



City of Colorado Springs

Regional Development
Center (Hearing Room)
2880 International Circle

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Wednesday, April 9, 2025

9:00 AM

2880 International Cir., 2nd Floor, Hearing Room

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Present: 8 - Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Rickett, Chair Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Casey and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

2. Changes to Agenda/Postponements

Kevin Walker, City Planning Director called off item 8.C. 25-187, Public Art Ordinance to delay it to a date uncertain.

3. Communications

Andrea Slattery - Planning Commission Chair

Chair Slattery said there are Commissioners coming to the end of their terms and there will be openings and if anyone is interested, check the City's website.

Kevin Walker - Planning Director

Mr. Walker said City Council adopted the UDC Ordinance, and a final outlined copy will be sent to the Planning Commissioners.

Mr. Walker said the Karman Line Annexation has been referred to the Ballot and the election will occur on June 17th, 2025 by mail-in ballot to all City residents. He said this will be to appeal the ordinance on the final annexation regarding the proposed development.

Mr. Walker said there was a special meeting with City Council regarding the OneVeLa high-rise apartment complex. The Downtown Review Board approved the development plan. There was an appeal of the approved development plan to City Council. City Council voted to deny.

4. Approval of the Minutes

4.A. [CPC 2565](#) Minutes for the March 12, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting

Presenter:

Andrea Slattery, City Planning Commission Chair

Attachments: [CPC Minutes 3.12.25 Draft](#)

Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Commissioner Robbins, that this Minutes be accepted Motion to approve the minutes for the March 12, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting. The motion passed by a vote of

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Rickett, Chair Slattery, Commissioner Robbins and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic, Alternate Benenati and Alternate Case

Abstain: 3 - Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Cecil and Commissioner Casey

5. Consent Calendar

Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Commissioner Casey, that this be accepted 5. Consent Calendar The motion passed by a vote of

Aye: 8 - Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Rickett, Chair Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Casey and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic, Alternate Benenati and Alternate Case

Rockrimmon Christian Preschool at Woodmen Valley Chapel

- 5.A.** [CUDP-25-0002](#) A Conditional Use to allow a large childcare facility in the MX-N/CR/HS-O/AF-O/WUI-O/CU (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Scale with a Condition of Record and Hillside, USAFA, and Wildland Urban Interface Overlays and Conditional Use) zone district consisting of 8.39 acres located at 260 E Woodmen Road. (Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Drew Foxx, Planner II, Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment 1 - Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 2 - Traffic Memo](#)

[Attachment 3 - Land Use Statement](#)

[Attachment 4 - City File No. AR DP 03-542-A1\(04\)](#)

[7.5.601 CONDITIONAL USE](#)

This Planning Case was approved on the Consent Calendar.

Aye: 8 - Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Rickett, Chair Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Casey and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

Black Rock Coffee Conditional Use

- 5.B. [CUDP-25-0006](#) A Conditional Use to allow a drive-through coffee kiosk in the MX-L/cr (Mixed-Use Large Scale with Conditions of Record) zone district consisting of 0.91 acres located at 5570 Barnes Road. (Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Allison Stocker, Senior Planner, Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, Planning Department

Attachments: [CUDP-25-0006 Staff Report 20250303 v2](#)

[Attachment 1- Ordinance 11-15](#)

[Attachment 2 - Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 3 - Land Use Statement](#)

[Attachment 4 - Preliminary Development Plan](#)

[Attachment 5 - Traffic Impact Statement](#)

[7.5.601 CONDITIONAL USE](#)

This Planning Case was approved on the Consent Calendar.

Sunnyside AA LLC

- 5.C. [ZONE-25-0002](#) Ordinance No. 25-52 amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs relating to 0.35 acres (15,153 square feet) located at 1202 North Academy Boulevard from R-5 and MX-M (Multi-Family High and Mixed-Use Medium Scale) to MX-M (Mixed-Use Medium Scale). (Quasi-Judicial) (Second Reading and Public Hearing)

Related Files: N/A

Located in Council District 5

Presenter:

Ethan Shafer, Urban Planner II, Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Director, Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report for ZONE-25-0002](#)
[Attachment 1 - Land Use Statement](#)
[Attachment 2 - Project Description](#)
[Attachment 3 - Legal Description and Exhibit](#)
[7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \(REZONING\)](#)
[Ordinance ZONE-25-0002 1202 N Academy Blvd](#)
[Exhibit A - Legal Description](#)
[Exhibit B - Legal Exhibit](#)
[CC Presentation for ZONE-25-0002](#)
[Signed Ordinance No. 25-52.pdf](#)

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

Sunnyside AA LLC

- 5.D. [ZONE-25-0001](#) Ordinance No. 25-51 to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 0.41 acres located at 1222 North Academy Boulevard from R-5 and MX-M (Multi-Family High and Mixed-Use Medium Scale) to MX-M (Mixed-Use Medium Scale). (Quasi-Judicial) (Second Reading and Public Hearing)

Related Files: N/A
Located in Council District 5

Presenter:
Ethan Shafer, Urban Planner II, Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Director, Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report for ZONE-25-0001](#)
[Attachment 1 - Land Use Statement](#)
[Attachment 2 - Project Description](#)
[Attachment 3 - Legal Description and Exhibit](#)
[7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \(REZONING\)](#)
[Ordinance ZONE-25-0001 1222 N Academy Blvd](#)
[Exhibit A - Legal Description](#)
[Exhibit B - Legal Exhibit](#)
[CC Presentation for ZONE-25-0001](#)
[Signed Ordinance No. 25-51.pdf](#)

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

2024 E Boulder Rezoning

- 5.E. [ZONE-22-0005](#) Ordinance No. 25-53 to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 0.39 acres (16,884 square feet) located at 2024 East Boulder Street and 408 Iowa Avenue from R-4 (Multi-Family Low) and MX-M (Mixed-Use Medium Scale) to R-Flex Medium.
(Quasi-Judicial) (Second Reading and Public Hearing)

Presenter:

William Gray, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report 2024 E Boulder](#)

[Attachment 1-Zone Map](#)

[Attachment 2-First Addition to Knob Hill](#)

[Attachment 3-Context Map](#)

[Attachment 4-Concept Plan](#)

[Attachment 5-Project and Land Use Statement](#)

[Attachment 6-Rezone Legal and Drawing](#)

[Attachment 7-Knob Hill Plan](#)

[7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \(REZONING\)](#)

[Ordinance 2024 E Boulder](#)

[Exhibit A and B Legal Description and Drawing 2024 E Boulder Final](#)

[Concept Plan Final](#)

[CC Staff Pres 2024 E Boulder](#)

[Signed Ordinance No. 25-53.pdf](#)

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

6. Items Called Off Consent Calendar

7. Unfinished Business

8. New Business

Flats at Sand Creek Appeal

- [APPL-25-0003](#) An appeal of the administrative approval for a development plan consisting of 6.94 acres located at the northeast corner of N Carefree Circle and Peterson Road.
(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Austin Cooper, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Flats at Sand Creek DP Appeal Staff Report](#)[Attachment 1 - Project Statement](#)[Attachment 2 - Development Plan](#)[Attachment 3 - Appeal Letter](#)[Attachment 4 - Public Comments](#)[Attachment 5 - Public Comment Response](#)[Attachment 6 - Traffic Impact Study](#)[7.5.415 APPEALS](#)

