

MINUTES  
City of Glenwood Springs Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting  
May 26, 2026  
Council Chambers, First Floor  
101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM

**1. Roll Call**

**Present:** Chairman Peter Waller, Kyle Jones, Patrick Corcoran, Amy Connerton, Joy White, John Houghton, Connie Geiman.

**Also Present:** Economic and Community Development Director Trent Hyatt, Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray, Long Range Principal Planner Jim Hardcastle, Permit Technician Joel Asplund, and City Attorney Karl Hanlon.

**Conflicts of Interest**

No conflicts of interest were declared.

**2. Receipt of the Minutes**

**a. March 24, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** Councilor Amy Connerton made the motion to approve the meeting minutes for March 24, 2026, and Commissioner Patrick Corcoran seconded the motion.

**Commissioner Comments:** None

**Outcome:** Motion was approved by unanimously.

**b. April 28, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** Commissioner Amy Connerton made the motion to approve the meeting minutes for April 28, 2026, and Commissioner John Houghton seconded the motion.

**Commissioner Comments:** None

**Outcome:** Motion was approved unanimously. Commissioner Joy White abstained from the vote due to her absence at the April 28, 2026 meeting.

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

No public comments offered in person or online.

#### **4. New Items**

##### **a. APPEAL-000029-2026 319 Park Drive Short Term Rental**

Director Trent Hyatt explained that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting due to health complications. The applicant requested that this item be continued to the June 23, 2026 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. The applicant was asked to attend this meeting instead of last month's meeting due to the anticipated length of last month's meeting. The applicant agreed to the change initiated by staff and the same consideration should be extended.

**Motion:** Councilor John Houghton made the motion to continue consideration of Item a. APPEAL-000029-2026 319 Park Drive Short Term Rental to the June 23, 2026, Planning and Zoning Meeting and Commissioner, Joy White seconded the motion.

**Commissioner Comments:** None

**Outcome:** Motion was approved unanimously.

##### **b. CDA-000049-2026 Code Amendment Short Term Rental and Accessory Tourist Rental**

Community Development Director Trent Hyatt elaborated that due to the close relationship of the appeal and the wording in the code that staff requests the item also be continued to the June 23, 2026, Planning and Zoning Meeting.

**Motion:** Commissioner Joy White made the motion to approve the continuation of Item b. CDA-000049-2026 Code Amendment Short Term Rental and Accessory Tourist Rental to the June 23, 2026, Planning and Zoning Meeting and Commissioner Patrick Corcoran seconded the motion.

##### **Commissioner Comments:**

- Commissioner Connie Geiman: While the two are related, aren't these two separate items?
  - Staff Response: That is correct the items are separate. However, it could lead to confusion, and the amendments are closely related.
- Commissioner Joy White: Is it possible that the applicant doesn't show for the next meeting as well causing problems for the neighboring parcels?
  - Staff Response: Continuances are at the discretion of the commission. Typically, an appellant is granted a single continuance unless there is good reason. Appeals mostly involve a review of the records and can continue without the appellant present.

**Outcome:** Motion was approved by a vote of 6-1 with Commissioner Connie Geiman opposed.

**Public Comment:** Staff stated that all comments should be held until the application is considered at the next meeting.

**c. CDA-000038-2026 Code Amendments to Sign Regulations**

**Presenter:** Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray

Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray presented proposed amendments to the municipal sign code. The purpose of the amendments is to improve clarity, maintain consistency within the code, and address the expiration of the Glenwood Meadows Annexation and Development Agreement (ADA) and the related Glenwood Meadows Master Sign Plan (GWMSP).

**Key points of the presentation included:**

- Incorporation of the expired Glenwood Meadows Master Sign Plan into Title 070 of the municipal code.
  - The GMMSP, adopted in 2003 with the original annexation documents, has been the governing signage document for Glenwood Meadows.
- The ADA expired in August 2024, leaving signage within the development being subject to general requirements in the municipal code not those developed specifically for the mixed-use area.
- Staff proposes incorporating the master sign plan into the municipal code by reference without modification to preserve existing signage standards and avoid ongoing administrative inconsistencies.
- Citywide edits to window and interior sign regulations
- Current code language surrounding window signs contains inconsistencies.
- Staff proposes removing the definition of “window sign,” creating a new definition of “interior sign,” and clarifying how vinyl-applied window signage is regulated.
- The goal is clarification, not substantive changes to current practice.
- Clean-up of illuminated sign regulations in the Downtown Core
- Staff proposes eliminating two sections of code: one redundant with other provisions and one that conflicts with an existing section.
  - These relate to illumination standards for specific sign types in the downtown area.

**Commission Questions & Discussion Included:**

- Commissioner John Houghton: Asked whether municipal code applies when the Glenwood Meadows Master Sign Plan is silent on a topic.
  - Staff Response: In such cases, general municipal code regulations do apply. This amendment also attempts to proactively resolve potential conflicts that might arise such as with illumination standards.
- Commissioner Joy White: Asked what elements of the ADA expired beyond signage, and whether land use or density rules were affected.
  - Staff Response: Zoning in Glenwood Meadows remains in effect because zoning does not expire. However, most elements tied to the expired

annexation and development agreement; such as design standards, sign and lighting rules, density limits, traffic fees, and affordable housing requirements no longer apply unless they were adopted directly into the zoning. Two parcels remain developable, and any new projects there must now follow current city code and design standards.

