

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Patricia Dekal <77blubrds@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 4:50 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

We ask you to stop the development "The Ranch" as stated for the following reasons:

This development violates the long time zoning regulations in the Black Forest area - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. This places heavy burdens on the Black Forest fire department.

Have you considered the increase in traffic in this area? Has any research been done on the addition of 5000 cars to the already overburdened 2 lane roads in this area ?

It places high density into an urban area. The people who have lived here for years have expected their lifestyle to remain a rural area, and this destroys their way life.

Along with these high densities comes the strain on our aquifers. This is happening all along the front range and the expectation of ground water depletion ranges high for the people who have lived here for years and depend on the aquifers. This development puts an additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin

The county commissioners continue to approve these high density developments but refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire districts.

We ask you to please consider decreasing the density of this development. Not everything is about money, it's about a way if life that is disappearing with this kind of unchecked growth.

Sincerely

Patricia Dekal

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Joycelaine Muhs <jkmuhs413@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 4:02 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Change of zoning for Black Forest properties/The Ranch

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

I purchased my property 20 years ago because of the rural atmosphere of the Black Forest, knowing that I would not have a neighbors house so close that I could shake that neighbors hand through facing windows. I loved the Black Forest Land Use Plan that required a minimum of 5 acre plots per homesite. I am appalled at how close home are being built to one another with no room for children to play in back yards and no privacy due to trying to build on smaller and smaller lots. We have only commissioners such as yourself to thank for this deterioration of our living standards.

I recently had Hamacher Well Works out to my property for a minor repair and in questioning them about the availability of water in the Denver Aquifer they chuckled and said at the rate wells were being drilled it may or may not be possible to obtain water from the "Denver." Other Aquifers would cost considerably more money to drill wells into and prohibit landowners such as myself from accessing those deeper Aquifers, even if they had the water that we might need.

I also read where all of the larger cities in and around Denver are trying to purchase water rights from different irrigation/farm communities throughout our state. I wonder where you think our future generations will be when all we have is homes and concrete but no land/water to generate food/water necessary for life. Are you thinking we will find it on Mars and transport it back to our planet Earth????

When I read that our planning commission is more interested in the number of home sites that can be constructed (for tax purposes and to appease contractors) rather than following the Black Forest Land Use Plan, and not considering why most of us in this area purchased the larger lots and rural atmosphere to begin with, I am wondering whether you truly represent the people you profess to represent.

While I am absolutely opposed to your proposal I wonder how much money Classic Homes provided to you and the other commissioners to convince you that you needed to allow them this drastic change from the Black Forest Land Use Plan that has existed for many years. One only has to "follow the money" when it comes to decisions such as this!

Please allow those of us who love the rural atmosphere of the Black Forest to maintain our lifestyle including having enough water to support our needs without having to drill into the deeper Aquifers because "lining your pockets" is more important to you than to our current standard of living.

I respectfully request that you deny Classic Homes the opportunity to change the zoning to much smaller lot sizes and to allow all of those homes to diminish the water from the Denver Aqueduct that no one at this time can predict will even be available for those of us that have lived here for some time.

Sincerely,  
Joycelaine Muhs

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Scoutmaster Doc <nelsonnylt18@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 4:26 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Dear Commissioner,

I have lived in Colorado since 1972. I was then part of Colorado's population growth and understand the need for new housing. The proposed Ranch at Stapleton and Raygor is not a good solution for this. The ground water supply is not sustainable for long term. Neighbors will lose the rural character they trusted the zoning was to protect. And the fire protection buildout expense is substantial for tax payers who will not even live in this development. The city has surface water and much room for houses, let's use the better resources in Colorado Springs for our burgeoning population.

Sincerely, Donald A Nelson

4595 Shady Lane CS, CO 80908

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Victoria Johnson <gardendreamer@q.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 4:36 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Oppose The Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Ms Parsons: I am a resident of Black Forest since 2003. I moved out here for a reason. I did not want to live in an urban environment. Now, with all the development being done or is in the planning stages, my life and lifestyle is under attack. If I wanted to live in a close-knit, over-utilized, city-mentality I would have stayed in Colorado Springs. The continuing impact of poor decision making on the Black Forest is appalling. The commissioners continuing to ignore their voters is also appalling. Living here with the constant threats of changes and the actual changes that most residents of the Forest are experiencing is starting to have me rethink about continuing to live in the Forest and Colorado. Taking that lifestyle from me and other residents is shameful. If the commissioners feel they don't need to support their voters, then they won't get my vote ever again.

