

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, November 21, 2024
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
Held at Centennial Hall, 200 S Cascade Ave, Colorado Springs, Colorado

REGULAR HEARING, 9:00 A.M.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND VOTING: Thomas Bailey, Sarah Brittain Jack, Jim Byers, Jay Carlson, Eric Moraes, Bryce Schuettpelz, Tim Trowbridge, Christopher Whitney, and Jeffrey Markewich.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: None.

PC MEMBERS ABSENT: Becky Fuller and Wayne Smith.

STAFF PRESENT: Meggan Herington, Justin Kilgore, Kari Parsons, Kylie Bagley, Lisa Elgin, Joe Sandstrom, Elizabeth Nijkamp, Charlene Durham, Daniel Torres, Bret Dilts, Lori Seago, and Erika Keech.

OTHERS PRESENT AND SPEAKING: Cindy Landsberg, Rick Van Wieren, Matthew Grubacich, Bryan Bagley, Charles Blasi, Matt Dunston, Harold Larson, Bruce Sidebotham, Maria Edh, Chris Sparkes, Darcy Schoening, Judy Williamson, Robin Wright, Allison Catalano, Steve King, Mitch LaKind, Laura Lucero, Christie Beverly, Christi Beyer-Tarver, Bernard Humbles, Skyler Smith, Michael Schmidt, Jacques Lemond, Kenneth Kimple, and Angela Larson.

1. REPORT ITEMS

Ms. Herington advised the board that the next PC hearing will be on Dec. 5, 2024. That agenda will include a legislative LDC Amendment. A measure was passed in 2022 regarding Natural Medicine. The State tasked local jurisdictions with defining the time, place, and manor, which needs to be established before the end of the year. Due to the short amount of time, PCD will be asking the board to make a recommendation at the next hearing. She then discussed the revised minutes that had been presented to the board. She suggested adding a time to further discuss the minutes on the Dec. 5, 2024, agenda.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE HEARING AGENDA

Ms. Cindy Landsburg spoke about a future proposal, Buc-ee's, adjacent to the Monument Ridge East proposal. She spoke about how Monument was originally designed to preserve the natural environment (no streetlights, compact developments, etc.). She is concerned by the changes happening in that area of the County.

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Adoption of Minutes for meeting held on November 7, 2024.

DISCUSSION: Board Members requested a scheduled time to discuss the changes to the minutes.

PC ACTION: THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED (8-1)

IN FAVOR: (8) Bailey, Brittain Jack, Byers, Carlson, Moraes, Schuettpelz, Trowbridge, and Whitney.

IN OPPOSITION: (1) Markewich.

B. P2410

ELGIN

**MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
WINSOME COMMERCIAL LOT REZONE TO RESIDENTIAL**

A request by Proterra Properties for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 7.21 acres from CC (Commercial Community) to RR-2.5 (Residential Rural). The property is located at 16511 Early Light Drive, on the northwest corner of Hodgen Road and North Meridian Road. (Parcel No. 4119007001) (Commissioner District No. 1)

NO PRESENTATION, PUBLIC COMMENT, OR DISCUSSION.

PC ACTION: TROWBRIDGE MOVED / MORAES SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3B, FILE NUMBER P2410, FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), WINSOME COMMERCIAL LOT REZONE TO RESIDENTIAL, UTILIZING THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION 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: (9) Bailey, Brittain Jack, Byers, Carlson, Markewich, Moraes, Schuettpelz, Trowbridge, and Whitney.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

4. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS

(NONE)

5. REGULAR ITEMS

A. P249

PARSONS

**MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
SCHMIDT RS-5000**

A request by Turkey Canon Quarry Inc., and Sugar Daddys, LLC, for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 23.02 acres from RR-5 (Residential Rural) to RS-5000 (Residential Suburban). The property is located north of Vanderwood Road, west of Vollmer Road, and east of Black Forest Road. (Parcel Nos. 5200000577 and 5200000570) (Commissioner District No. 1)

