



City of Colorado Springs

Regional Development
Center (Hearing Room)
2880 International Circle

Meeting Minutes - Draft City Planning Commission

Wednesday, February 11, 2026

9:00 AM

2880 International Cir., 2nd Floor, Hearing Room

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Present: 9 - Vice Chair Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby and Vice Chair Case

2. Changes to Agenda/Postponements

3. Communications

Kenneth Casey - Planning Commission Chair

Kevin Walker - Planning Director

Kevin Walker, City Planning Director, said the Fishers Canyon Stratton Meadows and Ute Valley Park rezoning items will not be heard at this meeting, and will be postponed to different dates.

Mr. Walker said City Council heard the Mormon church steeple appeal the day before and approved the development plan without conditions.

Mr. Walker said there will be a joint meeting between City Council and City Planning Commission, tentatively in March or April for approximately a two-hour session.

Mr. Walker said during March Work Session there will be a Spacious Skies presentation and invited Commissioners to provide any other topics that might be of interest to them.

Vice Chair Hensler asked when the Downtown Master Plan will be presented. Mr. Walker said probably around April.

4. Approval of Minutes

4.A. [CPC 2728](#) Minutes for the January 14, 2026, City Planning Commission meeting.

Presenter:

Kenneth Casey, City Planning Commission Chair

Attachments: [CPC Minutes 1.14.16 Draft](#)

Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Commissioner Clements, to approve the Minutes for the January 14, 2026, City Planning Commission meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-1-0.

Aye: 8 - Vice Chair Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano and Case

Abstain: 1 - Commissioner Willoughby

5. Consent Calendar

**Motion by Commissioner Slattery, seconded by Vice Chair Hensler, to approve the Consent Calendar.
The motion passed unanimously.**

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

6473 Vincent Dr Rezone

- 5.A.** [ZONE-25-0010](#) An Ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to approximately 2.93 acres located southwest of Dublin Boulevard and Vincent Drive from A/PDZ/R-1 6/HS-O/AF-O (Agriculture, Planned Development Zone, and Single-Family Medium, with Hillside and United States Air Force Academy Overlays) to MX-N/AF-O (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Scale with United States Air Force Academy Overlay). (Quasi-Judicial) (1st Reading only to set the public hearing date for March 24, 2026)

Related Files: ZONE-25-0010
Located in Council District 1

Presenter:

Austin Cooper, Senior Planner, City Planning Department
Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

- Attachments:** [Ordinance](#)
[6473 Vincent Dr Rezone Staff Report](#)
[Attachment 1 - Project Statement](#)
[Attachment 2 - Land Use Statement](#)
[Attachment 3 - Public Comments](#)
[Attachment 4 - Public Comment Response Letter](#)
[Attachment 5 - Legal Description](#)
[Attachment 6 - Legal Depiction](#)
[7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \(REZONING\)](#)
[Presentation CPC 01.14](#)
[Presentation CC 03.24](#)
[Excerpt Minutes - Vincent Drive - CPC 02 11 2026](#)

Cumbre Vista Park

- 5.B.** [ZONE-25-0032](#) An Ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to approximately 5.75 acres located at 7915 Hunter Peak Trail from R1-6/DF/AP-O (Single-Family Residential Medium with Design Flexibility Overlay and Airport Overlay) to PK/AP-O (Public Park with Airport Overlay). (Quasi-judicial - first reading and setting the public hearing date for March 24, 2026)

Council District: 2

Presenter:

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

- Attachments:** [ZONE-25-0032 Ordinance](#)
[ZONE-25-0032 Staff Report](#)
[Attachment 1 Cumbre Vista Land Use Statement](#)
[Attachment 2 Cumbre Vista Project Statement](#)
[Attachment 3 Public Comments](#)
[Exhibit A Zone Legal Description](#)
[Exhibit B Zone Map Exhibit](#)
[ZONE-25-0032 CPC Presentation](#)

Grey Hawk Park

- 5.C.** [ZONE-25-0033](#) An Ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to approximately 4.48 acres located at 950 Spectrum Loop from PDZ (Planned Development Zone) to PK/AF-O

(Public Park with United States Air Force Academy Overlay).
(Quasi-Judicial - first reading and setting the public hearing date for
March 24, 2026)

Council District 2

Presenter:

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

Attachments: [ZONE-25-0033 Ordinance](#)
[ZONE-25-0033 Staff Report](#)
[Attachment 1 Land Use Statement v2](#)
[Attachment 2 Project Statement](#)
[Exhibit A Zone Legal Description](#)
[Exhibit B Zone Map Exhibit v2](#)
[ZONE-25-0033 CPC Presentation v2](#)

US24/SH21 Street Name Change

- 5.D. [SUBD-25-01](#) A Street Name Change from Airport Road to Headwind Way located
[32](#) east of the new Airport Road / HWY21-24 (Powers) Interchange.

