

MINUTES
City of Glenwood Springs Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
July 28, 2026
Council Chambers, First Floor
101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call

Motion: Commissioner Connie Geiman Made a motion to seat Alternate Jim Frale and Commissioner Kyle Jones Seconded the motion.

Outcome: The motion passed unanimously via hand vote.

Present: Chairman Peter Waller, Kyle Jones, Patrick Corcoran, John Houghton, Connie Geiman, alternate Jim Frale (seated via motion)

Not Present: Amy Connerton and Joy White.

Also Present: Economic and Community Development Director Trent Hyatt, Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray, Permit Technician Joel Asplund, City Engineer Ryan Gordon and City Attorney Karl Hanlon.

Conflicts of Interest: No conflicts of interest were declared.

2. Receipt of the Minutes

a. May 28, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Outcome: Approval of minutes was continued to August 25, 2026 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting due to an error in the date of the minutes listed on the agenda.

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

No public comments were offered in person or online.

4. Acting as the Building Board of Appeals

a. APPEAL-000067-2026 506 Maple

Presenter: Community Development Director Trent Hyatt introduced the appeal on behalf of Senior Planner Emery Ellingson (not present). He explained that the appeal challenges the building official's interpretation of the International Building Code (IBC) 2021 section 903.2.8 that requires an automatic fire sprinkler system for Group R-1 occupancies. Staff stated they do not provide recommendations for appeals, as the applicant must demonstrate why the interpretation is incorrect. Community Development Director Trent Hyatt outlined the appeal process, the authority of the Building Board of Appeals, and the possible actions the commission may take.

Presenter: Susan Wilmot and her daughter, Rebecca Baggett, presented an appeal requesting relief from the requirement to install an automatic fire sprinkler system in their existing 400-square-foot guest cottage at 506 Maple Street. They provided background on their longstanding small family business, Splendor Mountain Spa, described the history and use of the cottage, detailed their efforts to comply with sprinkler requirements, and explained the financial and practical challenges that make installation infeasible. They emphasized the safety measures already implemented, the uniqueness of their property and business, and the importance of supporting small, locally-owned businesses in Glenwood Springs.

Key points Included:

- Susan purchased 506 Maple Street in 1998 to establish Splendor Mountain Spa with a focus on healing and wellness.
- The cottage was renovated into a studio and used for massage therapy and Watsu aquatic therapy for 27 years before transitioning to a day spa.
- Attempted compliance:
 - Consulted plumbing and sprinkler contractors.
 - Existing water pressure is adequate, but water piping too small.
 - No attic or crawl space, making a storage tank option unfeasible.
 - Only remaining solution: replace entire water service line at an estimated cost of over \$60,000.
- Existing and planned safety measures:
 - Combination smoke/Carbon Monoxide detectors.
 - Two wall-mounted fire extinguishers.
 - Installation of a code-compliant egress window, resulting in two exits.
 - Max occupancy of four guests; no smoking allowed.
 - Building is small, detached, and surrounded by open space (alley, parking, patio).

Commission Questions & Discussion Included:

- **Chair Peter Waller:** I would just like some clarification on the size of the cottage, and the site layout.
 - **Susan Wilmot:** The cottage is 20'x20' making it exactly 400sqft. The cottage is separate from the main building and the entrance to the cottage is located in the rear of the site. The interior is a studio apartment layout with a sofa, bed, bathroom, and a kitchenette with a microwave, sink and coffee maker. The only gas appliance in the structure is a gas furnace.
- **Commissioner John Houghton:** What is the Use of the main building on the property?
 - **Susan Wilmot:** The main building is mixed use acting as a spa and residential use.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** What options did staff provide you with as far as bringing your business up to compliance?

- **Rebecca Baggett:** The cottage was classified as an R-1 occupancy only because it will be used as a short-term rental, triggering the sprinkler requirement. That requirement is intended for hotels not a small, 400-sq-ft brick building with comparatively low fire risk.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Is the only requirement that is giving you trouble the fire sprinkler requirement?
 - **Rebecca Baggett:** That is correct. We have made all changes to meet other safety requirements required by us.

