

Kari Parsons

From: Robert Tillman <retillman@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 4:45 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Oppose Classic Homes plan 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 Kari,

I am a resident of Black Forest and am writing to encourage you to oppose the approval of Classic Homes plan for The Ranch. The density of the plan is not consistent with the area and is in violation of current zoning.

Please oppose the plan for The Ranch.

Sincerely,

Robert Tillman
6980 Tobin Road

Kari Parsons

From: Lisa Sullivan <lisamcgnss@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 7:36 AM
To: Kari Parsons; Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller
Subject: Black Forest Development- 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 County Commissioner,

As a resident of Black Forest, I STRONGLY oppose further development of the land in Black Forest. If these massive developments continue, they threaten our way of life, endanger the citizens of Black forest and take away one of the best places near Colorado Springs for people to come to hike and ride (both bikes and horses).

I agree with the Land Use Committee, and as a resident of El Paso County, I am calling on you to PAY ATTENTION to what the people are saying. The City Board of Commissioners is realizing that we cannot keep growing and using our non-renewable resources indefinitely. I urge you to consider their position and VOTE AGAINST yet another development that threatens those resources.

The Black Forest Land Use Committee opposes 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.

5. 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: Kayla McDermott <kayla.mcdermott@outlook.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 10:42 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: OPPOSITION TO THE 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.

The Black Forest Land Use Committee opposes 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.

5. 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 consider this.

Kayla McDermott

Resident

Kari Parsons

From: John Ward <wardj7368@outlook.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 11:56 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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.

Dear County Commissioners,

I oppose the plan under consideration for the Ranch Development. The plans violate zoning regulations and would change a rural area into an urban one. The plans violate the existing PUDs and the proposed development would be completely out of character with surrounding areas.

Moving forward with the plan for the Ranch development hits me as a personal violation – my wife and I selected our current location as home expecting existing zoning rules to be followed. We moved from Briargate to exchange that increasingly crowded environment for a rural setting. The plan for Ranch Development effectively creates another Briargate next to us.

My guess is no one has performed a technical/financial evaluation on the plan assessing the impact of the Ranch Development on traffic, schools, fire services...

Again, I oppose this plan.

Dr. John E. Ward Jr, PhD, PMP
8884 Shipman Lane
Colorado Springs CO 80908

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Kari Parsons

From: Steven Gutman <avantisteve@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 4:09 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons; Craig Dossey; Nina Ruiz
Cc: Terry Stokka; Judy von Ahlefeldt
Subject: Comments regarding "The Ranch" and Development in Northeastern El Paso County

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.

September 20, 2019

Commissioners and Staff of the El Paso County Planning Commission and
El Paso County Board of County Commissioners
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, CO

RE: "The Ranch" Sketch Plan Review

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

I am a retired community and regional planner. When I saw the draft Sketch Plan for what should have been named "Definitely Not a Ranch," I was completely aghast and signed up to speak at the initial County Hearing on July 19. I could not stay at this Hearing long enough to speak during the public comment period, and I am writing today to urge you to consider my comments now in reviewing this project.

I consider this project to be truly horrific because of what its approval would signal for our rural area and its future benefit for the diversity of the County's future housing stock. I offer my comments below not only as a resident of Walden North being directly impacted by development on the State Highway 83 corridor, but as a retired professional planner (MS-LA Community Planning from Univ of Wisconsin-Madison and BArchitecture-Planning from Univ of California Berkeley). I worked for some of the finest developers in the country, and for companies doing environmental studies and master plans for innovative new communities such as Colorado's own Battlement Mesa, Palm Coast FL, Rayburn Country, TX, and Doe Valley, KY. Prior to moving to Colorado 9 years ago I was one of a dozen families in rural Palm Beach County that organized residents of our area to write a charter and obtain an act of the legislature to create Florida's 38th municipality, Loxahatchee Groves, in a successful effort to wrest control of our land use from a corrupt government. (3 Palm Beach County Commissioners and 2 additional high County officers

served 5-year federal terms for facilitating up-zoning at the same scale we are seeing today in Northern El Paso County).

It was upsetting to see the El Paso County Commissioners over-rule Planning & Community Development's recommendation to DENY approval of Flying Horse North and its water-guzzling aquifer-watered golf course, which was followed by Staff's recommendation to approve the Sketch Plan for "The Ranch." Add to this the issuance of a building permit for the proposed Monument Academy Secondary School without completion of traffic/safety studies by the County and CDOT that consider the School's site non-compliant location on a major transportation corridor, and you may understand why I am fearful that the County is abandoning good planning practices as well as its approved Master Plan documents in considering new development such as "The Ranch" in Northeastern El Paso County. New development does NOT pay its way, especially when developers get a pass on impact mitigation fees as they open up large geographic areas without roads and essential infrastructure. And, citizens are picking up more and more of the tab for such development. We will long be paying for impactful urbanization such as "The Ranch" that promises to imperil the very quality of life that brought all of us to this wonderful area. By sending "The Ranch" and its truly outrageous urban densities back to the drawing board, you can let El Paso County citizens know that developers do not control the County's land use approval processes, and that that the County's elected officials are seeking to maintain the quality and affordability of life in Northeastern El Paso County.

In the last three years I have become very familiar with the County's planning processes related to the Walden Preserve subdivision of the Walden PUD, and more recently, the proposed Monument Academy school at the intersection of SH83 and SH105. I attended the Master Plan visioning meetings held by Houseal & Lavigne and am currently participating in the updating of the Black Forest Preservation Plan. The attractiveness of our area for development, *without incentives*, is due to El Paso County not yet having the overwhelming congestion and traffic now being faced in Denver and all its suburbs. That is rapidly changing in the Black Forest and the rest of Northern El Paso County, and I ask Commissioners and Staff to consider the following concerns and questions regarding Northeastern El Paso County rural area (Black Forest) development in general and "The Ranch" in particular. I cite the Ranch as a particularly egregious example of inappropriate development in the Black Forest and Northeastern El Paso County:

1. The County's master plan is considered by developers in the Black Forest to be a "joke" to the extent that a procession of what County staff describe as "urban density" subdivisions have been approved and are under construction, and each one creates the precedent for the next one on its boundary to do the same thing. It is one of the craziest planning phenomena I have witnessed, and it can be stopped simply by requiring developers to stick to the Master Plan. Period. Not award them 10 and 12-fold increases in allowable density such as the wretchedly excessive

density being sought for "The Ranch." Once RR-5 and RR2.5 large lot zone districts in the Forest are gone, so too will be the County's vanishing close-in large-lot housing stock, key to being able to continue to attract major employers and their executives who want to live in rural areas that do not require dangerous long distance commutes in winter. The Black Forest Preservation Plan is the product of decades of citizen input and, from what I have seen at numerous BFPP citizen review meetings for the current updating process, its basic tenants have not changed a bit. Tell "The Ranch" developers to come back with a plan that has the number of lots permitted by current zoning. There are no mitigating reasons why this number needs to be increased. None.

Question: It is unclear as to whether the Small Area Plans like the Black Forest Preservation Plan will be preserved as an integral part of the County's Master Plan Update process. Residents of the Black Forest are anxious and upset at the prospect that the County may have directed its Master Plan updating consultant, Houseal & Lavigne, to recommend doing away with the Black Forest Preservation plan and other Small Area Plans. What are the County's specific intentions and instructions to its consultant regarding Small Area Plans?

Question: Is it the County's intent to continue to allow Developers to ignore the County's Master Plan and the BFPP and actively promote maximum growth for RR-5 and RR2.5 land use districts in the Black Forest?

2. The Planned Unit Development (PUD) is the strategy being used by Developers to multiply residential development density. This is a perverse application. The PUD originally became a "mainstream" master planning tool to protect sensitive natural areas and increase open space. It was never intended to increase by more than ten times the allowable residential development in a given zone district, and to multiply developer profits to grand levels, leaving the public holding the tab when the actual costs to the County become apparent, way too late.

