



City of Colorado Springs

City Hall
107 N. Nevada Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO
80903

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Thursday, April 19, 2018

8:30 AM

Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Present: 6 - John Henninger, Samantha Satchell-Smith, Vice Chair Carl Smith, Chairperson Rhonda McDonald, Jim Raughton and Jamie Fletcher

Excused: 4 - Reggie Graham, Jeff Markewich, Jeff Markewich and Ray Walkowski

2. Approval of the Minutes

[18-0192](#) Minutes for the March 15, 2018 City Planning Commission Meeting

Presenter:

Rhonda McDonald, Chair, City Planning Commission

Motion by Vice Chair Smith, seconded by Satchell-Smith, that this Minutes be approved Approve the March 15, 2018 City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:3

Aye: 6 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

3. Communications

Peter Wysocki - Director of Planning and Community Development

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

Classic Offices at Flying Horse

- 4.A. [CPC ZC 18-00022](#) Ordinance No. 18-55 amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 1.3 acres of land from (A) Agricultural to (OC) Office Complex.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Director Planning and Community Development
Daniel Sexton, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Staff Presentation:

Dan Sexton, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Applicant Presentation:

No presentation

Supporters:

None

Opponents:

None

Questions of Staff:

Commissioner Fletcher stated at the time of annexation was not a firm demand for an interchange. However, if the city chose to have the interchange the developer would pay for that. So what has changed in Flying Horse which Mr. Sexton answered by stating there are 1,000 fewer houses, less commercial so CDOT doesn't see a need for this interchange.

Kathleen Krager Traffic Engineering Manager discussed this project with CDOT and developer when looking at a final design of the Powers Extension. The developer and reversed the right-of-way for possible development of the area. Now there is no need for the interchange, residents don't want it either. The developer dropped the request for an interchange and both the City and CDOT are comfortable with that choice.

Commissioner Fletcher asked about the cost for retaining walls and if the City will have that cost for those retaining walls. Mr. Sexton stated with no final design for Powers Blvd any costs associated with that are unknown until then. It would be premature to say what costs would be. Ms. Krager stated they are moving to a more final design. CDOT is working to assure that as building happens no minimal amount of retaining walls are built.

Commissioner Roughton stated the original design was a diamond interchange with one-fourth for each corner. Why not take one-fourth, develop that and leave three-fourths undeveloped. Ms. Krager stated if it was a city project it would be better to do it all at once. But this is being done by the developer. Mr. Sexton provided further clarification by stating two of the corners are developed, another corner is anticipating future commercial development. As development happens some land may be given back to property owners but they aren't going to narrow it down to the 200-ft with in the right-of-way reservation as discussed in the annexation agreement. Ms. Herington stated the adjacent property owner is the current developer. Ms. Herington clarified that this is not right-of-way, its reservation. Classic still owns this and along the eastern side there is also a landscape tract abutting the right-of-way and owned by the Metro District.

Classic also has a landscape buffer tract along the residential and in the future if the right-of-way was not needed it could be incorporated into that buffer tract. Commissioner Raughton stated his concern was leaving an out lot where there is ill-defined ownership and responsibility and based on the discussion that tract will be under the responsibility of the Metro District. Ms. Sexton said yes.

Rebuttal:

None

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

No discussion.

Motion by Henninger, seconded by Satchell-Smith, to recommend approval to City Council the zone change from (A) Agricultural to (OC) Office Complex, based upon the findings that the change of zone request complies with the three (3) review criteria for granting a zone change as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.603(B). The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:3

- 4.B. [CPC CP 12-00048-A1 MN18](#) The Flying Horse Parcel Number 18 minor concept plan amendment for 7 acres of land illustrating a layout for an office complex development, located north of Flying Horse Club Drive near the future alignment of Powers Boulevard.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Related File: CPC ZC 18-00022

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Director Planning and Community Development
 Daniel Sexton, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Motion by Henninger, seconded by Satchell-Smith, to recommend approval to City Council the minor concept plan amendment for the Flying Horse Parcel Number 18 project, based upon the findings that the minor concept plan amendment meets the review criteria for granting a concept plan as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.501(E). The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:3

Aye: 6 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

Bradley Ranch Park

- 4.C. [CPC ZC 18-00019](#) Ordinance No. 18-54 amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 8.7 acres of land from (PUD) Planned Unit Development (Single-Family Detached Residential, Maximum Density of 2.98 dwelling units per acres, and Maximum Building Height of 35 feet)

to (PK) Public Park.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Director Planning and Community Development
Daniel Sexton, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

This planning case was referred to City Council on the Consent Calendar.

