

MINUTES
City of Glenwood Springs
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
March 29, 2016
Council Chambers, First Floor, City Hall
101 W. 8th Street
6:00 p.m.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

1. Roll Call.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Michael Blair, Michael Dunn, Ingrid Wussow, Marco Dehm, Kathryn Grosscup, Sumner Schachter and Tim Malloy

Absent: Mary Elizabeth Geiger

Also present were City staff members: Andrew McGregor, Community Development Director
Jill Peterson, City Planner
Kathleen Michel, Administrative Assistant
Jon Hoistad, City Attorney's Office
Karl Hanlon, City Attorney

MOTION: Commissioner Dunn moved to seat Alternate Tim Malloy for this meeting. Commissioner Grosscup seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

2. Receipt of the minutes of the February 23, 2016 regular meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Schachter made a correction to page 5. Commissioner Malloy moved to receive the minutes of the regular meeting on February 23, 2016 as corrected. Commissioner Grosscup seconded the motion. Motion carried by voice vote.

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

No one wished to comment on items not on the agenda.

Chairman Dehm brought the following item forward on the agenda.

5. #2-16 – Consideration of a request for a major subdivision, zoning and design variances.

Applicant: Don Markley
Owner: MAHC, LLC
Location: 56 Gamba Drive (Lot 13, West Glenwood Estates)
Zone: R/2 Limited Multi-Family District

The Applicant has requested a continuance.

MOTION: Commissioner Dunn moved to continue the public hearing on Item #2-16 to the April 26 meeting. Commissioner Grosscup seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Continued Public Hearing:

Commissioner Malloy recused himself as he was not present for the original discussion. Commissioner Schachter stated he had listened to the recording of the hearing and had read the materials provided so was eligible to hear this item.

4. #21-15 – Consideration of a request for a major development, zoning and design variances for new residential apartments with 116 units in two (2) buildings.

Applicant: Ron Liston, Land Design Partnership
Owners: Richmark Holdings, Inc.
Location: 52089 and 52147 Highway 6 & 24
Zone: C/1 Limited Commercial District

Staff presentation

Jill Peterson presented the staff report. This application is for 116 apartments, one and two bedroom units. The application includes two zoning variances, a parking variance and eight design variances. Location is between Donegan Road and Hwy 6. She said there will be a stairway connection between the two buildings with pedestrian access to a crosswalk that extends across Donegan Road. Small adjustment to the crosswalk connection have been made to change the alignment with existing curb cut on north side of Donegan Road. Streetscape required by Code is an 8 foot sidewalk and 5 ft. planting strip. The applicant is requesting a design variance from these improvements on Donegan as there are no other streetscape improvements on the south side of Donegan and the topography is steep. Access points on Highway 6 will be reduced from four to two, but will still require a design variance as City Code limits to one access point.

Applicant is seeking a reduction in the applicable parkland dedication in exchange for open space amenities on the site. Fee in lieu assessment is \$478,483.44 and applicant has asked for the maximum 50% reduction permitted by Code. At the hearing in January, some of the Commissioners commented that the amenities addressed needs of toddlers and children but not adults and older children. Parks and Recreation Director is comfortable with the reduction requested, provided the amenities are built before the completion of the buildings, as required by Code.

The property will be served with City water. West Glenwood Sanitation District will provide sewer. Water Department has requested a looped water line on site. Storage space requirements per Code is 100 sq. ft. per unit. Commission asked the applicant to provide additional storage areas. The applicant has added shelving in the mechanical/laundry rooms within the individual units. Additionally, wall lockers will be added at the head of parking spaces in the parking garages. Staff still has concerns with storage. Only 49 parking spaces would get lockers (42% of units).

Ms. Peterson noted the Commission requested that more vertical elements be added to the building to reduce the impact of height. She displayed the architectural renderings and passed around the materials board.

Required parking for this development is 280 spaces. Applicant will provide 185 spaces and will prohibit RVs on site through the lease agreement. Applicant is seeking a variance based on criteria in Code that the use will not generate the parking demand as specified per City Code. The applicant cited other developments in Glenwood with reduced parking ratio, i.e. the Glenwood Green apartments and the Lofts. In your report, I noted that the Glenwood Green apartments are rent restricted to median incomes no greater than 60% of area median income for a period of 40 years. The Lofts are directly adjacent to a RFTA bus stop.

