



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

6 February 2008: 3 - 4:30 pm

LOCATION: El Paso County Development Services Department  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room  
2880 International Circle Colorado Springs, CO 80910

ATTENDEES: Jason Alwine – Committee Vice Chair  
Lynne Bliss – Committee Chair  
Aaron Briggs – HB&A  
Kevin Butcher – Committee Member  
Trent Harwig – Falcon Fire District  
Tim Kistler – Committee Member  
Darsey Nicklasson – Committee Member  
Tasha Norman – NES  
Amy Phillips – Black Forest Land Use Committee member  
Henry Reitwiesner – Committee Member – SD 49 Liaison  
Carl Schuler – El Paso County DSD  
Douglas Shaw – HB&A  
Mark Shook – Committee Member  
Adrian Stanciu – Committee Member  
Kathleen Wallace – New Falcon Herald newspaper  
Meggan Yoest – El Paso County DSD

**MINUTES**

Lynne called the meeting to order and gave the floor to Doug. He gave a summary of the January 16, 2008 committee meeting minutes. The floor was turned over to Aaron, who gave a summary of the public meetings in Falcon and Peyton that took place on January 23<sup>rd</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup>, respectively. He indicated that the turnout was much higher than expectations at both meetings, and many of the attendees provided useful input regarding the content of the plan. Aaron noted that several issues come up repeatedly, specifically water and roads.

Carl expanded on this by noting many citizens were concerned about the availability of water, school capacity, road capacity and extension of new roads, the provision of public safety, and the proliferation of septic systems that may adversely affect groundwater. He noted that the provision of services is only sometimes influenced by the County and its planning polices, for example the State controls funding for Highway 24 improvements.

Community members attending the meeting suggested that planning commission approval of new development could be tied to the provision of services. Carl noted that there have been proposals by developers to donate land for things such as Sheriff's Department substations, but the problem is that the Sheriff's Department does not have the resources for on-going operational costs such as staff for the facility or additional patrol officers, vehicles, equipment, etc. These are costs that cannot be addressed by impact fees.

Members of the Black Forest Land Use Committee noted that the draft of the Falcon-Peyton Small Area Plan update does not appear to be consistent with the existing Black Forest Plan. Specifically, the densities and development types indicated in the Falcon-Peyton Plan do not match those of the adjacent Black Forest planning area. They were also concerned that area which was previously included in the Black Forest Plan was seemingly arbitrarily moved into the Falcon-Peyton planning area.

The committee discussed with the Black Forest community members developing a "cooperative planning area" that provided a more gradual transition and some consistency between the planning areas. The committee agreed that this would make sense. Aaron indicated he would be willing to look at the options for accomplishing this.

The committee discussed encouraging a "town center" concept for certain locations in the planning area. Carl noted that this plan does not go into that kind of detail, although the County certainly wants to encourage quality urban design that promotes a consistent regional identity for communities such as Peyton. Several committee members suggested that including design guidelines in the plan might be an approach that should be considered.

Carl continued with the discussion of the comments he heard at the public meetings. He said he heard from many attendees that were concerned the maps shown at the meetings did not indicate parks and open space, giving the impression that the plan does not include any parks or open space. Carl noted that this was not the case, and he intended to include maps that would show existing and proposed parks and open space.

The matter of the scale of buffers proposed to separate different densities and land uses in the plan was brought up. It was noted that what might be considered a "reasonable" buffer by a developer may be unacceptably smaller than what is considered a reasonable buffer by adjacent landowners or area residents. Carl agreed that the scale of the buffers is important and should vary depending on the types of uses, proximity, and relative land use densities.

Carl moved on, commenting about the population projections used in the plan. He indicated that he intends to come up with a very general "big picture" projection in light of the expressed concern among many that the land use projections do not take into account water issues, including the scarcity of water in the area. The big picture projection would be based on a population range directly tied to water demand forecast assumptions. Some present at the committee meeting felt this was not enough and the plan's population projections should be based solely on the known sources of water and current use patterns of area residents. The concern is that the population projections assume existing aquifers, conservation and importation will provide enough water to support significant growth.

Some at the committee meeting want a full water study done before any more development is permitted, including a thorough study with the total capacity of area aquifers. They feel it is irresponsible to develop a plan by assuming that the water for the level of development anticipated will somehow be found.

Aaron continued with his review of the comments received at the public meetings. He indicated that he will combine and organize all comments from the public meetings and the committee meetings, and provide them for review to the committee as well as posting them on the project website.

Aaron said that the HB&A effort will transition from map-making to writing the body of the report in the next month. He suggested that while the writing process is going on there will not be much for the committee to contribute, and asked if the committee members wanted to skip the next scheduled meeting and meet again the 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of March (March 5<sup>th</sup>). The committee agreed.

Carl suggested that it would be most efficient to have committee members review specific sections of the full report based on a member's area of expertise rather than having them review the full report.

Some members wanted to see population projections done based on natural resource capacity. Aaron agreed, but noted that there is no conclusive information regarding resource capacity. In the case of water resources, it will be time-consuming, expensive and beyond the scope of this project to do any sort of conclusive study and analysis.

Lynne asked if there were any additional topics that needed to be addressed or any outstanding business that needed to be resolved. There were none.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:35 p.m.