

COMMISSIONERS: STAN VANDERWERF (CHAIR) CAMI BREMER (VICE-CHAIR) LONGINOS GONZALEZ, JR. HOLLY WILLIAMS CARRIE GEITNER

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT CRAIG DOSSEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Planning Commission Meeting
Thursday, July 15, 2021
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
200 S. Cascade Ave – Centennial Hall Hearing Room
Colorado Springs, Colorado

REGULAR HEARING 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT AND VOTING: BRIAN RISLEY, TOM BAILEY, JOAN LUCIA-TREESE, SARAH BRITTAIN JACK, TIM TROWBRIDGE, ERIC MORAES, AND JAY CARLSON

PRESENT VIA ELECTRONIC MEANS AND VOTING: NONE

PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: BRANDY MERRIAM

ABSENT: GRACE BLEA- NUNEZ AND BECKY FULLER

STAFF PRESENT: CRAIG DOSSEY, NINA RUIZ, RYAN HOWSER, JOHN GREEN, GILBERT LAFORCE, DANIEL TORRES, LUPE PACKMAN, JEFF RICE, ELENA KREBS, ELIZABETH NIJKAMP (VIA REMOTE ACCESS) AND EL PASO COUNTY ATTORNEYS MARY RITCHIE AND LORI SEAGO

OTHERS SPEAKING AT THE HEARING: ANDREA BARLOW, WILLIAM PARISH, JIM BEYERS, JASON ALWINE, LORI KING, DANNY MIENTKA, BROOKE TEAL, GLEN BUTTS, ROBIN SMITH, JAMES CHLEAN, ELIZABETH CULLER, CHIEF WRIGHT, JEFF DAZ, FELICIA GRILLO, AND BEAU WORTHINGTON

Report Items

- A. Report Items -- Planning and Community Development Department Mr. Dossey -- The following information was discussed:
 - a) The next scheduled Planning Commission meeting is for Thursday, August 5, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.



- **Mr. Dossey** gave an update of the Planning Commission agenda items and action taken by the Board of County Commissioners since the last Planning Commission meeting.
- B. Public Input on Items Not Listed on the Agenda NONE

2. Annual Meeting and Election of Officers

The Sunshine Law was presented at the first of the year and therefore did not need to be reviewed at this time.

Ms. Lucia-Treese nominated Mr. Risley as Planning Commission Chair seconded by Ms. Brittain Jack. Mr. Risley accepted the nomination. Ms. Lucia-Treese made a motion to close nominations. Motion passed unanimously to close nominations. Motion passed 6-0 to appoint Mr. Risley as Planning Commission Chair. Ms. Lucia-Treese nominated Mr. Bailey as Vice Chair seconded by Mr. Carlson. Mr. Bailey accepted the nomination. Ms. Lucia-Treese made a motion to close nomination. Motion passed to close nominations. The motion passed 6-0 for Mr. Bailey as Vice Chair.

CONSENT ITEMS

- 3. A. Approval of the Minutes June 17, 2021
 The minutes were unanimously approved as presented. (7-0)
 - B. SF-21-014 HOWSER VACATION AND REPLAT

VACATION AND REPLAT CLOVERLEAF FILING NO.1

A request by PT Cloverleaf, LLC, for approval of a vacation and replat of three parcels, collectively representing a portion of one platted (1) tract, into three (3) single-family residential lots. The three parcels total 1.5-acres and are zoned RS-20000 (Residential Suburban) and are located north of Leggings Way, east of Bowstring Road, approximately 0.34 miles northeast of the Higby Road and Jackson Creek Parkway intersection and within Section 23, Township 11, and Range 67 West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel No. 71231-02-047, 71231-02-048, and 71231-02-050) (Commissioner District No. 1)

PC ACTION: TROWBRIDGE MOVED/LUCIA-TREESE SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM NUMBER 3B, SF-21-014, FOR A VACATION AND REPLAT FOR CLOVERLEAF FILING NO. 1 UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 19, CITING, 21-039, WITH THIRTEEN (13) CONDITIONS AND THREE (3) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).

