ITEM PULLED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR

DATE: May 21, 2015 **ITEM:** A.1 – A.2 **STAFF:** Steve Tuck

FILE NO.: CPC ZC 15-00006

CPC CP 15-00007

PROJECT: Springs Ranch Golf Course

Commissioner Shonkwiler stated that he is particularly interested in the calculations for open space for Springs Ranch and how it relates to this particular issue.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Chris Lieber, Colorado Springs Parks Department

Mr. Lieber stated that in 1999, the city entered into an agreement with the golf course owner and as part of the Springs Ranch Master Plan and looked at the Park land dedication requirements. At that time it was recognized that a golf course was going to be part of that overall development. It was determined at that time that a privately owned course would still serve the needs of the public. A calculation was made at that time based on the amount of acreage within the golf course, the amount of acreage provided throughout the Springs Ranch Master plan in terms of open space corridors and neighborhood parks. In the end of the calculation roughly 31% credit for each acre that constituted the golf course. By doing that calculation Springs Ranch Master Plan was essentially whole in terms of the amount of credit that was given and the amount of land that was provided. So fast forward to the present day and the request to take portion of golf course out of the use to change to development scenario, it was important for the parks board and the parks staff that throughout all of this the public would essentially be made whole and the public interest. In addition that the park credits would be exchanged/transferred for another configuration. That exchange has resulted in a land exchange where land would be dedicated specifically to the city from Mr. Tauche, in the form of three parcels. Two of parcels are small pieces located on the north end of the golf course that provides access to the continuation of the Sand Creek Trail and will provide an underpass at Carefree. So that is something that is very much in the public interest. The other piece is approximately a three acre parcel that is located at the south end of the golf course and would expand the Tutt Sports Complex. The Tutt Sports Complex current configuration is much smaller than an ideal situation when you think about the types of land uses and the types of

demands that a sports complex often has. So by adding the three acres that provides the public benefit. The Parks Board did approve of this in April and one of the big things for them, they wanted to see the golf course remain viable. Although we have two public golf courses, there is a significant need for golf courses and to be able to participate in a way that keeps this golf course viable is in the community's best interest. A new piece of this park credit agreement that has been added to specifically identify for the golf course to remain a publically accessible course and that it remain a viable 18-hole golf course.

Steve Tuck adds that there is one other component that provides value to the Parks Department and that is the residential units will pay park fees at the time of building permit which will be used for the extension of the Sand Creek Trail.

Commissioner Shonkwiler asks how do we know what elements of the agreement will ensure that this will remain public and viable. Is there a contract in place? Mr. Lieber responds that there is a separate agreement that has been recommended for approval and that agreement will go before the City Council ultimately for their approval. They signed and agreed to the original agreement in 1999 so the amendment to the agreement will go before them as well.

Commissioner Shonkwiler states that this is the second time he and others on the board have seen pieces of the golf course taken away and asks if there is any inclination that that might happen again. Mr. Lieber states that is a question more for the owner of the property.

Commissioner Shonkwiler states that the last time the land was taken away, there were a number of neighbors concerned that more piecse will be taken away bit by bit, could this happen again. Marc Smith, attorney states that we certainly cannot stop anyone coming forward with a proposal but we would be in a similar position where it would require the Parks Board approval, Planning Commission approval and ultimately City Council approval. Mr. Smith states, in this case today what you are specifically looking at is a Concept Plan and a Zone change and the agreement is a separate issue that has already gone through it's review process of the Parks Board and will ultimately pass to City Council. So we need to focus on what the actual application is here today and you do have testimony that the Parks Department does believe that the parks system and the citizens will be whole through this, but you need to try to relate that back to what you are actually reviewing today.

Commissioner Donley has a question for Kathleen Kraegar or a NES representative. Looking at Tutt Boulevard that is a minor arterial and seeing that there is two access points onto it and his concern is that only one is necessary. Mr. Donley would like to discuss why two are needed and what were the justifications for that. Kathleen Kraeger responds that because Tutt is a minor arterial the goal was to minimize the number of traffic signals that we might need to put on

Tutt in the future so she'd rather give two access points that could operate without being signalized rather than giving one access point that might create enough of a delay that would end up as a request for signalization. Commissioner Donley asks Mr. Tim Siebert with NES if we have an anticipation of what the uses will be. Mr. Siebert states that the request is for R-5 zoning allows multiple types of residential but also allows assisted living, senior care, different human services establishments and that is the nature of the request. He also states just from a market approach there have been discussions will all of those types of entities. The property size is relatively long and skinny, so that does limit the viability of some of the uses but they are optimistic that they could get a couple uses that would diversify the housing availability in the area.

CITIZENS IN FAVOR

None present.

CITIZENS IN OPPOSITION

None present.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Henninger is in support of the application and he is basing that on the Parks Board review and their actions. He does not see a reason to oppose.

Commissioner Donley sees this as really important infill project. He has played at that golf course and had the reaction that there is a lot of land there, so this is a positive project for the viability of the golf course. He is concerned that we provided two access points on a minor arterial but will defer to the Traffic Engineering Department and their decision on that.

Commissioner Walkowski states that it meets review criteria and is in accordance with the comprehensive plan and the area master plan.

Commissioner Gibson is in agreement that it meets the criteria and will be in support of the project.

Commissioner Shonkwiler states that he was concerned that the golf course was being sliced and diced but the testimony before the board is that, that is not the case now. He thinks it will be necessary to be vigilant that slicing and dicing does not occur. He is in support of the application.

DECISION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Moved by Commissioner Walkowski, seconded by Commissioner Henninger, to approve Item **No. A.1 -File No. CPC ZC 15-00006**, a zone change from A/AO (Agricultural with Airport Overlay) to R-5/AO (Multi-family with Airport Overlay) for the Springs Ranch Golf Course R-5 Site, based on the finding the request complies with the review criteria in City Code Section 7.5.603.B (Establishment or Change of Zone District Boundaries). Motion passed 7-0 (Commissioner McDonald and Commissioner Markewich excused).

Moved by Commissioner Walkowski, seconded by Commissioner Gibson, to approve item **No.A.2 – File No. CPC CP 15-00007**, concept plan for the Springs Ranch Golf Course R-5 Site, based on the finding the plan complies with the review criteria in City Code Section 7.5.501.E (Concept Plan Review Criteria) subject to compliance with the following technical and/or informational modifications to the concept plan listed on page 9 of the CPC agenda. Motion passed 7-0 (Commissioner McDonald and Commissioner Markewich excused).

May 21, 2015

Date of Decision

Planning Commission Chair