The applicant's supplemental information adds two parking spaces, one in each building. In your packet you also have a spreadsheet of other multi-family housing developments in the City and their parking ratios. Most of these have met City's parking requirements. There is no room for on-street parking adjacent to this property.

Ms. Peterson referenced the zoning variance criteria. The Commission must find that zoning variances meet all four variance requirements. Design variances have similar criteria. Roof overhang will encroach into the setback from Donegan Road and requires a zoning variance. The building height of 60.85 feet requires a zoning variance from the maximum building height of 35 ft. per the C/1 zoning. The City's Comprehensive Plan designates this site and the corridor along Highway 6 as mixed use development. The Commission can recommend approval or denial, or continue the hearing for additional information. She outlined the order for consideration of the variances and then the major development permit. Staff does not recommend approval of the application and, therefore, is recommending denial with the findings outlined in your staff report.

Presentation by Applicant

Ron Liston, Land Design Partnership, said in addition to changes in the supplemental materials, they will be adding three (3) additional parallel parking spaces to outside parking. They would need to be covered by a requested variance as they are in the front yard setback. He commented that codes often do not keep up with the times. This is a rental situation but tenants are made aware of how much parking they can have for their unit. He said they have worked to meet the needs of the people who will be the tenants of the complex. People who have extra toys can lease space in a mini-storage for their toys.

Paul Schultz, Oz Architecture, 6931 Fairview Drive, Boulder, said that they have made some elevational changes and changed colors of Hardie panels to get more contrast. On the Donegan side, we varied between darker and lighter siding and there is a fairly large portion of the building that will be below grade when viewed from Donegan Road. In the garage, spacing of columns was adjusted and one parking space per building was gained. Storage lockers are mounted above car front. He showed a slide with an image of the storage lockers.

Mr. Liston commented that the indoor parking would be a slightly higher cost for the tenants utilizing those spaces. He also commented on the request for reduction of parkland in-lieu fee. For the adults we have provided a setting for meeting with friends such as the barbeque areas and lounge, even with the limited space on our site. He appreciates that Tom Barnes has supported our request for reduction of the fee in lieu. Even with a 50% reduction, we would still

be paying over \$200,000 for fee in-lieu for parks. Our engineers and the City engineers have been working on the utility plans. Things on the conditions list are standard for a development. He disagreed with a statement that multiple variances indicate that there is something wrong with a project. He talked about the Comp Plan and development code lagging behind the needs of the community. He felt that free market rents will set their own levels.

Questions of Applicant

Commissioner Grosscup asked how many parking spaces have been added.

Mr. Liston replied that they added a total of 5 with the 3 additional this evening, making the ratio 1.62 per dwelling unit.

Commissioner Blair asked about width of sidewalk along Hwy 6, distance between the two driveways. Would the apartments be rented at market rate?

Mr. Liston replied that it is 8 feet wide, a couple hundred feet between the access points.

Mr. Liston replied that this will be a rental property. If people do not rent there because of the price or the parking, that will drive rents down.

Commissioner Blair asked why they wouldn't want to control the rental rates on their own. His observation is that rents just keep going up.

Mr. Liston said that enough housing supply will help to eventually stabilize rents or even take the rates down. He said this community just doesn't have enough housing.

Commissioner Schachter asked how many bikes the bike storage would hold. Each bike needs about ten square feet.

Mr. Schultz said that they followed manufacturer's recommendation to hang the bikes. It will hold about 58 bikes.

Commissioner Schachter asked if there is a market study to show that the pricing itself is driving the market. It is the pricing itself, not the number of units available.

Mr. Liston commented it was a matter of supply and demand. If more units are built down the road, there will be more competition.

Commissioner Blair asked Mr. Schultz about the color presentation seeming different from the samples.

Mr. Schultz said they were copied and produced on a different computer. The samples are the actual colors.

