

City of Greeley, Colorado
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
May 11, 2021

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Yeater called the remote meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. via the City's Zoom platform.

The hearing clerk called the roll.

PRESENT

Chair Justin Yeater
Commissioner Brian Franzen
Commissioner Larry Modlin
Commissioner Chelsie Romulo
Commissioner Christian Schulte

ABSENT

Commissioner Louisa Andersen
Commissioner Erik Briscoe

Commissioner Briscoe joined the meeting at 1:16 p.m.

II. Acceptance of Agenda

Commissioner Romulo moved to accept the agenda. Commissioner Franzen seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. (Commissioner Andersen was absent.)

III. Approval of April 27, 2021 Minutes

Commissioner Romulo moved approve the minutes dated April 27, 2021. Commissioner Modlin seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. (Commissioner Andersen was absent.)

IV. Public meeting to consider a request for a preliminary plat on a 162.668 acre site to create 4 lots and 6.592 acres of dedicated rights-of-way

Project: Tointon Academy Preliminary Subdivision Plat

Case No.: SUB2020-0028

Applicant: Thomas Rudary of DLR Group, on behalf of Kent Henson of Greeley-Evans School District, and the City of Greeley

Location: West of 71st Avenue, east of 77th Avenue, north of 10th Street, and south of 4th Street

Presenter: Brittany Hathaway, Planner III

Ms. Hathaway addressed the Commission and introduced as a request for a preliminary plat to create four lots and dedicate 6.592 acres of rights-of-way on a 162.688-acre site to allow for realignment of the Boomerang Links Golf course

and construction of a new K-8 school. Ms. Hathaway presented a map showing the rights-of-way to be dedicated. She presented an aerial photograph showing the site and surrounding areas and described the surrounding area.

Ms. Hathaway reported that there is an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and the Greeley-Evans School District 6 that was approved by City Council on January 5, 2021. She advised that the agreement allows for a near even land swap of approximately 25 acres and presented a map showing the properties to be swapped. Ms. Hathaway stated that the School District would provide funding to relocate 3.5 golf fairways, greens, ditches and ponds, with Lot 3 to be owned by the City for a golf course and Lots 1, 2, 4 to be owned by the School District. She added that a proposed K-8 school, Tointon Academy, would be located on Lot 2. Ms. Hathaway presented photographs of the site and existing conditions.

Ms. Hathaway advised that the request complies with all review standards of Section 24-161, that no variances are being requested, and that there is not a DCMP or master plan located on the property. Staff recommended approval.

Upon question by Commissioner Modlin, Ms. Hathaway stated that she did not have information as to whether there was a contract placed on Lot 4 and suggested that representatives from the school district might be able to respond.

Thomas Rudary from DLR Group addressed the Commission on behalf of School District 6 and offered to answer questions. Commissioner Modlin asked whether a contract had been placed on Lot 4. Mr. Rudary deferred to Jeff Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain, RLH Engineering, 601 Gyrfalcon Court, Windsor, Colorado, addressed the Commission, stating that he is the owner's representative for School District 6. Mr. Chamberlain reported that there is a contract on Lot 4 for a proposed residential development.

Referring to a notation on page 11 of the packet, Commissioner Schulte noted that the plan will result in split zoning and asked whether that was allowed under the Code. Ms. Hathaway stated that is allowed, but is not best practice, adding that staff would want to ensure that any future development on those lots would be allowed each individual zoning district or would request a rezoning. She added that it did not create an obstacle at this time.

Commissioner Romulo moved that, based on the application received and the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the Tointon Academy Preliminary Plat complies with the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations and Development Code criteria outlined in Section 24-161; and, therefore, approves the Preliminary Plat as presented. Commissioner Schulte seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. (Commissioner Andersen joined the meeting at 1:23 p.m. as the vote was recorded and did not vote.)

V. Public hearing to consider a Final PUD Amendment, located at 4214 Centerplace Drive, to revise the allowed uses to those listed within the C-H (Commercial High Intensity) zoning district except for auto and residential uses to allow modifying guidelines and site improvements

Project: Lot 2, Centerplace 2nd Filing Phase 3 Final PUD – 1st Amendment

Case No.: PUD2021-0008

Applicant: Erica Vester

Location: 4214 Centerplace Drive

Presenter: Caleb Jackson, Planner II

Mr. Jackson addressed the Commission and provided a brief background of the site. He stated that the area was approved with a preliminary PUD in 2000 and that Phase 3 that included the Best Buy and other commercial development was approved in 2007. He added that the site was approved for a drive-thru restaurant, Steak 'n Shake, in 2014. He presented several photographs of the site. Mr. Jackson reported that as part of this application, the landscaping would be brought back to an approved status.

Mr. Jackson presented a map showing the site and the surrounding areas and zoning. He presented the approved Preliminary PUD for Centerplace approved for Commercial High Intensity (C-H) uses in 2000. He added that in 2007, a Phase 3 PUD was approved, allowing C-H uses but restricted certain uses, including residential, some commercial, some institutional, and some industrial. The Final PUD approved in 2014 allowed only a drive-thru restaurant to be developed on the site.

The PUD amendment considered today modifies land uses to those allowed in the C-H zoning district except residential uses, auto uses, and uses precluded by the overall Phase 3 PUD. It also allows modification of the façade and design guidelines, accommodation of new exterior building lighting, removal of the drive-thru equipment, relocation of a gas meter, and a new sidewalk at the north egress door.

Mr. Jackson described the PUD criteria found in Development Code Section 24-673 that a Final PUD plan is substantially in compliance with a Preliminary PUD plan. He reported that notices were mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the site, legal notice was published in the newspaper, and signs were posted on the site. No inquiries were received. Mr. Jackson reported that the applicant addressed all staff comments and staff recommended approval. Upon question by Commissioner Andersen, Mr. Jackson advised that since some of the changes to the façade require changing design guidelines, it come under the prevue of the Planning Commission.

Erica Vester, with Evergreen Development, 1873 South Bellaire Street, Denver, Colorado, addressed the Commission and introduced architect Jennifer Gray. Ms. Vester described some of the minor changes proposed to the site and façade. She confirmed that landscaping would be returned to what was requested in the original approved plans and that any signage associated with the drive-thru restaurant would be removed. Ms. Vester advised that the building

would be used for an Aspen Dental office, one of the first in Colorado. She presented the building elevations, colors, and exterior materials and described some of the changes to the structure.

Chair Yeater opened the public hearing at 1:35 p.m.

The meeting facilitator read a chat from Kim Drapeau who asked whether an entrance off Highway 34 would be added. Ms. Vester stated that no additional entrances would be added.

