



City of Colorado Springs

Regional Development
Center (Hearing Room)
2880 International Circle

Meeting Minutes - Draft City Planning Commission

Wednesday, April 8, 2026

9:00 AM

2880 International Cir., 2nd Floor, Hearing Room

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Present: 7 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

2. Changes to Agenda/Postponements

3. Communications

Kenneth Casey - Planning Commission Chair

Kevin Walker - Planning Director

4. Approval of Minutes

4.A. [CPC 2729](#) Minutes for the February 11, 2026, City Planning Commission meeting.

Presenter:

Kenneth Casey, City Planning Commission Chair

Attachments: [CPC_Minutes 2.11.16 Draft-Revised](#)

Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Commissioner Clements, to approve the Minutes for the February 11, 2026, City Planning Commission meeting.

The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-0-1.

Aye: 7 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

4.B. [CPC 2730](#) Minutes for the March 11, 2026, City Planning Commission meeting.

Presenter:

Kenneth Casey, City Planning Commission Chair

Attachments: [CPC_Minutes 3.11.16 Draft v2](#)

Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Commissioner Willoughby, to approve the Minutes for the March February 11, 2026, City Planning Commission meeting.

The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-0-1.

Aye: 7 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

5. Consent Calendar

Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Commissioner Clements, to approve the Consent Calendar.

The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-0-1.

Aye: 7 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

Reagan Ranch Community Park

- 5.A.** [ZONE-26-0003](#) An ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to approximately 9.04 acres located off Marksheffel Road, southeast of the intersection of Space Village Avenue and Marksheffel Road, from MX-M/AP-O/APZ-1 (Mixed-use Medium Scale with Airport and Accident Potential Zone Subzone-1 Overlays) to PK/AP-O/APZ-1 (Public Park with Airport and Accident Potential Subzone-1 Overlays). (Quasi-Judicial - First reading and setting the public hearing for May 26, 2026 in accord with City Code Section 7.5.407. Hearings for the ordinance and any related applications shall be conducted with the second reading.)

Related Files: CUDP-26-0001, DEPN-26-0018
Located in Council District 4

Presenter:

Chris Sullivan, Senior Planner, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Zone Ordinance](#)[Staff Report RR Community Park](#)[Attachment 1 Project Statement ZMA](#)[Attachment 2 Land Use Statement ZMA](#)[Attachment 3 Exhibit A and B ZMA](#)[Attachment 4 Peterson SFB Comments Reagan Ranch Community Park 03.05.26](#)[Attachment 5 USDA Communication](#)[7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \(REZONING\)](#)[CPC Presentation Reagan Ranch Staff](#)

- 5.B.** [CUDP-26-00](#)
[01](#) A Conditional Use to allow Park use in the MX-M/AP-O/APZ-1 (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with Airport and Accident Potential Subzone 1 Overlays) zone district, consisting of 9.04 acres located off South Marksheffel Road southeast of Space Village Avenue. (Quasi-Judicial)

Located in Council District 4

Presenter:

Chris Sullivan, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [7.5.601 CONDITIONAL USE](#)**Peaks Recovery Center**

- 5.C.** [CUDP-25-00](#)
[31](#) A Conditional Use to allow a Detoxification Center use in the MX-N/cr (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Scale with Conditions of Record) zone district, consisting of 0.75 acres located at 6430 Brook Park Drive. (Quasi-Judicial)

Located in Council District 1

Presenter:

Austin Cooper, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report Peak Recovery Center](#)
[Attachment 1- Project Statement](#)
[Attachment 2 - Fire Comments](#)
[Attachment 3 - Land Use Statement](#)
[Attachment 4 - Proposed Detox Bed Locations](#)
[Powerpoint Peaks Recovery Center](#)
[7.5.601 CONDITIONAL USE](#)

6. Items Called Off Consent Calendar

7. Unfinished Business

8. New Business

Elevate Downtown Plan

- 8.A. [NPLN-26-0001](#) The Elevate Downtown Plan, an update to the 2016 Experience Downtown Plan.
NPLN 26-0001.
(Legislative)

Council District 3

Presenter:

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Elevate Downtown Plan CPC Staff Report 040826](#)
[2026-ElevateDowntownPlan-PublicDraft-Reduced](#)
[Elevate Downtown Staff Presentation CPC 040826](#)
[2026-Final Downtown Plan Presentation](#)
[DRB Minutes 3.3.26 Draft](#)

Commissioner Slattery and Chair Hensler disclosed that they currently serve on the Downtown Partnership board, however, their roles do not create a conflict of interest and affirmed they could evaluate the Elevate Downtown Plan objectively.

