

City of Colorado Springs

*City Hall
107 N. Nevada Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903*



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Thursday, January 19, 2017

8:30 AM

Council Chambers

Planning Commission

1. Call to Order

- Present:** 8 - Reggie Graham , Rhonda McDonald, Jeff Markewich, Vice Chair John Henninger, Chairperson Eric Phillips, Robert Shonkwiler, Ray Walkowski and Carl Smith
- Absent:** 1 - Sherrie Gibson

2. Approval of the City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

2.A. [CPC 169](#) City Planning Commission Minutes for December 15, 2016

Presenter:
Eric Phillips, Chair, City Planning Commission

Motion by Smith, seconded by Vice Chair Henninger, to approve the December 15, 2016, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1.

- Aye:** 8 - Graham, McDonald, Markewich, Henninger, Chairperson Phillips, Shonkwiler, Walkowski and Smith
- Absent:** 1 - Gibson

3. Communications

[CPC-038](#) Chair Eric Phillips

[CPC-002](#) Director Updates, Peter Wysocki

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

4.A. [CPC CU 16-00141](#) This is a request for a Conditional Use to establish one unit of affordable housing (3 bedrooms) in a C-6 commercial zone. The subject property, which is surrounded by residential use, is a 4,500 square foot lot and is located one lot northeast of W. Kiowa St. and N. Walnut St.

Presenter:
Matthew Fitzsimmons, Planner II - Urban Planning, Planning and Community Development
Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development

This Planning Case was adopted on the Consent Calendar.

Approval of the Consent Agenda

Motion by McDonald, seconded by Walkowski, that all matters on the Consent Calendar be passed, adopted, and approved by unanimous consent of the members present. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1

- Aye:** 8 - Graham, McDonald, Markewich, Henninger, Chairperson Phillips, Shonkwiler, Walkowski and Smith

Absent: 1 - Gibson

These items will be acted upon as a whole, unless a specific item is called for discussion by a Commissioner or a citizen wishing to address the Planning Commission. (Any items called up for separate consideration shall be acted upon following the Consent Vote.)

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 5.A [CPC MP 16-00122](#) A resolution adopting the Envision Shook's Run Master Facilities Plan (Legislative)

Presenter:

Carl Schueler, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director
Aaron Egbert, Senior Engineer, Public Works Department

Staff presentation:

Carl Schueler, Comprehensive Planning Manager, gives a brief update regarding reasons for postponing voting on this item last month. The plan required input from the Downtown Review Board along with key stakeholder comments that required consideration. The Downtown Review Board heard this on January 4, 2017.

At Informal Planning Commission you received a January 12th updated version of the document plan, draft minutes from the Downtown Review Board from January 4, 2017. They recommended approval by a 7-0 vote but included comments along with their recommendations that primarily dealt with the relationship between private development and implementation of this Plan over time, specific concerns from the Catalyst Campus, and questions about the timing and impact of the Sustainable Implementation Plan (SIP). There have been verbal comments about the rail spur. These conversations come from a community planning standpoint, and not a particular property owner. The idea is the City needs to be careful if there were any City initiatives to vacate or sell off the remaining rail spur especially south of Costilla Street. Chris Jenkins of Nor'wood has stated before vacating any of the rail there should be an active public process particularly in the far southern part of the corridor.

Letters of support from the following received from: Ms. Richter with Catalyst Campus, The Downtown Partnership is also in support, Hillside Neighborhood, Ms. Nancy Brown, Charles Castle who is on the Parks Board but more as an individual letter, Colorado Springs Chamber and EDC, Middle Shooks Neighborhood Association, and the Urbanites of the Pikes Peak region in the southern part of the corridor are in support.

A four page summary was handed out describing the changes from the November 2, 2106 draft Plan. That you received at the December CPC meeting which primarily deal with the relationship and support of private development and what those obligations might be. There is a specific

graphic change and language for the Catalyst Campus and Transit Mix properties. The Catalyst Campus has a specific vision and that part of the plan now has the flexibility to accommodate three scenarios: 1.) Transit Mix staying. 2.) Catalyst acquiring the Transit Mix sites and expanding. 3) Another developer acquiring the Transit Mix site and redeveloping it.

There is additional language addressing what the SIP will do, what the SIP will say and how projects will be prioritized. Aaron Egbert, Public Works Manager discussed how planning, design and prioritization will happen going forward.

Dan Kruger discussed specific changes that were handed out. Changes are to the Transit, Railroad and Project Scope and Coordination sections. The most changes are in the Project Scope and Coordination section which deals with the SIP and what it will do. This plan will primarily be the responsibility of Public Works along with coordination other departments, stakeholders and the Mayor's office.

Questions: Commissioner Walkowski said as a member on the Downtown Review Board, there were issues and concerns that they wanted addressed. One was the SIP. Why does it need to follow the Master Plan? Mr. Kruger stated when they began the project there was only going to be a SIP. As community input was gathered they wanted the area to change in a larger way. A Facilities Master Plan was added as a framework document to guide the all development. The SIP will have more detail of prioritization, how the projects could be phased in groups, how funding could occur and include a recommended program for implementation. There will be a detailed project list with recommended time frames. What made the best sense was to keep the two plans separate. The SIP will be a working document that will need to be more flexible than the Master Plan. The SIP will be easier for quicker accessibility as things change. Economic development factors could determine the timing and details associated with implementation.

