

MINUTES
City of Glenwood Springs
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
May 24, 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.

MOTION: Commissioner Grosscup moved to seat alternates Tim Malloy and Chelsea Carnaoli Parkison. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion. Motion carried by voice vote.

1. Roll Call.

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

Absent: Mary Elizabeth Geiger and Sumner Schachter

Also present were City staff members: Andrew McGregor, Community Development Director
Trent L. Hyatt, Planner II
Kathleen Michel, Administrative Assistant
Jon Hoistad, City Attorney's Office

2. Receipt of the minutes:

A. Special meeting, March 29, 2016.

B. Regular meeting, April 26, 2016.

MOTION: Commissioner Dunn moved to receive the minutes of the special meeting on March 29, 2016 as written and minutes of the regular meeting on April 26, 2016 as written. Commissioner Grosscup seconded the motion. Motion carried by voice vote. Commissioners Malloy and Parkison abstained as they were not seated at the prior meetings.

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

No one wished to comment.

New Public Hearings:

4. #05-16 – Consideration of a request for a major subdivision without a development plan and a design variance.

Applicant: Doug Pratte/The Land Studio, Inc. for The Lydia Development Company
Owner: Steinbrecher Investments, LLC
Location: Oasis Creek Subdivision Tract A, North Traver Trail
Zone: PUD R/3 Planned Unit Development Multifamily Residential

Trent Hyatt presented the staff report. Oasis Creek Subdivision was annexed to the city in 1980 and was separated into lots and tracts for various residential uses as well as some limited commercial uses. Tract A is the subject of tonight's hearing was originally zoned for multi-family residential dwellings up to a maximum of 50 residential units. Tract A has been vacant since annexation except for a public trail easement dedicated by the subdivision plat. The trail there today is maintained by the City. The current proposal is to divide Tract A (5.278 acres) into seven lots. Lots 1 through 6 are intended for single family residential development. Lot 7 is reserved for some form of either a conservation easement or combination with the applicants' adjacent lot or some form of deed restriction that would limit its development later. Lots 1 through 6 use Traver Trail for access and the applicants propose to dedicate additional width for the existing public trail where it is not located within the easement deeded to the City. Tract A is governed by the Oasis Creek Subdivision protective covenants. The Architectural Control Committee recently approved a variance that would allow for the subdivision of Tract A into not more than 10 lots. The current proposal would likely limit that number of 50 units significantly as well. The zoning of the property is the Oasis Creek PUD. The majority of surrounding uses are zoned the same way and contain some multi-family as well as single-family residential development.

Mr. Hyatt reviewed some of the standards that apply to the subdivision such as uniform street standards. Traver Trail is a local street that will serve each lot. There was a specific driveway envelope on Lot 6 due to the proximity to a curve and to maintain a safe sight distance in the future. There were no comments from the Public Works Department that would limit utilizing that for access to the proposed lots. The drainage report did not identify need for any specific drainage improvements or features for the subdivision. For the development of single-family homes on each lot, there is enough vegetation to protect from increased runoff from normal storms. The code requires a sidewalk and planting strip on Traver Trail. A sidewalk variance is requested. There are no sidewalks elsewhere in the subdivision. Staff supports this requested design variance. He summarized the findings necessary to approve the variance. Access does not require an access permit from CDOT. All utility services currently exist. Geo hazards are not identified for this property. Site specific soils reports will be required for each home constructed. In 1980, 6.4 acres were dedicated to park land for this development. School, fire and emergency impact fees will be calculated at the time of issuance of building permits.

The Commission has two action items: design variance and approval of major subdivision. The Commission can take action to approve, deny or continue the hearing for further information. Staff recommends approval of both and finds the proposed subdivision is in compliance with City codes.

Questions of staff

Commissioner Grosscup had a question about drainage plans.

Mr. Hyatt replied that the City will require site specific drainage plans for each residence constructed.

Commissioner Blair asked if this was a recommendation to Council.

Mr. Hyatt confirmed that it would go to the Council next.

Commissioner Blair asked if a drainage report was submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Hyatt said it was in the packet. Each property will require a site specific plan at the time they build. Large amounts of undisturbed vegetation will protect lands from runoff.

Commissioner Wussow asked who will serve these lots, West Glenwood Sanitation or the City.

Mr. Hyatt said that City services apply.

Commissioner Wussow asked about the slopes on the lots.

Mr. Hyatt said the slopes were less than 20% so Hillside Preservation Overlay Zone did not apply.

Commissioner Wussow asked about lot sizes in adjacent areas.

Mr. Hyatt said the lots were a similar size.

