EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING RESULTS (UNOFFICIAL RESULTS)

Planning Commission (PC) Meeting

Thursday, October 15th, 2026, El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle, Colorado Springs, Colorado – Second Floor Hearing Room

REGULAR HEARING at 9:00 A.M.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND VOTING: Thomas Bailey, Jim Byers, Mae Emrick, Eric Moraes, Tim Trowbridge, Christopher Whitney, and Jason Wulf.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: Michael Brewer (Virtual).

PC MEMBERS ABSENT: Sarah Brittain Jack, Suzanne Casagrande, Bryce Schuettpelz, and Blaine Brew.

STAFF PRESENT: Meggan Herington, Erika Keech, Jen Uhler, Joe Letke, Ryan Howser, Kari Parsons, Kylie Bagley, Kurt Arnoldussen, Charlene Durham, Daniel Torres, Mindy Schulz, and Marcella Maes.

OTHERS PRESENT AND SPEAKING: Ren Trudel, Sean Murphy, Megan Becher, Randy Goodson, and Scott Souders.

1. REPORT ITEMS

Ms. Herrington informed the Planning Commission that Planning Manager Justin Kilgore had resigned from his position with El Paso County. The next PC Hearing is Thursday, November 5th, 2026, at 9:00 A.M.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE HEARING AGENDA

Mr. Ren Trudel, a resident of northern El Paso County, expressed opposition to the ongoing Buc-ee's development near I-25 and County Line Road. He raised concerns regarding potential traffic congestion, the scale of the proposed development, and impacts to the surrounding community. Mr. Trudel also

questioned the classification of the facility as a convenience store and requested that County staff carefully review the submitted development documents, particularly the soil reports and proposed grading and compaction activities.

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Adoption of Minutes for meeting held on October 1st, 2026.

PC ACTION: THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED (7 - 0)

IN FAVOR: (7) Bailey, Byers, Emrick, Moraes, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

B. P2610 **UHLER**

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)

SIESTA GROVE REZONING RR-5 TO RR-2.5

A request by Quentin Dassonville for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 35.08 acres from RR-5 (Residential Rural) to RR-2.5 (Residential Rural). The property to be rezoned is located at 15850 Siesta Grove and is approximately 1.63 miles southwest of the intersection of Black Forest Road and Hodgen Road. (Parcel No. 6100000292) (Commissioner District No. 1)

NO STAFF OR APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS OR DISCUSSION

PC ACTION: BAILEY MOVED / EMRICK SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3B, FILE NUMBER P2610 FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), SIESTA GROVE REZONING RR-5 TO RR-2.5, 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 (7-0).

IN FAVOR: (7) Bailey, Byers, Emrick, Moraes, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

C. LDC264 **ARNOLDUSSEN**

LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT

ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES AND LEGAL REMEDIES AMENDMENT

A request by El Paso County Planning and Community Development to amend Chapter 1, Section 1.15 Definitions, and Chapter 11, Sections 11.1.4 Right to Inspect and 11.3 Zoning Violations, of the El Paso County Land Development Code pursuant to C.R.S. § 30-28-124 and C.R.S. § 30-28-124.5 The purpose of this amendment is to update the requirements for enforcement procedures and legal remedies pursuant to HB 26-1239 and comply with State of Colorado requirements.

NO STAFF OR APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS OR DISCUSSION

PC ACTION: MORAES MOVED / BAILEY SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3C, FILE NUMBER LDC264 FOR A LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT, ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES AND LEGAL REMEDIES AMENDMENT, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (7 - 0).

IN FAVOR: (7) Bailey, Byers, Emrick, Moraes, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

D. CR261 **LETKE**

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)

THE MARKETS AT BENT GRASS REZONE (I-2 TO CR)

A request by Cythia DeYoung and Lena Gail Case for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of a 17.17-acre property from the I-2 (Industrial) to the CR (Commercial Regional) zoning district. The property is located along Woodmen Frontage Road and Bent Grass Meadows Drive and 0.64-miles west of the intersection of Woodmen Road and Meridian Road. (Parcel Nos. 5301000016) (Commissioner District No. 2)

PC ACTION: THIS ITEM WAS PULLED TO BE HEARD AS A CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEM PER REQUEST BY PLANNING COMMISSIONER BYERS.

