

Christopher J. Amenson
and other Residents of the
Forest View Estates Property Owners Association
620 Forest View Way
Monument, CO 80132

January 21, 2021

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

Re: Red Rocks Acres Rezone Request – 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 31 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 purchased their respective home with certain understandings described by the zoning and other requirements of both the FVEPOA and El Paso County.

We object strenuously to the request by Olive Real Estate Group and JZs Land Development, LLC, to rezone the subject land area from the current RR-5 to RR-.5. 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) and intersection (Red Rock Ranch Drive and Highway 105) defeat the established standards in area lot density, and overly tax the already severely depleted Forest View Acres Water District.

According to the El Paso County (EPC) 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.

According to the EPC Land Development Code, there are four criteria for approval of any rezone request:

- 1. It conforms with the EPC and Tri-Lakes Comprehensive Plans.** Both of the referenced plans require careful consideration of new developments on the integrity and carrying capacity of the roadway system, as well as consideration of impact on schools, police and fire departments, water usage, and current land use expectations. The Tri-Lakes plan requires this West Monument Creek Sub Area to remain primarily rural residential. Zoning requires predominantly residential lots or parcels ranging from 2.5 to 10 acres in area (Ch IV: Section 7 – Growth and Land Use.) A rezone to ½-acre lots does not comply.

2. **The rezone is in compliance with statutory provisions.** Both C.R.S. section 30-28-111 and C.R.S. section 30-28-113 state that county planning commissions must consider size of lots and open spaces when making zoning decisions, as well as density, distribution, and safety of population. A change from 5-acre to ½-acre lots would adversely impact these considerations and we believe that the vast majority of residents polled are against a this drastic reduction in lot size and substantial increase in density for this parcel of land.
3. **The zone district is compatible with existing land uses in all directions.** EPC has zoned areas north and west of the proposed area as agricultural or rural residential with which we are sure you are familiar. To rezone to .5 acre lots would not be consistent with adjacent developments and would not “ensure the orderly progression of land use densities.” Therefore, a rezone to higher density would violate the objectives of both the EPC Land Development Code and the Tri-Lakes Comprehensive Plan.
4. **The site is suitable for the intended use.** The site under consideration is part of a watershed and is used extensively by deer, waterfowl, fox, coyote and other wildlife. Based on the 1998 EPC Policy Plan, this rezoning would not be in compliance with the stated policy to protect “the natural resources or unique land forms.” This development should not have reduced lot sizes and higher home density than currently mandated.

Attached hereto are the comments of the homeowners in FVEPOA, exactly as submitted to me, for your review. We collectively believe that you should deny this request to rezone the parcel from 5-acre to ½-acre lots.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Amenson
620 Forest View Way
Monument, CO 80132
camenson@comcast.net

NOTE: Below is the letter soliciting comments from the homeowners with the Forest View Estates Property Owners Association as well as their responses:

From: Christopher Amenson <camenson@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 10:31 AM
Subject: Important Call for Your Comments

FVEPOA Neighbors,

The following is information you should find of interest, and here is an opportunity to let your voice be heard, but you must act soon.

DEVELOPMENT NEARBY:

A developer has purchased the land on the right side of Red Rock Ranch Drive, as you go up the hill from the pond toward Rte. 105. His intent is to seek rezoning of the majority in the area down to RR.05 so that the developer can build approximately 37 single family homes between Monument Creek and Rte. 105 with the overwhelming majority (31) on ½ acre lots. (For comparison, that is the equivalent density of

putting 4 additional homes on your lot).

The development, as planned, would get its fresh water from the Forest View Acres Water District and dispose its sewage into the Town of Palmer Lake sewage drainage pipe which runs along Monument Creek.

If you copy and paste into your web browser the link below, you will go to El Paso County website where you can see the proposed Zoning map as requested by the developer, along with other documentation concerning the project including detailed descriptions:

<https://epcdevplanreview.com/public/projectdetails/167954>

Go to Review Documents and take a look at the full project details by clicking on the 'View' tabs.

