

**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, March 7, 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, BRANDY MERRIAM, ERIC MORAES, BRYCE SCHUETTPELZ, WAYNE SMITH, AND CHRISTOPHER WHITNEY.

**PC MEMBERS VIRTUAL AND VOTING:** NONE.

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

**PC MEMBERS ABSENT:** JAY CARLSON, JEFFREY MARKEWICH, KARA OFFNER, AND TIM TROWBRIDGE.

**COUNTY STAFF PRESENT:** MEGGAN HERINGTON, JUSTIN KILGORE, RYAN HOWSER, KYLIE BAGLEY, SCOTT WEEKS, DANIEL TORRES, ED SCHOENHEIT, VICTORIA CHAVEZ, MIRANDA BENSON, AND LORI SEAGO.

**OTHERS PRESENT AND SPEAKING:** DAVE GORMAN, LARRY FARISS, NANCY REINHARDT, CHERYL PIXLEY, JUDITH VON AHLEFELDT, DOUG DIDLEAU, ARTHUR GONZALES, ADAM LANCASTER, AND JASON NELSON.

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

**Ms. Herington** updated the board regarding the anticipated Land Development Code update. PCD has entered into a contract with a Colorado-based planning and law firm, Clarion Associates. In addition to involvement from herself and Mr. Kilgore, Kylie Bagley will be the project manager. Ms. Bagley will be scheduling meetings with PC members and stakeholders. Once the plan is established, PCD will bring Clarion before the PC for more information. Additionally, PCD staff is working on a Master Plan implementation report. Ryan Howser will be the project manager for that report. She anticipates a presentation to the PC by this summer. The next PC Hearing is Thursday, March 21, 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 February 15, 2024.

**PC ACTION: THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT (9-0).**

#### B. SF2215

**BAGLEY**

#### **FINAL PLAT PAIR-A-DISE SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1**

A request by Aaron Atwood for approval of a 5.04-acre Final Plat creating two single-family lots. The property is zoned RR-2.5 (Residential Rural) and is located at 515 Struthers Loop, one-third of a mile south of the intersection of West Baptist Road and Leather Chaps Road. (Parcel No. 7136002005) (Commissioner District No. 3)

**NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR DISCUSSION**

**PC ACTION: MS. FULLER MOVED / MR. MORAES SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3B, FILE NUMBER SF2215, FOR A FINAL PLAT, PAIR-A-DISE SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH ELEVEN (11) CONDITIONS, TWO (2) NOTATIONS, ONE (1) WAIVER, AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICIENCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DEPENDABILITY, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (9-0).**

#### C. MS237

**BAGLEY**

#### **MINOR SUBDIVISION GRAUPNER SUBDIVISION**

A request by M.V.E., Inc. for approval of a 41.37-acre Minor Subdivision creating four single-family lots. The property is zoned RR-5 (Residential Rural) and is located at 14710 Tanner Trail, 0.64 miles south of the intersection of Woodlake Road and Tanner Trail. (Parcel No. 4132000010) (Commissioner District No. 1)

**NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR DISCUSSION**

**PC ACTION: MR. SCHUETTEL MOVED / MS. BRITTAIN JACK SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3C, FILE NUMBER MS237 FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION, GRAUPNER SUBDIVISION, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH TEN (10) CONDITIONS, TWO (2) NOTATIONS, ONE (1) WAIVER, AND A RECOMMENDED FINDING OF SUFFICIENCY WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DEPENDABILITY, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (9-0).**

#### D. SF235

**HOWSER**

#### **FINAL PLAT CRAWFORD APARTMENTS**

A request by Aime Ventures, LLC for approval of a 1.157-acre Final Plat creating one multi-family lot to accommodate 22 multi-family units. The property is zoned RM-30 (Residential Multi-Dwelling) and is

located on the north side of Crawford Avenue, approximately 350 feet west of Grinnell Boulevard. (Parcel No. 6513125009) (Commissioner District No. 4)

**NO PUBLIC COMMENT**

**DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Bailey** recognized that public comments had been received and provided to the board.

**Mr. Moraes** expressed gratitude for the public comments. He further stated that the zoning on the property is already RM-30, so the owner has the legal right to build up to 30 units per acre on their property. There will be further steps before the structure is built. He encouraged the public to work with PCD to stay engaged and follow the process.

**Ms. Fuller** reiterated that Final Plat is further along in the process than the zoning decision. She encouraged members of the public to review the criteria of approval for project types to understand what the PC is required to look at when making their recommendation.

