

TOWN OF ERIE

*645 Holbrook Street
Erie, CO 80516*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, January 7, 2026

6:30 PM

In Person Meeting

To View Meeting Virtually on Zoom: <https://bit.ly/7Jan26PCMtg>

To Sign Up for Public Comment: www.erieco.gov/PublicComment

Planning Commission

I. CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO FLAG

Chair Hemphill called the January 7, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:30pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Roll Call:

- Commissioner Booth - present
- Commissioner Sawusch - present
- Commissioner Dreckman - present
- Commissioner Burns - present
- Commissioner Baham - absent
- Vice Chair Braudes - present
- Chair Hemphill - present

Secretary Melinda Helmer noted that a quorum was present for the meeting.

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Booth moved to approve the agenda of the January 7, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Dreckman, carried with all those present voting in favor thereof.

Chair Hemphill noted that the motion passed unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2026-37](#) Approval of the November 19, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Nov. 19, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

Commissioner Booth to approve the November 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. The motion, seconded by Vice Chair Braudes, carried with all present voting in favor thereof.

Chair Hemphill noted that the motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments were taken at this time.

VI. GENERAL BUSINESS

[2026-1](#) PUBLIC HEARING: A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the Town of Erie Recommending Approval of the Canyon Creek Planned Development Amendment No. 11

Attachments: [Staff Presentation](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Applicant Presentation](#)
[Application and Narrative](#)
[Proposed PD Amendment](#)
[Additional Application Materials](#)
[DRT Comments](#)
[Neighborhood Meeting Notice and Summary](#)
[Public Hearing Notices](#)
[PC Resolution P26-1](#)
[Public Comments Received as of 12222025](#)

Chair Hemphill announced Agenda Item 2026-1: A Public Hearing for a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the Town of Erie Recommending Approval of the Canyon Creek Planned Development Amendment No. 11.

Chair Hemphill opened the public hearing for Agenda Item 2026-1 and turned it over staff for a presentation.

Harry Brennan, Senior Planner presented tonight's agenda item explaining the request this evening is for the Canyon Creek PD Amendment No. 11. The undeveloped site covers just under two acres to update the allowable uses on the site. Future required submittals would include a Site Plan, Final Plat, Public Improvement Permits, then Building permit. Next step after this evening is a Town Council hearing after the Planning Commission recommendation.

The parcel at the southeast corner of Erie Parkway and Meller Street in the Canyon Creek neighborhood is part of the existing Canyon Creek Planned Development. It was originally designated for daycare use and then amended to allow for residential lots. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the site as Residential Medium, with neighborhood commercial allowed as a secondary use. A new PD amendment is now proposed to establish a defined list of permitted uses, removing residential and expanding commercial options with specific allowances. Updated development standards will be added to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area.

Dominick Schwartz, Project Development Manager for Emerald Development and Paul Anderson, Architect of Independent Architecture provided information about the proposed project on the site. Emerald Development is based out of Boulder focusing on small scale housing, community based neighborhood retail, and mixed use projects along the front range.

At 6:50pm - following the presentation - Chair Hemphill opened up the public hearing for anyone wanting to give public comment.

Comment was received from the following persons:

Bob Finocchiaro, 1585 Bain Ct, Erie, CO supports the project if it remains respectful to the neighboring properties.

Paula Martin, 688 Mathews Circle, Erie, CO noted that part of her lot backs up to property, doesn't support commercial use of this site. Proposed commercial would change the feel of the neighborhood and states that she wasn't aware of the neighborhood meeting but would like to discuss this separately and how it would affect her property and neighborhood.

Matt Flood - 609 N Beshear Ct, Erie, CO, added that he has been here since 2005 and struggles with this being a commercial site. It was originally designated to be a daycare and it makes more sense to keep this as residential. With the Town Center so being so close, he is concerned about what commercial will be on site. There is no control over what business will be on the site. There is a concern for traffic, activity, lights, and noise.

