

Department of Community Development

Reference: Grein Property Planned Development

To: Mayor Gregroy Mills and Members of the City Council
Through: Michael P. Martinez, City Manager
Prepared By: Emma Lane, AICP, Senior Planner – Historic Preservation
Date Prepared: February 5, 2026

PURPOSE

The Planned Development (“PD” or the “Application”) application before the City Council is for an approximately 88.303-acre property (the “Property”), generally located to the north of the Longs Peak Street alignment, south of East Baseline Road, east of the Fulton Ditch and west of the North 27th Avenue alignment and the Brighton Lateral Ditch. Currently, the Property is zoned A-1 (Agriculture-1) within Adams County. Travis Frazier of Redland is the project contact working on behalf of the Property owners and applicants, Ivan E. Grein Living Trust and CC Realty, LLC (the “Applicants”). The Applicants are requesting a zoning map amendment to Planned Development (PD).

PROCESSES

A planned development is a type of zoning map amendment that establishes a detailed plan for development within a defined area. A planning development is processed according to the planned development review criteria set out in Section 2.04(C) of the *Land Use & Development Code* (LUDC). Rezoning is the second step in the land development process with the City (Annexation > Rezoning > Platting > Site Plan Review > Permits). Before any permits related to new development can be issued, a subdivision plan must be approved through a public process, a final plat must be approved administratively, and a site plan must be approved administratively, if applicable. All will be reviewed using the City’s LUDC to ensure a proposal’s compliance with City codes and policies.

City staff collects and analyzes application materials, and after a thorough review, presents their findings to the Planning Commission and, thereafter, City Council. Requests to rezone via planned development are brought before the Planning Commission for recommendation prior to review and final determination by the City Council. A planned development must be approved by ordinance, which requires two readings before the City Council.

CRITERIA BY WHICH CITY COUNCIL MUST CONSIDER THE ITEM

The LUDC states that the planned development process is intended for projects that require a higher degree of specific planning due to their scale, complexity, and relationship to the surrounding context, allowing for a more flexible application of standards to meet the code’s purpose and objectives. The LUDC further clarifies that a development plan must include sufficient area to implement planning concepts that deliver broader public benefits that can only be realized through the flexible application of the standards.

Section 2.04(C)(1) of the LUDC outlines the review criteria upon which the City Council must consider the Application. Specifically, the City Council must consider the following:

- (a) The plan better implements the Comprehensive Plan, beyond what could be accomplished under application of general zoning districts and development standards.
- (b) The benefits from any flexibility in the proposed plan promote the general public health, safety and welfare of the community, and in particular, that of the areas immediately near or within the proposed project, and the proposed flexibility is not strictly to benefit the applicant or a single project.
- (c) The flexibility in the proposed plan allows the project to better meet or exceed the intent statements of the base zoning district(s).
- (d) The proposed adjustments to the standards do not undermine the intent or design objectives of those standards when applied to the specific project or site.
- (e) The plan reflects generally accepted and sound planning and urban design principles with respect to applying the goals and objectives of the Compressive Plan to the area.
- (f) The plan meets all of the review criteria for a zoning map amendment.

BACKGROUND

The Property is currently in the process of annexing into the City. The Property is zoned Agriculture-1 within Adams County and is within the City’s growth boundary.

Surrounding Land Use(s):

<i>Surrounding Direction</i>	<i>Land Use(s)</i>	<i>Zoning</i>	<i>Annexation Status</i>
North	Residential	Weld County Agriculture	Unannexed
South	Open Space	PL	City of Brighton
East	Residential/Agricultural Vacant	Adams County A-1 Mountain View Estates PD	Unannexed City of Brighton
West	Residential Residential Open Space	Adams County A-1 R-1-B, R-2, R-3 PL	Unannexed City of Brighton City of Brighton

STAFF ANALYSIS OF THE APPLICATION

The purpose of the PD is to establish development standards tailored specifically to the Property, allowing for greater flexibility than what is required by the LUDC. Specifically, the PD proposes alternatives to standards set forth in Article 5. These deviations are essential for enabling a unique development pattern that moves away from traditional layouts. The summary below highlights, at a high level, the key deviations from the LUDC.

