

Van Nimwegen, Hannah

From: Kala D <k_darbs@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2021 8:49 AM
To: Van Nimwegen, Hannah
Subject: Kettle Creek North Appeal

CAUTION! - External Email. Malware is most commonly spread through unknown email attachments and links. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email!

To whom it may concern;

We am submitting my concern for decreased safety of the residents of the North Fork neighborhood, including my family, based on the current final plans for the Kettle Creek North subdivision.

The only proposed access for the residents of Kettle Creek North is through the North Fork neighborhood via Thunder Mountain Ave. This street is one lane at the high school leaving the neighborhood. In an emergency evacuation situation such as a fire the time to safely evacuate both neighborhoods would be unacceptably high.

The extra traffic on the North Fork neighborhood roads will also be greatly increased, making the North Fork neighborhood much less safe for children, including those walking to and from the new elementary school in the neighborhood. North Fork should not be the only way to access the Kettle Creek North subdivision.

I am also concerned about the amount of storm water that will be held by the current drainage area. This drainage area looked like it was already at capacity last year with a good rain and adding more drainage from a second residential area may be too much for it to handle.

Please reconsider the current plans for no independent access point before giving final approval for the Kettle Creek North development. Thank you.

Kala and Ryan Miller

Van Nimwegen, Hannah

From: Laureano Siqueiros <chivasray0617@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 16, 2021 10:51 AM
To: Van Nimwegen, Hannah
Subject: Kettle Creek North Appeal - I Vote NO

CAUTION! - External Email. Malware is most commonly spread through unknown email attachments and links. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email!

Ms. VanNimwegen: As a resident of North Fork, I do not approve adding an additional 250+ home subdivision next to us. The drawings I reviewed did not show any additional traffic outlets.

As it is, the only two traffic outlets out of North Fork are Thunder Mountain Avenue and Forest Creek Drive. As it is currently drawn, the approval of the Kettle Creek Subdivision would add roughly 500+ cars traveling in front of the nearly complete elementary school and Pine Creek High School on Thunder Mountain Drive.

Question: what does the city Fire Chief have to say about the lack of evacuation routes for the new neighborhood?

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Laureano S. Siqueiros
3471 Prairie Bluff Circle
Colorado Springs, CO. 80908

Van Nimwegen, Hannah

From: Greg Edwards <gredwards2542@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 6:18 PM
To: Sam Bryant
Cc: Lobato, Elena; rs@truevine.net; ryanmmiller@hotmail.com; Van Nimwegen, Hannah; Mary Shinn
Subject: Re: Kettle Creek North
Attachments: SmithDisapprove.JPG

CAUTION! - External Email. Malware is most commonly spread through unknown email attachments and links. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email!

Hello Ms. Lovato and Ms. Van Nimwegen,

I am also a North Fork at Briargate resident.....the original annexation master plan for our area included a west and a south bound road exit to Powers via Thunder Mountain Ave. or Thunder Mountain connecting to Old Ranch Rd.....Thunder Mountain Rd. was spec'd to be 4 lanes....but just past the high school it is only 2 lanes. Todd Frisbie, City Traffic Mgr noted that the Thunder Mountain Ave intersection with the Pine Creek High School near the entrance to our development is a Level of Service of 'F'. So instead of two directions in and out, we have one. **NOW** they are adding a new elementary school on the same road and want to add 243 new homes in Kettle Creek.

In filing Todd Frisbie says these issue have been known and to ignore the much needed second direction into the development.....great for keeping costs down for the developer but dangerous for our area and over 2,500 students and teachers *ALL* dependent upon **Old Ranch Rd**.....where Thunder Mountain exits. But to 'paper over' the issue, Planning and Traffic point to another road 200 feet from Thunder Mountain and Old Ranch Rd. That road 200 feet away is 'Forest Creek'. And it too, intersects again with the same **Old Ranch Rd**. As two different Fire Dept personnel have told me, should **Old Ranch Rd**. be blocked by fire, vehicle accident or a hazmat issue then the entire development is stuck in place unable to evacuate.

