

Meggan Herington, AICP, Executive Director
El Paso County Planning & Community Development
O: 719-520-6300
MegganHerington@elpasoco.com
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

Board of County Commissioners
Holly Williams, District 1
Carrie Geitner, District 2
Stan VanderWerf, District 3
Longinos Gonzalez, Jr., District 4
Cami Bremer, District 5

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING RESULTS (UNOFFICIAL RESULTS)

Planning Commission (PC) Meeting

Thursday, August 15, 2024, El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle – Second Floor Hearing Room
Colorado Springs, Colorado

REGULAR HEARING, 9:00 A.M.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND VOTING: THOMAS BAILEY, SARAH BRITTAIN JACK, JIM BYERS, JAY CARLSON, BECKY FULLER, JEFFREY MARKEWICH, TIM TROWBRIDGE, BRYCE SCHUETTPELZ, AND CHRISTOPHER WHITNEY.

PC MEMBERS VIRTUAL AND VOTING: NONE

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: MR. SMITH (Voted on last item. File # ID243).

PC MEMBERS ABSENT: BRANDY MERRIAM

STAFF PRESENT: MEGGAN HERINGTON, JUSTIN KILGORE, KYLIE BAGLEY, RYAN HOWSER, LISA ELGIN, KARI PARSONS, EDWARD SCHOENHEIT, DANIEL TORRES, HAO VO, MIRANDA BENSON, MARCELLA MAES, ERIKA KEECH AND LORI SEAGO.

OTHERS PRESENT AND SPEAKING:

1. REPORT ITEMS

Ms. Herington – advised the board that on September 5th, Mr. Ryan Howser will present to the board a report on the implementation of the El Paso Master Plan. This presentation is part of the Master Plan’s scheduled reporting, which occurs every 2 to 3 years since the last report, the Commission has requested this update.

Mr. Kilgore - NONE

2. CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE HEARING AGENDA (NONE)

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Adoption of Minutes for meeting held August 1st, 2024.

PC ACTION: THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT (9-0).

**B. PUDSP2210
HOWSER**

**PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT / PRELIMINARY PLAN
THE ESTATES AT CATHEDRAL PINES**

A request by Villagree Development, LLC, for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 35.09 acres from RR-5 (Residential Rural) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) with approval of a Preliminary Plan depicting 8 single-family residential lots, 2 open space tracts providing 2.5 acres of open space provisions, 2.3 acres of easements for open space preservation, and 1 private road tract. The property is located on the west side of Winslow Drive, approximately 1 mile northwest of the intersection of Shoup Road and Milam Road. (Parcel No. 6200000411) (Commissioner District No. 1)

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

DISCUSSION

Mr. Bailey – stated that it was noted that one comment was added late this morning regarding the application. The chair inquired if anyone from the audience with concerns about the application was present and intended to speak on the matter. No concerns were expressed.

Mr. Trowbridge – stated I have a question for engineering. In reviewing the report, I noticed a waiver for the road construction. Additionally, the letter of intent mentions some deviations from the ECM (Engineering Construction Manual). Are the ECM deviations intended to be included in the waiver for the road construction?

Mr. Howser – agreed with Mr. Trowbridge on his first statement that this is more of an engineering question. Mr. Schoenheit was the engineer on this project.

Mr. Schoenheit– explained that we have the waiver for the private road and internal private road itself. One of the deviations is for the block length of the access road coming off the public road.

Mr. Trowbridge – stated that he thought there were four or five ECM deviations that just mentioned line of sight and intersections spacing.

Mr. Schoenheit- stated that the line of sight was rectified. It had been taken care of where the intersection is going to go off Winslow. Those lines of sight have been met. The entrance has been relocated slightly as they build up the entrance to the subdivision will be taken care of. We have gone out and vetted that with the developer as well for the line of sight down Winslow. That is not a concern. Is there a specific deviation?

Mr. Trowbridge – I wanted to make sure that those deviations were included or implied with the approval of the waiver that was being requested. The waiver was the only thing I saw in the staff report and was not sure if it was all picked up within the resolution. I am just asking that everything the applicant needs is included.

Ms. Herington – stated that the deviations are separate from this process and the waiver process. The waiver is only for the private road. The deviations would not be picked up specifically in the resolution because those are all approved or denied by engineering separately.

Mr. Trowbridge – asked if everything has been handled?

Ms. Herington – answered yes.

Mr. Trowbridge – answered sometimes we do see those.

Mr. Bailey – asked if there were any more questions.

PC ACTION: MARKEWICH MOVED /BRITTIAN JACK SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3B, FILE NUMBER PUDSP2210 FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT / PRELIMINARY PLAN, THE ESTATES AT CATHEDRAL PINES, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH SEVEN (7) CONDITIONS AND FIVE (5) NOTATIONS, ONE (1) WAIVER AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICIENCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DEPENDABILITY, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (9-0).

IN FAVOR: BAILEY, BRITAIN JACK, BYERS, CARLSON, FULLER, MARKEWICH, SCHUETTPELZ, TROWBRIDGE, WHITNEY.

IN OPPOSITION: NONE.

COMMENTS: NONE.

**C. SP232
HOWSER**

**PRELIMINARY PLAN
THE COMMONS AT FALCON FIELD**

A request by Falcon Field, LLC for approval of a 57.67-acre Preliminary Plan depicting 169 single-family residential lots, 8 commercial lots, and 7 open space, utility, drainage, and right-of-way tracts. The property is zoned CR (Commercial Regional), RS-5000 (Residential Suburban), and RM-12 (Residential, Multi-Dwelling), and is located on the South side of East Highway 24, at the intersection of East Woodmen Road and East Highway 24. (Parcel Nos. 4307000001 and 4307200015) (Commissioner District No. 2)

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

DISCUSSION

Mr. Trowbridge – had another engineering question regarding drainage. Mr. Torres there was a note in the report about continuing drainage study. I know that drainage in that area has been an issue in the past. Could you elaborate more particularly what you are waiting on from the applicant regarding drainage, is it volume, flow rate, or something like that?

