



# City of Colorado Springs

Regional Development  
Center (Hearing Room)  
2880 International Circle

## Meeting Minutes - Draft City Planning Commission

---

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

9:00 AM

2880 International Cir., 2nd Floor, Hearing Room

---

**ZONE-25-00** An ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs  
**23** pertaining to approximately 7.93 acres located at 1625 Springcrest Road from BP/CR/HR-O/AF-O (Business Park with Conditions of Record, High-Rise Overlay, and United States Air Force Academy Overlay) to MX-M/AF-O (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with United States Air Force Academy Overlay). (Quasi-Judicial) (1st Reading only to set the public hearing date for July 14, 2026 in accord with City Code Section 7.5.407. Hearings for the ordinance and any related applications shall be conducted at the second reading.)

Related Files: LUPL-25-0010  
Located in Council District 2

Presenter:  
Allison Stocker, Senior Planner, City Planning Department  
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

**Attachments:** ZONE-25-0023\_Ordinance  
Staff Report\_v2  
Attachment\_A\_Briargate\_Master\_Plan  
Attachment\_B\_Ordinance\_99-139  
Attachment\_C\_CPC DP 99-125  
Attachment\_D\_Public\_Comments  
Attachment\_E\_Public\_Comment\_Response\_Letters  
Attachment\_E1\_Public\_Comments\_from\_CPC  
Attachment\_F\_Traffic\_Impact\_Study  
Attachment\_G\_Land\_Use\_Plan  
Attachment\_H\_USAFA\_Avigation\_Easement  
Attachment\_I\_CDOT\_Final\_Review\_Comments  
Attachment\_J\_Project\_Statement  
Attachment\_K\_Public\_Notice\_Affidavits  
Attachment\_L\_Owner\_Authorization\_Form  
Attachment\_M\_Mineral\_Estate\_Form  
Attachment\_N\_BBCOA\_Letter\_of\_Support  
Attachment\_O\_Neighborhood\_Meeting\_Sign\_In\_Sheet  
Attachment\_P\_Briargate\_MP\_Signed\_Resolution\_No.\_43-22  
Exhibit\_A\_Legal\_Description  
Exhibit\_B\_Zone\_Map  
7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)  
Briargate\_Voyager\_CPC\_Presentation\_v2

Allison Stocker, Senior Planner, presented the application for a Zone Map Amendment for 7.93 acres at 1625 Springcrest Road, proposing a change from Business Park with Conditions of Record, High-Rise Overlay, Air Force Academy Overlay to Mixed Use Medium Scale with Air Force Academy Overlay. She explained the site's context, existing entitlements, and the impact of the previously adopted Briargate Master Plan. Ms. Stocker noted that the current high-rise overlay allows up to 68 feet, compared to 50 feet allowed in MX-M. She reviewed the anticipated future process, which would require both a development plan and subdivision replat if the rezoning were approved.

Ms. Stocker detailed the surrounding conditions, noting that the site sits amid a transitional area: county enclaves and estate-sized lots to the north, the Classical Academy to the east, commercial and mixed-use development to the south, and principal arterial streets (Voyager Parkway and Briargate Boulevard). She summarized required transportation improvements, including striping turn lanes,

right-in/right-out access management, and right-of-way/easement dedication. The Skyline Regional Trail extension and parkland/school fees-in-lieu would also be required.

Ms. Stocker reported extensive community outreach, including mailed notices, a neighborhood meeting attended by about 70 people, and numerous public comments and a Change.org petition, with about 1000 signatures. Common concerns included traffic congestion, school safety, emergency evacuation, compatibility, visual impacts, and the presence of multifamily housing adjacent to an elementary school. Ms. Stocker stated that staff found the request generally compliant with PlanCOS and the rezoning criteria in City Code.

### **Comments and clarifications**

Trevor Gloss, City Attorney's Office, clarified that the motion for the rezoning would be a recommendation to approve to City Council, however, if the City Planning Commission denied the request, it becomes an appeal to City Council.