Council District 4

Presenter:

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

Attachments: [Staff Report Airport Rd Street Name Change](#)
[Attachment 1 Project Statement](#)
[Attachment 2 Legal Description](#)
[Attachment 3 Site Map](#)
[Street Name Change Presentation Planning](#)
[7.4.304 STREET IMPROVEMENTS](#)
[7.5.531 STREET NAME CHANGE](#)

Moxie Suites

- 5.E. [CUDP-25-00](#) A Conditional Use to allow a Small Personal and Business Service
[33](#) use in the MX-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Scale) zone district
located at 2402 North Nevada Avenue.
(Quasi-Judicial)

Located in Council District 5

Presenter:

William Gray, Senior Planner, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment 1 - Zoning Map](#)

[Attachment 2 - North End Addition](#)

[Attachment 3 - Ordinance No. 25-75](#)

[Attachment 4 - Context Map](#)

[Attachment 5 - Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 6 - Land Use Statement](#)

[Attachment 7 - North End Existing Land Use](#)

[Attachment 8 - North End Future Land Use](#)

[Staff Presentation](#)

[7.5.601 CONDITIONAL USE](#)

6. Items Called Off Consent Calendar

7. Unfinished Business

8. New Business

5226 Brady Road Garage Addition

- 8.A. [NVAR-25-0014](#) A Non-Use Variance to City Code Section 7.3.304.C.1.a to allow 3,296 square feet of total garage space where 1,650 square feet is required on a 1-acre site zoned R-E/AP-O (Residential Estate with Airport Overlay) located at 5226 Brady Road.
(Quasi-Judicial)

Located in Council District 5

Presenter:

Matthew Ambuul, Planner II, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [Staff Report 5226 Brady Road NVAR-25-0014](#)

[Attachment 1 - Site Plan](#)

[Attachment 2 - Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 3 - Rustic Hills Improvement Association Memorandum](#)

[Attachment 4 - Public comments and responses](#)

[Staff Presentation NVAR-25-0014](#)

[7.5.526 NON-USE VARIANCE](#)

[Applicant Presentation for 5226 Brady Rd NVAR-25-0014](#)

Matthew Ambuul, Planner II, presented the non-use variance for a garage addition on the property located at 5226 Brady Road, where the current zoning is Residential Estate with Airport Overlay, on Council District 5. The application is to construct a 2,560 square-foot detached garage, adding space to the primary structure for a total space of 3,296 square feet. They meet the setback and easement requirements. He said there have been similar non-use variances approvals in the area, even prior to the UDC. This project will also require an administrative adjustment for the height of 18 feet, four inches, where 16 feet is permitted. The application went through three review cycles. Standard notice was sent out twice and comments were received with concerns about the size, architectural compatibility, possible commercial use, potential neighborhood devaluation, too close to the entrance of the neighborhood and not meeting code; as well as comments in support, given that it could increase property values, help clean up the neighborhood and upgrade the existing property. Agency Review was conducted and comments were addressed. The application complies with PlanCOS, however, it is unclear if the application meets the review criteria.

Applicant's Presentation

Scott Schwartz, property owner, said he is applying for a detached garage to be built in his property that has a total lot coverage of 12.4% where 30% is allowed. He said the garage will be used for his personal equipment such as cars and boats. Mr. Schwartz said his property is one acre in size, similar to the other properties that got their non-variances approved. He said once the structure is built, the total lot coverage will be less than 13% and they are fully compliant with the Residential Estate requirements. He said the structure will not exceed the two-story structures from the neighborhood, being even lower than the main structure, reducing its visual presence. Mr. Schwartz said Rustic Hills Acres has previously supported this type of request that has been approved by DRE and City Planning Commission. He said the structure will not pose any adverse impact but enhancement of the lot landscape and appearance, and the materials will be similar to the existing house and the neighborhood. He said there are 50 and 70-foot trees on the perimeter of the property that would cover the

structure from the neighbors' view.

