

# NORWOOD PLANNING AND ZONING / BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS

Monday September 15, 2025

Regular Session 6:30 p.m.

NORWOOD COMMUNITY CENTER

1670 Naturita St, Norwood, CO 81423 - And - Via Zoom

## AGENDA

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85001344971>

**Meeting ID: 850 0134 4971**

**Passcode: 8142302**

**Dial In**

1-346-248-7799

### Call Regular Meeting To Order

This Planning and Zoning

### Board Attendance:

Mayor – Candy Meehan - Present

Mayor Pro-Tem – Shawn Fallon - Present

Norwood Fire Chief – John Bockrath – Present

Member – Kerry Welch – Present

Member – Nancy Willis – Present

Member – Isabella James – Present

Member – Jenny Wheeler – Present

Member – Mark Eckard – Present

Member Brian DiPaola – Present, via Zoom

Member – Bronwen Spielman - Present

### Staff Attendance:

Administrative Director – Sara Owens – Present

Public Works Director – Randy Harris – Present

Town Clerk – Cidney Ross - Present

### Public Comment For Items Not On The Agenda

NOTE: Please limit comments to 3 minutes. If comments are not related to an item on the agenda, there will be no Board response or action taken since the topic was not posted with proper notice and any comment could potentially violate the Colorado Open Meetings Law.

### Consent Agenda

#### Board Business Agenda

##### 1. Election of Officers

MOTION: Nancy Willis motioned to elect Bronwen Spielman as Planning and Zoning Commission Chair. Kerry Welch seconded the motion. All voted, motion carried.

MOTION: Jenny Wheeler motioned to elect Nancy Willis as Planning and Zoning Commission Vice-Chair. Bronwen Spielman seconded the motion. All voted, motion carried.

MOTION: Nancy Willis motioned to elect Kerry Welch as the Board of Adjustments Chair. Mark Eckard seconded the motion. All voted, motion carried.

MOTION: Kerry Welch motioned to elect Mark Eckard as the Board of Adjustments Vice-Chair. Nancy Willis seconded the motion. All voted, motion carried.

## 2. Establishment of Meeting Schedule

MOTION: Kerry Welch motioned to set the Planning and Zoning meeting schedule at every third Monday of the month at 6:30 pm. Bronwen Speilman seconded the motion. All voted, motion carried.

It was agreed that Board of Adjustment meetings would be held on an as-needed basis.

## 3. Review of Rules and Procedures

There will be a scheduled board training with attorney David Reed and Kat Herbert from KLJ. There was a discussion of reviewing the code of conduct and rules of procedure, which could be addressed in the upcoming training session.

## 4. Orientation

This item was tabled for the October meeting.

## 5. Discussion of Upcoming Projects or Applications

The town discussed upcoming land use code updates, with Kat Herbert explaining that spot amendments will be introduced this year to clarify processes and improve efficiency, followed by a comprehensive overhaul in 2026. The town plans to start the land use code project first, as they are already working with the Westin Vision Project on the master plan.

## 6. Discussion of Special Construction Permits

Sara Owens asked the board for thoughts and updates on the current policy on unpermitted work within town limits. Mark Eckard suggested implementing a Stop Work Order and fees on projects that are being done with no permit.

## 7. Discussion of Current Land Use Code

The board also discussed the need to review and update the land use code, with Kat Herbert proposing to start by addressing procedural issues and clarifying administrative permits, particularly for construction in the right-of-way and subdivision standards. Members on the board noted that both the land use code and municipal code need significant updates, and Kat offered to provide copies of the land use code to those who need them.

## 8. Discussion of Proposition 123 – Fast Track Affordable Housing

The board discussed a resolution related to affordable housing and Prop 123, expressing concerns about fire safety, water supply, and energy requirements. They agreed to consult with the town attorney and DOLA about the process, with Kat planning to reach out to Patrick for clarification. The group also touched on the high cost of housing in the area and the need to balance affordability with building codes. John Bockrath asked for clarification on the amount that is considered as affordable housing.

## Staff Reports

None

## Board Member Reports

None

Executive Session

None

Adjourn

MOTION: Jenny Wheeler motioned to adjourn the first regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting / Board of Adjustments meeting at 7:46 pm. Mark Eckard seconded the motion. All voted, meeting is adjourned.

APPROVED

APPROVED AS CORRECTED

DATE APPROVED:

---

Minutes Taken by: Cidney Ross, Town Clerk

# PROPOSITION 123 FAST TRACK GUIDANCE



**COLORADO**

**Department of Local Affairs**

Division of Local Government

# Table of Contents

Section 1 - Introduction	5
Section 1.1 - Key Terms	5
Section 1.2 - Resources	6
Section 1.3 - DOLA's Process for Developing These Guidelines	7
Section 1.4 - Proposition 123 Statutory Language for Fast-Track Process	8
Section 2 - Legal Requirements	10
Section 2.1 - Applicability & Design of a Fast-Track Process	10
Section 2.2 - Administration of a Fast-Track Review Process	15
Section 3 - Optional Best Practices and Advisory Guidance	18
Best Practices	18
Section 3.1 - Avoid Extensive Pre-Application Requirements	18
Section 3.2 - Clearly Define Complete Applications	19
Section 3.3 - Enable Concurrent Review of Multiple Permits	19
Section 3.4 - Coordinate Early with External Review Agencies	20
Section 3.5 - Consider Expanding Eligibility Beyond Minimum Requirements	20
Section 3.6 - Plan for Continuous Process Improvement	20
Section 3.7 - Consider Extending Improvements to All Development Types	21
Section 3.8 - Streamline or Expedite the Appeals Process	21
Section 4 - Strategies to Expedite Affordable Housing Development Review	22
4.1 - Strategies Overview	22
4.2 Strategies	23
Section 5 - Community Examples	31
Local Government Fast Track Adoption	31
5.1 Examples of Communities Implementing Expedited Review Strategies	31
Section 6 - Frequently Asked Questions for Expedited Review	36
Contents	36
Frequently Asked Questions	37
Proposition 123 Resources	47
Data Resources	47

## Version History

This guidance was originally published on April 24, 2024. DOLA may update this guidance in the future, and will document any updates in this section. Comments and questions about this guidance may be submitted through the “[Ask a Question](#)” form on the DOLA website.

### Updates published on August 20, 2025

- Revised statutory interpretation on the allowable extensions.
- Subsection on application types was streamlined with more clarity provided on which application types require expedited review and which types do not.
- Added a subsection with guidance on planned unit developments (PUDs).
- Reorganized and streamlined content to make the guidance easier to navigate. This included the addition of a legal requirements and best practices section.
- Removed the analysis and side-by-side analysis sections, incorporating their content into the updated guidance.
- Added multilevel numbering to facilitate navigation and make subsections within the guidance easier to reference.
- Updated and Expanded the Frequently Asked Questions section.

### Updates published on September 22, 2025

- Updated guidance in Section 2.1A regarding affordability mechanisms and terms.
- Added guidance to the FAQ section (6.1B) regarding affordability mechanisms and terms.

## Section 1 - Introduction

This guidance is provided by the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) to help Colorado cities, towns, and counties navigate the expedited review requirements of Proposition 123 (Fast Track Review Process). Establishing and implementing a compliant expedited review process is required by January 1, 2027 for all jurisdictions who wish to maintain eligibility for all future Proposition 123 funding and commitment cycles, beginning in calendar year 2027.

- This guidance addresses the legal requirements for the design of a Fast Track Review Process and the administration of that system to comply with Proposition 123 (C.R.S. 29-32-105(2) et seq.).
- This guidance is intended to allow Colorado local governments flexibility to become and remain eligible for Proposition 123 funding while continuing to implement their current development review systems.
- This guidance should not be considered legal advice. Jurisdictions are encouraged to consult with their own legal counsel.
- Over time, as communities implement their expedited review process, DOLA may add to these guidelines to address new questions that arise and to highlight new examples of innovative and effective adoption of expedited review processes.
- This information pertains specifically to the expedited review requirements of Prop. 123 (C.R.S. 29-32-105(2) et seq.). For other Prop. 123 requirements, please visit the [DOLA Proposition 123 compliance website](#).

### Section 1.1 - Key Terms

## A. Affordable Housing

Generally means a residence where the housing costs do not exceed 30% of a household's gross monthly income. In the context of the Fast Track requirements of Proposition 123, this means: A housing development project in which 50% or more of the dwelling units are either rental housing at or below 60% AMI, or are for-sale housing at or below 100% AMI, and that cost the household less than 30% of its monthly income. This definition is applicable when the proposed housing includes an affordability mechanism such as a deed restriction, not necessarily to market-rate housing units that happen to be affordable but do not require income-verification for tenants or buyers.

## B. Area Median Income (AMI)

AMI is the midpoint income for a specific geographic area, used to determine eligibility for affordable housing programs. AMI varies by County and is dependent on household size. HUD develops income limits for each area, with results published annually. These AMI tables are expressed as percentages of AMI (e.g., 30% for Extremely Low Income, 100% for Median Income, etc.).

For HUD's latest AMI income limits, visit:

- [HUD Income Limits Dataset](#)
- [HUD AMI Lookup Tool](#)

## Section 1.2 - Resources

DOLA staff are available to provide a wide assortment of implementation support and technical assistance including courtesy reviews of draft policies, downloadable resources, webinars, and more. Local governments who are [eligible for Proposition 123](#) may seek funding from the [Local Planning Capacity grant program](#) to support local policy adoption and implementation efforts.

See the list below for a sampling of the support and resources available. A full list with links can be found on DOLA's [Fast Track Support & Technical Assistance webpage](#).

- Courtesy reviews
- Technical assistance
- Self-assessment checklist for local governments
- Template resolution
- Webinars
- List of adopted and verified expedited review policies from local governments

## Section 1.3 - DOLA's Process for Developing These Guidelines

Efforts to develop these guidelines began in November 2023 and extended into April 2024. Outreach efforts included the following:

- 16 partner agencies were invited to participate.
- 3 targeted stakeholder meetings were held, composed of:
  - Over 65 planners from every region of the state.
  - Over 30 developers and builder groups with affordable housing expertise, including housing authorities.
- 1 state-wide survey distributed by DOLA, partner agencies, and stakeholders.
- 2 educational webinars presenting the final guidelines.

During initial listening sessions with partner agencies and stakeholders, it became apparent that there are misunderstandings surrounding the language of Proposition 123 expedited review requirements. This process also uncovered insights into the barriers and opportunities within local government processes, potential avenues to explore for expediting review processes, and feedback on what information would be most helpful to include in these guidelines.

The process also involved reviewing nationwide studies, reports, and best practices from nonprofits, development professionals, other states and municipalities, including communities within Colorado, and drawing from recommendations and lessons learned.

## **Section 1.4 - Proposition 123 Statutory Language for Fast-Track Process**

Statutory language for the Proposition 123 Fast Track Process can be found in [Colorado Revised Statute, Title 29, Article 32: Statewide Affordable Housing Fund](#) under the following sections:

### **C.R.S. 29-32-101(2):**

"Affordable housing" means rental housing affordable to a household with an annual income of at or below sixty percent of the area median income, and that costs the household less than thirty percent of its monthly income. "Affordable housing" also means for-sale housing that could be purchased by a household with an annual income of at or below one hundred percent of the area median income, for which the mortgage payment costs the household less-than thirty percent OR LESS of its monthly income.

### **C.R.S. 29-32-105(2):**

(a) In order to receive financial assistance under this article, or for affordable housing projects within a tribal government, municipality, a city and county, or the unincorporated area of a county to be eligible for funding, the tribal government or local government, other than a local affordable housing authority, must establish processes to enable it to provide a final decision on any application for a special permit, variance, or other development permit, excluding subdivisions, of a development project for which fifty percent or more of the residential units in the

development constitute affordable housing not more than ninety calendar days after submission of a complete application, referred to herein as a "fast-track approval process."

(b) A local government's or tribal government's fast-track approval process may include an option to extend the review period for an additional ninety days at the request of a developer, for compliance with state law or court order, or for a review period required by another local government, tribal government, or agency, within the local government or tribal government or outside, for any component of the application requiring that government's or agency's approval.

(c) A local government's or tribal government's fast-track approval process may include extensions to allow for the submission of additional information or revisions to an application in response to requests from the local government or tribal government. Such extensions shall not exceed the amount of time from the request to the submission of the applicant's response plus thirty days. Applicants shall provide such additional information or responses promptly and shall, whenever practicable, provide a response within five business days.

(d) Nothing in this subsection (2) shall be interpreted as requiring an affordable housing developer to utilize a fast-track approval process.

## Section 2 - Legal Requirements

This section of the Fast Track Guidance addresses the legal requirements for the design of a Fast Track Review Process and the administration of that system to comply with Proposition 123 ([C.R.S. 29-32-101\(2\)](#) and [29-32-105\(2\) et seq.](#)).

### Section 2.1 - Applicability & Design of a Fast-Track Process

#### A. Project Applicability

The Fast-Track Review Process must apply to all applications in which 50% or more of the dwelling units are Affordable:

- For rental housing units, Affordable means that **monthly rent is less than or equal to 30% of the monthly income of a household earning at or below 60% Area Median Income (AMI).**
- For for-sale housing units, Affordable means that **monthly payments are less than or equal to 30% of the monthly income of a household at or below 100% Area Median Income (AMI).**

**Note:** The statute's definition of affordable housing is silent on affordability protection mechanisms or terms of affordability (i.e., does not require a contractual requirement for affordability protection for any term length). Nothing in statute requires nor prohibits this type of restriction on the criteria that qualifies an applicant for expedited review.

The Fast Track Review Process can be modified to apply more broadly than the minimum defined in statute:

- Local governments may establish a review process that applies to housing projects with less than 50% of the units being affordable, or that would fast

track housing projects that include higher AMIs (i.e., above the 60%/100% AMI requirements).

- **Example A - Exceeds Requirements:** A local government could apply its Fast Track Review Process to housing projects where only 30% of the units are affordable because the jurisdiction is trying to incentivize any development that provides affordable housing. This not only meets but exceeds the statutory requirement.
- **Example B - Exceeds Requirements:** A rural resort community that wants to incentivize housing developments with higher AMIs could apply its Fast Track process to a development with up to 150% AMI. This not only meets but exceeds the statutory requirement because the process is applicable for both lower AMI units as well as higher AMI units.
- **Example C - More Restrictive:** A community requires all units in a housing development project to be Affordable in order to be eligible for its Fast Track Review Process. This does not comply with statute because Proposition 123 requires a fast track review process for any housing development project with 50% or more Affordable units. Requiring all units to meet affordability requirements would be more restrictive than the law requires.

### (1.) Mixed-Use Projects

The Fast Track Review Process may also apply to development applications that are either mixed-use or mixed-income, as long as 50% of the residential units in the project meet the definition of Affordable Housing. If the local government has a separate review and approval process for these uses, the administration of those separate procedures is allowable as long as a decision on the Affordable Housing portion of the project can be issued within 90 days.

## B. Process Design

The Fast Track Review Process must render a final decision on a permit or approval required for an Affordable Housing application **within 90 calendar days** after receipt of a completed application.

Communities that already have a process in place that meets or exceeds the 90-day Fast Track Review Process requirements only need to document that process to DOLA in the form of a resolution, ordinance, policy, or land use code that lays out the policy specifics that meet or exceed Proposition 123 requirements. DOLA offers a downloadable template resolution as a resource for local governments which can be found on our [Fast Track Support & Technical Assistance webpage](#).

Where a local government has a separate application process for a particular type of development approval, permit, or variance, a separate 90-calendar day Fast Track Review Process may apply to each of those procedures.

Example: a town might require a project to apply for three permits for a specific project: a conditional use, site plan, and building permit. Each of those review processes must take no more than 90 days (or 270 days total, although DOLA recommends local governments utilize overlapping rather than stacked review time periods to reduce the overall length of the review process).

### **C. Application types - Required**

The Fast Track Review Process must apply to the following types of applications if they are defined as separate types of applications by the local government and the application includes initial construction or modification or adaptive reuse of an existing structure for Affordable Housing.

- Site Plan
- Development Plan
- Building Permit
- Planned Unit Development approval or amendment that is not limited to zoning approval or subdivision of land
- Construction or engineering documents that local

- Variance
  - Conditional or Special Use Permit or Approval
  - Permitted Use Permit or Approval
- regulations require be included in the types of applications listed above
- Modifications of site plan, development permit, variance, or required construction or engineering documents following initial approval of an Affordable Housing project

For those types of applications listed above, the 90-calendar day review period must also include a final decision on any request for an administrative adjustment or administrative minor modification of development standards permitted by the local government for that type of application.

## D. Fast-Track Review Process Exceptions

### (1.) Application types - NOT Required

Does not apply to any of the following types of approvals necessary for an Affordable Housing project:

- Annexation
- Preliminary or Final Subdivision of land
- Comprehensive Plan Amendment
- Concept Review
- Pre-Application Review
- Initial Zoning or Rezoning
- Appeals
- Planned Unit Development approval or amendment that includes zoning approval or subdivision or land
- Sign permits or other related permits related to the development where the timing of approvals will not prevent or delay the applicant from moving forward with the Affordable Housing construction
- Permits related to changes in non-residential use, occupancy, or tenant finish for a project or portion of a project that has already been constructed or is already in non-residential use
- Construction or engineering drawings that local regulations do not require be included in the types of applications listed above

### (2.) Additional instances where requirements DO NOT apply

In addition to the application types listed above that do not require Fast Track Review, Fast Track Review requirements DO NOT apply in the following instances:

- Do not apply to any of the application types listed in the table above;
- Do not apply to any applicant who decides to opt out of the Fast Track Review Process, which the applicant can do at any time by notifying the local government in writing. If the project requires more than one Fast Track application, the applicant can opt out for one, or some, or all of the required Fast Track applications; and
- Do not apply to projects that do not meet the definition of Affordable Housing above, even if the project has obtained Proposition 123 funding.

## E. Additional Guidance for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)

Colorado communities use their PUD powers in a wide variety of ways. Some use PUDs as a special form of base or overlay zone district, some use it as an alternative form of subdivision approval, some as a type of special development permit, and still others as a way to “bundle” several deviations from specific development standards without requiring a separate variance for each one. The applicability of Fast Track procedures varies depending on how PUD powers are used, as shown by the following examples.

- If PUDs are approved as a form of special permit or a way to grant a single approval for what would otherwise require more than one variance, then they are subject to Fast Track final decision requirements, because the text of [C.R.S. 29-32-105\(2\)\(a\)](#) states that those requirements apply to a “special permit, variance, or other development permit, excluding subdivisions” related to an Affordable Housing project.
- If PUDs are approved as a new base or overlay zoning district they are exempt from the Fast Track final decision time requirements because zoning is not a type of development permit or variance.
- If PUDs are used as an alternative way to get subdivision approval, they are explicitly exempted from Fast Track time requirements by the statute text quoted above.

## Section 2.2 - Administration of a Fast-Track Review Process

### A. The 90-Day Decision Requirement

- The 90-calendar day Fast Track Review Process time frame starts upon submission of a complete application, as defined by the local government. A

completed application includes all required studies or documents required by local regulations.

- The 90-calendar day clock must run continuously following determination of a complete application as defined by the local government unless and until the applicant or local government exercises one of the extension options described below.
- A final decision of project approval, approval with conditions, or denial must be issued within 90 days after acceptance of a completed application.
  - A recommendation from a recommending body (such as a Planning Commission) is not considered a final decision.
- If a project is withdrawn and a new application is submitted, a new 90-day review process applies to the new application.
- Post-approval steps such as obtaining signatures or recordation of documents do not have to be completed within the 90-day period.

## **B. Extensions**

Local Fast Track Review Processes may allow for extensions to the 90-calendar day time frame as long as they align with Prop. 123 statutory requirements ([C.R.S. 29-32-105\(2\)\(b\) and \(c\)](#)).

### **(1.) Developer-Requested and Externally Required Extensions (2b)**

Local governments may offer: (1) a one-time 90-calendar day extension at the request of the applicant, (2) an extension to allow time to comply with a state law or court order (the length of which is determined by the law or court order), and (3) to address comments from an agency that has approval authority over the project (this required review timeline is out of the control of the local government, and could theoretically extend beyond 90 days). For example, local review may refer project review to a water district to determine whether they can serve the project. DOLA

encourages local governments to work with referral agencies and create agreements to expedite reviews.

## (2.) Local Government-Initiated Extension (2c)

During each Fast Track Review Process, the local government may notify the applicant of its intent to extend the 90-calendar day period by an additional 30 days in order to address additional comments or concerns that arise during development review. The applicant is encouraged (but not required) to respond within 5 business days acknowledging the extension notice. The extension is for 30-calendar days (which begins once the local government receives the applicant's response). While this optional extension can be exercised more than once, DOLA encourages local governments to adopt solutions that will minimize the need for multiple extensions.

# Section 3 - Optional Best Practices and Advisory Guidance

This section of the Proposition 123 Fast Track Guidance contains optional best practices that DOLA encourages local governments to consider implementing to help streamline the review process. These best practices are not required to achieve compliance with the expedited review requirements of Proposition 123.

## Best Practices

Avoid Extensive Pre-Application Requirements	Expand Eligibility Beyond Minimum Requirements
Clearly Define Complete Applications	Plan for Continuous Process Improvement
Enable Concurrent Review	Extend to All Development Types
Coordinate Early with External Review Agencies	Streamline or Expedite the Appeals Process

## Section 3.1 - Avoid Extensive Pre-Application Requirements

When development review timelines apply to specific types of development applications, some local governments respond by "front-loading" multiple rounds of informal development review before accepting an application. They want to ensure that a development is "perfect" and approvable before starting the time-limited development review period. This often does not speed up development review and approval, because any time "savings" achieved during the 90-day formal review period are offset by the significant investment of time required by the applicant before the application is submitted. Although the Prop. 123 90-day timeline begins at the time a completed application is received, requiring multiple rounds of informal

pre-application development review is not the best way to meet the intent of Prop 123. Instead, local governments should meet the intent of the 90-day review requirement by streamlining, clarifying, and simplifying development review requirements so that extended pre-application reviews are not necessary.

## **Section 3.2 - Clearly Define Complete Applications and Require Only Necessary Detail**

Local governments should define what a complete application entails by establishing a thorough completeness check process. In addition, communities should think carefully about the level of detail needed for each type of application in light of the scale and complexity of the project and whether it represents a preliminary or final approval. Over time, many communities increase the level of detail involved in the early stages of development review even when it is likely that any related impacts can be addressed later in the process, or when it is likely that smaller projects will not create any impacts of that type. The best development review systems phase the levels of detail required in application materials to match the size and complexity of the project and the stage of the development process and avoid requiring the applicant to incur very significant expenses before the general feasibility of the project has been established.

## **Section 3.3 - Enable Concurrent Review of Multiple Permits**

The Guidance allows local governments to apply a separate 90-day Fast Track Review Process to each type of permit or approval required for the project, rather than requiring that all permits and approvals be completed in a single 90-day period. However, local governments should allow concurrent review and approval of all permits and approvals required for an Affordable Housing project whenever possible,

rather than applying 90-day review periods one at a time in a linear fashion. For example, if a conditional use approval and site plan approval are both required, the intent of Prop. 123 would be best achieved by allowing joint review of both required approvals during a single 90-day review period.

## **Section 3.4 - Coordinate Early with External Review Agencies**

Process improvement efforts should always involve external agencies that must review or approve aspects of affordable housing projects. Failure to include those agencies can significantly undermine intended process improvements. Intentional coordination, particularly early in the process, can prevent delays caused by missing documentation or duplicative requests.

## **Section 3.5 - Consider Expanding Eligibility Beyond Minimum Requirements**

The Fast Track Review Process can be modified to apply more broadly than defined in statute. Local governments may establish a Fast Track Review Process that applies to projects with lower percentages of affordable housing (i.e., less than 50% of the units), or that applies to projects that include higher AMI restrictions (i.e., above the 60/100% AMI requirements). See section 2.1A of the Fast Track Guidance for examples.

## **Section 3.6 - Plan for Continuous Process Improvement**

Good planning and process improvement work takes time to complete. Process improvement work should begin well before the Prop 123 deadlines.

Process improvements are not a one-time effort. Improvements designed to streamline the review and approval of Affordable Housing development projects should be tested and continually refined to meet the local government's intended goals.

Even those local governments that already comply with the Prop. 123 expedited review requirements should review their processes, consider potential improvements, and adopt language that aligns with DOLA's Proposition 123 Fast Track Guidance.

## **Section 3.7 - Consider Extending Improvements to All Development Types**

After identifying development review process improvements for Affordable Housing projects, local governments should also consider whether the same clarifications, efficiencies, and streamlining should be extended to other types of projects to improve overall community governance.

## **Section 3.8 - Look for Opportunities to Streamline or Expedite the Appeals Process**

Any appeal of the project approval or denial does not need to be completed within the 90-day period leading to the final decision. However, to align with the spirit of the law, local governments are encouraged to consider opportunities to streamline or expedite the appeals process for affordable housing projects.

## Section 4 - Strategies to Expedite Affordable Housing Development Review

In 2024, key stakeholders from local and tribal governments, developers, and others were engaged to understand challenges and opportunities to expedite review of applications to increase the supply and variety of housing in Colorado communities. The strategies identified during this process are presented in this section of the Fast Track Review Guidance and summarized in the table below. This should not be considered an exhaustive list of strategies, and DOLA encourages local governments and developers to collaborate in developing additional innovative methods to meet the intent of the fast track requirements in Proposition 123 (Prop. 123). Examples of Colorado communities that have implemented some of these strategies are presented in [Section 5](#) of this Guidance.

NOTE: Although each of these strategies can help speed up development review, not all of them will satisfy the Prop.123 requirements for creation of a Fast Track Review Process. Please refer to [Section 2](#) (Legal Requirements) of this Guidance.

### 4.1 - Strategies Overview

#### Planning Process and Zoning Reform

- [Affordable Housing Action Plan](#)
- [Code Assessment and Update](#)
- [Development Review Process Audit and Improvement](#)
- [Administrative or Planning Commission Approval](#)
- [Intergovernmental Agreements](#)

#### Development Review Administration

- [Application Checklists & Guides](#)

- [Pre-Application Meeting](#)
- [Prioritize Affordable Housing Projects](#)
- [Consolidated Public Meeting Notices and Schedule](#)
- [Post-Review Meeting with Staff and Referral Agencies](#)

## Staffing Resources

- [Dedicated Staff Planner or Liaison](#)
- [Development Review Committee \(DRC\)](#)
- [Contracted Planning Support](#)

## Additional Trainings

- [Review Staff Training Sessions](#)
- [Developer Training Sessions](#)

# 4.2 Strategies

## A. Planning Process and Zoning Reform

### (1.) Affordable Housing Action Plan

The process of creating a Housing Action Plan typically follows the completion of a Housing Needs Assessment that documents local housing needs in detail. After understanding the local housing needs, the Housing Action Plan identifies strategies to address housing challenges. Once local leadership has agreed on the goals and priorities in a Housing Action Plan, it provides clear guidance to staff, developers, and other partners. Proposed housing projects that align with the goals outlined in a community's Housing Action Plan should experience a smoother entitlement process. This guiding document can also highlight incentives available for projects that meet certain criteria and help a community achieve local priorities.

## (2.) Code Assessment and Update

This strategy begins with an internal evaluation of the local government land use regulations to identify standards and provisions that are discouraging or preventing the production of needed types of housing. The result of the assessment is then followed by updates to the regulations to simplify the production of those types of needed housing. If possible, draft standards that are clear and objective enough to allow additional administrative approvals for housing projects that meet those standards, rather than requiring public hearings prior to approval. An update may be targeted to only select code sections or a larger, comprehensive overhaul of the code.

## (3.) Development Review Process Audit and Improvement

To improve the efficiency of development review procedures, the local government can map each step in the process and the time required to complete each step, and then evaluate the need for each step, the level of application detail that should be required at that stage, and the most efficient way to complete the review at that stage. Unnecessary steps should be eliminated, and steps that address the same or similar topics should be consolidated if possible. For this effort to be successful, all stakeholders, including external referral agencies, need to be involved.

Moving from a manual to an electronic application submittal, permitting, and tracking system can be an important part of a streamlined and efficient process for many communities, but local communities should not underestimate the time needed to configure and troubleshoot digital systems so they meet the needs of both internal staff and external referral agencies. Some communities refer to “Six Sigma”, “Lean methodologies”, or similar process improvement tools as ways to assess process improvements using data-driven tools and techniques.

## (4.) Administrative or Planning Commission Approval

Local land use regulations often allow some new residential projects to be approved administratively, while others require one or more public hearings before approval. By

allowing affordable housing projects to be approved administratively, the overall review process can be shortened and predictability for applicants enhanced. In many cases, possible concerns about the height, scale, operation, or impacts of new residential projects can be addressed through objective standards applied administratively rather than requiring public hearings to discuss potential concerns for each project independently. Alternatively, if a residential project currently requires approval by the elected governing body, the community could decide to let the Planning Commission be the final decision maker, which often shortens the approval process by one or two months while also reducing uncertainty for the developer. As with other strategies, DOLA encourages extensive community dialogue and collaboration to develop community support for these processes.

### (5.) Intergovernmental Agreements

Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) are a tool for establishing cooperative planning activities across government entities, which can include municipalities, counties, special districts, or other agencies charged with reviewing and influencing the local housing development. An IGA could establish a shared commitment to an expedited review process for projects that meet certain criteria, or a commitment to use a single list of application requirements and materials. Local governments should also consider collaborating to align similar policies and procedures at a regional level, which would reduce the amount of variability between local government regulations that applicants need to navigate. [View examples of housing-related IGAs on DOLA's website.](#)

## **B. Development Review Administration**

### (1.) Application Checklists & Guides

Local governments can improve development review speed and efficiency by better clarifying and describing the expectations, submittal requirements, responsibilities, and roles of both the developer and the local government in the application review

process. These should clearly identify the submittal requirements, level of detail required in application materials, review process and procedures, expected internal and external review timeframes, expectations for applicant resubmittal timelines, review/decision making bodies, and approval criteria. In addition, these materials should include names and contact information of those to whom the application should be submitted and to whom questions can be asked.

## (2.) Pre-Application Meeting

A pre-application meeting provides an opportunity for staff, referral agencies, and the applicant to discuss the submittal requirements, review process, approval standards and criteria, and any “red flags” identified by staff or reviewing agency(ies) that may prevent approval of the housing project. An agenda of topics to be discussed at the meeting should be provided to the applicant before the meeting, and notes summarizing the discussion should be provided afterward. The notes should include the required review process and a list of any possible concerns that will still need to be addressed in the application or review process. In addition, it is helpful for the notes to include a general timeline identifying how long the applicant can expect the process to take and highlighting opportunities for the applicant to partner with the local government in shortening the review process such as by promptly submitting clarifications, corrections, or additional materials.

## (3.) Prioritize Affordable Housing Projects

As an alternative to developing the formal 90-day or less Fast Track Review Process required for second round Prop. 123 funding, local governments can adopt an administrative policy to prioritize review of applications that meet certain criteria for affordable housing before other land use applications. While this alone does not ensure a final decision within 90 days, this policy places affordable housing applications (as defined by the local government) at the front of the development review queue rather than being placed behind non-affordable housing applications and non-residential applications that were submitted earlier. In order for this strategy

to be successful, all external referral agencies must generally agree to a similar policy.

#### (4.) Consolidated Public Meeting Notices and Schedule

Many jurisdictions hold public meetings at set intervals each month (e.g., the 1st and 3rd Wednesdays) and require public notices and hearings before more than one review body before project approval. When the need for a second public hearing cannot be removed, the local government can improve the efficiency of the review process by providing public notices to all of the required hearing bodies at the start of the review process, so that new rounds of public notice are not needed after each hearing. For example, the policy for affordable housing projects could be to provide notice for both the Planning Commission and elected governing body at the same time to ensure the request is considered at the earliest possible meeting of the governing body. In addition, scheduling joint public hearings involving both the Planning Commission and the elected governing body can significantly shorten the review timeline.

#### (5.) Post-Review Meeting with Staff and Referral Agencies

A post-review meeting allows commenting staff and referral agencies to discuss their comments with the applicant to ensure that the comments are understood and to clarify what level of detail will be needed for the response to adequately address their comments. Clarity in both the comment and the required responses will reduce the amount of time needed to review responses as well as the amount of time to review the resubmittal. Where possible, all agencies or departments that provided comments should be included in the post-review meeting.

## C. Staffing Resources

### (1.) Dedicated Staff Planner or Liaison

To maximize depth of understanding of affordable housing project review requirements, local governments can develop subject matter expertise in these types of applications and designate a single point-of-contact to assist affordable housing applicants throughout the entire planning process. Faster and more efficient processing through a single knowledgeable staff person can be a significant incentive for developers to provide affordable housing.

### (2.) Development Review Committee (DRC)

A Development Review Committee (DRC) is an internal group of local government staff and representatives of external review and referral agencies that meets regularly to discuss the application and coordinate review comments. This group generally includes local government departments, utility providers, special districts, and state and federal agency partners whose review and/or approval will be needed. Discussions among DRC members avoid the need for sequential review by committee members individually, which can result in inconsistent comments to the applicant. DRCs also help reduce the amount of time it takes to address and respond to comments and reduce the number of reviews needed to clarify comments and reconcile potentially conflicting standards or requirements. Meetings should be scheduled frequently to allow an opportunity to identify and resolve potential concerns quickly.

### (3.) Contracted Planning Support

If limited full-time staff capacity is reducing the ability of the local government to process affordable housing applications quickly, increase staff capacity by contracting staff on an as-needed basis to review expedited projects, communicate with applicants to shepherd projects through the review process, or complete similar tasks. This can also include development of a longer relationship with a firm or

individual knowledgeable about the local code and about the challenges of developing affordable housing that will help expand the knowledge and capacity of local government staff. To be most helpful, procurement and contracting documents should clearly describe the community values, desired approach, how a successful partnership would operate, and how the success of the contracted firm or individual will be measured. Additionally, communities that currently meet the 90-day or less timeline may decide to hire an on-call contracted planner on an as-needed basis just for larger projects that might challenge the existing staff and process due to their complexity and/or size (i.e., as a contingency plan).

## **D. Additional Trainings**

### **(1.) Review Staff Training Sessions**

To enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the review process, local governments can conduct training sessions for in-house staff who lack experience in reviewing affordable housing applications. As well as describing the review procedure, criteria, and standards, staff with more experience should identify lessons learned and provide answers to frequently asked questions. Increasing staff capacity and knowledge base will not only minimize the need for follow-up reviews but also lead to clearer, more accurate, and more consistent review comments to the developer.

### **(2.) Developer Training Sessions**

To improve developer understanding about the steps involved and materials required for affordable housing project review, local governments can provide training sessions for existing and prospective housing developers. These can take the form of listening sessions, work sessions, recorded videos, webinars, or other media. Training session materials should be created with the active involvement of review and referral agencies so that developers understand both the internal and external requirements for successful project reviews.

## Section 5 - Community Examples

### Local Government Fast Track Adoption

Access a list of Colorado local governments whose Fast Track Review Process has been submitted to DOLA, and have been verified as meeting the statutory requirements in Proposition 123. This list will be updated regularly as more communities across Colorado achieve this milestone.

[Local Government Fast Track Policy Adoption](#)

### 5.1 Examples of Communities Implementing Expedited Review Strategies

While the communities listed below may not have adopted an expedited review policy yet that meets all the statutory requirements of Proposition 123, the examples below highlight examples of the strategies discussed in Section 4 of this Guidance, and may be useful references as Colorado local governments work to improve their affordable housing review and approval procedures.

#### Communities

- Broomfield, CO
- Colorado Springs
- Commerce City
- Denver
- Fort Collins
- Hugo
- Littleton
- Multiple Communities
- Northglenn
- Salida
- Steamboat Springs
- Windsor

## A. Broomfield

Broomfield provides an extensive amount of resources online, including applications, checklists, submittal guidance, and overall process workflow details. Additionally, the City and County offer a pre-application meeting with key staff for a developer to review their project and discuss requirements, process, and any “red flags” that staff may see.

- **Strategies:** Pre-App (staff level), Online Guides and Application Materials
- **Reference:** [Broomfield Planning Department’s Development Applications and Forms](#)

## B. Colorado Springs

The City has implemented a Rapid Response Team that serve as technical experts and liaisons for affordable housing projects that align with community goals. These experts provide guidance throughout the process to developers and other staff within the city.

- **Strategies:** Staff Liaison/Rapid Response Team, Expedited Process
- **Reference:**
  - [Colorado Springs Rapid Response Team \(RRT\) program](#)
  - [Colorado Springs Land Use Review / Development Review Enterprise](#)

## C. Commerce City

The City has developed administrative and expedited reviews for certain community benefit projects including affordable housing projects that meet certain affordability thresholds defined within the policy document. The City has a seven week, two round review timeframe that includes four weeks for round one and three weeks for round two with the intent of reaching the decision making step after round two.

- **Strategies:** Expedited Process (administrative review, 7-10 week average review time frame)

- **Reference:**
  - [Developing in Commerce City](#)
  - [Commerce City Expedited Priority Case Review Policy](#)

## D. Denver

Denver has a dedicated Affordable Housing Review Team to prioritize, provide technical assistance, and reduce the overall review time frame for affordable housing projects. The team is composed of key staff from multiple city departments.

- **Strategies:** Pre-App Meeting, Liaison during entitlements and permitting (Affordable Housing Review Team)
- **Reference:**
  - [Denver's Affordable Housing Review Team](#)
  - Denver's [Review Times Dashboard](#) with real-time data

## E. Fort Collins

The City of Fort Collins has a variety of online resources outlining application requirements, process flow charts, and policies on affordable housing project reviews. The City's expedited process includes prioritization by staff to complete eligible affordable housing project reviews within two weeks for each submittal/ resubmittal.

- **Strategies:** Online Guides and Application Materials, Expedited Process (2 week staff reviews)
- **Reference:** [Fort Collins Development Review Guide](#) including [Fort Collins Development Review Flowchart](#)

## F. Hugo

The Town amended their local regulations in 2023 to allow a variety of residential housing types through administrative review in the residential zone districts. This eliminated the need for special review of certain housing types that meet the updated dimensional criteria to allow for a variety of housing options within the town.

- **Strategies:** Expedited Process (housing types as use by right in residential zone districts)
- **Reference:** [Town of Hugo website](#)

## G. Littleton

Littleton’s website includes online resources and materials to help a developer clearly understand submittal requirements, certification blocks and forms, and overall workflows. Additionally, the City offers a pre-application meeting that is required for most application types as a benefit to developers.

- **Strategies:** Pre-App., Online Guides and Application Materials
- **Reference:** [Littleton’s Land Planning and Entitlement Site](#)

## H. Multiple Communities

To offset staffing shortages or the need for technical assistance, many communities throughout the state use on-call contract staff. Contract staff provide unique insights and targeted support depending on the contract structure and need of the community.

- **Strategies:** Contract Planning Support

## I. Salida

Salida’s expedited review process incorporates administrative review in certain zone districts for affordable housing projects and certain housing types. Shifting to administrative review trimmed weeks from the overall process.

- **Strategies:** Inclusionary Zoning, Expedited Process (administrative review in certain zone districts)
- **Reference:** [Salida Zoning and Development](#)

## J. Steamboat Springs

Steamboat Springs has an entire webpage dedicated to application resources with policy guidance, application materials, submittal guidance, and process workflows. The City's staff liaison structure supports and helps to expedite the overall review process for affordable housing projects. The liaison serves as a point of contact for the developer as their application works its way through the process. The City continues to evaluate and update their internal processes to further expedite the process for affordable housing projects. It has effectively reduced the average number of weeks for review and is actively working to further reduce, the target timeline for an application to reach the decision stage is 8-10 weeks or 56-70 calendar days. Steamboat Springs Planning Application Resource Center

- **Strategies:** Pre-App / Pre-Submittal Process, Online Guides and Application Materials, Staff Liaison, Expedited Process (8-10 week application to decision target timeline)
- **Reference:** [Steamboat Springs Planning Application Resource Center](#)

## K. Windsor

Windsor's website includes a variety of tools and resources to help guide a developer in submitting a complete application including checklists, a concept review meeting process, applications, and submittal requirements. The staff level concept review process is similar to a pre-application process and allows a developer to have their concept reviewed and discussed by the Town's development review committee.

- **Strategies:** Pre-App/Concept Review (staff level), Online Guides and Application Materials
- **Reference:**
  - [Windsor Planning Applications, Forms, and Handouts](#)
  - [Development Review Guide for Affordable Housing Expedited Review Applications](#)

# Section 6 - Frequently Asked Questions for Expedited Review

## Contents

### 6.1 Definitions

[What is the definition of affordable housing in Prop. 123?](#)

Can a local Fast Track Review policy include affordability protection mechanisms or terms of affordability?

[What defines the “submission of a complete application”?](#)

### 6.2 Applicability

[Do Fast Track Review requirements apply to tribal governments?](#)

[What development projects are subject to Fast Track Review requirements?](#)

[What types of development permit applications are required to follow the Fast Track Review process?](#)

### 6.3 The 90-Day Decision Requirement

[What constitutes a “final decision” on an application?](#)

[How does the 90-calendar day expedited review time frame work? Can the clock stop?](#)

[How can a local government address situations where an applicant's delayed response is endangering the ability to meet the 90-day timeline?](#)

[Are extensions to the Fast Track Review Process allowed, and if so, how do they work?](#)

## 6.4 Compliance

[What if our community already approves applications within 90-days?](#)

[How do we document that we have implemented a Fast Track Review process that is compliant with Prop. 123?](#)

[What happens if a local government fails to implement a Fast Track Review Process?](#)

## Frequently Asked Questions

### 6.1 Definitions

A. What is the definition of affordable housing in Prop. 123?

Proposition 123 provides the following definition of affordable housing that specifically applies to unit counting towards local government commitments:

(1) (a) Rental housing at or below 60% AMI, or

(b) For-sale housing at or below 100% AMI, and

(2) Which costs the household less than 30% of its monthly income.

Since the fast track section of statute doesn't specify, DOLA interprets this general definition to apply, but also considers it allowable for a local policy to have a [broader definition of affordable housing](#).

B. Can a local Fast Track Review policy include affordability protection mechanisms or terms of affordability?

The Proposition 123 statutory definition of affordable housing is silent on affordability protection mechanisms or terms of affordability (i.e., does not require a contractual requirement for affordability protection for any term length). Nothing in statute

requires nor prohibits this type of restriction on the criteria that qualifies an applicant for expedited review.