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, explained that the plan area matches the Downtown Development Authority's one-square-mile boundary and is largely governed by the City's Form-Based Code. He noted that Elevate Downtown is processed as a Neighborhood Plan and serves both strategic and regulatory functions. Like the previous plan, it includes two volumes: a state-required Plan of Development

outlining the use of DDA tax increment financing, and a broader neighborhood plan guiding land use, design, mobility, economic development, public spaces, infrastructure, and cultural identity.

He highlighted that the new plan replaces the 2016 document's eight-goal framework with a single vision statement and five integrated goals supported by updated strategies. Engagement efforts included extensive focus groups, interviews, surveys, and pop-up outreach, reaching a wide range of downtown stakeholders. More than 2,000 survey responses and strong online participation indicated that earlier engagement had already captured most community priorities.

Public themes consistently centered on safety and cleanliness, support for small businesses, amenities for a growing residential population, mobility options, activation of public spaces, housing affordability, and compassionate approaches to homelessness while maintaining usable public spaces. Mr. Tefertiller emphasized that all City departments participated to ensure technical alignment and feasibility.

Mr. Tefertiller concluded that Elevate Downtown aligns closely with PlanCOS principles, particularly around urban centers, mixed-use development, walkability, economic vitality, cultural identity, and reinvestment, as well as with transportation, creek, trail, and long-range mobility plans.

Applicant's presentation

Chelsea Gondeck, CEO of the Downtown Partnership, celebrated the milestone, noting it reflects more than a year of collaboration among MIG consultants, DDA and city staff, volunteers, and community members. She explained that the plan was updated ahead of the typical cycle due to significant post-pandemic shifts in downtown's economic, social, and mobility patterns. She emphasized downtown's dual role as an economic center and a neighborhood of roughly 5,000 residents, and highlighted the plan's five guiding themes: vibrancy, safety, economic diversity, place identity, and equitable access.

Elly Schaefer, Senior Project Manager with MIG, outlined the year-long engagement process, which included focus groups with a wide range of stakeholders and an online survey with more than 2,000 responses. She noted that public input consistently raised issues such as walkability, traffic safety, small business support, housing and homelessness, public restrooms, activation of public spaces, and arts

and culture opportunities.

Reviewing Volume 1, Ms. Schaefer summarized downtown's assets-historic character, trail and creek access, a growing residential base, arts and entertainment, and proximity to recreation-as well as challenges, including infill feasibility, limited neighborhood-support retail, safety and cleanliness concerns, traffic conflicts, workforce retention, and funding constraints tied to tax-exempt properties.

For Volume 2, she outlined the plan's five goals, which focus on positioning downtown as the region's heart, enhancing livability, embracing its identity as an "urban gateway to nature," strengthening civic and cultural life, and shaping the built environment around walkability, transit, and human-centered design.

Ms. Schaefer then highlighted major plan components: a refined land-use and character framework; updated height transition strategies; 26 catalytic opportunity sites; new gateway concepts; small-business and workforce strategies; and a mobility framework introducing new street typologies and safety improvements. She also detailed parks and open-space priorities, cultural initiatives, and new chapters addressing homelessness, housing, public restrooms, safety, and urban services. She concluded with recommendations for infrastructure, including fiber expansion, EV charging, drainage strategies, and potential underground utility opportunities.

Public Comments

Samuel Clark, Chair of the Downtown Development Authority and Executive Director of the Pikes Peak Real Estate Foundation, highlighted the extensive outreach that informed the plan, noting the unusually high level of community participation through focus groups, surveys, and public events. He emphasized that the plan reflects both community priorities and economic realities, describing it as a practical framework that will help guide public-private investment downtown.

