midland, and speed of traffic through the neighborhood.

Jim Richmond, Glenwood Springs provided comment on the following:

- Traffic and safety concerns regarding lack of pedestrian improvements in the neighborhood and increase in traffic from the neighborhood.

Gary Vick, Glenwood Springs provided comment on the following:

- Public notices not reaching the entire neighborhood, beyond the 300' required.
- Concerns for parking and its effect on the neighborhood, particularly the current requirement for 1.5 spaces per unit as opposed to 2 spaces per unit.

Commissioner Waller closed the item for public comment.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to approve Action Item 1 for Planning File #36-24 Residential Minor Site and Architectural Plan. Commissioner Cipperly seconded the motion.

Discussion after the motion included:

- Discussion of parking demands upon the neighborhood, Code requirements for parking, and management of the on-site parking spaces.
- Common open space requirements and the common open space fee-in-lieu
- How the applicant will meet the height transition design requirement on the east side of Building B.
- Clarification that approval of the Site and Architectural Plan was not approving any variances and that recommending conditions of approval for height transition, common open space, parking lot lighting, and landscaping did not constitute variance approvals.
- Inclusionary zoning requirements for the project

- Snow storage

Staff also provided additional information related to items discussed.

Roger Giard, Applicant explained to the Commission that the 26 parking spaces in the minutes was a typo and that 20 spaces was the amount described at the pre-application neighborhood meeting.

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

Commissioner Cipperly motioned for approval of Action Item 1 for Planning File #34-24 Preliminary Plat with conditions described in the staff report. Commissioner Connerton seconded the motion.

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

#### **b. Planning File 21-24, Location & Extent Review and 1041 Review for Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA)**

Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray presented both action items, a Location & Extent Review and 1041 Review, for RFTA at 2302 and 2307 Wulfsohn Rd.

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

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

- Clarification requested about a statement in the staff report that said “sidewalk width not provided.” **Staff response:** Fulk-Gray explained that the application materials did not state the width, but that it is required to be eight feet, and may currently meet code, but verification and detail is needed.
- Question how water would be delivered to the site. **Staff response:** RFTA will do the construction to get the water line to the site and then the City will take it over.
- How will pedestrian circulation work at the roundabout discussed for Wulfsohn and Midland. **Staff response:** The roundabout has not been designed yet, so many details are not known. Roundabouts are not ideal for pedestrians, but they can work and the City will make it work.
- Will the location of the current park’n’ride be the same location as the proposed one? **Staff response:** The new one will be much expanded but it is the same location.
- Will it be possible to make the landscaping compliant? **Staff response:** This will be a better question for the applicant. It should be possible meet most landscaping requirements, but the street trees may be challenging given the length of the bus platforms.
- Question about what the current construction project is near the site. **Staff response:** A new maintenance facility, bus barn, and fuel and wash are under construction or have been recently completed.

- Why are street trees required? **Staff response:** The City requires that 75% of all new plantings be native and drought resistant, and these plants, once they are established, can live on just the rainfall we get. The purpose of having street trees is for aesthetic reasons and to create a good environment for pedestrians.
- Question about the exterior lighting being out of compliance. **Staff response:** The conditions of approval require the lighting plan to be brought into compliance.
- Question about the GMADA. **Staff response:** It is similar to a PUD in that it is a separate set of zoning regulations, with City zoning as its base. It is an annexation and development agreement, and appended to it are zoning and design standards.
- Is this project the reason for needing to do electric system upgrades and the roundabout at the intersection. **Staff response:** The electric load is higher than the City believed it would be, so the peak load may increase 25% or 30% at worst case scenario. The infrastructure may need to be upgraded more than anticipated. The City has been looking at the Wulfsohn/Midland intersection for a year and a half and looked at other options such as signals, and landed on a double-lane roundabout. There is limited sight distance looking down the hill, so a roundabout is a safer situation. A full design is planned to happen next year. About \$2M to \$3M is budgeted in 2026 for the project.
- How close is the new transit center to the new large apartment buildings under construction? **Staff response:** About a quarter mile away.

#### Applicant Comments:

The applicant representative from RFTA, Ben Ludlow, introduced himself. The project has received federal grant funding. He displayed an overall site plan of RFTA's buildings and gave an overview of recent development, then displayed the current site plan for the transit center. He said they planned to move the We-Cycle station out of the right-of-way. He then displayed the site plan for the administration building and described its layout. The maintenance building, which is actually to be for parts storage, is next to the very large retaining wall.

Mr. Ludlow said the lighting plans meet or exceed Glenwood's lighting standards, though they do still receive complaints from residents. He said the priority is safety for employees and passengers, but that they will meet the lighting standards in the places where the photometric plans do not meet it.

He noted that RFTA does not have to follow the Location & Extent conditions of approval, but they prefer to follow them. Mr. Ludlow said the current proposal will not exceed the City's current capacity.

While not arguing that the intersection does not need a roundabout or improvements, Mr. Ludlow said that the transit center parcel falls within an exception that exempts them from having to contribute to the intersection improvements. He said that RFTA would resubmit their traffic study to accurately reflect their now-current RFTA buildout. He said he does not agree with the suggested condition of approval requiring RFTA to contribute toward funding the roundabout; however, he encouraged the City to come to the RFTA board to discuss participation.