Austin Cooper, Senior Planner presented the appeal for Flats at Sand Creek located on the northeast corner of Peterson Road and north Carefree Circle. The site is 6.94 acres and is currently zoned as R5 multifamily residential with an airport overlay. The proposed land use was a multi-family residential with associated site improvements. Mr. Cooper said the appeal of the development plan is based on a multi-family dwelling unit with 144 units and a 38-foot building height which is permitted within the R5 zoning district. He said the parking required for the project was 239 spaces and the parking provided was 249 spaces. Mr. Cooper said the appeal basis is that the plan is not compatible and harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood, it does not provide adequate parking, there will be an increase in congestion in the surrounding neighborhood and there is more detail in the appeal statement and the opponent presentation. Standard notice was done, and 49 comments were received with concerns about traffic, intensity of residential use, effects on surrounding neighborhoods and affordability. Mr. Cooper said Agency Review was done with comments from Traffic, Parks, CSFD and School District 49. Staff finds the plan complies with PlanCOS.

Appellant Presentation

Michelle Bork, resident of the area, spoke on behalf of the appellant Jeremy Hoffman and provided a slideshow. Ms. Bork said the members of the Spring Ranch community have all banded together to appeal the development for some agreed upon reasons and others have individualized reasons that are personal and passionate to themselves that they will express. Ms. Bork asked the Commission to tune into their inner compassion and understand the situation that they are creating for us. Ms. Bork as the residents and future residents that would reside in that apartment complex, to hear their perspective of the impact the development will have on the community and asked them to put themselves in the community's shoes. Ms. Bork asked if the residents would you be comfortable living in this neighborhood? Would you purchase a new home in this community? Would you feel safe walking or driving around this intersection with your children and feel safe walking across that intersection. Would you agree and support a massive apartment complex being built within 2,000 feet of your own current home? Ms. Bork said they

understand the need for affordable housing and support affordable housing needs. Ms. Bork said they simply do not want this apartment complex in our neighborhood and why the specific parcel of land is the wrong area to deliver the value that City of Colorado Springs and Lincoln Avenue communities are targeting to achieve their various initiatives. Ms. Bork said it will instead have a negative impact on safety, disrupt the harmonious environment and trait unnecessary tension between old and new residents. She said they feel that there are better suited areas across Colorado Springs for this development. Ms. Bork said they are asking that the land is zoned for commercial use with something that adds value to the community and supports the neighborhood. Ms. Bork said under the home COS Housing Initiative, 1,703 units were set to be built across Colorado Springs as of 2022, 1236 were already under construction. Ms. Bork asked if they have reached 1,703 units and are the filled to capacity and is there an actual need for another large apartment complex. Ms. Bork said residents have raised concerns specifically about developers on this project. She said Lincoln Avenue Communities claim they strengthen communities, yet reviews of tenants from the recently built property in Colorado Springs, Interquest Ridge paints a much different picture. Ms. Bork provided multiple samples are the reviews with common themes such as lack of accountability, lack of care in maintenance, upkeep and parking. Ms. Bork said the development plan and the existing issues across Interquest Ridge display their failure to take into account the best interest of the Colorado Springs communities and the future residents. Ms. Bork said this development violates the "Keep Colorado Springs Beautiful" initiative by adding 144 units, 249 parking spots, a pool and clubhouse in the only remaining open space directly within the neighborhood, while also eliminating several homeowner's mountain views. Ms. Bork provided a list of the proposed development items compared to the current neighborhood items to show why the development does not belong there. This included building height, parking, water restrictions, HOA fees, light pollution, lack of public transportation and dangerous intersection crossings. Ms. Bork said the traffic study conducted on June 19th, while school is out, does not capture the true traffic experience. She said the traffic study conducted in June did take into consideration that the previous study conducted in 2021, which was a year after COVID came to life when schools and businesses were virtual. She said since 2021, there has been an explosion of new buildings and homes in that area. Ms. Bork spoke about the lack of adequate parking and provided examples of dangerous scenarios while having to walk from parking away from the complex and increased crime in Colorado Springs. She said lack of adequate parking will also create animosity from the single-family homeowners who will now have to deal with the constant noise, a car door slamming and headlights being into their homes and not having a place to put their trash cans for pickup because the streets are covered in cars. She also said this will create issues for trash collecting trucks. Ms. Bork said the entrances and exits onto the apartment complex will be off Peterson without a turn lane and off the

tracks, which are already congested during peak commute times. She said when 144 families are added into an already crowded area, the parking and traffic issues create much more than just congestion. It also creates the risk for both auto and pedestrian accidents as the land sits at a very dangerous intersection. Ms. Bork said that she almost killed by careless reckless driver was walking on north Carefree and legally crossing Peterson at 11:09am, on a bright sunny Saturday. She said she was a distance runner and wore bright pink and electric blue clothing to ensure she was visible. She said she was hit by a car and left unconscious in the gutter, and it is a miracle that she is not paralyzed or permanently brain dead. Ms. Bork said she has permanent injuries due to the accident and provided pictures of the accident. Ms. Bork said she is passionately involved in appealing this apartment complex because of the danger it is placing on the future residents, and not because of who those residents are, which has nothing to do with the appeal. She said the high school students and every other pedestrian and driver in this community are also at risk. Ms. Bork said her attorney's investigator came to explore the intersection, they were within inches of getting hit by a driver that was not paying attention and refused to go back out to the site. Ms. Bork said when looking at the developer's comment of not including adequate parking because not everyone owns a car, asked why a development would be approved that will create an increased safety risk to the tenants who do not own a car and will be forced to constantly walk across a dangerous intersection. Ms. Bork said the intersection is not the right place for an apartment complex of any kind and if this is approved, it will knowingly create a risk. Ms. Bork said she is urging the Commission to not allow an apartment complex of any kind on the corner. She said there is a safety issue for two businesses in the neighborhood. Ms. Bork said she understands the landowners are seeking revenue-generating opportunities, but there are many other revenue avenues aside from this opportunity. She said the space should be used for something that can create meaningful and positive impacts to the community. Ms. Bork said it is negligent to say that the apartment complex would not create negative impacts to the current and future residents in the area. She said it is time for Colorado Springs to put the residents about the dollar and tax credit. Ms. Bork said the land is simply not the right place for an apartment complex of any kind.