Lance Dawson, 743 S Beshear Ct, Erie, CO emphasized that the area is a residential neighborhood and one they chose specifically for the open areas, lack of development/construction on every corner, and wanted a place to raise a family. They value the walk ability of the community but expressed significant concerns about traffic, noting that the site's only access point is off of Meller Street which would cause an increase in traffic - where many children ride bikes. He believes additional traffic would create safety risks and pointed out that substantial retail development already exists nearby. The town cannot guarantee occupancy on this site. He does not support adding commercial uses at this location.

Sharon Kent, Bain Dr, Erie, CO would like to maintain the current quiet neighborhood residential and keep the commercial activity on County Line Rd/Erie Parkway to keep the area safe for the children that walk to the elementary school as well as keep the area clear from additional traffic.

Lunell Gilliland, 730 Mathews Cr, Erie, CO does not support plan for several reasons including the increase in traffic, kids walk and ride their bikes in this area, the increase in noise, and light pollution. She is concerned if this is a goal to have a walk ability neighborhood center why it needs 86 - 100 parking spots which would defeat the purpose. Having a grocery store and various coffee shops in the area seems to cover this. She would like to keep the town feeling of Erie.

Garret Mathews, 730 S Beshear Ct voiced opposition to the rezoning. Has concerns with traffic increases along Meller, privacy for the home nearby, and particularly with safety especially with respect to the children who often take this route to school. He does not want to see safety concerns in the neighborhood with this commercial space and would like to keep the current feel of the neighborhood. The neighbors have stated that they do not agree to the proposed project. If the Resolution is approved, he does not agree that it satisfies the Approval Criteria regarding the improvement of public health, safety, and general welfare. There seems to be overwhelming opposition in this meeting as well as the neighborhood meeting as this is not a benefit to the community.

Ryan Durfey, 601 N Beshear Ct, Erie, CO is opposed to the development. Noted that the homes that back to proposed project are all partial walkout basements. There is no amount of buffering that would stop you from seeing the cars and traffic on this site. He has concerns regarding traffic, buffering, noise, and loss of privacy. Is generally in favor of mixed use, but a thoughtful idea is transition from single family to multi-family to office space to commercial/retail with parking. There is no transition to the more intensive uses and is more in

favor of thoughtful development.

Kevin Cheek, 1679 Bain Dr, Erie, CO is in opposition of this plan. Has concern for the safety of children walking to school, increased traffic, speeding, and there is still wildlife in the neighborhood. He voiced concerns about the light & sound pollution coming from this project making it less hospitable to wildlife and owls.

Niall Griffin, 645 N Beshear Ct, Erie, CO is in support of the project and understands the concerns of others. Erie seems to sequester and put businesses in areas that end up making it look like strip malls which has negative impacts on the community development side of things. Having this project might change a little bit for the neighborhood but doesn't see a large negative level of risk. There are a lot of assumptions being made. Would like to see the mixed zoning in his community - realizing there are tensions but this an opportunity for the community to increase and grow. Is not against it and is part of the cul-de-sac that will be primarily impacted by the project.

Jeremy Tieber, 628 N Beshear Ct, Erie, CO thinks it sounds good in theory, thinks there are people that are for this that only see one side - there are good intentions but there's a lot negative stuff that goes on with this. Biggest concern is the impact towards the school - there is currently not a bus route so many kids have to walk to school. There will be an increase in traffic, an increase in danger to children - there are orange flags on the corner traffic poles installed by the scouts to try to minimize the danger at the intersection. Adding commercial to the area increases crime, foot traffic through the cul-de-sac since there's no barrier to get through, people passing through where the children play, and additional noise and light noise pollution. Erie Town Center meets the needs of the area for commercial. The town has lied to the residents about what's going on with this lot and what the lot was platted for. Had the HOA known about the ability to change the zoning, they likely would have been interested in purchasing it for the neighborhood, for an HOA, a pool or HOA community building. Neighbors weren't properly notified of the neighborhood meeting. Proposals for the site have continually changed.

Chair Hemphill closed the public comment portion of the public hearing at 7:11pm.

Chair Hemphill brought it back to the Commission for questions and comments at 7:12pm.

