

Meggan Herington, AICP, Executive Director
El Paso County Planning & Community Development

O: 719-520-6300
MegganHerington@elpasoco.com
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

Board of County Commissioners

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

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING RESULTS (UNOFFICIAL RESULTS)

Planning Commission (PC) Meeting
Thursday, September 19, 2024, El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle – Second Floor Hearing Room
Colorado Springs, Colorado

REGULAR HEARING, 9:00 A.M.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND VOTING: THOMAS BAILEY, SARAH BRITAIN JACK, JIM BYERS, BECKY FULLER, BRYCE SCHUETTELPELZ, WAYNE SMITH, TIM TROWBRIDGE, AND CHRISTOPHER WHITNEY.

PC MEMBERS VIRTUAL AND VOTING: NONE

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: NONE

PC MEMBERS ABSENT: JAY CARLSON, JEFFREY MARKEWICH

STAFF PRESENT: MEGGAN HERINGTON, JUSTIN KILGORE, KYLIE BAGLEY, RYAN HOWSER, EDWARD SCHOENHEIT, DANIEL TORRES, GILBERT LAFORCE, MARCELLA MAES, ERIKA KEECH, AND LORI SEAGO.

OTHERS PRESENT AND SPEAKING:

1. REPORT ITEMS

Ms. Herington stated she did not have any updates.

Mr. Kilgore stated he did not have any updates.

The next PC Hearing is Thursday, October 3rd, 2024, at 9:00 A.M.

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

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Adoption of Minutes for meeting held September 5th, 2024.

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

B. SF2325

BAGLEY

**FINAL PLAT
RHETORIC SUBDIVISION**

A request by N.E.S. Inc., for approval of a 32.62-acre Final Plat creating two industrial lots. The property is zoned I-3 (Heavy Industrial) and is located one quarter mile southeast of the intersection of Vollmer Road and North Marksheffel Road and is directly southwest of the intersection of North Marksheffel Road and Sterling Ranch Road. (Parcel No. 5300000743) (Commissioner District No. 2)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Trowbridge said the Planning Commission typically does not see a Final Plat, and asked if it was because the water finding was not done at the Preliminary Plan stage?

Ms. Bagley answered that is correct and said they did a combined Final Plat/Preliminary Plan so there is a water finding associated with this plat.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR FURTHER DISCUSSION.

PC ACTION: BRITAIN JACK MOVED / BYERS SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3B, FILE NUMBER SF2325 FOR A FINAL PLAT, RHETORIC SUBDIVISION, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH NINE (9) CONDITIONS AND THREE (3) NOTATIONS, AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICIENCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DEPENDABILITY, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (8-0).

IN FAVOR: BAILEY, BRITAIN JACK, BYERS, FULLER, TROWBRIDGE, WHITNEY, SCHUETTPELZ, AND SMITH.

IN OPPOSITION: NONE

COMMENTS: NONE

4. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS - NONE

5. REGULAR ITEMS

A. SKP237

HOWSER

**SKETCH PLAN
ESTEBAN RODRIGUEZ**

A request by Brent Houser Enterprises, LLC for approval of a 493.21-acre Sketch Plan consisting of approximately 119.73 acres allocated toward single-family residential uses with a minimum lot size of 5 acres, 312.84 acres allocated toward single-family residential uses with a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres, 15.07 acres allocated toward commercial uses, 8.52 acres allocated toward parks and open space, 5.90 acres allocated toward stormwater detention facilities, and 30.21 acres allocated toward proposed rights-of-way. At full build-out, the maximum development potential contemplated within the Sketch Plan area consists of 142 single-family residential lots and 15.07 acres of commercial development. The property is currently zoned A-35 (Agricultural) and is located on the south side of Judge Orr Road, approximately 1 mile east of the intersection of Judge Orr Road and Curtis Road/Stapleton Road. (Parcel Nos. 4300000534, 4300000537, and 4300000538) (Commissioner District No. 2)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Brittain Jack asked Mr. Guman if a central water system like that is paid for by the special district.

