

City of Colorado Springs
City Planning Commission
Draft Meeting Minutes – Excerpt
Wednesday, September 10, 2025

8.D. APPL-25-0006 – Old Ranch Road Self Storage Appeal

An Appeal of the administrative approval for the Old Ranch Storage Filing No 1 Development Plan consisting of 4.70 acres located at the northeast corner of Old Ranch Road and Rhinestone Drive.

Council District # 2

Tamara Baxter, Planning Supervisor presented the appeal of the administrative approval for the Old Ranch Storage Filing No 1 Development Plan consisting of 4.70 acres located at the northeast corner of Old Ranch Road and Rhinestone Drive. This is an appeal of the development plan of a mini warehouse located in an MX-M zone, previously PBC under Chapter 7, which this application was reviewed under. This application was approved on July 9, 2025, for a mini-warehouse facility with an on-site office, nine one-story buildings, with access off Rhinestone Drive. Ms. Baxter said according to the Briargate Master Plan approved in 1980 this property was identified as Commercial – Village Center. In 1998 this was broken out to include Neighborhood Commercial, Community Commercial, which is the subject property, and Regional Commercial. The Briargate Master Plan is considered an implemented plan and amendments to it were not necessary, neither for the concept plan from commercial to commercial use. The Bison Ridge at Kettle Creek Concept Plan was approved by City Council on June 4, 2004, including 16.7 acres for two commercial properties, the subject property and the one to the west, which were rezoned to PBC that allowed mini warehouses as permitted use.

Ms. Baxter said Chapter 7 got replaced by the UDC, that was adopted in February 2023 and became effective in June 2023. Some zones that transitioned were PBC to MX-M, PUD to PDZ, and R-5 adopted different criteria. PBC zone district allowed commercial uses of moderate intensity and MX-M allows commercial, retail, office, multi-family residential and civic uses. Ms. Baxter presented a comparison between Chapter 7 and the UDC regarding the use, architectural standards, parking, height, lighting standards, landscaping and site-specific standards.

Ms. Baxter said this project was submitted in August of 2022, and the development plan was approved on July 9, 2025. A complete appeal application was submitted on July 21, 2025. Standard notice was made, 20 comments were received regarding traffic, compatibility of use, lighting, access, crime and safety, inadequate infrastructure, and decrease in value of home. Agency Review was conducted, and all comments were addressed before the development plan was approved. Regarding PlanCOS this project is in between two established areas integrating residential with commercial type uses.

Appellant's presentation

Julie Price, representing the community around the approved Self Storage, said she will talk about the background, the appeal basis, the application process and the appeal recommendation and considerations. She said from the previous items discussed the theme is community and neighborhoods. Ms. Price cited PlanCOS Vision, highlighting that every person and place is a part of a neighborhood, and each one deserves a great neighborhood. She said Policy VN-1.B calls to inform and engage with stakeholders during the development review process, capital improvement planning and decisions on City and County facilities and services, which did not happen for this application. She said by the time of the application in August 2022, the UDC was already in place and it was up to the applicant to choose to be reviewed under Chapter 7 or the UDC.

Ms. Price said there was a sign posted on September 16, 2022, indicating the comment period will end on September 28, 2022, but there were concerns about its position in a corner facing opposite flow of traffic, and similar concerns were raised about the noticing for the appeal. She said the premise of this application was so disconcerting to the community that 168 thoughtfully prepared comments were provided by the community, but did not receive a response until July 9, 2025, same day of the approval, and not made publicly available until July 18, 2025.

Ms. Price said there was no response to the 168 community comments, nor did a community meeting take place. She said information about recent studies regarding Preble's Jumping Mouse was not provided, but her research shows that for matting purposes they will travel to high ground as far as 2500 feet. She said according to the staff packet, this facility is planned for 1900 feet from Kettle Creek Open Space, within the 2500 feet mice would travel. Ms. Price said the application was reviewed under one code but due to delays, the appeal had to be filed under a different one, and they did not understand

what the differences were. She said when she pointed out the communication issues, she received a response that mistakes are made, this has already been approved, and she filed her appeal as well.

