PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

TO: **El Paso County Planning Commission**
Thomas Bailey, Chair

FROM: **Kylie Bagley, Principal Planner**
Bret Dilts, P.E., Senior Engineer
Meggan Herington, AICP, Executive Director

RE: **Project File Number: SP241**
Project Name: Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan
Parcel Numbers: 712201014, 7102200013, 7102200008, 7102200010, 7102200006, and 7102201001

OWNER:	REPRESENTATIVE:
Monument Ridge East LLC 5055 List Drive Colorado Springs, CO 80919	Vertex Consulting Services 455 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 101 Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Commissioner District: 1

Planning Commission Hearing Date:	**11/21/2024**
Board of County Commissioners Hearing Date:	**12/12/2024**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A request by Vertex Consulting Services for approval of a 59.48-acre Preliminary Plan creating 37 single-family lots and 21 multi-family lots. The property is currently zoned PUD (Planned Unit Development), C-1 (Commercial), CS (Commercial Service), CC (Commercial Community), and RS-20000 (Residential Suburban). A concurrent rezoning to RS-6000 and RM-12 is also proposed. The property is located directly southeast of the intersection of Interstate 25 and County Line Road, southwest of the intersection of County Line Road and Doewood Drive and a half a mile north of the intersection of Monument Hill Road and Misty Acres Boulevard.

Vicinity Map

A. WAIVERS AND AUTHORIZATION

Waiver(s): There are no Waivers associated with this request.

Authorization to Sign: There are no items requiring signature associated with this request.

A. APPROVAL CRITERIA

In approving a Preliminary Plan, Section 7.2.1.D.2 of the El Paso County Land Development Code (As Amended) states the BoCC shall find that:

- The proposed subdivision is in general conformance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Master Plan;
- The subdivision is consistent with the purposes of this Code;
- The subdivision is in conformance with the subdivision design standards and any approved Sketch Plan;
- A sufficient water supply has been acquired in terms of quantity, quality, and dependability for the type of subdivision proposed, as determined in accordance with the standards set forth in the water supply standards [C.R.S. §30-28-133(6)(a)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of this Code;
- A public sewage disposal system has been established and, if other methods of sewage disposal are proposed, the system complies with state and local laws and regulations, [C.R.S. §30-28-133(6) (b)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of this Code;
- All areas of the proposed subdivision, which may involve soil or topographical conditions presenting hazards or requiring special precautions, have been identified and the proposed subdivision is compatible with such conditions. [C.R.S. §30-28-133(6)(c)];
- Adequate drainage improvements complying with State law [C.R.S. §30-28-133(3)(c)(VIII)] and the requirements of this Code and the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) are provided by the design;
- The location and design of the public improvements proposed in connection with the subdivision are adequate to serve the needs and mitigate the effects of the development;
- Legal and physical access is or will be provided to all parcels by public rights-of-way or recorded easement, acceptable to the County in compliance with this Code and the ECM;
- The proposed subdivision has established an adequate level of compatibility by
    - (1) incorporating natural physical features into the design and providing sufficient open spaces considering the type and intensity of the subdivision;

- (2) incorporating site planning techniques to foster the implementation of the County's plans, and encourage a land use pattern to support a balanced transportation system, including auto, bike and pedestrian traffic, public or mass transit if appropriate, and the cost effective delivery of other services consistent with adopted plans, policies and regulations of the County;
- (3) incorporating physical design features in the subdivision to provide a transition between the subdivision and adjacent land uses;
- (4) incorporating identified environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to, wetlands and wildlife corridors, into the design; and
- (5) incorporating public facilities or infrastructure, or provisions therefore, reasonably related to the proposed subdivision so the proposed subdivision will not negatively impact the levels of service of County services and facilities;

- Necessary services, including police and fire protection, recreation, utilities, open space and transportation system, are or will be available to serve the proposed subdivision;
- The subdivision provides evidence to show that the proposed methods for fire protection comply with Chapter 6 of this Code; and
- The proposed subdivision meets other applicable sections of Chapter 6 and 8 of the Code.

B. LOCATION

North:	Douglas County	Vacant Land
South:	C-1 (Commercial)	Single-Family Residential
East:	RS-20000 (Residential Suburban)	Single-Family Residential
West:	C-1 (Commercial)	Vacant Land

C. BACKGROUND

Please see the staff reports associated with PCD File No. P245 and P246 for background information regarding the project.

D. ANALYSIS

1. Land Development Code and Zoning Compliance

The applicant is proposing a 59.48-acre Preliminary Plan creating 37 single-family lots and 21 multi-family lots. A concurrent request has been submitted to El Paso County to rezone 40 acres to RM-12 and 18 acres to RS-6000. The applicant states in their Water Resources Report that the project will include 37 detached single-family residential lots on 18.96 acres and 305 multi-family attached units on 40.52 acres. In the Letter of Intent, the applicant states there will be attached single-family rental units or condo units, not individually owned lots. The Traffic Impact Study

states that the site will contain duplex, tri-plex and four-plex dwelling units in addition to the single-family lots. The applicant has not provided specific dwelling types for the 40.52 acres that are proposed to be RM-12.

To evaluate Chapter 6 and 8 of the Land Development Code, the Planning Department requested a Landscape Plan be submitted concurrently. A preliminary landscape plan was submitted by the applicant, but County staff could not verify if the plan met the requirements of Chapter 6 because the specific residential use has not been provided. Chapter 6 has different requirements for buffering and open space for multi-family dwellings and single-family attached dwellings. The Land Development Code defines both multi-family dwellings and single-family attached dwellings in Section 1.15.

> **Dwelling, Multi-family —** A structure containing 3 or more dwelling units designed for or used exclusively as a residence by 3 or more families, living independently of one another with accessory uses, limited to an office, laundry and recreational facilities, used in common by the occupants.
>
> **Dwelling, Single-Family Attached —** A structure containing more than 1 dwelling unit, each of which has primary ground floor access to the outside and are attached to each other by party walls without openings, where each dwelling unit is generally located on its own lot. The common or abutting wall shall be shared for at least 50% of the length of the side of the dwelling units. A single-family attached dwelling does not share common floor/ceilings with other dwelling units. A single-family attached dwelling is also sometimes called a townhouse or row house.

The subject property has an abundance of trees on the southern 23 acres of the property, Chapter 8 of the Land Development Code states that when dividing land, the preservation and enhancement of the natural landscape and vegetation shall be considered. An overall concept plan of the proposed property was not submitted with the Preliminary Plan, nor did the preliminary landscape plan show how the existing vegetation would be incorporated into development. The applicant chose to defer addressing comments on the preliminary landscape plan to the time of Final Plat. Conditions of approval No. 5 and 6 are recommended by staff to ensure that Chapters 6 and 8 of the Land Development Code are met at the time of subsequent Final Plat submittals.

A noise study was conducted on the property due to its proximity to Interstate 25. The noise study shows three areas where decibels were greater than what is allowed by the Land Development Code. The noise study states that in these areas where the decibels exceed what is allowed a waiver will need to be submitted. The Land Development Code allows for multiple forms of mitigation where noise exceeds 67 dba. The Letter of Intent states mitigation will take place in the form of increased building setbacks and landscape buffers in lieu of a noise barrier. The landscape buffer and berm will be installed along the western boundary of the property. The applicant is proposing an additional 40-foot building setback along I-25 due to the existing topography. The builders constructing within the Preliminary Plan boundary will also be required to use noise mitigation construction techniques.

G. MASTER PLAN COMPLIANCE

1. Your El Paso County Master Plan

a. Placetype Character: Suburban Residential

Suburban Residential is characterized by predominantly residential areas with mostly single-family detached housing. This placetype can also include limited single-family attached and multifamily housing, provided such development is not the dominant development type and is supportive of and compatible with the overall single-family character of the area. The Suburban Residential placetype generally supports accessory dwelling units. This placetype often deviates from the traditional grid pattern of streets and contains a more curvilinear pattern.

Although primarily a residential area, this placetype includes limited retail and service uses, typically located at major intersections or along perimeter streets. Utilities, such as water and wastewater services are consolidated and shared by clusters of developments, dependent on the subdivision or area of the County.

Some County suburban areas may be difficult to distinguish from suburban development within city limits. Examples of the Suburban Residential placetype in El Paso County are Security, Widefield, Woodmen Hills, and similar areas in Falcon.

Recommended Land Uses:

Primary

- *Single-family Detached Residential with lots sizes smaller than 2.5 acres per lot, up to 5 units per acre*

Supporting

- *Single-family Attached*
- *Multifamily Residential*
- *Parks/Open Space*
- *Commercial Retail*
- *Commercial Service*
- *Institutional*

b. Area of Change Designation: Minimal Change: Developed and New Development

Minimal Change: Developed:

These areas have undergone development and have an established character. Developed areas of minimal change are largely built out but may include isolated pockets of vacant or underutilized land. These key sites are likely to see more intense infill development with a mix of uses and scale of redevelopment that will significantly impact the character of an area. For example, a large amount of vacant land in a suburban division adjacent to a more urban neighborhood may be developed and change to match the urban character and intensity so as to accommodate a greater population. The inverse is also possible where an undeveloped portion of an denser neighborhood could redevelop to a less intense suburban scale. Regardless of the development that may occur, if these areas evolve to a new development pattern of differing intensity, their overall character can be maintained.

New Development:

These areas will be significantly transformed as new development takes place on lands currently largely designated as undeveloped or agricultural areas. Undeveloped portions of the County that are adjacent to a built out area will be developed to match the character of that adjacent development or to a different supporting or otherwise complementary one such as an employment hub or business park adjacent to an urban neighborhood.

c. Key Area Influences: Tri-Lakes Area and Potential Areas for Annexation

Tri-Lakes Area:

Tri-Lakes is the northern gateway into the County along Interstate 25 and Highway 83. It is situated between Pike National Forest, the United States Air Force Academy, and Black Forest. With significant suburban development and some mixed-use development, this Key Area supports the commercial needs of many of the residents

in northern El Paso County. Tri-Lakes also serves as a place of residence for many who commute to work in the Denver Metropolitan Area. It is also an activity and entertainment center with the three lakes (Monument Lake, Wood-moor Lake, and Palmer Lake) that comprise its namesake and direct access to the national forest. Tri-Lakes is the most well-established community in the northern part of the County with a mixture of housing options, easy access to necessary commercial goods and services, and a variety of entertainment opportunities. Future development in this area should align with the existing character and strengthen the residential, commercial, employment, and entertainment opportunities in the adjacent communities of Monument, Palmer Lake, and Woodmoor.

Potential Areas for Annexation:
A significant portion of the County's expected population growth will locate in one of the eight incorporated municipalities. As the largest municipality in El Paso County, Colorado Springs is expected to grow in population over the next several decades. As a result of this growth, Colorado Springs, and other municipalities including Fountain and Monument, will need to annex parts of unincorporated County to plan for and accommodate new development. This will either occur through new development within existing municipal limits or the annexation of subdivisions in unincorporated parts of the County.

This Key Area outlines the portions of the County that are anticipated to be annexed as development occurs. It is imperative that the County continue to coordinate with the individual cities and towns as they plan for growth. Collaboration with the individual communities will prevent the unnecessary duplication of efforts, overextension of resources, and spending of funds. The County should coordinate with each of the municipalities experiencing substantial growth the development of an intergovernmental agreement similar to that developed with Colorado Springs.

d. Other Implications (Priority Development, Housing, etc.)

The subject property is located within the Highway 105 and Interstate 25 Suburban Residential Priority Development Area.

The area is located between Monument, Woodmoor, and Palmer Lake. Due to its proximity to these communities, this area has largely developed to match that community's style of suburban residential and should continue to do so without

impediment. It would also be supported by commercial and public services, both of which are important factors when considering denser development. Furthermore, increased density at the northern end of the County would help support residents who commute north for work every day.

- ***New and infill development should be encouraged within the significant area of available vacant or underutilized agricultural, land across Interstate 25*** *to continue the expansion of existing Suburban Residential areas.*

- ***Single-family attached and detached housing units should be developed in a cohesive manner that establishes a seamless transition between different housing types****, as opposed to large, isolated clusters or blocks of a single type of housing. Maintaining this mixed development pattern should be prioritized by the County to preserve the existing residential character of this area.*

e. Analysis

The Preliminary Plan is proposing single-family detached, single-family attached and multi-family units located along I-25 and County Line Road. The Suburban Residential placetype allows for a variety of housing units, with the primary land use being single-family detached on lots less than 2.5 acres. The property is located within two areas of change, Minimal Change: Developed and New Development. Both of these areas of change talk about new development occurring on undeveloped portions of land and matching the existing community or being a supporting use to what already exists. The Minimal Change: Developed states regardless of the development that may occur, if these areas evolve to a new development pattern of differing intensity, their overall character can be maintained. Relevant goals and objectives from the Master Plan are as follows:

Goal LU3 – *Encourage a range of development types to support a variety of land uses.*

Objective LU3-1 – *Development should be consistent with the allowable land uses set forth in the place types first and second to their built form guidelines.*

Objective HC1-4 – *In Suburban Residential areas, clustered development should be encouraged to increase density while also preserving open space and such*

development should consist of a mix of single-family detached, single-family attached, and multifamily units.

Objective HC1-5 – *Single-family attached housing such as townhomes, rowhomes, and multi-unit apartment homes should be used to create seamless transitions between low-intensity and high-intensity neighborhoods as well as nonresidential uses.*

2. Water Master Plan Analysis

The El Paso County Water Master Plan (2018) has three main purposes; better understand present conditions of water supply and demand; identify efficiencies that can be achieved; and encourage best practices for water demand management through the comprehensive planning and development review processes. Relevant policies are as follows:

Goal 1.1 – *Ensure an adequate water supply in terms of quantity, dependability and quality for existing and future development.*

Policy 1.1.1 – *Adequate water is a critical factor in facilitating future growth and it is incumbent upon the County to coordinate land use planning with water demand, efficiency and conservation.*

Goal 1.2 – *Integrate water and land use planning.*

The Water Master Plan includes demand and supply projections for central water providers in multiple regions throughout the County. The property is located within Planning Region 2 of the Plan, which is an area anticipated to experience growth by 2040. The following information pertains to water demands and supplies in Region 2 for central water providers:

The Plan identifies the current demand for Region 2 to be 7,532 acre-feet per year (AFY) (Figure 5.1) with a current supply of 13,607 AFY (Figure 5.2). The projected demand in 2040 for Region 2 is at 11,713 AFY (Figure 5.1) with a projected supply of 20,516 AFY (Figure 5.2) in 2040. The projected demand at build-out in 2060 for Region 2 is at 13,254 AFY (Figure 5.1) with a projected supply of 20,756 AFY (Figure 5.2) in 2060. This means that by 2060 a surplus of 7,502 AFY is anticipated for Region 2.

See the water section below for a summary of the water findings and recommendations.

3. **Other Master Plan Elements**

The El Paso County Wildlife Habitat Descriptors (1996) identifies the parcels as having a moderate wildlife impact potential. El Paso County Parks and Community Services Department and Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) were each sent a referral and have the following comments:

CPW is concerned that some trees may be removed during the development process. The concern lies in the fact that trees may be currently occupied or be historic bird nesting sites. Please take care to avoid removal of trees with visible nests within the canopy. We recommend leaving as many native healthy trees on site and replacing trees that are removed with comparable native species on a 3:1 basis. Dead trees, or snags, provide valuable perching areas for native birds or nesting opportunities for cavity nesting species. Snags should be left standing where possible.

CPW would recommend that home buyers are provided with educational material regarding wildlife either through the purchase process, or through the development itself. CPW strongly recommends that homeowners are advised to purchase bear-resistant trash containers, and that potential homeowners are advised that bears will be present in the area.

It is the applicant's responsibility, and not El Paso County's, to ensure compliance with all applicable county, state, and federal laws and regulations, including, but not limited to, the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Colorado Noxious Weed Act and El Paso County Weed Management Plan.

The Land Development Code states that when dividing land the preservation and enhancement of the natural landscape and vegetation shall be considered. The layout and design of lots, blocks, and rights-of-way shall provide desirable settings for structures by making use of natural features, unique or distinctive topographic features including buttes and rock outcroppings; existing vegetation; drainage; riparian and wetland areas; significant wildlife habitats; identified aquifer recharge areas; and aesthetic features. Alteration of features shall be kept to a minimum and shall be based on practical engineering considerations. Staff requested a landscaping plan in order to verify CPWs concerns regarding tree removal and

Chapter 8 were being met during the subdivision process. A preliminary landscape plan was provided to staff that did not show internal landscaping, the applicants chose to defer the landscaping plan to the final plat stage. The developer has stated in the Letter of Intent that they support the transplant of trees from the subject property to neighboring properties when requested by the adjacent property owner. While the developer is supportive of tree relocation there is no mention to a plan for the existing trees on the property.

The Master Plan for Mineral Extraction (1996) identifies floodplain deposit in the area of the subject parcels. A mineral rights certification was prepared by the applicant indicating that, upon researching the records of El Paso County, no severed mineral rights exist.

F. PHYSICAL SITE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Hazards

Geologic hazards and constraints were identified during the review of the Preliminary Plan and have been found to impact many of the proposed lots. The Colorado Geological Survey (CGS) has reviewed the Preliminary Plan documents and has provided mitigation measures within their comment letter (attached to staff report).

Proposed geologic mitigation measures include groundwater monitoring, labeling of no-build areas and setbacks for the depicted wetlands. CGS also recommends that the constraints and hazards, and corresponding mitigation measures, are depicted on all subsequent Final Plats. CGS recommends that the Preliminary Plan include a statement indicating "no basements or other below-grade spaces allowed" or that mitigation measures, such as raising the site grades, be incorporated. The statement recommended by CGS has not been added to the Preliminary Plan.

Condition of approval No. 8 is recommended by staff to ensure that CGS's recommendations are followed at the time of subsequent Final Plat submittals.

2. Floodplain

This site is not located within a defined floodplain as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Rate Insurance Map (FIRM) numbers 08041C100065G, and 0804C0276G effective December 7, 2018.

3. **Drainage and Erosion**

The property is in the Bald Mountain Drainage Basin (PLPL0200) which is a part of the El Paso County Drainage Basin Fee program. This drainage basin does have associated drainage basin fees. The fees will be assessed with the Final Plat application.

Stormwater runoff from the project generally flows from south to north. Curb and gutter and storm drain systems convey the flow to six privately maintained extended detention basins (EDB). The EDBs will be owned and maintained by the Monument Ridge Metropolitan District, which is under concurrent review (PCD File No. ID-24-005). Flows are ultimately discharged under County Line Road into an unnamed drainage way in Douglas County. The culvert under County Line Road will be upgraded as part of this project to handle the additional flow. The Preliminary Drainage Report summarizes that the "Site runoff, storm drain, and associated appurtenances will not adversely affect the downstream and surrounding developments".

4. **Transportation**

The El Paso County Major Transportation Plan Update (2024) identifies County Line Road for a Rural County Road upgrade project through this proposed project area, from the existing Monument Hill Road intersection to Vista Clara Lane. Three deviation requests were submitted with the Preliminary Plan and all three were approved.

The traffic study estimates the proposed Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan would generate 2,580 or more daily vehicle trips. The findings within the traffic impact study state that the existing intersections in the study area will adequately accommodate the projected traffic volumes and continue to operate within acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better). Long term analysis shows that a new signal will be required at the intersection of County Line Road and Misty Acres Boulevard to maintain acceptable levels of service.

The development proposes three access points from the planned extension of Misty Acres Boulevard, extending north to Country Line Road, as well as one existing access point from the intersection of Misty Acres Boulevard and Old Antlers Way. These roadways are owned and maintained by the County. Proposed internal roadways will be a mix of new private and public roadways. The private roadways will be owned and maintained by the proposed Monument Ridge Metropolitan District. Offsite improvements include a new right-turn lane on the northbound

Interstate 25 exit ramp, a new eastbound right-turn lane on County Line Road, eastbound left-turn storage bay on County Line Road, and a new westbound left-turn lane on County Line Road. Monument Hill Road will be realigned with this project and will no longer intersect with County Line Road and will instead intersect with the proposed extension of Misty Acres Boulevard.

The Road Impact Fee, as established by Resolution 19-471, will be assessed either at the final land-use approval stage or when the applicant applies for a building permit, whichever occurs later.

G. SERVICES

1. Water

Water sufficiency has been analyzed with the review of the proposed subdivision. The applicant has shown a sufficient water supply for the required 300-year period. The State Engineer and the County Attorney's Office have recommended that the proposed minor subdivision has an adequate water supply in terms of quantity and dependability. El Paso County Public Health has recommended that there is an adequate water supply in terms of quality.

2. Sanitation

Wastewater services will be provided by Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District.

3. Emergency Services

The property is within the Tri-Lakes Monument Fire Protection District, which is committed to providing fire protection services to the proposed development. The District was sent a referral and has no outstanding comments.

The Colorado State Forest Service recommends that all forested acres be mitigated to reduce the risk of wildfire and that defensible space be created for each dwelling using the standards in the CSFS "Home Ignition Zone Guide" located on the Colorado State Forest Service website. In addition, CSFS recommends that all wildfire mitigation be completed before or during dwelling construction.

4. Utilities

Mountain View Electric Association will provide electric service and Black Hills Energy will provide natural gas services. Both agencies were sent a referral and have no outstanding comments.

5. **Metropolitan Districts**
   The southern 29.93 acres are within the Misty Acres Metropolitan District. The remaining parcels are not located within a Metropolitan District.

6. **Parks/Trails**
   Fees in lieu of park land dedication will be due at the time of recording the Final Plat(s).

   The Park Advisory Board recommends that the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners include the following conditions when considering and/or approving the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan:

   (1) provide a Letter of Intent in all forthcoming submittals;
   (2) provide a Preliminary Plan with associated Landscape Plan and detailed tract table;
   (3) fees in lieu of land dedication for regional park purposes in the amount of $172,710 and urban park purposes in the amount of $103,626 will be required at time of the recording of the forthcoming Final Plat(s).

7. **Schools**
   The site is within the boundaries of the Lewis-Palmer School District #38. Fees in lieu of school land dedication shall be paid to El Paso County for the benefit of Lewis-Palmer School District #38 at time of recording the Final Plat(s).

H. APPLICABLE RESOLUTIONS

See attached resolution.

I. STATUS OF MAJOR ISSUES

There are no outstanding major issues. The applicant has not addressed all of staff's comments that were provided with this Preliminary Plan submittal. Due to the lack of information provided regarding housing types, staff could not fully evaluate the project against Chapters 6 and 8 of the Land Development Code. Staff has added additional conditions to this application to ensure that Chapters 6 and 8 can be fully evaluated at the time of Final Plat.

J. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS AND NOTATIONS

Should the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners find that the request meets the criteria for approval outlined in Section 7.2.1 (Subdivisions) of the El Paso County Land Development Code (As Amended) staff recommends the following conditions and notations:

CONDITIONS

1. Applicable traffic, drainage and bridge fees shall be paid with each Final Plat.

2. Applicable school and park fees shall be paid with each Final Plat.

3. Developer shall comply with federal and state laws, regulations, ordinances, review and permit requirements, and other agency requirements, if any, of applicable agencies including, but not limited to, the Colorado Division of Wildlife, Colorado Department of Transportation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the Endangered Species Act, particularly as it relates to the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse as a listed species.

4. The requirements contained in the Water Supply Review and Recommendations as provided by the County Attorney's Office shall be adhered to at the appropriate time.

5. A Site Development Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department for the entirety of the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan, concurrent with the Final Plat Submittal.

6. A Landscape Plan and detailed tract table shall be submitted to the Planning Department for the entirety of the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan, concurrent with the Final Plat Submittal.

7. Applicant shall comply with all recommendations by Amy Crandall, Engineering Geologist contained in the Colorado Geological Survey's Review letter, dated 9/18/2024, as provided by the Colorado Geological Survey.

8. Applicant shall comply with all requirements contained in the Colorado Parks and Wildlife Department of Natural Resources letter, dated 6/08/2024.

9. Applicant shall comply with all requirements contained in the Water Supply Review and Recommendations, dated November 14, 2024, as provided by the County Attorney's Office.

NOTATIONS

1. This Preliminary Plan approval does not authorize future Final Plat filings to be approved administratively.

2. Approval of the Preliminary Plan will expire after twenty-four (24) months unless a Final Plat has been approved and recorded or a time extension has been granted.

3. Preliminary Plans not forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for consideration within 180 days of Planning Commission action will be deemed to be withdrawn and will have to be resubmitted in their entirety.

4. The El Paso County Road Impact Fee Program Resolution (Resolution Subdivider(s) agrees on behalf of him/herself and any developer or builder successors and assignees that Subdivider and/or said successors and assigns shall be required to pay traffic impact fees in accordance with the No. 19-471), or any amendments thereto, at or prior to the time of building permit submittals. The fee obligation, if not paid at Final Plat recording, shall be documented on all sales documents and on plat notes to ensure that a title search would find the fee obligation before sale of the property.

K. PUBLIC COMMENT AND NOTICE

The applicant held a neighborhood meeting in June of 2024 and discussed the rezone and plat project. Over 100 citizens came out to listen to the applicant's presentation and ask questions. Neighbors had concerns about traffic, especially as it relates to the neighboring schools, fire evacuation, open space, and density. The property is currently vacant with existing large trees, many of the neighbors do not want to see the trees removed and wanted greater open space than what the applicants are proposing.

The County asked the applicant to extend the scope of the traffic study further south as many neighbors stated that the proposed development would impact traffic near the existing schools. The applicant stated that they would not extend the scope of the traffic study and would only do what was required by County criteria.

El Paso County has received 39 public opposition letters regarding the Monument Ridge East project. The Town of Monument has submitted a resolution protesting the rezoning of Monument Ridge East. The Town's resolution states that the development has minimal to no passive or active open space, would put a strain on the Town's police department, is detrimental to the preservation of the natural environment, and urges the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to reconsider the proposal as a PUD to ensure sustainable, compatible and community-focused growth.

The Planning and Community Development Department notified 98 adjoining property owners on November 7, 2024 for the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioner meetings. Responses will be provided at the hearing.

L. ATTACHMENTS

Map Series
Letter of Intent
Preliminary Plan Drawing
State Engineer's Letter
County Attorney's Letter
Public Comment
Draft Resolution

Aerial Map

File No. SP241

Map Series No. 1

N

0 0 0.1 0.1 Miles

Zoning Map

File No.SP241

Map Series No. 2

N

0 0 0.1 0.1 Miles

Placetypes Map

File No.SP241

Map Series No. 3

N

0 0 0.1 0.1 Miles

Areas of Change Map

File No.SP241

Map Series No. 4

N

0 0 0.1 0.1 Miles

Key Areas Map

File No.SP241

Map Series No. 5

N

0 0 0.1 0.1 Miles

Vertex Consulting Services, LLC
455 E Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 101
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-3672
719-733-8605

Monument Ridge East

Preliminary Plan

Letter of Intent

May 17, 2024
REVISED: August 18, 2024

PCD File No: SP241

Monument Ridge East, LLC
5055 List Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80919

OWNER: Monument Ridge East, LLC
5055 List Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80919

PLANNER: Vertex Consulting Services, LLC
455 E Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 101
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
719-733-8605
craig.dossey@vertexcos.com

PROPERTY LOCATION:
Southeast of the Interstate 25 and County Line Road interchange

TAX SCHEDULE NOS:
7102200013, 7102200008, 7102200006, 7102201001, 7102201014, and 7102200010

ACREAGE:
59.48 acres

CURRENT ZONING:
PUD, CC, CS, C-1, RS-20000 (Concurrent application for rezoning to RM-12 and RS-6000)

REQUEST AND SITE SIZE:

Vertex Consulting Services, LLC, on behalf of Monument Ridge East, LLC, is respectfully submitting an application for approval of a preliminary plan for the six parcels listed above which comprise a total of 59.48 acres. The preliminary plan depicts 59 lots ranging in size from 0.14 acres to 1.62 acres and ten (10) tracts ranging in size from 0.09 acres to 7.31 acres. The property is located on the east side of Interstate 25, south of County Line Road and is bisected by the planned extension of Misty Acres Boulevard.