Mr. Guman confirmed

Ms. Brittain Jack asked do the other developments become members of that district.

Mr. Guman answered they met with the County Attorney as the applicant for BOCES to discuss the requirements for creating a Metro District, Water District, or Special Improvement District. He said the details are still being developed, as they are exploring a hybrid approach that balances private and public interests. The water district would be funded by the public entity, with BOCES potentially covering costs for the water treatment facility and extending water mains to adjacent properties.

At this stage, the Service Plan has not yet been drafted or reviewed by the County Attorney. He submitted applications with the understanding that if issues arise, the Rodriquez Subdivision can operate independently, based on the available water supply to support the development without needing to join the water district. He will have all details finalized when the Preliminary Plan and development plan are presented to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Brittain Jack asked when establishing a water district, how many homes can it serve considering that there are several development members involved.

Mr. Guman answered they had proposed the BOCES campus to include up to 121 single-family staff housing units, although the likely estimate is around 75 to 80 homes. Additionally, there are 142 homes proposed in the Rodriquez Sketch Plan and 92 homes in the Jane Davis Sketch Plan, which the Planning Commission has not yet seen.

The water resources plan accounts for all three developments. Combining these, he said they will have adequate resources to provide water, contingent on the central water system extending to all developments. The water treatment facility is currently being planned and engineered to accommodate the total demand from these projects.

He said they do not yet have signed agreements or contracts with the private developments to participate in the central water system that BOCES will develop. The central water facility is designed to provide sufficient water for all three developments.

Ms. Brittain Jack asked rather than drilling wells all the time why we don't do this more often and how many communities can be served in the County this way.

Mr. Guman answered the Planning Commission is likely aware that water issues arise with nearly every application that is reviewed. The estimated cost for developing a water treatment facility, which BOCES will manage, is approximately \$5.5 million. This substantial expense may explain why many developers opt for drilling wells instead.

However, they see a significant opportunity to create a central water facility that could serve 350 to 400 homes from a single supply. This facility would require the drilling of one to two wells, and while they await their engineer's proposals, they believe it remains a viable option for the future.

Currently, there are three large developments adjacent to one another, excluding Saddle Horn Ranch, which has its own water treatment facility. In contrast, Saddlehorn Ranch utilizes a central water system with no wells. This model could serve as an excellent reference for future adjacent developments.

While establishing a central water facility involves considerable costs, the long-term benefits and efficiencies it could provide are worth serious consideration.

Mr. Byers stated he was disappointed that the park was going away. There appears to be a Metro District and an HOA proposed, and asked why wouldn't one of those maintain the park.

Mr. Guman answered if the park would come to fruition that would be an option.

Mr. Byers asked didn't he just say that a park would not be part of the plan.

Mr. Guman answered the park is not being required by County Parks. On the first review plan this park is not on the County's list. The County did ask for fees.

Mr. Byers stated fees would work but why not as the developer, install the amenity and let the district maintain it.

Mr. Guman stated that was something that he doesn't know if he can answer. If the County does not choose to have a park in that location, then what Mr. Byers is suggesting would be a private park.

Mr. Byers answered if it was a Metro District, it would be open to the public.

Mr. Guman replied that the review raises important considerations regarding the responsibilities of the Metro District in relation to the Rodriguez Subdivision and other developments. It is not necessarily the case that the Metro District would be responsible for all developments within its service area, including the Rodriguez Subdivision. If the Metro District encompasses this area, it could be accountable for various developments, such as those from BOCES or Davis, which are not public entities. This distinction is crucial for understanding the scope of the Metro District's responsibilities and its implications for service provision.

Mr. Byers stated once the Metro District is created, he believes that it does create a public facility and you can't restrict the park.

Mr. Guman stated he would have to defer to the County Attorney.