Commissioner Malloy clarified that this was an amendment to a subdivision. Annexation agreement addressed school dedication, water, and wastewater. He wondered if the City had the ability to renegotiate the fees established by the annexation agreement. He wondered if the Applicant would consider an increase to that fee on the grounds that it is so much lower than if there were 50 lots.

Mr. Hyatt said this was a legal question that would have to be looked into if it was the recommendation from the Planning & Zoning Commission. We'd have to ask Applicant if they were open to that.

Commissioner Malloy asked about the open space requirement and whether the open space standard had changed over the years. Would this subdivision meet our current standards for open space? He said it was not clear whether staff was contemplating Lot 7 as open space. The Applicant seems to be saying it might have development potential in the future. If it wouldn't meet open space in current conditions, would Applicant consider dedicating Lot 7 as open space in the context of this subdivision?

Mr. Hyatt clarified that undeveloped areas of the lots counted toward open space. He was not able to compare to past years.

Commissioner Malloy said we don't know the impact of this subdivision amendment on overall open space.

Mr. Hyatt said that because of the reduced number of lots, a balance is maintained.

Commissioner Malloy asked if the fee they were talking about, the \$150, is that a substitute for the tap fee or is it an annexation fee per lot.

Mr. McGregor said our practice and our legal advice has been to honor the annexation agreement. It is a fraction of what is full retail today. In terms of the open space, we've never done an analysis comparing this to compliance with PUD standards today. There was a great amount of acreage dedicated as part of this PUD, some as formal park space but there is also a great amount of natural hillsides plus the whole trail corridor down to Highway 6 which is also dedicated to the City.

Mr. Hyatt said that Applicant has not indicated that they will develop Lot 7. They are reviewing options for how they want to restrict that property. They own the property to the north of Lot 7. When I refer to a combination with their property, they want to combine it with their own property so it is not a building site.

Commissioner Dunn questioned the plat process for these lots. He also wondered when the protection of Lot 7 becomes final.

Mr. Hyatt believed the language was "prior to recordation of final plat."

Commissioner Dunn wondered regarding the lack of sidewalk. Are bikers and pedestrians using the trail easement? Do they walk in the road?

Mr. Hyatt said that a couple of trails crossed the lots. People do use the roadway to walk.

Commissioner Grosscup wondered if there was an option for an ADU.

Mr. Hyatt said that an ADU is not a condition of the original PUD.

Commissioner Parkison asked about use of the unofficial trail at Lot 6. Was there a possibility to relocate this trail?

Mr. Hyatt said that the owners had some concerns about people using the property over the years as open space. Trails end up where topography places them, rather than over steep grades.

Commissioner Parkison asked about the use of Lot 7 and any future plans with the formal trail.

Chairman Dehm commented on the detail of the lots. There is not a specific development plan for this subdivision. He thought this was pretty detailed for a subdivision without a development plan.

Mr. Hyatt said that each individual lot will be subject to Oasis Creek covenants as it is developed. If they want to change from the PUD, we will see them again.

Commissioner Malloy wondered if there is a reason why they didn't identify a building envelope on each the lots. We do have some hypothetical driveways and buildings but that will be up to the individual property owner in the future.

Mr. Hyatt replied that the characteristics of the lots will dictate where they place the buildings.

Commissioner Malloy commented that limited disturbance of the surface is more likely with building envelopes.

Mr. Hyatt said that the site specific drainage plans will address this.

Applicant presentation

Doug Pratte, The Land Studio, Inc., 365 River Bend Way, said he was there on behalf of Lydia Development Company, aka Jerry and Mary Steinbrecher. Dean Gordon is the engineer for this project. He pointed out the Steinbrechers' residential property. There is a relationship between their residential property and Tract A. There is a commitment not to develop Lot 7 but the mechanism has not been chosen. The other six lots will be developed. The access for Lot 6 is dictated so it cannot be on the curve in the road. Lots are a little more than half an acre. In terms of amending the PUD, we are not attempting to amend the PUD and looked at what was allowed in the PUD. He presented a quick time video to illustrate the subdivision and how it looks.

Mary Steinbrecher, 611 West Harbor Drive, Glenwood Springs, said that in 1993 they purchased the 5 acres across from them that was originally approved for 40 condos. Most of the neighbors were not in favor of that much density and traffic in the area. We have planned to do something with the property that was consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. We wanted to preserve and protect that. With that in mind, we began this project with six half-acre lots and will take Lot 7 as part of our property. The trails are natural deer trails that have appeared over the years. Everyone walks their dogs in the streets and pushes their strollers in the streets. No matter where you walk in the subdivision, you walk in the street. We have no sidewalks. People do park along the road adjacent to our property. We want to preserve and protect the neighborhood as it is now.