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities

Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin

Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

Thank you for listening. I hope you and the other commissioners will finally stop and think about people, animals and local environment and not greedy commercial developers continuing to tear up the Forest and other surrounding areas that is not sustainable.

Victoria Johnson

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Teri Holt <tlholt2003@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 2:20 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch Development by Classic Homes

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

---

I adamantly oppose The Ranch development proposed by Classic Homes. The following is a summary of the key reasons why:

- Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase
- Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density
- Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities that have 5 acres or more
  
- Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin
- Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

Unfortunately, our Commissioners have repeatedly shown a disregard for zoning regulations, negative impact to natural resources and wildlife, and the negative impact to the quality of life for established residents. Colorado Springs and nearby areas are/were desirable because of these assets. If sufficient affordable housing is an issue, then stop allowing investors to continue buying up properties for the purpose of Air BNBs!

*Teri Holt*

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Marlice VanZandt <marlice.touchtheearth@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 2:22 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

This is to inform you that as a long standing resident of Black Forest, I am vehemently opposed to the development known as The Ranch as proposed.

Following are some key reasons for my opposition:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities (The attached map shows the surrounding lots (house symbol) that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square.

Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin

Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

I trust that your just and sincere consideration of this issue will result in true service to the people you represent

Marlice Van Zandt

Black Forest resident since 1975

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** fleets@q.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 2:33 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Cc:** Barbara Fleet; Stokka, Terry  
**Subject:** Opposition to the Proposed Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Kari,

My wife and I strongly oppose the proposed "high density" RANCH development for the following reasons:

1. This proposal is a blatant violation of zoning regulations (changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase). Moreover, Planned Unit Development (PUD) is supposed to be for density transfer, not an obvious re-zoning intended to increase density.
2. The proposal is totally inconsistent with the surrounding development (i.e., urban density surrounded by rural density)
3. It ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors (on 5 acre or more lots) who rightly expected lower densities with any new development in the area
4. This proposed urban density will definitely place additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from the Denver Basin and considerable financial burden on the Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities.

We moved to the Black Forest 13 years ago from Washington DC to retire in a rural setting that offers peace and quiet, low light levels, minimal traffic, and small population densities--among a myriad of other reasons retirees typically enjoy. We already see considerable evidence of encroachment on this safe and secure lifestyle (e.g., Sterling Ranch on Vollmer Road). The Black Forest Preservation Plan was written for good reasons and its' tenets are as true today as when it was approved in 1974 and updated in 1987.

Please DO NOT endorse or approve the RANCH development proposal as written!! Let's get back to the basics of common sense development with strict adherence to existing zoning regulations, appreciation for the rural environment and respect for all of us who already live here because of our "open space" vision and independent, rural lifestyle values.

STEPHEN FLEET

BARBARA FLEET

Black Forest Residents



## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Marlice VanZandt <marlice.touchtheearth@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 2:34 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

This is to inform you that as a long standing resident of Black Forest, I am vehemently opposed to the development known as The Ranch as proposed.

I have been well aware of the fact that water is a primary need for sustainability especially in our arid climate. I also am aware of the fact that there are some who have endeavored to monopolize and capitalize by securing water rights over many decades in order to further personal power and gain.

I can only hope that you will strive to make decisions that are just and fair and that ensure your position as a worthy representative of the people.

The following is from the Black Forest Land Use Committee and reflects my sentiments...

The Black Forest Land Use Committee continues to oppose The Ranch for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septics. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had

plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.

6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.

7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

Sincerely,  
Marlice Van Zandt

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Kathleen Cook <ucookkm@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 2:41 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Cc:** Glenn Cook  
**Subject:** The Ranch - Opposition

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Dear Ms. Parsons. I am a homeowner in Black Forest near Vollmer and Burgess. I oppose the grant of a variance to build ten times as many dwellings as called for in the Black Forest Preservation Plan for the reasons stated by the Friends of Black Forest, and especially because to approve this variance makes a mockery of the Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton plan.

The development would surround a rural area of 5 acre homes with high density housing, completely disregarding the rights and expectations of those homeowners that the governing land use plans would be honored and they would be able to live in a rural lightly populated area.

I'm also very concerned that the County is giving away water that was envisioned to be allocated for rural sparsely populated areas.