CALL FOR COMMENTS:

An ad hoc group, Red Rock Ranch United (RRRU), has been formed to provide constructive comment to the El Paso County decision makers. I have volunteered to work with this group and to contact the members of the FVEPOA. This issue has been and is visible on Nextdoor Palmer Lake should you wish to catch up on some of the conversation concerning this.

You may or may not personally favor this development plan. The intent of RRRU is to seek to provide sufficient neighbor input to substantially reduce the project density, for aesthetic, safety, water, traffic and property value reduction reasons.

I am asking that you provide to me any comments and concerns you may want included in the response to be provided by RRRU by this coming Tuesday evening, January 19th, in the form of a return email. I will consolidate (not edit) all FVEPOA members comments and get them included in the response being provided to El Paso County. Please provide logical, calm comments in a paragraph or two concerning the impact you anticipate from this development and the concerns you may have. You may also include any photos which describe the concern you may have.

Time is of the essence so please consider this carefully and use this opportunity to let your voice be heard.

Thank you,

Chris Amenson
camenson@comcast.net

COMMENTS FROM HOMEOWNERS OF FOEST VIEW ESTATES PROPERTY ONERS ASSOCIATION.

1.Chris,

Thanks for organizing a response! Rhonda and I concur with the same themes as the rest of the responses you received: water; wildlife and traffic. Danke!

Check Six!

Popeye

Tod Fingal

Tod.fingal@gmail.com

2 .Chris,

Thank you for taking the lead to gather the input from FVEPOA.

I also have read through the project on the El Paso County website. The biggest concerns that I have are water, traffic safety, and wildlife impact with the density of these homes. David Kumpf has described these concerns that I have with his questions and I do agree with his recommendations. The wildlife impact is concerning for traffic safety as the creek runs through the area and homes that are in smaller lots may be allowed fencing, which will redirect the movement

I believe that FVEPOA needs to be included in the notifications in the future on this project. Also, investigations and further explanations into these three areas of concern need to be further addressed to our community.

Thanks,

Melissa Bronson

616 Forest View Way

adamsmelissa83@me.com

3. Chris,

Thanks for the conversation this AM and the clarification on several issues.

I have read all of the comments that have been provided and in addition I have read the El Paso County website on the project, including the comments on the website and the full Traffic Impact Study.

I am in total agreement with the comments by Dave Kumpf and those comments would have my total proxy for as an addendum to my comments shown below.

My comments specifically in addition to Dave Kumpf's are:

- I think there are several key pieces of information lacking for us to make an informed decision. The plot layout of the proposed subdivision is not included in the materials on the El Paso County website (showing the layout of the lots and roads). As Dave indicates in his comments the Red Rock Acres Traffic Impact Study is a **Draft** and more importantly the key maps are unreadable because they are obscured by the **Draft** watermark. Without this information the reviewer can not make an informed decision about the proposed development. I realize a draft preliminary plot plan was shown on the Red Rock Ranch Nextdoor Site, but if this is the actual proposed plan it should be on the El Paso County site for review. I was unable to locate on the El Paso County site. I think these items are both "War Stoppers" and I think the plan should be rejected until they are provided to the public.
- The developer indicates that they have plans for Forest View Acres Water. I can understand that is what they represent and the FVAWD (Forest View Acres Water District) may have given them representation for the water. My only comment (based on the history of the FVAWD) is that a 3rd party should verify that the FVAWD can actually supply not only the water quantity but also reliably supply the water. Once the new homes are built it will be too late if there are water issues for the new homeowners.
- Dave does a great job on discussing the traffic issues and I am complete agreement. One other issue after reviewing the Traffic Study is access to Red Rock Ranch Drive from lots 34,35,&36. The

access road from the subdivision to Red Rock Ranch Drive is described on Page 2 of the study and it identifies several issues in regards to sight distance. This road from the proposed subdivision is shown entering Red Rocks Ranch Drive right at the beginning of the curve on the south side. This placement has some serious safety issues and should absolutely be rejected. I won't go in to details, except to say I was in a very serious accident on this road 16 years ago when someone went thru the curve going north while I was going south and they missed the curve and hit me. I know this stretch of road and this would not be a place to enter Red Rocks Ranch Drive. This needs to be seriously reviewed as part of the Traffic Impact Study.

