



El Paso County
Falcon/Peyton Small Area Master Plan Update
Advisory Committee Meeting

16 January, 2008: 3-5 pm

LOCATION: El Paso County Development Services Department
2nd Floor Conference Room
2880 International Circle Colorado Springs, CO 80910

ATTENDEES: Jason Alwine – Committee Vice Chair
Lynne Bliss – Committee Chair
Dave Elliott – Committee Member
Tim Kistler, Committee Member
Neil Moran – Committee Member
Darsey Nicklasson – Committee Member
Tasha Norman – NES
Henry Reitwiesner – Committee Member – SD 49 Liaison
Conrad Schaap – Committee Member
Douglas Shaw – HB&A
Mark Shook – Committee Member
Meggan Yoest – El Paso County DSD

MINUTES

Lynne called the meeting to order and gave the floor to Meggan. As a matter of full disclosure, Meggan told the committee that she resigned from her position at El Paso County effective February 6th, 2008.

Meggan gave a summary of the January 2, 2008 committee meeting, including the upcoming public meeting organization, content and marketing, meeting flyer distribution, discussion of polices, Sunshine Act, and sub-areas. Meggan moved on to discuss the assumptions Carl provided to the group prior to the meeting. The assumptions outline the issues and considerations that went into the development of the policies.

Meggan reviewed the process for determining the population estimates for the Plan. The numbers used in the population projections were compared with those done by the PPACG (Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments). Meggan noted that estimated population projections done by Carl track closely with those developed by the PPACG. The projections done by Carl estimate approximately 58,000 residents in the planning area in the year 2035. The corresponding population projections for the planning area done by the PPACG (based on their Transportation Analysis Zones in the planning area) is 60,000 residents in 2035. Meggan noted that these numbers are within a few

thousand of each other, suggesting that such agreement lends validity to the methods and results of the two different approaches to population projection.

The committee asked about annexation of parts of the planning area. Meggan noted that there are developments that have the potential to be annexed into the City of Colorado Springs in the near future, particularly developments adjacent to the Colorado Springs city limits. In particular, Meridian Ranch will possibly be annexed. Committee members also noted that if parts of the planning area incorporate, it will not make a difference to the overall plan or the projections made in the plan.

Meggan reviewed assumptions and used the draft density map to illustrate several of the policy statements. The discussion centered on the projected densities shown on the map as they relate to policies. The concern was wording in the policies that would restrict or completely ban certain types of development in particular parts of the planning sub-areas. Some committee members felt the policies, as stated, cannot be reconciled with the densities shown on the sub-area map. There was a concern that references to "higher density" in policies is not clear and could mean different things to different people. Some clarification and restatement is needed to achieve the intent of the policies and the sub-area map. It was suggested that further input at the upcoming public meeting was a good way to refine the policies and the sub-area map.

Some committee members discussed the desire to have "firewalls" to preserve open space in parts of the planning area, rather than assuming that the entire planning area will be developed. It was noted that the current planning process up to this point has deliberately kept the development density boundaries vague and avoided definitive "firewalls" on the map. With that in mind, the current suggestion is going against the initial direction taken by the committee to avoid "hard line" boundaries. Meggan reminded the committee that this plan is advisory and shows a desired land use scenario, and is not able to prevent certain types of development. As such, hard line boundaries or firewalls to control or prevent certain types of development will not be effective and cannot be enforced. The document is simply a tool used by the County officials when making land use decisions.

Meggan reviewed the proposed commercial and mixed use centers and corridors on the sub-area map. Committee members asked about the cluster development shown on the map and asked what the advantage to clustering would bring to the area. There was a concern that clustering would preclude five-acre lots or the ability to keep livestock such as horses.

Meggan noted that it appears the Committee is not united in how to portray or designate the north and east portion of the planning area. Some seem to want to restrict most development in the north and west and some want to see more development.

Committee members had concerns that some of the highest density development was shown closest to the Meadow Lake airport, which they suggested is the least desirable place to locate it. They suggested that commercial or industrial uses in the area made sense, but higher housing densities near the airport does not make sense. Committee members suggested that perhaps an airport overlay zone or airport influence area be included and as well as modifying the policies accordingly. Meggan encouraged the committee to consider adding to the existing three policies that Carl developed for the airport as a way to address their concerns.

Meggan asked the committee to suggest any other changes they would like to see to the sub-area map, as it was their last opportunity to do so before the upcoming public meeting. There were no other suggested changes.

Meggan continued to review the policy document where Carl left off at the previous meeting, beginning with a discussion of the Water Resources section of the policy document.

A discussion took place among committee members of the use of the words 'accommodate' and 'encourage' together in many of the policy statements. The two words seemed to work at cross purposes and the committee agreed to eliminate the word "accommodate" and leave the word "encourage" in the statements since it is the purpose of the plan to not just accommodate a certain type of development but to actually encourage certain types of development.

Some committee members were concerned about the wording of the policies that appeared to preclude individual water users from drilling wells by requiring them to hook up to central water systems. They said central water systems are not feasible in the more remote portions of the planning area. Meggan noted that the policies simply encouraged users to hook up to central water systems, but did not exclude the use of wells. She noted that the State of Colorado and other planning organizations had much more control over water use in El Paso County than the County planners.

Meggan moved on the wastewater portion of the policies and noted that there is a plan for an additional sewer plant at Santa Fe Springs. A facilities map will be put in the plan showing water and wastewater resources and infrastructure. Tasha noted that the "sunset:" for constructing the approved Santa Fe Springs sewer plant is May 2008. The sunset for constructing the Cherokee sewer plant is 2012.

The committee had no suggestions or changes to the Parks, Trails & Open Space policies.

Meggan moved on the six policies on fire protection. The focus of the discussion was the requirement for secondary fire access to developments and the State of Colorado requirements (adopted from the International Fire Code) for water cisterns of 30,000 gallons or larger within a mile of development for fire suppression using tanker trucks.

Meggan said she will revisit the fire protection requirements with Carl to determine what criteria will be used. She suggested that we may have to modify the policies.

The end of the allotted meeting time was reached, and Meggan suggested that the committee members review the policy statements further and call or send e-mails with suggested changes. Meggan said that committee members can suggest revisions or new policies leading up to the public meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:15 p.m.