




# City of Colorado Springs



## Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

*Those who wish to join/comment during the meeting by phone should wait to be admitted into the meeting after calling in. For those who participate by calling in, you will be muted upon entry to the meeting.*

*Once an item has been heard, the Chair will open the public portion of the hearing for those who wish to comment. There is a three (3) minute time limit for each person. In order to speak, you must press \*6 on your phone to unmute yourself.*

---

Thursday, April 30, 2020

8:30 AM

Council Chambers

---

### Kettle Creek North

- 6.B. [CPC PUZ 19-00090](#) Ordinance No. 20-36 amending the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs relating to 61.71 acres located southeast of Powers Blvd and Highway 83 from A (Agriculture) to PUD (Planned Unit Development: 35-foot maximum height, single-family detached units, maximum density of 4.0 du/ac)

(Quasi-Judicial)

Related File: CPC PUP 19-00091

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director

**Staff presentation:**

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

**Applicant Presentation:**

John Maynard, N.E.S., representing Kettle Creek North, presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project.

**Questions:**

Commissioner Rickett asked what was the density for North Fork. Ms. Van Nimwegen stated there are two areas of North Fork and they both have different densities. The main density that is south of the Kettle Creek North subdivision has a gross density of 3.6 dwelling units per acre. The area that is closest to/adjacent to Howells with the larger lots has a gross density of 1.92 dwelling

units per acre. The area which is closest to Kettle Creek north has 3.6, consistent between the three to four proposed density range.

Commissioner Rickett asked for a walk through of the traffic study. Mr. Maynard said the study is reviewed by City Traffic and the parameters of that study are established by the City Traffic Department. When an area is studied, it is required that adjacent vacant properties be assigned a traffic number and included in the traffic study as part of the background traffic. The timing of the background traffic is variable depending on the traffic analysis, but in the case of North Fork, it was included as the urban density is similar to what's proposed.

**Supporters:**

None.

**Opponents:**

Louellen Welsh, resident on Howells Road

- Would be supportive of the development if modifications were made:
  - Traffic is a real issue already
  - A change to the Briargate Master Plan is needed to lower the density rate at three maximum
  - Something has to be done so the impact of the traffic is not as bad

Duncan McNabb, resident north of the proposed site

- Not opposed to development of the area, but has concerns with the proposal.
  - Major concern is the growth in the area, and mitigation of potential traffic issues at Old Ranch Road
  - Residents have not been able to review the traffic report
  - Wants to know how the City uses the contracted traffic report
  - Would have liked to have the traffic issues addressed at another town hall before the Planning Commission meeting
  - Believes there are other alternative to create additional roads for entry and exit to support the Kettle Creek development
  - Lack of infrastructure is a quality of life issue
- Recommended postponement of the development until traffic issues are resolved, and would like all the raised concerns from public meetings to be addressed before approval.

Samuel Bryant, lives in North Fork, and is opposed due to the following:

- Kettle Creek development has a serious safety issue for egress
  - No secondary exit to this development making an evacuation dangerous

- Traffic report says 3200 cars going in and out of one road, Thunder Mountain, daily
- With the high school right there, several times last year during normal school hours, when trying to exit from North Fork, you are waiting three to five minutes at a stop sign by the high school because the high schoolers are coming in to the school. That's a tremendous amount of time with just six cars ahead of you, but when adding 188 cars egressing Kettle Creek during rush hour, it's going to be a serious issue
- A secondary exit is needed
- Applicant has not attempted to work with the county to get an access road to Howells Road, which is next to North Fork

Judith von Ahlefeldt

- Concerned about open space on the north side of town, and only using minimum requirements for the Preble's jumping mouse habitat
- There needs to be space for animals to move
- Need to balance open space and parks better and plan them ahead rather than trying to retrofit them
- Asked to postpone this
- Agrees that this is a safety issue and is concerned about a fire

**Questions of Staff:**

Todd Frisbie, City Traffic, said they did require the applicant to do a traffic study and that they worked extensively with the applicant's consultant. Mr. Frisbie said they required the consultant to update the traffic counts in the area because the counts in the initial studies were a little dated. Mr. Frisbie went on to explain about the traffic reports and how the level of service (LOS) works.

Commissioner Rickett asked for an example of a level of service. Mr. Frisbie gave the example of a level of service F where you sit through multiple cycles of a traffic signal. Mr. Frisbie referenced the intersection of Austin Bluffs and Woodman and how that would be a LOS D where you might sit through a cycle or two, but you generally get through the intersection relatively easy.

Mr. Frisbie said by the City's analysis, the range of delay that we use to define a LOS D, is 35 to 55 seconds per vehicle.

Commissioner Rickett asked if there had been consideration on adjusting this intersection, and if there is an opportunity to pick up the road that is further to the east.

