

# **Planning and Zoning Commission**

## **Roll Call Attendance Public Comment Correspondence**

February 15, 2024



**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Sign-In Sheet**

DATE: Feb 15, 24

Name	Mailing Address	Email and/or Phone	Reason for Attendance
ROBIN OWENS	3232 CHASE DRIVE / FORT COLLINS	robin.owens@aci.com	EXPRESS CONCERNS FOR ADVANCED ENERGY

THIS IS A PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD  
Please contact Katie Claypool at 970-416-4350 or [kclaypool@fcgov.com](mailto:kclaypool@fcgov.com) if you inadvertently end up with it. Thank you!

# Planning & Zoning Hearing Attendance

February 15, 2024

Online

## Staff Attendance:

- ✓ Shar Manno – P&Z Secretary
- ✓ Katie Claypool – P&Z Admin
- ✓ Brad Yatabe - City Attorney
- ✓ Clay Frickey – Interim Planning Manager
- ✓ Paul Sizemore – CDNS Director
- ✓ Justine Vonkoepping – FCTV
- ✓ Clark Mapes - City Planner
- ✓ Ryan Mounce – City Planner
- ✓ Em Myler – Development Liaison
- ✓ Sophie Buckingham – Engineering
- ✓ Steve Gilchrist – Traffic Operations
- ✓ Kristie Raymond – Environmental Planning
- ✓ Matt Simpson – Utilities
- ✓ Dave Betley – Engineering
- ✓ Wes Lamarque - Utilities
- ✓ John Grewel - Engineering

## Commission Members – all in person

- ✓ Chair, David Katz
- ✓ Vice Chair, Julie Stackhouse
- ✓ Samantha Stegner
- ✓ Ted Shepard
- ✓ Adam Sass
- ✓ York

## Applicant Attendees

- **Item 2 – Prospect Sports Club**
  - ✓ Amanda Hansen – RB+B Architects
  - Dylan Huey - RB+B Architects
  - ✓ Rebecca Spears
  - ✓ Kim O’Neil
  - Angie Milewski
- **Item 3 – Mason Street Infrastructure**
  - ✓ Russ Lee – Ripley Design
  - ✓ Kara Rossouw – Ripley Design
  - ✓ Blaine Mathisen – Ripley Design
  - ✓ Andy Reese – Ripley Design

1. Alex Williamson
2. Bob Meserve
3. Babbee Lewis
- PI- 4. David Strathman
5. Reb
6. Guy Frank
7. Greg
8. Goin
9. Robin Paulmier
10. Shawn Mallinger
11. Steve Tenbrink
12. Arrie Rossouw
13. Stephen M.
- PI- 14. Trisha Scott
15. John Freshwater
16. Amanda Hansen - RB+B
- PI- 17. Ginny Simpson
18. Cusky Parnes
19. John
20. Bauers
21. Aritchen
22. James
- PI - 23. Mike DuHadway
24. Pat Serrier
25. Gahl Wojahn
26. Frank Martinez
- PI- 27. Amanda Fraht
28. Jason Claeys
29. Oryssman
30. Alisa Babler
31. Karen Bright
32. Kay Holter
- Item 4 – Union Park
33. Maj - lis Delgado
34. Badger
- PI- 35. Dale
- PI- 36. Jon Mosier
37. Barbara
38. RM
39. Hunter
40. Bess
41. Matt

- Chris Beabout – Landmark Homes
- Matt Delich
- ✓ Mike Walker
- Jason Sherrill
- ✓ James McNutt
- Zach Wiele

**From:** [Sharlene Manno](#)  
**To:** [Development Review Comments](#); [Katie Claypool](#)  
**Subject:** FW: comments for 2/15/2024 PZC meeting - Union Park PDP  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 14, 2024 4:52:28 PM  
**Attachments:** [2-15-24 PZC letter.pdf](#)

---

**Shar Manno**  
Administration Services Manager  
Community Development & Neighborhood Services  
970.221.6767  
[smanno@fcgov.com](mailto:smanno@fcgov.com)

---

**From:** Greg Rosing <grosing@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2024 2:01 PM  
**To:** Sharlene Manno <smanno@fcgov.com>  
**Cc:** fridaysr1derful@yahoo.com; Jeff and Laurel <ljjanelle@1791.com>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] comments for 2/15/2024 PZC meeting - Union Park PDP

Attached are comments for the February 15, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, regarding the Union Park Project Development Plan.  
Please accept the and distribute to all PZC members prior to the meeting.  
Thank you.

Greg Rosing  
2608 Southfield Court  
Fort Collins, CO 80525  
(970) 689-9222

February 14, 2024

City of Fort Collins

Planning and Zoning Commission

To the members of the PZC:

As you consider the Project Development Plan for Union Park, we again urge you to have the developer NOT INCLUDE the street connection to Edmonds Road.