- It would be appreciated if the developer would expand the adjacent owner notification letter beyond what they have provided at this point.

Thanks for taking the lead on this important issue for our subdivision and thanks for allowing the opportunity to comment.

Respectfully,

Bob Scharp

bobscharp@earthlink.net

4.

Janis and I agree with much of what has been pointed out so far and resonate with the the key issues that have been raised:

- 1) The density is not consistent with our neighborhood. Would prefer 2.5 acres as the minimum.
- 2) The water issue is critical and its irresponsible to add to the problem without viable solutions to solve it. We are already in conservation mode and it's likely to get worse. Adding that many units will only make the problem worse.
- 3) Traffic
- 4) Environmental impact to the creek area.

Thank you, Chris. We really appreciate your involvement.

Best regards,

Kevin and Janis Pettijohn

kjpettijohn@gmail.com

5. I don't know if you are aware of the activities of Ms Marty Brodzic, who has been very active since December trying to galvanize support to oppose this development [biz1@mmbrodzic]. She and her husband live directly across Hwy 105 from Red Rock Ranch. She might be a useful allie in influencing the County.

My concerns are much the same as everyone else in Forest View Estates. The addition of a large number of residences on that parcel of land will have a significant impact on traffic flow, infrastructure degradation, increased burden on fire and police protection, emergency egress in case of wildland fires in areas to the West and South, and aesthetic incompatibility with the surrounding area.

If the RRRU feels strongly enough about the request by the developer to re-zone to the higher density on the western parcel, I would be willing to contribute to hiring a land-use consultant to advise us on our options.

Regards,

Robert Tramaloni

tramalonir@gmail.com

6. Chris,

As this is my backyard, literally, I am very concerned for each of the things mentioned below as well as the aesthetics of views of monument ridge.

Thanks for taking point and making this happen.

Del

dchristman@mac.com

7.

Along with all the other comments so far, these these comments hit right to the bone for the county and will go far to set some hard limits (I would prefer nothing less than 2.5 acres if any at all). The water situation is a mess, let alone the traffic.

David and all, thanks for elaborating so well on this. Letting them do this will cause a myriad of problems now and well into future, probably adding traffic lights as it's already a pain to just in and out of neighborhood

Steve Sicola

gumbydi@aol.com

8. Chris,

Thanks so much for representing us. None of us want to see homes go up there, but the reality is, we probably can't stop it. I agree with Lisa and the others that water is the main factor. It doesn't make sense to me that we have water restrictions and yet new developments keep popping up.

I tried to see how Boulder stops development and it appears as if they tag land as open space.

I think you should go to the meeting and say you saw a Preble's Jumping mouse on the other side of the pond.

Good luck!

Susan

voyzey@comcast.net

9.

I am concerned about the effect it will have on our home values. I am also concerned about the water situation We have had many water restrictions in the past. The extra traffic is also a consideration. I understand that this is progress but the security of our present residents must be considered. We invested in this neighbourhood because of it's beauty and convenient location. I know that this is progress but I hate the thought of this turning into a crowded , town like community. I love the country setting and small, caring community Please don't spoil it

June Isobel
juneisobel@comcast.net

10. Chris:

I hope the powers to be are not taking the attitude that silence is a stamp of approval on the proposed project. Liz and I are out of state, recently saw your text and obviously have not had a great deal of time to respond.

I have read the response from Dave Kumpf and would join in his well-reasoned concerns. I trust restating the issues raised; water, traffic, light pollution, infrastructure, is not needed. I do not oppose the right of development, I moved into a new development 30 years ago when I would imagine people in the area raised similar concerns. I just hope that plans are not rubber stamped and that thorough evaluation of the impact and consequences occurs.

