

MINUTES

CITY OF FORT COLLINS • BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS



Planning & Zoning Commission REGULAR MEETING

June 18, 2026 – 6:00 PM

Council Chambers, City Hall 300 Laporte Ave

Also via Zoom

1. CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 PM

2. ROLL CALL

- Board Members Present – Adam Sass (Chair), Russell Connelly (Vice Chair), Shirley Peel, York, Julie Stackhouse, Kent Bruxvoort
- Board Members Absent – Trevor Sheeley
- Staff Members Present – Beals, Kidwell, Yatabe, Myler, Baty
- Guest(s) – Jan Clodfelder, Jennifer Markiewicz, Nick Markiewicz, Nadine Jung, Stuart Clodfelder, Kevin Lear

3. AGENDA REVIEW

Noah Beals, Development Review Manager, provided a review of the agenda.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

• CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 21, 2026

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the May 21, 2026, meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Vice Chair Connelly made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Peel, to approve the Consent Agenda. Yeas: Connelly, Bruxvoort, York, Peel, Stackhouse and Sass. Nays: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. DISCUSSION AGENDA

- **LIVESTOCK GRAZING AT RIGDEN FARM – FDP260002**

DESCRIPTION: This is a request for a combination Major Amendment and Final Development Plan to have livestock grazing on parcel #8729163025 at Rigden Farm HOA. The applicant is proposing hogs to treat the invasive weeds in Rigden Farm HOA's open space area. Access can be taken from Exmoor Lane along the east and north. The property is approximately 3.96 acres and is located 0.13 miles west of Ziegler Road and approximately 0.25 miles north of William Neal Parkway. The site is located in the Low-Density Mixed-Use Neighborhood District (LMN) and the project is subject to an Addition of Permitted Use (APU) and Major Amendment (MJA) with a Type 2 (Planning and Zoning Commission) hearing for a recommendation to City Council for a decision.

STAFF: Jill Baty, City Planner

APPLICANT: Christof Meyer
AloTerra Restoration Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 212
Fort Collins, CO 80522

PROPERTY OWNER: Rigden Farm HOA
2902 Rigden Parkway
Fort Collins, CO 80525

STAFF OVERVIEW

Jill Baty, City Planner, outlined the location of the proposed livestock grazing on an HOA property that has more than a decade of weed citations. She stated the applicant is proposing to use five to fifteen pigs to graze the seed bank of weeds for two to five years to allow the property to ultimately be planted with native prairie plants per a 2019 minor amendment. She stated the property is in the Low-Density Mixed-Use Neighborhood (LMN) zone district which does not permit farm animals.

Baty outlined the Addition of Permitted Use (APU) process which allows for a land use to be located on a specific parcel within a zone district that would otherwise not permit such a use. Additionally, Baty noted there are two parts of the approval process for this proposal: the site and management plan and the modification of standard are the components for which the Planning and Zoning Commission is the decision maker, and the addition of permitted use for the farm animals for which City Council is the decision maker with a recommendation from the Commission. Baty noted that if Council votes to deny the APU, the site and management plan and modification of standard would automatically be terminated.

Baty stated the overall project involves two phases: phase one involving the pigs and phase two involving seeding and planting the native vegetation. She provided a history of the property and noted pigs were brought onto the site without permission of the City in 2024 and 2025, and after concerns were raised by neighbors, the City shut down the operation; however, there is evidence that the treatment was working over the past two years.

Baty discussed allowed uses in the LMN and commented on the Land Use Code and Municipal Code regulations regarding farm animals. She went on to discuss the stormwater runoff regulations and neighborhood feedback.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Christof Meyer, AloTerra Restoration Services, outlined the goals of the HOA for the property and stated the ultimate proposal was designed to address the seed bank, reduce water use, and create a permanent solution. He provided additional details regarding each of the phases and discussed the fact that the pigs will fully consume all parts of the weed plants and are not dangerous nor do they produce foul odors. He showed images of the property before and after having the pigs graze in 2024 and 2025.