NOISE MITIGATION STANDARDS AND LDC APPLICABILITY:

Land Development Code Discourages the Use of Noise Barriers

In discussions with County review staff, there was a request for the applicant to construct a noise barrier along the area of the property that is projected to potentially experience increased noise levels originating from the Interstate 25 offramp to County Line Road. Subsection (c)(1) of Section 8.4.2(B) of the Code should be considered when determining the appropriateness of requiring a noise barrier. While this section clearly states that "Noise barriers are generally more appropriate within an urban area or adjacent to urban development" it also goes on to caution the use of noise barriers by stating the following:

> ***"A noise barrier should not be the default design alternative unless other mitigation strategies cannot practically and effectively achieve the noise reduction."*** (emphasis added)

Based upon this citation from the County's Land Development Code and the minimal degree of potential noise overage for a very limited area of the project, as discussed below, it is appropriate to complete a full evaluation of the Code standards and to do so with the perspective that constructing noise barriers is not the desired noise mitigation approach of the County.

Analysis of Noise Impact Standards, Assessment of Applicability, and Proposed Mitigation

Section 8.4.2 of the El Paso County Land Development Code provides standards for addressing noise impacts associated with divisions of land. More specifically, subsection (a), Impacts of Noise Pollution to be Minimized, states the following:

> "Divisions of land shall be designed to minimize the impacts of noise pollution to residents. Divisions of land shall be designed with reference to potential and actual noise pollution hazards based on both existing conditions and project conditions as identified in the TIS or noise study."

The associated Noise Impact Study, prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. dated August 2, 2024, identifies the potential for 3 of the 25 noise receptor locations to exceed the County's noise level threshold of 67dBA associated with projected roadway noise coming from Interstate 25 and County Line Road. More specifically, the receptor locations that were found to potentially exceed the threshold are location nos. 12, 13, and 25 (see map below) with potential exceedances of 2.6, 4.1, and 1.4 dBA, respectively. Each of the receptors is located near Monument Hill Road as it is proposed to turn east into the development and near the northbound Interstate 25 offramp at County Line Road.

Subsection (2)(b) of Section 8.4.2.B of the Land Development Code specifically addresses "Roadway and Railroad Mitigation." Each of the provisions of that subsection are included below along with an analysis of their applicability to the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan and the mitigation measures being proposed by the applicant where required.

<u>Subsection 8.4.2.B(2)(b)(i):</u>

(i) Types of Noise Mitigation. Where noise levels exceed or are predicted to exceed 67 dBA Equivalent Sound Level (Leq), any or all of the following mitigation measures shall be included in the design:

- *Increased building setbacks;*
- *Modified site orientation for buildings and outdoor areas;*

- *Landscape buffers or tracts;*
- *Noise easement;*
- *Soil berming;*
- *Noise barrier.*

In the event that building setbacks or orientation standards are utilized as the mitigation strategy, those building setbacks and orientation standards shall be noted on the plat.

Subsection 8.4.2.B(2)(b)(i) Analysis: No Waiver Needed – Mitigation Proposed

The associated Noise Impact Study projects that a small, isolated area of the project nearest to the extension of Monument Hill Road may experience noise levels slightly in excess of the standard of 67dBA. Those exceedances have been projected to amount to 2.6, 4.1, and 1.4 dBA for receptors 12, 13, and 25, respectively. For this reason, the applicant is proposing to install a landscape buffer and berm along the western boundary of the property. More specifically, the proposed landscaping in the area of the potential noise exceedance is proposed to include only evergreen plantings in the form of 6-foot-tall Austrian Black Pines and 6-foot-tall Pinion Pines (both highlighted in green) as depicted below in a selection from the associated preliminary landscape plan:

In addition, the existing topography of the property suggests that vertical construction of residences on the site will occur at an elevation approximately 20 feet below the edge of the adjacent right-of-way to the west. In addition, due the slope of the hillside extending east from the edge of the right-of-way to the west towards the buildable portion of the property will cause the building footprints to be located further east into the site in a location that will far exceed the required RM-12 setback of 20 feet (the structures in this area are double-fronted as a result of backing up to Monument Hill Road and fronting the local roadway providing access to the units). The estimated distance from the eastern right-of-way line on Monument Hill Road to the planned building sites is approximately 60 feet, which would represent an increase in building setback of around 40 feet beyond the required 20 feet. When taken together, the existing/finished grade of the property, the necessity of having increased building setbacks, and installation of the planned landscaping and berming in the area will have the cumulative effect of mitigating any potential impacts to residences in the area of the projected minor exceedances.

Subsection 8.4.2.B(2)(b)(ii):

*(ii) Mitigation in Residential Subdivisions. Noise mitigation may be required for any residential subdivision, and shall be required for single-family and duplex residential subdivisions, which contain lots that will be individually owned, **and** are located adjacent to expressways, principal arterials or railroads. Where required, mitigation shall reduce the existing or projected exterior noise levels at the building site location and outdoor areas for patios and decks closest to the noise generator to 67 dBA Leq. A noise study to determine the area of potential impact is required where a subdivision includes or borders an expressway, principal arterial or railroad. A noise study is not required for minor subdivisions and minor replats.*

Subsection 8.4.2.B(2)(b)(ii) Analysis: No Waiver Needed and No Mitigation Required

The first sentence of this standard does not apply to this project because the proposed preliminary plan does not "contain lots that will be individually owned". The area of the preliminary plan that is projected to potentially exceed the noise standard is being designed and will be developed for attached single-family rental units or condo units, not individually owned lots. While there is an argument that this area "borders an expressway, principal arterial or railroad" via the proximity to the Interstate 25 offramp, that portion of the standard only applies as a result of the "and" separating the two requirements, which has been emphasized above for reference. For this reason, and due to the fact that this area will not have individually owned lots, the applicant suggests the proximity of the property to the Interstate 25 offramp does not have any bearing on the project in the context of noise mitigation for the purposes of applying this subsection (ii).

Subsection 8.4.2.B(2)(b)(iii):

(iii) Noise Activity Covenant and Disclosure Required. In the event noise mitigation within the area subject to noise levels of 67 dBA Leq would not achieve a noise level reduction of a minimum of 5 dBA Leq without a noise barrier, a Noise Activity Covenant and Disclosure is required to be applied to each lot which will remain in the 67 dBA Leq, either by notation on the plat or by recording a separate document.

Subsection 8.4.2.B(2)(b)(iii) Analysis: No Waiver Needed – Mitigation and Noise Activity Covenant & Disclosure Proposed

It is anticipated that the landscape buffer along the western portion of the property will reduce the level of noise from the Interstate 25 offramp as experienced by the occupants of the single-family attached housing. However, in order to ensure that all owners of property within the identified area are fully aware of the potential for noise impacts, even if such impacts are, in fact, mitigated by the proposed landscaping buffer, the applicant is proposing to apply the standard Noise Activity Covenant and Disclosure to each ownership within the potentially affected area via notation on the subsequent final plat and agrees to a condition on the Preliminary Plan approval to that same effect. Since the maximum project noise level overage in the area is 4.1 dBA, the use of the Covenant and Disclosure would be in compliance with this subsection (iii) in lieu of building a relatively short, standalone noise barrier. In addition, the developer intends to require builders of residences in the area to use noise mitigation construction techniques such as higher rated wall and roof insulation and thicker, higher quality windows.

Subsection 8.4.2.B(2)(b)(iv):

(iv) Noise Mitigation Located Outside Right-of-Way. Noise mitigation measures shall be located in easements or on tracts to be maintained by a special district or homeowners association and outside of the right-of-way or roadway easements, unless otherwise approved by the ECM Administrator. A noise easement or maintenance agreement is required to assure access to and maintenance of the noise mitigation.

Subsection 8.4.2.B(2)(b)(iv) Analysis: No Waiver Needed – Landscape Buffer to be Located within Tracts

The proposed landscape buffer along the west side of the property is proposed to be located within tracts and will be owned and maintained by the proposed Monument Ridge Metropolitan District. A noise access and maintenance agreement can be put in place for the benefit of the County upon request, otherwise, maintenance of the area will be solely the responsibility of the District.

OVERLAY ZONING:

There is no overlay zoning applicable to the subject property.

COMPLIANCE WITH CRITERIA OF APPROVAL AND SUBDIVISION DESIGN STANDARDS

The proposed subdivision meets the criteria for approval included within Section 7.2.1.D.2 of the El Paso County Land Development Code as described below:

The subdivision is in general conformance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Master Plan;

Your El Paso County Master Plan

Chapter 1 of Your El Paso Master Plan (2021) states that the Plan is "general in nature-it cannot tackle every issue in sufficient detail to determine every type of necessary action." In addition, Chapter 1 goes on to state that the Plan "is intended to provide clearer and more coordinated policy, resulting in a document that effectively communicates County goals and identifies specific actions to achieve both County-wide and local area objectives." When taken together, these two statements suggest to the reader that the Plan may only address certain issues at a cursory level and that specific steps or actions for addressing such issues may not be offered within the Plan. However, that is not the case with this preliminary plan and the concurrent map amendment (rezoning) request, as identified below.

Chapter 3 Land Use

Key Area Analysis: "Tri-Lakes Key Area" and "Potential Areas for Annexation"

"Tri-Lakes" Key Area

A portion of the property is located within the Tri-Lakes Key Area. The Plan describes the key area as follows:

> "Tri-Lakes is the northern gateway into the County along Interstate 25 and Highway 83. It is situated between Pike National Forest, the United States Air Force Academy, and Black Forest. With significant suburban development and some mixed-use development, this Key Area supports the commercial needs of many of the residents in northern El Paso County. ***Tri-Lakes also serves as a place of residence for many who commute to work in the Denver Metropolitan Area***. It is also an activity and entertainment center with the three lakes (Monument Lake, Woodmoor Lake, and Palmer Lake) that comprise its namesake and direct access to the national forest. Tri-Lakes is the most well-established community in the northern part of the County with ***a mixture of housing options***, easy access to necessary commercial goods and services, and a variety of entertainment opportunities. ***Future development in this area should align with the existing character and strengthen the residential, commercial, employment, and entertainment***

> ***opportunities in the adjacent communities of Monument, Palmer Lake, and Woodmoor."*** (emphasis added)

The proposed preliminary plan and map amendment (rezoning) will help support the existing character of the Tri-Lakes Key Area by providing additional places of residence for those who commute to work in the Denver Metropolitan Area. In addition, the preliminary plan proposes to implement the concurrently proposed rezoning which includes two different zoning districts, RM-12 and RS-6000. The two different zoning districts will allow for a greater variety (mixture) of housing options in the area. Developing additional housing in the area will help strengthen the current residential market as well as generate increased sales for any existing and future commercial uses in the area.

The map on the next page shows the relative location of the site with respect to the rest of the Tri-Lakes Key Area. The context provided by this exhibit indicates the importance of supporting the preliminary plan (and subsequent final plat) as well as the concurrent RM-12 and RS-6000 rezoning requests due to the immediate adjacency of the site to Interstate 25, which is even more pertinent when compared to the rest of the Key Area. Other locations in the Tri-Lakes Key Area would not be appropriate for increased residential densities due to concerns over use-to-use or even zoning-to-zoning compatibility such as in areas located to the east that are currently zoned RR-5 or RR-2.5. As the Tri-Lakes Key Area continues to build out the most logical location for meaningful residential growth is along the Interstate 25 corridor, whether within the incorporated boundaries of Towns of Monument or Palmer Lake, or on centralized services in unincorporated El Paso County, as would be the case with this site.

"Potential Areas for Annexation" Key Area

The remaining portion of the property that is located outside the boundaries of the "Tri-Lakes" Key Area is within the "Areas for Potential Annexation" Key Area. The Plan describes the Potential Areas for Annexation as follows:

> "A significant portion of the County's expected population growth will located in one of the eight incorporated municipalities. As the largest municipality in El Paso County, Colorado Springs is expected to grow in population over the next several decades. As a result of this growth, Colorado Springs, and other municipalities including Fountain and Monument, will need to annex parts of unincorporated County to plan for and ***accommodate new development***. This will either occur through new development within existing municipal limits or the annexation of subdivisions in unincorporated parts of the County."
>
> "This Key Area outlines the portions of the County that are ***anticipated to be annexed as development occurs***. It is imperative that the County continue to coordinate with the individual cities and towns as they plan for growth. Collaboration with the individual communities will prevent the unnecessary duplication of efforts, overextension of resources, and spending of funds. The County should coordinate with each of the municipalities experiencing substantial growth the development of an intergovernmental agreement similar to that developed with Colorado Springs."

The challenge for owners of land located within the "Potential Areas for Annexation" Key Area is that the final decision as to whether to annex the land into the respective incorporated city or town lies exclusively with the city or town itself. The owner of the property experienced this challenge firsthand while twice attempting to annex the property into the Town of Monument. The first attempt at annexing the land into the Town of Monument in 2022 ultimately resulted in the property owner withdrawing the annexation petition after an unfavorable and formally continued Town Planning Commission hearing. Delaying the hearing via a continuance strategically allowed for the then-recently elected but not yet seated Town Trustees to hear the request instead of the then-seated Trustees.

On the property owner's second attempt to annex the land into the Town of Monument, which occurred in 2023, the Town Board of Trustees denied a separate annexation petition for property located at the southwest corner of Interstate 25 and County Line Road, which is also owned by the owner of the subject property. Denial of that annexation petition effectively rendered annexation of the subject property into the Town impractical due to contiguity issues. On both occasions, Town staff invited and encouraged the property owner to annex into the Town only to then have the proposed development meet political opposition.

One of the main reasons for annexing land into a municipality is to obtain centralized water and wastewater service, which can help justify an overall increase in development intensity, whether that be as more intense commercial or industrial development or higher density residential development, as was the intent of the landowner in requesting annexation into the Town of Monument. Centralized water and wastewater services can, however, still be provided to developments in the County via a special district. In this case, Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District was already going to provide water and wastewater service to the development even if annexed into the Town of Monument due to Monument's inability to serve new development on the east side of Interstate 25 in this area. Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District has confirmed its commitment to providing municipal-level water and wastewater services to the proposed development even if it develops in unincorporate El Paso County.

Even though annexation of the land has been repeatedly rejected by the Town of Monument, the intent of the Key Area designation of the land as a "Potential Area for Annexation" can still be maintained with inclusion of the land into the Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District. All of this suggests that development of the subject property in unincorporated El Paso County is equivalent if not more sustainable in this area of the County than it might have otherwise been in the Town of Monument.

***Area of Change Analysis*: "Minimal Change: Developed" and "New Development"**

The subject property is identified in the Areas of Change map within the Plan as being primarily with the "New Development" area of change with a smaller portion within the "Minimal Change:

Developed" area of change (see the map on the next page for the delineation of the two areas).

"New Development" Area of Change

Page 21 of the Plan characterizes areas of "New Development" by stating:

> "These areas will be significantly transformed as new development takes place on lands currently largely designated as undeveloped or agricultural areas. ***Undeveloped portions of the County that are adjacent to a built out area will be developed to match the character of that adjacent development or to a different supporting or otherwise complementary one*** such as an employment hub or business park adjacent to an urban neighborhood." (Emphasis added)

Your El Paso Master Plan identifies only 9% of land within unincorporated El Paso County as being within an Area of Change for "New Development." For comparison purposes, 90% of unincorporated El Paso County is expected to see minimal change, if any. These areas are comprised of 70% as "Minimal Change: Undeveloped", 6% as "Minimal Change: Developed", and the remaining 14% as "Protected/Conservation Area". Page 20 of the Plan states the following:

> ***"As El Paso County plans for growth and development over the coming decades, it is anticipated that some areas of the County will change more significantly than other areas."***

Further down on page 20 the Plan goes on to focus the discussion of change specifically on the need to address housing affordability, without regard for existing demographics or localized preferences, when it says:

> ***"A key factor in identifying areas of new development, particularly for residential uses, is affordability. Housing affordability is addressed in Chapter 4 Housing & Communities page 58)."***

These statements indicate that the proposed preliminary plan and concurrent RS-6000 and RM-12 rezoning requests, which will allow for new development to occur on the property, is consistent with the "New Development" Area of Change designation and are even more uniquely supported by the Plan as an opportunity to help address the County-wide issue of housing affordability. This is particularly critical in the Tri-Lakes Area of the County which is generally void of any form of affordable housing or even mid-level housing. The proposed subdivision and zoning change to the property is residential in nature and would provide an appropriate transition between existing residential to the east and Interstate 25 to the west. The residential "character" of the area is, therefore, maintained, which would not necessarily be the case if the property were to be developed pursuant to the current mix of residential and commercial zoning.

"Minimal Change: Developed" Area of Change

Page 21 of the Plan characterizes areas of "Minimal Change: Developed" by stating:

> "These areas have undergone development and have an established character. Developed areas of minimal change are largely built out but may include isolated pockets of vacant or underutilized land. These key sites are likely to see more intense infill development with a mix of uses and scale of redevelopment that will significantly impact the character of an area. For example, a large amount of vacant land in a suburban division adjacent to a more urban neighborhood may be developed and change to match the urban character and intensity so as to accommodate a greater population. The inverse is also possible where an undeveloped portion of an denser neighborhood could redevelop to a less intense suburban scale. Regardless of the development that may occur, if these areas evolve to a

new development pattern of differing intensity, their overall character can be maintained."

The mapping of the boundary of the "Minimal Change: Developed" Area of Change on the property is not consistent with the actual developed status of the property. The exhibit provided above shows an aerial image of the property underlying the Area of Change designations. The aerial image clearly shows that no development has occurred on the property, which suggests that all of the property probably should have been designated as "New Development."

Placetype Analysis: "Suburban Residential"

The subject property is shown on the Placetypes map of Your El Paso Master Plan as being within the Suburban Residential Placetype.

Page 28 of the Plan identifies the following land uses as being Primary Land Uses within the Suburban Residential Placetype:

- Single-Family Detached Residential with lot sizes smaller than 2.5 acres per lot, up to 5 units per acre.

In addition, the Placetype includes the following Supporting Land Uses:

- Single-Family Attached
- Multifamily Residential
- Parks/Open Space
- Commercial Retail
- Commercial Services
- Institutional

The Suburban Residential Placetype is described further on page 28 as follows:

> "Suburban Residential is characterized by predominantly residential areas with mostly single-family detached housing. This placetype can also include limited single-family attached and multifamily housing, provided such development is not the dominant development type and is supportive of and compatible with the overall single-family character of the area. The Suburban Residential placetype generally supports accessory dwelling units. This placetype often deviates from the traditional grid pattern of streets and contains a more curvilinear pattern.
>
> > Although primarily a residential area, this placetype includes limited retail and service uses, typically located at major intersections or along perimeter streets. Utilities, such as water and wastewater services are consolidated and shared by clusters of developments, dependent on the subdivision or area of the County.
> >
> > Some County suburban areas may be difficult to distinguish from suburban development within city limits. Examples of the Suburban Residential placetype in

El Paso County are Security, Widefield, Woodmen Hills, and similar areas in Falcon."

A review of this area of the County in the context of the mapped Placetypes in the County Master Plan reveals a significant amount of single-family residential development ranging from neighborhoods located immediately east of the subject property all the way east to Furrow Road and beyond as well as north to the Douglas County/El Paso County line. Similarly, single family residential is found west of the property from properties along Beacon Lite Road to the Town of Palmer Lake. These areas are typical of the Suburban Residential Placetype Designation. It is important to note, however, that the Suburban Residential Placetype also includes single-family attached and multi-family residential as supporting land uses, which would be consistent with the proposed preliminary plan and concurrently proposed RS-6,000 and RM-12 rezonings as evidenced by the list of allowed land uses included above. Roughly six (6) square miles (or approximately 3,956 acres) of Suburban Residential Placetype-designated land located in this area of the County is already predominately developed with single family residential dwellings, suggesting that there is almost an overabundance of existing single family residential in the area when compared to the supporting single-family attached and multi-family residential land uses, of which there is basically none in the same area.

The 59.48 acres that make up the proposed rezoning area are estimated to represent less than 2% of the land included in the local Suburban Residential Placetype area. This means that the proposed development is not only a "Supporting Land Use" to the sprawling single-family residential development that existing in this area today, but it can also be characterized as "Supportive" in terms of its size and scale in the context of the overall surrounding Suburban Residential Placetype area.

Inclusion of compatible, but not necessarily the same, residential land uses such as multi-family and single-family attached within the Suburban Residential Placetype demonstrates the overall vision of the Master Plan. No better location exists in this area, or perhaps even throughout the County as a whole, to locate a subdivision that is aimed at providing new, market-driven residential dwellings than the subject property, which just so happens to be conveniently located immediately adjacent to Interstate 25.

Chapter 4 Housing & Communities

In addition to supporting and being in compliance with the applicable Areas of Change, Key Area, and Placetype designations and policies in Chapter 3 of the Master Plan, the proposed subdivision and concurrent rezoning requests are also in total alignment with the Residential Priority Development Area designation found in Chapter 4 of the Plan. The Monument Ridge East property is identified as being within the Highway 105 & Interstate 25 Priority Development Area. Page 52 of the Plan describes this area as follows:

> "The area is located between Monument, Woodmoor, and Palmer Lake. Due to its proximity to these communities, this area has largely developed to match that community's style of suburban residential and should continue to do so without impediment. It would also be supported by commercial and public services, both of which are important factors when considering denser development. ***Furthermore, increased density at the north end of the County would help support residents who commute north for work every day."*** (emphasis added)

The Suburban Residential Priority Development Areas section then goes on to support well-planned higher-density residential development in this area by stating:

> "Single-family attached and detached housing units should be developed in a cohesive manner that establishes a seamless transition between different housing types, as opposed to large, isolated clusters or blocks of a single type of housing. Maintaining this mixed development pattern should be prioritized by the County to preserve the existing residential character of this area."

By including RS-6,000 zoning within the proposed subdivision in a location between the proposed RM-12 zoning and the existing single family residential lots to the east, and by proposing a condition of the RS-6,000 zoning that requires a minimum of 15,000 square foot lots adjacent to the existing residences, the applicant is helping to establish a seamless transition along the property's only shared border with existing residential development.

Furthermore, the proposed development can be served by centralized services which justifies "increased density" so as to support residents who commute north to the Denver metropolitan area for work every day.

The multi-family and attached single family supporting land use allowance in the Suburban Residential Placetype found in Chapter 3 of the Plan combined with the encouraging and prioritizing language in Chapter 4 supporting increased residential density on the subject property as a "Priority Development Area" result in a County master plan that overwhelming supports the proposed subdivision and concurrent RS-6,000 and RM-12 rezoning requests. Housing availability and affordability is one of the main issues facing the Pikes Peak Regional today. Projects like the Monument Ridge East subdivision cannot by itself resolve that issue, but it can be part of the solution. The housing solutions for the otherwise homogenously developed Tri-Lakes Area are evident throughout the Master Plan as discussed above. It is through this rezoning request that the applicant is championing those solutions for the Tri-Lakes Area and proposing to aid the County as a whole as it continues to address this ever-increasing Countywide housing challenge.

El Paso County Water Master Plan

The subject property is located within Planning Region 2 of the Water Master Plan, pursuant to Figure 3-1 on page 25, which includes Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District along with several other central water providers. Table 5-3 of the Plan identifies that Region 2 has a current demand of 7,532 acre-feet per year and a current supply of 13,607 acre-feet per year, which results in current excess water supplies in the amount of 6,075 acre-feet per year. Tables 5-4 and 5-5 project Region 2 as continuing to have excess water supplies at year 2040 and at full buildout (2060) in the amount of 1,894 acre-feet and 353 acre-feet, respectively. A Water Resources Report, prepared by Whitehead Engineering, LLC, dated April 2024, has been provided in support of the preliminary plan application. The Report projects 37 detached single family residential lots on 18.96 acres and 305 multi-family attached units on 40.52 acres and an annual water demand of 105.23 acre-feet (93,948 gallons). Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District has provided a commitment letter to provide water service to the proposed subdivision. Woodmoor has calculated water demand projections that have been accepted by the State Water Engineer's Office for both single family and multi-family residential homes based upon actual usage within the District, which are as follows:

Single Family Equivalent (SFE)	= 0.3584 ac-ft/year
Multiple Family Equivalent (MFE)	= 0.2688 ac-ft/year

The District has adequate water supplies to provide reliable service to the proposed subdivision without injuring other water rights pursuant to the District's decreed water rights.

El Paso County Parks Master Plan

The El Paso County Parks Master Plan (2022) depicts the property as having "local access" within five (5) miles of two parks, Palmer Lake Recreation Area and Fox Run Regional Park. The Plan does not depict any planned trails or open space within or adjacent to the subject property. Land dedication, or fees in lieu of land dedication will be required at the final plat stage of development.

2024 Major Transportation Corridors Plan (MTCP)

Map 14. The 2040 Roadway Plan (Classification and Lanes) exhibit of the 2024 El Paso County Major Transportation Corridors Plan (MTCP) doesn't identifies Interstate 25 to the west of the project as a "Freeway" and it depicts several other "Collector" level roads in the area. No new roadways or roadway classification upgrades are depicted for any of the roads within or immediately serving the proposed development.

A northern extension of Misty Acres Boulevard connecting to County Line Road has been planned for well over two decades but is not depicted on the 2024 MTCP. Nevertheless, the applicant is proposing to construct the planned extension of Misty Acres Boulevard and will seek County Road Impact Fee credits therefrom. The anticipated intersection of Misty Acres Boulevard and County Line Road will likely need to be phased from a three-way stop-controlled intersection to a signalized intersection. The fourth leg of the intersection coming from north of County Line Road in Douglas County is not anticipated at this point since the property in that area is subject to a conservation easement.

At the request of the County, the applicant also plans to construct an easterly extension of Monument Hill Road through the proposed development as a connection to Misty Acres Boulevard. This connection has also been planned for some time and will eliminate the dead-end terminus of Monument Hill Road that exists today.

Other Topical Elements of the County Master Plan

The proposed subdivision and concurrent rezone are in compliance with the other topical elements of the County Master Plan, including the Master Plan for Mineral Extraction, and the El Paso County Wildlife Habitat Maps and Descriptors.

The Master Plan for Mineral Extraction, and specifically Map 1 Aggregate Resource Evaluation, identifies the property as having "Upland Deposits" which is defined as including "sand, gravel with silt and clay, remnants of older stream deposited on topographic highs or beach like features." Map 2 of the Plan, which is the Exclusive Version of the Aggregate Resource Evaluation, more or

less dismisses the property from potential mineral resources excavation by identifying the major of the property as "Platted and/or Developed." Lastly, Map 3, which is the Residual Version of the Aggregate Resource Evaluation, only preserves the drainage area and wetlands as having potential "Upland Deposits." Preservation of the wetlands is required and the drainage areas are being protected via located them within tracts thereby eliminating the potential for commercially viable mineral extraction on the property now or into the future.

The Mineral Rights Affidavit submitted in support of the preliminary plan application identifies that there is not a separate mineral rights owner(s) on the subject property that would be impacted by the approval and development of the proposed subdivision and concurrent rezoning requests.

The subdivision is consistent with the purposes of the Land Development Code;

The subdivision is consistent with the purposes of the Land Development Code as outlined in Chapter 1 of the Code including full implementation of the goals and policies of the Master Plan specific to the property as well as those aimed at addressing many of the housing and land use-related issues within the County. The subdivision will allow for orderly development of the property pursuant to the concurrently-requested rezoning and will be financially supported by an Colorado Revised Statutes Title 32 special district for the purposes of construction facilities and infrastructure necessary to serve the development.

The subdivision is consistent with the subdivision design standards and any approved sketch plan;

The subdivision meets all of the design standards included within Chapter 8 of the Code as well as the dimensional standards of the concurrently proposed zoning districts (RS-6000 and RM-12). The reports and maps submitted in support of the application are in full compliance with the County, State, and Federal rules and regulations as well as the County adopted checklists.

A sufficient water supply has been acquired in terms of quantity, quality, and dependability for the type of subdivision proposed, as determined in accordance with the standards set forth in the water supply standards [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6)(a)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of this Code (this finding may not be deferred to final plat if the applicant intends to seek administrative final plat approval);

The associated water resources report identifies a sufficient water supply has been acquired in terms of quantity, quality, and dependability. The source of water supply is Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District No.1, which has provided a service commitment letter dated April 22, 2024. The letter identifies a project total water demand of 95.3075 acre-feet per year. The service commitment is only conditioned upon entering into an agreement for water service and upon the development complying with Woodmoor's rules, regulations, specifications and policies, both of which are standard conditions for providing service.