Mr. Torres – answered we are not waiting on anything right now; it is a Preliminary Plan. Only the hydrology is provided. The applicant has an approved conditional letter of map revision from FEMA for that flood plain where that drainage is. There will be further analysis with the final drainage report that will provide the hydraulics of that drainage channel there. Currently in the Preliminary Plan they are identifying to be conveyed a box culvert then it will transition back to regular open channel. With the final drainage report we will have a lot more detail and further analysis downstream as the Staff report identified all the way down to possibly Falcon Highway because that is of concern. We won't have the final details until the final drainage report.

Mr. Trowbridge – stated there was a note that they might have to amend their plan based on what the study showed.

Mr. Torres – answered even though it is not required we would want further analysis of the downstream for them as well as to what would be required to improve. It is not required but if for some reason that analysis turns that there may be some changes to the Preliminary Plan then a Preliminary Plan amendment would come back and get it approved in that regard.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR DISCUSSION.

PC ACTION: CARLSON MOVED / TROWBRIDGE SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ITEM 3C, FILE NUMBER SP232 FOR PRELIMINARY PLAN, THE COMMONS AT FALCON FIELD, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH FIVE (5) CONDITIONS AND THREE (3) NOTATIONS, AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICIENCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DEPENDABILITY, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (9-0).

IN FAVOR: SCHUETTPELZ, CARLSON, TROWBRIDGE, FULLER, BRITTAIN JACK, WHITNEY, BYERS MARKEWICH, AND BAILEY

IN OPPOSITION: NONE

COMMENTS: NONE

**D. P229
BAGLEY**

**MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
WINDERMERE SOUTH ZONE CHANGE TO RM-30**

A request by Windsor Ridge Homes for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 9.25 acres from RS-5000 (Residential Suburban) to RM-30 (Residential Multi-Dwelling). The property is located 7653 Mardale Lane and is directly southeast of the intersection of North Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road. (Parcel No. 5329416011) (Commissioner District No. 2)

PC ACTION: THIS ITEM WAS PULLED TO BE HEARD AS A CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEM PER MS. FULLER'S REQUEST.

**E. CS242
BAGLEY**

**MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
VILLAGE AT LORSON RANCH REZONE**

A request by Matrix Design Group for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 9.73 acres from PUD (Planned Unit Development) to CS (Commercial Service). The property is located directly northeast of the intersection of Fontaine Boulevard and Marksheffel Road. (Parcel No. 5515413054) (Commissioner District No. 4)

NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR DISCUSSION

PC ACTION: SCHUETTPELZ MOVED / BYERS SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ITEM 3E, FILE NUMBER CS242 FOR MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), VILLAGE AT LORSON RANCH REZONE, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH THREE (3) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS AND NO FINDINGS OF WATER SUFFICIENCY THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (9-0).

IN FAVOR: FULLER, TROWBRIDGE, CARLSON, SCHUETTPELZ, BRITTAIN JACK, WHITNEY, BYERS, MARKEWICH, AND BAILEY.

IN OPPOSITION: NONE

COMMENTS: NONE

**F. VR239
BAGLEY**

**VACATION AND REPLAT
FALCON RANCHETTES FILING NO. 1A**

A request by Galloway & Company, Inc., for approval of a 9.604-acre Vacation and Replat creating two commercial lots and one tract. The property is zoned CS (Commercial Service), and is located at 11750 and 11690 Owl Place, and is directly northwest of the intersection of Meridian Road and Owl Place. (Parcel No. 5301001001 and 5301001002) (Commissioner District No. 2)

NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR DISCUSSION

PC ACTION: TROWBRIDGE MOVED / CARLSON SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ITEM 3F, FILE NUMBER VR239 FOR VACATION AND REPLAT, FALCON RANCHETTES FILING NO. 1A, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH TEN (10) CONDITIONS AND ONE (1) NOTATION, AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICIENCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DEPENDABILITY, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (9-0).

IN FAVOR: BRITTAIN JACK, WHITNEY, BYERS, MARKEWICH, FULLER, TROWBRIDGE, CARLSON, SCHUETTPELZ, AND BAILEY.

IN OPPOSITION: NONE

COMMENTS: NONE

4. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS

**3D. P229
BAGLEY**

**MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
WINDERMERE SOUTH ZONE CHANGE TO RM-30**

A request by Windsor Ridge Homes for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 9.25 acres from RS-5000 (Residential Suburban) to RM-30 (Residential Multi-Dwelling). The property is located 7653 Mardale Lane and is directly southeast of the intersection of North Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road. (Parcel No. 5329416011) (Commissioner District No. 2)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Markewich – asked about the traffic light. We are putting money in escrow has the City of Colorado Springs traffic department estimated as far as to when that light will go up.

Mr. Houk – answered No, we did not get a final date on that.

Mr. Carlson – asked about access on to Antelope Ridge, is it too busy to have an access point over there?

Mr. Houk – answered yes it does not meet the distance. We do have two accesses on to the neighboring streets.

Mr. Smith – asked is the utilities property direct to the South is that the propane facility?

Mr. Houk – answered it is a substation.

Mr. Smith – asked if there is any concern about leakage or fire? I know there has had a problem in the past putting numerous houses nearby is that an issue.