Ms. Price referred to Section 7.5.603.B.1, Detriment to Public Interest, Health, Safety, Convenience and General Welfare, and said this industrial-scale facility brings commercial use to a high-density residential area, that is not designed for the volume, size and weight of trucks and trailers. She said their calculations using the same sources as NES presented in the post-approval meeting show something different. She said the volume and types of vehicles raise safety concerns for community and neighborhood children. Ms. Price said the fencing and the lighting are incompatible with the character standard and expectations of the community, and they do not provide adequate buffering, privacy and transition from the neighborhood to an industrial complex. She said the health welfare, peace, safety and security pose risk and detriment to the community due to the light, pollution, noise, late night traffic and crime. She said in the news it was shared that dead pets were found in a facility, and there have been reports of people living in these units.

Ms. Price referred to Section 7.5.603.B.2, Inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and said it exists for the protection of neighborhood character to ensure compatible infill, mitigates negative impacts on non-residential development, making a positive contribution to what makes a community and a neighborhood, and helping to establish a community-based need for developments. She said this project does none of these. She said within a five-mile radius of the facility there are 10 storage facilities that are not at full capacity.

Ms. Price referred to Section 7.5.603.B.3, Inconsistency with Master Plans, and said, according to Staff and NES this Master Plan is from 40 years ago and has been modified several times, and there are no recent amendments to support how this project supports the community. She said the surrounding areas consist of a community with a golf course and two schools, but no commercial use until getting to Voyager Parkway. Ms. Price said, according to Section 7.5.603.B.4, Location Criteria for Mixed-Use, the zone is supposed to provide transitional benefits from residential to commercial zoning, which is not what the storage facility offers.

Ms. Price said there were emails exchanged with City Staff in November 2022 stating that comments cannot be released to the applicant until the application payment is received. She said on February 2023 an email stated if an application is dormant for 180 days it will

expire, and this application was almost expiring. She said the application fee was paid on February 28, 2023, after the 180 expiration days. Ms. Price said there was an additional email from Staff on March 2023 stating that one of the requirements will be that the applicant conduct a community meeting, however, it did not occur until August 2025, after the application was approved, and only because the appeal was filed. She said attempts to communicate with Staff were made in July 2023 but were unsuccessful, and later they learnt that the application had changed Planners. Ms. Price said after that only a few members of the community received an email on July 9, 2025, notifying them of the administrative approval and beginning of the appeal timeframe under the UDC, even when the application was reviewed under a different code.

Ms. Price said there were emails and comments from Staff stating the applicant was not being very responsive and submittals were taking a long time, causing delay to the entire process, however, in July 9, 2025, it was a fast approval. She said a different Planner took over this project and also made comments about the extreme delay in moving this application forward. Ms. Price said there were a couple of instances where a resubmittal took longer than 180 days, but the application never became expired. She said information online notes the normal application timeline for City Planning takes months, not years.

Ms. Price said the community would like to recommend approval of the appeal and denial of the application for the storage facility, based on all statements provided during her presentation, and the five basis elements on the appeal form. She said if the Commission were to deny the appeal, they would request considerations to the community. Ms. Price said the hours of operation have significantly changed during the application process, and the traffic will not be like regular delivery vans. She said these hours do not account for seasonal daylight and darkness, because nothing good happens after dark. She said if the appeal is denied, they would like to request that a condition be put to respect the hours mentioned at the after approval community meeting, and do not allow them to be changed without a new application process that allows the community input and involvement. Ms. Price said the traffic flow is a safety and quality of life concern, because there is no way currently into the facility going eastbound other than going through the neighborhood, due to the median on Old Ranch Road. She said the approved plans show a forced left turn out of the facility to bypass the neighborhood, but there is no mention on how this will be enforced. She said a no U-turn sign was recently posted at Old Ranch Road and Chapel Ridge Drive and there is nowhere close to make a U-turn, making it difficult for eastbound traffic to turn back. Ms. Price said the median is wide enough to allow for a left turn into