There being no communication by U.S. mail, email, Zoom Chat or Q&A, the public hearing was closed at 1:36 p.m.

Commissioner Andersen moved that, based on the application received and the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed Final PUD Amendment is in compliance with the Development Code and is consistent with the Preliminary PUD; and, therefore, approves the Final PUD Amendment as presented. Commissioner Romulo second the motion.

Chair Yeater observed that this is a creative use of the property and indicated that he would be voting in support.

Motion carried 7-0.

VI. Public hearing to consider a Final PUD Amendment, located at 4330 Centerplace Drive, to revise the allowed uses to those listed within the C-H (Commercial High Intensity) zoning district except for auto and residential uses

Project: Kohls Final PUD 1st Amendment

Case No.: PUD2021-0009

Applicant: Greg Wheeler

Location: 4330 Centerplace Drive

Presenter: Caleb Jackson, Planner II

Mr. Jackson addressed the Commission and presented an aerial photograph showing the site location, indicating that it is part of a strip retail center near Kohls and Target. He advised that the Centerplace Preliminary PUD was approved in 2000 and the Kohls Final PUD was approved in 2003. Mr. Jackson stated that the amendment today is to allow more flexibility in the uses at this site.

Mr. Jackson presented a map and photographs showing the site, surrounding areas and zoning. He presented the approved Centerplace Preliminary PUD and stated that it allowed C-H uses in the area, adding that the approved Final PUD limited uses of the area to retail, restaurant, office and personal services. He added that the proposed amendment would revise the allowed uses on Lot 2 and allow all C-H uses except auto and residential uses.

Mr. Jackson described the PUD criteria that the Final PUD is substantially in compliance with the approved Preliminary PUD plan. Staff recommend approval on the basis that it has a land use, intensity, traffic pattern, character and development standards consistent with the approved Preliminary PUD. Notices were mailed to 11 property owners within 500 feet, legal notice was published in the newspaper, and signs were posted on the site. No inquiries were received. The applicant addressed all comments and staff recommended approval.

Upon question by Commissioner Andersen, Mr. Jackson advised that staff questions and comments addressed by the applicant were mainly about correcting the exhibit and including all necessary information on the exhibit.

Commissioner Briscoe asked about the original approved uses and how much those uses are now being expanded. Mr. Jackson advised that the current approved uses are for restaurant, retail, office and personal services. The amendment would allow for all uses in the C-H zone with the exception of residential and auto uses.

Patrick Groom, 822 7th Street, Suite 760, Greeley, introduced himself as the attorney representative for the applicant and addressed the Commission. Mr. Groom indicated that the application arose because the landlord had entered into a new lease agreement with a chiropractor's office and a question arose from Planning as to whether it was an allowed use under the current PUD. He advised that under the PUD approved in 2003, some of the uses are not defined under Greeley Municipal Code which created ambiguities such as whether the term "office" included a medical office. Mr. Groom went on to state that there was no indication in the original PUD of an intent to exclude other commercial uses that might fall within the margins of the definitions that were proposed in the PUD.

Mr. Groom stated that in the previous hearing item, the PUD listed uses that were not allowed, adding that the Kohls PUD did not exclude any uses. He added it was the applicant's position that C-H uses under the Code today were what were contemplated under the original PUD when it was developed. Mr. Groom advised that following discussions with Planning, it was determined that a chiropractor's office was not an excluded use. The applicant felt it made sense to amend the PUD going forward to address any future issues that might arise regarding allowed uses. Mr. Groom offered to answer questions from the Commission.

Chair Yeater opened the public hearing at 1:45 p.m. There being no communication by U.S. mail, email, Zoom Chat or Q&A, the public hearing was closed at 1:45 p.m.

Commissioner Andersen expressed thanks to the applicant for taking time to stay ahead of this and be thinking into the future.

Commissioner Andersen moved that, based on the application received and the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed Final PUD Amendment is in compliance with the Development Code and is consistent with the Preliminary PUD; and, therefore, approves the Final PUD Amendment that revises the allowed uses on Lot 2, as presented. Commissioner Romulo second the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

VII. Public hearing to consider a request for a Preliminary PUD Amendment to add all C-H (Commercial High Intensity) and R-H (Residential High Density) uses, including schools, and removing the commercial acreage cap within Tract B, Promontory Imagine School Second Filing only

Project: Promontory Preliminary PUD, Areas M & N, 1st Amendment

Case No.: ZON2021-0002

Applicant: Weldco Land Investors LLC

Location: North of Highway 34 Bypass, east of Promontory Parkway, south of future 20th Street

Presenter: Mike Garrott, Planning Manager

Mr. Garrott addressed the Commission and introduced the item as a request for a preliminary PUD amendment to change some of the uses within specific areas from an earlier PUD approval in 1999. He presented an aerial photograph showing the location of the property located in the Promontory area. Mr. Garrott also presented a map of the original Tri-Pointe PUD approved in 1999 and highlighted Tract B and Areas M and N, which are the subject to today's hearing.

Mr. Garrott provided a plat of Promontory Imagine School Second Filing, adding that the name was provided because a charter school was originally planned for a portion of the site. He noted that Tract B came about through a replatting process. Mr. Garrott provided an aerial photograph of the entire area. Mr. Garrott provided a list of allowed uses within Areas M and N, with Area M being mostly residential and Area N being mostly commercial. The applicant requests to allow Tract B (Areas M and N only) to be rezoned to allow for all C-H uses, R-H uses, including schools. Mr. Garrott also presented photographs of the site.

Mr. Garrott described the zoning criteria of Section 24-625 and indicated that all criteria had been met and complies with the Comprehensive Plan. He added that the proposal matches the zoning suitability plan and complies with the preliminary PUD standards. Notices were mailed to seven property owners within 500 feet, signs were posted on the site and notice was placed in the newspaper with no comments received. Staff recommended approval.

Randy Schwartz, the property owner and applicant, 9193 E. Vassar Avenue, Denver, Colorado, addressed the Commission and advised that the purpose of the request is to clean up old and dated zoning with input from planning.

Chair Yeater opened the public hearing at 1:55 p.m. There being no communication by U.S. mail, email, Zoom Chat or Q&A, the public hearing was closed at 1:56 p.m.

