



COMMISSIONERS:  
MARK WALLER (CHAIR)  
LONGINOS GONZALEZ, JR. (VICE-CHAIR)

HOLLY WILLIAMS  
STAN VANDERWERF  
CAMI BREMER

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
CRAIG DOSSEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Planning Commission Meeting  
Thursday, January 7, 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, SARAH BRITTAIN JACK, TIM TROWBRIDGE, BECKY FULLER, JAY CARLSON, JOAN LUCIA-TREESE, AND ERIC MORAES**

**PRESENT VIA ELECTRONIC MEANS AND VOTING: GRACE BLEA-NUNEZ**

**PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: NONE**

**ABSENT: BRIAN RISLEY AND THOMAS GREER**

**STAFF PRESENT: CRAIG DOSSEY, MARK GEBHART, NINA RUIZ, RYAN HOWSER, GILBERT LAFORCE, JACK PATTON, LUPE PACKMAN, ELIZABETH NIJKAMP (VIA REMOTE ACCESS), AND EL PASO COUNTY ATTORNEY LORI SEAGO (VIA REMOTE ACCESS)**

**OTHERS SPEAKING AT THE HEARING: DAVE GORMAN, TOM SPITZA, DEBRA EILAND, DANIEL NIEMAN, GUY AND KRISTIN MAHONEY, MARK RATTS, TIM MCGEE, STEVE SWANSON, WADE WILSON**

### 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, February 4, 2021 at 1:00 p.m. There will be no Planning Commission hearing on Thursday, January 21, 2021.**

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. He also gave building permit numbers for year-end 2020.
  - c) **Mr. Dossey** introduced **Ms. Lupe Packman** as a newly hired engineer for the department. Welcome Lupe!
- B. Public Input on Items Not Listed on the Agenda – Ms. Fuller** – Grants will be offered for businesses again.
2. **A. Sunshine Law – Ms. Lucia-Treese** read the statement into the record and made the motion to approve. **Mr. Moraes** seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (8-0)
- B. Approval of the Minutes – December 17, 2020**  
The minutes were unanimously approved as presented. (8-0)
- C. U-20-002** **HOWSER**

**APPROVAL OF LOCATION  
SECURITY FIRE STATION 4**

A request by Glen Investment Group No. II, LLC, and Security Fire Department for approval of location to allow for a new fire station. The property is zoned CS (Commercial Service) and is located at the northeast corner of the Mesa Ridge Parkway and Powers Boulevard intersection and is within Section 28, Township 15 South, Range 65 West of the 6<sup>th</sup> P.M. (Parcel No. 55282-00-005) (Commissioner District No. 4)

A member of the audience requested that the item be pulled to Regular. It will be heard as a full presentation.

**Mr. Ryan Howser** gave a brief overview of the project and asked **Ms. Seago** to go over the review criteria and CRS statement for an approval of location. He then introduced the applicants' representative, **Mr. Dave Gorman**, to give their presentation.

**Mr. Carlson** – The access coming onto Mesa Ridge seems like a bad place for access. I would think noise is going to be significant as well as acceleration of the trucks and lights. **Mr. Gorman** – We did propose an access onto Mesa Ridge without a light, but the County is not willing to offer that access. It was decided to concentrate on the Wayfair access. The trucks will leave the station

with full lights and sirens on, as required, but they expect only 1-2 calls a day. The safety provided by the sirens and lights outweighs the inconvenience.

**Mr. Carlson** – It appears that the commercial portion of that site also only has access onto Mesa Ridge. Is there no other access? **Mr. Gorman** – It's a principal arterial and it's ¼ to ½ mile distance requirement. So to add a lane, would also require a median.

**Mr. Howser** then gave his full presentation. **Ms. Packman** gave the engineering findings report.

#### **IN FAVOR: NONE**

#### **IN OPPOSITION:**

**Mr. Tom Spitza** – (His emailed correspondence is on file.) We are in favor of the location subject to meeting some conditions with lighting, noise, and traffic. We were advised that the building would be much more compatible to the surrounding homes in the neighborhood. I'm not favorable to the picture that was shown. Regarding traffic, the clues of striping and lights do not protect people. The statement about significant study of accidents located there. Well that's why we are looking into the safety issues now and not when someone is hurt or killed. There is potential for a serious accident on East Mesa Ridge Parkway and Wayfair. It's very dark and dangerous. We need lighting there.