Rhinestone Drive heading eastbound. She said if this appeal is denied, they request the City to require the applicant to implement the latest suggestion. Ms. Price said another consideration would be landscaping, lighting and aesthetics. She said pertaining to landscaping, parts of the community will have direct view into the storage facility, making it look like an industrial park. She said lighting would be likely be reconsidered due to the change of hours in operation, and the inclusion of security cameras, that do not need additional lighting of what is already approved. She said community standards for exterior barriers on major roadways are greater than six feet and are made of precast concrete wall, the metal fencing and building walls are not secure and do not conform to community standards, as opposed to the standard barrier, that would also provide safety. She said that signage should also conform to the rest of the community to provide a transition from the neighborhood to the commercial building. Ms. Price said if the appeal is denied, they request the Commission to require mature landscape that is not impacted by seasonal change, no changes to the approved lighting, and the exterior barrier and signage to conform to the community standards.

Applicant's Presentation

Andrea Barlow, with NES, representing the applicant, said NES was brought into the project on July 21, 2025, when the appeal was submitted and was not involved in the application process. She said the facility is located on the corner of Old Ranch Road and Rhinestone Drive, adjacent to Powers Boulevards, and it is under five acres. She said they reviewed the neighborhood concerns submitted for the initial application, as well as the ones submitted for the appeal, and they referred to inconsistency with the Mastel Plan and neighborhood compatibility, industrial-scale facility, aesthetics, massing, lighting, fencing, noise pollution, gate placement, security concerns, crime, Mouse Habitat and drainage issues.

Ms. Barlow said the site has been commercial since the conception of Briargate Master Plan, and it was zoned commercial in 2003 as Planned Business Center (PBC) that allowed a 45 feet maximum height. She mentioned the rezonings that occurred to the adjacent properties in 2003, 2014 and 2017. She said that accompanying the rezone of this site there was a concept plan that identified 41,000 feet of commercial use. Ms. Barlow said in June 2023, the UDC revised the zone to MX-M (Mixed-Use Medium). She said this application was submitted well before the UDC was approved. She said it was mentioned that the applicant can choose to work with Chapter 7 or the UDC, but this option was not

applicable, since it only pertained to submittals between the adoption of the UDC in early 2023, and its implementation in June 2023. Ms. Barlow said other properties have developed around this site, and the time of the rezoning, the property was still undeveloped.

Ms. Barlow said under Chapter 7, the definition for Mini Warehouse is the same as Self-Storage in the UDC, pointing out that access to the facilities is infrequent and there are no utilities provided, other than lighting. She said the maximum height under Chapter 7 is 45 feet, and for UDC is 50 feet. Ms. Barlow said a lot of the appellant's presentation was about the process, and, although it is unfortunate from a neighborhood involvement perspective, it is not part of the criteria for a development plan. She said the site will include 519 units for a total of approximately 80,000 square feet of storage, and 1,400 square feet of office. She said circulation is required for the storage units, but parking is only required for the office, and stalls have been provided. Ms. Barlow said the building setbacks are 25 feet, which are met on all sides. She said the permitted height is 45 feet, however, they are proposing a height of 17 feet and three inches for the office and for the storage units. She said if they get approved, they will start construction in spring 2026 and will open the facility in summer 2027.

Ms. Barlow said landscaping setbacks and buffers are located all around the perimeter, they meet all the requirements and exceed them for shrubs, which are evergreen, meeting the 50% requirement of seasonality. She emphasized it was never mentioned at the community meeting that hours of operation would be from 9 am to 5 pm. She said it was offered that they will have a discussion with the operator to decide on that matter, and the hours of operation will be Monday to Saturday 6 am to 10 pm and Sunday from 8 am to 6 pm, which are standard operating hours on similar facilities in the area. She said access will be gated and will have an entry code. Ms. Barlow said there will be on-site management and security during normal business hours, and operational security cameras will be in place 24/7. She said rental units will be subject to a contract that prohibits their use for housing.

Ms. Barlow said no outdoor storage would be permitted. She said the material and color of the office are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, nothing industrial-looking, as it will be a low-key development. She said they will be adding a sidewalk along Rhinestone Drive, because it is currently nonexistent. Ms. Barlow presented renderings showing how the development would look from different views. She said the adjacent townhomes are

elevated approximately 10 feet above the grade of the road and will have a bird's view of any development on that site. She said they have a six-foot fence that does not provide much screening, so the proposed landscaping will improve that.