Commissioner Andersen moved that, based on the application received and the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendment to the Promontory Preliminary PUD, Areas M & N, within Tract B, Promontory Imagine School Second Filing, meets the applicable Development Code criteria, Sections 24-625(c)(3) a, b, f, g and h and Section 24-663(b) 1 and 2; and, therefore, recommends approval of the rezone to the City Council. Commissioner Romulo second the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

VIII. Public hearing to consider amending 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 Section 24-5

Project: Code Update – Household Occupancy Standards

Case No.: CU2021-0001

Applicant: City of Greeley

Presenter: Caleb Jackson, Planner II

Chair Yeater began by stating that it was anticipated there might be several people wishing to speak during the public hearing. He advised that everyone wishing to speak would be invited at the appropriate time and would receive an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Jackson addressed the Commission and provided a recap of some of the reasons to reevaluate the housing occupancy standard that had been described in prior hearings, including a City Council initiative, “Your Home is Here” that looks at providing varied housing choices and also addressing recommendations in the Strategic Housing Plan adopted by City Council. Mr. Jackson described some of the obstacles including increasing pressures on finances, low housing stock, increased home prices, and changing demographics.

Mr. Jackson noted the current definition of “family” in the Code that includes three descriptions, including 1) an individual living alone, 2) any number of persons interrelated by blood, marriage, adoption or other legal custodial relationship, or 3) not more than two unrelated adults and any number of persons related to those unrelated adults by blood, adoption, guardianship or other legal custodial relationship. Mr. Jackson pointed out that under the current definition, a married couple cannot add any unrelated adults. He added that in high density residential and commercial zones there is currently no limit to the number of unrelated adults, and that is not proposed to change. Mr. Jackson provided a few scenarios allowed by the current standard in lower density zones, Residential Estate (R-E), Residential Low Density (R-L), Residential Medium Density (R-M) and Residential Mobile Home (R-MH) that include a married couple plus zero unrelated adults, a single person plus one unrelated adult, or an unmarried couple plus zero unrelated adults.

Mr. Jackson briefly described the vetting process that has been presented at previous hearings, including the Housing Task Force, Code Advisory Committee, an initial public questionnaire in January-March 2021, Council worksession in February 2021, second public questionnaire in February-March 2021, a public

open house on March 1, 2021 and three Planning Commission worksessions on January 12, March 9 and March 30.

Mr. Jackson explained the proposed definition of family, adding that the number of household occupants must be compliant with the International Property Maintenance Code. He summarized statements made during the previous Planning Commission meeting and presented a few scenarios using a 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom home in the Residential Estate, Residential Low and Residential-Mobile Home zone districts, as well as Residential-Medium.

Mr. Jackson provided some of the feedback commonly shared on both sides of the discussions. Those in opposition cite issues with parking and traffic, property maintenance, overcrowding, density and character of neighborhoods, trash, noise, crime and decreased property values. Those in support cite increased flexibility, increased privacy, affordability, changing demographics, housing stability and economic development.

According to Mr. Jackson, some of the remaining key issues include neighborhood impacts, how to address civil unions, clarifying the "family" definition, small format housing and housing opportunity. He added the issues such as noise, trash and parking continue to be enforced by Code Compliance or Greeley Police Department. Mr. Jackson advised that next steps include a recommendation by Planning Commission today and a hearing before City Council scheduled to take place in June.

Commissioner Franzen asked about Information showing the percentage of homes in each zone district. Mr. Jackson stated that he would locate the information and provide it after the public input portion.

Upon question by Chair Yeater, Mr. Jackson advised that any neighborhood within a homeowner's association (HOA) that has more restrictive standards than the Code could be enforced under the HOA requirements. Commissioner Schulte asked if the burden to enforce would be shifted onto an HOA and Mr. Jackson responded that an HOA would assume responsibility for enforcing its own rules and covenants.

Commissioner Romulo mentioned that other cities have moved to change the household occupancy standards and asked what has happened in those communities after increasing the standard, especially with regard to public concerns. Mr. Jackson reported that a good example is Fort Collins that increased the occupancy standard to U+2 approximately 10 years ago. He noted that there are still some issues, mainly related to areas around the university that are more particular to college students and not necessarily tied to the number of unrelated adults. He added that Fort Collins recently updated its strategic housing plan and is looking to further relaxing the occupancy standard.

Chair Yeater pointed out that one of the major concerns has been about parking or traffic and asked Mr. Jackson to speak to what types of increases might occur. Mr. Jackson stated that in a new development with single-family homes, the requirement is to provide two off-street parking spaces, adding that

a 60-foot-wide lot, typically allows one to two spaces on the street in front of a house. He noted that renting a bedroom to one unrelated adult is similar to parking vehicles driven by teenagers who are living in the house.

Commissioner Briscoe asked Mr. Jackson to bring up the slide with the proposed allowance table and noted that conceivably a post-war era home with less square footage on a smaller lot could be two bedrooms upstairs and two conforming bedrooms in the basement. He noted that in this scenario, it would be allowed to have "U" plus a family plus two unrelated adults. Mr. Jackson clarified that Commissioner Briscoe was referring to the portion of the table depicting three or more bedrooms in an R-L zone.

Commissioner Romulo sought to clarify the information in the table and observed that what is changing is adding a second line in the residential R-E, R-L, R-MH category what allows for two unrelated adults in homes with three or more bedrooms. Mr. Jackson confirmed that the current standard allows for one unrelated adult in homes with two or fewer bedrooms, adding that in the lower density zones, the proposal is to increase the number of unrelated adults by one in larger homes.

Chair Yeater observed that under the current Code, a married couple is not allowed to rent out an additional bedroom. Mr. Jackson confirmed and added that with the change in the core part of the "family" definition clarifying the relationship of a married couple, they would count as one unit rather than two. Commissioner Romulo pointed out that the current Code does not reference civil union, domestic partnership or common law marriage. Mr. Jackson confirmed and stated that civil union would be added to the Code language.

Commissioner Schulte noted that one of the concerns is about the reduction in property values and asked whether there are any studies available that bear that out. Mr. Jackson was not aware of any studies and added that it did not appear to be a concern in Fort Collins when the standards were loosened in that community. He added that the concern expressed seems to tie unrelated adults to an unkempt property. Mr. Jackson also noted that some individuals have expressed concern that investors will purchase single-family properties and rent them out. He was not aware any comprehensive research on this topic.

Upon question by Commissioner Modlin, Mr. Jackson reported that he was not aware of any conversations about a change of neighborhood character or demographics in Fort Collins as a result of increased occupancy standards. He added that Fort Collins is considering relaxing its standard even further.

Chair Yeater opened the public hearing at 2:23 p.m.