Ron Schreiber

941 Forest View Road

Monument, CO 80132

719-641-1358

ronaldkschreiber@hotmail.com

11. Chris:

Judy and I agree with the comments posted, and think that any development of lots at highway 105 and red rocks ranch rd. should be compatible with existing neighborhoods of Forest View, Red Rocks, and Sundance Estates.

Dennis Augustine augptg@outlook.com

12.

I feel Lisa Butler's comments on the proposed development are excellent, well stated and accurate on the salient points of concern. One of the newest developments on the east side of 105 is Pioneer Preserve and the lot size is 5 acres. The proposed development is adjacent to Red Rock Ranch and Forest View Estates each with 2 1/2 acres. Thank you for addressing our concerns to El Paso County. Lynn Gardner

Lynn Gardner

lynnieg7@gmail.com

13.

Chris,

First – thanks for your interest in the RRRU and keeping us informed.

Second – Laurie & I don't have any new ideas/info to add. But we feel the water issue is huge, impacts all

neighborhoods and has dramatic implications into the future. I believe this needs to be resolved before any earth is moved. I do not believe there is any interest from Palmer Lake or Monument to provide water to the surrounding neighborhoods. Not far behind is safety – the increased vehicle traffic and additional families with children changes the current dynamic of the area. Since we moved in four years ago the number of children has increased. We have noticed two things – the increase speed of young drivers driving in the residential area and the increase of children using the road (biking, playing ball, etc.). Again there needs to be a plan. The request to re-zone can't be ignored without a comprehensive plan & impact to the current homeowners. Lot size, the water shed and wildlife are also part of the issue

Thanks again

Jim Wolf

akwlfpc@gmail.com

14. Hi Chris,

We have to be concerned about how the value of our properties will be affected by smaller lots and probably lower valued homes. We have worked hard as I expect you have also , to acquire what we have and hate to see our wonderful community be degraded by smaller lots and houses. This will be detrimental on the value of all of our properties. We love our community and do not want to see it deteriorate and the values bottom out June and Ken Gray

Ps. The water situation has to be of great concern

juneisobel@comcast.net

15.

Chris. I share Lisa's concerns about proposed dense development at Hwy 105 and Red Rock Ranch Road. Traffic on 105 has become heavy as people divert off I-25 through Palmer Lake to Larkspur. Is there any way to appeal to County officials?

Carrie Bartell,
348 Forest View Road
carriebartell3@gmail.com

16. Chris,

Gary and I appreciate you collecting the concerns of the potential rezoning. We read folks input and agree with the comments. Dave Kump's email would be a ditto for us. And there's not much more to pile on. We certainly would want concerns addressed as we are hard pressed to understand how the infrastructure could support 37 homes in a sustainable way.

Liz and Gary Gipson
1lizgipson@gmail.com

17. Chris,

Yes--Kris and I are concerned about this development. We agree with the resident's previous comments. The water issue, the traffic, and of course, the amount of homes in the small area. Not sure if we will have any affect on the outcome (it seems like it is a "done" deal), but we do not want this to happen.

Thank you for representing our neighborhood!

Dennise and Kris Wilson

denniseloree@yahoo.com

18. Chris,

I think all the others have addressed our concerns. We are not in favor of this development. Our main concerns are lot size, traffic, and water. I think David summed it up nicely. Thanks for your efforts, and good luck. I really hope you can get the lot sizes up to at least 2.5 acres.

Drake and Charlotte Dennert

dennert257@gmail.com

19.

Following are two important factors that should lead to the rejection of this proposal:

1. Water: The dearth of water, as can clearly be seen by the vanished pond just across Red Rock Ranch Drive from the acreage in question, is a primary reason to deny permission to construct such relatively high density housing. As another surface example of how local aquifers are not being replenished, take a ride one exit south down I25 to the new Forest Lake development and notice how the large Bristlecone Pine Lake has lost much of its water.