- Commissioner Connie Geiman: Who would review sign variance requests for properties within Glenwood Meadows under the updated system
  - Staff Response: All sign variance requests would go to Planning and Zoning Commission.
- Commissioner Amy Connerton: Are the proposed updates to window sign regulations needed to avoid conflicts in the language of the code?
  - Staff Response: Current code language contains conflicts and lacks clarity, and the proposed changes aim to make the regulations clearer and more usable for everyone.
- Chair Peter Waller: With the ADA expired, the remaining Glenwood Meadows parcels are still bound by the original ADA density limits or is density now determined solely by current zoning standards?
  - Staff Response: The original ADA density caps, square footage and number of units would no longer apply. Future development can always choose to apply to stricter versions of the code but are not required too. Without the ADA future development would have to follow current zoning and all modern code requirements with the density limitations of today.
- Chair Peter Waller: Without the ADA would existing signs, for example need to comply with current codes when any changes are made?
  - Staff Response: That is correct, any future changes would require compliance with current city standards or a variance request. Without adopting the GMMSP, new or replacement signs would end up conflicting with the surrounding grandfathered signage, creating inconsistency, administrative complications.

**Public Comment:** One written letter in favor of the Code Amendment was provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**Motion:** Commissioner Amy Connerton made the motion to approve CDA-000038-2026 Code Amendments to Sign Regulations and Commissioner Patrick Corcoran seconded the motion.

**Commissioner Comments:**

- Commissioner Geiman: Are you able to provide an example of a window sign and what we are trying to avoid?
  - Staff Response: A visual example was displayed of a sign taking up an entire windowpane. Window signs are currently permitted with wording being vague

on how much of a window can be taken up by a window sign. This amendment would give us clarity on those decisions.

- Commissioner Kyle Jones: How does this amendment interact with the previously discussed illumination, lighting and curfew standards?
  - Staff Response: By incorporating the GMMSP into municipal code all existing citywide illumination standards including maximum foot-candle levels and lighting curfews will now apply.

**Outcome:** Motion was approved unanimously.

#### **d. CDA-000039-2026 Code Amendment Right-of-Way Encroachment License**

**Presenter:** Long Range Principal Planner Jim Hardcastle

Long Range Principal Planner Jim Hardcastle presented proposed updates to the municipal code governing right-of-way encroachment licenses. The purpose of the amendments is to streamline the process, reduce unnecessary costs, improve clarity, and ensure consistent application of standards for items extending into public streets, sidewalks, or other city property.

#### **Key points of presentation Included:**

- A right-of-way or ROW encroachment is the placement of any private property into any publicly owned right-of-way.
  - City street
  - Sidewalk
  - Or any other city owned property
- Items can be temporary like a small blade sign or permanent like a retaining wall.
- The proposed changes are needed to improve accuracy and clarity of the code.
- Changes remain restrictive and subject to utility and mobility needs.
- More permissive and predictable in:
  - Denser areas
  - Patios
  - Canopy signage
- Context based
- Expands applicability to include retaining walls, foundations, buildings, lighting and fences.
- Eliminating reference to Planning and Zoning Commission as reviewing body to City Council.
  - This was likely an oversight and was always meant to be City Council.
- Wording changed to include a site plan as part of the application.
- Wording changed for umbrella liability insurance to be at the discretion of the Public Works Director and City Council.
  - This change is meant to accommodate for encroachments that would have no potential risk to public safety, health or general welfare.

## **Commission Questions & Discussion Included:**

- Commissioner John Houghton: Is there a reason right-of-way encroachment is in Title 70 Development and not incorporated into Title 90 Public Lands of the code where right-of-way permits are located?
  - Staff Response: A right-of-way permit is intended for temporary use of the right-of-way while an encroachment is usually a more permanent fixture that would require more work if removal was needed. At the same time, when this code was developed the Engineering and Public Works departments were not equipped to handle permits like Community Development.
- Commissioner Amy Connerton: Should all encroachments be approved by City Council?
  - Staff Response: That would only be applicable when staff and the director deem it appropriate. Without that measure in place all projections greater than a foot would have to go to council. Based on feedback from council projections above the right of way like awnings and canopies don't always need that level of review for a decision.
- Commissioner Patrick Corcoran: How often do right-of-way encroachments occur?
  - Staff Response: The frequency of these permits can fluctuate with demand, two being requested recently. Things like outdoor dining leases fall into the right-of-way permit category while encroachments would be things like signs and awnings. With items like these, decisions should be made at the staff level to speed up the process for local shops and businesses.
- Commissioner Connie Geiman: The wording of the amendment refers to encroachments at ground level as well while all our examples keep gravitating towards signs and awnings.
  - Staff Response: These types of encroachments can be quite common within our historic downtown especially. Previous surveys were not as accurate as they are today leading to parts of developments in the right-of-way. As developments come in, we can notice these encroachments and make the owner aware the city can use this land for public use if needed and secure proper insurance for any damage that could occur from this encroachment.

**Public Comment:** None

**Motion:** Commissioner Connie Geiman made the motion to approve CDA-000039-2026 Code Amendment Right-of-Way Encroachment License and Commissioner Amy Connerton seconded the motion.

**Outcome:** Motion was approved by digital vote unanimously.

## **5. Commissioner Comments:**

None

## **6. Director Comments**

### **Director Trent Hyatt:**

- Two items for next month's meeting so far.
- There has been a lack of planning and zoning items makes it easier for staff to address much needed code amendments and improve clarification of the code.

## **7. Adjournment** Meeting adjourned at 6:52PM.