



BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

December 9, 2025, at 1:15pm

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call - Present

Chair Justin Yeater
Vice Chair Louisa Andersen
Commissioner Erik Briscoe
Commissioner Jeff Carlson
Commissioner Brian Franzen
Commissioner Larry Modlin
Commissioner Christian Schulte

Absent

3. Approval of the agenda

There were no changes to the agenda and Chair Yeater proceeded with the agenda as published.

4. Approval of the November 18, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Franzen:

He moved to approve the minutes as presented.

Second: Commissioner Briscoe

Vote: Motions approved 7-0

Absent:

5. A public hearing to review the proposed 2026 Three-Mile Plan Resolution and make a recommendation to City Council.

Michael Franke (Planner III) began his presentation by introducing himself and the item as published.

Vice Chair Andersen inquired about the sewer, asking whether a lift station would be required and if that had been accounted for in the plans. Mr. Franke stated Water and Sewer has not indicated whether a lift station will be required, as the project is still conceptual. This determination would be made during a formal development proposal review.

Vice Chair Andersen noted that the area sits downhill and asked how the system would function and where they would ultimately lead. Caleb Jackson (Interim Planning Manager) explained that several conceptual options exist for handling the site's sewage, including the possibility of a lift station, but no specific approach has been selected yet.

Vice Chair Andersen asked how Windsor will coordinate or interact with Greeley on this plan. Mr. Jackson shared that a representative from the Town of Windsor is here, so we may be able to hear their position directly from them.

Chair Yeater mentioned the packet references the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Windsor and asked for clarification on whether this agreement is still under consideration or has been finalized. The specific focus was on the sewer and water provisions. Mr. Jackson shared the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Windsor applies only to the U.S. 34 corridor, generally extending one mile north and one mile south of the roadway. As a result, the subject property is not governed by that IGA, including the provisions related to how sewage from that area would be treated.

Commissioner Briscoe was seeking clarification regarding the three-mile plan discussed earlier this year. Specifically, given that the approval is still within the one-year timeframe, the referenced "annual update" pertains solely to the two properties discussed in the packet. Mr. Franke confirmed that it was correct. The update is intended specifically to incorporate the addition of the GWIP Broe site. The previous plan included Care Stream, which is directly adjacent to the GWIP site; this update expands the scope to include the GWIP site as well. The matter is scheduled to be presented to Council in 2026.

Commissioner Schulte asked if there were any new intergovernmental agreements currently being developed, or if that was under consideration. Mr. Jackson was not aware of any formal intergovernmental agreement discussions currently underway. However, if landowners in the area were to pursue annexation into Greeley, coordination with Windsor would be necessary due to the shared boundaries.

With no other questions for staff Chair Yeater opened the public portion of the meeting at 1:24pm. He asked if anyone in attendance was wishing to speak to the item.

Scott Ballstadt (Director of Planning for the Town of Windsor) sought to resubmit comments previously provided on the previous Three-Mile Plan to reiterate concerns regarding annexation issues and the reliance of both the Care Stream and BROE GWIP properties on Windsor's infrastructure. Additional comments were offered regarding the proposed GWIP/BROE annexation, which was described as inconsistent with prudent planning principles outlined in annexation statutes. Mr. Ballstadt continued by stating those statutes encourage well-planned development and discourage "leapfrog and flagpole annexations", particularly within another jurisdiction's growth management area, areas in which both properties have been located for the past 26 years. Mr. Ballstadt requested that these comments, related to both the annexation and the Three-Mile Plan, be entered into the record and included in City Council packets going forward.

Chair Yeater asked Mr. Ballstadt to identify the packets he presented to the Commission for the record. Mr. Ballstadt explained that the letter dated April 18 was submitted during consideration of the previous Three-Mile Plan, prior to its approval at the June meeting. A second set of comments, dated October 14, addressed the proposed Great Western Industrial Park BROE annexation. Although the annexation may still be under staff review, Mr. Ballstadt provided these comments because the Three-Mile Plan was intended to set the stage for that annexation. He emphasized that while the proposal may meet the Three-Mile Plan requirements, it appears to conflict with state statutes concerning the logical extension of a community.

Commissioner Franzen asked if the applicant had approached the Town of Windsor for a potential annexation. Mr. Ballstadt said no, the subject property, the former Kodak campus, has

never been proposed for annexation. Mr. Ballstadt added that the proposed flagpole and annexation involve a 20–30 foot strip along the eastern boundary of Windsor’s wastewater treatment plant. This strip was intentionally left unannexed to avoid creating an enclave, and the parties have nonetheless worked collaboratively for the past 20 years on surrounding development while Kodak remained in operation.