Commissioner Dunn asked about two bedroom apartments. And if they had two cars, how many that would be. He asked if all the units would have the shelves added.

Mr. Liston said there were 190 parking spaces. It works out to be one space per bedroom.

Commissioner Dunn said that if we have a couple in a one bedroom unit, then we have a parking problem. He asked how many storage lockers would be available.

Mr. Liston said there would be 50 lockers. He said they went to a stacked washer/dryer in the mechanical/laundry room to open up some additional floor space.

Commissioner Wussow asked when the applicant acquired the property.

Answer: November 2015.

Commissioner Wussow asked if the changes on the materials board changed the cost. Are there additional costs to add parking spaces? The parking challenge is a product of the location.

Mr. Liston said they could wipe out recreation space by extending parking all the way to the east end of the property. We are trying to balance the needs and serve at least a segment of the population that wants to live in Glenwood.

Commissioner Grosscup noted that not every bike would have storage if everyone had a bike. How much parking could you add by eliminating the bike kitchen and dog wash. Can bikes go into a pavilion outside? How many can you hang in the area?

Answer: Three or four spaces per building. For the bikes, 112 total, close to one bike per unit.

Commissioner Grosscup asked if the bikes could be locked in the bike storage areas.

Mr. Liston said the bikes will be locked by the owners individually. He said they had looked at putting bike storage outside but it did not make the best sense.

Mr. Schultz said there was hanging storage for 56 bikes. Adjacent to the lobby and next to the handicapped parking we also have bike parking there. That probably will hold about ten more per building. That makes 112 total.

Chairman Dehm noted that Hwy 6 and Donegan are no on-street parking zones.

The Chairman called for public comment:

Bill Bullock, Bullock & Hinkey, said he is a realtor in Glenwood Springs. City is changing rapidly. Rental demand is very strong right now. People will take anything even without parking because they want to live in Glenwood Springs. This site can handle the height variance because of the high ridge behind it. He thought we were becoming more urban and not country any more. He thought we were losing the middle class down valley because they cannot afford to be here because we don't have enough housing.

Karen Stripp, 1653 Donegan Road, said that she lives behind the proposed development. We are concerned with the height. Also, as you make a left turn at the intersection of Donegan with Highway 6 it is difficult now as the traffic comes quite fast on Highway 6. More cars will add to this. She is concerned that someone will park on her commercial property on Donegan. She is concerned about the storage because people will use balconies if they don't have enough storage.

Adam Killian, Shaw Construction, Grand Junction, said they have 1,800 units under construction throughout the state. They built the Glenwood Green apartments. He mentioned multiple housing authorities they have worked with. The parking standard is 1.5 in other communities, i.e. one space per bedroom. That is the practical approach in the current market in Colorado.

Grace Stahlschmidt, 2129 Midland Avenue, Glenwood Springs, said that she supports the staff recommendation. Some variances can result in great public harm. The median income in Glenwood Springs is \$28,000 but most people in this community earn minimum wage. The impacts for this project and its requested variances are an additional cost that are put upon the people in Glenwood Springs. Owner occupancy is dropping in Glenwood Springs, 54 % is much less than other communities around here. She said she did not see anything addressing the additional impacts of non-owner population on Glenwood Springs. There is no way for safe egress in Glenwood Springs. Glenwood is very limited in its ability to handle additional traffic. Only so many people can safely fit on our egress routes through Glenwood. She thought it was inappropriate to look at this without addressing transportation issues. She advises caution in approving new development. She fears an effect like the Coal Seam Fire had on traffic. Affordable housing was removed from the Glenwood Springs Code. Other communities in this valley have affordable housing. She thought these units would also lend themselves to use for short term vacation rentals. The developers may decide to use this project to rent out as short term condo rentals for tourists. This will not address the middle class housing issue as they are not looking for rentals; they want to buy. She feels there is a veiled threat of challenging the City regarding this project. If they can't make the project work, maybe they should sell to someone who can.