As you will likely recall, some residents of the Woodland Park neighborhood appealed the previous decision to approve the project with the alternative compliance (with a traffic signal on Ziegler at Hidden Pond) based on the assertion that without a street connection to Edmonds Road, the development would lack full connectivity per the Fort Collins Land Use Code section 3.6.3. While we understand that you approved the Union Park ODP with that connection (when remanded back to the PZC by the City Council), we would like to present some information that was not sufficiently represented at the time of that decision.

They stated that the Union Park connection to Edmonds Road would increase the traffic counts on Paddington sufficiently to warrant a traffic light on Ziegler Road at Paddington Road/Grand Teton Place instead of at Hidden Pond Drive. They stated that they want the traffic light located at Paddington Road/Grand Teton Place to increase connectivity between the two neighborhoods because it is very difficult for residents of Woodland Park to cross Ziegler Road in order to get to English Ranch Park. While they were honest about wanting the traffic light at their preferred location, it is clear they are more concerned about how long it takes to turn left while exiting their neighborhood than about getting across Ziegler Road into the English Ranch neighborhood. Please refer to the January 2024 Union Park Mixed-Use Transportation Impact Study (prepared by Delich Associates), Page 6, Figure 3, Recent Peak Hour Traffic and Page 7, Figure 4, Average/Balanced Recent Peak Hour Traffic – please note that the study shows exactly zero trips from the Woodland Park neighborhood across Ziegler to the English Ranch neighborhood and zero trips in the opposite direction. If there were truly a desire for the Woodland Park residents to commute to the English Ranch neighborhood, it would show in the traffic study. Again, their sole reason to appeal the approval of the development with the alternative compliance, and with the traffic signal located at Hidden Pond Drive, is that it did not give them the sense of immediate resolution of their frustration with turning left out of their neighborhood.

They stated that most of the English Ranch residents support the connection of the Union Park development to Edmonds. This is emphatically untrue. English Ranch resident Jeff Janelle has collected signatures from over 500 English Ranch residents who are OPPOSED to such a connection due to the foreseeable impacts.

While we are sympathetic to their frustration, eventually resolving their problem by requiring the street connection from Union Park to Edmonds Road WILL create much more traffic through the English Ranch neighborhood on streets that are not up to current Connector Street standards and WILL CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD by making the streets less safe for pedestrians and cyclist that currently travel the Kingsley Drive corridor in significant numbers. With over 5,000 daily trip ends estimated by the transportation impact study noted above, it is guaranteed that many of those trips will 'cut through' the English Ranch neighborhood. Traffic will back up at Paddington Road and Ziegler Road just as it does on the Target access road. When that is backed up, drivers will travel north on Kingsley Drive. Motorists will travel north on Kingsley Drive to Horsetooth Road and drivers, knowing that traffic backs up at the stop sign at Horsetooth Road, will travel west on Sunstone Drive to Caribou Drive and then to Timberline Road. This is where there is the most danger for residents as that road is too narrow and has too many elementary student crossings to handle more traffic.

English Ranch residents are not opposed to the connectivity goal of the Land Use Code. We know that you can have connectivity without direct vehicular access as is evident with the pedestrian and cyclist access between Front Range Village and English Ranch. In fact, we feel that there is greater community connectivity when residents travel as pedestrians and/or cyclists rather than as motorists since there is greater opportunity to interact when passing on foot or on bike than there is when passing in cars and trucks. If you continue to provide more and more vehicular access, the result will be more vehicular usage – contrary to multiple goals and objectives of the City of Fort Collins to reduce residents' reliance on cars and trucks to move about in the city.

With the above information in mind, it makes no sense to placate the traffic concerns of the motorists in one much smaller neighborhood by reducing the pedestrians and cyclists of a much larger neighborhood. Such a decision, specifically, is in opposition to various stated purposes of the City of Fort Collins Land Use Code:

*(F) encouraging patterns of land use which decrease trip length of automobile travel and encourage trip consolidation.*

*(G) increasing public access to mass transit, sidewalks, trails, bicycle routes and other alternative modes of transportation.*

*(H) reducing energy consumption and demand.*

*(M) ensuring that development proposals are sensitive to the character of existing neighborhoods.*

...and is in opposition to the City of Fort Collins goals and objectives:

*To reduce carbon emissions specific amounts with the goal of being carbon neutral by 2050*

*To improve indoor and outdoor air quality*

*To support an efficient, reliable transportation system for all modes of travel, and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT)*

*To reduce auto-dependency and increase other mode shares*

Further, there are numerous examples of very fine developments/neighborhoods in Fort Collins that do not have street connections to at least three major arterials. You can start with the Woodland Park and Hidden Pond neighborhoods... the fact that there is access to only one arterial hasn't driven residents to find better housing options elsewhere nor has it reduced their property values. In spite of this, some residents of Woodland Park are determined to significantly increase the traffic through English Ranch to further their efforts to obtain a traffic signal EXACTLY where they want it. It is not right that the residents (of Woodland Park) who will not be affected by this increase in traffic and hazards to pedestrians and cyclists are able to force the decision to do just that.

