



Planning Commission Remote Meeting Instructions for June 22, 2021 Meeting

In order to comply with all health orders and State guidelines to stop the spread of the COVID-19 Coronavirus, **no physical location, including the City Council Chambers, will be set up for viewing or participating in this meeting.**

Citizen Participation During Hearing

Click the link below to join the virtual meeting. During the public hearing portion, use the Q&A or raised hand features at the bottom of the screen and you will be called upon to speak at the appropriate time.

<https://greeleygov.zoom.us/j/85034152372?pwd=TzdGbzMyaFczQTZlOGlnZjdBVFpDQT09>

Passcode: 452212

Livestream on YouTube:

View a live stream of the meeting on the City of Greeley YouTube channel
<https://www.youtube.com/CityofGreeley>.

Other options for sharing public comments:

E-mail – Submit to cd_admin_team@greeleygov.com

All comments submitted by e-mail will be read into the record at the appropriate points during the meeting in real time. Comments can be submitted up to and throughout the meeting.

Traditional Mail – Planning Commission, 1100 10th Street, Greeley, CO 80631

All written comments must be received no later than the day of the meeting. Written comments received by mail will also be read into the record in real time.

To download the agenda and agenda packet, click on the "Enter City Meeting Portal" button on the Planning Commission web page – <https://greeleygov.com/government/b-c/boards-and-commissions/planning>. You may also call the Planning office at 970-350-9780 if you have any other questions or require special accommodations to attend a virtual hearing.



Chair
Justin Yeater

Vice-Chair
Erik Briscoe

Commissioners
Louisa Andersen
Brian Franzen
Larry Modlin
Chelsie Romulo
Christian Schulte

**A City Achieving
Community Excellence**

Greeley promotes a healthy, diverse economy and high quality of life responsive to all its residents and neighborhoods, thoughtfully managing its human and natural resources in a manner that creates and sustains a safe, unique, vibrant and rewarding community in which to live, work, and play.

Planning Commission Agenda

June 22, 2021 at 1:15 p.m.

This meeting will be conducted remotely. (See previous page or participation instructions and/or to view the YouTube replay.)

- I. Call to Order & Roll Call
- II. Approval of Agenda
- III. Approval of June 8, 2021 Minutes
- IV. Worksession: Code Update, Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 & 13

Presenter: Carol Kuhn, Chief Planner

- V. Adjournment

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATES:

Meetings are held on the 2nd and 4th Tuesdays of the month at 1:15 p.m.

July 13, 2021

July 27, 2021

August 10, 2021

August 24, 2021

September 14, 2021

September 28, 2021

October 12, 2021

October 26, 2021

November 9, 2021

November 23, 2021

December 14, 2021

December 28, 2021

Roll Call

Chair Yeater

Commissioner Andersen

Commissioner Briscoe

Commissioner Franzen

Commissioner Modlin

Commissioner Romulo

Commissioner Schulte

City of Greeley, Colorado
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS

June 8, 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 Louisa Andersen
Commissioner Erik Briscoe
Commissioner Chelsie Romulo
Commissioner Christian Schulte

ABSENT

Commissioner Brian Franzen
Commissioner Larry Modlin

II. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Andersen moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner Romulo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

III. Approval of May 11, 2021 Minutes

Commissioner Andersen moved to approve the minutes dated May 11, 2021. Commissioner Romulo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

IV. Approval of May 18, 2021 Special Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Andersen moved to approve the minutes dated May 18, 2021. Commissioner Romulo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

V. Approval of May 25, 2021 Minutes

Commissioner Andersen moved to approve the minutes dated May 25, 2021. Commissioner Romulo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

VI. Public hearing to consider amending Title 24 of the 2021 Greeley Municipal Code to adopt Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 & 12 as part of the overall code update to be adopted by ordinance at a future date

Project: Title 24 – Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 & 12 – Development Code Update

Case No.: CU2021-0004

Applicant: City of Greeley, Community Development Dept.