E. SP262 **LETKE**

PRELIMINARY PLAN

THE MARKETS AT BENT GRASS - PRELIMINARY PLAN

A request by Cythia DeYoung and Lena Gail Case for approval of a 53.91-acre Preliminary Plan creating 14 commercial lots. The properties are located along Woodmen Frontage Road and Bent Grass Meadows Drive and 0.64-miles west of the intersection of Woodmen Road and Meridian Road. (Parcel Nos. 5301000016, 5301000017, & 5301002007) (Commissioner District No. 2)

PC ACTION: THIS ITEM WAS PULLED TO BE HEARD AS A CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEM PER REQUEST BY PLANNING COMMISSIONER BYERS.

4. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS:

3D. CR261 **LETKE**

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)

THE MARKETS AT BENT GRASS REZONE (I-2 TO CR)

A request by Cythia DeYoung and Lena Gail Case for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of a 17.17-acre property from the I-2 (Industrial) to the CR (Commercial Regional) zoning district. The property is located along Woodmen Frontage Road and Bent Grass Meadows Drive and 0.64-miles west of the intersection of Woodmen Road and Meridian Road. (Parcel Nos. 5301000016) (Commissioner District No. 2)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

DISCUSSION: Mr. Trowbridge asked whether any outstanding easement or right-of-way issues would affect the project. **Ms. Charlene Durham,** Principal Engineer, explained that the necessary easements and right-of-way requirements would be finalized during the final plat process. **Mr. Trowbridge** also asked about the status of the FEMA floodplain map revision and whether its approval would be required prior to final plat approval. **Ms. Durham** clarified that the map revision is a separate process and would not delay final plat approval, as the anticipated floodplain changes had already been accounted for in the project design.

Mr. Byers asked for clarification regarding the proposed traffic modifications at Golden Sage Road and Woodman Road. **Mr. Sean Murphy,** with Evergreen Dev Co, Inc., explained that the existing signal at

Golden Sage Road would remain but would be modified to a continuous green T-intersection, allowing westbound Woodman Road traffic to proceed without stopping. He stated that certain turning movements would be redirected to the proposed signal at Switchgrass Drive, with the final configurations to be determined during construction drawing review in coordination with the County and City of Colorado Springs.

Mr. Byers also asked about the removal of a portion of Woodman Frontage Road and whether the associated right-of-way would be vacated. **Mr. Murphy** clarified that the right-of-way would remain under County ownership and would be repurposed for drainage conveyance.

Ms. Emrick asked how residents of the surrounding neighborhoods would access Meridian Road following the proposed roadway modifications. **Mr. Murphy** explained that residents would continue to have multiple access options utilizing the existing frontage road connections or the proposed roundabout and signalized intersection improvements.

Ms. Emrick also asked whether speed limits along Bentgrass Meadows Drive or Woodman Frontage Road would change. **Mr. Murphy** stated that the speed limit would be reduced to 25 mph along portions of Bentgrass Meadows Drive adjacent to the proposed roundabout.

Mr. Wulf asked whether the proposed improvements to Woodman Road would be completed prior to or concurrently with the development. **Mr. Murphy** explained that the new signal at Switchgrass Drive and modifications to Golden Sage Road are intended to be constructed in a single phase concurrent with the development, as identified in the Traffic Impact Study.

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS OR APPLICANT REBUTTAL

PC ACTION: WULF MOVED / MORAES SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3D, FILE NUMBER CR261 FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), THE MARKETS AT BENT GRASS REZONE (I-2 TO CR), 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 (7 - 0).

IN FAVOR: (7) Bailey, Byers, Emrick, Moraes, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

3E. SP262 **LETKE**

PRELIMINARY PLAN

THE MARKETS AT BENT GRASS - PRELIMINARY PLAN

A request by Cythia DeYoung and Lena Gail Case for approval of a 53.91-acre Preliminary Plan creating 14 commercial lots. The properties are located along Woodmen Frontage Road and Bent Grass Meadows Drive and 0.64-miles west of the intersection of Woodmen Road and Meridian Road. (Parcel Nos. 5301000016, 5301000017, & 5301002007) (Commissioner District No. 2)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION IN COMBINATION WITH ITEM 3D CR261

PC ACTION: BAILEY MOVED / BYER SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3E, FILE NUMBER SP262 FOR A PRELIMINARY PLAN, THE MARKETS AT BENT GRASS - PRELIMINARY PLAN, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH FOUR (4) CONDITIONS, THREE (3) 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 (7 - 0).

