

**Attachments:** [2312 W Pikes Peak - CPC Staff Report](#)

[2312 W Pikes Peak Ave Project Statement \(Eave Projection Setback\)](#)

[2312 W Pikes Peak Ave Plans](#)

[2312 WPP Vicinity Map](#)

[PlanCOS Vision Map](#)

[7.5.526 NON-USE VARIANCE](#)

**Motion by Commissioner Hente, seconded by Commissioner Almy, to approve the Non-Use Variance to City Code Section 7.4.203.A allowing a 6" roof eave setback based upon the findings that the request complies with the criteria as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.526.E The motion passed by a vote of 5:3.**

**Aye:** 5 - Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Briggs, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Hente and Commissioner McMurray

**No:** 3 - Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Cecil and Chair Slattery

## Centennial Townhomes

- 7.E. [CUDP-22-0014](#) A Conditional Use to allow for multi-family residential development consisting of 20 attached townhomes in the MX-M (Mixed-Use Medium Scale) zone district consisting of 1.62 acres located at 4113 Centennial Boulevard.

Presenter:

Tamara Baxter, Senior Planner, Planning + Neighborhood Services

**Attachments:** [Staff Report Centennial Blvd Townhomes TPB](#)

[Project Statement](#)

[Conditional Use Development Plan](#)

[CONTEXT MAP](#)

[Public Comments](#)

[Public Comment Responses](#)

[7.5.704 Conditional Use Review](#)

[7.5.502.E Development Plan Review](#)

Tamara Baxter, Senior Planner, presented the scope of the project to the board. The developer, Gavin Light, presented the scope of the project to the board.

### Questions from commissioners

Commissioner Briggs inquired about visitor parking, to which the developer responded that the project was not designed with visitor parking capability.

Commissioner Hensler expressed a lack of visibility on building design components and questioned if there were driveways leading up to the garages. The developer confirmed the presence of driveways but emphasized that they were not intended

for regular parking; instead, they were designated for emergency vehicles such as fire trucks.

Commissioner Hensler sought clarification on whether the properties would be for rent or for sale. The developer explained that individual lot lines were incorporated into the design, considering the possibility that laws might change in the future. The developer clarified their intention not to sell any of the properties.

#### Public comment

Marcia Wick, citizen, spoke in opposition of this project. Her comments included concern for overflow parking, the increase level of noise, the impact of her view of Pikes Peak, and drainage issues.

#### Applicant Rebuttal

The developer conveyed that they couldn't control where people parked, emphasizing that if individuals parked improperly, they had the option to be towed. Acknowledging the possibility of one-car households, the developer mentioned that, as per code requirements for three-bedroom residences, they had provided two parking spots. Expressing reservations about a fully gated community, the developer raised concerns about maintenance issues such as mowing and trash pickup, favoring a more open community. They believed that an open community would be better but were open to discussing the matter. Addressing concerns about parking, the developer pointed out that Holly Springs, a public road, was nearby, suggesting it as a potential area for guests to park. Regarding drainage, they assured the presence of a detention pond to minimize pooling, and new sites were designed to manage their own drainage.

#### Additional comments from commissioners

Chair Slattery addressed the concept of being a good neighbor and proposed the idea of putting conditions on the development plan. She suggested working collaboratively to establish these conditions, particularly questioning the need for a back fence and its potential impact on utility easements.

The developer expressed the belief that making the area attractive would be beneficial for the community, including the appearance of fences. However, they admitted not having the specific fence locations memorized.

Commissioner Cecil raised concerns about pedestrian access onto the property, seeking clarification on the site plan. Tamara Baxter, Senior Planner, provided information about the location of the sidewalk connecting to the ADA portion of the property.

Commissioner Hensler expressed a lack of favor for the project due to insufficient development plans and information. She suggested that with better articulation of the plans in the future, she could support the project.

Commissioner Briggs commented to the developer that he was unprepared for the presentation.