Presenter: Carol Kuhn, Chief Planner

Carol Kuhn addressed the Commission and introduced the item. She reminded Commissioners of the schedule, and review and vetting process. She advised that a section map is included for each chapter and described the key changes proposed for each chapter. Ms. Kuhn advised that notices were published in the newspaper and that referrals were sent to surrounding communities. Staff recommended approval. Ms. Kuhn offered to answer any questions.

Commissioner Schulte pointed out an error or typo on page 65 of the packet and asked whether a final look for those types of things would be conducted at the end of the process. He also stated that the requirements for a quorum for Historic Preservation Commission differed from that of Planning Commission and asked whether both should conform. Chris Brewster responded that no substantive changes were made to the Historic Preservation section and advised that he would go back and confirm the number required for a quorum.

Commissioner Andersen asked about the parking reduction credits and whether the various types of proposed credits were cumulative. Mr. Brewster advised that the intent was to show the outer limits of what staff could approve. He stated that if the 25% limit is exceeded, the matter would bump up to an alternative parking plan and a Use by Special Review for review by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Andersen clarified that the 25% transit credit could be available if a bus stop is located four blocks from a development.

Commissioner Andersen also expressed her concern that the credit allowed for bicycle storage could become onerous on a developer if they are required to construct areas for bicycle storage. Mr. Brewster advised that storage could be as simple as under a stairway or anything that kept bicycles stored outdoors protected from the elements. Upon question by Commissioner Andersen, Ms. Kuhn advised that the requirement for bicycle storage or lockers would pertain only to new development and would not be grandfathered for existing areas. Commissioner Andersen stated that the word "required," seems to be one more hurdle for a developer and when it is an administrative decision, could become a planner's interpretation and not be consistent among planners.

Chair Yeater offered that he is excited about increasing the standard and feels that it is a valuable addition to the code. He added that as parking standards for vehicles are now in place, this is standardizing how to store bicycles and stated that he was in support. Ms. Kuhn advised that she has seen residents in multi-family units requesting this type of code.

Commissioner Schulte asked whether the proposal is following a market trend where people building multi-family units are finding it necessary to accommodate more bicycle users. Chair Yeater pointed out that the Commission recently approved projects along 8th Avenue that included bicycle lockers and areas for bicycle repair. Commissioner Andersen noted that there is a difference between an amenity and a requirement and was uncomfortable with the word "requirement." Mr. Brewster advised that where there is long-term parking, it is a good idea to dedicate some space for bicycles that can be stored out of the weather, adding that it is a matter of staff working with a developer to include available space for bicycles.

With regard to the hillside development standards and requirement that residences are painted using earth tones, Commissioner Andersen asked why that was a concern to add to the code. Ms. Kuhn pointed out that it is part of the current code. Brad Mueller, Community Development Director, added that as a planning principle, the thought is that neutral colors would allow homes to better blend into the environment and minimize the visual impact. Commissioner Andersen expressed that this is a standard she would like to see changed and did not feel it belongs in the code. Mr. Mueller advised that if there is a consensus among the Commission, it could be stricken.

Commissioner Schulte expressed his opinion that this is ministerial in nature and at this time staff is moving existing sections of the code into a new organized table of contents. He indicated that there could be a number of these types of issues to address in the future, but that it seemed outside the scope of the immediate task, adding that doing so on an ad hoc basis may not be the most careful way to go about making revisions. Mr. Mueller suggested that it might be appropriate to flag some of the individual topical matters and bring forward at a later time. Commissioner Andersen expressed appreciation and suggested creating a sort of "punch list." Commissioner Romulo agreed that a list would be helpful to maintain consistency in the future.

Commissioner Andersen had similar questions regarding parking of oversized vehicles, but could not locate the exact code reference in the packet materials. Ms. Kuhn advised that the reference to oversized vehicles is part of the police section in the Municipal Code and not part of the Development Code. Mr. Mueller added that putting this question on the record today provides direction for staff to review in the future.