We understand that the PZC has the authority for modification of standards, so it is entirely possible for you to again approve the Union Park development without the street connection to Edmonds Road, just as it is possible to approve the PDP with the two additional modifications requested by the developer in the PDP before you on February 15, 2024. We hope that your decision on the PDP will include NO CONNECTION to Edmonds Road and we will be watching the results closely.

Sincerely,

Greg Rosing and Melodee Barcelona

2608 Southfield Court

Fort Collins, CO 80525

From: [Sharlene Manno](#)  
To: [Development Review Comments: Katie Claypool](#)  
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Re: SLIDE 1 for P and Z Hearing  
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 6:52:06 PM

---

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device  
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

---

From: Jeff and Laurel Janelle <ljanelle@1791.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 4:06:26 PM  
To: Sharlene Manno <smanno@fcgov.com>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: SLIDE 1 for P and Z Hearing



# Coloradoan.



[Subscribe](#) [Sign In](#)

---

Landmark Homes CEO Jason Sherrill said his company wasn't tied to connecting to Edmonds but the city has certain connectivity requirements they were trying to meet. "We don't have any preference to connect our project to Paddington or English Ranch through Edmonds," he said. "We are trying to honor the city requirement. If it is not desired, I don't think it will happen. We will work to eliminate the Edmonds connection."

## ITEM 5, ATTACHMENT 7



Planning & Zoning Commission Hearing - Agenda Item 2  
 ODP210004, Ziegler - Corbett ODP  
 Thursday, February 17, 2022 | Page 15 of 17

north. Engineering and Traffic Operations staff have reviewed the Traffic Impact Study for the proposed ODP, which analyzed scenarios with and without a vehicular connection to Paddington Road. Similar to the 2011 staff findings, nearby arterial streets are able to accommodate additional trips that result from the lack of a local street connection between the ODP property and Paddington Road. Tradeoffs remain that while any detour of vehicular trips are small in distance, it will require travel onto an arterial street, which many neighbors have expressed can be difficult when attempting left-turning movements during busy traffic periods.

**Alternative Compliance:**

*Review Criteria for Alternative Compliance:* To approve an alternative plan, the decision maker must first find that the proposed alternative plan accomplishes the purposes of this section equally well or better than would a plan and design which complies with the standards of this section, and that any reduction in access and circulation for vehicles maintains facilities for bicycles, pedestrians and transit, to the maximum extent feasible.

In reviewing the proposed alternative plan, the decision maker shall take into account whether the alternative design minimizes the impacts on natural areas and features, fosters non-vehicular access, provides for distribution of the development's traffic without exceeding level of service standards, enhances neighborhood continuity and connectivity and provides direct, sub-arterial street access to any parks, schools, neighborhood centers, commercial uses, employment uses and Neighborhood Commercial Districts within or adjacent to the development from existing or future adjacent development within the same section mile.

The applicant's alternative compliance request is attached. Staff recommends approval of alternative compliance, which recognizes the unique history and constraints of land use and transportation policy affecting nearby properties, the enhanced nature of existing and proposed bike/pedestrian connections that can be made, and the limited impact to nearby arterial streets that would result from the lack of a vehicular connection.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

- 1) The lack of a local street connection and vehicular access does not result in any reduction to access or circulation for bicycles, pedestrians, or transit. The ODP property and adjoining north/south developments share three existing or proposed bike/ped connections along their shared boundaries.
- 2) The primary amenities to the north of the ODP property include English Ranch Park and Linton Elementary School. Both sites are located approximately half a mile (walking distance) from the center of the ODP property. City policies and goals encourage non-vehicular trips at this distance. Poudre School District bussing eligibility is typically not available within one-mile of an elementary school and no impact is anticipated to bus routes.
- 3) The land-uses and proposed amenities within the ODP partially mitigate the loss of vehicular access to the nearby park and school. The ODP commits to providing a 1.5-acre park/gathering space for the development, greatly exceeding HC zone district standards. The residential component of the ODP features attached and multifamily residential units. According to a 2015 National Association of Homebuilders study of US Census Data, on average, new multifamily units feature approximately one third the number of children versus single family detached development (21.9 versus 61.5 per 100 units).
- 4) A local street connection to Paddington Road would mean vehicles could travel to Corbett Drive through the ODP street network in nearly an identical alignment to what was previously illustrated on the Master Street Plan. The removal of a vehicular connection is being requested by many neighbors within English Ranch to reduce cut-through traffic to Front Range Village and reduce the amount of traffic within the neighborhood that they feel detracts from bike/pedestrian safety. The lack of a vehicular connection maintains the intent of the previous policy decision by City Council to remove the Corbett connection from the Master Street Plan.
- 5) The proposed alternative plan accomplishes the purposes of this section equally well or better than would a plan and design which complies with the standards of this section because the overall neighborhood including and surrounding the ODP is well served by a network of local, collector and arterial streets, has

[Back to Top](#)

### Attachment "A" Transportation Impact Study Base Assumptions

<b>Project Information</b>			
Project Name Union Park Mixed-Use			
Project Location West of Ziegler Road, North of Front Range Village			
<b>TIS Assumptions</b>			
Type of Study	Full: Yes	Intermediate:	
	MTIS:	Memo:	
Study Area Boundaries	North: Paddington	South: Council Tree	
	East: Ziegler	West: Corbett	
Study Years	Short Range: 2028	Long Range: 2045	
Future Traffic Growth Rate	2% per year		
Study Intersections	1. Ziegler/Council Tree	5.	
	2. Ziegler/Hidden Pond-Site Access	6.	
	3. Ziegler/Paddington-Grand Teton	7.	
	4. Corbett/Site Access	8.	
Time Period for Study	AM: 7:00-9:00	PM: 4:00-6:00	Sat Noon: N/A
Trip Generation Rates (see attached)	Per ITE		
Trip Adjustment Factors	Passby: Per ITE		Captive Market: N/A
Trip Distribution (see attached)	North	South	East West
Mode Split Assumptions	N/A		
Design Vehicle Information	Passenger Car		
Committed Roadway Improvements	City Provide		
Other Traffic Studies	ADT/Speed Studies on Kingsley, Paddington, Sunstone- See locations on Trip Distribution map. <u>Redistribute traffic through English Ranch in the long range per redlines.</u>		
Areas Requiring Special Study	Connection to Paddington and signal at Ziegler/Paddington intersection (In the long range only)		

Date: Delich Associates

Traffic Engineer: November 2, 2023

Local Entity Engineer: Steven Gilchrist 11/17/2023

## 5. Findings of Fact/Conclusion

In evaluating the request for the Ziegler - Corbett Overall Development Plan, ODP210004, Staff makes the following findings of fact:

1. The Overall Development Plan complies with the applicable procedural and administrative requirements of Article 2 of the Land Use Code.
2. The Overall Development Plan's proposed alternative street connectivity accomplishes the purposes of Section 3.6.3 equally well or better than would a plan and design which complies with the standards of this section because the overall neighborhood including and surrounding the ODP is well served by a network of local, collector and arterial streets, the plan continues to enhance the connectivity for bicycle, pedestrian and transit by providing for connectivity through the site, and the proposed on-site amenities and land uses minimize and mitigate the generation of vehicular trips to the north.
3. The Modification to Section 4.26(D)(2) Secondary Uses is not detrimental to the public good and meets criteria 2.8.2(H)(2) because the ODP plan provides a substantial benefit to the community by addressing

**From:** [Ryan Mounce](#)  
**To:** [Development Review Comments](#); [Sharlene Manno](#); [Katie Claypool](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] english ranch connection road from mega density development  
**Date:** Thursday, February 15, 2024 10:58:32 AM

---

Em / Katie / Shar,

Forwarding this public comment that just came in regarding the Union Park item tonight at P&Z. Wasn't sure if this was already included in some of the other messages that came in overnight and this morning.

Ryan Mounce  
Planning Services  
City of Fort Collins  
970.224.6186 | [rmounce@fcgov.com](mailto:rmounce@fcgov.com)

---

**From:** dave poppe <[poppe.dave@gmail.com](mailto:poppe.dave@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 15, 2024 10:29 AM  
**To:** Ryan Mounce <[RMounce@fcgov.com](mailto:RMounce@fcgov.com)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] english ranch connection road from mega density development

Hi Ryan,

I may not be able to make it to the meeting today.

And I know it's late, but I would like to voice my opposition to a connection between the new MegaDensity development and english ranch/fox stone.

The connection to Paddington should not be done.

Our streets are not built for that density and all the new traffic between many houses and the park would be a danger to people going to the park.

Please oppose this connection to paddington.

I really think the development is a bad thing to do I think the new development is going to put more people in the 31? acre site than we may have in the whole enclosing square mile.

So I'd like to voice my opposition to making such a dense development next to a 30 year old existing normal density development.

Thanks,  
Dave Poppe  
3731 Stratford Court  
719-231-7950.