



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

14 November 2007: 3-5 pm

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

ATTENDEES: Aaron Briggs, HB&A
Meggan Yoest, El Paso County DSD
David Sealander, Committee Member
Darsey Nicklasson, Committee Member
Tim Kistler, Committee Member
David Powell, Planning Commission Liaison
Chuck Burnett, Committee Member
Kevin Butcher, Committee Member
Jason Alwine, Committee Vice Chair
Janice Bennett Good, Mountain View Properties
Kathleen Wallace, New Falcon Herald
Adrian Stanciu, Committee Member
Dave Elliott, Committee Member
Carl Schueler, El Paso County DSD
Lynne Bliss, Committee Chair
Mark Shook, School District 49 liaison
Henry Reitwiesner, School District 49 liaison

MINUTES

1) Summary of Previous Meeting & Agenda for this meeting

Aaron went over the minutes from last meeting, and there were no comments or additions from the committee.

2) Stakeholder Interviews – Status

Case International – Carl met with the Case's and their attorney.

- They agreed with the assumptions we'd made for their properties as far as future expectations go.
- The relevant properties are the Bentgrass Project, the High Plains Ranch Project, and the Latigo Business Park Project.
- Lindsey Case had some concern that we didn't extend the area east because of some overlapping water issues.

- They are also interested in creating some kind of transportation-specific funding mechanism for regional transportation projects that aren't covered by existing funding sources, similar to impact fees.
- They recognize there's not enough physical and legal water to go around for the current proposed projects.
- They are generally pro-development, and they generally don't like hard line arbitrary boundaries.
- The 5-6 landowners who own almost all of the important approved and proposed developments in the area will need to work together.

The notes from that meeting are available on the website.

Mountain View Properties – There have been some updates to the meeting minutes since we originally wrote those minutes. Those updates are available on the website.

3) Future Land Use Analysis

Aaron led a discussion about the future land use.

- We made a transition in the map since the last meeting. The new map is more detailed and the boundaries of different areas are more accurate. It also has the data behind it.
- The approach has been the same, trying to define the existing development, approved development, and anticipated future development.
- Light orange shows rural residential densities
- Dark orange shows urban densities
- Green shows rural densities that are a fixed condition
- Blue shows major landowners and projects.

Adrian asked whether we've included parks and open spaces in the analysis. Aaron responded that we don't have that yet, but we are planning to do it.

Dave asked why Meadow Lake Airport is shown as urban, since it's not residential development. He'd like it to be shown as non-residential. That would help call out different types of land uses. Aaron and Carl responded that this is essentially a density map, not a land use map, and we considered the Airport to be urban-level development, even if it's not residential. We will take another look at how to display this.

Aaron shared the numbers we've generated in the analysis thus far with the committee.

Existing Population =	19,749
Existing Capacity =	2,428
Approved Capacity =	28,736
Anticipated Capacity =	73,669
Total Future Population =	130,642

- Lynne asked what the difference is between Existing Population and Existing Capacity. Aaron and Carl explained that the existing capacity is meant to account for platted development areas that might not yet have houses built on them. Vacant lots in platted developments.
- Mark Shook asked about whether developments are typically built-out at lower numbers than they are typically approved at. Carl explained that often, that is the case. Sometimes they end up higher.
- Adrian asked for clarification on the "approved" vs. "anticipated" categories. Basically, the approved numbers include everything from sketch plans up to

platted lots. Anticipated numbers include areas that are foreseen, but they're not in the official process yet.

- Kevin asked about the timing of these numbers, and how much existing build-out capacity the area has in those existing developments. There is capacity for roughly 800 houses, which could be 2-3 years of capacity at the current market pace, but it's a complex question, because the existing capacity doesn't necessarily fill out before the newer areas.
- The population growth, according to these estimates is 660% growth.
- This analysis accounts for only 60% of the acreage of the area, but we've captured the areas that are going to develop quickly. We've captured all of the small parcels and the very large owners, what's left is individual 35 acre fractured ownership areas that we consider to be slower in developing.

Aaron then summarized the exercise results from last meeting.

- The key discussion is about where the urban-rural distinction should sit in the area. He showed a graphical "heat map" that showed where there was agreement on the urban areas that exercise participants identified.
- The interesting thing about the exercise is that most people drew the urban-rural line in a position that limits urban growth to what has currently occurred and what is imminent.
- This result conflicts somewhat with the views previously expressed by the committee that there should be no limits on growth in the area.
- Aaron asked if the exercise was designed correctly and if there were any miscommunications about what the task was, Adrian responded that maybe people would have drawn the line in a different location had they had all of the information in front of them regarding approved and pending development. Water and sewer facilities would have affected it as well.
- Several committee members expressed surprise that more people didn't consider the Peyton Area to be urbanized. Peyton seems like a logical place for development, but it has some special barriers, including lack of services and fractured ownership.
- Lynne asked if high-density is equated with high-agreement on the map, and Aaron clarified by explaining the map shows where people agreed on urban density, and thus implies where they agreed on rural densities too.
- There was some discussion of the development of Banning-Lewis Ranch, and whether that development was stalled by fractured ownership or not. Legal processes stalled the development of that area. There is some sense that the stall in Banning-Lewis caused Falcon-area development to proceed quickly over the last 10 years, and that the area might absorb fewer people in the coming years now that Banning-Lewis is being developed.
- Dave Elliott asked why we have to accept that there will be a clear line between urban and rural. Aaron answered that the reality of the situation is that development won't have a clear line, but that density difference is significant to people, and so that's what we're keying in on.
- There is still the question of whether there is enough water to support development. Maybe water will be the limiting factor no matter what our plan says about the area.
- Kevin brought up wastewater treatment, and asked how that will impact the development in the area. This capacity could be critical. In essence, wastewater capacity is being considered a following factor rather than a dominant factor. We think that the wastewater system will be sorted out by the market as development proceeds. It will be important in the timing of development in the area, however, which is important.