Ms. Barlow said one of the biggest concerns in the community meeting was traffic, especially about the access from Rhinestone into Old Ranch Road, that is right-in and right-out only, because there is a median across Old Ranch Road. She said if someone wants to go east, they will have to go through the neighborhood. Ms. Barlow said a mini warehouse is the least traffic generator commercial use, that a traffic report is not even required. She said they compared traffic between uses as single-family attached housing, a strip retail plaza, a general office building, and medical and dental offices, and it showed the total traffic generated by this development is significantly less than the preferred alternatives, especially during peak hours. She said the management company considers that, compared to similar projects they manage in the area, they would probably get 16 trips in and out a day. She said the mini warehouse has a steady trip generation, while the other uses vary throughout the day.

Ms. Barlow said there were concerns about sight visibility and an analysis was done and Traffic Engineering agreed with it. She said there was a request to move the gate back and they did. She said the site is designed to accommodate the turning requirements for emergency vehicles, small box trucks and moving vans, but not semitrucks. Ms. Barlow said 54 wall-mounted lights are proposed, that will be downward facing, which will not cause any impact farther than 10 feet away. She said for security purposes only the minimum necessary lighting will be kept on 24/7.

Ms. Barlow said they are proposing a precast concrete screen fence along Rhinestone Drive and a security rail fence on the east and south sides of the property, and no additional fence on the north, since there is an existing one. Ms. Barlow said regarding the environmental concerns for the Mouse habitat, it is focused near the creek because of the water source. She said once the water source is disrupted by development, which this has been, there is no habitat beyond that. She said Kettle Creek development got all the permits needed with the US Fish and Wildlife, and there was an authorized take of habitat.

Ms. Barlow said what is relevant is the review criteria, where the site design, building location, orientation and exterior building materials are compatible with the neighborhood and complies with the City adopted plans. She said when there is a master plan and a

zoning in place, PlanCOS requirements become less relevant, however, when it comes to creating vibrant neighborhoods, this commercial site has always been part of the neighborhood. She said it meets the dimensional standards in the Zoning Code, complies with the Drainage Criteria Manual, as it allocates a detention pond on the northwest of the property that will address all the existing and future drainage issues. She said it also provides adequate parking and everything else meets standards. Ms. Barlow said it complies with the Landscape Code, addresses sensitive natural features, complies with the traffic criteria, has adequate utilities services and addresses significant off-site impacts.

Ms. Barlow said the appellant referred to public health, safety and welfare, which is a zoning criteria, not a development plan criteria. She said once a zone is established, there is an assumption that allowed uses are compatible with the neighborhood from that perspective. Ms. Barlow said at the meeting they held there were 61 attendees, and one approached saying that a different use could be worse. She said some of the attendees got their concerns addressed and clarity that this has always been commercial, and no changes are being proposed to the master plan nor to the zoning.

Commissioners' Questions

Commissioner Hensler asked if they analyzed traffic generation for a multi-family development, which is permitted use. Ms. Barlow said they wanted to be realistic in their analysis, so they used townhomes as example.

Commissioner Robbins asked if going from Powers on Old Ranch Road there are two lanes going west. Ms. Barlow said there are two lanes in both directions.

Commissioner Robins asked if going on Old Ranch Road there is an apron to turn right into Rhinestone. Ms. Barlow said there is a deceleration lane to go in and an acceleration lane when you come out.

Public Comments

Chris Radcliff, resident of the area, said he is there because they were only informed of the approval after years of dormancy. He said it was mentioned that the site was always commercial, and where he now lives was also commercial at one point. He said this

development has not been very transparent, so the appeal is the only resource they have. Mr. Radcliff said minimal traffic was mentioned, however, it will still be more than what it currently is. He said he worries about his son that has to walk by the area everyday to go to school.