Rob Anderson, 1405 Donegan Road, said that he has watched this property for a lot of years. He said he would not have the nerve to ask for these variances. He wants to know who the listing realtor is for this project. Are there guest parking spaces? How many? Commercial property brings money into the town. Tenants do not always enhance tax base but may create a new burden for police and fire services because it puts more people in that space. Could this be amended to keep it as a forever rental and not be sold as individual units in the future?

Chairman Dehm asked the speaker to address his questions to the Commission and we will direct the questions to the applicant.

Dean Moffatt, 326 Second Street, said that he was a retired architect and land planner, he has designed more than 500 projects on the Western Slope. He said he has no problem with the architect. Oz Architects are good architects. No one has addressed the scope and scale of this project. Our professional associations have a code of ethics. This project does not seem to adhere to the professional ethics of these professional associations. The staff does not support due to scope and scale and the number of variances requested. Historically, a variance is a minor adjustment, not a major one. We are looking at a five story building. Parking can be up or down by 10 percent, not 100 percent. We have a code for this community and staff must evaluate a project based on the code. This is way, way overboard. He has walked the site and has seen several options for this land that would maximize legal units without variances. He strongly suggested the Commission consider denial. The Doctrine of Consistency means when you have a Comprehensive Plan, you have a master plan, zoning and regulations then follow that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It is a good piece of land for many uses but not for this project. You are nibbling at the small pieces, parking and storage, and missing the big picture.

David Winter, 343 Sunny Acres Road, talked about traffic flow on Hwy 6. Has anyone taken a look at what may be required at this intersection? Perhaps an actual stop light there.

Chairman Dehm closed the public portion of the hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Applicant response

Ron Liston stated there is no listing realtor. It is a rental property. Parking is one space per bedroom. CDOT has approved access for the project and issued an access permit. He stated he was concerned about the needs of this community and this project is a critical contribution to the housing shortage.

Additional questions from the Commission

Commissioner Blair asked applicant to clarify the number of parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Liston replied there was one space per bedroom and that leaves 12 over and above. 188 spaces as revised with the additional three spaces this evening.

Commissioner Dunn asked Jill if she recommended denial of one or more then why all should be denied.

Ms. Peterson stated that each variance has its own effect. A denied variance may require an amendment to the overall plans that requires further review by staff.

Commissioner Blair asked Jill about CDOT comments on two entrances.

Ms. Peterson said the applicant had obtained an access permit from CDOT and they would have to follow the conditions of the access permit.

Commissioner Grosscup questioned Jill about the City being a third party for parking enforcement.

Ms. Peterson clarified that Commissioner Grosscup might be referring to a reference in the January meeting to the City being a third party beneficiary. She deferred to the City Attorney for comment.

Karl Hanlon said this becomes a huge burden for the City. The City does not want to be involved in disputes between tenants and landlords about parking. There are a wide variety of options available from the Code.

Commissioner Blair had a question for applicant. Where are these renters coming from?

Mr. Liston said people who live down valley or maybe even some from up valley.

Chairman Dehm asked if these will be long term rental units that will never convert to condominiums.

Mr. Liston replied that we can never say never. These owners have numerous rental properties; and their goal is to create such a project in Glenwood Springs.

Chairman Dehm wondered if they were being constructed with an eye to future condominiumization, i.e. with separate utility services, etc.

Mr. Liston said that is normal construction and we don't rule that out for the future.

Chairman Dehm wondered how far the building was above Donegan at the east end.

Mr. Liston replied that it was 15 to 18 feet.

Chairman Dehm brought the discussion back to the Commission:

MOTION; Action Item 1: Commissioner Schachter moved to deny a zoning variance from 070.040.030(g)(6) to allow a maximum building height of 60.85 feet which exceeds the maximum allowed height of 35 feet in the C/1 Limited Commercial Zone based on the findings in the staff report, pages 9-13. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.

Commissioner Blair said that he does not object to variances as they provide a better path than we have now. He thought that taller buildings and more efficient use of land is appropriate and is addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. There is good work on this site plan; the size and conditions of the site have existed for a long time and there was knowledge of the site conditions and requirements of the City code. There is a provision in the Comprehensive Plan that allows for additional height or additional units if affordable units are included in the project. This density cannot be supported without the affordable component.