Mr. Houk – stated there were no comments that came through with Colorado Springs Utilities or Staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

In Favor – NONE

Mr. Bazemore – spoke in opposition as a long-time resident of Pronghorn Meadows. The property in question is directly adjacent to my backyard and those of my neighbors. Initially, I hadn't considered the concerns raised by Mr. Smith regarding the city-owned propane plant, but as a retired Fire Chief, I am acutely aware of the hazards associated with propane. I have been concerned for the past eighteen years about the potential devastation an explosion could cause to our community. While this not mentioned in my letter, it is a significant concern.

In my letter, I noted that the surrounding property is Mardel Lane. We are discussing a change from RS-5000 or RS-6000 zoning, which applies to my property, to RM-30. Based on my calculations, RM-30 could allow for as many as 278 units on the property. I understand from the gentleman's presentation that RM-30 could accommodate approximately 8 to 12 units per acre, potentially resulting in around 118 units. However, if the zoning changes to RM-30, the new or existing owner could develop up to 278 units, depending on the compliance with the RM-30 code. This could lead to significant infrastructure issues, especially concerning traffic.

There is a Charter school nearby, and with no busing or mass transit available, traffic congestion on Antelope Ridge and Barnes is already severe. This morning, at 8:30 A.M., I had to bypass the first entrance to my neighborhood due to extreme traffic backups. I believe the County needs to conduct its own traffic study, as the current situation would only worsen if RM-30 zoning is approved. This is a major concern for both me and my neighbors.

Regarding water concerns, it is difficult for any hydrologist to predict when Cherokee will run out of water. We have been under water restrictions for 18 years. I am here to express these concerns and am open to any questions.

Mr. Bailey – clarified that at this stage of the process, we are evaluating a rezoning request. Many of the concerns raised will be addressed at a later stage, once a final plan is developed, if the rezone is approved. Issues such as traffic and water are significant as the County continues to grow. However, I want to clarify that the safety concerns related to the city's propane plant are not directly related to the application. While it is a concern for area, it does not pertain to the current rezoning request.

Mr. Bailey – asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak on this item.

Mr. Coleman – stated that for several years, I took my grandson to that school, and I can attest to the traffic issues mentioned. I have experienced firsthand sitting in traffic from Peterson Road all the way down to Antelope Drive and Carefree. The congestion is so severe that you often must do a zipper merge just to get through. On some occasions, you can be stuck in that line for up to one to one and half hours.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Brittain Jack – asked is someone can tell how long the propane plant has been there?

Mr. Bailey – replied for the record that someone from the audience said it has been there about twenty years. If staff can find that information, we can have it available for the County Commissioners when they hear this item with our recommendation.

Mr. Bailey – called up the applicant to make any additional comments.

Mr. Houk – stated that he would like to offer a few quick comments. The propane plant is a regional issue and is not directly related to the current development proposal, which involves a modification of the existing land use plan. We considered various density options for the RM-30 zoning, but due to significant topographical constraints and the need to manage stormwater from the northern part of the development, maximizing density is not feasible. The intent was to explore what might be possible, but the topography remains a major limitation.

We do acknowledge the concerns about traffic, particularly give the school's impact during peak times. We are actively working with the Colorado Springs Traffic Department to address these issues, and our discussions have helped to elevate the importance of traffic management at that intersection.

Mr. Whitney – asked what you're saying is that while RM-30 zoning permits significantly higher density, the practical constraints of the topography and other factors limit the feasible development to approximately 12 to 18 townhomes.

Mr. Houk- answered we are looking at about 12 units per acre. They allowed 30 at this point.

Mr. Byers – stated 118 townhomes approximately.

Mr. Byers – asked do you have any idea if there are any lane improvements that will come along with the traffic signal? There are issues with the left turn.

Mr. Houk – stated the left turn has bigger challenge with the traffic heading south. The light will create some windows for those turns. They have already done some work to expand the left-hand turn lanes heading towards Marksheffel.

Mr. Byers – stated that Marksheffel is controlled by the city now in that area.

Mr. Houk – answered Yes, we will be adding a deceleration lane into the development from the northbound lane, which will help alleviate some traffic at the intersection. Mr. Houk brought up Mr. Hodson from LSC Traffic Consultants.

Mr. Hodson – mentioned that their study fully incorporates the school traffic, with counts taken during peak school times-both in the morning and just before the main afternoon commuter peak. We observed that the school previously had a program to stagger the exiting traffic, releasing vehicles in batches to create gaps in the flow. However, we are unsure if this program is still in place. This traffic management could impact the ability to turn in and out of side streets along Antelope Drive by creating those gaps, though this effect was not fully reflected in the numbers.

Ms. Bagley – answered the question about the power plant. It was built in 1974.

Ms. Fuller – stated I appreciate the discussions regarding water. It seems that Mr. Baezmore's concerns are specifically with the Cherokee Water District, as they will be responsible for providing a well-served letter. The county does not conduct its own traffic or water engineering reports; these are provided by the applicant. We cannot overrule a licensed engineer's findings.

I understand the frustrations of dealing with school traffic – I lived two doors from Steel Elementary School for 16 years and experienced firsthand the difficulties of accessing your driveway during peak school times. However, the school is likely the primary traffic generator, not the proposed development. Given the location at Carefree and Marksheffel, higher density housing at busy intersections is not unusual.

In my view, the location seems appropriate for this rezone. The presence of utilities and the propane facility, which has been there for a long time, does not significantly affect the decision. As a community, we must ensure that unsafe facilities are not tolerated, but I believe the applicant is fulfilling their obligations. Therefore, I will be in favor of the rezone and do not believe it is the applicant's responsibility to address school traffic issues.

Mr. Trowbridge – pointed out that water and traffic considerations are not part of the current criteria for this rezone. These issues will be addressed in the Preliminary Plan stage. It would be interesting to see a comparison in the traffic study between RS-5000 and RM-30 zoning. A delta analysis from the applicant could provide valuable insights into this.

