

Rad Dickson

From: Maria Wilson <maria@day-off.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 2:20 PM
To: Rad Dickson
Subject: Re: Haddock project

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.

Yes please... thank you so much

On Thu, Dec 10, 2020, 1:45 PM Rad Dickson <RadDickson@elpasoco.com> wrote:

Would you like me to post this to EDARP as well?

From: Maria Wilson <maria@day-off.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 12:52 PM
To: Rad Dickson <RadDickson@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Haddock project

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 Mr. Dickson,

I'd like to take this opportunity to rebutt Mr. Stokka and the LUC's input regarding the Haddock project, dated Dec 8th, 2020 and filed with the County. I have counter argued each point he makes in his analysis. Please be sure to forward to the Planners and Commissioners. Thank you.

1) The Black Forest Preservation Plan does NOT state that "commercial SHOULD be limited to a quarter mile surrounding the two commercial nodes". It simply recognizes that they do, there is no mandate anywhere in the Black Forest Preservation Plan . Under "Estimated Commercial Demand", page 51, last paragraph, it states "All commercially zoned property associated with either center IS located within one quarter mile of the respective intersections". The is no "shall be" "must be" "will be" in the BFPP.

2)...

A) none of it is true if they fill the buildings with employees. One must take into account the space accommodation, not the word of a man who builds a total of 12,300 sq ft of structures and claims there will be an average of 20-25 employees at any given time but also said the barn like structure would be "a fancy goat barn". Mr. Haddock has not been forthcoming and truthful so far and I have no reason to trust anything he says.

B) The forest residents would never allow a Kum n Go in our forest and actually, the only way possible for a Kum n Go to enter the forest would be if Mr. Haddock gets his rezoning approved then turns around and sells it to them. No CC zoning for Mr. Haddock, no possibility of a Kum n Go here. Will Mr. Haddock guarantee he will NEVER sell that property to Kum n Go or any other company who may fill the buildings with employees? Doubtful...

C) Mr. Stokka's reference to the barn being "all alone on a lot, starkly standing out" is not only incorrect but it conjures up concern for Mr. Stokka's eyes and their inability to see the house sitting right next to the barn.

D) Mr. Stokka's comment about the footprint of the building being 4400 sq ft is wildly misleading. I don't think the people of the forest care to know the square footage of a box with a view from above. What they want to know is usable finished space and that happens to be 8800 sq.ft. That building can easily fit 60 people and that's not even taking the 3500 sq ft structure into account. Both buildings amount to 12,300 sq ft.. That's a lot of bodies. Bodies that will cause traffic and interruptions to our way of life.

With these considerations in mind, I can't imagine what it is that has stricken Mr. Stokka with not just approval but downright enthusiasm for a project that as "keeper of the forest", knows well does not belong here.