Commissioner Cecil questioned whether specific zoning alternatives, such as Mixed-Use Transition (MX-T), might be more appropriate given the site's adjacency to a school and low-density neighborhoods. Ms. Stocker explained that MX-T is intended primarily for institutional or campus-transition areas such as Colorado College or UCCS and tends to allow greater heights than MX-M. MX-N allows only low-intensity neighborhood uses and would constitute spot zoning at this location. She added that MX-M provides continuity with the mixed-use zoning immediately to the south and was consistent with the area's zoning pattern.

Commissioner Willoughby asked when parkland dedication or fees in lieu are required and where does that fee go. Ms. Stocker said those funds might be used in the future by the Parks Department to purchase Parkland and typically sites smaller than 20 acres do fees in lieu as it becomes difficult to accommodate the applicant's project and parkland on the same site.

Commissioner Robbins disclosed familiarity with one of the members of the public from the Korean Baptist Church that submitted their comments in opposition. Commissioner Robbins said has no financial benefit from this project.

**Applicant's Presentation**

Jennifer Shagin, Kimley-Horn, presented on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Shagin reviewed the site's history, including prior office entitlements and the market transition since the Briargate Master Plan. She explained the proposed MX-M zone as a continuation of zoning to the south and described the intent to develop attached multifamily residential housing consistent with PlanCOS goals for varied housing types.

Ms. Shagin outlined stormwater plans, the Skyline Trail connection, and traffic improvements, including required turn lanes and striping. The project's traffic study reported that office development under existing zoning would generate significantly more trips than the proposed residential use. Additional school-hour counts showed pickup queues spilling into public streets, and the report recommended the school and City work together to keep queues on-site.

Andrew Ritter, Blackburn Communities, summarized the developer's operational practices, tenant screening, and intentions to create a well-managed residential community. He confirmed that the maximum density permitted under MX-M, 236 units, would define the project's limit.

**Public Comment**

Amanda DeMarco, Apartment Association of Southern Colorado, stated her support for the multifamily proposal. She emphasized the region's documented housing shortage and argued that it is inconsistent for the community to acknowledge the need for homes while opposing most residential projects that reach the public hearing stage. She described the project as infill on a vacant parcel already served by major arterials and utilities, and she noted that City staff found the rezoning and land-use plan consistent with the review criteria and PlanCOS goals. Ms. DeMarco addressed concerns raised by residents about student safety and crime, asserting that professionally managed apartment communities use screening and background checks that are often more rigorous than in the for-sale housing market. She concluded that the development would expand housing choice, support the workforce, reduce sprawl, and make productive use of an underutilized site.

Jill Gaebler, Executive Director of the Pikes Peak Housing Network,

voiced support for the rezoning and land use plan. She stated that the area is dominated by single family homes and lacks sufficient rental housing for lower and moderate income households, including teachers, health care workers, military families, and service sector employees. Ms. Gaebler explained that rising home prices have outpaced incomes, pushing the average age of first-time home buyers upward and increasing the need for rental options. She argued that the proposed apartments would generate less traffic than office uses allowed under current zoning and would allow families to walk to the nearby school, reducing car trips. She added that the project aligns with PlanCOS by promoting infill, supporting economic development, and bringing a vacant parcel into productive use.

Barbara Voget ceded time to Allison Flannery, who spoke in opposition of this item and described past experiences with natural disasters and evacuations and expressed deep concern that adding approximately 236 apartments and their vehicles to Springcrest Road would endanger residents during an emergency. She emphasized that her neighborhood has only one viable exit and recounted the mobility limitations of elderly and disabled neighbors who would be among the last to evacuate. Ms. Flannery argued that an apartment complex would add hundreds of cars to an already strained evacuation route and stated that approving the rezoning would put lives at risk.

Patricia Peveto ceded time to Jacqueline Peveto, who spoke in opposition and focused on traffic impacts and roadway limitations. She stated that the surrounding neighborhoods have only two access routes and that Springcrest already experiences congestion from school traffic. She argued that residents of the proposed development would likely use Otero Avenue to avoid delays, although it is a county road not designed for higher volumes. Ms. Peveto identified safety issues posed by the proposed right-in/right-out access on Voyager and stated that the short distance between intersections would create weaving and merging conflicts, worsening existing congestion. She also argued that the traffic study failed to account for actual gridlock during school pickup times. She further expressed concern that the developer's suggested fire-evacuation plan, which relied on shelter-in-place for existing residents, was unacceptable and showed disregard for current neighbors.

