

Kari Parsons

From: Donna Duncan <donnaduncan66@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 2:35 PM
To: Kari Parsons; EXTERNAL Donna Duncan
Subject: The Ranch needs to look more like a 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.

Hi Kari,

Please oppose Classic Home's plans for The Ranch development in Black Forest!

My main objection is 2100 homes getting their water from the over-subscribed Denver Basin aquifers. I'd be happy to send you links to USGS graphs that show the steady decline in well water levels. Our aquifers are a non renewing water source. If I lived near the future Ranch, I'd be very concerned and certainly wouldn't buy a home there.

Classic is welcome to build, preferably on 5-acre lots, using a municipal water supply from surface water. Any hope?

- Donna Duncan

Black Forest Water and Wells

A subcommittee of the Friends of the Black Forest Preservation Plan (we've got to get a shorter ID)

Kari Parsons

From: Mark Adams <adamseod21@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 3:00 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.

Hello Kari,

1. I am expressing my opposition to "The Ranch" development in the area of Stapleton Road and Raygor Road, here in the Black Forest. The Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon/Peyton Plan does not permit any lot sizes less than 2.5 acres for this area. And changing the zoning master plan from 2.5 acres to 1/5 acre lots is just insane! It's a 10-fold increase in the density!
2. This proposed development is completely inconsistent with the surrounding developments!
3. Changing the urban density this drastically completely ignores the rights of those individuals in surrounding neighborhoods, who expected the minimum of 2.5 acre lots for this proposed "The Ranch" development.
4. As an home owner in the Black Forest myself, who relies on well water to sustain my property, I'm deeply concerned about the amount of water required for 2100 homes in this proposed "The Ranch" development. I would not like my well to go dry just because of ELECTED officials fail to do make the right decisions regarding minimum 2.5 acre lots versus 1/5 acre lots.
5. Approving this sketch plan of The Ranch development puts an unfair financial burden on everyone currently residing in the area for Fire Protection. We would be stuck paying for Fire Protection for 2100 homes in The Ranch development versus 150-200 homes under the RR-2.5 zoning requirements.
6. I am asking you to disapprove the sketch plan of The Ranch development and any zoning requests to change for RR-2.5 to smaller lot sizes. Since you are filling a position as an elected official, I'm asking that you truly listen to the individuals who elected you in the first place. Not the developers who are making promises to you. Their not the ones who will be living in the Black Forest area, reliant on individual wells for their water. They're in it to make a huge profit from this dense of zoning!

I ask that you do make the correct decision to deny this sketch plan and enforce the Black Forest Preservation Plan along with the Falcon/Peyton Plan, and not make the decision based solely on what tax revenue this proposed development would bring in. Any sane individual can see that this proposal doesn't fit into the "Master Plan" for the area or the limited water resources which are available for this area.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Mark Adams
14730 Spiritwood Loop
Elbert, CO 80106
AdamsEOD21@gmail.com
720-320-1926

Kari Parsons

From: richard harrington <rahpost@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 10:36 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.

Hello Kari Parsons,

As a multi-generational land owner in the Black Forest area, I feel it is imperative that the congruity of the area be maintained. All who have bought property in the area and live here have done so with the intent and understanding that this is a rural area.

Allowing a development to build homes with 1/4 acre or smaller lots in an area where nearly all lots are 5 acres or more is inconsistent, and would damage the area beyond recognition or repair.

Such a move is unfair to those who have purchased land in this area with intent to rural lifestyle.

Such a move is unfair to those in the area who would have to support the burden of the infrastructure to support these new communities.

Such a move is unfair to those whose homes are dependent upon the limited water resources available in this area.

Such a move is unfair to the intent and purpose behind zoning in the first place.

Please take these factors into consideration, and please oppose and prevent The Ranch Development until it conforms with existing zoning.

Regards,

Richard August Harrington III

Kari Parsons

From: JOHN E KOWALL <jkowall@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 9:47 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Fw: 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.

Dear Kari,

I am asking you to please vote against the Classic homes plan.
Here are some of the reasons we in the Black Forest have put together.

Regards

John and Linda Kowall
7145 Wildridge Road
80908

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 systems. 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.

Kari Parsons

From: Lindsey B <msldbrian@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 10:19 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: 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.

Hello,

I am in opposition of The Ranch for all of the reason's listed below. We recently purchased property in Black Forest and did so because we were told that you had to have the 5 acre lots to have wells, making it a smaller community and there would be water with the wells. By adding so many homes to the area the wells are going to go dry sooner making the properties worthless for the future! Do not allow big developers to ruin our communities for present and future generations!

Lindsey Brian

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.

Kari Parsons

From: Charles Harris <charris7525@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 10:17 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Think it through

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.

Terry Stokka highlighted seven points to consider with the Ranch proposal by Classic Homes. For a start, the approval of a "sketch plan" should only be started after addressing the zoning - as highlighted in #2 of his remarks ("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."). The proposed sketch plan disregards the words WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING.

