

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Ray Chamberland <raychamberland@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 2:54 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.**

---

Ms Parsons,

I understand you are compiling responses regarding the Ranch and their plans for the benefit of the Commissions' Tuesday meeting. If you would be so kind as to ensure the Commissioners receives my response it would be greatly appreciated. I am strongly against the proposal by The Ranch. Our property is on the West side of Tomahawk trail, and we will be directly affected by this development as our property abuts the proposed development. When we purchased our property in 2005, we were assured that the 1500 acres between our home and Volmer Rd was zoned for 5 and 10 acre properties. As my neighborhood is 5 acre parcels, this was reasonable.

I understand the Commission later authorized the Ranch to develop 2.5 acre parcels. While this was upsetting, we decided this would not unreasonably impose on our quiet enjoyment of our property. I understand The Ranch is now requesting permission to dense pack the area. This is totally unacceptable and if allowed to proceed will destroy the character of this area. We moved out here to be away from city life and overcrowded neighborhoods, not to have the city come to us.

I am a horse owner and the whole reason we moved out here was for the peace and quiet, a place where I can ride in nature not in a neighborhood. I feel as though our voices against the dense packing are being mollified and not taken seriously. I agree with my husband. There are plenty of other spaces around to accomplish the developing that their plans call for. Please not here.

Sincerely,  
Mary Chamberland

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Dave and Ellen Nelson <ndnelson@usa.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 3:31 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Opposition to 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.**

---

Dear Ms. Parsons,  
As a resident of Black Forest, I strongly oppose The Ranch development for the following reasons:

This is a violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase in housing.

This development is a violation of the Black Forest Preservation Plan and Falcon/Peyton Plan.

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

This ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities. The places along Powers Blvd where this type of development is running rampant are an eyesore and a dangerous threat to water availability.

This development would produce significant strain on traffic and already congested roads.

This violates PUD principles. PUD is not meant to increase density by multiple amounts.

This would place a financial burden on the Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required coverage.

Submitted with respect and great concern,

Norman and Ellen Nelson

4260 Hidden Rock Rd.

719-495-0630

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Hank Walters <coswalters17@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 3:37 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Hearing for The 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.**

---

Ms. Parson,

These planning Commission Hearings on Black Forest development are seemingly an attempt to fill a square prior to the usual Colorado Builders Association bought and paid for lackeys to once again ignore the Black Forest Preservation Plan. The greed of the developers and CBA financially supported commissioners completely ignore the basic purpose of the BFPP – and it's not only for the lifestyle of current residents. Ignoring the plan will once more:

Violate Black Forest Preservation Plan and Falcon/Peyton Plan;

Violate zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots, a 10-fold density increase;

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density creates access and use problems within the rural areas;

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities;

Produces significant strain on traffic, roads and congestion. The developer will provide development infrastructure but the county is always slow to provide the connectivity to existing roadways;

Z Violates PUD principles - PUD not meant to increase density by multiple amounts;

Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities and without required support from the new development;

Horace M. Walters Jr.

7090 Tobin Road

Colorado Springs, CO 80908

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Kelly Thomas <kelly.thomas99@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 1:44 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.**

---

Changing lot sizes is unacceptable. We moved to the country, to be in the country. 1/5 acre lots increases the traffic. School classroom sizes. Pollution. Impacts our water. And puts neighbors on top of neighbors. It violates the black forest preservation plan for developer greed. Do the right thing.  
Kelly Thomas

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Carolyn Bond <cbond2008@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 1:43 PM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** SKP-18-006 Sketch Plan The Ranch Comments

**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:

Re: SKP-18-006 Sketch Plan The Ranch, Letter Dated June 26, 2019

I am an adjacent land owner to the proposed Sketch Plan by Classic Homes of the Ranch. I am AGAINST this plan as it violates the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan. When I moved to this location at 9860 Stapleton Road in 1997, I had an expectation that this rural/residential area would remain as it was zoned RR5. Since that time, it has been rezoned to RR2.5. Creating a PUD that would violate the principles of a PUD with the proposed density of 2150 homes on 605 acres is UNACCEPTABLE to the current landowners in this area. Three sides of this property currently have 5 acre lots. Even with 2.5 acre lots, this area will not be consistent in its development. With 2.5 acre lots, there should be an open space between the development and the current landowners for access by antelope, jack rabbits, and falcons and hawks that regularly graze and hunt this area. This is an equine area with several horse owners and should remain a semi-rural area to respect the current landowners that have paid property taxes for many years and valued this area.