Questions of the applicant

Commissioner Wussow questioned the actions of the HOA architectural review committee or design review committee.

Mr. Pratte said there is an active design review committee. We did interact with the committee.

Commissioner Malloy asked if the applicant would be opposed to a plat note regarding the future of Lot 7 as undeveloped.

Mr. Pratte said they would attach a deed restriction after the plat was recorded. That is how the accountant said to do it. The difficulty to develop it was that it was on the switchback curve.

Commissioner Malloy asked about the trail. If those are volunteer trails, you should consider where they connect. Would the applicant consider a trail easement at Lot 1 to accommodate the trail system?

Mr. Pratte said that we don't want to do an impervious surface. We hope to leave it available for the wildlife that use it.

Mrs. Steinbrecher said it is a dirt trail and it is dirty. A majority of people walking are using the road. She did not think a hard surface was appropriate there.

Commissioner Malloy asked about the left side of the image where it looks like a trail.

Mrs. Steinbrecher said they were looking at the original driveway to Traver Ranch. The public uses it all the time. She thought it was an open space dedication to the City.

Jerry Steinbrecher said the trails are part of our neighborhood. People use the road and then cross the trail on Lot 7. They don't use the deer trail that goes behind the proposed lots because it is so steep and dirty. He thought people were voting with their feet.

Commissioner Blair asked if it was definite there will only be seven lots and open space.

Mr. Pratte said six lots and the seventh will be deed restricted.

Commissioner Blair asked what happens to the units originally approved.

Mr. Pratte said there was never a site plan applied to the property to develop 50 units. He said it would not happen. It would have to go through a process with the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council to get that approved.

Commissioner Blair wondered if residents will be allowed to access Lot 7.

Mr. Pratte said that there is a pedestrian trail there now. He said that there will not be easements from the backs of the six lots.

Commissioner Blair asked about the street in front of the lots. Will that street be repaved in front of the lots?

Mr. Pratte answered that there will be new driveways paved to the edge of the road but Traver Trail will stay as it is.

Commissioner Dunn was trying to figure out if there is some sort of solution to where people are walking. Was there consideration of improving the deer path or was there something to encourage people to walk off of the street? This seems to be a safety issue.

Mr. Pratte said there was a utility easement outside the right of way on Traver Trail that could accommodate a soft shoulder/path as opposed to a five foot concrete sidewalk with a landscape median.

Commissioner Blair asked about parkland which was settled in the past. Where is the 6-acre parkland?

Mrs. Steinbrecher showed it on the map. It is where the playground is. There are also small pockets of open space here and there.

At 7:12 p.m. the Chair opened the hearing to public comment.

Verne Lincoln, 614 Traver Trail, Glenwood Springs, thanked them for not building apartments. He said he had worked on water and sewer lines up there. Lot 7 has a 50-foot ravine so there is no way to build back in there. The water line is in the road. There are no sidewalks up there. The improved trails are blacktop. There are no longer enough children living up there to get the school bus up there. He talked about plans from Glenwood Caverns for a large parking lot on Iron Mountain. Our roads could not handle that. He talked about the wildlife on Lot 7.

Jesslyn Hildred, 502 Princeton Circle, Glenwood Springs, said that she would like to maintain walkability of the neighborhood. She described her route to the park from her home with her toddler on a strider using the deer trail. She wants neighborhood to stay walkable so kids can play and ride bikes. There are more families with kids moving into the neighborhood.

Christine Godfread, 544 Traver Trail, Glenwood Springs, said there was amazing open space up there. We see all the people from Traver Point walking their dogs in the open space. Her son can go to his friend's house by bike. She is concerned about construction vehicles on their narrow road. Younger families with children are moving up there. The curve is dangerous.

Virginia Minch, 819 Traver Trail, Glenwood Springs, said that the curve will become less visible with more homes built along the roadway. Line of sight is a concern for her. She is concerned about preserving the trails in the neighborhood.

At 7:24 p.m. the Chair closed public comment.

Applicant response

Mrs. Steinbrecher said that most comments are about the deer trail along the ravine. With new houses, the deer will move their trail over and create a new trail naturally.

Mr. Pratte said that a concrete sidewalk is more urban landscape. It will behoove us to take another look at the soft path that allows people to walk. Our preference is to not have to put in a sidewalk. We prefer a soft path. He repeated that they were trying to respect the established path for the neighborhood.

Mrs. Steinbrecher wants to follow the natural trails.

Additional questions to staff or applicant

Commissioner Dunn asked if they could add a condition regarding the design variance for the deer trail.