Zoning and Restrictions

The PD proposes an underlying zoning of R-1-B within Planning Area A, and an underlying zoning of R-2 within Planning Area B. As the LUDC does not specifically mention density, the PD proposes these denser zone districts with the caveat that the overall development will not exceed 5 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC). Individual Planning Areas may exceed this density but will be compensated for in another Planning Area, if needed. This allows a higher density product in

some areas but also results in the Property as a whole complying with the Future Land Use portion of the Comprehensive Plan.

Building Types

Within Planning Area A, the PD specifies building types that differ from the LUDC. The PD proposes all categories of detached houses be allowed in the R-1-B underlying zone district. This differs from the LUDC as the PD allows for Detached House – Rural and Detached House – Suburban, which are not currently allowed, and restricts Duplex/Multi-unit House and Row House, which are both allowed locationally per the LUDC.

Within Planning Area B, the PD also specifies building types that differ from the LUDC. The PD proposes to allow all types of detached houses, both types of duplexes, and row houses. This differs from the LUDC by allowing the Detached House – Rural, Detached House – Suburban, and prohibits all apartments, which are conditionally allowed in the R-2 district per the LUDC.

Development Standards

In both Planning Areas, a few development standards are proposed to be altered. Driveway spacing for local roads shall be 30 feet from the corner. This differs from the LUDC in that the LUDC requires a 50-foot distance from the corner. The current standard makes it difficult for narrow lots to have individual driveways. Additionally, driveway widths are proposed to vary from the LUDC requirements. The proposed PD allows driveway widths of 16 feet for a single car driveway and 24 feet for a double car driveway. The LUDC requires different widths for different building types, with the wider lots allowing wider driveways. This also makes it difficult for narrow lots to have individual driveways.

All other development standards in the LUDC shall be followed.

Preservation of Existing Site Character

As required per LUDC Section 10.03(F)(2), cultural resource surveys were completed for the existing homes on the site. Three separate sites were studied, and two of the sites, both along East Baseline Road, were deemed eligible for local designation.

The first site, known as 5AM.3728, has historical significance on the local level in the areas of agriculture and architecture. The farmstead as a whole is eligible for designation on the local level and on the state and national levels as well. The farmstead contributed to agricultural production and expansion of Brighton in the 20th century and is also an example of the Bungalow farmhouse architectural style that was common in Brighton in the early 20th century. The residence maintains character defining features, such as the prominent porch, the side gabled roof, original wood siding, and many of the original windows.

There are several outbuildings that also retain character and integrity. These outbuildings supported agricultural operations once pertinent to the farmstead. Three outbuildings remain in good condition, while a fourth is considered ruins as it has collapsed in recent years.

The second site, known as 5AM.4300, is also considered eligible for designation at the local level. The home was built in the Craftsman style, with Craftsman features such as decorated knee braces, overhanging eaves, and a prominent front porch. The accessory structure on this site lacks integrity, which means that the architectural features have been lost. The residence has historical significance in the areas of agriculture and architecture but is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places because the farm is no longer active onsite and because of some

modern modifications to the structure. The residence is still eligible for the local register because its character defining features, mentioned above, are still original to the home.

Rather than official designation of the structures, the PD proposes to preserve two homes and two accessory structures in perpetuity. This allows more flexibility for changes to the structures, but ensures the history and architecture remains. The homes will be integrated into the landscape buffer along East Baseline Road and will preserve the rural and agricultural character along this portion of East Baseline Road.

The additional historic home site was not deemed eligible for designation and can be demolished. Because of the site's involvement in the agricultural history of the area, interpretive signage will be incorporated within the neighborhood to educate the public and celebrate the agricultural heritage of the site.

Additionally, the PD proposes to preserve as many healthy, established trees on the Property as feasible. This will add to the historic character of East Baseline Road by preserving the tree canopy within the landscape buffer and provides shade from mature trees in open spaces that could be used by residents of the neighborhood.

A preservation and maintenance plan for both the structures and the trees will be submitted at time of subdivision plan review, once further investigation on location and condition of the trees has been completed through a tree survey. The future metropolitan district will be responsible for maintenance and repairs on both the structures and the trees.

Land Use & Development Code:

Below, Staff analyzes how the Application meets and/or exceeds the criteria set forth in Section 2.04(C)(1).

- a) The plan better implements the Comprehensive Plan, beyond what could be accomplished under application of general zoning districts and development standards.**

The future land use section of *Be Brighton*, the Comprehensive Plan, designates the Property as Low Density Residential. This designation is intended to provide single family neighborhoods that are built on a highly connected street pattern. The average density under this designation is between 0.5 DU/AC and 5 DU/AC. Per the Comprehensive Plan, R-1-B is a compliant zone district, but R-2 is not. By allowing the denser zone district but limiting the overall density, the PD meets this portion of the plan.