C. MS-21-001 GREEN

MINOR SUBDIVISION D. JOHNSON SUBDIVISION

A request by Delroy and Janet Johnson for approval of a minor subdivision to create four (4) single-family residential lots. The 28.62 acre property is zoned RR-5 (Residential Rural) and is located on the west side of Highway 83 approximately one half (1/2) mile north of the intersection of Highway 83 and Old North Gate Road and is within Section 34, Township 11, and Range 66 West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel No. 61000-00-157) (Commissioner District No. 1)

PC ACTION: BAILEY MOVED/TROWBRIDGE SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM NUMBER 3C, MS-21-001, FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION FOR D. JOHNSON SUBDIVISION, UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 19, CITING, 21-038, WITH THIRTEEN (13) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).

D. PUDSP-20-005 PARSONS

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT/PRELIMINARY PLAN FALCON MEADOWS AT BENT GRASS

A request by Better Land, LLC, and Challenger Communities, LLC, for approval of a map amendment (rezoning) from a site-specific PUD (Planned Unit Development) to a site specific PUD (Planned Unit Development) and approval of a preliminary plan for 267 single-family residential lots. The seven (7) parcels, totaling 67.01 acres, are located along the northwest side of Bent Grass Meadows Drive, approximately 0.7 miles east of the intersection of Meridian Road and Bent Grass Meadows Drive and are within Section 1, Township 13 South, Range 65, West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel Nos.53010-00-019, 53012-01-061, 53012-01-062, 53012-01-063, 53012-04-005, 53010-00-023, and 53012-04-006) (Commissioner District No. 2)

Item PUDSP-20-005 was requested to be pulled from the Consent calendar and heard as a Regular item with an abbreviated presentation. It was heard after all the Consent items.

Ms. Parsons gave an abbreviated presentation of the project, she also read the criteria of approval into the record.

Mr. Carlson – My main concern is trying to understand what was of record and what we're amending. Were there density changes? What was the change?

Ms. Parsons – Referring to the PUD from 2006 (Ms. Parsons full report is part of the public record) You are basically modifying the lot layout, the street pattern and incorporating the development of lots. The regional trail corridor will be brought up from south to north and to the west and recommending approval of a large open space tract be located at the northern property line. You are also approving a greater buffer of 50 feet and then the detention instead of having the setback on the rear of the lots, you would be modifying that to have a buffer plus the detention tract. On the western portion of the property, instead of having the 35-foot setback in the rear of the lots, you would be proposing to create a 35 open space tract, then a wall and then the single family lots.

Mr. Carlson – On the northern lots, I believe you said there was a 100-foot setback? **Ms. Parsons** – It was 50 foot. Now we have a large open space between the two developments.

Mr. Risley – I assume the applicant is aware of the proposed modifications? **Ms. Parsons** – We have reviewed them in detail with the applicant.

Mr. Bailey – Can you tell us the purpose of the maintenance access road in the open space tract alongside the wall?

Ms. Parsons – In the case for some reason that the metropolitan district wasn't maintaining that, the county needs the legal and physical access to maintain it. Ultimately, the responsibility will fall with the Bent Grass Metropolitan District. That is fairly standard on all the detention ponds. We need to have legal and physical access.

Mr. Bailey- My question, is that because the whole northern boundary is the channel, is that the reason for the access? It's not just to get down to the detention pond. It seems like access to that will be much quicker from Bent Grass Meadow Drive but is there a need for that maintenance access road along the northern boundary? **Ms. Parsons** – It serves two-fold. There is a 25-foot trail corridor easement that will potentially parallel that access road and that will be determined at the final plat. **Mr. Bailey** – Ok, that does clarify.

Mr. Trowbridge –Why are we being asked to let them build most of the development for the CLOMR (Conditional Letter of Map Revision) in the revised condition 8D?

Mr. Rice – The reasoning for that CLOMR is because if it is needed it would most likely be for offsite improvement which would be involved with other

property owners. **Mr**. **Trowbridge** – So it's not a drainage issue? **Mr**. **Rice**- We don't anticipate issues on their site, there could be, but we just don't know. Downstream is where we anticipate where there will need to be a CLOMR. Also, to clarify on the west side of the property that maintenance road will also be used to maintain a drainage swell.

Mr. Risley – What would trigger condition 10? A traffic impact study? Ms. Parsons – It would be based on that traffic impact studies that would be submitted with the final plat and other developments in the area. Mr. Rice – Basically once a number of trips tries making a left turn there, it becomes a queuing issue or a safety issue, so our criteria require left turns after certain peak number of trips have been meant to make it safer. Mr. Risley- So it is implied it would be triggered by a traffic impact study through the Land Development Code. Mr. Rice – Right and the assumption is based on the development it would generate that number of trips. Mr. Risley - I just wanted to make sure we aren't creating a grey area. Mr. Rice – With each final plat we would get an updated traffic study that counts that traffic that is going through there.

Ms. Barlow – I want to emphasize that the previously approved site specific PUD and Preliminary Plan did not include the area to the south and east of Bent Grass Meadows Drive and that the under original PUD plan the allowed density was 8 to 12 units per acre. That was always intended to be a much higher density in that area.

William Parish – My main concern is having motorized vehicles on that maintenance road. It's important that there are no vehicle signs posted. I am asking to have that fence moved all the way down, about 90 to 110 yards. I am the only lot that has the fence going halfway down my property.

Jim Beyers – To respond about the comment on the wall. We tentatively identified a spot where that would terminate. We intend to build the wall.

Mr. Risley – My understanding is that an agreement between a developer and an adjacent landowner would be imbedded at the final plat stage.

Ms. Parsons - In a nutshell with the existing filing that this particular developer constructed and is still constructing, there was agreement at the final plat that the masonry wall would be extended. The staff did have concerns with the masonry wall being extended across the drainage way. That particular portion of the drainage way is what we are now platting with this plat. I think what the resident is asking for is that the applicant go ahead of time and continue the wall that was agreed upon sooner than what this particular filing is moving.

Mr. Parish – I just want to clarify. I am not asking them to go to the water way, just close to it

Ms. Parsons - Staff is reviewing final construction drawings with the final plat submittal. For obvious reasons we would want to allow the improvements of the channel and detention before we place something that would interfere with the construction. That is why staff didn't have a concern with the installation of the wall at this time.

Mr. Risley – We are hearing the Preliminary Plan today and that it really doesn't apply to the approval criteria but acknowledging that there is an ongoing discussion.

Mr. Moraes – I don't know if we can prevent private vehicles being on there versus the county vehicles going out there. **Ms. Parsons** – The vehicle that would on there would just be the maintenance vehicle. If someone were to trespass on this private property that would be up to the Sheriff's department to enforce that, not the Planning and Community Development Department.

PC ACTION: CARLSON MOVED/LUCIA-TREESE SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM NUMBER 3D, PUDSP-20-005 FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT/PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR FALCON MEADOWS AT BENT GRASS, UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 31, CITING, 21-036, WITH ELEVEN (11) CONDITIONS AND FIVE (5) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).

E. PUDSP-20-006 HOWSER

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT/PRELIMINARY PLAN EAGLE FOREST

A request by Eagle Forest Development, LLC, for approval of a map amendment (rezoning) from PUD (Planned Unit Development) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) and approval of a preliminary plan for nine (9) single-family residential lots. The 44.19-acre property is located on the north side of Shoup Road, approximately one-half (1/2) mile west of Herring Road and within Section 8, Township 12 South, Range 65 West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel No. 52080-00-071) (Commissioner District No. 1)

PC ACTION: TROWBRDIGE MOVED/BRITTAIN JACK SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM NUMBER 3E, PUDSP-20-006 FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT/PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR EAGLE FOREST, UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 31, CITING, 21-037, WITH EIGHT (8) CONDITIONS AND FIVE (5) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE

ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).

Regular Items 4. VA-21-001

GREEN

VARIANCE OF USE BLACK FOREST MEADOWS

A request by Deborah and Edward Ritchy for approval of a variance of use to allow a business event center. The 20-acre parcel is zoned RR-5 (Rural Residential) and is located approximately one-quarter (1/4) of a mile north of the Goshawk Road and Hodgen Road intersection along the west side of Goshawk Road and is within Section 23, Township 11 South, Range 65 West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel No. 51230-00-017) (Commissioner District No. 1)

Mr. Green gave a brief overview of the project and asked **Ms. Ritchie** to go over the review criteria for a variance of use. He then gave his full presentation.

Note for the record: The Planning Commission took a brief break after Mr. Green's presentation in order to allow the Board of County Commissioners to come back into the hearing room and adjourn their hearing that was held earlier in the day.

Mr. Trowbridge – How many events do you anticipate holding per week, per month?

Ms. Ritchy – We are planning on seasonal events so, June through September possibly October, maybe twenty events per year with one event per weekend.

IN FAVOR: NONE

IN OPPOSITION: NONE

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Risley – Having grown up in Black Forest I am always interested in projects that are sensitive to the contextual surrounding of the forest but are also ways of creating economic activity in Black Forest as well. In my opinion, it looks like a well-balanced project and I wish you the best.

<u>PC ACTION:</u> TROWBRIDGE MOVED/LUCIA-TREESE SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM NUMBER 4, VA-21-001

FOR A VARIANCE OF USE FOR BLACK FOREST MEADOWS, UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 51, CITING, 21-041, WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS AND THREE (3) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).

5. P-20-009 GREEN

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONE) ROCK CREEK MESA

A request by Colorado Springs Equities, LLC, Golden Eagle Ranch LLC, and New Direction IRA INC, for approval of a map amendment (rezoning) of 37.26-acres from F-5 (Forest) to RS-5000 (Residential Suburban). The six (6) parcels included in the request are located west of the intersection of Colorado Highway 115 and Pawnee Road, approximately one-half (1/2) mile south of the City of Colorado Springs incorporated boundary and are within Sections 30 and 31, Township 15 South, Range 66 West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel Nos. 65303-00-017, 65303-00-022, 65304-00-009, 65304-01-001, 65312-00-007, 75000-00-236) (Commissioner District No. 3)

Note for the record: **Mr. Carlson** recused himself from hearing this item due to a professional relationship with the applicant. Quorum is still in place with six voting members.

Mr. Green gave a brief overview of the project and asked **Ms. Ritchie** to go over the review criteria for a map amendment (rezone). He then introduced the applicants' representative **Mr. Jason Alwine** give their presentation.

Mr. Mientka – In my mind this application represents solid planning. We are across the street from Fort Carson, our largest employer, we are in an environment where housing is at a critical shortage. So, when we look at this particular piece of real estate, we ask how it can best benefit the community and make sense within its surroundings. This application doesn't come without a history. The majority of the land I have owned since 1995 so I have been a neighbor in the community, and I understand there are concerns and anxiety with change and I welcome their concerns. The reality is that this is a balanced zoning application. This property could have been developed in 1995, but there isn't any water available, there is an existing water district, but it hasn't been able to issue taps. Coincidentally I owe about 16 acres north of this property that is within the City of Colorado Springs limits. From that effort we looked at the opportunity to serve this property. When you run the economics on the utility extensions it's about density. We would love to have 400 or 600 units in order to make economic sense of utility extensions. We tried to balance out an amount of density that is compatible with a highly dense

mobile home park and others' that have larger lots. In order for us to get the utilities to serve Rock Creek Mesa, we needed to get a couple things, the density and the Springs utilities to serve out of boundary. There isn't going to be thousands of homes. We bring more than just housing for Fort Carson and housing for Department of Corrections. Right now, Fort Carson is short 4300 units for housing and we have a responsibility collectively where possible to protect the base. Housing is a strong motivator for this approval. We have a fire district that is capable, but they lack a dependable supply of water. This proposal gets us a step closer to providing southwest 115 fire protection. Eliminating the water treatment facility is going to be good for everybody up there. We satisfy that form the mobile home perspective. As you hear from folks that are opposed to this that don't want growth and I understand. I bring them stable property values. Let me help you with fire protection.

Mr. Green provided a brief history of the project area. His full presentation is on the public record. **Mr. Green** also noted that since the application was submitted prior to the Master Plan being adopted it was judged against the Southwest Highway 115 comprehensive plan.

Mr. Trowbridge - Can you tell me how this plan complies with 6.1.2 which discourages small discontiguous land development projects?

Mr. **Green** – In staff's review of this item and looking at what the existing development of the area that would be how it was reviewed what would be discontiguous or not. That it's not a standalone leapfrog development that it would be around existing development in the area, specifically approximately 273 dwelling units, including the mobile home park.

Daniel Torres provided his engineering findings on behalf of **PCD**.

IN FAVOR:

Lori King – We moved into the area about six years ago and we bought a working well at that time and within six months of us living here, the well went dry and we had well technicians come out and they said it's a common issue in this area. We have water delivered. At that point we went to the Rock Creek Water District and they told us they would not be able to take on new customers due to low water as well. We have called every water district in and out of town and they are all saying they can't. We are concerned about a large fire. We just wanted to speak up and ask for the critical resource of water.

IN OPPOSITION:

Brooke Teal – I'm a resident of the mobile home park and my main concern is egress in case of a wildfire. Although additional water is important, it means nothing if there is a fire coming down and we have no way out. It's not a matter of

if, it's a matter of when it burns. Adding a hundred or so homes on that park with only one way out. Our fire department is mostly volunteer.

Glen Butts - I'm curious how Piute inward is still just one road. He talked about bringing in water, no sewer, we haven't had a septic system, I'm just curious about natural gas, we are all on propane. Is that something that's going to come in too? We did truck water during the drought; we're not hauling now. It's only happened a few times in many years that I know of. Development is inevitable. My biggest complaint is that we all had to comply to the F-5 building.

Robin Smith – I'm directly above the planned development. I'm happy to see they've added plans on things like having a playground. I do believe it is a good location, the other one is too small with limited access. One of the things I've been worried about with having kids running around, with them taking out the only playground we had because when kids don't have something to do they become destructive. I want to make sure we keep our kids safe. The only thing is that they don't own that land yet. Currently our roads going up and down are very small. We have no sidewalks, so people currently walk in the road. We need more infrastructure before we add more residents.

James Chlean – I'm completely opposed because it's going to completely change our neighborhood. The population density is going to increase so much that is going to create a lot of problems, we don't have road or sidewalks. I do understand the fire concerns. I believe our area is a wildlife corridor. It will completely change the character of our area. I think building would be reasonable if it was kept the same way. Adding more people will increase traffic, crime and add more stress on our first responders. I don't believe it's just grass land that they are going to develop, two of the parcels are F5 for a reason, animals need those areas. I just would hate to see our neighborhood change from the country environment to this dense suburbia

Elizabeth Culler – My only concern is the density. The density is based off the mobile home park but that is only a portion of the neighborhood. I would recommend basing the density off the current single-family homes.

Chief Wright – I'm the fire chief for the south west highway 115 district. I'm here to tell you what I would have to deal with if this is approved. This will require significant upgrade to infrastructure. We are a very small fire district. The 80926-zip code is in a high fire situation. Adding 211 all of a sudden would be a major impact. If this development goes through, we will have no room for expansion. We currently have five feet on all sides. Our response comes from the station that is ten miles south of this location. The fire district wouldn't see any tax revenue for 18 to 24 months after the houses are sold. In talking to the developer, which was a pretty short conversation, the only thing they wanted to tell us was the water that they are bringing. That water is great except we already have 300,000 gallons

sitting up the road. Fire is 5% of what we do. We mostly do medical and traffic accidents. 70% come from that trailer park which is higher density just like you are proposing.

Ms. Brittain Jack – Are you speaking on behalf of the fire district or personal?

Chief Wright - On behalf of the fire district. We're not for or against this. We're just telling you our reality.