Jon Hoistad, City Attorney's office, replied that the Commission could work with staff to get the applicants to commit to something.

Commissioner Dunn wanted to encourage people to use the natural trails and not walk in the road.

Commissioner Blair asked Trent to revise conditions to have street trees not so close to driveways and to provide some type of walkway, maybe with crushed gravel, along the utility easement. How can we include that in the conditions?

Chairman Dehm asked about the utility easement. Was it also used as a trail?

Mr. Hyatt replied that it was both.

Chairman asked if there was an easement for the trails on Lot 7.

Mr. Hyatt said there was for the trail up through the Steinbrecher parcel.

Chairman Dehm questioned that the right fork was still part of the easement.

Mr. Hyatt confirmed that it was a utility and trail easement.

Commissioner Grosscup asked for clarification about neighbors walking along the property on an existing trail. She said she was talking about both sides of the fork.

Mr. Hyatt pointed out the trail that was not a formal easement.

There was a discussion without benefit of microphones regarding easements and deer trails.

Mr. Hyatt said the paved trail went up to Princeton and the other went along the rear property line.

Commissioner Malloy said that he had some condition questions. There was language he did not like and wanted staff to clarify it. There is language that says it applies to (c) the Annexation Agreement, (d) the PUD agreement and (e) the Covenants. On page 8 under recommended conditions, at the end you have "or as amended" in each of those. Is that amended by virtue of these conditions or should we say that? What was your intent there?

Mr. Hyatt replied that his intent was for amendments in the future so we may want to add some other language there.

Commissioner Malloy said the second piece is Condition 8b "any other restrictions that the developer wishes to incorporate that are beyond the scope of the Glenwood Springs Municipal Code." What does that language accomplish? What is your intent there?

Mr. Hyatt replied that it was just for the restrictions on the lots that they may want to include as deed restrictions. If they have specific architectural considerations or if they go beyond the things currently outlined.

Commissioner Malloy asked if it was standard language that we use.

Mr. Hyatt replied that it was taken from a previous one that you just heard last month, from Lot 13 division. It is something we have included in the past.

Commissioner Malloy said he did not like the language as it means that there are things that can be restricted or otherwise altered without any real discussion.

Mr. Hyatt said that technically they could apply those regardless.

Chairman Dehm said we'll get there with the motion.

Commissioner Blair had more questions on recommendations on 3, Lot 7 is not intended for development and shall acknowledge and address this limitation in a form. He thought that "address" seemed general and vague. Could "confirm" be used instead of "address"? On 8a, off-street parking shall be permitted in accordance with the Glenwood Springs Municipal Code. That should be clarified as to when

Mr. Hyatt said that would depend on the year the building permit was issued.

Commissioner Blair said we might not know next year what your intent was. That's why he wanted to clarify it. He continued to 8b. Shouldn't this say subject to staff review?

Mr. Hyatt said that was not the intent so we may remove that altogether.

Commissioner Blair continued just so people know what was added to the agreement. He said that 8d opens up conflicts with the PUD Agreement and any conditions that might be imposed by the City at this time. Can it be clarified?

Mr. Hoistad said that it works with the PUD and may be more restrictive over and above what already exists for the PUD. The PUD is more restrictive than Code.

Commissioner Blair said that condition f, installation and maintenance of drainage improvements and so forth are the responsibility of the owner of each lot. Wouldn't it help clarify things if we added "in accordance with the master drainage report"?

Mr. Hyatt replied with "sure."

MOTION: Action Item 1: Design variance from 5 foot sidewalk and 5 foot planting strip. Commissioner Malloy moved to approve the requested design variance as indicated in staff recommendations without change and with findings on pages 6-8 and clarify that rather than a hardship that street front sidewalk is out of character with the neighborhood. Commissioner Grosscup seconded the motion.

Commissioner Dunn asked if this was where they should be considering an additional condition regarding the deer path or would that be more appropriately served in the next action item.

Chairman Dehm said as he read it, this motion should not have additional conditions attached to it.

Commissioner Malloy said it was his intention to address the deer path in the second motion.

Mr. Hoistad said to wait for subdivision motion.

Commissioner Wussow suggested a walking path between Lot 3 and Lot 4 to get people to Lot 7. She said that it would be a difficult subdivision to install sidewalks in and she agreed with the motion to eliminate sidewalks.

Commissioner Dunn had a question re gravel walkway along the street. If that was to come up would it also be done with the second action item?

Chairman Dehm agreed.

Commissioner Grosscup said she seconded the motion as it would lead to continuity in the neighborhood not to have a sidewalk.

Commissioner Malloy commented that it would be part of the motion related to the action.