Questions for Staff:

- **Alternate Jim Frale:** Is this situation to have fire sprinklers in this type of occupancy and use typical?
 - **Staff response:** As a reminder as the Building Board of Appeals we cannot consider the zoning of this space only the development. Fire sprinklers are not typical if we were to classify this as a short-term rental which is its intended use. This property cannot be classified as a short-term rental because it falls in the 250' buffer of another short-term rental. This building cannot be classified as an accessory dwelling unit because the primary residence is not classified as a single-family home. The building could be classified as lodging unit in that zone. However, it would have to meet all development codes for an R-1 in that zone hence the fire sprinkler requirement.
- **Commissioner Patrick Corcoran:** Do R-1 lodgings have any minimum square footage requirements?
 - **Staff response:** In the building code where commercial structure requirements come from there are no minimum square footage requirements. In the residential code the council made amendments to the requirement for fire sprinklers on homes less than 2,000 square feet.
- **Commissioner John Houghton:** Would the requirements still apply if this structure was conjoined via an addition and used as an owner-occupied business in an R-3?
 - **Staff response:** That is one of the options available and proposed to the owner. However, those requirements did not work with their business and life situations.
- **Commissioner John Houghton:** Were there any amendments to the fire code for sprinkler exemptions?
 - **Staff response:** The only amendment is a blanket requirement for single family homes/duplexes of less than 2,000 square feet.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Didn't we talk about waving sprinklers for Accessory dwelling units or ADUs?
 - **Staff response:** The International Code Council recommends all buildings with humans in them to be sprinkled. Local amendments are the things that change that requirement. The discussion arose around newly built ADUs which the blanket statement about any new home less than 2,000 square

feet applies to. The council discussed waving the requirement for sprinklers for all ADU's which is not codified. As a reminder this building cannot be classified as an ADU.

- **Chair Peter Waller:** Can we see the specific code and its language?
 - **Staff response:** Code books are copyrighted documents so we will have to show you in the printed book. Section 903.2.8 of the 2021 International Building Code (IBC).
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** What does it mean in the code that it should be noted that buildings constructed under the IRC (international Residential Code) are not included in group R and would not therefore be subject to particular requirements.
 - **Staff response:** Because the building is a commercial use of lodging the residential building code does not apply.
- **Alternate Jim Frale:** Are we supposed to focus on just the building official's interpretation of the code today?
 - **Staff response:** That is correct.

Public Comment:

- **Laurie Maciag,** owner of 402/404 Maple, stated that she reported the property at 506 Maple for operating an illegal short-term rental. She expressed concern that the cottage was listed and used as a short-term rental for months despite being out of compliance and continued to be advertised even after notification. She emphasized that this affected her own compliant short-term rental business and believes the applicants attempted to bypass required procedures. She requested that full R-1 requirements be enforced.

Applicant Closing Remarks:

- **Rebecca Baggett:** Stated they initially attempted to use the cottage as a short-term rental, believing it was simply an extension of their existing spa services. After receiving the city's notice in January, they immediately removed the listing from Airbnb and later from their website and have not rented the cottage since. They emphasized that they did not intend to act improperly and have complied since being notified.

Commissioner Comments: None.

Motion: Commissioner John Houghton made the motion to affirm the building official's interpretation that an R1 occupancy requires sprinklers and Commissioner Patrick Corcoran seconded the motion.

Commissioner Comments:

- **Commissioner John Houghton:** It is important for us to remember our authority is very limited here. We do not have the authority to wave or modify requirements.

Outcome: Motion passed unanimously via verbal vote.

5. Old Items:

a. CDA-000049-2026 Code Amendment Short Term Rental and Accessory Tourist Rental request for continuance to August 25, 2026 Planning and Zoning Meeting.

Motion: Commissioner John Houghton made the motion to continue CDA-000049-2026 Code Amendment Short Term Rental and Accessory Tourist Rental to August 25, 2026 Planning and Zoning Meeting and Commissioner Patrick Corcoran seconded the motion.

Outcome: Motion passed unanimously via hand vote.

6. New Items

a. VAR-000056-2026 Variance 1108 Colorado Avenue.

Presenter: Community Development Director Trent Hyatt presented on behalf of Senior Planner Emery Ellingson (not present).

Community Development Director Trent Hyatt presented Variance Case VAR-000056-2026 for 1108 Colorado Avenue, requesting relief from the required 5-foot side-yard setback to allow reconstruction of a porch that previously existed but was removed for safety reasons. Because more than 12 months passed after removal, the structure lost its legal nonconforming status, making a variance necessary. Hyatt reviewed the seven variance criteria and stated staff recommends approval, finding the request meets all required standards and does not harm public interests or violate building or fire code requirements.