Question: Is it the County's intent to continue to allow developers to obtain development density increases such as the urban densities being allowed for "the Ranch?" Perhaps a new designation for "PUD" should be considered: "Planned Urban Density." The County can and should stop this practice, immediately, before Northern El Paso County is forever ruined for future generations of rural living. Incredibly easy to do, administratively.

3. The greatest threat to the future of the Black Forest and all its residents is runaway urban and suburban density development that proposes to use water from wells in non-renewable aquifers. "Metro Districts" ultimately chained together are the biggest present and future enablers of this unsustainable practice other than County government's willingness to allow this. State water legislation has "decreed" that 300 years "paper" rights are "sufficient." This definition does not hold up under unlimited demand like we will soon be facing unless massive development on wells is checked. We all understand that developer water is "paper water," that actual

future adequacy (whatever that is) is not known. That is why sustainable cities use surface water with impoundments, not wells, and it is why Colorado Springs is buying up all the water right it can in agricultural areas far from the city to sustain the City in the future. RR5 and RR2.5 zoning protects future water supplies by assuring lots large enough to have individual wells and septic sewage disposal systems. These zoning districts were applied and have been retained for many years for good reason in the Black Forest, and need to be maintained.

Question: What is to keep the County from directing highest density growth to Banning Lewis and other areas "watered" by surface water and preserving the remaining RR5 and RR2.5 area for what will be an invaluable future County housing resource? This is something the County can do immediately to promote sustainable development and protect a unique resource, the rural forests and grasslands of the Black Forest. Why not do this?

4. Persons residing in the rural wooded and grassland area of the Black Forest moved here precisely because they wanted to be in a rural area, not in the middle of huge residential land development density giveaways posing as PUDs. Fairness has become a forgotten concept when the ephemeral "rights" of existing residents to enjoy a rural lifestyle face hyperactive development pressure. Many thousands of people live in the Black Forest, and thousands more can do so in the future, helping to assure the County's continued housing diversity, if the County does not make the area urban and suburban.

Question: Would the County be willing to consider making the remaining RR5 and RR2.5 areas of the Black Forest a "no fly zone" for intensive development to protect the area for sustainable development on private wells? If not, why not?

I am available to meet with any commissioners to constructively share ideas that can help preserve what is special about the Black Forest and Northern El Paso County, for the benefit of the County and its residents in our area. I am retired and cannot think of anything more important than meeting with you.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Steve Gutman
17770 Woodhaven Drive
Unincorporated El Paso County, Walden North (in the Black Forest Small Area Plan)
561 676-9539

Kari Parsons

From: Randy & Linda Watson <randylindawatson@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 4:56 PM
To: Holly Williams; longinosgaonzalezjr@elpastoco.com; markwaller@elpaso.com; 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 El Paso County Board of Commissioners,

We want to express our concerns for The Ranch, a proposed high-density development by Classic Homes located in the Black Forest.

1. First of all, the proposed development ignores the rights of those who have chosen to live in the Black Forest and is a violation of the preservation plan designed to "keep and preserve" this region of Colorado Springs. The residents who live there because they want to enjoy land and acreage, with most of them living on 5-acre lots.
2. The proposed 1/8 to change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a whopping 10-fold increase in density - and a PUD violation. Approval of this sketch plan Violates the rules of Zoning.
3. This change is plainly inconsistent with the surrounding development. If you have a few minutes to drive by this area, it will be very clear to you that The Ranch as proposed doesn't make sense.

Clearly, Classic Homes is a developer that is building communities in our city. But in this case, they have aggressively overstepped a boundary.

Just as Coloradans would want to preserve a National Forest in our state -- we should also preserve the Zoning of the Black Forest for its unique beauty and land in Colorado Springs. It deserves to protection.

Although we are Black Forest residents living in another area not directly impacted by this -- it indeed affects us all. We are all watching this one closely, and expect this matter to be handled and voted on appropriately.

Thank you for faithfully serving the people of Colorado Springs.

Sincerely,

Randy & Linda Watson

Kari Parsons

From: Bill Manning <mntman123@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 5:42 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: The Ranch - Opposition to the 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.

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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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.

Bill Manning
19530 Soaring Wing Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80908
719-505-4629
mntman123@comcast.net

Kari Parsons

From: Angela Hill <lilmakwa@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 7:32 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Classic Homes proposal

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 am very concerned about the sketch plan of Classic Homes and the irreversible damage it would do to the Black Forest Community and the lifestyle of living in Black Forest.

My family and I have lived in Black Forest for 26+ years. The rural close community that we have enjoyed would be gone if this development was approved.

Black Forest would become just as congested as Colorado Springs. And our roads were not built to sustain that type of traffic.

Approval of this plan would set a precedent that would be the death of Black Forest.

I also have the following concerns:

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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.

5. 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,

Angela Peterson-Hill

Kari Parsons

From: Terry Stokka <tastokka@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 7:44 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Objection to Sketch Plan 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.

Commissioners,

On Tuesday you will be hearing the application for the sketch plan for The Ranch, a 2100-home development south of Stapleton Road. I am writing to express my opposition to this sketch plan and ask you to deny the application. Here are my reasons:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. The Black Forest Preservation Plan calls for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities because they believed zoning regulations would protect them. You as commissioners are our elected officials who are supposed to be taking care of us in this way to follow zoning regulations.

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

The Planning Commission approved this sketch plan 5-2 but this vote was misleading. They spent a lot of time discussing what "compatible" meant in the context of density compared to surrounding density. Those of us in the audience were baffled that a density 10 times as great would be even considered compatible. Several commissioners felt uncomfortable with The Ranch being "compatible" with surrounding development of 5 acres and greater. The Chairman of the PC said this issue would be discussed much more in future hearings on The Ranch so it didn't need to be decided then. I am surprised that he and the other Planning Commissioners didn't realize and remember that while a sketch plan does not establish zoning, it sets the wheels in motion in a de-facto approval of the zoning that is very hard to change. I can't imagine a planning commission or board of county commissioners denying a preliminary plan because of density when they had earlier approved the sketch plan with the same zoning categories.

Please deny this sketch plan. It belongs in Banning-Lewis Ranch and not 2 miles north of Woodmen Road.

Terry Stokka

Kari Parsons

From: Terry Stokka <tastokka@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2019 7:45 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Opposition to sketch plan 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.

Commissioners,

On Tuesday you will be hearing the application for the sketch plan for The Ranch, a 2100-home development south of Stapleton Road. I am writing to express my opposition to this sketch plan and ask you to deny the application. Here are my reasons:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. The Black Forest Preservation Plan calls for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities because they believed zoning regulations would protect them. You as commissioners are our elected officials who are supposed to be taking care of us in this way to follow zoning regulations.

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

The Planning Commission approved this sketch plan 5-2 but this vote was misleading. They spent a lot of time discussing what "compatible" meant in the context of density compared to surrounding density. Those of us in the audience were baffled that a density 10 times as great would be even considered compatible. Several commissioners felt uncomfortable with The Ranch being "compatible" with surrounding development of 5 acres and greater. The Chairman of the PC said this issue would be discussed much more in future hearings on The Ranch so it didn't need to be decided then. I am surprised that he and the other Planning Commissioners didn't realize and remember that while a sketch plan does not establish zoning, it sets the wheels in motion in a de-facto approval of the zoning that is very hard to change. I can't imagine a planning commission or board of county commissioners denying a preliminary plan because of density when they had earlier approved the sketch plan with the same zoning categories.

Please deny this sketch plan. It belongs in Banning-Lewis Ranch and not 2 miles north of Woodmen Road.

Artha Stokka

Kari Parsons

From: Dawn Healy <dawneshealy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2019 5:44 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Please help preserve our plan - oppose 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.