As Ms. Fuller mentioned water availability is not something we have significant control over. If the applicant has the necessary letter of intent and the county attorney's analysis confirms the sufficiency of the water, we are bound to accept it.

Mr. Whitney – stated that for Mr. Baezmore, it may seem counterintuitive to approve a rezone if there is already a potential water problem, assuming that is the case. As previously mentioned by panel members, even if this rezone is approved, it does not mean the project is finalized. While the rezone itself might be approved, the project still requires proof of adequate water and sufficient traffic management as part of the Preliminary Plan review. This process is far from over. The current discussion is only about the RM-30 rezoning; we have not yet reviewed or approved the actual project.

Mr. Bailey – pointed out to remember we are only making a recommendation at this point for the Board of County Commissioners the final decision is theirs. This item will go to them on September 12th, 2024.

PC ACTION: FULLER MOVED / SCHUETTPELZ SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CALLED-UP ITEM 3D, FILE NUMBER P229 FOR MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), WINDERMERE SOUTH ZONE CHANGE TO RM-30, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (9-0).

IN FAVOR: BRITTAIN JACK, BYERS, CARLSON, FULLER, TROWBRIDGE, WHITNEY, MARKEWICH, SCHUETTPELZ AND BAILEY

IN OPPOSITION: NONE

COMMENTS: NONE

5. REGULAR ITEMS

A. U241 ELGIN

APPROVAL OF LOCATION BOCES

A request by Pikes Peak Board of Cooperative Educational Services (“PPBOCES”) for Approval of Location to allow for the placement of an 86.38-acre campus comprised of secondary education facilities for vocational training, campus housing, and a community water system. The project is proposed to be constructed on an existing BOCES parcel. The 86.38-acre property is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Judge Orr Road and Elbert Road. (Parcel No. 4200000362) (Commissioner District 2)

Mr. Bailey – asked Ms. Seago to explain the process of how the Approval of Location works.

Ms. Seago – County Attorney – explained the Approval of Locations applications are submitted under Colorado revised statute 30.28.110 which requires that public projects such as schools, power plants, fire stations any kind of public building, public facility come to the planning commission of the county of which it is located to seek approval of the location of that facility. Under the statute the objective is to give the Planning Commission an opportunity to review the siting of that facility against the county’s Master Plan. According to the statute the Planning Commission can vote to approve or vote to deny the project. If it does vote to deny the project, then the application can be referred to the governing body or the governing board of the entity

that's proposing the project and they then can take action to approve the project and move forward with development. This board does then have its full discretion to approve or deny the project if it chooses to deny however then the governing body would have an opportunity to take another look at it and approve it nonetheless.

Mr. Bailey –clarified that we are not recommending we are approving that this will not go to the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Seago – County Attorney –answered that is correct this does not go to the Board of County Commissioners.

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Carlson – asked can you tell us more about the buildout itself, the height of the buildings?

We heard someone is concerned about a water tower. I saw firefighting as one of the teaching categories. Is their going to be a training tower 3 or 4 stories tall that they train in. Are any of those things going to be involved?

Mr. Breshinsky – answered that when we initially began, we reached out to the community to identify needs. For example, we spoke with Falcon Fire, who expressed interest in having a local training facility, as they currently must travel to Kiowa for training. While it's uncertain if this will materialize, it remains a consideration.

Additionally, there are plans underway to develop a centralized water system to support our campus. The housing we're discussing is intended to accommodate teachers for rural districts, addressing the current challenge of hiring teachers. Our goal with affordable housing is to include it as part of a benefits package to attract quality teachers from outside areas like Miami-Yoder, Peyton, Calhan, and Elbert. This initiative aims to enhance the quality of education in rural districts by providing better housing options for educators.

Mr. Carlson – stated I am concerned about the height of structures out there.

Mr. Guman – stated we have included a aviation easement on the plot plan submitted with this application, which we are committing to with Meadow Lake Airport and Colorado Springs Airport. We will ensure no towers are constructed on the property and will adhere to the height limitations for the A-35 district.

Additionally, we are proposing a couple of water tanks integral to the community water systems for this facility. These tanks will be similar in size to the one at the Saddle Horse Ranch

development, located immediately to the northwest of this property. The tanks are approximately 40 feet tall.

Mr. Carlson – asked if they were putting up 60-foot towers?

Mr. Guman – answered No.

Mr. Markewich – stated the scale of the project is obviously large. Do you intend to build it in phases? Are you going to build it in phases and bring the students in phases? How is that going to work? What is the plan for the phasing?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered we do have a phasing plan. Our focus is rural. Other districts are going to want to take advantage of our facility. It will be about 100 kids to start.

Mr. Markewich – asked if you build out and occupy the campus, the teachers and the single-family homes what would the maximum enrollment be?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered I have no idea probably about 500.

Mr. Bailey – asked if the students are going to be the residents on this campus or are they bused in for the school day then they leave?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered the residence will be for the school district staff to have somewhere affordable to live.

Mr. Bailey – stated there seems to be a large misunderstanding in the community as to what the intent is. We saw some objections based on the students getting out.

Mr. Bershinsky – answered we have talked about the programs we have. We do not want to keep kids 24 hours a day. Eight hours a day is enough that entails a lot more problems to house kids overnight.

Mr. Markewich – asked if there would be any dormitories or apartments?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered No.

Mr. Bailey – stated thank you for clarifying that is key.

Mr. Schuettpeiz – asked about the housing with about 120 units and enrollment maxed out at 500. I am assuming that is not just for teachers on that campus. That is space for the teachers at the school districts around there that they can utilize and be able to use. Correct?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered Exactly. If Miami-Yoder needs an English teacher in the future, our vision is to include affordable housing as part of their compensation package for teachers in Miami-Yoder. This campus will not replace or take over a significant number of instructors for this campus alone. Instead, we aim to address the broader issue of attracting and retaining staff across rural districts.