Applicant Presentation

Andrea Barlow, NES, provided a slideshow on grounds of appeal and then invited Ben Taylor to come and speak. Ben Taylor, Lincoln Avenue Communities, Vice President and Partner spoke on the application. Mr. Taylor said he lives in Denver and Colorado Springs is a second home to him. Mr. Taylor said he would be addressing comments made on the Interquest Ridge. He said they have worked on Interquest Ridge for over three and a half years and consider it to be a very successful community and development. Mr. Taylor said there were tough times as they moved in over 240 families in a span of

seven to eight months. He said with that, you have issues such as trash collections and negative comments. Mr. Taylor said they respond to every comment and engage with people who have concerns. He said he wants the community to succeed, and it will. Mr. Taylor said he is personally invested in the property and communicates with the property on a daily basis. He said they own and manage the properties for a minimum of 15 years and their reputation stands on what they build, how they operate and manage the properties. Mr. Taylor said their funding is from State and City agencies and if they do not have a good reputation as an owner operator developer, they and their bottom line suffers. Mr. Taylor said they are in this to build the best affordable house possible and be the best partners with every local partner that they have. He said they are here to be community partners, and they are bringing the investment to Colorado Springs. He said Colorado Springs is business friendly and is a firm believer in the direction it is heading. Mr. Taylor said they are a nationwide company specializing in affordable housing. Mr. Taylor provided pictures of two developments that were completed in May. He said they strive to invest in these communities and provide market rate housing and provided an affordability breakdown. He said they are partnering with early connections learning centers on another development. Mr. Taylor said they want to provide workforce housing to allow people to live where they work. He said the government is not paying their rent and the rent is set at an annual level. He said they have greater tenant selection criteria and go through more background, criminal and income checks than any other apartment community.

Ms. Barlow continued the presentation by showing where the proposed site will be located and the surrounding areas and the zones. Ms. Barlow provided a site history of the property and how the density has changed with the new code. Ms. Barlow said the development plan proposed was administratively approved in February which has led to the appeal today. The approved concept plan with the density limits was provided. Ms. Barlow said they are proposing a relatively small multifamily residential development of 144 units. She said apartments usually are more than 200 to 250 units. She said there are a number of on-site amenities including a clubhouse and fitness center, indoor bike storage, package delivery rooms, EV charges, covered parking, dog running stations and a playground. Ms. Barlow said they initially were anticipating a pool, but it was removed. She said they are meeting all technical requirements of the development plan review criteria. She said during the City agency review, Colorado Springs Utilities stated that there are no issues regarding the use of the property. She said Traffic Engineering thoroughly reviewed the traffic impact study as well as other City agencies. Ms. Barlow said the maximum height allowed for the R5 zone is 50 feet and the proposed development is 38 feet. She said a standard single-family home is around 30 feet, with a ranch home being less, so this development is not a significant increase in height of on the surrounding area. Ms. Barlow said they had a neighborhood meeting in

October 2024, and it was very well attended with several issues raised and they will address the issues in the presentation. She said changes were made to the site plan. Ms. Barlow said the use is established as multi-family and does not distinguish between rentals, for sale, affordable or subsidized. Ms. Barlow provided the development review criteria. She said the location is the best for the type of development. Ms. Barlow provided neighborhood compatibility maps. She discussed the changes in parking and how it was reduced by three spaces. Ms. Barlow said they worked closely with the neighbors to the north and made changes to address their concerns and are affected by the development the most and are satisfied with the changes to the site plan. Ms. Barlow said there are options on the northbound portion of Peterson Road to provide a left turn lane if needed. Ms. Barlow said 252 parking spaces were required, and 249 parking spaces are shown on the site plan with 1.2% or three spaces in reduction is requested to address the neighborhood concerns. Ms. Barlow said the main trail segment has public access. Ms. Barlow said D49 reviewed the proposed application and issued a letter of support for the project and had no concerns about school safety. She said there is a Police and Fire stations on Tutt close to the site.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Hensler asked why there is a detention there as opposed to using the regional one to the east. Ms. Barlow said they are required to have one there due to the way the stormwater flows.

Public Comment

Francis Lucas, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Ms. Lucas said there are many reasons why the project should not go forth, one being the traffic concerns such as Sand Creek High School opens in the morning and leaves in the afternoon. Ms. Lucas said there are major parking issues, and a three-story apartment complex would be out of keeping with the neighborhood of single- and two-story homes. Ms. Lucas said she is proposing that this project be built in an area of town crying out for revitalization such as Shooks Creek Corridor, Sound Creek near Holland Park and Broadmoor or North Nevada avenue. She said the area buses, restaurants and a new gym in the area. Ms. Lucas said she would rather not see the area proposed for Flats at Sand Creek development at all, but if something must go there, a park or pickle ball court would benefit the residents in the community.

McKayla Stoltenberg, resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Ms. Stoltenberg said there are several things that the community needs to thrive on such as strong social networks, recreation and leisure opportunities, safety, green spaces in nature, mental health resources, skills, development and quality education. Ms. Stoltenberg said within El Paso County in 2023, 196 people died from suicide and 32% were veterans. She said in Colorado, 25% of

adolescents watch television 3 or more hours per day on an average school day. Ms. Stoltenberg said that the specific development area is unique with the high school across the road and the heavy presence of military with the proximity of Peterson and Shriever. She said an option to best serve the people that have chosen to make this area their home is to have a community center. This would provide year-round opportunities for youth, military members, veterans and the general community. Ms. Stoltenberg said when people feel socially connected, they thrive, and it would provide a safe haven for youth. It will provide a chance to learn lifelong lessons, increase their self-esteem, build friendships, serve the community, build character and be physically active. She said all of that would increase the mental and emotional health of all members of our community. Ms. Stoltenberg said other options could be a library, public pool, mini-golf course or batting cages. Ms. Stoltenberg asked is the mental and emotional health of this community within the Springs worth investing in. She asked the Commission to consider what would be best for our community, not only for the current students and residents, but for many generations to come.

Steve Lavato, resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Lavato said he decided to stay in Colorado Springs because of the robust culture, and it is a great place that people want to be. Mr. Lavato said the corner of North Carefree and Peterson Road is the cornerstone for the neighbors heading north. He said he understands it is zoned for multi-family use and what was not addressed is how it will harmoniously flow with the rest of the residents in the neighborhood. Mr. Lavato said he has a video showing that there is not another three-story complex in the neighborhood. He said if it has to be developed that they will build something that is not an eyesore and will flow with the rest of the neighborhood. He said the community wants it to feel like a family-oriented neighborhood. If the developers can keep it to a two-story complex, it will eliminate some concerns with traffic, parking, safety concerns and property values. Mr. Lavato asked if the development plan needs to be a three-story building and does that fit the needs of the housing demand.

Nancy Stoltenberg and Chris Polis ceded their time to Carol Clark, resident of Falcon Terrace, spoke in support of the appeal. Ms. Clark said her concern addresses compatibility, continuity, connectivity in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood. She said the project does not achieve this goal structurally and demographically. She said the surrounding neighborhood includes one- and two-story homes with HOA's to maintain standards and said that most households take care of their property whereas renters tend to be a gamble. Ms. Clark provided an example of renters turned squatters next door to them and were eventually evicted. She said there was a concern about drug use and dealers in proximity to Sand Creek High School. Ms. Clark said the mindset of people living in the neighborhood is an important compatibility issue. She said the Interquest Ridge Complex, with section 42 housing, has seen

some troubling trends concerning maintenance management car break-ins, pet feces, parking problems, etcetera and the Flats at Sand Creek will likely follow suit. Ms. Clark said there is nothing in the development that benefits the neighborhood, and the tax paying homeowners will share in the consequences of the incompatibility. She said the developer is allowed to pay the City in lieu of fees to absolve themselves of responsibility for Parkland and School Dedication and future traffic mitigation in the area and does not know how the City spends fees collected by the developer. The majority of the green space in the geographical area has been taken over by numerous apartment complexes. Ms. Clark said the City can not find time or the resources to fix the crack in the streets and adding several hundred more people in vehicles will ensure increased deterioration. She said their HOA has a responsibility for maintaining the trail based on reports from Interquest Ridge, however there is no reason to believe that residents of Flats at Sandcreek will do any better at cleaning up after their pets. Ms. Clark said there are several other vacant pieces of land where the complex could be located to allow the perspective residents access to the services on which they rely while having less impact on the single-family homes in their neighborhood. Ms. Clark voiced concerns about dispersing low-income individuals into neighborhoods where people of work to pay for their homes, with other concerns on car and home insurance rates being affected. Ms. Clark provided scenarios on combined annual income and low-income housing. She said according to Section 42 guidelines, immigration status requirements may vary. Ms. Clark said the structure, nor the occupants, are compatible with their neighborhood.