The homes directly to the west of the Property range in building type and density. Allowing a more diverse range of housing types while still meeting the 5 DU/AC will allow the proposed development to blend into the existing landscape and provide a more diverse neighborhood, while also meeting the expectations of density as mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan.

Within the Comprehensive Plan Chapter Four on 'Citywide Principles, Policies & Strategies', the PD advances a number of these goals:

Policy 6.1: Create and Maintain Inviting, Safe, Walkable and Bikeable Streetscapes

- By preserving existing structures within the landscape buffer along East Baseline Road, this creates a safe pedestrian route within a larger buffer than would be required typically. The space between the existing structures will act as a natural open space that easily

integrates into the streetscape and current landscape of this portion of East Baseline Road. The large landscape buffer creates connectivity through the neighborhood and along a major roadway but allows for safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

Policy 6.5: Encourage Projects that Enhance the Diversity of Housing Types and Costs, and Manage Affordability through Supply and Subsidy

- By allowing a more diverse array of building types for both Planning Areas within the Development, the project will aid in diversifying the existing housing supply. Additionally, updating the standards on driveway separation and driveway widths allows for smaller lots and can make it easier to build varied building types.

Policy 7.5: Design the Streets, Pedestrian Environments and Gateways of Brighton with Consideration to the Visual Character and Experience of Users and Adjacent Development

- The proposed PD's extended landscape buffer to accommodate the existing structures and trees ensures that the buildings and the streetscape design work in harmony and exceed the community's expectations. Preserving the rural and agricultural feel of this portion of East Baseline Road with the preservation of the existing structures and trees celebrates the history of the area as a whole but also leaves room for modern development.

Policy 10.1: Encourage and Support Historic Preservation and Reuse of Existing Structures

- Preserving the homes and trees along the East Baseline Road corridor maintains a visual representation of the past. Brighton's progress from a prairie to a farming-oriented community to a City has allowed the City to thrive, and remnants of historic sites and structures have become increasingly important resources. The history behind the farmhouses and associated outbuildings will be preserved, as well as the visual reminder of where Brighton started as a community. With the combination of the mature trees and the existing farmhouses, the farming community in Brighton will be celebrated, even though the farming use has become obsolete on this Property.

- b) The benefits from any flexibility in the proposed plan promote the general public health, safety and welfare of the community, and in particular, that of the areas immediately near or within the proposed project, and the proposed flexibility is not strictly to benefit the applicant or a single project.**

The surrounding properties, particularly on the west side of the Property along the Fulton Ditch, vary in terms of density and product type, ranging from single family homes to apartment complexes. Allowing a more diverse range of housing types than allowed by the LUDC while still meeting the 5 DU/AC will allow the proposed development to blend into the existing landscape and allow the property to integrate into the community.

- c) The flexibility in the proposed plan allows the project to better meet or exceed the intent statements of the base zoning district(s).**

Both underlying districts, R-1-B and R-2, focus on a range of small-scale residential building types and developing properties as compact and walkable neighborhoods, while the Comprehensive Plan suggests 5 DU/AC maximum density. Implementing more flexibility in the housing types and less flexibility in the DU/AC allows the project to meet and exceed the intent statements by

providing more diverse housing stock while simultaneously meeting the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

- d) The proposed adjustments to the standards do not undermine the intent or design objectives of those standards when applied to the specific project or site.**

The proposed adjustments to the standards within the PD have been carefully considered and do not undermine the intent or design objectives of the LUDC. While the PD incorporates some deviations from the traditional standards, these modifications are intended to provide more variation in building type, and to allow smaller front-loaded lots within the proposed development.

- e) The plan reflects generally accepted and sound planning and urban design principles with respect to applying the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan to the area.**

The proposed PD will allow the Property to develop in a manner that will support and advance a number of policies of the Comprehensive Plan. While the PD proposes alternatives to typical development standards and adds a density maximum which is not included in the LUDC, the overall design adheres to sound planning and urban design principles. Key elements, such as the deviations from the LUDC in terms of driveway spacing and width, allow lots to develop as narrower and more walkable areas within the neighborhood.

