

MEGGAN HERINGTON, AICP, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUMMARY MEMORANDUM

TO: El Paso County Board of County Commissioners
FROM: Planning & Community Development
DATE: 09/24/26
RE: P268; Needles Highway 83 Rezoning RR-5 to RR-2.5

Project Description

A request by North Ranch LLC for approval of a Rezoning (Map Amendment) of one property totaling 47.55-acres in size from RR-5 to RR-2.5. The property is located along Colorado State Highway 83 and is 0.7 miles south of the intersection of Colorado State Highway 83 and Colorado State Highway 105. The item was heard as a regular item at the September 3, 2026, Planning Commission meeting, and was recommended for approval with a split vote of 6-3. (Parcel No. 6100000369) (Commissioner District No. 1)

Notation

Please see the Planning Commission Minutes for a complete discussion of the topic and the project manager's staff report for staff analysis and conditions.

Planning Commission Recommendation and Vote

Brittain Jack moved / Bailey seconded for Approval of the Rezoning utilizing the resolution attached to the staff report, that this item be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for their consideration. The motion for Approval was approved (6-3). The item was heard as a regular agenda item.

Attachments

1. Planning Commission Minutes from 09/03/26.
2. Signed Planning Commission Resolution.
3. Planning Commission Staff Report.
4. Draft BOCC Resolution.

MEGGAN HERINGTON, AICP, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING RESULTS (UNOFFICIAL RESULTS)

Planning Commission (PC) Meeting

Thursday, September 3rd, 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, Blaine Brew, Sarah Brittain Jack, Suzanne Casagrande, Eric Moraes, Bryce Schuettpelz, Tim Trowbridge, Christopher Whitney, and Jason Wulf.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: None.

PC MEMBERS ABSENT: Jim Byers, Michael Brewer, and Mae Emrick.

STAFF PRESENT: Meggan Herington, Kylie Bagley, Joe Letke, Erika Keech, Gilbert Laforce, Jalal Saleh, Jen Uhler, Charlene Durham, and Jessica Merriam.

OTHERS PRESENT AND SPEAKING: Nina Dossey, Dean Couture, Kim Westfall, and Rene Trudel.

1. REPORT ITEMS

Ms. Herington advised the board that the next PC Hearing is Thursday, September 17th, 2026, at 9:00 A.M.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE HEARING AGENDA

None.

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Adoption of Minutes for meeting held on August 20th, 2026.

PC ACTION: THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED (9 - 0)

IN FAVOR: (9) Bailey, Brew, Brittain Jack, Casagrande, Moraes, Schuettpelz, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

B. P265

UHLER

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)

HILLPOINTE APARTMENTS REZONE

A request by Hillpointe, LLC for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 14.09 acres from CR (Commercial Regional) and CAD-O (Commercial Airport Overlay District) to RM-30 (Residential Multi-Dwelling) and CAD-O (Commercial Airport Overlay District). The property is located at 485 Meadowbrook Parkway and is approximately 250 feet northeast of the intersection of Highway 24 and Peterson Road. (Parcel Nos. 5408007001 5408007004 5408007008) (Commissioner District No. 4)

NO STAFF OR APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS OR DISCUSSION

PC ACTION: BAILEY MOVED / MORAES SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3B, FILE NUMBER P265 FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), HILLPOINTE APARTMENTS REZONE, 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 TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (9 - 0).

IN FAVOR: (9) Bailey, Brew, Brittain Jack, Casagrande, Moraes, Schuettpelz, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

4. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

5. REGULAR ITEMS

A. P268

LETKE

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)

NEEDLES HIGHWAY 83 REZONING RR-5 TO RR-2.5

A request by North Ranch LLC for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) totaling 47.55-acres in size from RR-5 to RR-2.5. The property is located along Colorado State Highway 83 and is 0.7 miles south of

the intersection of Colorado State Highway 83 and Colorado State Highway 105. (Parcel No. 6100000369) (Commissioner District No. 1)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

DISCUSSION: **Mr. Moraes** asked for clarification regarding the discrepancy between the average daily trips listed as 200 and the 127 trips shown in the presentation. **Mr. Saleh**, Senior Engineer, explained that a corrected traffic study has been requested and clarified that 200 is the correct total number of average daily trips. He stated that 127 trips are anticipated to be generated by the proposed development, which, when added to the existing trips, results in a total of 200.

Mr. Whitney asked for confirmation that access to Highway 83 would be for emergency use only. **Mr. Saleh** confirmed that the access would be for emergency use only, would remain closed at all times, and would be equipped with a Knox Box.

Mr. Whitney asked whether the Fire District's lack of comments was typical at the rezoning stage and whether fire-related comments would be expected later during the subdivision and planning process.

Mr. Letke confirmed that the lack of comments is typical at the rezoning stage because fewer technical elements are required. He explained that items such as cistern drawings and fire protection reports are not required at this stage and anticipated that the Fire District would provide fire code-related comments during the subdivision and planning stages.

Mr. Whitney asked how cumulative impacts are considered when reviewing an application, particularly when the proposed development may generate a relatively small number of trips on its own but could contribute to greater impacts when combined with existing and future development in the surrounding area. **Mr. Letke** explained that cumulative growth is considered through the Master Plan, which provides guidance regarding anticipated growth and development within the area. He noted that the property is located within a priority development area where large-lot residential development at approximately 2.5 acres is anticipated. He also noted that coordination occurs with other agencies, including the Colorado Department of Transportation, regarding potential future improvements to the highway. For the broader area, staff relies on whether the application is in general conformance with the recommendations of the Master Plan. **Ms. Nina Dossey**, with Vertex Consulting, added that County traffic study requirements account for potential future development within the surrounding area rather than evaluating only

existing traffic conditions and the trips generated by an individual application. She explained that Engineering staff considers surrounding parcels that may develop in the future when evaluating cumulative traffic impacts. She also noted that the County's road impact fee provides funding for roadway improvements that may become necessary as a result of cumulative development impacts.

Mr. Trowbridge asked why an extension of Needles Drive directly to Highway 83 had not been considered. **Ms. Dossey** explained that the applicant had requested a direct connection; however, CDOT would not allow it due to its existing access management plan, which limits permanent access points to those already identified. She stated that CDOT is requiring the existing driveway on Needles Drive to be closed and replaced with emergency-only access. She acknowledged that a direct connection would be preferable but is not permitted by CDOT.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Mr. Dean Couture, property owner southeast of the subject property and a 35-year resident of Needles Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed 2.5-acre lots, noting that the existing properties along Needles Drive and east of the subject property are generally 5-acre lots. He raised concerns regarding fire protection and referenced fire protection improvements he was required to provide when developing the Majestic Pines subdivision. Mr. Couture also expressed concern regarding the additional traffic that would be generated on Needles Drive, which is currently a dead-end road serving approximately 13 homes, and questioned whether roadway improvements, including paving, would be required as development occurs. He questioned why the property could not be developed with 5-acre lots consistent with the surrounding area and suggested exploring an additional access connection to create a loop rather than continuing to rely on a dead-end roadway. Mr. Couture acknowledged that development and growth will occur but reiterated his concerns regarding the impacts of increased density and traffic on the existing neighborhood.

Ms. Kim Westfall, a neighboring property owner whose family purchased their property approximately 30 years ago, expressed concern regarding the proposed reduction in lot size from 5 acres to 2.5 acres. She stated that the surrounding properties within the Walden area are 5-acre lots and questioned how the proposed density would affect existing property values and the character of the area. Ms. Westfall also raised concerns regarding existing and future traffic conditions on Highway 83, potential impacts from planned roadway improvements, and the cumulative effects of additional development. She expressed particular concern regarding water availability and the potential impact of additional wells on existing

property owners, as well as impacts to wildlife and emergency evacuation in the event of a wildfire. Ms. Westfall stated that she understands development will occur but questioned why the property should be rezoned to allow 2.5-acre lots when it was purchased with 5-acre zoning and reiterated her concern that the proposed density would significantly change the existing character of the Walden area.

Mr. Rene Trudel, a resident of the Woodmoor/Trail Lakes area, spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning from RR-5 to RR-2.5. He stated that he initially did not have concerns with 2.5-acre lots but, after reviewing comments from surrounding residents, became concerned regarding water, traffic, and fire impacts. Mr. Trudeau discussed existing traffic and safety concerns along Highway 83, noting that the roadway also serves as an alternate route when traffic is congested on I-25 and that turning movements along Highway 83 can result in traffic backups and unsafe conditions. He expressed concern regarding the cumulative impact of continued development in northern El Paso County, particularly during peak commuting hours. Mr. Trudeau requested that the property remain zoned for 5-acre lots and stated that existing zoning and planning decisions should be respected. He also raised concerns regarding proposed residential setbacks, noting that residents choose larger-acreage properties in part to provide greater separation from neighboring homes and roadways. He concluded by asking the Commission to consider the impacts of continued development on the existing character of northern El Paso County.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL: Ms. Nina Dossey stated that several of the concerns raised during public comment would be addressed at a later stage of the development process. Regarding traffic concerns, she noted that the traffic study has been approved by El Paso County and presented a comparison of existing and proposed traffic conditions showing that the level of service during the PM peak hour would remain the same following development, with most intersections operating at Levels of Service A and B. She explained that roadway improvements, including whether Needles Drive would be required to remain gravel or be paved, would be evaluated during the subdivision process. In response to comments regarding the existing zoning and Master Plan, Ms. Dossey stated that the proposed RR-2.5 zoning is consistent with the Master Plan, including the Priority Development Area, place type, and area of change designations, which support 2.5-acre lots. She also addressed concerns regarding setbacks, explaining that the setbacks for the RR-5 and RR-2.5 zoning districts are generally the same, with the primary difference being the side setback, which is reduced from 25 feet in RR-5 to 15 feet in

RR-2.5. She noted that, depending on the configuration of the lots, most adjacent properties would likely be subject to the 25-foot rear setback.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: Mr. Moraes raised a broader concern regarding how the County evaluates maintaining existing character within Large-Lot Residential Priority Development Areas. He noted that while individual rezoning requests may appear consistent when reviewed independently, the cumulative effect of repeatedly rezoning properties from RR-5 to RR-2.5 could gradually change the established character of an area. He questioned at what point continued increases in density would move beyond maintaining the existing character contemplated by the Master Plan and instead create a new character over time. Mr. Moraes encouraged the Commission, County staff, applicants, and surrounding property owners to consider the cumulative effect of these zoning changes when evaluating future applications.

PC ACTION: BRITTAIN JACK MOVED / BAILEY SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5A, FILE NUMBER P268 FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), NEEDLES HIGHWAY 83 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 (6 - 3).

IN FAVOR: (6) Bailey, Brittain Jack, Moraes, Schuettepelz, Trowbridge, and Whitney.

IN OPPOSITION: (3) Brew, Casagrande, and Wulf.

6. NON-ACTION ITEMS

None.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:57 A.M.

