



# 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, May 21, 2020

8:30 AM

Remote Meeting

### 1. Call to Order

- Present:** 8 - Vice Chair Scott Hente, Commissioner Jim Raughton, Commissioner James McMurray, Chair Reggie Graham, Commissioner Alison Eubanks, Commissioner John Almy, Commissioner Marty Rickett and Commissioner Natalie Wilson
- Excused:** 1 - Commissioner Rhonda McDonald

### 2. Approval of the Minutes

- 2.A. [CPC 20-214](#) Minutes for the April 30, 2020 City Planning Commission Meeting

Presenter:  
Reggie Graham, Chair

The minutes for the April 30, 2020 meeting will be voted on during the June 18, 2020 meeting to allow time for review.

### 3. Communications

Peter Wysocki - Director of Planning and Community Development

### 4. CONSENT CALENDAR

Items 4.A. and 4.B., Advanced Concrete Motocross, were pulled from the Consent Calendar by a member of the public, Dillon Freelance.

Items 4.F., 4.G., and 4.H. (Urban Collection at Briargate), were pulled from the Consent Calendar by a member of the public, Mr. Butler.

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

### Townhomes at Jetwing

- 4.C. [CPC CU](#)  
[19-00128](#) The Townhomes at Jetwing Conditional Use Development Plan to allow 48 townhome units in the PBC (Planned Business Center) zone district, located northeast of Jetwing Drive and Colony Hills Circle.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:  
Lonna Thelen, Principal Planner, Planning & Community Development

**This Planning Case was approved on the Consent Calendar.**

### Solid Rock Christian Center

- 4.D. [CPC ZC](#)  
[20-00026](#) The Solid Rock Christian Center zone change of 4.48 acres from R-1 6000 (Single-family Residential) to R5 (Multi-family Residential) located at 2520 Arlington Drive.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:  
Lonna Thelen, Principal Planner, Planning & Community Development

**This Ordinance was referred on the Consent Calendar to the City Council.**

- 4.E. [CPC CP](#)  
[20-00027](#) The Solid Rock Christian Center Concept Plan establishing a multi-family and religious institution use located at 2520 Arlington Drive.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:  
Lonna Thelen, Principal Planner, Planning & Community Development

**This Planning Case was referred on the Consent Calendar to the City Council.**

### Approval of the Consent Agenda

**Motion by Commissioner Raughton, seconded by Vice Chair Hente, 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 8:0:1:0**

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

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner McDonald

**ITEMS CALLED OFF CONSENT**

**Advanced Concrete Motocross**

**4.A.** [CPC MP 87-00381-A2 2MJ18](#) A major amendment to the Banning Lewis Ranch Master Plan changing the land use of 28.11 acres from Research and Development to Commercial generally located south of the southwest corner of Drennan Road and Aerospace Boulevard.

(Legislative)

Presenter:  
Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development

**Staff presentation:**

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

**Questions:**

None

**Supporters:**

None

**Opponents:**

Dylan & Jillian Freelance

- Concerned with street racing on Marksheffel between Bradley and Drennan and believed having the Motocross would increase the street racing
- Concerned about the increase in traffic because there are difficulties getting out of the neighborhood as it is
- Several members of the community have requested the intersection of Marksheffel and Drennan have additional traffic resources on the east side, such as a right turn lane or even a stoplight
- Wanted to know what the plan was for dealing with the increased traffic
- Wanted to know what kind of sound would emit from the facility because they would prefer not to hear screams of motocross bikes

**Questions of Staff:**

N/A

**Rebuttal:**

Ms. Van Nimwegen addressed the noise concern by explaining that City Code does limit the amount of sound that can exist within a property and what can go past property boundaries. If there was an issue with noise, a complaint could be made with the City's Neighborhood Services Division who would investigate whether the Motocross was exceeding that decibel level.

Ms. Van Nimwegen said the City Traffic Engineering Department asked the applicant to produce a queuing analysis for Drennan Road and Marksheffel with that intersection in particular with queuing onto Drennan Road. Upon reviewing the analysis, they did not see an issue with the potential increased traffic.

As far as the street racing, that would fall under the jurisdiction of the Colorado Springs Police Department (CSPD). Ms. Van Nimwegen said the CSPD can be notified about the street racing complaints to see if they know of the situation or if they could have someone monitor the situation.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:**

There was no discussion by the Commissioners.

**Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Commissioner McMurray, to recommend approval to City Council the major amendment to the Banning Lewis Ranch Master Plan changing the land use designation from "Research and Development" to "Commercial," based upon the finding that the request complies with the master plan amendment review criteria in City Code Section 7.5.408. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1:0**

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

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner McDonald

- 4.B.** [CPC CU 18-00170](#) The Advanced Concrete Motocross Conditional Use Development for an indoor motocross training facility on 10.09 acres zoned PIP-2/CR/AO APZ-2 (Planned Industrial Park with Conditions of Record and an Airport Overlay-Accident Potential Subzone 2), located south of the southwest corner of Drennan Road and Aerospace Boulevard.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning & Community

Development

See Item 4.A. (CPC MP 87-00381-A22MJ18)

**Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Commissioner Almy, to recommend approval to City Council the Advanced Concrete Motocross Conditional Use Development Plan, based upon the findings that the application meets the review criteria for granting a conditional use as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.704 and meets the review criteria for granting a development plan as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.502(E). The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1:0**

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

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner McDonald

**Urban Collection at Briargate**

- 4.F. [CPC MP 07-00061-A8 MN20](#) A minor amendment to the Briargate Master Plan changing the land use of 7.29 acres from Residential-Medium High to Residential-Medium, generally located north and east of the Austin Bluffs Parkway and Research Parkway intersection along Scarborough Drive.

(Quasi-Judicial)

**Presenter:**  
Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development

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

**Applicant Presentation:**  
Andrea Barlow, N.E.S, presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project.

**Questions:**  
Commissioner Raughton asked if the streets in the community were all private. Ms. Barlow answered that the streets were all private.

Commissioner Rickett asked if the current Planned Unit Development (PUD) allowed for a building height of 35-feet and asked if the new PUD maximum building height limit would be 30-feet.

Ms. Barlow said that was correct and that the 35-feet was for the apartments,

which were more of a garden apartment type development, but currently proposing 30-feet for the project.

**Supporters:**

None

**Opponents:**

Richard Butler, resident in the area of the proposed site. Mr. Butler had submitted a letter that was never received regarding concerns with the project. Mr. Butler highlighted the following for the Planning Commission to consider before a decision was made on this project:

- Concerned about the infrastructure; there are only two stoplight intersections that can handle this increase in traffic with 140 to 250 additional vehicles in a confined space
- Concerned that emergency vehicles will not be able to respond due to the vehicle density in the development; not all people will park in their garages
- Similar problem in the Antelope Trails development
- Several other developments in the area that make the infrastructure dangerous: areas of Research Parkway and Austin Bluffs with restricted access and a dangerous hill and have to pull out into traffic
- Several major accidents at the intersections
- Mr. Butler wants to know what has been done to alleviate some of these concerns

**Rebuttal:**

Ms. Barlow addressed the concerns regarding the emergency accesses and said the plans had been reviewed by the fire department with no concerns. Ms. Barlow further added the project was designed to ensure that all the units would be accessible to the fire department.

- None of the dead end roads serving the development exceed 200 feet, which is the fire department's requirement so they can actually access the buildings from the end of the alleys or reverse up the alleys without any issues
- They were specifically designed to accommodate the fire department's access requirements as well as the width of the roads
- The fire department reviewed the plans and had no comments or concerns for the project

As for the constrained parking by parking on the street, Ms. Barlow explained the following:

- Parking will not be allowed in the alleys other than on about 34 of the 70 units, which have two driveway spaces in front of their unit

- So each unit has a two-car garage, and then half of the units have a two-space parking area in front of their units
- The width of the alley is 24 feet to allow fire access and the other roads will be marked as no parking fire lanes. Additionally, the main street that runs through the development allows parking on both sides of the street
- There are approximately 37 parking spaces that are provided on street for guests, and an additional 5 parking spaces adjacent to the detention pond

The general traffic concern:

- Applicant was not required to provide a traffic impact study for this project because of the reduction of density from the original approved plan.
- Original plan required as a condition of record the installation of a traffic signal at Research and Scarborough, which has already been done
- Wider traffic concerns beyond this site is really a matter for the City Traffic Engineering department
- The roads in the area have been planned for this scale of development if not a greater scale, with the previous plan being a much higher density

Mr. Butler asked to address the commission again, and Chair Graham explained he had already given his testimony. Mr. Butler said because his letter was never delivered and was not entered as part of the record, he was only able to give a synopsis of his concerns. He said he only wanted to add one more thing and stated with the downturn of the economy, he was concerned that projects getting started will quickly evaporate and wanted to know how assured was this developer with funding and ability to sell in an environment right now where people are getting laid off.