**PC ACTION: MS. BRITTAIN JACK MOVED / MS. MERRIAM SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3D, FILE NUMBER SF235 FOR A FINAL PLAT, CRAWFORD APARTMENTS, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH NINE (9) CONDITIONS, TWO (2) 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 (9-0).**

**E. MS206**

**HOWSER**

**MINOR SUBDIVISION  
FOREST HEIGHTS ESTATES**

A request by Jon Didleaux and Phyllis Didleau Revocable Trust for approval of a 32.62-acre Minor Subdivision creating four single-family residential lots and two tracts. The property is zoned RR-5 (Residential Rural) and is located at 8250 Forest Heights Circle. (Parcel Nos. 5209000050, 5209000120, and 5209000121) (Commissioner District No. 1)

**PC ACTION: THIS ITEM WAS PULLED TO BE HEARD AS A CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEM PER MS. FULLER.**

**4. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS**

**3E. MS206**

**HOWSER**

**MINOR SUBDIVISION  
FOREST HEIGHTS ESTATES**

A request by Jon Didleaux and Phyllis Didleau Revocable Trust for approval of a 32.62-acre Minor Subdivision creating four single-family residential lots and two tracts. The property is zoned RR-5 (Residential Rural) and is located at 8250 Forest Heights Circle. (Parcel Nos. 5209000050, 5209000120, and 5209000121) (Commissioner District No. 1)

**STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS**

**Mr. Moraes** asked where the private road would begin.

**Mr. Daniel Torres**, with DPW Development Services (Engineering), answered that the private road begins where Forest Heights Circle (private) meets Herring Road (public).

**Mr. Smith** asked why an applicant would choose a private road over a public road.

**Mr. Torres** explained that opting for a private road would give the developer additional allowances regarding right-of-way (ROW) width or paved cross-sections, as examples.

**Mr. Whitney** asked why more people aren't opting for private roads.

**Mr. Torres** replied that there are various reasons, but provided maintenance as one example.

**Mr. Whitney** reiterated that upkeep is the owner's responsibility if it's a private road. He then asked if the County has a preference between public or private so long as the road meets the criteria.

**Mr. Torres** clarified that County staff does review the proposed road to ensure it is sufficient. That process was completed in this case and the 20-foot cross-section was agreed upon.

**Mr. Smith** asked if a private road could restrict public access (to trails, for example).

**Mr. Torres** answered that it would depend on what the access easement identifies. If a gate were put on the road, that could restrict access. He further stated that most private roads remain open to the public. The staff presentation concluded. The applicant's presentation began.

**Mr. Bailey** asked for clarification regarding whether a trail easement was being requested on the northern side of the proposed Lot 1.

**Mr. Dave Gorman**, with M.V.E. Inc., representing the applicant, stated they are not proposing an easement in the location. He explained that the property owners are not comfortable with having a public trail on or leading directly to their mother's backyard (8250 Forest Heights Circle). He further explained that fencing along the property line has been in existence since the 1980s.

**Mr. Bailey** expressed his position that nothing compels a property owner to grant an easement. He recognizes that someone has asked for it but Mr. Gorman has explained why the family did not grant that access. He recognizes that that is the applicant's choice.

**Mr. Gorman** added that nothing prevents future discussion between the property owners. As trails extend, other doors may open. The presentation continued.

**Mr. Whitney** asked for verification that the applicants had no issue with the Black Forest Trail easement running along Forest Heights Circle.

**Mr. Gorman** confirmed. The easement can be placed on the roadway. He added that there is another resident who owns connecting land, so they would need to approach them to see if they are agreeable. Regarding the land included on this Final Plat, that easement is acceptable.

**Mr. Byers** clarified that they were just discussing the east to west trail that would lay over the roadway. He then asked about the platted easement that runs north to south.

**Mr. Gorman** explained that the north to south utility easement is for a gas line and a trail easement runs over it as well.

**Mr. Byers** asked why trails were being dedicated when there is no apparent connectivity.

**Mr. Gorman** answered that the County Parks Department asked for the trail dedication, knowing there was no current connectivity outside the subject plat, with the hopes and/or expectation that there would be trail connections in the future.

**Mr. Byers** asked if there was a current trail connection to the south.

**Mr. Gorman** replied that there is no connection. He added that he's not sure if unofficial trails exist.

**Mr. Bailey** reiterated that the utility easement exists regardless of an additional trail easement.

**Mr. Byers** pointed out that that parcel of land excluded from the subject plat (in the center) does not have the trail easement. The trail is not continuous through the property.

**Mr. Gorman** confirmed. The current applicant cannot grant that easement as they are not the owner of that parcel. Even though there is no current connection, the applicant complied with the dedication requested by the Parks Department.