Commissioner Carlson asked whether the claim that the proposal conflicts with several state statutes means that the annexation would be illegal. Mr. Ballstadt stated that the proposed annexation would undermine the intent of state annexation statutes by creating a fragmented mix of Windsor and Greeley jurisdictions, resulting in a patchwork of municipal regulation, road access, and emergency services. He noted that the property has been within Windsor’s growth management area for over 20 years, making the proposal inconsistent with orderly and well-planned development.

Commissioner Carlson then asked whether the contention was not that the annexation would be illegal, but rather that it would be inconvenient and create confusion. Mr. Ballstadt responded that he would characterize it as poor planning.

Chair Yeater asked whether staff wished to comment on the documents provided to the Commission. Mr. Jackson stated that comments on the prior three-mile plan were fully vetted and addressed before receiving Council approval and therefore did not require further response. He added that it would be inappropriate to discuss annexation-related comments at this time to avoid ex parte communication without the applicant present.

Chair Yeater requested clarification on the vote occurring today. Stating that the goal was to evaluate the three-mile plan based on the applicable criteria and, in summary, to determine whether the City of Greeley could effectively serve and facilitate development within the three-mile area. Mr. Jackson stated that it was correct.

Commissioner Modlin asked if the property owner ultimately makes the final decision, and this simply provides an additional option for them to consider. Mr. Jackson confirmed that approval would allow landowners in the overlapping area to petition either municipality for annexation. Chair Yeater sought to confirm his understanding, asking whether a property owner or applicant would still have the opportunity to petition either Windsor or Greeley, regardless of the plan. Mr. Jackson explained that the area would need to be included in the City of Greeley’s three-mile plan to give the landowner the option to petition for annexation into Greeley.

Commissioner Franzen asked whether there is an existing overlapping three-mile plan, specifically if Windsor already has a three-mile plan in this area. Mr. Jackson noted that Windsor’s growth management area likely serves as their equivalent of a three-mile plan, covering this geographic area.

Vice Chair Andersen asked that the three-mile plan is a state-mandated process the city is following and asked whether that would imply that Windsor is not in compliance with the statute. Mr. Franke noted that Windsor complies by maintaining a growth management area that encompasses this site.

With no other questions for staff Chair Yeater asked if anyone else in attendance or online was wishing to speak to the item. Seeing none, Chair Yeater closed the public portion of the meeting at 1:36pm and turned it over to the commission for action.

Motion made by Commissioner Briscoe:

He moved that based on the preceding analysis, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed 2026 City of Greeley 3-mile Plan resolution is consistent with Colorado Revised Statute 3112-105E, meeting statutory requirements related to infrastructure, parks, transportation, and land uses that will allow the City to annex future properties within its three-mile boundary, and therefore recommends that the City Council approve the 2026 City of Greeley Three-mile Plan resolution as submitted.

Second: Commissioner Franzen

Commissioner Franzen expressed concern that similar issues may continue to arise with neighboring properties in the future. While he did not view this as a determination on annexation itself and acknowledged the situation as somewhat unclear, he noted that the process follows state statute and stated his support for the plan.

Commissioner Schulte stated that the plan preserves options for the property owner, providing more choices than otherwise available, and concluded that, despite Windsor’s concerns, it makes sense to recommend approval to the City Council.

Chair Yeater echoed that sentiment and added that he hopes staff provides detailed information on annexation impacts and any cooperation with Windsor to ensure the city would not be overburdened before proceeding.

Vice Chair Andersen expressed concern that discussions from the commission have not consistently been conveyed to City Council and emphasized the need for this hearing’s discussion to be properly documented and shared. While she supports the motion, she wanted to formally record her concerns about the commission’s participation in the process.

Vote: Motion passed 7-0

6. Staff Report:

Caleb Jackson provided an update on the Westside Area Plan, noting that consultants will return in the last week of January to meet with stakeholders. A public open house is scheduled for January 26, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. at the Family Funplex, and Planning Commissioners are invited. Additionally, a tour of Bradburn, a walkable neighborhood designed by the same consultants, will take place January 26, 2026, at 2:30 p.m. in Westminster, with follow-up details to be emailed. Work sessions on both the Westside and Eastside Area Plans are planned for January 27, 2026. The Consultants will be present for those work sessions.

7. Adjournment:

Chair Yeater adjourned the meeting and at 1:41pm.

DocuSigned by:
Justin Yeater
3F44E3E176F84C8...

Justin Yeater – Chair

DocuSigned by:
Don Threewitt
2A71D92FBF874DE...

Don Threewitt – Interim Comm. Dev. Director