Mr. Risley – The staff report indicates your district had been sent a referral copy for the proposal and that there were no comments received. **Chief Wright** – I did send in comments.

Jeff Daz – I've been living in Rock Creek Mesa for 25 years. The water issue has only happened once. My biggest concern is the wildfires. There is only one way in and one way out. The proposed building is right next to the park entrance. It will be dangerous with the proposed stop light at 115 and Pawnee with the truck traffic. The roadways are very narrow and can't support the traffic.

Felicia Grillo – We are a small community and the issue here is water. RS-5000 does not fit into Rock Creek Mesa. Most of the properties are not on 10,000 square foot lots, everyone is on large acreage. The mobile home park is on 42 acres. They are talking about spot zoning, which is illegal. I have pictures to show why there shouldn't be a stoplight on Pawnee. Ms. Gillo's pictures are on the public record. The terrain of the mesa is not just grass. The forestry department does have a letter in requesting the applicant to mitigate all the high fire vegetation prior to building. We believe it should have been RR-.05. This will benefit the developer and not our community.

Beau Worthington – There is an over whelming concern for the unique nature of the area that will be lost and the overwhelming density. We're taking land zoned for agricultural uses to the and converting to the highest density that is allowed by the planning department. Our clients aren't opposed to ever developing this area. They are opposed to the 5000 square foot lots that ignore the historical trends. There are 20 homes in the area that have between 4 acres and 25 acres. Historical trend is to move away from high density development. The applicant is proposing to have half the lot size than which they were originally for. Rock Creek Mesa is not a place for high density, it would lose the rural characteristics of the area. The lots are much bigger outside of the mobile home park. In summation the plan as proposed should be denied by this board for all the reasons you have heard this afternoon.

Ms. Ruiz – I did want to clear the record on the comments by the fire district. We did take a look into EDARP and we did send a request through EDARP and EDARP reflects that no response was received for the latest request forwarded to

the Fire Department. The chief will send the comments via email and will be included for the BoCC. I did want to remind everyone that the request is for a rezone today. Concerns have been brought up about potential roadway alignment and evacuation routes. These types of discussions are not appropriate at the rezone stage as we do not have a specific layout for the lots and roadways.

Mr. Bailey – I would like to hear the staff's perspective about the spot zoning comment.

Ms. Ruiz – This is a unique portion of the county. We have F-5 immediately surrounding the property but if you look at the actual lot sizes, they are actually much smaller than 5 acres and are more similar to suburban development. RM-30 is also in the area, which is our most dense residential zone district. There is also the mobile home park. There are non-conforming lots and non-conforming lot sizes within this area. We have high densities within the RM-30 area and we also have high density mobile home park within the area. As John pointed out, immediately north, the city would permit urban type of development and dense development as well. So, we would not consider this as spot zoning for these reasons. **Mr.** Bailey – Thank you. I didn't either but I just wanted to make sure we were able to address that for the record. **Ms.** Ruiz – We have a lot of these areas in the county because lots were created, and some development occurred prior to there being zoning. Typically when we implement zoning we did a blanket zoning and not pay attention to the land uses or lot sizes, so this is an example of that.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Moraes – At least twice you went back to the mobile home density and your development in these areas. What is the density outside of the mobile home that five of the properties abut?

Mr. Alwine – We do have various lot sizes, 10,000 to 30,000. It will range anywhere from quarter acre size up 60,000 plus. Anywhere from four units per acre to less than a unit per acre. **Mr. Moraes** – Density of 5.4 and proposed 4.3 but you skip over everything in the middle (referring to the vicinity map). **Mr. Alwine** – Correct, part of that is because we have 30 dwelling units per acre, so it's going to skew the numbers. We have a church facility that is almost an acre and half that doesn't allow density. There are multiple parcels that are vacant. From a zoning standpoint we feel we fit in the transitional use, buffering the higher density mobile home park to the existing 20,000-foot lots.