Diane Bridges, Vice President of the Historic Uptown neighborhood and Chair of the Historic Neighborhoods Partnership, expressed appreciation for the plan's broad scope and the responsiveness of staff and consultants throughout the process. She noted that residents felt their feedback was genuinely considered and that the plan thoughtfully addresses recurring neighborhood concerns, such as safety,

walkability, and maintaining downtown's cultural identity, while still encouraging growth.

Commissioners' Comments and Discussion

Commissioners expressed appreciation for the depth of the planning effort and the clarity of the final document. Several commented positively on the extensive public engagement and the way the plan integrates land use, mobility, and public realm goals. Commissioners asked staff and the consultant team to elaborate on how comparable cities were selected for benchmarking; the consultant clarified that cities such as Salt Lake City, Spokane, Buffalo, Minneapolis, Raleigh, and Denver were used for studying density, urban design, and economic performance, and noted that these comparisons appear in the plan's analysis section.

Commissioners emphasized the importance of the plan aligning with existing form-based zoning and supporting predictable review processes for future development. Staff confirmed that the Downtown Review Board, Planning Department, and Downtown Partnership will continue close coordination to ensure consistency between policy guidance and project-level decisions.

Commissioner Gigiano raised concerns about the pace and scale of potential future downtown development and the pressure that added density could place on municipal services and public facilities. Commissioner Gigiano voted in opposition.

Motion by Commissioner Robbins, seconded by Commissioner Clements, to recommend approval to City Council the Elevate Downtown Plan.

The motion passed by a vote of 6-1-0-1.

Aye: 6 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

No: 1 - Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

Kettle Creek Addition No. 1

- 8.B.** [ANEX-25-00](#) [02](#) Kettle Creek Addition No. 1 Annexation Consisting of 19.88 acres located northeast of the Kettle Creek Road and Old Ranch Road intersection.

(Legislative)

Related Files: LUPL-25-0014, ZONE-25-0028

Council District: Upon Annexation District 2

Presenter:

Chris Sullivan, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report Kettle Creek CS](#)

[Attachment 1 Petition MGLG](#)

[Attachment 2 Petition RP](#)

[Attachment 2b Petition Waldo](#)

[Attachment 3 Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 4 Annexation Plat](#)

[Attachment 5 FIA Combined](#)

[Attachment 6 Zone Exhibit B](#)

[Attachment 7 Zone Exhibit A](#)

[Attachment 8 Land Use Plan](#)

[Attachment 9 USFWS Effects Determination Request Challenger at Kettle Creek 8-5-25](#)

[Attachment 10 Geo-hazard Report APPROVED](#)

[Attachment 11 TIA](#)

[Attachment 12 Overall Legal](#)

[Attachment 13 DRAFT Annexation Agreement 03.11.2026](#)

[Combined Public Comments - Kettle Creek](#)

[CPC Presentation Kettle Creek CS](#)

[7.5.701 ANNEXATION OF LAND](#)

Chris Sullivan, Senior Planner, presented a 19.88-acre annexation northeast of Kettle Creek Road and Old Ranch Road. The proposal establishes R-Flex Medium with Streamside and United States Air Force Academy overlays, with a companion Land Use Plan for single-family attached/detached at approximately 123 units, 11-12 du/ac within R-Flex's 5-16 du/ac range, streamside habitat buffer, Preble's mouse determination, detention at the southwest corner, and primary access via Old Ranch Road with realigned Kettle Creek Road to achieve a 90° intersection; secondary access through the adjacent Cottages at Kettle Creek. Mr. Sullivan said there were some agency comments, Traffic Engineering requires dedication, approximately 13' ROW plus 8' improvement easement, and an eastbound left-turn lane on Old Ranch; Parks and School District 20 addressed park/school dedication and student service capacity; Standard Notice was posted and yielded multiple comments focused on traffic, connectivity, environmental impacts, and

housing need. Staff found consistency with PlanCOS and annexation, rezoning and land use plan review criteria.

Colorado Springs Utilities Presentation

Bryan English, Project Manager, summarized water extension ordinance thresholds, 128% buffer; de minimis definition of 1% of available surplus, approximately 53 AFY. The project's projected demand of about 29 AFY qualifies as de minimis and is an enclave, satisfying extension conditions; aggregate recent annexation demands were noted. He addressed groundwater rights dedication, electric service territory overlap, MVEA currently serves existing homes; just compensation would be required upon incorporation to CSU territory, and natural gas/electric extensions at developer expense. Infrastructure capacity and cost/payback considerations were outlined, with a more robust financial model planned for Council.