Commissioner Schachter said that his motion was based on fact, that in his opinion, this variance request does not meet all four of the requirements for a variance.

Commissioner Dunn said he seconded the motion and does not have a problem with the height if that were the only variance. It is the scope and scale of this project that creates difficulty.

Commissioner Grosscup said that she could support the height variance but would not be able to support the other variances. We need to consider larger structures with more density. She commented that with rent control comes income restrictions and she thinks this is one of the mismatches in comparing this project with Glenwood Green. Here you might have people with better incomes who make a conscious choice to live in lower cost housing.

Commissioner Wussow agreed with the other Commissioners. She agreed that we have a need for affordable housing. The number of variances was indicative that this might not be the right approach. We have a renter pool living in the valley and their housing was not necessarily legal or safe. The project seems fantastic but the number of variances for it is not something she can support.

Chairman Dehm said he really liked this project but he believed this was just too big for the site. If you took off a story, this could work for us and you. Thirty units less would make it work.

The Chairman called for the question. The motion to deny carried 5-1, with Commissioner Grosscup voting no.

MOTION: Action Item 2: Commissioner Grosscup moved to deny the variance request from 070.050.060(b)(4), requiring 280 parking spaces, to allow 188 parking spaces with findings on page 8 of the staff report. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.

Commissioner Dunn commented on how the units actually will be used. He said that most likely, a one bedroom unit will have two adults who will need two cars. From this location, you need to drive to work or drive to the grocery store.

Commissioner Grosscup agreed that a couple or two roommates would all have cars. The comments from Mr. Killian of Shaw about fewer cars is applicable to housing authority projects which restrict incomes and rents. This does not match.

Commissioner Dehm thought this variance request was a sign of too much for the site.

The Chairman called for the question. The motion to deny carried unanimously.

MOTION: Action Item 3: Commissioner Schachter moved to deny a zoning variance from 070.040.030 (n)(7) to allow a roof eave encroachment of 38.5 inches reducing the required setback from 25 feet to 21 feet 9.5 inches. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion to deny carried unanimously.

MOTION: Action Items 4 through 10: Commissioner Schachter moved to deny design variances 4 through 10 based on staff recommendation on page 9. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.

ACTION ITEM 4 – Design Variance from Section 070.030.080(b) and (e) streetscape requirement to provide an 8 ft. sidewalk and 5 ft. planting strip along Donegan Road.

ACTION ITEM 5 – Design Variance from 070.030.090(b) limiting access points on arterial and collector streets to no more than one (1) access point.

ACTION ITEM 6 – Design variance from 070.050.060(b)(4) and 070.160090(a)(5)ii., restricting developments which require more than 60 parking spaces from providing more than 60 parking spaces outside of the footprint of a building.

ACTION ITEM 7 - Design Variance from 070.050.100 (3) and (4) dimensional requirements for parking spaces to allow 24 parking spaces with reduced dimensions.

ACTION ITEM 8 - Design Variance from 070.050.100(8) maximum grade of 4% for access ways in parking areas within 100 ft. of an access drive, and for parking spaces exceeding the maximum cross slope of 5%.

ACTION ITEM 9 – Design Variance from 070.160.090(a)(5)b.i.1.&2. to allow parking within proximity of a street frontage and to allow parking spaces within the 25 ft. front yard setback.

ACTION ITEM 10 – Design Variance from 070.160.090(b)(2)b.v.1 – Development parcels greater than three (3) acres shall incorporate a minimum of two (2) housing types.

Commissioner Dunn commented on the storage and said he still has an issue with it when we are encouraging bike riding and yet there is not enough storage space for every unit to have a bicycle.

Commissioner Schachter commented that the design variances were not significant factors in earlier denials of zoning variances.

Commissioner Blair said that he could approve the sidewalk variance and access points. He would disapprove Action Item 6. On 7, 8 and 9, he would approve. He said he would deny Action Item 10.

Commissioner Wussow agreed with Commissioner Blair on Action Items 4 and 5. She would not approve 6. She would approve 10 as it would be unnecessary to have two types of housing on this site.

Commissioner Grosscup said that she agreed with the motion to deny.

