



City of Colorado Springs

Regional Development
Center (Hearing Room)
2880 International Circle

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

9:00 AM

2880 International Cir., 2nd Floor, Hearing Room

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Present: 7 - Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

2. Changes to Agenda/Postponements

3. Communications

Kenneth Casey - City Planning Commission Chair

Kevin Walker - Planning Director

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, said their budget proposal to City Council has been finalized and they are trying to keep all positions funded. He said he will provide the Board with updates.

Mr. Walker said City Council will appoint vacant positions for a member and an alternate member of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Walker said some edits are still being made to the Rules and Procedures and once completed they will be brought forward for approval.

Mr. Walker said in September they had the lowest number of applications submitted in the last five years, and yesterday they had one of the highest. He said these include development reviews and the items presented to the Commission.

4. Approval of the Minutes

4.A. [CPC 2716](#) Minutes for the September 10, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting.

Presenter:

Kenneth Casey, City Planning Commission Chair

Attachments: [CPC Minutes 9.10.25 Draft](#)

Motion by Commissioner Hensler, seconded by Commissioner Cecil, to postpone the approval of the Minutes for the September 10, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting, to the November 12, 2025 meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-0-1.

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

5. Consent Calendar

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

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

35 E Ramona Rezoning

- 5.A.** [ZONE-25-0012](#) An ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 14,553 square feet located at 35 East Ramona Avenue from R-5/SS-O (Multi-Family High with Streamside Overlay) to MX-M/cr/SS-O (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with Condition of Record and Streamside Overlay). (1st Reading and setting the public hearing for November 25, 2025). (Quasi-Judicial)

Related Files: None
Council District # 3

Presenter:
William Gray, Senior Planner, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Ordinance 35 E Ramona Rezoning](#)
[Staff Report 35 E Ramona Rezoning WEG Final V2](#)
[Land Use Plan 35 E Ramona Rezoning Revised](#)
[Attachment 1-Zoning Map](#)
[Attachment 2-Ordinance No. 80-171](#)
[Attachment 3-Ivywild Addition No 1](#)
[Attachment 4-Context Map](#)
[Attachment 5-Project Statement](#)
[Attachment 6-Land Use Plan](#)
[Attachment 7-Legal Description and Drawing](#)
[Attachment 8-Vicinity Map](#)
[35 E Ramona Rezoning CC Staff Presentation WEG](#)

Conditional Use for a Retail Marijuana Products Manufacturer

- 5.B. [CUDP-25-00](#)
[15](#) A Conditional Use to allow Retail Marijuana Products Manufacturing in the MX-M (Mixed-Use Medium Scale) zone district consisting of 0.12 acres located at 2119 W Colorado Avenue. (Quasi-Judicial)

Council District #3

Presenter:

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

Attachments: [Staff Report for CUDP-25-0015](#)
[Attachment 3 - Land Use Statement](#)
[Attachment 1 - Ordinance 25-10](#)
[Attachment 2A - Public Comment](#)
[Attachment 2B - Response to Public Comment](#)

BLR 50A Park Rezone

- 5.C. [ZONE-25-00](#)
[19](#) An ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to 6.07 acres located northeast of Stetson Hills Boulevard and Last Chance Drive from PDZ/AP-O/SS-O (Planned Development Zone District with Airport and Streamside Overlays) to PK/AP-O (Public Park with Airport Overlay). (1st Reading and setting the public hearing date for November 25, 2025) (Quasi-Judicial)

Related Files: ZONE-25-0019
Council District #6

Presenter:

Austin Cooper, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Ordinance](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Attachment 1 - Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 2 - Land Use Statement](#)

[Attachment 3 - Exhibits A & B](#)

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

[BLR 50A Park Rezone - Staff Presentation](#)

980 Dublin Rezone

- 5.D. [ZONE-25-0016](#) An ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to approximately 3.41 acres located northeast of Dublin Boulevard and Vincent Drive from PF/SS-O/AF-O (Public Facilities with Streamside and United States Air Force Academy Overlays) to MX-M/SS-O/AF-O (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with Streamside and United States Air Force Academy Overlays). (Quasi-Judicial)
(1st Reading and setting the public hearing date for November 25, 2025)