This development also puts an excessive burden on the sheriff's department for crime with this kind of urban density. This is El Paso County and not regularly patrolled nor does it have a police force to enforce the law. Currently, people often travel 60 mph on Burgess Road, and there is no enforcement of the current speed limit of 45 mph. There would be little enforcement in this development of current laws. During the 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebration, I heard and saw many fireworks shot in the air in the Peyton/Falcon area that has the kind of housing density that is being proposed and no enforcement could be seen or heard.

Another concern is the burden this development will place on the Falcon Fire Protection District. There are seniors here living on a fixed income, and it sounds like we will be expected to pay even more property taxes to fund extra fire protection as well as for schools. We have already been asked to pay for ambulance services to this area.

There has been no study to determine the traffic and road congestion that would be caused by this development. Even though the south end of the development traffic has been considered, there has been no consideration for the access to the northeast end of the development from Raygor Road to Burgess Road and then through Black Forest. Many people travel from this area north to Denver and other areas along the Front Range. The proposed development would create too much traffic and too much noise in this otherwise quiet area.

There is a drainage ditch through this area and twice in the 20 years that I have lived here, I have seen water 2 feet deep from the rains in 1997 as well as the rains in September after the Black Forest fire. Personally, I don't believe the drainage planned for this area is enough and will put an undue burden on the homeowners after they move in to put in French drains or suffer structural damage for those kind of water events. Will there be a study to determine how much drainage is really needed for this kind of urban development?

For all of the above reasons and the cultural differences between rural and urban development, I am AGAINST this sketch plan. This area needs to remain zoned at RR2.5 since it has already been rezoned to this density in recent years, and it is not necessary to rezone again. The developer needs to create a plan for the current zoning of RR2.5 and consistent with the Black Forest Preservation Plan as well as the Falcon/Peyton Plan.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Carolyn Bond

9860 Stapleton Rd

Colorado Springs, CO 80908

719-646-5351

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Eunice T McGarrahan <juniormcg@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 11:41 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.

Dear Ms. Parsons,

This is to express my sense that the current plans for developing The Ranch should be denied for several reasons, the primary one being that the escalating increase in density will put dangerous and/or undue burdens on traffic and water supplies. The current northern development in El Paso county and the developing Flying Horse North subdivision have already put a strain on traffic on CO 83 and Roller Coaster Rd, creating some dangerous situations due to speeding and disregarding surroundings.

There are preservation plans in place for both Black Forest and Falcon/Peyton and the wisdom of those plans should be heeded.

Our concerns were ignored regarding Flying Horse, leaving the impression that developers have the last say. If that is the case, their short term financial desires will obliterate the very things that make this area a desirable place to live. Short term gain for them - permanent loss for Colorado Springs.

Eunice McGarrahan  
2660 Stagecoach Rd  
Colorado Springs CO 80921

Sent from my iPad

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Aaron Kingstrom <AaronK@frontrange-wireless.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 11:59 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Cc:** Heidi Kingstrom  
**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,  
How could it be right to change the zoning for this development? Everyone that lives in Black Forest area moved out here for an RR zoning and somewhat of a rural lifestyle. To now even except or worst case approve this proposal should not even be an option. El Paso County committed a rural lifestyle to all of us homeowners with the zoning that was in place when we purchased our land and homes, that expectation has not changed. This should truly be against the law and I believe that is what we need to do. Also, hold any and all people that our approving proposals like this accountable. I have watched Black Forest degrade over the last few years because of irresponsible actions such as this proposal . Has any of the planning commission members driven in Black Forest lately ? As usual with government it is always the cart before the horse mentality. I live off of Holmes road right before Flying Horse North and what a nightmare this chip seal narrow road has become(before any houses built ). People will surly lose their life on this road in coming years and it is not all because of drivers. Holmes road was not designed for this kind of heavy traffic with no shoulders or centerline. You are approving developments without any consideration of the current inadequate infrastructure or the commitments you made to homeowners with the current zoning. None of what is going on recently is responsible growth. I believe in time we are going to be able to legally hold the people making these irresponsible decisions accountable. I for one will back up my opposition to this kind of reckless and irresponsible proposal with my vote and or money if legal action can be taken .