**Mr. Carlson** – Are you looking for a traffic signal at Wayfair and East Mesa Ridge Parkway? **Mr. Spitza** – We need lighting, striping, and possible traffic signals to warn people of that dangerous area.

**Mr. Gilbert LaForce** – This application met all the requirements for no TIS (Traffic Impact Study) required. The large commercial lot that is adjacent will trigger that TIS and we can do the analysis at that time when its warranted. The lighting is not in the criteria as a requirement. A signal would not be required until it's also warranted after a period of time of monitoring. **Mr. Bailey** – Are those things addressed at the time of a site plan application? **Mr. LaForce** – Yes, those things are addressed at the site plan stage.

**Mr. Gorman** had a chance for rebuttal. The presence of the fire station will not become a safety hazard but more of a benefit to have those services in the area for its residents.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Moraes** – I noticed some fire stations, not all, have traffic lights strung across the road to indicate a fire station. It's just something to think about during this process.

**Ms. Seago** – I just wanted to make a note for the PC to remind you this is a rare occasion where the PC has the final vote and not a recommendation that goes to the BoCC. Pursuant to state statute, if the PC disapproves it, the Fire Board has the authority to overrule the disapproval and place the fire station under state law regardless of the Planning Commissions' recommendation.

**Ms. Fuller** – There was concern about the lighting, the fire truck is going to be full of lights to signal its intention. This service is needed, and I am in favor of this location.

**Ms. Lucia-Treese** – I will be in favor and I live very close to this area. This fire station is very much needed for this area. I also live in an area that receives mutual aid from other agencies. This service is desperately needed.

**Mr. Bailey** – The approval of location is just the first step and there will be a site development plan. All those concerns will be addressed at the appropriate time.

**PC ACTION: LUCIA-TREESE MOVED/MORAES SECONDED FOR APPROVAL OF CONSENT/MOVED TO REGULAR ITEM NUMBER 2C, U-20-002, FOR AN APPROVAL OF LOCATION FOR SECURITY FIRE STATION #4 UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 11, CITING 20-001 WITH FOUR (4) CONDITIONS AND ONE (1) NOTATION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0).**

**Regular Items**

**3. VA-18-005**

**RUIZ**

**VARIANCE OF USE  
ROCKY TOP CAMPGROUND**

A request by G&D Enterprise, Corp., for approval of a variance of use to legalize an existing Recreational Vehicle Park, Recreation Camp, and Automobile and Boat Storage Yard. The 9.32 acre property is zoned C-2 (Commercial) and is located northeast of the Highway 24 and Lucky 4 Road intersection and within Section 9, Township 13, Range 68 West of the 6th P.M. (Parcel No. 83092-00-011) (Commissioner District No. 3)

**Ms. Ruiz** gave a brief overview of the project and asked **Ms. Seago** to go over the review criteria for a variance of use.

**Mr. Carlson** – For disclosure, I'm in the commercial real estate business, and I have a listing adjacent to this property, but I believe I can make an impartial vote today.

**Ms. Ruiz** asked the applicants' representative, **Ms. Debra Eiland and Mr. Daniel Nieman**, to give their presentation.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – Could you explain your extended stay program? **Mr. Nieman** – Tour season is 5 months of a lot of campers coming to our area. Outside of that we have campers who want to stay for extended periods.

**Ms. Blea-Nunez** – What percentage of the sites are occupied during extended stays? **Mr. Nieman** – 100%.

**Ms. Fuller** – I would like you to go through the approval criteria and exceptional circumstances. **Mr. Nieman** – I do not have experience in this type of forum. The hardship is that the property had been run very similar to this prior to me owning it, including the extended stay and storage. If it's not full, my mortgage is based on it being full, so that is a financial hardship. **Ms. Fuller** – In your due diligence, was there any indication that all these uses were allowed? **Mr. Nieman** – We were able to repair the wastewater system and bring it up to code. Then we repaired the roof/awning of the hotel. It was my own ignorance to not understand what a C-2 zoning was and what was allowed. I felt that I was operating it the same as it had been operating.