Public Comments

David Murr, resident of the area, said the properties in the area are one acre or bigger and people like them for different activities. He said the covenant in this area was written in 1963, and there is a volunteer-run Architectural Control Committee (ACC), which has led to subjective decisions and inconsistent approvals. He said many structures have been approved or built that encroach on setbacks and property lines, with limited resident participation and weak enforcement on other issues. He said there are no specific guidelines in their Architectural Committee to be based on, and he considers approvals have been granted by whether they like the applicant or not.

Bill Brown, resident of the area, said his home was built in 2005 and exceeds size limits that existed at the time, including a large three-car garage and a 2,000-square-foot barn, and neighbors have not complained about it. He said many oversized structures in the area have been allowed, often without complaints from neighbors. Mr. Brown said Mr. Schwartz has enough space and the structure would be isolated and should be approved.

Jon Newmann, resident of the area, said he has no personal conflict with the applicant. He said both the Architectural Committee and the HIA board previously voted against the variance. He said that granting one variance often sets a precedent for future ones, citing a recent nearby project where incremental approvals led to a much larger outcome.

Gordon Stegner, Chair of the Architectural Control Committee, said variances set a precedent for additional oversized structures in the future. He said the proposed building exceeds what is reasonable for the neighborhood and could lead to further requests for increased size and height. Mr. Stegner said he understands that the applicant needs storage but, for the benefit of the neighborhood, limits on accessory structures should be maintained.

Applicant's Rebuttal

Mr. Shwartz said he has lived in that association for approximately 25 years, and he used to belong to the Architectural Control Committee as well. He said the decision comes down to the president, where they have approved these structures for 20 or 30 years, however, he does not understand why his application was denied.

Commissioners' Questions and Comments

Commissioner Slattery asked what the proposed access to the new structure is. Mr. Schwartz said it would be from Brady Road, there is an opening to the south of the driveway, and there is additional access on the west property line.

Commissioner Willoughby asked how the square footage and the height were determined. Mr. Schwartz said the height depends on the required roof pitch and wall height. He said a 12-pitch roof is essentially the minimum, which determines the overall ridge height. He said the garage door heights are about 9 to 10 feet so the resulting roof peak on the detached garage will be only a few inches higher than typical proportions for such structures, but lower than the main house structure.

Commissioner Robbins asked how many similar variances have been approved in the area. Mr. Schwartz said going down the road there are at least 12. Mr. Ambuul said there are multiple variances that have been approved all around the area, even before the UDC.

Commissioner Robbins said he wonders why the Architectural Control Committee and the HOA are not enforcing cleanliness in other areas, as it seems to be a worry for the neighbors. Commissioner Robbins said he thinks this structure would add value to the property, as it has done for similar properties around the area.

Commissioner Cecil said the Planning Commission is required to be based on the UDC, evaluate the criteria for this non-use variance and look at specific findings. Commissioner Cecil asked if she interpreted the code right by saying that stables are allowed as accessory use and do not have size limitations. Mr. Ambuul said that accessory structures are also based on habitable space and the lot coverage cannot be exceeded.

Commissioner Cecil said she does not see the extraordinary, unique lot conditions, even when there is a precedent, but that is not part of the standards. Commissioner Cecil wondered why a garage would not be allowed by code if it would not have negative impact like traffic, noise or smell.

Commissioner Slattery asked what the difference is between Chapter 7 and the UDC regarding this variance. Mr. Ambuul said Chapter 7 had a maximum height for garage doors, which is not considered in the UDC anymore. He said earlier code allowed certain areas to be excluded from being classified as garage space if vehicle access was restricted, but with the updated UDC adoption, such exclusions no longer apply; the entire area must now be treated as garage space regardless of internal walls or restricted sections. Mr. Ambuul said there is no longer a maximum number

of garage doors, and that garage size thresholds are now based solely on square footage, with either two 16-foot openings, or two 20-foot openings, depending on overall garage height. Daniel Sexton, Planning Manager, said previous regulations included several dimensional standards for detached garages, including limits on garage door numbers, overall garage size, and separate size restrictions for storage areas. He said under the old Chapter 7, storage space was internally divided from garage space using walls, curbs, or bollards to prevent vehicle access. Mr. Sexton said with adoption of the UDC, these internal distinctions were eliminated, the garage door limit was removed, and the maximum allowable size for garage space was increased, simplifying and consolidating the standards.