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

MOTION: Action Item 2: Commissioner Malloy moved to approve the request for subdivision without development plan and include staff recommendations on page 7 with a finding with conditions from staff report with the following changes strike 8b and that conditions 8c,d and e include language “except before or as amended by the conditions contained herein or as otherwise amended pursuant to approval by the City Council if required” and that is intended to get at the generic case where there is some amendment to one or the other of the three documents that are referred to in c, d and e. Only apply that specific language to c. The other two would read “except as amended by the conditions contained herein or as otherwise amended.” Condition 7: Development of residential structures on lots shall be in accordance with the requirements of Title 070 “in effect at the time of the building permit.” New condition 9: “The applicant would revise the plan to include a dedicated trail easement either along the alignment of existing deer trail or as close to it as possible given their other design objectives.” Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.

Commissioner Dunn asked about the language for 8 c and d.

Commissioner Malloy repeated the language changes.

Commissioner Dunn had concern that applicant has stated the majority of people walk in the road. Will that be enough to get people off the road?

Commissioner Grosscup inquired when we say “easement” what is our standard. 5 feet, 10 feet?

Mr. Hyatt said the deer path is one foot wide.

Commissioner Grosscup said that she doesn't know what this will accomplish.

Commissioner Malloy said that his intent was to alter the situation from the public being unwilling to use the trail to avoid trespass. He thought that the motion should be altered to include a reasonable width. He does not care if the trail is paved. He does not care

about the alignment except that it be similar to what is there today because we have learned that the trail is used. That makes for a compelling reason to provide an easement for this particular trail. It needs to be similar to what is there today. Sees compelling reason to establish trail through the neighborhood. The applicant has expressed a willingness to allow legal access. He wants to preserve that right to use the trail.

Commissioner Blair spoke re trail paving with gravel, etc. and including the timing of the trail to after the third building permit. He advocated for a soft shoulder trail with gravel.

Commissioner Malloy says as the maker of the motion, he does not accept that amendment.

Chairman Dehm said he would be more comfortable with the trail behind the lots and go away from the soft shoulder idea. It would be necessary to retain the neighborhood to use this trail and stop walking in the streets.

Commissioner Malloy says the applicant should not be required to do both.

Commissioner Dunn suggested that we leave it to staff and applicant to work out what is best.

Commissioner Malloy said that the deer trail easement width should be 10 feet.

AMEND MOTION: It was agreed to amend the motion to have either the deer trail easement (10 foot width) or an improved soft shoulder along the street.

Chairman Dehm called for the question, reminding the Commissioners of the amended motion and the either or choice, and the easement width. The motion carried unanimously.

Recess at 8:13 p.m. Meeting resumed at 8:23 p.m.

5. #10-16 – Consideration of a request for a location and extent review.

Applicant: Roaring Fork School District RE-1
Owner: Roaring Fork School District RE-1
Location: 504 27th Street
Zone: C/1 Limited Commercial

Trent Hyatt presented the staff report. As background, in February the Council added a section to the Municipal Code for location and extent review for development projects by public entities in compliance with Colorado Revised Statutes allowing local public agencies and special districts an exemption from local land use control. The process allows the local jurisdiction's commission to conduct an informal advisory review. The Roaring Fork School District is proposing addition of a steel building with an 18,617 square foot footprint at the existing transportation site in Glenwood Springs. There are 18 passenger vehicle parking spaces and some landscaping to be added. The site and surrounding properties are zoned C/1. Properties to the north and east are zoned C/3, general commercial and there are some residential PUDs in the area.

There are no specific considerations are associated with the location and extend review except that it shall be in compliance with the municipality's comprehensive plan. This parcel is identified as commercial in the City's Comp Plan. Goals ability to promote long term sustainable, diverse economic development. Public schools are specified as a goal. Another goal is to maintain the City as a regional center. C/1 would apply to private providers, for general service establishments. All service operations would occur within a building. That is the intent of the new building as they need space for bus storage as well as washing and conducting maintenance on the vehicles. All loading and unloading shall occur on private property. No odor, flare, noise or vibration is projected beyond the site. Servicing buses inside the new building will help to meet this standard. The Commercial Design Standards would apply to private development projects. The proposed layout takes advantage of the topography, layout and existing buildings and uses and vehicular circulation.

The Rio Grande Trail is adjacent to the site. A sidewalk is not proposed at this time. The building does not include any Commercial Design Standard architectural features except for window frosting. The District lacks funds to provide architectural features at this site. There is some masonry to be included in building in El Jebel. Parking lots will try to include a limited amount of landscaping but will not comply with the Commercial Design Standards.

