



BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

July 08, 2025, at 1:15 pm

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Andersen called the meeting to order at 1:13 pm

2. Roll Call – **Present**

Vice Chair Louisa Andersen

Commissioner Erik Briscoe

Commissioner Jeff Carlson

Commissioner Brian Franzen

Commissioner Larry Modlin

Commissioner Christian Schulte

Absent

Chair Justin Yeater

3. Approval of the agenda

There were no changes to the agenda

Vice Chair Andersen called for a motion to approve the agenda as published

Motion: Commissioner Modlin

Second: Commissioner Franzen

Vote: Motion carried 6-0 (Chair Yeater absent)

4. Approval of Minutes

Approval of May 27, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

There were no changes to the minutes.

Motion: Commissioner Franzen

Second: Commissioner Carlson

Vote: Motion carried 6-0 (Chair Yeater absent)

5. Staff Report:

Don Threewitt (Deputy Director of Community Development) thanked everyone for accommodating the temporary meeting space, which was due to scheduling around the Council's budget retreat. Regular meetings will resume in the usual room. Mr. Threewitt noted that the community meeting regarding the Grow West Area Plan is scheduled for tomorrow evening (7/9) and encouraged everyone to invite others to attend.

6. Adjournment:

Vice Chair Andersen adjourned the meeting at 1:15 pm and moved into the workshop portion of the meeting.

Workshop

7. Grow West Area Plan, Caleb Jackson:

-The meeting began with the introduction of a West Greeley subarea plan project, led by consultants Jason King (Able City) and Jeff Speck (Speck Dempsy), which aims to create walkable, mixed-use communities while balancing development with agricultural preservation. The discussion covered various planning and development strategies, including form-based coding, community engagement approaches, and the challenges of implementing new urbanist concepts in a rapidly growing rural area. They also spoke about zoning criteria, public input processes, and the relationship between development projects and infrastructure financing. The consultants placed particular emphasis on Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), stressing the importance of the city and its commissioners ensuring that these areas are thoughtfully and intentionally designed by developers during the application process. In some cases, specific requirements may need to be mandated to support the overall success of the plan. -The consultants then asked for feedback from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Modlin emphasized the importance of residents on the west side, understanding that they're now at the heart of the city. Questions like how long changes will take and what's being planned are key.

Commissioner Briscoe noted that Greeley development is spreading westward, mainly as apartment buildings, raising concerns about sprawl reaching the city limits. He stressed the importance of sharing the long-term vision with the community. Commissioner Briscoe also observed that while newcomers may expect Greeley to resemble places like Fort Collins or Longmont, the city has deep agricultural roots. Many residents are accustomed to driving long distances, a behavior shaped by rural lifestyles and likely to persist.

Commissioner Briscoe raised the question of how to encourage or incentivize developers to build in a way that aligns with the community's vision. Right now, it's often more affordable

and profitable for developers to build dense, continuous housing rather than smaller, separate clusters or “pods.”

Commissioner Briscoe suggested that as the team reviews the code, finding ways to support and promote this kind of development approach will be a critical part of the overall plan.

Vice Chair Andersen mentioned industrial businesses and how they would fit into this plan.

Vice Chair Andersen spoke about similar projects that came before them only to be dismantled. St. Michael’s and Promontory were her two examples. She stated she is hesitant to go completely onboard with another DCMP (Development Concept Master Plan) concept because they simply have not worked for Greeley in the past.

Jeff Speck recognized Vice Chair Andersen’s concerns and expressed a desire to review the plans for the projects mentioned, noting a desire to dig into the reasons for this lack of success.

Commissioner Franzen raised concerns about whether impact fees are reduced when developments provide public benefits—such as walkability, reduced need for busing, or lower demands on services like fire and police. In response, Mr. King explained that they work with developers to identify incentives that make such projects feasible. These may include streamlined permitting or reductions in impact and mitigation fees. Mr. King continued by saying the process involves assessing measurable benefits—like block perimeters or intersections per square mile—and discussing what kind of public-private partnerships or incentives are needed to make the project viable. Mr. King said ultimately, the economic case must be clear, with quantifiable data showing potential cost savings or returns on investment to convince stakeholders.

8. PUD (Planned Unit Development) Process Criteria, Brian McBroom

Don Threewitt (Deputy Director of Community Development) started this portion of the meeting with a disclaimer: They are talking about community criteria generally, not about any specific cases.

Brian McBroom (Director of Community Development) opens by highlighting a repeated issue: Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) frequently include undeveloped “wrap-around” parcels that are later absorbed into the same project, creating lasting uncertainty about future uses—especially since the PUD code allows numerous flexible interpretations. This uncertainty spurs recurring questions: What will it become? How do we protect ourselves? Yet those concerns are usually relegated to future review rounds, without a preemptive resolution.

Mr. McBroom urged a structured, pre-application discussion—or even a code amendment—defining expectations for PUD wrap-around parcels in advance of project initiation. While today’s meeting addresses an immediate planning challenge, he asserted that broader reform is still needed to stop PUDs from becoming a catch-all workaround in zoning practice. The same concerns will return unless there’s deliberate refinement now. Mr. McBroom added that

they need to move away from using PUDs for small areas since they were originally intended for larger master planned communities.

Commissioner Modlin suggested that a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and agricultural land holding can work together as the project phases in over time. By establishing a PUD nucleus and designating surrounding land as agricultural until it's ready for development, growth can be more focused and intentional. Commissioner Modlin explained this approach prevents scattered, unplanned development and ensures future PUD expansions align with a clear vision and established criteria, rather than creating large, undefined planning areas. Mr. McBroom replied that the matter would require further internal consideration and that the outcome would hinge on the developer's intended plan, but acknowledged the idea is exploratory.

Mr. McBroom started the presentation as published, specifically concentrating on the finances and economics that surround projects the commission is asked to make decisions on. He found that the most direct and consequential connection between project financing and the city's code-based evaluation criteria lies in whether the proposed development is supported by adequate public infrastructure—a central prerequisite for City Council recommendations.

Conversation ensued between the commission and Mr. McBroom; they discussed the need to ensure land use entitlements don't place an undue burden on the city to provide infrastructure. While not focused on a project's financing model, the conversation centered on how infrastructure needs can affect feasibility. The commission agreed that applying criteria objectively is key, and if infrastructure availability is uncertain, conditions can be imposed to ensure a project only proceeds when adequate city services are in place.

Vice Chair Andersen spoke about public hearings for these projects and the lack of any further opportunities for public input after their Planning Commission meetings. She emphasized that this is a deep concern of hers that there are such limited opportunities for the public to express their concern or objection on projects in their areas. Mr. McBroom and Mr. Threewitt clarified, adding that PUDs undergo a second public hearing during City Council meetings. Additionally, the public has the option to submit statements via email or phone.

The meeting ended at 2:54 pm.

DocuSigned by:

Justin Yeater

3F44E3E176F84C8...

Justin Yeater – Chair

Signed by:

Brian K McBroom

FA3AF812F8A645A...

Brian McBroom – Community Development Director