

**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

---

## **PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **MEETING RESULTS (UNOFFICIAL RESULTS)**

Planning Commission (PC) Meeting  
Thursday, February 16, 2023  
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:** TOM BAILEY, SARAH BRITTAIN JACK, JAY CARLSON, BECKY FULLER, ERIC MORAES, BRYCE SCHUETTPELZ, AND CHRISTOPHER WHITNEY.

**PC MEMBERS VIRTUAL AND VOTING:** TIM TROWBRIDGE.

**PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND NOT VOTING:** NONE.

**PC MEMBERS ABSENT:** BRIAN RISLEY, BRANDY MERRIAM, AND JOSHUA PATTERSON,

**STAFF PRESENT:** MEGGAN HERINGTON, JUSTIN KILGORE, KARI PARSONS, JEFF RICE, MIRANDA BENSON, AND EL PASO COUNTY ATTORNEY LORI SEAGO.

**OTHERS VIRTUAL AND SPEAKING:** RAUL REYES, ANGELIKA BUSH, CHRISTINE REYES, MIKE ROKES, RACHONNE SMITH, DAN MAS, PHILIP PENNINGTON, ANTHONY HICKS, GARY BEIERLE, AND DANIEL SMITH.

#### **1. REPORT ITEMS**

**A. Planning Department.** Next PC Hearing is Thursday, March 2, 2023, at 9:00 A.M.

**Ms. Herington** stated she had no items to report. Neither did Mr. Kilgore.

**B. Call for public comment for items not on hearing agenda.** NONE.

#### **2. CONSENT ITEMS**

**A. Adoption of Minutes of meeting held February 2, 2023.**

**PC ACTION: THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT (8-0).**

**3. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS. NONE.**

**4. REGULAR ITEMS**

**A. SKP225**

**PARSONS**

**SKETCH PLAN  
JAYNES SKETCH PLAN**

A request by Classic Communities, for approval of a sketch plan consisting of a maximum of 450 single-family residential lots (101 acres), approximately 4.5 acres of commercial, 13.7 acres of future right-of-way, and approximately 22.9 acres of open space. The 142.1-acre property is zoned RR-5 (Residential Rural) and is located at the southwest corner of Vollmer Road and Poco Road. There is opposition to the requested Plan which includes: increased density and traffic to area, water supply, and loss of habitat. (Parcel Nos. 52280-00-024 and 52280-00-025) (Commissioner District No. 2).

To view full staff report: <https://epcdevplanreview.com/Public/ProjectDetails/178314>.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

**Ms. Fuller** asked when Stapleton/Briargate Road would be built?

**Mr. Rice** answered that there is no timeline yet. A portion of the plan is in the PPRTA3 update and they are currently finishing a corridor study to see what the design will be. Once that concept for the corridor plan is done, they'll get more into the design of the road. It could take many years.

**Ms. Fuller** asked if it would be a decade?

**Mr. Rice** answered that it would not likely take a decade, but it may take up to that long. It depends on funding.

**Ms. Fuller** asked if easements had been identified? The concept plans are showing a significant road, but there is no road there currently, so she explained that she is trying to understand when that road will be built. The neighbors are concerned about the added traffic that will need access to these proposed lots.

**Mr. Rice** the portion of Briargate that serves this development will likely be constructed by the developer when they need to provide that capacity to provide access points to the development. Most of the portions to the west have about 120 feet of right-of-way which has already been platted. The area to the east is part of Sterling Ranch. He stated that assuming the same developer is involved, they will have no problem building right-of-way as it goes to the east.

**Mr. Kilgore** advised that this item will be heard at the BOCC hearing on March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2023.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

**Mr. Carlson** asked how about the results of the meetings with the neighborhood members. Were people generally pleased?

**Mr. Moreland**, with Classic Homes, answered that they were not pleased. They tried to find a win-win in the middle of everyone's suggestions and concerns. Presentation continued.

**Mr. Carlson** asked Ms. Barlow to explain the decision to establish .5-acre lots on west side of Plan? The sketch plan may accommodate the 5-acre properties at northern end of the property, but 5-acre lots are also on more than half of the western side. Why is there a .5-acre wrap around the Smith property, and why is there .5-acre instead of 1-acre on the west?