I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

Kathleen M. Cook

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Michael Pipan <mpipan44@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 3:22 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Cc:** trblx3@aol.com  
**Subject:** Strongly Opposed to The Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

I wish to register my opposition to The Ranch development for the following reasons:

1. The development and density of this project is at odds with the existing zoning and the character of the area and the surrounding land use.
2. Residents have moved to the area in the expectation that zoning regulations would be enforced; instead, the continued development would result in a complete change of environment from a rural one to a densified, urban setting.
3. This will also put an unnecessary strain on the water supply from the aquifer. Development should instead be focused on areas that are supplied from other (renewable) sources.
4. As fire is a major concern in the area, the development will placing an additional burden on the Falcon Fire Protection District, which in turn means an additional financial burden for residents OUTSIDE of the proposed development.

For all of the above reasons, I urge you to DISAPPROVE the sketch plan for The Ranch.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Mike

Michael Pipan  
12153 Wellwood Ct  
Elbert, CO 80106

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Dave and Stella <steda4us@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 2:01 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Ms. Parsons - please note that we are deeply concerned about this project and object to any adoption by our Commissioners for the following reasons:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities (The attached map shows the surrounding lots (house symbol) that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square

Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin

Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

Our Sheriffs' are already over worked and a few we have spoken to are against this as well. People are so cheap and don't vote to increase taxes which would help fire and police, this has been proven over and over from the outcome of voting.

People like the space but then start overcrowding and then we no longer have our space.

Thank you for your time.

Dave and Stella Buck  
Falcon, CO 80831

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** John Ward <wardj7368@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 1:47 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Proposed Black Forest Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Ms Parsons,  
I'm a 14 year resident of Black Forest and am opposed to the proposed Ranch Development.

The proposal violates zoning regulations that were part of the reason we bought in Black Forest. The proposal represents a ten-fold increase in density – exactly the density problems that convinced us to move out of Briar Gate in 2005. This proposed urban-level density in the Black Forest area is inconsistent with the surrounding area and again – violates the zoning regulations.

Allowing this urban level density ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expect lower densities.

The urban level density will over-stress infrastructure such as water (non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin), place financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities, and exacerbate worsening traffic issues in Black Forest.

Thank you.

John E Ward Jr., PhD., PMP  
8884 Shipman Lane  
Colorado Springs, Co 80908  
719.459.0774  
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Jeff Johnson <jdjohnson429@q.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 1:22 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Black Forest Land Use Committee continues to oppose The Ranch

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

The Black Forest Land Use Committee continues to oppose The Ranch for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septic. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.
6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.
7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities (The attached map shows the surrounding lots (house symbol) that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square.

Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin

Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Debby Davidson <debbyjeand@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 12:35 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

As a resident of the Black Forest I am against the destruction of our beautiful rural community by allowing Classic Home.

We feel it is a violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase.

It is inconsistent with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density.

By approving this plan you are ignoring the rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities. Most of which have 5 acres or more.

In addition, it places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin and a financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities.

Deborah J Davidson

4807 Silver Nell Drive

ColoradoSprings, CO 80908

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Mike Parcha <mikeparcha@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 12:36 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Black Forest Development Opposition

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Kari Parsons,

As a resident of Black Forest, I oppose The Ranch development, a 2100-home urban development south of Stapleton and Raygor Road for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septics. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.
6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.
7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater

Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Mike and Debbie Parcha  
17430 Fairwind Drive  
Elbert CO 80106  
719-396-9008

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Sarah Simon <sarah.simon@usa.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 12:37 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch Development: why I oppose

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

Dear Ms Parsons:

I have grave concerns about The Ranch proposed development in the Falcon Fire District.

The developer proposes a density of homes far outside of the current rural density. Ten times the density, in fact!

Thousands of people living at urban density using Denver Aquifer groundwater is not sustainable.

Please stand up for the residents of this area and help them maintain the way of life they have invested in for their families.

Sincerely,

Sarah Simon  
[sarah.simon@usa.net](mailto:sarah.simon@usa.net)  
719-494-6402

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Katee Schoepp <ktschoepp@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 10:34 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** opposition to The Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

- Kari,
- As a concerned resident of Black Forest- I strongly oppose the development of The ranch for the following reasons. I hope you will continue to protect the land, resources and people in Black Forest.
1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septics. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
  2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
  3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
  4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
  5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.
  6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.

7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

Thank you for your support.

Katee Schoepp

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Mike and Lori Lewis <YANKEETOWN5@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 10:44 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Rezoning opposition for The Ranch

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

My name is Mike Lewis and I am a resident of the Black Forest. I strongly oppose rezoning for the development known as "The Ranch" in El Paso County for the reasons listed below.

### Input for The Ranch sketch plan from the Black Forest Land Use Committee

The Black Forest Land Use Committee continues to oppose The Ranch for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septic. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.
6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.
7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon

Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

Thank you  
Mike Lewis

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Randy Garcia <garciare@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 10:51 AM  
**To:** Holly Williams; Kari Parsons; Cami Bremer  
**Cc:** Longinos Gonzalez Jr; terry.stokka@fobfpp.org; Stan VanderWerf; Mark Waller  
**Subject:** Opposition to The Ranch Development  
**Attachments:** The Ranch surrounding lots.jpg

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Hi Holly! I hope all is well.

We spoke about this prior to the election. The previous commissioners sold the north/east parts of the county down the river by allowing reckless development that has impacted the rural/forest areas of the county.

My hope is you will take a hard look at this plan and modify it to complement the 5 acre rural zoning and not smack a high density subdivision in the middle of existing rural areas.

Thanks for your support, and to Cami and the rest of the team, here is your chance to shine. Please let me know how I can help in any way.

All the best!

Randy

Dr Randy Garcia  
LtCol USMC Retired  
13210 Crump Road  
Black Forest, CO 80908  
719 290 1527

PS as you probably know the Union/Old Ranch/Milam development just lopped off a mountain top/forested area and created a new scar along the lines of the gravel quarry on the west side. Once we make these errors, there is no going back.

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Terry Stokka <terry.stokka@fobfpp.org>  
**To:** "friends@fobfpp.org" <friends@fobfpp.org>; Kevin Curry <currykevin@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019, 10:19:06 AM MDT  
**Subject:** [Friends] Opposition to The Ranch Development

Dear Friends,

One week from today, July 16th at 900am, the El Paso County Planning Commission will be hearing the application from Classic Homes, for a sketch plan on The Ranch, a 2100-home urban development south of Stapleton and Raygor Road. If the sketch plan is approved, Classic will have the urban development locked in and they can move ahead to a preliminary plan.

The Black Forest Land Use Committee opposes this proposal for several reasons outlined below and I need you to rally and send emails by the hundreds to the county planner, Kari Parsons, to express our opposition. For the Planning Commission we will send emails to Kari Parsons and when the sketch plan is presented to the county commissioners on August 27th we will send emails to the individual commissioners. This is the first significant land use issue for the two new commissioners, our own Holly Williams and Cami Bremer, commissioner for the downtown district, so we will see how they vote on these things.

Here is the input we provided to the county from the Land Use Committee:

---

## Input for The Ranch sketch plan from the Black Forest Land Use Committee

The Black Forest Land Use Committee continues to oppose The Ranch for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septs. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.
6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.
7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

=====

I ask you to send emails to Kari Parsons ([kariparsons@elpasoco.com](mailto:kariparsons@elpasoco.com)) expressing your opposition to this sketch plan. You may cut and paste from above or summarize on your own.

Here are the key points to highlight:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities (The attached map shows the surrounding lots (house symbol) that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square.

Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin

Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

---

=====

Thank you so much for your support. Together we can have a strong voice to protect the forest.

Terry Stokka

---

Friends mailing list  
[Friends@lists.fobfpp.org](mailto:Friends@lists.fobfpp.org)  
<http://lists.fobfpp.org/listinfo.cgi/friends-fobfpp.org>



## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Deborah Brown <Deborah.Brown@netally.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 10:56 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Hello Kari,  
I'm writing to express my opposition to The Ranch development.

As a resident of Black Forest, I am opposed to these massive developments with increased density that violate the Black Forest Preservation Plan.

The area in question is zoned RR 2.5 and I oppose changing it to PUD with 9000 sq ft lots. 2100 homes with potentially 5000 residents in a level of density that is simply inconsistent with the area. I'm very concerned about the massive water usage that will result from this and other developments. This proposal ignores the Black Forest Preservation Plan and expectations of residents that it remains a rural area of 5 acre or larger lots. It's time the county planners stopped ignoring the citizens of Black Forest and started saying "NO" to developers who ignore the existing zoning.

Thank you,  
Debbie Brown  
18280 Woodhaven Dr

**Kari Parsons**

---

**From:** Paul Herbig <hhcap@q.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 11:11 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Request for Zoning Change

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Please do not approve this zoning change. Paul Herbig Black forest 719-495-2026

=====

Input for The Ranch sketch plan from the Black Forest Land Use Committee

The Black Forest Land Use Committee continues to oppose The Ranch for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septics. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.
6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.
7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5

zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

Sincerely,

Paul Herbig  
Insurance Broker

COWEST INSURANCE GROUP  
7608 N. UNION BLVD. SUITE G  
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO.  
80920

719-247-8421 Direct  
719-228-6055 Office  
719-228-6058 Fax  
[hhcap@q.com](mailto:hhcap@q.com)

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Charles Dibrell <cdibrell4@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 11:19 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Classic Homes "The Ranch"

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

I'm writing in opposition to zoning/planning changes requested by Classic Homes.

Many, if not most of the residents of Black Forest and adjacent neighborhoods bought property with the idea that zoning would remain constant and they would not have urban crawl on their doorsteps.

The zoning of the greater Black Forest area as RR 2.5 or RR 5 is a compact between the county and the residents to maintain a particular look and feel. Changing this at the request of a multi-million dollar developer makes a complete mockery of the zoning system and serves to disenfranchise the current citizens of El Paso County.

Beyond that, water resources are increasingly a concern. Continuing to permit large scale residential development using ground water is dangerous and short sighted. This practice will end at some point - better now than when the wells run dry.

In recent years, it seems like the developers always win these battles (Flying Horse North and McCune ranch being the most recent). I urge you to contemplate the precedent that sets. Individual home owners are powerless and the gov't/big business always win...is that to be your legacy?

v/r

Charles Dibrell

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Harry Wilson <hwilson@day-off.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 11:24 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Opposition to The Ranch Development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

Kari

I have been in the construction business for over 40 years, now here in Denver but previously in South Florida and have never seen a developer try to drastically change zoning regulations. Why won't the County Commissioners levy impact fees on these developers that put first responder under maned and under equipped to handle such a growth. There is a reason I live in the Black Forest and that is to get away from the Urban Development of the city and live where zoning is 2.5 acre lots or larger. The Denver aquifer also can't handle the water use from this development. My neighbors and I believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells me that zoning means nothing in land use planning.

My neighbors and I oppose The Ranch for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septics. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.

6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.

7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing.

That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

Thank you and please do the job we elected you for!

Harry Wilson

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Lisa Anderson <lealo71@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 11:24 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Ranch Sketch Plan

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

As a rural resident that chose a longer commute to work to enable me to bring up my family in a quiet rural community I am disgusted and angry that permission keeps being given to build urban developments that impact wildlife, traffic, water, noise and light pollution. The large existing developments like Banning Lewis Ranch offer more sustainable housing opportunities yet the greedy local government officers and committees collude with rich developers without consideration of the affects on current residents. When will this Idiocracy stop. I support the Black Forest Preservation Plan and I hope you do too!

Lisa Anderson  
Black Forest resident

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Richard Babcock <richard.b@sasi-services.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 11:27 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Ms. Parsons,

I have been personally sued by a developer when we recently opposed a similar intrusion into the Black Forest area so am a little concerned about expressing opposition on this most recent incursion. That being said it is clear to residents of the Forest there is little restriction on development in El Paso County however we will continue to express our opposition for the reasons clearly stated below.

Some how in some future tragic way it will become evident probably when we have another bad snow year that unbridled development was a gross error. At least we will be on record as being in the non-control seat but in a counter position for all the good it may do then. Likely too late to be right by that time...

thank you for registering our concerns.

The Black Forest Land Use Committee continues to oppose The Ranch for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septic. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling

Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.

5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.

6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.

7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

The information contained in this transmission is privileged and confidential and/or protected health information (PHI) and may be subject to protection under the law, including the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, as amended (HIPAA). This transmission is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, printing or copying of this transmission is strictly prohibited and may subject you to criminal or civil penalties. If you have received this transmission in error, please contact the sender immediately by replying to this email and deleting this email and any attachments from any device.

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** curtis bosley <curtisbosley@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 11:51 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch Development

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

We oppose the development for the following reasons.