Thank you

Aaron Kingstrom  
Mobile 303-929-5341



## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Dana Kuhlman <danakuhlman529@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 10:07 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Please honor original zoning regulations

**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,

As a 20-year property owner in the Black Forest area (Silver Ponds HOA where all properties are 2.5 acres), I ask you to please help maintain the openness and beauty of the Black Forest and surrounding area and please do not allow Classic Homes or any builder/developer to petition to change the zoning laws in that area to make it an urban area. Home and property owners purchase in that area to be able to enjoy the peace and serenity it offers over being in the city. Below are specific reasons we ask you and the other commissioners to honor and respect the original zoning laws:

- \* Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase
- \* Violation of Black Forest Preservation Plan and Falcon/Peyton Plan
- \* Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density
- \* Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities
- \* Produces significant strain on traffic, roads and congestion
- \* Violates PUD principles - PUD not meant to increase density by multiple amounts
- \* Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

Again, please consider current property owners in our more rural areas and honor their desires to maintain their surroundings as originally zoned.

Respectfully,

Dana Kuhlman

7125 Silver Ponds Heights

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Lori Niell <lori@yoursoulhastheanswers.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 10:51 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Protesting further development where it cannot be sustained with our aquifers/wells, and where we long time RURAL residents believed we would remain in a rural area, which we paid extra for at the time we bought our property!

**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,

The fact that anyone is considering further over-development and changing the 5 acres per single family residence rule is just sickening to many of us LONG term El Paso County residents! It is bad enough that Flying Horse II has completely ruined our quality of life and the rural setting we enjoyed for over 40 years prior to all the over-development happening already. The idea that even more density will happen with the so-called "The Ranch" subdivision is unconscionable to most of the residents who were promised that the County would maintain the 5 acre rule in perpetuity. It is WRONG to ruin the way of life we paid heavily to enjoy at the time we bought our lots over 40 years ago. PLEASE do not allow any further development of our spaces that are supposed to remain RURAL areas. Here are only a few of the many reasons this decision would be a disaster for the current residents out here:

1. Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase
2. Violation of Black Forest Preservation Plan and Falcon/Peyton Plan
3. Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density
4. Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities
5. Produces significant strain on traffic, roads and congestion
6. Violates PUD principles - PUD not meant to increase density by multiple amounts.
7. Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities

We already lost the fight over Flying Horse II and it has been devastating to see acres and acres of lodge pole pines and old growth forest all destroyed for dense housing and a golf course that is unneeded in this area, as there are many golf courses within a 10 mile radius already, some of whom are struggling to keep enough golfers on their greens to afford watering their courses.

We BEG the County to see reason and to just say NO to "The Ranch" and any other development that breaks long standing rules and zoning out here that we had a right to expect to last forever at the time that we bought out here.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Lori Niell  
719-495-9168  
3385 Stagecoach Rd.

Colo. Springs, CO. 80921

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Nahla Tw <myinlaws@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 11:08 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Violation of zoning regulations

**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.**

---

Re: Classic Homes 2100 home urban development S of Stapleton and Raygor Rd.

Progress is exciting if done right. When it's done wrong, or especially for the wrong reasons, people suffer. I hope and pray our elected officials do right for its citizenry and not allow anything to cloud judgment.

There. Is. No. Race.

I read Colorado Springs projects to be as large or exceed Denver's population by 2050.

Not comforting since we have big problems in crime alone. Currently, property crime in CoSpgs is 17% higher than the national average, 2% higher than Denver. Violent crime is at par with national avg in CoSpgs and 6% below Denver. Still bad because Denver is way above, ~7% higher than the national average. These are today's every day problematic issues impacting Colorado Springs taxpayers concerned about how to keep our families safe from crime...and now water. WATER?! Yes, water. I'm reading that's because of the Classic Homes 2100 home build proposal.

I am a relatively new homeowner having moved from northern CO. and rented here for a while. It was important for my family to buy preowned v new for the same reasons I am now concerned about along with my neighbors. I would not have thought to question my Planning Commish but people talk.