Commissioner Hente expressed a desire for more information on various aspects of the project, such as drainage and parking. He sympathized with both the citizen's concerns and the developer's issues, proposing a postponement to provide more time for preparation and discussion. The developer, however, requested a vote on the project on the same day instead of waiting for a postponement.

**Motion by Commissioner Briggs, seconded by Commissioner McMurray, to deny the Conditional Use based upon the finding that the request does not comply with the criteria as set forth in City Code Chapter 7 Section 7.5.704 and City Code Chapter 7 Section 7.5.502.E due to a lack of specificity. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0.**

**Aye:** 8 - Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Briggs, Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Hente, Commissioner McMurray, Commissioner Cecil and Chair Slattery

#### UDC Annexation Section Amendment

7.F. [24-106](#)

An ordinance repealing and re-ordinating Section 701 (annexation of land) of Part 7 (Policy Decisions by City Council) of Article 5 (Administration and Enforcement) of Chapter 7 (Unified Development Code) of the Code of the City of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended, pertaining to annexation.

(Legislative)

**Presenter:**

Peter Wysocki, Director of Planning + Neighborhood Services  
Renee Congdon, Utilities Division Chief, City Attorney's Office

**Attachments:** [Attachment 1 - UDC-AnnexationORD-2024-01-03](#)  
[Attachment 2 - Table with Proposed Changes to the Annexation Section](#)  
[Attachment 3 - CSU-ExclusiveProviderExceptions-ORD 2024-01-02](#)  
[Attachment 4 - CSU-OutsideCityService-ORD 2024-01-02](#)  
[Attachment 5 - CSU-WaterServiceCh12-ORD 2024-01-09](#)  
[Attachment 6 - CSU-outside city wastewater service 12.5](#)  
[1-Annexation-Related Code Changes Presentation for CPC 2-14-24](#)

Renee Congdon, City Attorney, presented the scope of the code to the board. Chair Slattery expressed a concern about the potential difference between the utilities board and the nine members of the city council. She suggested adjusting the

language in the code to account for this potential difference, particularly if the composition of the board differed from the city council. Renee clarified that the City Council ultimately controls the code and serves as the approving party, allowing them to make changes to the code.

Commissioner Hensler remarked that "utilities board" is a generic term, but even if it is generic, the language in the statute would still be correct.

Commissioner Briggs raised a procedural point, noting that they would vote on section 7 while the Utilities Board would vote on section 12, and all the sections would then go to the City Council for consideration.

**Motion by Vice Chair Foos, seconded by Commissioner Hente, that this Ordinance be accepted The motion passed by a vote of 8:0.**

**Aye:** 8 - Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Briggs, Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Hente, Commissioner McMurray, Commissioner Cecil and Chair Slattery

## **8. Updates/Presentations**

### **8.A. [CPC 2201](#) Post Occupancy Analysis of the Ridge**

**Presenter:** Katie Sunderlin, Senior Affordable Housing Coordinator – Housing and Community Vitality Department

**Attachments:** [The Ridge Analysis 02142024](#)

Katie Sunderlin, Senior Affordable Housing Coordinator, presented the scope of Post Occupancy Analysis of the Ridge to the board.

Commissioner Hente reflected on his interim time on the council and planning commission, mentioning that neighbors opposed to the project approached him. Initially supportive, he started second-guessing his decision as he met with them, and his opinion further shifted with the project's increasing publicity. The turning point came during a fire incident, though he remained uncertain about the rumors surrounding its cause. Hente expressed satisfaction when projects approved despite neighbors' opposition turned out positively.

Commissioner Briggs brought up the idea of replicating the process in other locations, referring to it as data point one. Katie explained that the project discussed was one of their newest older projects and expressed a desire to recreate it with the now-established methodology. Commissioner Briggs acknowledged the usefulness of the process, emphasizing the importance of gathering more information for the benefit of the body and the public.

Commissioner Cecil commended the presentation as a great first step in destigmatizing negative associations with integrating affordable housing. She