

Dear County Officials and Board of County Commissioners,

I am writing to formally oppose the variance of use request for 11910 Green Acres Lane, submitted by Sterling Providence LLC / Joseph Z Ministries / et al. As a neighboring resident who shares a property line with 11910 and is directly impacted by the activities at this site, I respectfully ask the Board to evaluate this application with careful attention to the criteria outlined in Section 5.3.4(C) of the El Paso County Land Development Code.

First, the applicant has not demonstrated that strict application of the Land Development Code creates any peculiar or exceptional hardship. Conditions such as rural zoning, limited access via private easements, and shared infrastructure are not unusual but features that define the Black Forest area. These are not hardships unique to this property, but standard characteristics of rural residential parcels in Black Forest. The request is therefore not about relief from hardship, but about enabling a use that the zoning clearly does not allow.

The proposed use is also not consistent with the County's Master Plan. This area is designated for low-density, large-lot residential living, with an emphasis on preserving rural character and minimizing intensity of use. What is taking place at this property—a high-output media production, logistics, shipping and receiving, and organizational operation—is a clear departure from those objectives. The scale, staffing, and activity level alone are far beyond what could reasonably be considered compatible with the County's long-term vision for this area.

Equally important, the use is not at all compatible with nor safe to operate in the surrounding neighborhood and is already proving detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of nearby residents. Traffic has increased dramatically along narrow private easements that were never designed for commercial use. The application's claim of standard residential deliveries is demonstrably inaccurate. There is clear evidence of regular semi-truck trips traveling up and down these private easements, including across neighboring properties, for palletized commercial shipments related to merchandise and distribution operations. This type of activity is entirely inconsistent with residential use and creates serious safety, access, and infrastructure concerns.

These easements are private, shared, and intended for residential access, not for commercial use. Importantly, the driveway easements do not comply with IFC standards for minimum width and compaction to allow adequate access to commercial properties by fire department and emergency services. The two private easements used to access 11910 total about 980 feet in length, comprising about 600 feet along 11750 and about 380 feet along 11760. IFC standards mandate a minimum driveway width of 20 feet for driveways 151-500 feet in length, a width of 26 feet for those 501-750 feet, and that driveways longer than 750 feet (applicable here) require additional special approval. The easement along 11750 is primarily dirt with a thin layer of crushed asphalt and does not meet IFCs minimum compaction and load bearing ability, and is incapable of supporting the imposed load of a fire apparatus weighing 75,000 pounds.

None of the governing easement agreements authorize this level or type of commercial activity. Despite this, the property owners have not once coordinated with neighbors regarding the burden their operations place on these shared routes. They do not proactively participate in maintenance and have only contributed when directly asked, while the rest of us residents coordinate and contribute more than our fair share of maintenance and upkeep of shared resources. At the same time, their usage far exceeds that of the other residents combined, by a substantial margin, resulting in accelerated deterioration and increased risk for everyone who relies on these access points.

The application further suggests that off-site impacts have been addressed, but this is not the case. There has been no meaningful effort to resolve issues related to road and easement maintenance, traffic volume, safety, or shared resources. These impacts are not hypothetical—they are ongoing, visible, and unresolved. This failure alone should weigh heavily against approval under the County's criteria.

Additional inconsistencies further call into question the accuracy of the application. The applicant represents that staffing will be limited to approximately 10 employees max on busy days; however, observed activity has often exceeded that level. They also indicate limited guest presence, despite publicly describing plans for in-person participation and events on their website and YouTube channel. Of particular concern, the level of vehicle traffic generated by current operations appears likely to exceed thresholds that would typically require a formal traffic impact study, despite claims to the contrary.

In addition, the presence of multiple large shipping containers on the property does not appear to have been fully accounted for in the reported disturbed land areas, and the landscape plan appears to misrepresent existing tree coverage on the site. Taken together, these discrepancies among many others suggest that the true scale and impact of the operation have been materially understated and make it difficult to rely on the application as an accurate representation of the proposed use.