Chuck Harris

Kari Parsons

From: Dawn Healy <dawneshealy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 9:18 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Meeting next week on the Ranch - opposition
Attachments: The Ranch surrounding lots.jpg; ATT00001.txt

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 Kari - I cannot make the meeting, as I'll be out of town, but I would like to voice my concerns, as Terry has highlighted. I've been in the forest since 1982 and all I see is encroachment against everything the Preservation Plan stands for. Please share the concerns of the people in the forest and stop developers from continually winning against all of our wishes! Things have only gotten worse since the Black Forest Fire - we continue to feel like the county commissioners and developers are taking advantage of us. Someone needs to stand up for us!

Thanks for your assistance.

Dawn Healy
5910 Schwencks Place
Colorado Springs, CO 80908

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.

Kari Parsons

From: Kristin Wilczynski <jkwilczynski@q.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 9:37 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Input 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.

Dear Ms Parsons,

Developers are using "country" names such as "The Ranch" and "The Farm" to describe their PUD developments, when in fact such developments are a far cry from the ranching and farming lifestyle. Developers are destroying Black Forest Colorado for their own greed. We in Black Forest are not interested in being surrounded in PUD developments. I oppose The Ranch development plans 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.

Please stop these developers from destroying a way of life in rural residential areas. I VOTED FOR YOU, HOWEVER, if this development meets your approval, you will never get another vote from me.

Kristin G. Wilczynski

Kari Parsons

From: Margene Horne <organicmargene@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 8:37 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.

Good Morning Kari Parsons,

We appreciate your service to our community. Personally - we have been living here for over 30 years. We live here because we love the wildlife, the trees and animals. We love the nighttime star gazing, (which becomes more difficult every season).

People are not thinking about future community impacts. What will happen to our already established neighborhoods when we run out of water?? Some of us are struggling now, making our wells deeper, placing water filters in our houses because our water is so murky and replacing well head/pumps.

Now a days it is even a challenge to cross the street to get our mail. People are speeding while texting over roads that are not so perfect - this is a very challenging problem here already - and NOBODY to police the situation ever.

We have raised two children here in the Black Forest, one a doctor and the other a local fireman/paramedic which assists YOUR community every day! These are difficult jobs to perform and as you know, only a certain type of individual can accomplish these jobs. We should treat these individuals with more respect!

Most of these new developments will strip away all the parts of the forest that we love and cherish for decades. The quiet, the animals and the trees and wildflowers in our meadows will all go away along with the ability to see the night stars!

Why is all this happening? Are we being lazy? Please spend some time in the Black Forest, re-read the Black Forest Land Use document which many put together to alleviate this situation we are in with YOU and our developers. This is all about money, and that is not a smart reason to cut down all the trees that are already working overtime already to clean our air.

How about paying attention to what is happening here:

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

An Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density.

We are Ignoring the rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities as planned originally.

All this places additional strain on non-renewable groundwater from Denver Basin, this is BIG.

What would you do when YOUR water turned brown and then just stopped? What do you do then???? After three decades for us, what about my neighbors???

I understand this all will place financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities. We know these people as our friends. Please visit the Fire Station. Talk to our Firefighters - get the REAL story instead of making assumptions at your desk.

Thank you for listening to my voice. The Black Forest is a special and beautiful place, please come visit, experience our environment - do not make a guess about our future in El Paso County come and experience our lives here, now!

My Best Regards,
Margene (and Bob) Horne
719 495-4732

Kari Parsons

From: Ciara Gavin <cgavin@allergendetectorservicedogs.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 7:16 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Citizen 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.

To whom it may concern:

I am a citizen of Colorado Springs and am **highly opposed to the proposed Ranch development**. It makes a mockery of our zoning system and shows clear favoritism for developers over the citizens of this community!

Please remember who it is you are working for. We will certainly remember it at election time!

The Ranch development:

*Violates zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase!

* Is inconsistent 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: D. Taylor <DITAY@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 6:37 AM
To: Kari Parsons
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.

Kari,

Please note for the record we do not support the Ranch development due to

1. Density is inconsistent with the surrounding area and inconsistent with BFPP
2. Too many homes/people to serve the monetary interests of the developer and not the community.

Time to stop changing zoning to these high density developments which changes the feel of the area with the non-rural areas infiltrating the rural neighborhoods. The developers can make lots of money in keeping with zoning originally in place.

I even disagree with clustering as set forth in BFPP. Separate the housing.

Michael and Diana Taylor
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Kari Parsons

From: Ricky Davidson <rickyлиндad@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 12:37 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: We are against the Ranch. Please consider those of us that live here. We would not have purchased if we knew that our representatives would willfully erode the benefits our area. Please vote no or severely adjust the following items and make the n...

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

From: Charlotte Krause <neenieck@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 9, 2019 10:12 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Re: [Friends] Note regarding email to county on 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 will add my voice to Terri Stoka's and agree to all he has already e-mailed to you. The county commissioners must stop re-zoning Black Forest for all the builders, why is this being done?

Charlotte Krause

On Tuesday, July 9, 2019 08:36:08 PM MDT, Terry Stokka <terry.stokka@fobfpp.org> wrote:

Dear Friends,

I failed to mention that in the sketch plan stage for The Ranch, there is no discussion or decision that is based on availability of water. That decision comes in the preliminary plan stage or final plat. (It should be in the sketch plan stage but it is not.)