The Chairman called for the question. The motion to deny Action Items 4-10 carried 5-1, with Commissioner Blair voting no.

MOTION: Action Item 11: Commissioner Dunn moved to deny the design variance from 070.160.090(b)(6)b.i.1 requiring a minimum of 100 square feet per residential unit of enclosed storage space with findings on page 9. Commissioner Schachter seconded the motion.

Commissioner Dunn did not think storage was adequately addressed for this many units and that can lead to problems down the road.

Commissioner Blair agreed with staff comments and reminded the Commissioners that the Comp Plan provided for additional height or other accommodation that can be granted for providing affordable housing.

Commissioner Grosscup said that she approves this variance. The storage area could be variable for this type of housing.

The Chairman called for the question. The motion to deny carried 4-2, with Commissioners Wussow and Grosscup voting no.

MOTION: Action Item 12: Commissioner Schachter moved to deny the major development permit finding that the proposed development does not comply with the regulations of the City's Municipal Code due to the deviations from allowed building height, required parking, storage requirements, and other requested variances. Commissioner Grosscup seconded the motion.

Commissioner Schachter said he was aware that this is hard on applicant and hard on staff. There is a perceived need for housing in Glenwood Springs but we have to meet all four

conditions for variances. Comparing to other sites does not meet the condition. He said that it is not our role to design or determine economic viability of the project. We have all agreed that every objection is to density and scope. We don't dispute the need for housing; everything relates to that issue. The applicant, through Mr. Liston, referred to revising the development code. This does not mean that the City is changing the Code to make it less restrictive or changing the vision of the Comprehensive Plan. We have a demand for housing but does free market housing solve our problem or will we price ourselves out of the market? He said that he would rather be making decisions at the very lowest demand. If we err in terms of variances and conditions then the cost to the City now and in the future could be very high and we have no further control. He thought they were looking for the greater good.

Commissioner Wussow agreed with Commissioner Schachter that we have the highest need for affordable housing. We need to make decisions based on the long term. She thought that variances served as checks and balances. Is this right for right now? It needs to be fine-tuned to fit better. She thanked the applicants for continuing to work on it.

Commissioner Blair thought the Comp Plan would apply to this application. There are no hardships involved here so variances cannot be allowed. The applicant obtained the property with knowledge of the Code and the limitations of the property.

Commissioner Dunn said that he echoed Commissioner Schachter. He thanked the applicant for bringing this project forward. It just comes down to the overall scale.

Chairman Dehm said that he liked the project. He thought they needed another acre. He said that they have a great site but this is just too much for the site. Please come back with a more fitting proposal.

The Chairman called for the question: The motion to deny the major development carried unanimously.

The Chairman called for a short break at 8:25 p.m.

At 8:37 p.m. the meeting reconvened. Commissioner Malloy was reseated.

New Public Hearings:

6. #3-16, Request for a sign variance to revise the square footage calculation for awning signs in areas of Glenwood Meadows.

Applicant: Scott Goldammer
Owners: Weingarten Miller Glenwood, LLC
Location: Multiple addresses within development
Zone: C/1 Limited Commercial District, C/2 Core Commercial

Trent Hyatt presented the staff report. He noted there were multiple properties in Glenwood Meadows. Seven properties were owned by Weingarten Miller. He noted that Lowe's and Target were not party to this application. The request for the sign variance was specific to area calculations for awnings and graphics thereon. Glenwood Meadows has its own sign regulations separate from the City. This is a procedural action amending their Master Sign Plan. In that plan, signs are categorized as primary signs and secondary signs. Primary signs

include fascia signs, feature signs, awning signs and canopy signs. The secondary signs are awning valance signs, projecting blade signs, and plaque signs. Unit B at 20 Market Street was in conflict with section 3.5 of the Glenwood Meadows master sign regulations. Area of the sign was calculated on the entire face of the awning, not on the letters and the logo. The area of the sign seems larger than the actual lettering on the awning. The master sign plan states that tenants with less than 10,000 square feet are allowed one square foot per linear foot of their frontage. This would allow a 20 sq. ft. sign when they would actually be entitled to 25 sq. ft. Lettering is limited to two feet in height. Amend master sign plan by multiplying the length by width of lettering and the logo. No change in the height of the letters. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the request.