Don Anderson, resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Anderson said something that never changes besides the buildings, is trash. He said the paths are filled with garbage and no one picks it up and taxpayers are going to have to pay for it. He said having the garbage picked up three times a week is not enough for an apartment complex. Mr. Anderson said the dog park has dog waste along the creek and they have been lawsuits for dirty water. He said they need to keep business clean and if they get approved then they need a plan to ensure garbage is picked up and the trash enclosures are closed. Mr. Anderson also asked for a streetlight for North Carefree due to the trucks going up and down the street.

Tim Bayless, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Bayless said overcrowding and parking will shift downward resulting in a decline for homes in the area and home values could slow or even reverse for a period of time. He said there are not many studies that would contradict that. Mr. Bayless said the apartment complex is ill fitting for an area that is already crowded. He said he works three jobs to afford to live and is the same for many in the area. He asked the Commissioners to consider retired and active-duty military residents in the neighborhood, and it is most likely that their homes are

their most single valuable asset. Mr. Bayless said the project will plausibly have an outsized negative impact on the financial futures of those who have served our country and military service members and asked the Commissioners to decline the approval of the project as this is the wrong neighborhood to build the complex in.

Nuala Poulos, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Ms. Poulos said she has driven out and spoken to residents at Interquest Ridge Apartments and the website is very deceptive. She said there are safety issues with multiple bicycles hanging from the 3rd floor over the railings, missing window screens, playground with no fencing near where cars drive by no cover on the pool, trash and marijuana. Ms. Poulos said she walked into the leasing office and waited a long time before someone came to speak with her. She said there is trash overflowing and the doors were wide open to the receptacles. There are also out of state vehicles that have license plates but no tags on them. Ms. Poulos said Downtown Colorado Springs has approximately a 32% vacancy rate. If the developers care so much about our community, they would consider doing something along the lines of low-income senior housing. She said the seniors are limited due to a lack of family availability for transportation and caregiver help, access to basic needs such as shopping, senior day care centers, etcetera. Ms. Poulos said some of the low-income senior facilities are not located in the best areas of town and do not provide security for our ageing population. She said this location would be better suited for senior living where they would have access to First and Main Target and places to eat. She said they are living like mice in a maze in Colorado Springs. In the case of a catastrophic emergency evacuation event which at some point could occur and probably will, how will this developer or this city going to get everyone safely out of town.

Craig Clark, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Clark said he can see the open space and Pikes Peak from his window, and both will be lost in the build. He said he is fully aware of how this development will negatively change the area. Mr. Clark said the entire City Planning and developer documents are laced with government and consultant buzzwords to glorify the wonderful improvement the apartment complex will have for the low-income people. He said it avoids the actual expected outcomes responsibility of the development on the surrounding area residents. Mr. Clark said the planning proposal says significant off-site impacts are reasonably anticipated as a result of this project but are being mitigated or offset to the extent proportionable and practicable. He said that is government speak for; we know we're creating a problem for the surrounding neighborhood, but our desire to place homeless or low-income people out of the downtown pretty much trumps any of the bad effects that this development will have on the outlying residents. Mr. Clark said he is a transportation professional and the 2024 traffic

report, provided by Kimley-Horn used existing data from the April 2021 traffic report that was done for the townhomes never built, and they extrapolated the data on paper which does not have actual traffic counts. Mr. Clark said Kimley-Horn assumed a 1.3% growth rate since 2021, which he said is underrepresented. He said the City website shows over a 2% annual growth, meaning Kimley-Horn's traffic numbers are half of what they should be. He said most of the growth in Colorado Springs is occurring in the Northeast. Mr. Clark said the study was done when traffic was extremely low during COVID in April 2021 with Sandcreek High School students staying home with hybrid classes, residents were working from home and restaurants and other venues were closed or severely limited, making the roads empty. He said Kimley-Horn estimated the apartment complex will add 1,200 more vehicle trips on Pony Tracks alone, which is more vehicles than existed in Falcon Terrace Subdivision. He said the road is already maxed out and the ruts are huge. Mr. Clark asked if the City is going to fix the gaps in the road and maintain them with the increase in traffic.

Ernest Przybyla, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Przybyla said he pays a homeowners association fee and receives notes for clutter. He said there was a multi-housing development added toward Peterson Road with no homeowner's association and can park cars wherever they want and this will be worse with the new apartment complex. Mr. Przybyla suggested to the Commission that the area be re-zoned to a community garden space to teach children to grow vegetables like Victory Gardens of World War II. He said he fears that the City Council will approve this like the 27-story building downtown and pollute their visual space.

Kelly Hoffman, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Hoffman said she has three children, and her biggest concern is them having to cross the street in traffic to get to Sandcreek High School. She said the traffic study was done in April 2021 when the school was online and does not include the kids that come from the surrounding areas. She said if the Commission would take their safety into account, then they would not approve this. Mr. Hoffman said she hopes that there are no more accidents on that street.

Jeremy Hoffman, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Hoffman said his family live at the first cul-de-sac north of the apartment complex, 500 feet away. He said when they purchased their house in June 2024, they looked at neighborhoods where houses were not stacked on top of each other, mountain views and safety. He said his back deck overlooks the field with the mountain views. Mr. Hoffman said this is disappointing and eventually they will be downsizing and when they sell their house in three to five years the apartment complex will affect their property value with the construction being a couple years and then overlooking a three-story apartment

building instead of a mountain view. He said they would like to see senior living. Parking, traffic and increased noise are going to be a huge issue.