Mr. Frisbie said Traffic Engineering can adjust signal timing to make that traffic

movement. In terms of traffic, the Union connection will be a reliever of some of that traffic volume, but North Fork and Kettle Creek all comes down to Old Ranch Road and there are no plans for connection to 83 or Powers.

Commissioner Rickett asked the developer if connecting Howells Road was a possibility. Mr. Maynard explained that Howells Road is El Paso County's jurisdiction and it is a dirt road. During the annexation process, it was discussed and a commitment was made to the county residents who live on Howells Road that a connection would not be made. During the neighborhood meetings for this project, the residents on Howells Road were adamant that there not be that connection to Howells Road. Mr. Maynard said they have not spoken to the county about a connection or what the requirements would be.

Mr. Wysocki added that a connection to Howells Road would yield very minimal improvements to trip distribution generated within Kettle Creek and North Fork assuming the majority of the residents would travel to the west and to the south. The effort of building the connecting road to Howells Road through the very sensitive land and the improvements to Howell Road would really yield very minimal improvements to the other intersections in question.

Mr. Wysocki went on to say the level of service D is really only during the a.m. peak hour when Pine Creek high school is starting. The majority of the day is not a level of service D. Mr. Frisbie confirmed and added the intersection of Old Ranch Road and Thunder Mountain Avenue operates at a level of service C, and that's why the possibility of having the high school start at a later time out of the peak time would benefit that intersection.

Commissioner Almy asked about the emergency planning aspects from a traffic standpoint. Mr. Frisbie said in the course of review, the everyday scenario is evaluated and he would defer that to the fire department and their review.

Fire Protection Engineer, Steve Smith with the Colorado Springs Fire Department said they did an analysis on emergency response times. Mr. Smith said the area is just outside the standards of coverage. The standards of coverage are eight minutes for the first responding company 90% of the time, and then 12 minutes for a full effective force, which is two engines, two trucks 90% of the time. That point is just outside these standards of coverage, so Kettle Creek would be outside of that response time. Mr. Smith said they did request the connection to Howells Road, and as Mr. Maynard previously mentioned it wasn't desired by the county and wasn't looked upon as an option. Evacuations are not analyzed, only response times into those neighborhoods.

**Rebuttal:**

Mr. Maynard addressed the traffic and fire safety:

- School district was approached to see if they were amenable to having an emergency access to Howells Road through their elementary school site and their answer was no
- Mr. Maynard said their traffic consultant and he believed the city's traffic engineering requested a staggered start time for Pine Creek High School, but there has been no commitment from the school

Mr. Maynard said they are consistent with the master plan and believe this subdivision and zoning action should be approved.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Commissioner Almy said in general he is in favor of the project and thinks it will be a great place to live, but is also sensitive to the traffic patterns in the community. Commissioner Almy said he visited the site and said you have to go through a maze to get there. Commissioner Almy said he planned to recommend approval; however, he was concerned that the community needs to understand what emergency planning effects there are as part of this to alleviate the community's concerns.

Commissioner Rickett concurred with Commissioner Almy in that traffic in that area is difficult at times. Commissioner Rickett is in support of the project but requested the developer and the county have another conversation to see if they could extend the road to the east to be able to give a second exit out of the neighborhood in the event of emergencies.

Commissioner Wilson agreed with Commissioner Rickett but thought if there was no opportunity for any new egress for safety purposes that maybe a reduction in the housing density should be looked at.

Commissioner McMurray said looking at this project with the nature of the impacts to the neighborhood and based on the approval criteria for concept plans and zone changes, he would not be voting in favor of this project.

**Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Vice Chair Hente, to recommend approval to City Council the rezone of 61.71 acres from A (Agriculture) to PUD (Planned Unit Development: 35-foot maximum height, single-family detached units, maximum density of 4.0 dwelling units per acre), based upon the findings that the change of zoning request complies with the three (3) criteria for granting of zone changes as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.603(B), as well as the criteria for establishment of a PUD zone district as set for in City Code Section 7.3.603. The motion passed by a vote of 7:1:1:0**

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

**No:** 1 - Commissioner McMurray

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Raughton

- 6.C.** [CPC PUP 19-00091](#) The Kettle Creek North Concept Plan for a single-family residential development with density between three and four dwelling units per acre, generally located south and east of the Powers Boulevard and Highway 83 intersection.

(Quasi-Judicial)

Related File: CPC PUZ 19-00090

Presenter:

Hannah Van Nimwegen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Peter Wysocki, Planning and Community Development Director

**Motion by Commissioner Rickett, seconded by Vice Chair Hente, to recommend approval to City Council the concept plan for Kettle Creek North based upon the findings that the concept plan complies with the review criteria for concept plans as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.501(E) and criteria for PUD concept plans set forth in City Code Section 7.3.605. The motion passed by a vote of 7:1:1:0**

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

**No:** 1 - Commissioner McMurray

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Raughton