Applicant's Presentation

Andrea Barlow, NES, speaking on behalf of the applicant team, said the three parcels form a county enclave surrounded by city limits, making annexation a logical and consistent step for long-term service delivery and planning coordination. She explained that the proposed R-Flex Medium zoning was intentionally selected because it provides a transitional density between existing commercial and industrial uses to the south and established residential neighborhoods to the north and west.

Ms. Barlow noted that the project team worked closely with City Planning, Colorado Springs Utilities, and Traffic Engineering to design a layout that responds to known constraints in the area, particularly traffic circulation, access safety, and environmental sensitivity along Kettle Creek. She highlighted that the development achieves a relatively low density within the R-Flex range, with approximately 123 units concentrated in a compact pattern to preserve the natural drainage corridor and meet the Streamside Overlay requirements. The internal street network and block layout were shaped to improve emergency access and avoid routing traffic into smaller neighborhood streets.

Ms. Barlow also stressed the importance of the realignment of Kettle Creek Road, which brings the intersection with Old Ranch Road into safer geometry and supports future multimodal improvements planned by the City. She said the applicant will construct the required eastbound left-turn lane on Old Ranch Road and will dedicate additional right-of-way to support long-term corridor upgrades. Sidewalk connections along Old Ranch will complete a missing link and create a more walkable connection

to nearby residential areas and schools.

Ms. Barlow noted that the land use plan was prepared to reflect the expectations of the R-Flex zone while ensuring compatibility with neighboring developments such as the Cottages at Kettle Creek / Hope Chapel property. The streamside buffer aligns with the adjacent project's open space and maintains ecological continuity along the riparian corridor. Barlow stated that the applicant believes the annexation and zoning package provides a balanced approach that supports housing needs, strengthens infrastructure planning, and ensures an orderly transition of county land into the city.

Traffic Engineering

Todd Frisbie, City Traffic Engineering, explained planned PPRTA-funded projects on Old Ranch Road, such as the bridge widening east of the site to accommodate future improvements; safety/multimodal enhancements; likely single lane each direction with a center turn lane from Lexington to Voyager; intersection upgrades at Voyager including dual lefts southbound; potential interim left-turn improvements at Otero. The proposed access for the project includes a stop-controlled intersection at the new Kettle Creek Road alignment and the required eastbound left-turn lane on Old Ranch Road; volumes at build-out are expected to meet acceptable levels of service.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Commissioners' Questions and Discussion

Commissioners raised several questions regarding traffic impacts, neighborhood compatibility, public infrastructure, and the practical implications of annexing an enclave already surrounded by city limits, focusing on Old Ranch Road and existing congestion patterns during school pick-up and drop-off periods, noting that this corridor already experiences delays and queueing. Mr. Frisbie reiterated that the required eastbound left-turn lane, right-of-way dedication, and the planned Kettle Creek Road realignment were designed specifically to address safety, spacing, and future multimodal improvements identified in the PPRTA project list. Commissioners acknowledged that although the City's long-range transportation improvements would not eliminate congestion entirely, they do create a more structured approach to managing it as growth continues.

Commissioners emphasized that the enclave situation warranted annexation, explaining that it would allow the City, not the County, to coordinate long-term roadway design, utilities, and emergency response. They also noted that the proposed R-Flex Medium zoning served as a reasonable transition between the more intense commercial and employment areas to the south and the lower-density residential neighborhoods nearby. Commissioners supportive of the proposal remarked that the applicant's plan stayed at the lower end of the R-Flex density range, preserved the creek corridor, and provided clear access points that avoided routing additional traffic onto smaller local streets.

Commissioner Robbins expressed concern about adding any new development to an area that he believes already struggles with traffic volume and vehicle stacking during peak hours. Commissioner Robbins pointed specifically to safety issues and felt that Old Ranch Road's current design and school-related congestion made the timing of new development problematic.

Commissioner Gigiano expressed her concern, stating that while the annexation was technically logical, she was not convinced that the combination of density, circulation, and public-facility impacts aligned with what the existing neighborhood could support.

