

Jen Uhler

From: Trey Spiller <tspill29@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 3:24 PM
To: Jen Uhler
Cc: Meggan Herington
Subject: File AL269 — Yakalo Ranch Special Use Permit (Parcel 7500000275) — Formal Objection and Request to Elevate to Public Hearing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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 message needs your attention

- This is a personal email address.
- This is their first mail to some recipients.

Mark Safe

Report

El Paso County Digital, Strategy & Technology (DST)

Dear Ms. Uhler,

I am an El Paso County property owner on the Old Stage Road corridor at 3450 Old Stage Road. Please enter this email into the AL269 project file as my formal written objection, make me a party of record, and confirm receipt in writing.

I respectfully request that the County:

1. Deny File AL269 — or, if the County intends to move it forward, elevate it to a full public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. On this record, I ask for denial. If the County nonetheless continues processing the application, a commercial recreation camp on an unpaved, effectively single-egress mountain road in the wildland-urban interface — noticed to five owners within 500 feet — warrants public process, not an administrative sign-off. This application has been pending since June 2025; the owners of this corridor deserve resolution.

2. Issue a cease-and-desist on the unpermitted commercial operation. A recreation camp requires special use approval that has not been granted; this parcel carries two notices of violation; and paid stays are documented through July 2026 — after both notices. I ask that Code Enforcement order the

commercial use to cease pending abatement of the cited violations and any lawful approval, and that compliance be verified rather than assumed.

3. Make no decision while code enforcement case CE26550 remains unresolved. CE26550 was opened June 18, 2026 on this same parcel, with a notice of violation for prohibited use in the zoning district, the principal-structure requirement, and setbacks; its docket shows "Executive Determination Requested" on July 7, 2026. The parcel's prior case, CE25228, produced a Notice of Violation on April 4, 2025 and a Final Notice on April 24, 2025. Abatement should precede permitting.

4. Refer the operating record to the Office of the County Attorney for the remedies the law provides — injunctive relief and criminal penalty under C.R.S. § 30-28-124, and civil penalties of \$500 to \$1,000 per day for continuing violations under C.R.S. § 30-28-124.5 — consistent with the County's handling of APPCE215 / CE20865 on the adjacent parcel (appeal denied by the Board of County Commissioners on December 19, 2022). The public record documents continued paid operation after both notices of violation — including seven paid-stay guest reviews dated July 2026, during Stage 2 fire restrictions — and an open wood fire at the property on July 2, 2026, documented on video during those restrictions. The file also now contains the applicant's August 2026 letter to state and county officials stating the property "is not operating as a commercial campground"; the operation's own published guest reviews for July 2026 document seven paid stays that month.

5. Route the fire record to the enforcement authorities. Independent of the land-use track, I ask the County to forward the July 2 video, the listing's marketed-fire copy, and the dated guest reviews describing provided firewood and kindling to the Sheriff's Office — the enforcement authority for Stage 2 restrictions under EPC Ordinance 19-001 — and to the District Attorney for evaluation under C.R.S. §§ 18-4-105 (fourth degree arson) and 18-3-208 (reckless endangerment). I make no charging judgment; those decisions belong to the Sheriff and the District Attorney. But the record should reach them.

There is also the precedent to weigh. This operation was built and run for fifteen months after a Notice of Violation and a Final Notice, through a second enforcement case and a Stage 2 fire ban — and its application now stands to be decided administratively while those violations remain unabated. Approval on this record would teach every resident of this county that the way to obtain a permit is to operate first and apply later, and that enforcement can be outlasted. The County litigated the opposite lesson on the adjacent parcel in APPCE215. Compliance cannot be the more expensive path. An ordinance enforced only in notices operates as a suggestion; the owners of this corridor have treated it as law.

The building record independently supports each of these requests. I have identified two Pikes Peak Regional Building permits of record on this parcel, both residential: P40224, a detached garage, issued July 9, 2024 and finalized; and P69388, a new single-family dwelling, issued January 13, 2025, which expired July 12, 2025 and is Admin-Closed with no Certificate of Occupancy — the EPC Zoning/engineering final marked Not Complete and the Health Department final marked Partial, both blocking. On the County's and Regional Building's own records, the parcel has no completed principal residence, no approved wastewater final, and no permit authorizing commercial use of any structure — while paid stays continued, including eight reviewed stays in the month the residence permit expired. I do not see how the required adequate-facilities finding could be made on this record.

There is a further matter the County should weigh, because it bears on the integrity of this process. The applicant's August 2026 letter — sent to state and county officials while this application is pending, and expressly referencing the evaluation of her permit application — alleges that evidence against the

operation was obtained by trespass and states that she is "prepared to pursue all available legal remedies." As the neighbor who reported the July 2 fire and documented the operation, I understand these statements to be directed at me. For the record, the evidence I have referenced comes from two sources: public records and the operation's own public advertising, captured from the public internet under an integrity manifest; and the July 2 video, which I recorded from Old Stage Road while traveling it. At no point did I enter the applicant's property. To the extent the trespass allegation reflects a claim of private ownership or control over Old Stage Road itself, the County should take particular note: residents, guest operations, and emergency responders depend on that road; the corridor's evacuation route runs over it; and the applicant's own proposed use depends on it for access. Litigation threats aimed at a participating neighbor while a quasi-judicial application is pending escalate the seriousness of this matter, and they are a further reason this decision belongs in a public hearing on a full record — a process that protects every participant, including the applicant. These statements will not deter my participation; I will continue to communicate through the county record and, where appropriate, through counsel. I ask that the applicant's letter and this objection be maintained together in the AL269 file.

I also request the following in writing:

- a. The decision date for AL269, and the process by which substantial objections elevate an administrative decision to a public hearing;
- b. The referral list for this application — specifically whether the fire protection district, the Sheriff's Office (as the fire-restrictions authority), the Colorado State Forest Service, the U.S. Forest Service, El Paso County Public Health, and Pikes Peak Regional Building have been asked to comment;
- c. The right-of-way status of Old Stage Road at and near the subject parcel — including whether the applicant has asserted to the County any private interest in the road — given that the application's required access and the corridor's evacuation route both depend on it;
- d. Whether, independent of the outcome on AL269, the County intends to pursue the accrued penalties and remedies for the documented violations — and, if it does not, a written statement of the reasons;
- e. That this objection be shared with the PCD Director and the Office of the County Attorney.

Every statement above is supported by preserved exhibits — including the July 2 video, a hash-verified capture of the operation's public listing and dated guest reviews, and the archived PPRBD permit records (P40224, P69388) — available immediately on request. I will also submit this objection through EDARP's public comment function on Project 206839.

Given the potential decision date of August 20, I would appreciate acknowledgment by end of business Tuesday, August 18.

Respectfully,

Trey Spiller
3450 Old Stage Rd, Colorado Springs, CO 80906
tspill29@gmail.com | 303.349.8155