A public sewage disposal system has been established and, if other methods of sewage disposal are proposed, the system complies with state and local laws and regulations, [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6) (b)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of this Code;

The service commitment letter provided by Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District No. 1 discussed above also includes a commitment to provide wastewater service to the development. Woodmoor's wastewater treatment system is regulated by the State of Colorado, specifically the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

All areas of the proposed subdivision, which may involve soil or topographical conditions presenting hazards or requiring special precautions, have been identified and the proposed subdivision is compatible with such conditions. [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6)(c)];

A Soils and Geology Study, dated March 7, 2023, was prepared by Entech Engineering, Inc. and was submitted as a supporting document to this preliminary plan application. The conclusion of the Study was that "This site was found to be suitable for the proposed development." Entech did identify that there were areas on the property that will impose constraints on development and land use, and highlighted that those areas include artificial fill, potentially expansive soils, shallow groundwater, seasonally wet, potentially seasonally wet, and potential areas of shallow bedrock. In conclusion, however, Entech stated the following:

> *"In general, it is our opinion that the development can be achieved if the observed geologic conditions on site can be property mitigated with site grading and engineering design."*

Adequate drainage improvements complying with State law [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(3)(c)(VIII)] and the requirements of this Code and the ECM are provided by the design;

A drainage report has been submitted addressing the requirements of the Land Development Code and the Engineering Criteria Manual at the preliminary plan stage of development and all applicable design criteria requirements have been implemented in the associated preliminary drainage plan. A final drainage report, final drainage design and construction drawings for all necessary drainage infrastructure will comply with the requirements of the Code and ECM at the final plat stage of development.

The location and design of the public improvements proposed in connection with the subdivision are adequate to serve the needs and mitigate the effects of the development;

The roadways planned to serve the subdivision include two significant connections of existing roadways in the area, with those being Misty Acres Boulevard and Monument Hill Road. These connections have been planned for over two decades. Both connections will provide much improved traffic circulation in the area as well as an alternative evacuation route in the event of an emergency in the area. The Traffic Impact Study prepared by LSC, Inc., has been submitted in support of the preliminary plan application. The Study identifies that the proposed connections of

Misty Acres Boulevard and Monument Hills Road, combined with existing roadway and intersection capacity in the area are able to adequately serve the proposed subdivision.

The internal roads to the subdivision are proposed to be publicly accessible, with most of the roads being constructed and maintained by the anticipated special district. The internal roadways are depicted as "private" on the preliminary plan per the direction of the County review staff, however, the roads will be public pursuant to the definition of "Road, Public" included in Chapter 1 of the Land Development Code:

> " A road located in a public right-of-way or easement and open to the public for travel and accepted for maintenance by El Paso County or another governmental jurisdiction."

The Metropolitan District (governmental district) will maintain the roads and they will be accessible to the public.

The extension of water and wastewater service to the property will require construction of Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District's infrastructure. The design and construction of these lines will be subject to approval and acceptance by the District.

The proposed stormwater detention facilities have been appropriately sited to ensure full compliance with the County's Engineering Criteria Manual and Drainage Criteria Manuals.

Legal and physical access is or will be provided to all parcels by public rights-of-way or recorded easement, acceptable to the County in compliance with this Code and the ECM;

Access will generally be provided by public rights-of-way including County Line Road, Misty Acres Boulevard, Monument Hill Road, and internal publicly dedicated roadways as well as internal publicly accessible roadways proposed to be owned and maintained by the anticipated special district. All lots and tracts depicted on the associated preliminary plan map will have direct access to a public road or a publicly accessible road.

The proposed subdivision has established an adequate level of compatibility by (1) incorporating natural physical features into the design and providing sufficient open spaces considering the type and intensity of the subdivision; (2) incorporating site planning techniques to foster the implementation of the County's plans, and encourage a land use pattern to support a balanced transportation system, including auto, bike and pedestrian traffic, public or mass transit if appropriate, and the cost effective delivery of other services consistent with adopted plans, policies and regulations of the County; (3) incorporating physical design features in the subdivision to provide a transition between the subdivision and adjacent land uses; (4) incorporating identified environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to, wetlands and wildlife corridors, into the design; and (5) incorporating public facilities or infrastructure, or provisions therefore, reasonably related to the proposed subdivision so the proposed subdivision will not negatively impact the levels of service of County services and facilities;

A riparian analysis was prepared by Bristlecone Ecology (February 13, 2024) identifying that wetlands comprise 2% of the property included within the preliminary plan and riparian areas

covered another 0.3% of the property. Delineation of the wetlands and riparian areas by Bristlecone Ecology resulted in the following conclusions:

> *"It is [Bristlecone Ecology's] professional opinion that no high value habitat will be adversely impacted by the proposed development. There is little riparian habitat present within the Project Area, and all riparian habitat and wetlands will be preserved in an open space tract as part of the Project."*

Open space areas are being provided within a number of different tracts within the preliminary plan, including tracts needed to preserve and protect sensitive wetlands and riparian areas as well areas for construction and ongoing operation of planned stormwater treatment and detention facilities.

The design of the preliminary plan implements a transition of land uses from Interstate 25 to the west to existing single family detached dwellings to the east, more specifically the preliminary plan includes large acreage tracts along the western side of the property (west of Misty Acres Boulevard) to allow for attached residential development as well as increasingly-sized single family detached lots along the east side of the property (east of Misty Acres Boulevard) to ensure use-to-use compatibility with the existing neighborhood. In addition, many of the open space tracts are conveniently located along the east side of development, providing an enhanced buffer and transition between the proposed development and the existing residences on the east side of Misty Acres Boulevard.

Necessary services, including police and fire protection, recreation, utilities, open space and transportation system, are or will be available to serve the proposed subdivision;

The property is served by the Tri-Lakes Monument Fire Protection District, which has an obligation to provide fire protection service to the development, and is within the patrol area of the El Paso County Sheriff's Office. Mountain View Electric Association will provide electric service and Black Hill Energy will provide natural gas service to the development. The proposed roadways will be adequate and allow for emergency response access to the site and will provide increased access to neighboring residential areas via connection of Monument Hill Road and Misty Acres Boulevard. The internal roadways that will be constructed within the RM-12 zoning area are not proposed to be dedicated to the County and will instead by owned and maintained by the anticipated special district. The internal roadways within the RS-6000 zoning area as well as the extensions of Monument Hill Road and Misty Acres Boulevard are all proposed to be constructed to the County's standards and dedicated to the County for ongoing ownership and maintenance.

The subdivision provides evidence to show that the proposed methods for fire protection comply with Chapter 6 of this Code; and

Fire hydrants will be installed within the subdivision. All roadways are designed to meet the fire apparatus turning radius requirements and minimum width requirements for two-way travel.

The proposed subdivision meets other applicable sections of Chapters 6 and 8 of the Code;

The proposed subdivision meets all applicable regulations included within Chapters 6 and 8. Please review the associated soils and geology report, onsite wastewater treatment system report, traffic study, drainage report, and grading and erosion control plan which document compliance with both chapters, as applicable.

COUNTY ROAD IMPACT FEE

The proposed subdivision will be subject to the County's Road Impact Fee. Payment of fees will be required. The applicant intends to apply for Road Impact Fee credits for the design and construction of the Misty Acres Boulevard and Monument Hill Road extensions and any other qualifying improvement as determined at the final plat stage of development.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH EFFORTS

The applicant previously held three neighborhood meetings at the time the project was proposed to be annexed and developed in the Town of Monument. An additional neighborhood meeting is being planned for June 4, 2024 in connection with the rezoning and preliminary plan applications to El Paso County. For more information, please see the associated document uploaded to the EDARP file regarding a summary of neighborhood meetings.

MONUMENT RIDGE EAST

LOCATED IN THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF SECTION 2, T 11 S, R 67 W OF THE 6th P.M.
EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

LINE TABLE FOR LOTS 38-59		
LINE	BEARING	LENGTH
L120	N00°13'38"W	76.50
L121	S89°46'22"W	286.00
L122	S00°13'38"E	89.72
L123	N89°46'22"E	210.01
L124	N29°57'52"E	353.71
L125	N60°02'08"W	76.50
L126	S29°57'52"W	401.00
L127	S60°02'08"E	64.00
L128	S07°26'31"W	306.65
L129	S82°33'30"E	80.33
L130	N07°26'31"E	348.00
L131	N82°33'30"W	76.50
L132	N07°26'31"E	76.50
L133	N82°33'30"W	279.00
L134	S07°26'31"W	74.19
L135	S82°33'30"E	262.52
L136	N82°33'30"W	290.40
L137	S58°25'02"W	11.60
L138	S07°26'31"W	69.22
L139	S82°33'30"E	222.80
L140	S07°26'31"W	121.50
L141	S82°33'30"E	76.08
L142	N07°26'131"E	185.83
L143	N60°02'09"W	76.29
L144	S29°57'52"W	398.00
L145	S60°02'108"E	73.28
L146	N29°57'52"E	355.93
L147	S89°4622"W	76.50
L148	S00°13'38"E	359.00
L149	N89°46'22"E	76.50
L150	N00°13'38"E	359.00
L151	N00°13'38"W	229.00
L152	S89°46'122"W	76.50
L153	S00°13'38"E	229.00
L154	N89°46'22"E	76.50
L155	N12°36'26"E	73.50
L156	N77°23'34"W	172.00
L157	S12°36'26"W	73.50
L158	S77°23'34"E	172.00
L159	S77°23'34"E	165.00
L160	N12°36'26"E	73.50
L161	N77°23'34"W	165.00
L162	S12°36'26"W	73.50
L163	S07°26'31"W	860.00
L164	S82°33'30"E	76.50
L165	N07°26'31"E	860.00

NOTE: L109-L119 NOT USED

LINE TABLE FOR LOTS 38-59		
LINE	BEARING	LENGTH
L166	N82°33'30"W	76.50
L167	S07°26'31"W	309.92
L168	S82°33'30"E	76.50
L169	N07°26'31"E	309.92
L170	N82°33'30"W	76.50
L171	S07°26'31"W	111.00
L172	S82°33'30"E	76.50
L173	N07°26'31"E	111.00
L174	N82°33'30"W	76.50
L175	S82°33'30"E	695.00
L176	N07°26'31"E	695.00
L177	N82°33'30"W	76.50
L178	S07°26'31"W	695.00
L179	N07°26'31"E	359.60
L180	N82°33'30"W	133.45
L181	S07°26'31"W	462.00
L182	S82°33'30"E	76.50
L183	N07°26'31"E	97.50
L184	N82°33'30"W	140.00
L185	S07°26'30"W	97.50
L186	S82°33'30"E	140.00
L187	N07°26'30"E	160.00
L188	N82°33'30"W	97.50
L189	S07°26'31"W	160.00
L190	S82°33'30"E	97.50
L191	S07°26'31"W	169.67
L192	S82°33'30"E	97.50
L193	N07°26'31"E	187.10
L194	N00°51'05"E	83.90
L195	N89°08'55"W	97.46
L196	S00°45'58"W	63.82
L197	S89°08'55"E	400.00
L198	N00°51'05"E	97.50
L199	N89°08'55"W	400.00
L200	S00°51'05"W	97.50
L201	S89°14'03"E	97.50
L202	N00°45'58"E	330.00
L203	N89°14'03"W	97.50
L204	S00°45'58"W	330.00
L205	N89°14'03"W	97.50
L206	S00°45'57"W	565.11
L207	S89°14'03"E	97.50
L208	N00°45'58"E	565.11
L209	S00°51'05"W	97.50
L210	S89°08'55"E	250.00
L211	N00°51'05"E	97.50
L212	N89°08'55"W	250.00

CURVE TABLE FOR LOTS 38-59		
CURVE	LENGTH	RADIUS
C40	77.51	225.00
C41	46.86	225.00
C42	41.59	225.00
C43	16.70	60.00
C44	12.18	175.00
C45	33.65	175.00
C46	8.64	175.00
C47	26.22	225.00

NOTE: C29-C39 NOT USED

LOT AREA TABLE		
LOT	SQ FT	ACRES
1	6150.00	0.14
2	6150.00	0.14
3	6150.00	0.14
4	6150.00	0.14
5	6150.00	0.14
6	6150.00	0.14
7	7743.30	0.18
8	7743.30	0.18
9	6150.00	0.14
10	6150.00	0.14
11	6150.00	0.14
12	6150.00	0.14
13	6150.00	0.14
14	6150.00	0.14
15	6150.00	0.14
16	6150.00	0.14
17	6150.00	0.14
18	6150.00	0.14
19	6150.00	0.14
20	9643.75	0.22
21	5182.18	0.12
22	6933.15	0.16
23	5665.55	0.13
24	15019.14	0.35
25	15000.00	0.34
26	15000.00	0.34
27	15000.00	0.34
28	15000.00	0.34
29	15000.00	0.34
30	15000.00	0.34
31	15000.00	0.34
32	15000.00	0.34
33	15000.00	0.34
34	15000.00	0.34
35	15047.00	0.35

LOT AREA TABLE		
LOT	SQ FT	ACRES
36	29258.83	0.67
37	23686.04	0.54
38	22207.79	0.51
39	30748.61	0.71
40	26674.66	0.61
41	21330.92	0.49
42	32163.26	0.71
43	30410.57	0.74
44	27463.50	0.63
45	17514.39	0.40
46	12642.00	0.29
47	12127.50	0.28
48	65790.00	1.51
49	48406.45	1.11
50	8491.50	0.20
51	53562.26	1.23
52	69809.00	1.60
53	13650.03	0.31
54	15600.04	0.36
55	25865.81	0.59
56	39000.00	0.90
57	32175.00	0.74
58	55099.30	1.27
59	24374.91	0.56

TRACT USE TABLE			
TRACT	USE	AREA	OWNERSHIP & MAINTENANCE
A	DRAINAGE,UTILITY	1.58 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
B	DRAINAGE,UTILITY USE	1.44 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
C	DRAINAGE,UTILITY,WETLANDS	5.50 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
D	DRAINAGE,UTILITY	0.65 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
E	UTILITY,OPEN SPACE	1.53 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
F	UTILITY,OPEN SPACE	0.83 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
G	DRAINAGE,UTILITY	5.39 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
H	UTILITY,OPEN SPACE	0.04 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
J	UTILITY,OPEN SPACE	0.73 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
K	UTILITY,STREET	4.79 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
L	UTILITY,STREET	3.07 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
M	DRAINAGE,UTILITY,WETLANDS	3.91 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
N	PARKING,UTILITY	2.28 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
O	PARKING,UTILITY	0.05 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
P	PARKING,UTILITY	0.08 AC	MONUMENT RIDGE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

VICINITY MAP
NTS

URBAN LOCAL (LOW VOLUME) ROADWAY
STANDARD CROSS SECTION
STORMY HILL GR
SCALE: NOT TO SCALE

URBAN LOCAL ROADWAY
STANDARD CROSS SECTION

SCALE: NOT TO SCALE
PRIVATE: WHITE SNOW GR, MILKY WAY VW, RAFTER PL, SNOWY RIDGE PT, CANNELLA GR, BIRDS NEST VW, LUPINE FIELD GR, GALEXY QUEST VW.
PUBLIC: SNOWY TOP DR, MONUMENT HILL RD, OLD ANTLERS WY.

URBAN NONRESIDENTIAL
COLLECTOR ROADWAY
STANDARD CROSS SECTION

SCALE: NOT TO SCALE
MISTY ACRES BLVD VARIABLE WIDTH FOR TURN LANES

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A TRACT OF LAND IN THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60 FOOT WIDE COUNTY LINE ROAD AND THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60 FOOT WIDE DOEWOOD DRIVE AS DEDICATED IN "HEIGHTS FILING TWO" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 228 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2287623 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, SAID POINT BEING ALSO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THAT RIGHT OF WAY PARCEL FOR COUNTY LINE ROAD GRANTED IN SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED RECORDED UNDER RECEPTION NO. 214002145, OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THENCE S 00° 02' 24" W, ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE THEREOF, 20.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUE S 00° 02' 24" W, ALONG THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF SAID DOEWOOD DRIVE, 250.05 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 10 IN SAID "HEIGHTS FILING TWO"; THENCE S 89° 06' 54" W, ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE, 129.47 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER THEREOF; THENCE S 15° 04' 41" W, ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID "HEIGHTS FILING TWO", 981.29 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF "HEIGHTS FILING ONE" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 167 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2225904 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THENCE S 88° 45' 14" W, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE THEREOF, 306.89 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 3951 AT PAGE 1433 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO AND AN EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN PUBLIC TRUSTEES DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 5852 AT PAGE 323 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THENCE N 14° 12' 38" E, ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINES, 102.54 FEET TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 3951 AT PAGE 1433 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THENCE N 89° 57' 36" W, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE THEREOF, 732.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF A TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 6488 AT PAGE 243 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THE FOLLOWING TWO COURSES ARE ALONG THE BOUNDARY OF SAID TRACT; THENCE (1) N 06° 43' 00" E, 337.98 FEET; THENCE (2) N 89° 57' 36" W, 251.71 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS, STATE OF COLORADO RECORDED IN BOOK 1984 AT PAGE 836 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THE FOLLOWING FOUR COURSES ARE ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE; THENCE (1) N 06° 43' 00" E, 36.92 FEET; THENCE (2) N 29° 16' 30" E, 675.30 FEET; THENCE (3) N 89° 05' 00" E, 500.00 FEET; THENCE (4) N 29° 33' 00" E (BASIS OF BEARING), 180.19 FEET TO INTERSECT THE SOUTH LINE OF AFORESAID 60 FOOT WIDE COUNTY LINE ROAD; THENCE N 89° 06' 54" E, ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE 258.85 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE AFORESAID RIGHT OF WAY PARCEL GRANTED TO EL PASO COUNTY FOR COUNTY LINE ROAD UNDER RECEPTION NO. 214002145 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THE FOLLOWING FOUR COURSES ARE ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE THEREOF; THENCE (1) S 00° 53' 11" E, 11.00 FEET; THENCE (2) S 89° 57' 43" E, 186.01 FEET; THENCE (3) N 89° 46' 13" E, 87.26 FEET; THENCE (4) S 89° 02' 16" E, 154.69 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PARCEL CONVEYED TO WOODMOOR WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT FOR THE CRYSTAL CREEK LIFT STATION BY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 30, 1998 AT RECEPTION NO. 98175218 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; EXCEPTING DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 29, 2010 AT RECEPTION NO. 210120918 AND JANUARY 9, 2014 AT RECEPTION NO. 214002145 AND FURTHER EXCEPTING ANY PORTION WITHIN THE RIGHT OF WAY OF COUNTY LINE ROAD OR INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 25, AND FURTHER EXCEPTING THAT PORTION DEDICATED AS DOEWOOD DRIVE IN "HEIGHTS FILING TWO" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 228 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2287623 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO CONTAINING 29.19 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

PARCEL E-1:

LOT 1, HEIGHTS FILING ONE, COUNTY OF EL PASO, STATE OF COLORADO CONTAINING 3.62 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION CONTINUED

PARCEL E-2:

AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS, EGRESS AND UTILITIES AS DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 1989 IN BOOK 5691 AT PAGE 1415 AND RE-RECORDED NOVEMBER 8, 1991 IN BOOK 5901 AT PAGE 177 AND RE-RECORDED JANUARY 14, 1992 IN BOOK 5924 AT PAGE 316 CONTAINING 0.00 ACRES (EASEMENT BENEFITING PARCEL E-1 ONLY).

PARCEL E-3:

A TRACT OF LAND LOCATED IN THE NORTH ONE HALF OF SECTION 2, TOWNSIDP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M. IN EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SECTION; TH S 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 54 SECONDS WA DISTANCE OF 1320.00 FEET; THENCE S 00 DEGREES 53 MINUTES 12 SECONDS WA DISTANCE OF 300.01 FEET; THENCE S 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 34 SECONDS WA DISTANCE OF 1599.97 FEET; THENCE S 14 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 38 SECONDS WA DISTANCE OF 887.45 FEET; FOR THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THE PARCEL TO BE DESCRIBED HEREBY; THENCE CONTINUE S 14 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 38 SECONDS W, A DISTANCE OF 102.63 FEET; THENCE S 86 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 14 SECONDS WA DISTANCE OF 350.00 FEET; THENCE S 00 DEGREES 24 MINUTES 09 SECONDS WA DISTANCE OF 236.98 FEET; THENCE N 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS WA DISTANCE OF 649.40 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 25; THENCE N 06 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 00 SECONDS E, ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE, 696.96 FEET; THENCE S 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS EA DISTANCE OF 251.71 FEET; THENCE S 06 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WA DISTANCE OF 337.98 FEET; THENCE S 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS EA DISTANCE OF 732.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING CONTAINING 8.00 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

PARCEL E-4:

A TRACT OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF SECTION 2, TOWNSIDP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ALSO BEING A PORTION OF PARCEL A AND PARCEL BAS DESCRIBED BY DOCUMENT (RECEPTION NO. 99035205, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO RECORDS), SITUATE IN COUNTY OF EL PASO, STATE OF COLORADO, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF PARCEL A (ALL BEARINGS IN THIS DESCRIPTION ARE RELATIVE TO A PORTION OF THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL A, MONUMENTED AS SHOWN AND ASSUMED TO BEAR NORTH 01 DEGREES 04 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1833.20 FEET) (THE FOLLOWING SIX (6) COURSES ARE ALONG THE LINES OF SAID PARCEL A AND PARCEL B); 1) NORTH 01 DEGREES 04 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, 1833.20 FEET; 2) NORTH 00 DEGREES 50 MINUTES 54 SECONDS EAST, 370.05 FEET; 3) NORTH 00 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, 443.01 FEET; 4) NORTH 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 35 SECONDS WEST, 395.12 FEET; 5) NORTH 07 DEGREES 27 MINUTES 26 SECONDS EAST, 1273.57 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL B; 6) SOUTH 89 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 42 SECONDS EAST, 437.24 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF MISTY ACRES SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1 (RECEPTION NO. 205190028, SAID EL PASO COUNTY RECORDS) (THE FOLLOWING FOURTEEN (14) COURSES ARE ALONG THE WESTERLY LINES OF SAID FILING); 1) SOUTH 00 DEGREES 48 MINUTES 57 SECONDS WEST, 54.29 FEET; 2)ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 16 DEGREES 23 MINUTES 27 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 601.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 171.93 FEET; 3) SOUTH 15 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST, 647.10 FEET; 4) ON A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 29 DEGREES 05 MINUTES 22 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 521.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 264.52 FEET; 5) SOUTH 13 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 52 SECONDS WEST, 382.56 FEET; 6)AN A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 29 DEGREES 13 MINUTES 34 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 650.71 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 331.92 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVE; 7) AN

LEGAL DESCRIPTION CONTINUED

SAID REVERSE CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 41 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 48 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 548.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 398.96 FEET; 8) SOUTH 01 DEGREES 01 MINUTES 38 SECONDS WEST, 172.86 FEET; 9) ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 25 DEGREES 14 MINUTES 35 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 740.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 326.03 FEET; 10) SOUTH 24 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 57 SECONDS EAST, 474.89 FEET; 11)ON A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 63 DEGREES 38 MINUTES 53 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 521.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 578.76 FEET; 12) SOUTH 39 DEGREES 25 MINUTES 56 SECONDS WEST, 87.74 FEET; 13) ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 17 DEGREES 26 MINUTES 58 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 601.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 183.08 FEET; 14) SOUTH 21 DEGREES 58 MINUTES 58 SECONDS WEST, 91.58 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL A; THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 35 MINUTES 50 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID PARCEL A'S SOUTHERLY LINE, 64.39 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING CONTAINING 21.74 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

EASEMENTS:

1. ALL RIGHTS OF WAYS SHALL HAVE A 5 'UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG AND ADJACENT TO RIGHT OF WAY.
2. ◊ INDICATES EXISTING EASMENT TO REMAIN.
3. * INDICATES PROPOSED EASEMENT AS SHOWN.
4. Δ INDICATES EXISTING EASEMENT TO BE VACATED.

NOTES:

1. BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPLE MERIDIAN EL PASO COUNTY COLORADO WITH AN ASSUMED BEARING OF NORTH 00°15 '53 "EAST.
2. LINEAR UNITS USED IN THIS DRAWING ARE US SURVEY FEET.
3. THERE WILL BE NO VEHICLE ACCESS TO ANY LOT TO COUNTY LINE ROAD, MONUMENT HILL ROAD, INTERSTATE 25, OR MISTY ACRES BOULEVARD..
4. THIS PROPERTY IS SUBJECT TO THE FINDINGS SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF A SOILS AND GEOLOGY STUDY PREPARED BY ENTECH ENGINEERING, INC., REVISED DATE AUGUST 6, 2024, ENTECH JOB NO. 230248, WHICH IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING GEOLOGIC CONSTRAINTS/HAZARDS ON THE PROPERTY: ARTIFICIAL FILL, POTENTIALLY EXPANSIVE SOILS, NON-JURISDICTIONAL WETLANDS, SHALLOW GROUNDWATER, SEASONALLY WET, POTENTIALLY SEASONALLY WET, POTENTIAL AREAS OF SHALLOW BEDROCK, AND POTENTIAL FOR ELEVATED RADON.
   THE FOLLOWING MITIGATIONS WILL BE REQUIRED WHERE APPROPRIATE:
   - ARTIFICIAL FILL – REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF UNCONTROLLED FILL WHERE ENCOUNTERED
   - EROSION – PERMANENT EROSION PROTECTION OR CHANNEL ARMORING
   - POTENTIALLY EXPANSIVE SOILS – OVEREXCAVATION OF EXPANSIVE SOILS WHERE ENCOUNTERED
   - LOOSE SOILS – REMOVAL AND RECOMPACTION
   - PONDED WATER, SEASONAL AND POTENTIALLY SEASONAL SHALLOW GROUNDWATER AREAS – AVOIDANCE OR DRAIN SYSTEMS, STRUCTURES SHOULD BE A MINIMUM 3 FEET ABOVE WATER OR HAVE SITE SPECIFIC DRAINS
   - RADON – SITE SPECIFIC TESTING AS REQUIRED
   - SHALLOW BEDROCK – MAY REQUIRE TRACK-MOUNTED EQUIPMENT FOR EXCAVATION
5. SEE SHEET 2 FOR EXISTING AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
6. SEE SHEET 3 FOR GEOMETRICS
7. SEE SHEET 4 FOR EXISTING AND PROPOSED GRADING
8. MONUMENT HILL ROAD SHALL BE REMOVED AND ROW VACATED AFTER THE NEW ALIGNMENT HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED.
9. "NO BASEMENTS OROTHER BELOW GRADE SPACES ALLOWED" OR THAT MITIGATION MEASURES, SUCH AS RAISING THE SITE GRADES, BE INCORPORATED

CERTIFICATION:

The undersigned Professional Land Surveyor licensed in the State of Colorado, hereby states and declares that the accompanying plat was surveyed and drawn under his responsible charge and accurately shows the described tract of land and subdivision thereof, and that the requirements of Title 38 of the Colorado revised statutes, 1973, as amended, have been met to the best of his knowledge and belief. This statement is neither a warranty nor guarantee, either expressed or inquired.