Questions of Staff

Commissioner Dunn asked if there was a limit to the size of the awning.

Mr. Hyatt said there was no specific provision but it should be a matter of scale of the awning. There was still a limit to the size of the letters.

Commissioner Schachter asked if all awnings were unlighted. What about the hang down in front (vertical) portion?

Mr. Hyatt said that the signage was lighted from above.

Commissioner Schachter asked if the variance would apply to the vertical part of the awning that hangs down in front.

Mr. Hyatt replied that the valance is covered by another portion of the regulations. It is a secondary sign area.

Commissioner Schachter asked if they had their own internal color guidelines.

Mr. Hyatt said they do.

Commissioner Grosscup asked how they compared to what we have for the downtown area. The one foot per linear foot of sign.

Mr. Hyatt said that multi-tenant buildings allocate sign areas to their tenants.

Commissioner Blair asked if the surface of the awning dictates the square footage of the sign or is it the linear foot measurement of the building.

Mr. Hyatt replied that it is limited by the size of the awning.

Commissioner Malloy asked if the City adopted the master sign plan.

Mr. Hyatt said it was adopted as a variance from our sign code.

Karl Hanlon commented that the Commission is amending a variance.

Commissioner Malloy said most signs are measured by the logo and actual lettering area.

Mr. Hyatt said that the height of the lettering is limited to two feet.

Commissioner Wussow asked about the process of application. Does it go to Meadows for review and then to the City? What prompted this?

Mr. Hyatt replied that Scott thought it was fine but when it reached my desk, it would found to need modification.

Applicant presentation

Scott Goldammer, 6900 Belleview Avenue, Greenwood Village, Colorado, said this is a formality due to a technical error in the Master Sign Plan. The exterior of the awning is always going to be larger than allowed if sign is calculated by that basis. Many of our retailers have removed the awnings from the buildings and gone to channel lighted letters.

Commissioner Schachter asked if this means the tenant has more space to use.

Mr. Goldammer replied that the primary sign would be on the awning. We trying to screen these as best we can.

Commissioner Blair asked about different signs at the Meadows. There are different kinds of signs on the buildings; some businesses have large letters attached to the buildings; others have awnings and he thought there was another type of signage. He asked if the different kinds were part of a plan by management or was it up to the individual.

Mr. Goldammer said the intent was to make the facades differ from the others. We have flat metal awnings and we have the fabric awnings. Some of these awnings would be very difficult to remove. We take into account what each merchant's design or brand is. We did modify the language somewhat. They had "do you wax it?" and we thought that was inappropriate so it was changed to simply "wax it." Their logo is pink. If you looked at Savvy Nails, they have a bright yellow sign; Allure Medical Spa has a bright blue sign. There is a great variety of colors in the signs. This is a sole proprietor from Grand Junction and she decided to expand to Glenwood Springs.

No one from the public wished to speak.

At 9:08 p.m., the Chairman closed the public portion of the hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Grosscup moved to approve the sign variance recommendation for the Glenwood Meadows Master Sign Plan based on findings on page 5 of the staff report. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion. [Inaudible comment made.] The Chairman called for the question: The motion carried unanimously.

7. #6-16 – Consideration of a request for a location and extent review for the expansion of an existing park and ride facility, drainage improvements, and construction of a pedestrian trail.

Applicant: Roaring Fork Transportation Authority
Owner: Roaring Fork Transportation Authority

Location: 2302 and 2307 Wulfsohn Road
Zone: C/1 Limited Commercial District

Trent Hyatt presented the staff report. Location and extent review is a new section in the code. They follow Colorado statutes for special districts and quasi-governmental agencies. RFTA has an application for various activities at its park and ride facility. Property is zoned C/1 and HPOZ applies. In general compliance with City's comp plan. Design details for the retaining wall will come later. The parking lot requires a special use permit.

Questions to staff

Andrew McGregor described the City's development of a trail access leading from Lowe's to Midland Center and then to the parking lot at the White Water Park.