Richard Davidson and Gigi Greer ceded time to Ariane Peveto, who argued that the MX-M zoning district is too intense for the area and does not meet the Unified Development Code's intent for emerging

activity centers. She stated that the surrounding context includes rural residential, churches, and the school, not mixed-use commercial areas. She emphasized that the project would not provide meaningful pedestrian connections for the existing neighborhood and that bus service is not realistically accessible. Ms. Peveto also asserted that alternative zoning categories, such as mixed-use transition (MX-T) or mixed-use neighborhood (MX-N), would have been more appropriate and compatible. She expressed concern that approving MX-M could open the door to future commercial or more intense uses incompatible with the school and the surrounding residential areas.

Becky Francione ceded time to Nancy Carsten stated that traffic through the Pine Woods neighborhood is already unsafe, with nonresidents using local roads as cut-throughs. She described dangerous turning movements from Voyager and expressed concern that the development would bring more vehicles onto Springcrest and Otero, worsening existing congestion and safety problems. Ms. Carsten also raised safety concerns about having a four or five-story apartment complex next to an elementary school, citing risks related to visibility from balconies, inadequate vetting of visitors, and opportunities for harmful behavior. She asked the Commission to prioritize community and child safety over developer interests.

Cassie Carrigan ceded time to Dr. Sarah Pramanik, security engineering expert, opposed the rezoning on the grounds of student safety, traffic, and the shifting of burdens onto residents and the school. She stated that the development would introduce elevated vantage points overlooking the school playground and increase risks of voyeurism, unauthorized photography, and misuse of images through modern technology. She objected to the developer's suggestion that the school should modify its traffic operations to compensate for project impacts and argued that it was inappropriate for existing institutions to bear the burden of accommodating a private development. Dr. Pramanik also raised concerns about proximity to I-25 as a trafficking corridor and stated that higher-density housing brings increased transiency and additional safety concerns.

Patricia Krueger ceded time to Elizabeth Gilbert, a parent with children at TCA, opposed the project due to incompatibility with PlanCOS, school security risks, and market oversupply of apartments. She stated that school-safety best practices emphasize perimeter protection and that a tall building overlooking school grounds conflicts with established guidelines on surveillance risks. Ms. Gilbert cited a fatal incident

involving a tenant at another property operated by the developer to argue that screening cannot eliminate safety issues. She also pointed to rising vacancy rates in nearby multifamily communities as evidence that the development is not needed and expressed concern about the long-term risk of future redevelopment under MX-M zoning.

Diane Myers ceded time to Elissa Tipps, who spoke on behalf of parents and teachers, expressed concern about health risks from wind-blown construction dust affecting students who spend significant time outdoors. She stated that the area experiences frequent high-wind events, which could carry debris and contaminants onto school grounds during years-long construction. Ms. Tipps also addressed the danger of additional traffic at the already congested Voyager/Briargate/Springcrest area and asserted that the proposed right-in/right-out access would worsen safety issues. She argued that the zoning was originally set appropriately to avoid these hazards and asked the Commission not to rezone the land.

Hillary Jeanjacquet ceded time to David Wahl, a Springcrest resident of 27 years, who argued that the neighborhood's only viable access road is already strained and that adding hundreds of residents would "bottle-cap" the community by overwhelming Springcrest Road. He noted that Otero is also becoming limited due to another apartment project and that the rezoning would double traffic volumes. Mr. Wahl expressed concern about emergency vehicle access and for traffic during school pickup times. He also objected to five-story buildings overshadowing the school and said the project would eliminate the "margin of safety" his neighborhood currently has.

KC Voget ceded time to Lance Miller, who presented an opposition argument based on the UDC criteria for rezoning and land-use plans. He stated that the area is an established neighborhood and that the proposal does not meet compatibility or public-interest standards. He argued that cumulative developments, including another large project at the end of Otero, would overwhelm local infrastructure. Mr. Miller presented renderings to illustrate how the building massing would dominate the school's field and stated that MX-M would allow too intense a use for a small parcel next to a low-density neighborhood and elementary school.