**Ms. Barlow** explained that the west side includes 5-acre zoning at the northern end and then 2.5-acre zoning in the middle, and 5-acre zoning again at the southernmost part. The detention pond and park align with most of the southern 5-acre section. The applicant thought that the buffer plus .5-acre zoning would be equivalent to the 1-acre lot size. Representatives of the HOA to the west seemed to be satisfied with that change from the original submittal.

**Mr. Carlson** asked if the HOA representatives were pleased with the .5-acre plus buffer plan?

**Ms. Barlow** answered that it had seemed like they were happy with it *at that time*. She added that there was previously a 50-foot buffer along the north, along Poco, but the applicant was asked to remove the buffer because the community members did not want that to be used as a trail corridor adjacent to Poco Road. The trail was removed from the sketch plan and was replaced with 1-acre lots and a 35-foot setback within the 1-acre lots.

**Mr. Carlson** stated he appreciated the efforts by staff and the applicant to provide a density buffer. He asked about the area surrounding the Smith property.

**Ms. Barlow** answered that the .5-acre lots on the east of the Smith property provide a transition from the 1-acre lots into the higher density of the development. They felt the most sensitive part of the Smith property was the western side because of the views of the mountains, and that is why the western edge is adjacent to 1-acre lots. Presentation continued.

**Mr. Moraes** stated that this is a Suburban Residential placetype which is defined as anywhere from 1 dwelling unit per 2.5 acres up to 5 dwelling units per acre in the Master Plan. He asked what the 'dwelling units per acre' calculation for this project will be when considering the proposal of 450 dwelling units?

**Ms. Barlow** answered that she believes the residential portion of the proposal is 102 acres. With 450 dwelling units, that should calculate around 4.5 dwelling units per acre.

**Mr. Moraes** pointed out that there are areas in the sketch plan that propose more than 5 dwelling units per acre.

**Ms. Barlow** agreed that it is included in the proposal and added that they consider it to be part of the Supporting Uses identified in the Suburban Residential placetype of the Master Plan. Supporting Uses should not be the predominant Land Use, which this is not. Regarding the commercial type of land use within Suburban Residential, it should be limited and only found at major intersections, which this sketch plan has done. In the orange areas of the sketch plan, which are identified as 5-12 dwelling units per acre, there's a good chance that some of those will be single-family detached just at a higher density. There may also be single-family attached in the form of townhomes.

**Mr. Moraes** clarified that they are proposing to go more dense within Suburban Residential.

**Ms. Barlow** affirmed, as within the Supporting Use recognized in that placetype of the Master Plan.

**Mr. Moraes** then asked why Ms. Barlow said in her presentation that 5-acre and 2.5-acre lots were not appropriate for Suburban Residential?

**Ms. Barlow** stated she believes she said that about 5-acre lots on the north part of the property. She added that 1 dwelling unit per 2.5 acres is the lower limit of the Suburban Residential range for single-family detached. She thinks the applicant is providing an appropriate transition with the buffer and the .5-acre and 1-acre lots proposed going down to the higher density residential area.

**Mr. Moraes** asked if 2.5-acre lots could be appropriate?

**Ms. Barlow** said 2.5-acre lots could be appropriate in terms of the supporting land-use density range of the Suburban Residential placetype.

**Mr. Moraes** asked PCD staff how large the lots are north of Poco Road. He thought he read they range from 5 to 12 acres.

**Ms. Parsons** answered that the zoning is RR-5, but some properties are combined and can be 10 acres. The minimum lot size is 5 acres.

**Mr. Moraes** reiterated that the zoning is RR-5, but the use of the land is bigger than just 5-acre properties.

**Ms. Parsons** stated the land-use type is single-family detached. The size of the property, the dimensional standard, is greater than the zoning would require.

**Mr. Whitney** asked for clarification on Ms. Barlow's quote that the area is "not built out yet". Is Mr. Moraes' observation of lot sizes what Ms. Barlow meant by that statement?

**Ms. Parsons** affirmed and continued that she also applied that line of thought in her presentation when talking about the Master Plan identifying the areas to the north, south, and east of this proposal as being high priority areas to be redeveloped to the Suburban Residential placetype.

**Mr. Whitney** added that he was interested in the comment because it presumes that it will be built out. If he were the owner of 12 acres, he may not want it to be built out.

