



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
Wednesday, May 5, 2021
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
200 S. Cascade Ave – Centennial Hall Hearing Room
Colorado Springs, Colorado

SPECIAL HEARING
9:00 a.m.

**PRESENT AND DEEMED VOTING MEMBERS FOR THE MAY 26, 2021 HEARING:
BRIAN RISLEY, TOM BAILEY, TIM TROWBRIDGE, BECKY FULLER, JAY
CARLSON, JOAN LUCIA-TREESE, SARAH BRITTAIN JACK, GRACE BLEA-
NUNEZ, AND ERIC MORAES**

PRESENT VIA ELECTRONIC MEANS: NONE

ABSENT: THOMAS GREER

**STAFF PRESENT: CRAIG DOSSEY, MARK GEBHART, NINA RUIZ, TRACEY
GARCIA, AND EL PASO COUNTY ATTORNEY LORI SEAGO**

**OTHERS SPEAKING AT THE HEARING: JOHN HOUSEAL, ANDREA BARLOW,
JUDY VON AHLEFELDT, TERRY STOKKA, KEVIN CURRY, AND ANN WERNER**

Regular Items
1. MP-21-001

**Adoption of Your El Paso Master Plan as the Master Plan for El Paso County,
replacing previously adopted County Master Plan elements**

El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department requests adoption of Your El Paso Master Plan as the El Paso County Master Plan for physical development of the County, pursuant to CRS 30-28-106. This master plan repeals and/or replaces the existing Policy Plan, Small Area Plans, and Sketch Plans as Master Plan elements, but retains the existing Topical Elements and the Drainage Basin Master Plans as elements of the Master Plan. The Master Plan area includes all land within El Paso County located outside the incorporated municipalities and

2880 INTERNATIONAL CIRCLE, SUITE 110
PHONE: (719) 520-6300



COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80910-3127
FAX: (719) 520-6695

www.ELPASOCO.COM

includes the accompanying maps, plats, charts, and descriptive and explanatory matter. The Master Plan is an advisory document to guide land use decisions.

Type of Hearing: Legislative

Craig Dossey gave an overview of the Master Plan agenda for the day and went over a brief history of the 2 ½ year process.

Andrea Barlow, Chair of the Master Plan Advisory Committee (MPAC), gave comments and thanks to all those involved in the process, Ryan Wanner, Becky Fuller, Sarah Brittain Jack, Matt Carroll, Mark Volcheff, Doug Stimple, Tim Trowbridge, Tom Bailey, Phil Thomas, Randy Case, Victoria Chavez, Lonnie Inzer, Crystal LaTier, Brian Potts, Ann Werner, Julie Sands de Melendez, and (parks). Ms. Barlow is representing the MPAC and recommends approval of the Your El Paso Master Plan on May 26, 2021.

Lori Seago gave the legal overview of adopting a County Master Plan. Adoption is a requirement of the local Planning Commission. CRS 30-28-106 gives that authority.

Mark Gebhart gave the staff presentation on the background of the entire Plan process. The current Plan consists of the El Paso County Policy Plan, ten County small area plans, topical elements, drainage basin plans, and older sketch plans. Your El Paso Master Plan will be used to share the vision of the County and to evaluate development proposals, and it establishes a regulatory framework coordinating regional and local initiatives. His presentation is on permanent file.

John Houseal gave the consultant presentation to the Planning Commission and public. He gave thanks to the staff support throughout the process. There are 14 chapters to the Master Plan (Introduction, Community Vision, Land Use, Housing & Communities, Economic Development, Transportation & Mobility, Community Facilities, Infrastructure, Military, Recreation & Tourism, Community Health, Environment, Resiliency, and Implementation).

Tom Bailey – There is consternation about the term “priority development areas.” Could you describe that more? **John Houseal** – The theory prevents the leap-frog development or the premature development. We anticipate growth in areas of development, but we will mitigate and minimize anticipated impacts related to development.