Karen Knowles, resident of the area, said her grandchildren play on the street in the area constantly, and to access the site, people will have to come through her street or the one perpendicular to hers. She said she is concerned about the moving trucks that will be coming in and blocking the street for the buses at school pick-up time. Ms. Knowles said kids ride their bikes or scooters to schools and after school programs, and will have to fight the trucks. She said when she moved there 20 years ago, they were promised a park behind Bison Ridge, and she would love to see a park because there is nowhere for the kids to play. She said she is concerned about the operation times, and people and trucks coming and going all the time.

Linden Kinkead, resident of the area, said she bought a property in the neighborhood on August 1st, when the city had moved forward with this and she had no option to get out of buying it, and she will have to be next to the storage facility. She said there is a major concern about moving trucks parking on the outside while they unload, because they cannot go in. She said if two trucks are parked, that turns the street into one way only. She said if landscaping is not mature enough and not taken care of, it will die and leave the metal fencing by itself, and all should be evergreen. She said if all surrounding properties rezoned into residential, why is this still commercial.

Jim Lubban, Vice President of the HOA at Bison Ridge and Kettle Creek, said most residents are very opposed to this. He said he considers a mistake that all surrounding properties were approved to be residential, leaving this site as MX-M. He said two sides of the site are facing residential properties. Mr. Lubban said townhomes might bring more traffic, but residents will be cognizant of the children when they circulate. He said the crime rate is 1200 plus burglaries in Colorado Springs, from which 10% occur in self-storage areas, and the proposed fencing would not be much of security. He said that traffic going through the neighborhood at 10 pm at night is not acceptable.

Robert Stein, a resident of Kettle Ridge Drive, said his street will be where all trucks and extra traffic go into this facility. He said he drives a semi-truck and knows that small businesses store their stock in storage facilities, meaning commercial vehicles will

frequently travel through the neighborhood. He said the neighborhood already floods during rainstorms and fears the facility's driveway will worsen the situation. He said they should consider access from Old Ranch Road, instead of through the neighborhood, because truck activity at 10 pm will be very disruptive. He said it would be better to have townhomes instead of the commercial facility.

Kimberly Stein, Bison Ridge resident, said she has lived there for nearly 10 years, and her primary concern is traffic, particularly on Kettle Ridge Drive that will have all incoming traffic to access this facility if you are coming from the west. She said traffic studies considered Old Ranch Road, not their street. She said children walk to and from school in the area, and that large trucks, including semis and moving vans, would pose a danger. She said truck traffic from 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM daily, and until 5:00 PM on Sundays is not acceptable. She said this can have a negative impact on property values and it would not benefit the residents of her neighborhood.

Dave Murphy, Townes at Kettle Creek resident, said he was the person corresponding with City Staff in 2022, and a community meeting was offered to be a requirement due to the neighborhood opposition, however it never happened. He said he only received notification of approval and is frustrated about the process, which was not fair. He said the applicant's responses to comments were not available on Accela until the day of the approval. He said he read all 168 comments that were written in a respectful and thoughtful manner with concerns about a development that does not add value to the neighborhood. He said he is concerned about the light and the noise pollution, declining property values, traffic, potential crime, and constantly changing hours of operation, the trucks beeping when backing up and the doors rolling. He said he is also concerned about the lack of landscaping planning.

Jenn Murphy, resident of the neighborhood, said she is frustrated about how this application was handled. She said she considers it unsafe and unfair that the development will use the existing fence facing the townhomes instead of adding a new one. She said not including the members of the community in the process was disrespectful, and they are confused and frustrated. She said they talked to the neighbors and maybe only five people were in support of the proposal. She said they kept open communication with City staff until 2023, and since communication stopped, they thought this project was not moving forward, until they received the approval notification. She said none of the 168 complaints were made public until the day of approval.

Chris Annan, Slumber Ridge Way resident, asked if there was a traffic study done. He said the biggest concerns are the values of the homes with a commercial property sitting in the middle of a residential area. He said to go in and out of the storage complex there is no other option than going through Kettle Ridge. He asked if studies can be done about an entrance or traffic change on Old Ranch Road, to avoid a neighborhood with families, dogs, kids walking to and from school.