Phoenix Multisport Gym

- 4.D.** [CPC CU](#) [18-00004](#) A conditional use for a personal improvement service (Phoenix Multisport Gym) in the M1 (Light Industrial) zone located northeast of Hagerman Street and South 22nd Street.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Rachel Teixeira, Planner II, Planning and Community Development

This item was approved on the Consent Calendar.

- 4.E.** [CPC NV](#) [18-00005](#) A nonuse variance from City Code Section 7.4.203, Parking Space Requirements by Use, to allow 26 parking spaces where 38 are required located northeast of Hagerman Street and South 22nd Street.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Rachel Teixeira, Planner II, Planning and Community Development

This item was approved on the Consent Calendar.

Fieldhouse Brewing

- 4.F.** [CPC UV](#) [18-00012](#) Fieldhouse Brewery Use Variance to allow a bar use within the PIP2/AO (Planned Industrial Park with Airport Overlay) zone district located at 2480 & 2490 Victor Place south of the Constitution Avenue and North Powers Boulevard intersection at the eastern terminus of the Rock Island Trail.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Presenter:

Michael McConnell, Planner II, Planning & Community Development

This item was approved on the Consent Calendar.

- 4.G. [CPC NV 18-00013](#) Fieldhouse Brewery Nonuse Variance to allow a liquor establishment within 200 feet of a residentially used or zoned property located at 2480 & 2490 Victor Place south of the Constitution Avenue and North Powers Boulevard intersection at the eastern terminus of the Rock Island Trail.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Presenter:

Michael McConnell, Planner II, Planning & Community Development

This item was approved on the Consent Calendar.

Victory Ridge

- 4.H. [CPC PUZ 18-00016](#) Ordinance No. 18-49 amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 152.4 acres located at the southeast intersection of Interquest Parkway and Voyager Parkway from PUD (Planned Unit Development; maximum density of 24.99 du/ac residential, mixed-use, commercial, office, civic and park use with a maximum height of 125-feet) zone district to a PUD (Planned Unit Development; maximum density of 24.99 du/ac residential, mixed-use, commercial, office, light industrial, civic and park use with a maximum height of 125-feet) zone district.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Related File: CPC PUP 05-00078-A3MJ18

Item on the Consent Calendar:

4.H: CPC PUZ 18-00016 - Victory Ridge zone change of 152.4 acres from PUD (Planned Unit Development; maximum density of 24.99 du/ac residential, mixed-use, commercial, office, civic and park use with the maximum height of 125-ft) zone district to PUD (Planned Unit Development; maximum density of 24.99 du/ac residential, mixed-use, commercial, office, light industrial, civic and park use with a maximum height of 125-feet) zone district located at the southeast intersection of Interquest Parkway and Voyager Parkway.

4.I: CPC PUP 05-00078-A3MJ18 - A major amendment to the Victory Ridge PUD Concept Plan (previously named Colorado Crossing) illustrating future development of the 152.4 acres located at the southeast intersection of Interquest Parkway and Voyager Parkway.

Planner: Katie Carleo

This item was acted on as a whole as part of the Consent Calendar

and voted on as a whole as part of the Consent Calendar

Motion by Commissioner Henninger seconded by Commissioner Satchell-Smith to approve the Consent calendar

Aye: Fletcher, Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Raughton, McDonald

Absent: Graham, Markewich, Walkowski

No: none

Passed: 6-0-3

This planning case was referred to City Council on the Consent Calendar.

- 4.I. [CPC PUP 05-00078-A3 MJ18](#) A major amendment to the Victory Ridge PUD Concept Plan (previously named Colorado Crossing) illustrating future development of the 152.4 acres located at the southeast intersection of Interquest Parkway and Voyager Parkway.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Related File: CPC PUZ 18-00016

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Directory Planning and Community Development
Catherine Carleo, Principal Planner, Planning and Community Development

This planning case was referred to City Council on the Consent Calendar.

Approval of the Consent Agenda

Motion by Henninger, seconded by Satchell-Smith, 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 6:0:3

Aye: 6 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

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

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR

Palmer HS EMC

- 6.A. [CPC UV 18-00039](#) Request from the Palmer High School Student Council on behalf of Colorado Springs School District 11 for a Use Variance to allow an Electronic Message Center (EMC) for the High School at 301 N. Nevada Ave. The site is zoned R-1-6000 (Single Family Residential), is approximately 3.67 acres in size, and is located on the northeast corner of N. Nevada Ave. and E. Platte Ave.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Presenter:

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, Planning & Community Development

Staff presentation:

Mr. Tefertiller gave a PowerPoint Presentation

Applicant Presentation:

Palmer High School Student Council introduced each member of the Student Council and gave a portion of the presentation.