Chair Casey asked why it is mentioned in the staff report that it is unclear whether this application meets the criteria. Mr. Ambuul said the proposed structure does not meet the applicable standards because it exceeds both the guideline size of 1,650 square feet and the allowed building height. He said the property is one acre, with screening, open space, and sufficient lot coverage, which is a standard size for the area, but not for all Colorado Springs, which makes it unclear whether the site qualifies as having extraordinary or exceptional physical conditions needed to justify a variance. Regarding reasonable use, he explained that the building would serve as storage for vehicles and personal items to help clean up the property, which could be a beneficial use for the applicant, though he expressed some uncertainty about whether this fully satisfies the required criteria.

Commissioner Cecil asked if all criteria must be met or if meeting one of them would be sufficient. Sara Brewen, City Attorney's Office, said, after looking at the code, they are additive criteria so all of them must be met.

Commissioner Slattery said one-acre lots are unusual within Colorado Springs and considers it an extraordinary condition compared to most city parcels. Commissioner Slattery said despite the garage appearing large, the total lot coverage is under 13 percent, well below the 30 percent allowed, and nearby properties also include similar outbuildings. Commissioner Slattery said she finds the proposal meets the criteria and will be voting in favor of the non-use variance.

Vice Chair Hensler said the proposal falls well below the 30 percent lot-coverage limit and meets setback requirements, and if the structure were a livable building or a barn, it would likely qualify for administrative approval. Vice Chair Hensler said the situation is a narrow gray area, where the ambiguity itself suggests the application is very close to meeting approval standards. Vice Chair Hensler said while the HOA may aim to reinforce older rules, current conditions support establishing updated

precedents. Vice Chair Hensler said the proposal aligns with neighborhood character and will be in favor of approving the variance.

Commissioner Robbins said he agrees with previous commissioner's comments about approving this variance, as long as it is not intended for commercial use. Commissioner Robbins said growing up with many vehicles parked outside, he thinks a large garage can help maintain order on a property, something he believes HOAs should encourage when addressing neighborhood upkeep. Commissioner Robbins said he is in favor of the variance.

Commissioner Cecil said she does not feel that this application meets three of the four criteria, so she will be voting against it.

Vice Chair Hensler said she thinks being a one-acre lot is an extraordinary condition, and this application will not adversely impact the neighborhood.

Chair Casey said his primary concern is not creating an adverse impact on surrounding properties, because 50% of public comments have mentioned it does, as well as the Architectural Review Committee of the Rustic Hills Improvement Association, whose role is specifically to assess potential impacts. Chair Casey said other variances have been approved in the past and encouraged the applicant to work with the association to gain its support. Chair Casey said, given the association's opposition, he will vote against the variance.

Motion by Commissioner Robbins, seconded by Vice Chair Hensler, to approve the Non-use Variance to City Code Section 7.3.304.C.1.a allowing 3,296 square feet of garage space based upon the findings that the request complies with the criteria as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.526 with the following conditions of approval and technical modification:

Conditions of Approval

- 1. Prior to Building Permit issuance, a Final Drainage Letter needs to be reviewed and approved by City's Stormwater Enterprise.**
- 2. Prior to Building Permit issuance, an Administrative Adjustment application must be reviewed and approved for the proposed 18-foot, four (4) inch building height for the garage.**

Technical Modification

- 1. Update the FEMA Firm map information on the plan.**

The motion passed by a vote of 7-2-0-0.

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

No: 2 - Commissioner Cecil and Chair Casey

Landings Business Park

- 8.B. [ZONE-25-00](#) [24](#) An Ordinance to amend the zoning map of the City of Colorado Springs pertaining to approximately 319.94 acres located west of Marksheffel Road, north of Drennan Road, and southeast of Peterson Airforce Base from MX-M/cr/GI/cr/BP/cr/APD/AP-O/APZ-1 (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with Conditions of Record, General Industrial with Conditions of Record, Business Park with Conditions of Record, and Airport Planned Development with Airport Overlay and Accident Potential Zone) to PDZ/AP-O/APZ-1 (Planned Development Zone with Airport Overlay and Accident Potential Zone). (Quasi-Judicial - First reading and setting the public hearing for March 24, 2026, in accord with City Code Section 7.5.407)