Key Points:

- Relief from the 5-foot side-yard setback to rebuild a porch at a 2 ft 3 in setback.
- Original porch was removed due to safety concerns.
 - A lapse of more than 12 months triggered need for a variance rather than being able to rebuild it under an existing use.
- Existing house already encroaches in the same area.
 - Proposed porch aligns with existing structure.
- Proposed materials meet higher fire-resistance standards.

Commission Questions & Discussion Included:

- **Commissioner John Houghton:** Where does the stipulation on 12 months exist in the code?
 - **Staff response:** Section 010 non-conforming use of the Municipal Code.
- **Commissioner John Houghton:** Repairs even if it requires the removal of the deck would be allowed as part of a non-conforming use, right?
 - **Staff response:** That is correct. Had staff known that the applicant intended to replace the porch we would have advised them of that 12-month timeline.

- **Alternate Jim Frale:** Is the building next door also within that five-foot setback?
 - **Staff response:** I am not certain the distance between the two structures if they are less than 10 feet away they can trigger additional fire-rating and safety requirements. This was a reason the variance was brought forward for public hearing, ensuring adjacent owners could comment if the reduced setback affected them. The building department has reviewed the safety implications, and no objections have been raised.

Applicants Representative:

Presenter: Brad Jordan (Architect)

Architect Brad Jordan stated the project maintains the required 10-foot separation from the neighboring house. He confirmed the submitted plans illustrate both the proposed porch restoration and an alternative design that is less desirable. He noted the intent is to restore the home's Victorian character and mentioned that the property owners are present and have provided several letters of support.

Commission Questions and Comments:

- **Commissioner John Houghton:** What is the minimum distance to the lot line for the proposed deck?
 - **Brad Jordan:** 2'3"
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** I would like to commend the work being done on the house, it has come a long way.
 - **Brad Jordan:** Thank you. With this work we offered to voluntarily meet a higher level of code rather than using the existing non-conforming code.

Public Comment: None

Motion: Commissioner Kyle Jones made the motion to approve VAR-0000056-2026 1108 Colorado Avenue and commissioner Patrick Corcoran seconded the motion.

Outcome: Motion Passed unanimously via verbal vote.

b. L&E-000076-2026 Location and Extent Review 3500 Airport Road

Presenter: Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray

Senior Planner Watkins Fulk-Gray presented a Location and Extent review for the relocation of the Glenwood Springs Airport hangar and maintenance building at 3500 Airport Road. The relocations are required due to impacts from the South Bridge project, and the city is acting as the applicant since the project affects city-owned airport facilities. He described the characteristics of both existing buildings, the proposed new locations, applicable code considerations, and how the project aligns with the comprehensive plan. Despite not meeting standard design requirements, staff found the proposal consistent with the intent of the code and recommended approval with conditions.

Key Points

- Location and Extent Permit L&E-0000076-2026 for relocation of airport hangar and maintenance building.
- City of Glenwood Springs is the applicant; relocations required due to South Bridge project impacts.
- Tin aircraft hangar will be deconstructed and rebuilt in a new location; maintenance building will be demolished and replaced.
- New building sites located roughly 700 feet north/northwest of current positions.
- Proposed metal buildings do not meet standard design-detail requirements but comply with height and setback standards.
- Design standards deemed not applicable due to airport-specific functionality.
- Project supports airport operations and aligns with comprehensive plan goals, including transportation and South Bridge implementation.
- Building department supports no sprinkler requirement for the three-sided hangar.
- Location and Extent criteria: consistent with plans, consistent with code intent, and minimizes adverse impacts.
- Staff recommends approval with findings and conditions listed in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation:

Presenter: Ryan Gordon City Engineer

Ryan Gordon City Engineer added context to the airport building relocation, explaining that the goal is to fully restore all existing utilities and functions for the hangar and maintenance building as they are moved due to the South Bridge project. He described utility plans, structural assessments confirming the hangar can be deconstructed and reused and noted that the maintenance building will include a sprinkler system while the open-sided hangar will not.