It's pretty clear that the original annexation plan to have Thunder Mountain provide a west exit to Powers was reasonable and safe. I mention this because **Fire Inspector Steve Smith** 'requested' a second access road 'other than from the south' (**Old Ranch Rd**.) due to housing density and schools. (See attached) Instead the Fire Marshall, *overrode* the recommendation of the Fire Inspector stating that our current one-direction in is '*not desirable but workable*'. But this is the same City Official pointing to the success of the Waldo Canyon event.....where the area had dozens of lanes out in three directions.

It is our sincerest hope that losing 35 streets of homes, and 345 homes and two dead will not be the way our beautiful city measures 'success'.

So as Mr. Bryant asked, 'Does planning indeed recommend 2 exit routes for a development'...Please let us know, what is the verbiage in city code?

And why, with over 665,000 wildfire acre burns last year are we having to argue about a wildfire threat for Kettle Creek when they are building up to the tree line in the Kettle Creek Canyon?

If Venezia and Classic Homes wants to build doesn't the city have any responsibility to insure over 2,500 students and staff along with over 1,100 home owners families have TWO different directions to get out when fire rips through Kettle Creek Canyon and through the forests that line Cordera Crest homes.....we all have only Old Ranch Rd as a way out!

When an *evac order goes out*...will the elementary school just release 600 young kids onto the street or hasn't anyone realized parents will be making a mad rush into North Fork development and **Old Ranch Rd** to pick up their little ones.

We have to really wonder what type of planning is being done and the seemingly, so far, empty promises of preserving 'safety'. These kids, for the elementary school (600) and high school (1,600), will be coming from all over the surrounding area and they ALL have only Old Ranch Rd. to come in and leave.....

Really, this is inconvenient for the developer to pay for a new access road that was originally planned and sealed with promise by the vote to annex.....this road, either north or west bound, if built, is the infrastructure we must expect and demand. Never in our history has it been more lucrative for the developers and builders....never have prices been this high, yet they begrudge those they sell to the basic infrastructure to leave in the event of a fire? So once they sell the land and build, thousands of people will be left with the 'plan' City Planning requires for *safe* growth. We won't look to the developer or builder then.....we will point fingers at our public officials that are required to set some standards of safety. We will show the press our emails. We will say those names when we speak about the losses.

When something happens, a house fire that rages through the development, a wildfire that sets dozens of homes and the schools afire, a gas leak explosion that destroys access and escape these emails will show that City Planning officially, first by the Fire Inspector and the City Council was contacted dozens of times and all City Officials were warned. That creates a severe liability for City Planning. Not the developers....as you represent the current and future residents.

And as Todd Frisbie told our North Fork Safety First committee on April 20th, his department's concerns are for the safety of the intersections....not the development. So please realize and have no illusions....Traffic Managers cannot approve anything as *safe* beyond the intersections....and his comments to disregard this request for access is not within his jurisdiction and to comment about evacuation is not his purview or right to judge.

In closing, if you lived here, saw the backed up traffic in the morning only a few months before the new elementary school opens adding over 800 kids and staff, you might reconsider where you might safely send your kids to school. With the nearby Briargate fire and Waldo Canyon fire and losses still fresh, the threat of wildfire where homes are adjacent to forests.....North Fork and Cordera homes...does not require us to connect too many dots to not require some basics for evacuation routes.

Right now, North Fork homes do not sit adjacent to the Kettle Creek meadow trees and canyon....but allowing homes in Kettle Creek meadow next to the canyon and hundreds of trees highlights the need for the developer to provide a north or west bound access road BEFORE they build. Building adds a bridge of homes to burn that could sweep through Kettle Creek into North Fork.....we hope these are hard won lessons learned.

Please put yourself and your family in our 'shoes'. Please return our areas approved and planned second in/out road. The one that was planned for and approved in the annexation. We look forward to speaking with you on May 20th.

Please represent the citizens of our beautiful city first, over the developers.... Yes, Let them build **SAFELY**....the 'safely' is on City Planning.

Thanks for your time and dedication to our city's safe growth!

Greg and Aida Edwards
11736 Thunder Mountain Ave., 80908
713.364.2542

On Fri, May 14, 2021 at 3:34 PM Sam Bryant <samanddarcy@aol.com> wrote:

Yes, thank you Elena. Our concern is the Kettle Creek North development and their lack of a second egress/ingress road for that neighborhood. Their **ONLY** exit is to go through

our neighborhood of North Fork on Thunder Mountain Ave. I believe this is a high safety hazard and is EASILY mitigated by having the builder add a second road to the Kettle Creek North development. I also believe it violates city code since it does not have 2 egress/ingress roads for this development and it forces drivers to use Thunder Mountain Ave.