- There was a question raised about the fractured ownership in the Peyton area, and there is one developer just east and northeast of Peyton that has some dense development envisioned for the future. There was some discussion and clarification that this particular development has a northern portion, which is almost approved, and a southern portion which is not in the pipeline yet. The northern portion includes rural residential development that is on central water and individual septic systems. The denser, urban part of the development, including the commercial part, is a future vision for the southern part of that relevant land.
- There was a discussion about the number of metropolitan districts in the area, and that the area might be getting too complex with many many metro districts that have to cooperate as development infills and services become more important.
 - Carl mentioned that Metro Districts serve two roles: 1) to actually provide services (water, sewer, etc.) to residents of the district, and 2) to provide public financing for facilities.
 - Almost all districts are created to provide services and provide significant public financing for other facilities like roads that the developer is responsible for.
 - When this happens, you set yourself up for proliferation because when Developer A sets up a district, Developer B is not interested in joining that district and helping pay for Developer A's roads. He'd rather set up his own district and thus get public financing to pay for his own road obligations.
 - The county is trying to ensure that they don't create a proliferation of districts, but it's a complex issue. There are already around 15 districts.
 - This plan could have policies that could influence the establishment of districts, but the County is really already pretty on top of the problem.
 - There are not many alternatives other than removing the public financing part of the district because in most cases, developers would be happy to cooperate on the provision of services. One barrier to this is that the county requires quite a great deal of public infrastructure to be built by developers, and there has to be a way to finance it.
 - Kevin asked if the county itself can create the public infrastructure that the districts fund and therefore remove the incentive for proliferation. Carl answered that the county does cover some of that responsibility, but it would be a big change for the county not to shift most of that to other entities.
 - It is easier for the county to provide services to denser developments and more efficient in an atmosphere of predictability.
 - Ultimately, the county doesn't control many of these decisions, they're made by private developers cooperating with other developers.
- Aaron moved the discussion to talk more about which areas in particular are going to require additional analysis to deconflict some of our conclusions.
- He drew circles on the map to distinguish between areas where there was high agreement on rural/rural residential development and high agreement on urban density development in the future.
 - The area surrounding and west of Falcon is an agreed-upon urban area
 - The north and northwest part of the planning area is an agreed-upon rural and rural residential area.
- The next step is to divide the land where there was low agreement into subareas that share characteristics with each other.
 - The southern part of the planning area is one area where there is low agreement on whether it should be urban or rural in character.

- The band including Shaw Ranch and 4-Way Ranch is another area that will require more discussion.
- The area surrounding Peyton is a third subarea that will require more discussion.
- This definition of subareas sets us up to analyze these specific areas with more detail in the next meeting.
- Tim asked about whether we have to take the future expectations of developers and landowners at face value when we make our recommendations. The committee discussed the fact that we are using these expectations as a starting point, but we'll generate scenarios of our own that will add structure to our recommendations about the areas. Tim requested that HB&A provide maps to the committee in advance of the next meeting so that they can come prepared to work out the issues involved in the areas.

4) Discuss Public Meeting

a. Date

There was some discussion about the date of the next public meeting. We had been planning for a December 12th date, but there was some concern expressed by several committee members that we might be rushing it with that date, given the surrounding holidays and our goals for what we'd like to be able to present at that meeting. Dave Elliott suggested that we consider moving the meeting to mid January, and no committee members disagreed. A tentative date was set for January 15-16.

b. Outreach

The committee brainstormed several different ways to get the word out.

- Road Sign – location and timing
- BOCC meeting announcement
- Fliers in Utility Bills
- Falcon Professional Development League
- Ranchland News
- Ag Journal
- Repeated announcements in the papers
- Productive controversy
- Personal networks
- Schools (websites, fliers)

In general, the committee felt that timing was the most important thing, and as long as we get the word out early, we should be able to get the right people at the meeting.

c. Location

The committee discussed the possibility of having two meetings, one in Peyton and one in Falcon, and it was generally agreed that having two meetings on consecutive days would increase the amount of input and buy-in we received from the community. We tentatively plan on using Peyton High School and Falcon High School for the meetings. Tim and Henry agreed to check the on availability for the tentative dates.

d. Structure/Content

The main items that we'd like to be able to present at the meeting are updated policy-level goals and the process and outcome of our future land use process.

5) Discuss Upcoming Considerations
a. County Staffing Issues

Carl mentioned that because of the County's budget crisis, he and Meggan will be unavailable on Fridays and during the week of Thanksgiving and Christmas. This shouldn't affect the committee much, but they should be aware of it.

b. Protect Our Wells meeting

There is a gathering sponsored by Protect Our Wells on Monday evening that Sandra Martin invited the committee to send a representative. Lynne and Aaron agreed to attend this event.

6) Miscellaneous / Administrative Items / Additions / Questions

There were no additional issues.