Mr. Trowbridge – asked will the housing sales be restricted to the instructors at the school?

Mr. Guman – stated there are no sales proposed for this project. This will be a land lease situation where BOCES would act as the developer, potentially in collaboration with one or more construction trades programs. The homes envisioned are between 800 and 900 square feet and may be built by students on the campus. These homes would be wholly owned by BOCES and are not intended for sale.

Mr. Trowbridge – asked will residency be restricted to staff?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered it will be school district staff depending on what it is eventually we would like to open it to first responders further down the road. First and foremost is trying to take care of the problem to find teachers to come in. I'm not saying just the teacher it could be any staff it could be a janitor, head of maintenance or head cook. We are having a problem finding staff.

Mr. Bailey – stated the intent of the housing is not a revenue generator for BOCES. It is filling a need that seems to be out there.

Mr. Guman – answered we hope that including affordable housing as part of a compensation package will serve as an incentive for instructors considering a position with BOCES. Prospective teachers will soon face the challenge of finding attainable housing in the Pikes Peak region, where entry-level housing costs around \$400,000 or more.

The homes we plan to offer are not priced at \$400,000; the details are still being finalized. However, when teachers and instructors review their compensation packages, they will see that we offer on-site housing. These will be well-designed homes available at entry-level rates. The

rental cost is expected to be between \$600 and \$700 per month, which is appealing for those just starting out in their careers. The homes will be rented, not sold.

Mr. Bershinsky – stated all our school districts are in partnership with BOCES. we do not create to make money off our school districts it would not work. The thought is to keep it affordable it is not a revenue generator at all.

Mr. Guman – continued presentation.

Mr. Smith – asked for clarification of 2 questions. When we first started hearing about this you were talking about special needs. Where are we going with that is it for severe needs children? We focused on the rural areas.

Mr. Guman – answered the focus is on rural area kids and vocational education. This is not a special needs facility. It does have a special need element in it.

Mr. Bershinsky – answered about the special needs that is what we do as one part of our business in town. Eventually that building will be sold, and the school will be moved out there. For the severe need kids, we have four different programs. We have the high behavior program, dual diagnosis program, autistic program and the little kids. These are the highest risk most needed kids in the state. The problem that I have now is the building and location. It is right by highway 25 and is not safe for the children. We have about 80 kids.

Mr. Smith – stated the 2nd question is totally different but that answers the first question. I know there is a severe need for help in that area.

Mr. Bershinsky – answered that is what my business is. My problem is I cannot offer these kinds of programs to the kids in that building. There is not enough space, and I don't have the room. My kids do get the same opportunity as the other kids in that region is because I can't create it for them. Some of these programs we have you probably read about it and my kids can be a part of it. They can go on and have outstanding careers. Right now, I can't do that.

Mr. Smith – it is about the distance. There were comments about how far people were to drive to take the kids to and from. It sounds like we are already covering great distances. Moving it to another location somebody is going to drive far, and somebody is not.

Mr. Bershinsky – answered it was not feasible to find a spot in town it was not affordable. I think it is the perfect location.

Mr. Smith – asked his 2nd question about technical trades training. Pikes Peak State College is doing that with a great many high schools here in town probably not at the level that you are talking about. Have you worked with them to balance how this is going to work out?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered Constantly. Pikes Peak State College runs into a space and instructor issue as well. When this is done Pikes Peak State College will be a partner to the point where they will be helping with instructors. They are reaching out to the rural districts now. Pikes Peak doesn't have the capacity to build it out any further.

Mr. Smith – Thank you.

Mr. Bailey- made a comment. I am aware that BOCES had in the past and probably continues a lot of different partnerships with similar programs that are not necessarily controlled exclusively by BOCES. Educational programs, vocational programs that are out there this isn't being created out of nothing there is a demonstrated need out there. This helps to address, centralize some things and helps to make it more universally available then some of the ones may have been in the past. I think I'm correct to say that. Clearly a need in our county, statewide and nationally.

Mr. Bershinsky - answered I'm not sure if your packet includes information on some of the partnerships we've established with local unions. For example, we have a partnership with the El Paso County Sheriff's Office and Sheriff Roybal. We launched a program in February with El Paso County and Teller County's local 911 services, where high school students began training to handle 911 phone calls. Six students graduated in May and are now employed, gaining income without needing a college degree. This is part of a nationwide initiative.

Additionally, we are introducing a new heavy equipment operator program, which is unique in its scope. We have secured equipment such as skid loaders, forklifts, and excavators for Miami-Yoder, marking the first program of its kind in the nation where students will operate live machinery.

Mr. Carlson – asked to define the kids that are a higher risk and most needy in the districts. Have they been kicked out of districts or just developmentally challenged. Tell me about those definitions.

Mr. Bershinsky – answered no they are not kicked out. I have a special education team. Every school district has a special education team. We are not any different than a Cedar Springs, Round Up. If both special educations teams deemed that this child should be placed a BOCES that is where they are placed. We have them in a smaller area, fewer kids and we have highly specialized people trying to work with these kids

Mr. Bailey –stated you said various populations. You're not talking about all the same groups of kids right. You are not serving just one need of those special needs they cover a range of things.

Mr. Bershinsky – answered I have the four different programs. I have the higher behavior kids that are cognitively on track that need direction. They need programs like we are talking about up to severely blind autistic kids that have intense ABA therapy and things of that nature. When you talk about a parent with one of these kids it is very expensive. Our program works with all the school districts in our building they see what their kids doing. They do not get lost out in a program they never see.

Mr. Carlson – asked do you work with kids who just decide they don't want to go to college they just want to learn a trade?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered every day.

Mr. Carlson – asked so they could be not as needy or at risk you teach them as well?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered, No, not at my school. That is why I represent all these school districts. Whether it is a kid from Calhan they're in their school district they don't need a program like mine in town. If they trying to be in a construction program in Elbert school district Elbert school district can piece together somewhat of a construction program. If we pull all our resources together and put in one spot, we can construct a world class construction program for those kids.

Mr. Carlson – stated that is my question. Can that kid from Elbert come to this school and learn construction?

Mr. Bershinsky – answered, Yes, that's what the whole program is about.

Mr. Schuettpelz – stated I want to piggyback on that question. You work with the high schools and have the kids while they're in high school. This program sounds like someone who graduated from high school and wants to work for law enforcement they can come there and do this after graduation get that certificate and move on or is it just for the high school kids you are working with for now.

Mr. Bershinsky – answered it will be high school kids. We think it is a great idea.

Mr. Bailey – stated Cleary it's a good idea I think so too.

Mr. Bershinsky – asked the board to come to his school and see what everybody does it is amazing.

Mr. Bailey – stated will turn to public comment and get back to the Approval of Location. The concept pretty much everybody in this room thinks it's a great idea. The location might be problematic for some. In public comment we like to ask those in favor to come up first.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Kistler - (In favor) I am a retired Superintendent from the Peyton School District, where I served for 22 years. I was also involved in creating a similar initiative called The Mill, which parallels what we are aiming to achieve here.

I have three main reasons why I support this project. First, it is highly problematic and challenging for special needs students from districts like Miami-Yoder and Big Sandy to travel over an hour on a bus to reach town. A centralized location would be incredibly beneficial for rural districts.

Second, Peyton developed an auto program and a woods program as part of The Mill, which provided services to other school districts. As rural districts, we cannot offer all the diverse programs or employ numerous instructors independently. A centralized location allows students from various rural districts to access these programs, with travel times of about 25 minutes.

Lastly, offering housing for teachers is a crucial opportunity. It is a necessity for rural districts to attract and retain quality educators.

Mr. Barnes– (In favor) I am the Superintendent for the Miami-Yoder School District, and I want to address the importance of the location. My facility is about 30 miles from this property, which is similar for Simila and Elbert. In fact, 70 to 80 percent of high schools in Colorado Springs fall within this travel time frame. The scope of our coverage is extensive, and I manage one of the largest Career and Technical (CT) programs, with six different programs.

We send between 11 to 30 students each year to Pikes Peak State College for career start programs. However, Pikes Peak does not offer all the programs we need or that our students want. We have discussed the importance of heavy equipment operation, and having a centralized facility is crucial for us since we focus on hands-on training.

Once this program is operational, we anticipate hosting students from Elbert, who will need to travel approximately an hour to reach our facility. A central location is ideal for preparing these students effectively and ensuring they are ready to enter the workforce.

Mr. Elliott - (In opposition) My wife and I own a 40-acre property adjacent to the proposed development, on the north side of their property line. We have lived here for 30 years. Previously, T-Cross Ranch owned the land to the east and south of us. The proposed development, named Santa Fe Springs, was initially planned for this area but fell through. The properties to the east of us are 35-acre tracts with homes, and to the southwest, there are 200 homes on 2.5-acre tracts, part of the Saddle Horn project, along with other proposed projects such as Davis Ranch and Rodriguez.

I disagree with the BOCES representative's statement that this development is in the middle of nowhere. We are only 5 miles away from approximately 50 commercial businesses. Our concerns with the development include:

1. **Decrease in Property Value:** We are worried that the development will negatively impact our property value.
2. **Noise:** We are concerned about potential noise from outdoor activities, carpentry, and heavy equipment operations.
3. **Odor:** The proposed water treatment ponds could produce unpleasant odors affecting not only the trade school but also the 121 homes.
4. **Safety:** With 121 homes and trade school students, we are worried about potential safety issues, including curious students trespassing, interacting with our livestock, or causing harm.
5. **Water Supply:** If the development is to serve 121 homes, the trade school, and another 400 homes, it seems unlikely that one 40-foot water tower will be sufficient.

When Santa Fe Springs was proposed, I sought approval for a minor 5-acre subdivision on our property but was turned down. Two years ago, I inquired about a minor subdivision of 5 acres and a house to RR-5, and was told our chances were slim. Now, a trade school with 121 low-income homes is being proposed right next to us, which seems unfair given our previous experiences.

I understand that this project has already received attention from Governor Polis, and it seems likely to be approved. However, I wanted to highlight how it would impact our lives. Whether using central water or individual wells, all projects are drawing from the same aquifers, affecting the overall water supply.

Mr. Townsend - (In opposition) I hope to clearly convey why this project is not suitable for this location. I live on a 52-acre parcel adjacent to the proposed development. As the owner of a manufacturing company in Colorado Springs, I understand the value of vocational training and the BOCES model. I agree that improving training for young people in the trades is crucial, as finding qualified individuals can be challenging. However, my concerns are centered around the zoning and appropriateness of this project for this area.

