

Christopher J. Amenson
On behalf of himself and 32 other Residents of the
Forest View Estates Property Owners Association (“FVEPOA”)
620 Forest View Way
Monument, CO 80132

April 27, 2021

To: El Paso County Planning Commission
Board of County Commissioners
Nina Ruiz, EPC Planning Manager
John Green, EPC Planning and Community Development Dept Project Manager

Re: Red Rocks Acres Rezone Request – 2nd Letter in Opposition

This letter is submitted by Christopher J. Amenson, a resident of the Forest View Estates Property Owners Association (FVEPOA), on behalf of himself and 32 fellow homeowners within this association. All referenced homes are to the immediate northwest of the subject area and will be affected by the decisions made by the El Paso County Planning Commission and the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners.

Each owner has in various times past, and some very recently, purchased their respective home with the understanding of the rural nature of this area as described by the extant zoning stipulated by El Paso County. The owners see the contemplated, significantly increased, residential density contained in the re-zoning request as a substantial, unnecessary and undesirably deleterious action by the developer (and El Paso County) if it were allowed to go forward as proposed.

Specifically, we object strenuously to the request by Olive Real Estate Group and JZs Land Development, LLC, (“JZ”) to rezone the subject land area from the current RR-5 to RR-.5. By changing the zoning of the subject area the developer will substantially increase lot density, increase the traffic on an already congested road (Red Rock Ranch Drive) as well as at the intersection of Red Rock Ranch Drive and Highway 105. The development would also severely tax the already unstable Forest View Acres Water District.

According to the El Paso County Land Development Code, paragraph 5.3.5, zoning (1) protects the rights of property owners and (2) promotes the general welfare of the community. The area in question is part of West Monument Creek, Sub Area 3 of the Tri-Lakes Comprehensive Plan. Zoning is primarily for 2.5 and 5 acre lots south of Hwy 105 and Rural agricultural lots (10+ acres) north of Hwy 105. Any increase in density will not promote the general welfare of the community and will unnecessarily overtax the local water, traffic, sewage and other infrastructure in place. Any rezoning undertaken as contemplated would be arbitrary in nature and damaging to both the existing homeowners and to intent of the original zoning in place, solely for the benefit of JZ.

Previously we sent to you our first ***Letter in Opposition*** by referring to objections according to the El Paso County Land Development Code. This current ***Letter in Opposition will address***

two aspects of non-conformity of the proposed development according to the El Paso County Master Plan.

First, within that Plan, **Policy 6.1.3** stipulates the development be “compatible with previously developed areas in terms of such factors as density...” . The proposed development is in violation as it would increase density from previous developments of 10, 5 and 2.5 acres lots of the nearby developments. Of significant interest, JZ’s own previous development of the nearby Pioneer Estates is a case in point. Please note that Pioneer Estates, which is within 1/8 mile of the planned development on Red Rock Ranch Dr., complies with El Paso County zoning regulations “Residential Rural District (RR-5), a 5 acre district intended to accommodate low-density, rural, single-family residential development.”

The adjacent FVEPOA is zoned “RR-2.5, a 2.5 acre district intended to accommodate low-density, rural, single family residential development”. Also, the nearby development Forest View Estates Neighborhood Association-Filing-IV is also zoned “RR-2.5, a 2.5 acre district intended to accommodate low-density, rural, single family residential development”. Why would El Paso County allow land located between the RR-5 and the RR-2.5 to be zoned with the much higher density RR-0.5, as requested? This would not be the “compatibility”, as stipulated in the Master Plan.

Secondly, **Policy 6.1.11** stipulates that any development should “implement land development so that it will be functionally aesthetically integrated within the context of adjoining properties”. As indicated above, high-density housing located where JZ wants to place this development would NOT be “aesthetically integrated within the context of adjoining properties” for the very reason that the JZ development would many times more dense than ALL of the adjoining and nearby properties.

Finally, please note that while JZ may have reportedly held a Zoom teleconference in order to brief the nearby property owners of its plans, nothing that JZ would have indicated would change the facts of this zoning request without JZ filing an amended request indicating property density in accord with those forementioned nearby developments.

If any of the recipient of this letter have any question please advise and we will respond to such questions in a timely manner.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Amenson
719-235-2950
camenson@comcast.net