Related Files: ZONE-25-0016

Council District #1

Presenter:

Austin Cooper, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Ordinance](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Attachment 1 - Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 2 - Land Use Statement](#)

[Attachment 3 - Public Comments](#)

[Attachment 4 - Public Comment Response Letter](#)

[Attachment 5 - Exhibit A](#)

[Attachment 6 - Exhibit B](#)

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

[980 Dublin Rezone - Staff Presentation](#)

6. Items Called Off Consent Calendar

7. Unfinished Business

8. New Business

Woodmen East Commercial Filing No. 1

- 8.A. [CUDP-22-0008](#) A Conditional Use Development Plan to allow a 362-unit residential multi-family dwelling (apartments) development and ancillary site improvements in the MX-M/AP-O (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with Airport Overlay) zone district consisting of 14.11 acres located at the southeast corner of East Woodmen Road and Mohawk Road. (Quasi-Judicial).

Council District # 6

Presenter:

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report - Woodmen East Commercial Multi-Family](#)

[Attachment 1 - Concept Plan](#)

[Attachment 2 - Public Comment](#)

[Attachment 3 - Conditional Use Development Plan](#)

[Attachment 4 - Project Statement](#)

[7.5.704 Conditional Use Review](#)

[7.5.502.E Development Plan Review](#)

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor, presented the Conditional Use Development Plan to allow a 362-unit residential multi-family dwelling (apartments) development and ancillary site improvements in the MX-M/AP-O (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with Airport Overlay) zone district consisting of 14.11 acres located at the southeast corner of East Woodmen Road and Mohawk Road. This project was reviewed under Chapter 7, and the previous zone was Planned Business Center (PBC). There were seven parcels identified in the concept plan, six for commercial use, and one for future multi-family with a density of 25 dwelling units per acre. Under Chapter 7 multi-family was a conditional use. There are four access points for this project, two of them are on a cul-de-sac to the north, and one is off Mohawk Road to the west. The proposed height will be 45 feet, where the current maximum allowed is 50 feet. Parking requirements have been met with surface parking and tucked in garages. Standard Notice was sent; two comments were received. Agency Review was made,

and all comments were addressed. This project is in compliance with PlanCOS and meets the review criteria in Chapter 7.

Applicant's presentation

Ted Featherstone, Sares Regis Group, representing the applicant, said their proposal is for a 362-unit multifamily residential development on a 16.35-acre site, part of the 31-acre Woodmen East Master Plan approved in 2022. He said the project aligns with the city's goal of promoting diverse housing types to meet the needs of residents across life stages and income levels. He said this multifamily project is located near Banning Lewis Ranch and adjacent to large single-family developments and is positioned as a necessary complement to the surrounding housing stock. Mr. Featherstone said the fastest-growing demographics in Colorado Springs, ages 25 to 34 and 65+, are more likely to rent apartments, reinforcing the relevance of the proposed development, that will also function as a transition between the residences at Banning Lewis and the commercial area in Woodmen Road. He said there is a 300-foot buffer with the homes in Banning Lewis, which is comprised of parking areas, storm water detention, right of way, vacant land under the power transmission lines and a pedestrian trail. Mr. Featherstone said the plans for the project have seven buildings and two amenity structures. He said 70% of units will be in elevator service buildings, with a higher ratio of internal covered parking, and larger floor plans, particularly among two and three-bedroom units. He said the proposal exceeds requirements for off-street parking and open space.

Mr. Featherstone said the project is being reviewed under Chapter 7 rather than the new Unified Development Code (UDC), because the initial submissions began in 2022, well before the UDC took effect, and the team had already progressed through multiple design iterations with staff guidance. He said although the plan has remained unchanged since 2023, final approval was delayed due to external factors, including the late completion of the final drainage report and the need to vacate a utility easement with CSU to get the final plat approval for the 31-acre master plan. Mr. Featherstone said these steps were necessary to align the development plan with the approved master plan and confirmed the project is fully compliant with PBC zoning and ensures sufficient roadway capacity.

Commissioners' Questions

Chair Casey asked who is improving Mohawk Road. Mr. Featherstone said the Master Developer is.