Minutes Prepared By: Jessica Merriam

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING) (RECOMMEND APPROVAL)

Ms JACK moved that the following Resolution be adopted:

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

OF THE COUNTY OF EL PASO

STATE OF COLORADO

RESOLUTION NO. P268
NEEDLES HIGHWAY 83 REZONING RR-5 TO RR-2.5

WHEREAS, The North Ranch LLC did file an application with the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) to amend the El Paso County Zoning Map for property in the unincorporated area of El Paso County as described in Exhibit A and depicted in Exhibit B, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, from the RR-5 (Residential Rural) zoning district to the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by this Commission on September 3, 2026; and

WHEREAS, based on the evidence, testimony, exhibits, consideration of the Master Plan for the unincorporated area of the County, presentation and comments of the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department and other County representatives, comments of public officials and agencies, comments from all interested persons, comments by the general public, and comments by the El Paso County Planning Commission Members during the hearing, this Commission finds as follows:

1. The application was properly submitted for consideration by the Planning Commission;
2. Proper posting, publication, and public notice were provided as required by law for the hearing before the Planning Commission;
3. The hearing before the Planning Commission was extensive and complete, that all pertinent facts, matters, and issues were submitted and that all interested persons and the general public were heard at that hearing;
4. All exhibits were received into evidence;
5. That changing conditions clearly require amendment to the Zoning Resolutions;

6. For the above-stated and other reasons, the proposed amendment of the El Paso County Zoning Map is in the best interest of the health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, and welfare of the citizens of El Paso County.

WHEREAS, this Commission further finds that the request meets the criteria for approval outlined in Section 5.3.5.B of the El Paso County Land Development Code (as amended), as follows:

1. The application is in general conformance with the El Paso County Master Plan including applicable Small Area Plans or there has been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood since the land was last zoned;
2. The rezoning is in compliance with all applicable statutory provisions, including but not limited to C.R.S. § 30-28-111, § 30-28-113, and § 30-28-116;
3. The proposed land use or zone district is compatible with the existing and permitted land uses and zone districts in all directions; and
4. The site is suitable for the intended use, including the ability to meet the standards as described in Chapter 5 of the Land Development Code, for the intended zone district.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the El Paso County Planning Commission recommends that the petition of The North Ranch LLC for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) to amend the El Paso County Zoning Map for property located in the unincorporated area of El Paso County from the RR-5 (Residential Rural) zoning district to the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district meets the criteria for approval outlined in Section 5.3.5.B of the El Paso County Land Development Code and be approved by the Board of County Commissioners with the following conditions and notations:

CONDITIONS

1. The developer shall comply with federal and state laws, regulations, ordinances, review and permit requirements, and other agency requirements. Applicable agencies include but are not limited to: the Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Colorado Department of Transportation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the Endangered Species Act, particularly as it relates to the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse as a listed threatened species.
2. Any future or subsequent development and/or use of the property shall be in accordance with the use, density, and dimensional standards of the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district and with the applicable sections of the Land Development Code and Engineering Criteria Manual.

NOTATIONS

1. If a zone or rezone petition has been disapproved by the Board of County Commissioners, resubmittal of the previously denied petition will not be accepted for a period of one (1) year if it pertains to the same parcel of land and is a petition for a change to the same zone that was previously denied. However, if evidence is presented showing that there has been a substantial change in physical conditions or circumstances, the Planning Commission may reconsider said petition. The time limitation of one (1) year shall be computed from the date of final determination by the Board of County Commissioners or, in the event of court litigation, from the date of the entry of final judgment of any court of record.
2. Rezoning requests not forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for consideration within 180 days of Planning Commission action will be deemed withdrawn and will have to be resubmitted in their entirety.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution and the recommendations contained herein shall be forwarded to the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners for its consideration.

Mr Bailey seconded the adoption of the foregoing Resolution.

The roll having been called, the vote was as follows: (circle one)

Thomas Bailey	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Blaine Brew	aye / <u>no</u> / non-voting / recused / absent
Michael Brewer	aye / no / non-voting / recused / <u>absent</u>
Sarah Brittain Jack	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Jim Byers	aye / no / non-voting / recused / <u>absent</u>
Suzanne Casagrande	aye / <u>no</u> / non-voting / recused / <u>absent</u>
Mae Emrick	aye / no / non-voting / recused / <u>absent</u>
Eric Moraes	<u>aye</u> / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Bryce Schuettzel	<u>aye</u> / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Tim Trowbridge	<u>aye</u> / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Christopher Whitney	<u>aye</u> / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Jason Wulf	aye / <u>no</u> / non-voting / recused / absent

The Resolution was adopted by a vote of 6 to 3 by the El Paso County Planning Commission, State of Colorado.

DONE THIS 3rd day of September 2026 at Colorado Springs, Colorado.

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

By: 

Chair

EXHIBIT A

A tract of land being portions of the Southeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 15 and the East half of the Northwest quarter and the Northeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 22, Township 11 South, Range 66 West of the 6th P.M., all lying easterly of the easterly right-of-way line of Colorado State Highway No. 83, situate in El Paso County, Colorado, and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Northwest quarter of Section 22; said point also being the Southwest corner of Walden III as platted and recorded in Plat Book H-2 at Page 19 of the records of the El Paso County Clerk and Recorder; thence S 0 degrees 02 minutes 32 seconds W on the east line of the Northeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 22 a distance of 47.44 feet to a point on the easterly right-of-way line of Colorado State Highway No. 83; the following fifteen (15) courses are on said easterly right-of-way line:

1. Thence on a curve to the right, non-tangent to the previous course, having a radius of 2232.00 feet through a central angle of 9 degrees 15 minutes 44 seconds an arc distance of 360.81 feet, the long chord of which bears N 23 degrees 25 minutes 04 seconds W 360.42 feet;
2. Thence N 10 degrees 02 minutes 21 seconds W a distance of 781.50 feet;
3. Thence N 02 degrees 59 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 348.75 feet;
4. Thence N 04 degrees 01 minutes 09 seconds E a distance of 212.83 feet;
5. Thence N 02 degrees 25 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 263.03 feet;
6. Thence N 25 degrees 01 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 200.33 feet;
7. Thence on a curve to the left, non-tangent to the previous course, having a radius of 1970.26 feet through a central angle of 11 degrees 23 minutes 37 seconds an arc distance of 391.80 feet, the long chord of which bears N 22 degrees 20 minutes 51 seconds W 391.15 feet;
8. Thence N 32 degrees 51 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 203.23 feet;
9. Thence N 31 degrees 02 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 57.21 feet;
10. Thence N 30 degrees 08 minutes 21 seconds W a distance of 364.83 feet;
11. Thence N 34 degrees 47 minutes 08 seconds W a distance of 219.16 feet;
12. Thence N 24 degrees 50 minutes 08 seconds W a distance of 71.96 feet;
13. Thence N 16 degrees 59 minutes 08 seconds W a distance of 91.92 feet;
14. Thence N 11 degrees 14 minutes 08 seconds W a distance of 691.72 feet;
15. Thence N 04 degrees 07 minutes 38 seconds W a distance of 29.29 feet to the Southwest corner of Lot 18 of said Walden III subdivision;

Thence S 88 degrees 47 minutes 14 seconds E on the south line of Lots 18, 19 and 20 of said subdivision a distance of 1163.66 feet to the Northeast corner of the Southeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 15 as established by said subdivision plat;

Thence S 0 degrees 16 minutes 42 seconds E on the westerly line of Lots 21, 22, 23 and 24 of said subdivision a distance of 1321.21 feet to the Northeast corner of the East half of the Northwest quarter of Section 15 as established by said subdivision;

Thence S 0 degrees 02 minutes 01 seconds W on the westerly line of Lots 24 and 25 a distance of 664.98 feet to a found 1/2" rebar;

Thence S 0 degrees 01 minutes 38 seconds W on the westerly line of Lot 26 of said subdivision a distance of 559.86 feet to a found 1/2" rebar;

Thence S 0 degrees 12 minutes 31 seconds E on the westerly line of Lot 27 of said subdivision a distance of 390.18 feet to a found 1/2" rebar;


Thence S 0 degrees 06 minutes 42 seconds W on the westerly line of Lot 37 and the right-of-way of Needles Drive of said subdivision a distance of 906.31 to a found 1/2" rebar;

Thence S 0 degrees 16 minutes 16 seconds E on the westerly line of Lot 38 of said subdivision a distance of 128.44 feet to the point of beginning;

County of El Paso, State of Colorado

(The basis of bearings for this description is the south line of Walden III (S 88 degrees 48 minutes 11 seconds E) as shown on the recorded plat thereof; Plat Book H-2, Page 19.)

EXHIBIT B



MEGGAN HERINGTON, AICP, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

TO: El Paso County Planning Commission

Timothy L. Trowbridge Chair

FROM: Joseph Letke, Planner

Bret Dilts, PE, Senior Engineer

RE: Project File Number: P268

Project Name: Needles Highway 83 Rezoning RR-5 to RR-2.5

Parcel Number: 6100000369

Commissioner District: 1

OWNER:	REPRESENTATIVE:
North Ranch LLC 944 Cheyenne Blvd Colorado Springs, CO 80905-2428	Vertex Consulting Services 5825 Delmonico Drive, Suite 320 Colorado Springs, CO 80919
Planning Commission Hearing Date:	9/3/2026
Board of County Commissioners Hearing Date:	9/24/2026

A request by North Ranch LLC for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of one property totaling 47.55-acres in size from RR-5 to RR-2.5. The property is located along Colorado State Highway 83 and is 0.7 miles south of the intersection of Colorado State Highway 83 and Colorado State Highway 105. (Parcel No. 6100000369) (Commissioner District No. 1)



A. Authorization to Sign: There are no documents associated with this application that require signing.

B. APPROVAL CRITERIA

In approving a Map Amendment (Rezoning), the Board of County Commissioners shall find that the request meets the criteria for approval outlined in Section 5.3.5 Map Amendment (Rezoning) of the El Paso County Land Development Code (as amended):

- *The application is in general conformance with the El Paso County Master Plan including applicable Small Area Plans or there has been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood since the land was last zoned;*
- *The rezoning is in compliance with all applicable statutory provisions including, but not limited to C.R.S §30-28-111 §30-28-113, and §30-28-116;*
- *The proposed land use or zone district is compatible with the existing and permitted land uses and zone districts in all directions; and*
- *The site is suitable for the intended use, including the ability to meet the standards as described in Chapter 5 of the Land Development Code, for the intended zone district.*

C. LOCATION

North:	RR-5 (Residential Rural)	Residential
South:	RR-5 & RR-2.5 (Residential Rural)	Residential
East:	RR-5 (Residential Rural)	Residential
West:	PUD (Planned Unit Development)	Residential

D. BACKGROUND

The 47.55-acre unplatted property was initially zoned on January 3, 1955, and is currently located within the RR-5 (Residential Rural) zoning district. The applicant is requesting a Map Amendment (Rezoning) from the RR-5 to the RR-2.5 zoning district. The subject property currently contains an existing single-family residence, an accessory living quarters, and a barn, all of which are permitted

uses within the proposed RR-2.5 zoning district. Approval of the rezoning would establish a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres, allowing future subdivision of the property in accordance with the proposed zoning district standards and Land Development Code.

E. ZONING DISTRICT COMPARISON

The applicant is requesting to rezone 47.55-acres to the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district. The RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district is intended to accommodate low-density, rural, single-family residential development. The density and dimensional standards for the existing and proposed zoning districts are as follows:

	Existing Zoning District: RR-5 (Residential Rural)	Proposed Zoning District: RR-2.5 (Residential Rural)
Maximum Density	N.A	N.A
Minimum Lot Size	5 Acres	2.5 Acres
Minimum Width at Front Setback	200 Feet	200 Feet
Front Setback	25 Feet	25 Feet
Rear Setback	25 Feet	25 Feet
Side Setback	25 Feet	15 Feet
Maximum Lot Coverage	25%	None
Maximum Height	30 Feet	30 Feet

F. MASTER PLAN COMPLIANCE

1. Your El Paso Master Plan

a. Placetype Character: Large-Lot Residential

The Large-Lot Residential placetype consists almost entirely of residential development and acts as the transition between placetypes. Development in this placetype typically consists of single-family

homes occupying lots of 2.5 acres or more, and are generally large and dispersed throughout the area so as to preserve a rural aesthetic. The Large-Lot Residential placetype generally supports accessory dwelling units as well. Even with the physical separation of homes, this placetype still fosters a sense of community and is more connected and less remote than Rural areas. Large-Lot Residential neighborhoods typically rely on well and septic, but some developments may be served by central water and wastewater utilities. If central water and wastewater can be provided, then lots sized less than 2.5 acres could be allowed if; 1.) the overall density is at least 2.5 acres/lot, 2.) the design for development incorporates conservation of open space, and 3.) it is compatible with the character of existing developed areas.