- f) The plan meets all of the review criteria for a zoning map amendment.**

The review criteria for a zoning map amendment is set forth in Section 2.03(B) and outlined below:

- 1) *The proposal is in accordance with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and any other plan, policy or guidance adopted pursuant to that plan.*

As stated above, the Property's rezoning to PD will help support policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

- 2) *The proposal will support development in character with existing or anticipated development in the area, including the design of street, civic spaces and other open space; the pattern, scale and format of buildings and sites; and the integration, transitions and compatibility of other uses.*

The surrounding area, particularly development to the west of this Property, differs in density. The PD proposes a wider range of building types than what would be allowed per the LUDC. The higher intensity Planning Area with an underlying zoning of R-2 is proposed along the existing R-3 and R-2 properties, which integrates with the existing character and allows this development to blend in with existing development.

Additionally, the preservation of the existing structures and trees along East Baseline Road preserves the agricultural corridor which matches the existing character of the area to the north of East Baseline Road. This creates a cohesive street design and allows for a larger open space buffer along the south side of the road while still allowing the land to develop as a modern residential neighborhood.

- 3) *The City or other agencies have the ability to provide services or facilities that may be necessary for anticipated uses in the proposed district.*

The Property can be adequately served, and any future site developer will pay applicable costs to connect to City infrastructure.

- 4) *The change will serve a community need, amenity or development that is not possible under the current zoning or that was not anticipated at the time of the initial zoning of the property.*

The Property is in the process of being annexed. With the annexation, the Property must be assigned zoning. As the current agricultural zoning does not meet the City's current Comprehensive Plan designation of low-density residential, staff believes that the PD, along with the proposed underlying zoning of R-1-B and R-2 while staying under 5 DU/AC will allow the property to develop at a comparable density to the rest of the surrounding area, which would not be allowed with the current agricultural zoning.

- 5) *The recommendations of any professional staff or advisory review bodies.*

City staff finds this site is appropriate for low-density residential uses given its specific location and based on the desires of the community as expressed in the Comprehensive Plan. Site development, including buffering and building design, will occur in accordance with the applicable zone district standards as outlined in the LUDC. Any site development on the Property will only be permitted with a design that ensures it fits in with the context and development patterns of the area.

The Development Review Committee (DRC) reviewed the Application and recommends approval.

Note: A complete list of comments and the agencies who made them are available upon request.

The Planning Commission heard the request on February 12, 2026, and recommended approval. (See the attached Resolution #26-02)

PUBLIC NOTICE AND INQUIRY

Mailings were sent to all property owners within 1,000 feet of the proposed zone change, as required by the LUDC. These mailings were sent on January 27, 2026, and included a letter describing the proposed rezoning, as well as the time and place for the public hearing. Also, included with the letter, was a map of the subject area. On the same day, notice was published on the City's website and City staff also posted public hearing information on Facebook and NextDoor in the days leading up to the meeting. Also on January 27, 2026, two signs were posted for the both the Planning Commission Public Hearing and the City Council Public Hearing. As of the posting of this report, Planning staff has not received any formal comment regarding the project in anticipation of the public hearing.

On November 20, 2023, as required by Code prior to the submission of the Application to the City, the Applicant held a neighborhood meeting. The notification mailings, sent by the Applicant to property owners within the applicable mailing radius of the Property, included information on the meeting. The Applicant had multiple members of their team available to present their proposal, field any questions, and take feedback from meeting participants. A copy of the neighborhood meeting minutes is attached to this report.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff finds the Application is in general compliance with the criteria outlined in Section 2.04(C)(1) of the LUDC and, therefore, recommends approval. Staff has prepared a draft ordinance for approval if the City Council agrees with this recommendation.

OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

The City Council has four options when reviewing the Application. The City Council may:

- 1.) Approve the Application via ordinance;
- 2.) Deny the Application;
- 3.) Approve the Application with changes to the drafted ordinance; or
- 4.) Continue the item to be heard at a later, specified date if the Council feels it needs additional information to ensure compliance with the approval criteria as set forth in the *Land Use & Development Code*.

ATTACHMENTS

- Draft City Council Ordinance
- Planning Commission Resolution #26-02
- Aerial Map by City Staff
- Proposed Planned Development (Exhibit B of the Ordinance)
- Neighboring Property Owner Notification and Website Notice
- Buffer Map of Mailing Area
- Website Publication Proof
- Affidavit of Sign Posting
- Draft Staff Presentation