



450 S. Parish Avenue
Johnstown, CO 80534
970.587.4664
JohnstownCO.gov

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

450 S. Parish, Johnstown, CO
Wednesday, January 8, 2025, at 6:00 PM

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Grentz called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Abel, Baily, Campbell, Flores, Jeanneret, Urban, and Chair Grentz were all present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made to approve the Agenda by Commissioner Jeanneret and Seconded by Commissioner Abel. The motion was passed 7/0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve November 13, 2024, Meeting was made by Commissioner Flores and Seconded by Commissioner Jeanneret. The motion was passed 7/0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - *Regarding items and issues not included as a Public Hearing on this Agenda (limited to 3 minutes each)*

No Public Comment was made.

NEW BUSINESS

Zoning Case No. ZON34-0006 -CONCEPT REVIEW for Larson Zoning

Planning Director Mr. Gleim introduced the project and invited the applicant to present their concept plans.

Mr. Buckendorf discussed the project's history, including certain policy positions that had changed at the Town due to staff turnover. He further explained that the project was being reviewed under the prior Land Use Code because of the timing of the original application. The applicant stated that the purpose of presenting concept plans was to gain clarity on the Town's position related to PUD zoning.

Mr. Buckendorf presented Concept #1, which is based on PUD zoning and is their preferred option. As part of the presentation, the applicant stated that the proposed mixture of housing types presented in Concept #1 could not be achieved through traditional straight zoning, thus the request for PUD zoning.

Mr. Buckendorf presented Concept #2, which is based on traditional straight zoning. The applicant stated that this plan was not preferred due to the homogenous nature of the project. The presentation concluded with the applicant restating their preferred concept.

Commissioner Campbell expressed concerns about “for-rent” product. The applicant stated that the single-family product shown in Concept #1 would not be rental product, and only the multi-family product would be rented. He also stated that the project would be virtually identical to the Clearview project, including the same floor plans and buildings. Commissioner Campbell asked about the fit of the design pursuant to surrounding developments.

Mr. Gleim clarified that the prior land use code included traditional zoning designations for which the proposed concept plan could potentially fit and that PUD zoning is not the only option for building this type of development. Mr. Buckendorf disagreed, stating that based on their interpretation of the code and conversations with previous employees of the Town, the project would not fit in a traditional zoning designation. He also stated that he would be willing to investigate that again.

Commissioner Urban asked about Concept #3, since it was not discussed. The applicant stated that Concept #3 did not make a lot of economic sense.

Commissioner Campbell asked about traffic. Mr. Gleim stated that a traffic study had not yet been developed, since they are based on specific designs.

Commissioner Abel asked about the primary concerns raised by the public regarding the multi-family. Mr. Buckendorf stated that it is mostly based on traffic and demographics. Commissioner Abel asked about the management of the apartments.

Commissioner Flores asked about the tank battery to the immediate north of the property. He asked about the setback requirements from gas and oil facilities and wanted to make sure it was addressed pursuant to applicable regulations.

Commissioner Campbell asked staff about traffic improvements related to the project. Mr. Gleim stated that traffic and transportation studies would come at a later date when the subdivision design was further along.

Chair Grentz invited the public to make comments on the project.

Jeremy Wangerow, 1915 Goldenvue Dr., appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback and thanked the applicant for responding to some of their early concerns. He inquired about the connection to Brittany Avenue (Rolling Hills) and the greenbelt between Rolling Hills and the new development. He asked if there would be a sidewalk in the greenbelt area. Mr. Wangerow asked for clarification on Concept #3 and what the concept for the greenbelt would look like.

Cindy Clark, 2003 Goldenvue Dr., thanked the applicant for responding to their early concerns. She expressed her concerns regarding apartments and prefers townhomes and patio homes. She questioned the need for more apartments, stating that 1,200 apartment units were under construction at Ledge Rock Center. She requested ranch homes (single-story) be constructed along the shared boundary with Rolling Hills Ranch. She asked about parking relative to the multi-family.

Darin Davis, 2007 Goldenvue Dr., thanked the applicant for responding to their early concerns. He voiced opposition to the apartments and advocated for an increase in greenbelt space between Rolling Hills Ranch.

Jane Patterson, 1905 Goldenvue Dr., requested clarification on the multi-family housing proposal, specifically asking what would happen if the quantity was reduced. She also asked about changes to the plan after zoning was approved.

Carrie Holly, 2005 Goldenvue Dr., voiced her opposition to the apartments, citing traffic concerns. She asked about drainage. She felt a single-family development was more appropriate. Ms. Holly also requested more information regarding the greenbelt and the fencing plan.

Jeff Winter, 1727 19th Ave., stated that he would support patio homes across from the ball fields instead of apartments. Mentioned views to the west. Wants variety in the development, including lot size variation. He doesn't think the apartments fit. Appreciated the applicant's early response to their concerns.

Jane Patterson, 1905 Goldenvue Dr., asked about wild fire mitigation.

Cindy Clark, 2003 Goldenvue Dr., raised questions about the value of homes and how the proposed value changes with the size increase of homes. Ms. Clark also proposed not having Brittany Ave. connect to their development (Rolling Hills).