Conservation design (or clustered development) should routinely be considered for new development within the Large-Lot Residential placetype to provide for a similar level of development density as existing large-lot areas while maximizing the preservation of contiguous areas of open space and the protection of environmental features. While the Large-Lot Residential placetype is defined by a clear set of characteristics, the different large-lot areas that exist throughout the County can exhibit their own unique characters based on geography and landscape.

Recommended Land Uses:

Primary

- *Single-family Detached Residential (typically 2.5-acre lots or larger)*

Supporting

- *Parks/Open Space*
- *Commercial Retail (Limited)*
- *Commercial Service (Limited)*
- *Agriculture*

Analysis:

The subject property is located within the Large-Lot Residential placetype as delineated in the Master Plan. This placetype primarily supports single-family residential development on lots that are “typically 2.5 acres or larger”, reflecting the area's intended and existing low-density residential

character. The applicant's request to rezone the property is generally consistent with the Master Plan, as the proposed RR-2.5 zoning district continues to support large-lot single-family residential development in conformance with the Large-Lot Residential placetype recommendations.

b. Area of Change Designation: Minimal Change: Developed

These areas have undergone development and have an established character. Developed areas of minimal change are largely built out but may include isolated pockets of vacant or underutilized land. These key sites are likely to see more intense infill development with a mix of uses and scale of redevelopment that will significantly impact the character of an area. For example, a large amount of vacant land in a suburban division adjacent to a more urban neighborhood may be developed and change to match the urban character and intensity so as to accommodate a greater population. The inverse is also possible where an undeveloped portion of an denser neighborhood could redevelop to a less intense suburban scale. Regardless of the development that may occur, if these areas evolve to a new development pattern of differing intensity, their overall character can be maintained.

Analysis:

The subject property is located within the Minimal Change: Developed Area of Change designation. The Master Plan recommends that if development is to occur in this area, that the general character is maintained. To that effect, the property is adjacent to the south to existing Majestic Pines RR-2.5 subdivision (PCD File No. P132) and the existing Cherry Creek Crossing PUD which contains a minimum lots size of 2.5-acres (PCD File No. PUD97003 & PUD97003).

c. Key Area Influences: Tri-Lakes Area

Tri-Lakes is the northern gateway into the County along Interstate 25 and Highway 83. It is situated between Pike National Forest, the United States Air Force Academy, and Black Forest. With significant suburban development and some mixed-use development, this Key Area supports the commercial needs of many of the residents in northern El Paso County. Tri-Lakes also serves as a place of residence for many who commute to work in the Denver Metropolitan Area. It is also an activity and entertainment center with the three lakes (Monument Lake, Woodmoor Lake, and Palmer Lake) that

comprise its namesake and direct access to the national forest. Tri-Lakes is the most well-established community in the northern part of the County with a mixture of housing options, easy access to necessary commercial goods and services, and a variety of entertainment opportunities. Future development in this area should align with the existing character and strengthen the residential, commercial, employment, and entertainment opportunities in the adjacent communities of Monument, Palmer Lake, and Woodmoor.

Analysis:

The subject property is located within the Tri-Lakes Key Area. The El Paso County Master Plan identifies a land use goal for this area stating that, *"Future development in the Tri-Lakes Area should align with the existing character and strengthen the residential, commercial, employment, and entertainment opportunities in the adjacent communities of Monument, Palmer Lake, and Woodmoor."* The proposed rezoning is generally consistent with this Key area and goal, as the surrounding area is characterized by similar rural residential development. Additionally, the property's designation within the Large-Lot Residential placetype and the Minimal Change: Developed area supports the proposed land use.

d. Other Implications (Priority Development, Housing, etc.)

The subject property is located within the Priority Development Areas as delineated in the Master Plan. The Master Plan identifies these areas as locations throughout the County that should be prioritized for new development to help accommodate future growth. Additionally, the Master Plan states that, *"The County should maintain and expand the Large-Lot Residential placetype in this area in a development pattern that matches the existing character of the developed Black Forest community."* The anticipated future development pattern of this property is consistent with the surrounding large-lot residential character and supports the intent of the Priority Development Area designation.

2. Water Master Plan Analysis

The El Paso County Water Master Plan (2018) has three main purposes; better understand present conditions of water supply and demand; identify efficiencies that can be achieved; and encourage best practices for water demand management through the comprehensive planning and development review processes.

A finding of water sufficiency is not required with a Map Amendment.

3. Other Master Plan Elements

The El Paso County Wildlife Habitat Descriptors (1996) identifies the parcels as having a moderate wildlife impact potential. Colorado Parks and Wildlife was sent a referral and have no outstanding comments.

The Master Plan for Mineral Extraction (1996) identifies floodplain deposit in the area of the subject parcels. A mineral rights certification was prepared by the applicant indicating that, upon researching the records of El Paso County, no severed mineral rights exist.

G. PHYSICAL SITE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Hazards

Geologic hazards were not identified during the review of the Map Amendment (Rezoning) application. A full geological analysis and review of the subject property will be conducted if the applicant applies for a Preliminary Plan and Final Plat applications.

2. Floodplain

The property is not located within a floodplain as determined by a review of the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map number 08041C0285G, effective December 7th, 2018. The property is in Zone "X," which is an area of minimal flood hazard determined to be outside the 500-year flood zone.

3. Drainage and Erosion

The property is located in the West Cherry Creek (CYCY0400) drainage basin. The West Cherry Creek drainage basin does not have associated drainage basin fees or bridge fees. A drainage report and grading erosion control plan is not required with a Map Amendment (Rezoning) request but will be reviewed with subsequent development applications.

4. Transportation

A traffic impact study was submitted with the Map Amendment (Rezoning) request. The traffic impact study indicates that the project is anticipated to generate 127 daily trips. Access to the proposed development would be from an extension of Needles Drive to the north from its current terminus. No direct lot access to Highway 83 would be allowed. Emergency access will be allowed at the location of the existing driveway on Highway 83.

The 2024 Major Transportation Corridors Plan depicts Highway 83 as a facility owned and maintained by CDOT. Highway 83 is identified as a Regional Highway in the traffic study. Needles Drive is a rural, gravel local road, owned and maintained by El Paso County. Any improvements that may be required will be identified in potential subsequent subdivision applications.

A CDOT access permit will be required for the development at the time of Final Plat. El Paso County Road Impact Fees, as approved by Resolution 25-337, are applicable to the development and will be assessed at the last land-use approval or when the applicant applies for a building permit.

H. SERVICES

1. Water

A finding of water sufficiency is not required with a Map Amendment. Water is currently provided by individual wells.

2. Sanitation

Wastewater is currently provided by on-site wastewater treatment systems.

3. Emergency Services

The property is within the Monument Fire Protection District, which is committed to providing fire protection services to the proposed development. The District was sent a referral and stated *"Monument Fire District does not provide comments either in support of or in opposition to proposed zoning changes. Accordingly, the District has no comments regarding the merits of the requested change."*

4. Utilities

Electric service is anticipated to be provided by Mountain View Electric. Natural gas will be provided by Black Hills Energy

5. Metropolitan Districts

The subject property is not located within a Metropolitan District.

5. Parks/Trails

Land dedication and fees in lieu of park land dedication are not required for a Map Amendment (Rezoning) application.

6. Schools

Land dedication and fees in lieu of school land dedication are not required for a Map Amendment (Rezoning) application.

I. STATUS OF MAJOR ISSUES

No major issues.

J. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS AND NOTATIONS

Should the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners find that the request meets the criteria for approval outlined in Section 5.3.5 Map Amendment (Rezoning) of the El Paso County Land Development Code (as amended), staff recommends the following conditions and notations:

CONDITIONS

1. The developer shall comply with federal and state laws, regulations, ordinances, review and permit requirements, and other agency requirements. Applicable agencies include but are not limited to: the Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Colorado Department of Transportation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the Endangered Species Act, particularly as it relates to the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse as a listed threatened species.
2. Any future or subsequent development and/or use of the property shall be in accordance with the use, density, and dimensional standards of the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district and with the applicable sections of the Land Development Code and Engineering Criteria Manual.

NOTATIONS

1. If a zone or rezone petition has been disapproved by the Board of County Commissioners, resubmittal of the previously denied petition will not be accepted for a period of one (1) year if it pertains to the same parcel of land and is a petition for a change to the same zone that was previously denied. However, if evidence is presented showing that there has been a substantial change in physical conditions or circumstances, the Planning Commission may reconsider said petition. The time limitation of one (1) year shall be computed from the date of final determination by the Board of County Commissioners or, in the event of court litigation, from the date of the entry of final judgment of any court of record.

2. Rezoning requests not forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for consideration within 180 days of Planning Commission action will be deemed withdrawn and will have to be resubmitted in their entirety.

K. PUBLIC COMMENT AND NOTICE

The Planning and Community Development Department notified 36 adjoining property owners on August 19, 2026 for the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners meetings. Responses will be provided at the hearing.

L. ATTACHMENTS

Vicinity Map

Letter of Intent


Rezone Map

Public Comments

Draft Resolution


MAP SERIES

Zoning Map




8/5/2026, 7:57:36 AM

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Override 1 County Roads Parcels County Zoning A-5: Agricultural (5 acres) PUD: Planned Unit Development RR-0.5: Residential Rural (0.5 acres) RR-2.5: Residential Rural (2.5 acres) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR-5: Residential Rural (5 acres) Initial Zoning Special Use World Imagery Low Resolution 15m Imagery High Resolution 60cm Imagery High Resolution 30cm Imagery Citations |
|--|--|



El Paso/Teiler E-911, El Paso County Development Services, Sources: Esri, TomTom, Garmin, FAO, NOAA, USGS, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community, Vantor

Placetypes Map



8/10/2026, 11:18:12 AM


Override 1	Placetypes	Regional Open Space
County Roads	Large-Lot Residential	Incorporated Cities
Parcels	Suburban Residential	World Imagery
	Incorporated Area	Low Resolution 15m Imagery

High Resolution 60cm Imagery

High Resolution 30cm Imagery


Citations

9.6m Resolution Metadata



El Paso/Teller E-911, Created by Houseal Lavigne Associates (2021).
Sources: Esri, TomTom, Garmin, FAO, NOAA, USGS, © OpenStreetMap

Areas of Change Map




8/10/2026, 12:24:44 PM


- Override 1
- County Roads
- Parcels
- Areas Of Change
- Protected/Conservation Area
- Minimal Change: Developed
- Incorporated Cities

World Imagery
Low Resolution 15m Imagery
High Resolution 60cm Imagery

High Resolution 30cm Imagery
Citations
9.6m Resolution Metadata



Key Areas Map




8/10/2026, 12:27:16 PM


- | | |
|--------------|---------------------|
| Override 1 | KeyAreas |
| County Roads | Forested Area |
| Parcels | Tri-Lakes Area |
| | Incorporated Cities |

World Imagery
Low Resolution 15m Imagery
High Resolution 60cm Imagery

High Resolution 30cm Imagery
Citations
9.6m Resolution Metadata



The North Ranch
Map Amendment (Rezoning)
Letter of Intent
May 14, 2026



PCD File No. P268

The North Ranch LLC
944 Cheyenne Blvd
Colorado Springs, CO 80905

OWNER: The North Ranch LLC
944 Cheyenne Blvd
Colorado Springs, CO 80905

REPRESENTATIVE: Vertex Consulting Services, LLC
5825 Delmonico Dr., Suite 320
Colorado Springs, CO 80919

PROPERTY LOCATION: East of Highway 83 and North of Needles Drive

TAX SCHEDULE NO: 6100000369

ACREAGE: 47.55 acres

CURRENT ZONING: RR-5

PROPOSED ZONING: RR-2.5

UTILITY SERVICE:

Mountain View Electric Association (MVEA) provides electric service and Black Hills Energy provides natural gas service to the area. Each new dwelling unit will be served by individual onsite well and septic systems.