Other commissioners countered by noting that development of the land was inevitable and that annexation into the City ensured a higher standard of review, broader public oversight, and more predictable infrastructure coordination than if the area were left under County jurisdiction.

Motion by Commissioner Case, seconded by Commissioner Willoughby, to recommend approval to City Council of the annexation of 19.88 acres as the Kettle Creek Addition No. 1 Annexation based upon the finding that the annexation complies with the Conditions for Annexation set forth in City Code Section 7.5.701.

The motion passed by a vote of 5-2-0-1.

Aye: 5 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

No: 2 - Commissioner Robbins and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

- 8.C.** [ZONE-25-00](#) The establishment of a R-Flex Medium/SS-O/AF-O (Residential Flex Zone Medium Scale with Streamside and United States Air Force Academy Overlay) zone district, in association with the Kettle Creek Addition No. 1 Annexation consisting of 19.88 acres located northeast of the Kettle Creek Road and Old Ranch Road intersection. (Legislative)
- [28](#)

Related Files: ANEX-25-0002, LUPL-25-0014

Council District: Upon Annexation District 2

Presenter:

Chris Sullivan, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

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

Motion by Commissioner Case, seconded by Commissioner Willoughby, to recommend approval to City Council of the establishment of 19.88 acres as a R-Flex-Medium/SS-O/AF-O (Residential Flex Zone Medium Scale with Streamside and United States Air Force Academy Overlays) zone district based upon the finding that the request complies with the criteria for a Zone Map Amendment set forth in City Code Section 7.5.704.

The motion passed by a vote of 5-2-0-1.

Aye: 5 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

No: 2 - Commissioner Robbins and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

- 8.D.** [LUPL-25-0014](#) Establishment of the Kettle Creek Annexation Land Use Plan for proposed Single-Family Residential Attached and Detached use consisting of 19.88 acres located northeast of the Kettle Creek Road and Old Ranch Road intersection.
(Legislative)

Related Files: ANEX-25-0002, ZONE-25-0028

Council District: Upon Annexation District 2

Presenter:

Chris Sullivan, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [7.5.514 LAND USE PLAN](#)

Motion by Commissioner Case, seconded by Commissioner Willoughby, to recommend approval to City Council the Kettle Creek Annexation Land Use Plan based upon the finding that the proposal complies with the review criteria for Land Use Plans set forth in City Code Section 7.5.514.

The motion passed by a vote of 5-2-0-1.

Aye: 5 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

No: 2 - Commissioner Robbins and Commissioner Gigiano

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

Child and Adult Day Care Center - Code Amendment

- 8.E. CODE-25-00 06** An Ordinance amending Article 3 Use Regulations, Article 4 Development Standards and Incentives, and Article 6 Definitions and Rules of Constructions of Chapter 7 (the “Unified Development Code”) of the Code of the City Of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended, as related to permitted locations and standards for each Adult or Child Day Care Centers.
(Legislative)

Presenter:

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

Attachments: Childcare_Ord_Staff_Report
Attachment_A_Allowed_Use_Table_Comparison
Attachment_B_Childcare_Ord_Factsheet
Attachment_C_Existing_Childcare_in_Residential_Zones_Map
Attachment_D_State_Childcare_Building_Requirements
Exhibit_1 - Ordinance_v4
CC_WS_Childcare_Ord_Presentation_v2

Allison Stocker, Senior Planner, described a focused UDC amendment (separate from Phase 2 updates) to expand appropriate siting of commercial daycare centers (adult/child) across zones, clarify definitions, introduce a commercial accessory daycare category co-located with civic, employment, or high-density residential uses (no affiliation required), reduce parking minimums (from 1/400 sf to 1/600 sf where appropriate), and add location-specific standards for residential areas, most notably prohibiting use of residential streets as primary access and requiring development plans when converting dwellings to commercial daycare. She illustrated barriers faced by recent applicants, such as the Revolution Church daycare that required a use variance due to affiliation limits, that emphasized state licensing and building code constraints unaffected by the UDC, and summarized stakeholder engagement and survey themes, like availability versus home-provider vacancies; support for neighborhood-scale options tempered by compatibility concerns.