From a personal experience, a couple of decades ago we were ready to build a house on our 3 acre lot in Forest View Estates. We had to wait several years to do so, as there was a moratorium on permits to hook up to the water line. I reckon that these days, water resources are much more limited. If so, isn't it prudent to preclude a development that is five times more dense?

2. Traffic: Rte 105 traffic is much heavier than even a couple of years ago. The road should have two lanes in each direction. The bottleneck at the intersection of 105 and Red Rock Ranch Drive would be intensified with the proposed increase of contiguous housing. It is surprising that serious accidents don't often occur as cars that are headed north on 105 try to turn left onto Red Rock Ranch Drive. Following cars often speed past on the right shoulder, even though there is no official lane for them, creating a dangerous situation.

So to summarize, water and traffic issues are the two main arguments against allowing this proposed development.

Thank you for your consideration,

David and Marie O'Donnell
davidmarieodonnell@comcast.net

20.

SECOND COMMENT: Thanks Lisa. Your comment is on point. The question is where to draw the line. I originally wrote something like "2.5 acre preferred, minimum of 1 acre" as a concession to that issue, but deleted it as the question is where to draw the line in negotiating. Chris or others might have more background in that area. Nevertheless, many of the lots to the east and northeast are larger; I think the lots in the recent development on the north side of 105, maybe 1/2 mile to the east, are 5 acre.

David Kumpf

dckumpf@yahoo.com

FIRST COMMENTS: Thanks Chris.

Sharon and I agree with the comments presented so far. Water is a serious concern; so is the density (well out of character for the immediate area), as well as the environmental impact. Traffic is also a problem. Two areas of specific comments, as follows:

Water. Forest View Acres Water District is, in our view, in no position to add 37 homes to its distribution network. There has been a history of mismanagement and lack of controls in this district, in our knowledge and experience. Just a few months ago, they had imposed water restrictions, and there were tanker trucks pulling up to refill the storage tank located next to our home on Red Rock Ranch Drive. Based on that and other history, we don't think that the District actually has a long-term water management plan that is realistic. Therefore, they should not be considered as a viable provider of water for the development. In fact, to paraphrase a movie quote, it seems as if the Forest View Acres Water District plan might be "if you build it, we'll go find water" - and it's unclear that there is any such water to be found, nor have they had enough to fulfill their existing commitments. (Note the Town of Palmer Lake's own challenges in this regard.)

Traffic. While I've not read the entire traffic report in detail, I've skimmed enough of it to be concerned. Much of that document - provided in PDF on the web link - has its images and maps obscured by the "DRAFT" watermark created in what was obviously Microsoft Word, rendering much of the document useless. Thus, it is unclear how traffic might enter/exist State Highway 105 or Red Rock Ranch Drive. Beyond that, the report recommends construction of a westbound left-turn lane from 105 onto southbound Red Rock Ranch Drive now, as well as a northbound Red Rock Ranch Dr to eastbound Hwy 105 acceleration/merge lane to be added now. Both make sense and must be implemented. However, the traffic report doesn't contain a single mention of the word "light" and that raises concerns. While we wouldn't necessarily advocate for installation of a traffic light at the intersection of Highway 105 and Red Rock Ranch Drive, there is a significant nighttime lighting problem at this intersection. That problem has existed for many years. There is also a grade issue that compounds the lighting problem.

Specifically, when a vehicle approaches Highway 105 northbound, intending to make a right-hand (eastbound) turn, the vehicle's headlights are pointing skyward because of the grade. The poor illumination means the driver consequently has no real view of the road surface, shoulder location, or lane location until the turn is mostly completed. Eventually, this will cause a serious accident at this intersection (if it hasn't already). Significantly upgrading the street lighting at the intersection will help. Re-grading the approach of Red Rock Ranch Dr to Hwy 105 would also help, and would address a second problem - that of poor traction during winter snow and ice on the grade. It's fine for 4WD or AWD vehicles but a hazard for 2WD (even FWD) vehicles.