City attorney, Ben Bolinger, explained that people get one opportunity to offer testimony, and at this point, the commission will have to allow Ms. Barlow the opportunity to rebut. Mr. Bolinger said that no further testimony from Mr. Butler should be taken. Mr. Butler said he believed that was a fallacy given the letter could not be found.

Commissioner Raughton suggested the record reflect that Mr. Butler submitted this letter and it be forwarded to the appropriate departments: fire, police, traffic, and then put into the consideration for the project. Commissioner Raughton said it was clear to him that Mr. Butler was not arguing that the reduced density exacerbated the problem. It improves the ultimate development of the area, but we should at least have it reflected and appropriately referred to the departments.

Chair Graham asked that the letter be resubmitted and included as part of the

file.

**Questions of Staff:**

Commissioner Rickett said Mr. Butler brought up a good comment on traffic. Commissioner Rickett said he knew the light at Scarborough and Research was installed, which was helpful, but since then, Research has moved out to Black Forest Road. Commissioner Rickett asked if Traffic Engineering has taken another look at this since the time that the original PUD was approved.

Todd Frisbie, City Traffic Engineering, said it has not been looked at recently in terms of new traffic numbers. Mr. Frisbie did state that prior to working for the City, he was a consultant who worked on the Research/Powers interchange and did a traffic analysis. They looked at 20 year projections along Research Road, and Scarborough was a part of that intersection analysis. In that analysis, we assumed that Research would actually connect all the way back down to Marksheffel and Woodmen. So that analysis showed that the intersection would operate with an acceptable level of service given the 20 year projections and that connection push through to Woodmen.

Mr. Frisbie also confirmed that the original master plan assumed much higher levels of traffic and a higher intensity of development and that's why it shows Research being six lanes to accommodate that traffic. The six lane roads now have excess capacity to handle additional traffic even as vacant land begins to develop in this area.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Commissioner Almy said he had two concerns with one being the public input appeared to have been lost and wanted to make sure we were giving the public adequate opportunity to voice their opinions. The other concern was there had been a series of items brought before the commission that were basically infill projects where traffic analysis seemed to be getting more and more important. Commissioner Almy said he agreed with the city traffic engineer that these roads are designed for a higher level of service than what they are currently being used for, but this just needs to be addressed stronger up front.

**Motion by Vice Chair Hente, seconded by Commissioner Rickett, to recommend approval to City Council of the minor amendment to Briargate Master Plan changing the land use designation from "Residential Medium-High" to "Residential Medium" based upon the finding that the request complies with the master plan amendment review criteria in City Code Section 7.5.408. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1:0**

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

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner McDonald



- 4.G. [CPC PUZ 20-00002](#) A zone change pertaining to 7.29 acres generally located north and east of the Austin Bluffs Parkway and Research Parkway intersection along Scarborough Drive from PUD/CR/AO (Planned Unit Development with a Condition of Record and Airport Overlay) to PUD/AO (Planned Unit Development: 30-foot maximum building height, single-family attached units, density range of 8 to 11.99 dwelling units per acre with an Airport Overlay).

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development

Please see Item 4.F. (CPC MP 07-00061-A8MN20)

**Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Vice Chair Hente, to recommend approval the rezone of 7.29-acres from PUD/CR/AO (Planned Unit Development with a Condition of Record and Airport Overlay) to PUD/AO (Planned Unit Development: 30-foot maximum building height, single-family attached units, density range of 8 to 11.99 dwelling units per acre with an Airport Overlay), 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 Raughton, Commissioner McMurray, Chair Graham, Commissioner Eubanks, Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Rickett and Commissioner Wilson

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner McDonald

- 4.H. [CPC PUD 20-00003](#) The Urban Collection at Briargate Square Development Plan for 7.29 acres containing 70 single-family attached residential units generally located north and east of the Austin Bluffs Parkway and Research Parkway intersection along Scarborough Drive.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development

Please see Item 4.F. (CPC MP 07-00061-A8MN20)

**Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Vice Chair Hente, to recommend approval the development plan for the Urban Collection at Briargate Square based upon the findings that the development plan complies with 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 Raughton, Commissioner McMurray, Chair Graham, Commissioner Eubanks, Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Rickett and Commissioner Wilson

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner McDonald

**5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None**

**6. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR**

**Atrium Senior Apartments**

**6.A.** [CPC CU 19-00148](#) A conditional use development plan for the Atrium Senior Apartments project illustrating a 54-unit senior apartment complex on the 1.14-acre site with ancillary on-site improvements, located at 4921 Templeton Gap Road.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Daniel Sexton, Principal Planner, Planning & Community Development

**Staff presentation:**

Daniel Sexton, City Planning, presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Lee Patke, Executive Director of Greccio Housing, presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project.