The application was circulated to internal departments and others for comments. Black Hills Gas had no comments; the Building Department had specific comments but did outline the large mass of the building and the need to properly discharge an oil and sand separator; the Electric Department stated that they may need to upgrade the transformer at the site; Engineering outlined the need for percolation testing in order to determine proper size for drainage and also the need for a sidewalk along 27th Street. Parks and Recreation recommended revising the Autumn Blaze maple tree to an alternate species that would be better suited there. Water and Wastewater responded that their comments addressed specifications for and questions regarding providing water and sewer service to the proposed building and the installation of new fire hydrant that would be required.

The Commission has three options: approve, approve with findings and conditions, or deny the application finding that it is not in compliance.

Commissioner Dunn wondered if the City had plans for a grade separation at 27th Street and South Glen. I don't want to do anything here that would interfere with plans for that intersection so anything we need to do should probably be done now.

Mr. McGregor commented that the City had been talking to CDOT and RFTA about the need for grade separated crossings at both the north-south length of the Rio Grande Trail and over Highway 82. Those plans haven't congealed very far at this point, but it is recognized as an area that needs attention. To the extent that the School District can work with us going forward, I think we can continue to work on that. These address mutual needs.

Commissioner Dunn also inquired about the use of the existing building for preschool and kindergarten classrooms.

Mr. Hyatt said there were no specifics other than as noted by Commissioner Dunn.

Commissioner Blair asked if a drainage report had been submitted.

Mr. Hyatt said it had not been submitted but would be required prior to issuance of a building permit. We included a condition that they provide information associated with comments from review.

Commissioner Blair asked if the recommended plant was a tree or a shrub.

Mr. Hyatt said it was a tree and that it would be more suitable to the site in terms of the parking lot and runoff, things impacting the site that might mean their choice was not the best species for the location.

[Commissioner Blair's additional comments were inaudible and unclear as he was not speaking into the microphone.]

Mr. Hyatt said that the objective here is to be a commenting agency in terms of our review. There are many aspects that they don't meet.

Commissioner Parkison asked about the angle parking spaces shown on the eastern portion. Are they already there or are they being added?

Mr. Hyatt said they were proposed.

Commissioner Parkison wondered if there was any expected change in traffic in that narrow passageway on the eastern angle.

Mr. Hyatt said it looked like there would be a 24 foot aisle width between the building and the new spaces. That is a standard width for two-way traffic.

Commissioner Grosscup said that there are things she doesn't understand either. This is an application for review of the construction, so it would meet the same tests as any other commercial development.

Mr. Hyatt replied no, that the location and extend review is a specific process that allows quasi-governmental agencies and special districts a means to bypass local land use authority but still allow the local planning and zoning commission to review an application and make recommendations. Limited oversight in our regard is compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. They can take or leave our recommendations.

Commissioner Grosscup said she agreed with the Autumn Blaze Maple. Regarding the sidewalk, the condition was "shall work with the city." The sidewalk is needed but will be expensive with the existing slope. What does "shall work with the city" mean?

Mr. Hyatt said we intentionally left it wide open in terms of what that could be. We may need additional right of way there. We would like them to be our partner in that, whether it be obtaining an easement, right of way funds or actually constructing it themselves. We all understand that it is necessary and needed. We can be more specific is you need us to.

Commissioner Grosscup commented that this would be a showcase building as one was entering the town, so given the constrained budget whatever they can do support that is important.

Commissioner Wussow is curious whether this facility will service activities that took place elsewhere in town. Does it allow us to free up other spaces that were being used for some of the services?

Mr. Hyatt replied that he did not think so. It is meeting a general need at this location.

Commissioner Blair asked if staff was concerned about the building, visibility, location or the code itself.

Mr. Hyatt replied that it was all of them as it is a prominent location in the community. Also, staff felt it did not comply with standards that would be applied to any other commercial development in the City.

Commissioner Blair commented that the site was only visible from Hwy. 82 when moving slowly. Main building is pretty good. He thought that staff could work out an improvement in the appearance that would not raise the costs. He was also concerned about the short time given staff for review.

Mr. Hyatt replied that they had an earlier update that predated the materials in the packet.

Commissioner Malloy asked if they have authority to apply conditions.

Mr. McGregor replied that conditions function like suggestions as it is at the discretion of the Board of Education. Our role is purely advisory.

Commissioner Malloy said he had seen a news article stating that a short term solution being contemplated for 27th and South Grand Avenue was a round-about. He felt that was not a friendly pedestrian solution as traffic does not stop.

Mr. McGregor acknowledged that it functions differently than a traditional signalized intersection.