1. **Zoning Concerns:** El Paso County describes the primary function of large lot residential zoning as serving as a transition between rural and suburban areas, typically with single-family homes on 5-acre lots or more. This proposed project calls for a higher density of housing than what is observed in nearby developments like Banning Lewis Ranch and Meridian Ranch. Specifically, it proposes 120 residential units on 20 acres, resulting in approximately 6 structures per acre, with lot sizes around 6,960 square feet. This density is comparable to more urban areas, not the large lot residential zoning typically found in our region.
2. **Workforce Housing Model:** I am skeptical about the workforce housing model proposed for this rural area. While workforce housing can be effective in urban settings or high-cost areas like Vail, this location is surrounded by large lots and spread-out housing. The model, where instructors do not own property and may experience high turnover, seems more akin to an apartment complex rather than a stable residential neighborhood. This contrasts with the rural character of our area, where property owners have a vested interest in their own property values.
3. **Location and Accessibility:** It is not that we oppose development or recognize that the 82 acres along Judge Orr Road will be developed. We have seen similar developments on 5-acre

and 2.5-acre plots. However, placing 121 homes on this relatively small area does not align with the large lot residential zoning. It would be more fitting to have larger lot sizes in line with the existing developments. Additionally, the proposed location is quite distant from the school districts associated with Pikes Peak BOCES, which are primarily to the east of this site. A more central and cost-effective location would better serve the students and teachers associated with this project.

In summary, while we acknowledge the need for improved vocational training and support for young people, this location and the density proposed do not align with the current zoning and character of the area. It seems more appropriate to consider developments that fit within the established patterns of the region.

Mr. Bailey – asked if there were any other members of the audience who wished to speak opposition to the project, no one else came forward. The public comment period was closed. Mr. Bailey then invited the applicant to provide any final remarks.

Mr. Guman. – stated he only had a couple of comments regarding some of the statements that were made. The water treatment facility is an enclosed system for community water distribution it is a central water system. There are no leach fields or sewage fields that were referred to. One thing I did not mention this will be dealt with at a future planning phase. We will be on the wastewater sewer system that exists with the Meridian services metro district. We will have central sewer system as well extended to this site. There will be no sewage on the site. The other thing that I did not mention is the plot plan that you have seen we were very conscious in laying this out as far as the rural nature of the vicinity. There is 27 percent of this site that is allocated to open space that far exceeds the open space requirements that we would be required to provide if we ran a higher density to this situation. We were careful to place all the structures in a clustered pattern in the central area of the property. You don't have buildings that are adjacent to who are within a stone throwing distance of our neighbors. The questions about a 40-foot water tower they exist out there. They are right down on the corner at Curtis Road and Judge Orr in the Saddle Horn Ranch development. We are encouraged now to avoid seeking multiple wells, multiple septic systems and to try and develop central water systems that provide water to the community central facility.

The other question that Mr. Townsend brought up we have had some challenges identifying a location that is suitable for the BOCES campus. I'll read from our letter of intent you have this in front of you it is on page 11 regarding place type transitions. This is right out of the El Paso County Master Plan.

We are not going to be putting one home on 35 acres – we are not going to put one home on 5 acres we clustered the housing element. I will make a comment here the Sante Fe Springs development we were the planner which was unanimously approved by the BoCC about 14 years ago. Had the Sante Fe Springs PUD development move forward as approved it was approved for 5,470 single family dwelling unit with urban density. You have old west ranches on 35-acres. There were financial problems as to why Sante Fe Springs never materialized. I don't think we are doing anything foreign to the area. This area has been primed for urban density and we are not seeking

approval for urban density today. This is a campus and 27 percent of open space. That I think is keeping with the intent of the facility and why we are seeking Approval of Location for this area.

Mr. Bailey – asked if there were any questions for the applicant

Mr. Markewich –asked I know we are not at the detailed part but from a transition to the neighbor properties to what extent will you be using fencing, landscaping, trees, other things to block views from neighbors to the campus. What type of screening do you anticipate. In general, do you tend to have a fence around the whole property that will block it or will there be partial. What are you thinking?

Mr. Guman - (In response) The property is currently fenced, but the intention is not to maintain this fencing. Instead, we are adhering to the buffering requirements set by the El Paso County Planning Code. A landscape plan has been developed to meet these requirements, which includes planting 850 trees around the perimeter of the property. These trees will be irrigated and are designed to satisfy the buffering requirements for each boundary of the property.

Additionally, there is a 180-foot-wide transmission easement along the east and south sides of the property, which was purchased by a utility company years ago. This easement serves as a no-build zone in perpetuity and will act as a natural transition between our facility and the adjacent properties. Internal landscaping will also be provided for each building as required, ensuring that the development plan includes comprehensive landscape development.

Mr. Markewich – asked you mention the electrical easement I see that on the plan. Are there electrical lines there now or is this anticipated for the future?

Mr. Guman – answered No the electrical easement that is there now runs from the BOCES property south into the Rodriguez Ranch property also. I believe that was purchased by a utility company I do not know the name of it in 2014. Part of the deed restrictions is that there is no development allowed within that easement.

Mr. Markewich – asked are their high-tension lines there now?

Mr. Guman – answered Yes.

Mr. Bailey – asked if there were any questions for the applicant?

DISCUSSION

Mr. Trowbridge – I have questions for the staff. It may be more for Mr. Kilgore or Ms. Herington. My first question is under the approval criteria it says the application is reviewed for conformity with the submittal and processing requirements. This project seems very expansive and it not just a location approval for a school. This is a campus. I would like some explanation of how this conforms with what is in the land development code for approval for a public utility or school location.

Mr. Kilgore – stated he understood the question. I think I will just point out that this is just an Approval for Location of a school. Is this inappropriate?

Mr. Trowbridge – answered, I disagree with you. I believe this is an abuse of the process. There are several things within this plan. I would be troubled by the approval of just the school buildings alone because there are half a dozen buildings so I would view potentially each of those as a location approval for a school. I could be persuaded that the school campus itself could fall within that application however there is also the question of the water utility which is included in this. We are being asked to not only approve the location of a school but the approval of a water utility unless you're going to tell us that is going to come back to us.

Mr. Kilgore – answered, that Ms. Parsons has some history on that. You can disagree, that is your part as a Planning Commission member to make a recommendation.

Mr. Trowbridge – asked, are we not being asked to approve a water utility as well as a part of this application?