Commissioner Walkowski asked when would the SIP be put together. Mr. Krieger said final version in will be done in June. Once the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) is approved there will be some work sessions with the City, then meetings will begin with the community around March or April to present a draft version of recommendations.

Commissioner Walkowski said one other issue the DRB discussed was the flexibility of the amendment process, so he asked what the changes were. Mr. Schueler said there are changes from the November document. There was always the intent to have major and minor amendments and the changes focus on the importance of the document being adaptable and flexible.

Commissioner Walkowski said the DRB had issue with it being a 50 year plan that will need to be amended and have the flexibility to adjust to those major and minor amendments. The proposed language addresses those concerns. Mr. Schueler agreed that once adopted even though a 50-year

plan, it will need to be periodically updated.

Commissioner Markewich asked what the public process will be regarding amendments. Mr. Wysocki said the Code is specific about amendments. The Code contemplates private master plans but this is beyond a land use master plan. So if there is an amendment it will have a level of public process. Commissioner Markewich asked if it was the same process that exists now. Mr. Wysocki used an example of what could be done if a development came in and didn't follow everything to the T in this plan what could be done. Mr. Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager noted page 108 & 109 of the January 12 version of the plan describes this process. The language has been added so developers would know what would trigger different processes.

Commissioner Markewich asked if the SIP will be an amendment and come back through the Planning Commission. Aaron Egbert said the FMP will be updated every 10 years and will capture all the amendments that have happened. They are not planning on bringing the SIP back through a public process. But, there was some interest expressed from the DRB that they wanted updates know how things were progressing and we could do the same for CPC. From this point on Planning staff will become less involved in the project team. It will be more of a technical Park-and-Rec, Public Works, Stormwater, Transit and Traffic document. Commissioner Markewich said he thought having Planning Commission updated regularly of the major events of the SIP was important.

Aaron Egbert said as development occurred Planning Commission will see the development applications and will be on the "front lines" from the perspective of development and review. Commissioner Markewich asked if they had an idea of when implementation will start and what citizens might see. Aaron Egbert said the Mayor's office wants to move some of this forward to address funding. Once the SIP is in place it will help to get things started and provide some framework for when things could happen.

Commissioner Markewich asked about Historic Preservation because it was mentioned by the DRB. This is a corridor that has been here a long time so how much time has been put into identifying what is historic and in line for preservation or re-use? Aaron Egbert said they reviewed the entire corridor and nothing is registered as an historic element. There are elements like the railroad areas that have a historical feel to them. Depending on funding sources this will also influence the requirements for further study and we've identified some of the art we'd like to keep.

Mr. Schueler said there is language in the plan talking about historical legacy. It's one thing to preserve a railroad but another to preserve the legacy of the railroad. We can intertwine different aspects of preservation.

Commissioner Phillips asked about the Catalyst Campus stating he knows they want to do some things and where is the Plan with that. Mr. Tefertiller said the entire project team has worked closely with Catalyst Campus and Ms. Ritcher about their immediate concerns and long range plans for their

current property including the potential expansion. Catalyst has been in negotiation with the Railroad to acquire some of the Transit-Mix and railroad property to the south to expand into. Those properties represent the largest development potential along the corridor. They are aiming very high and looking at unique funding sources and contractors. But there's some uncertainty in what they want to do and when to do it. They want flexibility depending on what acquisitions they have for the next 5-15 years and predictability in knowing what type of City improvements will happen along the stream and what expectations would be placed on them for making those improvements. Ultimately they will be impacted by what resources will they have either bisecting their site or going along the edge of their campus. It's been a challenge to provide flexibility and predictability. But the letter they issued this past Friday shows they are in support and felt comfortable enough they didn't feel it necessary to attend today's hearing.

Richard Shaw, part of the Consulting Team listed some of the newer elements within the plan that address this area and illustrate the options graphically and textually

Commissioner Shonkwiler thanked everyone for all the hard work and said these things are very important for Colorado Springs. Areas need to be rebuilt and he would like to see if move forward quickly. Once the plan is approved it will be easier to say we have a Master Plan and be able to access funding.

Supporters: None

Opponents: None

Questions of Staff: Mr. Schueler said the motion should include the language with respect to minor technical and typographical corrections and specifically reference the handout received today which is the additional clarification and these most recent changes do not substantively affect the view of the plan.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

Commissioner Walkowski said he's in favor of the FMP. It's a proactive approach. They have done a lot and included a lot of the contributions from the community and have a comprehensive approach to this area of town. They've addressed a lot of the issues brought up by the public and have a framework everyone would be able to work with. He is in support of the plan.

Commissioner Markewich said he's encouraged by plan. The challenge will be to tie together this plan into the Comprehensive Plan and then integrate this into all the other plans and have them work as one as whole to guide us in the future. He's in support.

Commissioner Henninger said he's impressed with the work gone into the Master Plan. He hopes the plan gets implemented before 50 yrs. We don't

want to let this languish. This is a key area of the city. Some concerns are financial support - this will have an uphill fight to get funding and when started that it continues to flow. Keep this on the front of the table. He is in support.

Motion by Walkowski, seconded by Markewich: Recommend approval of the Envision Shooks Run Facilities Master Plan to the City Council based on the findings that the plan complies with the criteria found in Section 7.5.408 of City Code including the revisions presented to the City Planning Commission on January 19, 2017 with minor technical and typographical changes.. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1

Aye: 8 - Graham, McDonald, Markewich, Henninger, Chairperson Phillips, Shonkwiler, Walkowski and Smith

Absent: 1 - Gibson

6. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR

7. Adjourn