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septics. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.
6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.
7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and

not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

We oppose the planned development for the reasons above.

Curtis and Alta Bosley  
9770 Tomahawk Trl. 80908

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Kevin Szczudlak <lknfer8@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 12:10 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Cc:** KC Hebner-Szczudlak  
**Subject:** The Ranch (Classic Homes)

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Dear Ms Parsons,

We strongly oppose the development of the 610 acre property referred to as The Ranch.

Although we're a military family & will not be calling this our forever home, the irresponsibility we see from this county in regards to growth & development is comical, and we wish to protect the neighbors that do intend to call this their forever home for years to come.

There's not enough roadway into the area to support it, (US24 or Woodmen Rd.) not enough water to sustain it, or enough residents currently residing around the site that wish to see our rural overlay ruined by all of the cookie-cutter construction this town continues to allow...

Please reject this amount of density and make sustainable, responsible decisions for the future of El Paso County and the overgrowth impact we're already enduring.

KC & Kevin Szczudlak  
9386 Rockingham Dr  
Peyton, CO 80831

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Andy Meng <amcolorado@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 12:14 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The Ranch

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.**

---

Greetings Kari,

I've been following the development of "The Ranch" subdivision being considered south of Stapleton and Raygor Rd. through the Friends of the Black Forest Preservation Plan. If what they are saying about densities, total number of homes built, fire protection and groundwater usage are true I wish to express my complete opposition to what Classic Homes is proposing. The key points for my opposition are:

- Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is a 10-fold density increase
- Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density
- Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities.
- Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin
- Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

I'd urge you to vote or decide, or use whatever influence you have in your role in El Paso County land planning to disapprove any zoning or land use that violates the spirit and letter of the law as set forth in the Black Forest Preservation Plan. At a minimum, you simply cannot ignore the implications of the continual assault on ground water resources by building thousands of homes into the already taxed aquifers that underlie the Black Forest and adjacent areas.

Sincerely,

Andy Meng

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Jeremy Beach <jeremy.beach@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 12:29 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Opposition to the ranch development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

I oppose the 'ranch' development for the following reasons:

1. The Ranch is surrounded by parcels 5 acres or larger except for a small area of half-acre lots on the northeast corner. This area is zoned RR-2.5 for 2.5-acre lots and individual wells and septics. Placing an urban town of 2100 homes and 5000 people in the middle of these larger lots is totally inconsistent with the character of surrounding land uses.
2. To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. Approval of this sketch plan makes a mockery of zoning. The purpose of a PUD is to give flexibility to a developer in the size of lots WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The Black Forest Preservation Plan, page 77, Proposed Actions, 1. b, says, "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved." The Falcon/Peyton Plan calls for a balanced mix of rural and urban uses for this section of their plan - this proposal does not achieve that.
3. This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. These residents believed that their elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan tells them that zoning means nothing in land use planning.
4. The water required for this development is largely water that has been granted by the state but very little proven capability has been shown in wells drilled and pipelines installed. The water provider (Sterling Ranch Metro District) has water rights (paper water) in several places in the Black Forest, but no proven water quantity (real water) or infrastructure to transport over half of that water.
5. Continuing to use non-renewable aquifer water for urban development is placing a huge strain on an already stressed Denver basin aquifer structure. This single development would use half as much water as the entire remainder of the Black Forest. Water providers all over northern El Paso County and beyond were told they had plenty of water yet all are searching for new sources. This practice must NOT continue.
6. Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through CSU and the SDS. The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan.
7. The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, yet the El Paso Board of County Commissioners refused several years ago to permit impact fees on new residential lots to fund new fire stations, equipment and staffing. That means that existing residents around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District will pay for increased fire capabilities and possibly a new station and not the new residents of the Ranch. This dense, urban development is unfair to existing residents of the fire district. Maintaining the RR-2.5 zoning would permit

only 150-200 homes, far less than the proposed 2100 and would have a much smaller impact on the fire district.

Jeremy Beach

YNWA

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** lpboruck@netzero.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 12:31 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** opposition to Classic Homes the Ranch plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities surrounding lots have 5 acres or more. The Ranch does not.

Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin

Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities and resources i.e. buildings, trucks, equipment. All would have to pay for this instead of just the Ranch folks! L. Borucki

---

1 Weird Trick That "Forces" Your Eye To 20/20 Vision -Try It

Igenics

<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3231/5d24dd694a3a25d690dbbst03vuc>