****This item was heard in a combined presentation with P248. All discussion was combined.**

**MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
SCHMIDT RM-12**

A request by Turkey Canon Quarry Inc. for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 34.98 acres from RR-5 (Residential Rural) to RM-12 (Residential Multi-Dwelling). The property is located north of Vanderwood Road, west of Vollmer Road, and east of Black Forest Road. (Parcel No. 5200000577) (Commissioner District No. 1)

COMBINED STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Parsons addressed concerns raised in written public comment; the detention pond proposed to the southeast will remain, and the existing berm will be addressed during the Preliminary Plan stage of the process. **Mr. Carlson** asked about the density within the southern PUD zoning. Ms. Parsons later answered that lots ranged from 5,400 to 8,400 sq ft. RM-12 zoning would require 3,500 sq ft lot sizes for single-family attached or detached dwellings. The LDC requires that townhomes each be on their own lots. **Mr. Markewich** asked for clarification regarding the benefits of annexation as it pertains to utilities, which was answered by Ms. Barlow. Cottonwood Creek improvements were briefly discussed; the floodplain will not be impacted by the subject proposal, but they are proposing a bridge for Marksheffel Boulevard over the creek. The existing permit for mining operations remains valid, but the property is in the reclamation process and the applicant is proposing a change in use. **Mr. Moraes** confirmed the design of townhomes/single-family attached units and expressed a struggle with finding compatibility if the RM-12 rezoning ultimately resulted in multi-family units (which would be allowed). Ms. Barlow indicated that apartments are not in their plan and RM-12 would not support the high-density complexes typically designed with apartment communities.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None in favor. **Mr. Rick Van Wieren** opposed the increase in density. He discussed the inconsistent transition from a suburban neighborhood to higher density (proposed), and then rural lots to the north. He referred to the plan as “death by 1,000 cuts” to the rural character of the Black Forest Road corridor. **Mr. Matthew Grubacich** disagreed with the statement that there will be minimal impact to traffic. He would rather see acreage lots. **Mr. Bryan Bagley** opposed the rezoning to RM-12. He did not agree that the rezoning would be consistent or compatible with the neighborhood. He further mentioned a lack of buffer or transition between the proposed development and the existing residents to the north. **Mr. Charles Blasi** opposed the lack of transition between the proposed RM-12 and the RR-2.5 lots to the north. He mentioned a desire to retain the existing berm. He requested sound mitigation adjacent to the road expansion.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL: Provided by Ms. Andrea Barlow with N.E.S. She discussed a neighborhood meeting held prior to the adjacent rezoning to RM-30 where future plans were discussed. Regarding the traffic study, the one she referenced in her presentation was “subject to improvements”, meaning only the capacity of existing roads and intersections was reviewed. The future expansion of Marksheffel to a 4-lane arterial roadway will alleviate current traffic concerns and accommodate growth. The berm that has been discussed is within the right of way and regardless of the mining reclamation process, will need to be removed to allow construction of the road. She then discussed the various changes to the area and how compatibility is discretionary. She believes the proposed zoning is compatible due to the arterial roadways and surrounding suburban development.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: Ms. **Brittain Jack** asked about the existing berm, and Ms. Barlow indicated in her rebuttal that the berm would need to be removed for construction of the road. **Mr. Moraes** asked if apartments were developed on RM-12 zoning anywhere in the County. Ms. Parsons stated that all apartment projects she had been part of were within RM-30 zoning. **Mr. Markewich** and **Mr. Bailey** discussed the Planning Commission's role in the land use process. **Mr. Whitney** sympathized with the neighbors' perspectives but explained that they could only consider the criteria of approval. **Mr. Carlson** stated that he views the RS-5000 as compatible with the southern development and he sees no issue with the RM-12 zoning because of the 106' wide roadway creating a separation adjacent to the rural lots to the north. **Mr. Moraes** stated that he does not think the RM-12 is compatible with the surrounding character, even with a 106' wide road. He would have supported the entire parcel being rezoned to RS-5000 instead. **Mr. Markewich** agreed.