Knowing the crime rates and the water issues, why ever would elected officials vote yes for such absurdity without having tangible answers to current landowners concerns? If there are no incentives from the developer for us or the commissioners to approve, why are my neighbors worried the Planning Commission will vote in Classic Homes favor with so so many negatives?

Now, I, along with my constituents, want to understand why any commissioner would ever think adding 21, 210, much less an eye popping 2100 homes is a good idea rather than improvements?

Thank You  
N. Williamson  
12175 Howells Rd  
80908

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Art Candelas <candelasart@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 9:42 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Classic Homes Applicaion

**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 writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development from Classic Homes called "The Ranch" for the following reasons:

My wife I used to live in Springs Ranch in town off of Powers and Constitution. We bought our 5-acre lot in Black Forest in 1998 because Powers was expanding quickly and along with that, came increased traffic/criminal activity/city living. We had just moved from Los Angeles to move away from these same issues. In 2003, we broke ground on our lot and have lived in Black Forest with our two daughters since. We have observed as Black Forest and the surrounding areas have expanded quickly and that disappoints us because the same issues are cropping up. We realize that development is inevitable but Black Forest has such a unique quality about it and part of that is being rural. Please preserve what we bought into for us and for our future generations. We are active members of the community but are seriously considering a move out of Black Forest and Colorado because of the loss of that rural feeling. We don't agree with "The Ranch" development for the following reasons:

- Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots would create city living versus rural country living

- Ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities

- Places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin; we are worried that we will either run out of water or have to drill another well which would not be in our budget

- Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities. The Black Forest Fire in 2013 strained the Falcon Fire Dept already. Increased growth would create even more of a burden

- We are already seeing increased traffic, along with, aggressive driving in the Black Forest area from all the development around us. Denser housing will make this problem worse.

Please vote "No" on "The Ranch" development and preserve the Black Forest as a rural area where we can enjoy nature and family living.

Sincerely,

Art Candelas  
12803 Fulford Court, Black Forest 80908

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Anita Smith <anita@sunsetdreamhomes.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 8:46 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, Please pass on my objections to the Planning Commission members regarding this development.

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

Violation of Black Forest Preservation Plan and Falcon/Peyton Plan

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities

Produces significant strain on traffic, roads and congestion

Violates PUD principles - PUD not meant to increase density by multiple amounts.

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

Those of us that are long term residents DO NOT SUPPORT these types of developments in Black Forest. When we moved here the minimum lot size was supposed to be 5 Acres, this has totally gotten out of hand.

--  
Anita Smith

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Steve Smith <steve@sunsetdreamhomes.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 8:47 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, Please pass on my objections to the Planning Commission members regarding this development.

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

Violation of Black Forest Preservation Plan and Falcon/Peyton Plan

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities

Produces significant strain on traffic, roads and congestion

Violates PUD principles - PUD not meant to increase density by multiple amounts.

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

Those of us that are long term residents DO NOT SUPPORT these types of developments in Black Forest. When we moved here the minimum lot size was supposed to be 5 Acres, this has totally gotten out of hand.

--  
Steven M Smith



## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Craig Dossey  
**Sent:** Friday, July 12, 2019 5:53 PM  
**To:** 'Mark Marion'  
**Cc:** Kari Parsons; Diana May; Brad Walters; 'Todd Evans'; David Parkerson  
**Subject:** RE: Stop Work Response

Mr. Marion,

This email is a follow up to your letter dated July 12, 2019 (today), which was in response to the Stop Work Order issued by El Paso County for the Palmer-Williams Creek solar energy generation project (PCD File Nos. AASI-18-006, WSEO -18-006, and PPR-19-006). To summarize, the Stop Work Order was issued due to extensive non-compliance with County-approved and conditioned land use approvals. A summary of the material points of your letter and my responses are included below:

1. You state that you have commenced construction of a road (the "Internal Road") to connect the two "halves" of the project. This connection is necessary, as you know, to ensure that hauling traffic to and from the site is limited to approved haul routes. You previously chose to haul on unapproved County roads, causing damage to those roads. You commit to continuous construction of the Internal Road, which you estimate to take two to three weeks.

RESPONSE: Again, this Internal Road connection is necessary to achieve full site access and to avoid additional illegal hauling on County owned and maintained roadways. Construction activities on the site that are uniquely necessary to construct the Internal Road are permitted at this time.

2. Your letter states that you have now directed your subcontractors and material suppliers to use only the haul routes approved in the Project permits. Obviously, this should have been achieved on your end prior to initiating any hauling within El Paso County, in order to ensure compliance with the associated land use approvals. You also commit to ceasing all deliveries to the "Squirrel Creek Site via the Link Road route" and commit to only delivering to that "half" of the project once the Internal Road is completed, which means that all hauling until the Internal Road is constructed must be performed along the Birdsall Road route.

RESPONSE: I concur with this approach. With that said, hauling along the Birdsall route and construction on the Birdsall "half" of the project may resume. Please be advised that if ANY hauling occurs along any County Roads not approved for hauling for the purpose of constructing the Project then the Planning and Community Development Department may pursue full revocation by the Board of County Commissioners of all land use approvals for the project, including, but not necessarily limited to, the "1041" Permit, the WSEO overlay rezoning, and the Site Development Plan.

Please be advised that this decision shall serve as a temporary suspension of the Stop Work Order only as it pertains to hauling and construction on the Birdsall site of the project. The restrictions of the Order shall still apply as it pertains to hauling and construction on the Squirrel Creek site.

3. You indicate that the Road Condition Survey for the unauthorized Hanover Road to Peyton Highway route, which is the route that you illegally chose to haul on and subsequently caused damage to, has been completed. You also indicate that the Pavement Assessment will commence on July 15, 2019. You also accept full responsibility for paying your fair share of the road damage repairs.

RESPONSE: I greatly appreciate your immediate attention to this matter. The safe travel of the citizens of El Paso County is of the utmost importance and the cost to remedy the damage caused by the Project should in no

way to borne by the tax payers of the County. The Planning and Community Development Department, which is the lead department for the County on the permitting and inspection of the project, will continue to monitor your progress in achieving remediation of the roadways with the County's Department of Public Works. If at any time there is a lack of good faith effort to make the County whole as it relates to the degradation of the County's roads then the current STOP WORK ORDER will no longer be suspended, following notice to you as the project point of contact, and County staff may pursue full revocation by the Board of County Commissioners of all land use approvals for the project, including, but not necessarily limited to, the "1041" Permit, the WSEO overlay rezoning, and the Site Development Plan.

Again, this correspondence should not be perceived or otherwise interpreted as the County "lifting" the Stop Work Order, but instead serves as a temporary suspension of the Order as detailed above.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Craig Dossey

Executive Director  
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department  
2880 International Circle, Suite 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80910  
719-520-7941  
[craigdossey@elpasoco.com](mailto:craigdossey@elpasoco.com)

**EXCITING NEWS:** WE ARE UPDATING THE COUNTY MASTER PLAN AND NEED YOUR INPUT! Please complete the County Master Plan Survey at <https://elpaso-hlplanning.hub.arcgis.com/>

To review all El Paso County projects go to: <https://epcdevplanreview.com/>

To review the El Paso County Land Development Code go to: [https://library.municode.com/co/el\\_paso\\_county/codes/land\\_development\\_code](https://library.municode.com/co/el_paso_county/codes/land_development_code)

**From:** Mark Marion [mailto:MMarion@juwiamerica.com]

**Sent:** Friday, July 12, 2019 8:53 AM

**To:** Kari Parsons; Craig Dossey

**Subject:** Stop Work Response

**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 and Craig,

Thanks for the conversation yesterday. As discussed, we wrote a plan for our path forward. Please see attached. I'll be available all day via email or cell phone at 508-479-3903.

Regards,  
Mark

**Mark D. Marion**  
SVP, Projects Group

juwi Inc. • 1710 29th Street, Suite 1068 • Boulder, Colorado 80301 • USA  
office +1.720.838.2291 • fax +1.303.442.1981  
mobile +1.508.479.3903 • [mmarion@juwiamerica.com](mailto:mmarion@juwiamerica.com) • [www.juwiamerica.com](http://www.juwiamerica.com)

This communication may contain privileged or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that you have received this message in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of juwi solar Inc. or its affiliates. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by email, and delete the original and any copies of the message. We do not waive confidentiality if you have received this communication in error.