Darryl Dean Decora Colorado Professional Land Surveyor NO 38068

BEAR CREEK SURVEYING INC.
BRENT SMITH
95 South Bear Creek Road, Bayfield, CO 81122
P.O. Box 2015, Bayfield, CO 81122
ph(970)884-5069

DRAFTED BY: DBH
CHECKED BY: BJS

CLIENT: MONUMENT RIDGE EAST, LLC
MUNICIPALITY: COUNTY: EL PASO

PRELIMINARY PLAN

OWNER OF RECORD: MONUMENT RIDGE EAST LLC
ADDRESS: 5055 LIST DRIVE
TELEPHONE NUMBER: COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80919

SUBMISSION DATE: 4/12/24
REVISON DATES: 8/12/24
REVISON DATES: 11/08/24

PROJECT #: SP241 21-014
SHEET 1 OF 4

MONUMENT RIDGE EAST

LOCATED IN THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF SECTION 2, T 11 S, R 67 W OF THE 6th P.M.
EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

EASEMENT TABLE		
EXISTING	PROPOSED	VACATE
◊	*	Δ

BOUNDARY CURVE TABLE		
CURVE	LENGTH	RADIUS
C1	254.83	630.71
C2	254.36	501.00
C3	704.94	835.00
C4	412.13	715.00
C5	481.30	835.00
C6	603.66	715.00
C7	89.77	155.00

BOUNDARY LINE TABLE		
LINE	BEARING	LENGTH
L1	S13°30'52"W	382.56
L2	S15°34'31"E	375.61
L3	S32°47'55"W	226.03
L4	S00°13'38"E	554.56
L5	N89°46'22"E	417.09
L6	N29°57'52"E	675.33
L7	N07°25'58"E	733.92
L8	N07°26'31"E	1273.66
L9	N89°08'55"W	394.97
L10	N00°45'57"E	443.14
L11	S89°49'59"W	197.08
L12	S15°45'03"W	284.74
L13	S15°46'17"W	983.10
L14	S89°48'16"W	129.45
L15	S00°41'25"W	249.64
L16	S88°29'26"E	157.65
L17	S89°40'12"E	87.26
L18	S89°17'54"E	182.88
L19	S00°19'37"E	11.00
L20	N89°36'58"E	259.32
L21	N30°14'22"E	106.84
L22	N00°13'38"W	617.79
L23	N32°47'55"E	226.03
L24	N15°34'31"W	97.39
L25	S30°35'19"W	196.92
L26	S59°09'28"E	49.90
L27	S11°49'44"E	121.06
L28	S14°00'26"W	242.35
L29	N89°15'42"W	487.45
L30	S00°17'38"E	184.62
L31	S89°42'21"W	74.90
L32	S14°23'28"W	10.26
L33	N89°42'21"E	104.86
L34	N14°32'38"E	128.71
L35	S89°35'16"W	41.27
L36	N40°11'32"W	135.79
L37	S89°35'16"W	41.27
L38	N40°11'32"W	135.79

LOT AREA TABLE		
LOT	SQ FT	ACRES
1	6150.00	0.14
2	6150.00	0.14
3	6150.00	0.14
4	6150.00	0.14
5	6150.00	0.14
6	6150.00	0.14
7	7743.30	0.18
8	7743.30	0.18
9	6150.00	0.14
10	6150.00	0.14
11	6150.00	0.14
12	6150.00	0.14
13	6150.00	0.14
14	6150.00	0.14
15	6150.00	0.14
16	6150.00	0.14
17	6150.00	0.14
18	6150.00	0.14
19	6150.00	0.14
20	9643.75	0.22
21	5182.18	0.12
22	6933.15	0.16
23	5665.55	0.13
24	18049.14	0.41
25	18000.00	0.41
26	18000.00	0.41
27	18000.00	0.41
28	18000.00	0.41
29	18000.00	0.41
30	18000.00	0.41
31	18000.00	0.41
32	18000.00	0.41
33	18000.00	0.41
34	18000.00	0.41
35	18047.00	0.41
36	29258.83	0.67
37	23686.04	0.54

STREET ℄ LINE TABLE			
LINE	BEARING	LENGTH	SLOPE*
L51	S13°30'52"W	382.56	–
L52	N15°34'31"W	99.01	–
L53	S15°34'31"E	276.60	2.00
L54	S32°47'55"W	226.03	–2.00
L55	S00°13'39"E	32.94	–1.50
L56	S00°13'38"E	330.00	1.50
L57	S00°13'38"E	389.19	–2.00
L58	N89°46'22"E	248.20	3.50
L59	N89°46'22"E	51.81	1.50
L60	N00°13'38"W	330.00	1.50
L61	N89°46'22"E	248.20	4.53
L62	N00°13'38"W	100.00	–1.50
L63	N77°23'34"W	231.00	3.00
L64	N22°58'34"E	82.90	–3.50
L65	N82°33'30"W	332.30	–3.50
L66	N07°26'31"E	99.55	1.50
L67	N07°26'31"E	210.83	2.52
L68	N29°57'52"W	355.93	2.52
L69 – L76 NOT USED			
L77	N07°26'31"E	426.96	–3.02
L78	N07°26'31"E	563.00	–1.50
L79	N82°33'30"W	203.00	2.77
L80	N07°26'31"E	134.87	–1.50
L81	S82°33'30"E	80.00	–1.50
L82	N07°26'31"E	204.50	–1.50
L83	N07°26'31"E	398.10	–2.50

STREET ℄ LINE TABLE			
LINE	BEARING	LENGTH	SLOPE*
L84	S74°25'30"W	167.84	–1.50
L85	N82°33'30"W	150.39	3.36
L86	S82°33'30"E	182.00	4.09
L87	S07°26'31"W	25.00	–2.50
L88	––	––	––
L89	S07°26'31"W	84.32	1.50
L90	N00°45'58"E	196.15	1.50
L91	N00°45'58"E	409.47	2.75
L92	N00°45'58"E	109.57	2.75
L93	N89°14'03"W	99.69	1.50
L94	S89°08'59"E	344.72	1.01
L95	S89°08'55"E	121.71	1.50
L96	N00°51'05"E	123.20	1.50
L97	S07°26'31"W	219.87	–1.51
L98	N07°40'24"E	87.63	2.18
L99	S82°33'30"E	191.14	1.50
L100	S82°33'30"E	113.30	1.50
L101	S59°45'36"E	90.00	1.50
L102	N59°45'36"W	112.03	1.50
L103	S89°15'42"W	142.64	–4.25
L104	S15°46'17"W	685.14	–1.07
L105	S15°46'17"W	473.34	–1.50
L106	N74°13'43"E	30.00	1.50
L107	S74°13'43"E	178.07	4.08
L108	S89°46'22"W	94.77	1.50

STREET ℄ CURVE TABLE			
CURVE	LENGTH	RADIUS	SLOPE*
C11	309.61	690.71	–
C12	284.82	561.00	–
C13	654.32	775.00	–1.65
C14	34.61	775.00	–2.00
C15	446.72	775.00	–5.86
C16	208.77	200.00	2.52
C17	112.00	500.00	–3.50
C18	90.49	500.00	1.50
C19	67.58	52.00	–2.50
C20	78.62	200.00	2.52
C21	80.34	200.00	3.36
C22	46.61	400.00	2.75
C23	23.01	200.00	1.50
C24	313.35	200.00	6.30
C25	79.58	200.00	6.00
C26	102.98	200.00	–4.25
C27	82.43	63.00	–4.25
C28	55.85	200.00	1.50
C29	65.09	200.00	–2.50
C30	65.09	200.00	–2.50

*SLOPES ARE APPROXIMATE FROM VERTICAL POINTS OF INTERSECTION, VERTICAL CURVES NOT REPRESENTED.

LINE TABLE FOR LOTS 20–23		
LINE	BEARING	LENGTH
L40	N89°15'42"W	78.82
L41	S15°46'17"W	53.58
L42	S89°15'42"E	50.00
L43	N00°44'18"E	103.64
L44	N89°15'42"W	50.00
L45	S74°16'39"E	35.34
L46	S30°14'25"W	113.82
L47	S89°15'42"E	22.38
L48	S59°45'35"E	46.78
L49	S32°47'08"W	115.11
L50	N59°45'36"W	31.59
L51	S74°13'43"E	123.00
L52	N00°44'18"E	103.64

CURVE TABLE FOR LOTS		
CURVE	LENGTH	RADIUS
C8	35.33	27.00
C9	69.64	175.00
C10	20.35	175.00
C31	38.17	30.00

BEAR CREEK SURVEYING INC.
BRENT SMITH
95 South Bear Creek Road, Bayfield, CO 81122
P.O. Box 2015, Bayfield, CO 81122
ph(970)884-5069

CLIENT: MONUMENT RIDGE EAST, LLC

MUNICIPALITY: COUNTY: EL PASO

PRELIMINARY PLAN

SUBMISSION DATE:	4/12/24
REVISON DATES:	8/12/24
REVISON DATES:	11/08/24

DRAFTED BY: DBH
CHECKED BY: BJS

OWNER OF RECORD: MONUMENT RIDGE EAST LLC
ADDRESS: 5055 LIST DRIVE
TELEPHONE NUMBER: COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80919

PROJECT #: 21-014
SHEET 3 OF 4

MONUMENT RIDGE EAST

LOCATED IN THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF SECTION 2, T 11 S, R 67 W OF THE 6th P.M.
EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

EXISTING EASEMENTS:

A– 30' PIPELINE EASEMENT 210120919 TO BE MAINTAINED
B– 60' TEMP CONST EASEMENT 210120920 TO BE VACATED
C– 30' PIPELINE EASEMENT 098175216 TO BE PARTIALLY VACATED
D– 16.5' TELEPHONE EASEMENT 202118048 TO BE PARTIALLY VACATED
E– 20' UTILITY EASEMENT 99133706 TO BE PARTIALLY VACATED
F– 10' UTILITY & DRAINAGE HEIGHTS FILING ONE TO BE VACATED
G– 20' MVEA EASEMENT BK 5576 PG 673 TO BE VACATED
H– 30' ROADWAY & UTILITY EASEMENT BK 5691 PG 1415, BK 5901 PG 177, BK 5924 PG 316 TO BE VACATED
I– 30' PUE 99027885 TO BE PARTIALLY VACATED
J– NO BUILD PER MISTY ACRES FILING #1 TO BE MAINTAINED
K– 30' PUE 99027885, 200081620 TO BE PARTIALLY VACATED
L– 20' roght of way 206105680 TO BE VACATED
M– MISTY ACRES BLVD MISTY ACRES FILING #1 TO BE PARTIALLY VACATED
N– 20' MVEA EASEMENT 200009083 TO BE MAINTAINED
O– 16' WOODMORE UTILITY EASEMENT TO BE MAINTAINED
P– 16' WOODMORE UTILITY EASEMENT TO BE MAINTAINED
Q– 50' WOODMORE TEMP CONST EASEMENT TO BE VACATED
R– CABLE LINE APPROXIMATE LOCATION TO BE VACATED

LEGEND

- BOUNDARY
- RIGHT OF WAY
- LOT LINE
- EASEMENT
- —W— WATER
- —S— SEWER
- —F— FORCE MAIN
- —TV— TELEPHONE
- —FO— FIBER
- EX ROADS
- STORM DRAIN
- PMDOM PROPOSED FIRE HYDRANT
- Public Metropolitan District Owned and Maintained

BEAR CREEK SURVEYING INC.
BRENT SMITH
95 South Bear Creek Road, Bayfield, CO 81122
P.O. Box 2015, Bayfield, CO 81122
ph(970)884-5069

DRAFTED BY: DBH
CHECKED BY: BJS

CLIENT: MONUMENT RIDGE EAST, LLC
MUNICIPALITY:
COUNTY: EL PASO

PRELIMINARY PLAN

OWNER OF RECORD: MONUMENT RIDGE EAST LLC
ADDRESS: 5055 LIST DRIVE
TELEPHONE NUMBER: COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80919

SUBMISSION DATE:	4/12/24
REVISON DATES:	8/12/24
REVISION DATES:	11/08/24

PROJECT #: 21-014
SHEET 2 OF 4

LEGEND

EXISTING	(E)
PROPOSED	(P)
CURB AND GUTTER	C&G
PUBLIC	PUB
PRIVATE	PVT
PROPERTY BOUNDARY	
RIGHT-OF-WAY	
PROPERTY LINE	
(E) CONTOUR, INDEX	7300
(E) CONTOUR	
(P) CONTOUR, INDEX	7300
(P) CONTOUR	
(E) STORM SEWER, INLET, MH	
(P) STORM SEWER, INLET, MH	
DIRECTION OF FLOW	2.00%
DIRECTION OF OVERLAND FLOW	

REV.	DESCRIPTION	DATE
1	ADDRESS AGENCY COMMENTS	11/08/24

811 Know what's below. Call 72 hours before you dig.
For more details visit: www.call811.com

PREPARED FOR:
MONUMENT RIDGE EAST, LLC
5055 LIST DRIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80919

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PRC ENGINEERING
4465 NORTHPARK DRIVE, SUITE 400A
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80907
(719) 291-2744

MONUMENT RIDGE EAST

PRELIMINARY GRADING

DESIGNED BY: MGP	DRAWN BY: MGP
SCALE: 1" = 100'	DATE: 11/08/24
JOB NUMBER 21-003	SHEET 4 OF 4

October 28, 2024

Kylie Bagley
El Paso County Development Services Department
Sent via online portal at: https://epcdevplanreview.com

RE: Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan
N1/2 of Section 2, Twp. 11S, Rng. 67W, 6th P.M.
Water Division 1, Water District 8
CDWR Assigned Subdivision No. 32357

Dear Kylie Bagley,

We have received the third referral on the above-referenced submittal to subdivide 63 acres into 37 single-family detached residential lots on 7.99 acres and 303 multi-family attached units/lots on 40.52 acres. The proposed source of water supply and wastewater disposal is to be served by the Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District. This letter supersedes the comments provided by this office on September 12, 2024.

Water Supply Demand

According to the updated Water Supply Information Summary provided in the referral, the estimated household use demand for 340 units in the proposed development is 94.72 acre-feet per year (84,563 gallon per day). No irrigation demand is proposed for any of the lots.

Source of Water Supply

The proposed water supplier is Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District ("District"). According to a letter dated August 7, 2024, the District is committed to serving 94.719 acre-feet per year of water required for this development, to serve 303 multi-family attached units/lots on 40.52 acres and 37 single-family detached residential lots on 7.99 acres.

Based on the August 7, 2024 commitment letter the District is committed to providing water and sewer services to the development provided the developer complies with the District Rules, Regulations, specification and policies regarding water and wastewater service and the developer enter into an agreement with the District for supplemental water service. We do not know if the applicant has met these requirements.

According to the December 2022 *Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District Long Range Plan (LRP),* previously provided to this office, the District utilizes two water supply sources. The first supply of water comes from the Denver Basin Aquifers, which the District can pump up to 6,322.4 acre-feet per year (based on a 100 year aquifer life) or 2,107.47 acre-feet per year (based on a 300 year aquifer life). The second supply of water comes from diversions on Monument Creek and Dead Woman Creek that occur via an exchange of treated wastewater effluent for surface water, which supplied an average of 347 acre-feet per year over the period 2017-2020 (an annually renewable supply with no administrative lifespan). Combined, the Denver Basin water rights (based on a 300-year aquifer life) and surface water exchanges (annually renewable with no administrative life span) exceed the average annual water demand of 2,122 acre-feet estimated for current build-out (based on Section 1.4.1 of the 2022 LRP).

As indicated in our previous letter our records show permit no.167104-A located on the subject property. Based on the information in the Water Resource Report the District would like to plug and abandon this well. Therefore, a Well Abandonment Report (available at https://dwr.state.co.us/eforms) must be filed with this office prior to the subdivision approval to affirm that this well (permit no. 167104-A) was properly abandoned.

Additional Comments

The applicant should be aware that any proposed detention pond for this development, must meet the requirements of a "storm water detention and infiltration facility" as defined in section 37-92-602(8), Colorado Revised Statutes, otherwise the structure may be subject to administration by this office. The applicant should review DWR's Administrative Statement Regarding the Management of Storm Water Detention Facilities and Post-Wildland Fire Facilities in Colorado to ensure that the notification, construction and operation of the proposed structure meets statutory and administrative requirements. The applicant is encouraged to use Colorado Stormwater Detention and Infiltration Facility Notification Portal, located at https://maperture.digitaldataservices.com/gvh/?viewer=cswdif, to meet the notification requirements.

State Engineer's Office Opinion

Based upon the above and pursuant to Section 30-28-136(1)(h)(II), C.R.S., it is the opinion of this office that the proposed water supply is adequate and can be provided without causing injury to decreed water rights, provided a Well Abandonment Report (available at https://dwr.state.co.us/eforms) is filed with this office prior to the subdivision approval to affirm that well no. 167104-A was properly abandoned.

Please contact me at 303-866-3581 x8246 or ioana.comaniciu@state.co.us with any questions.

Sincerely,

Ioana Comaniciu, P.E.
Water Resources Engineer

Ec: File for well permit no.167104-A
District File

Kenneth R. Hodges, County Attorney
719-520-6485
Centennial Hall
200 S. Cascade, Suite 150
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
www.ElPasoCo.com

Board of County Commissioners
Holly Williams, District 1
Carrie Geitner, District 2
Stan VanderWerf, District 3
Longinos Gonzalez, Jr., District 4
Cami Bremer, District 5

November 14, 2024

SP-24-1 Monument Ridge East

Reviewed by: Lori Seago, Senior Assistant County Attorney
April Willie, Paralegal

WATER SUPPLY REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Project Description

1. This is a proposal by Monument Ridge East, LLC ("Applicant"), to subdivide an approximately 63 +/- acre tract of land into 37 single-family detached residential lots and 303 multi-family attached units. The property is zoned PUD (Planned Unit Development).

Estimated Water Demand

2. Pursuant to the *Water Supply Information Summary* ("WSIS"), the Applicant estimates its annual water needs to serve this subdivision at 94.72 acre-feet/year with no request for irrigation. Based on these figures, the Applicant must provide a supply of 28,416 acre-feet of water (94.72 acre-feet/year x 300 years) to meet the County's 300-year water supply requirement for the subdivision.

Proposed Water Supply

3. The Applicant has provided for the source of water to derive from the Woodmoor Water & Sanitation District No. 1. The *Water Resources Report* ("*Report*") estimates the total annual water demand for the subdivision at 94.72 acre-feet/year, consisting of household uses. The *Report* indicates that the District's decreed Denver Basin water rights annual entitlement available for use totals 6,322.4 acre-feet per year. This amount is in addition to exchange water rights and senior surface water rights owned by the District. The total water commitment to serve existing development from Denver Basin water as of 2022 is 2,575 annual acre-feet. "…[T]he District has an excess of 3,747.4 af/yr of Denver Basin water rights annual entitlement available for future water commitments."

4. The Woodmoor Water & Sanitation District No. 1 District provided a letter of commitment dated August 7, 2024, for Monument Ridge East, in which the District committed to providing water service for the 340 units in an annual amount of 94.72 acre-feet per year. This commitment is contingent upon the Applicant entering into a Supplemental Water Service agreement with the District and complying with all District rules, regulations, specifications, and policies.

State Engineer's Office Opinion

5. In a letter dated October 28, 2024, the State Engineer's Office reviewed the application to subdivide the 63 +/- acres into 37 single-family detached residential lots and 303 multi-family attached units/lots. The State Engineer stated that "[t]he proposed water supplier is Woodmoor Water and Sanitation District ("District")." The State Engineer noted the estimated water demand of 94.72 acre-feet per year for the subdivision. Further, the State Engineer stated that "…pursuant to Section 30-28-136(1)(h)(II), C.R.S., it is the opinion of this office that the proposed water supply is adequate and can be provided without causing injury to decreed water rights..." The State Engineer requires that a Well Abandonment Report be filed prior to subdivision approval for the existing well on the property.

Recommended Findings

6. Quantity and Dependability. Applicant's water demand for Monument Ridge East is 94.72 acre-feet per year for a total demand of 28,416 acre-feet for the subdivision for 300 years, to be supplied by Woodmoor Water & Sanitation District No. 1. **Based on the District's available water supply of approximately 3,747 annual acre-feet, but given the District's requirement of a Supplemental Water Service Agreement, the County Attorney's Office recommends a finding of conditional sufficiency as to water quantity and dependability for Monument Ridge East.**

7. Quality. The water quality requirements of Section 8.4.7.B.10 of the Code must be satisfied. Section 8.4.7.B.10.g. of the Code allows for the presumption of acceptable water quality for projects such as this where water is supplied by an existing Community Water Supply operating in conformance with Colorado Primary Drinking Water Regulations unless there is evidence to the contrary.

8. Basis. The County Attorney's Office reviewed the following documents in preparing this review: the *Water Supply Information Summary*, the *Water Resources Report* dated September 2024, the *Woodmoor Water & Sanitation District No. 1* letter dated August 7, 2024, and the *State Engineer Office's Opinion* dated October 28, 2024. The recommendations herein are based on the information contained in such documents and on compliance with the requirements set forth below. ***Should the information relied upon be found to be incorrect, or should the below requirements not be met, the County Attorney's Office reserves the right to amend or withdraw its recommendations.***

REQUIREMENTS:

A. Applicant and all future owners of lots within this filing shall be advised of, and comply with, the conditions, rules, regulations, limitations, and specifications set by the District.

B. Prior to **approval** of the first final plat for this preliminary plan, Applicant must provide proof that a Well Abandonment Report has been filed with the State Engineer's Office for the existing well under permit no. 167104-A.

C. Prior to **recording** the first final plat for this preliminary plan, Applicant must provide proof that it has entered into an approved Supplemental Water Service Agreement with the District.

cc: Kylie Bagley, Project Manager, Planner

Project Name: Monument Ridge East, Rezoning (RM12)

Project Number: P245 / RE2024-031
Date Received: 03/25/2024

Jurisdiction: El Paso County
Due Date: 04/15/2024

Addressing Comments:
No Comments

Engineering Comments:
No Comments

Planner Comments:
As mentioned previously, Douglas County Planning has concerns with isolated urban-level multifamily development adjacent to rural and open space areas. The proposed zoning would allow approximately 500 multifamily dwellings in an area that is better suited to less intense development such as the proposed adjacent suburban residential zoning. While the narrative states the need for multifamily development in El Paso County, it does not discuss the appropriateness of this isolated location relative to services and facilities for the approximately 1,000 future residents. Such density is better suited to municipalities that provide public services and facilities within a reasonable distance.

4/26/2024

Kylie Bagley, Planner III
Meggan Herrington, Planning Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

I am Steve King, Mayor Pro tem of the Town of Monument.

Monument Ridge applied for annexation into the town of Monument with the plan that they are proposing to El Paso County. There were discussions on what a suitable zone district might look like for this property and the property owner was not willing to adjust the densities, product type, nor were they willing to protect the natural features, or willing to change the zoning into a PUD zone district, so it was declined at the Monument Council public hearing.

This property would be a natural fit into the town of Monument through annexation as it is at the extreme northern county line and is difficult for El Paso County to service this area, and the Town has this property in our Three Mile Plan.

Because of the large number of homes proposed, the Town of Monument would have to hire additional police due to of the MOU that we have with El Paso County, which would become a negative economic burden to the Town, so annexation would be the only way we could reasonably provide services. El Paso County does not currently have sufficient resources to provide police services or otherwise. It's a natural fit to annex.

But the Town would not annex this property under these conditions. This project does not meet the intent of our Comprehensive Plan or the future land use map.

In my opinion, Monument Ridge should become a PUD zone district. This property is the gateway to El Paso County and special attention needs to be paid to the natural beauty that is the Palmer Divide. The El Paso County Master Plan as well as the Monument Comprehensive Plan speak clearly as to the protection of natural areas, which include dense tree strands of old growth conifers.

When asked for agency comments, and because this project abuts Douglas County, The Douglas County Planning department stated: *"As mentioned previously, Douglas County Planning has concerns with isolated urban-level multifamily development adjacent to rural and open space areas. The proposed zoning would allow approximately 500 multifamily dwellings in an area that is better suited to less intense development such as the proposed adjacent suburban residential zoning."*

The Town of Monument comments included: "*The development as currently proposed will be incompatible with the adjacent properties and will be detrimental to the preservation of the natural and rural character of the area."*

And: *"The Town Council continues to oppose proposed development densities, whether built within or outside of the Town boundaries. The Town Police Department continues to be the first responders to the subject properties given the proximity and adjacency to the Town. The Town's Police Department serves the property when County services are not immediately available. The proposed residential densities will*

quantity of police requests without providing that additional tax income needed to support such services."

Clearly, Monument Ridge East does not warrant the procedure for a straight zoned property. According to the applicant during the Monument Town council public hearing, Nina Ruiz, a former Monument Town Planning Director and current consultant for this project, directed the applicant to rezone the property under a straight zoned district in Monument, while the Planning Director for Monument.

Her original proposal was not what Town Council considered a viable choice because of the uniqueness of this area. It should be noted that Ms. Ruiz left the Town of Monument before this project was presented to Town Council.

The property owners purchased this property zoned as it is currently. The surrounding property owners also purchased their property knowing what the current zoning is, and the likelihood that it could be built under those circumstances.

That is the reason when a zoning change is requested, it should generally become a PUD zone district with community input. Property rights are the rights currently allowed on the property; not future rights requested. Otherwise, it would be granting rights an owner does not currently possess. Surrounding property owners also have property rights, among them, the right to peaceful enjoyment.

The criterion for rezoning also demands that there is a need not being served. That is unsure as there are many parcels of land in Monument that are approved, but not yet developed, which contain higher and high density uses. Normally those areas would be permitted to be built out before we make premature decisions on more of the same.

These are requirements the El Paso County master plan, as well as Monument's Comprehensive Plan, put in place when it comes to rezoning parcels. There are several natural features and topography, including dense tree strands, a protected wetlands area, rural zoning to the east and also to the west, a 36,000 acre protected conservation easement adjacent to the north, and the issue of water service as we explore long term planning.

This project is what PUDs were invented for. While it is warranted to have transitional zoning between the interstate frontage and these rural properties that dominate the area, simply zoning this entire area into one or two straight zoned districts of higher density properties throughout does not respect the rights of adjacent homeowners invested in the community, and not in spirit with the characteristics of the area or the El Paso County Master Plan, or the Monument Comprehensive Plan. Another reason a PUD is the clear choice.

Because this property is changing zoning and altering the character of the community, impacting property values of those who live adjacent, the residents should be afforded the right to address their grievances with the property owner, allowing everyone come together to be heard. This promotes goodwill and avoids unnecessary conflict.

Clearcutting trees for development is not allowed anywhere along the front range, and the Palmer Divide region is no different. Castle Pines, Larkspur, Castle Rock, Parker, Elizabeth, Colorado Springs, and EL Paso County have no areas where existing trees, and especially old growth trees are permitted to be completely eliminated.

Those areas are considered an asset to the community and an asset to the projects built in those areas, many of which are parks or open space. Douglas County has consistently promoted open space areas and parks, something El Paso County has been negligent in. This is apparent again due to the 36,000-acre conservation easement adjacent to County Line Rd and north to Larkspur.

In the case of the Monument Ridge East, with the straight zoned districts proposed, there is a very real possibility that every single tree could be removed. They have stated a plan to relocate trees, but any arborist will tell you that the survival rate for transplanting established trees is very low.

The adjacent neighbors on the east side purchased their property realizing that this area would be developed at some point, however, the El Paso County zoning adjacent to them only permits 20,000SF lots, more closely resembling the existing uses, and the El Paso County master plan reinforces those uses setting aside this area for suburban use. Suburban uses consist of R20000 and that is exactly what is in place currently.

In addition, Suburban uses on the El Paso County master plan list attached housing only as support uses, requiring that the vast majority are single family uses. Keep in mind that this is the gateway to El Paso County, and while exiting a 36,000-acre conservation easement, the welcome sign to El Paso County would become multi-family units right next to the interstate, on newly cleared land where a forest once stood. Our Comprehensive Plan speaks about preserving natural amenities, as does the El Paso County master plan.

In Monument, every area in the perimeter of the town has lower density uses. Only high-density uses are included in the heart of the town, Jackson Creek Parkway and Old Denver Highway. Willow Springs Ranch is about 1 unit per acre, Jackson Creek is about 3 per acre. Sanctuary Pointe is less still, about 1.6 per acre. The densest sections of Village Center are slightly over 4 per acre. The adjacent Woodmoor area is .5 per acre on average. On the West side, all the parcels adjacent to the interstate are on larger acreage parcels, some 5 acres.

Again, the combination of proposing higher density uses in combination with eliminating the natural features, whether it be terrain or dense strands of forest, is not compatible with the character of the area, or the standards in the Monument Comprehensive Plan that calls for maintaining a small-town feel, protecting the view corridors and natural features.

El Paso County's Master Plan rates this area as a Suburban Placetype. According to the master plan, Suburban Residential is characterized by predominantly residential areas with predominately single-family detached housing.

The areas of change designation is: Minimal change.

The R20000 zoning is consistent with the El Paso County Master plan future land use which classifies this area as Suburban and in an area of minimal change. This would also permit saving many of the existing old growth trees that make this part of the county a desirable feature. Again, since they want a mix of uses, this entire area should be zoned as a PUD with community input afforded to the people this project negatively affects.