Chair Casey asked if there will be any improvements to the Mohawk and Woodmen intersection, like turning lanes or lights. Mr. Featherstone said there might be one more turning lane put at the intersection.

Chair Casey asked if Mohawk would connect to Golden Jubilee. Mr. Featherstone said it will connect as a dead-end, it will be an east-facing left-hand turn, with Golden Jubilee going east-west. He said Mohawk would not extend into Banning Lewis. Ms. Baxter said Golden Jubilee will be constructed further east through Percheron.

Chair Casey asked what the timing for the project is. Mr. Featherstone said they would like to start construction by this time next year, but it depends on finishing the construction drawings and getting the necessary permits.

Commissioner Slattery asked if Golden Jubilee would connect to Banning Lewis Parkway, so Mohawk is not the only path out. Ms. Baxter said that is correct.

Commissioner Slattery said this project meets the criteria, is a natural transition from commercial to single-family, and it has been established as a multi-family use, so she will be voting in favor of the application.

Commissioner Cecil said she agrees with Commissioner Slattery about the appropriateness of the transition and scale and asked if any of the units will be affordable. Mr. Featherstone said they would not.

Chair Casey said this project meets the criteria for conditional use and development plan.

Commissioner Hensler said she concurs with what was said and thanked the applicant for sticking with the application regardless of challenges with the process. Commissioner Hensler said there is a need for housing at all levels and types, and she will be in support of the project.

Commissioner Robbins said he also concurs and thinks this is a good project for those who cannot afford a single-family house, and it also supports growth. Commissioner Robbins said he will be in support.

**Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Commissioner Robbins, to approve the Conditional Use Development Plan based upon the finding that the request complies with the criteria as set forth in form City Code Chapter 7 Section 7.5.704 (Conditional Use) and Section 7.5.502.E (Development Plan).
The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-0-1.**

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

1210 Eagle Rock Rd Retaining Wall

- 8.B. [NVAR-25-0010](#) A Non-Use Variance to City Code Section 7.2.610.D.1.d to allow a fifteen (15) foot retaining wall within the Hillside Overlay where a maximum of four (4) feet is usually required located at 1210 Eagle Rock Road.
(Quasi-Judicial)

Council District # 1

Presenter:

Drew Foxx, Planner II, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment #1 - Original Hillside Development Plan](#)

[Attachment #2 - Notice of Opposition](#)

[Attachment #3 - Public Response Letter](#)

[Attachment #4 - Code Enforcement Complaint](#)

[Attachment #5 - Hillside Development Plan](#)

[Attachment #6 - PPRBD Correspondence](#)

[Attachment #7 - Project Statement](#)

[Attachment #8 - Geologic Hazard Report](#)

[Attachment #9 - 1220 Eagle Rock Grading Plan](#)

[Attachment #10 - Landslide Susceptibility Map](#)

[Attachment #11 - Photo Simulations](#)

[7.5.526 NON-USE VARIANCE](#)

[7.2.610 HS-O HILLSIDE OVERLAY](#)

Drew Foxx, Planner II, presented the variance application about an existing retaining wall at 1210 Eagle Rock Road, located northeast of the Austin Bluffs Parkway and North Nevada Avenue intersection. The property is zoned residential with Hillside and wildland-urban interface overlays. It shares a driveway with the adjacent lot at 1220 Eagle Rock Road. The two lots were originally part of the Riley Subdivision, approved in 1999. The residence at 1210 was permitted shortly after, while the home at 1220 was permitted in 2019. A shotcrete retaining wall was constructed along the east side of the 1210 residence in 2003, facing Eagle Rock Road. The wall reaches up to 15 feet in height, exceeding the 4-foot limit allowed under the Hillside overlay.

Mr. Foxx said the variance request aims to address a code enforcement complaint filed by the neighboring property owner at 1220 Eagle Rock Road. The complaint cited violations of the original development plan and the absence of a building permit for the wall. The variance also seeks to preserve the Hillside, manage erosion and stormwater runoff, and avoid the cost of removing the wall or building additional structures upslope. No changes to the wall are proposed. However, approval of the variance would require an amendment to the original Hillside development plan, which had specified two 4-foot retaining walls further upslope. Both a variance and building permit should have been obtained prior to the wall's installation in 2003. Standard notice was made; comments in opposition were received from the neighbor to the south with concerns about code compliance, drainage, erosion, ponding, safety. Agency review was made and comments were addressed. The application is in compliance with PlanCOS and meets the review criteria for a Nonuse Variance, however it does not meet the review criteria for the Hillside review criteria.

