



MANITOU SPRINGS CITY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

All upcoming CPC meetings are scheduled to be hybrid,
Zoom (remote) or in-person at Memorial Hall.

In Person: Memorial Hall

606 Manitou Avenue

Manitou Springs, CO 80829

Remote: A link is provided on the City's Official Website at

<https://www.manitouspringsco.gov/544/All-Boards-and-Commissions>

December 10, 2025

5:30 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. CPC Minutes 11-12-2025

C. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. MJT 2503 - 134 and 142 Manitou Avenue Dillon Mobility Hub Temporary Use Permit (request to continue to January 14, 2026)

F. OTHER BUSINESS

1. LUDC updates - Density, Height, and Variance Criteria

G. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION AND UPDATES

H. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioners:

Alan Delwiche, Chair (12/31/2026)

Justin Wilson, Vice Chair (12/31/2029)

Stephen Graybill (12/31/2026)

Gloria Latimer (12/31/2025)

Roy Rosenthal (12/31/2028)

Carey Storm (12/31/2028)

Megan Day, Alternate Commissioner (12/31/2027)

Frank DeLay, Alternate Commissioner (12/31/2029)

Keith Harper, Alternate Commissioner (12/31/2029)

City Council Liaison: Julie Wolfe

Staff:

Fred Rollenhagen, Planning Director

Chelsea Royston, Senior Planner

Erin Ringsred, Planner and Landscape Architect II

Zachary Davison, Planner II

1 regular position available

The City of Manitou Springs does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission to, access to, or operations of programs, services or activities. Reasonable accommodation will be provided to ensure equal access to all. Individuals who would like to request auxiliary aids or services should contact the ADA Coordinator at (719) 685-5481 or jfryer@manitouspringsco.gov. You may also contact the City Clerk's Office at cityclerk@manitouspringsco.gov or (719) 685-2554. Please provide a minimum of 3-5 days advance notice.

Interested citizens are invited to serve on any of the City's Boards or Commissions. Please contact the City Clerk's Office for more information or visit our website at: www.manitouspringsgov.com.



**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

Regular Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting via Zoom and at Memorial Hall
November 12, 2025

A. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs City Planning Commission (CPC) was held at Manitou Springs Memorial Hall, 606 Manitou Avenue. Chair Delwiche called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM and declared a quorum present.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT FOR ROLL CALL:

Chair Alan Delwiche
Vice Chair Justin Wilson
Commissioner Stephen Graybill
Commissioner Roy Rosenthal
Commissioner Gloria Latimer
Commissioner Mike Casey
Alternate Commissioner Keith Harper
Alternate Commissioner Frank DeLay (Non-Voting)
Alternate Commissioner Megan Day (Non-Voting)

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT FOR ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Carey Storm

STAFF PRESENT:

Planning Director Frederick Rollenhagen
Senior Planner Chelsea Royston
Project Manager Erin Ringsred
Deputy City Clerk Kristen Dukoi
Court Clerk Daniele Owens

GUESTS PRESENT:

CPC Attorney Kunal Parikh

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. CPC Minutes 10.08.2025

Vice Chair Wilson moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Rosenthal seconded the motion. Commissioners Latimer and Casey abstained due to their absence from the October meeting. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

C. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public comment.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

No unfinished business was discussed.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Effective Meetings Board Training – Clerk's Office

Deputy Clerk Dukoi and Court Clerk Owens gave a presentation regarding effective meetings. Topics included the importance of roll call and tracking absences, the procedure for approving agendas and making changes, and examples of motions to reorder agendas. The presentation also covered roles and responsibilities of board members, requirements for voting and quorums, and relevant municipal code requirements for boards and commissions. The process for turning a discussion into action was explained. Appropriate and inappropriate discussion language was reviewed, with examples. Ethical and conflict-of-interest expectations were outlined.

2. Consideration of Title 18 Code Revisions for ADUs

Director Rollenhagen gave a presentation regarding Title 18 Code Revision considerations, including housing occupancy limits, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), and minimum parking requirements for multi-family developments. Director Rollenhagen explained that the City Council directed the CPC to consider and recommend rulings on construction in front yards and conversion of covered parking spaces to ADUs. A drafted ADU ordinance was reviewed, along with possible code revision language.