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT:

The site is currently developed as a rural residential lot with one primary dwelling, one accessory living quarters, and a barn. All structures are proposed to remain. The anticipated subdivision application will include a site plan depicting each one of the homes being on separate lots meeting the setback requirements of the RR-2.5 zone district.

REQUEST:

This is a request for approval of a map amendment (rezone) of 47.55 acres to the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district.

Analysis and Justification:

The following is an analysis of the Map Amendment (Rezoning) criteria included within Section 5.3.5 of the El Paso County Land Development Code and justification for approval:

REZONING CRITERIA #1: "The application is in general conformance with the El Paso County Master Plan including applicable Small Area Plans or there has been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood since the land was last zoned."

Your El Paso County Master Plan

Chapter 1 of Your El Paso Master Plan (2021) states that the Plan is “general in nature-it cannot tackle every issue in sufficient detail to determine every type of necessary action.” In addition, Chapter 1 goes on to state that the Plan “is intended to provide clearer and more coordinated policy, resulting in a document that effectively communicates County goals and identifies specific actions to achieve both County-wide and local area objectives.” When taken together, these two statements suggest to the reader that the Plan may only address certain issues at a cursory level and that specific steps or actions for addressing such issues may not be offered within the Plan. However, that is not the case with this map amendment (rezoning) request, as identified below.

Chapter 3 Land Use

Key Area Analysis: “Tri-Lakes Key Area”

“Tri-Lakes” Key Area

The property is located within the Tri-Lakes Key Area. The Plan describes the key area as follows:


“Tri-Lakes is the northern gateway into the County along Interstate 25 and Highway 83. It is situated between Pike National Forest, the United States Air Force Academy, and Black Forest. With significant suburban development and some mixed-use development, this Key Area supports the commercial needs of many of the residents in northern El Paso County. ***Tri-Lakes also serves as a place of residence for many who commute to work in the Denver Metropolitan Area.*** It is also an activity and entertainment center with the three lakes (Monument Lake, Woodmoor Lake, and Palmer Lake) that comprise its namesake and direct access to the national forest. Tri-Lakes is the most well-established community in the northern part of the County with ***a mixture of housing options***, easy access to necessary commercial goods and services, and a variety of entertainment opportunities. ***Future development in this area should align with the existing character and strengthen the residential, commercial, employment, and entertainment opportunities in the adjacent communities of Monument, Palmer Lake, and Woodmoor.*** (emphasis added)

The proposed Map Amendment (Rezoning) is in general conformance with the El Paso County Master Plan, specifically the goals and policies applicable to the Tri-Lakes Key Area. The Master Plan identifies Tri-Lakes as a well-established residential community that accommodates a significant population of residents who commute to employment centers in the Denver Metropolitan Area. The proposed rezoning supports this role by providing additional residential opportunities that expand housing availability and reinforce the area’s function as a commuter-oriented community. The property’s proximity to Highway 83 further supports its suitability, offering convenient regional access and strengthening the connection between housing supply and employment centers to the north and south.

Furthermore, the Master Plan emphasizes that future development within the Tri-Lakes Key Area

should “align with the existing character” while strengthening residential, commercial, and community opportunities in Monument, Palmer Lake, and Woodmoor. The proposed RR-2.5 zoning is consistent with this directive and reflects the established pattern of mixed residential densities in the surrounding area. Adjacent properties to the north and west are zoned RR-5, while properties immediately to the south are zoned RR-2.5, creating a compatible and gradual transition in lot sizes. The nearby Cherry Creek Crossing PUD (approximately 2.5-acre lots) and the Walden Preserve PUD (approximately one-acre lots located roughly 800 feet to the east) further demonstrate the existing mixture of residential densities that characterize the area (see map below).

By reinforcing the existing development pattern, supporting commuter housing demand, and maintaining compatibility with surrounding zoning and land uses, the proposed Map Amendment aligns with and advances the intent of the Master Plan. As such, the application meets the review criterion that it is in general conformance with the El Paso County Master Plan.



Area of Change Analysis: “Minimal Change: Developed”

The subject property is identified in the Areas of Change map within the Plan as being within the “Minimal Change: Developed” area of change.

“Minimal Change: Developed” Area of Change

Page 21 of the Plan characterizes areas of “Minimal Change: Developed” by stating:

“These areas have undergone development and have an established character. Developed areas of minimal change are largely built out ***but may include isolated pockets of vacant or underutilized land. These key sites are likely to see more intense infill development with a***

mix of uses and scale of redevelopment that will significantly impact the character of an area. For example, a large amount of vacant land in a suburban division adjacent to a more urban neighborhood may be developed and change to match the urban character and intensity so as to accommodate a greater population. The inverse is also possible where an undeveloped portion of a denser neighborhood could redevelop to a less intense suburban scale. ***Regardless of the development that may occur, if these areas evolve to a new development pattern of differing intensity, their overall character can be maintained.***
(Emphasis added)

This parcel is an underutilized vacant property in an enclave of developed property on all sides. To the north and east is the Walden subdivision, to the west and south the Cherry Creek Crossing subdivision. As discussed above, the proposed RR-2.5 zoning is consistent with the established pattern of mixed residential densities in the surrounding area. The proposed rezone is consistent with the surrounding established development character.

Placetype Analysis: “Large-Lot Residential”

The subject property is shown on the Placetypes map of Your El Paso Master Plan as being within the Large-Lot Residential Placetype.

Page 26 of the Plan identifies the following land uses as being Primary Land Uses within the Large-Lot Residential Placetype:

- Single-Family Detached Residential (typically 2.5 acre lots or larger)

In addition, the Placetype includes the following Supporting Land Uses:

- Parks/Open Space
- Commercial Retail
- Commercial Service
- Agriculture

The Large-Lot Residential Placetype is described further on page 26 as follows:

“The Large-Lot Residential placetype consists almost entirely of residential development and acts as the transition between placetypes. ***Development in this placetype typically consists of single-family homes occupying lots of 2.5 acres or more, and are generally large and dispersed throughout the area so as to preserve a rural aesthetic.*** The Large-Lot Residential placetype generally supports accessory dwelling units as well. Even with the physical separation of homes, this placetype still fosters a sense of community and is more connected and less remote than Rural areas. Large-Lot Residential neighborhoods typically rely on well and septic, but some developments may be served by central water and wastewater utilities. If central water and wastewater can be provided, then lots sized less than 2.5 acres could be allowed if; 1.) the overall density is at least 2.5 acres/lot, 2.) the design for development incorporates conservation of open space, and 3.) it is compatible with the character of existing developed areas.

Conservation design (or clustered development) should routinely be considered for new development within the Large-Lot Residential placetype to provide for a similar level of development density as existing large-lot areas while maximizing the preservation of contiguous areas of open space and the protection of environmental features. While the Large-Lot Residential placetype is defined by a clear set of characteristics, the different large-lot areas that exist throughout the County can exhibit their own unique characters based on geography and landscape.” (emphasis added)

The proposed rezone allows for lot sizes of 2.5 acres or greater. The anticipated subdivision application will also depict a total of 15 lots, resulting in an average of 3.17 acres per lot.

Chapter 4 Housing & Communities

In addition to supporting and being in compliance with the applicable Areas of Change, Key Area, and Placetype designations and policies in Chapter 3 of the Master Plan, the proposed rezoning is also in total alignment with the Residential Priority Development Area designation found in Chapter 4 of the Plan.

The subject property is located within a Priority Development Area, specifically the Black Forest/North Central Area. Priority Development areas were specifically identified in an effort to guide growth towards certain areas of the County first, before developing others.

The Plan states “El Paso County is expecting significant growth over the next 20 years. While large expanses of undeveloped land exist throughout the County, particularly in the Rural Placetype, development should be prioritized elsewhere to efficiently utilize and extend existing infrastructure, conserve water resources, and strengthen established neighborhoods. This framework identifies specific locations throughout the County that should be prioritized first for new residential development to help accommodate growth.”

The Black Forest/North Central Area is described further on page 57 as follows:

Black Forest is a community with one of the strongest and most well-established characters in El Paso County. This area is built around protecting the forest and preserving its rural quality. Due to this natural amenity, many new residents seek to live in this area when moving to the County.

- ***Careful planning is required to promote health of natural areas, especially the forest, while accommodating new development for future residents.***
- The County should ***maintain existing and expand the Large-Lot Residential place type*** in this area in a development pattern that matches the existing character of the developed Black Forest community.

- Commercial nodes should be considered where appropriately served by the transportation network in the northern area to provide commercial goods and services within closer proximity to the population in this area. This would reduce unnecessary travel to other parts of the County and establish key commercial areas within the communities that need them.

The proposed zoning aligns with the Master Plan recommendations, including prioritizing development in this area of the County while maintaining and expand the Large Lot Residential Placetype. Additionally, the property owners have already completed a tree survey which resulted in the removal of beetle-infested trees. The property owners have also drafted a detailed forestry management and wildfire mitigation plan and begun the necessary mitigation to ensure not only the health of the forest but also the safety of those in the area.

El Paso County Water Master Plan

The subject property is located within Planning Region 2 of the Water Master Plan, pursuant to Figure 3-1 on page 25, which includes Walden Water and Sanitation District along with several other central water providers. Table 5-3 of the Plan identifies that Region 2 has a current demand of 7,532 acre-feet per year and a current supply of 13,607 acre-feet per year, which results in current excess water supplies in the amount of 6,075 acre-feet per year. Tables 5-4 and 5-5 project Region 2 as continuing to have excess water supplies at year 2040 and at full buildout (2060) in the amount of 1,894 acre-feet and 353 acre-feet, respectively. A Water Resources Report is not required with a rezone application and, therefore, has not been provided. A finding of water sufficiency will be required at the subdivision stage of development.

El Paso County Parks Master Plan

The El Paso County Parks Master Plan (2022) does not depict any planned open space on, or adjacent to the subject property. The Plan depict a planned bicycle route along Highway 83 and Walker Road. Land dedication, or fees in lieu of land dedication are not required at the rezoning stage of development, but will be required at the final plat stage of development.

2024 Major Transportation Corridors Plan (MTCP)

The 2045 Roadway Plan (Classification and Lanes) exhibit of the 2024 El Paso County Major Transportation Corridors Plan (MTCP) identifies Highway 83 to the west of the project as a “Principal Arterial”. A traffic impact study was prepared by SM Rocha and has been submitted in support of the requested rezone application. The anticipated subdivision application will depict the extension of Needles Drive into the subject property. Needles drive is an local gravel roadway. The extension into the subject property will meet the County standards. The design of the anticipated roadway extension will be reviewed and ultimately approved with the subsequent subdivision

application.

Other Topical Elements of the County Master Plan

The proposed rezone is in compliance with the other topical elements of the County Master Plan, including the Master Plan for Mineral Extraction, and the El Paso County Wildlife Habitat Maps and Descriptors.