Located in Council District 4

Presenter:

Drew Foxx, Planner II, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [ORD Landings Business Park](#)
[Staff Report Landings Business Park](#)
[Attachment 1 Land Use Plan](#)
[Attachment 2 PSFB Review Comments](#)
[Attachment 3 Project Statement](#)
[Attachment 4 Traffic Impact Study](#)
[Attachment 5 Banning Lewis Ranch Master Plan](#)
[Attachment 6 Contrarian MD 1-6 Resolution No. 106-25](#)
[Attachment 7 Peak Innovation Park Master Plan](#)
[Banning Lewis Ranch No. 1 \(Ord. 88-114\)](#)
[Banning Lewis Ranch R-5 Zone Establishment \(Ord. 88-134\)](#)
[Exhibit A Legal Description](#)
[Exhibit B Zoning Map Amendment](#)
[M-2 GI Zone Establishment \(Ord. 88-126\)](#)
[PBC\(2\) MX-M Zone Establishment \(Ord. 88-131\)](#)
[PIP-2 BP Zone Establishment \(Ord. 88-122\)](#)
[7.5.704 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT \(REZONING\)](#)
[Staff Presentation Landings Business Park](#)

Motion by Vice Chair Hensler, seconded by Commissioner Willoughby, to recommend approval to City Council of the zone

change of 319.9 acres from MX-M/cr/GI/cr/BP/cr/APD/AP-O/APZ-1 (Mixed-Use Medium Scale with Conditions of Record, General Industrial with Conditions of Record, Business Park with Conditions of Record, Airport Planned Development with Airport Overlay and Accident Potential Zone) to PDZ AP-O APZ-1 (Planned Development Zone with Airport Overlay and Accident Potential Zone) based upon the finding that the request complies with the criteria for a Zoning Map Amendment set forth in City Code Section 7.5.704.
The motion passed by a vote of 8-1-0-0.

Aye: 8 - Vice Chair Hensler, Commissioner Cecil, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano, Commissioner Willoughby and Case

No: 1 - Commissioner Slattery

- 8.C.** [LUPL-25-001](#) Establishment of the Landings Business Park Land Use Plan for proposed use types classified as residential, civic, public, institutional, commercial, industrial, civic, accessory, and temporary and consisting of 319.9 acres located west of Marksheffel Road, north of Drennan Road, and southeast of the Peterson Space Force Base.
(Quasi-judicial)

Located in Council District 4

Presenter:

Drew Foxx, Planner II, City Planning Department

Kevin Walker, Planning Director, City Planning Department

Attachments: [7.5.514 LAND USE PLAN](#)

Motion by Vice Chair Hensler, seconded by Commissioner Robbins, that this Planning Case be accepted Recommend approval to City Council the Landing Business Park 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 with the following technical modifications:

- 1. The existing zone districts under the site data shall be updated to state all current zone districts and conditions of record.**

The motion passed by a vote of 7-2-0-0.

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

No: 2 - Commissioner Cecil and Commissioner Slattery

4880 Airport Road

- A. [ZONE-24-0020](#) Reconsideration of a Zone Map Amendment (Rezone) consisting of 2.17 acres located at 4880 Airport Road from R1-6/AP-O (Single Family - Medium with Airport Overlay) to R-5/AP-O (Multi-Family - High with Airport Overlay).
(Quasi-Judicial)

Council District 4

Presenter:

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

Attachments: [Staff Report - ZONE-24-0020](#)

[Zone Ord_ZONE_24-0020](#)

[Signed Ordinance 25-102.pdf](#)

[Attachment 1_Updated Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 2_Land Use Statement](#)

[Attachment 3_Rezone Exhibit A_B](#)

[Attachment 4_Public Comment Response](#)

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

[CPC Minutes Excerpt - 4880 Airport Rd Rezone - 11.12.2025](#)

[4880 Airport Rd Rezone Presentation - Planning](#)

Chris Sullivan, Senior Planner, said the item was brought back for reconsideration because, during preparation for its second reading before City Council, the City Attorney's Office determined that the rezoning process did not align with the code, and City Council chose to withdraw the item. Mr. Sullivan presented the reconsideration of the zone map amendment of the 2.17 acres site from single-family medium with airport overlay to multi-family high with airport overlay. The applicant has also submitted a land use statement proposing a concept plan for three-story, 50-unit multifamily building with green space, on-site parking and access for Karr Road. He said there is a right-of-way issue involving a 20-foot strip along Airport Road, which extended the review timeline to seven review cycles, and led staff to propose a condition requiring dedication of that portion to the city. Standard notice was made; comments were received with concerns regarding the intensity of use, traffic impact and quality of life. Agency review process was conducted and all comments received were addressed or will be submitted prior to their plan submittal. The proposal complies with PlanCOS and meets the review criteria.

Applicant's Presentation

Ann Odom, NES, representing the applicant, said this is an infill development located along a major four-lane arterial with nearby connections to key corridors and employment centers. She said

surrounding zoning consists in R1-6 and R-5, and the latter accommodates a range of residential types at up to 25 units per acre. Ms. Odom said when similar properties were rezoned, they would have been allowed to go up to 50 units per acre. She said the day before the meeting they received additional 36 comments with concerns regarding traffic. She said that the proposal meets the review criteria and aligns with PlanCOS goals for infill development, housing diversity, and support for nearby employers, and highlighted existing higher-intensity uses along Airport Road, ongoing infrastructure improvements, and the area's evolving development pattern. Ms. Odom said the immediate area includes a mix of multifamily developments and older single-family homes along Karr Road, many of which were built in the 1950s and 1960s and are now out of character with the more suburban, higher-intensity development occurring along Airport Road. She said there have been nearby approvals for large multifamily projects, including a 27-acre development with more than 450 units, demonstrating precedent for increased density. Ms. Odom presented the development standards required and compared them to what they are proposing to show they are in compliance. She said that an R-5 buildout could accommodate up to 50 units in a three-story structure while meeting setback, buffering, fencing, landscaping, open-space, stormwater, and parking requirements. Ms. Odom said fire and traffic staff reviewed the conceptual layout and confirmed that one access point would be sufficient with fire sprinklers, and a right-in/right-out onto Airport Road could be supported if warranted. She said preliminary trip-generation estimates showed a relatively small increase in morning and evening traffic, with a full traffic study required at the development plan stage. She said the project is similar to Silver Key project, which was recently approved in a smaller site by the Commission. She said that the larger context mapping shows how a building of this scale fits within the surrounding area and reinforced that future design and mitigation requirements in city code would provide compatibility.

Ms. Odom said fire officials confirmed the project could operate with a single access point if the building is sprinklered and a fire lane is provided, and traffic staff indicated a second right-in/right-out access onto Airport Road could be supported if warranted. She said, regarding ongoing traffic concerns raised by commissioners and neighbors, a full traffic study is not required at this stage, but at the development review stage. She said preliminary trip-generation estimates show only a modest increase in peak-hour traffic from about one car per 52 seconds to one car per 42 seconds. She said code-required buffering, landscaping, and design standards will help mitigate potential impacts and that R-5 zoning remains appropriate.

Public Comment

Tao Thai, owner of the Temple across the street, although his property is zoned R-5, that does not mean large buildings must be constructed. He said Karr Road is the community's only access point, and during a past emergency it became completely blocked, preventing residents from entering or leaving. He compared this road to an airplane exit, stressing the need for clear, unobstructed escape routes. Mr. Thai said, from his volunteer experience with the police department, cramped living conditions can contribute to domestic crises, mental-health strain and family stress. He said constructing a large multifamily building would reduce open space, diminish residents' ability to decompress, and negatively affect the well-being of those already living in the neighborhood. He said the long-term psychological and safety impacts on current residents should be considered.

Helen Mackey, a 20-year resident and HOA board president of Sand Creek Commons, said Karr Road is frequently obstructed by abandoned vehicles and debris, which she documents and reports to the Police Department as a volunteer. She said, with families living in 187 units already relying on a limited access system, she said the community often becomes backed up, especially when cars park along Karr Road or when emergency vehicles respond to incidents. Ms. Mackey said there is frequent police and fire activity, high speeds on Airport Road, and worsening congestion since nearby roadway changes. She said residents already struggle to exit the neighborhood safely and that adding more density would increase danger and delay commuters.