Another implication is that if there is more traffic turning left from Hwy 105 onto Red Rock Ranch Drive, the ability to make a left-hand turn from Red Rock Ranch Dr to Hwy 105 westbound will become increasingly difficult - increasing the probability that traffic will stack on Red Rock Ranch Drive. It is unclear to me from the traffic report whether the upgrade of Red Rock Ranch Dr to "rural major collector standards" would offset this somewhat by including dedicated left-hand and right-hand turn lanes on northbound Red Rock Ranch drive.

A related consideration is that people turning left from Hwy 105 onto Red Rock Ranch Dr southbound often "cut the corner" into the northbound lane of Red Rock Ranch Drive.

Beyond those issues, it's hard to predict the likely impact of 37 addition units on the traffic flow on Red Rock Ranch Drive if the ingress/egress is from the Drive. Will we see stacking of traffic at the Red Rock Ranch Drive and Hwy 105 intersection? Almost certainly during construction, which could realistically be an period of two years. Longer term, it may be difficult to know.

Recommendations. Given these concerns, and those expressed by others, the following recommendations seem reasonable:

1. Require the developer to determine a viable source of water.
2. Address the traffic concerns by implementing the recommendations for turning lanes, acceleration/merge lanes, and adding new considerations for improvements to Red Rock Ranch Drive and lighting at the intersection of Hwy 105 and Red Rock Ranch Drive.
3. Reducing density to being more in character with the area, with recommended lot sizes of 2.5 acres.
4. Addressing all environmental impacts to minimize impact to the creek area.

As an aside, we have not received the adjacent owner notification letter. Judging by the mailing receipts in the PDF letter posted to the website, those notifications were sent only to immediately adjacent owners, not others that might be affected (namely, residents of FVE I, II, and III).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on this important issue.

Dave Kumpf

dckumpf@yahoo.com

21.

FIRST COMMENT: Dear Chris,

I fear we have little hope of stopping the rezoning (developers seem to have all the influence) but I do think we should call for an environmental impact investigation. I have put in 3 lawns in 20 years due to stringent water restrictions. There simply is not enough water to support the current residents. With climate change we have been warned that there will hotter weather and less water in the not so far future. If we can't guarantee water to the current residents, we can't support another 37 homes.

You say the lots will stretch to Monument Creek. When Dave Miller divided the lots up, he retained about 10 feet of land on our side of the creek. I am not sure of his reasons but it has meant that that stretch has stayed untouched and pristine. It is also a vital source of water for animals in the area. Tall fences would block the natural flow of animals to the creek. I know because they traverse my property to access it. I worry that home owners might not accept stewardship of that vital watershed. Will the pond and boggy areas be back filled to increase buildable lots? Will they divert water for ponds, watering yards, and their fertilizers degrade the water. etc. ? Will they pollute it with dumping toxic liquids like used oil? Laws alone can't prevent them from doing so, only fine them after the fact, if any one notices. I would think that Monument Creek is a vital part of the watershed of the area and provides runoff in case of flooding. How will the cities beyond us feel about the use of the land being changed and the water flow disrupted? Do they have a say?

Lastly, though our large lots sizes In Forest View are certainly a privilege, it has meant that the wild life and natural fauna are not crowded out. Two of my acres leading down to the creek are natural meadow. Such small lots would preclude any wild meadows filled with species we want to encourage. It would also affect the natural drainage and filtering of the water from that side of the creek.

The site below says we would get a letter of intent from the developer. I have received NO NOTIFICATION from any official source. Is that coming after the fact to preclude our action?

Feel free to share my letter with my permission.

Sincerely, Lisa Butler

lisa.butler5@comcast.net

SECOND COMMENT: Me again,

One last thought. I think if we push for 2.5 acre lots, as much as we would like to see that, it may be perceived as elitism, just trying to extend our neighborhood and view. I think the number of lots should be decreased but allowances for some more affordable housing must be part of the solution. I think it is more vital that we stress the environmental impact, protecting the waterway, pond, and wetlands to preserve the flood plain and the wild life corridor, the water considerations, and traffic implications.