I will send you more info so that you can forward to all the planning commissioners.

Many thanks,

Samuel Bryant
3456 Wind Waker Way
C/S, CO 80908

-----Original Message-----

From: Lobato, Elena <Elena.Lobato@coloradosprings.gov>

To: Sam Bryant <samanddarcy@aol.com>

Cc: rs@truevine.net <rs@truevine.net>; grededwards2542@gmail.com <grededwards2542@gmail.com>; ryanmmiller@hotmail.com <ryanmmiller@hotmail.com>; Van Nimwegen, Hannah <Hannah.VanNimwegen@coloradosprings.gov>

Sent: Fri, May 14, 2021 9:23 am

Subject: RE: Kettle Creek North

Hello Mr. Bryant,

Thank you for reaching out to me. Our next Planning Commission meeting is on May 20 and I have included the link to join the meeting via MS Teams, as well as put the call in number and conference id in case you can't join by computer.

Please confirm that this inquiry is regarding Kettle Creek North project. I googled your address to see what part of town you lived in order to find the project I thought you might be interested in.

There is an appeal of the Kettle Creek North project that will be heard on May 20 where the Planning Commissioners will be hearing this item. Since this is a quasi-judicial item, the commissioners are not allowed to have any ex-parte communications regarding anything there is a hearing on.

All communications to the commissioners have to come from staff. I will be happy to forward any emails or letters to the commissioners for you, but we need to get that right away for the commissioners to review before next Thursday. However, if you are unable to get me the communication before then, you are more than welcome to join the meeting and give your input at that time.

The chair will open up remarks to the public and allow three minutes per person. Again, I have included the information below with the link to join via MS Teams.

The commissioners were provided all public comments that were sent to the case planner, Hannah Van Nimwegen-McGuire. We can forward any late communications to them until next Wednesday, as we have to give them time to review the information.

You can also view the agenda with all the documents included before the meeting, which is exactly what the commissioners review. Here is the link to that agenda: [City of Colorado Springs - Planning Commission \(legistar.com\)](https://legistar.com/City_of_Colorado_Springs_-_Planning_Commission)

Please don't hesitate to contact me or the case planner, Hannah, if you have further questions.

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

+1 720-617-3426,,81513701# United States, Denver

Phone Conference ID: 815 137 01#

Warmest Regards,

~ Elena

elena.lobato@coloradosprings.gov

719.385.5608

From: Sam Bryant <samanddarcy@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 6:00 PM
To: Lobato, Elena <Elena.Lobato@coloradosprings.gov>
Cc: rs@truevine.net; gregedwards2542@gmail.com; ryanmmiller@hotmail.com
Subject:

CAUTION! - External Email. Malware is most commonly spread through unknown email attachments and links. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email!

Hi Elena,

Can you please send me the names and emails for each of the planning commissioners. We would like to update on our concerns for an upcoming meeting.

Thanks,

Sam Bryant

3456 Wind Waker Way, 80908

--

Greg Edwards
(713) 364-2542

**COLORADO SPRINGS FIRE PREVENTION
PLAN REVIEW REPORT**

March 23, 2021

Tax Id: 620000698

DSN: CPC PUP 19-0091

Project Description: Kettle Creek North. Located southeast of Powers Boulevard and Interquest Parkway, west of Howell Road.

SYSTEMS:

CN:Code: IBC - IFC - PPRBC /**Class:** / **Const:** /**Stories:** /**Size:** /**OL:**

FH:Required Flow: gpm /# Hydrants /On site flow:

DV: Proposing two different parcels will different proposed densities.

Additional Comments:

Business Name:

Address:

Plan Id: 20191380-CP-1

Plan Description: CONCEPT PLN

Plan Status: Disapproved

Contractor: NES, INC

Review Status: DISAPPROVED

Plan Reviewer: Smith, Steven D

Review Date: 10/24/2019

Status

Disapproved

Comment

Due to the large amount of anticipated lots that are accessible only from the south along Old Ranch Road, another access point to this area other than from the south is requested. This will aide in future fire apparatus response times.