Annie Han ceded time to Patricia Gould, who opposed the proposal as a grandparent who regularly drives through the area and experiences congestion at Voyager and Springcrest. She stated that adding

hundreds of residents would cause unsafe traffic conditions at times when students are present. Ms. Gould warned about security risks posed by balconies overlooking the playground, including possible active-shooter scenarios. She argued that the density and height were inconsistent with the neighborhood and suggested that open space or low-intensity use would be more appropriate.

Madeline Han, school student, expressed fear of additional traffic and discomfort being watched while playing.

Ellie Han, school student, said she worries they would not enjoy the sun because it will all be shaded by the apartments.

Hannah Adams, school student, said she would not like strangers looking out from their windows into the school.

Millie Gearhart, school student, said she and her classmates spend significant time outside and would not feel safe with people looking at them. She is also concerned about what could happen when they are walking to and from school.

Lydia Gearhart, school student, expressed concerns about inappropriate behavior, smoking, and loss of mountain views.

Steve Luna, area resident, TCA students' father, said the proposal is not compatible with the neighborhood, since all the surrounding properties do not exceed two stories. He said zoning categories such as OC MX Neighborhood or R-Flex Low would provide a more reasonable transition. He said height should be limited to two-story homes or similarly low-scale housing. Mr. Luna also raised traffic and safety concerns, stating that the proposed right-in/right-out access would worsen school-hour merging conflicts and that allowing four- or five-story apartments overlooking the elementary school playground would pose unacceptable security risks.

Brandi Henderson opposed the rezoning and raised concerns about marijuana smoke from legal personal use drifting toward the school due to prevailing winds. She also argued that the developer's description of the units as "luxury housing" contradicts the stated goal of providing affordable options and stated that such units are not accessible to the average household.

Rebecca Hernandez, a Pine Woods resident, opposed the project due

to increased congestion on the community's single access road, emergency evacuation concerns, and the proximity of a tall apartment building to an elementary school. She stated that the project is incompatible with the character of the surrounding single-family neighborhoods and argued that the Voyager corridor already has added too many apartments.

Ilgie Watkins stated that she frequently walks in the neighborhood and is concerned about safety on Otero and Springcrest. She argued that residents deserve the same privacy buffer that city facilities have around them. She expressed doubt that the apartments would remain luxury units and stated that the zoning could allow undesirable uses if the current project failed. Ms. Watkins encouraged the commission to prioritize people over revenue.

John Percell, a parent of two TCA students, argued that higher population density correlates with increased crime risk and that the development would create opportunities for exploitation or harm to children due to direct visual access from balconies. He stated that screening and background checks cannot eliminate risks posed by visitors or future occupants. Mr. Percell said the project is inappropriate land use adjacent to an elementary school.

Christina Winger mentioned statistics on mental-health trends and violent incidents nationwide and argued that placing a five-story building 15 feet from the playground would create unacceptable safety risks. She described the number of students and staff regularly outdoors and stated that the project would give too many potential vantage points overlooking children. Winger asked the Commission not to prioritize developer interests over student safety.

Jack Stewart, a nearby resident, stated that he would not introduce new arguments but questioned whether the concerns raised by the community would have any real effect on the outcome. He expressed skepticism about the process, asking whether the Planning Commission or those who appointed its members were influenced by developers and suggesting that approval of the rezoning might already be predetermined. He concluded by asking whether the extensive opposition presented by residents would genuinely be considered.

Jeff Willsey, a resident of Bramblwood Lane, opposed the rezoning due to traffic congestion, safety concerns, and the developer's reliance on the school and residents to mitigate impacts. He stated that

multifamily housing should be in walkable, high-density, mixed-use areas, not in an isolated pocket beside single-family homes and a school.

#### Applicant's Rebuttal

Mr. Ritter thanked the public for their comments.

