



## MEETING NOTES

---

Subject: Cottages at Mesa Ridge – Neighborhood Meeting  
Date: November 18, 2021, from 5 – 7pm  
Meeting Location: Sunrise Elementary School, 7070 Grand Valley Drive  
Notes by: Phil Stuepfert

---

- **The meeting started with Kari Parson (El Paso County Planner) providing an overview of the process and provided some general comments**
  - this neighborhood meeting is not required but encouraged by the County, the applicant decided to do the meeting.
  - no decisions are being made at this meeting, for informational purposes only.
  - meeting must be civil or the meeting will be ended immediately.
  - Kari further explained that the applicant has already submitted the zoning and preliminary plans and the County has provided the first round of comments. They can be found on the EDARP system. All information on the project will be on EDARP in the future.
  - Next step is for the applicant to resubmit and address comments.
- **Following Kari's introductory comments Phil Stuepfert from HR Green (planner/landscape architect) provided a presentation including:**
  - Introductions (Dave Morrison-Goodwin Knight (Sr. Project Manager), Ken Huhn-HR Green (civil engineer), Jeff Hodsdon (traffic engineer from LSC)
  - Project Location and Background
  - Zoning and Land Use
  - Site Plan, Architecture and 3D Renderings
  - Questions

Note: The presentation included the site plan and 3D visualizations
- **Following the presentation, the meeting continued with comments and questions from the attendees. A summary of the questions and answers are provided below:**
  1. **Are there incentives for military? And what is the rental rate?**
    - applicant answered that Goodwin Knight has not considered providing incentives but will certainly take this under consideration. Rental rates will be market driven and will be in line with rents that are currently being asked for similar rental products.
  2. **Will there be fencing around the project? Concern for noise and dogs/children going into Powers Blvd.**
    - applicant said fencing has not been planned for around the perimeter of the project. It may be considered along the Powers corridor but not decided. Kari said she has the same concern with small children and will request that applicant install fencing along the Powers corridor.
  3. **Is their capacity for schools?**
    - applicant will pay fees in lieu of land. A school district employee was in the audience and explained they do have capacity at Sunrise Elementary school for these children.

4. **Comment was made that the modular homes changes the culture and environment of the area, taxes will go up and property values will go down because of this development.**  
-applicant provide comments that is typically not the case, especially when residential is placed next to residential like with this proposal.
5. **Traffic is already too busy at the Sneffels and Powers intersection, how will that be accommodated? Comment that the County has not done a good job at planning development and traffic?**  
-applicant explained the County is requiring some minor improvements to that intersection and explained other planned studies the County has undertaken in the area.
6. **Comment that the Fire department response time is poor now and this development could make it worse**  
-consultant explained that the proposed project has been reviewed by the Security Fire Department and they have given preliminary approval of their ability to provide fire protection for this project.
7. **Question on how will we address noise from Powers?**  
-applicant explained that these units sit above Powers and a sound wall will likely have minimal impact and that if completed this will not cut down noise for adjacent homeowners.
8. **Concern with the architecture colors, comment was made to avoid bright colors (i.e. pink). Kari asked the developer Dave Morrison if he would be willing to put in the formal submittal documents commitments (write into the PUD) the color of the structures.**  
-applicant is willing to look at this but no final commitments were made. Goodwin Knight will review their typical modular unit color schemes with County Planning staff to determine if modifications to the palette would be acceptable to staff and neighbors.
9. **What is the long-term quality of the homes and project, how is it maintained?**  
-applicant explained they are built in a factory in Pueblo and shipped to the job site. It was explained that the developer will be the sole owner of the project and use a professional management company to manage and maintain company manage the community. A representative will not be on-site 24 hrs/day but will be present under established business hours.
10. **What is the access to the site? Will there be access on to Powers?**  
-applicant explained there is not any access on to Powers. There is one main vehicular access for ever day traffic (Landover Lane) and the second access is for emergency only. That access is on top of the irrigation ditch to be piped (as shown on the plan).
11. **An attendee who lives on Woody Creek (road immediately west/northwest of this site) asked if he could walk or access his lot from the rear of his property?**  
-applicant and Kari explained that any current use of the project property is trespassing now and once these units are built there will be no pedestrian or vehicular access allowed to the rear of the Woody Creek Parcels.
12. **What will be the landscape treatment along the north property line?**  
-applicant explained 15' is required by the County for a landscape buffer, we are provided 20'. The applicant is also proposing a 20' building setback so essentially those two items are both set at 20' from the property line as shown on the PUD plans.



### **Greg Harsch (adjacent neighbor) presentation**

Following the applicant's presentation Greg provided a presentation to the group with boards showing photos of the area and site. He had requested he have time for his presentation from the County and applicant prior to the meeting which was granted.

The following summarizes points this individual made by Greg and responses by applicant and County.

***-Greg has concern about traffic from this project.***

***-Greg believes the watershed drains on our site and has bad drainage coming from the southwest corner on to our site.***

-Applicant said the drainage will be taken care of with our stormwater plan.

***-Greg commented that he thinks taxes will double and rates will rise significantly***

***-Greg commented that CDOT promised trees, a trail and nice landscaping along Powers when they did improvements and most of it was not completed. Sprinklers remain in the open space and do not work.***

-applicant commented likely temporary irrigation and Kari was going to check the facts on this item.

***-Greg expressed concern of the irrigation ditch not working correctly.***

-Applicant (engineer Huhn) explained the irrigation ditch will be piped underground.

***-Greg asked how will the pipe allow trucks to go over it?***

-Applicant (engineer Huhn) explained the pipe can handle it with the cover of soil/base over it

***-Greg asked for a motion and vote of who was in favor of stopping the zoning by raise of hand.***

-Nobody in the room raised their hand and Kari told the audience the best way is provide formal comments to the County and individually sign the comments and to have them address the County review criteria.

***-Greg made the comment he already had signatures on the sign in sheet from the people that attended tonight and would turn that into the County.***

-Kari told the audience that is not legal to take a sign in sheet and turn in to the County as opposition of the project.

### **Conclusion**

At the end of the meeting applicant/developer Dave Morrison addressed the crowd and made the following comments:

-Dave thanked everyone for coming and encouraged participation throughout the process of the project

-Dave said they could contact him at any time if they have more questions or concerns.