RetoolCOS Public Open House

July 6, 2021 – 5:30p – 6:30p

WebEx (Virtual Meeting)

Participants (24 total)

Clarion

- Don Elliott
- Geoff Green

City of Colorado Springs

- Morgan Hester

Public Participants

- Annette
- Barb Van Hoy
- Beth
- Chelsea
- Cheryl

- Cimarron Hatch
- CMB
- Conner
- Dave
- Dave Donelson
- Dianne
- Dutch Schultz
- Gary Rapp
- Mary Shinn
- Mike Anderson
- Nancy Henjum
- Sam Friesema
- Tasha Brackin
- + 3 call-in participants

Meeting Discussion

- Clarion began the meeting by reminding everyone that the existing residential zoning districts will NOT be converted to R-Flex Districts and of existing rezoning processes.
- Clarion provided a 30-minute presentation, highlighting the proposed language in Module 3. The presentation is available for download on the RetoolCOS project website under the 'Stay Involved' tab.

Participant questions (**Clarion and Staff's responses have been bolded**)

- Beth –
    - Neighborhood Meeting Requirements?
        - **Neighborhood Meeting requirements can be found in Section 7.5.40 of Module 3.**
            - **Note – Staff feels it is important to increase notification boundaries from 500' to 1,000'. This change will be noted in the Consolidated Draft.**
    - Has there been a change to what goes to City Council?
        - **This can be found in Table 7.5.1-A. No requests that currently go to Council are being removed aside from proposed changes to Appeals.**
- Conner –
    - What happens to C-5 and C-6 zoning?

- C-5 and C-6 zoning districts will be renamed to MX-M: Mixed-Use Medium Scale and MX-L: Mixed Use Large Scale, respectively. As mixed-use districts, the uses will include residential use types. Dimensional standards will also be updated. Language can be found in Modules 1 and 2 in the following Sections –
  - Section 7.2.302: MX-M: Mixed-Use Medium Scale
  - Section 7.2.303: MX-L: Mixed-Use Large Scale
  - Section 7.3.2 Allowed Use Tables
  - What about neighborhood character overlay? What is the process or where is it spelled out?
    - Chapter 7 currently outlines this process in Section 7.5.1603 'Designation Process for Historic Preservation Overlay Zoning' and has been written into the Retool Module 3 draft in Section 7.5.704 'Historic Preservation Zoning Designation'. The establishment of an Overlay is similar to a rezoning in that it (put simply) requires moving through the public hearing process with City Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council.
- Tasha –
  - How will the transition to the new code be managed, and will there be cutoff dates for which the current code versus new code applies?
    - Details have not been established but most cities follow this process after City Council adoption – if submit a complete application in prior to the effective date, can adhere to "old Code". Having two Codes in place at the same time can be very difficult to regulate.
- Dave –
  - Which other cities similar in size to Colorado Springs have also most recently changed their appeal process to exclude their City Council and which ones were clients of Clarion?
    - Aurora wanted to do away with the appeal process to City Council but ultimately did not move forward with the proposal to remove the option. Albuquerque recommended it and City took position that they agreed the new Code should NOT appeal to City Council. Most cities that are very large do not allow for appeals to City Council.
      - (Clarion was the hired consultant for both Aurora and Albuquerque)
- Mike Anderson
  - Are there any proposed changes in the administration or creation of Historic Preservation overlays?
    - Cannot say that there are absolutely no changes, as wordsmithing and rearranging language as occurred, but there are no major changes.
  - Does Module 3 include any changes to the current timeframes/deadlines for an appeal of a land development review decision by the CPC, City Council, or the Planning Director?
    - No, the timeline for submitting an appeal request is still 10 days as currently codified.

- o Does Module 3 include any changes to the current dimensional standards for R-4 and R-5? Specifically, setbacks and maximum building heights?
    - **All dimensional standards can be found in Module 1; however, readers will note that existing R-4 and R-5 have been put back into the draft as they will NOT be converted to R-Flex High.**
- o Are there any changes to subdivision regulations being proposed that will either make it easier, or harder, to divide existing developed lots for redevelopment?
    - **Subdivision regulations can be found in Module 2, but Module 3 does outline process requirements for platting, lot line adjustments, etc.**
- o Can you refer me to the section of the existing City Code that allows the formation of a neighborhood character overlay?
    - **Chapter 7 currently outlines this process in Section 7.5.1603 'Designation Process for Historic Preservation Overlay Zoning' and has been written into the Retool Module 3 draft in Section 7.5.704 'Historic Preservation Zoning Designation'. The establishment of an Overlay is similar to a rezoning in that it (put simply) requires moving through the public hearing process with City Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council.**

- Sam F –
    - o The new proposed flexible zoning districts are so exciting. It is so disheartening to hear that we are doing almost nothing to our existing residential zones. We cannot realistically expect to meet the goals of PlanCOS without modifying the massive percentage of our city currently occupied as low-density developments.

- Tasha –
    - o Could you explain the moderate changes to setbacks and lot coverages mentioned in the PPT presentation?
        - **Proposed dimensional standards can be found in Module 1. Please reference Section 7.2.2 'Agricultural and Residential Zone Districts'.**

- Beth –
    - o Why were the expanded residential zones (R-4, R-5) proposed in Module 1 removed from subsequent drafts?
        - **Initial Retool drafts suggested the conversion of residential districts to the proposed R-Flex districts. This proposal was in-line with PlanCOS in the provision of flexible densities and multiple housing opportunities within residential developments. Due to extreme public opposition and Council direction, the proposal to convert any existing residential districts to R-Flex districts will no longer be pursued. With that said, the residential districts that can be found in the draft are as follows –**
            - **R-E – Single-Family Estate**
            - **R-1 9000 – Single-Family Large**
            - **R-1 6000 – Single-Family Medium**
            - **R-2 – Two-Family**
            - **R-4 – Multi-Family Low**
            - **R-5 – Multi-Family High**
            - **R-Flex Low**

- **R-Flex Medium**
- **R-Flex High**

The R-Flex districts will be available options for rezoning requests.

Although language in Modules 1 and 2 have not been revised comprehensively, it can be noted that the existing R-4 and R-5 districts have been replaced in Module 3 as promised by Staff.