Commissioner Malloy commented on the criteria for this review. The standard is compliance with the Comp Plan. He does not like the wall and we don't know much about its design. There is almost no landscape for this parking lot at all. It is all pretty unattractive next to a major roadway.

Commissioner Blair asked if the P&Z would see this again with the details we want to see.

Mr. Hyatt said this is it as state statute requires speed for this type of application.

Applicant presentation

Michael Hertz, 675 Surrey, Carbondale, director of facilities for RFTA, introduced Nick Senn, RFTA engineer, who will take some of the technical questions. He presented the history about this parcel and the project proposed. The parcel was purchased jointly with the City and the project is partially complete. New elements are a restroom, a trail, and parking for CDOT's Bustang. This is a cooperative effort with CDOT. We need more room to park the buses and for them to turn around. That's how the lot on the other side of the street got involved in this project. We will be expanding our shop. We are trying to complete before the bridge project. We have two grants for this project. We have rules about spending the money that limit what we can do with the wall.

Questions to applicant

Commissioner Grosscup asked about a reviewing agency comment about ADA maximum of 5%. Can you explain this comment?

Nicholas Senn, 85 Red Cliff Circle, Glenwood Springs, senior project manager for RFTA, replied that the comment was regarding a sidewalk on the park and ride side of the street. The sidewalk grade will be greater than ADA allows because it follows the road. There is a difference between sidewalk and trail ADA standards. The grade is more than 5%.

Commissioner Grosscup said she was hearing that it was not practical because you are following the street.

Mr. Senn said trails have a different ADA standard from sidewalks.

Commissioner Blair asked if RFTA intends to complete the parking lot and the project will include preliminary grading for the next phase. He asked if they plan for revegetation of the site.

Mr. Senn said that the north side of property has the City's force main and we cannot build on top of that. We will be talking about walls for the terraced parking lot expansion. We will put native grasses in. Our plans are controlled by who gives us money. We will work with the City on the wall surface and let you pick the color. There will be a series of walls for the terraced parking lots.

Commissioner Dunn asked if there was space for bike racks or space for Bike Share.

Mr. Senn said they will address this as we go along. We Cycle is working with us.

Commissioner Schachter asked if the restroom would be similar to the one at the terminal.

Mr. Hertz said it would be similar and would have automatic timed locks to close the facilities during certain hours.

Commissioner Malloy asked about landscaping and the walls.

Mr. Senn said walking soils are something we have learned about. We are keeping water away from the walls due to the hydro-compactive soils. He said that most of the landscaping was near the retention ponds. The stock pile area will be seeded with native grasses. That dirt will be rearranged as the terraced parking lot progresses. CDOT has asked for some space but it may be a lease because RFTA will eventually need the land themselves.

Commissioner Wussow thanked them for explaining the ambiguity. She wondered if there was an expiration for the grant funds.

Mr. Senn there are three grants and we have to spend all the design money by June. We have three years to complete construction.

Commissioner Blair asked if they will put buildings on the lot on south side of Wulfsohn.

Mr. Heinz said they were building another bus barn. They are trying to get all our buses in doors. All the buses parked outside have to idle all night so we want to get them inside.

The Chairman called for public comment. There was none. The Chairman closed the public portion at 9:51 p.m.

MOTION: Commissioner Schachter moved to recommend approval with conditions on page 4 with an additional condition No. 5 re dust control measures with findings on page 4 of the staff report.

Commissioner Malloy suggested amendment to condition No. 2 to include review and approval by staff prior to issue of the building permit so staff has the opportunity to review the materials and colors of the wall(s). A second amendment would be to add language at the end: "accepted and modified by the new conditions because we are adding some requirements that were not in their plans."

Commissioner Schachter amended his motion to add to the conditions 2 and 4 as stated by Commissioner Malloy. Seconded by Commissioner Grosscup. The Chairman called for the question. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Community Development Director's Update. Liaison to Code Writing Advisory Group. Tim Malloy will do it.

9. Comments from the Commissioners.

None were offered.

10. Adjournment. 9:58 p.m.