Chair Yeater summarized that the items to be added to a list include hillside development standards, requirements for bicycle storage, and requirements for oversized vehicles. Ms. Kuhn advised that Chapter 15 of the Municipal Code (police) addressed oversized vehicles. Commissioner Andersen stated that she would like it to be added to the list for future review.

Commissioner Andersen noted that historic signs and monuments such as the Color Portraits, Weld County Garage, and Hillside signs would not be built today given the proposed guidelines and asked if the revised code would restrict a person from building something creative that might one day be considered historic. Commissioner Schulte appreciated the concern and acknowledged that it is difficult to quantify in the code. Upon question by Chair Yeater,

Mr. Mueller advised that an applicant could appeal a staff decision to the Planning Commission. He added that staff is also looking to expand the subarea plan to provide the capacity to do more fine grain planning.

Chair Yeater opened the public hearing at 2:10 p.m. There being no communication by U.S. mail, email or Zoom Chat or Q&A, the public hearing was closed at 2:10 p.m.

There was discussion about whether to include the creation of a punch list in the motion. Upon advice of legal counsel, the recommended motion in the packet was determined to be sufficient.

Commissioner Andersen moved that, based on the project summary and attached drafts of Chapters 7-12, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed revisions to Chapters 7-12 are consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and are necessary and appropriate in meeting the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and to clarify administration of the Development Code and recommends that the City Council adopt Chapters 7-12 of Title 24 as shown in Attachments A, C, E, G, I and K. Commissioner Schulte seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0.

VI. Public hearing to consider a request for a Preliminary PUD of 99.233 acres of land into 363 residential lots, a 9.40-acre future park site, open space and drainage lots

Project: Promontory Imagine School, Third Filing Preliminary PUD

Case No.: PUD2020-0014

Applicant: Larry Buckendorf, on behalf of Promontory Investments LLC and Weldco Investors LLC

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

Presenter: Mike Garrott, Planning Manager

Mike Garrott addressed the Commission, introduced the item and presented aerial photographs showing the location of the site. He described the proposal for 363 single-family residential lots on 99.233 acres that also includes a future park, outlots for detention, utilities, open space and a dedicated right-of-way.

Mr. Garrott reported that the zoning allows residential uses on the site, adding that the applicant is proposing a preliminary plat allowing that land uses can vary from a typical residential development. Mr. Garrott stated that the applicant proposes to vary the minimum lot size, setbacks, house frontage area, window and door openings, and driveway coverage.

Mr. Garrott presented a proposed preliminary plat and pointed out the utility easement, Outlot D and open space when fully amenitized. He discussed the proposal for a park and described the access points to the site from Promontory Parkway and 16th Street. Mr. Garrott also presented a proposed landscape plan and stated that non-potable water is proposed for irrigation of landscaping. He

added that approximately 28 percent of the overall site is open space and presented photographs of the site.

Mr. Garrott highlighted the development code criteria, noting that staff found the project supports the core values and principles of the comprehensive plan and strategic housing plan. He briefly described the amenities that will enhance the aspect of the project, including a connection to trails. Notice letters were sent to property owners within 500 feet, signs were posted, and notice was published in the newspaper with no citizen input. Staff recommended approval.

Commissioner Schulte asked whether there are restrictions in place limiting how far the front of a garage can extend from the front of a house. Mr. Garrott reported that the garage must be set back 20 feet from the street and the house set back 14 feet, adding that the developer is looking to set the garages back from the dwelling.

Morgan Kidder, 1751 West 20th Street, Greeley, addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. He indicated that the oil and gas well on Outlot H has been plugged and abandoned. Mr. Kidder offered to answer questions.

Chair Yeater opened the public hearing at 2:32 p.m. There being no communication by U.S. mail, email or Zoom Chat or Q&A, the public hearing was closed at 2:32 p.m.

Commissioner Andersen commented that she liked the idea of varying lot sizes.