**Ms. Parsons** replied that he would not need to go through an application process, then. No one would require a landowner to develop their property. If the landowner wanted that opportunity, they could pursue that entitlement through El Paso County.

**Mr. Whitney** replied that the statement connotes a notion of inevitability that not everyone is comfortable with.

**Ms. Parsons** also reminded the board that the Master Plan is a guiding document.

**Mr. Bailey** added that he understands how the interpretation of inevitability might be made, but realistically, the characterization came about because this area is within that 10% of the County where development is most likely to occur. It should not be construed as inevitable that it will be developed in a certain way, it's that this is the most logical place to put that certain type of development (Suburban Residential) when looking at the macro-view, county-wide.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Mr. Bailey** reminded the room that they are reviewing a sketch plan at this time. The criteria for approval is broad and less restrictive than what comes later in the process. The PC's responsibility is to focus on the specific review criteria. He stated that unfortunately for some people opposing, the reasons mentioned in opposition that are important to an individual may not be included in the application's review criteria. He thanked members of the public for attending the meeting. He mentioned that the applicant's process may also require or allow for public engagement and neighborhood meetings. Making comments during the public hearing is the opportunity to express concerns or support, not a back-and-forth discussion. All PC members were given and read the responses that PCD received. They are familiar with and understand the concerns. He then explained the public comment protocol.

**Ms. Fuller** asked for review criteria to be shown on the screen. She added that the board read all letters of public comment. She read one letter aloud and stated that she disliked the way PCD staff was spoken to. Accusatory emails are not convincing or persuasive.

**Mr. Reyes** lives on one of the 5-acre parcels north of Poco Road. He stated that he didn't realize his 5-acre lot with home, outbuildings, animals, and family was considered undeveloped land. He understands the PC only considers rules and regulations, but his concerns relate to people and family. His family saved all their lives to move to the country. Poco Road is a dirt road. He understands "NIMBY" (not in my backyard), but people need to live somewhere, so it comes down to compromise. Having spoken to others on Poco Road, where everyone knows each other, the neighbors would tolerate 2.5-acre lots on the south side of Poco Road. His lot is one of the smaller ones at 5 acres; most others have 10-12 acres. He stated the reality is that over 400 homes will be built across their street. They understand no one is getting everything they want, but he asks that one adjustment be made and the lots along Poco Road be 2.5 acres.

**Ms. Bush** lives in The Retreat at TimberRidge and opposes the application. She listed the responsibilities of the PC and stated they shouldn't just go along with any petition received. The people, the neighbors should be considered. She stated this application goes against what Black Forest is about. Black Forest is not Colorado Springs; it is rural in character and should be protected and maintained. Black Forest faces different issues than Colorado Springs with water, wildlife, and country lifestyle. Traffic is a big concern after the approval of Homestead North Filing No. 3 which brings an additional 4,200-7,300 trips per day. She stated she used to live in Colorado Springs but moved to be in the country near peace and quiet. She observed that Classic Homes is building in many other places, and the homes are all the same design. She thinks apartments, townhomes, and multi-family dwelling units do not need to be in Black Forest and should stay in the city. She would like Black Forest to maintain its acreage sites, natural wonders, and wildlife habitat. She stated Classic Homes is not the savior of the housing crisis; They are in the business of making money. She believes what the proposed development would destroy is priceless and irreplaceable. She thinks Classic should go back to the drawing board and build "Black Forest style", to respect people and wildlife, and be mindful of water and environmental consequences.

**Ms. Reyes** stated she understands the need for development; however, she didn't realize they would need to go through this when they bought their property. She requests this proposal match the communities of TimberRidge and Highlands Park that have 2.5-acre properties. She doesn't think that would be unreasonable along Poco Road, and she would consider that to be a transition. North of Poco Road has lot sizes of 5, 10, and 12 acres. She asks that the transition of 2.5-acre lots along Poco be considered.

**Mr. Rokes** lives immediately west of the proposed development. He is surprised by the County's disregard for existing zoning. He also stated he is not against development. He did not assume the land around him would remain cow pastures, but he did think he was protected by the RR-5 zoning that characterized the area around his property. He thinks anyone would be upset by a gas station being put next to your house, but what protects someone from that change in land-use is being surrounded by residential zoning. He expected that same level of protection by being surrounded by RR-5. He anticipated the 142 acres of Jaynes property to consist of less than 28 houses, but Classic Homes is proposing 450 homes and commercial. The Master Plan states twice (sections 3 and 14) that, *"Undeveloped portions of the County that are adjacent to a built-out area will be developed to match the character of that adjacent development..."* The representative from N.E.S. categorized Mr. Rokes' home (west) and the homes north of this proposal as undeveloped. He feels that comment infers that in the future they can anticipate being developed differently. He stated the 450 homes proposed by Classic is more than 15 times the density of those already developed properties bordering 2 of the 3 sides of their development. He stated the increase to density does not match the character of the adjacent development. For that reason, along with the disregard to current zoning and the written intent of the Master Plan, he asks for disapproval of this proposal.

**Ms. Smith** lives in the 5-acre parcel cut out of the northern boundary of the proposal. She mentioned that the representative of Classic Homes (Loren) indicated she was happy with the buffer around their property after a meeting, but she feels that buffer is inadequate. She doesn't think 1-acre or .5-acre lots around their property is an appropriate transition from their 5-acre lot. She appreciates that Loren came out to meet with them, but they would like 2.5-acre adjacent lots and along Poco Road. She thinks Classic should redraft their sketch plan and can make up the lost revenue of putting 2.5 acre lots on the northern boundary by making it more dense further south where it will not directly affect the existing residents.

**Mr. Mas** (called-in) stated he lives in Black Forest. He made comments on the Quasi-Judicial type of hearing. He reviewed PC Minutes from the Flying Horse North proposal on Nov. 3, 2022, for example reasons of approval or denial recommendations.

**Mr. Bailey** asked Mr. Mas to make a point relevant to this proposal.

**Mr. Mas** continues to give examples of decision reasons from past meeting minutes. He stated that the criterion for this project asks if the proposed subdivision is compatible with existing and adjacent property. Several people argue that it is not compatible with the RR-5 to the north, west, and south. Another item of criterion is that it protects natural resources and unique landforms. The representative stated they moved the park in an attempt to try to preserve those features, but that does not fulfill the criterion. In LDC 7.2.1.D.1.C the 11 criteria are not optional but are required to be met.

**Ms. Seago** responded that each PC member received training in the Quasi-Judicial process. The excerpts quoted by Mr. Mas are not the official record, they are a summary prepared by staff and approved by this board. She has served as legal counsel for this board for 18 years. If she has

concerns about the process, she raises those concerns at the appropriate time. She ensures the board is following correct procedures, abides by Quasi-Judicial principals, and that the decision made is legally defensible. It is the burden of the applicant to ensure the review criteria has been met. It is not their burden to overcome objections raised by opposition. If the commission is satisfied by the evidence presented that the criteria has been met, they are legally authorized to approve that application. If it is felt that one or more of the criteria has not been met, they can and should vote against approval. The criteria which you feel has not been met may be identified. The decision that is reviewed is by the whole body, not picked-apart individual votes. As previously stated, this is a recommending body. This is not the final decision-making body on this type of application, so it is not the PC's decision that is reviewable by court.

**Mr. Bailey** commented that Mr. Mas' comments were noted.

**Mr. Pennington** stated he lives west of the proposal. He stated he was unable to participate in any previous neighborhood meetings. He feels his property is one of the more affected 2.5-acre parcels north of the Briargate easement. The buffer zone Classic has proposed would detract from why he purchased his property. He believes it would create an encumbrance to him because he would need to pick up things left behind from others using the trail Classic has proposed. He does not wish to be a custodian of that buffer. He believes this proposal will detract from his property value. He agrees with the previous comments that the land should be developed in the same character as the existing developments. He also reiterated that Highlands Park is not undeveloped.

**Mr. Hicks** (called in) lives in Highlands Park and owns two 2.5-acre parcels (5 acres). He did attend the October neighborhood meeting. He agrees with the Black Forest Land-Use Committee that a transition or step down from 5-acre zoning should be 2.5 acres. A step down from his zoning district (RR-2.5) to the west of this proposal should be 1-acre lots. He thinks what Classic is proposing is a cliff, not a step down. He asks for a better transition from what is proposed.