PC ACTION: MORAES MOVED / BRITAIN JACK SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5A, FILE NUMBER P249, FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), SCHMIDT RS-5000, UTILIZING THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION WITH THREE (3) 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: (9) Bailey, Brittain Jack, Byers, Carlson, Markewich, Moraes, Schuettpelz, Trowbridge, and Whitney.
IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

PC ACTION: TROWBRIDGE MOVED / CARLSON SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5B, FILE NUMBER P248, FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), SCHMIDT RM-12, UTILIZING THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION WITH THREE (3) 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 (5-4).

IN FAVOR: (5) Bailey, Brittain Jack, Byers, Carlson, and Trowbridge.
IN OPPOSITION: (4) Markewich, Moraes, Schuettpelz, and Whitney.

****Mr. Carlson** was excused due to a schedule conflict. There were eight (8) voting members moving forward.

C. P246

BAGLEY

**MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
MONUMENT RIDGE RS-6000**

A request by Vertex Consulting Services for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 18.97 acres from PUD (Planned Unit Development), CC (Commercial Community), C-1(Commercial), and RS-20000 (Residential Suburban) to RS-6000 (Residential Suburban). The property is located directly east of Monument Hill Road and west of Misty Acres Boulevard, one-quarter of a mile south of the intersection of I-25 and County Line Road and one-half of a mile north of the intersection of Monument Hill Road and Misty Acres Boulevard. (Parcel Nos. 712201014, 7102200013, 7102200008, 7102200006, and 7102201001) (Commissioner District No. 1)

****This item was heard in a combined presentation with P245 and SP241.**

D. P245

BAGLEY

**MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
MONUMENT RIDGE EAST RM-12**

A request by Vertex Consulting Services for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 40.51 acres from PUD (Planned Unit Development), C-1 (Commercial), CS (Commercial Services), and CC (Commercial Community) to RM-12 (Residential, Multi-Dwelling). The property is located directly east of Monument Hill Road and west of Misty Acres Boulevard, one-quarter of a mile south of the intersection of I-25 and County Line Road and one-half of a mile north of the intersection of Monument Hill Road and Misty Acres Boulevard. (Parcel Nos. 7102200006, 7102200010, and 7102201013) (Commissioner District No. 1)

****This item was heard in a combined presentation with P246 and SP241.**

E. SP241

BAGLEY

**PRELIMINARY PLAN
MONUMENT RIDGE EAST PRELIMINARY PLAN**

A request by Vertex Consulting Services for approval of a 59.48-acre Preliminary Plan depicting 37 single-family lots and 21 multi-family lots. The property is located directly southeast of the intersection of Interstate 25 and County Line Road, southwest of the intersection of County Line Road and Doewood Drive, and one-half of a mile north of the intersection of Monument Hill Road and Misty Acres Boulevard. (Parcel Nos. 712201014, 7102200013, 7102200008, 7102200010, 7102200006, and 7102201001) (Commissioner District No. 1)

COMBINED STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS.

DISCUSSION: During the engineering portion of the presentation, **Mr. Moraes** asked if the County had any reservations about taking a highway frontage road and running it through a suburban neighborhood. Mr. Dilts referred to a presentation slide to explain that the curves of the realigned road (running east to west through the proposal) would have speed limits of 25 mph and be reduced to an urban collector type of roadway. Mr. Moraes had concerns that the MTCP calling for the road in that placement may have made sense when the land was zoned commercial, but it doesn't make sense if rezoned to residential. **Mr. Markewich** confirmed that commercial development (current zoning) on the lot would have a greater traffic impact than the proposed residential. **Mr. Carlson** discussed the comparison between the current zoning and proposed rezoning in terms of density. **Mr. Moraes** asked for more information regarding sidewalks and walkability due to proximity with the school. Ms. Ruiz discussed internal sidewalks on the Preliminary Plan. Mr. Dossey indicated there are no sidewalks currently along Monument Hill Road or Misty Acres Boulevard. The County may require one to be constructed. **Mr. Moraes** pointed out that clear imagery of the proposed districts were not included in the applicant's Letter of Intent.