**Ms. Blea-Nunez** – I have a question regarding compatibility and how this fits in with the neighboring community? **Mr. Nieman** – There are no residential homes abutting the area. There's a lot of open space.

**Mr. Carlson** – Isn't there an RV storage business adjacent? **Mr. Nieman** – That business is closing as we speak; the church has purchased it for more parking.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – Was the RV storage in place when you bought it? **Mr. Nieman** – it was already existing, I just relocated it.

**Mr. Bailey** – I'd like clarification of legal non-conforming uses vs. unauthorized uses. **Ms. Seago** – A legal non-conforming use is a use that was legal at the time it was established, either because it complied with the zoning at the time or it was in use before zoning for that property was established and then if zoning changes rendered that use illegal, that previously established use become legally non-conforming as long it was not abandoned or expanded. Unauthorized uses are those uses not allowed in a zoning district in the Land Development Code.

**Mr. Carlson** – For the hotel, do you limit the time people can stay if it's for tour season or for extended stay? What percentage is short term rentals? **Mr. Nieman** – 90% short term rentals. We do not limit the time they stay.

**Mr. Moraes** – How long is the longest someone has stayed? **Mr. Nieman** – 9 months. One person stayed longer as a caretaker of the property as an employee of mine.

**Ms. Ruiz** then gave her full presentation and answered questions from the Planning Commission. **Mr. Patton** gave the engineering report/findings.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – Could you summarize the changes that have taken place? Are there restrictions on a green house? **Ms. Ruiz** – The outside RV storage area is very new, and the campground was expanded. We rely on aerial imagery. (showed multiple aerial photos spanning many years).

**Ms. Fuller** – What is allowed in the C-2 zone district? **Ms. Ruiz** –There are a lot of allowed uses in C-2, we can pull up the permitted uses chart 5-1 if needed.

**Mr. Carlson** – My concern is not necessarily the number of campsites or the RV storage, but what is concerning is the extended stay part. They are asking for some waivers on the LDC for the extended stay. **Ms. Ruiz** – Our definition for a recreation camp is for tents, and an RV park definition there is no time limit. There is no need for a waiver of the requirement. Our code requires paving for 25 or more spaces, but these are not designated spaces.

**Ms. Fuller** – I looked at the CDOT application, one thing that glares at me is it states Teller County. Has this been completed correctly? **Ms. Ruiz** – That is probably in error. We have followed up with CDOT and they are not ready to give that access yet. We haven't heard that they are leaning towards denying the access, we just don't have their final word yet.

**Ms. Fuller** – I'm irritated because visually it's disappointing. I can understand why the neighbors are upset.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – I'd like to get specific numbers to how many campsites, what type they are and how many storage spaces are allowed. I'd like condition number four amended to show specific numbers. Ten years from now, another owner comes in, we will end up back here without the specific numbers locked down.

**Ms. Fuller** (to applicant) – Did you put in the RV storage after you purchased it? **Mr. Nieman** – Yes I did. **Ms. Brittain Jack** – Did you move it from the center of the property to the outside? **Mr. Nieman** – Yes, I did.

**IN FAVOR: NONE**

**IN OPPOSITION:**

**Mr. Wade Wilson** – I live at the only house that is adjacent to this property. The LOI said that it is in need of significant repairs and will be a hardship on **Mr. Nieman** due to the expense. They continue to use the southern part of the property for RV storage. They would have to make the fence 20 ft tall for me to not see their RV storage. They were continually asked to stop, and they came here wanting to ask for forgiveness instead of doing it the right way. I am concerned how this will affect my well. I've had their tenants yelling at me across the fence. Safety is an issue. The pictures speak volumes. I've stayed at Rocky Top Campground in the past: I have fond memories of it; but this is not how they are operating now.

