



# City of Colorado Springs

Due to COVID-19 Health Concerns, this meeting will be held remotely.

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

**HOW TO WATCH THE MEETING  
SPRINGSTV**

**Coloradosprings.gov/SpringsTV  
Comcast Channel 18/880 (HD)  
CenturyLink Channel 18**

**To make comments during the meeting, please wait for your specific item to be read into the record, you will remain on hold until the public comment portion:**

**Phone: +1 720-617-3426  
Conference ID: 935 469 214#**

Thursday, April 30, 2020

8:30 AM

Council Chambers

### Palermo Filings 3, 4, & 5

**6.D. CPC PUZ  
19-00095**

An appeal of an Ordinance amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 59.52 acres from A (Agriculture) to PUD (Planned Unit Development: 35-foot maximum height, single-family detached units, 2-3.5 dwelling units per acre).

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director

**Staff presentation:**

Hannah Van Nimwegen, City Planning, presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project.

**Applicant Presentation:**

John Maynard, N.E.S, presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project.

**Questions:**

Commissioner Hente asked if it was a requirement to put in the deeds that Powers Boulevard was initially planned to go through.

Mr. Maynard explained the annexation agreement requires that the Powers Boulevard right-of-way be dedicated to the City at such time that Powers is funded by the state. That hasn't happened yet. So the right-of-way continues to

be shown on the master plan and the requirement to dedicate it to the city is still in place via the annexation agreement.

Commissioner Hente said what he remembered was that it had to be included in the deed so when people bought it, they knew it was being planned sometime in the future. Commissioner Hente wanted to know if that was still the case?

Mr. Maynard referred to a person in the audience representing Classic, who indicated that was not the case anymore. Commissioner Hente then asked how buyers were notified about Powers going there? Mr. Maynard said the purchasers are required to sign a disclosure. Commissioner Hente said he had used the wrong term, but that was what he wanted to make sure of.

**Supporters:**

None

**Opponents:**

Rick White, Treasurer for Deer Creek Homeowners Association

- HOA opposed to the rezoning on the grounds that it will turn Silver Creek and Snowflake into dangerous thoroughfares with volumes in excess of City standards for average daily traffic on residential streets
- The simple solution is do not route Palermo traffic through Deer Creek
- Since last August have asked the city why it doesn't open an entrance from Palermo on Highway 83 bypassing the Deer Creek neighborhood. The answer received was that CDOT won't talk to the City of Colorado Springs.
- It appears the City is taking shortcuts and not exercising diligence on its citizens' behalf
- Feels their objections are being dismissed particularly with respect to traffic considerations
- Master Plan has been so heavily amended that it bears little resemblance to the one shown in 2003
- A community the size of Deer Creek to the back our neighborhood will create serious traffic problems on our residential streets
- Don't route traffic through our neighborhood

Mike Thorne, former HOA president for Deer Creek

- Mr. Thorne pointed out on page 40 of the city's traffic criteria manual, which has a table stating the maximum allowed average daily traffic would be 1500 cars for our street
- Ms. Van Nimwegen provided the traffic engineering assessment for Silver Creek which showed there to be 150 cars per day. There are 20 homes located on Silver Creek with the only outlet being Snowflake

Drive. Using the traffic engineering assessment, it is an average of 7 ½ cars per home. That accounts for homeowners making multiple trips per day, deliveries, or just general traffic

- There has not been an average daily traffic assessment provided to the Deer Creek homeowners for Snowflake
- The combined homes on Snowflake, Silver Creek, and Cloudy Creek Court is 51, and by applying traffic engineering's 7.5 average daily traffic number per home would yield 382 cars
- In January 2020, Ms. Van Nimwegen provided the traffic engineering assessment for Silver Creek Drive coming from Palermo and this was 1300, which does not include Snowflake
- When adding Snowflake, the number is 1682 cars, which well exceeds the 1500 car maximum
- The Palermo expansion would significantly violate the City's maximum average by a 24% increase
- Requests the developer to add an entrance into Palermo from Highway 83 to alleviate this violation

Sharon Wood, vice president of Deer Creek HOA

- Does not think the issues that have been presented have been sufficiently addressed.
- Wants all the options for access and egress to be addressed
- Major concern it the traffic down Snowflake and then down Silver Creek and into the subdivision with no other access or egress
- It does not seem that there were any in depth studies done to alleviate the traffic through Deer Creek
- It is apparent that our roads were never intended to carry the 1800 and some cars a day
- Would like for the pedestrian bridge to be a traffic bridge that takes traffic south
- Does not seem that any of the alternatives are under serious consideration
- Concerned about a viable plan for emergency evacuation
- Asked for a delay in this proposal to reconsider the traffic plan and density
- Ms. Wood said she spoke to CDOT and they told her there might be an option if someone would actually pursue that

Sean Haller (inaudible), resident on Wildwood Pass (just south of the project)

- Echoed the concerns of the neighborhood association and has the same concerns of traffic flow through the whole area
- Wanted to know if Palermo Filings would also be contributing to the cost

of the pedestrian bridge, as they would be benefitting from it

- Questioned whether single-family detached homes are really the right need for the community on the north side of the Springs when cost of living is so high

Ralph McLain, resident of Deer Creek on Snowflake Drive

- Reiterated the concerns of doubling traffic
- Concerned with evacuations in case of an emergency
- Request the development plan be denied or delayed pending access to Hwy 83 to alleviate the traffic concerns

Robin Thorne, resident on Snowflake Drive

- Ms. Thorne spoke of traffic calming measure in Palermo and said Snowflake Drive is a direct shot from Silver Creek to Ridgeline and there have been issues from those coming from Flying Horse and no measures have been taken to calm traffic on Snowflake Drive

Tracy Swiontek, Deer Creek resident on Fieldcrest Dr

- Said they already have parts of Flying Horse coming into the neighborhood, which was opened up at the end of the original line
- Reiterated the traffic problem and the volume of traffic
- Safety concern with speed
- 10 or more cars backed up at the street light at Voyager and Ridgeline

Jim Tiedemann, lives on Silver Creek Drive

- Echoed the comments regarding the traffic, which would be a safety issue

**Questions of Staff:**

Chair Graham requested staff address the traffic concerns that were expressed.