Jeff Plank, Traffic Engineer, addressed congestion concerns by explaining that the proposed multifamily project would generate far fewer trips than the office development already permitted under existing Business Park zoning. He noted that, in response to community concerns, additional school-hour counts were conducted and showed that congestion was primarily caused by pickup queues spilling into the roadway from the school's site. Mr. Plank stated that this issue could be resolved through operational changes by the school to keep queues on campus, rather than through major roadway modifications. He added that the project's required improvements, such as striping adjustments, turn-lane enhancements, and a right-in/right-out access on Voyager, would help manage traffic flow and reduce conflict points. Overall, he maintained that the apartments would have a lower peak traffic impact than office use and would not exceed the capacity assumptions of the City's traffic standards. The applicant reiterated its willingness to work with the City and neighborhood.

Mr. Ritter emphasized that safety, particularly school safety, was also a serious concern for the development team. He stated that their company hires professional property-management firms and requires criminal background checks, credit checks, and income verification for all prospective residents. Mr. Ritter noted that while no system is perfect, these procedures are more rigorous than those applied to single-family homeownership or informal rental arrangements and help maintain a safe residential environment.

Mr. Ritter added that single-family neighborhoods are not inherently safer, as individuals who pass background checks can still engage in harmful behavior, and visitors to any home or rental are not subject to screening. He argued that the multifamily product, given its management structure, allows for more consistent oversight than other allowable land-use categories under BP zoning, which could include office, retail, or other commercial uses with uncontrolled public access.

Mr. Ritter then addressed comments raised about the prior rezoning request on the church property to the north. He stated that the earlier case differed materially because that site lacked access to Voyager Parkway and relied solely on Springcrest Road and Otero Avenue. In contrast, he explained, the current proposal includes a right-in/right-out access directly to Voyager, which significantly reduces traffic impacts on Springcrest, a key concern noted by both staff and residents.

Mr. Ritter reiterated that the existing BP zoning already allows a 68-foot-tall structure by right, whereas the MX-M rezoning would reduce the maximum height to 50 feet. He emphasized that the development proposes substantially less square footage and far fewer peak-hour trips than an office building built under existing entitlements. He also addressed market-demand concerns, stating that vacancy has dropped sharply in Colorado Springs in the last two years and that the region continues to experience housing shortages projected to worsen. Mr. Ritter said apartment construction decreased significantly from 2024 to 2026, and demand is projected to outpace supply again.

Ms. Shagin added a brief statement addressing PlanCOS. She noted that the property lies within an “area of change,” meaning the City’s long-range planning framework anticipates redevelopment and infill. She stated that the proposed land-use plan aligns with PlanCOS goals regarding infill development, housing diversity, and reinvestment in existing transportation corridors. Ms. Shagin reiterated that the project transitions appropriately from high-intensity uses along Voyager to lower-intensity residential areas to the north and east.

#### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Engel asked how residents would reach I-25. Ms. Shagin replied that drivers would travel from Springcrest to Voyager Parkway, then to either the InterQuest Parkway or Briargate Parkway I-25 interchanges. Commissioner Engel next asked about the differing unit numbers shown in earlier materials, noting references to both 250 and 236 units. Mr. Ritter explained that early conceptual plans included 250 units, but under MX-M zoning the maximum allowed was 236 units, which is now the limit. Commissioner Engel also asked whether the applicant could meet parking requirements for 236 units; Mr. Ritter confirmed that they could.

Commissioner Engel questioned the assumption that 80% of residents would travel south in the morning. Mr. Plank responded that the 80% figure applied specifically to morning peak commuting patterns. He explained that returning residents would primarily enter via the Voyager right-in/right-out

rather than Springcrest, resulting in no net increase in afternoon traffic at that intersection.

Commissioner Engel ultimately stated that the additional review step, requiring the development plan to return for Commission approval, helped address his concerns. Commissioner Engel expressed support for the application and noted that the change from BP to MX-M would not intensify traffic or operational impacts in a way that violated review criteria. Commissioner Engel stated that the project met approval standards and did not express concerns requiring conditions beyond those proposed by other commissioners.