REZONING CRITERIA #2: *The rezoning is in compliance with all applicable statutory provisions, including but not limited to C.R.S. § 30-28-111 § 30-28-113, and § 30-28-116.*

County staff has not identified any issues regarding the proposed rezoning's compliance with all applicable statutory provisions. Pursuant to state statute and El Paso County's notification procedures, the County will cause the public hearing notice to be published in the newspaper ensuring all statutory requirements have been satisfied.

REZONING CRITERIA #3: *The proposed land use or zone district is compatible with the existing and permitted land uses and zone districts in all directions.*

The property owner is requesting to rezone the property from the RR-5 zoning district to the RR-2.5 zoning district. The parcels located immediately adjacent to the south are zoned RR-2.5. The property is also surrounded by the RR-5 and PUD (2.5 acre) zoning districts (refer to zoning map above). The RR-2.5 zone is compatible with the RR-5 zone.

Section 3.2 of the Code provides the purpose statements for all conventional zoning districts within unincorporated El Paso County.

The purpose of the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district:

"The RR-2.5 zoning district is a 2.5 acre district intended to accommodate low-density, rural, single family residential development."

The purpose of the RR-5 (Residential Rural) zoning district:

"The RR-5 zoning district is a 5 acre district intended to accommodate low density, rural, single-family residential development."

The primary difference in the intent of the above zoning districts is the dimensional standards, more specifically the minimum lot size requirement. Both districts purpose statement includes "to accommodate low density, rural, single-family residential development." Both districts allow for

single-family and rural land uses. The purpose statements of the zoning districts are compatible with one another.

The Land Development Code definition of "Compatibility" clearly points out that two items do not need to be identical in order to be considered compatible; "The characteristics of different uses, activities or designs which allow them to be located near or adjacent to each other in harmony. Some elements affecting compatibility include height, scale, mass and bulk of structures. Other important characteristics that affect compatibility are landscaping, lighting, noise, odor and architecture. Compatibility does not mean "the same as." Rather, compatibility refers to the sensitivity of the proposed use, activity or design in maintaining the character of existing development within the vicinity."

Using the Code definition, compatibility can be accomplished if:

1. Located adjacent to one another in harmony (coexist without negative impacts).

The existing condition is harmonious. The fact that the surrounding zoning districts are already varied with A-5, RR-5, RR-2.5, RR-0.5, and PUD adjacent to one another is evidence enough that these zoning districts can, and do, abut one another harmoniously.

The RR-2.5 zoning district permitted uses is essentially a paired down, or less intense, list of those land uses allowed in the RR-5 zoning district. There are no permitted uses in the RR-2.5 zone that are not permitted in the immediately adjacent zoning. The zone districts can remain adjacent in harmony.

2. Compatible height

The adjacent zoning districts all allow for a maximum height of 30 feet.

3. Compatible scale, massing, and bulk

The RR-5 and adjacent PUD zoning district have a maximum coverage of 25% whereas the RR-2.5 does not include a maximum coverage. However, the drainage report to be submitted with the anticipated subdivision application includes a maximum lot coverage of 10%, which is lesser than that required by the PUD or RR-5 zoning districts. Anticipated structures in all zone districts include single-family detached dwellings, garages, and barns. The scale, massing, and bulk standards within the surrounding zone districts are compatible, and identical.

4. Compatible landscaping, light, noise, odor, and architecture

All zone district have the same landscaping, lighting, noise, and architectural standards.

5. Maintain the character of existing development in the vicinity

As discussed above, the proposed RR-2.5 zoning is consistent with the established pattern of mixed residential densities in the surrounding area.

REZONING CRITERIA #4: *The site is suitable for the intended use, including the ability to meet the standards as described in Chapter 5 of the Land Development Code, for the intended zone district.*

Table 5-4 of the Land Development Code identifies the density and dimensional standards of the RR-2.5 zoning district:


Minimum lot size: 2.5 acres
Front Setback: 25 feet
Side Setback: 15 feet
Rear Setback: 25 feet
Maximum Height: 30 feet

The anticipated subdivision application will depict lot sizes meeting the 2.5 acres size limitation. Each dwelling unit will be required to submit for approval of a residential site plan demonstrating compliance with the dimensional standards included in Chapter 5.

THE NORTH RANCH

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONE)

Southwest quarter of Section 15 and the Southwest quarter of Section 22, Township 11 South, Range 66 West of the 6th P.M
El Paso County, State of Colorado



GENERAL NOTES

See page 2 for graphical depiction of legal description.

See page 3 for written legal description and easements.

NO.	REVISION /ISSUE	DATE

The North Ranch. LLC
944 Cheyenne Blvd
Colorado Springs Co 80905
rob@myerscompany.biz

VERTEX
Consulting Services
455 E. Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 101
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903
719-753-8605

PROJECT NO.	SHEET	1 of 3
P268		
DATE	APPROVED	
	CAD	

[illegible]



The North Ranch. LLC
944 Cheyenne Blvd
Colorado Springs Co 80905
rob@myerscompany.biz

VERTeX

Consulting Services
455 E. Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 101
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903
719-733-8605

PROJECT NO. P268	DATE	SHEET
PREPARED		

2 of 3



SE 1/4 SECTION 15

NW 1/4 SECTION 22

SE 1/4 SW 1/4 SECTION 15

[illegible]

17675 STATE HIGHWAY NO. 83
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

[illegible]

1. CHRISTOPHER THOMPSON, COLORADO P.L.S. NO. 19625, DO HEREBY CERTIFY TO ROBERT L. MYERS AND GUARDIAN THAT THE ACCOUNTING SURVEY PLAT REPRESENTS AN ACCURATE DELINEATION OF A MONUMENTED LAND SURVEY OF THE PARCEL DESCRIBED HEREIN, COMPLETED UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND CHECKING.

DATE April 15, 2026

SURVEYOR THOMPSON
COLORADO PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR NO. 19625
ON BEHALF OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN LAND SERVICES
1465 NORTH PARK DRIVE SUITE 303
DENVER, COLORADO 80907

ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW YOU MUST COMMENCE ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT IN THIS SURVEY WITHIN THREE YEARS AFTER YOU FIRST DISCOVER SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT, MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.

ALL EASMENTS SPECIFIED HEREON ARE BASED ON A COMMITMENT FOR TITLE INSURANCE PREPARED BY TITLE RESOURCES GUARANTEE COMPANY (COMMITMENT NUMBER 3171292-00-0124 WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF JANUARY 13, 2026). THE NUMBERS UTILIZED CORRESPOND WITH SCHEDULE "B, PART II--EXCEPTIONS".

[illegible]

PROJECT NO. P268	SHEET
DATE	
PREPARED	APPROVED
	CAD

VERTEX

Consulting Services
455 E. Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 101
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903
719-733-8605

**The North Ranch. LLC
944 Cheyenne Blvd
Colorado Springs Co 80905
rob@myerscompany.biz**

[illegible]

GENERAL NOTES

P268
Needles Highway 83
Rezoning RR-5 to RR-2.5
Map Amendment
(Rezoning)
Public Comment -
Letters of Opposition

OPPOSE

Name: Stephan Millard

Date: 6/28/2026 3:09 PM

Please see attached file with my full comment. This comment section is not long enough to post. I strongly oppose this project.

RE: P268 Needles Highway 83 Rezoneing RR-5 to RR2.5

To Whom it May Concern;

I am strongly opposed to this project as it seeks to increase water usage, traffic ingress and egress, Utility load, and density as well as noise to an area that is already being overbuilt on all sides. To these points more specifically, 1-water availability is already a concern for residents in the area and with the extraordinary amount of building happening within less than a few miles in all directions, this is massive concern as we are all on wells and not dependent on a municipality to provide a constant water source. 2-Traffic counts on hwy. 83 are already more than steadily increasing at a pace that is not sustainable. To the extent that residence are dealing with traffic related jams and accidents much more often than ever before. This stretch of road was never designed to handle this kind of load and with the lack of acceleration/deceleration lanes we are seeing more and more accidents. Now you are asking for additional traffic loads, which will only bring more accidents and traffic jams. 3-Regarding density, we live in a part of Walden 3 that was platted a long time ago with the vision of 5 acre lots and open space. This has slowly and not so quietly been changed and modified over the years. Our precious open space to the north has been somehow sold to developers and built out for the sake of profit! What was once a beautiful, quiet, serene part of black forest is not filled with million-dollar Mc Mansions and light and noise pollution. The idea of the lower density outside of the city has a lot of value to the people who live here. We enjoy seeing wildlife. We enjoy having no lights on at night and it actually being dark. We enjoy our privacy. I currently share one side of my property boundary with this parcel. It has always been a beautifully treed, quiet property. Lending itself beautifully to the surrounding area. It allows deer as well as other wildlife to exist within our urban interface peacefully. This property also serves as a wonderful sound barrier for my property as well as other neighboring properties on our street. If the proposed use is changed, and the property developed, we will not only be subject to multiple new neighbors but will also be subject to countless months/years of construction and noise, the removal of trees and sound barriers, the removal of wildlife habitat as well as light and noise pollution all for the sake of profit. In an area that has been decimated by overbuilt mega-homes I am asking you not to allow more building. At some point, profit cannot continue to win, and the land needs to be allowed to thrive! If we were in the city, or even next to the city, I would not be writing this letter. I appreciate your time and consideration and ask to be kept in the loop regarding meetings pertaining to this project.

Thank you,

Stephan Millard-concerned citizen

I most definitely oppose this rezoning proposal. My family has owned our property since the mid 1960's and it was purchased by my parents. They lived here until 2020 after my husband and I purchased it from them. We have lived here since Apr of 2017 while I took care of my elderly mother. I have known and been on this property for almost my entire life, having been born in 1962. I have been witness to many changes here in the name of progress. This was originally a ranch that was divided up and sold into mostly 5 acre lots.

There used to be as part of Walden III and great open space area where we could walk our pets and enjoy the scenery. That was supposed to remain. But in recent years, it was taken and turned into a mini-mansion subdivision. So, we lost that benefit. So did countless wildlife that used to roam freely. We have limited supply of water and now with all the excess building of these homes, that supply is being taxed more than ever before.

It has already become more difficult during rush hour times to turn onto Hwy 83 from Walden Way due to the increased traffic. Turning onto Walden Way from Hwy 83 is usually a "take your chances kind of prospect", because the traffic heading North, doesn't like to slow down for you when you turn on your signal. Many times it is best to merge off the road onto a well-worn dirt area so that you aren't rear ended and your life is ended.

One of the reasons residents have purchased here on 5 acre lots, is because we enjoy the peace and quiet being surrounded by the Forest offers. Putting in another 20 plus or minus homes will end that. You will need to cut down most of the trees. The streets will become further congested, more wildlife will leave, more water will tax the already taxed water available and there will be much less of a sound barrier from the traffic on Hwy 83. All in the name of lining an investors' pockets with more profit. Is it just greed that drives this proposal? they have the property already and it is zoned for 5 acre lots - can they not be happy with the profit that they will receive on just 10 plus or minus new mini-mansions?

Either way, when they start to develop that area, it will be our signal to put our home up for sale and find another place to live. Already, my property taxes have increased a great deal due to the mini-mansions that were built on our open land and the school that was placed there.

Colorado Springs used to be a place that people could come to find a more peaceful way of life. To enjoy the great outdoors without having to live in a small mountain town. It used to be affordable. Not anymore. Now, every time that I leave home, I see a new house, building, shopping center, etc. Literally, every time. I'm all for having enough homes to keep up with demand. But here is the thing, with the economy as it is and is likely to stay for quite some time, why build million-dollar plus homes that the average American cannot afford?

