



BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

November 18, 2025, at 1:15pm

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call - Present

Chair Justin Yeater
Commissioner Erik Briscoe
Commissioner Brian Franzen
Commissioner Larry Modlin

Absent

Vice Chair Louisa Andersen
Commissioner Jeff Carlson
Commissioner Christian Schulte

3. Approval of the agenda

Chair Yeater asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Seeing none, Chair Yeater proceeded with the agenda as published.

4. Approval of the October 14, 2025 & October 28, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Franzen:

He moved to approve both sets of minutes as presented.

Second: Commissioner Modlin

Vote: Motion approved 4-0

Absent:

Vice Chair Louisa Andersen
Commissioner Jeff Carlson
Commissioner Christian Schulte

EXPEDITED AGENDA

The following items are routine in nature, fully described in the accompanying reports, and therefore staff summary presentations will be suspended unless requested by the Commission or members of the public in attendance at the meeting.

- 5. A public hearing to consider a request for approval of a Preliminary Subdivision request to create twelve lots, four outlots, and dedicate public right-of-way on approximately 36.21 acres in the Commercial High Intensity (C-H) zoning district**

located at the Northeast Corner of 83rd Avenue and 10th Street, known as West Greeley Commons (SUB2025-0011).

Chair Yeater asked the Commission if they would like to see a presentation. Seeing none, Chair Yeater asked anyone in attendance or online if they wished to see a presentation. Seeing none, Chair Yeater invited Staff to answer questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Briscoe asked how the stoplight decision was made and who was involved, including whether CDOT had a role. He expressed concern about the increasing number of stoplights and the risk of the corridor becoming another Harmony Road, suggesting that added signals could impede traffic and deter residents and businesses on both the east and proposed west sides of Greeley. Dylan Belanger (Civil Engineer III) explained that 77th Avenue has long been designated for a signal in the CDOT access control plan. A development agreement for the site, dating back to the early 2000s, had already identified and planned for that signal.

Chair Yeater sought clarification, asking whether “planned” meant the signal was required to be installed or simply intended as part of the long-term layout. Mr. Belanger explained that while the signal was originally an intended part of the plan, CDOT will ultimately require its installation. The city has been coordinating with CDOT, and both agencies support adding the signal because full-movement access and traffic volumes on both sides make it the most practical and logical solution.

Chair Yeater asked for more detail on the basis for recommending the signal, requesting an explanation of the analysis that supported its installation. Mr. Belanger explained that traffic volumes from the new development, combined with the existing neighborhood to the south, create a need for a full-movement intersection, which in turn warrants a signal for both safety and traffic control. Mr. Belanger added that the city requires full access for emergency vehicles, since 83rd offers only right-in/right-out access, and that both CDOT and the city mandate the signal for these operational and safety reasons.

Commissioner Franzen asked if the signal would also loop into the smart signals that are already in place. Mr. Belanger confirmed that this would be the case.

Commissioner Modlin asked whether the same reasoning would apply to the next potential intersection at 95th—essentially, whether any four-way intersection would warrant a similar approach. Mr. Belanger answered yes, specifically to a major arterial roadway like this one.

With no other questions for staff, Chair Yeater invited the applicant to speak if present.

Applicant Brian Bartels spoke to the traffic questions asked earlier by saying that this section of 10th Street falls under both CDOT and the City of Greeley. He noted that staff are working closely with CDOT, with the hope of reducing speeds along the corridor. According to police, the stretch from 83rd to 47th has the city’s highest rate of severe and fatal crashes, largely due to speed. He added that long-term plans already envision lowering speed limits farther west on 10th Street.

Commissioner Modlin noted that it also connects to 83rd, similar to the configuration on the west side of that road. Mr. Bartels confirmed and added that the project’s access would be similar to the development on the south side of 10th Street.

With no other questions for the applicant, Chair Yeater opened the public portion of the meeting at 1:24pm.

Sara Witherell 450 25th Ave. Ct., Greeley, spoke in opposition of the project noting a concern about urban sprawl on open lands in western Greeley.

Seeing no others in attendance nor online wishing to speak to the item, Chair Yeater closed the public portion of the meeting at 1:27 pm and turned it back to the Commission for action.

Motion by Commissioner Franzen:

He moved that based on the application received in the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed preliminary subdivision plat is in compliance with Development Code Section 24-203.b.1, and therefore approves the preliminary subdivision plat with the condition of approval that the 9th Street section of the neighboring parcel to the west be dedicated as a right-of-way prior to acceptance and approval of the final subdivision.