Barbara Overgaard, a 21-year resident of Sand Creek Commons, said she agrees with previous concerns, particularly regarding traffic. She said the neighborhood's quality-of-life character, is a small, tucked-away community valued for its open space, surrounding undeveloped R-5 parcels, and limited multifamily presence. She noted that nearby multifamily developments each have their own direct access to Airport Road, unlike the proposed project, which would rely on the already congested single egress shared by her neighborhood. She said residents chose the area for its quieter, more single-family-oriented environment and fear being increasingly surrounded by multifamily projects, which they believe would erode integrity of the community.

Joyce Salazar, Executive Director, RISE Southeast, said her organization supports responsible growth and additional housing but emphasized that community safety must be considered early in the process. She said nearby residents rely on single egress on Karr Road, creating safety risks during congestion or emergencies. She said, while traffic and safety are

typically reviewed at the development-plan stage, rezoning decisions determine the scale of future development, shifting the discussion from whether a use is appropriate to how its impacts will be managed. Ms. Salazar said this sequence can leave residents feeling reactive rather than involved and asked the commission to consider how rezoning affects communities with single-access roads and to ensure that safety, livability, and preventative planning are addressed at the front end, not only later in the review process.

Applicant's Rebuttal

Ms. Odom said, regarding emergency access, Sand Creek Commons already has an emergency route onto Airport Road, which could assist residents in blockage situations. She said a second access for the proposed development, such as a right-in/right-out onto Airport Road, remains a viable option at the development-plan stage. She said future development will still provide significant setbacks, open space, and landscaping, even at maximum density. Ms. Odom said development typically reduces activities such as vehicle camping and debris on Karr Road, opposed to vacant parcels. She said infill should be expected in this area, which is experiencing major infrastructure upgrades, growing employment centers, and rising housing demand. She said the maximum density shown is only a possibility; the actual project could be lower intensity and will still be subject to further traffic, safety, and design studies. Ms. Odom said zoning approval does not eliminate future public input or detailed review of off-site impacts.

Commissioners' Comments and Questions

Vice Chair Hensler asked who determined the closure of the exit adjacent to the housing development to the east. Zaker Alazzeah, City Traffic Engineering, said he is not aware of this closure being requested by them. Vice Chair Hensler asked if it was a violation to have it closed off. Mr. Alazzeah said it is a private driveway so they might not be violating code. Steven Smith, Fire Protection Engineer, said he is not familiar with the site; however, it looks like an emergency exit.

Vice Chair Hensler said she understands the concerns about Karr Road's limited access and the adjacent development appears to have an emergency route that could improve circulation. Vice Chair Hensler said she would support requiring a secondary access point, if allowed by safety and legal standards, and asked staff to clarify whether such access should be expected. Mr. Smith said emergency access routes are typically intended for fire department use only; however, the fire department would not object to it being opened for regular use. Chair Casey said there is a

white solid line which might indicate is not access.

Chair Casey asked if an entrance like that would be something this new development could have. Mr. Sexton said final decisions about ingress and egress will be made during the development-plan stage, not at rezoning. He said he understands residents' concerns about the adjacent multifamily project's access conditions and said staff can review that site with traffic and fire officials to ensure it complies with current standards.

Commissioner Case asked if, based on current traffic conditions, there have been any existing issues in the area as it stands today. Mr. Smith said he does not currently have operations details. Mr. Alazzeah said they checked for the past five years and did not see any problem in that intersection.

Commissioner Robbins said the interchange to the east has already increased traffic in the area, and congestion on Airport Road remains a significant problem. Commissioner Robbins said adding another residential complex near multiple existing developments could create dangerous conditions, especially given the nearby elementary school and heavy parent traffic. Commissioner Robbins said the area could become unsafe in the near future and said the city should reevaluate plans for Airport Road before allowing additional density. Commissioner Robbins said he is not in favor of this project.

Commissioner Case said after hearing public comments and knowing that Fire and Traffic might not have enough information, having a 25-unit per acre density does not seem to fit. Commissioner Case asked what the thought process is behind deciding to propose the maximum density. Ms. Odom said determining an appropriate density would involve market analysis, evaluation of intersection performance, and assessing whether needed improvements are feasible and who would bear their cost. She said emergency access, evacuation needs, and preventative measures, such as sprinklers, are all reviewed early in the development-plan process. Ms. Odom said reducing the unit count per acre would generate a pretty marginal decrease in potential traffic.