Mr. Todd Frisbie, Traffic Engineering, responded to the following concerns:

- Traffic on Snowflake exceeding the residential standard up to 200 vehicles a day
  - Mr. Frisbie acknowledged that the number of vehicles a day would be close to the 1500 threshold, but explained those numbers are what the City tries to achieve from a quality of life perspective. They are not necessarily hard and fast, but a guideline
  - Mr. Frisbie said there is not an actual count on Snowflake to make that assessment, but admitted that the number is close
- Things Traffic Engineering can do:

- There is a neighborhood traffic management program designed to respond to existing issues, so it is a road that we could monitor for traffic and if we see issues, there are some traffic calming options that we can do to address that
  - Volumes are harder to address, with speeds being easier with that program, but that is something that could be looked at in the future
- Ridgeline Drive
  - Traffic Engineering has been contacted a couple of times with concerns regarding speeds
  - Ridgeline is a collector street so is designed to accommodate these traffic volumes
  - In regards to speed, the neighborhood traffic management program is what we like to use once a development has settled in, and then we know the specific issue to address
  - Mr. Frisbie said they had already been contacted by this neighborhood in regards to the neighborhood traffic management and some speed studies have been conducted. Mr. Frisbie did not have the data with him
  - Mr. Frisbie stated speed humps are not an option for traffic calming measures
  - Some things that can be done are striping changes and speed display radar signs
- Intersection of Ridgeline and Voyager
  - Signal timings can be adjusted to accommodate the additional traffic at that intersections
- Commissioner Rickett asked if the 7.5 trips per house to develop the amount of traffic was standard and where did that number come from?
  - Mr. Frisbie said to calculate the number, take the traffic count and divide it by the number of homes. Mr. Frisbie said he did not know where the resident got his traffic count
  - Mr. Frisbie said the standard grade that traffic engineering uses in planning is 9.5 daily trips per single family home, so the 7.5 is in line with that 9.5

Mr. Peter Wysocki, Director of Planning and Community Development, explained that the numbers our traffic engineers use come from the ITE manual, which is the International Traffic Engineers manual. The 7.5 number is basically an accepted number. When traffic analyses are prepared and submitted to the city, the traffic counts are determined based on the type of use and the big manual has a plethora of different uses and associated traffic counts based on square footage of those uses or the density of the housing.

Mr. Frisbie clarified that the manuals are called the Trip Generation Manuals published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and is updated every three to four years.

Commissioner Rickett asked with the new development if we were at that 1500 trips with this new edition or is it past that? Commissioner Rickett also wanted to know if that was just a recommendation or a hard and fast rule?

Mr. Frisbie said the 1500 is a planning tool. When developers are planning out a subdivision, they can plan it out in such a way that they lay out the lots so that a local residential street does not exceed that number. Mr. Frisbie explained it is a tool to help guide the planning and the classification of the roads, and is not a hard and fast rule.

**Rebuttal:**

Ms. Van Nimwegen said she had heard from one of the citizens who called in that the Flying Horse Master Plan had been amended so many times it wasn't recognizable. Ms. Van Nimwegen said she just wanted to clarify that the parcels that are applicable to the proposed development (Parcels 3A and 10), that parcel 3A has not changed since the master plan's initiation in 2003. Parcel 10 was amended in 2014 or 2015 to reduce density. It had been designated as 3.5 dwelling units per acre and was reduced to be similar to Parcel 3A, which is two to 3.5 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Maynard pointed out all of the collector streets on a map and said that was a pretty robust collector system for the amount of density that's shown on the master plan.

Mr. Maynard also commented that the original Flying Horse Master Plan had approximately 4000 units approved. The final development is likely to be less than 3000, so it's a 25% reduction in the number of units that were originally proposed, and the original traffic study for Flying Horse anticipated public improvements that would service those 4000 units. There is a less dense situation than was originally planned in the master plan.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:**

None

**Motion by Vice Chair Hente, seconded by Commissioner Rickett, to recommend approval to City Council the rezone of 59.52 acres from A (Agriculture) to PUD (Planned Unit Development: 35-foot maximum height, single-family detached units, 2-3.5 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. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1:0**

**Aye:** 8 - Vice Chair Hente, Commissioner McMurray, Chair Graham, Commissioner McDonald, Commissioner Eubanks, Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Rickett and Commissioner Wilson

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Raughton

**6.E. CPC PUD  
19-00096**

An appeal of The Palermo Filings 3, 4, and 5 Development Plan illustrating 151 single-family detached residential units located north and east of the Voyager Parkway and Ridgeline Drive intersection.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director

**Motion by Vice Chair Hente, seconded by Commissioner Almy, to recommend approval to the City Council the development plan for 151 single-family detached residential units based upon the findings proposal meets the review criteria for development plans as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.502(E) and criteria for PUD development plans set forth in City Code Section 7.3.606. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1:0**

**Aye:** 8 - Vice Chair Hente, Commissioner McMurray, Chair Graham, Commissioner McDonald, Commissioner Eubanks, Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Rickett and Commissioner Wilson

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Raughton