

**SPECIAL MEETING
City of Glenwood Springs
Planning and Zoning Commission
Development Code Rewrite Project Kick-off
March 29, 2016
Training Room, 3rd Floor, Room 302
101 W. 8th Street
12:00 noon to 1:30 p.m.**

Present were Commissioners: Michael Blair, Michael Dunn, Marco Dehm, Kathryn Grosscup, Sumner Schachter and Tim Malloy

Absent: Mary Elizabeth Geiger and Ingrid Wussow

Also present were City staff members: Andrew McGregor, Community Development Director
Jill Peterson, City Planner
Kathleen Michel, Administrative Assistant
Gretchen Ricehill, Senior Planner
Trent Hyatt, Planner II

Representatives of Clarion present: Matt Goebel and Tareq Wafaie

Member of the public present: Doug Pratt

On Tuesday, March 29, 2016, members of the City of Glenwood Springs Planning and Zoning Commission attended a Development Code Rewrite Project Kick-off meeting in the Training Room, Room 302, on the Third Floor of City Hall from 12:00 noon to 1:30 p.m. Representatives of Clarion, Matt Goebel and Tareq Wafaie, the City's Development Code Rewrite Consultants, apprised the Commission of their progress to date.

Using a PowerPoint® presentation, the consultants outlined the process they will follow during the code rewrite. They pointed out that their first action was to point out the problems with the code and now they are solving those problems. They expect to accomplish this within a one year timeline.

Commissioner Malloy asked if they envisioned the code rewrite giving the Commissioners more intellectual freedom in their review. He agreed that more things should be handled on the administrative level.

Commissioner Blair agreed with his statement.

Commissioner Malloy noted that the sketch plan seems to have disappeared from the process.

Mr. Goebel said they were seeking to get meaningful feedback on a project and not lock it into something too early.

Commissioner Schachter hoped the end product will give applicants a clearer view of the process.

Mr. Wafaie said the rewrite would allow staff and the Commission to move forward.

Commissioner Malloy talked about how Pitkin County tried to build a partnership with an applicant and be less authoritative.

Doug Pratt commented that codes were a linear process and design is not. He thought that interaction improved the process.

Mr. Wafaie commented that the pre-application process in Glenwood Springs worked well.

Mr. Goebel asked the Commission about its priorities.

Commissioner Malloy commented that he may not be as familiar with the Glenwood Code as others but noted that landscaping is the last thing that is considered. He felt that Glenwood Springs seemed to lack this focus.

Commissioner Blair commented that many developers think landscaping is not important or that it is too costly.

Mr. Wafaie noted that one size fits all does not work for Glenwood Springs.

Commissioner Schachter commented that with green-scaping and limited water usage, beautiful landscaping can still be done.

The consultants wondered if the City had an approved plant list.

Ms. Ricehill replied that the City has an approved tree list.

Mr. McGregor commented that there are some unique trees in Glenwood and he believed the City had a fairly complete inventory of them.

Ms. Ricehill pointed out that one of the problems with trees is that they are in the parking section of the code.

Ms. Peterson commented that over time, a landscape plan gets left behind as a development is completed.

Commissioner Malloy commented that Glenwood Springs was more of a city than other communities in the area.

Commissioner Schachter said that he has heard others comment that Glenwood Springs is "more real." He thought that was accurate when taking into consideration the people, the demographics, traffic and other elements.

Commissioner Dunn wanted to maintain perspective for the code users who need to follow design guidelines.

Commissioner Schachter wanted to know how they would incentivize or partnership for affordability.

Mr. Wafaie said that affordable is sprinkled throughout the Code. They are loosening some of the conditions so it is easier to build.

Commissioner Schachter wondered how a code might steer away the requests to undermine the fee structure.

Mr. Wafaie said the first choice was to remove the fees from the code.

Mr. Goebel asked if the City charged for individual variances or all together as a single fee. He also pointed out that allowing neighborhood retail may change an area.

Mr. Goebel also asked about inclusionary housing and whether it should be carried forward in the code since there was currently a moratorium on imposing it.

The response to that was to leave it in the code unless Council changed it.

Mr. McGregor asked if they could provide an example of a successful project for us to look at.

Mr. Goebel suggested that we look at Carbondale which they just finished. There is a new distinction between major and minor.

Commissioner Dunn asked if other communities charged fees per variance.

Mr. Goebel replied that they do and it tends to dis-incentivize the requests.

Commissioner Malloy commented that a community becomes known for granting variances.

Chairman Dehm commented that he liked what he was hearing. He said that HPOZ and parking give him the most difficulty.

Mr. Goebel noted that the process would take a deep dive on reorganization and parking was one of the targets. He said that drafts will contain footnotes and comments and that the first module will be the procedural portion of the code.

No regular business was conducted during this informal session.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.