Commissioner Malloy said he was thinking about the potential for a trail connection between the Rio Grande Trail and the sidewalk that crosses the bridge and takes you to the trail on the west side of the river. If a round-about is the solution there, then this side of 27th isn't a great solution for a trail. The other side would be better because you could cross to the right hand side, stay on the right hand side of the bridge and get on the river.

Chairman Dehm asked about building materials.

Mr. Hyatt replied that it was a steel building and they are proposing alternating colors which they outlined, probably tan and gold, to match the existing buildings.

Chairman Dehm wondered if we would allow such a building if it was a regular commercial development.

Mr. Hyatt replied that we would if they proposed a steel building. We have had steel buildings in industrial zones proposed such as Osiris. There are some steel aspects to some of their buildings. The key there is alternating materials. i.e., a masonry façade, projections. If you construct this way, it would just look different.

Chairman Dehm commented that it would look better if it was a regular commercial project.

Applicant presentation

Gregg Mason of Tabb Associates, 56 Edwards Village Blvd., Edwards, architect, said that the purpose of the building is to replace an existing structure, allowing them to pull a bus inside for service. The existing building will become space for the landscaping and parks department. There will be no additional traffic to the site. He pointed out the bus wash bay. They are adding paved parking spaces and a sand and oil separator. They are willing to work with the trees to plant a hardier species. The percolation test is under way.

Shannon Pelland, Assistant Superintendent, Roaring Fork School District, 1405 Grand Ave., Glenwood Springs, spoke about uses of buildings on site. Preschool classroom are for overflow as there was no room for the programs at other schools. They will be relocated to the new East Bank School and Glenwood Elementary School following their respective building programs. There are things that were not included at the time the budget for the project was developed. Regarding the sidewalk issue, we might be able to provide right of way.

Commissioner Blair said he could not hear the architect's comments and asked if he addressed the building exterior and what the staff was requesting.

Mr. Mason said that he did not mention it. At this point, it is a budget issue. We chose a simple metal building to keep costs down. He said that changes from the metal building would cost too much to change the budget. We might do some facade things.

Commissioner Blair asked about the maple trees.

Mr. Mason replied that those were the trees suggested by the landscape architect but if Parks and Rec has a more appropriate species, that is fine.

Commissioner Malloy said he parked on the site and there is a two-foot grade drop on the property. He does not have an issue with the location. Lower height would help it blend in better. Suggests shrubs along the trail to screen visual impact instead of trees between buildings.

Commissioner Wussow asked about long term plans for the site.

Ms. Pelland said that long-term it will remain a maintenance and transportation center for the District. The preschool program will go somewhere else in a couple of years. Classrooms will become office space for grounds, One maintenance and transportation operations. One end of the building is actually garages and they will continue to use that area for maintenance of their white fleet.

Commissioner Dunn do you have foot traffic from the tech center. Is there some ability to provide an access to the Rio Grande Trail?

Ms. Pelland was not sure cost would justify this. Most people come from outside the Glenwood Springs area. Most of them come in from other areas. We have very few people that would get to the site on bikes. Our drivers park there for a limited time, most of them have other jobs. They are in to drive their buses and then back out in their vehicles. It would not get much use.

Commissioner Blair visibility from Rio Grande Trail would be improved by shrubbery. The workers and staff might appreciate some shade trees.

At 9:07 p.m., the Chair opened the meeting for public comment. No one wished to comment. The public portion of the hearing was closed.

MOTION: Commissioner Malloy moved to approve with findings and conditions on page 4 of the staff report with the following additions: that applicant consider lowering building elevation and focus landscape budget on shrubs along Rio Grande trail whether they include the trees or not. Commissioner Grosscup seconded the motion.

Commissioner Wussow was not sure if budget would allow the cost of lowering the grade of the building for additional grading and concrete work.

Commissioner Dunn asked for the east facade to have a little more detail.

Commissioner Grosscup said that she has seen people walking in the street. People walking there are at risk.

Chairman Dehm wants to see the area look better. Would like to see the east side be prettier.

Chairman Dehm called for the question. The motion carried unanimously.

6. Community Development Director's Update.

Reminded the Commissioners of the workshop sponsored by Garfield County. Asked them to RSVP directly to Becky at the County.

Items for future agendas were an upcoming subdivision on Midland at the old First Baptist PUD and a mobile home park expansion request in West Glenwood.

7. Comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Grosscup commented on traffic congestion on Midland at the round-about. She thought it needed signage for "Take Your Turn!"