Citizens have been attempting to save a way of life and the future of Black Forest, not to mention drinking water for Colorado, in general. This development is in conflict with preserving the plan put in place for many years. Please stop rampant development that has no consideration for the future of Colorado. Major points we oppose:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

Dawn Healy
Black Forest Resident since 1982

Kari Parsons

From: E MIKUSKA <mrmikus@msn.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2019 6:58 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: The Ranch development by Classic homes
Importance: High

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 commissioners,

I'm joining in with fellow neighbors and other Black Forest residents to oppose this action by Classic homes. This is not the first time that they have tried and often successfully lobbied to pursue their agenda that essentially violates our Black Forest Preservation Plan. Below is a summary of key points where Classic's plan contradicts and violates the Black Forest Preservation Plan. I urge you to consider us, the existing residents, and beauty of Black Forest before her character is ruined forever.

As an alternative, I offer a suggestion to revitalize the existing areas of Colorado Springs that suffer from old and empty houses, lots and business. I'm sure you are familiar with such places in town.

Now I'd like you to focus your attention to the key points below I mentioned earlier:

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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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.

Kind regards,

Eric Mikuska
Black Forest, CO

Kari Parsons

From: Heidi Arbury <harbteaches@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2019 1:41 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Please consider disallowing 2100 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.

Dear Ms. Parsons,

Permitting a huge development with almost ten times the current allowable zoning is not in the best interest of the current area residents.

It appears that my taxes, which have already escalated without merit, will increase even more to pay for The Ranch.

Before permitting any zoning variance, the developer should have to show that it is in the best interests of the Current Residents to alter current zoning.

The Ranch clearly will increase profits for the developer- why should I have to worry about my well running dry? Where are protections for us, the current area residents?

I urge you to postpone the sketch approval until we can demonstrate that area residents won't be adversely impacted.

Please contact me if you have any questions about my position on the Ranch development.

Respectfully,

Heidi Arbury harbteaches@gmail.com
17895 Walden Way
Black Forest 80908

Kari Parsons

From: Steve & Genna Gaines <sandggaines@q.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2019 5:59 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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.

Good Day,

I suspect you have received a number of emails objecting to the Ranch Development as proposed by Classic Homes. Please accept this email as a constituent objection to the proposed development. We purchased our home on 2.5 acres land in the Black Forest area because of the low density lifestyle. Even today, we find ourselves on crowded roads that were open when we purchased our house here in 2007. We are sincerely worried that the sprawl of the city will soon make our life outside the city unbearable.

We request you please vote against this proposal an uphold the tenants of the Black Forest Preservation Plan.

Please contact me if would like a direct input.

Sincerely,
Steve & Genna Gaines
Highland Park
719-641-2416



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Kari Parsons

From: Linda Bandy <goofeegal51@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 12:23 PM
To: Mark Waller; Stan VanderWerf; Cami Bremer; Kari Parsons; Holly Williams; Linda Bandy
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.

My name is Linda Bandy and I have lived in The Meadows for 33 years so I have seen a lot of changes. I am NOT against development BUT the developer, Classic Homes, should follow the zoning that was in place when they purchased said acreage..

When I lived in town and wanted to build an addition I had to go through a variance, All the property owners around me had a say and that say was considered very highly for the approval of my plans. There is an overwhelming amount of homeowners that disagree with this project. It seems that **Classic Homes feel they have the right to change these rules.** They bought the land for 2 1/2 acre lots, now they have changed to 5 homes in an acre. This zoning should not be granted because:

Traffic in the Falcon area right now is terrible. The only way out of this site is either Woodmen Road, from Falcon Meadows Blvd,, Meridian Road from Falcon Hills Blvd and Highway 24 which intersect with both roads. Right now the back up on all three is unbelievable. The traffic map on TV everyday shows the slow and stopped vehicles. There is wait times at all the lights. Woodmen Road from Powers to Marksheffel is always backed up coming into town. Highway 24 and Meridian is a joke. People are backed up from Woodman Road to Garrett on the West. Falcon Meadows is being considered for entry and exit of the proposed area. Also the new King Soopers being built at Meridian and Woodman has a frontage entrance that will effect Falcon Meadows Blvd also. Falcon Meadows is chip and seal and will not handle the traffic of 2100 cars. The new roads North of development will not occur for many years.

Drainage is a big concern of mine. This is all down hill from us there is no place for the water to go, The retention pond will not handle the water.

I agree with all of the following.

. 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 skeptics. 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.? The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."

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. 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.

5. 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.

Let me spotlight these concerns again.

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase.? Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house ??? ??? ??? symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

Please do the right thing and NOT allow the zoning to change. Fewer homes is the best answer and better life for all concerned.

Linda Bandy
9925 Tercel Drive
Falcon, CO 80831
719-290-2500

Kari Parsons

From: Donna Duncan <donnaduncan66@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 1:07 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons; Donna Duncan
Subject: The Ranch (oddly named) 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 Commissioners,

Please consider the pleas of residents of Black Forest residents when you review the sketch plan by Classic Homes for The Ranch Development. When we ask for an average of one home per 5 acres we do so to be good stewards of the land and to be supportive of the current residents.

We also believe when an area is zoned RR5, we can count on that not being overturned. Do you stand up to developers? I really hope you have the fortitude to do so.

Thank you for your consideration,
- Donna Duncan

Kari Parsons

From: Roy Garcia <rnbgarcia@netscape.com>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 1:41 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: The Ranch SKP-18-006
Attachments: Sketch Plan.pdf; 20171222_080801.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.

Dear Board of Commissioners,

Please find enclosed our petition to the El Paso County Board of Commissioners regarding Project File #: SKP-18-006 Project Name: The Ranch Sketch Plan

Bottom Line Up Front: Please consider rejecting the plan based upon converting RR-2.5 zoned area to high density urban development.

To: El Paso County Planning Commission
c/o Kari Parsons

From: Roy & Betty Garcia
9414 Rockingham Dr.
Falcon, CO

Subject: The Ranch Sketch Plan, Project File #: SKP-18-006

Commission,

We were disappointed to hear the Planning Commission passed along the Ranch Sketch Plan without any consideration for residents affected or variations to plan. We want to go on the record as opposing PRI No. 4, LLC (Classic Homes) proposed sketch plan for 610 acres named The Ranch. Based upon the counties unbridled urban sprawl, we would like you to respectfully consider the following factors in your decision to approve or disapprove the planned development.

1. We built our home in 2004 on a ½ acre lot adjacent to the planned development (see parcel information sheet). We understood at the time the property being considered was and still is zoned RR-2.5 (residential and rural) parcels. We opted not live in Colorado Springs to escape the city congestion. Now, the planned development will put a multi-family dwelling and densely populated houses (see sketch) right behind our property which is now wide open and home of several wildlife (Pronghorns, red fox,

jack rabbits, coyotes). As a minimum, we would like to see the boundary of the development consistent with adjacent housing areas (1/2 -2-1/2 acres). The plan clearly violates policy 6.1.11 (compatibility with existing areas).

2. The urbanization of our neighborhood's country feel and view has us concerned about our property value. We are in our late 60s and cannot consider moving into another area at this stage of our life due to the rising costs of housing in Colorado Springs and surrounding area.