Second: Commissioner Modlin

Commissioner Briscoe emphasized the need to accelerate the synchronization of traffic signals along 10th Street, noting that efficient flow is critical for east-west travel into Greeley, given that most access to the city comes from the west. While acknowledging Highway 34 as an alternative, he pointed out it routes traffic to the far southeast, making 10th Street the primary corridor. His concern was the increasing frequency of stoplights—about every third of a mile—not the applicant's responsibility, though he recognized CDOT's role in the decisions.

Chair Yeater agreed but clarified that his concern was not about CDOT's involvement. He suggested a different approach, emphasizing that the stoplight was not the applicant's responsibility and that careful consideration is needed to manage signal development while keeping traffic moving, as the Commission recommended.

Vote: Motion passed 4-0

Absent:

Vice Chair Louisa Andersen

Commissioner Jeff Carlson

Commissioner Christian Schulte

6. A public hearing to consider a request for approval of a Use by Special Review request to allow a new 105' monopole plus 5' lightning rod for a wireless communication facility in the Industrial Medium Intensity (I-M) zoning district located at 2115 117th Avenue (WCF2025-0005).

Chair Yeater asked the Commission if anyone wished to see a presentation. Seeing none, Chair Yeater asked the public in attendance and online if they wished to see a presentation. Seeing none, Chair Yeater asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

Applicant Jared White stated that he was available to answer questions regarding the cell site, which is needed to fill a coverage gap. He noted that the staff report contains detailed information, including answers to most anticipated questions. He added that he had no initial comments beyond offering to respond to questions as they arise later in the meeting.

Chair Yeater inquired whether the depiction of the pole in the packet represents its permanent configuration or if further equipment could be installed on it in the future. Mr. White explained that antennas and equipment on cell towers are periodically upgraded, which may cause minor but not significant changes to the tower's appearance. He added that city requirements mandate allowing other providers to co-locate equipment on the tower, and it will be built to support such use.

Commissioner Briscoe asked if a monopine installation is more expensive than a monopole installation. Mr. White explained that monopines are significantly more expensive. They're also more difficult to co-locate, there's a lot less space for that. They also tend to stand out more if there's not something to blend them in with.

Chair Yeater asked the applicant if they would still be interested in developing the site if the monopole is rejected by the commission and a monopine is their only option. Mr. White confirmed that they would still be interested. If that were their only option, they would pursue it, as providing coverage to that area is essential, especially with the expected growth. They also noted that the tower would very likely be co-located.

Chair Yeater noted that in other applications they have seen, a single pole was used with no external hardware. They asked whether a similar design would be possible in this case, with the antennas housed inside the tower. Mr. White explained that this type of design requires a very specific deployment and that the slim, internal antennas used in such structures cannot provide the necessary capacity or coverage. While those antennas may work for limited voice service, they are not suitable for the full data and coverage needs of a macro cell tower.

Seeing no other questions for the applicant, Chair Yeater directed a question to staff regarding the height differential between the existing building elevations and the proposed tower height.

Caleb Jackson (Planning Supervisor) shared that the building is likely under 40 feet tall, and with the tower at 100 feet, it would clearly extend above the roofline.

Commissioner Briscoe asked how many additional carriers are allowed to co-locate on this pole. April Medeiros (Planner I) shared there can be at least two other co-locators on that pole.

With no other questions for staff, Chair Yeater asked if anyone in attendance wished to speak on the matter. Mr. White presented a visual to the Commission illustrating the location of the proposed tower and the position of a similar existing pole nearby.

With no other questions Chair Yeater turned it over to the Commission for action.

Motion by Commissioner Franzen:

He moved that based on the application received and the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed Use by Special Review for a new 105-foot monopole plus 5-foot lighting rod wireless communication facility in the I-M (Industrial Medium Intensity) District is in compliance with the development code criteria of Section 24-206.B.1-8 and therefore approves the use by special review as submitted.

Second: Briscoe

Vote: Motion passed 4-0

Absent:

Vice Chair Louisa Andersen

Commissioner Jeff Carlson
Commissioner Christian Schulte

END OF EXPEDITED AGENDA

7. A public hearing regarding a recommendation on an ordinance amending Title 24 of the Greeley Municipal Code relating to a text amendment to the Greeley Development Code codifying the fast-track review process for affordable housing.

Caleb Jackson (Planning Supervisor) introduced himself and his item as published. Commissioner Modlin asked whether the developer must adhere to a specific project timeline once approval is granted. He added that, considering the financial framework and the expectations for those investing in property, a defined schedule for development should be required if the City is to meet its obligations. Mr. Jackson explained that if approvals are granted within 90 days, they would expire in the same manner as any other development approval, typically within a year. Deb Callies (Housing Director) added that often with affordable housing projects, time is especially critical, and maximizing every phase of the process is essential. For that reason, the developers are moving forward promptly.

