

**From:** [ljnewpers@aol.com](mailto:ljnewpers@aol.com) <[ljnewpers@aol.com](mailto:ljnewpers@aol.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 13, 2020 12:20 PM

**To:** Nina Ruiz <[NinaRuiz@elpasoco.com](mailto:NinaRuiz@elpasoco.com)>

**Subject:** Grandwood Ranch

**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.**

---

Dear Ms. Ruiz:

You are a gem! Thank you so much for the information you passed on. I can only fault myself for being completely oblivious to the plans for Grandwood. If I was sent previous notices regarding this proposed construction I likely did not receive it or ignored it. My last two and a half years have been hell. Lying in a hospital or recovery center, or even in my bed at home, it would be easy to overlook a particular notice. June 20, 2018 I had radical reconstruction foot surgery -- which failed despite months of painful attempts at physical therapy. As soon as I could move, we escaped to attempt better recovery at our house in Mexico. Still not able to walk, on return to Colorado, I had a second, more radical surgery; with long recuperation and, unfortunately similar failed results, and another escape to enjoy my pain in Mexico. This year we only returned to our house here late July, and the letter dated September 9, 2020 was the first I heard of the plans. And if I did receive the notice soon after that date, I likely put it in the pile "To be looked at when I can." The day of our conversation was the first time I saw the notice. Your guidance led me to all the information regarding Grandwood, including all the letters of protest, the many, many, requests for deviation, the maps, etc. I DO have several concerns I'd like put in the record, and I'll try to get them in intelligible order today. I do hope that will not be too late for submission. If so, please call at 719-488-2771, or email at [ljnewpers@aol.com](mailto:ljnewpers@aol.com). I wish I could do a Seinfeld routine in front of the Board, as this entire proposal is a comedy of deviance's changes to rules and regulations throughout. With the exception that it is not at all funny. There are many issues I hope are addressed before any work is OK'd.

Thank You Sincerely, Lawrence (Larry) Johnson

From: [ljnewpers@aol.com](mailto:ljnewpers@aol.com) <[ljnewpers@aol.com](mailto:ljnewpers@aol.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 10:10 PM

To: Nina Ruiz <[NinaRuiz@elpasoco.com](mailto:NinaRuiz@elpasoco.com)>

Subject: Grandwood Ranch

**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.**

---

Date: October 13, 2020

To: Nina Ruiz, Planning and Community Development Department

To: El Paso Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners

Re: Comments on Grandwood Ranch proposed development

---

From: Lawrence Johnson

A quick background on my experience:

Double major, Geology and Geography, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs  
Extensive experience in Forestry and Environmental Sciences

Reading through all the information and charts submitted for Grandwood Ranch, my first impression is: Why would a thoughtful Board of Commissioners succumb to so many amendments, exceptions, and deviations? I understand construction of homes will eventually envelop this entire area, however very careful thought should be our (your) mantra in how the land is treated. Two active wetlands are inside the proposed development area. It seems the plans consider the wetlands quite well, however the USGS topo map of the area indicates intermittent water entering both wetlands from the north. As sited on the submitted proposal, there is not sufficient attention to allowing their free flow during periods of rainfall. As well, even the compaction of road construction definitely will have an impact on free flow of highly important subterranean water flow.

Throughout the proposal, reference is made to eastbound traffic toward the Furrow Rd/Higby Rd intersection bound to 35 mph. True, however, the truth is, once past the 35 mph at the Higby Rd/ Jackson Creek Parkway intersection, at Bowstring Drive the signage allows 45 mph until about 300 ft. past the Higby Rd/Fairplay Drive intersection, and on a downgrade with one rise just high enough to briefly block good visibility of a proposed Furrow Rd intersection. The stated 1,302 ft. sight distance described by Grandwood Developers is only partly true. And who slows down, braking, when you are just using momentum to go up the on-coming rise? Please be certain this entire down and upslope are well sand/salt cared for in winter conditions. Westbound Higby Rd traffic coming out of the woods toward Furrow Rd will be a dangerous time to be braking hard to avoid an entering vehicle.

I believe the Higby Rd/Furrow Rd intersection is just constructing a crash site. The Higby Rd/Fairplay Dr intersection has proven the dangers along this road. We have witnessed many more crashes there than I could document, including one where a female Gazette photographer coming to our house did not see the on-coming car from the east until too late.

Lost track of where I read it, but it was worded "The applicant will dedicate ROW for westbound right turn and left turn lanes (with length adjusted for the downgrade) on Higby Rd if needed in the future".

Question: How many crashes with potential lives lost does it take to show need? Why not make that construction part of the Commissioners' decision?

"Challenging topography and existing intersections along Higby Rd prevent access spacing from meeting County requirements for intersection spacing and sight distance". This is on pg.3 PCD File No. SP-195, **Cul-de-sac Length Deviation**. The regulations were drawn up with thought for public safety, and must not be tossed lightly aside for the good of the developer. To quote, "The deviation must not be detrimental to public safety", and "Not based on financial considerations" (for the developer).

**SPEED AND TRAFFIC** Yes, speed on Higby Rd east of Bowstring until about 300 ft. east of Fairplay Dr. is signed for 45 mph, but that is taken as a suggestion by far too many drivers. Due to topographical features and increasing traffic, Higby Rd is increasingly dangerous. The stated increase in traffic will only multiply that danger. It is my opinion the County must take quick measures to rebuild Higby Rd in anticipation, rather than wait until it becomes a bloody mess to thread through construction traffic. Example: **The Gap** And on the subject of construction, submitted traffic estimates neatly skirt the increase of construction traffic, much of which could be heavy, slower moving vehicles (concrete trucks, asphalt trucks, large loads of building materials, etc.).

My observations mainly were concerned with the western portion of the proposed Grandwood Ranch, however I did observe the entire area and could continue with concerns, but I believe I've made enough points. However, as I stated in a note to Nina Ruiz, Planning and Community Development Department, I almost wish I could do a Seinfeld routine in front of The Board, as so much of the proposal is a comedy of deviance's, changes to rules and regulations throughout.

Sincerely,  
Lawrence Johnson  
Phone 719-488-2771 email [ljnewpers@aol.com](mailto:ljnewpers@aol.com)

**From:** [ljnewpers@aol.com](mailto:ljnewpers@aol.com) <[ljnewpers@aol.com](mailto:ljnewpers@aol.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 14, 2020 11:18 AM  
**To:** Nina Ruiz <[NinaRuiz@elpasoco.com](mailto:NinaRuiz@elpasoco.com)>  
**Subject:** Grandwood Ranch

**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.**

---

Dear Nina;

I only realized this morning I sent my material in mini-print. I apologize, and hope it's still readable. One correction and one further comment, if I may.

The last sentence in the first paragraph should read: " sub surface water" and not "subterranean water."

Question: Has the developer had up-to-date water depth tests in this period of extensive drought? I would be surprised if the average depth to adequate water of about 20 ft. had not moved down somewhat; especially on the higher ground close to Higby Rd. F2 10, F2 11, F1 16, F1 17

Thank You again for your assistance.

Lawrence Johnson