3. We have several infrastructure and resource concerns that must be taken into account:

a. Traffic congestion in and around Meridian Road and Woodmen Rd are already an issue. There have been several bad accidents on both roads, which have resulted in serious injury or death of persons involved. To add an additional 2100 homes only exasperates the problem.

b. Schools, Fire protection, and law enforcement services are already strained without adding additional family dwellings. The developer, Classic, provides no plans to build additional schools or increase fire and police protection. This will lead to current residents paying higher taxes to fund additional services required. We have already seen an increase in crime (home break-ins) in our area over the recent years with the addition of dense housing. See Policy 12.1.3 (fire protection).

c. Water from finite aquifer resources is a major concern to all in the Falcon area. The developer plans to draw water from the Sterling Ranch Metro Dist. I have read several articles that indicate the Sterling Ranch Metro Dist, which services the Black Forest area from the Denver aquifer, may not be able to support the growth northeast of Colorado Springs. It is unknown what the sustainability of that aquifer is.

d. Current developments north of us have already rezoned what were 1/2 acre lots into densely populated area. Construction and development is currently ongoing adding to the population density in our area.

e. Classic's proposal states, "The proposed subdivision is in general conformance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Master Plan." In May, we had the opportunity to attend and provide input to the new El Paso County Master Plan; meetings were held throughout the area as well as an online survey. Thus Classic's proposal is referring to an outdated plan and I would recommend this proposal be put on hold until the completion of the New El Paso County Master Plan.

4. We like the El Paso County Board of Commissioners to thoroughly consider all ramifications (known and unknown) of approving Classic Homes proposed development of The Ranch. We would like to see the county and city focus on the Banning Lewis Ranch as urban development in the greater Colorado Springs.

The area of the Ranch should remain rural according to the Black Forest Preservation Plan and the Falcon - Peyton Plan.

5. Please take a moment to review the two attachments. We have included a picture from our deck of the area where a Classic plans to put 8-11.99 dwelling units/acre (implies town-homes) behind us as well as the Sketch Plan. If you do approve could you at least require the developer to build a sound barrier between road and our house?

Sincerely,
Roy & Betty Garcia

Enclosures:

1. Picture of planned development area from our back yard
2. Image of The Ranch Sketch Plan

Kari Parsons

From: Tye Prater <tye.prater@q.com>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 4:23 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Concerns about Classic Homes 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.

El Paso County Commissioners,

I want you to know I oppose The Ranch development for the following reasons:

1. **Water.** It is a limited resource. 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.
2. **Fire protection.** I lived through the Black Forest fire of 2013 and don't want available fire protection assets spread thinner. 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.
3. **Density and Zoning.** What are previously approved land use and zoning plans good for if completely ignored by our elected officials - which I've witnessed on numerous occasions in the county in the last 5 years and frankly, I'm getting sick of being ignored. 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions." 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. 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.

Because I live on a well, in an area where fire is real and I respect the rules and laws that are already in place, I would ask you not to harm my way of life.

Thank you, Tye Prater

Kari Parsons

From: jcmankow@netzero.net
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 5:26 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Urban 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.

All,
I am writing you today to express my opposition to The Ranch, a 2100-home urban development south of Stapleton and Raygor Road.

I oppose this for several reasons:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

This area is already developed, roads are crap, traffic is horrible, infrastructure does not support, how many more homes will the water reservoirs support? Enough is enough! Colorado Springs is already over built and too crowded. Do not pass this and allow 2100 more homes in this area, this area is beautiful and another 2100 homes will just destroy the area and environmental.

VR
Chris Mankowski

Do This Before Bed, Watch Your Belly Fat Melt Like Crazy
floraspring.com
<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3231/5d855ff48c6c05ff47bb4st04duc>

Kari Parsons

From: jcmankow@netzero.net
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 6:08 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Cc: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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.

All,
I am writing you today to express my opposition to The Ranch, a 2100-home urban development south of Stapleton and Raygor Road.

I oppose this for several reasons:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

This area is already developed, roads are crap, traffic is horrible, infrastructure does not support, how many more homes will the water reservoirs support? Enough is enough! Colorado Springs is already over built and too crowded. Do not pass this and allow 2100 more homes in this area, this area is beautiful and another 2100 homes will just destroy the area and environmental.

VR
Chris Mankowski

Put This Spice In Your Shoes To "Fix" Toenail Fungus
funguselimator.com
<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3231/5d8569babde4069ba15f9st03duc>

Kari Parsons

From: Jeannie <jemse65@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 6:59 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Re: Letter of opposition the The Ranch SKP186

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 disappointed that my email in opposition to the Re-zoning of the The Ranch was not included in the package. I am re-sending to you and will now send to the County Commissioners. Please let me know why my Email was omitted.

Thank you,
Jeannie Seetch

To whom it may concern,
We are in opposition to the rezoning of "The Ranch".
However, we are in complete agreement with allowing emergency access only on FMB. According to the Federal Highway Administration an average household average 9.5 car trip per day. When we bought our home, the property was zoned for RR35. If the entire property was developed as it was zoned it would have been 17 homes, rezoned at RR2.5 it exponentially increased the number of homes to 244 which means 2318 car trips per day. If it is rezoned to allow 2100+ homes the amount of traffic just on Falcon Meadows from just this subdivision will be close to 19950 car trips per day. This does not account for all of the high density neighborhoods to the north that will also use this road. We bought with the knowledge that an additional 17 homes would probably be using the small, rural, neighborhood road- Falcon Meadows. Opening up Falcon Meadows will decimate our property values and ruin our quality of life. Nobody wants to live in a rural neighborhood fronting a highway. We bought with the expectation that zoning would be respected and adhered to. Since it hasn't been and high density housing has been allowed it has changed the character of the area. The change to go with this should be keeping Falcon Meadows from connecting and becoming a highway. The construction traffic should be confined to Stapleton road and not be allowed to use the small chip and seal rural residential road Falcon Meadows.
We are also very concerned about the aquifers that will be supplying the high density housing. Those of us on private wells have no options when the aquifers are depleted.
To approve the rezoning to HUD will increase light pollution, trash, noise and crime that comes with city like density. Also we are very worried about flooding from the area to the north from runoff and changing the natural drainage of the area. To this end please consider requiring quality site lighting design to reduce excessive light levels, light trespass and glare. Lighting should reflect a balance for lighting needs with the surrounding nighttime characteristics of our community. We also think that appropriate buffers between the rural acreage homes and the high density homes should be implemented to help with the transition between rural and urban density.

Sincerely,
John and Jeannie Seetch
8265 Falcon Meadow Blvd

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeannie <jemse65@aol.com>
To: kariparsons <kari@elpasoco.com>
Sent: Sun, Jul 14, 2019 1:14 pm
Subject: Letter of opposition the The Ranch SKP186

Kari Parsons

From: Elizabeth Cutter <escutter52@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2019 8:04 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Please do NOT support The Ranch 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.

Dear Commissioners:

Along with the Black Forest Land Use Committee, I am writing to ask you NOT to support Classic Homes's sketch plan for The Ranch and NOT to approve a change in zoning. I have lived in Black Forest since 1991 and appreciated the support of previous members of the Board of County Commissioners -- especially in the aftermath of the Black Forest Fire in 2013 -- and hope you will continue to defend this regional jewel against threats to its water, wildlife, and peace. With my neighbors, I ask you to consider the following objections:

- 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 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 inconsistent with the character of the adjacent areas -- where, literally, the deer and the antelope still roam.
- The Black Forest Preservation Plan says that "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions." To change from RR-2.5 zoning to a PUD with lots averaging 9000 sq ft is a 10-fold increase in density. The purpose of a PUD is to give a developer flexibility in the size of lots within existing zoning, not to give them license to violate the zoning. The Black Forest Preservation Plan recommends that "Zone changes or variances resulting in densities which are inconsistent with the adopted Plan should be disapproved."
- 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.
- Urban development in the greater Colorado Springs area should focus on the Banning-Lewis area where renewable water is available through Colorado Springs Utilities and the Southern Delivery System. The Ranch should remain rural.
- The development of the Ranch would add 2100 homes to the Falcon Fire Protection District, even though 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 owners of existing properties around the Ranch and in the greater Falcon Fire Protection District -- and not homeowners in The Ranch itself -- will bear the costs of funding increased firefighting capacity and possibly a new station. 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.

