

May 18, 2021

Gary L. Beierle
8450 Poco Road
Colorado Springs, CO 80908

Kari Parsons, El Paso County Planning Commission
Commissioners: Stan VanderWerf, Cami Bremer
Longinos Gonzalez Jr., Holly Williams, Carrie Geitner

garyb4lee@hotmail.com
ph. (719) 661-5104

Re: Project: Homestead North
File #: P-20-005
Parcel No. : 52280-00-030

El Paso County Commissioners and Planning Commission members,

This request for rezoning does not meet approval criteria.

It is not okay for the developer and County to state falsehoods and deem them as facts.

Specifically, under Policy Plan Analysis, Policy 6.1.3, Policy 6.1.11 and Policy 6.2.1 are stating this development complies with and considers the impact of this zone change on the integrity of existing neighborhoods.

It does not. It is exactly the opposite. Because the developer and County say it's so, it does not make those false statements a reality.

Our property adjoins this parcel on the northwest corner. We have lived here for the past 43 years. We and the vast majority of every adjoining, adjacent and nearby homeowners are adamantly opposed to this density increase in our neighborhood.

I presented a petition signed by 29 adjoining, adjacent and nearby neighbors that were opposed to 'The Retreat' PUD rezone to the north of this parcel. The Planning Commission heard our concerns and voted 7-0 to deny the request. The County Commissioners paid little heed and voted to allow leapfrogging urban density into the middle of RR-5 zoning. Lots on the east side of the Retreat are an even higher density than what is shown adjoining on the Sterling Ranch Sketch Plan.

It's understood that developers have a right to purchase land and develop it, but it must be done to integrate and be compatible with adjoining properties.

The Letter of Intent misstates zoning is PUD to the east. The Executive Summary clarifies zoning is RR-5 to the north, west and east.

The Letter of Intent states: 'compatibility is defined as a state in which two things are able to exist or occur together without problems or conflict'. There are problems and conflict here. Our property adjoins this parcel at the northwest corner, and I'm vehemently opposed to urban density adjoining our RR-5 zoned property. We did not move this far away from the City 43 years ago to have urban density dumped on our back doorstep. How would you like to have a 12-fold density increase on the other side of your street? Traffic, safety, crime, and infrastructure that already cannot handle the density.

The Letter of Intent; Water Master Plan, Policy 6.0.11 – "Continue to limit urban development to those areas served by centralized utilities". Does everyone realize all the water for all of Sterling Ranch is from groundwater? A non-renewable resource that is guaranteed to be depleted in the future. The Executive Summary shows a water supply deficit of 1,143 Acre Feet by year 2060. Additional statements in the Letter of Intent: "additional priority is to acquire and invest in additional renewable water supplies. Future supply has been contracted for and implementation is under way". "Sterling wastewater is discharged in the Meridian System which in turn has potential to convert some reusable flows for available physical supplies."

What a wish and a prayer that all good things are going to happen, and everyone just accepts it.

Wildlife Report on the Executive Summary states "low wildlife impact potential", and Letter of Intent states rodents and deer have been viewed, potential is possible but "unlikely to be impacted by the project". My observation of 43 years is deer do not frequent this area, antelope thrived, but they've been pretty much eliminated by the development that's been allowed. There's another dead antelope on the side of the road about every other week, because of all the traffic from increased development. Coyotes used to take care of the carrion, but they've been eliminated also.

Again, more cherry-picked verbiage to distort reality and the truth. This entire process is like dealing with a school of pirhanas. The developers and County just keep nibbling away until there's nothing left. It appears it's okay to present false facts as reality. This is nothing but a pony show pretending to show concern for homeowners' rights.

We do not want urban density in our backyard and along the corridor entering Black Forest.

Neighborly cooperation requires compromise on both sides. Neither side wins, both sides must give a little. I feel a reasonable compromise would be 2.5 acre parcels all the way up Vollmer Road from proposed Briargate Parkway up to Poco Road and continue 2.5 acre lots along new Poco Road east to Sand Creek, with no additional traffic interconnections to Poco Road until east of Sand Creek. Lots adjoining these 2.5 acre lots should be 1 acre lots and then gradually increase in density farther east.

The Sterling Ranch Sketch is just that. It is a conceptual sketch. We homeowners have a right to expect future developments to be compatible with our neighborhoods and adjoining properties. As proposed, this rezoning request does not.

The approval criteria stated on the Executive Summary states this to be in general conformance with the Master Plan, or there's been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood since it was last zoned, and that its compatible with existing landowners in all directions. Again, this urban density next to existing RR-5 zoning is overwhelmingly opposed by surrounding and nearby landowners.

We request consideration and compromise as stated earlier for 2.5-acre sites, etc., along Vollmer Road and new Poco Road east to Sand Creek. If this can be achieved on this go-around, fine, otherwise this request for rezoning should be denied.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,



Gary L. Beierle