Tom Pfankuch recalled the housing crisis that occurred in Greeley in 2005-07 when there was no market for home construction and an increase in foreclosures. He noted that things have changed and that 8th Avenue is a qualified opportunity zone and asked if the units along 8th Avenue are full. Mr. Pfankuch expressed that there are opportunities to develop high-density housing without invading neighbors' privacy. He expressed concern about crime

and noise and asked for a development of affordable housing with prevailing options.

Jim Riesberg, 1726 18th Avenue, Greeley, addressed the Commission and stated that he was a member of the Housing Task Force. Mr. Riesberg observed that there are many single older adults who are widows or widowers living alone. He stated that being allowed to age in place is an important factor for older adults to maintain a healthy quality of life. Mr. Riesberg noted that one solution is to allow individuals to be matched with another person through house sharing. He added that loneliness is a major threat to older adults and that encouraging house sharing should be an important consideration in planning future housing options.

Lori McMurren, 507 North Wyndham Avenue, Greeley. Ms. McMurren stated that she is long-time Greeley resident and small business owner involved in real estate, construction and home design and opposes increasing the occupancy standard. She shared her experience with two rentals with multiple unrelated family members resulting in several police calls, adding that the property is run down and the lawn is a mess. Ms. McMurren noted that a lot is being done in Greeley to develop affordable housing. She understood the elder issues described by Mr. Riesberg, but felt that this would have a detrimental effect on the community. She suggested looking at more data and studies in an effort to continue to revise the standard.

Margaret Rothaus, 1700 Fairacre Drive, Greeley. Ms. Rothaus advised that her address should be familiar to the Greeley Police since the house across the street, 1701 Fairacre Drive, has received several visits from police. She stated that every bedroom has been rented out. Ms. Rothaus stated that most people in smaller residential, older neighborhoods do not object to sharing a house with another person. She added that what happened during the takeover in 2005 was that a number of houses on Fairacre Drive were foreclosed upon, prices reduced, and purchased to be used as rentals. She stated that the current codes were not being maintained or enforced.

Jimmy Kolis, 1928 14th Avenue, Greeley. Mr. Kolis thanked city staff for the work on this issue and Planning Commission for taking comments. He asked that the Commission consider looking at the characteristics Greeley shares with surrounding communities, including university towns. He stated that he lives in the university district and has had concerns with the increase in the number of student renters as well as trash, noise and parking. Mr. Kolis asked that, if the standard is increased, that there be a more responsive and effective response to those problems that come with increased occupancy, especially with student renters. He also asked that the City consider the opportunity to maintain some original intentions of the G-HOPE program.

Mary Enriquez, 2110 8th Street, Greeley, expressed her opposition to increasing the standard and stated her concern that out-of-town investors would purchase property in Greeley and create rentals. She also expressed concern that an investor would change a single-family home to a duplex in order to increase rental income. Ms. Enriquez asked that the issues of parking be addressed before changing the code to allow more people to live in one home.

Daniel Preshaw, 364 North Wyndham Avenue, Greeley. Mr. Preshaw stated that he is the managing broker and owner of His House Property Management and Real Estate and has firsthand knowledge of the housing challenges in northern Colorado. He felt that the information is being reviewed based upon what neighboring communities are doing rather than on an actual need. He added that creating a new occupancy standard based on the number of bedrooms is an arbitrary approach to solving the problem. Mr. Preshaw indicated that he had created a study that considers housing costs as a percentage of annual income and asked that it be considered as a way to determine occupancy limits.

Frank Oliver, 1503 44th Avenue Court, Greeley. Mr. Oliver noted that an increase in the occupancy standard would put an undue burden on homes in what used to be the R1 zone, adding that homes within a homeowners association would not be affected. He observed that the current codes are not being enforced. Mr. Oliver stated that the number of survey results is small compared to the population of Greeley and noted that in a recent survey published in the Tribune, 67 percent of those surveyed are in opposition. He felt that this created an unfair impact on long-time residents.

Lucy Shelofsky, 4918 W. 2nd Street Road, Greeley, echoed some of the previous comments in opposition. She stated that she did not have a problem with older people sharing houses to stay in their home. Ms. Shelofsky reported that all homes sold in her neighborhood over the past three years have been occupied by more than one family, creating increased vehicles and crowding in driveways and streets. She stated that current codes are not being enforced and reported that someone around the corner has a person living in an RV in the back yard that is clearly visible from 3rd Street. Ms. Shelofsky also felt it was not appropriate to compare Greeley with other communities.

Devin Sens, 2100 82nd Avenue, Greeley, opposed how the current proposal is written and felt it would open the floodgates. He noted that a married couple is not currently allowed to have an unrelated adult living in their home and suggested addressing only that issue without changing the entire code. He noted the number of rentals currently available with more being constructed and disagreed that there is a lack of appropriate housing in Greeley. Mr. Sens stated that a home purchase is the biggest expenditure of most peoples' lifetime and asked the Commission not to allow situations where an investor might purchase a property and rent to several unrelated adults.

Marlis Johnson, 5125 W. 5th Street, Greeley, addressed the Commission and stated that she lives on a cul-de-sac near Christa McAuliffe Elementary School. She recalled the days when there were alleys that allowed the ability to park vehicles behind a home. Ms. Johnson noted that if a non-owner occupancy situation existed in cul-de-sac, there would be no room for parking. She was not totally opposed to revising the standard, but suggested that alternative constructs be put into the plan.

Julie Jensen, 2017 26th Avenue Court, Greeley, stated that she is a member of the Development Code Advisory Committee. She acknowledged that the City has gone to great lengths to provide different options and involve various stakeholders and appreciates all of the work. Ms. Jensen advised that she works in the real estate community and has heard from many who are not in favor of basing the number of unrelated adults allowed on the number of bedrooms and stated that she would like to see staff going back to the drawing board on that subject.

A hearing clerk read comments in the Zoom chat and Q&A from Patricia Califana, Derek LeFebre, "K," Mary, Devin Sens, Frank Oliver, Mary Frame, Tom, and Barbara Hampton.

Additional individuals requested permission to speak to the Commission and were invited to speak.

Sue Anschutz, 1635 Montview Boulevard, Greeley, expressed concerns about altering the number of unrelated individuals who can live in a home. She noted issues resulting from multiple individuals living in a single-family dwelling and expressed that it is difficult for the City to manage. Ms. Anschutz stated that increasing the number of unrelated individuals in a single-family home would increase issues, including parking, trash, gatherings and property maintenance. She added that the City already has difficulty managing these issues, adding that it is hard to find out the number of unrelated individuals living in a dwelling. Ms. Anschutz opposed increasing the number of unrelated individuals in her neighborhood.