Jared Massey, a resident of Springs Ranch neighborhood, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Massey said he has lived there for 5 years and works as an RN and manager of DaVita Pikes, Peak Dialysis and have invested a lot of my time and blood, sweat and tears in caring for the dialysis, community in the Colorado Springs area. He said on September 14, 2025, he received an alert on his phone that no one wants to receive. It was from his wife's running watch alerting him that she had experienced a sudden impact that likely indicated her being hit by a motor vehicle. He said he drove to the location fearing the worst. Mr. Massey said he distinctly remembers the shell-shocked bloodied face and his wife as she stared at him from the gutter that she had been thrown into by a careless driver who struck her as she legally walked through the crosswalk of North carefree and Peterson, the intersection of the proposed building. Mr. Massey said he would never forget the look of fear and pain on her face as she struggled to breathe through a collapsed lung. He said she survived and recovered but is forever emotionally and physically scarred from the traumatic experience. Mr. Massey said he wishes that no one will have to receive that call or experience that fear and pain of being hit by a motor vehicle. He said with the already high-level traffic along North Carefree, adding another highly congested complex with poorly planned street access will create a more unsafe area for pedestrians and significantly increase the likelihood that one of our neighbors goes to the same horrible experience that he and Michelle went through. Mr. Massey said he is here today to personally and specifically oppose development plans for the Flats at Sand Creek and believes it is poorly thought-out design and nonsensical to be located in the chosen area as it creates a much higher safety risk to the established community.

Geoffrey Lockley, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Mr. Lockley said his two children went to school here. He said they want to see more growth in the neighborhood. He listed concerns with the development to include property value decline, increased traffic, strain on resources, changing neighborhood character, concentration of poverty, lack of integration, maintenance concerns, developmental costs, limited housing opportunities and community opposition. Mr. Lockley said he understands the need for affordable housing, but it is not necessary on this corner. He said he would like to see many different things happen in that area to benefit the community. He has been a High School football coach for 15 years and has seen thousands of single parents that are struggling to have a household, and he is a part of their success. Mr. Lockley asked the Commissioners to please consider not develop this in their neighborhood because it is not a contributing factor and it is going to contradict the neighborhood with the safety issues.

Shauna Lavato a resident of the area, spoke in support of the appeal. Ms. Lavato said she stands before the Commissioners not as a member of the community, but as a concerned mother, a neighbor and a voice of many concerned neighbors. She said In March of 2023, the town was shaken by the heartbreaking news of a young Doherty High School exchange student whose life was tragically cut short. She was only 17 years old when she was struck by a vehicle crossing the street right in front of the high school. Ms. Lavato said her passing had a profound effect on her and she is a mother of two sons who began their High School journey at Doherty. She said she understands the deep worry that parents feel for their children as they attend school and the tragedy is a reminder of the vulnerability their children face every day. Ms. Lavato said when she hears of the proposed construction, she was angry, then concerned as the why there would be more housing in close proximity to the school. She there are already devastating consequences from inadequate safety measures and asked how they could prioritize expansion over the safety of our children. Ms. Lavato said it is not just an issue of infrastructure, but also of human lives.

She urged the Commission to consider the situation as they are not merely discussing statistics or zoning laws, but they are talking about families dreams and futures. She said they must ask themselves what kind of community we want to create. Ms. Lavato said North Carefree is the busiest road in the area and heavy traffic they experience is a concern to many, particularly the parents who drive or walk their kids off a Sand Creek High School.

She said they have witnessed traffic jams on North Carefree and Powers where vehicles continue to back up as they turn into Target or Chick-Fil-A. She said the proposed development would increase the situation, particularly the turning lane headed into Pony Tracks.

Evelyn Galane Phillips, Community Facility Planning Manager, School District 49 spoke in opposition to the appeal. Ms. Phillips said safety of the kids, staff and community alike is paramount to the district. Historically, the district has had minimal student impact from the apartment buildings within the district. She said affordability is an opportunity for the workforce housing, teachers, staff members, custodial nutrition services, and this is why they support this.

Jill Gabler, Executive Director of Pikes Peak Housing Network, spoke in opposition to the appeal and in support of the Flats at Sand Creek as an affordable housing project is much needed in the specific area. Ms. Gabler said the project was approved administratively in the R5 zone as multifamily housing, which is the designated use for the land, the surrounding residential zones are almost exclusively single-family homes or townhomes, creating a

significant need for rental housing in the immediate area adjacent to Sand Creek High School. Ms. Gabler said over 50% of the students at Sand Creek High School qualify for free or reduced lunch, signifying a strong need for lower cost housing in the immediate area to serve the families of these students. She said the Flats at Sand Creek will provide needed housing for the families who will now have the opportunity to live close to their kids' school, reducing their own transportation costs, increasing their overall quality of life as they can spend more time with their kids. Ms. Gabler said it can overall reduce congestion in the intersections as fewer people would be driving their kids to school. She said it is concerning that the opposition states that those living in the Flat Sand Creek will increase crime and social issues in their neighborhood. She said almost everyone has rented a home at some point and as the home buyer has increased from 28 to 38 years old, more residents are living in rental housing for longer periods of time, increasing the needs for apartments and other rental options. She said the Flats at Sand Creek will house military service members, nurses and other medical employees and people who they rely on every day. This will not increase crime statistics in the area. The apartments will bring needed affordable rental housing to the City in an area where many individuals and families may currently not be able to afford to live.

Applicant Rebuttal

Ms. Barlow said they would have Mr. Taylor speak to the comments about operations. Mr. Taylor said he appreciates everyone's concerns, and they share concerns about traffic issues. He said their traffic engineer projected 2.4% increase to traffic and safety is a big concern for their residents. Mr. Taylor said holistically, their residents are workers, consumers and families. He said this location was in need of workforce housing given the large commercial corridor and the jobs in the area. Over half of the residents at Interquest Ridge are single mothers and they are expecting 250 kids aged 0-18 years old at the Flats at Sand Creek. He said regarding having a two-story building versus a three-story building, their development is 20% lower in height and density than what is allowed. Mr. Taylor said a three-story apartment community is efficient and there are construction cost issues and competitive bidding for the land. Mr. Taylor agreed that there are parking issues at Interquest Ridge, and they are adding 10% more parking at the Flats at Sand Creek. He said the playground will be much larger and there will be registration requirements for pets and pet bag dispensers installed in the parks. He said they will also implement fines or potential evictions for pet droppings. He said the State is not requiring that they must accept pets on their properties. Mr. Taylor said there are 100 pages of addendums that applicants must sign so that they are good residents of the properties. He said the EV charging stations are State requirement. Mr. Taylor said legal status and incomes are verified for all residents. He said the majority of the residents are parents and seniors that just need a break. He provided an example of a resident that was provided with a space at the Interquest Ridge

location.

Geoff Plank, Kimley-Horn, spoke on the traffic study. Mr. Plank said the previously approved 2021 traffic study was collected when school was in session, 14 months after COVID. He said the traffic study was not needed as the threshold for needing a traffic study is 150 trips during the peak hour in Colorado Springs. He said the proposed development is only 82 trips, which is one trip in the morning per minute and a trip and a half in the afternoon on average. He said this is a low trip generator and it was evaluated conservatively with regular multifamily rather than affordable multifamily. Mr. Plank said the pedestrian concerns could be mitigated with a protected green arrow light on the left turns so that vehicles would need to yield to pedestrians.

Ms. Barlow said any changes to the traffic lights would be the City's responsibility, not the developer. She said home values are not a part of the development plan review criteria. She said there was comment on the structures and occupants not being compatible with the neighborhood and felt there was emphasis on the occupants not being compatible with the neighborhood. Ms. Barlow said the key consideration for a development plan is whether the structures are compatible. She said the three-story apartment building at the intersection of two principal arterials is an appropriate use. She said they worked with the neighbors to the north who are most impacted with project, and they are not here today objecting.