Chair Casey said while the R-5 zone allows up to 25 units per acre, nearby multifamily projects are built at much lower densities, and the current R-1-6 zoning permits only about eight units per acre with much lower building heights. Chair Casey said approving R-5 would represent a significant jump to the city's highest density residential district, even though no specific development plan is tied to the request. Chair Casey said he has concerns about compatibility criteria, and he was not yet convinced the scale, height, and potential traffic impacts of R-5 would be compatible with the

surrounding neighborhood and asked whether anything presented should change that assessment. Ms. Odom said the R-5 district is intended for areas near higher-intensity uses and that the request represents an expansion of an existing R-5 zone, not a spot-zoning action. She said medium-density transitional zone could be considered, but the difference in potential trip generation between that and R-5 would be minimal. She said single-family development is unlikely on such a small arterial-frontage parcel, making the current zoning impractical. Ms. Odom said compatibility does not require identical density and that buffering, transition, and site-design standards can address impacts.

Chair Casey said Silver Key project was mentioned, however, it is not comparable to the current request because its zoning was already in place and the review focused only on a conditional-use modification to allow more units within a single building. Chair Casey asked how they think the two situations are similar. Ms. Odom said the Silver Key comparison was to illustrate building scale, as the project achieved a similar building size on a much smaller site and at a higher density, adjacent to single-story homes.

Vice Chair Hensler said a different zoning than R-5 would be more of a spot zone, given the adjacent properties, making this zoning appropriate, not necessarily the density compared to neighboring developments. Vice Chair Hensler said the commission's role is to evaluate zoning consistency rather than predict the exact number of units that may ultimately be built. Vice Chair Hensler said she understands the neighborhood concerns, but growth along Airport Road is expected given nearby commercial expansion and that the site sits in an area that is transitioning. Vice Chair Hensler said the R-5 request appears consistent and said she might be in support.

Commissioner Cecil said it is frustrating that the development plan is not coming back to the Commission for approval. Mr. Walker said the applicant as well as the public have the opportunity to appeal should they feel the decision was not appropriately made. He said even if the approval was administratively, the neighbors will be noticed.

Commissioner Cecil said she could not conclude the proposal would be detrimental to the public interest, since a ride-in/ride-out turn lane could address potential concerns and that the early stage of development leaves uncertainties. Commissioner Cecil said the request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and potential build-out would contribute to housing diversity. Commissioner Cecil said it is unreasonable to expect an undeveloped parcel in an unincorporated area to remain undeveloped indefinitely. Commissioner Cecil asked whether any elements of the concept plan raised concerns under Criteria 7. Mr. Sullivan said no.

Commissioner Cecil said she does not find reasons to oppose.

Commissioner Slattery said she recognizes the community's need for additional housing and the appropriateness of Airport Road for higher-intensity uses due to its arterial designation, however, she has concerns regarding compatibility. Commissioner Slattery said maximum build-out does not appear harmonious with the surrounding area, particularly the adjacent R-5 zoning. Commissioner Slattery said she is significantly concerned about the use of Karr Road as the primary access point, and the possible height of this development. Commissioner Slattery said she does not think it meets the criteria.

Commissioner Robbins said he is not in support, as he has concerns regarding the increasing traffic volumes on Airport Road. Commissioner Robbins said the rising number of accidents presents a public-safety issue and emphasized that protecting lives must take priority over other considerations. Commissioner Robbins said Airport Road now functions more like a highway than originally intended and that the conditions are dangerous until the City identifies appropriate safety improvements.

Commissioner Gigiano said she concurs with Commissioner Robbins regarding traffic and compatibility with the surrounding areas.

Commissioner Case said last time he voted in favor of this item, but after hearing public comments and Fire and Traffic, there are a lot of unknowns so he will be voting against it.

Motion by Commissioner Robbins, seconded by Commissioner Gigiano, to deny the zone change of 2.17 acres from R1-6/AP-O (Single Family - Medium with Airport Overlay) to R-5/AP-O (Multi-Family - High with Airport Overlay) based upon the findings that the request does not comply with the criteria for a Zoning Map Amendment as set forth in City Unified Development Code Section 7.5.704.

The motion passed by a vote of 6-3-0-0.

Aye: 6 - Commissioner Slattery, Commissioner Robbins, Chair Casey, Commissioner Clements, Commissioner Gigiano and Case

No: 3 - Vice Chair Hensler, Commissioner Cecil and Commissioner Willoughby

9. Presentations

10. Executive Session

11. Adjourn