Public Comment

Sherry Lynn Boyles, Joint Initiatives for Youth & Families, presented

regional childcare desert data, approximately 47,000 children under 5 versus 18,500 licensed slots, and urged scalable solutions; she endorsed zoning flexibility as the first regulatory step so providers can meet needs near homes and jobs.

Doug Schultz, Old North End and Historic Neighborhoods Partnership board, supported added availability but raised on-street parking and pickup/drop-off impacts and playground noise as principal neighborhood concerns that merit careful review and public input.

Diane Bridges, Historic Neighborhoods Partnership, received ceded time from the neighbors Jeanette Caproon and Louise Cinner. She expressed appreciation for the City's effort to update childcare regulations but emphasized the need for careful balancing in residential areas. She acknowledged the community's strong demand for more childcare options but cautioned that older neighborhoods, particularly those with narrow streets, limited on-street parking, and alley access, face distinct constraints. Ms. Bridges supported making small-scale centers more feasible in residential zones but urged that larger centers be directed to districts like R-5, where infrastructure can better accommodate higher traffic volumes. She also reiterated the importance of maintaining adequate parking requirements and limiting primary access from alleys to avoid circulation issues.

Amelia Walsh, President, Green Shade Schools, spoke in support of allowing adult daycare facilities to co-locate with existing child-focused centers. She noted that her organization has successfully operated shared-use facilities and found that coordinated pick-up and drop-off routines help minimize congestion and keep traffic moving smoothly. Ms. Walsh added that families generally do not linger on site, which helps maintain a calm and predictable circulation pattern.

Commissioners' Comments and Discussion

Commissioners generally expressed support for the intent of the amendment, noting that the shortage of childcare options in the region is both well-documented and frequently raised by constituents.

Commissioner Robbins shared that his own experience with childcare drop-off routines reflects what several public commenters described, brief, predictable traffic patterns rather than prolonged congestion. Commissioner Robbins emphasized that many families move efficiently through these sites and that concerns about lingering traffic often appear greater in theory than in practice.

Other commissioners echoed this sentiment and noted that allowing more flexibility in the location of childcare centers could help meet the needs of working families while reducing long commute patterns. Several commissioners pointed out that while childcare access is critically important, the amendment's safeguards, such as the prohibition on primary access from residential streets and required development plans for conversions in lower-density neighborhoods, serve as important tools to ensure compatibility.

Chair Hensler observed that the revised parking standards and clearer definitions help modernize the code and align it with how many centers operate today. Commissioner Hensler also acknowledged neighborhood concerns about noise and circulation but noted that licensing, building codes, and development-plan review would continue to regulate scale and safety regardless of zoning changes.

Commissioner Gigiano asked staff for clarification on how large centers could be managed in older neighborhoods with constrained street networks. Staff reiterated that the amendment does not guarantee approval in those areas; it simply allows applications to be reviewed under criteria that are now more aligned with current practice. They emphasized that large centers would still undergo a more rigorous, discretionary review.

Overall, the Commission expressed that the amendment strikes a reasonable balance, expanding opportunities for childcare providers while still giving the City the ability to evaluate traffic, parking, and neighborhood character concerns.

Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Commissioner Robbins, to recommend approval to City Council of the adoption of the Ordinance amending Chapter 7 (the "Unified Development Code") of the Code of the City Of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended, relating to permitted locations and standards for each Adult or Child Day Care Centers based upon the findings that the request complies with the criteria set forth in City Code Section 7.5.702. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-0-1.

Aye: 7 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

Single Exit and Single Stairway - Code Amendment

- 8.F. CODE-26-00** An ordinance amending Section 1404 (Code Adopted by Reference)
03 of Part 14 (Building Codes) of Article 4 (Development Standards and

Incentives) of Chapter 7 (Unified Development Code) of the Code of the City of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended, pertaining to the adoption of the Pikes Peak Regional Building Code standards for Single Exits and Stairways.