**Questions:**

Commissioner Rickett said the area was zoned C-6 and asked if there was a height restriction on the lot.

Mr. Sexton said (mic did not pick this up), but because this is a multifamily use in that commercial zone, it reverts back to the R-5 standard at 45-feet.

**Supporters:**

None

**Opponents:**

David Terry, lives next door to the proposed site

- Would like to know if the senior residents will be prohibited from owning vehicles

- If not, what is to prevent each resident from owning two automobiles
- Mr. Terry feels that residents and guests will encroach on nearby private property to park their vehicles
- There is no parking on Templeton Gap or Austin Bluffs, which would require them to park in a nearby neighborhood forcing them to cross the busy street
- Total travesty to try 50 apartment units on this small lot without adequate parking
- Will the residents be prohibited from owning dogs, if not, where are they going to walk their dogs, to our neighborhood property and then it will be up to the nearby owners to clean up the mess
- The setback from City Code was stringent for 4935 Templeton Gap Road set by City Council and now they are going to look the other way and allow this to go in
- Mr. Terry approves of having affordable senior housing, but believed this was the wrong project at the wrong place
- The neighborhood is going to suffer from this mistake
- Needs to be located on a bigger piece of property and a safer location

#### Kent Hill, lives in the neighborhood

- Nor'wood donated the land for public benefit and Mr. Hill does not understand how public benefit is for senior living
- Developers said they expanded the parking so that there would be 39 spaces, but with 50 residents in there, that is not adequate parking
- They will park in the neighborhood or on that side street that leads into the property
- Traffic concerns on Templeton Gap and Austin Bluffs
- Height of the building will block the sun during the wintertime on Templeton Gap, and Templeton Gap is not plowed, so ice will build up

#### Robert Hunt

- The proposed project endangers motor vehicle safety at the already dangerous intersection of Austin Bluffs Parkway and Templeton Gap Road by adding another layer of traffic congestion and severely restricts the motorists vision
- Despite the installation of cameras at the intersection, often Austin Bluffs Parkway is a speedway due to motorcyclists
- Should be a safer location for this project instead of trying to shoehorn in a three storey, 42-foot high, ugly monstrosity onto a small lot
- Asking for a nonuse variance along Templeton Gap is unconscionable
- Cannot believe City Council and City Planning would put profits ahead of public safety

- Does not want property value to be destroyed

Gabriel Grover, lives on Rushford Place

- Mr. Grover's backyard is directly across the street from the proposed project and will cause privacy concerns
- Multiple children play in Mr. Grover's backyard every day and is concerned for his privacy and the safety of his children
- Parking not sufficient and will be bleeding into the neighborhoods around the area
- Traffic will increase the danger for the area children
- Home values will decrease, especially going from a 20-foot setback to a 10-foot setback where privacy is a huge concern
- Vehicles going 35 to 40 mph on Templeton Gap will not have enough time to stop for people inherently going across the street to visit their senior living apartments
- Increased noise with fire trucks, ambulances, and other vehicles that the sound will echo off the building back into our residences, which will make it unbearable to be in the backyard

Caroline Chaney

- Agreed with the previous comments
- Ludicrous to think 60 plus adults will not have cars and will not have many visitors
- 39 parking spaces for 54 units is not enough
- Overflow to other neighborhoods for parking is going to be a problem, as well as more traffic

Wendy Everheart (inaudible)

- Agreed with all the other concerns mentioned
- Found it hard to believe a traffic study did not say there would be any adverse effects and needs to be relooked at
- The lot is too small
- With residents, staffers, shuttles, there will be more traffic than 14 cars per hour

Ruth McGuire

- Sent an email with thoughts
- This will cause a tremendous traffic problem

**Questions of Staff:**

Commissioner Wilson asked if the parking also included guest parking, as well as parking for residents. Mr. Sexton explained there was no requirement in

code for guest parking, so the available parking spaces on site would be available for both tenants, as well as guests and staff.

