

Miranda Benson

From: Steven Miller <steven.p.miller66@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 22, 2026 2:06 PM
To: Miranda Benson
Cc: Meggan Herington
Subject: Formal Opposition and Request for Full Compliance Review — PPR2515 / EA1944 — 7610 Maverick Road

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 email to your company.

Mark Safe

Report

El Paso County Digital, Strategy & Technology (DST)

Dear Ms. Benson,

RE: PPR2515 - Site Development Plan, Islamic Society of Colorado Springs

EA Number: EA1944

Parcel Number: 5304004008

Property: 7610 Maverick Road

I am writing as a concerned El Paso County resident to formally oppose **PPR2515, the proposed Islamic Society of Colorado Springs development at 7610 Maverick Road.**

For purposes of the County's land-use review, I respectfully request that this project be **unequivocally denied** based on the following concerns:

- **Traffic impacts and congestion**
- **Insufficient parking capacity**
- **Infrastructure and drainage impacts**
- **Private well and commercial septic capacity**

- **Potential noise impacts, particularly during early-morning activities**
- **Incompatibility with the surrounding RR-5 residential neighborhood**
- **Questions regarding compliance with RR-5 building-height requirements**
- **Unresolved questions regarding compliance with applicable development standards**

The project's technical documents and County review record identify several material issues that warrant careful scrutiny before any final determination is made.

Parking and occupancy: The applicant's Traffic Impact Study anticipates approximately **500 people for Friday worship**, yet the January 2026 parking plan identifies only **450 seats** and calculates exactly **113 required and 113 provided parking spaces** based upon those 450 seats. Please explain how a facility anticipating approximately 500 Friday attendees is adequately served by parking calculated from only 450 seats, particularly when the facility also includes daycare, office, educational and other activities.

Traffic: The Traffic Impact Study also anticipates five daily weekday prayer gatherings, weekday daycare, Sunday School for **100–120 children**, and substantial Friday attendance. Please confirm that the County's analysis adequately considers maximum realistic traffic, vehicle stacking, drop-off/pickup activity, simultaneous uses and special events at both Maverick and Mustang Roads—not merely average daily traffic.

Building height: County planning review comments state that the maximum building height in RR-5 is **30 feet, with the dome exempt**, yet the January 2026 Site Development Plan continues to identify the Phase I building as **38 feet tall**. Please clarify how the current 38-foot design complies with the applicable height limitation and whether the non-exempt portions of the structure remain within the 30-foot maximum.

Drainage and stormwater: Given the substantial conversion of this five-acre parcel to building and paved surfaces, please confirm that the latest Final Drainage Report and detention design have received final engineering/stormwater acceptance and adequately protect neighboring and downstream properties under applicable design-storm conditions.

Well and commercial septic: The project relies upon a private well and engineered commercial septic system. Please confirm that the latest design has received final Health Department approval for projected peak occupancy and adequately addresses groundwater protection, wastewater capacity, system maintenance and long-term operation.

Noise and residential compatibility: The applicant anticipates activity beginning around **5:30 a.m.** Please clarify whether exterior loudspeakers or other outdoor amplification will be used for calls to prayer, announcements, services or events and, if so, **what specific noise requirements and ordinances would apply and how compliance would be monitored and enforced.**

More broadly, the proposed project's size, intensity of use, operating schedule, anticipated traffic and institutional activities present substantial compatibility concerns with the character of the surrounding **RR-5 residential neighborhood.**

Finally, the public project record reflects multiple rounds of agency review and applicant resubmittals. This history raises additional concerns regarding whether the proposal, as submitted, satisfies all applicable requirements. I respectfully request identification of any outstanding or previously identified

issues from Planning, Engineering, Stormwater, Health and other reviewing agencies, together with documentation showing how each was addressed in the latest submission.

A religious institution may be an allowed use in **RR-5**, but an allowed use must still demonstrate compliance with applicable development standards designed to protect neighboring residents, infrastructure and public safety.

For these reasons, **I unequivocally oppose PPR2515 and respectfully request that El Paso County deny the application.**

Please enter this correspondence as formal public comment for **PPR2515 / EA1944 / Parcel 5304004008** and provide written responses, or links to the specific documents containing those responses, addressing the issues and concerns identified above.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Steven P. Miller
Concerned El Paso County Resident