Appellant Rebuttal

Ms. Bork said she has a deep love for saltine crackers as that was her dinner for a large portion of her life. She said the argument that they are only fighting this because it is low income is not accurate. Ms. Bork said she has stated multiple times one of the biggest reasons they are appealing is for the safety risks. It is about creating a safe environment. She said creating an environment with an apartment that will bring hundreds of kids in only going to exacerbate those safety issues. Ms. Bork said this has nothing to do with the income of the residents of those buildings. Ms. Bork asked the Commissioners to consider their points of view regarding safety and traffic and asked for a new traffic study as Marksheffel Road is peppered with houses and apartment complexes that were not there in 2021. She said there are a lot of people that could not be here today because of their jobs to represent themselves, there are more people from the community who feel the same way.

Mr. Hoffman said they are not here because of the people that are proposed to live in the apartments. This development will bring down the value of homes. He said no one wants to purchase a home overlooking an apartment complex and he would not have purchased his home had the apartment complex already been there. He said he will be moving if this development is approved. Mr.

Hoffman said he is concerned about safety and the parking is not ample and it will bleed over into their cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Comments

Chair Slattery said there are a lot of valid concerns that are not necessarily a part of the development plan and review criteria as a volunteer body appointed by City Council are purview to. City council has the criteria as well and more discretion. Chair Slattery said the development review criteria is what this body is bound to review and make judgment upon and reviewing the applications.

Commissioner Foos asked Mr. Barlow what the Fire Department comments were that needed to be addressed. Ms. Barlow said the Fire Department's comments were related to site design. Noah Brehmer, Civil Engineer, Kimley-Horn said the small comments were surrounding the large retaining walls around the site, north and east of the proposed buildings. Mr. Brehmer said that they added stairs with Knox Boxes for foot access. He said there were issues with aerial apparatus access to the to the 3rd floor of the building and worked with their team to get access to the tops of the buildings.

Commissioner Robbins asked Austin Cooper after his review of the application, what did he saw as the biggest problem. Kevin Walker said that it does not fit in with the criteria that have been established for the Planning Department's commentary. Mr. Walker said that they do not make a recommendation and that may be encroaching on that. Chair Slattery said this is an appeal of an administrative decision on the development plan and there will be opportunities to make comments, but they need to go through criteria and issues that were brought up by the public.

Chair Slattery asked if the development plan met the water usage requirements as detailed by Colorado Springs Utilities. Mr. Cooper said he reached out to Colorado Springs Utilities, and they stated there are no issues with the water supply being brought to the site and the reviewer with CSU would look into the official letters that CSU provided. Mr. Cooper asked why a neighborhood be under water use restriction and the reviewer said it could be due to nearby construction in the area and offered no other explanation beyond that.

Chair Slattery said regarding the zone usage it is not under the purview of the Commission to tell anyone what they should and can do with their land. The parcel is zoned for R5, R for residential and 5 for number of units to be built there. Chair Slattery asked when the R5 zoned designation established. Mr. Cooper said it was established in 2002, however, there were conditions of record placed on the property which only permitted a church-use to be located there. He said it remained vacant and in 2021 a staff report for a zone change application in order to remove the conditions of record to allow multi-family on

the property.

Commissioner Cecil said when the zone changed happened in 2021, there were still conditions required to include a six-foot sidewalk along Carefree and a five-foot sidewalk along Pony Trail and asked if those are still pertinent to this area. Mr. Cooper asked what document Commissioner Cecil was referring to. Commissioner Cecil said it is the recorded development plan that applied to the townhomes project approved in 2022. Mr. Cooper said the development plan was not established and they are trying to replace it with the new development plan, which would remove the conditions for the old plan. Commissioner Cecil said she would like to know why the sidewalks would not be present on the current plan. Mr. Cooper said he will look into it. Mr. Brehmer said as a part of the 2021 application, the sidewalks were required along each frontage and there is now existing sidewalk constructed along Carefree and Peterson and there is a proposed sidewalk along the frontage of Pony Tracks in compliance with City engineering requirements.

Chair Slattery said fees in lieu are for parks and schools for every multi or single-family development built is required to either dedicate land or pay fees in lieu.

Chair Slattery said there were concerns about student generation and asked Ms. Phillips what she is seeing in terms of multi-family student population generation and if D49 has the capacity to accommodate the students. Ms. Phillips said yes and historically they only see about a 2% capacity increase from apartment complexes. She said that it could change depending on economic conditions, but at this time the surrounding schools can fill that.

Chair Slattery asked Ms. Phillips to confirm if the fees in lieu was the choice of the district for the application. Ms. Phillips said fees in lieu of land is the choice of this application because six acres of land is not enough to support the district.

Mr. Walker said there was a question as to how the fees are spent and there are audits on Parkland Dedication Ordinance and the monies that are collected are delivered to the school districts and they also have regulatory functions on what they can spend the money on.

Chair Slattery said Code Enforcement that can assist with nuisances and there is an online portal to address those issues for any development or neighbor.

Mr. Walker said they reviewed the ordinance that that rezoned the property to R5 and removed the restriction and there are no other conditions of record. The comments may have been related to the development plan proposed at the time

but adopted. Chair Slattery asked if the development plan with a zone change would have been an independent action and not binding to the condition of record for removal of the R5 zone. Mr. Cooper said the zone change was accompanied by a concept plan and the development plan followed shortly after with a plat application. He said the zone change went with the concept plan. He said it was binding to the development. Chair Slattery asked if there were any other conditions within the concept plan that would apply to the current development application. Mr. Cooper said he did not find any in his review that were relevant to the application but will double-check.

Chair Slattery asked Todd Frisby, City Traffic Engineer in Public Works, what the options are for signaling changes or an analysis of the safety of the intersection and how those studies would be handled by the department. Mr. Frisby said one of their responsibilities is to address intersection and roadway safety. He said there have been steps over the years to improve safety including Citywide intersection and roadway safety studies and they have identified a series of projects. He said they continue to monitor intersection safety, responding to citizen or Police reports. Mr. Frisby said he did look at the safety history at the intersection and it does show an elevated level of crash history. He said they look for patterns and there are more left turn crashes than they would expect at the intersection. Mr. Frisby said they have a list of dozens of improvements and will add a protected-only left turn to the list. He said this is not related to the development but is something they would have discovered over time.

Chair Slattery asked if there is a process for citizens to bring these concerns to his attention outside of the Planning Commission. Mr. Frisby said they can call the Public Works department.

Chair Slattery asked Mr. Frisby to speak on the traffic study. Mr. Frisby said there is a trip generation threshold to determine whether a traffic study is warranted. He said this development would not have met those thresholds to warrant a traffic study. He said it is at the discretion of the City traffic engineer and the department to determine whether they do a study. Mr. Frisby said the traffic counts were made in April 2021 when school was in session and there was a 30% increase due to COVID and compared them to the 2018 traffic report. He said the comparison showed almost no difference in the two reports. Mr. Frisby said a 1.2% growth factor for CDOT 20-year growth factor. Chair Slattery asked with the traffic increase what the intersection would be rated. Mr. Frisby said they use a criteria called level service to show the acceptable level of delay and the analysis showed acceptable levels of service could be achieved with or without the development. He said some changes need to happen such as signal timing adjustments to improve operations.