Mr. Trowbridge – I like the idea that the applicant is bringing in utilities. I know the water is an issue up there and if they were proposing to bring this in and making it available to everyone, which is kind of hinted at, seems to be a good thing. Although we are not talking about traffic access, I am sensitive to evacuation in case of fire. I do have that concern with increasing the density up there. I also don't like the fact it is a half a dozen different parcels scattered up there all over the

place. If we were talking about the most eastern lots, I probably wouldn't have a problem. There are too many pros and cons for me to have a clear picture. I don't believe the RS-5000 is compatible

Ms. Lucia-Treese – I share **Mr. Trowbridge's** comments. I do not believe the RS-5000 is compatible with the existing zoning. Going from F5 to RS-5000 I just don't see where there is any compatibility.

Mr. Bailey - The overall context is a large area with significant density in the mobile home park and a very similar sized area of the larger lots the 10,000 and higher, originally zoned lots in the middle. To me the RS-5000 density for the parcels that we are looking at today are compatible. What we have is a transitional area that already has a critical mass of a population. There is certainly demand for housing in that area. We have a property owner who has come up with a way to get water to that area to support that level of density, I think is very consistent with the small area plan. The master plan that looks forward almost specifically addresses and tells us to do stuff like this where we can because the demand for housing in Colorado Springs is not going to decline. The demand is not the same as it was, it is significantly greater today and the places we have that can grow are places like this. This is the kind of thing we have to do in this county. People that have had the benefit of vacant land next to them are going to have to accept the fact that people want to live in close proximity to them. What was rural 30 years ago is not so rural anymore. I don't see any reason we should not rezone this land and approve this application.

Ms. Brittain Jack – I echo that. This is exactly what we have been looking at and what we've done in the eastern part of the county and in black forest, so I don't see the difference. It's across the street from Fort Carson and we need more density and we need more housing in this community because its growing and it's going to continue to grow.

Mr. Moraes – I look at the zoning of RS-5000 up north of Pawnee Road and I think that's a decent transition from a dense mobile home park to the 5,000 foot lots and now you hit Pawnee Road and there's that man made break right there and now you actually have development south of Pawnee Road. I look at the development on the south side. Where the minimum lot size is 5,000 square feet but I understand the current lot sizes are about 10,000. I can understand RS-5000 on the far south side. The southeast corner I can understand because it abuts the RM30 and the highway. I can't really make a case for the two larger lots. The far east side we have lots that are larger than an acre surrounding them and on the west side you have lots larger than an acre surrounding them. Now I have to look at the whole agenda item together and if approving all six of these development areas to RS-5000, I am not in support of that.

Mr. Risley – I think this is a fascinating project. I see the benefit of infilling and developing land that was difficult in the past to develop. This is no longer a rural area. In my mind I would rather see land like this developed than true forest land. I certainly understand the concerns of the neighbors and I think that is a situation where the devil will be in the details. We are looking at rezoning and when I look at the approval criteria, I think there is compelling support for a rezone of this nature. To **Mr. Moraes'** comments with having six different parcels the right approach. I think the applicant could have come in with a PUD and it would have created more density in a lot more different ways, so I think because of this approach there is some sensitivity to that aspect as well.

Ms. Ritchie - If a motion to approve fails, the item is deemed denied. If a motion denied fails, a motion to approve must pass in order to approve the item.

PC ACTION: BRITTAIN JACK MOVED/BAILEY SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM NUMBER 5, P-20-009 FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONE) FOR ROCK CREEK MESA, UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 27, CITING, 21-040, WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS DENIED (3-3). THE ITEM WILL GO TO THE BOCC. LUCIA-TREESE, TROWBRIDGE AND MORAES WERE THE NAY VOTES DUE TO DENSITY AND COMPATIBILITY.

The minutes were approved as presented at the August 5, 2021 hearing.

NOTE: For information regarding the Agenda item the Planning Commission is considering, call the Planning and Community Development Department for information (719-520-6300). Visit our Web site at www.elpasoco.com to view the agenda and other information about El Paso County. Results of the action taken by the Planning Commission will be published following the meeting. (The name to the right of the title indicates the Project Manager/ Planner processing the request.)