Respectfully,
Elizabeth Cutter
6395 Highline Place

Kari Parsons

From: Katy Dunn <katydunn@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 5:49 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Classic Homes sketch plan 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.

To all involved with decisions regarding development in Black Forest,

Please, please vote to respect the Black Forest Preservation Plan and honor the residence who have moved into Black Forest for what the Preservation Plan offers. Black Forest is a rural community and people move there because that is how they would like to live.

Our Planning Commission unanimously votes against a development in Black Forest and then the County Commissioners just override the recommendation and vote for development. It's all about money - money for the developers (who are tied in with the County Commissioners) and all about money for the city (which is just looking for the tax income). There is no consideration for what Black Forest is meant to be. There is plenty enough development in Colorado Springs without having to invade and destroy what Black Forest has to offer.

There are so many issues ignored by the County Commissioners regarding development in Black Forest. 1) The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions." What is being proposed in the Ranch is in no way compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions. 2) 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." 3) On top of the above, there are the very real issue of water (or lack thereof in the future) and the excessive burden on the fire department with no fiscal responsibility placed with it.

Please do the right thing for Black Forest disapprove the proposal by Classic Homes for The Ranch or other similar developments.

Sincerely, Katy Dunn (25 year resident of Black Forest)
(719) 495-2699

Kari Parsons

From: Rich Painter <painterengr@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 6:45 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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 fully support the opposition voiced by The Black Forest Land Use Committee for The Ranch for the reasons listed below.

Please vote AGAINST this development plan.

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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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.

--
Richard A. Painter, P.E.
Black Forest Resident

Kari Parsons

From: Charles Crupper <crupperc@q.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 8:04 PM
To: Kari Parsons; Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; camibremer@elpsoco.com; Mark Waller
Subject: Opposition to The Ranch for the following reasons:

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.

El Paso County Board of County Commissioners

My wife 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development, but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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.

Summary of our opposition:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing developments.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

Inconsistent with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density.

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

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

For once, please stand up and do what is right for the existing homeowners in Black Forest!

Charles & Yolanda Crupper
12811 Goodson Road
Colorado Springs, CO 80908

Kari Parsons

From: Tom DeClue <tdeclue@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 8:56 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: The Ranch Development, Concerns

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 County Commissioner,

Please know that my wife and I are residents of El Paso County and have lived in Eastern Black Forest for over 30 years.

I understand that Classic Homes is proposing a large subdivision just South of Black Forest near Raygor Rd and Stapleton Rd, which is about 3 miles from our property. We also understand this land is zoned rural residential for 2.5 acre lots minimum, which is consistent with the surrounding developed lots. We also realize that our county is a desirable place to live and will continue to grow, and I'm fine with reasonable and controlled growth that pays for itself.

However, I recently learned that Classic Homes is requesting a 'variance' to build an average of 5 homes to the acre. **YOU MUST NOT APPROVE THIS REQUEST!** This is completely unacceptable for so many obvious reasons such as inadequate road infrastructure to support the massive increase in vehicle traffic, overburdening the already crowded Falcon school district 49, the Falcon fire district which must absorb this huge increase without any funding from the builder, using scarce well water for this high density housing subdivision. Finally, approving this would put great pressure on the school district, fire district and the county itself to propose raising my taxes further to pay for the added infrastructure created by this subdivision.

DO NOT APPROVE THIS BLATANT ATTEMPT TO STEAMROLL OVER EXISTING ZONING !!!

Sincerely,

Thomas DeClue, USAF, Major, retired
11570 Milford Rd
Elbert, CO 80106

Kari Parsons

From: Stella Buck <stellabuck@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 2:04 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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.

Dear Commissioners

As a homeowner, we 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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.

Key points:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

Please support us and do not allow our area to become overcrowded and ruin our rural area. Stop giving in to builders.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Stella Buck

Kari Parsons

From: Ruth Rial <Ruth.Rial@RialHeating.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 2:01 PM
To: Holly Williams; Mark Waller; Stan VanderWerf; longinosgonzalexjr@elpasoco.com; Cami Bremer; Kari Parsons
Subject: The Ranch
Importance: High

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.

VOTE NO!!

The development of 2,100 homes is not consistent with the surrounding area. It is zoned R-2.5 and should be kept that way. Surrounding homes are R-5 and some R2.5. When people bought property out there they did not expect it to change to PUD. They bought their properties for the rural and openness in area. The development is HIGH density and doesn't belong there. High density should be kept in the city limits of Colorado Springs.

5000 more people!! The traffic that this development will cause a traffic nightmare. I would like to point out if there would ever be another Black Forest Fire access to get out Black Forest in a timely and safe manner is being jeopardized by all the development along Black Forest Road and Woodmen Road. The roads are not maintained and developed for high density properties in the area. Also strain on the Falcon Fire Department. People of Falcon will incur the rising costs that this development cause.

Well and septic are not a good supply for high density development. One development on Woodmen as run into problems and needed the city of Colorado Springs to step in and help with water issues. Will this happen down the road with this development.

I understand the developer wants to make money. High density development – more homes smaller lots = high profit.

I state not on the backs of El Paso County residents that have bought property zoned for R-5. I am tired of all this development. Commissioners and Ms. Parsons please start standing up to the developers and take control of El Paso County. We the people elected you to serve the residents of El Paso County – not the developers!

My husband and I live on 10 acres in Black Forest for 19 years. What we see over the 18 years of growth is damaging to the rural/openness living that we desire.

Thank you for your time and would be appreciative of a NO vote on this high density development.

Ruth A Krebill Rial

Kari Parsons

From: nicklavezzo@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 1:53 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Opposition to The Ranch proposed sketch plan 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.

El Paso County Commissioners and Planner,

I am writing in to voice my family's opposition to the proposed "The Ranch" development as proposed by Classic Homes.

This development not only violates but completely demolishes the existing zoning, going from 2.5 acres per lot to 0.2 acres per lot, over a 10 fold density increase.

This violates the rules of PUD which are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes within existing zoning regulations, which this is badly violating.

The Ranch as proposed would be totally inconsistent with the surrounding development. It is urban density, surrounded by rural.

It ignores the rights and expectations of the surrounding neighbors who relied upon the existing lower densities when making their property purchasing decisions.

It places a financial burden on the Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities.

Please deny this development approval until the above issues are resolved to the satisfaction of the surrounding community.

Regards,

Nicholas Lavezzo
4601 High Forest Rd.
Colorado Springs, CO 80908
(703) 855-0267

Kari Parsons

From: Shawn Buck <shawnbuck3669@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 1:47 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Black Forest Opposes Classic Home Propositions 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.

Please I ask you to review the below and tell me how in good conscience you can approve Classic Homes request to increase the amount of homes they had planned for The Ranch.

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

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

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

Thank you for your time,
Shawn Buck
Black Forest Resident

Kari Parsons

From: LADEFOGED, DEANNE K. <DEANNE.LADEFOGED@d11.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 12:45 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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.

I am in opposition of The Ranch Development that is being proposed by Classic Homes south of Stapleton and Raygor Roads, which is coming before you on September 24. As a resident of Black Forest since 2008 I have many concerns I am listing below:

- 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. According to the Black Forest Preservation Plan which says, "**Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions.**"
- 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.
- This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. **As a resident I believed that my 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.**
- 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 would request that the development proposal as it is submitted would not be approved.

Thank you,

Deanne Ladefoged

Kari Parsons

From: Dany Denehan <denehanusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:48 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller
Cc: Kari Parsons
Subject: Opposition to "The Ranch" by Black Forest homeowners

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,

as residents of Black Forest we oppose the planned development known as "The Ranch" by Classic Homes 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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 trust that you will keep the best interest of Black Forest in mind upon Tuesday's vote on the proposed plan.