Grace Blea-Nunez – given your experience with other communities, how did we compare with public involvement? **John Houseal** – Your community did great. You’re never going to get a true sample size of the entire community, but the feedback we got was very thorough and very thoughtful. We sent the draft plan out to over 200 agencies, and over 3000 people participated in the process.

Mark Gebhart went over the project website with all the documents and the master plan. He further described all the outlets available to the public including the PCD webpage, the consultants' project webpage, newspaper articles, and legal notices.

Brian Risley – I'd like to add also that the Planning Commission had biweekly updates at all our PC hearings for the last two years.

Tom Bailey – I feel that there has been adequate opportunity for public comments, and I want to assure the public that we've seen every single comment and we've acted on every single comment with the Advisory Committee and with the staff and the consultant. It's been a robust effort to ensure we've had access to all the data and input received to date.

Jay Carlson – Does the Master Plan trump zoning? If someone brings a development plan to us and there is a current commercial zoning, but the MP says they want single-family housing, how does that work. **Mark Gebhart** – It's a guiding tool for the PCD staff to use in development actions. It does not change the zoning. Any development approval has to conform to the zoning in place or do a zoning change request.

Jay Carlson – How will it look to the PC, when we are asked to approve something and now the MP is added to our criteria. How much of it is going to be looked at or put forward for us to consider in looking at the implementation areas and specific suggestions? **Mark Gebhart** – Your current staff reports conforms to the small area plans and policy plan; the staff reports now will reflect the Master Plan.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Judy Von Ahlefeldt – The plan is still a fairly rough draft. PC please hold off approving. There needs to be meetings on each chapter and how they affect all future actions. The plan needs some rearranging. It would be easier to understand. Conservation design, easements, and environment should be showcased more and not buried in other chapters. The areas of change map have conflicts with open space. The PC needs to consider my concerns. She will provide her exhibits to the Clerk.

Terry Stokka – He would like an addition to the plan. "Due to the unique history, precedent and nature of the Black Forest, lot densities in the timbered area will be no less than 5 acres per lot." The preservation plan was in place for 47 years. It stated that lots in the timbered area should be no less than 5 acres. There is fire danger in more dense areas. The 2.5-acre lot size changes the zoning from RR-5 to RR-2.5. Conservation design needs open undeveloped land that supports trees, forest plants, wildlife and natural settings. The Plan doesn't have enough teeth to guide development. The Plan strips the Black Forest of the last protection it had to densities. Compatibility and conservation design promises are hollow. His slides are part of the permanent file.

Jay Carlson – Is the burn scar considered part of the timbered area? **Terry Stokka**
– The burn area is in the middle of the timbered area.

Kevin Curry – The Plan needs improvement. This is a very long-term plan that will advise you and the future Commissioners in considering development applications and land use decisions; but the plan lacks elements necessary to do that. The Plan needs to acknowledge the possibility of independent incorporation versus Annexation. The Plan fails to address what if any impact independent incorporation of municipalities might have of the plan. Address density transitions between residential placetypes. Every small area plan includes references to density transitions between placetypes, but this draft makes only one mention of it and fails to address policy on when they might be required or appropriate. Include discussion of special district and policy for them in terms of land use matters. Special districts are ubiquitous quasi-governmental agencies with independent powers and varying standards, yet the plan does not discuss how they impact land use decisions. Add substantive discussion of Special District (including Metropolitan District) and how they impact the plan and land use decisions related to all the services they provide, not just water. The draft is a good start, but it lacks necessary content. Don't be pressured to pass the plan if you think changes are appropriate. The slides he provided are part of the permanent record.

Ann Werner – Interim Planning Manager at PPACG – This has been a valuable process and great working project. Giving Military a specific placetype in the master plan is above and beyond what we imagined, so we are grateful. Letter shown

1. Recognizing USAFA's letter from Col. Hartless from 12 April 21 as submitted to the MP Advisory Committee
2. Recognizing and including all of the comments from Schriever AFB submitted to the MP Advisory Committee.

Tom Bailey – If we get this plan on the 26th, and staff has not been able to reconcile the requested revisions, then it still falls within what we can approve the plan and allows staff to make the final changes in the final publication such as grammatical changes. I would be comfortable with that as long as the Plan depicts the correct content.

Mark Gebhart – We may have all the changes resolved for the publication on May 26. There may be a few changes that Schriever AFB recommended (shown) that we still need to change.

Craig Dossey – Our goal is whatever we review on May 26 is as close as we can get to a perfect copy. I think that's a good way to proceed.

Tom Bailey – You highlighted for us the thought process that has gone into this whole process. The level of discussion and thought has been great.

Craig Dossey – I wanted to address **Mr. Curry's** comments about special districts. They are unique; we already have special district policies established and adopted by the BoCC. They may be dated, but we are trying to figure out when exactly we can update those policies. The City of Colorado Springs is also going through the process. I'd like to work with them to see if we can get universal policies as they relate to special districts. The functionality of special districts could be a part of a master plan, but the policies don't really belong in a master plan. Special districts are governed by state statute.

Jay Carlson – With the plan to be ready for annexation, when we are looking at special districts, are we trying for those to be connected to city services? **Craig Dossey** – Under the IGA, the City can require that services be built to city standards. There are a lot of policies in the Water Master Plan that address interconnections between city and county services.

Joan Lucia-Treese – Could you address Mr. Curry's points about density and independent incorporation? **Craig Dossey** – It puts us on one side of the issue with regard to independent incorporation. There has been no formal request at this time. They can legally incorporate under state law as it is. I don't think it should be part of the master plan. With regard to density transitions, in the plan (Implementation Chapter) we discuss the fringes and how to assess those areas. We talk about compatibility and placetypes. Placetypes are lines on a map.

Tim Trowbridge – Page 23 of the Master Plan talks about those density transitions and lays out the placetypes and describes how you want to keep those transitions. It's up to the PC to help guide that to make sure we keep those densities. **Craig Dossey** – The challenge is we are covering the entire County. If we were to say this is how all transitions need to happen, we will get it wrong. It needs to be more project-by-project based and use the recommendations as a guideline.

Eric Moraes – My biggest concern is flexibility in the Plan. I can envision at some point, we will see a request where we will be asked to extend that placetype. What we approve could cause the domino effect. As we adjust placetypes, we need to keep in mind that we could be affecting future development. **Craig Dossey** – I would agree. Those are all the things that you have to balance. There are so many competing interests and many obstacles that have to be considered.

Sarah Brittain Jack – When the SDS came up, is that in the City or County? There are areas that should be City. Why haven't they (wastewater plants, wind farms) already annexed those? **Craig Dossey** – Under state statute they can annex those areas immediately. The treatment facility is in the City but was permitted by the County. The wind farm is in the County but is on the grid and provides energy to whomever needs it.

Grace Blea-Nunez – Could you address **Mr. Stokka's** and **Ms. Von Ahlefeldt's** comments? **Craig Dossey** – The structure of the document was discussed in detail with the MPAC early on. I agree that the environmental impacts are important. We've done a good job of speaking on that. I'm very proud of having a chapter on the military, and you heard that **Ann Werner** expressed that as well in her testimony. The day to day use is framed much better than what we have in place now.

Tom Bailey – With regard to the discussion about including language to stipulate a minimum 5 acre lot size in the timbered area of Black Forest, it's important to note that Black Forest already has lots that are smaller than the 5 acre lots that they suggest is the norm. The lot we own in Black Forest is less than 3 acres. What swayed me against putting language in the master plan is that the master plan is a guiding document and not a regulatory document. The intent was to make a plan that is applicable across the county and it should not include limitations that are only applicable to one area like the timbered area of BF. Zoning can change, but to change it takes people that own that property who want to do something with their own land. I appreciate that it is a very specific request, but it doesn't meet the reality and the level of coverage and detail of this plan. That's why we said we weren't going to include that and were content with the 2.5-acre size limit for that placetype versus imposing a 5-acre limit. **Craig Dossey** – Drawing rigid boundaries is a very short-sighted thing to do. Things will change and will continue to change. Those living in Black Forrest aren't all living on 5-acre lots. The concept of this plan is to provide flexibility based upon compatibility. Stringent inflexible standards could lead to a worse development than having a quality development plan.

Tim Trowbridge – I second everything Tom just said. In the document under Large Lot Development, it says the County should maintain and enhance the character.

Eric Moraes – The only thing I can see is to adjust the rural placetype and modify it to extend more to the west.

Craig Dossey – There are thoughts out there that the City or County might initiate rezones once a master plan is made. That is not our intent. There are so many things that you'll be able to consider with the placetypes as they are written.

Jay Carlson – By the time it gets to PC, it's hard to say sorry go back and do something again. As far as density, couldn't there be something else in place that allows a reasonable transition so that it's not left to us to make that decision. We don't want to undo the work that's already been done. How many zones can you have single-family detached? **Craig Dossey** – Many. You see it at so many different levels of the development process. Sketch plans will be based on the master plan, then the PUD depicts roads and lots, but at the zoning stage, there is little detail or investment at that stage. The closer you get to the final plat stage, the less discretion there is. When the master plan comes in at the higher level, the planner/developer will review those placetypes. The age of the small area plans hindered the County's

ability to set standards. The master plan equips the Planning Commission to now see those things earlier in the process.

Brian Risley – The purpose is a guiding tool, a framework. It does not spell out every scenario. It gives us the latitude to see how it fits. Zoning is different than planning. I focus on what is the spirit and the intent of the document. I don't see a document that says we want rampant development across the County. I see plans for smart growth. I acknowledge that growth will happen, so let's be smart and intentional on how it will occur. This is an overarching guiding document.

Becky Fuller – Can you comment on **Mr. Stokka's** comments on density and The Ranch? **Craig Dossey** – There are some fairly older lots and the City has grown into that area. Higher densities are occurring because of the growth pressures and the need for more housing.

Joan Lucia-Treese – No one likes change, no matter where they live. Don't assume that overnight everything will explode in development. Development takes time. It will take many years to see that kind of development. **Craig Dossey** – That's right. Even looking at annexations, that's going to take some time. They can take on some areas, but they have to be able to provide central services. The collaboration with the City is exactly what this region needed. The nation is about 10 million houses short and that deficit is growing. One solution is the extension of CSU services. We need to set expectations now and this plan will guide us in doing that responsibly.

Jay Carlson – Throughout the master plan, it talks about increasing density. It promotes high density in infill areas. It's concerning to me in section HC2, it talks about density bonuses for large acreage development. **Craig Dossey** – We want to make sure that if it's a priority to entertain affordable housing, we don't want to preclude that opportunity. It is a tool to incentivize some of these other kinds of amenities. **Tom Bailey** – The density bonus isn't going to allow you to put it anywhere. The zoning is still a part of that conversation. It's not intended to be a free card. It's not going to put urban density in the middle of Black Forest. **Jay Carlson** – It states it in large lot, so it reads like it could. **Craig Dossey** – It does not override the process of rezoning.

Eric Moraes – When I read through the master plan, I look at suburban residential, do we expect to see more along the lines of the 5 homes per acre or are we expected to see 2 lots per acre? Developers will look for areas that allow them the greatest density. **Craig Dossey** – There are so many factors that go into that. The compatibility section comes in to play. As development becomes denser, the investment in the development gets larger, such as central services, infrastructure, roads, etc.

Eric Moraes – With regard to accessory living quarters, we are missing the concept of residential and commercial. There should be an incentive on incorporating those areas

Sarah Brittain Jack – Does it refer to more opportunity for more kinds of affordable housing? **Craig Dossey** – Our plan does allow for many different scenarios that will allow more types of the housing we need.

Grace Blea-Nunez – Can you respond to the comment regarding the timing and the public's ability to review the plan and whether or not that should be extended? **Mark Gebhart** – Regarding the timing and the extension, it's not been an ideal world. There have been three versions of the plan that's been out there for review. We placed chapters 1-13 out first so that we could have it reviewed prior to the Implementation Chapter. After the MPAC met and approved things, we put another version out there. **Craig Dossey** – The public still has another three weeks to review. We will take additional public comment on the 26th. If you cannot download the plan, you can review it at the office. I struggle to see there wasn't adequate time. Regarding the Colorado Natural Heritage agency, the information is generally in the Parks Plan. The areas she (Ms. Von Ahlefeldt) speaks on is considered "wish lists" according to the Parks Department.

Eric Moraes – For staff, when I look at Chapter 14, page 147, it says go to page number next to the strategy, it doesn't say who is responsible. **Mark Gebhart** – One of the challenges is there are many agencies responsible for making the strategies happen. At one point we started to list them, but the list got so long that it wasn't feasible. **Eric Moraes** – To put the responsibility on the PCD department, I don't feel like it's PCD's responsibility but maybe another agency. The strategies may not be able to be accomplished. In Chapter 14, page 141, it states update regularly. Three years seems too long. A lot of strategy brackets are set up as three-year brackets. As a Planning Commission, we should get an update to see if strategies are being completed. I'd like to see an annual report on how those strategies are being accomplished. **Craig Dossey** – The County Strategic Plan is updated every five years, but can occur more or less frequently depending on budget, etc. The master plan timeline was decided but again depends on budget, change in circumstances, etc. I'd like to update it as often as we can, but if I don't get a budget it doesn't get done. **Eric Moraes** – Not a rewriting of the plan, but more of an update of the strategies and goals. **Craig Dossey** – I can see that. I have no problem committing that when I do my annual report, I will include those strategies in there.

Joan Lucia-Treese – We want to be careful not to get into micromanagement of the staff. I think they do a great job keeping us up to date. I don't want to see an artificial timeframe put on the plan.

Brian Risley – Are you recommending those two items be modified (to Mr. Moraes)?

Eric Moraes – I'd like to see additional commercial uses be allowed in Mountain Interface, where supporting uses doesn't include commercial as a use type. **Craig Dossey** – We could say limited commercial in Mountain Interface.

Grace Blea-Nunez – Other quickly growing cities have had the issue of not enough childcare. Some cities recommend that when commercial developers come that they allot a space for daycare. It was a growing problem before the pandemic, and it's worse now. **Craig Dossey** – I look at that as a regulatory issue. A childcare center is a commercial business, so we allow for that.

Tom Bailey – Stating an intent in 2-3 years to review the plan, I think we know things will change, agencies and entities supplied their info, that could change easily, but it doesn't change our review of a land use application. I think the timing specified for reviewing and updating the plan is adequate. **Craig Dossey** – All of this is market driven and conditions. **Brian Risley** – Would it suffice to say on an as-needed basis or as requested by the Planning Commission could be a change to the update of the master plan? **Craig Dossey** – We are happy to supply that any time.

PC ACTION: NO PC ACTION AT TODAY'S HEARING. THE NEXT HEARING IS A CONTINUATION HEARING OF THIS DATE ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 2021 AT 9:00 A.M. WHERE THE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL VOTE ON THE ADOPTION OF THE MASTER PLAN.

Planning Commission Meeting
Wednesday, May 26, 2021
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
200 S. Cascade Ave – Centennial Hall Hearing Room
Colorado Springs, Colorado

SPECIAL HEARING
9:00 a.m.

PRESENT AND DEEMED VOTING MEMBERS FOR THE MAY 26, 2021 HEARING:
BRIAN RISLEY, TOM BAILEY, TIM TROWBRIDGE, BECKY FULLER, JAY CARLSON, JOAN LUCIA-TREESE, SARAH BRITTAIN JACK, AND ERIC MORAES

PRESENT VIA ELECTRONIC MEANS BUT NOT VOTING: THOMAS GREER

ABSENT: GRACE BLEA-NUNEZ

STAFF PRESENT: CRAIG DOSSEY, MARK GEBHART, NINA RUIZ, TRACEY GARCIA, MINDY MADDEN, KARI PARSONS, JOHN GREEN, RYAN HOWSER,

