MINUTES
CITY OF GLENWOOD SPRINGS
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
February 27, 2024
Council Chambers, First Floor
101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call

Present: Commissioners: John Houghton Joy White, Carolyn Cipperly, Matthew Simms, Amy Connerton; complete quorum.

Also Present: Community Development Director Hannah Klausman, Planner II Emery Ellingson, Long Range Principal Planner Jim Hardcastle, City Attorney Richard Cremer-Petterson, Building Technician Jose Vega

2. Election of Officers

Election of Officers. Commissioner Cipperly motioned to nominate Commissioner Peter Waller for the Chair Position. Commissioner Connerton seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously with a vote of 5-0.

Commissioner Cipperly motioned to nominate Commissioner Joy White for the Vice Chair Position. Commissioner Connerton seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously with a vote of 5-0.

Vice Chair Joy White assumed the Chair seat in Chair Waller's absence.

3. Conflicts of Interest

None

4. Receipt of Minutes

February 27, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes

Commissioner White motioned to approve January Minutes. Commissioner Cipperly seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously.

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

No public comment was offered.

6. New Items

a. Planning File 02-24 Glenwood Hot Springs Signage Variance

Emery Ellingson, Planner II provided presentation on Planning File #02-24 for consideration of six variance items for relief from Section 070.040.100 for installation of attached and freestanding signage.

Staff recommended approval of Action Items 1,2,3, and 5 with recommendations for denial for Action Items 4 and 6.

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

- Clarification on illumination style of all the new signs compared to existing signs.
  Staff response: Staff confirmed all new signs with exception of Sign Type Z would be illuminated and deferred to applicant to explain illumination of existing signs.

- *Question on classification of Action Item 6 as an informational sign as opposed to a wall sign:*
  Staff response: Staff explained that sign could be considered a wall sign, however given its size and purpose staff classified it as informational sign. Staff also explained that if it were a wall sign it would still require a variance.

- *Questions and clarification on interior illumination, differences between face lit and halo style lighting, and differences between interior illuminated neon signage and other types that was not covered in staff report.* **Staff response:** Staff provided background information on lighting styles as well as further reasoning for recommendations for approval of the interior illumination in the Downtown Core.

- *Clarifiation on Action Item 4 variance items.* **Staff response:** Staff confirmed variances included variances for size, height, number, and location within sight distance triangle.

Following staff presentation, applicants Beth Rosa representing ArtHouse Design and Kevin Flohr representing Glenwood Hot Springs Pool and Lodge, Inc. provided Commission with an overview of the signage and their process for developing the application.

Commissioner questions and comments to applicant included the following:

- *Question of how the projecting signs were attached to the building:* **Applicant response**: Applicant provided drawing showing attachment details.
- *Question if there were alternatives for Action Item 4 for the sign types WF which exceeded maximum height and sign area.* **Applicant response**: Applicant stated they could look at making them slightly shorter but explained they would want to limit height reduction to preserve visibility for passing vehicles.
- *Question if there were alternatives for Action Item 6 for the pool entrance sign*: **Applicant response:** Applicant explained that in order to meet size limitations for informational sign, the letter height would need to be reduced to 5" for both signs, down from proposed 8" type for south side sign and 6" for west side sign.

- *Question if Spa of the Rockies sign was part of this sign package.* **Applicant response:** Confirmation that was not part of this sign application.
- *Clarification on which signs were double sided*: **Applicant response**: Applicant confirmed which sign types would be double sided, including the archway sign for the ramp and new entrance from 6th Street.
- *Question how the new proposed illumination compares to the existing illumination*: **Applicant response:** Applicant explained how the new signage would be a softer illumination style than some of the existing.
- *Question on longevity and durability of the selected sign types and materials, in particular use of glass on the pedestrian bridge sign.* **Applicant response:** Applicant provided further information on proposed materials as well as attachment details for the two projecting signs.
- *Clarification on the bridge easement as shown on site plan*: **Applicant/staff response:** Applicant explained the stairway to the bridge was owned by the Hot Springs and staff explained that the easement held by the City/CDOT was for maintenance and repair of the pedestrian bridge.

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

Staff provided clarification on Condition #4 relating to illumination and time limits. Commission did not find issue with signs being illuminated past 10:00 PM or 1 hour after close of business.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to approve Action Item 1 to approve Sign X.A. a pole sign with variance for relief from Section 070.040.110 to allow an internally illuminated sign within the Downtown Core with findings and conditions on pages 15-19 of the staff report. Commissioner Simms seconded the motion. Commission briefly discussed the sign in question and illumination. Commissioner White called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to approve Action Item 2 to approve Sign Type XBS and XBW, projecting signs with variance for relief from Section 070.040.110 to allow an internally illuminated sign within the Downtown Core and to exceed the limit of two wall, projecting, or roof signs total per building and one per building frontage for a single tenant building with findings and conditions on pages 15-19 of staff report. Commissioner Cipperly seconded the motion. Commission did not further discuss the item. Commissioner White called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion to approve Action Item 3 to approve Sign Types XBP, XBF, and XF, pole signs with variances for relief from Section 070.040.110 to allow internally illuminated sign within the Downton Core, exceed limit of one freestanding pole sign per street frontage, allow a pole sign within the Downtown North Sign District, and to allow pole sign with double pole design with findings and conditions on pages 15-19 of staff report. Commissioner Simms seconded the motion. Commissioner White called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Commissioner Cipperly made a motion to deny Action Item 4 to consider approval of Sign Type WF with variances for relief from Section 070.040.110 to exceed more than four signs per property, exceed 4 square feet per face, and 42” in height, allow for internal illumination, and relief from Sight Distance Triangle requirements with findings and conditions on pages 15-19 of the staff report. Commissioner Simms seconded the motion. Commission discussion included the need for redesign to meet sight distance triangle requirements and pedestrian and vehicular activity.

City Attorney Richard Petterson-Cremer explained to Commission the differences between the options to approve, continue, or deny this item. Staff further explained options available to Commission as well as clarification on sight distance triangle.

Commissioner Cipperly withdrew the original motion for denial of Action Item 4. Commissioner Simms withdrew the second.

Commissioner Cipperly made a motion for approval of Action Item 4 with findings and conditions on pages 15-19 of the staff report and the additional condition that the applicant work with City staff for approval of individual signs located within the Sight Distance Triangle. Commissioner Simms seconded the motion. Commissioner White called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion for approval of Action item 5 to approve Sign Type Z, information signs, located throughout the property with relief from Section 070.040.110 to allow information sign to exceed maximum size of three-square feet with findings and conditions on pages 15-19 of the staff report. Commissioner Cipperly seconded the motion. Commissioner White called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Commissioner Connerton made a motion for approval of Action Item 6 for relief from Section 070.040.110 to allow informational signs to exceed 3 square feet. Commissioner Simms seconded the motion. Commission discussion included distinction between wall signage and informational signs. Staff also explained these signs could have been considered wall signs but would have then needed a variance for number of signs. Commissioner White called the item to question. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

7. Commissioner Comments

- Commissioners were interested in updates on the density bonus and zoning changes that Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval on. Commissioners also made a request to assist in finding Commission alternates. Commissioner Connerton congratulated new Chair Peter Waller and Vice Chair Joy White Commissioner White admired the new sign proposals at Hot Springs Pool “cohesive branding” and added that the Arts Commission needs to restore mural by Mary Noon’s.

8. Director Comments

- Director Klausman updated the Commission on City Council’s work session on the zoning reform effort. Director Klausman also gave an update for Economic Development Manager position open in Community Development Office.

9. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM.