

MEGGAN HERINGTON, AICP, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING RESULTS (UNOFFICIAL RESULTS)

Planning Commission (PC) Meeting

Thursday, Thursday July 16th, 2026, El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle, Colorado Springs, Colorado – Second Floor Hearing Room

REGULAR HEARING at 9:00 A.M.

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND VOTING: Thomas Bailey, Michael Brewer, Jim Byers, Bryce Schuettpelz, Tim Trowbridge, Christopher Whitney and Jason Wulf (Virtual).

PC MEMBERS PRESENT AND NOT VOTING: None.

PC MEMBERS ABSENT: Sarah Brittain Jack, Blaine Brew, Suzanne Casagrande, Mae Emrick, and Eric Moraes.

STAFF PRESENT: Meggan Herington, Justin Kilgore, Victoria Chavez, Steven Klaffky, Kari Parsons, Ryan Howser, Jalal Saleh, Daniel Torres, Gilbert LaForce, and Jessica Merriam.

OTHERS PRESENT AND SPEAKING: Chief Trent Harwig, Craig Dossey, Scott Asher, Maureen Paz de Araujo, Eric Ecklund, and Steve Mulliken.

1. REPORT ITEMS

Ms. Merriam advised the board that the next PC Hearing is Thursday, August 20th, 2026, at 9:00 A.M.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE HEARING AGENDA

NONE.

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Adoption of Minutes for meeting held on July 2nd, 2026.

PC ACTION: THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED (7 - 0)

IN FAVOR: (7) Bailey, Brewer, Byers, Schuettepelz, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

B. P264

BAGLEY

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)

KYLE REZONE

A request by James Kyle for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 13.28 acres from RR-5 (Residential Rural) to RM-30 (Residential Multi-Dwelling). The property is located at 12057 E Highway 24 between Woodmen Road and Meridian Road. (Parcel No. 4307200007) (Commissioner District No. 2)

PC ACTION: THIS ITEM WAS PULLED TO BE HEARD AS A CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEM PER PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD REQUEST.

4. CALLED-UP CONSENT ITEMS:

3B. P264

BAGLEY

MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)

KYLE REZONE

A request by James Kyle for approval of a Map Amendment (Rezoning) of 13.28 acres from RR-5 (Residential Rural) to RM-30 (Residential Multi-Dwelling). The property is located at 12057 E Highway 24 between Woodmen Road and Meridian Road. (Parcel No. 4307200007) (Commissioner District No. 2)

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

DISCUSSION: **Mr. Byers** expressed concern regarding the number of trips that would be generated and the potential number of units relying on a single point of access configured as right-in/right-out within a constrained corridor. He asked whether the County viewed the proposed access as acceptable for approval. **Mr. Jalal Saleh**, senior engineer, responded that staff is aware of the access constraints and noted that the Commons at Falcon Field Filing No. 3 is anticipated to provide an additional connection from this development. He explained that provisions, including a stub connection, have

already been incorporated into the Commons at Falcon Field plans. Two intervening parcels currently separate the properties, and the additional connection to the Highway 24/Woodmen intersection area would become available when those parcels develop. **Mr. Byers** acknowledged the future connection but noted that the two intervening parcels are not under the control of the current applicant. He raised concern about the possibility of the project proceeding with approximately 300 units on a single point of access, which he characterized as substantially exceeding typical allowances. **Mr. Daniel Torres**, Engineering Manager, stated that the traffic study analyzed the proposed condition and found that levels of service at the affected intersections would remain acceptable at build-out. He noted that CDOT raised no objections to the projected traffic volumes. While the applicant had requested additional movements, including a three-quarter movement, CDOT limited the access to right-in/right-out only until the Falcon Field Filing No. 3 connection is constructed. The traffic study demonstrated that levels of service, with the proposed auxiliary lane improvements, would be sufficient under interim conditions. **Mr. Byers** further noted an apparent inconsistency in the traffic report (page 16 graphic) showing approximately 40 percent of trips oriented southbound, despite the physical inability to travel south without first traveling north and circulating through the Woodmen Road/Highway 24 intersection. **Mr. Torres** confirmed that southbound travel would require a U-turn or circulation via Woodmen Road and Meridian Road, and that this configuration was discussed with the traffic engineer. He indicated that trip distribution would be refined once a more detailed development plan and specific land uses are known. **Mr. Byers** stated that while the configuration may not constitute a formal approval criterion at this stage, it is important for the applicant to understand that the single point of access presents a difficult condition.

Mr. Bailey stated that the prior responses addressed his questions and emphasized that the application is at a very early stage in the process. He noted that CDOT's jurisdiction is significant because the County has less control over that access point, and that the applicant will have the opportunity to develop a workable access plan as the project advances. He further observed that a detailed development plan must be prepared and reviewed before final access configurations are locked in, providing additional opportunities for evaluation as the plans are refined. **Mr. Torres** confirmed that the access falls under CDOT jurisdiction and that CDOT will determine the specific requirements associated with any access permit. He explained that the current right-in/right-out configuration represents the most restrictive condition that could be imposed at this time. The traffic study analyzed

the maximum density permitted under the proposed RM-30 zoning; once a subsequent development plan is submitted, the applicant will be required to update the traffic study with actual unit counts and refined analysis. Mr. Torres also noted that the traffic study accounted for planned Highway 24 improvements, which are anticipated to begin in the summer of the following year and will widen the corridor to three through lanes. **Mr. Bailey** responded that it is appropriate at this stage to establish the most restrictive access limitations, so the applicant understands the constraints before advancing further. He indicated that the analysis provides sufficient confidence that the rezoning is feasible as the applicant moves into more detailed planning.

Mr. Schuettepelz echoed concerns regarding trip generation and reliance on a single right-in/right-out access to Highway 24. He questioned the certainty of the future northern connection, noting that the intervening property is not under the applicant's control and may never be acquired or developed in a manner that provides the additional access. He raised additional concerns about increased left-turn movements on Woodmen Road, where the existing left-turn lane already experiences high demand, as well as the potential for additional U-turns on Woodmen Road and southbound Meridian Road. Mr. Schuettepelz also expressed concern regarding emergency access, stating that a single point of access for approximately 300 units would create challenges for both resident evacuation and inbound fire response. While acknowledging that the current request is limited to a rezoning, he indicated he would closely evaluate traffic and access conditions when any future development plan returns for consideration.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT OR APPLICANT REBUTTAL

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: **Mr. Schuettepelz** stated that he preferred the higher-density RM-30 designation, noting it will allow the applicant flexibility to achieve greater density if additional access becomes available or to scale back if it does not. He indicated that the clarification regarding a practical unit threshold on the single access point provided greater comfort.

Mr. Bailey emphasized that the request is at an early stage and that the Commission should focus on the applicable rezoning criteria rather than projecting too far into future development details. He noted that compatibility is supported by the surrounding zoning pattern, that intermediate density options between RM-12 and RM-30 are not available, and that detailed access and traffic questions will be addressed at the development plan stage. He expressed support for the request.

Mr. Byers stated he was not opposed to the RM-30 zoning and considered it appropriate for the site. While he found the traffic study imperfect, he did not view that as a basis to deny the rezoning.

Mr. Whitney indicated that the clarification on the unit threshold for the single access point improved his comfort with the application.

PC ACTION: BAILEY MOVED / BYERS SECONDED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM 3B, FILE NUMBER P264 FOR A MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING), KYLE REZONE, UTILIZING THE RESOLUTION ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS AND TWO (2) NOTATIONS, THAT THIS ITEM BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL PASSED (7 - 0).

IN FAVOR: (7) Bailey, Brewer, Byers, Schuettpelz, Trowbridge, Whitney, and Wulf.

IN OPPOSITION: (0) None.