**MERCEDES RIVAS, LAUREN TOSTENSON, AND EL PASO COUNTY ATTORNEY
LORI SEAGO**

**OTHERS SPEAKING AT THE HEARING: JOHN HOUSEAL, JUDY VON
AHLEFELDT, BRUCE BRIAN, STEVE LENZO, WALTER LAWSON**

Regular Items

1. MP-21-001

**Adoption of Your El Paso Master Plan as the Master Plan for El Paso County,
replacing previously adopted County Master Plan elements**

El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department requests adoption of Your El Paso Master Plan as the El Paso County Master Plan for physical development of the County, pursuant to CRS 30-28-106. This master plan repeals and/or replaces the existing Policy Plan, Small Area Plans, and Sketch Plans as Master Plan elements, but retains the existing Topical Elements and the Drainage Basin Master Plans as elements of the Master Plan. The Master Plan area includes all land within El Paso County located outside the incorporated municipalities and includes the accompanying maps, plats, charts, and descriptive and explanatory matter. The Master Plan is an advisory document to guide land use decisions.

Type of Hearing: Legislative

Mr. Dossey welcomed the Planning Commission and public to the meeting. The schedule will show the background of the master plan process, advertising, consultant's presentation, redline itemized changes to the master plan, and another opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Gebhart gave a short background on the master plan, but did not repeat all of the May 5th presentation. **Mr. Risley** – It's important to note that this body has had updates every two weeks during regular Planning Commission hearings.

Mr. John Houseal gave an overview of the entire process including public participation opportunities, public feedback, and how revisions were made to the master plan to bring it to today's adoption.

Mr. Gebhart shared the last set of comments received pertaining to proposed revisions to the master plan including textual changes in a Bluebeam format so the Planning Commission could see each area of wording changes.

Mr. Trowbridge – Could you talk a little about the maps? They are illustrations but the actual maps come from the GIS system. **Mr. Gebhart** – We are a big county and a large amount of land is represented but it was challenging to get to a parcel level. Maps are generally done in GIS format.

Mr. Trowbridge – As the map changes, isn't appropriate to say that when we need to revise it, we will use what is in place at that current time. **Mr. Gebhart** – We are tying the maps to today in the plan. **Mr. Dossey** – This is a snapshot in time that shows what the areas are now, but when staff evaluates applications, they will look at what it is at the time of review.

Mr. Trowbridge – My perception is that we would go through a process like we are today to adopt changes to the plan in a year or so. **Mr. Gebhart** – Yes, they won't be as extensive as they are now most likely, but changes will happen. We don't think we want to be bound to a yearly update, but that will be determined as needed. **Mr. Bailey** – I can envision a broad range of updates if and when annexations happen, and the plan reflects that as well as other things like aquifers drying up or a complete revamp of the entire plan 10-15 years from now. I fully support and strongly agree that it must be a continual process. We are focused on this product, the plan today. The process now turns to the next steps of implementing these recommendations which will continue and will help us identify those more administrative updates that may need to occur. We will have a lot of latitude in the future and it reinforces to me the value of the process and how much this was needed in the County. We don't want our plan to become a 30-year outdated plan. **Mr. Dossey** – I don't see this as the end to anything, but only the beginning. It's unacceptable to have 30-40-year-old small area plans out there. It's my plan to have yearly check-ins on the master plan and determine if there are small or large proposed revisions. I would say at a minimum of every 10 years, there will be a more large-scale revision to the master plan but incorporate small changes possibly yearly. **Mr. Risley** – This is hopefully created a mind-set shift in the County in viewing land growth and should be evaluated yearly to see if changes are necessary. If there are dynamic shifts in the County, the plan should reflect that. **Mr. Dossey** – One area that we know will change the plan already is annexations by the City of Colorado Springs. I appreciate the expectation and discussion that we've heard to continue to update the plan.

Mr. Carlson – Is the airport overlay for Meadow Lake airport need to be included in the plan? **Mr. Dossey** – We are currently working with the airport on their 1041 permit, it has to start there. **Mr. Elliott** believes the County has failed them in not doing it, but we can't do anything for them until we get their 1041 application.