The current zoning does not permit the uses and densities proposed, nor does the proposed rezoning provide public hearings throughout the process. There is one public hearing for a zoning change, and

then it becomes an administrative process. This is why the applicant wants a straight zoned district, to minimize public input as the merit of the project can't stand on its own.

This property needs to become a PUD, with the protections that a PUD offers. The purpose of the PUD is to custom fit the zoning to conform with unusual properties and allows flexibility in the existing code in exchange for amenities to the community.

- This project does not meet the criteria in the El Paso Master Plan or the Monument Comprehensive Plan as proposed.
- This project should be a PUD with community input as it does not meet the criteria for a straight zoned district.
- This project is a good fit to become annexed into the Monument Town limits in order to provide emergency services that won't negatively impact the town's budget.
- Natural features should be saved as this is the gateway to El Paso County and abuts a 36000-acre conservation easement.
- Property rights are only existing rights, and that is what was purchased by this applicant. Newly granted rights should have adjacent community input throughout the entire process with public hearings as a PUD.
- Higher density projects in this area create impervious surfaces that will impact existing fragile wetlands.
- This area is a migration path for numerous large animal species and should have sufficient open space and shelter with existing large tree strands.
- When notified of Monument's Planning Department review, dozens of affected residents signed an opposition petition.
- Douglas County does not approve of this project as proposed.
- The Town of Monument does not approve of this project as proposed.

El Paso County, as well as Monument, have procedures and criteria in place to allow for responsible development and to prevent the general overall plan from being compromised. That is the intension of zoning, future land use maps, community input and master plans. The intention is to promote a community in such a way that it creates or maintains desirability and protects the property values of all who are impacted.

There is only so much undeveloped land remaining in the Trilakes area and it will be developed at some point. As elected officials, our main job is to make sure it is developed responsibly with the upmost respect to our residents and the El Paso County Master Plan. This plan isn't close to accomplishing those goals.

Please reject this project as proposed, due to the incompatibility with the El Paso Master Plan and the Monument Comprehensive Plan and respect the rights of those who chose this area as their home. Please also respect the governmental agencies that also oppose this plan.

This letter of opposition is on my behalf and other Council Members may have differing viewpoints, although this project was rejected by Monument Town Council as proposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve King
Monument Mayor Pro Tem

Marcella Maes

From: Aaron Kellar <aarondkellar@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 6:22 PM
To: PCD Hearings; PLNWEB; Holly Williams; Carrie Geitner; Stan VanderWerf; Longinos Gonzalez, Jr; Cami Bremer
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Application for Monument Ridge East (P245 Monument Ridge East LLC)

You don't often get email from aarondkellar@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

November 12, 2024

Board of County Commissioners
El Paso County Administration Building
200 S. Cascade Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Dear Members of the Board:

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the rezoning application for Monument Ridge East, which is scheduled for discussion at the El Paso County Board of Commissioners' meeting on November 21, 2024. As a long-term (19 years) resident of the North Woodmoor area and an owner of rental properties on the south end of Monument, I am deeply concerned about the proposed development and its potential negative impact on our community. I respectfully urge the Board to consider the following points when evaluating the rezoning request.

1. Prior Rejection by Monument Town Council

It is important to note that the Monument Town Council has already rejected the annexation and rezoning proposal submitted by Monument Ridge East LLC. During the Council's review, the developer declined to engage in meaningful negotiations to reduce the proposed density or address concerns regarding water resource limitations. This prior rejection underscores the broader community's opposition to this high-density development.

2. Incompatibility with Regional Zoning and Land Use

The proposed high-density rezoning is inconsistent with both the existing zoning in Northern El Paso County and the broader land use patterns in the area. The surrounding region, including Southern Douglas County, has consistently prioritized low-density, rural development to preserve its character. In fact, Southern Douglas County has also formally opposed high-density housing in proximity to its open spaces. The Monument Ridge East proposal fails to align with the rural and suburban character of the area and would set an undesirable precedent for future developments.

3. Environmental and Wildlife Concerns

The area under consideration is home to a variety of wildlife species, including elk, antelope, fox, mountain lions, bears, and deer. High-density housing would pose a significant threat to these species and disrupt the local ecosystem. Furthermore, the site contains protected wetlands that provide critical habitats for wildlife, and such sensitive environmental areas would be negatively impacted by the proposed development.

4. Inconsistent with Existing Zoning and Lot Sizes

Currently, the area is zoned for 1- to 2-acre lots, a designation consistent with the character of the surrounding community, including Woodmoor, which mandates a minimum lot size of 0.5 acres. The proposed rezoning to a higher density is out of character with the surrounding land use and would create an incongruent urban development in an area that is currently intended to remain rural and low-density. Moreover, the land directly to the north remains undeveloped, and its proximity to open space further emphasizes the incompatibility of the high-density proposal.

5. Infrastructure and Capacity Concerns

The rapid growth of Monument, particularly in the Jackson Creek area, has placed significant strain on local infrastructure. The town has seen a marked increase in population, yet essential community services, such as schools, parks, roads, and libraries, have not kept pace. The overcrowding of Monument's schools, the limited capacity of our roads and the deteriorating condition of roadways—including congestion along Misty Acres Road and near Palmer Ridge High School—demonstrate the community's inability to accommodate additional high-density development without substantial negative impact on public services and quality of life.

6. Water Resource Constraints

Water scarcity remains a critical issue in Colorado, and further development in this area would exacerbate existing challenges in managing local water resources. The proposed rezoning for high-density housing would put additional pressure on an already strained water supply, which is not sustainable given current and projected population growth.

7. Lack of Walkability and Community Integration

Typically, high-density developments are designed to be walkable, with access to public transportation, retail, and recreational facilities. The proposed site, however, is located in an area with no pedestrian infrastructure and minimal access to community amenities. This lack of walkability would significantly reduce the quality of life for residents and would be inconsistent with the principles of responsible urban planning.

Conclusion

In light of the above concerns, I strongly urge the Board to reject the proposed rezoning application for Monument Ridge East. The proposed development is incompatible with the rural character of Northern El Paso County and Southern Douglas County, and it would place undue strain on infrastructure, water

resources, and the local environment. I respectfully ask that the Board prioritize the long-term well-being of the community, the preservation of open space, and the protection of our natural resources.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

Aaron D. Kellar, MA, NCC

719.352.2005

Marcella Maes

From: Heidi Arbury <harbteaches@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 7:54 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: High density not appropriate

You don't often get email from harbteaches@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Planning commissioners:

I am deeply concerned about the level of growth especially in our Northern portions of El Paso County. Douglas County planning commission has already stated they do not approve this high density housing development so close to the county line. It will impact wildlife corridors. It will impact quality of life for current residents. We don't have adequate water. The infrastructure is not capable of handling such a huge population.
Please contact me if you have any questions about my concerns.

Respectfully.

Heidi Arbury
719 339-4972
harbteaches@gmail.com
17895 Walden Way, Colorado Springs, CO 80908

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 7:29 AM
To: J B
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument ridge east

Thank you, Janelle! Don't have answers for you yet as the project is still under review. We are going to ensure your comments are provided to the decision makers (and the property owner) and we will let you know about the public hearings moving forward.

Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

From: J B <baker1jm@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 5:39 AM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument ridge east

> You don't often get email from baker1jm@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Hi Meggan,

I was unable to attend the meeting last night but just wanted to express my deep concern for the monument ridge east development. As a 8 year resident of misty acres, I never in a million years thought a 300+ unit apartment complex would be considered so close to my home. Changing the zoning of that area is ridiculous and detrimental to the residents, wildlife and community as a whole. My primary concerns are a significant increase in traffic to what is now a quiet, family friendly neighborhood, increased crime, and destruction of plants and wildlife. I was trying to catch up on the slides from the presentation but didn't see what the plan was for the increase in kids for the schools. Are there going to be any parks or walking trails included in this plan? There is nothing about this that is beneficial to the residents of el paso county. Development is inevitable but it needs to be smart so we don't destroy our beautiful community.

Sincerely,

Janelle Baker

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 7:31 AM
To: Travis Beakley
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument Ridge East

Thanks for taking the time to send an email Travis. There aren't answers to all your questions yet as this is still in review. We are going to ensure your comments are provided to the decision makers (and the applicant) and we will let you know about the public hearings moving forward.
Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Travis Beakley <travisbeakley@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 7:07 AM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument Ridge East

[You don't often get email from travisbeakley@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

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.

Ms. Herrington
I understand that you were at the meeting and taking notes on during the open house on this project.
First of all, thank you for being there and recognizing that this is an important topic to people of monument. Many of us feel this great town is getting pillaged and overdeveloped to the point that we are essentially Colorado Springs.

Second, I am adamantly against this proposal. The loss of more habitat to install unneeded housing is absurd. Right now we have a green space allowing for noise, water, sediment reduction from the I-25 corridor. Every piece of ground does not need development housing or business.

I was not able to attend the meeting but I was able to view slides presented at the meeting. I would like to ask if this developer has conferred threaded and endangered species. Based on the slides there are riparian area for prebles mouse, monarch butterfly (listed as candidate species),western prairie fringe orchid and Ute-ladies tresses. There is also potential habitat for the soon to be listed Endangered Tri-color Bat. I am very well versed in habitat evaluations as it is what I do for my job. If I was having to develop these areas I would be required to look at these species. Has any of this work been completed?
Simply removal of the trees can trigger USFWS Consultation. Do you know if this has occurred?

As for wetland impacts does their plan account for the loss of over an acre of marsh/riparian habitat? This would trigger notification to US Army Corps for loss of greater than 1/10 acre. Has the developer started this?

Stormwater permitting aside, how does the county account for the additional water usage and increased traffic ? This is a finite supply and we keep tapping into this resource as though it's never ending. What about capacity at schools? Does the county consider that?

I beg you and the county commissioners to not allow this to happen, once we lose it, all is lost. We have a great place here but unneeded (greedy) development is slowly taking everything about Colorado away. This would be an eyesore (much like the development on both sides of I-25 in monument) to the community and detract from value of the land

Please take these concerns serious, people of Monument DO NOT want this development. I am open for discussion if that is warranted.

Thank you
Travis Beakley
713-305-8490
Sent from my iPhone

From: PLNWEB
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2024 4:15 PM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: EA2388

Importance: High

From: Virginia Beck <moonlady5@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2024 3:54 PM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA2388

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.

I oppose the proposed rezoning in EA2388. The home density and styles are much different than I expected when I moved here. I only support detached single family homes in the neighborhood.

Get Outlook for Android

From: PLNWEB
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 7:38 AM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: EA2388 - Opposition

From: Michelle Beichley <michelle.beichley@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:29 PM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA2388

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.

To whom it may concern:

I oppose the proposed rezoning in EA2388. The home density and styles are much different than I expected when I moved here. I only support detached single family homes in the neighborhood. Additionally, our schools and water needs will not support this rezoning.

Best regards,

Michelle Beichley

From: Miranda Benson2
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 2:07 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: FW: EA Number EA2388 File Number P246

From: Andrew Bussa <andrew.bussa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 1:07 PM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA Number EA2388 File Number P246

Hello,

I only support detached single family homes in the Monument Ridge East area. The neighborhood is established with single family homes and this would negatively alter the character.

The traffic study is insufficient. The intersection at HWY 105 and Woodmoor Dr must be considered because that's were everyone driving south winds up. The back ups after school are already ridiculous. Was the study run during a school break period (I did not see start and end dates)? If so, that should invalidate the data because it is not representative of actual peak traffic.

-Andrew Bussa

19855 Alexandria Dr, Monument, CO 80132

From: PLNWEB
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 1:25 PM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: EA2388

Importance: High

Kylie,
Mr. Bussa just sent a follow-up email regarding EA2388.

Kelly

From: Andrew Bussa <andrew.bussa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 1:20 PM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA2388

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.

I do not like the proposed high density housing because it negatively changes the nature of the community. We bought our home in 2019 with the undeveloped land zoning in mind so we could image what it would look like when finished.

Was the traffic impact study done over D-38 school holidays? If so, it should be rerun to account for realistic peak traffic numbers.

-Andrew Bussa

19855 Alexandria Dr, Monument, CO 80132

Kylie Bagley

From: Kelly Hills
Sent: Friday, June 7, 2024 12:08 PM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: EA2388/SP241

Importance: High

From: Andrew Bussa <andrew.bussa@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 7, 2024 11:55 AM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA2388/SP241

> You don't often get email from andrew.bussa@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

I oppose the planned rezoning in EA2388/SP241. Detached single family homes are the best fit for the area. The extra traffic will also be a mess for people going from the new homes to County 404 to get on I-25. It will also put a massive strain on the Woodmoor and 105 intersection, especially on school days at school run time.

-Andrew Bussa
19855 Alexandria Dr, Monument, CO 80132

From: Kelly Hills
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: EA2388
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 7:51:42 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: John Bussa <john.e.bussa@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2024 3:54 PM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA2388

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.

I oppose the proposed rezoning in EA2388. The home density and styles are much different than I expected. I only support detached single family homes in the neighborhood.

Sent from my iPhone

Marcella Maes

From: Brandy Doerner <brandy.doerner@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 8:02 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East Rezoning

[You don't often get email from brandy.doerner@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

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.

To whom it may concern...

ABSOLUTELY NOT!!! This proposed rezoning and housing development is not needed, wanted nor can it be supported by the current infrastructure!!!

It will destroy the current landscape and natural habitats that many of us came to Monument for in the first place! Dark skies, quiet and unencumbered neighborhoods in the wooded areas of North Woodmoor!!! Stop with this utter destruction! It is not progress.

We vote NO to this ... and to the proposal for a "Buc-ees" directly across the highway!!! NO NO NO!!!!

Brandy Doerner
1510 Longview Circle
Monument CO 80132

M: +1 720 233 4851

Sent from my iPhone, using Voice-to-Text technology. Please forgive brevity and typos.

Marcella Maes

From: steve draper <ssdraper@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 3:15 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East

[You don't often get email from ssdraper@mac.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

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.

Nov. 13 2024

To the EPC Planning Commission,

We intend to attend the Monument Ridge East public hearing on November 21st at 9:00 a.m., but in essence our concerns regarding this project are well-stated and in concordance with those of Steve King, pro temp Mayor of Monument, CO.

This is NOT a viable and community-beneficial project, seemingly thrown together without all the necessary diligence of a professional project as noted in Steve King's concise and clear review of the materials submitted by the owners.

As you must know, the city of Monument has already agreed to the objection and denied the Monument Ridge West project, and the same critical reasons should apply to the East project as well.

Further, majorities of the surrounding citizens reject it outright as evidenced by the Monument decision.

If El Paso County were to bypass the Monument decision, then the commission is misrepresenting the will and rights of its taxpaying citizens. Nowhere is an owner granted a "right" to build or develop projects. This project goes against zoning and codes, will inevitably cause devaluation of surrounding homes and property, degrade wildlife and arbor preservation, and cause encroachment of 35,000 acres of unique and highly valued green space. Adjacent Douglas County will have a strong opposition voice if the Monument Ridge moves any further.

Finally, EPC Planning Commission certainly doesn't want another Ford Amphitheater debacle, causing tension and anger of surrounding neighbors. If the Board votes to allow this project to move forward, it most certainly will get one with appeals and potential class action against the County - and anyone - fraudulent and with intentions to harm the nearby property owners and community.

The city of Monument has been gracious to consider a "PUD" development which the Monument Ridge owners have rejected.
It is time - once again - to reject Monument Ridge.

Sincerely,

Steve Draper
Carolyn Hill

From: Coele Durbin <coele.durbin@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 2:28 PM
To: PLNWEB; Holly Williams; Carrie Geitner; Stan VanderWerf; Longinos Gonzalez, Jr; Cami Bremer
Subject: P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12

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.

To the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Board,

My name is Coéle Durbin. I have lived in North Woodmoor for the past 7 years. I received notice regarding the application for rezoning by the P245 Monument Ridge East LLC owners. I would like to strongly oppose this rezoning application and would like to urge El Paso County to consider the following as reasons for the opposition:

- The Monument Town Council already declined Monument Ridge East LLC's annexation and overall rezoning project. During statements, the developer refused to negotiate with the town council to reduce the high density or to consider water limitations.
- The high density rezoning does not match Northern El Paso County, especially in the area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC. The high density rezoning also does not match Rural Southern Douglas County.
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC is currently zoned for 1 to 2 acre lots which is fitting with the immediate area of Woodmoor that has minimum 0.5 acre lots. Additionally, the land immediately north of this area is all undeveloped, further contrasting high density housing.
- High density housing has been exponentially increasing in Monument, especially among the Jackson Creek area, however there has not been an update to the infrastructure or community needs (rec centers, pools, roads, libraries, schools).
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC has protected wetlands that is home to wildlife that would be displaced by high density housing
- Traffic along Misty Acres Rd and by Palmer Ridge High School is already congested and would be greatly impacted by additional high density housing.
- Monument has one middle school and one small library, both of which are already overcrowded and cannot handle the exponential growth proposed by the developer.

Please consider the negative impact RM-12 rezoning would have on Northern El Paso County, as well as rural Southern Douglas County, who has been very sage in protecting open space.

Thank you,

Coéle Durbin
20360 True Vista Circle

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2024 8:19 AM
To: Stacey Ferguson
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument East Ridge

Thank you for the email, Stacey. We send all development applications to the school district and rely on them to tell us the needs. Staff will be sure to address this as part of the review process and add your comments to the record.
Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

From: Stacey Ferguson <sferguson3@dcsdk12.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 7:57 PM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument East Ridge

You don't often get email from sferguson3@dcsdk12.org. Learn why this is important

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.

Hello Ms. Herington,

I am writing about my concerns regarding the continuous building in Monument, specifically the Monument East Ridge. There are so many concerns from lack of infrastructure to support the builds, elimination of green space and the animals, to the impact this development has on education. I am just going to focus on education since that is my scope of practice.

I live in Monument, I have children that currently attend D38, and I have also previously taught in D38. Currently, I teach in Douglas County due the numerous concerns I have about D38 schools. First and foremost is the over population of the classrooms. Each year teachers were asked to do more with less. I know this is the current state of education. However specific to Monument, each year the district loses more teachers and is not able to fill those positions. A MLO has not be passed in years- please note although there is a concern about compensation, there is a bigger concern about not having the funds for resources like curriculums.

I know at the meeting last evening, the rep stated that the school board approved this plan. However, if you talk to the school board about this they will tell you they have never been presented with a plan to date about this development.

Our middle school is currently at the largest capacity of all time which has significant implications on education. Education as a whole is deteriorating in this country and research proves that large class size is a factor in this deterioration.

I also know that contractors typically either give land to the school district or money to off set the increasing student population. Typically the land is not suitable to be built on so that does not assist the school district. As for the monetary contribution, historically this does not even cover the salary of one teacher. Again demonstrating that the contractor contributions do not benefit or offset the current challenges that D38 already faces not to mention the additional challenges that this development will pose.

Thank you for your time and considering my concerns regarding education.

Stacey Ferguson

Stacey Ferguson, MA, CCC-SLP
Speech Language Pathologist
Douglas County High School '*GO HUSKIES*'
"The most important thing in communication is hearing what isn't said." Peter Drucker

Marcella Maes

From: Rachel Ford-Wilkinson <reford285@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 8:00 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East Project

You don't often get email from reford285@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

To whom it may concern,

As a resident living directly on County Line/Palmer Divide in Unincorporated El Paso county and a Realtor in the area that would actually benefit from selling these proposed properties - I am HIGHLY against this development for a multitude of reasons.

Not only are we now fighting off a Bucee's! County Line road is already getting busy to the point where there are multiple accidents in snow storms and is not wide enough to accommodate thousands of more residents that would be moving in right off of the road. The wildlife preserve directly across the street is home to a giant elk herd, coyote packs, bears, and more that use that area. This is a rural area - it's pure greed from developers. We just voted in this recent election to elect individuals that are not bought and paid for by developers. I hope we selected the right officials on this.

PLEASE stop trying to over develop and destroy the rural aspects of North Unincorporated El Paso County.

Thank you for your time and consideration - I hope you're getting a flood of emails and that the entire town shows up to oppose this action.

--

Rachel Ford-Wilkinson

In the end, only three things matter:
how much you loved,
how gently you lived, and
how gracefully you let go of the things not meant for you.

From: Rebecca Rudder
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 3:00 PM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12

From: grace <grace.allison@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2024 2:18 PM
To: Holly Williams <HollyWilliams@elpasoco.com>
Subject: P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12

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.

Ms. Williams,

I received notice regarding the application for rezoning by the P245 Monument Ridge East LLC owners. I would like to strongly oppose this rezoning application and would like to urge El Paso County to consider the following as reasons for the opposition:

- The Monument Town Council already declined Monument Ridge East LLC's annexation and overall rezoning project. During statements, the developer refused to negotiate with the town council to reduce the high density or to consider water limitations
- The high density rezoning does not match Monument, especially in the area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC is currently zoned for 1 to 2 acre lots which is fitting with the immediate area of Woodmoor that has minimum 0.5 acre lots
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC has protected wetlands that is home to wildlife that would be displaced by high density housing
- Traffic along Misty Acre Rd and by Palmer Ridge High School congested would be greatly impacted by additional high density housing
- Monument has one middle school and one small library, both of which are already over crowded and cannot handle the exponential growth proposed by the developer

We live in Woodmoor, directly east of the proposed rezoning area. Before purchasing our house in 2022, we reviewed the zoning of the acreage immediately alongside the highway and bought because it is currently zoned for 1 to 2 acre lots. It is unreasonable for a developer to purchase land that is already zoned, expecting it to be rezoned to fit their financial gain, especially after being turned down by the Monument Town Council.

Please consider the feel of Monument, the desire of the community, and the negative impact RM-12 rezoning would have on this area.

Thank you,

-Grace Foy

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2024 9:23 AM
To: Grace Foy
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument Ridge East

Thank you for the comments, Grace. We will include these in the record to the decision makers. Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Grace Foy <grace.allison@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:58 PM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument Ridge East

[You don't often get email from grace.allison@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

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.

Ms Herington,

Thank you for attending yesterday's meeting at the Woodmoor Barn regarding the proposed zoning changes for Monument Ridge East.

I hope that you heard the voice of the community and understand that the proposed zoning changes are in direct opposition to Monument's wants and needs.

I would like to echo what the Monument Mayor, the Monument Town Council, and Douglas County have already voiced - the proposed high density zoning changes would be detrimental to the community and to the current small town feel of Monument.

I respect that the developer has a right to develop, however it should be in accordance with the current zoning of the area. The developer noted that there would be a transition from the 0.5-1 acre lots in the immediate area, however, the proposed single row of 0.3 acre lots which then immediately progress into higher density housing is not keeping in line with any of the Woodmoor neighborhood.

We are first time home buyers with a young child. Before buying our house immediately off of Doewood we researched the zoning of the vacant land and were satisfied with its existing 0.5 acre zoned lots. We are concerned that such a dramatic increase of housing density in this area will impact the already full schools for our daughter and make the area dangerous to the many people who walk in the area to PRHS or for exercise. Monument Hill Rd, Misty Acres Blvd, Doewood, and Old Antlers Road are all already heavily traveled and do not have sidewalks to safeguard pedestrians. Similarly, the inclined portions of these roads are treacherous during snow and ice, and many accidents occur there during inclimate weather.

There are many other concerns about the current proposal, including concerns about resources, safety, and animal habitat, all of which have been eloquently voiced by Steve King of the Monument Town Council, the Mayor, and others.

I would like to urge you to strongly consider the clear concerns of the community and decline the developer's request to rezone the area.

Respectfully,

-Grace Foy

20205 True Vista Cir
415-819-6425

Marcella Maes

From: Grace Foy <grace.allison@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:07 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East

You don't often get email from grace.allison@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Good morning,

I am a resident of unincorporated El Paso County, directly adjacent to the proposed Monument Ridge East development. I will not be able to attend the county meeting on 11/21, but would like to dial in remotely if at all possible.

I would like to express my strong opposition to the rezoning application for Monument Ridge East. Both the Monument town council and Douglas County have officially opposed this rezoning application because it is not fitting with either Monument/Woodmoor or the hundreds of acres of green space that is directly adjacent in Douglas County.

The property is currently zoned for 0.5 - 1.0 acre lots, which we checked before purchasing our house which overlooks this area. A high density development neither fits with North Woodmoor, which is all minimum 0.5 acre lots, nor the surrounding area which is all open green space.

Additionally, the traffic impacts to this area would be disastrous on Monument Hill, especially during inclement weather. This area is well-traveled by families and students taking their kids to nearby Palmer Ridge High School, Lewis Palmer Elementary School, and Lewis Palmer Middle School (the latter of which is at near capacity and is the only middle school for all of the tri-lakes area).

The Tri-Lakes area is not set up for additional high density housing. El Paso County shows that there are numerous areas already zoned for high density housing, and that existing high density buildings are half empty. Not only is the Monument Ridge East proposal not fitting with Monument's master plan, but a rezoning would be against El Paso County's directive to rezone when there are already undeveloped areas zoned for the specific purpose.

Please listen to the residents of this area and deny the rezoning application for Monument Ridge East. Please allow Monument and unincorporated El Paso county to maintain the beauty of its current planning, and respect the voice of the residents in this immediate area.

Respectfully,

-Grace Foy

From: Hannah Shea <goofnutball@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2024 2:09 PM
To: Kylie Bagley; Meggan Herington; PLNWEB
Subject: P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12
Attachments: Steve King - 04-26-2024.pdf

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.

Ms. Bagley, Ms Herrrington, and to the entire El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department,

I am a resident near the proposed rezoning area entitled "P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12." I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the rezoning petition for the proposed area.

I would like to urge you to consider the clearly voiced objections of both Douglas County and the Monument Town Council and to reject the project as proposed. I am echoing the Steve King, Mayor Pro Tem of the Town of Monument, and his written statement to El Paso County on 26 April 2024, as attached.

The proposed rezoning does not fit into the community, is in direct opposition to the lower density population of the immediate area and the neighboring 36000 acre conservation easement, and would inhibit the existing wildlife and natural resource. Additionally, the Monument Town Council intensely researched the originally proposed annexation and denied it as it would negatively impact the town and its limited budget.

Respectfully,

Hannah Foy

From: Mike <michaelfoy7@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2024 2:43 PM
To: Kylie Bagley; Meggan Herington; PLNWEB
Subject: P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12
Attachments: Steve King - 04-26-2024.pdf

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.

Ms. Bagley, Ms Herington, and to the entire El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department,

I am a resident near the proposed rezoning area entitled "P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12." I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the rezoning petition for the proposed area.

I would like to urge you to consider the clearly voiced objections of both Douglas County and the Monument Town Council and to reject the project as proposed. I am echoing the Steve King, Mayor Pro Tem of the Town of Monument, and his written statement to El Paso County on 26 April 2024, as attached.

The proposed rezoning does not fit into the community, is in direct opposition to the lower density population of the immediate area and the neighboring 36000 acre conservation easement, and would inhibit the existing wildlife and natural resource. Additionally, the Monument Town Council intensely researched the originally proposed annexation and denied it as it would negatively impact the town and its limited budget.

Respectfully,

Michael Foy

Marcella Maes

From: Mike <michaelfoy7@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 6:01 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East Hearing

You don't often get email from michaelfoy7@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Members of the El Paso County Planning Board,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the rezoning application for Monument Ridge East. Every member of the community that I have spoken to is deeply concerned about the impact that this will have on the Monument and North Woodmoor neighborhood areas, as indicated in the contentious community meeting hosted by the developer at The Barn several months ago.

The town of Monument previously rejected the developer's petition to annex into the town because the developer ignored the apprehension of the community and refused to make any changes that would help address any of the valid concerns. Additionally, Douglas County has formally opposed this rezoning as it will be in direct opposition to the hundreds of acres of open space that is immediately across the street from the proposed site.