Meyer noted the plan has been adapted in several key areas in order to mitigate odor, noise, and dust, store food to prevent rodent infiltration, and to address runoff. He provided some additional details regarding the mitigation and reseeding plans and outlined alternative options, including boom spraying, that would not be as effective or cost efficient.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Baty discussed other cities' policies regarding using animals in land management, but noted staff is not aware of any other municipalities who are attempting to use livestock to manage seed banks in general and is unaware of any other municipalities using pigs for ecosystem management. She noted none of the City's plans or policy documents imagine this specific situation; however, there is encouragement for finding and using innovative and environmentally friendly land management tools.

Baty stated staff finds the APU is not detrimental to the public good, meets the eight APU evaluation criteria, and complies with the Land Use Code Section related to building and project compatibility. Additionally, farm animals are not specifically called out as a prohibited use in the LMN zone district. In terms of the Final Development Plan, staff finds the proposal complies with the Land Use Code. Baty noted a Modification of Standard is required for the proposed electric fencing, and staff finds it meets the applicable criteria. Baty stated staff recommends approval of the Final Development Plan comprised of the Site and Management Plan and Modification of Standard. Additionally, staff recommends the Commission adopt a recommendation of approval to City Council for the APU for farm animals in the LMN zone district in accordance with the associated Final Development Plan.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS

Commissioner Stackhouse asked about the environmental impacts of boom spraying. Meyer replied that herbicides would be used, though as sparingly as possible. He stated the herbicides used are low residual; however, they would kill all plants on the site. Meyer stated using pigs accomplishes the same result, but in a much more environmentally friendly way and without killing some of the more beneficial sub-surface fungi or microbes.

Commissioner Stackhouse asked how it can be guaranteed that responses to neighbor complaints will be effective. Meyer replied that his company's phone number is on the signs that are on the property

and noted they receive calls regularly that are primarily positive or inquisitive. He stated people can call the number 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He also noted they visit the property every other day.

Commissioner Bruxvoort stated there were neighborhood observations of odor with the two to six pigs that were previously placed on the property and noted the applicant presentation indicated that would not be the case. Meyer replied that the concept of odor is highly subjective which is challenging. He stated he believes the smell around these pigs is virtually non-existent and noted there were several neighborhood comments indicating there is no odor. He stated the odor mitigation plan is in place to help ensure concerns of all residents are addressed.

Commissioner Bruxvoort noted the previous two years have involved two to six pigs and this application proposes up to fifteen. He asked about the potential impacts associated with the larger number. Meyer replied there is a pound per acre per day calculation; therefore, the fewer pigs, the more days are needed. He stated that no more than fifteen pigs can be managed and stated using fifteen pigs would roughly double the current pace.

Commissioner Peel asked about the reasons for the operation being shut down in 2024 and 2025. Baty replied pigs are not a permitted use in the zone district, though in 2024, they worked with staff to allow them to continue for the season but not beyond. She stated the applicant was under the impression they had been granted five years of operations, though that was not the case, which is why the operation was shut down in 2025.

Commissioner Peel asked about the legalities of approving a project that may interfere with a homeowner being able to enjoy their property. Assistant City Attorney Yatabe replied he is unaware of a State statute related to the enjoyment of property, though there are many related to potential nuisances. He added that there are many overarching land use statutes that refer to the taking of property from private landowners. He also noted there are many mentions in the Land Use Code and City Code regarding noise and odors, though he concurred that odor is somewhat subjective.

Commissioner Peel noted the applicant mentioned that a fermented diet for the pigs would reduce the water supply contamination and asked if there is any data associated with that claim. Meyer replied there are some Stanford E. coli studies as well as one from CU regarding the impact of fermented food on harmful E. coli. He added that because the fermented grain is being fed to the pigs, the digestive process tends to leave less residue in the intestines, which leads to better stool and lower E. coli load. He also noted there are physical barriers to catch manure or runoff before it gets to the stormwater system. He emphasized the small amount of manure that will be produced.

Commissioner Peel asked staff if they agree with the assessment that the manure would not cause problems for the stormwater system. Baty replied work was done with the stormwater staff to ensure what is proposed in the management plan meets the requirements of the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) Permit issued by the State. She noted the soil on the site is quite permeable and will absorb much of the waste, with any runoff being adequately stopped by the physical barriers.

Commissioner Peel asked how long it would take a caretaker to arrive if there was an emergency. Meyer replied that the vast majority of his team lives within a ten-to-fifteen-minute drive from the location.