Chair Grentz closed the public comments portion of the meeting.

Mr. Buckendorf returned to address the questions raised by the public. He explained that the development will adhere to the Town of Johnstown's standards regarding connections and roadways. The buffer zone is set at 50 feet, with the intention of maintaining a well-kept landscape.

Concept #3 is a standard development featuring 6,300-square-foot lots. Mr. Buckendorf stated that they would consider ranch style houses along the southern boundary if they were permitted to move forward with Concept #1.

Parking spots will be designed to meet Town standards, ensuring that parking will not negatively impact surrounding neighborhoods. While ranch-style homes are still a possibility, any inclusion would require adjustments to the current concept. Home prices are expected to range from the mid-\$400,000s to \$650,000.

Drainage will be managed to prevent any adverse effects on neighboring areas, with water being detained and redirected away from the neighborhood. All flows would be detained on the subject property. Plans for fencing remain open for discussion, and the developer is willing to listen to feedback from nearby residents.

Mr. Buckendorf stated that the design of Concept #1 is traditional in that the multi-family is positioned along the main street and creates a buffer from the road to the single-family product to the west. Larger lots are positioned along the perimeter, which smaller lots more internal to the project. He stated that they do not construct patio or townhome product and will not develop condos.

Regarding Concept #1 (mixed residential with apartments), Commissioner Urban asked why the single-family lots along the southern boundary cannot extend to the east in lieu of the apartments. Mr. Buckendorf expressed openness to this suggestion. However, he mentioned there is a current street issue that needs to be solved. He noted that surrounding towns have adopted a similar concept.

Commissioner Campbell commented on the fact that these units are rentals. Mr. Buckendorf affirmed this, explaining that they are well-maintained and have historically been family-friendly.

Commissioner Urban inquired about the economic differences between the proposals to clarify the long-term value of multi-family housing.

Chair Grentz expressed appreciation for the applicant's response to the concerns. He further stated that he supports product variation but highlighted concerns about multi-family at this location. Mr. Buckendorf said he would explore roadway options to ensure compliance with codes. Chair Grentz expressed a preference for houses over apartments and suggested along the southern boundary.

Commissioner Campbell expressed her appreciation of the applicant's transparency regarding economics and revenue streams regarding Concept #1; however, she stated her opposition to the apartments at this location. Mr. Buckendorf stated that the Clearview neighborhood has been well-received and could serve as a positive example for this community.

Commissioner Flores supported the idea of the developer having a long-term stake in the community. He appreciated that the current plans depict livable homes and commended the developer's willingness to engage with the community. He prefers a developer to have a long-term stake in the community and appreciated the applicant's willingness to work with the neighbors. Mr. Buckendorf assured the Commission that he remains involved with the community even after the homes are built. He offered to provide a list of properties they have developed which mimic what they are proposing, stating that this is not a unique development and that it is a tried and true model.

Commissioner Urban asked Mr. Gleim to speak about some of the zoning issues that were raised. Mr. Gleim clarified that even under straight zoning, the property would still have to be subdivided. The subdivision of land requires a public hearing and would provide the public and decision-makers with an opportunity to comment on the project. He also clarified that projects like the one being proposed as Concept #1 can be developed under straight zoning designations; however, it would require a higher density zoning designation. He commented on Mr. Buckendorf's statement regarding the fact that this project is not unique, clarifying that in order to support PUD zoning, certain findings must be made, including a finding that the project is so unique and provides so much value to the community that it cannot be reviewed under traditional zoning designations.

Commissioner Urban clarified that if the applicant proceeded with Concept #2, they could still request larger lots. Mr. Gleim confirmed that this is correct and emphasized that there would still be opportunities for public comment on the subdivision of land. Mr. Buckendorf stated that the project would have to be approved if it met the provisions of the code. Mr. Gleim stated that the subdivision of land requires a public hearing process and is therefore a discretionary review. If it were not discretionary, staff would have to approve the project administratively, provided it meets the provisions of the code. Therefore, the Planning & Zoning Commission and Town Council have some discretion in their review and ultimate approval and/or denial of the project.

Chair Grentz asked why the applicant did not revert to the current land use code, since it seems to provide more flexibility in development. Mr. Buckendorf stated that the architectural standards in the current land use code are significantly different from the prior code, specifically regarding aesthetic requirements. He stated that the new requirements add a lot of cost that do not translate to a better product for the home buyer. Mr. Buckendorf reiterated that because of the time his application was submitted, he is bound by the previous version of the land use code. Mr. Gleim clarified that staff is not preventing the applicant from using the updated code, but he is entitled to use the previous code based on the time of his submittal. said that he wouldn't be opposed working with Mr. Gleim on this in the future.

Commissioner Jeanneret appreciated the comments and favored a reduction in apartments in lieu of more single-family lots. He also expressed his desire for generous open space within the development.

Mr. Buckendorf stated that he will continue to engage with the neighbors on this project.

Commissioner Bailey stated that the product being presented here is much different than what is being developed at Ledge Rock Center and is much more desirable. He also stated that he is in favor of a buffer along the roadway.

Discussion on this project concluded with no action being taken.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

No reports from staff.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

No reports from the Commissioners.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 by Chair Grentz.