**Mr. Beierle** lives on 12 acres touching the northeast corner of this proposal. He feels like they are fighting off urban density. He presented page 3 of the Master Plan and asked how it would feel to put urban density on the unique natural feature found on that page? He then showed a vicinity map from 2004. There is no Sterling Ranch or TimberRidge. Highlands Park was in the beginning stages. He anticipated nothing less than 5 acres to surround his property and the carved-out parcel where the Smith's live seemed a logical progression of what would happen. He thinks the parcel being discussed *does* contain a unique natural feature which should be protected. He described unique features of Black Forest. He believes the bluff/butte on the Jaynes property is the southernmost occurrence in the Black Forest area. He mentioned LDC 8.4.1.G and stated elevation, pine trees, and topography should remain unaffected. He believes that land is the only remaining natural element that blocks and protects the existing residents from the noise, light, and commotion of the city and future Briargate Highway. He referenced LDC 8.4.2, stating the bluff/butte should remain intact, and LDC 8.4.5, that existing drainage should be maintained. He is concerned about the existing drainage. He showed pictures of the area. He referenced LDC 7.2.1.D.1.C (SKP Criteria for Approval) stating developments are supposed to be compatible with existing land-uses. He does not think 1-acre lots next to 5 to 12-acre lots is acceptable. The original sketch plan showed 1 to 3 (-acre) lots at the north end. The revised sketch plan just reshapes the outlines but does not change the general density. That was not a compromise. He showed an aerial image from Highlands Park to the west. Between Highlands Park, TimberRidge, and Homestead, he feels that current residents have continued to compromise when the developer has not. He stated that if any compromise or consolation needs to be given, it should be more heavily weighted and borne by those imposing.

Classic's TimberRidge 2.5-acre lots are selling and filling up. Neighbors fought to keep RR-5 zoning for TimberRidge but were unsuccessful. He stated that its approval opened the floodgates for urban density to move northward via Sterling Ranch. With TimberRidge, they were able to keep 2.5-acre lots from Vollmer Rd east to the creek. That area is about the same as Poco Rd to the bluff they would like to maintain. Being that Poco Rd is a rural dirt road, he asked if it wouldn't make more sense to have lower density along that arterial road? He hopes the PC recommends the sketch plan be modified to protect existing, adjoining, and adjacent rural parcels to maintain the lifestyle they have experienced for decades.

**Mr. Smith** lives in the 5-acre parcel cut out of the northern boundary of the proposal. He mirrored the previous concerns regarding the lack of transition from the existing RR-5 zoning. As a commission member stated earlier, there is an inconsistency in the types of transition around his property. He doesn't think there is an adequate transition and he does not believe the current sketch plan addresses the problem. He mentioned that the bluff Mr. Beierle spoke about is part of his backyard. He was told it wasn't likely to be affected, but he doesn't know if he can believe that. It was implied that the landowners to the west were happy with the transition, but at the last meeting, only two people were in attendance from that side and neither of them have large lots. He stated that to make the claim of happiness along that entire border cannot be accurate when not all landowners were represented.

**Ms. Barlow** began by addressing Mr. Beierle's comment that The Retreat at TimberRidge paved the way for Sterling Ranch. She stated it was the opposite. Sterling Ranch sketch plan was approved in 2008 and The Retreat at TimberRidge was approved in 2018 because of the urban residential permitted in Sterling Ranch. He was correct that there was a lot of push-back and that 2.5-acre lots were preserved between Vollmer and the creek, but that was north of Poco Rd. She stated that everything south of Poco on the east side is suburban residential development. Regarding the discussion of natural features, state and federal agencies have reviewed and analyzed the area and did not identify anything as being a significant natural feature. She stated that it must first be identified as a significant natural feature before there can be discussion about preservation and be held to the standards of the Code Mr. Beierle referenced. She disagrees that this area be identified as "in the Black Forest". The Sterling Ranch area was developed and approved in the context of the Black Forest Preservation Plan (which is no longer part of the Master Plan for El Paso County) and provided a transition area north of Briargate for ¼ mile up to Poco Road. Beyond that, there was further transition to Black Forest, but this area is not "in the Black Forest". One person mentioned that he would need to pick up trash in the buffer, but the trails and buffer areas would be maintained by the metro district. The person who commented on the past meeting minutes was talking about a project which has much different circumstances. The primary complaint was the need for greater transition. Mr. Beierle's vicinity map shows that this area is developing as a suburban residential area. The Master Plan identified that this area would change over time, not that it is a requirement for anyone to rezone their property, but it provides the opportunity to do so. It was said in the past that the entire area should be 2.5-acres, but the extension of Briargate Highway through this property also needs to be considered. Having a four-lane principal arterial road will significantly change the character of this area. Where there is urban arterial roadway, urban or suburban-level development adjacent is expected. She stated that someone needs to pay for that road, and the County expects the developer to pay for it. This cannot be afforded if the developer is only permitted 2.5-acre lots on the entire property. She thinks people generally understood that at the neighborhood meeting. The next suggestion was to have 2.5-acre lots just along the northern boundary, but after discussion with PCD staff, those would be considered rural lots. Having 2.5-acre lots is allowed in the Suburban Residential placetype's range, but are considered more Rural



Residential, so would not meet the Suburban Residential placetype. If 2.5-acre lots are established along Poco, she thinks they should take access from Poco instead of within the urban development to the south, which would upgrade the development of Poco Road. She stated they did not want to put 2.5-acre lots along the northern boundary so that Poco Road would remain a rural road. She stated the proposed development will turn its back to Poco Road in order to preserve its rural character. She believes the developer has addressed the concerns for a transition with the current proposal and the reasons 2.5-acre lots would not be preferable even to the neighbors. She finished by saying that the applicant is not proposing apartments but may include townhomes or higher density single-family attached units.

**Mr. Moraes** asked for clarification regarding the comment that 2.5-acre lots is considered rural.

**Ms. Barlow** said that the RR-2.5 zoning type stands for Rural Residential. The rest of the development proposal follows the density standard of RS-6000 or RS-5000 for Suburban Residential zones. She explained the reason [for distinction between suburban and rural] includes the requirement to be on urban services like water and wastewater versus being on well and septic.

## DISCUSSION

**Mr. Carlson** thanked PCD staff for expanding the noticing procedure so that more people received the mailing. He also thanks PCD staff and the applicant for recognizing there needs to be a density buffer. Regarding the sketch plan, there have been comments that the sketch plan isn't as important as later steps, but he thinks it is very important. Later decisions can be made administratively based on what was approved in the sketch plan, so it is very important and shouldn't be taken lightly. He thinks the density transition is the most important factor of this proposal and he doesn't see the compatibility with adjacent properties. He stated neighbors did not have input on placetypes within the Master Plan unless they wanted to attend public meetings during COVID. He believes it is also the PC's job to stand up for communities and their recommendation to the BOCC should reflect that. He appreciates the efforts by the applicant but doesn't think 5 acres to 1 acre is a reasonable transition. He thinks 2.5-acre lots would be reasonable at least on the northern boundary. He isn't sure the western neighbors agree that a .5-acre transition is reasonable. He calculated that the proposed 85-foot combined buffer and setbacks in the sketch plan equal about 13 acres that could be available to be put into the 2.5-acre parcels to offset any lost profit if the applicant is able to make that change.

**Ms. Fuller** agreed with Mr. Carlson. She doesn't see the compatibility of this sketch plan with the northern properties. She also believes a sketch plan is important and is referenced for later decisions. Although this area is located within an area of anticipated development, it is currently rural residential, RR-5. To present it as an area of urban development is not accurate. She doesn't think 2.5-acre to .5-acre lots is a good transition along the west either. She stated having a certain number of houses within a development in order to pay for a road is not part of review criteria, though she understands the intent to spread the cost throughout more parcels. Not wanting lots to access Poco Road is likely because that road would have to be improved too, which is another cost. She isn't bothered by the RS-6000 in the center of the project, but it shouldn't be by the neighbors with the larger lots.

**Mr. Moraes** also thanked PCD staff for increasing the notification procedure. He understands the need for development within the County, but he doesn't see the compatibility of the bordering densities around this property. He thinks it could be said that the area is considered Large-Lot

Residential, but many lots on the north border are larger than the Rural Residential minimum. He read criteria of approval number 3 and said he can see the compatibility to the east, but not to the north. He thinks that 2.5-acre lots within Suburban Residential is appropriate. He isn't sure .5-acre lots on the west side is quite right, and that may be the appropriate place for 1-acre lots. He agrees that the closer you get to Briargate Parkway, the density should increase. He thinks there is still work to do on the sketch plan. He understands RR-2.5 zoning means Rural Residential, but he doesn't think the 2.5-acre lot size is inappropriate in Suburban Residential considering the proposed 1-acre lots would be larger than the Rural Residential RR-0.5 zoning type. With 2.5-acre lots considered the least dense side of Suburban Residential, he doesn't believe the argument that 2.5-acre lots don't fit in the Suburban Residential placetype and should be considered Rural Residential.