There are also serious concerns about the property owner's overall compliance with applicable regulations. The property has a documented history of zoning violations and remains out of compliance, with a recent notice of violation issued on March 19. Despite this, daily commercial operations continue, including employee activity and shipping and receiving functions that are not permitted under current zoning. This raises legitimate questions about whether the proposed use will comply with County regulations moving forward.

Beyond the policy and infrastructure concerns, the personal and community impacts have been severe. What was once a quiet and peaceful rural neighborhood has been fundamentally disrupted. The constant traffic, dust, and noise occur throughout the day and very early in the morning, creating an environment that no longer resembles the community we chose to live in. People associated with the operation frequently enter neighboring properties by mistake—delivery drivers, contractors, job applicants, and staff—creating ongoing intrusion and confusion.

There have been multiple instances of semi-trucks becoming stuck on the easements, striking and damaging neighboring fencing, and blocking access entirely, preventing residents from leaving their homes. Employee vehicles regularly travel at unsafe speeds along these narrow roads despite asking them to slow down. I have personally had to move out of the way to avoid a close call with a speeding vehicle while doing something as routine as wheeling trash out to the road. This is not just disruptive, it is dangerous.

The emotional toll of this situation has been significant. Many of us neighbors feel that we have lost the peace, privacy, and sense of home that defined this area. There is ongoing anxiety stemming from the traffic, the safety risks, and the uncertainty surrounding these operations. The scale of this business, combined with the inaccuracies in their application and the apparent effort to downplay their true level of activity, has left neighbors feeling frustrated, unsettled, and unheard. We simply want our homes, and our sense of peace, back.

In sum, when evaluated against the County's criteria, this application falls short on multiple fronts:

- There is no peculiar or exceptional hardship justifying a variance;
- The use is not consistent with the Master Plan or the intent of RR-5 zoning;
- The operation is not compatible with the surrounding area and is demonstrably detrimental to neighborhood character, safety, and livability;
- The property is not currently in compliance with applicable regulations, and ongoing operations raise serious concerns about future compliance;
- Critically, the applicant has not addressed off-site impacts, including road use, easement strain, IFC 2018 regulations, traffic safety, and shared infrastructure.

This is not a case of a modest home-based business seeking reasonable accommodation. It is a large-scale commercial operation attempting to function within a rural residential setting that cannot support it. This decision will determine whether our neighborhood remains a peaceful place to live or becomes a place for disruptive and out-of-scale commercial use. I ask you to protect the residents who live here and deny this variance. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Jason Roberts
11750 Green Acres Lane

Additional Resources and Supporting Evidence:

For more information about the organization, please visit:

<https://josephz.com>

Relevant materials include:

- 2025 Annual Partner Report: <https://online.flippingbook.com/view/358284967/>
- August 2025 Newsletter: <https://josephz.com/august-2025-partner-newsletter/>
- October 2025 Newsletter: <https://josephz.com/october-2025-partner-newsletter/>

These materials describe planned uses such as “in-studio intensives,” conferences, and special gatherings.

Examples from their publications include:

- Plans for events, courses, and gatherings at a “World Broadcast Center in Colorado Springs”
- A facility with shipping areas, offices, podcast rooms, and a large television production studio
- A staff of 40 full-time employees and ongoing expansion
- Potential acquisition of additional land for future growth
- Use of the property to support executive staff, media, shipping, and operations

YouTube Video: “TAKING YOU INSIDE THE NEW BUILDING!! Thank you Partners & Friends!”

<https://www.youtube.com/live/2uuGkRWYYTk?si=xlqRZxYp65FvGeG>

YouTube Video: “AUGUST UPDATE: ANNOUNCING THE NEW EXPANSION OF Z MINISTRIES! (Watch till the end)”

<https://www.youtube.com/live/BoTnYIETHSA?si=JZbfM8hke3dEUcBh>

*As of 4/13/2026, it has come to my attention that Sterling Providence / Joseph Z Ministries / et al has recently and retroactively removed many of the videos and related content on their website and YouTube channel that has been referenced above; likely in an effort to hide any content that may be incriminating or offering evidence that is in opposition to what they have represented in their variance application and to the county. Please be aware that I have all of the video evidence saved and stored in a secure location, and I am happy to share those files for review at the county’s request.