By the way, a 10 acre lot on the other side of Dave and Bev Miller's is up for sale for \$450,000. Is the impact of that being factored in? It must be very narrow as there are houses on either side and it extends from 105 to Monument Creek also. Has zoning been changed for that lot? Will it be allowed to be divided up by the new owner?

Just some thoughts for consideration.

Lisa
Lisa Butler lisa.butler5@comcast.net

22. Chris,

I am also concerned about the development and I agree with David's comments below. Much more info is needed

Dee Dee Eaton
deedeeaton@comcast.net

23.

Of course we object for the reasons I have read and others.. Would you give me a call? Let's see what else we can do and by when it has to be done.

Ron and Linda Voss

719-651-1705

Voss, Ron ron.voss@theoneilgroupco.com

24. Thank you Chris,

Denise and I are also concerned with this development. David addressed our three primary concerns, water, traffic and density very precisely. These three items are major issues that will negatively impact our community if they are not properly addressed.

Bob Lapham
rjlapham@msn.com

25.

I would vote against this new development.... for all the reasons you listed!!!!

Karen Jones
ksjones1975@gmail.com

26.

Dear Chris

Thanks so much for raising awareness about this project. My first knee jerk reaction was heck no. Lisa makes great points. I too am concerned the developers will have their way, and to me, the absolute worst case scenario would be a get rich quick, poorly designed development with cookie cutter large houses on small lots with privacy fences and our wildlife corridor and natural beauty of the creek geography destroyed or compromised to say nothing about our views. I did not see a development plan on the site. That said, in my experience, I feel the need to come to this discussion with an idea for a solution in the spirit of compromise. So I looked at this problem as an opportunity for excellence that could be a win for the developer, our community and future residents of Red Rock Acres. I realize this is more than you asked for or want. However I feel the need to offer the ideas below in an effort for us to think about acceptable alternatives in hopes the developer cares at all. I included a rough sketch as an idea of what a site plan of this area could look like as well as pics of similar communities.

So — here goes:

Build A High End Pocket Neighborhood

This idea is for certain types of buyers willing “to sign up for” the responsibility of participating and supporting a certain, community-conscious lifestyle.

Benefits for New Residents

Attracts a diverse community of families, seniors & singles who are looking to participate & contribute to an active, outdoor-oriented lifestyle in a community that fosters care for our environment while enjoying security, privacy and independence.

Benefits for surrounding Communities

Spaces & homes that are beautiful, unobtrusive & blends & not blights the unparalleled beauty of Palmer Lake while keeping our wildlife protected

Benefits to developer

An opportunity to be conscientious and discerning & creative by building a community with soul that is green, award-winning & built for people with varied lifestyles. It needs to be a development that is as unique as the land on which it rests.

The Land

- preserve all 22 acres of the land currently listed as a flood zone but improve it by adding trails, a playground, a dog park, greenhouse for community gardening etc. Call it a preserve so our wildlife is protected and has enough room to prosper
- Make the preserve accessible to “members only” outside the community so it doesn’t get crowded. Personally I would be the first to sign up & have no problem paying an annual fee to use it.

- Because overall buildable acreage would be reduced because of the preserve, use the 5 acres on the north side to build small homes on 1/4 acre & tuck in a few well-designed 800-1000 sf houses on 1/8 acre for singles or healthy seniors who want to downsize & might be lonely & can participate in a community such as this. No garages but community parking area (see sketch below).
- The remaining 9+ acres on the south side could be used for 1/2 acre sites w similar homes but are slightly bigger with garages accessible by alleys in the back of the houses yet still have the pedestrian walkways & front porches in front.
- additional perk is to build a Community Center and maybe a pool that backs up to the preserve

Features of Houses

- High end, natural materials (stone, wood, metal, slate roofs)
- High attention to detail
- One-story but high enough ceilings to provide psychological breathing space (17 ft) that could accommodate loft spaces)
- Houses are not big & range in size from 1-3 bdrms and at least 4 styles
- Build on 4' crawl spaces for storage etc (no basements)
- Deep front porches that welcome impromptu chats & gathering — pedestrian walkways not streets
- no privacy fencing bordering the lots
- xeriscape gardens