Mr. Byers – stated he believes that open space is a crucial amenity, and that the County does not mandate its inclusion. As a landscape architect, you likely appreciate the value of this aspect. He recommends that we seriously consider its incorporation into the plans.

Additionally, he had a question regarding the drainage and asked about the proposed concept for addressing the drainage crossings. There are two points where the drainage crosses the site, and it seems likely that some form of structure will be necessary unless there are alternative solutions being considered.

Mr. Guman showed on the Sketch Plan where the two crossings would be and said drainage would be handled the way that Saddlehorn Ranch was approved. There are culverts that go beneath the street to accommodate any drainage in those areas. He said they are including the "no build area" in those drainage areas as part of the open space calculation. We are at about 16 to 17 percent open space

excluding the park. He said if they are directed to develop an 8-acre park that the County's Park Department doesn't want or need, we would be glad to reevaluate.

Ms. Seago spoke in defense of the County Parks Department and said it is not generally the policy of El Paso County to own or maintain what is often called neighborhood parks, pocket parks, or these smaller parks that are within neighborhoods. The County typically maintains regional parks, regional trails and other regional facilities. She certainly doesn't want to speak for the developer or impugn the developer, from the County Parks Department perspective to say that the County is not interested in operating a park here doesn't mean that the County Parks Department is saying that a park would not be a benefit or that there is no need for a park.

Mr. Byers mentioned funding for the park and maintenance of the park could be handled by a Metro District.

Ms. Seago answered it could be handled by a metro district but could not be handled by a water district. Those are two separate districts. Park maintenance also could be handled by an HOA.

Mr. Byers mentioned the Sketch Plan does not show connection to Saddlehorn although Mr. Guman stated that there was a proposed connection.

Mr. Guman answered the circulation plan which you are looking at essentially shows our major collector system not minor streets. Mr. Guman showed the Sketch Plan where the streets are located.

Mr. Bailey mentioned that he could not see the cursor where he was showing the location of the streets and asked if it was right below the park? He said at the Sketch Plan level, the concept of a connection is really all the detail that is needed at this time.

Mr. Guman pointed out that as Daniel Torres (County Engineer) had mentioned also, when he showed the three points of connection you can see where access three is located there. Mr. Guman showed a slide of what they are planning.

Ms. Fuller stated they are getting off track as far as talking about the park and that is with the review criteria that comes later. To her an 8-acre to 8 ½ - acre park where all the lots are 2.5-acre lots, she doesn't believe it is meaningful to the people that will live there. She said to rely on the future customers to make that decision and we do not need to talk about where roads are going to connect at this moment.

Mr. Guman responded that their request demonstrates that this is very compatible with Judge Orr Road corridor. This is compatible with what the County approved in the past and what the Planning Commission will see in the future when he comes back to the Planning Commission with the Jane Davis Ranch Sketch Plan and the Preliminary Plan for the Rodriguez Subdivision.

Mr. Bailey – asked if there were any more questions for the applicant or Staff or any other discussion. There were none.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION.

PC ACTION: FULLER MOVED / TROWBRIDGE SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REGULAR ITEM 5A, FILE NUMBER SKP237 FOR SKETCH PLAN, ESTEBAN RODRIGUEZ, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS AND THREE (3) NOTATIONS, AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICIENCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND

DEPENDABILITY, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (8-0).

IN FAVOR: BAILEY, BRITAIN JACK, BYERS, FULLER, TROWBRIDGE, WHITNEY, SCHUETTPELZ, AND SMITH.

IN OPPOSITION: NONE

COMMENTS: Mr. Trowbridge appreciated the discussion about the park. He agreed with Ms. Fuller that the lot sizes don't necessarily lend themselves to require a park. He also appreciated the applicant buffering the development with the 5-acre lots to provide that transition. He thought that's a good idea in these types of cases.

6. NON-ACTION ITEMS – A presentation regarding the Implementation action matrix in the Master Plan (3-year update).

MEETING ADJOURNED at 10:33 A.M.

Minutes Prepared By: MM