Sincerely,

Bill and Dany Denehan

Kari Parsons

From: Jeff Richardson <jeff@coloradorichardsons.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:51 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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,

When considering the requests for the new "The Ranch" development, I hope you will push back on the density the developers are requesting. The current zoning of 2.5 acres per home fits perfectly with the rural feel of the area surrounding it. Building 4-5 homes per acre is an example of exactly the opposite of why most of the surrounding residents moved to this area – to get away from dense urban developments and the related noise and traffic. To simply disregard the zoning to such a degree is greedy of the developer and it would be irresponsible for us to allow this.

Thank you for your time and consideration!
Jeff Richardson
SE Black Forest Resident

Kari Parsons

From: Kathleen Salvione <ksalvione@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 12:01 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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.

Council Members,

I humbly implore you to carefully consider the harmful and devastating repercussions of deviating from the zoning regulations in Black Forest.

Violation of zoning regulations

- Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development so increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD

- Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes within the existing zoning. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly. Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighborhood- We moved out of the suburbs, and this put the suburbs smack in the middle of 5 acre ranches.

Places financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District who already cannot support without levies!

There is no road infrastructure for this initiative! Allowing the Woodmen/Black Forest Meridian/HWY 24 homes has already choked the area out from being able to move.

5000 more people makes the council personally responsible for the **GRAVE DANGER** you put the already existing residents lives in.

Thank you,
Kathleen

Kari Parsons

From: Louis Hazen <louishazen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 12:02 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Stop the madness with Classic Homes and their rezoning scam

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 and fellow Commissioners,

Please keep your trust and good word with the Friends of the Black Forest and do not allow this egregious violation of the zoning and environmental standards that were put into place to prevent a situation like Classic Homes, and the proposal of 2100 homes along with rezoning the land from 2.5 acres to 1/5 acre lots that allow track housing. Classic home developers desire to build 2100 homes and change the zoning so they can maximize profit to the detriment of the Black Forest is a violation of the Black Forest environment, the people who live there, and an unspeakable toll on the Dawson aquifer. The tapping into the Dawson aquifer is of particular concern because it does not replenish itself as quickly as other aquifers do. Here are the key points to keep in mind:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

Time and again we have seen Commissioners fail to protect the land and its resources in the interest of the land developer, but not the environment. Please take a stand and represent our wishes in the Black Forest.

Sincerely,

Louis Hazen

Kari Parsons

From: Marci Twombly <marcittwombly@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 12:10 PM
To: Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons; Stan VanderWerf
Subject: Fwd: [Friends] 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.

As a homeowner in Black Forest I oppose the Ranch for all of the reasons outlined below.

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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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: Heather Rainey <heathersmith03@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 12:35 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: The Ranch Development 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.

Good day. I am writing to express my opposition in regards to Classics plan to rezone land to build a large development called "The Ranch". My reasons for opposing this include:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

Inconsistency with surrounding development - urban density surrounded by rural density

Ignores rights and expectations of surrounding neighbors who expected lower densities

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

Displaces more wildlife (the prong horn are already being displaced due to over building on Vollmer and Black Forest roads)

I strongly encourage you to deny Classics request of rezoning this rural area.

**Thank You-
Heather Rainey**

Kari Parsons

From: Kevin Szczudlak <lknfer8@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 12:37 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Cc: KC Hebner-Szczudlak; garciar5169@gmail.com
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.

Commissioners...

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

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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."

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. 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.

5. 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.

In addition to the above...

Violation of zoning regulations -

Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible

Violates rules of PUD

Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

Kari Parsons

From: Freddie Stone <blackforestfreddie@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:06 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.

As a resident of Black Forest, 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 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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 DO NOT approve this plan.

Freddie Stone

Kari Parsons

From: LC Apricio <lapricio@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:07 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Opposition to Classic Homes proposed plan

Importance: High

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 Colorado Springs Native, I really wish planners would consider the long term impact the city is heading for with regards to water and urban congestion. Colorado Springs used to be a nice place to live, my family and I moved to rural living north of Falcon back in 2002 in the hopes of escaping the city hustle and bustle. Only to have it move to the Falcon and Black Forest areas and with NO regard to the plans of where to get water!! We are on a well and are extremely concerned that city planners are putting tax profits ahead of smart planned growth.. so please consider NOT letting Classic homes have their way with the proposed zoning change and please hold fast to the Black Forest preservation plan for lots and lot size – please see below:

Key Points:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

The Black Forest Land Use Committee opposes 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's. 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."

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. 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.

5. 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.

Respectfully,
///Lloyd Apricio

Kari Parsons

From: Gary Stone <streetrodgary@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:08 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.

As a resident of Black Forest, 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing surrounding land uses. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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 DO NOT approve this plan.

Gary Stone

Kari Parsons

From: Sarah Pelton <redzranch@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:10 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; 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.

As a Black Forest resident I am opposed to this development for the following reasons:

Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

Violates rules of PUD - Planned Unit Developments are a tool for developers to vary lot sizes WITHIN THE EXISTING ZONING. The PUD that would govern this development would violate that rule significantly.

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 with a house symbol on lots that have 5 acres or more. The Ranch is the white square in the middle.)

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

I urge you NOT to approve this development.

--
Sarah J Pelton, MRP, GRI, SRES
and AR (Awesome Realtor)
Front Range Real Estate Professionals
Cell: (719) 494-5939
Email: Redzranch@gmail.com
[Visit me on Facebook](#)
[Click here to view our website](#)
or [Connect with me on LinkedIn](#)
[and/or follow me on Twitter](#)

Stay Alert: Wire fraud is a prevalent problem in the real estate business. Front Range will NEVER ask you to wire money - always verify in person or phone before sending any money anywhere.

Kari Parsons

From: Jennifer Rinck <trichotomy18@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:14 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Ban 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.

Please Please Please DO NOT permit Classic to go forward with building The Ranch in Black Forest!

What is the purpose of presenting a zoning plan when you have a back door option to so drastically change it? The homeowners currently residing in Black Forest purchased here based on the rural/low density environment. Changing from 2/5 acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is RIDICULOUS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Additionally this places even more of a burden on our water supply, schools, police & fire departments. All around the only people who benefit from this development are the people at Classic.

Please do not allow them to build the future slums of Black Forest!

James & Jennifer Eisenhart
4260 Foxchase Way
Black Forest, CO 80908
Retired Air Force 26+ years of service
Retired teacher

Kari Parsons

From: Peter McCollum <saipan1959@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:19 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: please vote NO on "The Ranch" development 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.

On Tuesday the 24th, Classic Homes will be presenting a Sketch Plan for "The Ranch", with lots averaging just 9000 square feet, in an area zoned RR-2.5 (a ten-fold increase in density!).

PLEASE do NOT override the zoning, and allow them to do this!!!

This is irresponsible and excessive development, and the ONLY justification is so that Classic Homes can make big profits.

Myself and many others will be watching carefully to see how each of you votes on this issue. Please do the right thing!

Regards,

Peter McCollum

El Paso County resident for 37 years

Kari Parsons

From: Kevin Bringard <kevinbringard@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:32 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Opposition to The Ranch Development in 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.

Good morning, commissioners and county planner!

My name is Kevin Bringard. I live in the Cathedral Pines neighborhood at 14465 Millhaven Pl. in Black Forest.

I just wanted to take a moment to express my concern over the proposed sketch plan for The Ranch Development east of Volmer near Stapleton and Raygor road.