Commissioner Andersen moved that, based on the application received and the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed Preliminary PUD Plan is consistent with Section 24-663 of the Development Code; and, therefore, recommends approval of the PUD plan as submitted to the City Council. Commissioner Romulo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

VII. Staff Report

Mr. Mueller thanked the Commissioners for the time they spent on the development code update and added that the department continues to see a lot of development activity. He reported that City Council declined to advance the home occupancy standards update on first reading and expressed appreciation to the Commission for its work on the topic.

IX. Adjournment

With no further business before the Commission, Chair Yeater adjourned the meeting at 2:39 p.m.

Justin Yeater, Vice Chair

Brad Mueller, Secretary



Planning Commission Memorandum

Date: June 22, 2021
To: Planning Commission
From: Carol Kuhn, AICP, Chief Planner
Through: Mike Garrott, AICP, Planning Manager
RE: Development Code Update – Worksession – Chapters 3-6 Highlights

As part of the Development Code Update, staff has been working with the Technical Committee and the consulting team to revise various chapters in the Development Code, Title 24. The purpose of this worksession is to present highlights from Chapters 3-6. Staff and the Technical Committee members are working through the drafts of these chapters. Staff will provide drafts of Chapters 3-6 and 13 as part of the packet for the next Planning Commission worksession on July 13, 2021.

The proposed schedule for the adoption of the Development Code is as follows:

Track	Chapter(s)	PC Worksession	PC Hearing	CC Public Hearings
Track I - Non-substantive changes for organization and improved usability.	Ch 1 – General Provisions	March 23, 2021	April 13, 2021	June 1, 2021 (First Reading)
	Ch 2 - Procedures	April 27, 2021	May 18, 2021	June 15, 2021 (Public Hearing) September 21, 2021 (2 nd Reading – No public comment)
Track II - Non-policy technical changes and coordination with other City policies and documents.	Ch 7 – Access & Parking Ch 8 – Landscape & Site Design Standards Ch 9 – Signs Ch 10 – Special Purpose Districts & Areas	May 25, 2021	June 8, 2021	July 6, 2021 (First Reading) July 20, 2021 (Public Hearing) September 21, 2021 (2 nd Reading – No

Track	Chapter(s)	PC Worksession	PC Hearing	CC Public Hearings
	Ch 11 – Supplemental Standards Ch 12 - Reserved			public comment)
Track III - Substantive changes called for in the Comprehensive Plan, Strategic Housing Plan, and Council's 3-Year Priorities that need broader input and direction from the Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council.	Ch 3 – Subdivision Standards Ch 4 – Zoning Districts & Uses Ch 5 – Residential Development Standards Ch 6 – Non-residential Development Standards Ch 13 – Definitions	June 22, 2021 and July 13, 2021	July 27, 2021	August 3, 2021 (First Reading) August 17, 2021 (Public Hearing) September 21, 2021 (2 nd Reading – No public comment)

Chapter 3. Subdivision Standards

24-301	Streets
24-302	Open & Civic Space
24-303	Blocks & Lots
24-304	Required Improvements
24-305	Adequate Public Facilities

This chapter provides planning, engineering, and urban design standards for subdivisions. It establishes development patterns and infrastructure requirements as land is divided and ownership fractures. The changes in this code update are to reflect more “urban design” elements into the planning and development process at this key preliminary stage of development. This responds to Imagine Greeley’s call for greater distinction in the character of different places in the community, improvements to community image through development, and coordinated development with the “public realm” (streets and open spaces) of specific areas of the community.

Specific provisions would include:

- Reorganization of all of the subdivision standards into four key components of large-scale development patterns – Streets, Parks/Open Space, Blocks & Lots, and Required Improvements (infrastructure).
- *Streets*. The current street standards from various documents (current Development Code, Public Works Specifications, and Transportation Plan) would be consolidated in this section with the following additions:

- Refine the standards related to street connectivity to distinguish different contexts in the plan – primarily distinguishing walkable areas and car-oriented areas.
- Make the narrow neighborhood street, currently allowed only as a “performance option” in the current code applicable for all neighborhoods, provided there would be sufficient connectivity appropriate neighborhood design features to complement this street type.
- Add walkable mixed-use / commercial streets for application in the “centers” and mixed-use areas identified in Imagine Greeley.
- *Parkland & Civic Space*. Emphasize open space as a key image and development pattern for all projects. Improve criteria to link open space systems across projects and establish more context-appropriate open space standards.