There was a discussion regarding the conversion of garages to ADUs. Director Rollenhagen confirmed this is possible and noted that creating an ADU within an existing garage is more likely than building new structures because of city development constraints.

Commissioner Latimer asked whether an ADU garage would still meet the code requirements of not reducing parking spaces, if there is still adequate parking in a driveway.

Director Rollenhagen stated that the state does not allow the enforcement of extra parking for ADUs. He explained that it's possible for adequate parking to exist even if a garage is converted.

Planner Ringsred noted that Historic Preservation Guidelines restrict front yard ADUs.

Commissioner Casey stated that if the goal is to create living space, it should be the owner's choice whether to use a garage or not. He also voiced that a front yard ADU wouldn't be an asset to a neighborhood.

Commissioner Day voiced her opinion to deny both proposed code revisions, denying front yard ADUs and conversion of covered parking spaces.

Commissioner Latimer expressed support for banning ADUs in front yards. She added her support that ADUs in covered parking spaces should be allowed as long as they don't go below the minimum level of parking required for a property.

A discussion ensued about covered parking spaces becoming ADUs, and how adequate parking would be maintained in some areas. The motion language regarding ADUs in front yards was also discussed.

Commissioner Latimer moved to recommend to City Council to include the first limitation that prohibits ADUs in front yards by imposing front setbacks equal to the rear most façade of the primary residence for detached ADUs, and imposing front setbacks equal to the frontmost façade of the primary residence for attached ADUs. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Casey.

After discussion about attached ADUs, Commissioner Latimer amended her original motion to delete the second sentence restricting attached ADUs. Chair Delwiche provided a second. Commissioners Rosenthal and Graybill opposed. The motion passed. (5-2)

Planner Ringsred provided a possible viewpoint on parking. She explained that parking minimums for single family residential homes in a legal non-conforming lot require one parking spot, and two for more standard lots. She suggested that the language could contain the denial of a converted parking spot ADU if it places them below the minimum.

Chair Delwiche moved that the commission recommend that the City Council not implement the provision that would prohibit ADUs if they result in the loss of covered parking spaces. Commissioner Casey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (7-0).

3. LUDC Updates – Density, Height, Variance Criteria

Director Rollenhagen gave a presentation regarding Land Use Development Code (LUDC) revisions. He compared Manitou Springs to communities of similar size and economy in terms of density and dimensional allowances in zoning districts. He outlined variance criteria for the commission to review including Natural Hazard Areas, Adverse Impacts, Unique Hardship, No Alternatives, Rights Enjoyed by Others, Self-Imposed Hardship, and introduced a possible new code section related to disabilities. He also noted that the historic resource variance provision already exists within the Historic District Guidelines.

Commissioner Day stated that she is in favor of a higher commercial density to increase affordable housing possibilities.

Chair Delwiche commented that higher density could reduce the character of the city.

The consensus was to postpone density discussions until the commission has more information. A possible meeting with the Housing Advisory Board (HAB) was discussed.

F. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

G. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION AND UPDATES

Director Rollenhagen shared that the Hiawatha Gardens entitlements were approved by City Council in October. He explained that the project is expected to move forward with permitting and construction.

Chair Delwiche reviewed the reappointment procedure and confirmed that Vice Chair Wilson was requesting reappointment.

H. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, Chair Delwiche adjourned the meeting at 7:30 PM.

If you need this document in an alternative format, such as large print, accessible PDF, or Braille, please contact the City Clerk's Office at cityclerk@manitouspringsco.gov or (719) 685-2554.



Title: LUDC updates - Density, Height, and Variance Criteria
From: Fred Rollenhagen
To: City Planning Commission
Address of Proposal: N/A
Applicant: N/A

December 10, 2025

Proposal:

The purpose of this work session is to continue the discussion on potential code revisions related to height and density standards, and Variance Criteria. There may be additional information provided by Chair Delwiche on previous HAB and URA collaboration with CPC on density requirements, and a general understanding of the history of current density and height standards in order to contribute to how to move forward in this discussion.

Staff would recommend any updates to be provided by Chair Delwiche and any discussion related to those updates. Please note that the Urban Renewal Authority and Housing Advisory Board will be invited to the CPC meeting on January 12th for the discussion on density and height, so focusing today's discussion on Variance criteria will be important.

Zone District:

Background & Existing Conditions:

Residential Zoning Densities

The Planning Commission had asked to review the existing maximum residential densities in the City's various zoning districts to assure that they are appropriate

Variations

The Planning Commission has asked to review its process and criteria for granting variances to assure it is performing its intended function. The purpose of granting a variance is to provide relief to property owners where the strict application of the Code would cause an undue hardship or practical difficulty due to unusual circumstances of the land. Therefore, variances are granted to allow a property to be used in a manner that is not otherwise allowed by the Code, but ensuring that the purposes of the Code are not compromised. Generally, a variance would not be granted due to a self-imposed hardship, and is usually not granted to address an economic hardship. Most variance criteria also address the need to avoid negative adverse impacts on adjacent properties and/or the neighborhood.

Application Detail:



The attached Power Point presentation was presented last month. Along with density and height information, Variance criteria information was presented as summarized below: Staff identified and grouped the current Variance criteria into three groups based on the current LUDC: 1) Criteria that could be reviewed, refined and/or better defined, 2) Criteria that is currently regulated elsewhere in the Code, and 3) Criteria that could benefit from a new section as follows:

Terms to be Reviewed, Refined/Defined

E.2. No **adverse impact** will result on adjacent properties;

F.1. The applicant would suffer unnecessary hardship as a result of the application the LUDC, which **hardship** is not generally applicable to other lands or structures in the same zone district because of the unusual configuration of the applicant's property boundaries, unique circumstances related to the location of existing structures thereon, or the existence of **exceptional topographic conditions** thereon;

F.2. There are no **design alternatives or alternative locations** for structures that would eliminate the need for the requested variance or would reduce the amount of the variance required. The variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the **reasonable use of the land or structure**;

F.3. The enforcement of the provisions of the LUDC deprives the applicant of **rights enjoyed by a majority** of the other properties in the same zone district;

F.4. The need for the variance is not the result of **actions of previous property owners** or is an otherwise self-imposed hardship

Currently Regulated Elsewhere in the Municipal Code

E.1. Not result in development of areas at risk of natural hazards, unless adequate mitigation is provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Director pursuant to the standards in [Chapter 18.03](#); and

F.6. The variance request is required in order to preserve a contributing structure in a historic sub district

Possible New Section

F.5. There is a disability affecting the owners or tenants of the property or any member of the family of an owner or tenant who resides on the property, which impairs the ability of the disabled person to utilize or access the property;

Public Involvement:

Findings & Review Criteria:



Staff Recommendation:

N/A

Motion Language Options:



LUDC revisions

CPC WORK SESSION

11/12/25



Densities and Dimensions

Community Comparison of densities and dimensional allowances for Commercial and Mixed Use-type zoning districts where multi-family uses are allowed

Estes Park

Downtown Commercial (CD)

Density: 2250 sq ft per unit (19 du per acre) on first floor, no min land area for units on upper floors

Max bldg. height: 42'

Accommodation (A)

Density: 5400 sq ft(?) (8 du per acre) per unit

Max bldg. height: 30'



Densities and Dimensions

Woodland Park

Central Business District (CBD), Service Commercial (SC), Community Commercial (CC), Neighborhood Commercial (NC)

Density: No specific restriction

Max bldg. height: 35'

Multifamily urban residential (MFU)

Density: no specific restriction

Max Bldg. height: 30'



Densities and Dimensions

Salida

RMU

Density: 2734 sq ft (15/16 du per acre) per unit

Max bldg.. height: 35'

Buena Vista

Commercial and high-density residential districts

Max lot coverage: 75%

Max bldg. height: 30 – 35'



Densities and Dimensions

Leadville

Retail Core, commercial and retail/residential districts

Max bldg. height 35'

40 – 60 du per acre, commercial; 20 du per acre

Durango

Central business dist, business park, mixed use arterial, high-density residential: 24 – 42 du per acre

Fountain

Residential/mixed use, Mixed use

35 – 40' max bldg. height

16 du per acre



18.06.4.2 Variance Criteria

E. Approval Criteria. No variance shall be authorized unless the Planning Commission finds that all of the following criteria have been met. The endorsement of the variance by adjacent landowners does not relieve the applicant of the burden of meeting the requirements set forth in this section:

1. Not result in *development* of areas at risk of *natural hazards*, unless adequate mitigation is provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Director pursuant to the standards in [Chapter 18.03](#); and
2. No adverse impact will result on adjacent properties;

F. Additionally, variance requests must meet a minimum of four (4) of the following criteria:

1. The applicant would suffer unnecessary hardship as a result of the application the LUDC, which hardship is not generally applicable to other lands or structures in the same zone district because of the unusual configuration of the applicant's property boundaries, unique circumstances related to the location of existing structures thereon, or the existence of exceptional topographic conditions thereon;
2. There are no design alternatives or alternative locations for structures that would eliminate the need for the requested variance or would reduce the amount of the variance required. The variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land or *structure*;
3. The enforcement of the provisions of the LUDC deprives the applicant of rights enjoyed by a majority of the other properties in the same zone district;
4. The need for the variance is not the result of from actions of previous property owners or is a an otherwise self-imposed hardship;
5. There is a disability affecting the owners or tenants of the property or any member of the family of an owner or tenant who resides on the property, which impairs the ability of the disabled person to utilize or access the property;
6. The variance request is required in order to preserve a contributing structure in a historic sub district.



18.06.4.2 Variance Criteria

REVIEW AND REFINE/DEFINE

E.2. No **adverse impact** will result on adjacent properties;

F.1. The applicant would suffer **unnecessary hardship** as a result of the application the LUDC, which hardship is not generally applicable to other lands or structures in the same zone district because of the unusual configuration of the applicant's property boundaries, unique circumstances related to the location of existing structures thereon, or the existence of **exceptional topographic conditions** thereon;

F.2. There are no **design alternatives or alternative locations** for structures that would eliminate the need for the requested variance or would reduce the amount of the variance required. The variance is the minimum variance that will make possible **the reasonable use of the land or structure**;

F.3. The enforcement of the provisions of the LUDC deprives the applicant of **rights enjoyed by a majority** of the other properties in the same zone district;

F.4. The need for the variance is not the result of from actions of **previous property owners** or is a an otherwise self-imposed hardship;

REGULATED ELSEWHERE

E.1. Not result in *development* of areas at risk of *natural hazards*, unless adequate mitigation is provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Director pursuant to the standards in [Chapter 18.03](#); and

F.6. The variance request is required in order to preserve a contributing structure in a historic sub district.

POSSIBLE NEW SECTION

F.5. There is a disability affecting the owners or tenants of the property or any member of the family of an owner or tenant who resides on the property, which impairs the ability of the disabled person to utilize or access the property;

Natural Hazard Areas - Regulated Elsewhere



E.1. Not result in *development* of areas at risk of *natural hazards*, unless adequate mitigation is provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Director pursuant to the standards in [Chapter 18.03](#);

Referring to:

- 18.03.10.5 Ecological Characterization Study
- 18.03.10.6 Development in Flood Hazard Areas
- 18.03.10.7 Geologic Hazards Evaluation
- 18.03.10.8 Wildfire Mitigation Standards.

This criteria doesn't appear necessary since any project requiring a variance would be required to comply with the natural hazards standards anyway even if the variance criteria did not exist.

Adverse Impacts Review/refine/define



E.2. No adverse impact will result on adjacent properties;

“adverse impacts” and “adjacent” are not defined in code

- noise
- dust
- glare
- odor
- Vibration
- Traffic
- Solar access

How are these measured and enforced in Manitou Springs?

Does an impact create a detriment to the adjacent property?

Detriment - the state of being harmed or damaged/a cause of injury or damage

Impact – to have a direct effect or impact on: impinge on

Unique Hardship Review/refine/define



“The applicant would suffer unnecessary hardship as a result of the application the LUDC, which hardship is not generally applicable to other lands or structures in the same zone district because of the unusual configuration of the applicant's property boundaries, unique circumstances related to the location of existing structures thereon, or the existence of exceptional topographic conditions thereon;”

Flood Zone

“No-Build Area” – misnomer, Area exceeding 30% slope

Would the property have any beneficial use without the variance?

No Alternatives Review/refine/define



“There are no design alternatives or alternative locations for structures that would eliminate the need for the requested variance or would reduce the amount of the variance required. The variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land or *structure*”

What does “reasonable use” mean?

- Standards that would be required or permitted by the current LUDC
- Example: off street parking space is required for new single household residential development, therefore, a variance to permit an off-street parking space *could* be considered reasonable use of the property

Rights enjoyed by others

Review/refine/define



“The enforcement of the provisions of the LUDC deprives the applicant of rights enjoyed by a majority of the other properties in the same zone district;”

Similar to previous slide

Focus on the provisions of the zone district, not necessarily how those are implemented on each lot since many lots are legal nonconforming

- Off-street parking is mandated by the zone district, but neighbors don't have it because none of the lots have space that complies with modern dimensional standards.

Self-Imposed Hardship Review/refine/define



The need for the variance is not the result of from actions of previous property owners or is a an otherwise self-imposed hardship;

It is generally not typical of self-imposed hardship criteria to include previous property owners

Disabilities

Propose New Section



“There is a disability affecting the owners or tenants of the property or any member of the family of an owner or tenant who resides on the property, which impairs the ability of the disabled person to utilize or access the property;”

Should the City approve/deny reasonable accommodations in a public hearing?

Propose to create a new administrative adjustment section for these allowances

Already exists in code, could be expanded to include setbacks:

18.02.1.4.C.i Architectural features such as such as parapets, pipes, chimneys, heating and venting systems, cupolas, stairwell towers, elevator overrun, roof-mounted solar energy systems, or other similar projections shall not extend more than five (5) feet above the maximum permitted *building height* of the associated Zone District;

Historic Resource Regulated Elsewhere



The variance request is required in order to preserve a contributing structure in a historic sub district.

Dimensional allowances already exist:

[1] Within the Historic District, subject to the Historic District Design Guidelines, a permanent side setback of less than seven and one-half feet (7'6") may be reviewed and approved, conditionally approved, or denied by the Historic Preservation Commission. At no time without *variance* approval, shall the side setback be less than five feet (5') or less than a ten feet separation from neighboring buildings/ *structures* including across *property lines*.

[2] Heights of *structures* shall be as calculated in the Building Height definition unless property is located within the Historic District and receives a Material Change of Appearance Certification incorporating steep roof pitches, per the Historic District Design Guidelines, as amended. In such cases, building heights shall not exceed thirty feet (30').

18.02.1.4.C.i Architectural features such as such as parapets, pipes, chimneys, heating and venting systems, cupolas, stairwell towers, elevator overrun, roof-mounted solar energy systems, or other similar projections shall not extend more than five (5) feet above the maximum permitted *building height* of the associated Zone District;

Community Comparison of densities and dimensional allowances for Commercial and Mixed Use-type zoning districts where multi-family uses are allowed

Estes Park

Downtown Commercial (CD)

Density: 2250 sq ft per unit (19 du per acre) on first floor, no min land area for units on upper floors

Max bldg. height: 42'

Accommodation (A)

Density: 5400 sq ft(?) (8 du per acre) per unit

Max bldg. height: 30'

Woodland Park

Central Business District (CBD), Service Commercial (SC), Community Commercial (CC), Neighborhood Commercial (NC)

Density: No specific restriction

Max bldg. height: 35'

Multifamily urban residential (MFU)

Density: no specific restriction

Max Bldg. height: 30'

Salida

RMU

Density: 2734 sq ft (15/16 du per acre) per unit

Max bldg.. height: 35'

Buena Vista

Commercial and high-density residential districts

Max lot coverage: 75%

Max bldg. height: 30 – 35'

Leadville

Retail Core, commercial and retail/residential districts

Max bldg. height 35'

40 – 60 du per acre, commercial; 20 du per acre

Durango

Central business dist, business park, mixed use
arterial, high-density residential: 24 – 42 du per acre

Fountain

Residential/mixed use, Mixed use
35 – 40' max bldg. height
16 du per acre