Commissioner Peel asked how often periodic manure removal would occur. Meyer replied the manure becomes an organic source that is part of the treatment regime for the soil as it biodegrades. He noted the pigs' movement on the land will act to till the manure into the soil. He stated any unsightly piles of manure would be removed and remedied on a complaint basis.

Commissioner Peel asked if allowing this use would open the door to others who may want farm

animals in their backyards. Baty replied anyone wanting that would also need to go through the APU process.

Commissioner York asked if there are any weed species, such as leafy spurge, in the area that the pigs will not eat. Meyer replied he has seen the pigs eat leafy spurge, though it may not be healthy for them in large quantities. He stated they generally eat everything eventually but are picky about what they eat first.

Assistant City Attorney Yatabe clarified there are private rights of action for nuisances.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Jan Clodfelder discussed the HOA regulations and stated her property is 25 feet from the pigs which kept her from being able to entertain anyone because of the prevalence of mosquitoes and flies. She stated this use is not approved by the Health Department and expressed concern about the noise impacts of the pigs. She also noted the HOA regulations state that all open areas must be maintained and not have containers on them.

Jennifer Markiewicz stated her property is 700 feet from the site and stated the pigs are an eyesore and the use has a foul odor. She also expressed concern about the placement of an electrified fence in the middle of a neighborhood where children play. She disagreed that members of the AloTerra team attend to the animals every two days and stated there were times last year when the pigs had no water. She also stated this is an experiment and there is no guarantee it will work. She requested the Commission deny the application.

Nick Markiewicz opposed the application and reiterated concerns that there is no guarantee this will work. He requested the Commission deny the application.

Nadine Jung discussed the history of the HOA looking for solutions for this property and stated the odors from the sewage plant are worse than the odors from the pigs. She stated this solution is environmentally conscious and urged approval of the application.

Stuart Clodfelder noted that the HOA regulations mandate that all animal droppings be removed and that no nuisances, offensive smells, or animal mating shall be allowed in the residential environment. He stated they were told this land would be a park and questioned why the City never did anything about the fact that the developer never did anything other than let weeds grow there. He requested the Commission deny the application.

Kevin Lear expressed dissatisfaction with how the HOA has gone about this process and encouraged the Commission to take into account the fact that the HOA has violated City ordinances by putting pigs on the property initially and remains in violation of weed ordinances. He suggested the HOA may not be the best partner for this experiment and suggested spot treatment could be a possibility. He also commented on a conversation with an extension specialist who expressed concern that the weed seeds would simply return to the soil in manure. He requested the Commission deny the application.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Meyer stated this is precisely how pigs have been used in agriculture situations for hundreds of years. Additionally, he stated there is unequivocal evidence on this site that indicates there is no longer a problem with the kochia in the areas the pigs have already grazed. He reiterated that as soon as the pigs are moved from an area, straw and seed would be put down to help provide the optimal environment for the native seeds to grow.

Meyer noted some nearby neighbors spoke at previous meetings and indicated they did not have an issue with odor. He stated the seed bank is too deep for simple herbicide spraying, as evidenced by the year of that type of treatment that was already completed. Additionally, he suggested the pig portion of this project could likely be completed in two years and stated the pigs are not mistreated or given too little water.

Meyer stated he had not previously heard concerns about mosquitoes and stated there should not be standing water other than for a few hours after water is sprayed to create mud for the pigs' skin. Additionally, he noted he is not charging the HOA for his time and stated he believes this is the kind of solution needed for this piece of land.

STAFF RESPONSE

Baty provided a reminder that the City does not enforce private HOA regulations. She noted the Municipal Code does address the enjoyment of property, specifically in regard to odor, and she discussed the requirement for waste to be removed periodically, which is also the language in the management plan.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS

Commissioner Peel asked if there is a charge for the pigs and actual operation. Meyer replied that the basis of the cost is hourly for the team to attend to the pigs and move them, and there was a charge for the design of the overarching adaptive management plan for the entire area. He stated he is attempting to come up with a good ecological solution for the HOA.

Commissioner Peel stated she understands pigs need mud, but expressed concern about flies and mosquitoes given the mud will not completely dry. Meyer replied that the mud pit should be moved regularly which would prevent the mosquito egg hatch cycle from recurring. Additionally, the paddocks are moved every two weeks. He stated he is willing to guarantee in writing that they would not allow any puddle to remain for more than 48 hours.

Vice Chair Connelly asked about the enforcement mechanism for moving the mud pit. Baty replied it would be enforced in the same way as the rest of the management plan if it were added to that plan, and enforcement would be done on a complaint basis. Meyer noted he could not guarantee there would be no puddles given rain but stated he would guarantee the mud pits are moved.

Commissioner Bruxvoort asked if there has been any study done by the HOA regarding how much other land may face a similar weed situation. Baty replied AloTerra is contracted with the HOA to do restoration projects on all of its properties, and there are a few other areas with kochia problems, though using the pigs on those parcels is not part of this proposal and any expansion of the pigs to another parcel would require another APU process. Meyer noted the adaptive management plan did not specifically identify any areas that were as extensively degraded as this parcel. He stated the process is quite arduous and it is highly unlikely they will pursue it for another parcel.

Chair Sass asked if the original plan for the parcel was for a park. Baty replied that the plans called it out as being a small neighborhood park, though it was not meant to have any infrastructure and was planned to be a native grass open space.

Chair Sass requested additional details regarding what herbicide treatment would do to the site. Meyer replied that an herbicide would effectively kill all of the plants indiscriminately in an area that is dominated by one particular species. He noted that was attempted in one area and it was not found to be effective. He also stated the soil could physically be removed and replaced.

Chair Sass asked what would trigger the requirement for soil removal. Noah Beals, Development Review Manager, replied that mitigation, which could include soil removal, would be required when a contaminant in the soil reached a certain level, though noxious weeds are not considered a contaminant from the City's standpoint.

COMMISSION DELIBERATION

Commissioner York stated he understands the concerns about flies and mosquitoes; however, he noted the neighborhood is near the Environmental Learning Center and Poudre River and it would be difficult to necessarily tie the insects to the pigs. He expressed support for finding a creative, nontoxic way to deal with the weeds.

Commissioner Peel commended staff and the applicant for developing a well-thought-out program to address a problem and stated she would normally support something like it; however, she noted she has three acres of property and has had problems mitigating the impacts of odor, flies, and mosquitoes with various animal populations. She stated she does not believe the neighbors signed up to live next to a pig operation and stated the smell of pig manure is pungent.

Chair Sass stated there is some uniqueness to this intentional use of the animals as they are regularly moved and managed. He asked Commissioner Peel if her concern is with the management plan or recommendation to City Council regarding the APU. Commissioner Peel replied she believes the plan is detrimental to the neighborhood.

Chair Sass stated this situation is unique given the property's location; however, the plan offers a temporary state to improve the condition without using harmful herbicides. He stated he does not want to discourage outside the box thinking and added that he does not believe it is detrimental to the public good. However, he also noted having pigs near homes feels excessive particularly when the owners bought homes next to what they thought would be open space.

Commissioner Peel stated the role of government is to make things predictable; therefore, when one purchases a home in an LMN neighborhood, they should expect certain allowed uses. She concurred out of the box thinking is valuable; however, she believes this is a step too far regarding the assurance of predictability.

Commissioner York noted residents are allowed to have pets and commented on the noise made by pot-bellied pigs. He stated this would not be a conversation if this were a pet. Commissioner Peel replied that neighborhood residents agreed with a pet scenario, not with a farm scenario.

Commissioner York stated he does not see this as a farm scenario because of the limited number of animals.

Vice Chair Connelly stated that while this is a limited number of pigs, there still seems to be an impact; however, the HOA has found itself in a situation wherein no good options are available. He stated he is reluctant to require something that is more expensive or with potentially more unwanted impacts when it seems this plan has been well thought out.

Commissioner Peel asked if this situation has been brought about by the mismanagement of the weeds

by the developer or HOA and questioned whether it is appropriate to bend the regulations of the Land Use Code because someone did not properly do their job. Chair Sass stated the Commission could opine on that issue; however, asking staff or the applicant to opine on it would be inappropriate.

Commissioner York noted the HOA consists of the property owners who are in charge of that entity; however, the Commission is responsible for applying the Land Use Code in ways that benefit the city as a whole.

Chair Sass stated that if the negligence of the HOA resulted in this situation, members of the HOA could likely have acted sooner to deal with the situation.

