

City of Colorado Springs

*Plaza of the Rockies
South Tower, 5th Floor
Blue River Board Room
121 S Tejon St*

()1



Meeting Minutes - Final-revised

Tuesday, June 9, 2020

10:00 AM

Council Chambers

City Council

City Council meetings are broadcast live on Channel 18. In accordance with the ADA, anyone requiring an auxiliary aid to participate in this meeting should make the request as soon as possible but no later than 48 hours before the scheduled event.

- 10.A. [CPC PUZ 19-00090](#) Ordinance No. 20-36 amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs relating to 61.71 acres located southeast of Powers Blvd and Highway 83 from A (Agriculture) to PUD (Planned Unit Development: 35-foot maximum height, single-family detached units, maximum density of 4.0 du/ac)

(Quasi-Judicial)

Related File: CPC PUP 19-00091

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director

Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director, gave a brief background on the development of the North Fork area, the City's commitment not to connect Howell's Road, potential evacuation routes

Todd Frisbie, City Traffic Engineer, stated the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) would not allow emergency access to Powers Boulevard.

Councilmember Murray asked if the County has provided a letter of refusal for the connection to Howell Boulevard. Mr. Wysocki stated they have not.

Brett Lacey, Fire Marshall, Colorado Springs Fire Department, stated the emergency access is not desirable, but workable and they could accommodate it by working with the Police Department. He presented photos of the emergency access roadways within the development.

Councilmember Geislinger asked how the CSFD would evacuate this area. Mr. Lacey gave an overview of the procedures they would utilize in the event of an emergency.

Councilmember Knight stated the CSFD needs to address and be the enforcement agency regarding the issues with the access gates.

John Maynard, N.E.S, Inc., representing the applicant, stated this property was annexed forty years ago and there has been no change in the master plan and street system other than lowering the density and increasing the open space.

Councilmember Geislinger asked if the owners also own land to the north of this parcel. Mr. Maynard confirmed they did. Councilmember Geislinger asked if the secondary access could be developed in conjunction with this development. Mr. Maynard stated the secondary access is actually to the east of the property and the land suitability analysis identified this parcel as having development constraints so it has been deferred until a later time.

Councilmember Knight asked if there were any geographical reasons a connection could not be made to Powers Boulevard. Mr. Maynard stated there was not.

Citizens Sam Bryant, Andrew Hits, Louellen Welsch, Duncan McNabb, and Dennis Jaspin spoke in opposition of the project.

Mr. Maynard identified the access roads into the subdivision and stated it would not be feasible technically or financially to build a bridge over Kettle Creek.

Councilmember Knight asked if it possible to widen Thunder Mountain Road. Mr. Frisbie stated it was built to collector road standards which is one way in each direction and some widening has occurred near the high school.

Councilmember Knight asked if having evacuation routes going through neighborhoods would be a violation of City Code. Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development stated in the event of an evacuation, residents may need to go through neighborhoods and the master plan design envisioned Thunder Mountain Road as the access road.

Councilmember Gaebler stated this area was master planned in 1993 as one development and the City needs to continue to evaluate the streets to ensure safety to the community.

Councilmember Williams stated the access points of this development meets the City's requirement and in order to build a bridge over Kettle Creek, it would cost millions of dollars plus there is a Preble's meadows jumping mouse habitat in the area.

Councilmember Geislinger stated the concerns expressed are legitimate, but it is a City/County issue which needs to be addressed and he will be supporting this item.

Councilmember Knight stated he will be voting against this item because he believes this violates City Code 7.5.603(b) that the actions are detrimental to the health and safety of the residents.

Councilmember Murray stated access to Howells Road needs to be connected now rather than later and he will not be voting in favor of the motion.

Councilmember Pico stated he also has concerns regarding emergency access that the City and County need to address, but it meets the criteria.

Councilmember Avila stated it is always fire season, this is encroaching on wildlife, and will not be supporting this change.

Motion by Councilmember Gaebler, seconded by Councilmember Williams, that the Ordinance for the rezone of 61.71 acres from A (Agriculture) to PUD (Planned Unit Development: 35-foot maximum height, single-family detached units, maximum density of 4.0 dwelling units per acre), based upon the findings that the change of zoning request complies with the three (3) criteria for granting of zone changes as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.603(B), as well as the criteria for establishment of a PUD zone district as set for in City Code Section 7.3.603 be approved on first reading. The motion passed by a vote of 5-4-0-0

Aye: 5 - Gaebler, Geislinger, Pico, Strand, and Williams

No: 4 - Avila, Knight, Murray, and Skorman

10.B. [CPC PUP
19-00091](#)

The Kettle Creek North Concept Plan for a single-family residential development with density between three and four dwelling units per acre, generally located south and east of the Powers Boulevard and Highway 83 intersection.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Related File: CPC PUZ 19-00090

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director

Please see comments in Agenda item 10.A.

Motion by Councilmember Gaebler, seconded by Councilmember Williams, that

the concept plan for Kettle Creek North based upon the findings that the concept plan complies with the review criteria for concept plans as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.501(E) and criteria for PUD concept plans set forth in City Code Section 7.3.605 be approved. The motion passed by a vote of 5-4-0-0

Aye: 5 - Gaebler, Geislinger, Pico, Strand, and Williams

No: 4 - Avila, Knight, Murray, and Skorman