Commissioner Modlin asked whether, if the process is delayed for any reason, the indices used to qualify for the change would require the process to start over, or if a modification or amendment could be made instead, and how that would work. Ms. Callies explained that if the property is for sale, the sale price is updated annually based on income changes, maintaining a continuous, rolling set of data. Similarly, for rental properties, the rent is administered through CHFA, ensuring that the information remains current and self-updated.

Commissioner Franzen asked for clarification that the city's policy for determining the price is based on a matrix. The calculation is not on a rolling 12-month basis but rather follows the calendar year to establish the price for that year. Ms. Callies explained that while the method has not been finalized, the review will occur at least once a year. Depending on market conditions, it may be conducted two or three times annually to ensure prices remain realistic yet affordable.

Commissioner Modlin asked if the changes in the index as it goes forward would be included in one of the subtitles in the ordinance, so people understand. Ms. Callies explained that the policy outlines the exact calculation used to determine the sales price, including how frequently the various data points are updated, ensuring the process remains as objective as possible.

Commissioner Briscoe asked a question regarding the definitions and recent changes, specifically whether Proposition 123 prohibits deed restrictions. Ms. Callies explained that Proposition 123 does not prohibit deed restrictions. They prefer not to codify them because flexibility is needed for each project, depending on funding and other factors. The length of a deed restriction is particularly important, as overly long restrictions can affect mortgage eligibility, so each project must be evaluated individually to determine what will work.

Commissioner Briscoe inquired if specifying 60%, instead of allowing flexibility, could result in any future liability. Ms. Callies stated no, because it's always going to be flexible based on the HUD AMI.

Chair Yeater asked if an applicant applies for the Fast Track process, for which the required characteristics have already been defined, what mechanism the City of Greeley has, including continual review of the project after the full permitting process is complete, to ensure it remains affordable. Ms. Callies explained that most projects enter into development-type agreements with the city. Following feedback from developers, interdepartmental teams, and stakeholders, many of the relaxed standards were paused, and individualized incentive packages are now created for each project. These packages account for land, resources, project type, and funding, with affordability expectations tied to sales prices or CHFA rents. The Housing Solutions department continuously monitors compliance, ensuring properties remain affordable, owner-occupied, and that any deed restrictions are upheld, including annual checks on ownership and occupancy.

Chair Yeater asked about the code, noting that there appears to be limited latitude for ongoing monitoring of these properties and observed that this may need to be addressed in the future. Mr. Jackson explained that if a project demonstrates pursuit of the affordable housing designation and reserves affordable units, it qualifies for the 90-day process. If the project later transitions to market rate, any consequences would be addressed in the agreements with Housing.

Commissioner Modlin asked how many additional developers might be attracted to the area if the code changes, whether this would expand the pool of development, and if there are developers in other areas who have avoided projects here because the current code does not support their preferred housing designs. Ms. Callies reported that their department speaks with at least two new developers each week who are interested in building in Greeley, including affordable housing projects. There is strong demand from builders eager to develop, depending on how their projects align with the City's plans.

Commissioner Briscoe asked if there is an estimate of the 100% Area Median Income (AMI) in today's market dollars. Ms. Callies stated it's \$113,600.00 for a family of four. Affordable monthly rent or mortgage payment would be the same dollar amounts.

Chair Yeater asked if there were any more questions from the Commission. Seeing none, he asked if there was anyone in attendance wishing to speak. Seeing none, Chair Yeater closed the public portion of the meeting at 2:11pm and turned it over to the Commission for action.

Motion by Commissioner Franzen:

Based on the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed code amendment to the Greeley Municipal Code is consistent with the Development Code criteria of Section 24-211.b (Items 1 through 4) and therefore recommends that the City Council approves the code amendment to the Greeley Municipal Code as submitted.

Second: Commissioner Briscoe

Discussion between Commissioners ensued. Chair Yeater expressed concerns about enforcement, particularly the City's ability to manage potential bad actors, though he acknowledged that the policy aligns with state statute. He commended Planning for streamlining the process and noted that while he will vote in favor, he expects the issue to arise again in the future. Commissioner Briscoe voiced the same concerns as Chair Yeater. He expressed concern that the language is too broad and noted that other agreements are typically handled administratively within the city. He suggested including references in the code to ensure the city retains appropriate tools. He

cautioned against developers proposing short-term solutions without restrictions or administrative agreements, as agreeing to such terms could create long-term problems.