**Mr. Whitney** thanked PCD staff for increasing the noticing. He liked the new presentation procedure. He agrees with most of what the other commission members have said. He agreed with Mr. Carlson's statement that the sketch plan stage is important, even if the developer changes their mind multiple times before final approval. The sketch plan is the concept and very important. He worries about the domino effect of approving a sketch plan, thinking it's not as important, and then it spirals into something much larger down the road. He doesn't think this sketch plan is compatible for the same reasons stated by others. He appreciates the efforts that have happened so far. He understands development will happen here but it should be as compatible as possible. He stated that as the sketch plan looks now, he will vote against.

**Mr. Trowbridge** (online) agreed that the transitions could be different, perhaps larger, but he thinks the sketch plan is in general conformance with the Master Plan, so he is in favor.

**Mr. Bailey** commented that he thinks compatibility is a matter of perspective. From the north looking south, or from the west looking east, there is going to be different opinion of transition. That persuades him of the compatibility of this plan. He thinks the applicant has done a good job of creating transitions. He stated this is an area of the County where there is likely to be development that doesn't make everyone happy. He believes the transitions are compatible and he agrees with Mr. Trowbridge. He understands the perspectives of the other board members and stated that's why there is a commission and a criteria that relies on judgement to decide. He doesn't think it's as cut and dry as the online member of the public may have implied.

**PC ACTION: BRITAIN JACK MOVED / TROWBRIDGE SECONDED FOR APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 4A, SKP-22-005 FOR A SKETCH PLAN, JAYNES SKETCH PLAN, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT, WITH THREE (3) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION FAILED (3-5). THIS RESULTS IN THE APPLICATION MOVING FORWARD WITH A RECOMMENENDATION FOR DENIAL.**

**IN FAVOR:** MR. BAILEY, MR. TROWBRIDGE, AND MS. BRITAIN JACK.

**IN OPPOSITION:** MS. FULLER, MR. CARLSON, MR. MORAES, MR. SCHUETTPELZ, AND MR. WHITNEY.

**COMMENTS: MR. CARLSON** – Later administrative decisions can be made using an approved sketch plan, so this stage is very important. He doesn't think RR-5 to 1-acre lots is a reasonable transition and thinks 2.5-acre lots would be reasonable on the northern boundary. He calculated that the proposed 85-foot combined buffer and setbacks in the sketch plan equal about 13 acres that could be used in the 2.5-acre parcels to offset any lost profit. **MS. FULLER** – Doesn't see the compatibility of this sketch plan with the northern properties. The land is currently zoned RR-5. She

also doesn't think 2.5-acre to .5-acre lots is a good transition along the west. She stated that having a certain number of houses within a development to pay for a road is not part of review criteria. She approves of the RS-6000 density in the center of the project but doesn't think it should be by the neighbors with the larger lots. **MR. MORAES** – Doesn't see the compatibility of the bordering densities around this property, and pointed out that many lots on the north border are larger than the Rural Residential minimum. He doesn't think the sketch plan meets criteria of approval number 3. He said he can see the compatibility to the east but not to the north. He isn't sure about .5-acre lots on the west side and thinks that may be the appropriate place for the 1-acre lots. He thinks that 2.5-acre lots within the Suburban Residential placetype is appropriate. **MR. WHITNEY** – Doesn't think this sketch plan is compatible for the same reasons stated by others. The sketch plan is the concept and very important. He worries about the domino effect of approving a sketch plan, thinking it's not as important, and then it spirals into something much larger down the road. **MR. TROWBRIDGE** – Thinks the sketch plan is in general conformance with the Master Plan. He agreed the transitions could be different. **MR. BAILEY** – Thinks the transitions are compatible with the surrounding area.

**MEETING ADJOURNED at 11:57 AM.**

**Minutes Prepared By:** Miranda Benson