Commissioners' Questions

Commissioner Cecil asked about the origin of the Hillside Overlay criteria regarding the 4-foot retaining walls. Daniel Sexton, Planning Manager, said the criteria has been in place since the late 80's and it tries to minimize the impact within the overlay and have a safer drainage perspective. Mr. Walker said it is general criteria that addresses engineering and aesthetic issues.

Applicant's presentation

Dave Hostetler, Land Development Consultants, said work on the property began in 1998 for the Riley family, who intended to subdivide it for personal or investment use, but intended to preserve the area as much as possible. He said a Hillside plot plan was approved in 1999, for the two lots subdivision, followed by a residential Hillside plan. He said during construction in 2000, an unexpected rock embankment limited the backyard depth from the planned 25 feet to about 10-12 feet, making further excavation cost-prohibitive. Mr. Hostetler said surveying and planning were done by Land Development Consultants and Associated Design Professionals, the latter no longer in business. He said Katherine Roundtree, daughter of the original owners, and her husband got a building permit and occupied a house on lot one in 2000, and in 2003, a shotcrete covering was added to the rock outcropping for aesthetics and erosion control, using a method common in Hillside developments and not requiring a permit.

Mr. Hostetler said no neighborhood complaints were received until 2019, when the adjacent lot two, owned by the Fernandez family since 2016, became a source of conflict. He said although the Fernandez family had accepted the property "as is" during purchase, disputes arose over construction encroachments beyond the shared driveway easement. He said the Fernandez family later sought to expand their driveway and filed a lawsuit to remove the shotcrete that extended into their lot, the Roundtrees settled, and the shotcrete was removed. Mr. Hostetler said without the shotcrete, significant excavation and retaining wall construction would be required, disturbing the preservation area. He said the original owners followed Hillside criteria to preserve the land and that future owners must accept full responsibility for any wall failure. He said the Fernandez complaints might seem unjustified and unrelated to actual drainage issues, as lot one is not causing any adverse impact, detrimental to public health, safety or welfare to the surrounding properties.

Mr. Hostetler said when the city required a building permit, the owners consulted Regional Building staff, who said they would not issue a permit for work over 20 years old. He said the request should not undermine code enforcement or its regulations, as it pertains to a private condition. He said no complaints have been reported from neighboring properties, except from the adjacent southern neighbor.

Commissioners' Questions

Commissioner Slattery asked when the retaining wall between the properties was constructed. Mr. Hostetler said he thinks either last or this year. Mr. Sexton said the southern property sought a non-use variance in November 2024, which was denied. He said following coordination with city staff, the design was revised to set back from the property line, lower the wall height, and add a concrete extension serving as a fence, and this modified design was subsequently approved administratively under Hillside Overlay specifications.

Commissioner Slattery asked when the code violation was filed regarding the existing shotcrete wall. Mr. Foxx said it was filed on October 28, 2024.

Commissioner Slattery asked if the application was approved, what would the process be for the amendment to the development plan and the building permit. Mr. Foxx said the amendment would be administratively and they would need to apply at Pikes Peak Regional Building Department for a permit as if it was a new wall.

Commissioner Slattery asked how the ratio is to be considered for the wall. David Gorman, with MVE Inc. Civil Engineers said the wall varies in height, but there is a spot where it is 15-foot high, and it is 15 feet wide, so it will be a 1:1 ratio. He said the revised Hillside plan supporting the variance considered the existing site grades and residence. He said the original 1999 plan included two 4-foot tiered walls spanning both the Roundtree's lot and extending into lot tow, but these walls would not effectively connect the grade east of the house to its floor elevation, which required a 15-foot drop, necessitating four four-foot walls. Mr. Gorman said this design would exceed the building envelope and encroach into the preservation area under the 2:1 slope criteria. He said the original Hillside plan is no longer applicable due to the current site conditions and the involvement of the southern property, making it impractical to truncate the walls at the property line.