IN FAVOR: (7) Bailey, Byers, Emrick, Moraes, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

5. REGULAR ITEMS

A. ID261 **PARSONS**

SPECIAL DISTRICT SERVICE PLAN

BENT GRASS COMMERCIAL METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

A request from McGeady Becher Cortese Williams, P.C., for approval of a Colorado Revised Statutes Title 32 Special District Service Plan for Bent Grass Commercial Metropolitan District. The District is approximately 54 acres and is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Bent Grass Meadows Drive and Woodmen Frontage Road. The 17.17-acre portion included within the request is zoned I-2 (Industrial) and is anticipated to be rezoned to CR (Commercial Regional), and 36.76 acres is within the CR (Commercial Regional) zone district. The service plan includes the following: a maximum debt authorization of $33,000,000.00, a debt service mill levy of 45 mills for commercial,

and an operations and maintenance mill levy of 15 mills, for a total maximum combined mill levy of 60 mills.

The statutory purposes of the district include the provision of the following:

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

Parcel Nos. 5301000016, 5301000017, and 5301002007

(Commissioner District No. 2)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

DISCUSSION: Mr. Moraes, Mr. Whitney, and Mr. Bailey asked for clarification regarding the proposed commercial metropolitan district and its relationship to the existing Bentgrass Metropolitan District. **Ms. Parsons** explained that the proposed commercial district would operate independently from the existing district, with a special exclusion agreement preventing the existing district from issuing new debt obligations against the affected property. However, the property would remain responsible for its share of the existing district's debt obligations until those obligations are satisfied. **Ms. Parsons** further clarified that the proposed commercial district would have its own mill levy limitations consistent with the County's service plan policies. She explained that the overlapping financial obligations could result in a higher combined mill levy until the existing debt is paid. Additional discussion addressed the proposed district boundaries and a potential future inclusion area. **Ms. Parsons** explained that the additional inclusion area was identified to accommodate possible future commercial development or

redevelopment without requiring the creation of another metropolitan district, consistent with County policies intended to limit the proliferation of special districts.

Mr. Moraes asked about the proposed district's ability to repay its debt, noting that a significant portion of the projected revenue appeared to depend on a single commercial tenant. **Mr. Murphy** explained that the district's bonding capacity would be based on independently evaluated revenue projections and would be reduced if anticipated development or sales revenues did not materialize. He further explained that if revenues declined after bonds were issued, the district may need to consider options such as restructuring or refinancing its debt. **Mr. Moraes** also asked about the fixed annual payment of $20,000 over 30 years and whether inflation had been considered. **Mr. Murphy** explained that the amount was negotiated with the existing metropolitan district to address anticipated operation and maintenance costs following the exclusion. He stated that a fixed payment was selected to provide financial predictability for both districts over the 30-year period.

Ms. Emrick asked for clarification regarding the proposed funding allocation for parks and whether those funds would be used for future trail improvements. **Mr. Murphy** explained that the parks category includes various eligible public improvements, such as open space, landscaping, and water quality facilities, rather than exclusively traditional park facilities. He further clarified that while the proposed district would have the ability to contribute toward future trail improvements, those costs are not currently included in the proposed financial plan.

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS OR APPLICANT REBUTTAL

PC ACTION: MORAES MOVED / WULF SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5A, FILE NUMBER ID261 FOR A SPECIAL DISTRICT SERVICE PLAN, BENT GRASS COMMERCIAL METROPOLITAN DISTRICT, 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 (7 - 0).

IN FAVOR: (7) Bailey, Byers, Emrick, Moraes, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

B. PUDSP251 **HOWSER**

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT/PRELIMINARY PLAN

MAYBERRY PHASE 2

A request by Mayberry Communities, LLC, for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 18.70 acres from a conceptual PUD (Planned Unit Development) to a site-specific PUD (Planned Unit Development) with approval of a Preliminary Plan illustrating 92 single-family attached lots, 6 single-family detached lots, 1 clubhouse lot, for a total of 99 lots, 8 tracts, including 5.99 acres of open space provisions and 2.33 acres of land dedicated for public right-of-way. The property is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of State Highway 94 and Mayberry Drive. (Parcel Nos. 3400000472, 3400000473, 3414201024, 3414205001, and 3414206001) (Commissioner District No. 4)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bailey asked for clarification regarding the additional condition of approval included in the resolution. **Mr. Howser** confirmed that an updated resolution containing the additional condition had been provided to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Trowbridge asked whether a traffic signal would be installed at Highway 94 and whether the developer would be required to contribute funding toward the improvement. **Ms. Durham** explained that a traffic signal was not currently warranted and that any future installation would be subject to CDOT's schedule. She stated that she was unaware of any existing funding arrangements and deferred further clarification to the applicant.