In your emails to Kari Parsons the county planner (kariparsons@elpasoco.com) don't use the water issue as one of your points.

Terry Stokka

Friends mailing list
Friends@lists.fobfpp.org
<http://lists.fobfpp.org/listinfo.cgi/friends-fobfpp.org>

Kari Parsons

From: David Reily <daveruns@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 9, 2019 9:04 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Opposition to 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.

Hi Kari,

I'm a resident of Black Forest and heard about the development sketch for The Ranch. I understand the county's planning commission will be hearing about the sketch plan during a presentation on Tuesday, July 16th. I'm opposed to the sketch plan for two reasons.

1. **Fire Protection Costs.** I feel there should be impact fees added to the costs of the lots sold to pay for the increased fire protection needs that those lots will require. As a survivor of the Black Forest Fire, I know how important it is to have adequate fire personnel, nearby and ready to respond. The county should not expect us, the existing home owners around The Ranch, to pay for added fire protection needs, caused by the newcomers. The newcomers should pay the impacts caused by them.
2. **Zoning.** The current zoning is for 5-acre lots. What sudden change has prompted the plan-makers to change the zoning to a PUD? That is an extreme change to our existing zoning, and I would expect that an extreme and critical reason be provided for such an extreme change in our zoning. 2,100 new homes placed in the middle of 5-acre lots? How could such a monstrous change even be contemplated?

For these two reasons, I urge the planning commission to disapprove the sketch plan.
Thank-you for working with the existing residents of the Black Forest.

David & Jennifer Reily
12465 Casey Lane
80908

Kari Parsons

From: Wendy Sawtell <wsawtell@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 9, 2019 7:31 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: El Paso Planning for the Black Forest

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,

Thank you for serving in your role and your openness to look at the full picture when considering the impact of decisions made by the planning commission. I'm writing to request that the Planning commission vote NO to the request by Classic Homes to change the zoning regulations to profit this company. It does not serve the current residents nor the potential new residents. The following reasons are part of the bigger picture that impacts the residents of the Black Forest significantly.

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,
Wendy Sawtell

Kari Parsons

From: Peter McCollum <saipan1959@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 9, 2019 6:23 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.

Hi Kari,

As a resident of Black Forest and El Paso County, I want to express my opposition to Classic Homes' proposed 2100-lot development, in an area that is zoned RR-2.5.

I ask that you resist this and similar zoning abuses with whatever resources are available to you.

Thank you,
Peter McCollum
10875 Huntsman Rd., 80908

Kari Parsons

From: JJ <jjellis63@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 9, 2019 5:24 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.

Ms. Parsons,

I have live in Black Forest for 15 years and have come to expect a few things:

1. That State, County, and City planners would hold to their word that they would adhere to the law. Current land use zoning for Black Forest allow for 2.5 and 5 acre lots. The Ranch's proposes residential density is ten times this. It will be unlawful to allow the development of the Ranch as it is currently laid out. If planners/commissioners allow this lawlessness, then they can expect more of it from current residents.
2. I expect water. I have 15 acres and one domestic well. Per the density expectation of the Ranch, I could have 5 wells. If the Ranch is allowed and a new water use precedent is set, then I guess we all can put more well on our properties.

Please do NOT allow the Ranch to develop under it's current plan.

Thank You/Respectfully,
Jeffrey J Ellis
11450 Buckskin Ln.
80908

Sent from my iPad

Kari Parsons

From: Jim Moyers <jmoyers51@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 9, 2019 5:26 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.

Classic Homes is greedy and should not be allowed to change the development plan to urban density! You have a moral to once and for all stop this greed and protect our future. We are all watching you and other county officials to step up and end this madness. The roads are already overwhelmed and Classic isn't if held responsible to fix the mess they are creating. These greedy bastards are ruining our area and the county keeps allowing it to happen. They will leave us holding the bag and take money and to a paradise somewhere where the local government is not for sale!

Kari Parsons

From: Nancy Beers <sylviasage80908@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 9, 2019 5:29 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Oppose urban density 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.

Dear Ms. Parsons – I am a long time resident of El Paso County and Black Forest and I am deeply opposed to the urban density proposal of The Ranch, south of Stapleton & Raygor Roads. Changing from 2.5 acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is a 10-fold density increase and contraindicated by the Falcon/Peyton & Black Forest small area plans. It's inconsistent with surrounding development and a violation of zoning regulations.

It places unrealistic additional strain on non-renewable water from the Denver Basin. It is also my understanding that existing residents & the Falcon Fire Protection District will bear the financial burden of increased fire protection coverage, rather than the Ranch development which necessitates that coverage.

These factors completely ignore and disrespect the rights of existing property owners who chose to live here for the lower densities and at least a semblance of a rural lifestyle. We have our small area plans for a reason.

I am calling on my elected officials to represent my position. Too often the residents in this area have been ignored in favor of developers, making a mockery of zoning, planning and the duty of officials to duly represent the constituents they serve. Oppose this plan.

Respectfully yours,

Nancy Beers

Black Forest, CO