Commissioner Slattery asked if it is traditional to do borings and soil testing during landscaping or was it discovered during construction. Logan Langford, with MTEC Engineering, said the original excavation findings

were documented in the geohazard report, which identified sandstone at the excavation surface, and density tests were conducted. He said borings are typically done within the house footprint unless targeting structures like retaining walls. He said due to site constraints, drilling at the proposed retaining wall locations was not feasible.

Commissioner Slattery said the original plans might have not reflected the actual conditions of the lot, especially if soil testing was not performed where the proposed retaining walls were going to be installed.

Commissioner Slattery asked how it was determined that the wall that was built was the best solution. Mr. Hostetler said the Hillside plot plans were approved by the city and handed off to the general contractor and civil engineer. He said after the building permit was issued, Land Development Consultants (LDC) was not contacted again, and no revisions to the plan were required. He said in 2003, due to potential erosion risks from rainwater, the Roundtree's were advised to hire shotcrete walls professionals, to stabilize the sandstone rock embankment. He said the shotcrete installation has effectively provided erosion control since then without any issues.

Commissioner Cecil asked for clarification about Mr. Hostetler's comment that granting a non-use variance would make future owners aware that the city is not liable for potential shotcrete failure in the future. He said it was one of the requirements by SWENT and the owners agreed.

Public Comment

Jamie Fernandez ceded time to John Fernandez.

John Fernandez, owner of the adjacent lot, referenced the 1998 Radley Subdivision plan and the 1999 Eagle Rock Hillside plan, both of which required tiered retaining walls not exceeding four feet in height and to be built within the designated building envelope, avoiding the preservation area. He said although two four-foot retaining walls were approved, they were never constructed; instead, a 15-foot structure was installed without city or regional permit approval, violating code requirements. Mr. Fernandez said that encountering a rock embankment during construction should have triggered a revised hillside plan and certificate of occupancy review. He said LDC, the original engineer, is now supporting the non-use

variance to approve the 15-foot wall, contradicting their original code-compliant design. He said no evidence has been provided to show a compliant solution is unachievable and that a revised plan should have been submitted.

Mr. Fernandez said in 2024, a non-use variance request for a 9-foot engineered wall on the adjacent property was denied because a code-compliant solution was deemed feasible. He said following the denial, a revised permit was approved under Hillside overlay code, demonstrating that compliance is achievable. He said there are also concerns about drainage issues related to the shotcrete structure, citing expert recommendations that proper surface and subsurface drainage is essential to slope stability and foundation performance. He said the current shotcrete installation causes water ponding and fails to direct runoff away from adjacent structures, and it is a hazard to foundation, contradicting code and engineering guidance.

Mr. Fernandez said the non-use variance request seeks to classify the shotcrete structure as a 15-foot retaining wall, which contradicts the site observation report that consistently refers to it as slope stabilization, not a retaining wall. He said city code requires slopes steeper than 2:1 to be retained, and the request to approve slope stabilization as a retaining wall is flawed. Mr. Fernandez said slope stabilization does not provide proper drainage control, which is why the engineering report addresses drainage risks that would typically be managed by a true retaining wall.

Applicant's Rebuttal

Mr. Hostetler said LDC served only as the surveyor and planning consultant, while the civil engineer stamped the drawings, which showed dual retaining walls crossing lots one and two. He said after the house was built and occupied in 2000, inspections were conducted and the building permit was closed out. He said plan revisions were never requested. Mr. Hostetler said in 2003, the erosion control covering was installed without needing a permit, and drainage flowed evenly across the back of the property without causing erosion. He said that the southern neighbor has not addressed drainage issues caused by their new retaining wall and shotcrete removal, and their engineer never consulted LDC or ADP, nor constructed the originally approved four-foot walls.

Mr. Gorman said the existing wall has a brow on the uphill side that redirects smaller water flows around the house, and during heavy rain, some water may flow over the wall, but a swale along the east side of the house channels it to the north, preventing ponding. He said the current drainage functions properly without impacting adjacent properties, especially those uphill to the south. He said the originally planned two four-foot retaining walls could not be constructed as shown without extending into the southern property, per the 1999 plan.

