

**EL PASO**  **COUNTY**  
**COLORADO**

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, June 17, 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: TOM BAILEY, JOAN LUCIA-TREESE, SARAH BRITTAIN JACK, BECKY FULLER, TIM TROWBRIDGE, ERIC MORAES, AND GRACE BLEA-NUNEZ**

**PRESENT VIA ELECTRONIC MEANS AND VOTING: NONE**

**PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: NONE**

**ABSENT: BRIAN RISLEY, JAY CARLSON, AND THOMAS GREER**

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

**OTHERS SPEAKING AT THE HEARING: RAIMERE FITZPATRICK AND CHARLES COTHERN**

**Report Items**

- 1. 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, July 15, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.**

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



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

[www.ELPASOCO.COM](http://www.ELPASOCO.COM)

- b) **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**

**CONSENT ITEMS**

- 2. A. **Approval of the Minutes – June 3, 2021**  
The minutes were unanimously approved as presented. (7-0)

**B. SF-20-022** **HOWSER**

**FINAL PLAT  
WOODMEN HILLS FILING NO. 12**

A request by T-Bone Construction, Inc., for approval of a vacation and replat of one (1) commercial lot into two (2) commercial lots. The 1.64-acre property is zoned CR (Commercial Regional) and is located on the east side of McLaughlin Road, approximately one quarter (1/4) of a mile north of the Woodmen Road and Highway 24 intersection, and is within Section 6, Township 13 South, Range 64 West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel No.43063-01-002) (Commissioner District No. 2)

**PC ACTION: LUCIA-TREESE MOVED/MORAES SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM NUMBER 2B, SF-20-022, FOR A FINAL PLAT FOR WOODLAND HILLS FILING NO. 12 UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 19, CITING, 21-033, WITH EIGHT (8) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).**

**C. VR-20-004** **GREEN**

**VACATION AND REPLAT  
MOUNTAIN STATES SUPPLY AND REPLAT**

A request by BBP-740, LLC, for approval of a vacation and replat of a portion of a platted tract to create two (2) industrial lots. The portion of the tract totals 4.8 acres. The property is zoned M (Industrial) and is located southwest of the intersection of Electronic Drive and Marksheffel Boulevard and within Section 32, Township 13, and Range West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel No. 53320-02-019) (Commissioner District No. 2)

**PC ACTION: TROWBRIDGE MOVED/BRITTAIN JACK SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM NUMBER 2C, VR-20-004, FOR A VACATION AND REPLAT FOR MOUNTAIN STATES SUPPLY AND REPLAT, UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 49, CITING, 21-034,**

**WITH TEN (10) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).**

**CONSENT ITEM PULLED TO REGULAR**

Mr. Trowbridge requested to have the item pulled to be heard for a regular hearing due to concerns with density.

**D. SKP-20-002**

**GREEN**

**SKETCH PLAN AMENDMENT  
WATERVIEW NORTH**

A request by CPR Entitlements, LLC, for approval of a sketch plan amendment. The total sketch plan area consists of approximately 681 acres and is comprised of approximately 2,100 single-family residential units, 1,177 multi-family residential units, 92 acres of commercial land, 26 acres of industrial land, and 112.3 acres set aside for open space. The applicant has requested to amend the previously approved sketch plan to reduce the proposed commercial area from 38.2 acres to 22.1 acres and the industrial area from 78.9 acres to 26 acres to accommodate 1,260 additional single-family and multi-family residential units. The property is located within the A-5 (Agricultural) zoning district and is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Bradley Road and Powers Boulevard and is located within Section 9, Township 15 South, Range 65 West of the 6<sup>th</sup> P.M. (Parcel Nos. 55000-00-436, 55000-00-438, 55000-00-439, 55093-05-003, 55093-02-003, and 55092-00-003) (Commissioner District 4).

**Mr. Trowbridge** – I was noticing the significant change in density from prior single-family densities. For example, in phase two they had 865 units on 167 acres and with this replat they are proposing 850 units on 69 acres. Basically, the same number of units on the half amount of space. I just want to discuss the density. I'm not comfortable with that high of density. Also, **Mr. Moraes** had some comments on the airport lighting.

**Mr. Moraes** – The planner said they would pass my notes on the airport lighting improvements to the developer, so I am fine with that and need not discuss further.

**Ms. Ruiz** – In the 2018 sketch plan the total density was 2.9 dwelling units per acre and the amendment is going to be 4.8 dwelling units per acre. To compare that to the RS-5000 zone district which is our most dense conventional single family detached residential zone district. That equates to 8.7 dwelling units per

acre and the total number of dwelling units is going from 2,017 dwelling units up to 3,277 dwelling units.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – I had a total acreage of single family of 418 acres with 2,525 units for a density of about six for the entire sketch plan area.

**Ms. Ruiz** – The sketch plan area is 2.9 dwelling units per acre in 2018 and it is 4.8 is what they are requesting today and the total number of dwelling units that is being requested today is 3,277.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – Are you including the multi family in that? That may be the difference.

**Ms. Ruiz** – That's correct, multi-family is included.

**Mr. Moraes** – You're including the phase one in your numbers, right?

**Mr. Trowbridge** – I believe that is correct. She was looking at the whole thing.

**Mr. Moraes** – So really all this additional density is not happening in the entire area. It's really just happening where phase two and phase three are. So, you're increasing those number of homes in this smaller area. It looks like phase one is already developed or in the midst of development right now. I understand you're using the whole area, but the density is being packed in to just phases 2 and 3.