A hearing clerk read emails into the record received from Julie Miller, Susan Wickham, Margaret Rothaus, Karen Rossman, Stan Elmquist, Justin Walker, Therese Gilbert, Sarah Walker and Paula Powell. The emails are attached to these minutes.

A hearing clerk announced another person requesting to speak to the Commission.

Mary Frame, 1434 24th Avenue, Greeley, stated that she has lived in her home since 1974. She noted all of the comments and asked about the next step in the process and how the Commission would respond.

A hearing clerk read additional comments in the Chat and Q&A from "K" who asked that the current codes be enforced before adding more, Barbara Hampton who expressed frustration about comments in opposition and stated that there are rentals in Greeley with young professionals who keep the property beautiful and asked what makes an unrelated individual undesirable.

Janice Lichtenberger, 2244 80th Avenue Court, Greeley, also requested to speak to the Commission. She asked how the proposed change came about and whether it was politically motivated by a specific entity or group. She asked whether a new standard could be applied to new development rather than existing neighborhoods.

The public hearing was closed at 3:25 p.m.

Mr. Jackson thanked everyone for joining the meeting and sharing their comments. He indicated that many of the comments have been expressed previously and reminded those attending that there are tools available such as Police, Code Compliance and Parking Services to respond to several types of complaints.

In response to an earlier question by Commissioner Franzen, Mr. Jackson presented information about zoning and noted that approximately two-thirds of the units in Greeley are single-family with the remainder being multi-family. Mr. Jackson added that this trend is changing and in recent years seems to have reversed. Mr. Jackson acknowledged the citizen comment about turning a single-family unit into a duplex and advised that additional units cannot be added in areas that are not zoned to do so, adding that will not change. He offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Modlin noted several comments about investors or absentee landlords and asked how owner occupied homes fit into the equation. Mr. Jackson reported that in 1980 from which the bulk of the family definition dates back, Greeley had required that any unrelated adult in a home had to be an owner. The City was taken to court in 1990 and the family definition was thrown out and could not require ownership.

Commissioner Andersen asked for clarification on the number of unrelated adults allowed in a 3-bedroom home and asked whether two families could occupy a home. Mr. Jackson stated that a Supreme Court ruling determined that a municipality cannot restrict a blood relative from joining a household.

Commissioner Romulo observed that there seem to be several people who are not in compliance with current codes and asked if that number was known. Of those, she asked how many are currently out of compliance and how many might be in compliance with the proposed change to the household occupancy standard. Mr. Jackson stated that not a lot of data is available, adding that the City receives approximately 50 complaints each year about the unrelated adult issue. He reported that many more complaints are tied to noise, trash and other nuisances.

Chair Yeater asked, of the 50 complaints that pertain to the number of unrelated adults, how many might be resolved if this change went through. Mr. Jackson reported that out of 50 complaints, staff was able to prove and enforce upon five. Commissioner Schulte observed that approximately 10 percent may have had a different outcome and asked whether the remaining 90 percent would still have had a complaint. Mr. Jackson responded that with the five proven cases, it was difficult to extrapolate anything that would provide a good idea. Commissioner Schulte asked if staff has any sense that the types of complaints we currently get would still be complaints if the occupancy standard is increased. Mr. Jackson advised that it could potentially change as to the family definition, but some other issues would potentially remain violations. He added

that Code Compliance tries to drill down to root issues if they are unable to prove a violation of the family definition.

Chair Yeater asked if any staff was present who could speak to how complaints are investigated. Brad Mueller, Community Development Director stated that a basic approach to a complaint is to contact the property owner and property resident for a "knock & talk" and inquire about the relationship of those living in the home. Code Compliance can also request an affidavit, but it is voluntary on the part of the owner/occupant as to whether to comply. He added that officers could use that opportunity to observe if there are other violations and also conduct periodic equity sweeps of neighborhoods.

Gary Roberts, Code Compliance Supervisor, addressed the Commission and stated that this is one of the hardest issues to prove. He added that there is not a lot that can be done with a simple "knock and talk" if an individual indicates that all of the occupants are related.

Referring to the citizen comment about who began to push to change the occupancy standard and not being aware that this was a topic being considered, Commissioner Andersen asked how that might be changed and how citizens become aware of what is going on with Planning Commission or the City, especially with regard to code changes. Mr. Jackson advised that the Housing Task Force was a group of stakeholders interested in addressing the housing issues in City. The Task Force drafted the Strategic Housing Plan that was recommended by Planning Commission and adopted by City Council. He added that revising the household occupancy standards was one of the action items in the Strategic Housing Plan. As far as how people hear about items, Mr. Jackson stated that it is a bit more difficult and described methods utilized such as social media, surveys, a public open house and notices on the City website and local newspaper. He added that another good resource is the City newsletter and encouraged community members to consider it a resource to learn what is going on. Mr. Jackson reported that as feedback is collected, he adds the contact information to an email list that he has created for this topic. He added that word of mouth has also been helpful. For members of the public attending, Commissioner Romulo confirmed that the Housing Task Force created a plan in 2018 that was adopted in 2019.

Addressing Mr. Roberts, Chair Yeater asked if he felt a change to the Code would be helpful in enforcement or just provide a different standard by which to judge it. Mr. Roberts stated that it might be a little helpful, but it is still difficult to prove the number of unrelated people in a home. He added that he supports the proposal with some caveats such as tying the number of unrelated adults to the number of bedrooms. Commissioner Andersen asked whether he believed the caveats are addressed in the proposal. Mr. Roberts responded that he agrees with the proposal being presented.

Referring to the idea of empty nesters and other older adults who might want to take in a roommate to help financially, Commissioner Modlin asked how the code might be changed to accomplish that and minimize the other problems of a neighborhood degrading. Mr. Jackson acknowledged that this is a difficult idea to address and added that the family definition sets a community-wide

expectation regardless of race, sex, age, status, ownership, and the like. He was not sure how to accomplish this through the family definition. Commissioner Franzen agreed that the City cannot discriminate, but stated that certain areas such as 55+ communities are already in place.

Commissioner Andersen asked whether there would be improvements that address Code Compliance. Mr. Mueller advised that he has been asked to research the question, irrespective of this specific issue, and provide options to enhance enforcement around property issues.

Commissioner Schulte noted that the most quantifiable concerns he heard were around parking, trash and noise, which are already problems. He did not see a marginal increase in unrelated persons being a significant contributor. He added that some of the complaints about trash, noise and parking might be connected to geographical forces such as proximity to campus and those neighborhoods that currently do not experience those problems likely will not even if the standard is increased. He suggested that economic freedom and flexibility are increased by this measure and that he was in favor of increasing the limits as suggested at the previous Commission meeting.