Allyssa Downs, resident of the area, said she has been a Colorado Springs resident since 1987 and has seen a lot of change, especially about the open space that she misses a lot. She said she is very concerned about the traffic and safety, because there are a lot of people walking at any time of the day every day. She said she would love for the site to stay as open space. She said she agrees with Chris Annan about making the traffic change in Old Ranch Road, so the traffic does not go into the neighborhood that already has massive potholes. She said the setbacks for the facility should be larger to allow more evergreens on Rhinestone to cover the visual impact from the residential area, and more buffer to help with the noise.

Will Lassani, resident of the area, said he echoes all previous comments from the neighborhood and wants to add that the comment about all attendees to the community meeting have found their answers is not accurate, because clearly people are saying they do not want this. He said this is a commercial building and are not people that will be part of the community and will not take care of it the same way. He said he is concerned about the lack of emotionality because everything has to be done in terms of code.

Appellant's Rebuttal

Ms. Price said she speaks on behalf of the 168 people that submitted comments and the 61 people that attended the community meeting because most of them have to work. She said this is not a small voice. She said most people at the community meeting might have left with a better understanding of what is coming but not satisfied, so she requests the appeal to be approved, and the application denied. She said there are two schools in the area and kids walk by every day. Ms. Price said the evolution of the neighborhood was noted, with all properties changing from commercial to residential, except this one. She said this storage facility does not offer a transition at all. She said it was pointed out that

this has always been commercial, but it is not the case because she was able to buy a residential property.

Ms. Price said it was mentioned during her presentation that applications submitted before June 5, 2023, could choose to be reviewed under the UDC or Chapter 7. She said the delay for this application process has been years. She said according to the definition of mini warehouse access should be infrequent, but how will that be enforced. She said other facilities operate according to daylight time, unlike this one. She said other facilities have mentioned that people store their boats, small vehicles, barbeque grills or realtor signs, so how can they be sure that access will be infrequent. She said she believes PlanCOS is there to support community involvement, which was totally disregarded during this application. She said even though landscaping exceeds the requirements, it is the placement that is the issue.

Ms. Price said hours of operation were indeed mentioned at the community meeting, creating expectations on the schedule. She said Colorado Springs has more sense of community than other cities and that is why people move here. Ms. Price said it is not only the volume of traffic that is concerning, but the type; 16 to 26 feet might be also coming in. She said the minimal lighting is only offered for eight hours.

Applicant's Rebuttal

Ms. Barlow said community members are right about the traffic pattern because if someone wants to go east, they must go through the neighborhood. She said this facility will bring minimal traffic compared to any other use, and the type of vehicles that will come are already in the neighborhood. She said in residential neighborhoods, usually 3% to 5% are trucks, which are not part of the community either, therefore traffic will not be much different. Ms. Barlow said community members are right about this site being surrounded by residential areas because that is how the master plan was designed, and while it is not a residential transition, it is a low-key commercial transition. She said mature trees will not be planted but vegetation will meet the minimum height requirement for the different types. She said there will be a solid fence along Rhinestone with additional screening with the trees. She said they did discuss with Traffic Engineering the possibility of accessing from Old Ranch Road instead of Rhinestone, but it is too close to the intersection with Powers, making it not an option.

Ms. Barlow said the landowner of this site is the same owner as the other developments know as the Venezia of Briargate, and they purposely chose this use as the most compatible commercial use with the neighborhood. She said there was a comment about lack of emotionality on her presentation, and that is exactly what she is supposed to do, refer to the criteria, not emotions. She said property values are not part of the criteria, and each property has the right to their value. Ms. Barlow said regarding using the fence of the existing development, if they were to put another fence against it, it will just create maintenance issues, but they do have connecting fences to the rest of the perimeter for security. She said there were comments about this site being used for a park or as open space, however, it was never intended to be for any of those uses. Ms. Barlow said this is private property and as such the owner has rights and expectations to have it as commercial use. She said they are potentially improving the situation for school children by adding a sidewalk.

Commissioners' Questions

Chair Casey asked Todd Frisbie, City Traffic Engineering, representative of Public Works Department, if there is a possibility of extending the road across the median on Old Ranch Road. Mr. Frisbie said that is a possibility.