We are not opposed to the development of this land - we understand that Colorado is continuing to grow and that development is needed. However, we are asking the El Paso Planning Board to continue to practice responsible development that is fitting with the area and balanced with the needs of the community. Before purchasing a home in this area, two years ago, we reviewed the zoning of what would become the Monument Ridge East area and we were prompted to purchase our home because the land was and currently remains zoned for 1 acre to 2 acre lots that are fitting with the houses in the surrounding area. Since the developer has come to Monument with their development plans and since the developer has refused to cooperate with the town, dozens of houses in the area have been listed for sale specifically in an attempt to get away from this area before the building of what many consider to be an inevitable high-density development. With the proximity of Douglas' county's open space in the north, the ranches due east near King's Ranch, and the large agricultural zoned plots in the west near Palmer Lake, this is a rural suburban area that is not fitting with the developer's high-density plan.

In the few years that we have lived in the Woodmoor/Monument area, we have seen significant growth within the town, including at the Jackson Creek area which has seen the development of several housing subdivisions as well as multiple high-density apartment buildings. These houses and apartments are still for sale or for rent, showcasing that the need for housing in this area is not at capacity or a critical need. Additionally, the increased density in our town, which only has one middle school and one small library is not keeping up with the growth of the area. The proposed area for rezoning is immediately east of Palmer Ridge High School, one of the two high schools in the area, which already sees significant

traffic during school hours and dangerous driving conditions in the winter due to the hazardous conditions of the Palmer Divide microclimate and the elevation of Monument Hill.

We urge the Board to hear the needs of the community and the voiced concerns of the immediate residents, the town of Monument, and Douglas County. We ask the Board to reject the developer's plan to rezone Monument Ridge East to high-density and to instead encourage development within the current zoning requirements which is ultimately more fitting to the area and more in-line with the community's wishes.

We appreciate your consideration.

Respectfully,

Michael Foy

Marcella Maes

From: Pastor Jon Gorman <gorman@afbmissions.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 10:16 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: I want my voice heard

You don't often get email from gorman@afbmissions.com. Learn why this is important

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.

To whom it may concern:
In reference to the planning meeting on November 21st, I am writing to object to the proposed rezoning of the area east of Monument Hill and west of Misty Acres for housing development. Please do not allow a high-density housing community in this area. As a resident who lives nearby, I will tell you that this area is clearly not the right fit for this type of project.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Pastor Jon Gorman
1660 Plowman Place
Monument, CO 80132

Marcella Maes

From: Gorman <jnt4him@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 9:45 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: November 21 public hearing

You don't often get email from jnt4him@aol.com. Learn why this is important

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.

As a resident of El Paso County, specifically the area off of county line road near Monument Hill, I reject any and all proposed rezoning to take away our beautiful open space and fill it with a jungle of homes. Please reconsider and reject these proposals and requests. There have been far too many homes squished into monument and ugly warehouses too!
There is a place for growth and this is not it!!

Concerned Citizen
Tina Gorman

From: Tom Griesser <tomgrie@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 11:03 AM
To: corey.adler@state.co.us; Kylie Bagley
Subject: MONUMENT RIDGE EAST

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.

To the addressed government authorities,

I absolutely disagree with the Colorado Parks and Wildlife conclusion stating that they consider "impacts to the natural resources and wildlife to be negligible if any at this time" for this monstrous project. There are thousands of trees that will be destroyed and wildlife habitation that will be gone forever! How can this not have an impact??!!

Thomas W. Griesser
1270 Lone Scout Lookout

Map

Overview

Case Number: CCM-2408613

Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

Case Status: Submitted

Address: 19548 MONUMENT HILL ROAD 123, CO, 80132

Unit:

Priority: Normal

Category: Citizen Contact Management

Assignees:

Internal Workflow Status: Submitted

Submitted By: Anonymous

Created Date: 04/09/2024 12:11 PM

Updated Date: 04/09/2024 12:11 PM

Source: Web

Tags:

Resolution:

Details

Case Number: CCM-2408613
Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

I affirm that I am submitting my electronic email address, telephone number, and/or home address for the purpose of receiving future electronic communications from El Paso County related to this Citizen Connect request. I request that this information be kept confidential under C.R.S. § 24-72-204(2)(a)(VII).: No

Please note that information you submit, including your name, may be subject to release under the Colorado Open Records Act. Certain specific information may be withheld if you checked the box above. If you do not wish for your name to be potentially released, please submit your request anonymously.

Contact All Commissioners: No

Please note that anything put in these fields will be viewable by members of the public.

Type of Submission: Other

Subject: Serious concern about the proposed Monument Ridge East and West developments

Notes (Describe the issue for the Commissioner): Commissioner Williams, I just sent the following email to the Colorado Department of Parks and Wildlife and to the El Paso County Planning Commission: To the addressed government authorities, I absolutely disagree with the Colorado Parks and Wildlife conclusion stating that they consider "impacts to the natural resources and wildlife to be negligible if any at this time" for this monstrous project. There are thousands of trees that will be destroyed and wildlife habitation that will be gone forever! How can this not have an impact??!! Thomas W. Griesser 1270 Lone Scout Lookout I will be in touch with you in the future outlining my total opposition the two Monument Ridge housing projects.

GIS Attributes

District :1

Jurisdiction :

Contact Info

Thomas Griesser
Individual
Complainant

Call: (719) 481-2681

Email: tomgrie@aol.com

Address: N/A

Updated by:	On:
Anonymous	04/09/2024

Comments

No details available

Images

No documents associated

Activity Logs

04/09/2024 12:11 PM | Provider changed to CCM District 1

System

04/09/2024 12:11 PM | Case created

Anonymous

Marcella Maes

From: Annette Hagopian <annettehagopian@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 9:08 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge EAST planning

You don't often get email from annettehagopian@comcast.net. Learn why this is important

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.

I have found thru my observations of multiple county commissioner meetings, that the commissioners allow a lot of re-zoning, because planners/developers 'follow the rules' and it just gets rubber stamped by the commissioners. Which leads one to wonder, why? Could be pockets are being lined in some fashion? I don't know, but as a voter I feel the commissioners need to really look at and follow the county's master plan. I'm attaching a letter from Monument Mayor Pro Tem that clearly outlines why El Paso County should **not** approve this re-zoning request. I am in full agreement with this letter, and I hope I can count on your NO vote, when it finally gets to the board for consideration. And I hope you can convince your other board members to also vote NO.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HWkLIvH0xCH2UBbXAd8bjbuyR-Zj-Ft4/view

Thank you,
Annette Hagopian

Details

Case Number: CCM-2409549
Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

I affirm that I am submitting my electronic email address, telephone number, and/or home address for the purpose of receiving future electronic communications from El Paso County related to this Citizen Connect request. I request that this information be kept confidential under C.R.S. § 24-72-204(2)(a)(VII).: No

Please note that information you submit, including your name, may be subject to release under the Colorado Open Records Act. Certain specific information may be withheld if you checked the box above. If you do not wish for your name to be potentially released, please submit your request anonymously.

Contact All Commissioners: No

Please note that anything put in these fields will be viewable by members of the public.

Type of Submission: Other

Subject: Proposed Monument housing development off county line road.

Notes (Describe the issue for the Commissioner): Our family and the Chisholm Ranch HOA is completely against the proposed housing development off County Line Road. Please vote NO on this proposition. The choices above did not have the appropriate area for me to select. We are Monuments residents.

Contact Info

Denise Jelinski-Hall
Individual
Complainant

Call: (808) 291-5180

Email: ngbsea3@hotmail.com

Address: N/A

Updated by:	On:
Anonymous	06/05/2024

From: Holly Williams
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2024 1:23 PM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12

Commissioner Holly Williams
El Paso County Colorado
200 South Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2202
(719) 374-0856 (mobile)
(719) 520-6411 (office)

From: Aaron Kellar <aarondkellar@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2024 12:49 PM
Subject: P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12

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.

To the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Board,

My name is Aaron Kellar. I have lived in North Woodmoor for the past 18 years. I also own rental properties in other parts of El Paso County. I received notice regarding the application for rezoning by the P245 Monument Ridge East LLC owners. I would like to strongly oppose this rezoning application and would like to urge El Paso County to consider the following as reasons for the opposition:

- The Monument Town Council already declined Monument Ridge East LLC's annexation and overall rezoning project. During statements, the developer refused to negotiate with the town council to reduce the high density or to consider water limitations.
- The high density rezoning does not match Northern El Paso County, especially in the area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC. The high density rezoning also does not match Rural Southern Douglas County.
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC is currently zoned for 1 to 2 acre lots which is fitting with the immediate area of Woodmoor that has minimum 0.5 acre lots.

Additionally, the land immediately north of this area is all undeveloped, further contrasting high density housing.

- High density housing has been exponentially increasing in Monument, especially among the Jackson Creek area, however there has not been an update to the infrastructure or community needs (rec centers, pools, roads, libraries, schools).
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC has protected wetlands that is home to wildlife that would be displaced by high density housing
- Traffic along Misty Acres Rd and by Palmer Ridge High School is already congested and would be greatly impacted by additional high density housing.
- Monument has one middle school and one small library, both of which are already overcrowded and cannot handle the exponential growth proposed by the developer.

Please consider the negative impact RM-12 rezoning would have on Northern El Paso County, as well as rural Southern Douglas County, who has been very sage in protecting open space. I own other properties in Jackson Creek, and I feel this is the proper area for a development such as RM-12.

Thank you,

Aaron Kellar
20350 True Vista Circle

From: Holly Williams
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: Fw: Monument Ridge East Opposition Letter
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 11:22:26 AM

Commissioner Holly Williams
200 S Cascade, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(719) 520-6411 (office)
(719) 374-0856 (cell)

From: Laura Kellar <lzinsmaster11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 9:57 AM
To: Holly Williams <HollyWilliams@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument Ridge East Opposition Letter

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.

To the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Board,

My name is Laura Kellar. I have lived in the North Woodmoor area for the past 18 years. I also own rental properties on the south end of Monument. I received notice regarding the application for rezoning by the P245 Monument Ridge East LLC owners. I would like to strongly oppose this rezoning application and would like to urge El Paso County to consider the following as reasons for the opposition:

- The Monument Town Council already declined Monument Ridge East LLC's annexation and overall rezoning project. During statements, the developer refused to negotiate with the town council to reduce the high density or to consider water limitations.
- The high density rezoning does not match Northern El Paso County, especially in the area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC. The high density rezoning also does not match Rural Southern Douglas County which is why they are opposed to this development plan.
- We see elk, antelope, deer and other wildlife and this is a threat to them as well.
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC is currently zoned for 1 to 2 acre lots which is fitting with

the immediate area of Woodmoor that has minimum 0.5 acre lots. Additionally, the land immediately north of this area is all undeveloped, further contrasting high density housing.

- High density housing has been exponentially increasing in Monument, especially among the Jackson Creek area, however there has **not** been an update to the infrastructure or community needs (rec centers, pools, roads, libraries, schools). We have overcrowded classrooms at all levels, we have one "rec center" (YMCA), a TINY library, potholes on roads everywhere and one lane roads many places that will be stressed. Monument has one middle school and one small library, both of which are already overcrowded and cannot handle the exponential growth proposed by the developer.
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC has protected wetlands that is home to wildlife that would be displaced by high density housing
- Traffic along Misty Acres Rd and by Palmer Ridge High School is already congested and would be greatly impacted by additional high density housing.
- Water in CO is an issue, this will continue to strain the water supply.
- Typically a high density housing area would have some walkability - this area has a walkability of ZERO.

Please consider the negative impact RM-12 rezoning would have on Northern El Paso County, as well as rural Southern Douglas County, who has been very sage in protecting open space. I own other properties in Jackson Creek, and I feel this is the proper area for a development such as RM-12.

Thank you,

Laura Kellar, REALTOR and resident at 20350 True Vista Circle
Engel Voelkers Castle Pines
623-826-5025 (cell)
Laura.Kellar@engelvoelkers.com

Marcella Maes

From: Laura Kellar <lzinsmaster11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:54 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Opposition to the Proposed plan for Monument Ridge East

You don't often get email from lzinsmaster11@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Good afternoon El Paso County Leadership,

I am writing to comment on the plan for Monument Ridge East which is to be discussed on the agenda for your 11/21 meeting.

My name is Laura Kellar. I have lived in the North Woodmoor area for the past 18 years. I also own rental properties on the south end of Monument. I received notice regarding the application for rezoning by the P245 Monument Ridge East LLC owners. I would like to strongly oppose this developer application which would require re-zoning of the area and would like to urge El Paso County to consider the following as reasons for the opposition:

- The Monument Town Council already declined Monument Ridge East LLC's annexation and overall rezoning project. During statements, the developer refused to negotiate with the town council to reduce the high density or to consider water limitations.
- The high density rezoning does not match Northern El Paso County, especially in the area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC. The high density rezoning also does not match Rural Southern Douglas County which is why they are opposed to this development plan.
- We see elk, antelope, fox, mountain lions, bear, deer and other wildlife and this is a threat to them as well.
- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC is currently zoned for 1 to 2 acre lots which is fitting with the immediate area of Woodmoor that has minimum 0.5 acre lots. Additionally, the land immediately north of this area is all undeveloped, further contrasting high density housing - This space is right across from open space just north of County Line Rd - the rezoning does not match that area and Douglas County is also opposed to high density housing that would be so close to their open spaces.
- High density housing has been exponentially increasing in Monument, especially among the Jackson Creek area, however there has **not** been an update to the infrastructure or community needs (rec centers, pools, roads, libraries, schools). We have overcrowded classrooms at all levels, we have one "rec center"

(YMCA), a TINY library, potholes on roads everywhere and one lane roads many places that will be stressed. Monument has one middle school and one small library, both of which are already overcrowded and cannot handle the exponential growth proposed by the developer.

- The area proposed by Monument Ridge East LLC has protected wetlands that is home to wildlife that would be displaced by high density housing
- Traffic along Misty Acres Rd and by Palmer Ridge High School is already congested and would be greatly impacted by additional high density housing.
- Water in CO is an issue, this will continue to strain the water supply.
- Typically a high density housing area would have some walkability - this area has a walkability of ZERO.

Please consider the negative impact RM-12 rezoning would have on Northern El Paso County, as well as rural Southern Douglas County, who has been very sage in protecting open space. I own other properties in Jackson Creek, and I feel this is the proper area for a development such as RM-12.

Thank you,

Laura Kellar, REALTOR and resident at 20350 True Vista Circle
Engel Voelkers Castle Pines
623-826-5025 (cell)
Laura.Kellar@engelvoelkers.com

From: Sara Kershaw
To: PLNWEB; Meggan Herington; Kylie Bagley
Subject: Please reject P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12.
Date: Thursday, May 2, 2024 10:37:23 AM
Attachments: Steve King - 04-26-2024.pdf

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.

Ms. Bagley, Ms Herington, and to the entire El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department,

I am a resident near the proposed rezoning area entitled "P245 Monument Ridge East, RM12." I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the rezoning petition for the proposed area.

I would like to urge you to reject the proposal as proposed. Please consider the clearly voiced objections of both Douglas County and the Monument Town Council. I strongly agree with Steve King, Mayor Pro Tem of the Town of Monument, and his written statement to El Paso County on 26 April 2024, as attached.

The Monument Town Council intensely researched the originally proposed annexation and denied it as it would negatively impact the town and its limited budget. The proposed rezoning does not fit into the community and is in direct opposition to the lower density population of the immediate area and the neighboring 36000 acre conservation easement, and would inhibit the existing wildlife and natural resources.

Please do what's best for our community and reject the proposal.

Sincerely,

Sara Kershaw

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:10 AM
To: Shawna Knode
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument Ridge East

Thanks for the email, Shawna.

We will be sure to include your concerns in the materials moving forward to the public hearings. The Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners will be interested in hearing all input. We will be sure to let you know when hearings will be held.

Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

From: Shawna Knode <shawnaknode@googlemail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 9:24 AM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument Ridge East

> You don't often get email from shawnaknode@googlemail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Meggan,
I am writing as a concerned citizen, about the Monument Ridge East development.

I've read through Steve King's letter and agree with the many points he made in it.

Monument does not need more high density housing. Between lack of water, lack of police force, no new schools, and roads that can barely support the population as it is, a new high density housing area is unsustainable.

As well, the natural wildlife, flora, and fauna that would be decimated is not a responsible way to care for our environment. The proposed development sits at the junction of where El Paso County begins. You go from a beautiful, protected, natural area in Douglas County to the same in El Paso. With this proposal,

there would be no gradual change. Just an ugly, treeless, overcrowded, cheap apartment and multi-family paved area. A much better transition would be larger lot, single family homes, where trees and the natural beauty of the area would be preserved.

The developer argues that the existing zoning wouldn't allow them to make money. They bought the lot knowing the existing zoning. Why should the community be punished, to line developers already well padded pockets. Others, in the area, bought and built their homes with the knowledge of what would be built there. Why should they be punished, and their views and property values damaged, just so a developer can change the zoning to suit a greedy purpose.

The fact that the developer is threatening to build a bar, care facility for mentally unstable and drug addicted persons, or an adult X-rated sex shop if they do not get their way with the changed zoning shows they do not have any regard for the well being of the community and only want to make a quick buck.

Please do not advocate to change the zoning on this piece of land. Let the town of Monument and it's citizens make the decisions when it comes to the development of its town and the surrounding areas. Help us keep the beauty of the front range.

Thank you.

Map

Overview

Case Number: CCM-2408458

Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

Case Status: Submitted

Address: DOEWOOD DRIVE, 123, CO, 80132

Unit:

Priority: Normal

Category: Citizen Contact Management

Assignees:

Internal Workflow Status: Submitted

Submitted By: Anonymous

Created Date: 03/31/2024 11:12 AM

Updated Date: 03/31/2024 11:12 AM

Source: Web

Tags:

Resolution:

Details

Case Number: CCM-2408458
Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

I affirm that I am submitting my electronic email address, telephone number, and/or home address for the purpose of receiving future electronic communications from El Paso County related to this Citizen Connect request. I request that this information be kept confidential under C.R.S. § 24-72-204(2)(a)(VII).: No

Please note that information you submit, including your name, may be subject to release under the Colorado Open Records Act. Certain specific information may be withheld if you checked the box above. If you do not wish for your name to be potentially released, please submit your request anonymously.

Contact All Commissioners: No

Please note that anything put in these fields will be viewable by members of the public.

Type of Submission: Other

Subject: Serious Concerns about Proposed Re-Zone of Monument Ridge

Notes (Describe the issue for the Commissioner): This issue was brought before the Monument City Council and rejected and now it's being brought to El Paso County. There were multiple reasons for it's rejection from the town of Monument. Residents are very concerned about Water issues, we are told we don't have enough to provide for current residents, let alone proposed high density housing. Increase crime rates from introducing low income housing, in turn requiring funding for more law enforcement and first responders, increased issues with traffic, this would be very detrimental to current residents. THere are only a few means of getting in and out of our neighborhoods as they already exist. Let's not leave out our treasured Wildlife. Those of us who live here LOVE our wildlife and and enjoy them coming into our yards and seeing them regularly. THe proposed high density low income housing wil COMPLETLEY ruin and disprupt the current living conditions of current residents. We have beautiful trees and woodland areas between our housing areas and I-25. These areas are not only home to countless wildlife, it help keep down traffic noise from the freeway, block the eyesore of the freeway itself and provide a more natural enviroment. This was the primary reason for why people choose to pay more to live in this area. If we wanted to live in urban sprawl we would live in the Springs!!!

GIS Attributes

District :1

Jurisdiction :

Contact Info

Christina Laberteaux
Individual
Complainant

Call: (719) 495-5892

Email: cm.laberteaux@yahoo.com

Address: N/A

Updated by:	On:
Anonymous	03/31/2024

Comments

No details available

Images

No documents associated

Activity Logs

03/31/2024 11:12 AM | Provider changed to CCM

System

03/31/2024 11:12 AM | Case created

Anonymous

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:06 AM
To: Pamela Lawlor
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument Ridge East

Thak you for taking time to send comments. We will be sure to include all citizen comments in the materials moving forward to the decision makers and keep you updated on the process.
Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

From: Pamela Lawlor <pam.lawlor@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 9:05 AM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument Ridge East

> You don't often get email from pam.lawlor@live.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Meggan,

Thank you for listening to the concerned citizens of Monument. I have lived here in Monument for over 50 years and have seen enormous amounts of growth and I know it's not going to end anytime soon but this development is going to be a major concern for various reasons. We have wetlands that are going to be destroyed and more animals displaced, water that is going to be depleted more rapidly (there are those who are already struggling with their current wells in the area), and this is not going to address the ever increasing housing prices that have been an issue for new home buys for years.

My 34 year old daughter lives at home with us because even her salary at $90k keeps her out of the housing market. But these developers make promises of affordable housing to get zoning changed then price those same people they claim to be helping out of the market. We have duplexes off the Old Denver Highway that claimed the same but my daughter still can't afford those either. Developers aren't here to help out the needy. They are here to make a substantial profit in the least amount of time.

I really hope and pray that some of the development in this area slows down. Our roads are already strained, our water is strained, our wildlife is constantly getting killed because we have overcrowding on the roadways, our infrastructure is seriously lacking, and there seems to be no foresight into how all of this development is going to affect our future. Colorado puts up tons of apartments yet we still have a housing crisis. More development and killing our resources is not the answer.

Please help us protect our way of life in Monument. Protect our open spaces. Protect our natural resources, our water, our animals, and our peace. Enough development in Monument.

Get Outlook for iOS

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 2:12 PM
To: Karen & Stan Lawrie
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument Ridge East Proposed Development

Thank you Karen and Stan, we appreciate your comments. The Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners will have the final decision on this development request. Staff will make sure that your comments are provided to the decision makers.

Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

From: Karen & Stan Lawrie <sklawrie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 1:19 PM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument Ridge East Proposed Development

You don't often get email from sklawrie@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Ms Herington,

I am writing in regards to the proposed development of Monument Ridge East. My family is very concerned about potential issues to our community, wildlife and natural habitats if this development and zoning change requests are approved.

We live in unincorporated El Paso County, just outside of the town of Monument in a small subdivision of Arrowwood III. Our subdivision is comprised of 2.5 acre lots all with wells providing water to our homes. While we are a small community, the concern of the groundwater not being adequate to support our homes is becoming more and more a concern. Our neighboring subdivisions, Kings Deer and Woodmoor, which are both close to the proposed Monument Ridge East, have implemented water restrictions due to this rising concern about the water supply.

My question is, why would El Paso County approved a high density housing development project of Monument Ridge East, with this increasingly worrisome concern that there is enough water to sustain the current population of homes, much less another large influx of families who will live in Monument

Ridge East? If our wells dry up, all of the families in our subdivision, some who have lived here for more than 30 years, will be faced with astronomical costs to find a water source for our houses. Why would the county commissioners approve a development project knowing that the water is already becoming scarce, and then put all of our houses at risk of not having enough water?

Additionally, we are concerned that the proposed development of Monument Ridge East is not consistent with the character of the surrounding community. The developer proposes to cut all of the trees and the prairie grasses and wetlands, which support a population of wildlife, such as deer, coyotes, elk, bobcats, bears, prairie dogs, etc. Not to mention the birds and the endangered Preble Mouse and soon to be added Tri-color Bat. Once their habitats are destroyed, the options become more and more limited for their survival. Changing the zoning to allow dense housing development makes this development completely out of line in the surrounding communities. The developer who purchased the land parcel knew what the zoning restrictions were when they made the purchase and should NOT be allowed to pressure zoning changes just to make a profit. The developers do not care about the knock on effects of destroying precious wildlife habitats, natural resources such as trees, stressing water reserves, schools, roads and community services such as fire and police.

Please do not approve any changes to the zoning for Monument Ridge East development. Once the natural habitats and preservation of our unique community are destroyed with over development, it can't be changed.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Karen and Stan Lawrie

From: Laura Lucero <llucero19235@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2024 10:37 AM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: Objection to rezoning request Monument Ridge East

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.

Tax ID/Parcel Nos.: 7102200006, 7102200008, 7102200010, 7102200013, and 7102201001

Regarding PCD File No.: P245, Monument Ridge East, RM12 Project Description: Rezoning 40.51 acres to the RM-12 (Residential Multi-Dwelling) zoning district.

I am one of the many residents concerned about the request to rezone the property. The owner/investors purchased the property knowing what the current zoning was. Please keep the current zoning. It was well thought out at the time it was established and still fits with the master plan of this area.

If approved this will cause the elimination of trees, alteration of natural wetlands, and result in a negative impact on adjacent property owners. The proposed development that will result from rezoning is not consistent with this area of Monument or nearby areas. Also, we have already seen the result of high density housing right next to I-25 farther north. It's ugly.

Monument and nearby areas have already seen a huge amount of higher density housing built or in the process of being built (e.g., Jackson Creek, Higby, et al).

Please do not approve the rezoning. Let's keep the current zoning in place.

Sincerely, Laura Lucero
19235 Wakonda Way, Monument, CO 80132

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 7:27 AM
To: Stephanie Markle
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument Ridge East

Thank you, Stephanie. We are going to ensure your comments are provided to the decision makers and we will let you know about the public hearings moving forward.
Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

From: Stephanie Markle <smarkle@lewispalmer.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 5:02 AM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument Ridge East

> You don't often get email from smarkle@lewispalmer.org. Learn why this is important

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.

Hello Meggan,

I am concerned about the changing of zones for the area of Monument Ridge East that would allow higher density housing. I live and work off County Line and Monument Hill Road as I work at Palmer Ridge High School. In the mornings and evenings, it is near impossible to take a left hand turn from Monument Hill Road onto County Line. With this changing of zoning to allow for more cars on the road along with the commercial development coming south on Monument Hill Road, I worry about my students who are just learning how to drive, navigating an area that will become more difficult as more cars and trucks for business use this road.

Castle Rock and Monument have both said no to this development and their reasoning aligns to new urbanism principles as the people who will live in this region will have to take cars to get to and from places as there are no other transportation options to get to and from needed necessities like groceries and healthcare. Not only does this new plan not make logistical sense, it will be destroying hundreds of trees and using water that will cause my children further environmental chaos.

Housing needs to be available, but I am asking you to please save higher density housing for areas near work, food, and healthcare such as Jackson Creek. If zoning did change, please consider lots of 2.5 acres or greater to protect our trees and water for my children and students. We cannot easily undo these decisions fifty years from now. Please make a decision based on my home's future livability and safety.

Thank you,
Stephanie

Stephanie Markle
Palmer Ridge AP Human Geography, AP Psych
RAD and PAC Advisor
Currently Reading: **The Diamond Eye.** By Kate Quinn

Map

Overview

Case Number: CCM-2408449

Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

Case Status: Submitted

Address: 1213 GREENLAND FOREST DRIVE, 123, CO, 80132

Unit:

Priority: Normal

Category: Citizen Contact Management

Assignees:

Internal Workflow Status: Submitted

Submitted By: Anonymous

Created Date: 03/30/2024 07:53 AM

Updated Date: 03/30/2024 07:53 AM

Source: Web

Tags:

Resolution:

Details

Case Number: CCM-2408449
Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

I affirm that I am submitting my electronic email address, telephone number, and/or home address for the purpose of receiving future electronic communications from El Paso County related to this Citizen Connect request. I request that this information be kept confidential under C.R.S. § 24-72-204(2)(a)(VII).: No

Please note that information you submit, including your name, may be subject to release under the Colorado Open Records Act. Certain specific information may be withheld if you checked the box above. If you do not wish for your name to be potentially released, please submit your request anonymously.

Contact All Commissioners: No

Please note that anything put in these fields will be viewable by members of the public.

Type of Submission: Other

Subject: Monument Ridge East

Notes (Describe the issue for the Commissioner): Hi Holly, I am writing you to express my desire for you to oppose the extreme density of the proposed rezone/development of Monument Ridge East in Monument. There are a multitude of reasons to oppose it: this is a wildlife habitat area, there is insufficient infrastructure (roads), the surrounding neighborhoods are not as dense, loss of beautiful land/trees. Most importantly to you and your legacy of decisions should be the fact that this is the absolute gateway to El Paso County. It is right at the Douglas County and El Paso County lines. Heading south on I25, you'll be going from the wide open, beautiful open land (under conservancy) of Douglas County to a super dense development in El Paso County. Is this okay with you? Is this how you want people to be welcomed to El Paso County? Is this the legacy decision you want tied to your name? I pray that it's not. Please fight for the residents of this area and please do not approve the density of this proposed development. Thank you!

