

Ashlyn Mathy

From: Jinger Guigley <jguigley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 10:17 PM
To: Ashlyn Mathy
Cc: Michael Shannon2
Subject: Monument Glamping: File AL2321. Parcel:7127001011

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.

Ashlyn,

My name is Jinger Guigley of 2755 Spaatz Rd, Monument. This letter is in opposition to the notice received by neighboring homes of Monument Glamping and their submission for a modification to the structures on their sites.

Previously I was in approval of the glamping tents on the property at 16315 Rickenbacker Avenue. I even attended their open house in May of 2023. Having toured the property I found the campsites were well kept and a really neat way for others to enjoy our neighborhood. I was supportive.

I started to gain a concern when statements Mr Jeub was making about his operation didn't align with the county code nor was it accurate with my own personal experience attempting to rent a tiny home on our property in this same neighborhood. I will try to keep this brief but still cover a lot of ground as to why this special use modification should not be approved. There are many reasons other neighbors will express their disapproval (which I also support) but I will focus my opposition on the deceit and disrespect to the residents in our neighborhood. This behavior should not be rewarded by approving this submission for the special use permit modification. I will outline several points below to support my statement of how Monument Glamping has been presenting its operations as approved and allowed uses when it is not.

1. Monument Glamping received their special use approval from trusting neighbors in July 2022 who were given the impression that there would be small tents around the property and nothing more. These neighbors had strong opposition but decided that a few tents would be acceptable to keep peace in the neighborhood and avoid a large scale battle. To see the operation pushing the limits beyond the current special use permit is disrespectful. They were given an inch and are taing a mile.

2. Container homes:

a. The container homes were not part of the initial approval as rental units and were to be removed, however a unit has remained on the property and is being rented as part of the business. It is also advertised on their website for rent. The Jeubs knowingly rent this unit as a direct violation of the code and have been for years. I find this to be slap in the face to the county and to the neighbors who gave their approval for the use of tents only.

b. In their letter of intent, the Jeubs state : *The shipping container is a temporary unit and not intended to be a part of this special use application. This unit is planned to be a part of a separate application for a second glamping property. We ask Code Enforcement to allow the container to remain in its current location until a new suitable site for it is approved in the second application to prevent having to move it twice.*

Firstly, how many years does "temporary" include, as it has already been several? Secondly, do not be mis-led that rentals for the container will discontinue during its "unintended" stay. Expect that it will remain part of business operations until it leaves the property. Thirdly, the other glamping property they speak of in which to move the container has been in operation for years, the container could have moved anytime since July of 2022 when at that time it was deemed not part of the special use approval and a code violation. Deceitful.

3. Chris Jeub has shared with us that he will continue to operate in code violation until he is told he is shut down. This is a blatant act of disrespect to those who live around him, who he knows have expressed opposition to what he is doing - this is a slap in the face. The county should also recognize they are being disregarded as an authority who is meant to protect everyone's rights. This mentality should not be awarded with additional approvals.

4. In their letter of intent, the Jeubs state : *The special use will be in harmony with the character of the neighborhood.* There is nothing else like their operation in the neighborhood to harmonize with, this statement is fluffy and false. There are few neighbors who will agree that there is harmony with the current special use of Monument Glamping as it stands today. Misleading.

5. Monument Glamping on YouTube: My husband has shared with Mike Shannon several episodes of Chris Jeub "The Glamping Guy" that appear on YouTube. The episodes were shared with Mr Shannon to make the county aware of the slander and misinformation regarding county employees Mr Jeub had interacted with, the code violations he was facing and also approvals. There were many false statements that were made on this public platform that contradicted information we had received from county resources. The image that was portrayed to gain a following and support of Monument Glamping was deceitful. I have detailed the inconsistencies in an email copied below that was shared with Mike Shannon on June 5, 2023. Deceitful.

6. Tiny House:

a. Mr Jeub had reached out to me at the time he was looking to buy the Rv/Tiny House. He was very informed and aware at this time that this was not allowed in our neighborhood based upon my personal experience. I reminded him that the unit is not allowed. His response was that he was either going to flip it or place it on another property. At that time I had a gut feeling that he did not want his true intentions for the RV/Tiny House known, and as it turns out the unit sits on his property today and is being rented regularly in violation. Deceitful. I have an email below that I had sent to Mike Shannon with full detail of the conversation and supporting detail.

b. Mr. Jeub told me at the open house for Monument Glamping in May of 2023 that he didn't have approval for the tiny house. I found it alarming that he would continue to advertise the unit as a rentable space disregarding the neighbors concerns and his awareness it was a code violation. This unit was the key feature of the open house - it is where the food, drink and s'mores were placed to prompt tours of the unit. All without approval, but being presented as if approved. Deceitful.

c. In addition, the Open House had support from the Tri-Lakes Chamber of Commerce who were misled that this was a legal operation. They promoted Monument Glamping as it was presented to them by the Jeubs. This is deceitful - to have the local Chamber back a business and share it with the Tri-Lakes Community as an acceptable operation, an allowable use.