If a local government's affordable housing definition includes affordable housing protection mechanisms or affordability terms (i.e., how long the housing will be restricted as affordable), it could be considered more restrictive than statute, thereby denying fast track review to an applicant whose project may otherwise qualify for fast track.

DOLA recommends creating a more narrowly tailored definition for projects which qualify for expedited review that allows for any project that meets the income requirements listed in [Section 6.1A](#) above by separating references to affordability protection mechanisms or affordability terms from determining which projects qualify for expedited review. A local government may allow affordability protection in determining which projects qualify for other incentives.

For example, a project with a 15 year affordability term that meets the income limits would still qualify, according to statute, for expedited review.

A project intending to meet the required AMIs and income limits but without affordability protections may expect to be expedited based on the definition in statute. Local governments attaching affordability protections to the Fast Track eligibility criteria are encouraged to seek the advice of their attorney.

C. What defines the “submission of a complete application,” considering the overall process and time frame depend on this starting point?

Local governments are empowered to establish local policy and procedures by defining what a “complete application submittal” means. Typically, a complete application includes a thorough completeness check by local government staff to ensure all required materials are submitted before the formal review process begins. Although an application may be submitted, it may not be considered complete if there are deficiencies or missing items. As described in the Strategies section below,

communities are encouraged to define and clearly communicate to applicants what a complete application entails by establishing a thorough completeness check process. (See the [best practices](#) on pre-application checklists.)

## 6.2 Applicability

### A. Do Fast Track Review requirements apply to tribal governments?

While the Fast Track Review Process requirements outlined for Proposition 123 (C.R.S. 29-32-105(2)) include tribal governments, DOLA recognizes that the expedited review requirement is generally not applicable for tribal governments, as housing projects within sovereign lands are typically managed internally.

### B. What development projects are subject to the expedited review requirements under Prop. 123?

A development project is subject to the expedited review requirements if fifty percent (50%) or more of the residential units are classified as affordable. The Prop. 123 definition of affordable housing is considered a minimum standard. Local governments may establish a policy with a [broader definition of affordable housing](#). For example, a local policy may require expedited review for projects with higher AMIs or with a smaller percent of units being affordable. In other words, a local government's policies or procedures could exceed the Prop. 123 requirements, as long as the policy meets the minimum standard established in Prop. 123.

### C. What types of development applications are required to follow the expedited review process under Prop. 123?

DOLA has prepared the following list of commonly used local development application and permit names. Prop. 123 ties the expedited review process to the development of affordable housing projects (as defined in this statute) and is not applicable to other types of development projects or application types. A project applying for or having been awarded Prop. 123 funding does not necessarily meet the definition of

affordable housing provided in the statute and, thus, does not necessarily require expedited review.

The Fast Track Review Process must apply to the types of applications listed below if they are defined as separate types of applications by the local government and the application includes initial construction or modification or adaptive reuse of an existing structure for Affordable Housing. For the required application types, the 90-calendar day period must also include a final decision on any request for an administrative adjustment or administrative minor modification of development standards permitted by the local government for that type of application.

### *Required*

- Site Plan
- Development Plan
- Building Permit
- Variance
- Conditional or Special Use Permit or Approval
- Permitted Use Permit or Approval
- Planned Unit Development approval or amendment that is not limited to zoning approval or subdivision of land
- Construction or engineering documents that local regulations require be included in the types of applications listed above
- Modifications of site plan, development permit, variance, or required construction or engineering documents following initial approval of an Affordable Housing project

### *Not Required*

- Annexation
- Preliminary or Final Subdivision of land
- Comprehensive Plan Amendment
- Concept Review
- Pre-Application Review
- Initial Zoning or Rezoning
- Appeals
- Planned Unit Development approval or amendment that includes zoning approval or subdivision of land
- Sign permits or other related permits related to the development where the timing of approvals will not prevent or delay the applicant from moving forward with the Affordable Housing construction
- Permits related to changes in non-residential use, occupancy, or tenant finish for a project or portion of a project that has already been constructed or is already in non-residential use
- Construction or engineering drawings that local regulations do not require be included in the types of applications listed above

Each of the processes marked “required” above may require a 90-day process (e.g., a site plan, development plan, and building permit may be structured by the local government to each have their own permitting process and, thus, require their own 90-day review). However, DOLA encourages local governments to allow concurrent review rather than stacking 90-day review periods one at a time in a linear fashion.

The goal is to streamline and expedite local processes as much as possible while still supporting a thorough review process and informed decision-making.

Please refer to [Sections 2.1C](#) and [2.1D](#) of the Fast Track Guidance for more information.

## 6.3 The 90-Day Decision Requirement

A. What constitutes a “final decision” on an application under Prop. 123?

A final decision refers to the official approval or denial of an application. Local governments have autonomy to manage the expedited review process, ensuring it meets or exceeds statutory requirements. Final decisions include administrative decisions by staff or by a governing body through a public process, in accordance with local regulations.

A final decision does not refer to recommendations by a recommending body, such as a planning commission or review board, nor does it include the time needed for post-approval steps such as obtaining signatures or recordation. Appeals or petitions typically occur following a final decision and are not considered part of the original application process and are therefore not subject to the expedited review process of Prop. 123.

B. How does the 90-calendar day expedited review time frame work? Are there any instances where the clock can stop?

The expedited review process is a tool for local governments and private developers to work in partnership to expedite the review of affordable housing projects. The 90-calendar day clock starts once a local government deems a submitted application complete, as discussed above. The clock does not stop during the process or between review rounds or while the applicant is working on changes/revisions, but may be extended through the allowable extension options outlined below. If a project is withdrawn and a new application is submitted, the clock starts over with the new

application, as with any other new application subject to the expedited review process.

C. If a local government is doing everything right but an applicant is being slow to respond, how does that affect the 90-day requirement? Or is that when an extension would come into play?

This Guidance lists "If an applicant becomes non-responsive regarding their application and response to agency comments" as one of the reasons a local government may choose to use a 30-day extension.

For this reason, local governments are encouraged to convey to applicants the importance of working in partnership. Communities concerned about applicants being slow to respond should definitely set expectations on applicant response times either in their applicant guidance materials or in policy language.

D. Are extensions to the Fast Track Review Process allowed, and if so, how do they work?

Local Fast Track review processes may allow for extensions to the 90-calendar day time frame as long as they align with Prop. 123 statutory requirements ([C.R.S. 29-32-105\(2\)\(b\) and \(c\)](#)).

*(1.) Applicant-Requested and Externally Required Extensions (2b)*

This is an optional tool local governments can incorporate as part of their expedited review process. It is described in [C.R.S. 29-32-105\(2\)\(b\)](#) which includes three distinct scenarios where extensions are allowed:

- (1) a one-time 90-calendar day extension at the request of the applicant,
- (2) an extension to allow time to comply with a state law or court order (the length of which is determined by the law or court order),
- (3) an extension to allow for a review period by an agency that requires review and approval of the project (this required review timeline may be outside the control of

the local government, and could theoretically extend beyond 90 days). DOLA encourages local governments to work with referral agencies to create agreements that make it possible to expedite reviews, and minimize the need for extensions.

When requested by the applicant, the process is extended one time by up to 90-calendar days. If the local government offers extensions for situations (2) and/or (3) above, then the normal 90-day Fast Track decision requirement would be extended until the resolution of the conflict with the state law or court order or the completion of the government or agency review period and any changes required as a result of that review.