Supporters:

Downtown Partnership sent a letter of support

Opponents:

No opposition

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

Commissioner Fletcher is voting in support. Thanked the students and faculty advisors for a great job.

Commissioner Henninger thanked the students. Commissioner Henninger asked if the scoreboards at the athletic fields were under any sign ordinances. Kurt Schmitt Program Coordinator for City Sign Permitting and Sign Enforcement stated they were not. Commissioner Henninger asked if this EMC and its readability so was this sign a lower class or upper class sign. Mr. Schmitt stated signs come in different matrixes. The smaller the LED the more expensive it is. The sign is smaller than other civic types of uses. They are abiding by the city codes and down below what the city codes would allow.

Commissioner Roughton commended the students. He stated there's concerns for these type of signs in the community and the way these types

of signs wedge their way into the community is through civic organizations. He wanted the students to be careful with this and the development of it on this civic site. He's actively worked against illuminating and changeable signs over the years. He will vote against it as a form of policy.

Commissioner McDonald thanked the students for going through the process with the city and thanked the advisors

A motion was made by Fletcher, seconded by Satchell-Smith, to approve the use variance for the Palmer High School EMC, based upon the finding that the application complies with the review criteria in City Code Sections 7.5.803.B. and 7.5.502.E, subject to compliance with the technical modifications described in the staff report. The motion passed by a vote of 5:1:3

Aye: 5 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald and Fletcher

No: 1 - Raughton

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

Eastside Landing

6.B. [CPC CU 18-00001](#) Eastside Landing Conditional Use to allow a multifamily use within the PBC/AO (Planned Business Center with Airport Overlay) zone district located at the southwest corner of Stetson Hills Boulevard and North Marksheffel Road.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Presenter:

Michael McConnell, Planner II, Planning & Community Development

Postponement to May 17, 2018 CPC Meeting

6.B. CPC CU 18-00001: A conditional use to establish a multi-family townhome use in the PBC/AO (Planned Business Center with Airport Overlay) zone district. The property is 10.24 acres and located southwest of Marksheffel Road and Stetson Hills Boulevard.

Motion by Raughton, seconded by Vice Chair Smith, to postpone the Conditional Use to the May 17, 2018 City Planning Commission meeting due to unresolved issues with the Drainage Report. The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:3

Aye: 6 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

Dublin North

- 6.C. CPC PUZ
16-00029** Establishment of the PUD/AO (Planned Unit Development; Single-Family Residential, 3.5-11.99 Dwelling Units per Acre, 35-foot Maximum Building Height with Airport Overlay) zone district pertaining to 5.69 acres located between Dublin Boulevard and Vickie Lane east of Tutt Boulevard.

(Legislative)

Presenter:
Catherine Carleo, Principal Planner, Planning & Community Development

Staff presentation:

Katie gave a PowerPoint presentation discussing the scope of the project.

Applicant Presentation:

None

Supporters:

None

Opponents:

None

Questions of Staff:

Commissioner Henninger asked for clarification on the existing density on the south side of Dublin. Ms. Carleo said that the density is 15.14 dwelling units per acre with a maximum building height of 45-ft.

Commissioner Fletcher stated there were two letters discussing greenspace and asked how much green space will be required. Ms. Carleo stated green space can mean a couple of different things. One when you're talking about the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is an evaluation through that ordinance and a determination is made by staff if fees will be required OR dedication of parkland on residential density. Specific densities won't be established until they come in with their development plan. It would be at that time the Parks Department would evaluate the project and work with the owner to see what size dedication may be needed or the fees will be due in lieu of land.

Ms. Herington added that since this is a smaller piece of property the PLDO allows fees in lieu of a parkland dedication and it is likely that fees will be due instead of a dedication of land. In a PUD development a rule of thumb is 200-sqft per bedroom of open area. This is from the Small Lot

PUD and applied very loosely in different scenarios. It's not park space, but could be private trails, or a trail around a detention pond.