Many young adults must continue to live with their parents because they cannot afford to go out and find rentals that are affordable. Then let's look at the Seniors who live on limited income and have to move in with family or a tiny home on someones' property because their income doesn't stretch very far at all with the rising costs of EVERYTHING. I haven't mentioned that many times they are forced to live in retirement or assisted living and Medicaid is on the hook. That translates to more of a tax burden for income producing citizens. Where does the logic for "in the name of progress" come from.

What this proposal suggests is definitely NOT reasonable growth over time and careful planning for a sustainable way to provide homes. This caters to people in higher income brackets than most and to putting profit into a greedy developers' pocket. I'm sure that my opinion will not carry any weight - after all, money and power are the great influencers and I'm fully aware that in most government run agencies in our City - there is definitely a "you scratch my back and I will scratch yours" mentality. This will be passed despite the objections from the current Walden III residents. I will be looking for a new place to live and hopefully it will take a long time before that place does the same thing.

Yours Sincerely, Holly Millard

We bought this property a year ago for the large lot sized (5 acres), trees, low density development and quiet neighborhood. These proposed 15 sites of 2.5+ acre lots will exponentially increase traffic and noise as the population is being increased exponentially too. It says these houses will have septic systems and wells that will exacerbate the current ecological system that has been in place since the 60's. We are concerned that this additional development will threaten our water supply by adding 15 additional wells to the area and septic systems. Our 5 acre lot is a low point on Walden Way and development will interfere with the current drainage into this 47 acre area. It says the rear setback will be 25', meaning we will have neighbors only 25' from us. This will add considerable noise to our quiet property. The current zoning is 5 acre lots which would match the current surroundings would be a better fit for this current low use acreage. There would be less traffic, noise, water well concerns and septic issues if the zoning were left as it currently is.

We bought this property a year ago for the large lot sized (5 acres), trees, low density development and quiet neighborhood. These proposed 15 sites of 2.5+ acre lots will exponentially increase traffic and noise as the population is being increased exponentially too. It says these houses will have septic systems and wells that will exacerbate the current ecological system that has been in place since the 60's. We are concerned that this additional development will threaten our water supply by adding 15 additional wells to the area and septic systems. Our 5 acre lot is a low point on Walden Way and development will interfere with the current drainage into this 47 acre area. It says the rear setback will be 25', meaning we will have neighbors only 25' from us. This will add considerable noise to our quiet property. The current zoning is 5 acre lots which would match the current surroundings would be a better fit for this current low use acreage. There would be less traffic, noise, water well concerns and septic issues if the zoning were left as it currently is.

OPPOSE

Name: damian

Date: 7/19/2026 3:46 PM

this is a terrible place to build, the property is literally RIGHT next to the highway

OPPOSE

Name: John Godsey

Date: 8/19/2026 6:28 PM

Surprised there is any consideration of land use in the southern portion of this land parcel considering how narrow it is and how closely it parallels Hwy 83. I am sure development would have to include removing a number of mature pine trees which I don't support as they help mitigate existing highway traffic noise and beautify our properties to the west. Furthermore, I am concerned about additional traffic and residential noise along with the light pollution this would bring to the existing homes that border the parcel. Honestly, this is a poor location for development of this many structures. Naturally, as with any addition to development in El Paso County is the concern about the available water to service this new area without affecting other surrounding properties.

OPPOSE

Name: Tom T.

Date: 8/22/2026 11:09 AM

I am Opposed to P268 for the following safety reasons.

The proposed extension of the Needles gravel road (2,880 ft to 6,675 ft) is unlikely to be maintained or snow plowed by the county. The 14 new properties, therefore, will not have access to emergency services during Colorado snow events. Details of the ?Emergency-Only Access? are not clear in the traffic study (figure 2, page 4) and appears to impact about 6 of the proposed lots. Routine access to these properties is not clear. Since the barrier between proposed lots 8 to14 and HWY 83 is also not clear, unauthorized entry/exit could be problematic.

Aside from the safety concerns above, the area(s) near the proposed HWY 83 widening expansion need to be managed to ensure highway modifications are possible. During review of the many independent development requests, El Paso elected and planning staff should approve plans with the future HWY 83 in mind.

OPPOSE

Name: Marti Breedlove

Date: 8/24/2026 12:19 PM

See opposition letter attached.

Traffic, Rural Character, Cumulative Growth and Infrastructure Constraints

Chair and Members of the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners:

Please accept this letter as my formal opposition to the proposed rezoning and associated development.

I respectfully ask the Board to consider not only whether this individual project can technically be accommodated by the existing roadway network, but whether approving another residential development in this rural area is consistent with the County's Master Plan, applicable rezoning criteria, and the long-term capacity and safety of the transportation network.

The central issue is not whether 14 homes, standing alone, create an unacceptable traffic problem. The issue is what happens when one development after another is approved in a rural area without corresponding investment in the roads that serve them.

Each application may appear manageable when evaluated independently. Collectively, however, the impact of continued residential growth is significant.

That cumulative impact deserves to be considered before additional development rights are granted.

1. The Traffic Study Confirms This Development Will Add Meaningful Traffic to an Already-Constrained Rural Road Network

The applicant's own traffic study projects that the proposed development will generate approximately:

- **127 additional vehicle trips per day**
- **10 additional trips during the morning peak hour**
- **13 additional trips during the afternoon peak hour**

While the applicant may characterize these numbers as relatively modest, the more important question is **where those trips are being added.**

This is not an urban roadway network with multiple alternative routes, sidewalks, bike lanes and significant excess capacity.

This is a **rural roadway network.**

The traffic study itself acknowledges that the surrounding area does not currently provide sidewalks, trails or bicycle facilities and that the County intends to maintain the rural characteristics of these roadways.

Adding traffic to a constrained rural network has a different impact than adding the same number of vehicles to a fully developed urban transportation system.

2. Needles Drive Is Projected to Experience a Dramatic Increase in Traffic

One of the most significant findings in the traffic study is the projected change on Needles Drive.

The study projects:

2028 Background Traffic: 75 vehicles per day

2028 With Development: 200 vehicles per day

That represents an increase of approximately **167%** over projected background traffic.

The study attributes approximately 125 daily trips to the proposed development.

This is not an insignificant change for a rural roadway.

The study also indicates that Needles Drive would be extended from approximately **2,800 feet to 6,675 feet** as part of the development.

In other words, this project is not simply adding homes to an existing neighborhood street. It is extending the roadway network and directing substantially more traffic through an area that currently experiences relatively low traffic volumes.

The Board should consider whether this level of change is consistent with the rural character contemplated for this area.

3. The Impact Extends Beyond the Development's Immediate Entrance

The traffic impacts do not stop at Needles Drive.

The study projects:

Timber Meadow Drive

1,815 ADT → 1,920 ADT

An increase of approximately **105 daily vehicle trips**.

Walden Way

275 ADT → 295 ADT

An increase of approximately **20 daily vehicle trips**.

These numbers demonstrate an important point:

The traffic generated by the development becomes part of the larger transportation network.

Those vehicles do not remain within the subdivision.

They travel onto Timber Meadow Drive, Walden Way and State Highway 83 and eventually interact with other roads and intersections used by existing residents.

This is precisely why cumulative growth needs to be considered.

4. The County Should Consider Cumulative Growth, Not Each Rezone in Isolation

This is perhaps my greatest concern.

Residents understand that each individual development application is reviewed on its own merits.

But **our roads do not experience development one application at a time.**

They experience the cumulative effect of every home that is added to the surrounding area.

When one rezone is approved, the resulting traffic becomes part of the baseline against which the next development is evaluated.

Then another development is approved.

Then another.

Over time, what was once considered a manageable individual increase becomes a substantial cumulative change to the character, traffic patterns and infrastructure demands of the area.

The fact that an individual project can technically be accommodated today does not necessarily mean that continued approval of similar projects is sustainable.

The Board has an opportunity to look beyond the narrow question of whether these 14 homes can be accommodated in isolation and consider whether approving this rezone contributes to a pattern of incremental development that is changing the rural area without corresponding transportation improvements.

That is a legitimate long-term planning consideration.

5. There Are No Corresponding Regional Road Improvements

The traffic study makes another point that deserves careful consideration.

The analysis does **not assume regional roadway improvements to accommodate regional transportation demands.**

The improvements associated with the project are generally limited to site access and frontage improvements.

That means the surrounding roadway system is expected to absorb the additional traffic generated by this development largely within the existing network.

This raises a fundamental question:

If the County continues approving additional residential density in this rural area, when and where will the corresponding transportation infrastructure be provided?

The answer cannot continually be that the roads can accommodate one more project.

At some point, the cumulative effect becomes the issue.

6. State Highway 83 Is Already a Significant Concern for Residents

State Highway 83 is an important transportation corridor for this community.

Residents already experience safety concerns at the intersections serving this area, including the intersection of **Highway 83 and Walker Road**, where residents have observed frequent crashes and difficult traffic conditions.

Those concerns should not be dismissed simply because an individual traffic study determines that a particular intersection operates within an acceptable Level of Service.

Level of Service is not the same thing as safety. I would ask the board to pull the traffic incident reports from El Paso County Sheriff's Office to evaluate the traffic accident reports for this area.

A roadway can technically operate at an acceptable LOS while residents are still experiencing difficult turning movements, limited sight distances, higher speeds, increasing traffic volumes and dangerous interactions between vehicles.

The traffic study itself identifies additional traffic impacts on Highway 83 and indicates that **a southbound left-turn deceleration lane at Walden Way may be warranted** based on projected traffic from the development.

That is significant.

The development is creating additional transportation demands on a highway corridor that already serves the surrounding rural community.

7. Highway 83 Improvements Are Not Imminent

The traffic study also acknowledges that the planned widening of State Highway 83 is not anticipated until approximately **2045** and therefore is not included in the current analysis.

That creates a significant gap between the timing of development and the timing of major transportation improvements.

The proposed development would begin adding traffic to the network decades before that planned improvement.

Meanwhile, additional residential development is likely to continue increasing the number of people and vehicles using the same roads.

The County should not evaluate today's development using only today's traffic conditions while assuming that future infrastructure will eventually solve tomorrow's cumulative problem.

If significant roadway improvements are not anticipated for nearly two decades, the County should carefully consider whether additional development should be approved now at the expense of increasing pressure on the existing network.

8. The Proposed Density Should Be Evaluated Against the Rural Character and Master Plan

The County's Master Plan is intended to provide more than a framework for reviewing individual applications.

It establishes a vision for how land uses, transportation and infrastructure should work together over time.

This area is characterized by rural and low-density development patterns and a transportation network that reflects that character.

The question before the Board should therefore not simply be:

"Can the existing roads technically accommodate the traffic from these homes?"

It should also be:

"Is this level and pattern of additional residential development consistent with the County's long-term vision for this rural area, given the existing transportation infrastructure and the lack of planned roadway improvements?"

Those are two very different questions.

A project can technically function from a traffic-engineering standpoint and still represent a poor long-term planning decision and vice versa.

9. Rezoning Creates a Long-Term Change, Not Just 14 Homes

This is another reason I believe the Board should look carefully at the rezone itself.

Approving a rezoning changes the development rights associated with the property.

It is not simply approving 14 additional homes.

It establishes a new baseline for what development can occur on the property and contributes to the broader pattern of residential intensification in the surrounding rural area.

Once that development occurs, its traffic becomes part of the background traffic used to evaluate the next proposal.

That is how cumulative impacts can become difficult to see:

Each individual decision appears reasonable. The collective result can be very different.

The Board has the responsibility to consider that long-term consequence.

