

TOWN OF ERIE

*645 Holbrook Street
Erie, CO 80516*



Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 1, 2026

6:30 PM

In Person Meeting

**Link to Watch or Comment Virtually: <https://bit.ly/1APR26PCMTg>
Council Chambers
To Sign Up for Public Comment: www.erieco.gov/PublicComment**

Planning Commission

I. CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO FLAG

Vice Chair Braudes called the April 1, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:30pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Roll call:

Commissioner Booth - present
Commissioner Burns - present
Commissioner Dreckman - present
Commissioner Sawusch - present
Commissioner Baham - present
Vice Chair Braudes - present
Chair Hemphill - absent/excused

A quorum was present.

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Burns moved to approve the agenda of the April 1, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Dreckman, carried with all voting in favor thereof.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2026-241](#) Approval of the March 18, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [March 18, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

Commissioner Booth moved to approve the March 18, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Burns, carried with all voting in favor thereof.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments were taken.

VI. GENERAL BUSINESS

[2026-170](#) A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the Town of Erie Recommending Approval of the Spring Hill Preliminary Plat with Conditions

Attachments: [PC Resolution P26-07](#)
[Staff Presentation](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Applicant Presentation](#)
[Proposed Preliminary Plat](#)
[Parks and Open Space Exhibit](#)
[Application and Narrative](#)
[Additional Application Materials 1](#)
[Additional Application Materials 2](#)
[Additional Application Materials 3](#)
[Neighborhood Meetings Summaries](#)
[Public Notice Postings](#)
[Public Comments](#)

Vice Chair Braudes announced Agenda Item 2026-170 A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the Town of Erie Recommending Approval of the Spring Hill Preliminary Plat with Conditions.

Vice Chair Braudes opened the Public Hearing at 6:33pm and turned it over to staff, and then the applicant, for a presentation.

Harry Brennan, Senior Planner provided an overview of the Spring Hill property, including background on the site, details of the development proposal, and the upcoming steps in the review process. He explained that the project covers 300 acres and includes 632 lots consisting of single-family homes, duplexes, and townhomes. Mr. Brennan also reviewed planned access and roadway connections, along with ongoing oil and gas mitigation efforts on the property. In addition, he outlined the Town's approval criteria relevant to this application.

John Prestwich of PCS Group who represents the Spring Hill project, provided a timeline overview of the Spring Hill project, noting that the property was annexed into the town in March 2014 and is now in the Preliminary Plat stage. He confirmed that no additional oil and gas operations will occur on the site and that coordination with operators will continue until all remaining work is completed. Mr. Prestwich reviewed the project's submittal history, addressed comments, drainage channel design, roadway adjustments, and off-site improvements. He also highlighted the 35 acres of dedicated parks and open space, along with several miles of trails and planned spinetrail connections throughout the development.

Following the presentations, Vice Chair Braudes opened Public Comment at 7:05pm and asked if anyone was online or in-person wanting to give public comment on this agenda item.

Public Comment was taken from the following person(s):

Chris Nieves, 626 State Highway 52, expressed concerns about increased traffic generated by this development and other nearby projects. Specific concerns included the proposed traffic circle at Road 3 and discussions of an additional traffic circle at Road 3.5 related to the Shores at Plum Creek development. The

resident noted that higher traffic volumes could reduce traffic flow and emphasized support for development overall but urged consideration of long-term impacts on surrounding communities.

Julie DeMartino, a real estate agent that resides in Morgan Hill, raised several concerns related to the proposed development. Questions were asked about where future students would attend school and whether the project includes a pool or other amenities. Ms. DeMartino expressed significant concern about traffic impacts, stating that roundabouts in Erie have not functioned well and that a roundabout at this location may be dangerous. She also suggested considering alternative roadway designs to improve vehicle movement. Additional comments included concerns about Lennar as the sole builder, noting that the homes appear too similar, may be difficult to resell, and may not provide long-term market sustainability. Ms. DeMartino expressed a desire for more variety and unique housing options within the development.

Following public comments, both John Prestwich and Harry Brennan addressed some of the questions raised by the residents.

Vice Chair Braudes closed the Public Comment portion of the Public Hearing at 7:18pm.

Vice Chair Braudes brought it back to the Commission for questions and comments.

Some questions and comments included the following:

- Clarification regarding location of remediated soil contamination and multiple occurrences of contamination.
- Is there groundwater monitoring included?
- Regarding Annexation Agreement and current municipal code standard. There is a pocket park on the west side and it appears that there is a plugged and abandoned well. Does the park touch the 50 x 150 boxes (municipal code standard)?
- What are the Highway 52 plans with CDOT and widening this road?
- Does CDOT consider all neighborhoods or just the impact from this one development?
- The current level of service at County Road 3 and Highway 52 remains poor due to the lack of a signal, and CDOT's study timeline may be lengthy.
- Is any plan to increase capacity at the intersection leading into Highway 52.
- Will the installation of the double culvert box affect the flow of the irrigation ditch maintenance?
- NW corner entrance of the property - will it be a right-in, right-out?
- Connectivity to Morgan Hill
- Is the open space in this area usable for Erie residents?
- Boulder Lower Ditch lining
- OSTAB hadn't seen an updated plan since the 2021 plan
- Crusher fine trails: Town stopped using it because of the maintenance
- There is a detailed traffic plan
- Lot sizes and depth on slides - legends are different for the same lot
- Have we received comments from our Public Works Department regarding traffic plans at the North Water Treatment Facility and how they intersect the project?
- Has the town petitioned to have the access control points addressed? How do the new access point requirements come into play?