Chapter 4. Zoning Districts & Uses

24-401	District Intent & Applicability
24-402	Allowed Uses
24-403	Accessory Uses
24-404	Specific Use Standards
24-405	District Performance Standards

This chapter establishes the zoning districts to be used to implement Imagine Greeley, and specifies land uses that are allowed in each district. Uses are either allowed “by right”, subject to the applicable district development and design standards, or are permitted through a Use by Special Review application process, which evaluates the specific use based on context. Some uses listed individually due to specific standards unique to that use. This chapter would include few revisions, but would modify the existing standards by:

- Focusing purely on land use, and the zoning district development standards are shifted to Chapters 5 (residential) and Chapter 6 (non-residential districts).
- Adding two new Mixed-Use (MU-) districts – MU-L and MU-H, which would be proposed as counterparts to the existing commercial (C) districts. These proposed additions are based on the Placemaking discussions with the Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council. These new districts could be used for new development projects; no existing zoning would be changed through the code update – any applications to rezone to MU-L or MU-H would be initiated by an applicant. These mixed use zone districts would also provide an additional option rather than relying on the PUD process for mixed-use projects. As proposed, they are similar to the C districts with the exception of: (1) greater restrictions on the scale of uses to reflect the compact and walkable pattern desired; and (2) more emphasis on allowing a mix of different uses including residential.

Chapter 5. Residential Development Standards

24-501	Intent & Applicability
24-502	Residential Building Types
24-503	Neighborhood Design Standards

24-504	Courtyard Pattern
24-505	Manufactured & Small Format Housing

This chapter includes all of the development and design standards for residential neighborhoods. It consolidates the various residential lot, setback, and height standards and it incorporates both community and building/lot design standards from the current code. All of the topics in this section are regulated in the current code, however these proposed modifications aim to: (1) simplify current standards into objective, measureable standards; (2) focus or emphasize a key component of the current design standards; or (3) create more nuance and distinctions for standards based on the context of a particular neighborhood.

Specific provisions to note are:

- *Residential Building Types.* The current standards are a mix of district and building type standards; the proposed revisions shift to a “building type” approach, and has a greater emphasis on “missing middle” housing – higher-density, smaller-scale, multi-unit projects. Changes impacting the existing residential districts are:
 - R-E. No change
 - R-L. Allowing a minimum lot size of 4,500 s.f. lot by right, which is currently allowed through the cluster option.
 - R-M. Increasing the range of building types allowed - specifically the lower end of the “missing middle” types (smaller lot detached houses and small-scale multi-unit buildings, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs))
 - R-H – No significant change, but added specific language regarding standards that may apply to the missing middle building types and promoting these more as strategies for infill.
- *Design Standards.* The current standards are scattered throughout the current code. Similar sections repeat throughout the code, though they reference similar topics of neighborhood design, but sometimes in slightly different ways causing conflicts and interpretation issues. This section reorganizes the standards to focus on three key components – frontage design, building design, and block and lot open space design.
 - *Frontage Design* – emphasizes standards on garage and driveway placement. Current standards would be slightly relaxed for larger lot or suburban contexts (new “Suburban Frontage” type) but would be slightly increased for mixed-density and walkable neighborhoods (“Neighborhood Frontage” type, which reflects current standards with slightly greater restrictions). As the lot sizes are reduced, a greater focus would be placed on the design aspects. There is also a new option proposed (“Terrace Frontage” type) which would allow residential buildings to be placed even closer to the front lot line in exchange for stronger requirements that push the car access and garages to the backs of lots. These standards would provide options for different contexts and are based on the width of lots. They become more important with the addition of the smaller and narrower lots.