Commissioner Fletcher confirmed that per code a developer can pay a fee instead of dedicating park land. Ms. Herington said yes. Commissioner Fletcher said he was not in favor of that and could he vote against that because of the developer's offer of fees instead of parkland. Ms. Herington stated that is part and allowance is particular to a section of the subdivision code and isn't part of the concept plan it's looked at as part of the development plan. The Parks Department will look a size for a regional park and the acreage isn't there at this site to support that. This was not considered as part of the review criteria as part of concept plan. Ms. Carleo also stated parkland or green space was part of the evaluation at annexation because there 10 different property owners and none own a parcel for what Parks is looking for which is in support of how the current comprehensive plan and annexation support taking away these enclaves within the city.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if traffic was ok with the slight increase in density. Ms. Carleo stated there were no concerning comments from traffic

Commissioner Smith stated this plan approved by the Commission last October, so the conversation about fees, parks and park fees have already been decided. We're not looking at that issue right now. If we've already established that we have park fees in lieu of providing such a small parcel, he didn't see what the issue could possibly be. Ms. Herington stated this was brought back to the Commissioner due an increase in density.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

No Discussion

Motion by Vice Chair Smith, seconded by Satchell-Smith, to recommend approval to City Council the establishment of the PUD/AO (Planned Unit Development; Single-family Residential, 3.5-11.99 Dwelling Units per Acre, 35-Foot Maximum Building Height with Airport Overlay) zone district, 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) and complies with City Code Section 7.3.603 for establishment of a PUD zone. The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:3

Aye: 6 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

- 6.D. CPC CP 16-00030** Dublin North Addition Number 4 Concept Plan illustrating future development of 4.38 acres of commercial development and 5.69 of single-family residential development located between Dublin Boulevard

and Vickie Lane east of Tutt Boulevard.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:
 Catherine Carleo, Principal Planner, Planning & Community Development

Motion by Vice Chair Smith, seconded by Satchell-Smith, to recommend approval to City Council the Dublin North Addition Number 4 Concept Plan, based upon the findings that the proposal meets the review criteria for concept plans as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.501(E) as well as criteria for PUD concept plans as set forth in City Code Section 7.3.605. The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:3

Aye: 6 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

Villani Annexation

6.E. CPC A Villani Annexation consisting of 13.10 acres located northeast of the
16-00112 intersection of Tutt Boulevard and Dublin Boulevard.

(Legislative)

Presenter:
 Catherine Carleo, Principal Planner, Planning and Development

Staff presentation

Katie gave a PowerPoint presentation discussing the scope of the project.

Applicant Presentation:

No presentation

Supporters:

None

Opponents:

Larry Bowman stated he lives adjacent to where the project would be. He researched what type of structures would be built. He's looked at what the density would be per acre which is 10-20 and that density is too high. It's residential that surrounds this parcel. And doesn't want a 5-story apartment three because that doesn't fit in with the neighborhood. It will lower our property values. He also thinks access should be more to the northwest end of the property. When the owner comes in with their proposal multi-family is okay as long as it's not too high and he doesn't want large 5-6 story apartments that close to a residential area.

Commissioner McDonald stated once a concept plan is presented the neighbors would notified. Ms. Herington provided further comment stating how annexations come into the City, moving along the entire process of development. Commissioner McDonald said continue to follow the process along the way will give you some guidance on how to proceed.

Questions of Staff:

None

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

No discussion

Motion by Fletcher, seconded by Raughton, to recommend approval to City Council the Villani Annexation based upon the findings that the annexation complies with all of the conditions for annexation criteria as set forth in the City Code Section 7.6.203. The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:3

Aye: 6 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

6.F. CPC ZC 17-00112 Establishment of the A (Agriculture) zone district pertaining to 12.90 acres located northeast of the intersection of Tutt Boulevard and Dublin Boulevard.

(Legislative)

Presenter:

Catherine Carleo, Principal Planner, Planning and Development

Motion by Fletcher, seconded by Raughton, to recommend approval to City Council the establishment of the A (Agriculture) zone district based upon the findings that the zoning request complies with the three (3) criteria for granting of zone changes as forth in City Code Section 7.5.603(B). The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:3

Aye: 6 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Chairperson McDonald, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

Westcreek III at Wolf Ranch Appeal

6.G. [AR PUD 06-00515-A1 MN17](#) An appeal of the City Planning Commission’s decision to uphold the administrative approval of a minor PUD development plan amendment of the Westcreek III at Wolf Ranch project illustrating a revised layout of a 95-lot single-family detached residential development on 32.8 acres located north of Cowpoke Road and Tutt Boulevard intersection.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Related Files: AR PUD 06-00515-A1MN17, AR FP 17-00331

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Director Planning and Community Development

Daniel Sexton, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Chair McDonald recused herself from the proceedings

Staff presentation

Dan Sexton gave a power point presentation

Appellant Presentation

Mr. Ross Clinger gave a presentation.