10. The Traffic Study Should Not Be Used as a Finding of "No Impact"

I respectfully ask the Board to distinguish between "**no unacceptable intersection operations**" and "**no traffic impact.**"

The study clearly demonstrates that there **is** a traffic impact.

There will be:

- 127 additional daily vehicle trips;
- approximately 125 additional daily trips on Needles Drive;
- a projected increase on Needles Drive from 75 to 200 ADT;
- approximately 105 additional daily trips on Timber Meadow Drive;
- additional traffic on Walden Way;
- additional traffic entering State Highway 83; and
- a potential need for additional turn-lane infrastructure at Highway 83/Walden Way.

Those are real impacts.

The fact that the traffic study concludes that the analyzed intersections will continue to operate at acceptable Levels of Service does not erase those impacts.

It simply means the study does not predict intersection failure under the assumptions used in its analysis.

The Board's Opportunity

I recognize that the Board has to evaluate this application based on established criteria and the evidence before it.

I am not asking the Board to deny this project simply because residents do not want additional homes.

I am asking the Board to look at the **whole picture.**

Look at the Master Plan.

Look at the rural character of this area.

Look at the existing road network.

Look at the projected traffic increases.

Look at the lack of sidewalks and other multimodal infrastructure.

Look at the timing of planned improvements to Highway 83.

Look at the safety concerns residents already experience.

And most importantly, **look at the cumulative impact of continuing to add homes and people to an area without a corresponding plan to expand the roads serving them.**

The question is not whether these 14 homes alone will cause a traffic jam.

The question is whether approving another rezone is consistent with responsible long-term planning for a rural area whose transportation infrastructure is already constrained.

Respectfully Requested Action

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Board of County Commissioners to **deny the proposed rezoning.**

At a minimum, I ask the Board to require that the cumulative transportation impacts of continued residential growth in this area be fully considered rather than evaluating this application solely as an isolated development.

Our rural roads cannot be expanded one subdivision at a time after the homes are already built.

Once the homes are approved and occupied, the traffic is permanent.

The County has the opportunity to make a thoughtful decision now, one that considers not only this development, but the long-term future of the entire area.

I respectfully ask the Board to uphold the intent of the El Paso County Master Plan and applicable rezoning criteria, protect the rural character of this area, and ensure that additional development does not continue to outpace the transportation infrastructure needed to safely serve it.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of El Paso County.

Respectfully,

Marti Zehr-Breedlove

Walden Resident

OPPOSE

Name: April S.

Date: 8/26/2026 10:09 PM

Im opposed

OPPOSE

Name: Aubrei T

Date: 8/26/2026 10:37 PM

Oppose

OPPOSE

Name: Elisa R

Date: 8/26/2026 8:07 AM

Please see the attached letter and include this in the public record. Thank you.

August 26, 2026

El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
Board of County Commissioners
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

RE: Letter of Opposition — PCD File No. P268, State Highway 83 & Needles Subdivision

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners:

I am writing as a resident of the Walden neighborhood to oppose P268, the State Highway 83 & Needles Subdivision rezoning application. The applicant's traffic study looks only at this single 14-lot project in isolation, and on that narrow basis concludes the road network can absorb it. That framing understates the real problem: Multiple applications are expected in this immediate area, and State Highway 83 is a corridor the County and CDOT have already acknowledged cannot handle long-term growth in its current form.

I bring both a professional and a direct community perspective to this concern. I previously directed the Adolescent Trauma Recovery Program at the University of Maryland and conducted NIH funded research on teenagers who sustained head trauma in motor vehicle accidents. My work has given me firsthand experience with the human cost of injuries resulting from these accidents. I also personally reviewed the traffic study submitted for the nearby P261/P262 rezoning application, which documented intersection failures (Level of Service F) along this same SH 83 corridor during peak periods and will reach total functional failure by 2045 without major road improvements. This study is direct, project-specific evidence that SH 83 is already struggling under existing conditions, before this application's traffic is added.

1. Cumulative impact, not just 14 houses.

This application cannot be evaluated in a vacuum. Additional development applications are anticipated which will add trips to the same SH 83 and Walden Way intersections. Reviewing each project's traffic impact independently, without a cumulative corridor-level analysis, systematically understates the true burden on the road network. The County should require a cumulative traffic study accounting for all reasonably foreseeable development in the area before approving any single piece of it.

2. SH 83 is already flagged as inadequate — and no room is reserved for its fix.

The applicant's own memorandum cites CDOT's CO 83 Access Control Plan, which calls for widening SH 83 from two to four lanes between Old North Gate Road and Hodgen Road because the corridor cannot sustain projected long-term demand. In fact, when considering P261 and P262, CDOT recommended holding approval because acceptable operational thresholds were exceeded and roadway improvements were required. That widening is not funded. Approving further residential access and lot layouts along this corridor now, without

requiring dedication or preservation of the right-of-way and setbacks a future four-lane section will need, risks locking in a configuration that makes the County's own planned fix more difficult and expensive later. Any approval should be conditioned on reserving adequate right-of-way for the eventual four-lane cross-section.

3. The plat leaves little to no margin for that future widening.

The conceptual site plan shows the subdivision's internal access road running immediately parallel to SH 83 for nearly the entire length of the site, with only a narrow buffer between the two. A four-lane cross-section will require substantially more right-of-way than exists today. If the applicant's road and lot lines are platted this close to the highway now, the County will have little room left to widen SH 83 in the future without taking frontage from these same lots, relocating the access road, or accepting a substandard highway design. We request that the County require the applicant to disclose the existing SH 83 right-of-way width and the platted setback from centerline, and confirm in writing that sufficient right-of-way remains for the planned four-lane section, before this plat is approved. In addition, since SH 83 is owned by the state, CDOT should review this application with consideration given to the need for future widening of SH 83.

4. Increased accident risk from added access points on a high-speed highway.

SH 83 carries a posted speed limit of 60 mph, and every intersection in the study area — including SH 83 and Walden Way — is stop-controlled rather than signalized. Adding new turning movements onto a high-speed, two-lane highway at an unsignalized intersection increases the likelihood of rear-end and left-turn crashes, particularly if the recommended southbound left-turn deceleration lane is not required as a firm condition of approval. This risk will only grow as additional nearby development adds further turning traffic to the same corridor over time. In addition, nearby Monument Academy is targeted to grow which will add more traffic to SH 83 and the risk is further increased because inexperienced teen drivers will be commuting on these roads.

Given my professional background in trauma care, I do not raise this as an abstract concern. Within the past month, there have been 2 motor vehicle accidents. On July 30, NextDoor reported an accident at SH 83 and 105 closed this intersection for over 3 hours (under Richard R) and on August 24, 2026, [fox21news.com](https://www.fox21news.com) reported a 3 car accident on SH 83 just north of Walker road sent a 20-year-old driver to the hospital with serious injuries. The BOCC has an obligation to consider public safety and take all measures necessary to avert injury. The County should require a corridor safety and crash-history review, not just a capacity (level-of-service) analysis, before approving new access along this stretch of SH 83.

Requested action

- Deny the application, or continue it until a cumulative, corridor-wide traffic study covering all reasonably foreseeable nearby development, including potential growth from Tract A (P261/P262) and Tract B, is completed;

- Require dedication or preservation of right-of-way sufficient for the planned four-lane SH 83 cross-section, with the existing right-of-way width and platted setback disclosed and confirmed adequate, as a condition of any approval;
- Require a corridor safety and crash-history analysis addressing the added risk of new turning movements on this high-speed, unsignalized stretch of SH 83, and require the southbound left-turn deceleration lane as a firm condition rather than a deferred item;
- Require full supporting calculations confirming Needles Drive will remain below the 200 ADT gravel-paving threshold, with paving required if it is met or exceeded; and
- Deny the requested deviation for the length of the Needles Drive access corridor absent a second, standards-compliant emergency access.

Approving isolated projects one at a time, on a state-owned corridor already acknowledged to need capacity and safety improvements leaves the public's safety at risk. I urge you to deny this application, or withhold approval until these issues are resolved.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Elisa Rusonis, Ph.D.

Past Director, Adolescent Trauma Recovery Program, University of Maryland School of Medicine
Walden Neighborhood Resident

OPPOSE

Name: Heidi Arbury

Date: 8/26/2026 4:07 PM

We vehemently oppose any attempt to rezone, effectively halving lot size to allow for even greater density. When we bought our property 35 years ago, it was under protection of RR5 zoning. Obviously, our property value will be adversely impacted if this increase in density is permitted. It's unclear where the water will come from. Traffic will increase as will crime. The changes to our way of life are not acceptable and our County Commissioners are responsible for protecting us from exploitation by greedy developers. Say no to rezoning.

OPPOSE

Name: Jill Dodge

Date: 8/26/2026 9:38 PM

How can you even begin to think that Highway 83 or Highway 105 can safely accommodate any more traffic. What you are doing affects people's lives. Please take your development somewhere else to make your money.

OPPOSE

Name: Jill S

Date: 8/26/2026 10:45 PM

Zoned for a reason. Stop the madness

OPPOSE

Name: PJ C.

Date: 8/26/2026 7:36 PM

OPPOSE

OPPOSE

Name: Ryan T

Date: 8/26/2026 10:38 PM

Oppose

OPPOSE

Name: Steve S.

Date: 8/26/2026 10:10 PM

Opposed

OPPOSE

Name: Emma M

Date: 8/26/2026 10:14 PM

we don't need the traffic or the noise. leave the area alone

OPPOSE

Name: Catherine Oakley

Date: 8/27/2026 12:47 PM

The roads and water infrastructure do not support this development. Traffic coming out of Walden north is already difficult during peak school traffic hours.

The residences in the surrounding neighborhoods are on large lots. Zoning should not be changed.

OPPOSE

Name: Julie F

Date: 9/1/2026 8:57 PM

I strongly oppose the proposed rezoning of 17675 Highway 83 from RR-2.5 to RR-5. It is questioned whether our water resources, wastewater treatment, roadways, fire protection and emergency infrastructure can support that amount of development. We purchased our 5-acre lot for the quiet and space. It was a significant investment for us. We have an established rural-residential character consisting of predominantly 5-acre properties. 5-acre zoning preserves more natural landscapes. Reducing lots to 2.5-acres increases roads, driveways, fencing, tree removal. Changing zoning to RR-2.5 doubles the permitted residential density and begins changing the character we relied upon when we purchased. We ask that El Paso County demonstrate existing water supplies, wastewater systems, roads, emergency access and fire mitigation infrastructure can safely support this development. I respectfully ask the county to preserve the existing RR-5 zoning and deny additional requests for increased density.

09/02/2026

To: El Paso County Planning Commissioners & Commissioners

Regarding: File Number P268 – Needles Highway 83 Rezoning RR-5 to RR-2.5

We strongly oppose the continued rezoning of rural residential property in the Highway 83/Walden area to accommodate greater residential density. This is no longer a question about one isolated parcel. It is a question of cumulative development and whether our existing water, wastewater, roadway, fire protection, and emergency infrastructure can responsibly support the amount of development already underway.

This community was developed around low-density rural residential use. Doubling the permitted density means additional homes, vehicles, wells or water demand, septic or wastewater demand, impervious surfaces, and pressure on roads that were not designed to accommodate increasingly dense development.

Walden itself illustrates why additional density deserves far greater scrutiny. El Paso County records show that the Walden wastewater treatment system currently serves approximately 381 homes as well as Kilmer Elementary and Monument Academy East Campus, with anticipated residential buildout to approximately 520 homes. The existing wastewater treatment plant has now required replacement with an entirely new treatment system. That should be a significant warning against continuing to approve increased density throughout the surrounding area without first establishing that the infrastructure serving existing development is sustainable.