**Ms. Fuller** asked about the current shape of the overall parcel.

**Mr. Gorman** explained that over time, pieces of land were carved out and sold off by a previous owner before the State's subdivision law. The applicant's proposal attempts to create parcels that each have road access.

**Mr. Bailey** asked PCD staff if this subdivision created legal lots where there currently are none.

**Mr. Howser** confirmed.

**Mr. Gorman** noted that often in those cases, there are existing homes on the "illegal" lots, but there are no houses on the proposed lots of this subdivision.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Bailey** began the public comment period by asking for the LDC approval criteria to be presented and asked that public comments be limited to the criteria. He pointed to item 8 on the list, "Legal and physical access is provided to all parcels by public rights-of-way or recorded easement, acceptable to the County in compliance with the Code and the ECM." He stated that the criteria does not call for any other organization's need to approve easements. The PC cannot consider points that are not relevant to the LDC criteria of approval.

**Mr. Larry Fariss** spoke in opposition. He mentioned that trails are important to him, that there are many dirt road/trail connections in the area that go across people's properties, and that even his property had a trail between two adjacent dirt roads. He used these trails before the Black Forest fire, after which he became an "absent owner" (he still owns his property and lives in the region, but not on the same land that was burned). He was the president of the Black Forest Trails Association (BFTA) for 10-15 years, during which time he coordinated trail connectivity with private landowners, including the Didleau's. He believes the subject property to be a linchpin for the area's trail system. He then referred to the proposed Final Plat. He explained why a trail easement along the northern boundary of Lot 1 would create a connection from Meadow Glen Lane (to the north), down the utility easement, and west from Forest Heights Circle to Herring Road. If the Didleau family doesn't want a trail on or leading to their mother's property (which is directly east of Lot 1), he stated that the neighbors north of Lot 1 verbally agreed to allow a trail connection from Lot 1, across the corner of their property, to Meadow Glen Lane. He stated that as the next president of BFTA, he will target implementation of a trail connection in this area as a priority. He also requested that Forest Heights Circle not be gated so the public can walk along the road.

**Ms. Nancy Reinhardt** spoke in opposition. She previously lived south of Black Forest Section 16 Trail (which is south of the subject property). She described her previous use of trails in the area.

**Mr. Bailey** reiterated that the proposed Final Plat does not include an easement across Lot 1. He expressed that the board understands the issue - that other people want access to this landowner's private property - but that's not something the board can consider in review of this Final Plat request. He stated it is not the role of the PC to compel a landowner to grant public access to their property.

**Ms. Cheryl Pixley** spoke in opposition. She stated that the proposed plat notes already call for a 20' wide utility and drainage easement along the subdivision's boundary lines. As the northern lot line of Lot 1 is a subdivision boundary line, she is requesting that easement also be dedicated as a public trail easement. She stated that significant effort has been made since the Black Forest fire to reestablish trail connections. She stated that the Your El Paso Master Plan strategic plan goals could be accomplished by looking at the bigger picture of how the subject proposal serves the citizens. She stated this could be an example of cooperation between the County and the people it serves by respecting and securing for the future "historical amenities" used by other residents. She stated that she has no opposition to the Final Plat, but asks that the board use its discretion to recommend a plat modification and to recommend the following conditions of approval: 1) Designate a 20' wide multi-use, non-motorized trail easement along the 20' wide utility and drainage easement at the north lot line of Lot 1, starting from the regional trail in the gas pipeline easement and continuing to the northeast corner of Lot 1; and 2) Designate a public trail easement from Herring Road east along the length of the gravel road known as Forest Heights Circle.

**Ms. Judith von Ahlefeldt** spoke in opposition. She spoke about the history of the area. She was formerly the secretary for BFTA. She agreed that a trail easement across Lot 1 would be pivotal to BFTA's efforts in connecting dirt roads with private easements over the last 25 years. She continued to describe the history of the area. She then discussed the maintenance agreement for the road, which she did not sign because she did not feel protected. She described how the agreement was set up; the 2 elected administrators would make all decisions. She contributed financially to road maintenance in the past. She doesn't think the road needs the level of improvement proposed. She stated there are wetlands and springs on the subject property. She further stated Vollmer hill is the highest point east of the Rocky Mountains until the Mississippi River so there is not much watershed or flooding. She criticized County engineers' drainage report and suggestions, which she called "overkill". She dislikes the placement of the cul-de-sac because she believes the proposed location will have the maximum impact on wetlands and will incur a higher cost for the Didleau's. She thinks the cul-de-sac should be positioned further from her property, between proposed Lots 1 and 4, with only driveways leading east. As it is currently proposed, there will be a large ditch close to her property line. Her offer to purchase part of the Didleau's property so she could decide where the cul-de-sac and driveways were located was not entertained. She stated that she submitted multiple documents early in the subdivision process that discuss environmental impacts and the history of the property. She acknowledged that many of her issues were not resolved in the Final Plat process because they're not part of the review criteria. She referred to the Your El Paso Master Plan calling for each project in the forested key area to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine impacts. She read additional considerations from a list on page 8 of 13 within a document she provided, which is uploaded to EDARP and part of the public comment record. She asked for the PC to recommend the applicants collaborate with BFTA to establish a trail easement and maintain connection to Meadow Glen Lane.