Chair Casey asked if there is a methodology to look at to implement that. Mr. Frisbie said the number of vehicles that will trigger a left turn lane on that intersection is 25 vehicles at peak hour.

Commissioner Rickett said the intersection with Powers is not very far away. Mr. Frisbie said it is about 650 feet away, however, he does not like unprotected left turns, especially when there is a protected one 500 feet to the west. He said they did not see the need of the turn since this is a low traffic generation use.

Commissioner Hensler asked if there are similar types of use that do not require a traffic study. Mr. Frisbie said it usually depends on the number of trips generated at peak hour, if it is more than 100, a study will typically be required.

Commissioner Hensler asked if there are known issues about traffic around storage facilities. Mr. Frisbie said he has not received any complaints specifically about storage facilities.

Mary Rosenoff, Deputy Chief of Police in charge of the Patrol Bureau, said they do a lot of speed enforcement in the Old Ranch Road and Chapel Hills area, regardless of the presence of storage units.

Chair Casey asked Deputy Chief Rosenoff to speak about crime in storage facilities. She said there is about 120 storage facilities in Colorado Springs, with an average of 500 units. She said from January 2024 through July 2025 there were 2148 calls about storage facilities. She said in 2024 there were 286 burglaries reported, however property burglaries are down 8% from last year. She said between January and July 2024 there were 162 calls and for the same period in 2025, there have been 152. She said in August 2024 there were 36 burglary calls, but only 10 this year.

Commissioner Hensler asked if those facilities are fenced or controlled. Deputy Chief Rosenoff said they are all different facilities. She said they do facilitate the crime prevention procedure of having an officer come by and make recommendations; however, those are not always followed because it can become costly.

Chair Casey asked if she had more specific numbers about the storage facilities in that specific area. Deputy Chief Rosenoff said she does not because these are triggered by specific addresses, and those are not always related to burglaries, they could be traffic accidents, domestic disturbances or other issues but just people might use the storage location as a reference.

Chair Casey asked Richard Mulledy, Director of Public Works, if they see any issues with drainage and the retention pond in the area. Mr. Mulledy said according to the drainage report they are proposing minimal off-site flows for the existing conditions and are reduced for the post development conditions. He said the capacity of the existing storm sewer system was considered including this site, which will also be reduced in the post development.

Commissioner Cecil asked if there was a reference in the prior zoning that talked about expiration of an application. Ms. Baxter said in Chapter 7 and in UDC there is a withdrawal section establishing 180 days, with the option of extending response periods by the manager, as long as they are in communication with the City, because of external work that the application might need.

Commissioner Cecil asked what the process is to document the communication between the applicant and the City in case there are inquiries about it. Ms. Baxter said it depends on the Planner case, but it could be an email or a phone call.

Commissioner Cecil asked if the language from the Air Force Overlay that does not appear on the drawings was waived by the manager. Ms. Baxter said this applicant was referred to the Air Force Academy and the requirements will be on the subdivision plat, which has not been submitted yet.

Commissioner Cecil said it should also appear on the land use plan. Ms. Baxter said it might be on the concept plan for Bison Ridge at Kettle Creek, but this is the development plan.

Commissioner Cecil cited a code section about development plans including all documentation. Daniel Sexton, Planning Manager, said that section pertains to the UDC, and this application was reviewed under Chapter 7.

Commissioner Cecil asked how they should factor the criteria based on the old code that was presented. Trevor Gloss, City Attorney's Office, said when there is a recodification of a code specific standards should be maintained from the previous code and general applicability, like the appeal process, should conform to the new code.

Commissioner Cecil asked if somehow something is not permitted by the UDC it would not be relevant. Mr. Gloss said the development plan and requirements should be compared to Chapter 7.

Commissioner Rickett thanked the appellant for a good presentation, and the community members for providing their comments. Commissioner Rickett said there were comments about working for the people, he said they do work for the city, for the developers and for the community. Commissioner Rickett said feelings do not have to be considered and they make decisions based on the code. Commissioner Rickett said he understands the community's frustration with this being reviewed under one code but appealed under another. Commissioner Rickett said he had previously brought up to City Council that the development process itself needs to be improved, making it easily accessible and

understandable to the public. Commissioner Rickett said most of the comments were zone related.