Commissioner Smith asked Mr. Clinger several times to make clear to them the reason for his appeal today because the historical information isn't what is before them, it's on based on the applications presented today. They needed to have clear information to make a good decision.

(Please note - video of the meeting is lost after this. Minutes are based on brief notes taken during the meeting.)

Applicant Presentation:

Tim Seibert with NES gave a brief presentation discussing the reason for the amendment to the project.

Questions:

Commissioner Raughton asked about Tutt Blvd. Mr. Seibert answered (video lost during this section)

Supporters:

None

Opponents:

None

Questions of Staff:

Commissioner Fletcher discussed the Master Plan and expectations going further. Mr. Sexton stated that all information for the area have been already approved by the Master Plan. Further changes would involve having those discussions in more detail. What Mr. Clinger wants are more conceptual nature. His property isn't part of the city and they do not have a timeframe of when Tutt will be extended. Mr. Klinger will be required to

enter into an Annexation Agreement at the time he would petition the City to annex his property.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if they can appeal the annexation. Ms. Herington stated an annexation is a negotiation and an agreement for land development moving forward. Mr. Klinger would have the opportunity to work with staff related to the annexation agreement for his specific property at a future time of annexation of his property. The minor amendment that Mr. Klinger is currently appealing is of the minor amendment to the already approved Development Plan that does not propose a realignment of Tutt. The plan amendment proposes reconfiguration of a few lots to accommodate a detention facility. IF the appeal were granted, the developer still has the original approval to build the residential subdivision per the originally approved Development Plan.

Ms. Herington stated the only thing you can review is the lot change and the detention facility as that is the only requested change with this minor amendment. Mr. Sexton stated the applicant will update the notes for the Development Plan and redesign a cross-section of Tutt. Thus causing the redesign and the need for the current amendment.

Commissioner Henninger discussed Cowpoke and how it would be affected with the bridge and how it would work. He had no concerns on lot or stormwater pond.

Mr. Sexton stated they've engaged the Public Works Department to look at the bridge.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Clinger stated his concerns for his future share of improvements to serve development of his property. He wants the Cowpoke crossing to be adequate. He thinks it's on the fast track because of the Lawsuit. He doesn't feel this is best for the community.

Applicant Rebuttal:

None

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

Commissioner Raughton stated based on the information they have before them today he's in support of staff

Commissioner Smith state they are voting on the rephrasing of the project. This had been approved before they're just bringing up to the current standards. He's in support of staff.

Motion by Henninger, seconded by Satchell-Smith, to Deny the appeal and uphold Planning Staff's administrative approval, based on the findings that the appellant has not substantiated that the appeal satisfies the review criteria outlined in City Code Section 7.5.906(A)(4), and that the minor PUD development plan amendment application meets the review criteria in City Code Section 7.3.606 and City Code Section 7.5.502.E. The motion passed by a vote of 5:0:3:1

Aye: 5 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

Recused: 1 - Chairperson McDonald

6.H. [AR FP 17-00331](#)

An appeal of the City Planning Commission's decision to uphold the administrative approval of the final subdivision plat for the Westcreek III at Wolf Ranch Subdivision Filing Number 13 illustrating a 52 lot subdivision on 18.4 acres of land located north of the Cowpoke Road and Tutt Boulevard intersection.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Related Files: AR PUD 06-00515-A1MN17, AR FP 17-00331

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Director Planning and Community Development
Daniel Sexton, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Motion by Henninger, seconded by Satchell-Smith, to Deny the appeal and uphold Planning Staff's administrative approval, based on the findings that the appellant has not substantiated that the appeal satisfies the review criteria outlined in City Code Section 7.5.906(A)(4), and that the final subdivision plat for Westcreek at Wolf Ranch Subdivision Filing Number 13 meets that review criteria in City Code Section 7.7.102 and City Code Section 7.7.303.. The motion passed by a vote of 5:0:3:1

Aye: 5 - Henninger, Satchell-Smith, Smith, Raughton and Fletcher

Absent: 3 - Graham, Markewich and Walkowski

Recused: 1 - Chairperson McDonald

7. Adjourn