Some of the applicant's complaints from the review process were discussed. Mr. Dossey stated the Preliminary Plan provides more detail than a PUD. Potential future major amendments to the Preliminary Plan, if approved, would need to appear before the Board again. **Mr. Markewich** then asked if Mr. Dossey's requested changes to the Preliminary Plan conditions of approval had been addressed. Rewording was discussed. Rather than removal, the applicant requested that conditions

5 and 6 be revised to only include the RM-12 area. **Mr. Byers** discussed the applicant's criticism of a landscape plan request from County staff. He doesn't think the intent was as intensive as the applicant interpreted it to be and thinks the situation may be slightly misrepresented. Ms. Bagley clarified that the request for landscaping information would not have applied to single-family detached areas. **Ms. Herington** then gave clarification regarding how County staff followed the requirements of the LDC. She read LDC 8.4.1 (F), "*Lot Layout, Design and Configuration. Divisions of land shall be designed to provide for lots that are of an appropriate size and configuration for the site characteristics and intended uses; adequate buffering from the adverse impacts of adjoining uses through lot orientation, setbacks, landscaping or other appropriate methods; ...*" Because staff did not receive the information requested, they felt that they could not make a finding that it met those sections of the LDC. She further read the LDC definition for multi-family, "*Dwelling, Multifamily — A structure containing 3 or more dwelling units designed for or used exclusively as a residence by 3 or more families...*" Staff was unsure of what the applicant was requesting during the review process. She stated that the declaration made during the presentation (that the intention is to build single-family attached structures) is the first time staff has heard that commitment. She pointed out the reason for different requests for different project types (i.e., Rezoning versus Preliminary Plan).

Mr. Byers mentioned that Douglas County had previously been opposed to improvements at Misty Acres Boulevard where it met County Line Road. He asked if Douglas County was supportive of the traffic improvements presented by the applicant's engineer. Ms. Nijkamp replied that her team is working with Douglas County. She knew they would like to maintain the alignment to the north, so El Paso County is trying to maintain that alignment to the south as well. **Mr. Moraes** confirmed that Douglas County would be a review agency for the improvements.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: In favor: **Mr. Matt Dunston** spoke about the character of the area. He likes the proposal when compared to the potential options under current zoning. He believes redesigning the road through the proposal will make it less dangerous. **Mr. Harold Larson** discussed the zoning change from commercial to residential, which he appreciates. He is satisfied with the 15,000 sq ft lots adjacent to the existing homes. He encouraged other members of the public to work with the developer regarding finer details. **Mr. Bruce Sidebotham** discussed current misuse of the property and stated vacant suburban land is unproductive land until it is developed. He believes the residential design is compatible with existing uses and the Douglas County open space. **Ms. Maria Edh** expressed support for the proposal, especially when compared to the commercial alternatives. **Mr. Chris Sparkes** also supported residential rezoning to replace the commercial alternatives. He also supported increasing density as it abuts major roadways. **Ms. Darcy Schoening** believes the proposal meets the criteria of approval. She stated opposition is coming from emotional or political motivators and that the project was denied in Monument to "make an example out of the developer."

In opposition: **Ms. Judy Williamson** asked if local school arrival and dismissal times were considered in the traffic study. **Mr. Robin Wright** supports rezoning to residential but is concerned about the density of the RM-12. He questioned what the gateway of El Paso County should look like. He suggested maintaining the RS-6000 throughout the entire property, but he was told the RM-12 was included so the developer could recoup cost of investment. **Ms. Allison Catalano** expressed agreement with Steve King's letter found in the project file. She read directly from the Your El Paso Master Plan introduction, page 9, "Sense of Place" and other environmental considerations. In regard to compatibility with Douglas County's open space, she read directly from the Douglas

