



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

26 September 2007
3-5 pm

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

ATTENDEES: Lynne Bliss – Committee Chair
David Sealander – Committee Member
Tim Kistler – Committee Member
Tammy Jansma – Committee Member
Adrian Stanciu – Committee Member
Dave Elliott – Committee Member
Sandra Martin – Committee Member
David Powell – County Planning Commission Liaison
Mark Shook – School District 49 Liaison
Meggan Yoest – El Paso County
Carl Schueler – El Paso County (arrived late)
Aaron Briggs – HB&A
Tasha Norman – HB&A
Kathy Wallace – New Falcon Herald
Linda Summers - Citizen

Minutes

1) Summary of Previous Meeting & Agenda for this meeting

Aaron summarized the last meeting, going over the minutes (which were handed out to all committee members). The major topics mentioned are summarized below:

- Stakeholder meeting themes
 - Water, Wastewater treatment
 - Future land use map that is specific enough to be useful but general enough to be flexible.
- Mapping
 - Subarea definition, need for more detailed analysis. Need for some simplified analysis maps for the committee to get their arms around.
 - Census trend mapping

2) Future Land Use Map

A set of planning maps was distributed to all committee members that included a Natural Constraints map, a Major Landowners map, a Land Use map, and a Macro Site Analysis map.

There was some confusion about the inclusion of the wildlife impact areas on the Natural constraints map, as there is dense development over an area defined as a “high” impact area. Aaron and Meggan explained that while the wildlife impact does affect development, it is not a dealbreaker. Essentially, those areas require special study. The map layer is an old layer that still triggers additional coordination with the Division of Wildlife. There is some concern about de-legitimizing the plan by using old map layers like this. We will check with DOW to see if there is an updated map that we can ask for at our stakeholder meeting.

Aaron described the maps that were provided and shown at large scale on the wall.

Existing Land Use:

- There were some questions about the existing land use map and the absence of Homestead Park from the map as a recreational use. This is a tweak to the map that Aaron will investigate and make.
- Important trends and notes:
 - Small, well-spaced commercial centers
 - Bands of residential land separated by agricultural land
 - Some of the land that is identified as agriculture could actually be primarily residential, but assessed as agricultural land because of the tax advantages

Natural Constraints

- Colorado Geological Survey data shows stable and unstable moderately sloped land, highly sloped land, rockfall hazards, and debris fans. We’re still investigating what the real impact of debris fans is to development density.
- Wildlife impact areas as discussed earlier.

Major Landowners

- Approximately the top 20 landowners
- Tried to group associated owners whenever possible (e.g. Santa Fe Springs)

Macro Site Analysis

- Shows urban densities, rural residential densities (2.5 and 5 acre lots), and truly rural densities (35+ acres).
- Shows both existing and approved.
- An attempt to identify areas that will be “off the table” as far as this plan is concerned because it’s unlikely to change.
- Tried to identify areas where existing uses are fixed, and combined with approved plans.
- Also shows existing and approved commercial centers.
- A comment was made to show the airport’s influence to the north and east of the property as well as the South and West. An error was also noted just west of the airport, where an area is colored as if it were urban density, but it’s actually rural density (5 acre lots). Airport influence area on the west side was shown to reflect the crosswind runway orientation and the fact that any land adjacent to the airport will be influenced by it.
- Empty bubbles show what are the “big rocks” that we will be able to work with in the future land use plan
- The map is intended to show the development context.

3) Feedback on Planning Context Map

General Discussion on land use:

- Development South of Falcon
 - This area is patchy 2.5 and 5 acre development.
 - It may make sense to keep it that way and define that land use as preferable for the area.
 - On the other hand, if Santa Fe Springs is built out, and a sewer line runs directly down Curtis Road, there may be significant pressure to develop the area more densely. These are some of the questions that we as a committee can decide. If there is a demand for rural residential development, as we heard at the public meeting, then we should find a place for that desire.
- A visiting citizen commented that the character of commercial centers is important. What people want is a walkable street like Colorado Avenue rather than parking and corporate stores like the Shops at Briargate. Tasha answered that her concern was legitimate, but that this large-scale land use plan is probably not going to make recommendations at a detailed scale that would support that kind of desire. Lynne suggested that while it may not be applicable to this plan, it still might inform our shared vision and our idea of what the area should be like.
- Retail commercial should be treated differently from employment centers.

Tasha led an extensive discussion about the impact and ideal spacing of commercial centers and subareas.