7. Using ourselves as an example, my husband and I had a tiny home purchased and placed on our property a few years ago, about the time the Jeubs were submitting for their Special Use approval for the tents. We became aware that renting the RV/tiny house was not an allowed use in our neighborhood and that we had upset some neighbors with its arrival. We went thru the process with county on our options and gained a comprehensive knowledge of the code regarding Rvs/TinyHouses/ADU's etc. We even asked if we could use the RV/Tiny house in the same manner the Jeubs were with their tents as recreational camp - the county said no. No is no for everyone. We sold the tiny house out of respect for our neighbors and to express that monetary gain was not a priority over our friendships and maintaining the Pine Hills area in a way that everyone could appreciate. We expect the same courtesy from other residents that we have shown. We are disappointed that the Jeub family is not willing to conduct themselves in the same manner.

8. Monument Glamping is not an asset to the neighborhood, the residents do not want it to increase any more than they have reluctantly already allowed.

9. In their Letter of Intent the Jeubs state: *The proposed modification will not change the occupancy of our glamping units, so traffic will remain the same.* To this I would call out that there is not one reason in the Letter of Intent that expresses the benefit to the neighborhood or the surrounding areas by allowing their requested modification from tents to structures. The underlying reason this is being requested is so Monument Glamping can charge a higher rate for a nightly stay in a "unique structure". Monument Glamping was once estimated to produce a healthy revenue of \$150,000 / year (stated by Chris Jeub). Considering the disruption this business has caused among our neighborhood and the stress on relationships and friendships among us, it begs the question - what is the cost to the rest of us for another's monetary gain?

Chris Jeub may argue that my opposition comes from jealousy "that he was approved and I was not". (another false accusation since he is not approved for his tiny house) I hope the above proves that is not the case and that there is much more at stake for this neighborhood than his monetary gain. In closing when will they be forced to stop violating code? Codes are in place for the safety and wellness of residents as well as maintaining property values for everyone. I am just blown away that they have the nerve to operate beyond what they were approved for and to present it to the public as sunshine and rainbows.

Thank you for your time. I hope you take this information seriously in making the decision to not approve the modification to the special use permit.

Jinger Guigley

Email to Mike Shannon 6/5/23:

Hello Mike,

My husband Chris Guigley has been conversing with you about the property on Rickenbacher that has the glamping operation. He also mentioned anything we share would be anonymous, and I have some things I'd like to share that I think the Planning Commission should know.

Back when we had received our tiny house notice of violation, we befriended the Jeub family because we thought they had experience working with the Planning Commission and could be knowledgeable, we even wrote a letter of support for their Special Use permit with the understanding they were offering an upscale camping experience. In the past year we have come to understand that they are not the resource we had thought they were. This is why we have had a change of mind and no longer support this property use.

We first received our notice in early December of 2021 for violation of the tiny house we had purchased, since that time The Jeubs have known that tiny houses are not allowed in RR5 under and permit or use, only by means of a variance approval. They were very aware of our situation and that a second dwelling of any nature for rent is not allowed. This includes RV's (which our tiny house was titled), campers, tiny homes, mobile homes etc. Mr. Jeub recently reached out to me to say he was thinking of buying a tiny house and how much I thought the one sitting on his property today might cost. I questioned him on approval for the tiny house on his property and re-iterated all the facts from our violation, his response was that he was buying it to store at another property and was going to flip it. This was not the case. and the tiny house arrived at the Rickenbacher glamping site.

I explained to him that we questioned how we could keep and use the tiny house we had purchased in our Early Meeting with the County. We discussed the Special Use Permit for a Recreational Camp as Mr Jeub was pursuing and we were told No on the tiny house. I discussed it in length and his response was "I don't know why I can and you can't". I flat out told him if he was allowed that "would be a swift kick in the nuts to us". We later found out he was not approved or allowed for the tiny house, although he was presenting it that way.

As a good neighbor we did remove our "tiny home/rv/mobile home" from our property because we didn't want to upset our neighbors and cause issues. This is why we want to remain anonymous in an effort to stay friends with those who live near and around us but still share our concerns with you.

A few notes on the video link of "The Glamping Guy" my husband sent you yesterday morning. These are specific to what he says in his video.

- he is standing in front of a container home, this is not on the Rickenbacher property. There is another property with several tiny homes and container homes they are renting out. I'm not exact of the location of that property but it is wooded and "under the radar". He is also aware that container homes are not allowed on either parcel.
- a container home however still resides and is rented on the Rickenbacher property. He told us previously it was to be removed
- he refers to his business as "glamping" several times in the video
- definition of glamping: Glamping is a portmanteau of "glamorous" and "camping", and describes a style of camping with amenities and, in some cases, resort-style services not usually associated with "traditional" camping.
- tiny houses are not glamping
- He refers to the tiny house as an Rv - also not allowed in RR5

- Rvs are not glamping per definition
- Playing dumb and operating under false pretense is not a pass to continue operating
- He states the Rv is an upgrade to the neighborhood, this is merely his own opinion
- We are not in living in the "country", we are in a neighborhood called Pine Hills
- we also pursued the EPCO master plan as an allowed use for our tiny home but the Master plan is not yet in affect

A new video was posted 10 hrs ago stating he had a meeting with the Planners. Would you please share with us what the actual results of the meeting were and what the path is moving forward?

Link below:

<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=9KIVqeFS-ac&pp=QAFIAQ%3D%3D>