GIS Attributes

District :1

Jurisdiction :

Contact Info

Nolene Metzget
Individual
Complainant

Call: (719) 440-2638

Email: nolenemetzger@aol.com

Address: N/A

Updated by:	On:
Anonymous	03/30/2024

Comments

No details available

Images

No documents associated

Activity Logs

03/30/2024 07:53 AM | Provider changed to CCM District 1

System

03/30/2024 07:53 AM | Case created

Anonymous

Rebecca Rudder

From: Nolene <nolenemetzger@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 1:17 PM
To: corey.adler@state.co.us
Cc: Holly Williams
Subject: Monument Ridge East, RM12

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.

Good afternoon, Corey -

I strongly and vehemently disagree with the CPW statement that the impacts of this development on natural resources and wildlife are "negligible if any at this time."

Have you actually and physically visited this location? Have you compared the proposed development with the layout of the land? I believe the answer to those questions is no. Otherwise I don't know how you could possibly say the impact is "negligible if any at this time."

Please visit the site and seriously consider changing CPW's statement.

Thank you,
Nolene Metzger
1213 Greenland Forest Dr, Monument

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Map

Overview

Case Number: CCM-2408900

Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

Case Status: Submitted

Address: 20038 MONUMENT HILL ROAD 123, CO, 80132

Unit:

Priority: Normal

Category: Citizen Contact Management

Assignees:

Internal Workflow Status: Submitted

Submitted By: Anonymous

Created Date: 04/24/2024 07:31 AM

Updated Date: 04/24/2024 07:31 AM

Source: Web

Tags:

Resolution:

Details

Case Number: CCM-2408900
Case Type: Contact My Commissioner

I affirm that I am submitting my electronic email address, telephone number, and/or home address for the purpose of receiving future electronic communications from El Paso County related to this Citizen Connect request. I request that this information be kept confidential under C.R.S. § 24-72-204(2)(a)(VII).: No

Please note that information you submit, including your name, may be subject to release under the Colorado Open Records Act. Certain specific information may be withheld if you checked the box above. If you do not wish for your name to be potentially released, please submit your request anonymously.

Contact All Commissioners: No

Please note that anything put in these fields will be viewable by members of the public.

Type of Submission: Other

Subject: Monument Ridge East, Rezoning (RM12)

Notes (Describe the issue for the Commissioner): Why is it that the Douglas County Department of Community Development cares more about this rezoning than you, our El Paso County Commissioners, do? I find that very telling and I agree whole-heartedly with Douglas County. I hope you'll consider the views of Douglas County when making your decisions. Think about the people in this area, along with the wildlife, traffic, lack of services, etc. In addition, this will be the first thing people see when they enter El Paso County and the last thing they see when they leave. Do you really want that vision to be a massive housing development? There are other locations to put massive housing developments on. This location can be housing, but it needs to be fewer houses on bigger lots. Please read and re-read the Douglas County letter, copied below. Thank you. Project Name: Monument Ridge East, Rezoning (RM12) Project Number: P245 / RE2024-031 Jurisdiction: El Paso County Date Received: 03/25/2024 Due Date: 04/15/2024 Addressing Comments: No Comments Engineering Comments: No Comments Planner Comments: As mentioned previously, Douglas County Planning has concerns with isolated urban-level multifamily development adjacent to rural and open space areas. The proposed zoning would allow approximately 500 multifamily dwellings in an area that is better suited to less intense development such as the proposed adjacent suburban residential zoning. While the narrative states the need for multifamily development in El Paso County, it does not discuss the appropriateness of this isolated location relative to services and facilities for the approximately 1,000 future residents. Such density is better suited to municipalities that provide public services and facilities within a reasonable distance.

GIS Attributes

District :1

Jurisdiction :

Contact Info

Nolene Metzger
Individual
Complainant

Call: (719) 440-2638

Email: nolenemetzger@aol.com

Address: N/A

Updated by:	On:
Anonymous	04/24/2024

Comments

No details available

Images

No documents associated

Activity Logs

04/24/2024 07:31 AM | Provider changed to CCM

System

04/24/2024 07:31 AM | Case created

Anonymous

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 8:50 AM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: Monument Ridge East

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

From: Nolene <nolenemetzger@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 8:22 AM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Monument Ridge East

> You don't often get email from nolenemetzger@aol.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Hi Meggan -

Thank you for attending the meeting last night.

I just want to remind you of the comments from the Douglas County Department of Community Development:

DOUGLAS COUNTY
COLORADO

www.douglas.co.us

Project Name: Monument Ridge East, Rezoning (RM12)

Project Number: P245 / RE2024-031
Date Received: 03/25/2024

Addressing Comments:
No Comments

Engineering Comments:
No Comments

Planner Comments:
As mentioned previously, Douglas County Planning has concerns with isolat
development adjacent to rural and open space areas. The proposed zoning
multifamily dwellings in an area that is better suited to less intense develop
suburban residential zoning. While the narrative states the need for multifa
does not discuss the appropriateness of this isolated location relative to ser
approximately 1,000 future residents. Such density is better suited to munic
and facilities within a reasonable distance.

Douglas County and its amazing and beautiful 25,000 acre open space is directly across County Line Road from this proposed development. So we would be going from 25,000 acres of grass, hills, trees, ponds, cows and wildlife to 350 houses jammed up to the county border. That is not a good look for El Paso County and I urge you to please require a reduction in density.

Thank you,
Nolene Metzger
1213 Greenland Forest Dr
Monument

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Jacqueline Percy
1680 Old Antlers Way
Monument, CO 80132

25 April 2024

Holly Williams
HollyWilliams@elpasoco.com

Dear Mrs. Williams,

I recently received a copy of the developer's proposal for the Monument East property off County Line road to change zoning to RM-12 (residential multi-dwelling). As a resident who lives nearby to this property, the proposal is concerning to me for several reasons. I am opposed to the change. The following are some of concerns that I have in this regard:

1. Traffic
I live at a corner lot in Woodmoor at what already is a busy intersection due to the development over the last several years of Misty Acres and Palmer Ridge High School. Woodmoor is a neighborhood with no shoulders on the roads and no sidewalks. Adding more traffic for a significantly larger population for multi-dwelling units in the area will undoubtedly increase traffic that the neighbourhood will not be able to absorb. While the developers do propose the construction of alternate routes, their proposed development would still lead to additional traffic on side roads, whether they intend this or not. Any holdup or backup in the new development, to include construction traffic with building, will direct the traffic directly through my neighbourhood, which does not have the capacity to handle extra traffic.

2. Nature/Water
As many have already mentioned in multiple forums, there is concern about building on wild land and the disruption of our wildlife. Further, while the developer might have come up with a solution to meet their anticipated needs with water, I am concerned about the access to water for the residents who currently live in the area, as well as the quality thereof, as more surface water will likely be needed to augment our water sources.

3. Noise/Light Pollution
A population increase will lead to more light at night and more noise. While many who live so near I-25, like myself, can occasionally be disrupted by interstate traffic, I anticipate it will be much worse with multi-dwelling housing. Street and housing

lights have the potential to ruin our dark nights, and the noise generated by cars, alarms, music, parties, will threaten the nearby peaceful quiet neighborhoods.

4. Schools
I worry whether the local schools will be able to handle the upcoming surge in students. Lewis Palmer School District currently has one public middle school to support 5 elementary schools. The schools will already see more students due to the current multi-dwelling housing construction that is occurring on Jackson Creek Parkway. Looking at the current enrollment of students in D38 schools as of 15 April 2024, this middle school will soon be at capacity. Lewis Palmer Elementary School, which would likely be the local elementary school based on the location of Monument Ridge East, is 14 students under its capacity. Can the district handle significantly more students?

5. Infrastructure
Monument does not have enough restaurants, stores, businesses, roads to support a population surge that multi-dwelling residences would bring to the area. Monument currently has significant amount of housing in the process of construction. Adding more high density houses in the area will not improve the surrounding community, nor do I think that there are the resources to support such.

6. Crime
While the literature is mixed on this, there are many studies that support that high density housing increases the risk of crime, including violent crime, in surrounding neighborhoods. This is not something that I would wish on any neighborhood, let alone mine. Will the local police department be able to support this?

7. Local dissent
Of course, most neighbors with whom I have discussed the proposals for rezoning have significant concerns about rezoning to a the RM-12 zoning district. They do not want their way of life to change or to have the very reasons they moved to a quiet corner of Monument to dissolve with the disruption of significant building nearby. There is further concern for devaluation of properties in the adjacent areas.

However, this has also been echoed by the town of Monument. The developers already sent a request for annexation with this proposal to the town of Monument, with the plans that they are now proposing to El Paso county. The town of Monument was agreeable to annex but was not agreeable to rezoning as the developers proposed. There were concerns that this would bring “social impact of the development bringing multi-family dwellings to the area without having amenities that far north.” There were also concerns about the number of students

added to Lewis Palmer's School District. The developers then withdrew their application to annex in Monument.

Further, as per the Department of Community Development of Douglas County written on 4/15/24, "as mentioned previously, Douglas County Planning has concerns with isolated urban-level multifamily development adjacent to rural and open space areas. The proposed zoning would allow approximately 500 multifamily dwellings in an area that is better suited to less intense development such as the proposed adjacent suburban residential zoning. While the narrative states the need for multifamily development in El Paso County, it does not discuss the appropriateness of this isolated location relative to services and facilities for the approximately 1,000 future residents. Such density is better suited to municipalities that provide public services and facilities within a reasonable distance."

If there is such a local opposition to the developer's high density plan, even from outside of the county, is that not an indication that something may be amiss in the developer's plans for the local area?

Ultimately, I understand that development on this land will occur at some time in the future. I would just hope that it is the right decision for those who live here and their safety and for the town of Monument itself. A high density, multi-dwelling residential plan, such as is proposed the developers for Monument Ridge East is not the answer. I do not see that it benefits anyone other than the developers.

Please, if you have any influence on the El Paso County Planning and Community Development, help them make the right decision for the people who live in these areas and encourage them to not approve rezoning of Monument Ridge East to RM-12 (Residential Multi-Dwelling).

Thank you for your time. Should you have any questions or need to contact me, I can be reached at jackiepercy@hotmail.com.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Percy

References:

"Monument Ridge West and East recommended for annexation by planning commission but without zone for high density housing." The Tribune. July 8, 2023.

Douglas County Letter in regards to Monument Ridge East, Rezoning (RM12) dated 4/15/24

From: Debbi <arguscolor@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2024 12:12 PM
To: PLNWEB; Meggan Herington; Kylie Bagley
Cc: Debbi Radke; Holly Williams
Subject: Monument Ridge East, RM12

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.

April 28, 2024

Kylie Bagley, Planner III
Meggan Herington, Planning Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

Dear Ms. Bagely and Ms. Herington,

I am a 23 year resident of the Monument area and am opposed to the Monument Ridge East, RM12 rezoning project. I am opposed for the following reasons:

1. The nearby residents affected by the rezoning, if approved, purchased their properties knowing the current zoning to insure the value of their property would not decrease. If approved, the rezoning would most assuredly affect nearby home values in a negative fashion.
2. The removal of thousands of trees will affect the beauty and nature of this area. Even if SOME of the trees are replanted, not all the transplanted trees would survive. NOT ALL the trees would be transplanted, thus reducing the forest in the area and wildlife will be displaced. We will be losing the beauty of this area with the loss of forests and animals. The El Paso County Master Plan, as well as the Monument Comprehensive Plan, address issues as to the protection of natural areas, which include age tree strands of old growth conifers.
3. The entrance to El Paso county will be forever changed if approved. No more beautiful tress and country side views. The view will be mass development ugly to the eye.
4. Douglas County, which abuts this project, has concerns because of the nearby conservation area. The Douglas County Planning department stated: "As mentioned previously, Douglas County Planning has concerns with isolated urban-level multifamily development adjacent to rural and open space areas. The proposed zoning would allow approximately 500 multifamily dwellings in an area that is better suited to less intense development such as the proposed adjacent suburban residential zoning.". There are several natural features and topography, including dense tree strands, a protected wetlands area, rural zoning to the east and also to the west, a 36,000 acre protected conservation easement adjacent to the north.
5. This project does not meet the criteria in the El Paso Master Plan or in the Monument Comprehensive Plan as proposed.
6. Emergency Services would become a financial burden for the town of Monument as additional Police Officers would be required if zoning is approved and the 1,000 homes are built. This is because the county does not currently have sufficient resources to meet the future emergency needs of the residents.
7. The El Paso County Master Plan, as well as Monument's Comprehensive Plan, mandates that for rezoning, there must be a need not being served. This is NOT the case in Monument as there are many parcels of land in the Monument area that are approved, but not developed, which contain high density uses, that better conform to this project.
8. El Paso County's Master Plan rates the project area as a Suburban Placetype. According to the master plan, Suburban Residential is characterized by predominantly residential areas with predominately single-family detached housing.The current R20000 zoning is consistent with the El Paso County Master Plan.

Please reject this project as proposed as it is incompatible with the El Paso Master Plan and the Monument Comprehensive Plan. Please reject in order to save trees, wildlife and the home values of nearby residents.

Respectively,

Debbi Radke
P.o. box 771
Monument CO 80132

cc: Holly Williams

From: Kelly Hills
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: EA2388
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 7:51:09 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Anyeli Ramirez <anyelifernandar96@outlook.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2024 3:58 PM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA2388

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.

I oppose the proposed rezoning in EA2388. The home density and styles are much different than I expected. I only support detached single family homes in the neighborhood.

Sent from my iPhone

Marcella Maes

From: rochejoni@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 9:29 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East

[You don't often get email from rochejoni@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

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.

This is a dangerous exit. Numerous accidents every week. Before approving anything, consider studying the infrastructure. When this exit closes down, all of us on the area are stranded. Between Monument ridge East and a proposed Buckees on the other side, the current roads WILL NOT handle the traffic Sent from my iPhone

Marcella Maes

From: Hannah Shea <goofnutball@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 6:16 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East

You don't often get email from goofnutball@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

In light of the upcoming public hearing for the rezoning application of the Monument Ridge East development, I would like to echo the email that I already sent to the County Planning and Community Development Department in April 2024.

Please see the hundreds of comments against this rezoning application on the petition here: Stop the Monument Ridge East building project and that were voiced during the informational meeting hosted by the developer and Vertex Consulting Services several months ago at The Barn. We understand that Vertex is owned and operated by Craig Dossey, the former Executive Director of Planning and Community Development Department in El Paso County. The community was met by Mr. Dossey's contentious attitude which seemed to say that he would get what he wanted and that neither his company nor client cared about the community's wishes - further shown by the developer's refusal to enact any of the town's suggested changes when proposing for an annexation into the Town of Monument.

Please listen to the opposition already voiced by the Town of Monument and Douglas County, as well as the hundreds of residents that would be immediately impacted. The proposed rezoning does not fit into the community, is in direct opposition to the rural immediate area and the neighboring 36,000 acre conservation easement, and would inhibit the existing wildlife and natural resources.

Additionally, the Monument Town Council intensely researched the originally proposed annexation and denied it as it would negatively impact the town and its limited budget. Both the Monument Police and Fire Departments already stated that they do not have the manning, budget, or equipment to accommodate the high density proposed by the developer, and the D-38 schools in this area are nearing capacity in all its buildings.

Please encourage responsible development in this immediate area which is currently zoned for 1 acre to 2 acre lots. Both Monument and Colorado Springs have high density apartment vacancies and houses that have been on the market for months. This high density rezoning is not only unneeded in this area, but it would also adversely impact the neighborhood feel in North Woodmoor that has been built over decades.

I would like to encourage the Board to reject the developer's plan to rezone and to instead keep with the current zoning that is better fitting with the community's needs and the existing infrastructure.

Thank you,

-Hannah Foy

From: PLNWEB
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: EA2388
Date: Thursday, May 2, 2024 8:08:58 AM
Importance: High

-----Original Message-----
From: Ken Stone <kenkay7@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2024 2:19 PM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA2388

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.

I oppose the proposed rezoning in EA2388. The home density and styles are much different than I expected when I moved here. I only support detached single family homes in the neighborhood.

Sent from my iPhone

Kylie Bagley

From: Kelly Hills
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 1:37 PM
To: Kylie Bagley
Subject: FW: EA2388/SP241

From: Tara Stone <tjstone0828@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 10:02 AM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: EA2388/SP241

> You don't often get email from tjstone0828@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

I oppose the planned rezoning in EA2388/SP241. Only detached single family homes should be in that area. The planned rezoning will cause enormous traffic problems for people using County Line Rd. to access I-25. It will also put a massive strain on the Woodmoor and 105 intersection, especially on school days at school run time.

Tara J. Stone
Website | tarajstonewriter.com
Twitter | @tjswriter
Goodreads | Author Profile

Kylie Bagley

From: Meggan Herington
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:08 AM
To: Jennifer Wagner
Cc: Kylie Bagley
Subject: RE: Monument Ridge Traffic

Thank you for the comments, Jennifer. We will be working with the applicant to expand the traffic study and gather additional details. We will be sure to post all the info online and include your concerns to the decision makers. Stay tuned.
Meggan

Meggan Herington, AICP
Executive Director
El Paso County Planning and Community Development
719-520-7941
https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com

From: Jennifer Wagner <jennifercwagner@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 9:30 AM
To: Meggan Herington <MegganHerington@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Fwd: Monument Ridge Traffic

> You don't often get email from jennifercwagner@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Jennifer Wagner** <jennifercwagner@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 5, 2024 at 9:29 AM
Subject: Monument Ridge Traffic
To: <megganherinton@elpasoco.com>

Hi Meggan,

Thanks for coming to our meeting at the Woodmoor Barn last night.

I wanted to let you know that I think the traffic study they did is marginal at best. Not to diss on the guy doing the study, but here's the thing - they stopped right at Palmer Ridge High School.

If you look at a map of the Town of Monument, you'll see that most traffic toward Palmer Ridge High School happens along Woodmoor Drive and Highway 105. I was a substitute teacher last spring, and I can tell you that I often had to wait for 3 lights or more at the Woodmoor/105 intersection because of the traffic.

Monument Hill Road has single lanes north and south bound. It backs up to the I-25 Weigh Station on the West and then on the east side at this point, there is commercial property that has a retaining wall and berm. This is also right over a drainage area. I do not see how this road can be widened easily. The traffic engineer seemed surprised when I asked about this. The study should have shown traffic flow of the students attending this school, as this is the source of most of the traffic in the area.

I realize that people need places to live and that property owners have rights. But Classic Homes has been building over 100 homes in my backyard for over a year now, and they are sitting there, for sale. I have inches of dirt in my windowsills from the construction dirt because they don't spray. Every day from 6:30am - 6pm is filled with beeping and pounding noises. I am ready for this to be done. But they aren't, and the homes aren't exactly selling, either. I do not think that the new development at Monument Ridge is even needed at this point. The developer mentioned that he couldn't find any buildings for multiple housing in Monument. BULL. There are TONS of them popping up all along Jackson Creek. How could he miss that from the freeway when they are RIGHT THERE where the cow pasture used to be?!? He must be blind. There are MANY multi-family areas around Monument. Raspberry Lane right on Monument Lake, the Woodmoor Townhomes right next to the Barn, Deer Creek Townhomes, there are two large senior care facilities, the apartments on Leather Chaps, the apartments and town homes directly east of Lewis-Palmer High, and the newly built apartment just off Jackson Creek. This guy does NOT know the area AT ALL.

Overall, I think these developers have approached this as just another little community. It isn't. Monument Hill is notorious for its level of snow. It's also known for its fierce protection of wildlife and peaceful serenity. I grew up here; please let me know if I can help inform you during this application process. I am happy to help.

Thank you for helping our county!

Jennifer Wagner
(303) 777-9700
jennifercwagner@gmail.com

Marcella Maes

From: Janell Walter <jkwalter06@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2024 8:27 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East Public Comment

You don't often get email from jkwalter06@msn.com. Learn why this is important

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.

Good Morning,

I am emailing to state that I am against any further development at all on County Line road and I-25. Without a large undertaking of redevelopment of the overpass, and county roads on either side of this development and highway, I don't see any benefit other than to the pocket books of government officials of having this development go in.

At what point do we start to ask ourselves how much is too much? These houses are too close, too big, and with no yard space, no basements, nothing. They pose a large problem for fire risk, and if you don't believe me ask the people of Louisville who lost homes in those fires. Building homes that are the equivalent of matchboxes 10 feet from each other is a huge fire risk, tax on resources that are already scarce (water), fire, police, and a blight on our gorgeous community.

It's sad to think that this is even up for debate, and discussion. The answer should have always been no, or the space earmarked and utilized for community open space, a ball field, tennis courts, park for families in the neighborhood to walk to. Why does it always have to be more houses, more light pollution, more people for our severley underdeveloped infrastructure. People moved here for quiet, for space, for dark skies, not for street lights, and 100's of homes. Colorado has sold it's soul to developers, and it's time to tell them no, it's time to say enough and keep some area's green, and open.

Thank you,
Janell

Marcella Maes

From: Cfishwil@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 7:42 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Development

[You don't often get email from cfishwil@comcast.net. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

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.

Good morning,
I am writing to voice concern about the proposed high density housing proposed by Vertex Consulting/ Monument Ridge East.

This is the apex of the Palmer Divide and Monument Hill. Traffic, accidents and extreme weather patterns are already a problem. Backups and delays are commonplace at this spot. This area is excessively icy with curves and blind hills on both sides of the exit.

Additionally, the development's traffic will impact the frontage road where Palmer Ridge High School is located. It is already highly congested during storms and is often icy and snow packed.

Our students rely on that road to get to and from school safely. Additional traffic by those avoiding 1-25 will be dangerous. It's already difficult to make a turns out of the highway safely. My worry is this will make it even more difficult and cause more and more accidents.

In a nutshell, this is not a good location for high volume housing. I hope you all reconsider for safety reasons. Excessive cars using the exit, county line road and the frontage road are a dangerous problem in the making. All of this is multiplied by our extreme weather patterns.

Please think about this before approving. If you have never driven this exit or these roads during the winter, they can be treacherous.

Thank you for your consideration,
Cathy Wilcox
599 Forest View Way
Monument, CO 80132

Sent from my iPhone

Marcella Maes

From: rochejoni@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 11:04 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East

[You don't often get email from rochejoni@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

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.

I cannot attend the approval meeting. I am writing to oppose the building of this area. This is aggressive, even for this area.

Joni Roche
719-339-8097
Wissler Ranch Resident

Holly Williams
County Commissioner
200 South Cascade Ave, Suite 100
Colorado. Springs, CO 80903

RE: Monument East Ridge
East of I-25
South of County Line

As an immediate neighbor to this property, I am aware that the County will be reviewing a submission from the developer over the next few months. We have had numerous discussions with the developer, and they have reacted favorably to our input. At our request they adjusted (increased) the lot sizes immediately west of Doewood Drive to better transition the lot sizes. They have emphasized that they want to be good neighbors and will work with us to minimize the construction disruption to the neighborhood and invest in the landscaping of the neighborhoods.

We are in support of their proposed zoning adjustments as I would like to see residential neighborhoods on this land versus the existing mix of commercial and residential zoning. We need affordable housing in Monument as most of our service workforce must commute here for their jobs (care givers and responders). We also need to work with a developer that communicates, and they have made themselves available to anyone in the community who would listen. Unfortunately, many still believe they can stop development.

Currently our HOA is neighbor to a PUD development on Piney Hill Point which many would be considered "High Density" yet are very attractive single-family homes.

I was very disappointed in the process we experienced when the developer and the Town of Monument considered annexation. The developer relied on the input from and negotiated with the Town of Monument management team while simultaneously many officials worked behind the scenes to undermine the process.

In the end I am hopeful that El Paso County and their "Master Plan" has considered the economic and social needs of El Paso County and will approve the zoning change and the proposed plot plan.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Larson
Roberta M Larson
20270 Doewood Drive
Monument CO 80132
719-271-2439

Marcella Maes

From: Candice Pollack <candice@streetsidesouth.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 12:02 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: Monument Ridge East Project - Opposition

You don't often get email from candice@streetsidesouth.com. Learn why this is important

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.

To whom it may concern,
Our names are Candice & Dustin Pollack. We live at 20240 Doewood Drive, Monument, CO 80132.

We back directly to the property in question. Our backyard will be the line to this new development. We have been to every meeting to fight this project. The developer has never spoken directly to us regarding the project. We are not opposed to this land being developed in some fashion. For example, they could follow the current requirements for North Woomoor – 0.5 acre lots with a minimum square foot requirement for the home. The builder had refused to make any changes to the plan.

We do not believe the current plan of high-density housing follows the master plan of the Gateway to El Paso County. The high-density housing plan also does not go with conservation easement across the county line in Douglas County. I believe Douglas County opposes this development. There is no addressing the removal of trees and lack of parks to add to the community. This does not coincide with the beauty of the Palmer Divide.

There is also the issue of water and lack thereof. We are currently under water restrictions in Woodmoor. When the developer was trying to get approval through the town of Monument water was one of the main concerns and therefore could not gain approval. We also would like to address the impact of cars. On average the nearly 400 doors (new homes) with 4 household members would increase our small community by 1200-1600 people and 800 cars. These are conservative numbers. The off ramp of I-25 and County Line is also very dangerous. It is almost daily there is an accident there. Adding such a large amount of traffic will only increase this hazard. How are the police planning on addressing the influx with this high-density housing? And the increase to the schools and even our one supermarket. These are only a few of our main concerns. We have several more.

We are opposed to the current high density housing plan. We respectfully ask you to take our opinion into consideration. Not only does it affect us directly, but it also affects our community drastically.

We plan on attending the meeting virtually as we are traveling home from outside of the country.

Sincerely,

Candice & Dustin Pollack
720-350-2787

Kylie Bagley

From: Bruce Sidebotham <bts@telioslaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2024 9:36 AM
To: Kylie Bagley
Cc: nbt.nml@gmial.com; Ruiz, Nina; Theresa Lynn Sidebotham
Subject: Minority Neighbor view on Monument Ridge East

> You don't often get email from bts@telioslaw.com. Learn why this is important

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 Kylie Bagley,

I want to offer a perspective counter to the NIMBY Woodmoor resident email you are likely getting regarding the Monument Ridge East development project.

I own the 9 acres of suburban vacant land on the south end of that project. Those NIMBY residents haven't a clue about the indirect economic burden of undeveloped suburban private land on them and on everyone in El Paso County.

That land consumes resources to address liability, dumping, fire mitigation, vagrancy, noxious weeds, and pest control, not to mention taxes that are drastically increasing as surrounding values explode. Development solves these problems. Eventual development is an economic and survival necessity.

People who want to prevent privately owned suburban vacant land from being developed need to come up with a way to be willing to underwrite the costs associated with preserving it as such. For example, environmental easement (as exists in Douglas County just north of County Line Road) creates a tax benefit offsetting the cost of keeping land vacant. Unfortunately, environmental easement is not an option in suburban settings like in Monument. Agricultural Land, Forest Service Land, BLM Land, Public Open Space, Environmental Easements, and Municipal Parks pay for themselves. They are the economically productive way to absorb maintenance costs and a viable way to preserve wetlands, trees, and natural habitat.

Unfortunately, privately owned vacant suburban land is an economic burden for the owners and is also an economic drain on the community. It produces nothing. It costs me $16,000 a year in taxes to have a place where neighbor kids ride their bicycles, motorcycles, and ATVs; where vagrants sometimes camp; and where some people dump their trash. The only justification for that annual tax outlay is future return though development.

Please tell me if there is anyone else you know of with whom I should share my perspective.

Thank you,
Bruce Sidebotham
719-287-3910

PRELIMINARY PLAN (RECOMMEND APPROVAL)

_____ moved that the following Resolution be adopted:

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

OF THE COUNTY OF EL PASO

STATE OF COLORADO

RESOLUTION NO. SP241
MONUMENT RIDGE EAST PRELIMINARY PLAN

WHEREAS, Vertex Consulting Services did file an application with the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department for approval of a Preliminary Plan for the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan Subdivision for property in the unincorporated area of El Paso County as described in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by this Commission on November 21, 2024; and

WHEREAS, based on the evidence, testimony, exhibits, consideration of the Master Plan for the unincorporated area of the County, presentation and comments of the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department and other County representatives, comments of public officials and agencies, comments from all interested persons, comments by the general public, and comments by the El Paso County Planning Commission members during the hearing, this Commission finds as follows:

1. The application was properly submitted for consideration by the Planning Commission;

2. Proper posting, publication, and public notice were provided as required by law for the hearing before the Planning Commission;

3. The hearing before the Planning Commission was extensive and complete, that all pertinent facts, matters, and issues were submitted, and that all interested persons and the general public were heard at that hearing;

4. All exhibits were received into evidence;

5. All data, surveys, analyses, studies, plans, and designs as are required by the State of Colorado and El Paso County have been submitted, reviewed, and found to meet all sound planning and engineering requirements of the El Paso County Subdivision Regulations; and

6. For the above-stated and other reasons, the proposed Preliminary Plan is in the best interest of the health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, and welfare of the citizens of El Paso County.