Mr. Moraes asked whether the outstanding disagreement between staff and the applicant regarding permitted encroachments into side yard setbacks had been resolved. **Mr. Howser** explained that the issue remained under review and was addressed through Condition of Approval No. 7, requiring all outstanding staff comments to be resolved prior to final approval and recording of the plan. He clarified that staff's primary concern was ensuring adequate stormwater drainage between structures, particularly given the narrow side yard setbacks. Mr. Howser stated that the proposed resolution would restrict encroachments into side yard setbacks while allowing certain encroachments within front and rear setbacks.

Mr. Moraes asked whether the outstanding concerns from the Ellicott Fire Department were limited to wildfire mitigation or included additional fire protection requirements. **Mr. Randy Goodson,** President

of Mayberry Communities, explained that the applicant had experienced difficulties obtaining consistent responses from the Fire Department throughout the review process, despite submitting responses to previous comments. **Mr. Moraes** asked whether qualified fire protection professionals had participated in preparing the applicant's responses. **Mr. Scott Souders,** Director of Development with Mayberry Communities, confirmed that fire protection consultants had been involved and explained that the applicant believed the proposed development complied with applicable fire and building code requirements. **Mr. Moraes** expressed concern regarding the Fire Department's operational capacity to serve the proposed development, noting that compliance with adopted codes does not necessarily establish the availability of adequate emergency response resources. **Mr. Souders** acknowledged the concern and suggested that broader coordination among the Fire Department, County officials, and area developers may be necessary to address long-term service capabilities. **Mr. Goodson** further noted that the development would contribute additional tax revenue to the Fire Department and referenced existing fire protection facilities serving the area.

Mr. Moraes asked for clarification regarding the water supply available for fire protection. **Mr. Goodson** explained that Ellicott Utilities Company has an agreement with Cherokee for 200,000 gallons of storage capacity in an existing tank at Mayberry, of which 180,000 gallons is designated for fire flow.

Mr. Moraes also asked whether the applicant intended to pursue a modification to the required setbacks adjacent to open space. **Mr. Goodson** confirmed that the modification was still being requested to accommodate the proposed pedestrian-oriented design and direct trail access from the homes.

Mr. Trowbridge asked about the proposed residential density in relation to the overall Mayberry Sketch Plan and expressed concerns regarding the proximity of structures and potential impacts to fire safety and drainage. **Mr. Goodson** explained that while the proposed development falls within the highest density category identified in the Sketch Plan, it would not have the highest number of dwelling units per acre compared to other planned residential areas.

Ms. Emrick asked whether fire sprinklers had been considered for the proposed residential units, expressing concerns regarding the proximity of structures and accessibility for emergency vehicles**. Mr. Goodson** explained that the proposed roadways, fire hydrant locations, and building configurations were designed to meet applicable fire code requirements, including emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Wulf asked for clarification regarding staff's assessment of the outstanding fire protection concerns, given the lack of support from the Ellicott Fire District. **Ms. Herrington** explained that staff could not determine the extent of any outstanding issues due to unsuccessful attempts to coordinate with the Fire District. She noted that a qualified third-party fire consultant had reviewed the project for compliance with the adopted International Fire Code. Ms. Herrington further clarified that the Fire District would have an additional opportunity to review and sign off on individual building permits through the Pikes Peak Regional Building Department.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR APPLICANT REBUTTAL

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: Mr. Moraes expressed concerns regarding the proposed development's compliance with approval criteria related to the capacity of public facilities, particularly fire protection services. He acknowledged the applicant's efforts to meet applicable code requirements but questioned whether the Ellicott Fire District had the operational capacity to adequately serve future residents, given its lack of participation in the review process. Mr. Moraes also noted concerns regarding the justification for certain requested modifications and waivers but emphasized that the unresolved fire protection concerns were his primary hesitation in recommending approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

Mr. Bailey stated that he supported the motion to recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners. He expressed concern that allowing a public agency's lack of response or participation in the review process to prevent a project from moving forward could establish a problematic precedent. He emphasized that property owners and developers should not be penalized when no specific deficiencies or inability to provide services have been established.

PC ACTION: BAILEY MOVED / BYERS SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5B, FILE NUMBER PUDSP251 FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT/PRELIMINARY PLAN, MAYBERRY PHASE 2, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH EIGHT (8) CONDITIONS, 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 FAILED (3 - 4).

IN FAVOR: (3) Bailey, Byers, and Trowbridge.

IN OPPOSITION: (4) Emrick, Moraes, Whitney, and Wulf.

6. NON-ACTION ITEMS

None.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 12:15 P.M.

Minutes Prepared By: Marcella Maes & Jessica Merriam