(Legislative)

Located in Council Districts Citywide

Presenter:

Roger Lovell, Building Official, Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

Daniel Sexton, LUR/DRE Planning Manager, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: Single Exit and Single Stairway Ordinance

Staff Report CPC_Single Exist and Single Stairway (RE HB25-1273)

Attachment 1 - Single Exit and Single Stairway Ordinance

Attachment 2 - HB 2025a_1273_signed-act Single Stairwell

Attachment 3 - Legislative Justification Single Stairwell

Attachment 4 - States Advance Single-Stairway Reforms - Pew Charitable Trust

7.5.702 AMENDMENT TO UDC TEXT

CC Presentation Single Exit and Single Stairway Ordinance_Staff

Daniel Sexton, Planning Manager, presented an amendment to the UDC's building code reference to incorporate Pikes Peak Regional Building Code standards responsive to House Bill 25-1273, enabling up to five-story multifamily buildings with a single exit and single stair when stringent life-safety features are met. He explained the timing nexus with state energy code adoption deadlines and the need to sequence local code adoption to avoid triggering more restrictive energy standards prematurely.

Roger Lovell, Regional Building Official, explained applicability and safeguards: limited to multi-family occupancies with up to four units per floor and up to 6,000 square feet floorplate, non-combustible construction, full commercial sprinkler systems, pressurized two-hour-rated stair enclosure, and increased stair width to accommodate simultaneous evacuees and first responders. He noted the concept is gaining traction nationally and could be addressed in the 2027 International Building Code; locally, timing the adoption helps meet the July 1, 2026, energy code milestone and avoid premature shifts to the Colorado Energy & Carbon Code. Mr. Lovell, who had previously opposed the bill at the Capitol along with CSFD, stated that the added life-safety measures significantly mitigate risk and that market economics may limit uptake given the cost of

required features relative to installing a second stair.

Sara Brewen, City Attorney's Office, advised that declining adoption could lead to litigation given state mandates for municipalities over 100,000 population.

Commissioners' Comments and Discussion

Commissioners sought clarification from staff and the Regional Building Official on how the new single-exit, single-stair provisions would be applied in practice. Chair Hensler opened the dialogue by acknowledging that the topic had generated significant public interest statewide and asked staff to further describe the safety systems required for these buildings. Mr. Sexton and Mr. Lovell reiterated that the allowance is tightly limited: only multifamily buildings with four units per floor, 6,000 square-foot floorplates, and non-combustible construction would qualify, and each must include a fully pressurized, two-hour-rated stairway, a commercial-grade sprinkler system, and enhanced egress width to allow simultaneous evacuation and firefighter access.

Several commissioners commented that, while the concept of a single stairway in a mid-rise building can feel counterintuitive, the combination of enhanced fire protection systems and strict size limits appeared to meaningfully mitigate that concern.

Commissioner Robbins noted that the City's adoption schedule is also influenced by the timing of the state-mandated energy code rollout and asked how failing to adopt the amendment could affect local builders. Mr. Lovell explained that declining to act could trigger earlier mandatory compliance with the Colorado Energy & Carbon Code, which would increase construction costs for many residential and commercial projects unrelated to the stairway reform itself. Mr. Sexton added that adopting the amendment on the state's schedule preserves local flexibility and avoids placing unintended financial burdens on future developments.

Commissioner Gigiano voiced support, stating that while she still had reservations about the overall concept, the additional safety features and the limited scope provided reassurance.

Other commissioners agreed that the amendment does not broadly change the building environment but simply aligns local rules with the state law (HB25-1273) while incorporating the strongest available life-safety requirements. Commissioners also recognized that the market, not the code, would ultimately determine how often the single-stair option is used, given the cost of upgraded systems and steel-frame construction.

The Commission ultimately agreed that the amendment strikes a practical balance between safety, consistency with state requirements, and regulatory predictability for the building industry.

Motion by Commissioner Robbins, seconded by Commissioner Clements, to recommend approval to City Council of the adoption of the Pikes Peak Regional Building Code Standards for Single Exits and Stairways Ordinance amending Chapter 7 ("Unified Development Code") of the Code of the City of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended, relating to the adoption of the Pikes Peak Regional Building Code Standards for Single Exits and Stairways, based upon the finding that the request complies with the criteria set forth in City Code Section 7.5.702.

The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-0-1.

Aye: 7 - Chair Hensler, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby and Commissioner Case

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Cecil

9. Presentations

10. Executive Session

11. Adjourn