County letter found in the project file which raised concerns with the RM-12. She further mentioned page 19 in the Master Plan relating to the Tri-Lakes Key Area. She stated that if the proposal aligned with the character of the surrounding area, there wouldn't be so many people in opposition. She agreed with rezoning to residential but has issue with the RM-12. **Mr. Steve King**, Monument Mayor Pro Tem, referenced the Monument denial resolution found in the project file and explained that the proposal did not meet their Master Plan, nor could they supply water to it or the related proposal on the west side. He stated that property rights apply to the zoning rights granted and available currently, not the rights you want in the future. He dislikes the approach of straight zoning and would have liked to see a PUD. He finished by reiterating that the area is the gateway to the County, is heavily treed with wildlife, and has unique environmental features. He also discussed the proposed intersections and driving conditions. **Mr. Mitch LaKind**, Monument Mayor, reiterated that the Monument denial was not for political reasons. He spoke about Monument Police Department MOU's and IGA's across the Tri-Lakes Area that result in frequent coverage of services in unincorporated areas of the County. He does not believe the police force is staffed for the proposed increase in density. The Town will not receive revenue to assist in the increased calls for service to the area; the Monument taxpayers would have to foot the bill. Residential development is desired, but not at the density proposed. He asked that a PUD be considered so there would be more conformity with the surrounding area. **Ms. Laura Lucero** opposed the density of the RM-12 zoning. She then brought up the Douglas County letter regarding drainage found in the project file. She expressed concerns about traffic egress in case of emergency. **Ms. Christie Beverly** expressed opposition to the density and stated she thinks it should remain single-family detached. She has concerns about traffic and drainage. She doesn't think the Preliminary Plan is complete or ready to be approved. **Ms. Christi Beyer-Tarver** opposed the high density and clearing of trees. She thinks the proposal will overwhelm local schools. If the housing is low-income, that would statistically increase crime and burden local services. **Mr. Bernard Humbles** spoke about the character of the neighborhood. He opposed housing other than single-family detached. **Mr. Skyler Smith** spoke on behalf of **Mr. Michael Schmidt**. He read a letter which was also sent to County staff and is found in the project file. **Mr. Jacques Lemond** questioned the impact the proposal would have on adjacent property values. **Mr. Kenneth Kimple** reiterated opposition to the density of the RM-12 zoning. He discussed the traffic impact due to a lack of commercial services in the area. **Ms. Angela Larson** spoke about the character of the neighborhood.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL: Provided by Mr. Dossey with Vertex Consulting Services. He presented past aerial imagery of adjacent development where trees were removed. He stated home values would drop if a strip club were built. He stated the existing character of the neighborhood is commercial. He believes people don't like the proposal because they aren't in control of it. He discussed how it is typical to transition high density decrease to less density as it moves away from major roadways, which is what has been proposed. He stated that the comprehensive plan for the Town of Monument includes the subject property and plans for it to be mixed-use. He disagreed with the comments that the proposal would decrease people's peaceful enjoyment of their properties. He stated the applicant plans to preserve trees to re-plant in the proposals landscaping. Regarding the impact of Monument first responders serving the property, he stated future residents would likely shop in Monument, offsetting the cost. If the entire property were zoned RS-6000, it would allow for 290 dwelling units. He further stated straight zoning does not require open space or public landscaping. The schools did not raise concerns about capacity issues. He then discussed why the proposal would be fire-wise. He discussed compatibility with the existing residential use.

Mr. Moraes asked if the traffic study was conducted during school drop-off or pick-up times. Mr. Jeff Hodsdon with LSC Transportation Consultants Inc. answered that typical traffic studies near school areas would include 3 peak times, which include peak school times. He stated that their traffic study ultimately included 2 peak times because their study showed no significant increase in results heading north. School peak volumes were considered but they did not count the High School entrances. Mr. Moraes expressed concerns if Misty Acres becomes the main collector road in the area. Mr. Dossey then showed a preliminary landscape plan that had been submitted and addressed why he believes the proposal is in conformance with the Master Plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: Mr. Schuettpelz asked why the suggestion of rezoning to PUD would be beneficial. Ms. Bagley answered that a PUD would provide more information with conceptual plans, including landscaping and trails. It would also address requirements for usable open space. Having more information included would give comfort to neighbors. **Mr. Schuettpelz** asked if the same density and layout could have been achieved under PUD zoning, which Ms. Bagley confirmed. **Mr. Moraes** believes a PUD would have been a better option. He read about the purpose and intention of PUD zoning from the LDC. He then discussed the major entrances to El Paso County and how he would have liked to see something different in this area. He would have liked to see more innovation. **Mr. Markewich** believes the current proposal protects the current residents from something “crazy”. He discussed property rights and the consideration of criteria for approval. He expressed disappointment that an agreement was not made between the applicant and Town of Monument so that revenue and first responder concerns could have been addressed. **Mr. Trowbridge** agreed that rezoning to residential is better than the existing commercial zoning in the area. He agreed with Mr. Moraes’ desire for a more innovative package. He doesn’t love the RM-12 zoning and the size of that piece. He further mentioned the natural features. **Ms. Brittain Jack** expressed excitement for improvements to the intersection at County Line Road and I-25.