Commissioner Bruxvoort stated this issue is fundamentally related to land use and the Land Use Code. He stated he does not want the Code regulations to be bent and noted there is a high burden for the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed APU would be compatible. He stated the role of the Commission is to look at the examine the proposed use for compatibility and to determine whether its impacts are too great to approve. He noted the property was approved to be a park and stated its covering in weeds does not constitute a park; therefore, this is a good faith effort to try to establish the use that was identified for the parcel. He added that he recognizes there are impacts to neighbors; however, he noted the use is temporary.

Commissioner Peel stated she believes the mismanagement of the property needs to be taken into account when the Commission is asked to apply the Code to something that has been mismanaged.

Commissioner Stackhouse stated the current condition of the property is unacceptable and detrimental and must be addressed. She stated none of the alternatives for treatment are without negative consequences; however, the proposal will likely be the least costly to homeowners as a group. She stated she would be opposed to the proposal if it were a permanent change.

Chair Sass reiterated the pigs will be moved every two weeks and the operation will only be in place for six months of the year. Commissioner Peel noted the May to November timeframe is when people are outside enjoying their yard.

Assistant City Attorney Yatabe stated the role of the Commission is to determine whether the proposal meets the applicable criteria, not whether there is a better or less expensive alternative.

Commissioner Peel stated she is opposed to the proposal as she has the lived experience of having fifteen pigs on her property and she believes this would be detrimental to the public good and therefore not meet that criterion.

Commissioner York noted City Council will be making the final decision on the APU.

Chair Sass asked Commissioner Peel about her main criteria concerns. Commissioner Peel replied she believes the proposal is detrimental to the public good and stated neighborhood concerns are not acceptable. She also stated she is unsure whether the mitigation measures are enough or whether they will be followed.

Chair Sass stated this proposal is a temporary means of getting the open space for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Peel stated she does not believe two to five years is an acceptable timeframe.

Commissioner York made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Stackhouse, that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend that City Council approve the Addition of Permitted Use for farm animals for the project site as shown in the staff report. The Commission find that, in

consideration of the proposed project, the use meets the Land Use Code criteria for approving the additional use. This decision is based on the agenda materials, information presented during the work session and this hearing, and Commission discussion. The Commission adopts the information, analysis, findings of fact, and conclusions contained in the staff report included in the hearing agenda materials. Yeas: York, Stackhouse, Bruxvoort, Connelly, and Sass. Nays: Peel.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Commissioner Stackhouse made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Connelly, that the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the modification to Land Use Code Section 4.3.5(C)(3) to allow electric fencing as described in the hearing materials. The Commission finds that the modification would not be detrimental to the public good because it would comply with the Land Use Code electric fencing standards and the following modification criteria are met: the plan promotes the purpose of Section 4.3.5(C)(3) equally well or better than a compliant plan because it does not pose a safety risk and is being used for livestock management, and the plan as submitted will not diverge from Section 4.3.5(C)(3) except in a nominal and inconsequential way, and will continue to advance the Land Use Code purposes in Section 1.2.2 because the use of the fencing is limited and does not pose a safety risk. This decision is based on the agenda materials, information presented during the work session and this hearing, and Commission discussion. The Commission adopts the information, analysis, findings of fact, and conclusions contained in the staff report included in the hearing agenda materials. Yeas: York, Stackhouse, Bruxvoort, Connelly, and Sass. Nays: Peel.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Vice Chair Connelly made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bruxvoort, that the Planning and Zoning Commission approve Final Development Plan FDP260002 regarding livestock grazing at Rigden Farm 6th Filing with the following conditions: that the final plan satisfies any subsequent City administrative review necessary to finalize the plan, and that City Council approve the associated Addition of Permitted Use for farm animals, otherwise this approval shall be automatically null and void. The Commission finds, in consideration of the approved modification and conditions, that the final plan complies with all applicable Land Use Code requirements. This decision is based on the agenda materials, information presented during the work session and this hearing, and Commission discussion. The Commission adopts the information, analysis, findings of fact, and conclusions contained in the staff report included in the hearing agenda materials. Yeas: York, Stackhouse, Bruxvoort, Connelly, and Sass. Nays: Peel.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

8. ADJOURNMENT

- 8:25 PM

Minutes approved by the Chair and a vote of the Commission on 08/20/26.