Commissioner Blair said that he attended the County's consideration of the Cattle Creek subdivision and rezoning of an 80-acre parcel. The PUD was turned down based partly

on comments from this City and Carbondale and also because of the access issues. CDOT has said there will be no more traffic lights on Highway 82. The rezoning was voted down 2 to 1 which clearly indicated that they did not think the market was ready for it but if they could be given a better market study that indicated it was appropriate, they might consider it. That was his perception.

Commissioner Dunn asked if the dog kennel approval was appealed.

Mr. McGregor indicated it would go to Council at its next meeting on June 2. A resident of Cottonwood Landing filed the appeal.

Commissioner Dunn said he had some articles from the National Board of Realtors on the national view on affordable housing that he would make available for anyone interested. He thought the articles seemed right on for what we are experiencing here. He also asked about the code revision progress.

Commissioner Dehm missed the last 6th Street meeting. We are working toward a common goal.

Mr. McGregor said that the design team was now working on the design of the park and it will come back to the committee soon. The Planning Commission will get another look at it. They will finalize some street sections from the Vapor Caves out to Devereux Road and we be taking that to the next step and start on some streetscape sections. Most importantly, we reached a point where we will start some land use mapping and some rough design standards to reflect the land use goals. There are four different quadrants: (1) The historic area east of Pine (the Pool, the Hotel, the Vapor Caves, and the hydro-electric building). The emphasis there is on preservation. Don't compromise those landmark buildings. (2) From Pine west to Laurel, particularly on the north side there is some opportunity for expanding those buildings but not at the expense of compromising the neighborhood to the rear. Don't create things that impact the view shed of the Hotel Colorado; two to three-story buildings; perhaps another story on the south side. We are trying to coordinate that with the Pool's vision and some potential parking structure. The Pool has been somewhat reluctant to support at this point. (3) West of Laurel, out Highway 6, probably two different modified standards. On the north side, along motel row, increased intensity of development and trying to create more of a street edge, bringing things out and encouraging residential to be combined with any commercial development. (4) Across the street is where the most building mass/height can be accommodated without compromising any of the existing historic neighborhoods. Also, there was strong support for a pedestrian corridor and potentially large parking structure/civic-oriented structure. That would be behind Big Horn Motors near the Century Link structure. That was kind of a breakthrough that the group agreed to that. Fifth Street will be run all the way through to create an intermediate connection over to Two Rivers Park instead of going all the way out to Devereux and then across. This would be more of a straight shot.

Commissioner Malloy said when he last saw the progress, they were talking about several broad concepts. One was Center; one was Node. Has there been a narrowing of that discussion and which

Chairman Dehm said it had been narrowed and reworked.

Mr. McGregor asked if he would like to be sent the graphics that we were looking at during the last meeting. He said he would rather send them now and when new ones were received, send them.

Commissioner Malloy inquired about the parking structure that the Pool was reluctant to support. Is it at the same location?

Mr. McGregor said that would be vertically above their parking lot on River Street.

Multiple voices were commenting.

Mr. McGregor said he thought it was more the principle of dictating something to them. It is still a line in the sand kind of thing, not that it's a bad land use.

Chairman Dehm asked if the next meeting was the Steering Committee meeting or

Mr. McGregor replied that they had a public meeting and a Steering Committee meeting and he was not sure of the schedule. He will get a schedule out to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Dunn asked if there was an update on the code revision. He said he was still confused on the process.

Mr. McGregor explained the way the process would work. The work was done in three different modules. The first module is the process module. They are drafting the module and it will be with us by June 15. They will get it to staff; we get to work on it for about a week to make sure that it is accurate and then we will distribute it to the P&Z and the Steering Committee. They will have one meeting with the P&Z to hear your comments but the idea is they don't keep coming back and forth. The budget is tight so they don't come back and forth every time we suggest changes. You have one early opportunity per module and then at the end we will make all of the refinements collectively. This mirrors the process they did in Carbondale. It is simply a way to eliminate meeting back and forth for my changes/your changes. It is efficiency driven, not exclusion driven.

Commissioner Dunn asked if they are getting input from someone at the City as they are drafting.

Mr. McGregor reminded him that they prepared an extensive document at the end of the code assessment and analysis process. That, coupled with all the stakeholder interviews they conducted last fall and earlier this year, and the meetings with Council and the meetings with you, all of that is their fodder for making the first set of drafts.

Commissioner Dunn said that he was hoping they don't do a cookie cutter thing where take what they have done for other communities and try to include what we said and spit out a generic thing with a few little changes here and there and our only chance for input is to say "yes" or "no".

Mr. McGregor said it was our document and we can chew on it as much as we want. They will write it based on what they have heard. That is the way this is structured.

Commissioner Malloy said he has seen three communities where they worked and they are really good at it. They have sort of a standard approach but it works.

8. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.