**Ms. Ruiz** – That is correct. Those are the areas that are included within the amendment.

**Mr. Moraes** – It would be interesting to see what the numbers are in that.

**Ms. Ruiz** – That may be something the applicant can provide in their presentation.

**Mr. Moraes** – It is a question I have because we aren't talking about the whole thing today, we're talking about phases two and three.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – I did do the calculation. The prior sketch plan from 2018 had 340.89 acres for single family and with this amendment they're increasing that by 69.4 acres for a total acreage of 410.3 for a single family. They added five acres for the multifamily area, they decreased the commercial area by 21 acres and the industrial area by almost 53. They're taking land from commercial and industrial and putting it into housing. There's no change in the park area. My concern is phase 3, they're putting 850 single-family units on 69 acres whereas in phase 2 they had 865 units on 166.9 acres. So, they are cramming as many units in less than half as much of space, and my question is are we ok with that?

**Ms. Ruiz** gave an abbreviated presentation and asked **Ms. Seago** to go over the review criteria for a sketch plan. She then introduced the applicants' representative, **Raimere Fitzpatrick**, to give their presentation.

**Mr. Moraes** - Was there any consideration about buffering residential next to I-2?

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** – Yes. There is a 90-foot buffer to absorb the use to use, the zone to zone buffers and setbacks that get created when you introduce residential adjacent to industrial. Because that residential is coming to the Industrial, that buffer is being absorbed by the residential properties. The Industrial zone has its own setbacks. There is a 50-foot setback in the I-2. So, when you introduce residential those setbacks increase in the industrial zones. Specifically, in the I-2 it becomes 130 feet. So, the idea was to absorb as much of that as possible so as to not create any additional burdens to the I-2 zone.

**Mr. Moraes** – In the Sketch Plan Land Uses table, P-19 is the only area where you combine single and multifamily residential. Everywhere else in the sketch plan land uses you separate the multifamily and the single-family and in P-19 you combine them. To me, it makes it confusing to follow. My second question is from the note on Sketch Plan dealing with Phase 3 single-family residential and it talks about P-20 to include multiple residential product types that can range between 20 dwelling units per acre and 4 dwelling units per acre. Are you telling me that there are single-family homes that will happen in phase 3 at the density of 20 dwelling units per acre? **Mr. Fitzpatrick** – No, my understanding is that this note was developed in cooperation with PCD staff to identify the mix of residential uses and densities within this area but allow it to be less fixed into the individual residential types because as this plan was being developed the market was responding to the prospect that there would be residential land that was available for development and to allow some flexibility in the final configuration of those land use types. So, if we needed to make some adjustments to decrease the amount of detached product we could do that without coming back for another amendment, or if there was an opportunity to increase the amount of town home development that could also be done. The primary focus in developing the residential densities was to respond to the market to provide attainable and affordable housing.

**Mr. Moraes** – What is P-20?

**Mr. Cothorn** - These designations were put on the sketch plan from the very beginning. You're asking me where P-20 is and I'm not seeing P-20 on the map right now? **Mr. Moraes** – Ok, so that's the issue I have. We're talking about something in phase 3 that doesn't exist anywhere on the document. Supposedly it's phase 3 single-family residential.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – I believe that's a typo. The table on the drawing says P-19 but the footnote says P-20.

**Mr. Moraes** – Let's say that is a typo and it is P-19. You have single family residential that can range up to 20 dwelling units per acre. So, a single-family residential lot can be about 2,300 square feet.

**Mr. Cothorn** – Through a PUD process it probably could. In response to the note we basically transferred that note from phase 2 to try and create some flexibility and the purpose is that so every time that the product type changes we're not back again adjusting the sketch plan but addressing it more in the preliminary plan.

**Mr. Moraes** – I understand that you want the flexibility there. I just can't imagine what single family product is at 20 dwelling units per acre.

**Mr. Cothorn** – I don't know that it's quite 20. I think what the point was that there was residential that could have those kind of densities. Maybe it's a townhome, maybe it's a duplex because it does give the full potential range of densities in there. **Mr. Moraes** – If you say it that way, then it should say all residential in phase 3 can go to 30 dwelling units per acre because that's really what your table with your average between six and twelve. **Mr. Cothorn** – I understand your question. When we started this, we knew we needed more residential. We spoke with the airport and they would say we have runways, lights, noise and then they would say we have a lot of employment centers here and we love your residential being close to us. We're trying to put all these needs together and as this has gone through the process to be frank, the townhome project is under contract for 210 units, the RS-5000 is under contract for 114 units. The commercial property is already under contract for development. The RM-30 area was focused around a specific user that wanted to have commercial and residential together, it's a veteran focus project. You hear things as a planner/engineer like having residential near employment centers, so people aren't driving miles upon miles.

**Mr. Moraes** – I'm not opposed to having residential in this area. I am trying to put two and two together to make sure that down the road that we are adhering to what's written. I'm just making sure the citizens in the future get what they were told that they would get. However, when I read your documents, it is making it all very confusing with a note about single family residential at 20 dwelling units per acre that may not actually be single family residential. The note needs to be fixed prior to BoCC approval to reflect reality.

**Mr. Cothorn** – I calculated what our actual density will be and it's going to be about 9.8 units per acre.

**Mr. Moraes** - Are those numbers set in stone?

**Mr. Cothorn** – Those are the maximum numbers per the sketch plan.

**IN FAVOR: NONE**

**IN OPPOSITION: NONE**

**DISCUSSION: NONE**

**PC ACTION: MORAES MOVED/TROWBRIDGE SECONDED FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM NUMBER 2D, SKP-20-002 FOR A SKETCH PLAN AMENDMENT FOR WATERVIEW NORTH, UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 35, CITING, 21-035, WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, AND THAT THE ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (7-0).**

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](http://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.)

The minutes were approved as presented at the July 15, 2021 Planning Commission hearing.