- Movement across the street in terms of the town's own facility and impacts regarding vehicles and machinery
- Current study shows that nothing is warranted at this location as it stands and additional studies would be required
- Does the town have to request CDOT to come back out to see if the site now warrants a signal? Will they initiate this on their own?
- Is the Frederick High School complete yet? Is the school on this property an elementary school?
- Approximately where is the groundwater located? This could affect foundations.
- Appreciates that the applicant accommodated the current oil & gas setbacks.
- Is ALLO listed as one of the internet providers?
- There was a note regarding FEMA and recorded floodplains statement in this area. Does staff concur?
- Can you elaborate on the commitments noted in terms of the neighborhood meeting regarding trail connection, landscaping, open space areas, and drainage maintenance.
- Is it on the neighboring property or this property?

Vice Chair Braudes closed the Public Hearing at 7:49pm and asked the Commission for any final deliberations.

Some Commissioner comments were that Highway 52 has long been a major concern, describing the traffic impact as the worst they have seen. They appreciated the applicant's efforts to work with CDOT despite the lack of planned widening and expressed concern about the proposed roundabout, recommending additional public outreach. The Commission commended the applicant for listening to residents, documenting commitments, and presenting a well-designed community with substantial open space. Some Commissioners echoed these points, acknowledged that the town has no control over CDOT's timelines or decisions, and expressed appreciation for the applicant's work throughout the process.

Commissioner Dreckman moved to approve Resolution P26-07, a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the Town of Erie Recommending Approval of the Spring Hill Preliminary Plat with Conditions. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Burns, carried with all voting in favor thereof.

The motion passes unanimously.

[2026-207](#)

A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the Town of Erie Recommending Approval to the Town Council of the Rezoning of the Sierra Vista property to Community Mixed Use (CMU) and Airport (AP)

Attachments: [Resolution P26-06](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Staff Presentation](#)
[CMU and AP Use table](#)
[Applicant Presentation](#)
[Applicant Submittals](#)
[Combined Reviews](#)
[Neighborhood Meeting Information](#)
[Proposed Sierra Vista Zoning Map](#)
[Proposed Sierra Vista Minor Subdivision](#)
[PC Public Hearing Notices](#)
[Broomfield Final Comment](#)

Vice Chair Braudes announced Agenda Item 2026-207, a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the Town of Erie Recommending Approval to the Town Council of the Rezoning of the Sierra Vista property to Community Mixed Use (CMU) and Airport (AP).

Vice Chair Braudes opened the Public Hearing at 7:53pm and turned it over to staff for a presentation.

Chris LaRue, Principal Planner provided an overview of the project's zoning, noting that the property, annexed to the Town in 2012, is at the first step of the rezoning process. If the rezoning is approved, the project would proceed to Preliminary Plat with public hearings, followed by Site Plan and Final Plat, meaning the project is still in the early planning stages. He identified the site's location at Highway 7 and Bonanza Drive and explained that the existing zoning allows low density residential and community commercial uses, while the applicant is proposing AP (Airport-related and commercial uses) and CMU (Community Mixed Use). Access would come from Bonanza Drive, and developer commitments for Tract B include height limitations and buffering. Mr. LaRue also reviewed the approval criteria the applicant must meet, including future use considerations and required standards.

Heidi Majerik, the owner's representative of Gage Land Development, thanked the Commission and staff and introduced her team from Norris Design - Diana Rael, Becca Bailey, and Kevin Lovelace - in addition to Wyatt Carlson, the property owner.

Ms. Majerik and Ms. Rael provided an overview of the approval request, explaining the existing zoning and lot boundaries as well as the proposed changes associated with the rezoning. They outlined the application process, described the neighborhood engagement efforts, and summarized the concerns raised by nearby residents along with how those concerns were addressed. They noted that the applicant is requesting straight zoning with no special conditions and also responded to a neighbor's email regarding site access.

Vice Chair Braudes opened the Public Comment portion of the Public Hearing at 8:20pm and asked if there was anyone online or in-person to give public comments.

Public Comment was taken from the following persons:

Bryon Bednar, 280 Skylane Drive expressed concerns about the mixed-use zoning and the amount of discretion it gives the developer in determining future land uses, noted that the staff presentation did not address the mixed-use requirements in Section 10.2.4.A.6 of the code, recommended approving the rezoning only if it clearly satisfies the UDC, and also raised ongoing traffic concerns.

Tim Drnec, 3040 Cherokee Ct. stated that many of the issues relate to the Comprehensive Plan and that the proposed zoning is incompatible with it. They expressed concern about the 40-foot setback on the north side and the active taxiway easement, emphasizing the need to protect this area for safety and security. They also opposed placing higher density housing near the taxiway, noting worries about children and pets in that environment.

Johan Morris, Erie and HOA board member, agreed with a previous point that rezoning from Rural Residential to Mixed Use does not seem appropriate, stated that the aircraft easement does not provide an adequate buffer, and expressed surprise at the visuals shown, urging others to visit the area to see the significant grade change along Bonanza rather than assuming the terrain is flat.

Vice Chair Braudes closed the Public Comments portion of the Public Hearing at 8:29pm.

The applicant and staff addressed some of the concerns that were expressed by those that gave public comment.

Vice Chair Braudes brought it back to the Commission for any questions or comments.

Some questions/comments included the following:

- Was there any feedback on the Comprehensive Plan when choosing the zoning for this area?
- Can you elaborate on the outstanding questions and comments on the traffic study?
- Clarification on permitted uses under each category/parcel
- Is there a reason why CMU zone is split into two different parcels?
- Given some of the concerns along the easement and taxiway, is it possible to not have straight zoning?
- If the intent is to treat the parcels differently, is this the appropriate stage in the process to make that determination?
- This zoning is not as strict and is this something to address during the preliminary plat
- The CMU district limits to three stories in the UDC but not the FAA - can you clarify?
- What is the potential for how much residential can go in this project?
- Would there be residential in both zoning areas?
- Was there the ability to have 500 units in this area?
- Would the high density zoning have allowed the 500 units?
- Would the applicant like to address why the 2015-2016 application was withdrawn?
- Do we know where the airport avigation easement is?

- There is an avigation easement on the property, but that easement does not define the full extent of land that could be developed
- Within proximity of flight patterns and on airport premises, if we are now zoning this AP, does that force FAA review of this development at a later date?
- In 2015-2016, the major concern resulted in a determination and recommendation of denial and that's when the application was withdrawn.
- Staff reported no access to Highway 7 and now there is. Where was the access point?
- Bonanza was a thru street and residents used this access
- Soil analysis and over-excavation
- This item concerns zoning rather than site plan review, and the Commission must follow different requirements for each. There will be at least two additional opportunities for public comment as the project moves through the remaining stages of the process.
- Is there an RTD stop in the commercial uses/multi-family residential?
- Clarification: Easement and 40 ft. buffer - Would this be in addition?
- Transportation items to be addressed during the site plan review include the third submittal comments and a discrepancy identified in the traffic trip generator
- Have we addressed the comments on trip generation and the initial traffic impact study. If there is concern on trip generation calculated, has that been addressed?
- By preliminary plat, we should understand what is needed in certain areas regarding roundabouts, traffic, etc.
- CDOT has preliminary access via Highway 7. Assuming partial motion into the property is limited in movement?
- How is this submittal different from the initial 2015-2016 submittal?

Vice Chair Braudes closed the Public Hearing at 9:06pm and brought it back to the Commission for final deliberations.

The Commission thanked staff and the applicant for their responses and noted that this is a unique, long vacant property that aligns with the intent of the proposed zoning classification, even though there are existing residential homes to the north. They recalled that shifting to AP zoning on the west side had previously been viewed as beneficial for supporting airport needs and suggested staff confirm whether the site lies within or just outside the Airport URA. The Commission felt the proposed zoning could work, emphasized the importance of communicating with the Airport HOA for additional feedback, and expressed interest in seeing how the site develops. While acknowledging that the list of permitted uses can seem broad, they stressed the need to work collaboratively to ensure acceptable uses and to balance impacts on nearby residents. The Commission sympathized with neighbors' concerns but noted that the Commission must evaluate the request against the Comprehensive Plan, and that the Site Plan stage will involve a much more detailed review. For zoning purposes, they saw nothing that contradicts the standards the applicant would be required to follow.

Commissioner Burns moved to approve Resolution P26-06, a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the Town of Erie Recommending Approval to the Town Council of the Rezoning of the Sierra Vista property to Community Mixed Use (CMU) and Airport (AP). The motion, seconded by Commissioner Baham, carried

with all voting in favor thereof.

Motion passes unanimously.

VII. STAFF REPORTS

Kelly Driscoll, Deputy Director of Planning & Development noted that staff has been working with the Clerk's Office as they have been recruiting for the advisory boards. The Clerk's Office has been working with CIRSA for onsite training on May 4, 2026 at 6pm here in the Council Chambers. There will be a quasi-judicial portion of the training. Clerks office will record it if you're unable to make it. The Clerk's Office will send out notifications,.

VIII. COMMISSIONER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

Commissioner Sawusch asked staff what the next meeting for Planning Commission looked like as far as agenda items go.

Kelly Driscoll noted there would be an item on the agenda regarding non-functional turf and state compliance.

Vice Chair Braudes asked about the April 15, 2026 Planning Commission meeting agenda items.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Booth to adjourn the April 1, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Dreckman, carried with all voting in favor thereof.

Vice Chair Braudes adjourned the April 1, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting at 9:18pm.

Translation Services