



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

16 April 2008: 3 – 5 pm

LOCATION: El Paso County Development Services Department  
2<sup>nd</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  
Randy Case II – Marsheffel-Woodmen Inv. LLC  
Jim Fraas – Peyton Fire Department  
Tim Kistler – Committee Member  
Tammy Jansma – Committee Member  
Bob Martin – LDC Inc.  
Neil Moran – Rock Springs Ranch  
Tasha Norman – NES Inc.  
Dave Powell – EPC Planning Commission Liaison  
Carl Schueler – El Paso County DSD  
Doug Shaw – HB&A  
Judith P. Van Ahlefeldt – Black Forest Resident  
Ron Waldthausen – Millenium Development  
Kathleen Wallace – New Falcon Herald

**MINUTES**

- 1) Summary of Previous Meeting & Agenda for this meeting (5 Minutes – Aaron)

Aaron gave the summary of the previous meeting's minutes. There were no comments.

Carl mentioned that he had recently met with the 4-Way Ranch landowners, (fill in from handwritten notes)

Carl also mentioned meeting with Ellen Robley with Paint Brush Hills Metropolitan District. Ellen was concerned about our assumption that the Paint Brush Hills Waste Waster Treatment plant would eventually go away.

## 2) Progress Report on Draft Plan

Doug gave a quick update on the progress of the plan, saying that HB&A is making progress on completing it. Aaron gave a rough timeline, saying that the plan could be finished and made public in two weeks, brought before the Planning Commission in about 4-6 weeks, depending on the commission's schedule. The plan would be brought before the commission, and then adopted at the following commission meeting. The next step with the planning commission is to give an update briefing on May 6.

## 3) Revised Land Use Recommendations Graphic and Text

Carl introduced the discussion by mentioning that over the preceding two weeks, HB&A had revised the graphic significantly. Carl explained that the committee needed to move forward and make final comments. The graphic had been distributed for comment, and some comments had already been received and incorporated.

Aaron described the new recommendations graphic. The following bullet points summarize key factors that drove the revision of the graphic:

- The committee had asked for the map to be more nuanced and to make a better distinction between existing development and our recommendations.
- There needed to be some way to distinguish between timing-based recommendations and recommendations that were more
- The graphic also needed to be more specific and represent the intricacies of different existing and proposed land uses better.

Aaron described the changes he'd made:

- GIS data was brought into the map to outline parcels that we considered to be fixed existing development.
- Two hatches were brought into the graphic to signify areas in which our proposed land uses are timing-based. In these areas, the basic recommendation is for lower density development, but higher density development could be supported, given compliance with higher standards, site design particulars, specific local conditions, or other factors.
- A system of nodes and corridors was added to the map to signify future activity nodes. This overlay gives more flexibility to developments that might be able to justify higher density due to their proximity to an identified growth node.

Comments by meeting attendees:

- There was some confusion over which areas on the map represented existing development and which were recommendation areas.
- There was a question over whether the corridors represented transportation or utilities infrastructure, and Aaron answered that it was both. They coincide with some of the major transportation corridors.
- There was some concern that the corridors dominate the map, and perhaps stand out too much.
- The airport color is too dominant, and needs to be included on the legend.
- Carl commented that there would be other maps that would inform this map, including the utilities, green infrastructure, and transportation corridors.
- There was some discussion over what is meant by "rural residential cluster" development. Aaron commented that maybe the preference for clustered development should be saved for the policies, since it is basically a universal recommendation.

- There was a comment asking about the wording for the hatched areas. The recommendation for these areas was confusing. Aaron agreed to take another look at rewording it.
- Aaron commented that the intent of the hatched areas was to identify areas that could support higher densities, but it's not preferred, and if a developer proposes it, it shouldn't be approved unless the development is really something special. The solid areas essentially indicate the priority density areas, and the hatched areas represent secondary density areas.
- Aaron commented that the plan is very flexible, while still holding true to the core of what the committee wants.
- There was some discussion about why the highway 24 corridor and the Peyton area weren't identified as urban areas. Aaron commented that those areas are not ideal urban density areas for 3 reasons.
  - The area is relatively distant from any existing urban densities.
  - There was significant opposition to density from the Peyton public
  - The highway 24 corridor should be preserved, and we don't want it to fill in with strip development.
- Judy Ahlefeldt commented on several aspects of the map:
  - Confusion over which areas (particularly in the southern part of the map) are existing development and which areas are proposed land use changes.
  - Clarification needed on where the Black Forest Cooperative Planning Area is.
  - Different font for roads vs. place names.
  - The buffering language and symbol are inadequate. There are important places to show that wide buffers must be provided in the Falcon Peyton planning area.
- Dave Powell suggested that instead of "buffers," we should use the term "transition zone."
- There was quite a bit of discussion about the transition zones, and how those should be displayed on the map.
- Bob Martin commented that the wording on transition zones and on land use recommendations should be done very carefully, because it'll all be up to interpretation, and it's going to be challenged.
- Tammy Jansma commented that the Black Forest Cooperative Planning Area should be shown.
- Bob Martin suggested that Dublin Blvd. Should maybe be shown as a major corridor.
- There was general discussion about the importance of these transition zones throughout the graphic, and especially in making the neighboring areas (The City of Colorado Springs and Black Forest)

Carl summed up the discussion by saying that the planning team would revise the graphic according to the comments, and continue working on the plan text in the mean time.