References:

“Creating the Not So Big House”, by Susan Susanka

“Creating the Inspired House”, by John Connell

“A Pattern Language”, by Christopher Alexander, Sara Ishikawa & Murray Silverstein

Thanks for your time and consideration

Marea Yoswa

591 Forest View Way

303-246-8338

marea16@msn.com

27. Chris,

Thanks for taking the lead on this. Here are our concerns:

1. Demand on the water supply that seems already stressed (from what I've read in local paper). As

someone else commented, consumption/demand would raise at the same time that all signs point towards forest fire seasons continuing to worsen.

2. Infrastructure demands: there have already been 2 significant breaks in this general area in the last months (one up in RRR, the other on our street in FVE). Will infrastructure be updated/reinforced or is it just going to age faster?

3. Demand on the septic systems. Is there capacity? Is the infrastructure capable?

4. As I saw in NJ during my youth, as farmers sold to developers, thousands of houses went up along county and farm roads that were never designed to handle the traffic. At what point will the added density of homes cause excessive traffic and road "wear and tear" on 105?

Good luck!

Dave & Cynthia Bickerstaff

dave.bickerstaff.f16@gmail.com

28. Chris,

awfully good of you to act as focal point for this issue. Does anyone know if the Millers just sold the pasture or their house [Pickwick house] too.

While we on this side of RR Drive get our water from the town, the addition of 35 homes on that corner would impact us significantly as far as traffic, infrastructure, fire protection, law enforcement and drainage/flooding issues in the Monument creek drainage. For this reason I think it is important that the County know there is going to be significant interest from the HOA and probably from Palmer Lake Council.

Let me know what you think, and of course if I can assist in any way.

Bob

Robert Tramaloni tramalonir@gmail.com

29.

Lisa makes excellent points and I agree with all of them! Especially where is all this water supposed to come from? We don't have enough for the population density we currently have! I also think 1/2 acre lots are out of character for the area and it would definitely impact the wildlife...

Kristin Woestehoff

kgwoestehoff@comcast.net

30. Hi Chris,

Mike Brennan here. I won't give much input, due to conflict of interest, as Rhonda represented Ryan Nevins on the sale of that property to Jim Stiltner, MasterBilt Homes. As you know, although semi retired, I am a developer & builder as well. The acreage on the two parcels Jim purchased totals 52. As you say, at

max density of 37 lots for that zone, that comes out to a density of a home on every 1.4 acres. I would recommend you pull up properties just to the east & south of the aforementioned parcels on the EPC Assessor site. The community named Clover Hoof Estates has primarily .5 to 1 ac lots. This subdivision was developed back in the 70's/80's, & is serviced by FVAWD & septic systems. Furthermore, the Spanish looking building, on Rockbrook Rd, just adjacent to the east, is a duplex, two units on one lot. With the above said, I would request, & expect, the facts & truth of this development be included in your final comments for RRRU submittal. I could go into more details regarding the Nevins family owning & developing the FVAWD, exclusively for the development of the surrounding property. Also know that Dave Miller, thru precedent set by the Nevins, could of very likely got approved, & developed, FVE at the. 5 to 1 acre density. Just wanted to share. Please confirm receipt with a reply.

Thank you! MB

michael@mountaindesertgroup.com

31. Hi Chris,

I already wrote a letter regarding the development although, here are my concerns.

1. Impact to wildlife as this piece of land is a thoroughfare and source of water.
2. Very dangerous turn off from a two lane way road which will be even more dangerous in our severe winter weather.
3. Increased traffic in general.
4. Water usage issues and shortage of. Compounding a chronic problem.
5. Parcel size is not conducive to plot or surrounding neighborhoods. This development compromises the tone, aesthetics and natural environment of the area.

Thank you,
Cathy Wilcox
cfishwil@icloud.com