WHEREAS, when approving a Preliminary Plan, the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners shall find that the request meets the criteria for approval outlined in Section 7.2.1.D.2.e of the Land Development Code ("Code") (as amended):

1. The proposed Subdivision is in general conformance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Master Plan;

2. The Subdivision is consistent with the purposes of the Code;

3. The Subdivision is in conformance with the subdivision design standards and any approved Sketch Plan;

4. A sufficient water supply has been acquired in terms of quantity, quality, and dependability for the type of Subdivision proposed, as determined in accordance with the standards set forth in the water supply standards [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6)(a)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of the Code (this finding may not be deferred to Final Plat if the applicant intends to seek Administrative Final Plat approval);

5. A public sewage disposal system has been established and, if other methods of sewage disposal are proposed, the system complies with State and local laws and regulations, [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6) (b)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of the Code;

6. All areas of the proposed Subdivision, which may involve soil or topographical conditions presenting hazards or requiring special precautions, have been identified and the proposed Subdivision is compatible with such conditions. [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6)(c)];

7. Adequate drainage improvements complying with State law [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(3)(c)(VIII)] and the requirements of the Code and the Engineering Criteria Manual ("ECM") are provided by the design;

8. The location and design of the public improvements proposed in connection with the Subdivision are adequate to serve the needs and mitigate the effects of the development;

9. Legal and physical access is or will be provided to all parcels by public rights-of-way or recorded easement, acceptable to the County in compliance with the Code and the ECM;

10. The proposed Subdivision has established an adequate level of compatibility by (1) incorporating natural physical features into the design and providing sufficient open spaces considering the type and intensity of the Subdivision; (2) incorporating site planning

techniques to foster the implementation of the County's plans, and encourage a land use pattern to support a balanced transportation system, including auto, bike, and pedestrian traffic, public or mass transit if appropriate, and the cost effective delivery of other services consistent with adopted plans, policies and regulations of the County; (3) incorporating physical design features in the Subdivision to provide a transition between the Subdivision and adjacent land uses; (4) incorporating identified environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to, wetlands and wildlife corridors, into the design; and (5) incorporating public facilities or infrastructure, or provisions therefore, reasonably related to the proposed Subdivision so the proposed Subdivision will not negatively impact the levels of service of County services and facilities;

11. Necessary services, including police and fire protection, recreation, utilities, open space, and transportation systems are or will be available to serve the proposed Subdivision;

12. The Subdivision provides evidence to show that the proposed methods for fire protection comply with Chapter 6 of the Code; and

13. The proposed Subdivision meets other applicable sections of Chapter 6 and 8 of the Code.

WHEREAS, a sufficient water supply has been acquired in terms of quantity, quality, and dependability for the type of Subdivision proposed, as determined in accordance with the standards set forth in the water supply standards [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6)(a)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of the Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the El Paso County Planning Commission recommends that the petition of Vertex Consulting Services for approval of a Preliminary Plan for the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan Subdivision for property located in the unincorporated area of El Paso County be approved by the Board of County Commissioners with the following conditions and notations:

CONDITIONS

1. Applicable traffic, drainage and bridge fees shall be paid with each Final Plat.

2. Applicable school and park fees shall be paid with each Final Plat.

3. Developer shall comply with federal and state laws, regulations, ordinances, review and permit requirements, and other agency requirements, if any, of applicable agencies including, but not limited to, the Colorado Division of Wildlife, Colorado Department of Transportation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the Endangered Species Act, particularly as it relates to the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse as a listed species.

4. The requirements contained in the Water Supply Review and Recommendations as provided by the County Attorney’s Office shall be adhered to at the appropriate time.

5. A Site Development Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department for the entirety of the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan, concurrent with the Final Plat Submittal.

6. A Landscape Plan and detailed tract table shall be submitted to the Planning Department for the entirety of the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan, concurrent with the Final Plat Submittal.

7. Applicant shall comply with all recommendations by Amy Crandall, Engineering Geologist contained in the Colorado Geological Survey's Review letter, dated 9/18/2024, as provided by the Colorado Geological Survey.

8. Applicant shall comply with all requirements contained in the Colorado Parks and Wildlife Department of Natural Resources letter, dated 6/08/2024.

9. Applicant shall comply with all requirements contained in the Water Supply Review and Recommendations, dated November 14, 2024, as provided by the County Attorney's Office.

NOTATIONS

1. This Preliminary Plan approval does not authorize future Final Plat filings to be approved administratively.

2. Approval of the Preliminary Plan will expire after twenty-four (24) months unless a Final Plat has been approved and recorded or a time extension has been granted.

3. Preliminary Plans not forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for consideration within 180 days of Planning Commission action will be deemed to be withdrawn and will have to be resubmitted in their entirety.

4. The El Paso County Road Impact Fee Program Resolution (Resolution Subdivider(s) agrees on behalf of him/herself and any developer or builder successors and assignees that Subdivider and/or said successors and assigns shall be required to pay traffic impact fees in accordance with the No. 19-471), or any amendments thereto, at or prior to the time of building permit submittals. The fee obligation, if not paid at Final Plat recording, shall be documented on all sales documents and on plat notes to ensure that a title search would find the fee obligation before sale of the property.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution and the recommendations contained herein be forwarded to the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners for its consideration.

_____ seconded the adoption of the foregoing Resolution.

The roll having been called, the vote was as follows: (circle one)

Thomas Bailey	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Sarah Brittain Jack	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Jim Byers	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Jay Carlson	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Becky Fuller	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Jeffrey Markewich	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Eric Moraes	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Bryce Schuettpelz	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Wayne Smith	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Tim Trowbridge	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Christopher Whitney	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent

The Resolution was adopted by a vote of _____ to _____ by the El Paso County Planning Commission, State of Colorado.

DONE THIS 21st day of November 2024 at Colorado Springs, Colorado.

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

By: _____
Chair

EXHIBIT A

PARCEL E-1:
LOT 1, HEIGHTS FILING ONE, COUNTY OF EL PASO, STATE: OF COLORADO.

PARCEL E-2:
AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS, EGRESS AND UTILITIES AS DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 1989 IN BOOK 5691 AT PAGE 1415 AND RE-RECORDED NOVEMBER 8, 1991 IN BOOK 5901 AT PAGE 177 AND RE-RECORDED JANUARY 14, 1992 IN BOOK 5924 AT PAGE 316.

PARCEL E-3:
A TRACT OF LAND LOCATED IN THE NORTH ONE HALF OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M. IN El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
COMMENCING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SECTION;
TH S 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 54 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 1320.00 FEET;
THENCE S 00 DEGREES 53 MINUTES 12 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 300.01 FEET;
THENCE S 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 34 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 1599.97 FEET;
THENCE S 14 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 38 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 887.45 FEET;
FOR THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THE PARCEL TO BE DESCRIBED HEREBY;
THENCE CONTINUE S 14 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 38 SECONDS W, A DISTANCE OF 102.63 FEET; THENCE S 86 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 14 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 350.00 FEET;
THENCE S 00 DEGREES 24 MINUTES 09 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 236.98 FEET;
THENCE N 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 649.40 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 25;
THENCE N 06 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 00 SECONDS E, ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE, 696.96 FEET;
THENCE S 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS E A DISTANCE OF 251.71 FEET;
THENCE S 06 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 00 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 337.98 FEET;
THENCE S 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS E A DISTANCE OF 732.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

PARCEL E-4:
A TRACT OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ALSO BEING A PORTION OF PARCEL A AND PARCEL B AS DESCRIBED BY DOCUMENT (RECEPTION NO. 99035205, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO RECORDS), SITUATE IN COUNTY OF EL PASO, STATE OF COLORADO, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF PARCEL A (ALL BEARINGS IN THIS DESCRIPTION ARE RELATIVE TO A PORTION OF THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL A, Monumented AS SHOWN AND ASSUMED TO BEAR NORTH 01 DEGREES 04 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1833.20 FEET) (THE FOLLO'MNG SIX (6) COURSES ARE ALONG THE LINES OF SAID PARCEL A AND PARCEL B);

1) NORTH 01 DEGREES 04 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, 1833.20 FEET;
2) NORTH 00 DEGREES 50 MINUTES 54 SECONDS EAST, 370.05 FEET:
3) NORTH 00 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, 443.01 FEET;
4) NORTH 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 35 SECONDS WEST, 395.12 FEET;
5) NORTH 07 DEGREES 27 MINUTES 26 SECONDS EAST, 1273.57 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL B;
6) SOUTH 89 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 42 SECONDS EAST, 437.24 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF MISTY ACRES SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1 (RECEPTION NO. 205190028, SAID EL PASO COUNTY RECORDS)

(THE FOLLOWING FOURTEEN (14) COURSES ARE ALONG THE WESTERLY LINES OF SAID FILING);

1) SOUTH 00 DEGREES 48 MINUTES 57 SECONDS WEST, 54.29 FEET;
2) ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 16 DEGREES 23 MINUTES 27 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 601.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 171.93 FEET;
3) SOUTH 15 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST, 647.10 FEET;
4) ON A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 29 DEGREES 05 MINUTES 22 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 521.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 264.52 FEET;
5) SOUTH 13 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 52 SECONDS WEST, 382.56 FEET;
6) AN A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 29 DEGREES 13 MINUTES 34 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 650.71 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 331.92 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVE;
7) AN SAID REVERSE CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 41 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 48 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 548.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 398.96 FEET;
8) SOUTH 01 DEGREES 01 MINUTES 38 SECONDS WEST, 172.86 FEET;
9) ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 25 DEGREES 14 MINUTES 35 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 740.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 326.03 FEET;
10) SOUTH 24 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 57 SECONDS EAST, 474.89 FEET;
11) ON A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 63 DEGREES 36 MINUTES 53 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 521.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 578.76 FEET;
12) SOUTH 39 DEGREES 25 MINUTES 56 SECONDS WEST, 87.74 FEET;
13) ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 17 DEGREES 26 MINUTES 58 SECONDS. A RADIUS OF 601.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 183.08 FEET;
14) SOUTH 21 DEGREES 58 MINUTES 58 SECONDS WEST, 91.58 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL A;

THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 35 MINUTES 50 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID PARCEL A'S SOUTHERLY LINE, 64.39 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. EXCEPT ANY PORTION THEREOF DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 20, 2020 AT RECEPTION NO. 220189049.

PARCEL E-5
LOT 27, MOSTY ACRES SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1, COUNTY OF El PASO, STATE OF COLORADO

NORTH PARCEL
A TRACT OF LAND IN THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60 FOOT WIDE COUNTY LINE ROAD AND THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60 FOOT WIDE DOEWOOD DRIVE AS DEDICATED IN "HEIGHTS FILING TWO" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 228 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2287623 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, SAID POINT BEING ALSO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THAT RIGHT OF WAY PARCEL FOR COUNTY LINE ROAD GRANTED IN SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED RECORDED UNDER RECEPTION NO. 214002145, OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO;
THENCE S 00° 02' 24" W, ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE THEREOF, 20.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE CONTINUE S 00° 02' 24" W, ALONG THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF SAID DOEWOOD DRIVE, 250.05 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 10 IN SAID "HEIGHTS FILING TWO";
THENCE S 89° 06' 54" W, ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE, 129.47 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER THEREOF;
THENCE S 15° 04' 41" W, ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID "HEIGHTS FILING TWO", 981.29 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF "HEIGHTS FILING ONE" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 167 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2225904 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO;

THENCE S 88° 45' 14" W, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE THEREOF, 306.89 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 3951 AT PAGE 1433 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO AND AN EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN PUBLIC TRUSTEES DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 5852 AT PAGE 323 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO;
THENCE N 14° 12' 38" E, ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINES, 102.54 FEET TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 3951 AT PAGE 1433 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO;
THENCE N 89°57' 36" W, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE THEREOF, 732.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF A TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 6488 AT PAGE 243 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO: THE FOLLOWING TWO COURSES ARE ALONG THE BOUNDARY OF SAID TRACT;
THENCE (1) N 06° 43' 00” E, 337.98 FEET;
THENCE (2) N 89° 57' 36" W, 251.71 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY5, STATE OF COLORADO RECORDED IN BOOK 1984 AT PAGE 836 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO: THE FOLLO'MNG FOUR COURSES ARE ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE;
THENCE (1) N 06°' 43' 00" E, 36.92 FEET;
THENCE (2) N 29° 16' 30" E, 675.30 FEET;
THENCE (3) N 89° 05' 00” E, 500.00 FEET;
THENCE (4) N 29° 33' 00” E (BASIS OF BEARING), 180.19 FEET TO INTERSECT THE SOUTH LINE OF AFORESAID 60 FOOT WIDE COUNTY LINE ROAD;
THENCE N 89° 06' 54” E, ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE 258.85 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE AFORESAID RIGHT OF WAY PARCEL GRANTED TO El PASO COUNTY FOR COUNTY LINE ROAD UNDER RECEPTION NO. 214002145 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THE FOLLOWIN G FOUR COURSES ARE ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE THEREOF;
THENCE (1) S 00° 53' 11” E, 11.00 FEET;
THENCE (2) S 89° 57' 43” E, 186.01 FEET;
THENCE (3) N 89° 48' 13" E, 87.26 FEET;
THENCE (4) S 89° 02' 16" E, 154.69 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PARCEL CONVEYED TO WOODMOOR WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT FOR THE CRYSTAL CREEK LIFT STATION BY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 30, 1998 AT RECEPTION NO. 98175218 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; EXCEPTING DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 29, 2010 AT RECEPTION NO. 210120918 AND JANUARY 9, 2014 AT RECEPTION NO. 214002145 AND FURTHER EXCEPTING ANY PORTION THIN THE RIGHT OF WAY OF COUNTY LINE ROAD OR INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 25, AND FURTHER EXCEPTING THAT PORTION DEDICATED AS DOEWOOD DRIVE IN "HEIGHTS FILING TWO" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 228 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2287623 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO.

PRELIMINARY PLAN (RECOMMEND DENIAL)

_____ moved that the following Resolution be adopted:

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

OF THE COUNTY OF EL PASO

STATE OF COLORADO

RESOLUTION NO. SP241
MONUMENT RIDGE EAST PRELIMINARY PLAN

WHEREAS, Vertex Consulting Services did file an application with the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department for approval of a Preliminary Plan for the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan Subdivision for property in the unincorporated area of El Paso County as described in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by this Commission on November 21, 2024; and

WHEREAS, based on the evidence, testimony, exhibits, consideration of the Master Plan for the unincorporated area of the County, presentation and comments of the El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department and other County representatives, comments of public officials and agencies, comments from all interested persons, comments by the general public, and comments by the El Paso County Planning Commission members during the hearing, this Commission finds as follows:

☐ 1. The application was not properly submitted for consideration by the Planning Commission;

☐ 2. Proper posting, publication, and public notice were not provided as required by law for the hearing before the Planning Commission;

☐ 3. The hearing before the Planning Commission was not extensive and complete, that all pertinent facts, matters, and issues were submitted, and that all interested persons and the general public were heard at that hearing;

☐ 4. All exhibits were not received into evidence;

☐ 5. All data, surveys, analyses, studies, plans, and designs as are required by the State of Colorado and El Paso County have not been submitted, reviewed, and found to meet all sound planning and engineering requirements of the El Paso County Subdivision Regulations; and

☐ 6. For the above-stated and other reasons, the proposed Preliminary Plan is not in the best interest of the health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, and welfare of the citizens of El Paso County.

WHEREAS, when approving a Preliminary Plan, the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners shall find that the request meets the criteria for approval outlined in Section 7.2.1.D.2.e of the Land Development Code ("Code") (as amended):

☐ 1. The proposed Subdivision is not in general conformance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Master Plan;

☐ 2. The Subdivision is not consistent with the purposes of the Code;

☐ 3. The Subdivision is not in conformance with the subdivision design standards and any approved Sketch Plan;

☐ 4. A sufficient water supply has not been acquired in terms of quantity, quality, and dependability for the type of Subdivision proposed, as determined in accordance with the standards set forth in the water supply standards [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6)(a)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of the Code (this finding may not be deferred to Final Plat if the applicant intends to seek Administrative Final Plat approval);

☐ 5. A public sewage disposal system has not been established and, if other methods of sewage disposal are proposed, the system complies with State and local laws and regulations, [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6) (b)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of the Code;

☐ 6. All areas of the proposed Subdivision, which may involve soil or topographical conditions presenting hazards or requiring special precautions, have not been identified and the proposed Subdivision is compatible with such conditions. [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6)(c)];

☐ 7. Adequate drainage improvements complying with State law [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(3)(c)(VIII)] and the requirements of the Code and the Engineering Criteria Manual ("ECM") are not provided by the design;

☐ 8. The location and design of the public improvements proposed in connection with the Subdivision are not adequate to serve the needs and mitigate the effects of the development;

☐ 9. Legal and physical access is not or will not be provided to all parcels by public rights-of-way or recorded easement, acceptable to the County in compliance with the Code and the ECM;

☐ 10. The proposed Subdivision has not established an adequate level of compatibility by (1) incorporating natural physical features into the design and providing sufficient open spaces considering the type and intensity of the Subdivision; (2) incorporating site planning techniques to foster the implementation of the County's plans, and encourage a land use pattern to support a balanced transportation system, including auto, bike, and pedestrian traffic, public or mass transit if appropriate, and the cost effective delivery of other services consistent with adopted plans, policies and regulations of the County; (3) incorporating physical design features in the Subdivision to provide a transition between the Subdivision and adjacent land uses; (4) incorporating identified environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to, wetlands and wildlife corridors, into the design; and (5) incorporating public facilities or infrastructure, or provisions therefore, reasonably related to the proposed Subdivision so the proposed Subdivision will not negatively impact the levels of service of County services and facilities;

☐ 11. Necessary services, including police and fire protection, recreation, utilities, open space, and transportation systems are not or will not be available to serve the proposed Subdivision;

☐ 12. The Subdivision does not provides evidence to show that the proposed methods for fire protection comply with Chapter 6 of the Code; and

☐ 13. The proposed Subdivision does not meets other applicable sections of Chapter 6 and 8 of the Code.

WHEREAS, a sufficient water supply has been acquired in terms of quantity, quality, and dependability for the type of Subdivision proposed, as determined in accordance with the standards set forth in the water supply standards [C.R.S. § 30-28-133(6)(a)] and the requirements of Chapter 8 of the Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the El Paso County Planning Commission recommends that the petition of Vertex Consulting Services for denial of a Preliminary Plan for the Monument Ridge East Preliminary Plan Subdivision for property located in the unincorporated area of El Paso County be denied by the Board of County Commissioners.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution and the recommendations contained herein be forwarded to the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners for its consideration.

_____ seconded the adoption of the foregoing Resolution.

The roll having been called, the vote was as follows: (circle one)

Thomas Bailey	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Sarah Brittain Jack	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent

Jim Byers	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Jay Carlson	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Becky Fuller	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Jeffrey Markewich	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Eric Moraes	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Bryce Schuettpelz	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Wayne Smith	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Tim Trowbridge	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent
Christopher Whitney	aye / no / non-voting / recused / absent

The Resolution was adopted by a vote of _____ to _____ by the El Paso County Planning Commission, State of Colorado.

DONE THIS 21st day of November 2024 at Colorado Springs, Colorado.

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

By: _____
Chair

EXHIBIT A

PARCEL E-1:
LOT 1, HEIGHTS FILING ONE, COUNTY OF EL PASO, STATE: OF COLORADO.

PARCEL E-2:
AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS, EGRESS AND UTILITIES AS DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 1989 IN BOOK 5691 AT PAGE 1415 AND RE-RECORDED NOVEMBER 8, 1991 IN BOOK 5901 AT PAGE 177 AND RE-RECORDED JANUARY 14, 1992 IN BOOK 5924 AT PAGE 316.

PARCEL E-3:
A TRACT OF LAND LOCATED IN THE NORTH ONE HALF OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M. IN El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
COMMENCING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SECTION;
TH S 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 54 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 1320.00 FEET;
THENCE S 00 DEGREES 53 MINUTES 12 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 300.01 FEET;
THENCE S 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 34 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 1599.97 FEET;
THENCE S 14 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 38 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 887.45 FEET;
FOR THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THE PARCEL TO BE DESCRIBED HEREBY;
THENCE CONTINUE S 14 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 38 SECONDS W, A DISTANCE OF 102.63 FEET; THENCE S 86 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 14 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 350.00 FEET;
THENCE S 00 DEGREES 24 MINUTES 09 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 236.98 FEET;
THENCE N 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 649.40 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 25;
THENCE N 06 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 00 SECONDS E, ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE, 696.96 FEET;
THENCE S 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS E A DISTANCE OF 251.71 FEET;
THENCE S 06 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 00 SECONDS W A DISTANCE OF 337.98 FEET;
THENCE S 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 36 SECONDS E A DISTANCE OF 732.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

PARCEL E-4:
A TRACT OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ALSO BEING A PORTION OF PARCEL A AND PARCEL B AS DESCRIBED BY DOCUMENT (RECEPTION NO. 99035205, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO RECORDS), SITUATE IN COUNTY OF EL PASO, STATE OF COLORADO, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF PARCEL A (ALL BEARINGS IN THIS DESCRIPTION ARE RELATIVE TO A PORTION OF THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL A, Monumented AS SHOWN AND ASSUMED TO BEAR NORTH 01 DEGREES 04 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1833.20 FEET) (THE FOLLO'MNG SIX (6) COURSES ARE ALONG THE LINES OF SAID PARCEL A AND PARCEL B);

1) NORTH 01 DEGREES 04 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, 1833.20 FEET;
2) NORTH 00 DEGREES 50 MINUTES 54 SECONDS EAST, 370.05 FEET:
3) NORTH 00 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST, 443.01 FEET;
4) NORTH 89 DEGREES 06 MINUTES 35 SECONDS WEST, 395.12 FEET;
5) NORTH 07 DEGREES 27 MINUTES 26 SECONDS EAST, 1273.57 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL B;
6) SOUTH 89 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 42 SECONDS EAST, 437.24 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF MISTY ACRES SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1 (RECEPTION NO. 205190028, SAID EL PASO COUNTY RECORDS)

(THE FOLLOWING FOURTEEN (14) COURSES ARE ALONG THE WESTERLY LINES OF SAID FILING);

1) SOUTH 00 DEGREES 48 MINUTES 57 SECONDS WEST, 54.29 FEET;
2) ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 16 DEGREES 23 MINUTES 27 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 601.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 171.93 FEET;
3) SOUTH 15 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST, 647.10 FEET;
4) ON A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 29 DEGREES 05 MINUTES 22 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 521.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 264.52 FEET;
5) SOUTH 13 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 52 SECONDS WEST, 382.56 FEET;
6) AN A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 29 DEGREES 13 MINUTES 34 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 650.71 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 331.92 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVE;
7) AN SAID REVERSE CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 41 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 48 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 548.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 398.96 FEET;
8) SOUTH 01 DEGREES 01 MINUTES 38 SECONDS WEST, 172.86 FEET;
9) ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 25 DEGREES 14 MINUTES 35 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 740.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 326.03 FEET;
10) SOUTH 24 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 57 SECONDS EAST, 474.89 FEET;
11) ON A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 63 DEGREES 36 MINUTES 53 SECONDS, A RADIUS OF 521.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 578.76 FEET;
12) SOUTH 39 DEGREES 25 MINUTES 56 SECONDS WEST, 87.74 FEET;
13) ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT, SAID CURVE HAVING A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 17 DEGREES 26 MINUTES 58 SECONDS. A RADIUS OF 601.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 183.08 FEET;
14) SOUTH 21 DEGREES 58 MINUTES 58 SECONDS WEST, 91.58 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL A;

THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 35 MINUTES 50 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID PARCEL A'S SOUTHERLY LINE, 64.39 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. EXCEPT ANY PORTION THEREOF DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 20, 2020 AT RECEPTION NO. 220189049.

PARCEL E-5
LOT 27, MOSTY ACRES SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1, COUNTY OF El PASO, STATE OF COLORADO

NORTH PARCEL
A TRACT OF LAND IN THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60 FOOT WIDE COUNTY LINE ROAD AND THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF 60 FOOT WIDE DOEWOOD DRIVE AS DEDICATED IN "HEIGHTS FILING TWO" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 228 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2287623 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, SAID POINT BEING ALSO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THAT RIGHT OF WAY PARCEL FOR COUNTY LINE ROAD GRANTED IN SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED RECORDED UNDER RECEPTION NO. 214002145, OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO;
THENCE S 00° 02' 24" W, ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE THEREOF, 20.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE CONTINUE S 00° 02' 24" W, ALONG THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF SAID DOEWOOD DRIVE, 250.05 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 10 IN SAID "HEIGHTS FILING TWO";
THENCE S 89° 06' 54" W, ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE, 129.47 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER THEREOF;
THENCE S 15° 04' 41" W, ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID "HEIGHTS FILING TWO", 981.29 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF "HEIGHTS FILING ONE" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 167 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2225904 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO;

THENCE S 88° 45' 14" W, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE THEREOF, 306.89 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 3951 AT PAGE 1433 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO AND AN EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN PUBLIC TRUSTEES DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 5852 AT PAGE 323 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO;
THENCE N 14° 12' 38" E, ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINES, 102.54 FEET TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 3951 AT PAGE 1433 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO;
THENCE N 89°57' 36" W, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE THEREOF, 732.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF A TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN BOOK 6488 AT PAGE 243 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO: THE FOLLOWING TWO COURSES ARE ALONG THE BOUNDARY OF SAID TRACT;
THENCE (1) N 06° 43' 00” E, 337.98 FEET;
THENCE (2) N 89° 57' 36" W, 251.71 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF THAT TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY5, STATE OF COLORADO RECORDED IN BOOK 1984 AT PAGE 836 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO: THE FOLLO'MNG FOUR COURSES ARE ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE;
THENCE (1) N 06°' 43' 00" E, 36.92 FEET;
THENCE (2) N 29° 16' 30" E, 675.30 FEET;
THENCE (3) N 89° 05' 00” E, 500.00 FEET;
THENCE (4) N 29° 33' 00” E (BASIS OF BEARING), 180.19 FEET TO INTERSECT THE SOUTH LINE OF AFORESAID 60 FOOT WIDE COUNTY LINE ROAD;
THENCE N 89° 06' 54” E, ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE 258.85 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE AFORESAID RIGHT OF WAY PARCEL GRANTED TO El PASO COUNTY FOR COUNTY LINE ROAD UNDER RECEPTION NO. 214002145 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; THE FOLLOWING FOUR COURSES ARE ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE THEREOF;
THENCE (1) S 00° 53' 11” E, 11.00 FEET;
THENCE (2) S 89° 57' 43” E, 186.01 FEET;
THENCE (3) N 89° 48' 13" E, 87.26 FEET;
THENCE (4) S 89° 02' 16" E, 154.69 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PARCEL CONVEYED TO WOODMOOR WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT FOR THE CRYSTAL CREEK LIFT STATION BY DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 30, 1998 AT RECEPTION NO. 98175218 OF THE RECORDS OF El PASO COUNTY, COLORADO; EXCEPTING DEED RECORDED NOVEMBER 29, 2010 AT RECEPTION NO. 210120918 AND JANUARY 9, 2014 AT RECEPTION NO. 214002145 AND FURTHER EXCEPTING ANY PORTION THIN THE RIGHT OF WAY OF COUNTY LINE ROAD OR INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 25, AND FURTHER EXCEPTING THAT PORTION DEDICATED AS DOEWOOD DRIVE IN "HEIGHTS FILING TWO" AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK E-5 AT PAGE 228 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2287623 OF THE RECORDS OF EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO.