



PLANNING COMMISSION

Proceedings

April 27, 2021
1:15 p.m.

(Zoom Webinar and viewable on City of Greeley YouTube)

I. Call to Order

Chair Yeater called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Chair Yeater, Commissioners Andersen, Briscoe, Franzen, Modlin, Romulo and Schulte were present.

III. Approval of minutes for meeting held on April 13, 2021

Commissioner Andersen moved to approve the April 13, 2021 minutes. Commissioner Romulo seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

IV. Housing Plan Update

Presenter: Benjamin Snow, Economic Health & Housing Director

Benjamin Snow, Director of Economic Health & Housing (EHH) addressed the Commission and presented the Greeley Strategic Housing Plan update. He described the purpose of the Plan and emphasized how EHH is engaging with businesses and developers to consider Greeley for their projects. Mr. Snow advised that EHH is working closely with Community Development on amending the Development Code to promote housing choice, minimize development costs for affordable housing, and complete subarea and neighborhood plans

Mr. Snow focused on three projects that are either new or in progress, including Apartments at Maddie, 55 Resort Apartments, and University Flats. He shared the success of a private activity bond (PAB) strategy and explained how the City is teaming up with Weld County to leverage PAB and Colorado Housing and Finance Authority (CHFA) funds to create affordable housing options. Mr. Snow presented a Housing Ladder tool and

explained how EHH is working to fill in some of the missing or under represented rungs on the housing ladder with diverse housing options.

Mr. Snow highlighted other projects such as Northridge Trails, Ten West Greeley Apartments, Northridge Estates and Westgate and shared a new tool using GIS layers to identify sites for housing development. He acknowledged the impact of raw water costs on housing affordability and noted that the Terry Ranch project will provide a good long-term solution for Greeley.

V. A public hearing to consider amending Title 18 (to be re-codified as Title 24) of the Municipal Code regarding household occupancy standards, specifically regarding the number of unrelated adults allowed to comprise a household, as found in the definition of “family” in Appendix 18-B (to be re-codified as Section 24-5)

Project Name:	Code Update: Household Occupancy Standards
Case No.:	CU2021-0001
Applicant:	City of Greeley
Presenter:	Caleb Jackson, Planner II

Chair Yeater noted that staff is requesting a continuance of this item and advised those joining the virtual meeting that a hearing would take place on May 11, 2021.

Commissioner Andersen moved that the Planning Commission continue the consideration of a code update regarding household occupancy standards, case number CU2021-0001, to the regular Planning Commission meeting on May 11, 2021. Commissioner Franzen seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

VI. A public hearing to consider a request for a Use by Special Review to allow for a 30-unit apartment complex

Project Name:	Immaculata Plaza II Multifamily USR
Case No.:	USR2020-0008
Applicant:	Troy Spraker, of Lamp Rynearson, on behalf of Archdiocesan Housing Inc.
Location:	923 6 th Street
Presenter:	Kira Stoller, Planner II

Kira Stoller addressed the Commission and introduced the project. Ms. Stoller provided an aerial photo showing the location of the site and described the surrounding area, noting that the site is located within the Redevelopment District. She presented photographs of the existing structure on the site and the vacant lot adjacent to the site.

Ms. Stoller explained that the site encompasses two parcels that are proposed to be combined into one lot by way of a minor subdivision that will be processed administratively. She provided a brief history of the apartment building that is currently used for senior and low-income housing and stated that the new structure being proposed would operate in the same fashion.

Ms. Stoller presented a landscaping plan and site plan of the proposed new building, pointed out the setbacks and described the parking and recreational amenities. She noted that the applicant proposes a combination of indoor and outdoor spaces, a common patio area, pedestrian benches and a shared pathway between buildings. Ms. Stoller added that the lobby would include soft seating, a room for fitness activities, and a computer room for internet access by residents. She presented the building elevations, highlighting mixed materials on the exterior.

Ms. Stoller presented a slide explaining requests for alternative compliance and reduced parking, stating both requests had been approved by the Community Development Director. She noted that alternative compliance is allowed by Code for sites within the Redevelopment District where strict compliance with code may be impractical or impossible and equivalent standards can be provided in a creative way. Ms. Stoller explained that all units would have a Juliet balcony rather than a usable patio or deck. Regarding parking, Ms. Stoller reported that the property qualifies as an infill site and the applicant proposes to provide 22 percent of the required parking with 20 stalls (eight on site and 12 on the street).

Ms. Stoller summarized the Use by Special Review (USR) approval criteria, stating that the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, compatible with the area, physically suitable for the site, provides no adverse impact to traffic or parking, and does not create a cumulative effect with other USRs in the area. Notice letters were mailed to 33 owners within 500 feet of the site, signs were posted and legal notice was provided in the local newspaper with no comments received. Staff recommended approval.

Referring to the outdoor usable space, Commissioner Andersen asked why that requirement did not apply to the existing building. Ms. Stoller advised that the existing Code was adopted in 1988 and the building was constructed in the mid-1980s with different criteria required to be met for approval. Upon question by Commissioner Andersen, Ms. Stoller advised that the usable outdoor patio area was proposed for all three floors. She advised that the 55 Resort project that came before the Commission previously only requested alternative compliance for units along the street, adding that all units have the space for the project being considered today. Commissioner Andersen also asked whether there were any safety considerations or concerns with an additional external door on apartments in the downtown area. Ms. Stoller was not aware of any safety concerns.

Commissioner Schulte observed that additional parking might be required to accommodate the new building and asked how staff concluded that there would be no impact to traffic or parking, adding that available on-street parking will not increase over time. He also asked whether the proposal to provide 22 percent of the required parking spaces referenced by Ms. Stoller was proportionate to parking at the current structure. Ms. Stoller advised that many of the residents do not have a vehicle and that is likely to be the case with the new structure. Upon question by Commissioner Briscoe, Ms. Stoller explained that the 22 percent figure was determined since the property is located in the Redevelopment District and Code allows the Community Development Director to evaluate and make a determination. She agreed that parking is a big item being considered as part of the overall Code update.

Commissioner Modlin asked whether an alternative was being considered in the event parking becomes an issue in the future. Ms. Stoller advised that at this time there is no alternative component, adding that if the Commission has concerns, staff can evaluate adding a condition of approval. Brad Mueller, Community Development Director, addressed the Commission and advised that part of alternative compliance for parking is that it must be approved by the department director. He added that it is important to recognize that the percentage aspect is less important when talking about a low number of units. Mr. Mueller added that the history of a property is also a consideration.

Commissioner Schulte agreed and asked that staff consider each request individually and not make assumptions that because it is determined there is sufficient parking for this project, it would carry over to any other downtown project. Referring to a downtown parking study conducted a few years ago, Mr. Mueller advised that it was less an issue of the amount of available parking as how parking is distributed throughout the downtown area. Don Kirby, Senior Engineer, addressed the Commission and added that the 12 offsite spaces are new and include parking that complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Justin Raddatz, 6240 Smith Road, Denver, Colorado, addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant and stated that this is a great infill project for the City of Greeley and serves a much-needed segment of the community. He added that the location is perfect for residents in terms of walkability and will allow the two units to operate as a campus. Mr. Raddatz was grateful for the consideration and offered to answer any questions.

Commissioner Franzen asked what type of transportation is utilized by the current tenants. Mr. Raddatz stated that he visited with the site manager who has managed the property for the past ten years who indicated that during that time, he has not seen all eight spots for Immaculata Plaza I completely filled. He added that the senior center is located across the street and that Immaculata Plaza I and II are within walking distance of the downtown area. Mr. Raddatz added that many tenants use public transportation and that the property uses a 15-passenger van for organized activities for residents. He advised that eight spots for the 25 existing units have been more than sufficient.

Chair Yeater opened the public hearing at 1:58 p.m. There being no communication by U.S. mail, email or Zoom Chat or Q&A, the public hearing was closed at 1:58 p.m.

Commissioner Andersen moved that, based on the application received and the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed Use by Special Review for a residential apartment complex in the C-H (Commercial High Intensity) zone district is consistent with the Development Code criteria of Section 18.20.070; and, therefore, approves the Use by Special Review. Commissioner Briscoe seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

VII. Staff Report

Brad Mueller reported that work to update the Development Code is ongoing and added that there will be some busy meetings in the future. He advised that there are several items on the May 11 agenda and asked if Commissioners could be available for a lengthy meeting on that date. Following questions from the Chair about timing and logistics, the

Commissioners advised that they would clear their calendars for the afternoon. Upon question by Chair Briscoe, Mr. Mueller reported that a return to in-person meetings would be evaluated using various data, including the number of new COVID cases in the city, county and state and whether the numbers continue to decrease.

VIII. Worksession: Development Code Update – Chapter 2 - Procedures

Presenter: Carol Kuhn, Chief Planner

Carol Kuhn addressed the Commission and described the contents of Chapter 2 – Procedures. She presented a Chapter 2 table of contents and reviewed information presented at previous meetings. Ms. Kuhn described some of the enhancements such as addressing concurrent applications, public noticing, identifying the notice area, and changing the noticing requirement regarding minor variances. She also provided a brief description of options being added regarding minor and major subdivisions.

Upon question by Commissioner Modlin, Ms. Kuhn stated that staff is working with other parties and stakeholders, including a Development Code advisory committee, builders, developers and community members. She added that staff has also presented information at meetings of the Downtown Development Authority, Rotary and other organizations. Ms. Kuhn added that staff also plans to send portions of Chapter 2 to applicants who have made similar applications in the past two years and request their feedback and input.

Commissioner Andersen observed the number of variance requests submitted over the past few years and asked whether issues such as a design flaw might be remedied under the new Code. Ms. Kuhn responded that the Code should provide more latitude regarding allowances for alternative compliance and reduce the number of variance requests. Chris Brewster from Gould Evans added that the current Code contains several competing sections of flexibility and the goal is to enable staff to decipher the type of variance and use administrative discretion on any pure theoretical planning variance. He added that the desire is for a variance to be used only for issues that are truly unique and beyond a landowner's control.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

Justin Yeater

3F44E3E176F84C8...

Justin Yeater, Chair

DocuSigned by:

Brad Mueller

7418AD096A3C407...

Brad Mueller, Secretary