Ms. Callies explained that each application will be unique. Housing cannot approve contracts with builders without prior approval, and the Council will retain the ability to approve, deny, or request modifications for each development. All projects must still comply with existing City requirements. The current action is to approve code language aligning with Proposition 123, which must be completed by the end of the year to qualify for certain incentives.

Mr. Jackson stated that Phase 2 would be brought back to the Planning Commission, including the eligibility standards and long-term enforcement measures. The current proposal, however, is solely to align with Proposition 123's fast track requirements, while the remaining details are developed and returned for review.

Michael Axelrad (Senior Attorney) outlined two options given the deadline: approve the code amendments as submitted, trusting staff to later present the desired criteria, or approve with the condition that Housing Solutions returns within a set timeframe with a matrix of recommended changes for Planning Commission review.

Commissioner Modlin stated that he supports the motion on the floor to recommend approval, with the understanding that further details will be worked out over time. He emphasized the need to move the item forward to Council before year-end and did not want to delay the process.

Commissioner Franzen noted that two separate issues, enforcement conditions and incentive packages, are under discussion and may not be codified in an alternative motion. He expressed confidence in Planning and the Housing Solutions Department to continue evolving these matters over time.

Chair Yeater called for a vote.

Vote: Motion passed 4-0

Absent:

Vice Chair Louisa Andersen

Commissioner Jeff Carlson

Commissioner Christian Schulte

Chair Yeater observed that meeting only minimum standards makes a 90-day timeline difficult for complex projects and inquired about potential incentives to achieve this timeline for specialized developments. Don Threewitt (Interim Director of Community Development) explained that the average review time for such developments is 78 days. While the code commits to a 90-day review for affordable housing, the department's internal goal is to process all housing and even commercial projects within 90 days. Executive housing projects unrelated to affordable housing would follow the same process, though it would not be codified. Mr. Threewitt proposed committing to an extended work session on affordable housing incentives, led by Ms. Callies and Mr. Jackson, to review the full range of possibilities, potential initiatives, guardrails, and long-term enforcement. The goal is to provide a comprehensive overview for all stakeholders.

Commissioner Briscoe noted that over the past five years, Greeley's housing stock has lacked diversity, with developers focusing on multifamily housing due to the comprehensive plan and affordable housing language in the code. He expressed concern that incentives could be misused,

emphasizing the importance of ensuring projects honor the intended purpose, rather than resulting in only some levels of homes being built.

More conversation ensued regarding affordable housing between the Commissioners and Ms. Callies.

8. Staff Report:

Don Threewitt (Interim Director of Community Development) explained that a key part of the code audit and update is reassessing and right-sizing housing categories within the development code. With core development provisions and incentive structures beginning to overlap, he believes a joint, topic-focused work session is necessary and will require substantial time, likely a full commission meeting rather than a brief presentation. Although the current code technically allows a full range of “missing middle” housing, in practice it has produced only high-density multifamily and single-family development. To address this gap, Community Development aims to determine what is required to bring a full spectrum of housing products to the market in Greeley.

Mr. Threewitt shared that Brian McBroom (Community Development Director) has been appointed Interim City Manager. In the meantime, Mr. Threewitt will temporarily step into the Community Development Director role to ensure continuity. He assured the group that they do not anticipate any slowdown or change in the scope of Community Development’s projects and expressed optimism about bringing forward several exciting initiatives in 2026.

Mr. Jackson provided an update on the Eastside Area Plan. He reported that community feedback has been very strong, with hundreds of survey responses collected. The project team has been actively engaging residents by attending local events and connecting directly with people on the east side to help shape and guide the plan.

Mr. Jackson reported that consultants for the Westside Area Plan will return at the end of January. A public open house is scheduled for Monday, January 26, from 6–8 p.m. at the Family FunPlex, where the draft plan, covering land uses, development patterns, and a potential form-based code option, will be presented for community input. A Planning Commission work session will follow the next day to discuss the draft plan and the form-based code in more detail.

Mr. Jackson also noted that staff expect to receive the first draft of the development code audit by the end of the month. A Planning Commission work session is planned for mid-January, along with a City Council session, to review the audit, identify key areas needing attention, and establish the strategy for forthcoming code updates.

Adjournment:

Chair Yeater adjourned the meeting at 2:43 pm.

DocuSigned by:

3F44E3E176F84C8...
Justin Yeater – Chair

DocuSigned by:

ZA71092FBF874DE...
Don Threewitt – Interim Community Development Director