Mr. Moraes – On page 88, Transportation Section, there's a sentence there that speaks on compatible uses around airports. I believe that it should be under Meadow Lake airport as well or as a general statement under all airports. Denver Council of Governments states it applies to all then why wouldn't it apply to Meadow Lake? I think the MMLAA needs to be involved, and it would be interesting to see if they could be interactive to protect that land that they want preserved. **Mr. Dossey** – That's not a master plan element, that is specific negotiations we need to have with Meadow Lake. **Mr. Moraes** – We need to be smart in the planning around all airports. **Mr. Dossey** – If there is a desire to move that sentence, then we could put it under

general, but private and public airports are regulated differently. **Mr. Bailey and Mr. Trowbridge and Mr. Risley** – all agree to the move so it's a generic statement.

Mr. Trowbridge – You stated you had 200 external agencies that were sent the plan for their review. How many significant changes do you think you received? **Mr. Gebhart** – We've gone through three versions of these plans, and there were 75 minor comments on the last version. There were 3 or 4 that were fairly significant. The first version had approximately 275 comments. **Mr. Trowbridge** – There's been lots of eyes on this document and has been pretty well vetted in my opinion.

Mr. Carlson – Earlier we talked about changes in the future, you mentioned the maps can't be drilled down. Are there directions as to how the public can get to that data? **Mr. Gebhart** – The challenge is this is a 600 mb document. The document will be applied to the GIS system. Currently they are linked to the main County webpage, the department's webpage, and the project webpage. **Mr. Dossey** – I plan to have printed versions available to the public for a fee. We could speak to GIS to see if we can make some of those maps easier to access and navigate. There are some licensing constraints.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Bruce Bryon – I am a resident of Black Forest. I'm a retired psychologist and executive coach. I am a native of Colorado Springs. I have a wide diversity of contact and dealing with people. Without disparaging the work that has been done, there is one thing missing. It talks about land and not people. I understand what you do, and it will affect lives for decades. I chose to live in Black Forest because of the culture. This plan changes our area. You could double the population by adding that component in. There are many implications to do that. Water is affected, rural areas get lost. We cannot allow Black Forest to go there. We want to keep the five-acre standard. I can guarantee developers will come in there and change the culture of that area. If HOAs take over the area of Black Forest, the culture will be affected.

Mr. Steve Lenzo – I've lived here for less than a year. Today was the first time I looked at the plan. I have one comment regarding water resources. The plan predicts a significant increase in population and increased drought. Without any additional water resources. With no indication of where the water comes from, the plan needs to be loudly articulated in the plan for the future. It requires a change in how we live, how we landscape our yards, etc. This plan should at least call it out and acknowledge the seriousness.

Mr. Walter Lawson – I ask that you have a readable book for residents to use. The print is small and very hard to read. There is plenty of white space and room to expand the font. It needs a descriptive index and glossary. The public safety issue of emergency evacuation is under the purview of OEM, but I'm asking for a few changes to enhance their role. It would result in reducing response and evacuation times. I would like to ask that on page 134, the map depict the Broadmoor to Ft.

Carson wildfire. Create a chart that will give information on evacuation of 41,000 Black Forest residents. Land use planning is the only way this is going to change. Emergency access is needed but evacuation egress routes are needed more.

Ms. Lucia-Treese – I was dismayed to receive your email yesterday (from Judy Von Ahlefeldt). It was sent to the PC and not to staff. It is inappropriate and unprofessional to solicit members outside a hearing with information. You owe this PC an apology.

Ms. Judy Von Ahlefeldt – I apologize but I feel like my information was not provided as requested.