Walden Corporation provides central water and sewer service to the smaller residential lots within Walden Preserve, while the larger acreage properties depend upon individual wells and septic systems. Therefore, development pressures affect this area in two ways: they place additional demands upon centralized systems while simultaneously increasing groundwater withdrawal through private wells and adding additional septic systems throughout the surrounding rural community.

Residents have also publicly raised concerns regarding the capacity of the existing Walden system and odors associated with wastewater ponds. Whether or not every resident concern ultimately represents a regulatory violation, the fact that major wastewater infrastructure is being replaced while additional development continues to be proposed should cause the County to proceed cautiously, not accelerate density and existing residents should not

ultimately bear the financial or environmental burden of infrastructure improvements required by continued development.

Water is a finite resource. Wastewater treatment has finite capacity. Rural roads have finite capacity. Fire departments and evacuation routes have finite capacity.

Compatibility with the existing neighborhood. This area has an established rural-residential character consisting predominantly of five-acre properties, mature trees, horses, open space and agricultural/rural uses. Changing RR-5 zoning to RR-2.5 doubles the permitted residential density and begins changing the fundamental character people relied upon when purchasing property here.

Precedent and cumulative impact. Our concern isn't simply these 16 homes. It is what happens parcel by parcel along the Highway 83 corridor. If RR-5 parcels are repeatedly rezoned to allow greater density, the cumulative result will eventually bear little resemblance to the rural community that exists today.

Preservation of established zoning. The property already has a viable residential use under RR-5. The question should be why the County needs to grant additional development rights, particularly when the surrounding property owners purchased and invested based upon the existing zoning pattern.

Traffic and Highway 83. Additional residential development creates additional daily vehicle trips on Highway 83 and surrounding rural roads. I would specifically raise concerns about safe ingress/egress, sight distances, turning movements and the cumulative traffic burden created by continued development along this corridor.

Needles Drive. Because access is proposed from both Needles Drive and Highway 83, existing residents should not be expected to absorb substantially increased traffic on a road designed around rural five-acre development without a very careful analysis of capacity, safety and road impacts.

This area is also heavily treed and vulnerable to wildfire. Every additional home adds residents and vehicles that may need to evacuate while emergency equipment is attempting to enter the same area. Increased density therefore cannot be separated from questions of fire mitigation, emergency response, ingress and egress, road capacity, and public safety.

At some point, responsible planning requires the County to look beyond each individual application and examine what all of these developments collectively mean for the people already living here.

Existing residents purchased property in a rural, low-density area characterized by acreage, trees, horses, wells, septic systems, open land, and limited rural roadways. We should not continually increase density first and address inadequate infrastructure afterward.

Before approving additional rezoning or increased residential density, we respectfully ask El Paso County to demonstrate that existing water supplies, wastewater systems, roads, emergency access, evacuation capacity, and fire mitigation infrastructure can safely and sustainably support the development that has already been approved.

Until that can be demonstrated, we respectfully ask the County to preserve the existing RR-5 zoning and deny additional requests for increased density.

Sincerely

Mark & Julie Flansberg

3255 Pinehurst Circle

Colorado Springs CO 80908

OPPOSE

Name: Ray L

Date: 9/2/2026 8:13 PM

This proposed plan is considered unexpectable. Needles dr. is a 1/2 mile long rural, unpaved dead-end road. all residents on this road at elevation of 7,500 feet and above use wells for water supply. A suggestion of adding fourteen additional family residences would cause an unending list of additional problems and substantial devaluation of property values for the existing residents, including myself as I am possibly the most affected property owner as my property adjoins over 800 adjacent feet of the proposed tragedy. This would cause at minimum doubling traffic volume on Needles drive, not to mention the additional problems for emergency vehicles when needing access to the area. There is nothing about this proposal that would benefit anyone in this neighborhood other than for the current property owner to make a pocket full of money at everyone else's expense and additional problems.

RESOLUTION NO. 26-

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
COUNTY OF EL PASO, STATE OF COLORADO

APPROVAL OF MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)
NEEDLES HIGHWAY 83 REZONING RR-5 TO RR-2.5 (P268)

WHEREAS, North Ranch LLC did file an application with the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department for an amendment to the El Paso County Zoning Map to rezone for property located within the unincorporated area of the County, more particularly described in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference from the RR-5 (Residential Rural) zoning district to the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by the El Paso County Planning Commission on September 2, 2026, upon which date the Planning Commission did by formal resolution recommend approval of the subject map amendment application; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners on September 24, 2026; and

WHEREAS, based on the evidence, testimony, exhibits, consideration of the master plan for the unincorporated area of the County, presentation and comments of the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department and other County representatives, comments of public officials and agencies, comments from all interested persons, comments by the general public, comments by the El Paso County Planning Commission Members, and comments by the Board of County Commissioners during the hearing, this Board finds as follows:

1. That the application was properly submitted for consideration by the Board of County Commissioners;
2. That proper posting, publication, and public notice were provided as required by law for the hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners;
3. That the hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners were extensive and complete, that all pertinent facts, matters, and issues were submitted and reviewed, and that all interested persons were heard at those hearings;
4. That all exhibits were received into evidence;
5. That the proposed land use does not permit the use of any area containing a commercial mineral deposit in a manner, which would interfere with the present or future extraction of such deposit by an extractor;

6. That changing conditions clearly require amendment to the Zoning Resolutions;
7. That for the above-stated and other reasons, the proposed Amendment to the El Paso County Zoning Map is in the best interest of the health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, and welfare of the citizens of El Paso County; and

WHEREAS, this Board further finds that the request meets the criteria for approval outlined in Section 5.3.5.B of the Land Development Code (as amended):

1. The application is in general conformance with the El Paso County Master Plan including applicable Small Area Plans or there has been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood since the land was last zoned;
2. The rezoning is in compliance with all applicable statutory provisions, including but not limited to C.R.S. § 30-28-111 § 30-28-113, and § 30-28-116;
3. The proposed land use or zone district is compatible with the existing and permitted land uses and zone districts in all directions; and
4. The site is suitable for the intended use, including the ability to meet the standards as described in Chapter 5 of the Land Development Code, for the intended zone district.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners hereby approves the petition of North Ranch LLC to amend the El Paso County Zoning Map to rezone property located in the unincorporated area of El Paso County as described in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference, from the RR-5 (Residential Rural) zoning district to the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning district.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following conditions and notations shall be placed upon this approval:

CONDITIONS

1. The developer shall comply with federal and state laws, regulations, ordinances, review and permit requirements, and other agency requirements. Applicable agencies include but are not limited to: the Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Colorado Department of Transportation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the Endangered Species Act, particularly as it relates to the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse as a listed threatened species.
2. Any future or subsequent development and/or use of the property shall be in accordance with the use, density, and dimensional standards of the RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) zoning

district and with the applicable sections of the Land Development Code and Engineering Criteria Manual.

NOTATIONS

1. If a zone or rezone petition has been disapproved by the Board of County Commissioners, resubmittal of the previously denied petition will not be accepted for a period of one (1) year if it pertains to the same parcel of land and is a petition for a change to the same zone that was previously denied. However, if evidence is presented showing that there has been a substantial change in physical conditions or circumstances, the Planning Commission may reconsider said petition. The time limitation of one (1) year shall be computed from the date of final determination by the Board of County Commissioners or, in the event of court litigation, from the date of the entry of final judgment of any court of record.
2. Rezoning requests not forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for consideration within 180 days of Planning Commission action will be deemed withdrawn and will have to be resubmitted in their entirety.

DONE THIS 24th day of September 2026, at Colorado Springs, Colorado.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

ATTEST:

By: _____
Chair

By: _____
County Clerk & Recorder

EXHIBIT A

A tract of land being portions of the Southeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 15 and the East half of the Northwest quarter and the Northeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 22, Township 11 South, Range 66 West of the 6th P.M., all lying easterly of the easterly right-of-way line of Colorado State Highway No. 83, situate in El Paso County, Colorado, and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Northwest quarter of Section 22; said point also being the Southwest corner of Walden III as platted and recorded in Plat Book H-2 at Page 19 of the records of the El Paso County Clerk and Recorder; thence S 0 degrees 02 minutes 32 seconds W on the east line of the Northeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 22 a distance of 47.44 feet to a point on the easterly right-of-way line of Colorado State Highway No. 83; the following fifteen (15) courses are on said easterly right-of-way line:

1. Thence on a curve to the right, non-tangent to the previous course, having a radius of 2232.00 feet through a central angle of 9 degrees 15 minutes 44 seconds an arc distance of 360.81 feet, the long chord of which bears N 23 degrees 25 minutes 04 seconds W 360.42 feet;
2. Thence N 10 degrees 02 minutes 21 seconds W a distance of 781.50 feet;
3. Thence N 02 degrees 59 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 348.75 feet;
4. Thence N 04 degrees 01 minutes 09 seconds E a distance of 212.83 feet;
5. Thence N 02 degrees 25 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 263.03 feet;
6. Thence N 25 degrees 01 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 200.33 feet;
7. Thence on a curve to the left, non-tangent to the previous course, having a radius of 1970.26 feet through a central angle of 11 degrees 23 minutes 37 seconds an arc distance of 391.80 feet, the long chord of which bears N 22 degrees 20 minutes 51 seconds W 391.15 feet;
8. Thence N 32 degrees 51 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 203.23 feet;
9. Thence N 31 degrees 02 minutes 51 seconds W a distance of 57.21 feet;
10. Thence N 30 degrees 08 minutes 21 seconds W a distance of 364.83 feet;
11. Thence N 34 degrees 47 minutes 08 seconds W a distance of 219.16 feet;
12. Thence N 24 degrees 50 minutes 08 seconds W a distance of 71.96 feet;
13. Thence N 16 degrees 59 minutes 08 seconds W a distance of 91.92 feet;
14. Thence N 11 degrees 14 minutes 08 seconds W a distance of 691.72 feet;
15. Thence N 04 degrees 07 minutes 38 seconds W a distance of 29.29 feet to the Southwest corner of Lot 18 of said Walden III subdivision;

Thence S 88 degrees 47 minutes 14 seconds E on the south line of Lots 18, 19 and 20 of said subdivision a distance of 1163.66 feet to the Northeast corner of the Southeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 15 as established by said subdivision plat;

Thence S 0 degrees 16 minutes 42 seconds E on the westerly line of Lots 21, 22, 23 and 24 of said subdivision a distance of 1321.21 feet to the Northeast corner of the East half of the Northwest quarter of Section 15 as established by said subdivision;

Thence S 0 degrees 02 minutes 01 seconds W on the westerly line of Lots 24 and 25 a distance of 664.98 feet to a found 1/2" rebar;

Thence S 0 degrees 01 minutes 38 seconds W on the westerly line of Lot 26 of said subdivision a distance of 559.86 feet to a found 1/2" rebar;

Resolution No.

Page 5

Thence S 0 degrees 12 minutes 31 seconds E on the westerly line of Lot 27 of said subdivision a distance of 390.18 feet to a found 1/2" rebar;

Thence S 0 degrees 06 minutes 42 seconds W on the westerly line of Lot 37 and the right-of-way of Needles Drive of said subdivision a distance of 906.31 to a found 1/2" rebar;

Thence S 0 degrees 16 minutes 16 seconds E on the westerly line of Lot 38 of said subdivision a distance of 128.44 feet to the point of beginning;

County of El Paso, State of Colorado

(The basis of bearings for this description is the south line of Walden III (S 88 degrees 48 minutes 11 seconds E) as shown on the recorded plat thereof; Plat Book H-2, Page 19.)