PC ACTION: BRITTAIN JACK MOVED / SCHUETTPELZ SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5C, FILE NUMBER P246, FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), MONUMENT RIDGE RS-6000, UTILIZING THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION WITH FOUR (4) 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 (8-0).

IN FAVOR: (8) Bailey, Brittain Jack, Byers, Markewich, Moraes, Schuettpelz, Trowbridge, and Whitney.
IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: Mr. Markewich stated he understands concerns about the density of the RM-12 zoning, but that million-dollar houses next the highway wouldn’t sell. He stated the character of the existing neighborhood wouldn’t be able to extend throughout the full area. **Mr. Moraes** mentioned criteria for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) number 3, compatibility with land uses in all directions. He does not see RM-12 as being compatible. **Mr. Whitney** agreed with Mr. Moraes’ comment regarding incompatibility of RM-12 zoning. **Mr. Byers** explained that he did not hear compelling justification for the density of RM-12, and he does not see compatibility. Marketability is not part of the criteria for approval. **Mr. Trowbridge** stated he does not feel the RM-12 zoning is compatible. **Mr. Bailey** expressed that he does believe the RM-12 is compatible and a better option than the property’s current zoning.

PC ACTION: MARKEWICH MOVED / SCHUETTPELZ SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5D, FILE NUMBER P245, FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), MONUMENT RIDGE EAST RM-12, UTILIZING THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION WITH THREE (3) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL FAILED (4-4) RESULTING IN NO RECOMMENDATION BEING FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

IN FAVOR: (4) Bailey, Brittain Jack, Markewich, and Schuettpelz.

IN OPPOSITION: (4) Byers, Moraes, Trowbridge, and Whitney.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: Mr. Markewich asked to discuss modification of the conditions of approval. Ms. Herington clarified that staff did not modify the resolution or make changes based on the applicants request and if the board would like anything changed, staff would need more direction. **Mr. Trowbridge** suggested removing condition number 8 and made a motion to do so, which passed. **Mr. Schuettpelz** asked his fellow board members if revision of other conditions of approval should be considered. No one suggested to make further amendments. **Mr. Whitney** explained that he cannot support a Preliminary Plan which includes an element (RM-12) that he disagrees with. **Mr. Moraes** and **Mr. Trowbridge** agreed.

PC ACTION: SCHUETTPELZ MOVED / MARKEWICH SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5E, FILE NUMBER SP241, FOR A PRELIMINARY PLAN, MONUMENT RIDGE EAST, UTILIZING THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION WITH NINE (9) CONDITIONS, FOUR (4) NOTATIONS, AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICANCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DEPENDABILITY THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION.

TROWBRIDGE MOVED / WHITNEY SECONDED TO REVISE THE MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHUETTPELZ, REMOVING CONDITION NUMBER EIGHT (8) FROM THE RESOLUTION. THE MOTION TO REVISE THE MOTION PASSED (8-0).

THE REVISED MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SP241, FOR A PRELIMINARY PLAN, MONUMENT RIDGE EAST, UTILIZING THE REVISED RESOLUTION WITH EIGHT (8) CONDITIONS, FOUR (4) NOTATIONS, AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICANCY 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 (5-3).

IN FAVOR: (5) Bailey, Brittain Jack, Byers, Markewich, and Schuettpelz.

IN OPPOSITION: (3) Moraes, Trowbridge, and Whitney.

6. NON-ACTION ITEMS

(NONE)

MEETING ADJOURNED at 4:30 P.M.

Minutes Prepared By: Miranda Benson