Key Points:

- City is the applicant; relocations are required because of the South Bridge project.
- All existing utilities (power, water, gas, broadband) will be extended to the relocated buildings.
- Existing septic system will be replaced with a similar system at the new site.
- Structural assessment confirmed the hangar is sound enough to deconstruct and relocate.
- Both buildings will receive engineered foundations.
- Maintenance building will include fire sprinklers due to engine-work activities; hangar will not, as it stores planes only and has open sides.

Commission Questions & Discussion Included:

- **Alternate Jim Frale:** Are there any noise impacts for Park East or Cardiff Glen?

- **Staff response:** That is correct we have not received any outside comments and there are no changes besides the relocation of already existing structures.
- **Alternate Jim Frale:** Is any of the land proposed for use in an area other agencies had use of in the past?
 - **Staff response:** The proposed area did not have any functional use in the past and is actually fill material we brought in from mudslides in 2023.
- **Alternate Jim Frale:** in your presentation you mentioned that we would pay for the utilities for these buildings. Does this mean we pay for the expenses of these buildings each month?
 - **Staff response:** The city will not be paying their utility bill each month. Since the relocation is for the city, we are essentially just making them whole again by paying the relocation of utilities to the new site and building and any construction or relocation costs.
- **Alternate Jim Frale:** Is there any screening along the road for these buildings?
 - **Staff response:** There is no proposed screening along Airport Road. However, the natural topography of the area is higher along the road and lower where the buildings are located, making them barely visible from the road.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Is the airport owned by the city?
 - **Staff response:** The airport is owned by the City of Glenwood Springs and the ground is leased out under long-term leases, and the buildings are privately owned.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** How much will this project cost?
 - **Staff response:** It is estimated to cost between 1-1.5 million dollars.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Is the reason this project is getting done because of the South Bridge project?
 - **Staff response:** That is correct the proposed plans would call for the road to pass through the location of these buildings.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Is the South Bridge project approved.
 - **Staff response:** The project is approved but only part of the funds have been released.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Is this project then contingent on the release of those funds?
 - **Staff response:** That is correct construction will not start until the funds have been released and council has given final approval. This project will also finish construction before demolition of the old building to reduce the impact on the owner as much as possible.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Are there any landscaping plans with this area during any of these projects?
 - **Staff response:** There are no plans for landscaping due to wildfire risks, irrigation issues and a lack of need due to its industrial zoning. There is also no trigger for landscaping because the square footage of these buildings isn't

changing. All other aspects such as lighting and crosswalks during the South Bridge project will be completed along this section as well.

Public Comment:

- **Carol Parker** Resident of Park East Subdivision: expressed support for the South Bridge project but raised concerns about increased city truck traffic passing through her neighborhood, impacts to the nearby city gravel lot, and potential need to close the Park East gate to limit commuter traffic. She also asked how the relocation of the airport buildings might affect residential use in the area and emphasized preserving neighborhood character while minimizing traffic impacts.
 - **Staff response:** The city and the airport will be working with the neighborhood on long-term plans in the future.

Motion: Commissioner Kyle Jones made the motion to approve the conditions of the L&E-0000076-2026 review based on conditions in the staff report and commissioner Patrick Corcoran seconded the motion.

Commissioner Comments:

- **Alternate Jim Frale:** It is clear that this project will not start without the approval of the South Bridge Project first.
- **Commissioner Kyle Jones:** Thank you staff and representatives for all of the hard work on such a large project.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Is there access to the airport through Park East as well as Airport Road?
 - **Staff response:** There is access at the end of Sky Ranch Drive with a gate that is left open. During construction that gate will be closed to non-emergency traffic.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** I'm sure you have already considered this but getting the homeowners associations or HOAs in the area on board will be crucial.
- **Alternate Jim Frale:** I appreciate the work being done in the area to improve the airport.

Outcome: Motion Passed unanimously via verbal vote.

5. Commissioner Comments:

- **Commissioner Connie Geima:** I would just like to welcome Jim Frale.
- **Alternate Jim Frale:** Thank you for this opportunity

6. Director Comments

Community Development Director Trent Hyatt:

- Emery will be back to converse with us more about short-term rentals next month.

- Next Wednesday we will be having a sub-committee meeting about parking downtown that some of you will be attending.
- I would like another member willing to volunteer for another committee on the confluence if available. Commissioner Jones and Geiman volunteered.

7. Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned at 8:41PM.