Commissioners' Questions

Commissioner Hensler asked if the top of the wall is maintained on a regular basis or does not require maintenance. Mr. Gorman said it is formed into shotcrete, and it has additional rocks that help stabilize the soil. He said these do not require maintenance, but the earth next to it is being looked after by the owner.

Commissioner Hensler asked if drainage is happening into lot two. Mr. Gorman said drainage flows into the Roundtree's property and flows down their own driveway.

Commissioner Slattery asked if the retaining walls shown in Mr. Fernandez's exhibit 1 were to be constructed, they would go into the envelope of his building. Mr. Gorman said they would, as there is no way to stop them right on the property line without other extensive improvements, therefore this possibility would not be feasible.

Commissioner Cecil asked for additional details on preventing breakdown of the shotcrete. Mr. Langford said it is constructed with a mix of wire mesh and rebar into the sandstone, that require periodic maintenance to prevent erosion.

Commissioner Cecil said Mr. Fernandez mentioned in his comments that a decision previously made by the board established a precedent, however there are two sections that clearly mention that neither approval or denial by the Commission related to previous non-use variances establish a precedent.

Chair Casey asked if the building permit will require changes to the wall. Mr. Foxx said they would have to apply as if it is a new structure and would have to meet code and regulations.

Commissioner Hensler asked what the reasons were for filing the violation. Mr. Foxx said some of the concerns included not following the development plan, erosion, ponding, which are happening on the subject property. He said he is not aware of negative impacts to the surrounding properties.

Chair Casey said one of the criteria for a non-use variance is that it will not have an adverse impact on surrounding properties. Mr. Foxx said that he found the only concern with the wall would be the height, as the encroachment issues have been addressed by removing a piece of the wall.

Commissioner Hensler asked if there is any current encroachment on any side of the property line. Mr. Foxx said there is not.

Commissioner Hensler asked if the new wall is on the property line. Mr. Foxx said it is, and it has setbacks.

Commissioner Hensler asked if there is any visual impact on any neighboring property. Mr. Foxx said as far as he recalls he has not read any complaint about it. Mr. Sexton said the complete description of the code enforcement citation was included in the packet.

Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Cecil said the property meets criteria one and two, having the sandstone in extraordinary physical condition, as well as criteria three, as enforcing the original plans would impose substantial hardship and hinder reasonable use of both the subject and adjacent properties. Commissioner Cecil said criteria four is satisfied, as there is no significant impact on neighboring properties. Commissioner Cecil said, outside the formal criteria, revisiting construction completed over two decades ago seems unreasonable and undermines the intent of a certificate of occupancy.

Commissioner Slattery said she agrees with Commissioner Cecil and added that a demolition or additional construction would be far more

detrimental to preserving the natural features, which is the intention of the Hillside Overlay. Commissioner Slattery said she will be voting in favor of the non-use variance.

Chair Casey said he agrees with Commissioners Cecil and Slattery that the non-use variance meets the criteria and will be in support of the application.

Commissioner Robbins said he also agrees with previous comments and will be voting in favor.

Commissioner Hensler said she concurs with the Commission comments.

Motion by Commissioner Cecil, seconded by Commissioner Hensler, to approve the Non-Use Variance to City Code Section 7.2.610.D.1.d allowing a 15-foot retaining wall in the hillside overlay upon the findings that the request complies with the criteria as set for in City Code Section 7.5.526.E. with the following condition:

a. An amendment to the applicable hillside overlay development plan (City File No. AR DP 98-727) shall be processed. The motion passed by a vote of

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Sipilovic

9. Presentations

- 9.B.** [NPLN-25-00](#) The Southeast Strong Neighborhood Plan, a neighborhood plan developed as part of the PlanCOS initiative for a Neighborhood Planning Program.