Commissioner Briscoe stated that he was not in favor and would be voting against the proposal. He added that staff has done a good job putting things together, but often the response is that the concerns represent a worst-case scenario. Mr. Briscoe noted that they had just spent two hours hearing worst-case stories and that the appropriate tool is enforcement of the code. He stated that loosening the law makes it more difficult for someone to find relief with neighborhood problems and seems to take away options and asked whether changing the family definition might be a good first start. Commissioner Romulo added that changing the rules does not change the acts of bad actors, adding that changing the enforcement rules is a bigger item for discussion and agreed with Commissioner Briscoe about changing the family definition.

Commissioner Andersen indicated her understanding of Commissioner Briscoe's comment that it is unfortunate when someone purchases a single-family home and later learns that they cannot count on that expectation. Commissioner Andersen added that, however, she was hesitant to avoid changing the occupancy standard so as not to disappoint those individuals, adding that there are also quiet and positive people who want to do the right thing and are asking politely to be able to do that without breaking the law and that the Commission honors those making that request. She added the importance of increasing the ability to enforce and the rest would sort itself out. Commissioner Briscoe responded that he must take his responsibility and appointment to the Planning Commission and look at the desires and feedback from entire community, adding that he has not heard anyone politely asking but has heard many people asking not to do this. He felt that as a representative, he has to listen to those voices and nothing precludes the Commission from revisiting this in the future. He noted that the comments today were overwhelmingly in opposition.

Commissioner Romulo agreed with Commissioner Briscoe that more information would be helpful. She added that not every citizen is available between 1:00-5:00 on a Tuesday afternoon and felt it was important to recognize the people who attended today and spoke but also identify the missing voices.

Commissioner Romulo noted that 340 people responded to the survey prepared by staff, with the majority in support of increasing the occupancy standards, but stated that it is a small percentage of the community. She expressed the struggle to get a sense of what the community wants. Commissioner Briscoe stated that the Tribune survey showed that 67% of responders were opposed, which was much different from the public survey.

Chair Yeater expressed that he was challenged that the Commission has heard from very few people who are in favor of increasing the standard, but many who are opposed. He added that under the current Code, regardless of U+1, the family definition is still an issue and if a married couple is considered unrelated, that is a problem. He added that civil unions also needed to be addressed in the Code. He asked for thoughts from the Commission about the definition of "family."

Commissioner Franzen supported adding marriage to the family definition. Commissioner Romulo suggested that "U" is confusing and asked whether it could read "family" instead. There was further discussion among the Commissioners as to exactly what "U" represents and defining what constitutes "+."

Chair Yeater summarized what he felt were the Commission's three options. Mr. Mueller stated that anything is within the Commission's discretion, including continuation of the matter and suggested perhaps beginning with a yes or no vote on the staff recommendation and going from there. Chair Yeater expressed his hesitancy to call for a vote now and asked for a thumbs up or down about changing the definition of family. He asked how many were in favor of revising the definition of family and there were seven thumbs up. With respect to R-M, Chair Yeater asked how many could support what is being proposed and the response was mixed. He welcomed comments about why U+2 is an appropriate cap.

Commissioner Briscoe stated that he did not like how broad this is and added that if the family definition is changed to include a married couple or civil union, much of what has been suggested is accomplished. He added that if the proposal were to be presented with that change alone, he would support it. U+1 would allow a couple to have a renter. Chair Yeater stated that he did not believe affordability was a reason to change the code, but that it should be changed more because of behavior and the way people use their homes.

The Commission engaged in further discussion to come to an understanding and agreement of the family definition and what was allowed with a proposal for U+1 and U+2.

Chair Yeater confirmed that all Commissioners had expressed an opinion and suggested continuing the item to the following Tuesday to finish the discussion and make a recommendation.

Commissioner Schulte moved to set a special meeting for Tuesday, May 18, 2021 at 1:15 p.m. Commissioner Modlin seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Andersen moved to continue Items VIII, IX and X on the agenda until May 18, 2021 at 1:15 p.m. Commissioner Romulo seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

IX. Public hearing to consider amendments to Title 24 of the 2021 Greeley Municipal Code to adopt Chapter 1 (General Provisions) and Chapter 2 (Procedures) as part of the overall code update to be adopted by ordinance at a future date

Continued until May 18, 2021

X. Staff Report

Continued until May 18, 2021

XI. Adjournment

With no further business before the Commission, Char Yeater adjourned the meeting at 5:13 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

3F44E3E176F84C8...
Justin Yeater, Chair

DocuSigned by:

7418AD096A3C407...
Brad Mueller, Secretary

From: Julie Miller

Date: May 10, 2021 at 5:34:03 PM MDT

To: CD Admin Team <CD_Admin_Team@greeleygov.com>, John Gates <John.Gates@greeleygov.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed changes to housing code

Hello and thank you for your service to our community.

My name is Julie Miller and I have been a Greeley resident for almost 16+ years in the Maplewood neighborhood. I will not be able to attend the virtual meeting, but I wanted to be sure to voice my concerns about any relaxation of the current housing code.

We have had a flop house in the Maplewood neighborhood for several years. It is a known meth house, as well. The police know the home by the address numbers alone.

We have several homes in the area with very unkempt yards, furniture in the backyard - not lawn furniture, but rotting indoor furniture, cars parked on the grass, trailers in streets, and I believe we currently have someone living in a camper on the street nearby. And YES, we have reported these to code enforcement over and over. The lawns are the same, the furniture and mattresses are rotting, the grass is uncut, and things remain very much the same as they have for years - years!

Crime has increased in our neighborhood, not to mention traffic. A few years ago, we had 13 burglaries occur. Fortunately our neighbor was hard of hearing and he did not interrupt it. Another neighbor has had trash dumped in her cans, including the actual drag marks right across the alley to her cans! "Nothing we can do," was the response when it was reported and she had to pay for the trash removal.

The same neighbor has also interrupted a potential burglary. We have reported a possible car salesperson selling out of their apartment and yet, here we are. More traffic, same old issues, and very good people tolerating fires, explosions, a garage with plywood and plastic for a roof (since 2017) - which is from the resulting fire when a suspect tried to cover up a murder. They have bricks and boards covering their basement windows. It is known that people were living in the basement, as the police were called to a yard fire at this same address and were told it was someone living in the house, too. We KNOW what it's like with the current codes and can't possibly imagine relaxing the codes.