- Building Design – includes topics addressed in various ways throughout the current code, but reorganizes them into one section. Topics are grouped in three main objectives; breaking down the scale and massing of the building; creating transparency (windows and doors); and avoiding blank walls (by adding materials and architectural details). Objective standards and benchmarks are established for each of these objectives by using two categories of buildings – small and large. Guidelines are established for a wide range of design strategies and techniques that can be used to meet these objective standards.
- Alternative Compliance Criteria specific to each of these provisions are established. These sections supplement the administrative discretion provided by alternative compliance generally in 24-208.
- *Block and Lot Open Space Design*. This section would establish design standards for specific lot and building parks to ensure “useable open space” for all residences, beyond just meeting setbacks. Depending on the scale of the project and its location, exceptions may be given for coordinating with public or common open spaces required in Chapter 3.
- *Courtyard Pattern*. This pattern is related to a specific infill strategy, but it can also be used in new developments. It would grant an exception to the requirement that lots front a street and allows a slight lot size reduction. This pattern would combine the “missing middle” housing options and the smaller formal open space options into a particular type of residential development that can increase housing options while supplying a higher level of neighborhood design.
- *Mobile and Manufactured Home - and Small Format Housing District*. These changes would reflect the standards for the existing R-MH district but would also include the following changes:
 - Improve the neighborhood / community design of these projects based on the same principles applied to all neighborhoods – emphasizing the streets and open spaces and improving the relation of housing sites and buildings to those spaces;
 - Reduce the overall project size to allow projects to fit into more areas;
 - Align the density and lot sizes with sizes more comparable of typical manufactured housing sites;
 - Broaden the applicability of this district to more types of small format housing that would meet the same scale, pattern, design, and intensity standards.

Chapter 6 Nonresidential Development Standards

24-601	Intent & Applicability
24-602	Development Standards
24-603	Design Standards

This chapter includes all of the development and design standards for non-residential development. Similar to Chapter 5, Residential Development Standards, it consolidates the various commercial and industrial zoning district found throughout the current code. The topics of the design standards are all addressed in the current code, but are not well-coordinated and are difficult to follow. Many are addressed in alternatives or

performance options but do not have clear criteria on when and where they should apply. Propose changes to this section include (1) adding more specific criteria for the circumstances where alternatives and options should apply, (2) emphasizing the primary goal of the design standards (to create better relationships to the public spaces and strengthen the character of an area), and (3) mitigating impacts on surrounding property.

Specific sections to note include:

- *Non-residential Zoning District Standards.* This section would capture the existing district standards, but add limits on the scale of lots for the new mixed-use districts to promote compact, walkable patterns (maximum sizes, rather than minimum).
- *Non-residential Design Standards.* An outcome of the placemaking facilitated discussions was to “bundle” most of the building and design standards into packages that escalate the closer the building is placed to the street. Key aspects of this strategy include:
 - Building on topics already regulated in the current code by simplifying them into building placement and orientation, transparency, and facade design.
 - Replacing the current performance option for street-front buildings, but use criteria for which contexts and which types of streets are most appropriate for street-front buildings.
 - Increase the human-scale requirements beyond current standards for buildings closest to the street; but relax the current requirements for buildings far removed from the street and with little impact on public spaces.
 - Provide options for street-front buildings as well as allow for the existing commercial districts to maintain the default to more car-oriented patterns (C-L and C-H) with a minimum of a 25’ setback, with basic building design standards to reflect existing standards). The new mixed use districts (MU-L and MU-H, unmapped) would have default standards for more pedestrian-oriented patterns (0’ – 10’ setback, with enhanced human scale design), but allow options for more relaxed standards in specific cases.
 - Create a simple approach to more nuanced building form and design standards for specific areas, based on a block-by-block urban design plan.
- *Block and Lot Open Space.* This proposed section would establish design standards for specific lot and building open spaces to coordinate with the objectives for the space – whether to buffer and separate the site from adjacent areas; to screen high-impact areas; to improve aesthetics; or to provide compact and formal social spaces, emphasizing various objectives, based on the context and relationship to any public or common open spaces.