**Rebuttal:**

Daniel Sexton, City Planning, addressed the following:

Parking:

- Per City Code, with the self-imposed stipulation by the applicant to age restrict the development at a 60 plus development, they are able to take advantage of a reduced parking calculation ratio
  - With this project, there is a .6 parking requirement per unit within the development as opposed to a standard multifamily project where we would look at the bedroom count within each residential unit
  - Staff was confident and comfortable applying this parking ratio calculation for the project
    - Further enforced by the applicant's desire to utilize ride share programs and other means to help tenants get to various services and commercial uses in the area

Traffic:

- The traffic study showed no negative impact
- It was reviewed and accepted by the City's Traffic Division
- Traffic study was reviewed in accordance with the City's Traffic Control Manual and did meet the necessary parameters in terms of scope of area analyzed, as well as projection and duration of analysis

Community Benefit:

- When the City is looking to dispose of property, there is a solicitation or notification given to every department to determine whether there is a community benefit or use that the city can foster for that given parcel. For example, if the Parks Department saw this as a viable site and needed to have a park in this area, they could have proposed that they wanted to develop the site as a park
- The City's Community Development Division identified, based on community need and knowledge of a lack of affordable housing for seniors in this area, that this would be a desirable or appropriate location to develop this type of housing product

Mr. Lee Patke, Greccio Housing and Applicant, addressed the following:

Property Values

- This comes up frequently when new affordable developments are being proposed
- The meta analysis of all the analysis out there consistently say the property values either remain the same or actually increase

- These developments are thoroughly scrutinized to ensure they are in areas with need that are stable and will have a positive impact on the population
- The properties are not approved for funding in places that are not stable or secure; these are multimillion dollar properties

Traffic:

- Mr. Patke noted that senior affordable or senior housing is probably one of the least likely types of development to generate traffic
- A development of a restaurant, a gas station, or other type of business would generate far more traffic than what is being proposed

Parking:

- Neither Greccio Housing, nor any entities that are investing in this project, are interested in having a development that is bad for residents or has inadequate parking
- City Code's 0.6 parking spaces per unit is consistent with what Greccio Housing is seeing with existing residents that are consistent with this population

Todd Frisbie, City Traffic Engineering, addressed traffic study:

- Senior housing is generally a fairly low traffic generator compared to other uses that could potentially be at this site
- A lot of the concerns heard were for existing conditions
  - Intersection of Templeton Gap and Austin Bluffs Parkway
    - Currently operates on a coordinated plan for the Austin Bluffs corridor
    - This could cause some delays on Templeton Gap as it is coordinated to move traffic on Austin Bluffs
    - Continually evaluating that intersection and adjusting timing
  - Safety concerns
    - Mr. Frisbie pulled up crash data, ran a quick analysis, and didn't see any crash patterns to give concerns in terms of addressing safety at that intersection
    - There was a mention of a fatality on this stretch of Templeton Gap, but the fatality was actually further to the east along Templeton Gap between Corinth and Oakwood
    - In response to the fatality, traffic installed an all-way stop to help slow down traffic
  - Right-in/right-out on Templeton Gap
    - There are drivers who make illegal left turns at this

location

- Not much that can be done by Traffic other than monitor to see if any safety issues arise or crash patterns

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Commissioner Rickett said he understood the concerns from the neighborhood, but explained that as a commission, they have to look at the code. He also mentioned that with the area zoned C-6, this lot could have been an office building or a restaurant, which would have produced more traffic and have the same elevations on the building.

Commissioner Rickett went on to say the City needs affordable housing and senior housing. A lot of times, people take into consideration where they move so they can have their loved ones near them, so there are benefits to this project as well.

**Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Commissioner McMurray, to approve the conditional use development plan for the Atrium Senior Apartments project, based upon the finding that the request meets the review criteria for granting a conditional use, as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.704, and a development plan, as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.502(E). The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0**

**Aye:** 7 - Vice Chair Hente, Commissioner McMurray, Chair Graham, Commissioner Eubanks, Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Rickett and Commissioner Wilson

**Absent:** 2 - Commissioner Raughton and Commissioner McDonald

- 6.B.** [CPC NV 19-00151](#) A nonuse variance to City Code Section 7.3.104 to allow a 10-foot front building setback where a 20-foot front building setback is required.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Daniel Sexton, Principal Planner, Planning & Community Development

**Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Commissioner Eubanks, to approve the nonuse variance to City Code Section 7.3.104 for a 10-foot front setback where a 20-foot front setback is required, based upon the findings that the request meets the review criteria for granting a nonuse variance, as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.802(B). The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0**

**Aye:** 7 - Vice Chair Hente, Commissioner McMurray, Chair Graham, Commissioner Eubanks, Commissioner Almy, Commissioner Rickett and Commissioner Wilson

**Absent:** 2 - Commissioner Raughton and Commissioner McDonald

## **7. Presentations/Updates**

- 7.A. [20-098](#) An informational presentation of the 2019 PlanCOS Annual Report  
(Legislative)

Presenter:  
Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community  
Development  
Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director

## **8. Adjourn**