Chair Slattery asked about the turn lanes, and where the entrances and exits are for the development. Mr. Frisby said they have criteria that warrant when turns lanes are warranted. He said the volume of turns from the development did not meet the criteria to warrant a right turn lane.

Commissioner Hensler asked if this development had not been brought up, what would have triggered changes from the City and what can citizens do to find reprieve when they see issues. Mr. Frisby said they have City wide studies that are done to identify issues with safety related to traffic signals. He said they have 120 different improvements identified and they are working through the list. He said they also rely on citizen comments and Police Department reports. Mr. Frisby said citizens can contact the Public Works department or submit a request through GOCOS. He said they evaluate every request that comes in. Mr. Frisby said they installed a school zone for the crossing at North Carefree and plan to add school zones on Peterson just south of North Carefree.

Commissioner Rickett asked if a traffic study was not required for the project. Mr. Cooper said the traffic study was submitted on the application with the initial submittal. Mr. Frisby said by the criteria, a traffic study would not have been done. He said more often than not, if a development plan does not meet the criteria, a traffic study will still be done to make informed decisions.

Commissioner Casey asked if the parking formulas are based on 100% of cars that will be able to park in the development. Mr. Cooper said the parking calculations are determined based on parking on site with allowances for on-street parking, however the applicant did not choose to use that. Per code, a parking reduction of 5% is allowed if it is adjacent to a bike path.

Commissioner Rickett thanked the public for coming out and providing comments. He said he empathizes on their plight, however per code this development is allowed and is support of the project.

Commissioner Hensler agreed and said she also appreciates the public input, however the land use zoning is set, and it is the Planning Commissions responsibility to consider if the application meets the criteria. Commissioner Hensler said that we have to consider all citizens and believe that this project does that with an affordable component in trying to meet the needs of neighbors on all sides. Commissioner Hensler said she will be voting to approve the project.

Commissioner Cecil said she would like to reiterate what Chair Slattery said earlier about City Council's ability to hear things that are outside of the strict interpretation of the code that Planning Commission must sit to. Commissioner Cecil said the code section about compatibility and harmonious design is open

to interpretation to Council in a way that does not open to Planning Commission. Commissioner Cecil said the parking requirement is in alignment with the studies and practices that are part of the parking calculations and code which did not factor in any additional off-street parking and hopes their experience will reflect that to be sufficient. Commissioner Cecil said she does not see utility issues with the project and hopes the traffic infrastructure concerns are addressed as urgently as possible. Commissioner Cecil said she is in support of staff's approval of the original application.

Commissioner Robbins said everything fits in the box, however common sense does not fit in the box. Commissioner Robbins said he supports the appeal and does not see where affordable housing comes into play when there is a pool and a clubhouse. Commissioner Robbins said the Interquest Apartments are near his office and he sees congestion and parking issues. Commissioner Robbins said having a school down the street is a serious issue and is not comfortable using an old traffic study using projected figures. Commissioner Robbins said he supports the appeal.

Commissioner Gigiano agreed with Commissioner Robbins and said they should look outside of the box and wants to support the community and is support of the appeal.

Vice Chair Foos thanks everyone for coming out today and said the issues that were brought up today are valid concerns and is something as a City they should be talking about, but not under the purview of the Planning Commission. Vice Chair Foos said the project meets the criteria for R5 zoning and will be denying the appeal.

Commissioner Casey said he agrees with the other Commissioners on the importance of public involvement. Commissioner Casey said the development meets the criteria and will be voting to deny the appeal.

Chair Slattery echoed the sentiments from the other Commissioners, and the application does meet the criteria and will be voting to deny the appeal.

Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Vice Chair Foos, to deny the appeal and affirm the administrative approval of the development plan application, based on the provisions of the City Code (UDC), and that the appellant has not substantiated that the appeal satisfies the review criteria outlined in City Code (UDC) Section 7.5.415.A(2).

The motion passed by a vote of 6-2-1.

Aye: 6 - Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Rickett, Chair Slattery and Commissioner Casey

No: 2 - Commissioner Robbins and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic, Alternate Benenati and Alternate Case

Parkside Historic District

- 8.B. [ZONE-24-00](#) [18](#) An Ordinance amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs to establish a HP-O (Historic Preservation Overlay) pertaining to 4.15 acres located west of North Cascade Avenue and east of Monument Valley Park between West Dale Street on the North and St Vrain Street on the south and to be known as the Parkside Historic District.

(Quasi-Judicial) (1st Reading only to set the public hearing for May 27, 2025)

Presenter:

William Gray, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Located in Council District 3

Attachments: [Staff Report Parkside Historic District](#)
[Attachment 1-Parkside District Nomination](#)
[Attachment 2-Changes Summary](#)
[Attachment 3-Context Map](#)
[Attachment 4-Public Comment](#)
[Attachment 5-Design Standards](#)
[Attachment 6-Interpretive Guide](#)
[Attachment 7-February HPB Minutes](#)
[Attachment 8-March HPB Minutes](#)
[7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \(REZONING\)](#)
[Ordinance Parkside Historic District](#)
[Exhibit A and B Legal Description and Drawing](#)
[HPB Meeting Mins 2.3.25 FINAL](#)
[HPB Meeting Mins 3.3.25 FINAL](#)
[CC Staff Pres Parkside Historic District](#)
[Signed Ordinance No. 25-54.pdf](#)

Bill Gray, Senior Planner presented the application for the Historic Preservation Overlay District. The application is located on North Cascade Avenue, east of Monument Valley Park and on the north side of the district is Dale Street and the south side of the district is Saint Vrain Street. Mr. Gray said the area is comprised of multiple zone districts and the application would not affect the underlying zoning and add a Historic Preservation Overlay. The overlay is 4.29 acres and the predominant land use within the district is residential. The

process for establishing a Historic Preservation Overlay is following the rezoning or zone map amendment process of the development code. Mr. Gray said the district is located within the original town site of the City of Colorado Springs dating back to 1872 and the development of the area began around 1880 and continued through the 1950's. He said there are seven decades of development with three eras of growth including a variety of architectural styles. The application has both historical and architectural significance that allow it to be considered for a Historic Preservation Overlay. Mr. Gray provided images to show the properties included in the application. He said this is an owner-initiated application and the application does comply with PlanCOS and HistoricCOS. Mr. Gray said to ensure the character of the homes are protected over time, there is a recommendation to adopt design standards as a part of the district. He said standard public notice was done and the majority of comments received strongly supported the application with one opposition sighting increased maintenance, renovation costs and unpredictable review process. Mr. Gray said this property is not included in the application. Mr. Gray said staff and Historic Preservation Board finds the plan meets the review criteria.

Applicant Presentation

Cheryl Brown, President of the Historic Uptown Neighborhood Association, presented the application for the Historic Preservation Overlay. Ms. Brown provided an overview of the neighborhood to include the 17 properties on the application and the historic designations. She said this is a part of the original township and the first addition to the City of Colorado Springs. Ms. Brown said they visited the properties to gain permission to participate in the overlay. She said the purpose of this is to honor the historic resources in the neighborhood and preserve the buildings. Ms. Brown said there was extensive timeline starting in 2022 to research and prove the significance and history.