Commissioner Cecil asked for clarification from City Traffic Engineering about whether the two proposed access points, the right-in/right-out on Voyager Parkway and the full-movement intersection on Springcrest Road, were sufficient to manage traffic generated by the development. Commissioner Cecil also asked whether any mitigation measures had been recommended to manage peak-hour school congestion. Commissioner Cecil inquired specifically about potential pedestrian-conflict points, whether bus service or walking routes were relevant, and whether the roadway design supported safe circulation for both residents and school operations.

Commissioner Cecil asked whether certain MX-M uses, like bars, adult retail, or marijuana-related businesses, would already be prohibited because of separation requirements from schools. Ms. Stocker confirmed that marijuana businesses are prohibited within 1,000 feet of a school and that various adult-oriented uses carry similar separation requirements. She added that several other code layers, such as traffic, fire, and building code, further restrict uses, even if technically listed within MX-M.

Commissioner Cecil asked the applicant whether balconies could be eliminated on the school-facing side of the building or whether building orientation could be shifted to reduce visual exposure. Mr. Ritter responded that the site suffers from multiple constraints, including major drainage and sewer easements, which prevent reorienting buildings or pushing them further west. He stated that balconies are currently planned on the school-facing sides but noted that the team had already stepped down the closest building from five stories to four based on public feedback.

Commissioner Cecil stated that she could not support approval without conditions restricting incompatible uses. Commissioner Cecil emphasized concerns about building height transitions, safety considerations, and long-term effects of opening the door to more intense uses if the development were not built as proposed.

Commissioner Slattery shared a detailed comparison between the proposed MX-M zoning and the existing Business Park (BP) zoning, noting that BP currently allows several uses that could be more disruptive or hazardous near a school, including gas stations, truck terminals, hazardous-material uses, and various high-traffic commercial activities. Commissioner Slattery noted that the Master Plan historically envisioned high-intensity employment uses at this location and argued that mid-scale residential could be less impactful than a built-out office park.

Commissioner Slattery expressed concerns about compatibility and advocated for restricting specific MX-M uses such as heavy commercial/industrial operations, adult-oriented businesses, marijuana-related uses, and liquor sales. Commissioner Slattery also stated that although MX-M was not perfect, a rezoning with clearly defined use restrictions would better protect the school and neighborhood than leaving BP intact. Commissioner Slattery further recommended that the future development plan come back to the Planning Commission for full public review.

Commissioner Slattery asked how the right-in/right-out driveway would be striped to reduce weaving conflicts in the existing acceleration/deceleration lane. Mr. Frisbie explained that the future striped design would “force the lane drop” at the development driveway-meaning drivers exiting Briargate Parkway northbound would have to merge into the through-lane before the apartment driveway, eliminating conflict with vehicles entering from the right-in/right-out. Conversely, vehicles exiting the development would be forced to merge into Voyager traffic before reaching Springcrest. Frisby emphasized that detailed striping review would occur at the development plan.

Commissioner Slattery asked City Traffic Engineering whether the development would trigger any requirement to bring Springcrest Road up to city standards or add sidewalks. Mr. Frisbie explained that the development would be required to construct curb, gutter, and sidewalk only along the segment directly adjacent to the project. He noted that Springcrest east of Otero is a county road, and although the City has sidewalk-gap programs, there are no current plans to reconstruct the remainder. Commissioner Slattery also asked whether U-turn restrictions at Springcrest should be considered. Mr. Frisbie answered that current traffic data does not show a collision pattern requiring U-turn prohibitions, but such measures could be evaluated during the development-plan stage if concerns persisted.

Commissioner Robbins stated that he was uncomfortable with the proposal

overall, describing the surrounding area as constrained by narrow roadways originally configured under county standards. Commissioner Robbins expressed concern that approving multifamily development could exacerbate traffic issues, school congestion, and emergency-access limitations. Commissioner Robbins stated that he believed the project imposed unreasonable burdens on existing residents and schools and felt that the site was not appropriate for higher-density development.

Commissioner Willoughby asked whether new hydrants would be required. Steve Smith, Colorado Springs Fire Department, said hydrant requirements would be determined during development-plan review but at least one hydrant would likely be necessary. Commissioner Willoughby then asked whether emergency evacuations posed a concern. Mr. Smith explained that the fire code regulates emergency access, not evacuation, and confirmed that with two access points the development meets fire code.