Per the intent of the bill, DOLA interprets the phrase from statute “within the local government or outside” to mean within or outside geographically, but outside the control of the local government. Note: this guidance should not be considered legal advice. Jurisdictions are encouraged to consult with their own legal counsel.

#### *(2.) Local Government-Initiated Extensions (2c)*

This is another optional tool local governments can include as part of their expedited review process. It is described in [C.R.S. 29-32-105\(2\)\(c\)](#). When used, a local government will notify the applicant of the intent to extend the process. The applicant is encouraged to respond within 5-business days acknowledging the extension notice. The extension includes the full 30-calendar day extension, plus the time it takes to communicate with and hear from the applicant. The extension provides additional time for the applicant and local government to address substantial comments.

As a best practice, governments should use the 30-calendar day extension(s) for unique circumstances or delays to the overall review process that are outside the control of the applicant or local government. Examples of situations that may require extensions include:

- the receipt of additional information regarding soil conditions,

- the adequacy of existing utilities or fire protection services,
- or the safety of proposed site access points.

They do not include comments unrelated to project compliance with adopted plans or applicable laws or regulations.

## 6.4 Compliance

### A. What if our community already approves applications within 90-days?

DOLA recognizes that some communities may already have a process in place that meets or exceeds the 90-day time frame requirements of Proposition 123 without having a formally adopted process. These communities need only document their local process aligning with Proposition 123 criteria.

A local government whose development review process is already under 90 days per application, should be able to demonstrate compliance with the fast track requirement by completing these simple steps:

- Review the Local Government Self-Assessment Checklist provided by DOLA and internally confirm whether your jurisdiction is already meeting these requirements.
- Demonstrate your jurisdiction's commitment to continued compliance with these requirements by codifying the process. A downloadable template resolution has been provided for this purpose and can be found on the [Fast Track Resources webpage](#).
- Submit documentation through DOLA's [Proposition 123 Compliance Portal](#).

### B. How do we document that we have implemented a Fast Track Review Process that is compliant with Prop. 123?

Jurisdictions may demonstrate compliance in a variety of ways, depending on each community's unique circumstances. When reviewing a local government's submission to the Fast Track Compliance Portal, DOLA seeks to verify that the jurisdiction has

implemented a process to expedite the development review process for affordable housing applications, as required by statute (C.R.S. 29-32-105(2)). Inevitably, this means something different for each community.

For some communities, particularly smaller ones, who are already under 90 days per application (already compliant), it may be sufficient to adopt a resolution that codifies their commitment to continued compliance. DOLA provides a [template resolution](#) for this purpose and encourages communities to use it. This resolution probably isn't the right template for jurisdictions whose policies and procedures have more complexity.

For jurisdictions whose review process has historically required more than 90 days, it will be important to highlight the systemic changes that have been implemented, and a resolution or ordinance might be the final step to codify new policies and procedures. DOLA would also expect to see additional documentation of implementing a process with key policy language that:

- demonstrates an understanding of the statutory requirements,
- outlines which application types will be fast tracked, which housing projects are eligible, how the extensions work, and
- communicates to applicants the expectations for a complete and technically sufficient application, and what applicants can expect from the process.

Some jurisdictions are revising land use or development codes to outline Fast Track Review criteria and processes, which is then codified by an ordinance. Others have indicated that an Administrative Procedures document is where the majority of their Fast Track process would be outlined. Some are using inter-departmental agreements to ensure alignment between all involved parties, or MOUs / IGAs with external agencies, while others are pursuing interjurisdictional alignment of land use codes to provide a degree of regional predictability for developers. Theoretically, a community could demonstrate compliance by providing data of start dates and decision dates for

all affordable housing projects with evidence that application review times are always within 90 days.

Again, DOLA anticipates communities may demonstrate compliance in a variety of ways and is working to be flexible about the documentation that is appropriate for each community's situation. Communities can use the [Local Government Self-Assessment Checklist](#) as a guide and DOLA staff can provide a [courtesy review](#) of draft policies. Once a community's Fast Track Review policy is adopted, the community can submit it to the [Prop. 123 Compliance Portal](#).

### C. What happens if a local government fails to implement a Fast Track Review Process?

If a jurisdiction has not implemented the expedited review requirement by January 1, 2027, the jurisdiction would no longer be eligible for Prop 123 funding indefinitely, or until the jurisdiction can demonstrate compliance with this requirement. In this situation, ineligibility would extend to residents, developers, and other types of applicants for projects within that jurisdiction, other than funding from DOLA's Homelessness Support Programs, which are not subject to these requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 2025-1210  
TOWN TRUSTEES,  
OF NORWOOD, COLORADO

**A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING EXPEDITED REVIEW POLICIES FOR  
AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS**

WHEREAS, the voters of Colorado approved Proposition 123 in 2022 creating the State Affordable Housing Fund to make certain funds available to local governments as defined by [C.R.S. 29-32-104](#); and

WHEREAS, Town of Norwood, Colorado is a statutory municipality duly and regularly organized and validly existing as a body corporate and politic under and by virtue of the Constitution and laws of the State of Colorado and is eligible for Proposition 123 funding and programing; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Norwood has not adopted zoning, however, recognizes the importance of allowing affordable and attainable housing to be developed for its workforce and its residents; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Norwood has set a baseline and commitment to increase affordable housing as defined in [C.R.S. 29-32-105](#); and

WHEREAS, the Town of Norwood's current process for reviewing proposed housing projects **already** meets the requirement for a 90-day review process; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Norwood creates this policy for expedited review to ensure that affordable housing projects are reviewed and a decision rendered within 90 days of a complete application in alignment with the requirements of C.R.S. 29-32-105(2) et seq., as determined by the **Planner and Building Official**.

WHEREAS, The Town of Norwood recognizes that an affordable housing development project which has at least 50% of the units as affordable, as defined in statute (C.R.S. 29-32-101 and C.R.S. 29-32-105(2)) would be eligible for expedited review; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Norwood recognizes the following application types which require expedited review: Site Plan, Development Plan, Conditional Use Permit, Building Permit, Special Use Permit, Variance or Waiver, Administrative Modifications, and any other applications that meet the affordable housing requirement.

WHEREAS, The Town of Norwood's expedited review process for affordable housing projects does not apply if an applicant chooses to opt-out of the process.

WHEREAS, The Town of Norwood recognizes the allowable extensions in C.R.S. 29-32-105(2), both for applicants and for the Town, and recognizes the circumstances under which the expedited review timeline may be extended or the application may be removed from the expedited review process. **[add any specific local details about extensions,, incomplete application submissions, significant unforeseen issues]**

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Town Trustees of Norwood, Colorado, creates

the following policy to implement a system to expedite the development review process for affordable housing. The Trustees establish a formal policy that any complete application received by the Town for an affordable housing development will be placed on the next available agenda once proper public notice has been posted and a decision rendered on the application within 90 days to ensure an expedited and timely review of the affordable housing project, with the intent to comply with the requirements in C.R.S. 29-32-105(2) et seq.

Adopted this \_\_10th\_\_ day of \_\_December\_\_, 2025.

ATTEST: TOWN OF NORWOOD, STATE OF COLORADO:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sidney Ross, Town Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Candy Meehan, Mayor