Tim Scanlon, local historian, presented the individual building nominated for the Historic Preservation Overlay. Mr. Scanlon said all owners authorized Historic Uptown to act on its behalf. He said the Parkside District construction began in 1885 on the Hagerman Mansion and the development was stimulated by the affluence of the Cripple Creek Mining period. Mr. Scanlon continued his presentation with a wide history of the developments and the significance of their architecture to include all 17 individual buildings and their materials. Mr. Scanlon said there are tangible benefits are non-profit owners gain eligibility to apply for State Historic Grant funds, Historic Rehabilitation Tax credits and helps to keep properties safe. He said if the overlay is established, when a building permit is needed involving the exterior of a zoned property, then it is reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board.

Ms. Brown said the request for Planning Commission to find the nominated properties meet the historic and architectural eligibility criteria for the HPO and

requests that the secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation for use in reviewing the associate applications for the reports of acceptability.

Public Comment

Dianne Bridges, Historic Neighborhoods Partnership, spoke in support of the application. Ms. Bridge said the Historic Uptown is part of their partnership. Ms. Bridges thanked the Planning Commission and staff for their work and support. She encouraged the Planning Commission to support the efforts and recommend it to City Council for adoption. Ms. Bridges said there are benefits to the residents in designating their properties as historic. She said there are tax credits for home improvements on properties designated as historic. Ms. Bridges said it has been two decades since an HPO has gone before the City. She said she believes that what was done in this effort can be leveraged by Planning Commission, City Council and other residents to have additional preservation work across the City.

Commissioner Comments

Chair Slattery said a tremendous amount of work has gone into this and it is easy to support and is in favor of the application.

Commissioner Gigiano thanked the applicants for their presentation and said she is in support of the application.

Commissioner Casey asked if the tax credits for rehabilitation are just for the main structures or can they be applied to landscaping or general improvements to the property. Mr. Scanlon said the tax credits are for rehabilitation of historic properties which do not include landscaping, but it would include things like excavation to repair or replace the foundation. Commissioner Casey said he is in support of the application.

Commissioner Hensler asked if there are any challenges or drawbacks for anyone who may buy a property and not want to be a part of the overlay, and does it create limitations that would be a deterrent that the Commissioners should be aware of. Mr. Scanlon said the consequences of the overlay zone for future property owners will be if they want to obtain a building permit, they will have to apply and have that reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board. He said there is a fee associated with that application and review. Commissioner Hensler asked if they would be unable to make architectural or significant aesthetic exterior changes that would detract from the historic nature if the overlay did not approve. Mr. Scanlon said the level of authority depends upon the nature of the designations. He said they have a large historic preservation overlay zone in the north end and it is listed on the National Register. The City has the authority to deny the issuance of a permit appealable to City Council. Mr. Scanlon said for the properties that are only locally overlay zoned, authority

associated with the overlay zone is that the issuance of design permit can be delayed by no more than 90 days from date of application. Commissioner Hensler asked if the homes in the area that are not joining the overlay are beholden to those restrictions. Mr. Scanlon said no.

Chair Slattery asked if the overlay would be disclosed as part of any property transactions. Mr. Scanlon said yes.

Commissioner Cecil said that the Garrett House, the fence is deeply out of character with the rest of the house and asked what impact it would have if someone wanted to change the fence. Mr. Scanlon said unless it involves a building permit, then there is no involvement of the Preservation Overlay. If it does need a permit, then the applicant would use the secretary of the interior standards for rehabilitation. Commissioner Cecil asked what protection against demolition does this offer. Mr. Scanlon said it can delay the issuance of the demolition permit up to 90 days from date of application. Commissioner Cecil asked if there have been any discussions that have come about regarding the timeline on permits or cost of materials.

Ms. Brown said in general there is a delay if they need a permit, but an application has not been denied. She said the whole idea of this is to make the neighbors aware of the changes that can affect the historic nature of their building. She said there is a cost to fixing up old homes across the board, because no one knows how to fix them, but the overlay is not making the cost higher.

Commissioner Cecil asked if the applications go through the same application process. Mr. Gray said the only administrative procedure for the HPO is for roofs and it must be like for like. The report of acceptability is an application that is accepted and is reviewed by the board within 28 days.

Commissioner Rickett asked if the Preservation Board denies the permit, the applicant can wait 90 days and still get the permit. Mr. Scanlon said yes. Mr. Rickett said it does not actually preserve any of the houses. Mr. Scanlon said they are attempting to influence future behavior.

Commissioner Rickett said the interior standards of rehabilitation is 135 pages and there are a lot of restrictions and asked if it is a requirement or recommendation to follow it for exterior renovation. Mr. Scanlon said Commissioner Rickett is referring to the document called interpreting the Secretary of the interior standards and the standards themselves are one page long with 10 items and those can be used to property owners to see how their project might be regarded for interpreted. Commissioner Rickett said the references go into technical items and asked if the applicants need to follow it.

Mr. Scanlon said yes.

Commissioner Rickett commended the applicants on the overlay.

Vice Chair Foos thanked the applicants for the great presentation and is in full support of the application.

Mr. Walker said he thanked the applicants for their work and patience in the process.

Motion by Commissioner Casey, seconded by Commissioner Rickett, to recommend approval to City Council the Zone Map Amendment to designate 4.29 acres as Historic Preservation Overlay District (HP-O) located west of North Cascade Avenue between West Dale Street and West Willamette Avenue, based upon the findings that the request complies with the Standards for Designation of Areas for Zoning Overlay as set forth in City Code Section 7.2.608.B and the criteria for a Zone Map Amendment as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.704 with the following condition:

1) The Parkside Historic District Design Standards as proposed in the initial application are approved with changes as follows: (a) the "Old North End Interpretive Guide" is incorporated into the standards by reference or exhibit to be a supporting document for guidance and results at all levels of historic rehabilitation work in the District; and (b) add a reference to the Design Standards stating, "for additional information on the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation visit the National Park Service's Historic Preservation Tax Incentives page (Standards for Rehabilitation).

The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1.

Aye: 8 - Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Rickett, Chair Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Casey and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

Public Art Ordinance

8.C. [25-187](#)

An Ordinance amending Chapter 7 (Unified Development Code (UDC)) of the Code of the City of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended, pertaining to public art.
(Legislative)

Located in All Council District

Presenter:

Daniel Sexton, DRE Planning Manager, Planning Department
Michael Montgomery, Deputy City Council Administrator
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report Public Art Ordinance](#)

[Attachment 1 - UDC-PAC-Amendment-2025-05-05](#)

[Attachment 2 - Public Art Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

[Attachment 3 - Ordinance #25-138](#)

[Staff Presentation Public Art Ordinance](#)

Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Commissioner Casey, that this Ordinance be postpone to a date uncertain The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1.

Aye: 8 - Vice Chair Foos, Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Rickett, Chair Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Casey and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

9. Presentations

10. Adjourn