Commissioner Willoughby further asked the Police Department whether rising crime or apartment-related safety concerns applied. Deputy Chief Doug Traynor responded that the area currently reports low crime rates and that CSPD could not conclude that multifamily housing inherently increases crime relative to other uses.

Commissioner Willoughby acknowledged the community's strong concerns but noted that BP zoning today already permits several uses that would generate higher traffic or present greater safety risks than multifamily residential. Commissioner Willoughby cited examples such as fuel stations, parking structures, and certain industrial or commercial activities that could be developed by right without public hearings. Commissioner Willoughby also pointed out that apartments do not inherently pose higher risks than other residential forms, and that passive surveillance from nearby residences can sometimes increase safety rather than reduce it. Commissioner Willoughby stated that the key concerns could be addressed through use restrictions and additional scrutiny at the development-plan stage. Commissioner Willoughby supported a requirement to have the development plan return to the Planning Commission and favored prohibiting incompatible MX-M uses.

Commissioner Case spoke in favor of relying on City traffic engineers, fire, and police, emphasizing that multiple reviewing agencies did not find technical deficiencies in the application. Commissioner Case stated that the remaining concerns, particularly detailed traffic design and circulation, would be more appropriately addressed during the development-plan stage. Commissioner Case supported requiring the development plan to return to the Commission and agreed that some MX-M uses should be

excluded to ensure compatibility with the school and surrounding neighborhoods.

Commissioner Case asked whether the limited roadway network into the county enclave created hydrant or supply challenges. Mr. Smith replied that he was not familiar enough with water-supply specifics in that area to provide a definitive answer but confirmed the city-side infrastructure serving the development would follow fire-code requirements.

Commissioner Willoughby later asked the applicant whether they had considered offering housing incentives for teachers or school staff. Mr. Ritter replied that the company had provided such programs in other cities and would consider that opportunity here. He reiterated that the development would undergo full screening and professional management.

Commissioner Cecil asked Mr. Walker whether requiring the development plan to return to the Planning Commission for approval would create administrative issues. Mr. Walker stated that while the development plan could be referred or appealed regardless, requiring it to return was permissible, though it may extend scheduling. Walker emphasized that the development-plan stage contains compatibility criteria and is the appropriate point to resolve detailed design issues such as building massing, screening, access configuration, and adjacency to the school.

**Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Commissioner Willoughby, that this Ordinance be accepted Recommend approval to City Council of the zone change of 7.93 acres from BP/cr/HR/AF-O (Business Park with Conditions of Record, High-Rise Overlay, and the United States Air Force Academy Overlay) to MX-M/AF-O (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with the United States Air Force Academy Overlay) based upon the findings that the request complies with the criteria for a Zoning Map Amendment set forth in City Code Section 7.5.704. with conditions of record prohibiting the uses listed under the subcategories of Marijuana-Related Services, Heavy Commercial, Storage, and Industry; Industrial Hemp; Natural Medicine; and the following specific uses adult retail and liquor sales.**

**The motion passed by a vote of**

**Aye:** 9 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby, Commissioner Case and Commissioner Engel

- 9.C.** [LUPL-25-001](#) Establishment of the Briargate/Voyager Multi-Family Land Use Plan for proposed multi-family residential consisting of 7.93 acres located at 1625 Springcrest Road.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Located in Council District 2

Presenter:

Allison Stocker, Senior Planner, Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, Planning Department

**Attachments:** [7.5.514 LAND USE PLAN](#)

**Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Commissioner Willoughby, to recommend approval to City Council of the Briargate/Voyager Multi-Family Land Use Plan based upon the finding that the proposal complies with the review criteria for the Land Use Plans set forth in City Code Section 7.5.514. with a condition of approval requiring the future development plan application to be reviewed and approved by Planning Commission.  
The motion passed by a vote of 8-1.**

**Aye:** 8 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby, Commissioner Case and Commissioner Engel

**No:** 1 - Commissioner Robbins