Commissioner Rickett said he is in support of development plans and for the public to use them. Commissioner Rickett said this has been a commercial site and the owner has the right to use it as such, even though other surrounding properties have decided to become residential. Commissioner Rickett said he does not believe the comment about compatibility with the neighborhood under UDC has been met, but he asked for confirmation whether this is an applicable criteria. Mr. Sexton cited the first criteria under Chapter 7, which is comparable with the one mentioned, and is a subjective criteria. Commissioner Rickett said he is not opposed to the use of storage facility, however, he will be in support of the appellant, because he considers the application does not meet that one criteria, especially with the materials proposed.

Commissioner Hensler said she appreciates the public presence and their input. Commissioner Hensler said she understands the frustration when a process takes long and staff is changed but asked the public to give grace to staff that is currently working on the applications. Commissioner Hensler said she agrees with Commissioner Rickett that this has been a commercial property and in this case the owner decided to keep it like that. Commissioner Hensler said she considers the materials are compatible with the neighborhood to the extend possible and she will be in support of the application.

Commissioner Robbins said he agrees that the zoning in question has been in place for a long time. Commissioner Robbins said he understands the community's concerns, particularly regarding traffic and safety, but those would be much higher if it was a different development, as shown in the chart presented by the applicant. Commissioner Robbins said that the property is privately owned, and the owner has the right to sell or develop it according to current zoning regulations. Commissioner Robbins said he thinks the applicant will do a good job with landscaping. Commissioner Robbins suggested a website to tack crime and neighborhood data. Commissioner Robbins said that traffic from delivery services is already a factor in neighborhoods. Commissioner Robbins said he is not in favor of the appeal.

Commissioner Cecil thanked Ms. Price for a very detailed presentation. Commissioner Cecil said she thinks this approval was not erroneous but has brought up some operational

issues that have to be looked at. Commissioner Cecil said she did not find a criteria that was not met so she will not be in support of the appeal.

Commissioner Rickett said if the appeal is not upheld, he would suggest that the hours of operation be listed in the development plan. Chair Casey said the development plan has already been approved. Mr. Sexton said the item before the Commission is an appeal of an approved plan, and it would be very difficult to go back and change it, and typically in development plans they do not usually get into hours of operation. Kevin Walker said if that is a condition they want, that could maybe be included in the motion if it the Attorney's consider it feasible.

Commissioner Rickett asked if they can appeal to City Council. Mr. Walker said they can.

Commissioner Sipilovic thanked the community for participating. Commissioner Sipilovic said he understands not wanting a storage facility in the neighborhood, but the zoning is not under review today. He said he thinks the landscaping and the stone added to the facilities is cohesive with the surroundings so he will not be in support of the appeal.

Chair Casey said he is also not in support of the appeal. Chair Casey said he understands the process was flawed and Planning staff can address that. Chair Casey said the proposal is using the land for a permitted use by right, and property owner are allowed to do that as long as they have a responsible development plan. Chair Casey said that he has seen more crime occur in a park than in a storage facility.

Commissioner Rickett said The Broadmoor had the zoo paint a metal roof so it does not reflect into them. Commissioner Rickett said there is a possibility that the roof reflect into the townhomes.

Chair Casey said he does not think a condition on the hours of operation is appropriate, as the appellant has the opportunity to bring it as a consideration on the next appeal process.

Commissioner Clements said he voted against the item because he would not want that in his neighborhood either.

Mr. Walker said this process was not acceptable and will make sure they continue to improve it.

Motion by Commissioner Hensler, seconded by Commissioner Sipilovic, to deny the Appeal and affirm the administrative approval of the Development Plan application, based on the provisions of the City Code (UDC), and that the appellant has not substantiated that the appeal satisfies the review criteria outlined in City Code (UDC) Section 7.5.415.A.2.

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

Aye: 9 - Commissioner Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Robbins, Commissioner Sipilovic and Commissioner Casey.

No: 2 – Commissioner Clements and Commissioner Rickett.

Absent: 2 - Chair Slattery and Commissioner Gigiano.