Mr. Bailey – You have continually mischaracterized your input to the MPAC and to this body, and you need to understand that we have all seen everything that you have sent. At some point, you stop reading it because you give us so much information and repeat the same information over and over again, it loses something for me. Just because you haven't seen it shown on a screen, doesn't mean we haven't seen it when your comments have been provided to us. Our charge is to read it and consider it. The fact that we don't talk about it doesn't mean we haven't considered it. Today we are talking about a master plan that is specifically designed to develop unincorporated El Paso County. The fact that we don't agree with your suggestions doesn't mean we haven't read and considered them. We are giving you an opportunity to come back here and address us again, and I hope you don't repeat things we've already seen. If you have something to add, we will listen to you. The public input has been fairly weak because people just don't seem to care, but the handful of people who do care don't get to write the plan. We don't need a dissertation. The implication from the public comment is that the MPAC and the Planning Commission are not eligible to speak for the County. That's not true. We've been involved in this process for a considerable amount of time. We have a very specific charge in this process and the implication when someone emails me the day before a hearing saying that I haven't done my job is offensive and not helpful to the process. We've been subject to this for far too long. Please make this worth my while.

Ms. Judy Von Ahlefeldt – I am not criticizing the PC; I'm criticizing the process. I sent item analyses to **Mr. Gebhart**. The environment, water and transportation were my main topics. I asked for a reordering of chapters. I found that the plan was organized by issues and concerns at the beginning of the process and had little to do with impacts on people or environment. There's too much white space, font is too small. I'm begging you to accept it as a draft and open back up to the public for more review.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Dossey – This is not a final plan; it's a plan that will continue to change. It's been a rigorous process to get to this point. Staff would appreciate an opportunity to take those recommendations and bring you a modified plan.

Mr. Carlson – I think it's a great document. I would like to see the gentleman's comment regarding the font size be dealt with. I would also like to see it downloadable. More direction of assistance of how to view it at the front office and online will be helpful. **Mr. Dossey** – Accessibility to the document to everyone is important to me. So, we will look at more options and give you that information at a later time as to what we've done.

Mr. Trowbridge – The title of our document can have a lot of different connotations. It's not a detailed, here's everything plan; it's an overarching plan. We tried to capture all the different concepts that we need to consider as we look at development. There are many subdocuments that drive down to that level of review. I think it's a great document.

Ms. Lucia-Treese – This was a 2 ½ year process. I think it is an outstanding plan and am very pleased with the final product. We take the responsibility very seriously to ensure that we are working towards the very best final product to show that we have an overarching product to go through the growing development.

The Planning Commission took a lunch break at 12:00 noon. The meeting will reconvene at 12:30 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 12:30 p.m. A quorum is still in place; all the same voting members are accounted for that were present at the beginning of the hearing.

Mr. Gebhart presented the proposed changes to the Planning Commission.

FURTHER DISCUSSION

Mr. Trowbridge – If staff discovers any additional tweaks or changes, then the resolution should state they are empowered to do so. **Mr. Gebhart** -- That is specifically in the resolution.

Mr. Carlson – We had a change in access to a subdivision and reduced the number of access points to one in the last PC hearing. Does the plan provide the requirement for two access points? **Mr. Gebhart** – The LDC states there will be 2 access points with 25 or more lots.

The Plan is scheduled to be certified by the Board of County Commissioners on June 22, 2021. Any members who would like to attend, we encourage you to do so.

Mr. Trowbridge – Do we need a condition to take into account the Parks Master Plan when it is revised. **Ms. Seago** – If Parks Master Plan comes before you then it supersedes the notation in the master plan. I would suggest we take it one step at a time.

Mr. Dossey – I'd like to recognize **Mark Gebhart** for his amazing work on the master plan. His 34+ years of experience with the County has, and will, leave a legacy to this County for many years. I want the other planners to remember this day that this plan changed the course of the County for many years to come. Thank you all for the time you've put into this effort. We are very blessed for each of you and for Mark for this huge undertaking.

PC ACTION: MR. BAILEY MOVED TO APPROVE AND ADOPT THE MASTER PLAN, FILE # MP-21-001, USING THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION AND INCORPORATING ALL THE PROPOSED CHANGES AS PRESENTED AT TODAY'S HEARING. MS. LUCIA-TREESE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS TAKEN AND THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. (8-0). MR. GREER ABSTAINED FROM VOTING DUE TO NOT BEING ABLE TO WATCH/VIEW THE ENTIRE 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 minutes were approved as presented at the June 17, 2021 hearing.