



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

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION AGENDA COMMUNICATIONS

AGENDA DATE: January 8, 2025

SUBJECT: Zoning Case No. ZON24-0006 – Concept Plan Review

ACTION PROPOSED: **NO ACTION – Public Review and Feedback Only**

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Application
2. Project Narrative
3. Proposal #1
4. Proposal #2
5. Proposal #3

PRESENTED BY: Jeremy Gleim, AICP, Planning & Development Director

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY:

On January 22, 2022 Johnstown North Investments, LLC (“Applicant”), submitted a Land Use Application & Cost Reimbursement Agreement to request annexation and zoning designation for approximately 94 acres of land in Weld County. The subject property is located in the northeast quarter of section 6 and the northwest quarter of section 5, township 4 north, range 67 west of the P.M. More specifically, it is located west of Telep avenue (Weld County Road 15), west of the existing Thompson Parks Baseball Fields and immediately north of the Rolling Hills Ranch subdivision.

In January of 2024, the Planning & Zoning Commission (Commission) held a public hearing to consider the Larson Annexation (Case No. ANX22-0001). At the applicant's request, the consideration of zoning was removed from that agenda. The Commission recommended approval of the annexation by unanimous vote. On February 21, 2024 the Town Council approved Ordinance 2024-241, on first reading, for the annexation of the Larson Annexation. Ordinance 2024-241 was subsequently approved on second reading at the Town Council meeting of March 4, 2024.

The Community that Cares

Pursuant to state law, newly annexed land must be zoned within 90 days of annexation. On June 3, 2024, the Town Council approved Ordinance 2024-252, on first reading, establishing H-A (Holding-Agriculture) zoning for the subject property. The ordinance was approved on second reading at the Town Council meeting of June 17, 2024. The H-A zoning designation was meant as a placeholder until a more permanent zoning designation was proposed.

Prior to making a formal request for new zoning, the applicant requested a review of their concept plans in a formal setting. Pursuant to Section 17-2-2(D)(1) of the Land Use & Development Code, an applicant may present concept plans for public review by the Planning & Zoning Commission and Town Council to solicit their feedback, without the risk of formal approvals and/or denials.

INFORMATION

Proposal #1

This proposal is based on PUD zoning under the previous Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) and consists of both single-family detached and multi-family housing products. Project zoning is eligible for consideration under the prior code, because the project was submitted when the prior code was in effect. A total of 463 units are proposed under the plan, broken down as follows:

- 5,300 square foot lots – 213
- 6,300 square foot lots – 106
- Multi-Family – 144 units

Density under this proposal is approximately 4.9 dwelling units per acre.

Pursuant to Section 16-301(a) of the prior LUDC, the purpose of the PUD District is to facilitate greater flexibility resulting in higher quality development through more creative and imaginative design of the commercial, industrial and residential areas than is typically possible under conventional, restricted zoning regulations. In addition, pursuant to Section 16-302(a)(1), the intent of the PUD-R District is to support private residential development by providing incentives encouraging the use of innovative design techniques in order to achieve high quality residential development. For consideration of PUD zoning, the applicant will have to provide evidence and craft findings demonstrating eligibility under Sections 16-301(a) and 16-302(a)(1), respectively.

Proposal #2

This proposal is comprised of 360 single-family detached lots, broken down as follows:

- 5,300 square foot lots – 233
- 6,300 square foot lots - 127

Project density under this concept plan is approximately 3.8 dwelling units per acre.

This design is based on a blending of the current and prior LUDC, wherein the project would be zoned under a zoning designation from the current LUDC but would require relief from certain current zoning standards. In order to consider the proposed departures from the current requirements, the applicant would have to provide evidence and craft findings demonstrating the need for variances. Variances are regulated under Section 17-2-8 of the LUDC, including explicit review criteria.

Proposal #3

This proposal is based on the SF-1 zoning designation under the previous LUDC and is comprised entirely of single-family detached lots, all with the same dimensions:

- 6,300 square foot lots – 331

Project density under this concept plan is approximately 3.5 dwelling units per acre.

No special requests, variances, or departures from the LUDC have been identified with this concept plan.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

A Neighborhood Meeting for this project was held on December 4, 2024, at the Johnstown YMCA; the meeting started at 6pm. Notices for this meeting were mailed to all property owners within 800 feet of the subject property. The meeting was well attended by members of the public, with an estimated 25 – 35 attendees. The applicant gave a brief overview of the three proposals and opened the meeting for comments and questions. A summary of the comments is listed below:

- Multi-Family – How many buildings, units, and product type?
- Pipeline Easement – Width?
- Installation of Sidewalks?
- Roadway Improvements?
- Detention Ponds?
- Connectivity to Rolling Hills?
- Request for an open-space buffer between Rolling Hills and subject property.
- Request to mirror lot sizes along shared boundary with Rolling Hills.
- Request for an east-west pedestrian path along shared boundary with Rolling Hills.
- Request for uniform fences/walls for new lots that face Rolling Hills.
- Privacy concerns.
- Impacts to schools and safety of children?

- How do proposed lot sizes compare to lots in Rolling Hills?
- Will there be a road stub to the north?
- Fire safety concerns.
- Parking issues from ballfields.
- Emergency access?
- Utility demands?
- Model home locations?
- Some people are opposed to a connection with Rolling Hills.
- Multiple people expressed opposition to multi-family development.
- Questions about the process for this project.
- Request for pedestrian infrastructure between the shared boundary with Rolling Hills.

Members of the public were most vocal about the following topics:

1. Opposition to the multi-family product;
2. A strong desire to have an open-space buffer between the subject property and the Rolling Hills subdivision that would include pedestrian infrastructure; and,
3. Lot sizes that are complementary to those in the Rolling Hills subdivision, especially along the shared boundary.

PROCESS:

No formal action shall be taken by the Commission for this review; however, the Commission is free to provide comments as they see fit. Notices were mailed to all property owners within 800 feet of the subject property advertising the public review of this project at this meeting.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: N/A