Mr. Ludlow said that the tall retaining walls in phase 6B will not be visible behind their building. He said it will be very difficult to meet the street tree requirements given the needs of buses.

Comments to Applicant from Commissioners:

Question about the difference in current and proposed parking, and whether any alternative shading methods have been considered. Is overnight parking for Bustang users allowed?

**Applicant response:** Mr. Ludlow said that introducing water to this area is not something they want to do because of soil conditions. They prefer to not include plantings with their landscaping islands. There are mini shade structures in the waiting area. Doing solar on this site is not feasible because of the lack of sunlight. Geothermal is one green energy source they have considered at this site. The new project would add about 20 spaces. Parking is limited to 24 hours, and there are designated Bustang parking spaces.

Question about parking for trailers and overnight camping. **Applicant response:** No trailer parking is contemplated. The indoor waiting area will be open most of the day but not 24 hours.

Will this project cause any changes to the bus routes and if the electric buses will begin to serve more of the valley? **Applicant response:** More BRT service will be served at this location will be possible. It is difficult to use electric buses for longer routes, so right now the plan is not to run electric buses between Aspen and Glenwood.

Will Glenwood become RFTA's headquarters. **Applicant response:** RFTA has offices in many locations, and their goal is to get every department in one location.

How many employees would work out of the administration building and how many EV parking spots are at the park'n'ride and administration building? **Applicant response:** It is not known how many employees will work there. Two EV parking spaces will be roughed in at the park'n'ride and two at the administration building. They will not be installed until they receive future grant funding.

Does their grant funding include funding for the roundabout. **Applicant response:** No, only site work at the buildings.

Is the project fully funded and question about the timeline for the three phases. **Applicant response:** A Low/No Emission Grant and RAISE Grant and small DOLA grant are all in place. They hope to bid the project in the spring and start construction. Ideally, the project will be done in 2027.

What community amenities are to be provided? **Staff response:** A minimum "community amenity" area is required, but Staff considers that the shade structures and waiting area amenities can count for this.

What is the area of the snowmelt? **Applicant response:** I do not know, but the snowmelt system involves just a boiler.

Compliment of the 27<sup>th</sup> St. Station and question about if there is any possibility in the future for adding parking at the Phase 6A site. **Applicant response:** Mr. Ludlow said theoretically it is possible to convert the planned parking to structured parking.

Will motion sensor lighting be incorporated in the parking area. **Applicant response:** Yes, RFTA does this everywhere.

Comments from Assistant City Attorney Richard Peterson-Cremer

The applicant made Staff aware this morning of his position that the ADA exempts RFTA from having to contribute to the roundabout construction. He clarified that contributions to the roundabout are an “exaction,” not a “fee,” as the language of the ADA uses. The applicant made a request to remove the requirement to contribute to roundabout costs, and if this is so, he recommends continuing the items tonight. Fulk-Gray clarified that contribution to the project is a recommended condition of approval for both the Location & Extent and 1041 Review.

Mr. Langhorst said he has not provided a Can and Will Serve letter for electric service, so they could handle that by not providing service. Both of these projects will impact traffic and electric service beyond their respective lots. He said that an updated traffic report is needed.

In response to a question from Chair Waller about how to proceed, Mr. Peterson-Cremer recommended asking for any clarifications of the applicant now.

Mr. Ludlow said that the 1041 Review should not include the condition of approval requiring contribution to the roundabout project. Location & Extent conditions of approval do not have to be followed, but RFTA always tries to comply with them.

Mr. Peterson-Cremer reiterated his recommendation of continuing both the action items after opening public comment. He has not had any dialog with RFTA’s counsel yet. Mr. Ludlow said he prefers approval tonight of the Location & Extent Review.

Commissioner Geiman asked for clarification for why RFTA could ignore Location & Extent conditions of approval. Mr. Peterson-Cremer explained that this process is based on state law, like 1041 Reviews, but 1041 Reviews have much more stringent regulations. Location & Extent conditions of approval can be overridden by the applicant’s board, whereas 1041 Reviews cannot be.

Mr. Ludlow confirmed landscaping and roundabout contribution conditions are the only ones that have caused concern.

Comments from the Public

- No public was in attendance.

Commissioner Connerton asked if they have to make a motion to continue the items. Mr. Peterson-Cremer said that yes, and both items can be continued with one motion.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to continue Action Items 1 and 2 to January 28, 2025. Commissioner Cowan seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

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

## **6. Commissioner Comments**

Commissioner Haughton said he is surprised that the most recent FEMA flood map is from 1985. Mr. Langhorst said all of Garfield County is undergoing floodplain review, but it takes a long time to change these maps and they are not finalized.

Commissioner Geiman said the parking standards are too low and not realistic. Ms. Klausman said that the parking standards were thoroughly reviewed in 2018 and are middle-of-the-pack compared to other cities. Parking is a tricky balance because of the need to provide parking for people's cars but also not creating parking lots everywhere. Some communities are abolishing parking minimums altogether. Mr. Peterson-Cremer noted that the State legislature considered has considered abolishing parking minimums for multifamily development.

Chair Waller thanked Staff. He suggested that a training for P&Z in March might be a good idea. He asked about the status of the City's new permitting system. Ms. Klausman described the purpose of having an electronic permitting system that will go live at the end of February.

## **7. Director Comments**

Community Development Director Hannah Klausman said that RFTA will be on the January agenda and there could be additional items.

## **8. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 PM.