5. REGULAR ITEMS

A. MP245

WERRE

MASTER PLAN

SOUTH POWERS EXTENSION PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGES STUDY

AND ACCESS CONTROL PLAN

The El Paso County Department of Public Works requests adoption of the South Powers Extension Planning and Environmental Linkages Study (PEL) and Access Control Plan (ACP) into the Your El Paso Master Plan. With adoption, these Plans will become the principal plan for further planning and development of South Powers Boulevard in El Paso County. The South Powers PEL and ACP are a critical step in creating an effective and efficient transportation infrastructure that meets future needs. The Plan will provide an updated vision for future transportation, a list of transportation improvements, and a long-term right-of-way preservation plan for South Powers Boulevard. (All Commissioner Districts).

STAFF & APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bailey asked why no roadway connection was proposed with Marksheffel Road. **Mr. Scott Asher**, Associate Vice President with Wilson & Company, Inc, explained that the absence of a

connection is due to two primary factors. First, the spacing between Mesa Ridge Parkway and Marksheffel Road at the interchange is less than one mile, which is too tight and would create greater impacts on private properties along Marksheffel. Second, the long-term goal is for Marksheffel Road, as an expressway, to terminate at Mesa Ridge Parkway and utilize the Mesa Ridge interchange for access rather than continuing through. He also noted technical challenges associated with making a connection function effectively from a network connectivity and functional classification standpoint, identifying the roadway on the west side of the interchange as CNS Road, a minor arterial.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mr. Eric Ecklund, property owner of Wedgewood Farms along Old Pueblo Road, spoke in opposition to Option E. He explained that the proposed alignment would cross directly through the only portion of his approximately 80-acre property that contains existing infrastructure, including the residence, wells, barn, and equipment. He noted that the property, originally part of the historic Lock Ranch, is split by Fountain Creek and is one of only two properties south of Fountain with land on both sides of the creek. Mr. Ecklund stated that he and neighboring property owners along the southern portion of Old Pueblo Road had submitted a petition requesting that Option E not be considered. He clarified that he is not opposed to the overall project and recognizes the need for improved connectivity but requested that the alignment be shifted approximately one mile farther south to an area without residences, across from Clear Spring Ranch, then across the creek and Colorado Springs Utilities land to I-25 south of the railroad interchange serving the Ray Nixon Power Plant. He further explained that the majority of his property lies within the floodplain and consists of wetlands, with only about three acres above the floodplain, precisely the area containing the home and infrastructure that would be impacted by Option E. Mr. Ecklund noted extensive efforts over the years, including construction of dikes and coordination with the Corps of Engineers, to make the land usable while remaining subject to periodic flooding. He indicated he is not opposed to a new I-25 overpass serving the industrial area on the west side, as that location is well removed from his property. He questioned the prioritization of preserving hiking trails on Clear Spring Ranch over private homes and businesses. Finally, Mr. Ecklund expressed concern that communication with the project team had largely ceased after April 2024, and that property owners only received notice of the current meeting approximately ten days prior.

Mr. Steve Mulliken, an attorney representing the Southern Colorado Rail Park, spoke in support of the proposed Powers Boulevard extension and southern connection to I-25. He stated that the project

represents important regional planning that will improve long-term safety and traffic flow in the area. Mr. Mulliken expressed confidence in the process and the consultant team, noting that Wilson & Company had been selected for the Rail Park's own traffic work based on their experience with the County, the City of Fountain, and the local area. He praised the outreach conducted to stakeholders, including the Rail Park and Pikes Peak International Raceway, and stated that the team had carefully evaluated impacts while selecting an appropriate alignment. He acknowledged that a project of this scale will inevitably affect some property owners and expressed sympathy for the concerns raised by Mr. Ecklund. Mr. Mulliken also commended County staff member Victoria Chavez for her fairness, competence, and commitment to long-term planning. On behalf of the Southern Colorado Rail Park, he indicated strong support for the plan and a desire to see it ultimately adopted.

PC ACTION: NO ACTION NEEDED AT THIS TIME. THE ITEM WILL BE HEARD AGAIN ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2026, FOR CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION.

6. NON-ACTION ITEMS

A. U261 – FALCON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TRAINING FACILITY COMPLEX - PARSONS & CHIEF HARWIG

This item was moved up and heard after the Consent items on the agenda.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 10:56 A.M.

Minutes Prepared By: Jessica Merriam