Some questions and comments included the following:

- Thanked staff and the community for showing up tonight.
- Prohibited uses presentation slide - it a full list of prohibited uses?
- Application narrative states that this application is a minor change. Can you clarify why its considered a minor change?
- Clarification on whether this item will come back before the Commission?
- Per user guide for a Planned Development (PD), did we waive certain development reports for this site?
- Clarification on noticed dates for the neighborhood meeting notice and public hearing notice
- Is this within the window for publication? What was published or sent to residents?
- Do we know when notice was published on website or newspaper? Is this sufficient for public notice?
- Traffic analysis and traffic volumes/report since its a concern to the neighbors

- Terms of Neighborhood Mixed Use - is there a clear definition - how enforceable is this?
- If this is a walk-able site, why are there so many parking spots?
- Are we looking to remove parking minimums/calculations in the code?
- In promoting the neighborhood feel, this looks like a lot of parking
- Building max height regarding neighbor concerns: The graphic shows the intent of there being a 1 story building. Is there potential for 2 story buildings?
- Comprehensive Plan: What considerations were made for this proposal for that corridor?
- Parking: Seeing the site plan with the parking: we do have parking reductions available. Do we have more flexibility to reduce parking in the PD?
- Comment: Town has numbers about parking - if the project proceeds, we might want to look at the impact of parking
- There is a 20ft buffer to the south but not east, does the 20 ft apply toward the building or lot?
- It would be nice to do something in the PD on parking
- The way it's laid out implies loading/unloading would happen through the front door. Is this correct? We should consider things like this as we move forward.
- Buffer/fencing: would expect some type of fencing around the property so there are no pass through's into the neighborhood
- Do we have any other examples of neighborhood commercial?
- Would like to see adjustments to the parking. Spaces along the fence seem unnecessary
- There was talk about a grocery in the application submittal documents - is this an idea for this site? Do we consider a small scale grocery like Niwot Market? What does a small scale grocery look like?
- Clarification: There are some differing verbiage as far as the presentation and the applicant submittal documents regarding commercial/retail uses. What are the actual allowances for this parcel?
- You could have restaurants, food and beverage based on the allowances for this site.
- We're approving zoning that allows any use available within the Community Commercial (CC) zone district that is not listed as prohibited, as long as it fits within the PD. We're providing a blank space of allowances with this approval, correct?
- If ownership shifts, as long as the proposal is within the guidelines of the PD and CC zone, it would be permitted?
- If the PD Amendment received approval from Town Council, what are next steps, where is the application seen, where there's an opportunity for public hearing/comment?
- Is there a way in the PD to include restrictions on operating hours with light pollution restrictions?
- Can light fixtures/height restriction can be added to PD?
- With the current zoning use in place for the last 10 years, would a neighborhood park or neighborhood pool have been allowed under current zoning?
- Can any annexed lot apply for a PD zone change?
- Is there conversation about an RTD improvement in the dedicated stop?
- Since this project would be disturbing more than 1 acre of existing ground, permanent storm water quality would be required. Is this referencing a basin?
- Has staff worked with Transportation regarding traffic/vehicular/pedestrian circulation for this property?
- There is a lot of concern about pedestrians on the road and making it pedestrian friendly

- Municipal Code Section 10-3-1 on permitted uses for community commercial, food and beverage services are permitted. A tavern/nightclub is also a permitted use and is not explicitly prohibited. There is value in restricting this type of use for the site.
- The main concern is the buffer on the site.
- Not a lot of talk about it in the PD about the buffer and what has to happen. If this goes through, is there time to list the restrictions? Is it possible to carry this agenda item over?
- During the presentation, they way the property is zoned today is not feasible. Can the applicant talk more to this?
- Application materials: There was a statement about the proposed development would house small businesses, serving residents in the surrounding neighborhoods, compatible in scale to similar retail in the area - are we talking about the Walgreens/Erie Commons area?
- Where in the PD does it note that any use that is in Community Commercial (except those prohibited), are allowed in this tract?
- In the proposed PD: Is this a list of uses that are not allowed?
- Could we potentially show Filing 5 with it's own table of requirements? Could the applicant and staff work on this as part of the technical updates to the PD?
- Hypothetically, if we were to update the UDC and permitted uses in CC zone at any time, it could fluctuate because it's not static locked in to the PD.
- What happens if in the future we no longer have a CC zone yet CC is listed in the PD?
- Would the applicant be amenable to list what uses are envisioned for the site?
- Why did we look a Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) instead of Community Mixed Use (CMU) for dimensional standards?
- Dimensional standards between the two (NMU and CMU) are set in a way to fit that purpose.
- What was the reason for going down to a 0 ft setback on the residential side? (Side interior/side street) This is noted in the applicant presentation. Please clarify.
- Do we allow the parking spaces to enter into easements and setbacks?
- Knowing that we need barriers, we won't have parking lots going up to the property lines at the residences.
- Would the applicant be willing to note this in the PD - stating that parking lots need to be buffered? How could this be addressed?
- The 35 feet maximum height - what is planned in terms of number of stories?
- If this doesn't get off the ground, another applicant could build up to 35 feet, correct?
- Would applicant be amenable to lowering the height restriction to single story? Could this be added to the PD?
- Entrance into the site goes down Meller Street quite a way to get onto this development. Was there any thought for this going that far into the residential area to get to this commercial site? Is it possible to do a right in, right out?

Chair Hemphill closed public hearing at 8:20pm and brought it back to the Commission for deliberation.

Small businesses could be a benefit to the site, and mixed-use development seems generally supported. However, because this is a mature area with existing residents, there are legitimate concerns about impacts on neighboring properties that must be addressed. While the town's intent and the developer are viewed positively for the site, the project needs clear "guardrails," including restrictions

or amendments within the Planned Development (PD) covering allowed uses, adjustment to parking minimums, operating hours, no drive-thru uses, building height (including a preference for single-story), traffic considerations, and pedestrian safety. The development should not be a blank slate; uses must fit the neighborhood context, with conditions in place for current and future developers. A site plan review by the Commission is recommended as a condition, and the public should have another opportunity to provide input. Overall, there is agreement that the project has potential, but additional conditions and refinements are needed before approval.

The Planning Commission would like to include their conditions into the Resolution and continue the agenda item to a date certain.

The conditions included the following:

- Site plan is referred to PC
- Permitted and prohibited uses in a cleaner table (taverns and nightclubs should be prohibited)
- Setback should apply to parking as well as buildings and should be a landscape buffer
- Height limited to single story
- No parking minimum, but there is a parking maximum per the UDC
- Possibly set hours of operation to limit neighborhood impacts

Commissioner Sawusch moved to continue Agenda Item 2026-1 to a date certain of February 18, 2026. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Dreckman, carried with all present voting in favor thereof.

Chair Hemphill announced that the motion passes unanimously to continue to a date certain.

Chair Hemphill reminded those residents that came out tonight for this agenda item, that there will be another opportunity for public comment when the item goes before Town Council who has the final authority on the agenda item.

VII. STAFF REPORTS

Kelly Driscoll, Planning Manager noted that there was a Special Meeting with Town Council and one of the items was the Comprehensive Plan. Council had questions on density as it relates to particular properties. More specifically, at 111th and Arapahoe Road, Gateway, and Golden Run. Staff had an extensive discussion and received direction to create an additional residential category that would have a density range of 6 to 12 and to apply this to the 111th and Arapahoe site. The other sites would not have a land use designation change.

This will go through the same process that the Comprehensive Plan did to include public and property owner engagement. This will come before the Planning Commission for recommendation and to Town Council for approval or denial.

The Medium Low and Medium High density makes sense to have. The direction is to modify the Comprehensive Plan. There was discussion regarding policies to guide infill development where it may impact rural residential but it could apply to situations such as this evening's agenda item. There is no schedule as of yet.

Kelly also noted that Melinda Helmer would be joining the Planning Commission at the next meeting to discuss some UDC changes on the sign code.

The quasi-judicial list is on the website and an email with a link will be sent to the Commission monthly. Staff can include the PDF list as well as the link.

VIII. COMMISSIONER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

Commissioner Braudes stated that he hoped everyone had a great holiday.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Booth moved to adjourn the January 7, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Dreckman, carried with all present voting in favor thereof.

Chair Hemphill adjourned the January 7, 2026 Planning Commission meeting at 8:57pm.