- We can start by taking what currently exists, what is approved, and start to identify ideal areas for new centers.
- What are some of the factors to consider for commercial centers?
 - Transportation corridors and corners.
 - Existing residential development
- Alternative Scenarios
 - Regular even growth
 - Centers merging into each other over time
 - Dense centers separated by buffers of rural density.
- Dense nodes might make sense from several perspectives:
 - Environmental (vehicle trips, etc.)
 - Land use diversity (it would preserve some rural densities)
 - Services efficiency (utilities would be cheaper and more centralized).
- The Transportation network has a deep interdependent impact on the establishment of dense nodes.
 - It's a chicken and egg problem, with transportation responding to land use plans and land use plans responding to transportation plans.
 - Stapleton/Curtis and 24 will be a major intersection of corridors at some point. There are not many plans for the area currently. Stapleton may be a designated truck corridor back to I-25.
- Douglas County may be a good model for the concept of dense nodes with feathered out surrounding development.
- One option might be define subareas based on the large landowner tracts.
- We need to give some direction to all landowners. We shouldn't give free rein to large landowners to create their own master plan.
- We may need to start thinking about an additional level on our analysis map. In addition to existing and approved development, we should account for the

possible desires of large landowners. This would capture intentions that haven't necessarily entered into the official process yet.

- PPACG plan may not be adequate for us to use as a future population estimate. Generally speaking, it does not project the levels of absorption that are anticipated by some individuals and developers for this area of the County. This is because the PPACG model needs to allocate a finite amount of growth across the entire County.
- There is a distinction between predicting growth and planning for growth. This plan should resist the temptation to only try to predict growth. We are responsible for expressing the community's vision, not necessarily just giving an accurate estimate of where market forces would bring development. We should seek to channel development.
- Do we want unbroken development along 24? There was not a clear answer to this question.
- Possible Preliminary Subareas
 - 4-Way Ranch. Big enough to have its own gravity.
 - Northern Area (Bijou Basin, black forest adjacent area) – rural and rural residential development established. Different character from the rest of the area, lots of slope, some tree cover, etc.
 - South and Southeast of Falcon – 2.5 to 5 acre density pattern pretty well established.
 - Santa Fe Springs (possibly combined with Shaw Ranch? Or not because they are likely to be separated by a significant low density buffer.
- Some of the new population centers may develop their own sense of place. People may think of themselves as living in Santa Fe Springs or Shaw Ranch rather than Falcon or Peyton.
- It will be important to be distinct within the subareas. Some may have higher or lower resolution recommendations.
- Tasha asked for parameters for the development of alternative scenarios. She asked, the committee answered:
 - Should every subarea include a regional park? Not necessarily.
 - Should every subarea include a commercial, residential, and recreational component? Not necessarily, the folks up north may not need any significant commercial presence.
 - Should there be subareas at all? Yes.
 - Do we want the whole area to remain rural residential density? No, that's not realistic. We could say it in our plan, but it's not likely to be followed if we put forward a recommendation so out of touch with the market.
- Carl commented that the last plan assumed a lot less than we ended up getting. It accounted for Woodmen Hills, Paintbrush Hills, Santa Fe Springs, and a little bit of Meridian Ranch.
- Plan should contain major commercial nodes and neighborhood commercial areas.
- Should we include primary employment centers?
- Business centers should maybe be low-impact, light industrial in character. Stapleton/Curtis, Elbert/24.
- We need to take the utilities (especially wastewater) existing and future plans into account just as much as the future transportation corridors.

The committee was encouraged to play around with the map and make comments on the accuracy of it.

4) Discuss Upcoming Considerations

Tasha mentioned that we're going to be talking about transportation and water specifically at dedicated meetings on the subject.

5) Miscellaneous / Administrative Items / Additions / Questions

Tasha mentioned that the next public meeting, formerly scheduled for Nov. 14, will probably need to be pushed back at least a few weeks. We'll keep talking about it.

6) Stakeholder Interviews – Status

Carl briefly summarized the stakeholder meetings that took place over the last 2 weeks.

Falcon Fire Department board – ISO rating and 5-mile radius that is important for the growth of development. Most of the area is covered by those 5 mile radius circles.

4-Way Ranch – They just don't know yet what they're going to want to do with their property. This plan could be pretty definitive, but they'd like to keep as much flexibility as possible.

Greg Moran – The northern piece of their property is in the process right now. It will be decided before we're done with the plan, one way or the other. The southern end of the Rock Springs property will possibly be some kind of commercial strip.

Shaw Ranch – Wants to do an urban center in the middle, buffered by surrounding lower densities. Probably would do the rural densities first to generate funds for the urban portion. Sees the Upper Black Squirrel Creek drainage as a key amenity to use for open space and recreation. They have a draft, and may have an approved plan during our process.

Pam Dawson – Carl will talk with her.

Woodmen Hills – Carl talked with them, and there's nothing new.

Case Brothers – We are trying to set something up with them.

Grant Langdon – His property at Meridian and Woodmen. Will be urban density residential and commercial development. May also want to do rural residential development on another 200 acre area that he owns.

Lots more to do. Some will be phone calls or drop-ins.