There are many reasons the proposed plan is bad for Black Forest and El Paso County, but to hi-light a few of the most concerning ones:

- * Stretching the definition of PUD to completely change the existing zoning undermines the entire concept behind land use planning, and to allow it to happen is evidence that the county, the commissioners, the planner, and the people, have no power over those with the resources to do as they please
- * It completely ignores the rights and expectations of the residents who invested in this area under the auspices they would not be living next to a dense, suburban, development
- * It puts undue, and un-sustainable, demands on the Falcon Fire Protection District. The proposed 2100 homes is over 10 times more than the 150-200 homes the zoning was intended to support. A burden which, due to previous decisions to not impose fees for new fire stations, equipment and staffing on new developments, will have to be sustained by the existing residents
- * The groundwater can not sustain that level of urban development. Urban development should instead be focused where there are more renewable sources of water via CSU and the SDS (such as Banning Lewis, or other areas within Colorado Springs itself)

Thank you for your time, consideration, and commitment to protecting and representing the people, the beauty, the resources, and the heart of Black Forest in our great county.

Kevin Bringard
14465 Millhaven Pl.
Black Forest, CO 80908

Kari Parsons

From: Karrin Hopper <k_k_hopper@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:35 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: I oppose the Ranch Development
Importance: High

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 cut and pasted only because it is laid out better than I could have said it myself. This rubber stamping of any development that comes across your desks must stop!

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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible. The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions."
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. 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.
5. 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.

Karrin Hopper
Black Forest

Kari Parsons

From: Donald Sims <donald.l.sims@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 11:44 AM
To: Stan VanderWerf; Holly Williams; Longinos Gonzalez Jr; Cami Bremer; Mark Waller; Kari Parsons
Subject: Opposition to The Ranch Development 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.

My family opposes The Ranch for the following reasons:

The Black Forest Preservation Plan says, "Any new urban development should be compatible with existing rural residential subdivisions." This plan does not come close to meeting the Black Forest Preservation Plan.

1. Violation of zoning regulations - Changing from 2.5-acre zoning to 1/5 acre lots is 10-fold density increase. Small area plans call for new development to be "compatible" with existing development. Increasing density 10-fold is definitely not compatible.

This proposal ignores the rights and expectations of surrounding residents who almost all have lots of 5 acres or larger. We believed that our elected officials would follow zoning regulations to protect the rural, open character of the land. Approval of this sketch plan says our rights mean nothing in land use planning.

2. Places a huge financial burden on Falcon Fire Protection District for additional required capabilities. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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. The small area plans call for compatibility of new development with existing development but this sketch plan proposes a 10-fold increase in density, definitely not compatible.

5. 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.

Thank you for your time,

Donald & Heather Sims

Kari Parsons

From: Cole Emmons
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 3:48 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Cc: Diana May; Lori Seago
Subject: FW: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

Kari:
Please add the following e-mail to Commissioner VanderWerf to the comments packet for the hearing next week.

Thanks,
Cole

M. Cole Emmons
Senior Assistant County Attorney
El Paso County Attorney's Office
200 South Cascade Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(719) 520-6488
(719) 520-6487 (Fax)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT AND/OR ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT PRIVILEGES OR OTHER COMMUNICATION PROTECTED FROM PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER COLORADO LAW. This electronic mail transmission and any attachments contain information belonging to the sender which may be confidential and legally privileged. This information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom this electronic mail transmission was sent as indicated above. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or action taken in reliance on the contents of the information contained in this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately inform me by "reply" email and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Diana May <DianaMay@elpasoco.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 3:37 PM
To: Cole Emmons <ColeEmmons@elpasoco.com>; Lori Seago <LoriSeago@elpasoco.com>
Cc: Craig Dossey <craigdossey@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Fwd: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

Would that be one of you please? Thanks.

Diana K. May
County Attorney, El Paso County

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stan VanderWerf <StanVanderWerf@elpasoco.com>
Date: August 20, 2019 at 3:25:55 PM MDT
To: Diana May <DianaMay@elpasoco.com>
Subject: FW: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

Diana,
Can we get this to the right person for our hearing next week.
CMR Stan

From: Dean Boerrigter [<mailto:deanboerrigter@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 2:51 PM
To: Stan VanderWerf
Subject: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

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.

Commissioner VanderWerf,

I write as a concerned resident of The Meadows in Peyton regarding Classic homes proposed development of "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006. The Planning Committee voted in favor of the Sketch Plan at the July 18 meeting in a 4-2 decision. The next BOCC meeting regarding this plan is on August 27.

I'd like to acknowledge my agreement that Falcon Meadows Boulevard remain limited to emergency access only as the applicants have proposed. In doing so, Classic Homes and Falcon Fire recognized the severe negative impact that residents of The Meadows and Elkhorn Estates will experience should this be changed.

Additionally, I would ask that you require a larger buffer of rural lots between surrounding RR-5 neighborhoods and "The Ranch." The current proposed transition in the Plan is a 100-foot buffer and 1-acre lots with 200-foot lot width. A more natural, gradual transition would propose a larger buffer of 200-300-feet and lots 2.5-acres in size.

Our family recently moved to The Meadows to enjoy a rural life-style and were quite dismayed to hear of such a large urban density development so close to our new home. I am in agreement with neighbors who have stated other concerns regarding traffic, road use, safety, water use, drainage, erosion, and noise. I also realize that El Paso County is experiencing phenomenal growth at this time and that additional development is inevitable. I urge you, as a County Commissioner, to take measures to minimize the impact on rural residential neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Dean Boerrigter, Sr.
9995 Accipiter Dr.
Peyton, CO 80831
(719) 776-9496

Kari Parsons

From: Craig Dossey
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 1:44 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: FW: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

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

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

From: Longinos Gonzalez Jr
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2019 9:53 PM
To: Craig Dossey
Subject: Fwd: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cara Boerrigter <boerrigterc@gmail.com>
Date: August 18, 2019 at 8:40:23 PM MDT
To: <LonginosGonzalezJr@elpasoco.com>
Subject: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

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.

Mr. Gonzalez,

I am writing you as a concerned resident of The Meadows in Peyton regarding Classic homes proposed development of "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006. The Planning Committee voted in favor of the Sketch Plan at the July 18 meeting in a 4-2 decision. The next BOCC meeting regarding this plan is on August 27.

I would first like to acknowledge my agreement that Falcon Meadows Boulevard remain limited to emergency access only as the applicants have proposed. In doing so, Classic Homes and Falcon Fire have recognized the severe negative impact that residents of The Meadows and Elkhorn Estates will experience should this be changed.

Additionally, I would ask that you require a larger buffer of rural lots between surrounding RR-5 neighborhoods and "The Ranch." The current proposed transition in the Plan is a 100-foot buffer and 1-acre lots with 200-foot lot width. A more natural, gradual transition would propose a larger buffer of 200-300-feet and lots 2.5-acres in size.

Our family recently moved to The Meadows to enjoy a rural life-style and were quite dismayed to hear of such a large urban density development so close to our new home. I am in agreement with neighbors who have stated other concerns regarding traffic, road use, safety, water use, drainage, erosion, and noise. I also realize that El Paso County is experiencing phenomenal growth at this time and that additional development is inevitable. I urge you, as a County Commissioner, to take measures to minimize the impact on rural residential neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Cara Boerrigter
9995 Accipiter Dr.
Peyton, CO 80831
(719) 776-9496

Kari Parsons

From: Craig Dossey
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 1:45 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: FW: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

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

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

From: Holly Williams
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 12:06 PM
To: Craig Dossey
Subject: FW: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

Commissioner Holly Williams

El Paso County Colorado
200 South Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2202
(719) 374-0856 (mobile)
(719) 520-6411 (office)

From: Cara Boerrigter [<mailto:boerrigterc@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2019 8:43 PM
To: Holly Williams
Subject: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

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.

Mrs. Williams,

I am writing you as a concerned resident of The Meadows in Peyton regarding Classic homes proposed development of "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006. The Planning Committee voted in favor of the Sketch Plan at the July 18 meeting in a 4-2 decision. The next BOCC meeting regarding this plan is on August 27.

I would first like to acknowledge my agreement that Falcon Meadows Boulevard remain limited to emergency access only as the applicants have proposed. In doing so, Classic Homes and Falcon Fire have recognized the severe negative impact that residents of The Meadows and Elkhorn Estates will experience should this be changed.

Additionally, I would ask that you require a larger buffer of rural lots between surrounding RR-5 neighborhoods and "The Ranch." The current proposed transition in the Plan is a 100-foot buffer and 1-acre lots with 200-foot lot width. A more natural, gradual transition would propose a larger buffer of 200-300-feet and lots 2.5-acres in size.

Our family recently moved to The Meadows to enjoy a rural life-style and were quite dismayed to hear of such a large urban density development so close to our new home. I am in agreement with neighbors who have stated other concerns regarding traffic, road use, safety, water use, drainage, erosion, and noise. I also realize that El Paso County is experiencing phenomenal growth at this time and that additional development is inevitable. I urge you, as a County Commissioner, to take measures to minimize the impact on rural residential neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Cara Boerrigter
9995 Accipiter Dr.
Peyton, CO 80831
(719) 776-9496

Kari Parsons

From: Craig Dossey
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 6:32 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Fwd: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

Craig Dossey
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, CO
80910
(719) 520-6300 (main)
(719) 520-7941 (direct)
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Longinos Gonzalez Jr <LonginosGonzalezJr@elpasoco.com>
Date: August 19, 2019 at 3:16:45 PM MDT
To: Craig Dossey <craigdossey@elpasoco.com>
Subject: FW: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

FYI

v/r,

Longinos Gonzalez Jr., Lt Col, USAF (retired)
El Paso County Commissioner District 4
Office: (719) 520-6414
Cell: (719) 272-1185

From: Dean Boerrigter [<mailto:deanboerrigter@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 2:53 PM
To: Longinos Gonzalez Jr
Subject: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

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 write as a concerned resident of The Meadows in Peyton regarding Classic homes proposed development of "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006. The Planning Committee voted in favor of the Sketch Plan at the July 18 meeting in a 4-2 decision. The next BOCC meeting regarding this plan is on August 27.

I'd like to acknowledge my agreement that Falcon Meadows Boulevard remain limited to emergency access only as the applicants have proposed. In doing so, Classic Homes and Falcon Fire recognized the severe negative impact that residents of The Meadows and Elkhorn Estates will experience should this be changed.

Additionally, I would ask that you require a larger buffer of rural lots between surrounding RR-5 neighborhoods and "The Ranch." The current proposed transition in the Plan is a 100-foot buffer and 1-acre lots with 200-foot lot width. A more natural, gradual transition would propose a larger buffer of 200-300-feet and lots 2.5-acres in size.

Our family recently moved to The Meadows to enjoy a rural life-style and were quite dismayed to hear of such a large urban density development so close to our new home. I am in agreement with neighbors who have stated other concerns regarding traffic, road use, safety, water use, drainage, erosion, and noise. I also realize that El Paso County is experiencing phenomenal growth at this time and that additional development is inevitable. I urge you, as a County Commissioner, to take measures to minimize the impact on rural residential neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Dean Boerrigter, Sr.
9995 Accipiter Dr.
Peyton, CO 80831
(719) 776-9496

--

Dean Boerrigter
719-776-9496 H

Kari Parsons

From: Craig Dossey
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 6:32 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: Fwd: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

Craig Dossey
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, CO
80910
(719) 520-6300 (main)
(719) 520-7941 (direct)
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Holly Williams <HollyWilliams@elpasoco.com>
Date: August 19, 2019 at 3:11:48 PM MDT
To: Craig Dossey <craigdossey@elpasoco.com>
Subject: FW: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

Commissioner Holly Williams

El Paso County Colorado
200 South Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2202
(719) 374-0856 (mobile)
(719) 520-6411 (office)

From: Dean Boerrigter [<mailto:deanboerrigter@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 2:52 PM
To: Holly Williams
Subject: "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006 proposed Classic Homes Development- Peyton

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.

Commissioner Williams,

I write as a concerned resident of The Meadows in Peyton regarding Classic homes proposed development of "The Ranch"/ SKP-18-006. The Planning Committee voted in favor of the Sketch Plan at the July 18 meeting in a 4-2 decision. The next BOCC meeting regarding this plan is on August 27.

I'd like to acknowledge my agreement that Falcon Meadows Boulevard remain limited to emergency access only as the applicants have proposed. In doing so, Classic Homes and Falcon Fire recognized the severe negative impact that residents of The Meadows and Elkhorn Estates will experience should this be changed.

Additionally, I would ask that you require a larger buffer of rural lots between surrounding RR-5 neighborhoods and "The Ranch." The current proposed transition in the Plan is a 100-foot buffer and 1-acre lots with 200-foot lot width. A more natural, gradual transition would propose a larger buffer of 200-300-feet and lots 2.5-acres in size.

Our family recently moved to The Meadows to enjoy a rural life-style and were quite dismayed to hear of such a large urban density development so close to our new home. I am in agreement with neighbors who have stated other concerns regarding traffic, road use, safety, water use, drainage, erosion, and noise. I also realize that El Paso County is experiencing phenomenal growth at this time and that additional development is inevitable. I urge you, as a County Commissioner, to take measures to minimize the impact on rural residential neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Dean Boerrigter, Sr.
9995 Accipiter Dr.
Peyton, CO 80831
(719) 776-9496

Kari Parsons

From: Sharon White <shar1875@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2019 2:38 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: The Ranch - Please 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.

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. 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.

Please oppose this development!

Sincerely,
Sharon White
Black Forest Resident

Sent from my iPhone

Kari Parsons

From: Craig Dossey
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2019 11:56 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: FW: Oppose "The Ranch"

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

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

From: Holly Williams
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2019 11:42 AM
To: Craig Dossey
Subject: FW: Oppose "The Ranch"

This appears to be SKP186

Commissioner Holly Williams

El Paso County Colorado
200 South Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2202
(719) 374-0856 (mobile)
(719) 520-6411 (office)

From: Steven Cutter [<mailto:sandbcutter@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 14, 2019 7:56 AM
To: Kari Parsons
Cc: Holly Williams
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.

As a long term resident of Black Forest I urge you to oppose the proposed development known as "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 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. **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.**

Steven F. Cutter

6395 Highline Place, 80908

Kari Parsons

From: Craig Dossey
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2019 12:41 PM
To: Kari Parsons
Subject: FW: Opposition to The Ranch Development
Attachments: The Ranch surrounding lots.jpg

Add to file

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

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

From: Holly Williams
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2019 12:34 PM
To: Craig Dossey
Subject: FW: Opposition to The Ranch Development

Commissioner Holly Williams

El Paso County Colorado
200 South Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2202
(719) 374-0856 (mobile)
(719) 520-6411 (office)

From: Randy Garcia [<mailto:garciare@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2019 7:18 PM
To: Holly Williams
Subject: Fw: 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.

Hi Holly: I welcome your feedback.

All the best,

Randy

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

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

From: "Randy Garcia" <garciare@yahoo.com>
To: "HollyWilliams@elpasoco.com" <HollyWilliams@elpasoco.com>, "kariparsons@elpasoco.com" <kariparsons@elpasoco.com>, "CamiBremer@elpasoco.com" <CamiBremer@elpasoco.com>
Cc: "LonginosGonzalezJr@elpasoco.com" <LonginosGonzalezJr@elpasoco.com>, "terry.stokka@fobfpp.org" <terry.stokka@fobfpp.org>, "stanvanderwerf@elpasoco.com" <stanvanderwerf@elpasoco.com>, "MarkWaller@EIPasoCo.com" <MarkWaller@EIPasoCo.com>
Sent: Tue, Jul 9, 2019 at 10:50
Subject: Opposition to The Ranch Development

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
Lt Col 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 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.

I ask you to send emails to Kari Parsons (kari@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

<http://lists.fobfpp.org/listinfo.cgi/friends-fobfpp.org>