**Mr. Doug Didleau**, the applicant's son, provided rebuttal comments. He stated that a meeting with neighbors, BFTA, and Duncan Bremer (attorney) was held by his mother in May 2023. At that meeting, a trail was proposed traveling east from the cul-de-sac towards the Redtail Ranch subdivision, crossing Ms. von Ahlefeldt's property, then connecting back to Meadow Glen Lane with a trail on the northern lot line of 8250 Forest Heights Circle (his mother's property, not part of the current subdivision). This way, the trail would be in front of his mother's house, not behind. He

stated that Ms. von Ahlefeldt rejected that trail access on her property. He stated that his family did not feel like they should have 100% of a trail they don't want and won't use on their property when the advocate for the trail system doesn't want part of it on her own property. He stated that Ms. Pixley even made various suggestions to Ms. von Ahlefeldt, but they were all rejected. He provided photos of a fence that a previous owner of the property had installed in the 1980s, which are uploaded to EDARP and part of the record. He stated that recent work on the fence was only done as upkeep and repair. Anyone crossing that trail could only have done so after vandalizing the fence and trespassing. He further mentioned that his family had been victims of theft.

**Mr. Gorman** responded to the remarks about the road design. The road was designed to be as compliant as possible with the ECM for safety and durability and was reviewed by County staff. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was notified of the project, and they had no problems. He addressed the maintenance agreement even though it is a private matter. The co-administrators will be required to submit an annual budget report that must be approved by members of the agreement.

## DISCUSSION

**Ms. Merriam** asked who would be responsible for ensuring the safe public use within an easement if a trail were to be put on the property. Who would be responsible financially?

**Mr. Gorman** didn't know. (During this time, Mr. Howser approached Ms. Seago to discuss.)

**Mr. Bailey** noted that while interesting, the existence and/or details of a maintenance agreement are not relevant to the Final Plat request.

**Ms. Brittain Jack** stated there are many issues with people crossing private property. She is currently working with people in a similar situation; she doesn't think this applicant should be compelled to grant an easement. She mentioned there may be relevant legislation on the topic.

**Mr. Howser** stated that the County wouldn't be able to provide an answer to Ms. Merriam's question because it would not be a County easement. It would be a private matter between the property owners and BFTA.

**Mr. Whitney** agreed that a property owner shouldn't be made to do anything they don't want to do unless it's unlawful. Overall, the situation should be fixable, but the PC cannot order someone to give an easement.

**Mr. Bailey** reiterated that the PC is making a recommendation to the BoCC and is only considering the Final Plat request. He mentioned that once the lots are subdivided, it's possible that whoever purchases Lot 1 might agree to an easement along the northern lot line. He further mentioned that BFTA could purchase Lot 1. He stated that private property rights are important to the PC and BoCC. He agreed with Mr. Whitney's comments. There are other solutions to the problem.

**Ms. Fuller** asked about adding language to the Final Plat to dedicate Forest Heights Circle as a trail easement, as earlier discussed. She expressed that she will be in favor of the Final Plat. She doesn't think discussion of a maintenance agreement or location of the cul-de-sac are appropriate. She mentioned private property rights and remarked that if the Didleau's want to place it where they've proposed, then it's not up to the neighbor, who doesn't own the property and won't be paying for it, to change that decision. She expressed confidence in its design since it has gone through the review process. She agreed that there are likely other places to make a trail connection.

**PC ACTION: MS. MERRIAM MOVED / MR. SCHUETTELZ SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CALLED-UP ITEM 3E, FILE NUMBER MS206 FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION, FOREST HEIGHTS ESTATES,**

**UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH NINE (9) CONDITIONS, TWO (2) NOTATIONS, TWO (2) WAIVERS, 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 (9-0).**

## **5. REGULAR ITEMS**

### **A. MP233**

**CHAVEZ**

#### **MASTER PLAN CO 83 ACCESS CONTROL PLAN**

The El Paso County Department of Public Works in conjunction with Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the City of Colorado Springs requests adoption of the CO 83 Access Control Plan as an element of the El Paso County Master Plan. With adoption, this Plan will become the principal plan for further planning and development of the CO 83 corridor access within unincorporated El Paso County and the City of Colorado Springs on this CDOT owned highway. The Plan encompasses CO 83 at Powers Boulevard (CO 21) to County Line Road (Palmer Divide Road). (All Commissioner Districts)

#### **STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS**

**Ms. Victoria Chavez**, DPW Transportation Manager, introduced **Mr. Arthur Gonzales**, CDOT Access Manager. Mr. Gonzales began the presentation.

**Mr. Bailey** asked if any issues had been reported at Stagecoach after improvements were made.

**Mr. Jason Nelson**, CDOT Traffic Engineer, replied that Commissioner Williams had put him in contact with an HOA on the west side of Highway 83. He attended a large meeting with residents. He remarked that many items within the staff presentation were a result of that meeting. Flying Horse North made improvements on the east side of the road, but a study was conducted, a consultant is on board, and CDOT is looking to schedule a public open house. Opportunities for the intersection will be evaluated. There is no funding currently, but they are connecting with the public.

**Mr. Bailey** wondered if this was a situation where residents were worried about change but then pleasantly surprised after improvements were made.

**Mr. Nelson** sympathized with the residents' concerns that only half the intersection was improved.

**Mr. Gonzales** continued the presentation.

**Ms. Merriam** asked if traffic and incident reports were updated periodically given that so much change has taken place in the County and State. Numbers from 5 years ago may no longer be relevant in certain areas.

**Mr. Gonzales** used Stagecoach Road as an example. When changing traffic patterns are observed, or additional development occurs, CDOT does an operations evaluation to reassess that area.

**Mr. Nelson** further explained that there is a robust safety program and fatality investigations take place within 24 hours. CDOT tracks causation factors. He noted that El Paso County has a high crash rate. Regarding Highway 83, speeding and distracted driving are common causes.

**Ms. Merriam** suggested that updating reported numbers would be beneficial because only 5 years from adoption of this Plan, the statistics will be 10 years old.



**Mr. Nelson** replied that they could complete that update.

**Mr. Bailey** compared Ms. Merriam's observation to the situation the PC found themselves in when adopting the Your El Paso Master Plan. One segment of that Plan included an evaluation of "existing conditions". By the time the Plan was ready for adoption, the existing conditions had changed. He reiterated that CDOT is constantly monitoring data. He asked Ms. Merriam if she was requesting changes prior to adoption.

**Ms. Merriam** mentioned presentation slideshow page 7 and stated it might be better to include language that indicates continuous research. She doesn't see reference to ongoing data.

**Mr. Gonzales** understood the request and concluded the presentation.

## **NO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

## **DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Smith** asked how traffic is counted and monitored. He specifically asked about traffic congestion from southbound Highway 83 onto Powers Boulevard in. That traffic light is confusing for people who don't travel to that area often.

**Mr. Nelson** answered that CDOT has a yearly count program. He mentioned that over the last 5 year, CDOT has expanded a website called MS2 Data. All consultants and vendors in Colorado that do traffic counts are contributing to that database, so the info includes highways, rural roads, city streets, etc. If CDOT doesn't count a road every year, they'll grow it per year using a growth factor based on land-use. Overall, there's a robust data collection system in place. He then addressed the Highway 83/Powers Boulevard intersection. He explained that a second phase connection to Powers will move forward soon but is development funded. That intersection will change significantly in the future.

**Mr. Bailey** noted that traffic studies in the area will be artificially inflated as long as Voyager Parkway remains closed for improvements.

**Ms. Chavez** pulled up another presentation so that Mr. Gonzales could explain a change made because of public comment.

**Mr. Gonzales** reviewed the history of the change. There was a previous agreement with CDOT regarding where his property access would be located. That access had not been included in the initial Plan. They worked with the citizen to update the Plan.

**Ms. Chavez** pulled up other attachments included in the hearing packet. She explained that the IGA goes to the BoCC and is not signed by the PC. The chart shows updates made to the Plan. This Plan is used by PCD during EA meetings held with potential developers in the area.

**PC ACTION: MR. MORAES MOVED / MS. BRITTAIN JACK SECONDED TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF REGULAR ITEM 5A, FILE NUMBER MP233 FOR A MASTER PLAN, THE CO 83 ACCESS CONTROL PLAN, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS. THE MOTION TO APPROVE ADOPTION PASSED (9-0).**

## **6. NON-ACTION ITEMS (NONE)**

**MEETING ADJOURNED** at 11:40 A.M.

**Minutes Prepared By:** Miranda Benson