**Mr. Guy Mahoney** – My wife and I have been owners in the area since 2009. We have had difficulties with Rocky Top with various types of pollution such as debris and trash. It is evident that they had folks for extended periods of time. Some of the noise occurs at night with generator noise. Erosion has occurred with the use of the land. It was a quaint place that was occasional campers, but now there are people there all the time. We don't like the fencing. We are suggesting that the quality of life in our neighborhood will be impacted. I trusted El Paso County to protect the interest of all residents. It was zoned residential. The uses of that property are harmful to our properties and will bring a subclass type of residents there. They have failed to be good neighbors. I hope El Paso County protects our interests.

**Mr. Tim McGee** – I am separated by the campground by four properties. I am a private property rights kind of guy but also a rules follower. They have changed the visual impacts, and not in a good way. The fence that was ill-conceived and has caused erosion to the roads we use to get in and out of our property. I don't believe they are meeting setback lines. I appreciate the fact that he probably overpaid for the property, but I can't just put people in my yard to help pay for it either. He should be expected to have the property meet the requirements. If he is allowed to keep the RV storage up front, it will cause even more of a blight. I do not appreciate that my property value will go down for him to become more solid in his investment.

**Ms. Fuller** – Before he expanded to the perimeter of the property, did you mind what was there? **Mr. McGee** – No I didn't, there were trees and adequate setback from the road.

**Mr. Steve Swanson** – I live 50 yards from their property line. For the record, there are about 10 houses surrounding this property. I've been here since the 90s. It was pretty low key, almost closed down in the wintertime. Sewer lines, electric lines are going all over. There's more and more campers and full-time residents. He's wanting to put 60-70 RVs on the property. There are some RVs that have up to 5 people living in them. That's horrible for the water and for the neighborhood. Everyone in the area has signed petitions against this. The front of the property was a rolling meadow, now it's covered in RV storage.

**Mr. Mark Ratts** – I own the property adjacent to the hotel. One of the things that I haven't heard addressed is the fire access with regard to Lucky Ford Road. I understand the fire department wants it widened to better serve the area for fire protection. When they get into storage, that is more of a commercial or industrial use. I don't have as much against the residential living part.

**Ms. Kristin Mahoney** – I would like to add that when we first purchased the property, we checked with that property, and we were comforted with the structures they had and not expanding. I am very alarmed by the more recent expansions. Our roads have been impacted. It seems like people are coming now to look at for sale units as well.

The applicants had an opportunity for rebuttal. **Ms. Eiland** -- The number of campsites has been 72 and has been that number through the Assessor's website. **Mr. Nieman** does not have 72 sites and is not asking for that. His site plan asks for 60 RV sites and 7 tent sites for a total of 67 sites for camping. As far as parking in the RV storage area, there is space for 29 RVs on the east and 6 RVs on the west, for a total of 35 RVs. With regard to the expansion, he added the RV storage on the front of the property. He also added the tent sites on the boundary of Lucky Ford Road. Over the years, you can see that things have moved and/or added. It was not as organized in past years where there are designated sites now. He would like formal approval of those sites that he laid out. He would like the use as it is today legal. The greenhouse that has been mentioned, it is not a commercial greenhouse; it's a very small greenhouse for his wife to grow some vegetables. It's not for guests and will not be selling from it. The error on the access permit should say El Paso County and not Teller County. We have been in touch with CDOT for the access permit. Valerie Sword is looking at it with CDOT. Not all campers use Lucky Ford Road. The drainage that occurs on the road is naturally occurring and it is not the responsibility of Rocky Top. The well was adjudicated in 1972 so it's superior to other wells drilled after. **Mr. Nieman** – I'd invite anyone to come see what we are doing.

**Ms. Fuller** – The complaint came in when? **Ms. Ruiz** – In June 2018.

**Ms. Fuller** – Was that about the time that you started building the wall? **Mr. Nieman** – the fence was built in 2017, but other changes happened in 2018.

**Mr. Carlson** – Some of the folks that spoke in opposition, said they could only find a roofing permit and not other permits, how did you not get permits? **Mr. Nieman** – **The County** did not find the 2018 permit for the wastewater; I'm not sure why. That was engineered. We have 60-70 year old lines that need maintenance. Things had to be maintained and upgraded. There was no time for permits when it was emergency work.



**Mr. Carlson** – Does the mafia blocks require engineering or a permit? **Mr. Nieman** – If you stay under 4 feet or under you don't need a permit.

**Ms. Lucia-Treese** – When did you first become aware that you were not in compliance? **Mr. Nieman** – in 2018. That's when **Ms. Eiland** was retained, we started it back in 2018.

**Mr. Moraes** – Are there any setback requirements for tents? **Ms. Ruiz** – only for structures. However, there are landscaping setbacks and that would be reviewed at the site plan phase.

**Mr. Moraes** – If we denied this and this were to revert back to original use, is there any requirement for fencing? **Ms. Ruiz** – The only fencing that we would require is for the outside storage which has zero non-conforming status. Our LDC allows us to have the site brought up to today's standards if they are adding a new use which if this reverts back, would not apply.

**Mr. Moraes** – There was a concern about selling RVs in the storage area. Is that allowed? **Ms. Ruiz** – It's not allowed. Additionally, as we require 100% screening, so no one should be able to see that from the road. **Mr. Moraes** – But an owner could put an ad in the paper to come see their RV for sale at Rocky Top. **Ms. Ruiz** – If we found out that this was a lot that allowed RV sales, it could be a reason for revocation of the variance.

**Mr. Carlson** – If we don't allow any variance today, the only thing he could operate is the motel? **Ms. Ruiz** – He would have to remove outside storage and go back to using the spaces that were in existence before it became legal, non-conforming. He would still be able to have the hotel.

**Ms. Fuller** – He can have the hotel and 72 camping sites only? I'm really concerned about the long-term stay as well. Once it started to encroach on the adjacent properties and became visually unattractive, that's when the neighbors expressed opposition. **Ms. Ruiz** – Are you suggesting that you only approve part of the request for a variance and exclude the outside storage? **Ms. Fuller** – Yes I'm leaning that way. We could nix those as not allowing the outside storage and the encroaching areas and be able to define how many sites.

**Mr. Dossey** – Under LDC, I make the decision on these situations. We use aerial imagery to see scale and changes over time. I would caution you from simply relying on the Assessor's Office information. We tend to be lenient on disturbed areas. You are being presented with a variance of use, and unless the applicant says they want just to consider the outside storage, then you are tasked to look at that. You have to look at the entire request as the variance.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – Would the site development plan address drainage and if the concrete blocks are impacting the roads with erosion? And would it change required screening? **Ms. Ruiz** – We have identified that a drainage report will be required. We would look at whether they are in compliance with the ECM and not changing those historic flows.

**Mr. Carlson** – There is no determination how long someone can stay in an RV? **Ms. Ruiz** – That is correct.

**Mr. Moraes** – For the neighbors, if this doesn't survive in the C2, there are a lot of other uses that the neighborhood would not be happy with that is not a campsite.

**Mr. Bailey** – This is indicative as to where we are as a County as we continue to transition from the rural areas from the 80s and 90s. This use has been in place for 70 plus years. The fact that new people come and want to change Colorado from what it wasn't is something we deal with at every hearing. I am persuaded by the fact that the original use has been there for a long time, and I don't see where the changes are so drastic that we shouldn't approve this variance. I just think that this is difficult, but it's why we are here to listen to the public.

**Ms. Fuller** – I will respectfully disagree with **Mr. Bailey**. I don't think that the applicant has met the burden. Due diligence wasn't done. Clearly this was kind of a funky use and no one had an issue with it until the expansion happened. I don't think it's very neighborly or fair. On that standpoint, I don't believe the applicant has come prepared to show why this use is necessary or compatible. I would encourage the applicant to do a better job of how they are meeting the criteria.

**Ms. Brittain Jack** -- I grew up here and spent a lot of time in Green Mountain Falls area. This is not a new use. I would encourage them to be better neighbors but going back to the original use is not helpful.

**Ms. Lucia-Treese** – I don't like the asking for forgiveness and not permission. Ignorance is no excuse. I am concerned that this has been going on since 2018. I don't have an issue with extended stays. I have an issue with the applicant not proving to me a hardship if the variance is denied. I don't think he has brought together a cohesive presentation. I don't care if you aren't comfortable, but your legal counsel should have advised you to do better and be more prepared.

**Mr. Trowbridge** – How we vote is not an endorsement or an objection. I'll echo comments to the applicant. Your presentation was not done very well. I would expect you to be better prepared for the BoCC. I'm a private rights person too, but this is a commercial property and changes the rules a bit. My biggest concern is with the RV storage and not paying attention to the drainage on the west side. Also, keeping the

trash within the confines of the property is a concern. I cannot support this application.

**Mr. Carlson** – You may get turned down here and again at the BoCC. Does the applicant wish to change their variance request?

**Ms. Blea-Nunez** – I do agree with **Ms. Fuller** and **Ms. Lucia-Treese**. I'd ask that they narrow their request and be better to their neighbors.

**Ms. Lucia-Treese** – If the applicant would like to do something different for the BoCC, then that could change perhaps, but what is in front of us today, we have to vote either for or against in its entirety.

**Mr. Dossey** – If the applicant feels like moving forward with a vote is not in their best interest, they may continue to another meeting or withdraw. If they modify going to the BoCC, then it's not based on your recommendation.

**Mr. Bailey** – Does the applicant wish to request a continuance of this item? **Ms. Eiland** – We would like to request a continuance to February 4, 2021.

**PC ACTION: BLEA-NUNEZ MOVED/LUCIA-TREESE SECONDED TO CONTINUE REGULAR ITEM NUMBER 3, VA-18-005, FOR A VARIANCE OF USE FOR ROCKY TOP CAMPGROUND TO FEBRUARY 4, 2021. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (8-0).**

4. LDC-20-001

RUIZ

**EL PASO COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT  
FIRE PROTECTION AND WILDFIRE MITIGATION**

A request by the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department to amend Chapters 1, 5, and 6 of the El Paso County Land Development Code (2019) to remove discrepancies and add and modify language to eliminate the term "Fire Marshal". The proposed revisions, in their entirety, are on file with the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department.

**Type of Hearing: Legislative**

**Ms. Ruiz** gave a brief overview of the project and asked **Ms. Seago** to go over the review criteria for a land development code amendment.

**Mr. Moraes** – Is it illegal to shoot fireworks off when the El Paso County Sheriff implements a fire ban? And can we have a disclaimer to those purchasing fireworks in addition to the one currently required that setting fireworks off in El Paso County during a ban is illegal? **Ms. Seago** --- Yes, it is illegal to shoot off fireworks when

there is a fire ban. **Mr. Moraes** – Since we make fireworks sellers inform those that purchase fireworks that it is illegal to shoot off fireworks inside city and town limits; I believe we should also tell them that it is illegal to shoot off fireworks in El Paso County when the Sheriff implements a fire ban. We probably will not catch everyone that buys fireworks from outside El Paso County, we will at least inform those that purchase inside the County. **Mr. Dossey** – I would caution you on putting conditions in that we aren't able to enforce. People can simply go to Wyoming and buy fireworks and bring them to El Paso County. It's out of our control to be able to enforce. **Mr. Moraes** – All I am saying is that if we are telling them one thing to keep them out of trouble, we should also tell them the other thing to keep them out of trouble, and prevent a fire. **Ms. Seago** – I understand Mr. Moraes' suggestion to amend the signage requirements is not in any way asking the Planning Department to enforce the fire ban or fireworks restriction. It is just to amend the signage requirement that says if you are going to require a sign that notes the city fireworks ban, maybe consider adding similar language for the County. **IN FAVOR: NONE**

**IN OPPOSITION: NONE**

**DISCUSSION:**

**PC ACTION: TROWBRIDGE MOVED/BLEA-NUNEZ SECONDED FOR APPROVAL REGULAR ITEM NUMBER 4, LDC-20-001, FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND WILFIRE MITIGATION, UTILIZING RESOLUTION PAGE NO. 7, CITING 20-003, AND THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (8-0).**

- 5. El Paso County Master Plan – Information Update – No Action Needed – No update was given at today's 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](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.) If the meeting goes beyond noon, the Planning Commission may take a lunch break.

The minutes were approved as presented at the February 4, 2021 hearing.