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** KIMBERLY SANDOVAL <sandteam@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 8:08 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** No 1/2 Acre Lots

**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. Parson's,

I m a 15yr resident of Black Forest and 25yr employee of the city of Colorado Springs. In that time I have seen this city grow tremendously. Mainly sprawl outward, away from the city metroplex. We have out grown our resources and expanded out too much. Other than the financial benefits of the developers and tax increases the county obtains, I do not understand why we would establish new zoning regs just for this financial benefit. This is destroying the purpose people have purchased land in BF and counted on these regulations to buffer them against how the growth in CS has been haphazardly planned. Please consider these points:

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

Violation of Black Forest Preservation Plan and Falcon/Peyton Plan

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities

Produces significant strain on traffic, roads and congestion

Violates PUD principles - PUD not meant to increase density by multiple amounts.

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

Places burden on El Paso Sheriff's Office, adding additional areas and roads to patrol

If you have questions, please feel free to respond back or call me on my cell phone #719-210-3252. Thank you for your consideration.

Carlos Sandoval

Sent from Outlook

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Sheryl Granger <sherbilg@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 8:00 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Opposition to Classic Homes "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.**

---

Good Morning Ms. Parsons,

My family, and hundreds of others in Black Forest STRONGLY oppose the plan from Classic Homes, for "The Ranch". I am sick and tired of Classic Homes bullying their way into getting around zoning restrictions, and our commissioners letting them do so, without consideration for the ramifications. It seems to be all about profit. Do some research. Please read the information below for clarification on the ramifications of approval of the Ranch. Stop allowing Classic to bend the rules.

---

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. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

---

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

Thanks for your help in this matter,

Sheryl Granger

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** PATRICK and MICHELLE DUGAN <ASYOUWISH4901@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 6:45 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,

We are strongly in opposition to the development referred to as The Ranch. This high density increase of homes is a violation of 2.5 acre zoning by allowing 1/5 acre lots must be blocked. The Ranch development ignores the current residents expectations of rural living. Our natural environment is being changed by the onslaught of big money developers with no regard to the existing zoning regulations, the violation of PUD principles and the violation of Black Forest Preservation and Falcon/Peyton Plans. As residents of the Black Forest we have lived in a community of large acre parcels allows us the opportunity for wildlife, quite dark nights, privacy due to space between homes.

Your position as county planner gives the opportunity to shed light on the violations of zoning and rights of current residents, as well as the financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection Plan, the increased traffic on the roadways leading to rapid deterioration of those roads.

We of the Black Forest community rely on you to communicate to the Planning Commission members our concerns and opposition to this planned development.

Sincerely

Patrick and Michelle Dugan

719-963-7330

## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Cara Weed <mpr\_cara@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 6:16 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** Opposition to The Ranch (Classic Homes) 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.**

---

Kari,

Please note my opposition to the Sketch Plan for The Ranch 2100-home urban development. It seems our county is quickly being overtaken by money-hungry developers who have no concern for the people who moved to these rural areas with the expectation of a quieter lifestyle and also with the expectation that zoning regulations that protect that lifestyle would be upheld by the commissioners.

Adding 2100 new homes as opposed to potentially 200 new homes is horrific! This will create an additional burden on the Fire District, likely becoming a tax burden on the existing residents who didn't ask for this monstrous development to begin with. And it will have a HUGE impact on the surrounding roadways and on the safety and quality of life of the people who live up here -- something that seems to be largely overlooked and minimized by the commissioners of late.

Please work for the people of El Paso County instead of these developers. Every day I'm seeing new proposed ridiculously huge developments and requests for changes in zoning from rural to commercial use, and I see this beautiful area being paved over and swallowed up at the expense of the many and the huge profit for the few. Approval of this plan would open the door for other developers to put forward similar requests. Please stop the madness and preserve our county.

Thank you.

Cara Weed  
Concerned El Paso County Citizen



## Kari Parsons

---

**From:** Erin Lane <gimmedew@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2019 12:34 AM  
**To:** Kari Parsons  
**Subject:** The 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.**

---

Dear Ms Parsons,

For the following reasons I'm highly concerned and opposed to the Ranch Sketch Plan:

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

Violation of Black Forest Preservation Plan and Falcon/Peyton Plan

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities

Produces significant strain on traffic, roads and congestion

Violates PUD principles - PUD not meant to increase density by multiple amounts.

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

Please help us protect our land, our resources, and our residents

Respectfully,

Erin Lane