Our last discussion about these problematic issues with the city was that WE, as a neighborhood, would have to file a lawsuit against the problematic house. Would you? And how do you think this response leaves us feeling as homeowners and taxpayers? And, if we aren't going to enforce codes, why even have them?

We've been very fortunate to have a mixture of good and challenging neighbors, but we are growing very weary of the lack of code enforcement even with the current standard and the noise levels that have come ridiculous. Eventually, you have people, like myself, giving up. We don't

call, we don't email, we just get angry, frustrated, disappointed, and move - if and when we can move and Greeley suffers for that.

I was really taken aback that this was even being considered. Relaxing codes will not help the situation, but only enable more problematic behaviors and increase what I already believe to be problematic enforcement issues. If anything we need more support for code enforcement and stiffer penalties for a lack of adherence. I appreciate this last year being a challenge for all authorities, but you have to realize these code enforcement issues have been problems **for YEARS in our neighborhood:** Trash, yards, cars, abandoned vehicles, illegal parking, unlicensed vehicles, and occupancy issues and that does not include the problems that come with uninforced occupancy problems. You can simply drive down the alley and see the issues. As a code enforcement office, the city shouldn't have to wait for a complaint to act, should it?

Relaxing the code is not an answer to housing issues and especially for those of us who have already been facing continued issues with current code enforcement? It seems really ridiculous to even consider something like this.

Again, thank you for all you do for the community. I recognize your jobs are not easy, nor am I privy to all the information and issues with which you must face.

Sincerely,

Julie Miller
Maplewood resident and homeowner

From: Susan Wickham

Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 6:33 PM

To: planning <planning@Greeleygov.com>; CD Admin Team <CD_Admin_Team@Greeleygov.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Zoning changes

We are opposed to changing the zoning. We have lived in the Cranford neighborhood for 22 years and have enjoyed becoming friends with neighbors who are homeowners and genuinely care for the neighborhood and each other.

The planned change of zoning in our neighborhoods is a great concern as these changes will not benefit the people who live in and care for the neighborhood.

We are also concerned about the manner of communication regarding the public hearing. We heard of this from a neighbor just one day before the hearing. We heard nothing from the City or the Greeley Planning Commission about the zoning changes, or the public hearing.

Here are some reasons for our opposition:

- There are currently serious traffic safety and congestion issues which will be exacerbated by higher occupancy
 - Already we are experiencing more traffic in these neighborhoods
 - The increased traffic is traveling at higher speeds (exceeding limits)
 - Parking problems will increase with increased occupancy
 - Off-street parking is at capacity on many blocks, streets
 - Currently cars park on lawns already, this will likely increase
- Property care of rental properties in these neighborhoods has deteriorated
 - More renters in the neighborhood will exacerbate this problem
 - Trash piles up in alleys and driveways and often remains for weeks
 - Causing decrease in adjacent property values
- Noise pollution has increased and will likely increase with higher occupancy
- The Historic designation for many of the homes might be jeopardized

Thank you for your consideration,

Susan and Nat Wickham
1910 14th Avenue
Greeley

To the Housing Commission:

The Greeley Planning Commission is proposing that the city council accept a recommendation to overthrow the current zoning code in residential neighborhoods that limits the number of unrelated adults who can share occupancy of currently zoned single family home and replace it with a new code that would allow as many occupants - related or unrelated as can be shoe-horned into a single family to legally live there.

Essentially, as many bedrooms as a landlord could devise or jerry-build in a home in a residential neighborhood could then be occupied by an unrelated adult.

Many of the homes in Greeley's older neighborhoods have three bedrooms and space in the basement for another two bedrooms to be created. The houses in Greeley's quiet, pleasant residential neighborhood have a much lower price tag than in newer parts of the city. That is why these houses in areas, such as the Arlington, Cranford and Fairacre neighborhoods, have been such a magnet for young, first time home buyers.

Unfortunately, the lower price tag and downpayment are also a magnet for absentee landlords who are able to invest little and reap the benefits of renting to as many individuals as they can possibly squeeze into these smaller individual homes. They have no interest in maintaining the character of the neighborhood.

Those of us who live in the houses in these older neighborhoods which used to define the pleasant residential character of Greeley's neighborhoods already know the result of allowing multiple residents in single family homes: the front and back yards of these homes are often poorly or minimally maintained, multiple visitors to multiple residents greatly increase the traffic and safety of the neighborhood, parked cars line the streets, and the neighborliness that characterized these areas is greatly diminished. Longtime residents find that the neighborhood that they have enjoyed for many years is no longer a pleasant or safe place to live. They put their house on the market thus opening the neighborhood to even more uncaring landlords.

I understand the great need for more moderate priced housing in Greeley. The Greeley Planning Commission must continue to seek developers to create legitimate multiple housing solutions where individuals and families with moderate incomes can live pleasantly in their own home. Instead the Planning Commission is attempting a quick fix to the housing shortage by opening the door to crowding multiple individuals into single family homes and turning once desirable neighborhoods with smaller less expensive housing into undesirable places to live.

Margaret Rothaus
1700 Fairacre Drive, Greeley

Absolutely not!

Many houses in this area have historic designations! Greeley's history would be in jeopardy!

I found out about this proposal on May 10 at about 10 AM from a neighbor! Sparks suspicion!

I would like to know how home owners were notified? Please answer. Every homeowner should be sent a letter by mail! Time, due process and a voice should be given and honored!

If you say notification was in the Tribune, myself and many of my neighbors do not receive the Tribune. You know that! That tactic allows you a power-play to steamroll such a proposal through to benefit those who wrote and want the proposal implemented!

Please give ALL the affected property owners a voice/vote in this consequential decision!

Karen Rossman
1912 15th Ave

Dear Planning Staff and Planning Commission Members:

Having listened to deliberations from your previous (March) meeting held via “Zoom,” I can understand the desire for the Commission to reach a compromise and limit the “Plus Unrelated Person(s)” occupancy to no more than “Two” instead of earlier-proposed “Three” in a single-family residential zone.

I am aware that younger people are having difficulty affording single family houses almost anywhere in Front Range Colorado cities. However, it seems to me that if there is a market demand for this to occur, it should be offered in yet-to-be developed annexations of Greeley, possibly through the introduction of a new category of zoning.

The “You-Plus-One or Two” relaxation of standards should not be made retroactive in existing neighborhoods (i.e. ones with R-E, R-L, and R-MH zoning).

It is my fear—having received dozens of potential offers from out-of-town strangers interested in buying our single-family house—that “the market” is peppered with quite a few non-resident investors who are possibly trying to cause zoning code revisions. Their intent could very well be to become non-resident landlords of houses with three (or more) adult renters, plus any children and relatives. It is conceivable that this change in the density of neighborhoods’ populations could eventually cause prices-per-parcel to *increase* because of the potential *rental income* from multiple, unrelated adults; even so, this would be inconsistent with the neighborhood ambiance we sought and chose almost three decades ago when we moved into our current house in an “R-L” zone.

I would like to have seen some “before” and “a-few-years-after” appraisal statistics from other cities that have made these kinds of broad-brush revisions to zoning codes. If this kind of change would, as some have warned, actually *decrease* the value of single-family houses in R-E, R-L, and R-MH zones, then this is a stronger reason to oppose the change.

Based on what I have heard and read, I do not want the City to allow the conversion of existing single-family houses into ones with the head of household (and spouse?) “plus two” unrelated adults (instead of the current “plus one”). Once such a change in code would be approved, it would be practically impossible to reverse it if this would turn out to have been an undesirable change in some or all the current neighborhoods!

Thank you for the opportunity to comment!

Stan Elmquist
2152 27th Avenue
Greeley, CO 80634

I live at 1913 15th Ave in Greeley very near to the University and am quite concerned that allowing more adults from different households to occupy the homes in my neighborhood would lead to college renters with parties, etc... which would really change the culture of the community and potentially discourage us and other families from living here.

Thank you for your consideration,

-Justin Walker

May 10, 2021

Dear Greeley Planning Commissioners,

My name is Therese Gilbert and I have lived at 1715 14th Avenue, Greeley since 1995. I love my neighborhood and knew when I moved to Greeley that I would want to purchase an older, traditional home in the Cranford neighborhood. When I first moved onto my block in '95 there were no residents renting, only homeowners. Today I am one of 3 resident homeowners of the eight homes on my side of the block.

Over the past few years I have had different issues with the renters north and south of me and invariably these issues were more problematic when there were unrelated tenants in the home; beer bottles and cans thrown into my backyard, dogs running in my backyard, loud music playing into the early morning hours, etc. I kept in communication with the landlords and would gently remind them that they were in violation of city zoning codes when they were renting to unrelated people. They were always responsive and tried to mitigate the problems.

For the past three or more years there are still only three resident homeowners on the block, but the families in the rentals have stayed. Some are three generational in the home with grandparents, parents, and children. They take good care of their property and are great neighbors. I know their names and the names of their children. When we sit on our porches we greet each other and exchange pleasantries and I know that they are keeping an eye out for me and my property as I am doing so for them.

It makes a big difference when renters are stable and not transient as they are in neighborhoods with different zoning. Families need a quiet neighborhood to rent or own homes. Their needs are different. Children need to be able to sleep at night without loud parties and they need to be able to run and play in yards that are safe around neighbors they know. In the homes on my block, there may be 7 or 8 family members in the home, and this is making greater use of the space. Student housing continues to be built along 6th Avenue, and east of 11th Avenue.

Single renters can find housing, but it is more difficult for a family to find an affordable home to rent with enough rooms and space. Please consider this need! It makes a huge difference when a neighborhood is no longer low-density residential to the families that live there. The needs of families are different, and we need to respect this whether they own or rent their homes.

Thank you so much for your consideration of this important issue,

Therese Gilbert, 1715 14th Avenue, Greeley 80631

We live in the Glenmere neighborhood and are very opposed to changing the occupancy requirements to allow more unrelated people to live together in the same house in our neighborhood. It seems to me that it would greatly change our neighborhood, and would mostly benefit investors, who do not live here and are not a part of the fabric of the neighborhood. We have lived here for 12 years and love our neighborhood and do not want there to be more college housing and large groups of unrelated people living together. Glenmere and Cranford have a reputation for being safe, neighborly neighborhoods in central Greeley. It seems to me that changing the occupancy requirements could really change the feel of the neighborhood and send even more families west, if these neighborhoods no longer have their same charm and good reputation for being quiet, safe, and neighborly. It seems to me that it is in the best interest of the residents of these neighborhoods as well as in the best interest of the city to keep the best neighborhoods in central Greeley as desirable places to live. If these neighborhoods change, you will see more people moving west, and less support for the downtown/ 16th street businesses. Please do not change the occupancy requirements in our neighborhood. I just heard about this proposal yesterday, and I think many people in our neighborhood don't know about the proposed changes, and would not be in favor of them if they were aware of them.

Thanks so much
Sarah Walker
1913 15th ave

Fri, Apr 2,
1:35 PM

to developmentcodeupdate

April 2, 2021

Cale Jacobson, Planner II
City of Greeley, CO and
To Whom It May Concern:

I am wanting to give my input as to the rezoning of R-L Single-Family Housing in Greeley, as I was just made aware this is happening. I have lived in the Cranford area since October 1987 and have seen the changes in the area that have not been favorable for Greeley citizens living in our homes.

When I first moved into my home, I rented until 1992 when I was able to purchase it. I had loved the area as most people on my block owned and occupied their home. The neighbors knew each other, the lawns were maintained, people parked in their driveways and we helped each other when in need. As a single parent whose son went to UNC laboratory school and UNC, I have worked incredibly hard over many years to improve all of my property, from landscaping to many inside home improvements.

We had a survey in April of 1995 to identify the occupancy and use of our property. Over 220 properties in Cranford were inspected as well as rental properties (who were grandfathered in) to meet housing codes and safety codes. For many years, the Single Housing code was followed, and the area remained relatively a nice area to reside.

Over time, the zoning has become lax, and more and more renters have moved in with 7, 8 people living in one home. The traffic is worse, trash barrels left in front yards, the homes are not kept up and there are increasing parties with loud noise late into the night, which make it impossible to sleep.

When a new owner, who lives in Fort Collins, bought the house next door to rent, I reminded him of the Single Housing Occupancy zoning laws and he has kept to that law. However, many other owners that rent are no longer complying. Our once beautiful, quiet neighbor has become one which I do not want to continue to live very much longer. And now, if the zoning laws are again changed, homeowners who do not live in the area will have free range to have whoever move in to simply increase the money in their pockets, not the upkeep of the property or consideration of noise.

There are plenty of apartments, condos, etc. being built at a rapid rate and I am upset that this part of the city of Greeley is being neglected and being considered for further demise. I am asking that the zoning laws NOT be changed in my backyard and we can, at least, try to maintain some nice neighborhoods in one of the oldest parts of Greeley.

Thank you,
Paula Powell
1718 14th Avenue
Greeley, CO
970 352-8030