[01](#)

Presenter:

Page Saulsbury, Planner II, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Attachment 1 - Southeast Strong Neighborhood Plan spread 2025 9](#)
[CPC Staff Report Southeast Strong Neighborhood Plan 10 8 2025](#)

Page Saulsbury, Planner II, Comprehensive Planning, presented the Southeast Strong Neighborhood Plan, that is an area with great economic development potential with a strategic location of the Southeast, particularly for its proximity to the airport and the significance of South Academy Boulevard as a major corridor. She said community engagement has been

informative and survey-driven, with residents advocating for the Southeast to be promoted as a cultural destination. Ms. Saulsbury said the plan incorporates these suggestions, aiming to create cultural spaces and community hubs, expand walkable neighborhoods, support workforce development, attract primary employers and grocery stores, and improve access to parks, trails, and healthy food options.

Ms. Saulsbury said the plan is structured around “big ideas,” priority goals, and strategies, with a key focus in rehabilitation and development, with active redevelopment of vacant land and new projects in different emerging areas. She presented the priority goals regarding Grow and Support our Businesses and Entrepreneurs that include assisting with promotion of the area as a thriving business ecosystem with a unique cultural identity, creating additional water-wise standards for streetscapes - efficient and manageable, identifying potential funding for landscaping and site maintenance zoning compliance, attracting new retailers, developing initiatives with local and culturally significant small businesses and promoting new career opportunities. She said there are different key partners to accomplish all the proposed strategies.

Ms. Saulsbury said regarding Grow and Support our Housing, the identified goals are preserving the existing housing inventory and needs for existing and future residents, growing diverse housing options in proximity to transit, hubs, and essential services, and using support models to provide homeownership options.

Ms. Saulsbury said for Upgrade How We Move the priority goals include enhancing public transit accessibility and coverage, promoting sustainable first/last-mile transit solutions, studying and implementing safer intersections, roads, and sidewalks for pedestrians and cyclists (multi-modal design), slowing vehicle speeds near schools, healthcare centers, libraries, commercial areas, parks, and recreational centers, and enhancements to transit system identified in the 2050 Regional Transit Plan & Specialized Transportation Plan.

Ms. Saulsbury said for the Live Better, Live Longer aspect they identified goals such as enhance public spaces, focus on community hubs, prioritize connectivity and safety to area parks and trails, health and walkability promotion, supporting small businesses, improving streetscape, public-private partnerships, incentives for large retail and grocery stores to

open in the area to also support job growth, and support parks and trail improvements to include ADA upgrades.

Ms. Saulsbury said about Support our Safety the goals are to have safer and more inclusive community environment in partnership with community-driven resources and public infrastructure and implement signage, landscaping, and art features to define ownership of public and private land to deter crime.

Ms. Saulsbury said stakeholder engagement is ongoing; this presentation is expected to go before City Council in the next months, and implementation will be discussed after.

Commissioners' Questions

Chair Casey asked if this is located to the south of Monument Creek. Mr. Walker said the park America the Beautiful is south of it, however, that is located in a northern area and is not part of the one for discussion today.

Ms. Saulsbury said there has been about 350 million dollars of City investment for community centers, bonds, sports facilities and more. She said it is exciting to how much has happened since the development of this plan.

Mr. Walker said this is a work in progress and if the Commissioners have comments, can let staff know. He said staff will be having conversations with the Councilmember representing the area to decide how they want to proceed and eventually will bring this project forward for a formal decision by the Commission.

Commissioner Slattery commended Ms. Saulsbury for her enthusiasm and work on this project, and all the community engagement that has taken place. Commissioner Slattery highlighted all the success stories in the area and said with this plan it might be more desirable, achievable and efficient to implement different opportunities.

Commissioner Cecil asked if these areas are already on approved list for PPRTA. Ms. Saulsbury said they are, and they will be presenting to the Commission a list of Capital Improvement and Development Projects.

Commissioner Cecil said she hopes the best fit and definition for hub gets implemented in the city as cohesion, mental health and walkability are important. Commissioner Cecil said she is excited about anti-displacement concerns and the work that the Housing Affordability Department is doing. Mr. Walker said the housing needs assessment will be released in the next 30 days and there will be opportunity for discussion then.

Commissioner Robbins asked what the timeline for the project is and if personal property will be involved when working on roadways and similar. Commissioner Robbins said he appreciates the enthusiasm, and he likes the proposal. Mr. Walker said he expects to get approval of this in the next few months, and then it will be an ongoing project with constant updates as it deals with a large section of the community.

10. Adjourn