Ms. Parsons – answered, so first off in terms of the criteria for processing the requirement for the application to be heard within 30 days of complete submittal if the applicant did not agree to waive that, that has been met. Your number one question was the processing done correctly, the answer is yes, the applicants did agree to waiving that 30 day get me to hearing regulation. Number two the citing of the water infrastructure to serve the development a community system that ultimately will hook up to the Meridian Metropolitan District for services. It can be included as part of this. If it were done separately, it would not be done before this Planning Commission body it would have been part of an expansion of major utility under a 1041 we probably would have approved that administratively. That would not have been in your purview but now that it is included as a part of the Approval of Location application you are seeing it to support the projects uses. I would remind the body that if this were a State College and the college were coming here you would site that as well dormitories, restaurants, gymnasiums a very similar situation to this so that would be in the purview of an Approval of Location. I have answered and clarified your questions as well.

Ms. Seago – County Attorney – stated, I would like to add to Ms. Parsons answer that the Approval of Location process as its set forth in statute applies to any public way, ground space, building structure or utility. To the extent that any of these individual elements are considered a

public utility, a public structure, a public building then it would be appropriate to hear it through the Approval of Location process.

Mr. Markewich – asked Ms. Seago, obviously we are the approving body, and this will not go to the Board of County Commissioners as this process goes along there obviously designs and various things that need to be submitted. Is there going to be at any point a return to this body for approval? If we approve it everything else from this point forward would all be just an administrative review?

Mr. Bailey – answered, that is a question for planning department staff.

Ms. Elgin – answered yes, it would come back with a Site Development Plan which would be administratively approved.

Mr. Bailey – asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Carlson – stated he wanted to make a comment. I think this is about more than just a location. When we are talking about the preservation of rural life its not just about wide open 35 acre parcels. It is about people living in these other towns and how do they keep their kids there. How do you keep jobs in that area. This goes a long way to preserve living the rural life out in that area. Families are moving out of the rural areas because they do not like the education. It does follow in change and the new development overlay. I'm in favor of this project.

PC ACTION: BRITTAIN JACK MOVED / BYERS SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5A, FILE NUMBER U241 FOR APPROVAL OF LOCATION, BOCES, WITH THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH THREE (3) CONDITIONS AND ONE (1) NOTATION, AND WITH NO NEED OF FINDING SUFFICIENCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DEPENDABILITY. APPROVAL PASSED (8-1).

IN FAVOR: MARKEWICH, BYERS, WHITNEY, BRITTAIN JACK, FULLER, CARLSON, SCHUETTPELZ, BAILEY

IN OPPOSITION: TROWBRIDGE

COMMENTS: TROWBRIDGE - I am opposed to the location. I agree with the general principle. I am troubled again by the abuse of process. We did not get a report on the actual water. The County Attorney did not chime in with any approval to the fact that they have sufficient water. We did not receive a review of the housing.

**B. ID243
PARSONS**

**SPECIAL DISTRICT SERVICE PLAN
PRAIRIE RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT NOS. 1-3**

A request from Classic SRJ Land, LLC., and Spencer Fane LLP., for approval of a Colorado Revised Statutes Title 32 Special District Service Plan for the Prairie Ridge Metropolitan District Nos. 1-3. The 142-acre area included within the request is zoned RR-5 (Residential Rural) and is located south of Poco Road and west of Vollmer Road. The service plan includes the following: a maximum debt authorization of \$50,000,000.00, a debt service mill levy of 50 mills for residential, 50 mills for commercial and an operations and maintenance mill levy of 10 mills, for a total maximum combined mill levy of 60 mills. The statutory purposes of the district include the provision of the following:

- 1) street improvements, transportation, safety protection;
- 2) design, construction, and maintenance of drainage facilities;
- 3) design, land acquisition, construction, and maintenance of recreation facilities;
- 4) mosquito control;
- 5) design, acquisition, construction, installation, and operation and maintenance of television relay and translation facilities;
- 6) design, construction, and maintenance of water systems including fire hydrants;
- 7) sanitation systems;
- 8) security services; and
- 9) covenant enforcement.

(Parcel Nos. 5228000024 and 5228000025) (Commissioner District No. 1)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Bailey – stated we did lose a couple of voting members before we started. Mr. Whitney and Mr. Carlson could not stay so we will add Mr. Smith as a voting member. We will have 8 commissioners to vote on this.

Mr. Markewich – stated you mentioned you had a photo of Jane ranch now we are talking about Sterling Ranch. How large is this metro district? Is it covering several different properties?

Ms. Parsons – answered, so Janes property that was the historical name in the Falcon area. When the development team went to market, they modified the name to something a little more marketable which is The Retreat at Prairie Ridge. This development is now known as The Retreat at Prairie Ridge. It is about 142 acres. It does not overlap with another Special District. The Sterling Ranch district is across to the East across Vollmer Road. There is not a Special District to the North, West, or South of this property.

Mr. Bailey – asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak on this.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR DISCUSSION.

PC ACTION: MARKEWICH MOVED / BRITAIN JACK SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5B, FILE NUMBER ID243 FOR SPECIAL DISTRICT SERVICE PLAN, PRAIRIE RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT NOS. 1-3, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH SIX (6) CONDITIONS AND ONE (1) NOTATION, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (8-0).

IN FAVOR: SMITH, SCHUETTPELZ, TROWBRIDGE, FULLER, BRITAIN JACK, BYERS, MARKEWICH, BAILEY

IN OPPOSITION: NONE

COMMENTS: NONE

6A NON-ACTION ITEMS – A presentation by Elizabeth Garvin with Clarion Associates, LLC regarding the Land Development Code Update.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 12:45.

Minutes Prepared By: MM